



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 2044 019 278 563

C
157
10



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Bind flat

THE
SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL,

THE
SECOND OF NICEA, HELD A.D. 787,
IN WHICH

THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES WAS ESTABLISHED :

WITH COPIOUS NOTES

FROM

(1)

THE "CAROLINE BOOKS,"

COMPILED BY ORDER OF CHARLEMAGNE FOR ITS CONFUTATION.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINALS

BY THE REV. JOHN MENDHAM, M.A.,

RECTOR OF CLOPHILL, BEDS.

LONDON:
WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, 342, STRAND.

1850.

157.10

*Request of
Convers Francis, D.D.
& Cambridge.*

C 157.10

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

NOV 25 1987

EMENDATIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

INTRODUCTION.

- Page VIII., line 9, for "so," read "no."
" XLVI., " 2, after "O," read "Sun."
" LIV., " 26, dele the word "by."
" LXL., " 27, for "hydulia," read "hyperdulia."

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Read the pages from XCVI. to CIII.

ANTE-CONCILIAR DOCUMENTS.

- Page VII., line 6, for "we," read "and."

SESSION THE FIRST.

- Page 11, line 24 (note), after the word "remission," add. "of sins: and the."
" 18, " 20, for "us," read "in."
" 18, " 22, after "brought," insert "in."
" 35, " 23, for "did," read "judged."

SESSION THE SECOND.

- Page 45, line 5, for "in," read "on."
" 46, " 23, for "it is," read "is it."
" 46, " 25, after "head," place "I"
" 52, " 33, after "may," insert "be."
" 60, " 9, for "it," read "they."
" 61, " 8, for "fill," read "fills."
" 66, " 1, for "of," read "if."
" 72, " 15, for "with," read "was."
" 73, " 3 (last note), for "of," read "in."

SESSION THE THIRD.

- Page 91, line 9, for "his," read "their."
" 95, " 18, for "as Lamb," read "Lamb as."
" 103, " 25 (note), for "never," read "ever."
" 112, " 8, for "too," read "two."
" 121, " 10, for "do," read "does."
" 121, " 12, dele ";" put "," and add "and."

SESSION THE FOURTH.

- Page 127, line 26, for "either," read "other."
" 134, " 1, for "sn," read "son."
" 135, " 7, for "in," read "indeed."
" 138, " 9, dele the word "from."
" 152, " 18 (note), dele the word "not."
" 164, " 34 (note), after "Christians," dele the word "do."

EMENDATIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

- „ 178, „ 32 (note), after “know,” read “not.”
 „ 173, „ (last line of note), for “it is,” read “is it.”
 „ 180, „ 9, for “that all,” read “all that.”
 „ 181, „ 3 (note), for “Justus,” read “Justin.”
 „ 203, „ 23 (note), for “and,” read “from that of the.”
 „ 251, „ 2 (note), for “interpret,” read “apply.”
 „ 251, „ 16 (note), for “spoken of, such,” read “spoken of such persons.”

SESSION THE FIFTH.

- Page 265, line 6 (note), for “even,” read “were.”
 „ 274, „ 18, for “exposes,” read “exults.”

SESSION THE SIXTH.

- Page 311, line 25, for “Vinters,” read “Vintners.”
 „ 316, „ 26 (note), for “eight,” read “eighth.”
 „ 337, „ 1 (note), dele the word “that.”
 „ 349, „ 24, after “those;” read “who.”
 „ 369, „ 8, for “Mother, God,” read “Mother of God.”
 „ 376, „ 5, for “flesh,” read “faith.”
 „ 376, „ 6, for “right,” read “sight.”
 „ 377, „ 6, after “but,” insert a comma (,).
 „ 377, „ 7, for “letter. We,” read “letter, we.”
 „ 377, „ 7, before the word “to,” insert “relating.”
 „ 332, „ 10, before “admit,” insert “should.”
 „ 337, „ 14, for “for,” read “from.”
 „ 402, „ 14, for “as,” read “at.”
 „ 406, „ last line of the text, for “been grafted into the Church,”
 read “in Churches has been confirmed.”
 „ 416, „ 5, for “he,” read “the.”
 „ 418, „ 9, after the word “making,” insert “it.”
 „ 421, „ 8, for “ault,” read “fault.”
 „ 428, „ last line of the text, for “his,” read “sin.”
 „ 428, „ 9 (note), before “decrees,” read “the.”
 „ 431, „ 22, for “are ed,” read “are led.”
 „ 434, „ last line of note, for “rowardness,” read “frowardness.”

SESSION THE SEVENTH.

- Page 447, line 35-6, for “viaible,” read “riaible.”

SESSION THE EIGHTH.

- Page 464, line 33, place the words “requested them,” after the word
 “Council.”
 „ 465, „ 1, for “Stausarius,” read “Stauranius.”
 „ 465, „ 12, before “King,” insert “O heavenly.”
 „ 463, „ 2, for “directed the way, and now that,” read “directed
 now this way and now that.”

TO

The Right Honourable the Earl de Grey, K.G.,

LORD LIEUTENANT OF THE COUNTY OF BEDFORD.

THIS TRANSLATION

OF

THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL

IS

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

HIS HUMBLE AND MUCH OBLIGED SERVANT.

The Rector of Clapham.

1

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

THE worship of images, for the establishment of which the Second Council of Nice was called together, was one of those corruptions of Christianity which crept into the Church stealthily and almost without notice or observation. This corruption did not, like other heresies, develope itself at once, for in that case it would have met with decided censure and rebuke : but, making its commencement under a fair disguise, so gradually was one practice after another introduced in connection with it, that the Church had become deeply steeped in practical idolatry, not only without any efficient opposition, but almost without any decided remonstrance ; and when at length an endeavour was made to root it out, the evil was found too deeply fixed to admit of removal.*

That the worship paid to images in the eighth century was not primitive—that it had not its original with the Gospel as it has so often been asserted—is proved alike by the history of that early period, and by the fathers who lived in those ages. Not only do we find no allusion in those writers to any such reverence of images as the Council of Nice enjoins, but, on the

* See Chemnitz, " Examen Concil. Trid.," para. iiiii. loc. ii., pp. 40-47, ed. 1707.

contrary, language utterly inconsistent with it: and from their way of arguing against the Gentiles we may very fairly infer that no such practice was ever known amongst them as that of bowing the head to images, prostration before them, or the offering of incense or lighting of candles, all which practices are now adopted alike by the Church of the East and of the West. Many passages might be selected from Tertullian, Origen, Arnobius, and others, which certainly could not have been written by them if they had held the same sentiments with their successors of the eighth century. Thus Arnobius (lib. vi. p. 195) declares, "That if the gods be in heaven, it is a folly to direct our eyes to stones, and wood, and walls, when we address ourselves to them; and that rather we ought to direct our eyes to heaven, where we believe they are." Lactantius (lib. ii. cap. 2) argues that "images are either for the commemoration of the dead or of the absent: it being, therefore, a folly to adore either the dead or the absent, it must be much more folly to adore their images." Tertullian yet more strongly asserts that "the Devil brought into the world the artificers of statues and images." Such were the sentiments of the writers of the primitive ages. Would they have used language so strong and unequivocal as this, had they been accustomed to worship images themselves?

How, then, did it come to pass that a practice so strongly condemned in the pages of the Old Testament, and against which we find so express a testimony in the close of the first epistle of St. John—"Little children, keep yourselves from idols"—a practice utterly unknown in the purest ages of the Church—should so gain ground as to be made in after ages a test of orthodoxy—so much so, that they who would not worship

images were anathematized as Heretics, Pagans, Manichæans, and Mohammedans ?

It must be traced to the idolatrous tendency of the human heart, and its propensity to serve the creature more than the Creator. Taking advantage of this, the great enemy of souls, who led the human race astray in times of old after gods many and lords many, rested not till he had seduced the Christian Church into like error: turning Christians aside, first, from Christ to Saint and Angel mediators; and then, from pure and spiritual worship, to the worship of images and pictures. The Church had been assailed by fierce persecution: against this she had stood her ground, and by the grace of God was made more than conqueror. But though equal and even superior to all the assaults made by the enemy in this way, she was less on her guard against the attempts afterwards too successfully made to sully her purity and corrupt her simplicity: by adversity she was made great—in her prosperity was her fall.

Heresies had not, indeed, been wanting from the first to distress and perplex, but she was on her guard and they were speedily silenced; but afterwards the enemy found a new way of corrupting the truth—by the underhand introduction of unscriptural practices which should bring it to none effect. Thus while the Church seemed all glorious without, within it was full of corruption, formality, and hypocrisy. By none of her corruptions has the purity and spirituality of the Church been more seriously injured than by that of image worship—a practice distinguished from Gentile idolatry in little else than in name. The progress, however, of this corruption was very gradual. Images and pictures were at first introduced into churches not to be worshipped, but either in the place of books to give instruction to those who could

not read, or to excite devotion in the minds of others. How far they ever answered such a purpose is doubtful ; but, even granting that this was the case for a time, it soon ceased to be so, and it was found that pictures and images brought into churches darkened rather than enlightened the minds of the ignorant—degraded rather than exalted the devotion of the worshipper. So that, however they might have been intended to direct men's minds to God, they ended in turning them from Him to the worship of created things.

There are three successive æras through which we may trace the progress of this corruption. The First æra extends from the Apostolic age to that of Constantine the Great, during which period images were not admitted into churches at all. The Second æra dates from the time of Constantine to that of Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great : in this period, though images were admitted into churches, there is no record of any worship being paid to them. The Third æra is that which followed the time of Gregory, in which images were everywhere set up in churches and worshipped, and this brings us to the time when Leo and his successors made so noble and so ineffectual a struggle against this corruption.

Concerning the first of these periods we find no other testimony of any importance brought forward by the advocates of image worship, either as to the making or worshipping of images, than the instance recorded by Eusebius of the woman of Paneas. It was said that this woman, after having received the cure of her disease as mentioned in the Gospels, returned to Paneas, her own city, and that she set up in one of the streets an image of the Saviour, and of herself kneeling at his feet. But it requires little consideration to see how

feeble is this testimony, whether considered as a proof of the existence of image worship in those early centuries, or as an example to be imitated by Christians in after ages in their religious worship. This image is set up not in a *church*, but in a *street*; not by a *bishop* or a *priest*, but by a *woman*; not in a *Christian*, but a *Pagan* manner; for, as Eusebius expressly adds, this and like things were done by the heathen after a *Gentile* custom. This however was the only proof that the Nicene divines ventured to bring forward in favour of their assertion that the worship of images had existed from the first origin of the Gospel, or that they could produce from the history of the three best centuries of the Church's existence. As to the canon of the pretended Council of Antioch, which enjoined Christians to carry about with them the image of Christ, or the picture of Christ said to be sent by him to King Abgarus, or those other pictures of Christ and the Virgin said to be drawn by St. Luke, they are generally abandoned as alike devoid of all credit and probability. Indeed, it is allowed even by some of the most ardent favourers of this corruption that such was not the practice of the Church during this period, and they labour to justify the omission by pleas of expediency.

We come now to the second period commencing with the establishment of Christianity, under Constantine, and extending to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great. That during this period images were pretty generally admitted into churches cannot be denied; but that there was any authorized worship of them, or that the worship of them was considered in any way a Christian duty during the same period, cannot be proved. The testimonies, as far as they are genuine, which were selected by the Nicene divines from the fathers who

flourished during these centuries, prove that images were, indeed, set up in Churches, Martyria, Basilicæ, and the like, but not that they were worshipped. Still, though the worship of them was not authorized, it had begun by degrees to creep into the Church ; and those who might at first come to pictures for instruction had begun to look upon them as gods. Hence we find on record protests against such superstition made by men of ~~so~~ small eminence and authority in the Church. Early in the fourth century the Council of Elibiris, or Elvira, amongst many others, enacted the following Canon :— “ It is agreed that pictures ought not to be in churches, lest what is worshipped or adored should be painted on walls.” The Iconoclastic Council of Constantinople brought forward testimonies from the writings of Theodotus, Amphilochius and Epiphanius. The words of Epiphanius are :—“ In this respect be mindful, my beloved children, to introduce no images into churches, nor into the cemeteries of the Saints, nor yet into private houses : for it is not fitting for a Christian to be led by the sight of the eyes, or by the fancies of other people’s minds.” The protest of Epiphanius was not always confined to words, for on one occasion he is said to have done that which, had he lived in the times of the second Nicene Council, would have brought down anathema upon his head ; but, had he lived later still, he might have been compelled to expiate by fire or the sword.

The record is preserved in a letter written to a friend, in which he states that, as he was entering into a church at Anabathla, he saw on a veil an image of Christ or of some Saint, and that he tore the same in pieces, advising the keepers of the place to use it as a shroud for some dead pauper ; and when the keepers of the place murmured, and urged that he

ought to give them another veil in its place, he made them a promise that he would do so, and, in consequence, did send another, without any image upon it.

Towards the close of this century flourished Pope Gregory the Great : between him and Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, passed some letters on this subject. Serenus, indignant at the fast increasing superstition which, by means of images and pictures, was coming in like a flood, endeavoured to stem the torrent by causing them to be instantly banished from the churches of his diocese. This excited great anger amongst the blind devotees with which his diocese abounded, and an appeal was made to Pope Gregory on the subject.

Two letters are extant from Gregory to Serenus in both which the same doctrine is maintained—that images were to be *had*, but not to be worshipped. Gregory frankly allowed that Serenus was right in forbidding the worship of images ; but he sharply rebuked him for breaking or destroying them, because he considered them as absolutely necessary for the ignorant and unlearned who could not read. In the first letter he says : —“ Your zeal that nothing made with hands should be worshipped we praise ; but we still think that you ought not to have broken the images in pieces : for it is on this account that images have been set up in churches, that they who cannot read may obtain that knowledge by looking on walls which they could not obtain from books.” And, in the second letter, after advising Serenus how to act in respect to the scandal which his breaking of images had caused, he concludes thus :—“ If any would make images, by no means forbid him ; but to worship images by all means avoid—
ADORARE IMAGINES VERO OMNIBUS MODIS DEVITA.”

We come now to the last of these three periods—the

centuries which followed the Pontificate of Gregory the Great. In these was fully established this fatal corruption, which almost, more than any other, gives to Christianity the appearance of Paganism. Image-worship and picture-worship continued to gain ground without remonstrance or check for a hundred and twenty years together, when at length an honest and well-meant attempt was made to recover the simplicity and spirituality of Christian worship. The controversy began in the East and extended to the West. In the East, the endeavour was made to get rid of images and their worship together : in the West, the vain attempt was made to retain images in their places while their worship was forbidden ; but neither in East or West was the opposition effectual. After a lengthened struggle superstition and idolatry gained the victory, and ever since have maintained their conquest, save in those countries where the light of true Christianity has been brought back by the Reformation.

We will now give a succinct account of the rise, progress, and final suppression of this well-meant endeavour to rid the Church of her idols of gold and silver, brass, stone, and wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk. The opponents of this superstition were called Iconoclasts—a name descriptive of their practice as destroyers or breakers of idols ; but they were, furthermore, styled “*Christiano-categori*,” or calumniators of Christians, as if, in calling images idols, or worshippers of images idolators, they were bringing against the one and the other charges which they could not prove, and which were, therefore, nothing else than mere calumny. The rise of this so-styled heresy took place early in the eighth century, in the tenth year of the reign of the Emperor Leo III., surnamed the Isaurian. This

Prince was called to the throne of the East at a time when the empire needed an intrepid defender against her powerful and no less inveterate foes the Saracens. In this respect, at least, he did not disappoint the hopes of his country : he defeated both Saracens and Bulgarians, and obtained for the empire what she long had needed—the blessing of peace. “ Leo (says a modern writer*) reignèd with glory : beloved by his subjects, dreaded by the Saracens, he seemed to have been placed on the throne by heaven itself that he might restore the empire to its ancient splendour. He would, indeed, have been a great Prince, if he had not united to the love of reigning that of being a Reformer—an enterprise both delicate and dangerous in matters of religion.”

There are many fabulous reasons given by the Byzantine historians for this change in his views concerning image-worship ; but it may not be difficult to find a very fair reason for it from the nature of the thing itself, taken in connection with the peculiar circumstances in which Leo was placed. That the taunts of unbelievers, no less true than galling, urged against Christianity by its adversaries on account of this prevailing corruption had its weight with the Emperor in causing this change in his views, we may fairly infer from the words of Pope Gregory II. in his first letter. For thus he writes to Leo :—“ And hast thou scandalized the whole world, because thou hadst not courage to brave death, but hadst rather defend thyself by a sinful apology ?” Evidently the Pope deemed Leo’s regard to the charges made against image-worship as the result of cowardice, and a desire to disarm opposition by improper compliance ; whereas, from the known character of Leo for intrepidity, we may rather look upon it as the result of conviction on his own part of the truth of these

* Le Beau, “ Hist. du Bas Empire,” vol. xiii., p. 312.

reproaches, strengthened and confirmed by the representations of his counsellors and advisers. How often had it been brought before him that the image-worship practised by Christians was a great stumbling-block to the opponents of Christianity, and that they looked on the Church as absolutely idolatrous on that account! The Emperor, instead of treating these charges with contempt, began to examine whether there was not much truth contained in them?—whether it might not be that Jews and Mohammedans, however erroneous in other respects, were right in this?—and whether the Church, however defensible in other respects, was not indefensible in this? Nor was it want of proper firmness, from whatever quarter the censure might come, to remove that which was so scandalous and objectionable. For if ever the proverb, “*Fas est et ab inimicis doceri,*” was applicable, it was at this present crisis.

Leo is reported to have had two principal advisers—one of the senatorial and one of the episcopal rank. The name of the former was Beser: he had been in captivity amongst the Saracens, where it is reported that he denied the faith, whence he was styled *the God-denying*; but this apostacy may well be doubted of, since there is no other proof than the surmise of an enemy. It is possible that, from his Saracen masters, he might have learned this—that image worship and idolatry were counted but one by all the Church’s foes, and that Christians were looked upon as enemies of God because of their habitual breach of His commandment; that, therefore, it had become highly necessary to remove such stumbling blocks from the Church, and by a timely reformation to take such charges as that of idolatry out of the mouth of its adversaries. On the recovery of his liberty, and the

consequent return to the imperial court, he lost no time in communicating his sentiments on this head to the Emperor. The other adviser of Leo on this occasion was Constantine Bishop of Nacolia : he had come to the conclusion that created things ought not to be worshipped, nor was this conviction confined to himself; many others were of the same mind. From the letter of Germanus to John Bishop of the Synadensian we learn what his views were on this subject ; for in this letter he is represented as thus defending himself, when accused by certain persons, before the Patriarch :—" Seeing that the words of Scripture so expressly declare, Thou shalt not make any manner likeness to worship it, neither of things in heaven, nor of things on the earth, I have taught that we ought not to worship things made with the hand, or in any way constructed and put together by man." Such were his sentiments on this subject ; neither did the lofty prosy reply of Germanus to him make any abridgement or alteration in them.

To the remonstrances of his friends, as well as to his own rational convictions, the Emperor yielded himself and commenced his ever-memorable reform. That Leo was confirmed in his intentions by these two friends we have the testimony of Theophanes, who tells us " that Leo the Emperor, being infected with the same lawless and bitter pravity of sentiment,* found a man of like mind in one Beser, who, for his strength of body and unity of mind, was highly honoured by him, and to these was united in the same views, he, ever full of all impurity and ever living in a correspon-

* Namely—that of hatred to images, which Jezid, Sultan of the Saracens had displayed. See the history of this man and his Iconoclastic persecutions as recorded by John, pretended Legate of the East, in the Fifth Session of the Second Nicene Council towards the close.

ing contempt of discipline—the Bishop of Nacolia.” We are further told by the same historian that the Emperor’s convictions were quickened by the bursting out of a submarine volcano between the islands of Thera and Theranea, which covered the sea and the adjacent lands for miles round with pumice stones. “For (he writes) the Emperor, considering this as a mark of God’s anger against him, stirred up a most shameful war against holy and venerable images, having for his fellow warriors the God-denying Beser his equal in brutality.” It is not unlikely that this occurrence might have some influence with him, but certainly it was not the sole nor even the chief cause of his opposition.

The first public declaration of his sentiments was put forth with great moderation. This we learn from his inveterate opponent, John Damascen, who gives the following account in his life of St. Stephen the younger : “When Leo, the Isaurian Emperor, had reached the tenth year of his reign, having assembled the senatorial order, he vomited out that impious and absurd declaration, ‘*That pictures of images had but too much the appearance of idols, and that no worship ought to be paid to them, lest from want of care we be led to worship other things instead of God.*’ And he afterwards added, ‘*But my proposition is, not that they be utterly destroyed, but that they should be set up on high, that no one may touch them with his mouth, and in this way bring a scandal upon things otherwise worthy of honour.*’” Such was the way in which the Emperor unfolded his views, which however, to the bigoted historian it might appear impious and absurd, to every candid and impartial mind appears both moderate, pious, and rational. It is plain from this expression of his sentiments that Leo, in the first instance, intended to have retained

the *via media* inculcated by Gregory in his letter to Serenus, and so strongly enforced by the divines of Charlemagne in the "Caroline Books." But the fierce opposition which he had to encounter in respect of this moderate reform urged him onwards to more stringent measures, and led him from merely aiming to keep images in churches from being worshipped to seek their entire removal and extinction.

A reform so extensive had been hard to carry into execution, without most violent opposition, had the heads and rulers of the Church been favourably disposed towards it: how much more was this likely to be the case when they were entirely averse, and used all their influence in favour of this corruption? Pope Gregory II. and the Œcumenic Patriarch Germanus were in no respect so much united as in this—a zeal in behalf of images. Gregory in his epistle to the Patriarch declares that the letter he has received from him, notifying his zeal in this cause, had made his soul leap within him for joy and a new life to invigorate his frame. As might be expected, Leo met with most decided opposition from both the one and the other.

The Greek Patriarch with whom Leo first entered into conference on this subject was more mild in his manner, but not at all less determined in his resistance than Pope Gregory—less abusive in his language, but equally absurd in the arguments which he brought forward. The Patriarch gave the following reasons for his stedfast adherence to this worship:—First, its great antiquity—that from the very commencement of the Gospel the *Theandric* image of Christ and the image of the Virgin had been everywhere set up in churches and had been worshipped by all Christians—that this worship had now endured for seven hundred and twenty-six years, and had never been objected to by any but by the Emperor

Leo. Secondly, that it was sanctioned by our Saviour Himself, who made an image of Himself by placing a handkerchief over His face ; that this image was transmitted by one of the apostles to Abgarus king of Edessa, whom it cured of a painful disease under which he laboured. Thirdly, the example of an evangelist is alleged : for we are told that St. Luke* was accustomed to make pictures of the Virgin. And lastly, the Patriarch added the pretended authority of Councils,† which, as he declared, had ever enjoined the making and the worship of images. The Patriarch concludes this conference with the Emperor thus :—“ Wherefore, I would that you should know, O Emperor, that, if you intend to confirm and establish your impious decree, you will never have me as your ally ; but you shall find that I am ready and prepared to shed my blood for Christ’s image, who refused not to shed His precious blood for my fallen and ruined image.” ‡

Shortly after the publication of the Emperor’s edict, the inhabitants of the Cyclades rose up in actual rebellion against their Sovereign. They elected a new Emperor, and in full reliance on the aid of Mary and the Saints, whose pictures and images they had risen up to defend, they set sail for Constantinople in order to place him on the throne of the East in the stead of

* Gregory in his letter to the Emperor enlarges much on this sanction given to painting in apostolic times. Not only was Luke according to him a painter of images, but all Christ-loving men who were present at the day of Pentecost, and that they made images of not the Virgin only, but of St. Stephen, St. James, and indeed of many other martyrs besides, by means of which they converted the world.

† Gregory on the other hand considered that Councils had no more need to say anything about images than about eating or drinking ; for that the Bishops who attended them were as much accustomed to carry images about with them as to take their daily meals.

‡ Unless Christ died for the image of Germanus, this antithesis loses its force ; for Germanus declares his readiness to die, not *for Christ*, but for *His image* ; but by this word *image* different things are meant—viz., the image of Christ was the picture of Christ, but the image of Germanus for which Christ died was not a picture, but himself. But how can a man be his own image.

Leo. Their dependence was vain—their fleet was destroyed—their new Emperor, together with the commander of the fleet, were taken captive—their wooden and painted deities could not help them : for, as says the Prophet, “they could not deliver the burthen, but themselves are gone into captivity” (Isaiah xlv. 2). The Emperor Leo showed much clemency towards these rebels : except the commander of the expedition, and the usurper who had accompanied him, none suffered : the rest were allowed to return to their homes unpunished. By some Greek and Romish writers the punishment of these rebels was magnified into a bloody persecution. A more candid Romanist, M. Le Beau, says, on the contrary—“This Prince, magnanimous where *heretical* caprice did not influence his anger, signaled his clemency in this affair by contenting him with putting to death only Cosmas the rebel Emperor, and Stephen the rebel commandant.”

This insurrection having been quelled, Leo was more determined than ever to put in force his edict for the destruction of pictures and images—in other words, to purify the Church from her idolatries. For he was now inclined to carry his reform to a greater extent than at the first he intended, having been by this time convinced that the worship of pictures and images could in no other way be abolished than by the destruction of the images themselves.

A Council of Bishops and Senators was again convened in which the subject of the previous meeting was re-considered ; and, with the exception of the Patriarch Germanus, the determination to remove images entirely from all churches was unanimous. He, having declared that images were not only to be set up as of old, but to be worshipped also, with an intrepidity worthy of a

better cause, added in conclusion—"But if I am the Jonas to prevent the peace of the Church, cast me into the sea ; for without a General Council never can I be induced to make innovations in that faith which is in accordance with the doctrine of the Scriptures and the tradition of the Fathers." And having said this, he put off his pall, renounced the Patriarchate, retired to his own palace, and lived the remainder of his days in undisturbed quiet.

Some historians have represented that the departure of Germanus from the Council was accompanied with violence, and that he was, notwithstanding his great age, driven forth with blows and imprecations ; and others, in order to make Leo yet more odious as a persecutor and Germanus more glorious as a martyr, have added that he was brutally dragged from his house and strangled in his hundredth year. Both these accounts, however, may be dismissed as fables—the inventions of after times—for in contemporary authors they are nowhere to be met with.

A new and more complying Patriarch was found in Anastasius, who had been Chancellor to Germanus. The choice was in some respects unfortunate, as he was a man of unsteady principle, which occasioned him to take part with the usurper Artabasus against Constantine the lawful Emperor, and by a communication which implied at least great breach of confidence, if it were not altogether a fabrication, to excite a general rebellion against him, by which he brought disgrace upon himself and discredit upon his profession. His death is by the Greek writers represented as a judgment. The election of Anastasius as Patriarch in the place of Germanus, and the first attempt to put the Emperor's edict into execution, became the occasion of an outbreak at Con-

stantinople, which was put down with no more violence or bloodshed than was the previous insurrection of the inhabitants of the Cyclades.

The officers of the Emperor had commenced their work at his own palace by the destruction of an image which stood over the brazen gate. It was called *Antiphoneta*, and was celebrated for many a pretended miracle. While engaged in execution of the orders they had received, they were surrounded by a turbulent mob composed mainly of women. An officer, named Jubinus Spatharocandidatus, was already mounted on the ladder with the axe in his hand intending to strike down the idol : the women first used entreaties and adjurations to induce him to spare it ; but when deaf to all their prayers, he had given the first stroke, their grief turning to fury, they drew away the ladder from under him, and when fallen they trampled him to death under their feet. Thus far successful, they flew from the palace to the great church, where the newly created Patriarch was performing divine service : here (as one of their approvers declares), " casting off all shame for the sake of Christ, they discharged a shower of stones at the Patriarch, styling him hireling, wolf, traitor, heretic, and any other opprobrious name which occurred to their minds. The Patriarch, having received many wounds, was forced to flee for safety to the imperial palace : the Emperor provoked, not indeed without cause, sent forth his guards to quell these disturbances : many of the rioters fell in the first onset, and some of the more rebellious and audacious were afterwards punished according to their deserts. Theophanes, no friend to Leo, describes the whole proceeding as follows :—" The people of the royal city, being exceedingly grieved at the new doctrines, took council to

destroy Leo himself, and did actually kill some of the King's officers who were engaged in destroying the image of the Lord which stood over the great brazen gate : wherefore, he punished many of them for their *piety* with mutilations and stripes, fines and exile, and specially those who were illustrious by birth or learning." * In these proceedings of Leo we see nothing but the punishment of rebels against lawful authority, and there is no trace of that persecution which fills the pages of Baronius, Maimbourg, and others.

As far as the East was concerned, Leo seemed to have accomplished his design with little or no violence : his steady firmness bore down all opposition. Images were everywhere cast out of churches : if made of stone or wood, they were broken ; if painted on canvass, they were torn in pieces ; and, if painted on the walls, they were erased or blotted out. Thus, the Emperor had the satisfaction of seeing the Eastern portion of his dominions cleansed in a great measure from the idolatries which had so long defiled the Church.

After a glorious reign of twenty-four years, he died at a mature age of a dropsy, which ended in a dysentery. Maimbourg and others have been very anxious to make a divine judgment out of his death, as if no orthodox person had died of dysenteries, or as if that disease was at all more a token of the divine wrath than any other. Indeed, had he lived longer and died of any other complaint, it would with such writers have been considered a mark of God's anger. And for what is God by these men represented as being angry with Leo ?—for an earnest, simple, desire to cause the second commandment to be observed ! Theophanes tells us, that he

* Theop. Chronograph, A.M. 6218, A.D. 718.

died both body and soul ; and Cardinal Baronius on quoting these words, lest any should fail to understand what was intended, adds carefully—not to say spitefully—*nimirum detrusus ad inferos*. He left his crown and his sentiments to his son Constantine V. ; before proceeding to the history of whose reign we must give a short sketch of events which took place in Italy and the West.

Leo invited Pope Gregory II., as well as Germanus the Patriarch, to co-operation with himself in the good work in which he was about to engage ; but from the Pope he met with opposition no less decided than from the Patriarch, while it was accompanied with every expression of scorn, contempt, and defiance. The Pope well knew how powerless the Emperor was in Italy, and that there was but little likelihood he would be able to carry anything there by force. In his letter to Leo, therefore, he observes no moderation, and rather endeavours to provoke the Emperor by reproaches than to prevail with him by argument. He uses several of the same arguments which Germanus had used, but he brings them forward in a very different manner. Germanus had urged his pleas with mildness—Gregory, as it were, hurls them at the Emperor with bitter scorn. He accuses the Emperor of stupidity and obstinacy, of turning aside his people from prayers and worshipping God, to worldly, trifling, and vain occupations. He does just condescend to answer the Emperor's argument taken from the Old Testament prohibition of idols : he tells him that this command was to restrain the Israelites from the idolatries of the land of Canaan into which they were about to enter, not to prevent the formation of images for worship. For that the same God who forbade the former, raised up also Bezaleel and Aholiab for the very purpose of making

the latter for the tabernacle. Again, he declares, now that Christ had brought light into the world all was changed, for now was fulfilled that text, "Where the carcase is there shall the eagles be gathered together." The carcase, he says, is Christ, and the eagles are Christ-loving men who made pictures of Him, of His apostles and others, and carrying them all over the world, everywhere, by means of these, converted the nations : and he then triumphantly concludes this portion of his argument in the following manner—"And now, Oh Emperor, which appears right to you, that these should be worshipped, or the superstitions of Satan?" He next brings forward the oft-repeated instance of the picture of the Saviour sent by our Lord Himself to the King of Edessa, and the honour in which it was still held by the inhabitants of those parts. He describes the powerful effect that images had on himself—namely, that they brought him to tears. He indignantly, but with little success, tries to refute the charge that Christians worshipped walls, or stones, or boards, which he says they had as helps to spiritual contemplation on account of their dullness and worldliness. He tells the Emperor that, if he went into any school and declared himself against images, the very children would make sport of him. The Emperor had alleged that Hezekiah had broken in pieces the brazen serpent : to this the Pope replies, "Verily, Uzziah was brother to thyself, and displayed the same audacity as thou, and in like manner tyrannized over the priests, for that serpent was by the holy David brought into the temple together with the holy ark." Enough is quoted from the first of these letters to show how bitterly averse was Gregory against the Emperor's intentions, and how determined in his opposition.

We may, however, observe further concerning this letter, that by its silence it confutes many calumnies in after ages urged against Leo : for instance, according to Anastasius, Leo made many attempts to assassinate the Pope ; but concerning all this Gregory says not a word, noticing only his threat to come to Rome and carry him thence to exile, as Constans II. had done long since to Pope Martin. Again, though he speaks of the destruction of the image over the brazen gate, and the slaughter of those who murdered the Emperor's officers, yet we find no mention of the burning of the famous library with its twelve professors, a charge reiterated by one historian after another as he treats of these times. Yet, had it occurred, could Gregory have been ignorant of it ?—and, if he had known it, would he have been silent ? But neither in this nor in the subsequent letter do we find any mention of this outrage.

It was not to be expected that Leo would yield the point without a struggle. His Exarch, Paul, was ordered to seize the Pope, and to put the Emperor's edict into execution in the West as it had already been done in the East. But the Exarch was without power : he was murdered in the attempt, as were also the Duke of Naples and his son, who endeavoured to assist him. Eutychius, who was sent as Exarch after Paul, found that he could not prevail even at Ravenna, much less at Rome. The Pope, in defence of his rebellion, appealed to Luitprand, King of the Lombards, who quickly put an end to the Exarchate altogether, seizing it for himself. The Pope, however, who had rather that it should be in subjection to the Emperor than to the Lombard King, recovered it from him and restored it to the Emperor again so that Eutychius was for some years longer Exarch of Ravenna by sufferance ; but even this

was only on the express condition of his doing nothing against images.

To impress his sentiments more powerfully at Rome Gregory held a council for the confirmation of image-worship, in which he laid his views before the assembled Prelates in the following manner:—"If Moses commanded the cherubim to be *made*, and if Solomon did the same by the express command of God, then how much more ought we to *adore* Christ our Lord, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints, in their images? If the works of men's hands are to be rejected, then ought also the ark of the covenant and the cherubim to be rejected: but, if they are to be admitted, why not all other images—especially since they have wrought miracles no less than the ark, and since they no less than the ark are intended for the glory of God?" These arguments proved very satisfactory to Gregory and his divines; but Charlemagne and his divines, friendly as they might be to the Pope in temporal matters, thought very differently on this point, as is evident from the fact that this very comparison of the ark and images, of which Gregory thought so highly, is severely censured in a chapter of no small length in the "Caroline Books."

Soon after this Council Gregory II. died, and was succeeded by another Gregory of the same mind with himself in every respect; and, therefore, as much opposed to the Emperor as his predecessor. Some negotiations passed between him and the Emperor Leo, but all to no purpose: the Pope would not yield to the Emperor, nor could he come to any agreement with the Pope. In fine, Gregory III. called a Council, and excommunicated the opponents of image-worship. Leo on his part, sent a fleet to bring back his Western

dominions to their allegiance and their duty—the fleet was wrecked in the Adriatic and the armament destroyed. The Emperor, however, revenged himself on the Pope by seizing certain revenues which were styled the “Pope’s Patrimony;” and further, by separating the dioceses of East Illyricum and of Calabria from the Roman See and adding them to the See of Constantinople. The Emperor’s successors were all of the same mind in this respect; for, however willing to oblige the Pope in other respects, they never would give back to him what Leo had taken away. Irene in this respect remained a heretic, and even Basil himself, greatly as he honoured the Pope above the Patriarch, was unorthodox here. Peter’s patrimony was never restored. After the destruction of his fleet, Leo took no further steps with respect to the West, and there was an entire disruption between Italy and the East till communication between them was again opened by the Empress Irene on the convocation of the Seventh General Council.

Glad would the Pope have been that Ravenna and its vicinity should have continued to be in subjection to Leo or his son, notwithstanding their heresies and persecutions, rather than to the Lombards, orthodox as they were in respect of image-worship. For while the Emperor of the East was little to be dreaded, on account of his distance from Italy, the Pope feared a master in the Lombard, who, being close at hand, might have greater power to execute his will. Gregory III., though delivered from the Emperor, was ill at ease; for the Lombards, having taken Ravenna, came into a much closer proximity to Rome than was desirable. He made application to Charles Martel, the powerful Mayor of the Palace under the Kings of France; but Charles replied but

coldly to his invitations. While events were in this unsettled condition Gregory III. died, and in the same year Charles Martel and the Emperor Leo V. Gregory III. was succeeded by Pope Zachary : he had some negotiations with the Emperor Constantine, but not about images or their worship, but about what was much nearer his heart—protection against the encroachment of Astulphus the King of the Lombards. The Emperor would enter into no negotiation with him. Zachary, repulsed in this quarter, turned his eyes to the rising power of the French. Charles Martel was now succeeded by his son Pepin. Pepin, who long had enjoyed all the power of a Sovereign, was weary of the name of subject : before dethroning his master he applied to Pope Zachary for his advice, and his advice was quite in accordance with Pepin's views. Childeric was dethroned, deprived of the shadow of royalty which he had hitherto enjoyed, and imprisoned in a monastery ; and Pepin was acknowledged King of the French. Zachary now, in turn, applied to Pepin for aid against the Lombards, and Pepin out of gratitude could do no less than comply. He marched into Italy, defeated Astulphus, and made him cede Ravenna and the Pentapolis to the Pope. Thus the Pope was exalted to temporal dignity, and, from having been a servant of Sovereigns, now became Sovereign himself. Zachary was succeeded by Stephen I. He, finding the Lombards again likely to incommode him—for they had taken Ravenna and threatened Rome—makes most earnest application to Pepin to come forward on his behalf ; and in order further to enforce his claim he sends a letter, pretended to have come from St. Peter now in glory, stating the fear that he had lest the Lombards should ill-treat his bones, and exhorting

Pepin with all promises of success and happiness here, and of eternal glory hereafter to come and succour his afflicted brethren the Romans. The appeal was not in vain : Pepin once more appeared in Italy, humbled Astulphus and put the Pope in possession of Ravenna and the Pentapolis. As long, however, as the Lombard kingdom existed the Popes were ill at ease, and, in consequence, under Charlemagne son of Pepin, the entire overthrow of that kingdom was effected, and Charlemagne took the title of King of Italy and Emperor of the West. Thus, by means of one of the worst corruptions of the Church, the Popes raised themselves to sovereign power. Gregory II., on account of Leo's edict against images and in defence of their worship, raised the standard of rebellion. Gregory III. set himself for ever free from the Emperor of the East. Zachary first, and afterwards Stephen, by means of Pepin, were made masters of Ravenna and the countries adjoining, and this power was afterwards fixed on a basis not again to be overthrown by the taking of Pavia and the extinction of the Lombardic Kingdom.

Thus was laid the foundation of that despotic rule which made its power to be felt—its authority to be dreaded by every Sovereign in Europe in turn. Each succeeding Pope laboured to enlarge his claims and extend his dominions ; and this now by pious frauds and artful forgeries—now by the terrors of priestcraft—now by the intrigue of the politician—now by setting nation against nation—now by exciting internal discords, involving party against party in the same nation. Nicholas I. claimed a supreme dominion over the Bishops, Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs. Gregory VII. extended his power, not only over Priests and Bishops, but over Kings and Emperors. Thus the

Popes claimed not only Peter's spiritual sword as lord over the Priesthood, but, in like manner, the temporal sword as lord over Kings and Emperors.

It is now time to return to the East, to which this "Historical Sketch" mainly refers. Leo III. was, as we have said, succeeded by his son Constantine, the fifth Emperor of that name who had swayed the throne of the East. He carried out his father's views with still more ardour than Leo. On this account he, to a much greater extent than his father, became the theme for all the obloquy which malice could invent or bigotry suggest. For a proof we may take the portrait of the Monk, Theophanes, who compiled a history of the empire about thirty years after the death of Constantine :— "He was (says this writer) altogether abandoned and brutal, like a bloody and raging beast, alien from our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, from His undefiled immaculate Mother, and from all the Saints—delighting in magic, in all impurities, in the blood of victims, in horse-dung and manure, revelling in effeminacy, in the invocation of demons, and, in short, accustomed to every soul-destroying employment even from his youth."

To this portrait, which might surely be considered dark enough, succeeding writers, both Greek and Roman who have written any history of these times, have each added some additional feature of his own to make it darker still. Thus Suidas, a writer of the tenth century, in his "Lexicon,"* has the following account of Constantine V. For, after commencing thus :—"Constantine, Emperor of the Romans, son of Leo, the image-breaker—from the lion sprang forth the spotted panther—from the seed of the serpent the fierce basilisk, the flying dragon, the Antichrist of Dan"—he con-

* Suidas, Lexicon, Art. Constantine.

cludes his article as follows :—" He worshipped Venus, and offered to her human victims without the city, which he sacrificed to her honour in a place where once stood the temple of St. Maura. Now, this temple he razed to the ground, and in the place of it he erected there a slaughter-house, in which he performed his orgies by night, and was accustomed to slay children for this purpose."

It would not be difficult to compile from various Byzantine writers many such stories and tales equally false, equally calumnious. As an instance of the extent to which this mendacious spirit may be carried, we find in the " Tables of the Chronology," compiled by Christopher Helvicus, the following notice of Constantine :—" Constantinus Copronimus, son of Leo : he was called Cabbalinus the image-hater : he was called Copronimus, because he would have baptism performed *with dung*."*

Le Beau, inclined as he is to tax the Emperor with every possible crime, and to detract as much as possible from his merits, rejects some of these tales as too gross to admit of belief :—" It may not be unlikely (he writes in his summary of the character of the Emperor) that public hatred has overcharged the character of this Prince ; and that from a very natural prejudice the persecuted orthodox may have given credit to some popular reports without much examination, and amidst so many dark stains have imagined some other which, after all, had no real existence. Amongst these I place that which Suidas asserts—that this Prince was a Saracen in his heart—that he worshipped Venus—or sacrificed children by night. But (he continues) how dare any to contradict the numerous charges brought by contem-

* Chronology, p. 112.

porary writers against him of debauchery, cruelty, brutality, and the like ?” The ready answer is by a question on the other hand, Have the remainder of these charges any better ground to a claim on our belief than those which this author discards ? And do not the unblushing exaggerations of these writers afford fair ground for doubt and scepticism as to any of their calumnious statements ?

The charges brought against the Emperor rank themselves under three heads—that he was immoral, debauched, effeminate to the highest degree—that he was in religion everything that was wrong—Pagan, Jew, Nestorian, and Mohammedan, and, in fine, an Atheist—that he was the most furious persecutor that ever existed, far exceeding in cruelty the Neros, Domitians, and Dioclesians—those ancient enemies of the Church.

To take these charges in the order in which they stand—the charge of debauchery and effeminacy is first to be considered. To this may be opposed the activity and intrepidity of the Emperor in war. He was pretty constantly engaged in battle in behalf of his country, at one time against the Saracens, at another against the Bulgarians. Over the former he gained repeated victories ; and, though not so uniformly successful against the latter, he nevertheless in the end triumphed gloriously over them also ; and it is to be further observed that he did not spend his time slothfully in his palace while his soldiers were labouring in the field, but was himself ever on the spot, the commander in every campaign.

Then, in the intervals of peace, we find that he was not altogether unmindful of the good of his country and people : as an instance to the contrary may be alleged

the following. The Emperor, perceiving that Constantinople was ill supplied with water, caused the aqueduct of Valens to be rebuilt at his own cost, which had been in ruins since the reign of Heraclius. He took good care, also, that his people should be well supplied with necessary provisions during the whole of his reign. We find, further, that some acts of generosity are on record to his credit ; that he redeemed at his own expense twenty-five thousand captives from the Slavonians, gave them all that they required at the time, and dismissed them with liberty to go where they pleased. The Syrians whom he found captive at Melitene he located in cities which he had built for them in Thrace, furnishing them with such things as they required. Now, it is to be remembered that these traits of a more pleasing kind are recorded by his bitter enemies—writers who were but little inclined to say a word in his favour. How much more of this kind might we not hope to see, if we had but the biography of one who was of the same mind with himself ? The image-worshippers, however, have taken good care that nothing of this kind shall come down to posterity. In fact, notwithstanding the plagues, and droughts, and inclement winters, which it delights these historians to recount as undoubted records of God's anger against the Emperor for his endeavour to preserve inviolate the second command, the empire was, during the reign of Constantine, in considerable prosperity. Even Baronius seems struck at the great prosperity of this, as he styles him, *most wicked Prince* ; but tries to find a precedent for this seeming anomaly in Psalm cxliv., 11-13, which verses he so connects as to make them descriptive of the prosperity of ungodly men. He quotes the Psalm thus :—" Rid me from the hand of strange children whose mouth speaketh vanity ;

whose sons are as plants grown up in their youth ; whose garners are full, affording all manner of store ; whose oxen are strong to labour—happy the people that are in such a case.” “ Such (says Baronius) is the language of common people ; but the Prophet says, on the contrary, ‘ Blessed are the people whose God is the Lord.’ ” At any rate, we may infer from the Cardinal’s quotation that the state of Constantinople was one of prosperity during the reign of this Emperor ; but as to the fact that this prosperity was that of the wicked or of strange children, any more than the like prosperity of Pepin or Charlemange, may fairly be questioned.

As to the religion of the Emperor, what that was may best be learned from the Definition or Decree of that Council which he caused to be assembled to consider the question of image-worship. This Council, by its creed, is shown to be perfectly orthodox, acknowledging the doctrine of the previous Six General Councils ; and, so far from being defective in respect to the Saints or the Virgin, it speaks of them in a way which a Protestant would judge both excessive and unscriptural. As it met with the unfeigned assent and consent of the Emperor, it may fairly be asked, would he have thus sanctioned it, had he been a Manichean, Arian, Nestorian, or Eutychean ? Indeed, one ground for the condemnation of the worship of images is taken from the fact of its being a practical violation of the Third and Fourth General Councils.

To this Council, which Constantine caused to be held in the royal city, we would now direct the reader’s attention. The Emperor having, by several victories over the Saracens, set the empire free from alarm in that quarter, and being at leisure to attend to affairs at home, made it his first care to have the religion of his

subjects placed on a satisfactory basis. On account of his known enmity to image-worship, a rebellion had been excited against him on his accession to the throne : and after he had regained his rightful dominion, he had been engaged in perpetual war with the Saracens, so no opportunity was for some years afforded of making enquiry into this subject. But at length having an interval of leisure he determined in a lawful way to settle the question ; and, for this purpose, he caused a Council of three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops to be summoned to Constantinople to examine the Scriptures and the writings of the fathers, and to see whether the worship of images was Christian or not.

At this Council none of the reputed heads of the Church—that is, the Pope or the Patriarchs—were present, but very good reasons may be given for their absence. The Patriarch Anastasius was but lately dead, and another had not as yet been chosen in his room. As to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, they could not attend on account of the jealousy of their Mohammedan rulers, who would allow no kind of connection between any of their subjects and the Empire of the East. But neither were they present at the Sixth General Council, nor could they come to the Seventh, and this from the same cause ; and the monks, who assumed the names of Legates of the Eastern Sees at the Second Nicene Council, alleged this as the reason of the unavoidable absence of their superiors. Nor could it be expected that the Pope should attend, who was himself engaged at that very time with his clergy in carrying about his idols through the streets of Rome as a protection against the Lombards.

The Presidents of the Council were Theodosius Metropolitan of Ephesus and Exarch of the East, and

Sisinnius Metropolitan of Perga. The subject was carefully examined for six months together, and the unanimous decision of the assembly was that images and pictures ought to be altogether banished from the churches of Christians as a custom both strange and abominable.

Of this Council we have no other record than is to be collected from the hostile Council of Nice. In the Sixth Session of that assembly the Bishops were summoned to hear a refutation of the Decree or Definition of the Conventicle assembled at Constantinople against images and their worship. The Decree was read paragraph by paragraph, and an answer, which was considered as a Refutation, followed each as it was recited. Putting these paragraphs together, we have all that remains of the Council against image-worship. We are in some measure, therefore, obliged to the Nicene Synod for preserving so much of this Council, which otherwise would have been entirely lost to us ; though, had we its acts as well as its Decree, we cannot say to how much greater advantage the whole would have appeared.

From the portion of the Council thus preserved, we learn that its doctrine was in every respect orthodox ; for the dogmas which had been laid down in the Six General Councils were received in this also, and the heresies condemned in them were, in like manner, condemned in this. Of this Council we give the following succinct summary :—The fathers assembled commence by stating that, as Satan did at the first mar God's original creation by the introduction of that idolatry which prevailed amongst the heathen, so in these last days he had in like manner seduced Christians into idolatry by means of the introduction of pictures and images into the Church. They add that

this corruption had long prevailed, and would still have continued but that God had raised up Constantine to further His glory by the destruction of so pernicious a practice ; and that for this purpose, in compliance with the Emperor's command, they had met together to the number of three hundred and thirty-eight. After this preamble the Six General Councils are next considered in order, and it is declared that these had set forth, to the satisfaction of every Christian, all that was necessary for the completion of their immaculate faith, and that this faith so set forth was greatly blasphemed and seriously deteriorated by the art of the painter as applied to objects of divine worship. The image of Christ, therefore, becomes the principal object of discussion : for it was about His nature and person that the Six General Councils had been assembled ; and it was considered that the doctrine taught by them, and more specially that taught by the third and fourth General Councils, was thereby practically abrogated. This would appear when the enquiry is made, of which of the two Natures was the image of Christ the representation ? Of the human nature or of the human and divine conjoined ? If it was the picture of the human nature only, then did not the worshippers become practical Nestorians, worshipping the humanity apart from the divinity ? But did they, on the other hand, assert that the image of Christ was an image of His human and divine nature conjoined—what was that but the error of Eutyches ? This part of their discussion they conclude by showing that no other image of Christ was needed than that which He Himself had left us—namely, the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, true and real images of His body and blood.

They next consider the case of the images of the

Virgin and the Saints, concerning which they say, if the image of Christ be not needed, much less are these. And they further observe that the making of such images was an invention originating with the heathen, who, not having the hope of the resurrection, endeavoured, in this illusory manner, to supply the place of those who were departed. But, surely, Christians had no need of such a device : the Saints whom they loved were not lost, for, though absent from them, they were living in the presence of God ; and then, all resplendent as they were with glory, how could men do them honour by the lifeless strokes of the pencil ?

To these arguments they add some passages taken from the Scriptures and others from the fathers ; and here, perhaps, we may justly fear that the Nicene divines have cut short both the one and the other, leaving only those behind which they imagined that they could most easily confute. Some of these, however, give the confutors no small trouble. With respect to these passages of Scripture and of the fathers, and the way in which the Nicene divines attempt to rebut them, we must refer the reader to the Sixth Session of the Nicene Council. Then follows their decree :—“ We, all clothed with the dignity of the priesthood, being of one mind, in the name of the Holy, Super-substantial, and Life-giving Trinity, do with one voice determine ‘**THAT EVERY IMAGE OF WHATEVER MATERIAL COMPOSED, BY THE EVIL ART OF THE PAINTER, SHALL BE CAST OUT OF THE CHURCH OF CHRISTIANS AS ALIEN AND ABOMINABLE.**’”

After some regulations in which it was determined that no more images or pictures should be made for divine worship—and for the prevention of abuses that no image or picture should be removed from churches without reference to the Patriarch—we find the doctrine

and practice of the Council confirmed in the usual way by anathemas. Of these anathemas, which are nineteen in number, the first seven are levelled against those who were condemned as heretics by the first six General Councils. The six which follow strike against those who, though in theory orthodox, do practically, by means of image-worship, violate that orthodoxy: and are guilty, as the case may be, of either a Nestorian separation of the persons, or a Eutychian confusion of the natures in worshipping the image of Christ. The fifteenth condemns those who derogate in any way from the dignity, or despise the intercession, of the Virgin Mary. The sixteenth condemns those who attempt to honour the Saints by the illusory art of the painter rather than to make living images of them in themselves by following their holy and pious conversation. By the seventeenth, those are condemned who deny or despise the intercession of the Saints; by the eighteenth, those who deny any of the Articles of Christian faith as contained in the Nicene Creed; and, by the nineteenth, those are anathematized who refused to recognize the authority of the Council or to act in accordance with its decree.

The Council was concluded by acclamations and expressions of praise to the Emperor and others concerned in it, not unusual on such occasions. The Nicene divines have left these also on record, having brought them forward in order to notify what they consider words of impious flattery as addressed to Constantine. The words are—“*Ye have banished all idolatry:*” words capable, after all, of a favourable interpretation, and not at all more adulatory than the usual addresses presented from Councils to Emperors—not more adulatory than parts of the letter of the Nicene Council itself to Irene and her son—and not one half so impiously

flattering as many of the addresses made to the Popes by their parasites.

With respect to the anathemas, we can but grieve over them ; but it had been customary from the earliest ages of the Church to enact them against all who refused acquiescence to the decisions of a General Council, and the opposing Council of Nice acknowledge the justice of the principle, though they like it not when it bears hard upon themselves.

It is evident, then, that no further charge can be made against the religion of the Emperor, if this Council be taken as an exponent of his religious feeling, than that he was implacably hostile to images and the superstitious worship paid to them ; and so far is he from treating the Virgin Mary or the Saints with irreverence, as he is said to have done, that he seems to Protestants to have held them in a veneration both excessive and unscriptural.

This Council, its decrees and its enactments, lead us to consider the third charge made against the Emperor—that of being a persecutor more bloody and cruel than Nero or Dioclesian. The charge of persecution seems to be by far the best sustained of the three, though, if it be but candidly examined, its worst features will disappear, and Constantine's guilt will not only be less than that of Nero, but also than of some kings who bear the name of Catholic, Orthodox, and most Christian. Constantine would find in the decrees of his predecessors in the empire, who had the most unsullied reputation for orthodoxy, abundant precedent for his present proceedings. He made no severer laws against Christian idolators than Theodosius the Great had made against Pagan idolators, Arians, and the like ; or his grandson Theodosius II. against the Nestorians ; or Martian against the Eutychians ; Justinian against all Heretics ; or

Constans II. against the Monothelites. If any of these aggrieved parties had been writers, or if their writings had come down to us, we might have heard of persecutions far exceeding that of Constantine V. Indeed, history has preserved on record some of the doings of Justinian in this way, by which it was plainly proved that he scrupled at no amount of bloodshed to get rid of those to whom he was opposed. But how sinks the guilt of Constantine when the persecutions of a Theodora, Innocent III., Philip II., or Louis XIV. rise to view. Constantine's reign was of thirty-four years' continuance : in this period, making the utmost allowance to exaggerated representations of historians, the number who perished scarcely exceeded three hundred ; and, indeed, the probability is that there were not nearly so many. Now, let us take into view a like number of years, dating from the time that Torquemada was first appointed Inquisitor-General to the close of the rule of Cisneros, the third who bore this execrable name, and what is the record ? We number victims not by hundreds, but by thousands and tens of thousands. During this period upwards of sixteen thousand were burned at the stake, nine hundred more were burned in effigy, happily disappointing inquisitorial malice by death, and one hundred and sixty-eight thousand were sent to the galleys. Compare also the slaughter made by Theodora of one hundred thousand Paulicians, the massacre of one hundred thousand Albigenses by Innocent III. and his crusaders, or the destruction, torture, or imprisonment of five hundred thousand by Louis XIV., and what a light speck is Constantine's persecution taken at its very worst ?

We may further observe that, from the memorial made at the Nicene Council of the mischiefs which fol-

lowed from this edict, that the persecution was but light ; and though they made the most of their materials, yet do we find nothing approaching to anything like a massacre—nothing at all like the terrors of a Romish persecution. Those who suffered in this reign were mainly of the monastic order : the Bishops in general yielded to the decree, or went quietly into exile. But, even of the monastic order, those were mainly the sufferers who forced themselves upon the Emperor's notice. Zeal for what they styled their Christ—a piece of wood with an image on it—led them fanatically to provoke his vengeance by personal insults. This was eminently the case with two of the chief martyrs of this reign, Andrew and Stephen. The Emperor sought not them, but they sought him ; and, unhappily, the impetuosity of his temper gratified their desire, and made those, who should have been dismissed with contempt, objects of pity and admiration for the constancy in which they endured their self-sought sufferings.

Again, that Iconoclast Bishops were not persecutors may be fairly implied from the fact that, in reply to a charge brought forward at the second Nicene Council of persecuting the orthodox, Gregory Bishop of Neocesarea could triumphantly challenge the whole of those assembled to prove that he had beaten or persecuted any one ; and to this challenge we find no one replied. Indeed, weakness rather than violence seems to have been the character of the greater part of the Iconoclastic Prelates.

In a short sketch like the present it is not necessary to add more of the events of this reign, whether ecclesiastic or civil. The Emperor died while engaged in war with the Bulgarians, and few things have more delighted historians than to gloat with most unchristian malice

over every circumstance of his death, and one writer after another, as they had previously blackened the character of Constantine, so they add something to make the dying hours of the Emperor more awful and terrific.

Baronius concludes his remarks thus with allusion to Protestants :—"In such a leader let our innovators glory : him let them exalt as they do with praises ; but let these blasphemers of the Saints hear the buzz of the beetle involved in his own dung : let them roll about the same stercoraceous pellets as did he—namely, while they equally augment the same filthy heresies—since, beyond all question, they also in hell shall suffer the same punishment of which he, when about to die, experienced so awful a foretaste : for, while he thus expressed his expectation of the sentence of eternal condemnation against himself, he signified no less than that all his followers would suffer the same." Thus, by this writer, Constantine was sentenced to eternal wrath, because he kept the second commandment and compelled others to do the same, and all we who observe that command are in like manner to be condemned !—Let us compare this account with a like history of the death of Calvin from the pen of the Jesuit De Ballingham, for thus he writes :—"Of which blasphemies against Christ, and against the Virgin, and of his other heresies, a most miserable death was his reward : for he died being eaten of worms, agonized with a foul internal ulcer ! Moreover, in invoking demons, in devoting himself to the furies, in cursing the day and the hour in which he first gave himself to literature and writing, he breathed out his miserable soul." So writes this Jesuit. Now for the fact :—"The remainder of his days (says Beza) Calvin passed in almost perpetual prayer. He departed without even a sigh, in the full possession of his powers to the last."

If such misrepresentations were unblushingly put forth in an age when the art of printing, open to all, could easily manifest their falsehood, how much more might we expect this to be the case when books were scarce—when but few copies of a work could be published—when every statement which pleased not a dominant party could be easily destroyed. Had Beza published his account in the eighth century it would soon have perished, and the slanders of the Jesuit had come forth without contradiction. As, therefore, we know not what the friends of Constantine might have had to say concerning his last hours, we are at liberty to suspend our belief in the various slanderous tales set forth by his enemies. But if Constantine's death is to be considered a judgment, in what light are we to consider that of Philip II. of Spain, of which we have the following account in Mezeray's *History of France*:—"A hectic fever had wasted the king for above fifteen months when the gout seized him: these acid humours bred swellings and imposthumes which broke out first on his knee—then in divers parts of his body—whence issued perpetual swarms of lice which could in no way be prevented. The horrible stench proceeding from his ulcers, and those loathsome insects which did eat him to the bones, made the very hearts of all that did approach him ready to faint; but yet his own did not—he endured all these torments with marvellous patience." Such was the end of Philip: a death, as far as bodily sufferings were concerned, attended with circumstances more painful and revolting than that of Constantine: only in the one case we hear of patience and resignation—in the other of remorse and despair. Possibly, had some Protestants been near Philip in his last hours, we might have heard that his sufferings led him to reflect on the hor-

rible cruelties and fiendish malice exercised by him against their brethren in Spain, the Low Countries, and elsewhere. Certainly Constantine had no deeds so deep and foul to deplore as had the Catholic monarch.

If, however, Constantine's death were so fearful as reported—if he died so bitterly lamenting his zeal against images—how can we account for the fact that such an instance of remorse and despair should produce no effect—that his son, his courtiers, his soldiers, all held on the same course, and not one was converted by the dying regrets and horror of the Emperor? Surely the awful death of Constantine, rather than the peaceful death of the Patriarch Paul, ought to have been the means of awakening Irene's mind to her pretended concern about images.

To Constantine succeeded his son Leo IV. He, like his father, was a determined opposer of image-worship; but he seems to have been less rigorous in his mode of carrying out his views. He allowed the Monks, whom his father had dispersed, to return to their monasteries: he filled up vacant sees with Abbots renowned for their virtues: but still none were admitted who did not take an oath against the worship of images. He was no less brave than his father, and like him also successful in war. The veterans who had so often defeated the Saracens under Constantine defeated them no less signally under Leo. The hostile king of the Bulgarians fled to him for protection. In fact, the first four years of his reign have merited the praises even of Romanists. In his fifth year a circumstance occurred which lost him all his former grace in their eyes and which ended in his death. He discovered in his wife's chamber two images; upon which he upbraided her with her perfidy; for, though brought up "in the Catholic religion (as says

M. Le Beau),* she made no scruple to sacrifice to her ambition duties most sacred, and had sworn to Constantine, her father-in-law, that she had never paid to images any worship whatever." She now declared, with no less solemnity, that she knew nothing whatever about them. Leo did not for a moment believe her ; but, considering her as guilty, he banished her from his presence for ever. Having found out that these images were brought into her chamber by one of her officers named Papias, and that five others had been accomplices with him, he caused them to be shorn and severely beaten and imprisoned : one out of the number died under the punishment. He is, of course, called a martyr ; but he was a martyr in no other way than that condemned by the Apostle, who says :— "*Let none of you suffer as an evil doer and a busy-body in other men's matters.*" Leo did not very long survive this event : his death is imputed by the Byzantines and their followers to a miracle. The story runs thus—that being very fond of precious stones, he took a crown which had been placed over the altar of St. Sophia by Mauritius the Emperor, and putting it on his own head carried it into the palace, and that forthwith carbuncles broke out on his head which brought on a burning fever of which he died. Baronius has pleased himself with a pun on this occasion :— "*Amans igitur carbunculos ex sacrilegio carbunculos pariter passus est, et his coronatus est mortuus.*"

Such is the account given by historians of his death. That which they attribute to miracle may not without reason be attributed to different cause. So thought Mosheim : his words are as follows :—" A cup of poison,

* Le Beau, vol. xiv. p. 42.

administered by the impious counsel of a perfidious spouse, deprived Leo IV. of his life, and rendered the idolatrous cause of images triumphant." The whole of Irene's character and manner of life strengthens this suspicion : her ambition —her artfulness—her unscrupulous conduct whenever her will was thwarted—her treachery and cruelty to her unhappy son—all conspire to make it far from improbable that she should endeavour to rid herself of a husband to whom she had now become odious.

Leo was succeeded nominally by his son Constantine—really by his widow Irene. His death had made her undisputed mistress of the empire, for her son, being but nine years old, was entirely under her directions, so that for many years the throne of the east was altogether under her sway. As she was now her own mistress she determined to give the rein to her idolatrous propensities, and to make that worship, upon suspicion of attachment to which she had lost her husband's confidence, the religion of her empire. Irene acted with great prudence and caution ; not exciting public opposition by too hasty a change, but, gradually preparing the way by one enactment after another, she waited patiently for the time when she might hope to bring about this revolution without any effectual resistance. In order to strengthen her cause she allowed free liberty to all who would make and worship images ; those who had been exiled on this account were restored ; possibly images found their way back again into many churches ; great encouragement was given to those firm friends of images, the monks. A remarkable miracle is said also to have taken place. A coffin was discovered, and in it was found the body of a man, and on the lid of the coffin were these words written, " Christ shall be born

of the Virgin Mary. I believe in Him. Under the Emperor Constantine, and Irene, O, here shalt thou see me again." Still the Empress waited six years before the council in favour of images was convened. During this period her rule had become fully established, domestic rebellion was suppressed, and glory was added to her arms abroad; for in the first year of her reign the veterans of Constantine and Leo had gained a splendid victory over the Saracens, and subsequently they were no less successful against the Sclavi, who had overrun Greece and Macedonia. At length, deeming herself sufficiently popular and that the way was clear and open for the accomplishment of her purpose, she determines to bring about the public restoration of that worship to which she had from the first been so superstitiously attached. The abdication and subsequent death of Paul the Patriarch was made the immediate occasion of this change: he was too good a man to be slandered as former Patriarchs had been, and therefore it was pretended that he was not an Iconoclast. He suddenly abdicated the Patriarchate, possibly because he saw with regret all that good work which Constantine and Leo had done now undermined and likely to come to nought.

The accounts which we have of the reason why Paul abdicated are however of quite an opposite description; but it is to be remembered that they come entirely through the Empress and her Ministers, who alone were admitted to conference with him. The report of this interview is given with some variety in the Letter of the Empress to the Bishops of the Nicene Council, and by Theophanes in his "Chronography;" but in both the one and the other we may trace undoubted marks of fabrication. The reasons which the Patriarch is said to have given for his abdication are, that he had heard that a Council

had been held at Constantinople for the destruction of images ; and that the Church of which he was Patriarch was daily anathematized by every other Church ; and that if he died in such a presidency he feared that his soul would be lost for ever.

Now, if we consider that Paul must have taken the oath required of all Bishops not to worship any image at all—that he could not be ignorant that such oath was imposed in consequence of the Council held at Constantinople—that he knew well enough that the Patriarchs of the Eastern Sees had not expressed any opinion about the matter and that the See of Rome alone had hurled her anathema—how is it that he talks to the Empress as if he had but just in the last year of his Patriarchate come to the knowledge of all these facts ? Why did he ever accept the Patriarchate at all ? Why not abdicate in the very *first* year of the reign of Irene ? Why reserve his abdication and his disquietude about images till the last year of his life, or, as it appears, till the last week ? All these circumstances make the conference very suspicious.

His subsequent death, however, within a few days after this conference, prevented all counter disclosures and made way for the sequel. If we are to believe the Empress, she too was now greatly disquieted, as well as all her courtiers, at the awful position in which *obedience to the second command* had placed them ; and she professes to tremble at the anger of God against her for worshipping in churches which had neither images nor pictures.

Her first care was to elect a Patriarch in the place of Paul, and her choice was not a little singular. Instead of looking to the Bishops and Archbishops, or even to the Monks, Abbots, and Solitaries, or even to those who

had suffered much for images, she looks to her soldiery, and can find no person so fit for the Patriarchate as Tarasius, Master of the Horse and her own private Secretary. This choice so deeply scandalized the Pope Adrian that, as he declares, nothing but the zeal of this new Patriarch for image-worship could induce him for a moment to tolerate it: for (adds he), "as it is sad to say, and impossible not to say, they who should be under rule and teaching do not blush to become teachers; nor do they fear to take upon them the guidance of souls who are altogether ignorant of the path of the teacher—yea, who hardly know the way in which themselves should walk. For, if a general is not chosen for an army but from among those who have had experience of the labours and solicitude of warfare, what kind of generals of souls are they likely to make who aim with such infelicitous haste to reach the summit of the Episcopate?"

Tarasius affected an unwillingness to undertake, as he said, so great a burthen, but the Empress would not put up with his refusal: she continued to insist on his taking the vacant chair; and he, after he had acted the part of unwillingness long enough, allowed himself to be prevailed upon to accept it; but he would only do this on one condition—a condition which he knew was welcome to his royal mistress—namely, that a Council should be called to which the Pope and the other Patriarchs should be invited, in which the worship of images condemned by the Council held at Constantinople should be re-examined, and by which the said worship, so condemned, should be restored and re-established.

A letter styled "*Divalis*" was sent to Pope Adrian, to invite him to attend at the proposed Council. Highly

pleased as he was with the letter sent to him, he would not himself be present : that was too great a condescension for the Pope to grant, even when acknowledging the Emperor as a master—much more now that he was himself an independent Sovereign ; but he promised to send two Legates to the Council to represent him there. Letters were likewise sent to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. From the answer made to these letters, by those who styled themselves Priests and Chief Priests of the East, we find that they never reached these Patriarchs. For the Royal messengers having fallen in with certain Solitaries in their way disclosed the intention of their mission to them ; but these Monks, filled with fear of the consequences of any connection with the Emperor of the East, hid them in their cells, and would not allow them to go onward till they had consulted with their brethren on this subject. The result of this consultation was, not to allow them to proceed any further on their journey ; and the messengers being informed of this, were desired to return, as their attempt would not only involve themselves, but might bring great troubles on Christians living in those parts, now enjoying a measure of peace. Upon further remonstrance from the messengers, and that the mission might not be altogether in vain, it was agreed that two of these Solitaries should assume the name and authority of Legates from the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch ; while to represent the Patriarch of Jerusalem, as that See was vacant, they brought the Synodals of Theodore the late Patriarch. It is, however, very evident that these Monks were but pretenders, and that the Patriarchs they professed to represent had knowledge neither of them nor of their mission. Their names were John, Syncellus, as was said, of the Patriarch of Alex-

andria ; and Thomas Archbishop of Thessalonica, Syn-cellus of the Patriarch of Antioch. Of the two, Thomas at the Council said but little. John spoke on every occasion, and on every occasion draws forth some remark from the "Caroline Books" on his absurdities.

The Legates of the Pope, the pretended Legates of the Eastern Sees, and the Clergy, being now assembled at Constantinople, they proceeded to hold their first Session in the great Church of St. Peter, in the month of September, A.D. 786. But their Session was disturbed—first, by Bishops of the opposite party who were in the Council ; and next, by an attack from without of the soldiery, the veterans of Constantine and Leo, who were indignant that the idolatry exploded by their masters should again become the religion of the empire. The Bishops alarmed fled from the Council ; but, except being disturbed in their work, they experienced no other violence or ill-treatment. Irene bid the Prelates of the Council remain awhile in Constantinople, while she took upon herself so to arrange matters that when convened again they should not a second time be disturbed.

This she did in the following manner :—The troops who had occasioned the disturbance were marched off into Asia under pretence of a campaign against the Saracens : when there, they were informed that the Empress had no further occasion for their services, and they were disbanded forthwith. We may observe that this conduct brought its own punishment. By their means the Empress had overcome the Saracens ; but after they were disbanded neither she nor her son ever obtained another victory. The Saracens at one time, and the Bulgarians at another, ravaged the East to the very gates of Constantinople. Her inexperienced legions could not resist

them, and she was fain to purchase by money what could not be gained by valour. The long reign of Irene was as disgraceful and ruinous to the empire as those of Leo and Constantine had been honourable and glorious.

Irene had now overcome all obstacles in the way of holding her Council in favour of image-worship. The soldiery being dispersed, the Prelates were once more summoned, but not as before at Constantinople, as there were there very many who still were unfavourable to this superstition; but at Nice in Bythinia, the same metropolis where, about three hundred years before, had been held the celebrated Council of three hundred and eighteen Bishops against the Arians.

With this coincidence, and the consequent comparison of the Councils, it is hard to say whether Tarasius and his divines were more delighted, or Charlemagne and his divines were the more disgusted. Thus, in the close of the fifth Session, we find one of the so-styled Eastern Legates saying:—"Here, of old, Christ made the faith illustrious; and here again, by means of this Holy General Council, hath He made no less illustrious to all, the signs of His dispensation. Here in ancient times was the blasphemer Arius deposed; and here also hath the heresy of the God-hated Iconoclasts been brought to nought." On the other hand, Charlemagne counts it to be the part of no ordinary presumption to institute any such comparison between these Councils, since, except in name, they differ in every other respect. Thus in "Lib. Car." iv., c. 14, it is said:—"The former recovered the Church from error; the latter, on the contrary, leads her into error: the former rescued her from the most disastrous shipwreck of Arianism; the latter drives her to another shipwreck—that of adoring images:" and the contrast is further carried out between

the many particulars in which the first Council of Nice taught aright, and the many other particulars which the second Council taught no less erroneously.

The Council convened at Nice held its Sessions in the great Church of St. Sophia. A few general remarks in respect of the Council may not be deemed here superfluous. The Bishops assembled were not long in their deliberations : their work was begun and finished within a month. On the 24th of September was held the first Session, and before the 20th of October was the seventh Session concluded. But we need not wonder, as they seem to have met, not to enquire into and examine what was doubtful in the doctrine and practice of image-worship, but to establish and confirm the same by decree, as admitting of neither question nor enquiry. It was at once taken for granted that image-worship was established by the Scriptures and the fathers, and no one of the contrary opinion was admitted to urge what might be said on the other side of the question. The Iconoclast Bishops who appeared came not to argue or dispute, but to recant and confess ; and, before the subject was canvassed at all, it was determined by Tarasius the President that those who refused to worship images were as bad as Arians or any other heretics, and by John Legate of the East that they were even worse. The purpose for which they met was twofold : first, to establish image-worship by appeal to the Scriptures and the fathers ; and, secondly, to confute, reject, and anathematize the Definition put forth by the Council of Constantinople. To find proof from Scripture and the fathers for image-worship was the work especially of the Fourth Session, though their labour was in part forestalled by the letter of Adrain read in the Second Session. Of the proofs brought forward, whether in the

Second or Fourth Session, we may take the following account as given in Cave's "Historia Literaria."* He enumerates them in the following order:—(1). He observes that no treatise of any father previous to the fourth century is quoted, so that the practice of image-worship failed in being proved very primitive: since not one testimony in its favour can be found for three hundred years together. (2). Many spurious treatises are brought forward of which the authors to whom they are ascribed would have been ashamed—such as the long tale of the image of Berytus fathered on St. Athanasius—the letter to Julian ascribed to Basil—the sermon on the One Legislator attributed to John Chrysostom. (3). Many of the passages cited merely mention that certain pictures or images were in churches which they had seen, but not one word of any kind of worship paid to them. (4). In other passages the word *image* has no relation to any painted or sculptured image at all; but is merely brought forward by way of illustration. (5). The passages most in their favour are various old wives' tales and silly fables, destitute alike of authority and of any merit—as they are styled in the "Caroline Books," "*Apocryphas et omni derisione dignas nœnias*."

In the Fifth Session a further attempt is made to prove that image-worship is true, and to be received, because that, as on the one hand it is warranted by the Scriptures and the fathers, so on the other hand it has ever been rejected by Jews, Pagans, and Heretics—yea, that the very Devil himself is a most decided opponent of the worship of images, if not of images themselves. It was at the close of this Session that the Pope's Legates issued a proposition in part absurd, in

* Cave, "Hist. Lit." on the Conc. Gen.

part mischievous : the absurd part of the proposal was that an image should be brought into the presence of the Council for the Bishops to worship, and the mischievous part that all the writings of the Iconoclastic party should be destroyed. For the first they merit the derision, for the latter the execration, of posterity.

The first part of their intention in assembling together being now complete, in the Sixth Session, they proceed to the other portion of their work—the refutation and consequent anathematizing of the decree of the fathers of the Council of Constantinople. As to the mode in which this purpose of theirs was completed we must refer the reader to the acts of the Council. It will be seen that they can at least abuse and revile, if they cannot refute. Anathemas were showered forth in full plenty, but reasons for the same are very deficient.

In the Seventh Session is set forth their Definition or Decree, in which, after commencing with the Nicene Creed and rapidly passing over and declaring their agreement with the Six General Councils, they establish the making and the worship of images in the following manner :—“ We determine that holy images, whether painted or formed of any material whatever, should be set up in churches, on holy vessels, on sacred garments, on walls, on martyria, in houses, or the highways, and by that these be worshipped with salutation and the worship of honour ; but not with the worship which is in spirit and in truth, which belongs to the Divine Nature only.” This inferior honour is stated to be the offering of incense and candles, and all that may be meant by the word “ proscunesis,” bowing, prostration, and the like.

The Council having come to a conclusion of their

labours, the Bishops were invited to Constantinople ; and there, in the presence of Irene and her son, the decree was read over in the public hearing of all who were assembled ; and, for the further confirmation of those who were present the various scriptural and patristical testimonies which had been cited in the Fourth Session, and by which it was pretended that the doctrine of the Council was confirmed, were at the same time read aloud. To this decree the Empress, in the presence of all assembled, declared her adherence, by putting her royal seal thereto, and her son was made so to do at the same time. This act of the Empress and her son called forth repeated acclamations, in the midst of which triumphant shouts the whole was concluded.

The Council was agreeable to the Pope as far its main purpose was concerned—that is, the establishment of image worship, and the refutation and condemnation of the Council held in opposition to it ; but it was far from agreeable to him as to the minor details. A great practical grievance remained which Irene by no means intended to remove. Leo, the so-called heretic, had, as it has before been mentioned, seized certain revenues from Sicily and Naples, which were styled the Pope's patrimony : these revenues Irene, though now-reconciled to the See of Rome, would by no means restore. Leo also separated the Sees of East Illyricum, Sicily, and Calabria, from the Roman Patriarchate, and subjected them to the See of Constantinople ; and Irene manifested no disposition to alter this arrangement. Adrian, therefore, in his letter to Charlemagne, bitterly complains, that though in one point the Empress and her divines had returned from error, in two others they still persisted in obstinate error ; and he intimates that, if after further warning they do not

repent likewise of these—that is, if they do not restore back Peter's patrimony and the dioceses which formerly belonged to his jurisdiction—he shall judge the Emperor and Irene as heretical on account of their obstinacy. Indeed, he declares that he only received their Council for fear lest, by his rejection of it, the people of the East should revert into their former error; and then, as he says, who is so answerable as himself for the tremendous guilt of allowing the sheep of Christ to perish in error?*

Though to the Pope this must have been the greatest grievance, it was far from being the only thing in the Council which was not pleasing to him. He little liked the hasty promotion of Tarasius to the See of Constantinople; and, if it had not been for the purpose of image worship, he would by no means have consented to it. The title "Œcumenical" given to Tarasius, as Patriarch of the East, was not a little displeasing to him. In the letter sent to the Empress and her son, in answer to their *Divalis*, he expresses great wonder that, in her directions to Tarasius about the Council, she had given him this title, and he can only think that it was done through ignorance; and, after setting forth at some length the absurdity, not to say impiety, implied in it, he concludes thus:—"But if any take to himself the title 'Universal,' or give his consent to such a thing, let him know that he is alien from the Catholic faith, and rebellious against our Catholic and Apostolic Church." This part of the letter it was not thought safe to read at the Council at all, and Tarasius was throughout styled "Œcumenic," and once even by the Pope's Legates themselves. For the same reason, no small portion of Adrian's letter was left altogether un-

* The error of obeying the second commandment.

translated, and that which was translated was in various parts softened to suit the ear of the Greeks. Again, the Council Quinisexte, concerning which Pope Sergius had declared that he had rather lay down his life than receive it, was by Tarasius declared equally orthodox with the Sixth Council itself, and to have been authenticated by the very same divines; and a charge of ignorance is urged against all who presumed to doubt its genuineness or authority. All this was affirmed by Tarasius without one syllable of contradiction from a single Bishop, not even from the Pope's Legates themselves, thus proving pretty plainly that Tarasius spoke on the occasion, not his own sentiments only, but those of nine-tenths of the Bishops assembled in the Council. It is also to be noted that Pope Honorius, to the serious injury of Pontifical infallibility, is always numbered with the Monothelite heretics whenever any mention is made of them, as was often the case in this Council. Sergius, Peter, and Paul, successively Bishops of Constantinople, and Honorius Pope of Old Rome, are all stigmatized with the same brand of heresy; and many have been the attempts, though all in vain, to rescue Honorius from this disgraceful alliance. Whatever guilt, therefore, belongs to Monothelism is shared by Honorius in common with the rest of its upholders. Such were some of the bitters with which the Council abounded; but yet, as it came up to the great point of Roman orthodoxy at that time, Adrian would not object to it, but gave it his *inprimatur*, and did his best to defend it against the exceptions of Charlemagne and his divines.

But we have yet to remark that in two particulars the decision of the Council differs from the doctrine and practice of Rome in the present day. The first particular is this—the formation of images of God the Father

Such representations are far from uncommon—"Molanus and Thyraeus (says Stillingfleet) mention four descriptions of images of the Trinity. 1. That of an old man for God the Father, of Christ in human stature, and of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. 2. That of three persons of equal stature. 3. That of the image of the holy Virgin, in the belly of which was an image of the Holy Trinity. 4. That of one body with three heads, or one head with three bodies. These authors disapprove the two last, but defend the two former."* It requires, however, little research to find abundant proofs that such representations were forbidden by the Bishops of the Council of Nice—indeed, by the great body of divines, both East and West, living at that time: some, a few out of many, we will bring forward.

Gregory, in his letter to Leo, writes thus:—"Would you know the reason why we have not depicted or made an image of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? It is because we know not what He is, and it is impossible to describe or to depict the nature of God; but, if we had seen and known Him as we have seen and known His Son, we should have painted His image also, that you might have called His image an idol."

So Germanus in his letter to John Bishop of the Synadensians, and read in the Fourth Session of the Council, declares:—"We make no likeness or image of the invisible Deity, whom the highest order of angels are not able to comprehend." So, in the conference between the Pagan and the Christian about images, recited in the Fifth Session: the Christian is represented as saying, "We make images of God—I mean our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—representing Him in human form, not in His abstract Deity. For what

* "Defence of the Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome." 8vo., p. 568. London, 1676.

resemblance or likeness could we make of the incorporeal uncircumscribable Word of God the Father? For God is a Spirit, as it is written." So, again, in the Sixth Session, Epiphanius the advocate of the Council of Nice affirms:—"No man ever thought of depicting the Deity; for it is written, 'No man hath seen God at any time.'" Stillingfleet, in the work above cited, brings forward passages from some contemporary writers who were zealous patrons of image worship to same purpose. John Damascen says, "If we cannot paint a soul, how much less can we represent God by an image, who gave that being to a soul which cannot be painted?*" We should err, indeed, if we should make an image of God who cannot be seen. Who is there in his senses (says Stephen the younger) that would go about to paint the Divine Nature which is immaterial and incomprehensible? For, if we cannot represent Him in our minds, how can we paint Him in colours?" The Greek author of the book on the use of images goes further, for he saith, "That no images ought to be made of God; and that, if any man attempt it, he is to suffer death as a Pagan."† Romanist authors therefore have to labour as hard to reconcile themselves to the decrees of the Nicene Council, and the views of its divines, as had the Bishops of that Council, to reconcile its corruptions with reason, antiquity, and Scripture.

A second particular, in which many divines of no small eminence in the Church of Rome differ from this Council, is in the degree of worship paid to certain images. That Council had made a marked distinction between the worship due to God and that to be paid to any image

* Damascen, Orat. i., de Imag. p. 747; Orat. ii., p. 759.

† Stillingfleet's "Defence," pp. 556, 557.

whatever, even of Christ or the Virgin Mary. This superior kind of worship was to be paid to God alone and to no creature whatever ; while the inferior worship might be given to pictures and images, saints and angels, as well as God.

This distinction was founded on our Lord's reply to the tempter when he said—" All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." To this our Lord answered—" Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." The Council, quoting from an obscure writer, Anastasius Sinaita, and turning his words from their right meaning, conclude as follows :— That to the word *worship* there is no absolute restriction, but to the word *serve* there is. The worship first mentioned by our Lord is common to God with other things ; but the worship implied in the word "serve" is due to God alone. Such was the doctrine of the Council. Thus we find in the letter of the Council to Irene and her son :—" St. Paul speaks of Jacob, 'he worshipped the top of his staff ;' and, in like manner, Gregory, surnamed the Divine, says, ' Honour Bethlehem : worship the manger.' Who would ever imagine that by such directions was signified the supreme worship which is in spirit and in truth ? Did Jacob worship the top of his staff with latria ?—did Gregory bid us worship the manger with latria ? Never." That this inferior kind of worship was the only worship allowed to images of any kind whatever, is further evident from the words of their Decree or Definition on this subject. But this view has not satisfied later divines on this head, and they have, in part at least, come to an opposite conclusion : and it appears from Thomas Aquinas, and many others enumerated in Stillingfleet's " Defence," that, after all, latria

or supreme worship, does belong to images of Christ.* Romish doctors explain this discrepancy—some in one way, some in another : to them be it left. We, as Protestants, have little to do with it but to notice the vanity of all such distinctions. Hence also has arisen a third point of difference. The Council of Nice recognised but two kinds of worship—*latria*, the worship in spirit and in truth, due to God only ; inferior worship, which is common to all sacred things whatever. This latter was by the Council styled “Proscunesis,” but since it has been called *dulia*. A third kind of worship, entirely unknown to the Nicene divines, has been established in succeeding ages—a worship inferior to *latria*, and yet superior to *dulia*, which is styled *hyperdulia*, and belongs to the Virgin Mary only. How far these refinements may be carried may be seen from Bellarmine’s work on this subject.† He distinguishes between the worship due to the Saviour and that due to His image, which, though the same in kind, is different in degree ; and the same distinction follows between the *hyperdulia* belonging to the Virgin and the *dulia* common to the Saints ; so there are two *latrias*, two *hyperdulas*, two *dulas*. There is a superior or perfect *latria* due to God or to Christ as in themselves considered : an inferior or imperfect *latria* due to any image of Him : in like manner, to the Virgin herself perfect *hydulia* is due ; to images imperfect *hyperdulia* ; and to the saints perfect *dulia* is their due—imperfect *dulia* belongs to their image.‡

* Stillingfleet’s “Defence,” p. 606-607, &c.

† Bellarm. “De cultu Imag.” l. ii. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.

‡ Cultus qui posse, proprie debetur imaginibus, est cultus quidam imperfectus, qui analogice, et reductive pertinet ad speciem ejus cultus qui debetur exemplari. Cultus iste non est *latria*, nec *hyperdulia*, nec *dulia*, sed inferior et varius. Ita ut imaginibus sanctorum debeatur, *dulia secundum quid analogice*, sive reductive : imaginibus B. Virginis, *hyperdulia secundum quid analogice* et reduc-

From all these vain and trifling, these almost unintelligible, distinctions, we of the Church of England may rejoice that we are by the grace of God set free. These distinctions are unknown in the Scriptures: this we are content to take as our guide, and want no traditions or men's sophistical reasonings to explain to us that which is plain enough without. We worship God alone as revealed in His Trinity of Persons: we know but of one kind of worship—that which is in spirit and in truth: we acknowledge one Mediator alone, and discard all dependence on Saints or Angels or on the Virgin Mary; and, in coming to God, we want no pictures to remind us of His sanctity or images to enliven our devotion. We aim to honour Him, not by making oblations to painted and sculptured things of men's devising, but by embracing the salvation He has proclaimed by His ambassadors, and follow the precepts which He has caused His servants to deliver for our edification. Let us be thankful to God who raised up in behalf of His Church men such as Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, and others, who, by His grace, brought back the true light obscured by clouds of mediæval darkness. "*Let us stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and not be entangled again with the same yoke of bondage.*"

Thus far the history of the Council: as a sequel to which it may be not unacceptable to the reader to trace subsequent events relative to this controversy, till all opposition to images and their worship was silenced, both in the East and in the West, except as it might still linger amongst those who were styled Heretics, till the æra of the ever-blessed Reformation. With respect to the East,

tive: imaginibus Christi cultus *latría* inferior qui tamen reductive ad *latríum*, ut imperfectum ad perfectum.

we come first to consider the rest of the reign of Irene and her son, and we find a melancholy detail of crime and misery. Surely the events of that reign form no proof of the favour of God : for it was a reign both sad and disgraceful to the empire. Constantine's veterans being disbanded we hear no more of victories over the Bulgarians or Saracens : on the contrary, of repeated defeats in both quarters. An attempt was made by Irene to recover the Exarchate, now given to the Pope, to the empire, but in vain : the Greeks were defeated in a bloody battle, and all hopes of obtaining the Exarchate were for ever put to an end ; and, in the year 789, the Saracens in the South, and the Bulgarians in the North, ravaged the empire with impunity. Diogenes and his troops were cut to pieces by the Saracens ; Philetus Duke of Thrace was surprised by the Bulgarians and lost the greater part of his army ; the next year the Roman fleet was destroyed by the Saracens and their admiral taken prisoner. In the year 792, once more the Bulgarians were successful ; and in 798, the Saracens again ravaged the empire to the very gates of the royal city.

Such were the deplorable events of this reign as concerned the empire in general. The private history of Constantine and Irene discloses scenes yet more revolting and painful. Irene's great ambition was to reign : left a widow with a child in tender years, she long in his name swayed the empire according to her will ; nor was she willing to part with that power which she acquired. The Emperor was kept as a boy to his twentieth year : he was at first affianced to Rotruda, daughter of Charlemagne ; but Irene, fearing the consequence of such alliance, broke off the engagement, and forcibly married her son to an obscure person from

Armenia. With the name of Emperor he was but a private subject, destitute of all power and authority. His first attempt to gain his liberty was unsuccessful : the conspiracy was discovered : the domestics who had assisted were punished in different ways, and the Emperor himself not only had to endure reproaches but even blows from the hand of his royal mother. He continued in the condition rather of a prisoner than of a son and lawful Emperor until his faithful Armenian guards at last set him free from this disgraceful condition.

Irene, now despoiled awhile of her power, rested not till she had recovered it again : this the weakness of her son enabled her soon to do. By the intrigues of her courtiers, who were about the Emperor, a reconciliation was effected between her and her son little more than a year after her deposition. Once again in the way to power, she scrupled at no step, however atrocious, to attain the object of her wish. Her plan was, by bad advice, to make Constantine odious to the people, and then to stir up the people against him. By her advice he first became jealous of his Armenian guards, stirred them up by cruelty into rebellion, and finally disbanded and destroyed them. By the same advice his four uncles were deprived of their eye-sight ; and lastly, by the same advice, the Emperor divorced his wife Mary, to whom he was never attached, and married Theodota. The Patriarch Tarasius refused either to divorce Mary or to consummate the new marriage, and a more compliant divine was found in Joseph Abbot and Steward of the Church of Constantinople. The marriage was celebrated with great pomp, and Tarasius dared not ~~venture to~~ excommunicate the Emperor, lest he should in revenge become, like his father, an Iconoclast. This marriage was followed by con-

sequences the most deplorable. It was said that many others—courtiers, governors, and men in authority—followed the same example ; and, in a little time, the immorality thus introduced became very general. Bad as the consequences were to the empire in general, they were yet worse to the Emperor : for By it a general disaffection was excited against himself and his government alike. The rebuke which Tarasius failed to give on the marriage was given without moderation by the zeal of the monks, Plato and Theodore. Plato refused the communion of Tarasius because of his silence, and denounced the Emperor to his face as an adulterer : nor could he or his nephew, Theodore, be silenced but by imprisonment. The flame was not thereby extinguished : from Plato it was enkindled amongst the monks, and from them it was enkindled amongst the common people. Nor was this the worst : for now it was that Irene, ever watchful for an opportunity to dethrone her son and reign herself, had, as it were, an occasion put into her hands which she was not slow to use. Therefore, though she had herself advised this divorce and this marriage, she now made it a constant subject of blame and vituperation.

Having thus prepared the way, she formed a plot against the Emperor which was boldly planned and skilfully carried into execution. He was seized while in his tent, bound, made prisoner, brought to the purple chamber where he was born, and then, by the Empress's order, he was deprived of sight ; and, as a hopeless miserable captive, wore out the remainder of his days in utter obscurity and neglect. Some historians have execrated this deed, but others have palliated and justified it, among whom is Baronius. The Cardinal is, however, constrained to confess that it was "scelus plane

execrandum," unless Irene had been instigated thereto by her love of justice and piety. His words are :—" If Irene thus plotted against her son from love of reigning, she would have been more detestable than Agrippina the mother of Nero ; but as, from the testimony of certain orientals, it was religion and a love of justice that moved her to do this, then she merits our commendation, even as the sons of Levi who slew their brethren at the command of Moses." So then, it appears that love for images and their worship is to be considered as a cloak to cover all faults, and to make the crimes of an Agrippina worthy of our praise ! For the fall of Constantine was entirely owing to his mother. It was she who gave him the bad advice which made him odious to his people—she who excited them against him—she who gave the cruel order that his eyes should be put out and be confined for life to a prison. Now Irene reigns alone : her poor blinded son can give her no more trouble, unless conscience may now and then remind her of her guilt. But she reigns not in peace—the Saracens ravage her empire to the very gates of Constantinople—she is forced to buy them off from further aggressions. " This ambitious Princess (says Le Beau)* had obtained all she desired, except tranquillity of mind and the love of her subjects. She resolved to colour her remorse, and to overcome the aversion of the people by the colour of good and virtuous deeds : she opened her treasures and poured them with unsparing hand into the bosom of the unfortunate : she founded hospitals for old men, for strangers, for the poor ; and, above all, she remitted all that was due to the public treasury and greatly lightened the burthen of taxation." How far she succeeded in stifling

* " Histoire du Bas Empire," vol. xiv. p. 172 ; or lib. 66, c. 58.

remorse we are not informed—certain it is that she did little in gaining the love of her subjects. The five years of her reign were disturbed with perpetual plots, and she was at length deposed and exiled to the isle of Lesbos, where she was so reduced as to be forced to gain a livelihood by working with her needle. Such a reverse she was ill able to bear, and she died in the very same year in which she was sent into banishment. Bad as she was, her zeal for image-worship has covered her name with a halo of glory, and she has among the Greeks obtained admission into the rank of Saints, and the 15th of August is the day appointed for the celebration of her VIRTUES!

But we must now give a short sketch of the remainder of this controversy, till its final extinction under Theodora. Though by the Council held at Nice a foundation was laid for the lasting continuance of image-worship, it was not as yet so firmly settled but that it met with great opposition for many years to come. As it is said that love of image-worship instigated the Empress to imprison and blind her son, we may suppose some wavering on this point had been detected in him. Possibly this appearance of opposition was no more than a kind of threat, by which he would intimidate the Patriarch and others when they would thwart his inclination. When Irene reigned alone, image-worship stood on a firmer basis; but holy and venerable images could neither give comfort to her mind nor stability to her throne. "Her successor, Nicephorus, allowed (says Gibbon)* a general liberty of speech and practice: and the only virtue of his reign is accused by the monks as the cause of his temporal and eternal perdition. Superstition and weakness form the character of Michael I., but the saints and images were incapable of

* Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," c. 49.

supporting their votary on the throne." To Michael succeeded Leo V., styled the Armenian : he was decided against image-worship, and during his reign it was very much in abeyance, though far from being entirely put down. Some instances of persecution are laid to his charge, and these were uniformly cases where certain monks, by their officious boldness, provoked the anger of the Emperor when he was otherwise little inclined to meddle with them. He was a Prince of undoubted valour and bravery ; and, could we know all, we might find that he was not destitute of piety. He was slain in a church in an act of worship, and the signal of his destruction was his leading in the hymn—" All things have they despised for the love of their Lord." His love of justice and the general benefit of his rule to the empire is acknowledged even by his enemies. Nicephorus, the Patriarch, who was banished by Leo, said, with a sigh, on hearing his death—" Religion has lost a great enemy, but the State has lost a most useful Prince."

His successor, Michael II., attempted to hold a middle course on this controversy—to allow of images for the purpose of exciting devotion or teaching the ignorant, but not for worship. In vain that he made the attempt : he was called a chameleon to signify that his sentiments were of a variable nature, and he was also charged with some kind of Gnostic heresy. His reign was not like that of his predecessor—beneficial to the empire. In his reign the Saracens took the island of Crete, and held it till dispossessed by Nicephorus Phocas in 961. A letter sent from Michael to Louis le Debonnaire, son and successor of Charlemagne, and read by his order at the Council held at Paris in 824, reveals* some curious facts as to the height of absurdity to which love of images

* *Apud Imperialia de cultu Imag. Francof. 1601, p. 618.*

led many of the Greeks. "Many (writes Michael), covering these images with veils, choose them for sponsors at the sacred font of baptism ; others, when they received the religious habit, would no longer permit the holy persons whose business it was to receive the hair as they cut it off ; but must needs have images brought near, that the hair as it was cut off might fall into their lap. Some Priests and Clerics, scraping the paint from the images, would mix the same with the wine of the sacred oblations : others would place the Lord's body in the hand of images, from whence all who would communicate must receive it." Michael would have reigned mildly enough, requiring only liberty for himself and those who thought as he did ; but superstition would not be content without his being an idolater, and his compelling all others to be the same.

To him succeeded his son Theophilus, the last of all the Iconoclastic Emperors. The most opposite characters are given of this Emperor : some affirm that he was the most cruel of all the Iconoclasts—that he was an impious heretic who surpassed all the rest in cruelty—outrageously passionate ; and then, by way of a something to say—for those who said it never believed it—it is added he was given to magic arts and accustomed to consult magicians. Baronius is more mild :* his words are :—" But in respect of that which is said by many, that he surpassed all his predecessors in impiety, possibly they said this in respect of the worship of holy images, which he altogether abhorred ; but, though he was an Iconoclast, he was not an Hagiomachus : since he both worshipped all the Saints in general, and specially would frequent the churches of the Mother of God, and, what is more, he actually erected a church to her honour."

* Baron. " Eccles. Hist." vol. ix., ad. ann. 833, s. 4.

He was, according to others, illustrious both for valour and justice, and the most virtuous of all the Iconoclastic Princes. As a warrior, though brave he was unfortunate, and the ruin and sack of his native town, Ammorium, caused him to die of a broken heart. He was reported to have repented of his opposition to images at his dying hour, and his widow, Theodora, and the Patriarch Methodius, were each favoured with a dream to assure them that his repentance on this head was accepted, and that he was rescued from everlasting wrath to which, on this account, he would have been exposed.

He was succeeded by his son, Michael III., under the tutelage of his mother, Theodora : she found means entirely to suppress all further opposition to images and their worship. "Michael (says Jortin) his son and successor, who was then a boy, aided by his mother and instigated by the Monks, re-established image-worship in the year 842, which thenceforward was triumphant. On this glorious victory over reason and common sense a new festival was established, called the Feast of Orthodoxy, which is still observed in the Greek Church. Thus fell the *heresy* of the Iconoclasts, which had maintained itself about one hundred and twenty years after its introduction by Leo Isaurus ; and thus it appears that even in those dark, ignorant, superstitious, lying ages, there was a long and violent struggle against idolatry, till at length Monks and Women, Priests and Popes, bore down all opposition."

The character of Theodora appears far superior in every respect to that of Irene. She lies under no suspicion of having poisoned her husband—under no charge of plotting against her son when he would depose her from authority. "Instead (says Gibbon*) of conspiring

* Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix.

against the life and government of her son, she retired without a struggle, though not without a murmur, to the solitude of private life, deploring the ingratitude, the vices, and the inevitable ruin of that worthless youth." Theodora, though of respectable morals, was a remorseless bigot: under her the Paulicians, to the number of one hundred thousand, were destroyed without mercy. "Being highly delighted (says Curopalates*) with the conversion of the Bulgarians to the faith, in her desire to do what was good she determined to convert the Manicheans, or, as they were styled, Paulicians, to the study of piety and virtue; but, being unsuccessful, she determined to have them all destroyed—an order which filled the world with trouble: for they who were sent to execute this command—Leo son of Argyrus, Andronicus son of Ducas, and Sudalis—using their command with all cruelty, crucified some, slew others with the sword, tormented others with various tortures, and with various and diverse kinds of punishment of every sort slew about one hundred thousand men, despoiling them of all their goods. The rest of them were goaded thereby into a rebellion." For this, and her destruction of the Iconoclastic party, she was comforted in her solitude by a letter from the proudest of all prelates who had hitherto swayed the Roman See—Pope Nicholas. He tells her "that, like a ray of the sun, she had dispelled the dark cloud of error from the Church. The heretics (he continues) have found in thee the fortitude of a man, and, astonished at thine invincible bravery, did stand in doubt as to whether thou wert female or no. Whence this, but that you followed the dogmas of the Apostolic See, and that you received the admonitions of the Patriarch of the See of Constantinople with which the

* Baronius's "Eccles. Hist.," ad. ann. 845., sect. 9.

Roman Church now communicates." In short, the b oody Theodora was quite a Sovereign after the Pope's own heart.

As to Michael, the son of Theodore, the distinctive epithet of "The Sot" which is attached to his name, sufficiently marks the profligacy of his conduct and character. Nor can his immorality or impiety be traced to any Iconoclastic feelings: for, while wallowing in every crime, at one time he receives a crown from the hand of the image of the Virgin Mary, and at another, in a fit of pretended zeal, exhumes, maltreats, and burns to ashes the bones of Constantine V. His subjects at length grew weary of him, and the dagger of Basil, his successor, put an end to him and his immoralities and impieties together.

It should appear that, notwithstanding all the efforts of Theodora, the light she endeavoured to darken still lingered at Constantinople: there were for many years afterwards those who would not bow the knee to idols of wood and paint. A proof of this we find in the Council called by the Latins—not the Greeks—the Eighth Œcumenic Council, held at Constantinople under the Emperor Basil I., the Macedonian. In the Eighth Session* the Emperor Basil said to the Roman Legates:—"Theodore, surnamed Crithinus, chief of the sect of the Iconoclasts, has been brought to the Council; and what is your will about him?" The Legates replied:—"Let the most honourable of the Princes be sent to him, and let them declare to him, in the name of the Legates of the Roman Pontiff, that Pope Adrian, at the request of the most religious Emperor to his spiritual father, hath sent hither his Legates: in consequence whereof we have been convened, together with the Legates of the Eastern Sees at the Royal city, and we

* *Apud Labbe tom. viii., col. 1357.*

now send for you that we may absolve you from the errors in which you have so long been involved : these things say we and the Legates of the Eastern Sees."

Baanes the Prefect, and Leo the Patrician, went forthwith, by command of the Emperor, to Theodore, and laid before him the message of the Legates : to all which Crithinus returned no answer. Baanes the Prefect then laid before him a coin bearing the image of the Emperor, and said, "Do you recognize this image?" Theodore answered, "I receive it and honour it as far forth as the royal image may be honoured." Baanes then said, "If you honour the image of a mortal king, how dare you dishonour the Theandric image of the Lord, the image of His all-holy Mother, and of the Saints?" Theodore replied, "When you show me the coin, I know beyond all doubt that it bears the king's image ; but, when you ask me to receive the image and form of Christ, I do not know whether it be His command or whether it be agreeable to Him." Baanes rejoined, "We did not come here to dispute with you, but to admonish you ; and now, if you will yield, come : the whole Church invites you." Theodore would not be persuaded by them, and this was announced to the Council. The Legates said, "Let the chapter of Pope Nicholas concerning images be read ;" which was read as follows :—"Since it is most fitting that we keep inviolate the Decrees of our fathers, we decree that the images of our Lord, of the ever Virgin the Mother of God, and of all Saints who from the beginning of the world have pleased God, even as the universal Church has received, be worshipped in all coming ages ; and John, once Archbishop of Constantinople, and all his followers, if they agree not with us, we anathematize." Then the Emperor said, "We have here also some others

who are followers of this same Crithinus ; and, if it please your Holiness, let them be brought in." Elias, Legate of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, said—" Let them be brought in." On which Nicetas a cleric, and Theophilus a courtier, and Theophanes a lawyer, came in, to whom the Legates said, " Do ye anathematize the heresy of the Iconoclasts ?" And they answered, " We have been heretofore deceived by the sophistical reasoning of wicked men ; but now, having seen the consent and agreement of this Œcumenic and holy Synod, we denounce the heresy of the Iconoclasts, and all who worship not holy and venerable images we anathematize." And each in turn, having ascended a lofty pulpit, anathematized the heresy of the Iconoclasts and its promoters, and Patriarchs Theodorus, Antonius, John, and Theodore, surnamed Crithinus.*

Then Basil, most pious and puissant Emperor, calling each of them kissed them, and said :—" Now have ye been delivered from demoniacal possession. Now have ye become Christians, indeed ; and, with all the orthodox, are ye among the number of those who shall be saved by Christ Jesus, and ye have now been made worthy of eternal life : for, unless ye had anathematized the heresy of the Iconoclasts, *Christ would have profited you nothing.*" Elias, most beloved Presbyter in God, and Chancellor of the Eastern throne of Jerusalem, said—" The intervention of thy sacred authority has this day dignified them with no small benefit, my Lord, thou friend of Christ ; and very greatly hast thou

* The records of the Council, as far as they are in Greek and Latin, end with the usual anathemas against Iconoclasts and their doctrine and practices ; but in a Latin version, prefixed to the ordinary record of the Council, we find what is here subjoined as being spoken by Basil and the Legates. The anathemas are more numerous, and are followed up with some additional anathemas against Photius, and many expressions of praise to the Emperor Basil, his sons, his wife, and all belonging to him.—*Col.* 1107, *edit.* 1671.

caused us also to rejoice : yea, and even Christ Himself, who hath given thee the empire, and may He preserve thee in this zeal for religion now and for evermore." The most holy Legates of Old Rome said : " Now verily does it appear that the ineffable wisdom, Christ our God, rules the world ; for He hath raised up thee, our most religious Emperor, for the correction of all who did wrong, and for the safety and preservation of those who think aright ; and verily the Roman Church greatly rejoices in thee, beholding in thee such zeal for religion. But, as to him who would not understand or do aright, or repent and leave his peculiar impiety—namely, Theodore surnamed Crithinus—this holy Œcumenic Council lays its anathema upon him, and upon all who agree together with him, as well those who are now alive as those who in like opinion and sentiment have departed this life."

Anathemas were then pronounced by Stephen a deacon, from the ambo or pulpit, against Iconoclastic opinions in general, against the six Iconoclastic Patriarchs, and against all who agreed with them, especially Theodore surnamed Crithinus. Amongst these, that Anathema which is mentioned first, " To the conventicle still vaunting itself against holy images," may be noticed as showing that at this time the Iconoclasts still were a considerable body. In the Latin version are added anathemas no less vehement, and abuse no less virulent against Photius ; and a chorus of praises is shouted forth in honour of the Emperor, his wife, and children ; of the Greek Bishops who took part against Photius ; and of the Legates from Rome.

Connected also with the transactions of this Session we find, amongst the canons of the Eighth Council, two relative to the subject of images—viz :—

Canon III. "We define that the image of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is to be worshipped with the same honour which is paid to the book of the holy Gospels. For as, by the syllables found therein, all obtain salvation, so by pictures, formed by colours, both learned and unlearned obtain a benefit from that which is placed before them. For what things soever the word in writing displays, the same also does the pictorial delineation set forth and declare. If any one therefore worship not the image of our Lord and Saviour, *he shall not see His face at His second coming.* In like manner we worship and adore the image of His immaculate mother, and the images of the holy angels, as the holy Scripture describes them in its oracles, and let those who hold not with us be anathema."—*Col.* 1370.

Canon VII. "To set up holy and venerable images, and in like manner to give the instruction of wisdom human and divine, is very useful ; but it is not proper that either be done by unworthy persons. Wherefore, we decree that none who are under anathema shall paint images in holy churches, nor shall be permitted to teach in any place whatever until they return from their own private error. Whosoever, therefore, after this our decree, shall allow such either to paint holy images in churches, or in any manner to give instructions, if he be cleric let him be in danger of losing his rank ; but, if laic, let him be put aside and deprived of participating in the sacred mysteries"—*Col.* 1372.

By degrees, as the darkness of the mediæval ages drew on, the Iconoclastic party grew less and less, till they were no more found to exist as a separate sect ; and, not improbably, they united themselves to some of those bodies of Christians out of the pale of the Church who still kept up primitive simplicity of wor-

ship. The Paulicians were destroyed in Asia, but still subsisted in Thrace, whither many of them had been transported by Constantine V. There they resisted the storms of persecution and maintained a correspondence with their Armenian brethren. "Their exile (says Gibbon) in a distant land was softened by free toleration : the Paulicians held the city of Philippopolis and the keys of Thrace : the Catholics were their subjects, and the Jacobite emigrants their associates." This association of the Armenians, who were not Manicheans in any sense—for they believed though slightly misunderstood the Nicene Creed with the Paulicians—might seem to afford some proof that, after all, the latter were not Manicheans. The professors of two such discordant principles as that of Manes and Eutyches could hardly be united together in one community. The Armenians never admitted of images at all in their worship—content with a reverence, it may be of a superstitious kind, to the cross. Such were precisely the sentiments of the Iconoclasts. As superstition abounded, their position among the bigots of Constantinople would be increasingly harrassing and dangerous : they would, therefore, find a welcome refuge among either the calumniated Paulicians or the slightly wrong Armenians. Amongst the former might still exist the long lost simplicity of the Gospel ; and, if the latter were erroneous, it might be seen that the *theoretical* error of the Monophysites was not to be compared with the *practical* idolatry of the so-styled orthodox. Thus, however, was truth banished from the Eastern Church, and all her desolation has not made her as yet to repent of the works of her hands ; so that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold and silver, brass and stone and of wood, which can neither see nor read, nor

hear nor walk. From a like darkness in the West we Protestants, by the grace of God, have been rescued ; and are taught to worship God *alone* in His Trinity of Persons without the crowd of saint and angel mediators, and to worship Him in His Trinity of Persons *spiritually*, without the carnal medium of images and pictures.

Before the darkness of Popery overwhelmed the West, an attempt was made also in that part of the Church to restrain the incoming tide of superstition. It was well intended, but not well carried out ; for, while the noxious branches were lopped off, the offensive trunk remained. Images were to have no worship paid to them ; but they were to be set up in churches as helps for the unlearned. It has been already remarked how greedily Rome and all Italy ran into the error of idolatry ; and that, from North to South, from the Alps to Sicily, the Iconoclasts had no footing in so much as one city. The Popes used all their energy in defence of their idols and were quite successful ; but, though Italy was thus eager for idolatry, this was far from being the case with those nations who, by means of Charlemagne and Pepin, were coming into close connection with her. Rome, by means of Zachary, Stephen, and Adrian, had lately formed extensive connections with the nations of the North, and gloried in her new powerful ally Charlemagne, who had taken the title of "Emperor of the West and King of the Romans." As he had been found so ready a helper to the See of Rome in respect of temporal matters, Pope Adrian imagined that he would no less readily second her spiritual views ; and that as the See of Rome had by him been exalted to a degree before unknown, he would as implicitly receive her admonitions as to doctrine and worship. With

this view, Adrian transmitted to Charlemagne a translation of the Council of Nice : he himself had received it and he expected that the Emperor would do the same ; but the Council met with a very different reception amongst the divines of Germany and France from that which it had received in Italy. For to the hands of his divines Charlemagne had committed it ; and, in his name, they published the four books, known by the name of the "*Libri Carolini*," in confutation of the doctrine and errors with which that Council abounded. The work contains one hundred and twenty chapters, in each of which some error, real or supposed, is made subject of censure. The work was begun when the acts were first transmitted by Adrian in 787, and was not complete till the year 790. As large portions of these books are subjoined to the Council by way of notes, some account will here be given of them, as well as of the answer made to the objections contained in them by Adrian, to whom Charlemagne had sent them. In the course of the work, the quotations made by the Bishops of the Council from the Scriptures and the fathers, and furthermore arguments put forth by them in favour of the worship of images, are considered ; and, while the former are shown to be irrelevant and falsely applied, the latter are considered as equally vain and ridiculous. It may be observed that one point is ever kept in view throughout the "Caroline Books"—the entire prohibition of every kind of worship to images—not merely what might be understood by the word *latria*, but all that was signified by the inferior worship styled *proscunesis*. The *cultus*, the *observatio*, the *veneratio*, required in this latter kind of worship, each met with more or less censure ; while the bowing of the head to images is considered that which might be

with all prudence forbidden : the lighting of candles and the burning of incense in the presence of them is denounced as foolish and absurd. Thus, in lib. iv. c. 3, we have a long chapter against this latter practice, where it is specially noticed how foolish are they who light candles before things which cannot see, and burn incense for things which cannot smell.* But, as it was often said that the honour done to the image passes on to them of whom it is the image, this also is considered and refuted : and it is asked whether it is to be supposed that Paul, who would not on earth suffer the men of Lystra to worship him, or that Peter, who would not allow Cornelius to worship him, would, now that they are in glory, receive that honour which they refused while on earth. In short, nothing can be more contemptuous than the manner in which images and pictures are spoken of when considered as objects of any kind of worship. Besides these decisive and most indignant testimonies against image-worship, there is much to please the general reader in this work. It is written throughout in a grave serious strain, except when the absurdities of the Nicene Council provoke sarcastic mirth. Very honourable mention is made of the Scriptures, and a very long chapter is devoted to show how indignantly they reject any comparison between the benefit to be derived from them and that to

* It is to be remarked that, more or less directly, every word by which any kind of religious worship is intended, and every outward mark of such worship, is distinctly condemned as inappropriate to images : so that it is not merely the higher kind of worship which is forbidden, but all worship of any kind whatever. Thus we find it is said, lib. iii. 18, *Spretis cultus creaturarum*, censuring the *cultus*, or, as it is by some Englished, "cult," paid to images. Again, in lib. ii. c. 27, "*Sine istarum observatione omnes qui rectæ fidei sunt, salventur :*" so lib. ii. c. 30, they deride the *veneratio* paid to images thus—"*Tu fucatorum venerator esto colorum :*" so, in lib. ii. c. 1, they consider all bowing to such things superfluous : for speaking of the comparison of image-breakers to Nebuchadnezzar, made in the fifth Session, they say, "*Aliud crudeliter sancta sanctorum diruere, aliud, prudenter picturis colla deflectere inhibere.*"

be derived from pictures and images. Tradition is also mentioned, but it is very far from being put on the same ground with the Scriptures. Casual mention is made of the intercession of the saints, but little is said of them and nothing special concerning the Virgin ; while Christ, as the great source of salvation, the author and finisher of our faith, is often very prominently brought forward.

The work does not, however, claim entire approbation. It is disfigured with mystical interpretations and allegorical and patristic trifling. It contains the seeds of dangerous errors—namely, the intercession of saints mentioned above—the reverence due to relics—the admission of pictures in churches for purposes of instruction : and, though it bears a very decisive testimony against Christian idolatry, yet the allowance and approval of these errors has rendered it of little avail ; for, like the wheat amongst the thorns, it has been overpowered by them and ceased to bring forth fruit to perfection. For it was not long before this desire of the intercession of saints led to the worship of them—this veneration of relics to superstitious adoration—and this setting up of pictures in churches to that worshipping of them so deeply condemned by the divines of Charlemagne. It may be further observed that the confutation of the Council is not so complete as could be desired : many erroneous portions are not noticed at all ; and we find not unfrequently that the Council is censured amiss because its meaning has been mistaken. Thus, certain texts are censured as being applied improperly to image-worship ; but the censure falls back on those who made it, when it is found that the text was not alleged for any such purpose. One error seems to be but too common in these books—to take for granted that every text which

appears in the Council has been brought forward for the purpose of proving the worship of images—which is, after all, very far from being the case. Some of the objections seem rather hypercritical and captious, and others were occasioned by the very faulty translation of the Council transmitted by Pope Adrian. To this cause must be attributed the error of charging the Council of Nice with passages which were not spoken by the Bishops there, but which they had brought forward from the previous Council of Constantinople for the purpose of confutation. Still, on the whole, we may safely assert, in the words of Dr. Stebbing,* that “this work may be considered as one of the most valuable remains of the theological literature of the Eighth Century, and as the best medium at present existing for conveying a true notion of the real state of religious opinions at the time when it appeared.”

These books were brought to Rome and presented by Engelbert, the Emperor’s ambassador, to Pope Adrian. “The Pope (says Fleury) answered them by a long letter addressed to King Charles, whom he always treats with very great respect, notwithstanding the severity of the treatise which he answers: for, as he had by his Legates assisted at the seventh Council, the contèmp of that Council he considered to reflect upon him.” The Pope as little relished the “Caroline Books” as their author the great Charles had relished the Council of Nice. He was, however, not in a situation to offend the Emperor; and therefore, in his answer, affects as much moderation as he could, and endeavours to enforce his sentiments by perpetual appeal to the fathers, in which, as Du Pin observes,† “he makes such applica-

* Stebbing’s “Hist. of the Church,” vol. ii. p. 79.

† Du Pin’s “Eccles. Hist. on the Seventh General Council.”

tion of them as few would approve, and vindicates reasons which some could scarcely relish." Indeed, in most of the quotations, it is very hard to see the slightest connection between the point to be proved and the passages brought forward from the fathers for that purpose. Adrian notices eighty-seven out of the one hundred and twenty chapters which the books contain. In doing so his remarks are strictly confined to the title of the chapter—whether it was that he thought it beneath his dignity to read more of the work, or that the substance of the various chapters was beyond his power in any way to refute. This letter, as might be expected, had but little effect on the Emperor or his divines ; for in the Council of Frankfort held, A.D. 794, in which this question was agitated, they rejected the opinion of the Greeks and condemned all manner of adoration or worship of images.* “Adrian (says Mosheim) composed an answer to the four books against the Council of Nice, but neither his arguments nor his authority were sufficient to support the superstition which he endeavoured to maintain : for, in the year 794, Charlemagne assembled at Frankfort-on-the-Maine a Council of three hundred Bishops, in order to re-examine the important question, in which the opinions contained in the four books were solemnly confirmed and the worship of images universally condemned.

The Council of Frankfort was assembled for two purposes—first, to examine some new opinions advanced by Elipand Bishop of Toledo, and Felix Bishop of Urgel, concerning the Sonship of the Saviour ; and next to consider the Pope's letter and the question of image-worship. Of this Council but two canons remain. The

* Cent. viii. part 2, chap. xiii. sec. 14.

first of these was in condemnation of the opinions of the Bishops before mentioned, who had maintained that Christ, considered in His divine nature, was really and truly the Son of God ; but that, considered as Man, He was such only nominally and by adoption. The second canon condemned, with no less decision, the Council of Nice, miscalled the Council of Constantinople. The canon is as follows :—“The question concerning the new Synod of the Greeks that was held at Constantinople was brought forward. In that Council it was written that they who did not pay that service and adoration to images of saints which they paid to the Divine Trinity should be anathematized : whereupon our holy fathers, refusing in *any way to offer prayer to them or to worship them*, treated it with contempt and utterly rejected it.”

Of this Council we find the following notice in Hoveden, one of our ancient annalists :—“In the year 792, A.D., Charles King of France sent into Britain a synodical book which had been sent to him from Constantinople, in which alas ! were found many things very inconsistent and opposed to the true faith ; and not the least of all was this, that it had been decided by the unanimous consent of almost all the eastern Doctors, and by three hundred and more Bishops, that images ought to be worshipped, which *the Church of God altogether execrates* ; against which Alcuinus wrote an epistle well confirmed by the authority of holy Scripture, and presented it, together with the aforesaid synodical books, to the French King in the name of our Bishops and Princes.”*

The Council of Frankfort had no more weight with

* Hoveden, “Annal.,” part i. p. 405. Spelman, “Conc.,” p. 792.

the Popes than had the "Caroline Books:" they were firm to the Nicene Decree, giving relative worship to images. The French divines, on the other hand, were no less determined in their adherence to the *media via* as marked out by Gregory I., the "Caroline Books," and the Council of Frankfort. While things were in this state a new controversy arose between the divines of the Council of Frankfort, and Claude, Bishop of Turin. That eminent man had raised a host of enemies against him by his thorough reformation of the Churches over which he presided. Like Serenus of Marseilles, he saw the only way to prevent the worship of images was to banish them from the Church altogether, and he acted in accordance with his principle. He seems, from the extracts which even his enemies have preserved of his writings, to have been a man of firmness and intrepidity. His answers to his various opponents betray no want of confidence in the goodness of his cause; he acted in accordance with Scripture and was not afraid to own what he had done. As the French divines had urged the *media via* against the Council of Nice, and were resolutely determined against the worship of images, so they now urged the same against Claude, and were no less determined in the retention of them in churches for the purposes of instruction. While, therefore, censuring Claude for his zeal in taking them away, they certainly agree with him in this—that images are not to be worshipped; and one or two of them speak of such worship with great contempt. Baronius, though he quotes from several of them with approbation as opponents of Claude, severely censures their want of orthodoxy in this respect. From Jonas Bishop of Arles, one of Claude's principal opponents, we have the following:—"As to the excuse which you say is made by image-worshippers to you to

defend their error—namely, ‘that we do not consider any divinity to reside in the image, but we only worship it in honour of Him whose image it is’—*we censure and abominate it as much as you*; for, as it escapes not their notice that there is no divinity in an image, they are worthy of yet severer reproof, because they give the honour due to God only to a poor paltry image.” Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, writes* yet more boldly :—“The false Synod, called amongst the Greeks the Seventh Œcumenic, concerning images—(of which some declared that they ought to be broken to pieces; and others, that they ought to be worshipped; and neither party were right, defining as they did without the consent of the Apostolic See)—was held at Nice by no small number of Bishops shortly before our time, and was sent thence to Rome and by the Pope of Rome to France. Whence, in the times of Charles the Great, a General Council was held in France, at Frankfort, by some men of the Apostolic See, which the aforesaid Emperor called together. And, according to the direction of Scripture and the tradition of our elders, the same false Synod of the Greeks was altogether destroyed and abrogated. Concerning the abrogation of which, a volume of no small size, which, when a boy, I read in the palace, was sent by the same Emperor to Rome by some Bishops.” And shortly after, he continues :—“By the authority of the Synod of Frankfort this veneration of images was a little repressed; but, nevertheless, Hadrian and other Pontiffs persevered in their opinions; and, when Charles was dead, promoted with much more vehemence the worship of their *puppets*: so that Louis, the son of Charles, attacked the worship of images in a book far more violent than the above-mentioned book of Charles.”

* Apud “Imperialia Decreta,” pp. 82, 625.

The mention of Louis and his book against images brings us to the consideration of the famous Parisian Council, held A.D. 824, in which the question of images, the worship and the respect due to them, was again considered ; and in which it was determined, as before, that images should not be broken or trampled upon, but also that no kind of worship or adoration was in any way due to them.

The immediate occasion of this Council was the following* :—“ In the year 820, Michael Balbus convened a Council to take up the controversy about images and settle the peace of the Church. These fathers pitched upon the temper, and followed the sentiments, of the Gallican Church : they allowed the *use* but forbade the *worship*. Some of the bigots for image-worship took a journey to Rome to complain of this Council : upon this Michael sent his ambassadors to justify his proceedings and give him satisfaction on this point. They had directions given them by the Emperor to apply to Ludovicus Pius to strengthen their interests. The Western Emperor, finding a fair opportunity of putting an end to the dispute, sent Freulfus and Adegarius to Rome to treat of this affair ; but Ludovicus’s envoys, perceiving that the Romans were averse to accommodation, desired that the Pope would consent that their master might debate this matter with his own Bishops. The Pope agreeing to the motion, there was a Synod held at Paris in the year above-mentioned.”

Of this famous Synod we have the following documents preserved to us :—1. The Letter of Michael and Theophilus, Emperors of the East, to Louis King of the French and the Lombards. 2. An Epistle sent by the Council also to Louis and to his son Lothaire. 3. A very

* Collier, “ Eccles. Hist.,” vol. i. p. 41.

large Collection of Testimonials from the Fathers and Councils divided into two parts : (1), those which condemned the breaking of images : (2), those which condemned the worship of them. 4. An Epistle in the name of Pope Eugenius to Michael the Emperor; unfolding the doctrine of the Council. It seems generally agreed that this Letter was not written by him. Romanists think *it too bad*, and Protestants *too good*, for a Pope to write. 5. An Epistle of Louis to the Pope requesting him to write to Michael to further peace between the Churches of Greece and Rome.

Of these documents, we can only take a short notice of the letter of the Council to the Emperor Louis. In this letter they write that, having met according to the Emperor's command, they transmit this their Epistle, together with the collections they had made from the fathers, embodying their sentiments on this subject. They state that, first of all, they had examined the letter of Adrian in answer to the *Divalis* of Constantine and Irene, in which they think that he acted rightly in censuring the destruction of images, but very indiscreetly in sanctioning the worship of them ; and that in this Epistle he had inserted certain passages from the fathers very impertinent, and quite foreign to the matter in hand.

2. They then state that the Council which this letter advised and encouraged came next under consideration ; and they observe, that, as a former Synod under Constantine erred in determining upon the abolition of images, so that this Council was no less erroneous, which defined not only that images should be worshipped and adored, but professed also to believe that holiness was to be obtained by means of them ; and that, further, in order to confirm themselves in this error, they had brought

forward certain passages of the apostles and fathers, and had most unwarrantably inserted them in their work : for that the passages are brought forward and applied in a sense very different from that in which they are enunciated and understood by the ancient fathers.

3. Next they state that, after this, the Emperor's illustrious father had caused the acts of this Council to be read over in his presence, and that in many places he had most justly censured it, and had caused the censures to be set down under various heads. That the censures were sent to Pope Hadrian who, so far from approving them, endeavoured to defend the Council by saying, not what he *ought*, but what he *could* : in doing which he used arguments equally opposed to truth and pontifical authority ; but that, as, while thus urging arguments *inconsistent, absurd*, and even worthy of censure, he professed to take in all things Gregory as his guide, they conclude that he erred not knowingly but ignorantly ; and that, unless he had been restrained by the guidance of this same Gregory, he must have fallen into the very abyss of perdition.

4. They state that they then caused to be read before them the letters of the Ambassadors from Greece, and from thence they inferred the intentions of the Sovereign in calling them together—namely, by their means to point out a middle path, and to recall those who were in error on the one side and on the other to return to the truth. That having found very great difficulty where they looked for help in the overthrow of superstition—(namely, at Rome)—they rejoice that a door was opened to them by the Emperor, who had obtained permission for them to meet and discuss this subject in their own country.

5. And lastly they state, that having made all the

collections they could from the fathers, they had come to the *conclusion* "that images of Saints are not, by foolish presumption, to be broken in pieces, or to be abolished or held in contempt, to the injury of the Saints ; and, on the other hand, that they are not to be worshipped and adored in compliance with the dictates of superstition ; but that, putting away all superstitious reverence, they are to be retained for the sake of true religion, and for love and remembrance of them of whom they are said to have been the images, as had been sufficiently declared by the most holy Pope Gregory. They add that, for the sake of those who lived in the See of Peter, they had placed those passages first which condemned the breaking of images, that so they being animated against the errors of others and being united with them in that condemnation, they might be more willing to advert to their own errors, and to receive the testimonies of the truth against their own superstition."

As to any good effect which their Council might have had at Rome these divines were mistaken : it removed not the least particle of darkness there ; for Anastasius tells us that the Apostolic See "*always maintained unshaken faith on the article of image-worship.*" This makes it unlikely that Eugenius was the author of the letter contained in the records of the Parisian Synod. But though little successful at Rome, it might be the means of holding up a fading light to the Churches of France and Germany ; for we find the same Anastasius, who was secretary to Pope John VIII, who occupied the pontifical throne at the close of this century, stating that even at that time "there were certain French Bishops to whom the saving virtues of images had not as yet been revealed." As the night of Papal and mediæval

darkness came on, the opposition died away altogether ; the French Bishops, as Romanist historians write, “becoming better informed on the subject, having seen that they condemned the Council of Nice and Papal approbation of it through an error.” Protestants, on the other hand, will attribute this change rather to a carelessness and indifference about the truth, and to the fact that the having of images in places of worship had by degrees led to its almost infallible consequence—the worship of these images. That which was lost to Christendom in general was still preserved in the remote recesses of the Alps amongst the Churches of the Waldenses, and in other similar localities, till that time when it pleased God again to roll back the clouds of ignorance and superstition and to cause the true light of the Gospel to burst forth. The history of image worship has been traced out in this short sketch from its first origin to its final overthrow, both in the East and West. The Reformation in both cases left so much behind which ought to have been removed that the votaries of superstition soon regained their lost ground. Alike unconvinced and unscrupulous, they failed not to use opportunities afforded to them by the want of caution on the part of their opponents. The most powerful instrument in their favour was the worship of the cross, defended alike in East and West : this, as it enfeebled the opponents of image worship, so it emboldened their adversaries. Though less liable to the charge of idolatry than honour paid to an image or a picture, it borders on what is dangerous even in this respect. But the evil of the practice was felt when it was considered what a retort it put into the hands of the enemy : “ Why find fault with me (it was asked) for worshipping pictures and images as things made with hands ? In what way is

a cross itself made but by the hands? Why deride me for worshipping things made of stone and wood? Of what is the cross, which you do worship, made?" The argument in favour of the cross is the weakest point in the "Libri Carolini."

How much more noble and manly was the stand made by Claude the illustrious Bishop of Turin! He rejects not only images and their worship, but crosses and their worship. His sentiments are extracted from the works of his enemies, and therefore appear to a disadvantage, as they are misquoted and mutilated to suit the view of the adversary who would confute them: still they form a striking defence of the faith, exciting unbounded hatred in the minds of its opponents. Had he lived a few hundred years later, no doubt he would have been added to the mediæval martyrs, and we should have had, not merely a mutilated account of his sentiments, but a long catalogue of blackest heresies charged upon his name. But, though the archers shot sorely at him, he went to his grave in peace. Louis le Debonnaire deserves no little credit for continuing unmoved as his firm friend to the end of his life: he died in peace, and the light which he kindled long remained after him—yea, was it ever quenched? It was banished Turin, but it continued in Peidmont, in Calabria, in Bohemia, till, as has been observed before, by the Reformation it burst forth, not a second time, we trust, to be overwhelmed by superstition and credulity.

And does not the practical idolatry of the nations of the Continent at the present day prove how important would have been the Reformation of Leo, could it have been maintained as firmly as in the first instance it was boldly carried out? Yea, even if the cautious and guarded endeavour of the Councils of Frankfort

and of Paris could have restrained the Christian world from worship of created things? Who can witness crowds bowing to an image of the Saviour or of the Virgin and not feel, as the Apostles of old, their hearts burn within them to see the multitudes bearing the Christian name so wholly given to idolatry? For what could the heathen do more for his god than Christians do for their images—or what outward testimony of respect, reverence, regard, or worship can even Christians show to the Saviour or to God than do these men to things made of brass and wood and stone?

The COUNCIL which is now presented to the English Churchman in his own tongue shows by what arguments this antichristian practice was supported and on what proofs it is grounded; and, when he sees the emptiness of the one and the weakness of the other, he is assured of the falsity of the superstructure which is upraised by them. He may rejoice that from such superstitions he is delivered: he may be thankful for men in later days more successful than Leo and Charlemagne by whom, under God's providence, he has been set free from the chains of a galling and degrading superstition; and he may conclude as in the language of our Church—"From this deplorable superstition—not our merit, but Thy mercy—not our foresight, but Thy providence, delivered us; and, therefore, not unto us, but unto Thy Name, be ascribed all honour and glory in all Churches of the Saints from generation to generation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."



TO THE READER.

As the "Caroline Books" are written in the name of Charlemagne, and as some suppose him to have been the author, his name is frequently assumed for the sake of convenience when citations are made from them. The first edition appeared in 1549; the latest is that edited by C. A. Heuman, Hanover, 1731.

Adrian's letter, in answer to these books, is contained in the collection of the "Concilia" made by Binius, and is found in *tom. iii. pars 1, Sectio Secunda*, edit. 1618, of that work. As this mode of division is very inconvenient and lengthy, it will be quoted thus—"Adrian's Answer," with the page annexed.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ANTE-CONCILIAR DOCUMENTS.

	PAGE
First Letter of Gregory II. to the Emperor Leo in Defence of Images.	
Second Letter of Pope Gregory to the Emperor Leo on Image Worship.	xii
The Preface, addressed to John VIII., Pope of Rome, by Anastasius the Librarian, concerning his translation of the proceedings of the Council	xvii
Short Syllabus of the different Sessions.....	xx
The Sacred Divalis : or, Letter of Invitation from Constantine and his Mother the Empress Irene to Pope Adrian to attend the Council	xxi
Defence by Tarasius (once a soldier and layman) of his elevation to the Patriarchate	xxv
Short History of Transactions in the year previous to the assembling of the Council at Nicea.....	xxvii

THE COUNCIL.

SESSION THE FIRST.

The Council for the establishment of Image Worship, consisting of upwards of three hundred and fifty Bishops besides other Dignitaries of the Church, held its first Session at Nicæa, on the 24th of September, 787	1
Prefatory Speech by the Patriarch, Tarasius, of Constantinople.....	2-4
ΣΑΚΡΑ (or Letter of Convocation) from Constantine and his mother Irene to the Bishops	4-9

	PAGE
Recantation of imputed heresy (or Iconoclasm) by Basil, Bishop of Ancyra	10-18
Recantation of Theodore, Bishop of Myra.....	13-14
Recantation of Theodosius, Bishop of Ammorium	15-17
Admission of these three Bishops to the Council.....	19
Discussion on the case of Seven other Bishops more active in the cause of Iconoclasm	18-22
Extract from the Fifty-third Canon of the Book of Canonical Orders read in the Council	22
Eighth Canon of the Council of Nice.....	22-23
Third Canon of the Council of Ephesus.....	24
First Epistle of Basil to Amphilochius	24-25
Epistle of Basil to the Evesenians	25
Epistle of Basil to the Bishops of the West	25-26
Definition of the Third Council against the Messalians	26-27
Extract from the Commonitorium of Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, to Maximus, Deacon of Antioch.....	27
Epistle of Cyril to Gennadius	27-28
Epistle of St. Athanasius to Rufinian.....	28-29
Discussion on this last Epistle.....	30-31
Extract from the Acts of the Fourth Council of Chalcedon	32
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Rufinus.....	33-34
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates.....	34
Passage from the Life of Sabbas.....	36
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Rufinus.....	37
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus Lector.....	38
Preamble of the Council of Chalcedon	38-39
Passage (another) from the Life of Sabbas.....	39-41
Epistle of Basil to the Nicopolitans	42
Recantation of the several Bishops referred to.....	44
Conclusion of the First Session	44

SESSION THE SECOND.

The Council opened on the 16th of September.....	45
Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea, introduced.....	45
Discussion on Gregory's case of Heresy.....	46
Decision on Gregory's case postponed	47
Interpretation of the Latin Letter of Adrian (Pope of Old Rome) to the Emperor Constantine and the Empress Irene his mother (of New Rome or Constantinople)	47-69
Epistle of Adrian to the Patriarch Tarasius	71-77

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LXXXIII

	PAGE
Declaration of Agreement by Tarasius in the Letters of Adrian	77-78
Concurrence of the assembled Bishops (two hundred and sixty-three in number) in the Letters of Adrian to Constantine, Irene, and Tarasius	79-83
Confession of the Monks and Abbots.....	83-84
Conclusion of the Session.....	84

SESSION THE THIRD.

The Council opened on the 23th of September	85
Gregory, Bishop of Nescæsarea, examined	86
Recantation of Gregory.....	86
Discussion on the case of Gregory	87-89
Admission of Gregory into the Council.....	89
Admission of the other Bishops who recanted ..	89
Letter of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to the Chief Priests of the East	90-97
Letter of the Chief Priests and Priests of the East to the Patriarch Tarasius	97-102
The Synodals of Theodore, Patriarch of Jerusalem	103-116
Declarations of the assembled Bishops agreeing with the above Letters and Synodals	116-121
Conclusion of the Session.....	121

SESSION THE FOURTH.

The Council opened on the 1st of October.....	122
Passages from Scripture and from the Writings of the Fathers quoted in the Councils, as if proving the Worship of Pictures and Images.....	123
" " from Exodus	124
" " from Numbers	125
" " from Ezekiel	125
" " from Hebrews	126
Encomium of John Chrysostom on Meletius.....	130
Passage from St. Gregory of Nysæa ..	132

	PAGE
Epistle of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, to Acasius, Bishop of Scythopolis.....	133-134
Passage from the Poem of Gregory the Divine on "Virtue," concerning the picture of Polemon	134
xtract from the Discourse of Antipater on the Woman with the bloody flux.....	136
Narrative of Asterius, Bishop of Amasia, concerning the Martyr Euphemia	136-138
Concurrence of the Council in these and other Legendary Tales regarding Pictures	139-142
Passage from the Martyrdom of Anastasius the Persian	143
Miracles of the Martyr Anastasius.....	144-145
Miracle wrought by an Image in Berytus, and the Conversion of a Multitude of Jews	146-151
Epistle of Nilus to Heliodorus the "Silentiary" concerning Miracles.	152
Letter of Nilus, the Ascetic, to Olympiodorus, the Prefect, against the Worship of Images and Pictures.....	155-156
Extract from the Dogmas discussed by Maximus, &c., with the Consuls	158
The Eighty-second Canon of the Sixth Council	160
Observations by Tarasius on the Sixth Council	161
The Fifth Discourse of the Apology of Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis, in behalf of Christians against the Jews, and in the matter of Images.....	163-179
Epistle of Anastasius, Bishop of Theopolis, to a certain (unnamed) Lawyer, concerning the Diversity of Worship	181
Passage from the Discourse of Anastasius to Symeon Bishop of Bostra.....	183
Encomium of Sophronius, Archbishop of Jerusalem, on Saints Cyrus and John.....	184
Miracle from the "Spiritual Meadow" of Sophronius respecting the Recluse of the Mount of Olives, who was assaulted by the Demon of Fornication	186-188
Miracles of Saints Cosmas and Damian, the Physicians, called the "Anargyri"—(i.e., without money)	190-195
Extract from the same Miracles concerning the Woman who was cured of the gripes	194
Passage from the Discourse of John Chrysostom on the Laver of Purification	195
Passage from the Fourth Discourse of St. Athanasius against the Arians.....	196
Passage from the Thirty Chapters of St. Basil to St. Amphilochius on the Holy Spirit.....	196
Passage from a Discourse against the Sabellians, Arians, and the Anomœi	198
Legend of Symeon of the Wonderful Mount, and the barren Woman of Rhosopolis; or, the Devil and the Monk	203-204

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LXXXV

	PAGE
Miracle of the <i>Lawyer</i> of Antioch who was afflicted with an Evil Spirit	205-206
Extract from the Sermon of Basil on Barlaam the Martyr.....	207
Miracle from the Life of Father John, the Faster	208-211
Extract from the Life of a Courtezan called the "Blessed Mary of Egypt"	212-214
Miracle recorded in the Martyrdom of Procopius	214-215
Miracle from the Life of Theodore, Archimandrite of the Sicilians.	215-216
Letter of Pope Gregory to Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople ..	216-222
Epistle of Germanus of Constantinople to John Bishop of Synada ...	223-227
Epistle of Germanus to Constantine Bishop of Nicolia	228
Epistle of Germanus to Thomas Bishop of Claudianople	229-249
Anathemas and Declaration by the assembled Bishops, concluding the Session	249-255

SESSION THE FIFTH.

The Session opened by an address from Tarasius on the 4th October.	256
Extracts read in the Council from the Writings of the Fathers and others to prove that Samaritans, Jews, Pagans, Manichæans, Butycheans, and others, rejected Images; and therefore the Iconoclasts, who rejected Images, must be accounted Heretics—viz, from the Second Catechetical Lecture of St. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem	257
The Fifth Epistle of Symeon Stylites, of the Wonderful Mount, to the Emperor Justin the Younger	259-263
From the Discourse of John Bishop of Thessalonica	264-267
From the Dispute between the Jew and the Christian	267-268
From the Pretended Itinerary of the Apostles... ..	269-271
From the Treatise of Amphilochius against the Book of the False Inscription of Heretics	273-274
From the Letter of Eusebius Pamphilus to Euphratton	275
From the Confutation of Eusebius's Defence of Origen by Antipater Bishop of Bostra	276
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus Lector.....	277
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of John the Separated	278
Extract from the Life of Father Sabbas.....	280
Extract from Petition against Severus, Head of the Acephali	281
Extract from Life and Conversation of Severus the Heresiarch.....	282
Extract from the Discourse of Constantine, Deacon of Constantinople, on the Martyrs	283-285
Extract from the Old Testament and Scholia	286
Extract from the Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius	288-290

	PAGE
Extract from the Miracles recorded in the "Spiritual Meadow" of Sophronius.....	291-292
Narrative from the Roll of John, Legate of the East, respecting a Jew Wizard and the Caliph Jezid	294-297
Proposition of Peter, Legate of Adrian, that an Image be brought into the Assembly and that all the Members of the Council pay to it all due honour and reverence	297-298
Anathemas of the Council, and conclusion of the Session	299-301

SESSION THE SIXTH.

The Session opened on the 5th of October.....	302
Definition of the Council of Constantinople against Images read by Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea; and a pretended Refutation read in reply by Epiphanius, Deacon, and Vicar of Thomas Archbishop of Sardinia. The Definition and the Refutation are divided into Six Sections :—	
Section the First	303-319
" Second	319-339
" Third	339-357
" Fourth	357-378
" Fifth	378-405
" Sixth	406-411
Definitions and Conclusion of the Sixth Session	411-435

SESSION THE SEVENTH.

The Session opened on the 13th of October	436
Definition of the Council, the Second assembled at Nice	436-440
Approbation and Subscription of the assembled Bishops to the Definition of the Council	440-443
Letter from the Council to the Empress Irene and her Son on the subject of the Definition	443-452

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LXXXVII

	PAGE
Letter from the Council to the Priests and Clerics of Constantinople on the same subject	452-455
Canons of the Council, concluding the Seventh Session.....	455-461

SESSION THE EIGHTH.

The Session opened on the 20th October	462
Constantine and the Empress Irone present in person	462
Definition of the former Session read.....	463
Assent of the Council in these Definitions	463-464
Anathemas on all who hold not with the Councils in their reception of Images	464
Passages from the Fathers, as written in the Fourth Session, again recited.....	464
Final Letter and Report of the Council addressed to Pope Adrian, and conclusion of the Eighth and last Session by Tarasius	466-468

POST-CONCILIAR DOCUMENTS.

The following Documents, forming as it were a kind of Supplement to the Council, are found at the conclusion of the Eighth Session in the "Concilia" of Binius:—

1. A Letter from Tarasius to Pope Adrian on Simony.
2. A long laudatory Discourse delivered at the Council by Epiphanius, Deacon of Catania, in Italy, and Vicar of Thomas, Archbishop of the Island of Sardinia. This Sermon is extant in Latin only.
3. A Treatise as to the mode in which the incommunicable name of God is to be understood, and also every denunciation of the Prophet against Idols.
4. The old Latin Translation of the Seventh General Council, in many respects very defective.
5. A long Letter from Pope Adrian to Charlemagne defending the Council against the censures of the "Caroline Books."
6. The Notes of Severinus Binius on the Council.

Of these Documents only Adrian's "Letter" has been noticed, from which frequent quotations have been made by way of notes.

ANTE-CONCILIAR DOCUMENTS.

FIRST LETTER OF GREGORY THE SECOND. POPE OF ROME, TO THE EMPEROR LEO, IN DEFENCE OF IMAGES.

THE letters of your God-preserved Majesty and fraternity we received by Augustalis Spatharocandidatus during the whole of your reign from the fourteenth indiction; and, as we received the letters of this fourteenth and of the fifteenth, and of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth indictions, we carefully preserved them in the holy Church, laying them on the threshold of the sanctuary of the holy, glorious, and very chiefest of the Apostles, Peter, where are also laid up the letters of other holy and pious Sovereigns, your predecessors.

Now, in these first ten collections we find that thou didst well and piously, and as became a Sovereign, determine to observe and defend, without any omission, all the decrees and doctrines of our holy fathers and doctors. And, what was of the first importance, the writing was your own, and not that of another, safely sealed with the royal seal; and no less safe within were the signatures of your own hands, written in purple ink as is the royal custom, which laid before us your right and true confession concerning our immaculate and orthodox faith: wherein, moreover, you were accustomed to add that he who undermines and destroys the definitions of the fathers was accursed. Now, when we received these letters, we offered hymns of praise to God that he had thought fit to put the empire into thy hands.

Now, since ye ran so well, who hath rung this in thine ears and turned aside thy heart like a broken bow, that thou hast looked on things that were behind? For ten years, by the grace of God, thou didst walk well and madest no mention

"

of holy images ; but now thou sayst they occupy the place of idols ; that they who worship them are idolators ; and thou hast determined on their utter destruction. And thou hast not feared the judgments of God in thus causing scandals to arise, not only in the heart of the faithful, but of the unfaithful also.

But Christ commands you not to offend any of His little ones, and declares that, even for a slight scandal, you stand in danger of eternal fire. And hast thou scandalized the whole world because thou hadst not courage to endure death, but hadst rather defend thyself by a sinful apology ?

For thou hast written, "*That we ought not to worship things made with the hands, nor any image or likeness of things in heaven or things on the earth, as the Lord hath said.*" And again : "*Certify me who hath commanded us to worship and adore things made with the hand, and I will confess it as the ordinance of God.*"

Now why, as king and head of Christians, did you not ask of those who knew and had experience, and from them seek confirmation concerning what kind of things, made with the hand, God spake, before you stirred up, excited, and disturbed the common people ? Yea, you have driven away, you have denied and cast out, our holy fathers and doctors, whom, with your own hand and your own writing, you have declared that you would obey and follow. Scripture is ours—both light and salvation is ours—the holy and inspired fathers and teachers are ours ; and this practice the six holy Councils, which were in Christ, have handed down to us, and you receive not their testimony. It is necessary that we write to you things gross and unlearned, since you are so unlearned yourself ; but, nevertheless, they have in them the truth and power of God. We exhort you, by God, to lay aside that pride and arrogance which cleaves so fast to you, and with much humility to give us a candid hearing : and may God convince thee of the truth by means of His word ! It was because of the idolators who were settled in the land of promise that He spake thus : " For they worshipped figures made of wood, and gold, and silver, and every beast of the earth and fowl of the air, and they

said these are thy gods, and there is no other god beside." Now, it was these Satanic, accursed, and pestilential things made with hands which God forbad that we should worship.

But, since there are things made with hands for the glory and service of God—when He would bring in His own holy people the Hebrews, as He promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob their forefathers, and would give them the land of promise, and would make them possessors and inheritors of the possessions of idolators, and would destroy and utterly wipe out those nations because they had defiled heaven and earth with their wickedness—He spake thus before-hand, in order to secure them from falling into the like superstitions. But He chose of the Israelitish nation two men and blessed them and sanctified them, that they might form all kinds of works made with the hand, which were for the service and glory of God, as a memorial for their generations—these were Bezaleel and Eliab, of the tribe of Dan.

Moreover, God said to Moses, "Hew out two tables of stone and bring them to me." And he hewed them and brought them, and God wrote upon them with His finger the ten *life-giving* immortal commandments.* Then said God: "Make cherubim and seraphim, and make a table covered with gold within and without; and make an ark of imperishable wood, and place the testimonies within the ark as a memorial for your generation—that is, place therein the tables of stone, the golden pot, the rod, the manna." Now, are these things made with the hand, or are they not?—but surely they were for the glory and service of God. This same illustrious Moses, constrained by fear, wishing to see his shape and likeness lest he should be deceived, entreated God, saying, "Lord, show me thyself evidently, that I may see thee" (Exod. xxxiii. 18). And God answered: "If thou shouldest see me thou must die; but ascend into the cleft of the rock, and thou shalt see my hinder parts." Then God showed to him the mystery that was hidden from ages and from generations. Now, indeed, in our generation, in these last days, He hath manifested His hinder parts and His front parts together. For when God saw the

* St Paul thought otherwise. *Vide* 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9; Gal. iii. 21.

whole human race in danger of utter destruction, having pity on the work of His own hands, He sent His own Son, who was born before all worlds ; and He, having descended from heaven, entered into the womb of the holy Mary the Virgin, causing the true Light to shine in the Virgin's womb. And the Light, instead of seed, became flesh ; and He was baptized in the river Jordan, and He hath baptized us. And then He began to give us the assurance of distinctive signs that we might not err ; for, having entered into Jerusalem, in an upper chamber of the holy and glorious Zion. He gave to us His holy body, and made us drink His precious blood, in the mystical supper : then, as it were, He washed our feet, and we eat and drank together with Him, and our hands handled Him, and He made Himself known to us.

Thus the Truth has been manifested to us, and all the error and darkness with which we were involved has been utterly dispersed and hath vanished away ; for their voice went out into all the world and their words unto the end of the earth. For from the whole world men, winged as eagles, went to Jerusalem, as the Lord hath said in the Gospels, "Where the carcase is there shall the eagles be gathered together" (Luke xvii. 37). Now the carcase means Christ, and pious and Christ-loving men are the eagles which soar aloft. These, having seen the Lord, describing Him as He appeared, drew a picture of Him. And when they had seen James, the Lord's brother, as they saw so they made an image of Him ; and, having seen Stephen the proto-martyr, they made an image of him according to what they beheld ; and, in a word, as they saw the persons of those who shed their blood for Christ, they made pictures of them. These, when afterwards men throughout the world had beheld, left the superstitions of the devil, and these they worshipped, not with the worship of latria, but with relative worship.* And now, O Emperor, which appears right to you, that these should be worshipped or the superstitions of Satan ?

Moreover, while Christ was present at Jerusalem, Abgarus, who then swayed the power amongst the Edessenes, having

* See the origin and ground of this distinction in the Fourth Session of the Council, in the remarks on testimony brought forward by *Anastasius Sinaita*.

heard of the miracles of Christ, wrote an epistle to Christ, and Christ sent a reply to him, written with His own hand, and with it the figure of His holy and glorious person. Now, send to that image made without hands and see for yourself; for there it is that multitudes of the people of the East assemble themselves together and offer up their prayers; and there are many other such things besides which are made with hands, which the armies of those who love Christ retain and worship, but which you every day slight and despise.

Would you know the reason why we have not described or made an image of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? It is because we know not what He is, and it is impossible to depict or describe the nature of God; but if we had seen and known Him, as we have seen and known His Son, then we should have painted and described Him also, that you might have called His image also an idol.

But we entreat thee, as brethren in Christ, to come to that truth which thou hast deserted: cast away your arrogance: cease your vain confidence, and write to all and everywhere, so that you may restore those whom you have scandalized and whom you have blinded, of whom forsooth you, through your gross insensibility, think nothing at all. The love of Christ knows how, when we enter the church of the chief Apostle Peter and look on the picture of the Saint, we are filled with poignant grief, and, as a shower of rain from above, so are our tears poured forth. Christ made the blind to see; but you have blinded those who did see aright, and you have made them to stumble, just as if you thought this to be of no importance: you have made them stupid—you have taken away the right path from them—you have deprived them of prayers; and, instead of vigils and diligent attendance and affection towards God, you have driven your poor people headlong to sloth, drowsiness, and utter carelessness.

But you say that we worship stones, and walls, and boards. It is not as you say, O Emperor; but we have these things for our admonition and excitation, and that our dull, untaught, and gross mind may be raised on high by those whose names whose appellation, whose image, we see written thereupon. For

we have them not as gods—God forbid!—and our hopes are by no means placed in them. For if the image be of Christ, we say—“O Lord Jesus Christ, help and save us!” But if it be the image of His holy Mother, we say—“O holy Mother of God, intercede with thy Son, our true God, to save our souls.” Or if it be of any particular martyr, as of St. Stephen, we say—“O holy Stephen, who hast poured forth thy blood for Christ, having boldness, as the Proto-martyr, intercede for us.” And so we say of any other martyr who hath borne testimony to Christ. Such are the prayers we offer by them: so it is not, as you say, that we call on our martyrs as gods. Turn from thy evil imagination, I entreat thee; and free thy soul from the scandals and from the curses which come upon thee from the whole world. Yea, the very children will make sport of thee. Go into any of the elementary schools and say, I am the opponent and destroyer of images, and they will throw their writing tablets at thy head: so that, if thou wilt not be taught by the wise, thou shalt by the foolish.

But thou hast written that, “as Uzziah (Hezekiah) King of the Jews, after eight hundred years, brought the brazen serpent out of the temple, so I, after eight hundred years, have taken images out of the churches.” Verily, Uzziah was brother to thee, and exhibited the same audacity and tyrannized over the priests just as you do now; for that serpent the *holy David brought into the temple together with the holy ark*. And what was it except brass hallowed by God for the sake of those who were bitten and hurt by serpents? And it was placed there that it might be shown how that the same which injected evil into the first creation formed by God—namely, Adam and Eve—the same should be for the healing of sinners.

But as, forsooth, you boast that after eight hundred years you cast the holiness and the blessing of martyrs out of the churches, know that as at first you confessed rightly enough of your own good will, not by any compulsion, and as now you have with your own hand written as above, that you have brought their curse upon your own head. [We, indeed, were minded, as we had right and authority from St. Peter the chief of the Apostles, to inflict condign punishment upon you;

but as you have brought the punishment upon yourself, there let it abide and rest upon you, together with the counsellors whom you have in your confidence. To what extent have you not injured the edification and marred the course of those who ran well, the love of Christ knows. When we have entered any church we have seen the histories of the miraculous conversation of our Lord Jesus Christ, or of His holy Mother holding in her arms and suckling the Lord our God, and the angels standing all around, and singing the TRISAGION, we never leave without serious compunction. And who can but feel compunction, or refrain from tears, as he looks on the sacred bath—the priests standing around—the mystical supper—the giving of sight to the blind—the resurrection of Lazarus—the healing of the leper or the paralytic—the sitting down on the ground—the baskets (*τας σπυριδας και της κοφινους*)—the fragments—the transfiguration on Mount Tabor—the crucifixion of our Lord—His burial—His resurrection—His holy assumption—and the descent of the Holy Spirit? Who that contemplates the history of Abraham, laying his sword on the neck of his son, is not filled with remorse and melted into tears? And so with respect to any of the conflicts of the Lord.

But now, O Emperor, of the two it were better for thee to be called an heretic than the persecutor and destroyer of the histories, pictures, and images of our Lord's passion. Not but that it is, indeed, a thing bad enough, and by all means to be avoided, to be called *heretic* at all; but in what way this is better than the other I will now unfold. The heretic is so declared to be, even though he is known to be such, not in many points, but in few. Now, scandals are hard to avoid, and theological truths are oftentimes very involved and very difficult to determine: they, therefore, who discuss these matters without sufficient humility, from the ignorance and darkness under which they labour, fall forthwith into error. Surely their condemnation will not be so great as thine; for thou hast manifestly set thyself against things conspicuous enough and clear as the light, in that thou hast stripped the Churches of God, which our holy fathers clothed and adorned;

and this when you had such a Pontiff as my Lord Germanus, my brother and fellow-minister, whom you should have consulted as a father and a teacher as being now in years, and having no small experience in ecclesiastical matters. This day that holy man hath reached his ninety-fifth year, continually occupied in the service of Church and King; and constantly, in both these respects, he has been found abundantly useful. Alas! that you should have dismissed such a one from your counsels, and should have listened to that lawless fool, Ephesus the son of Apsimar.

Now, it was my Lord Germanus, and the then Patriarch my Lord George, who advised and persuaded Constantine, the son of Constans, and father of Justinian, to correspond with us (our predecessors) at Rome. And he wrote on oath entreating that we would send men of worth, that so an Œcumenical Council might be assembled together; and he declared:—"I will not preside therein as Sovereign or speak at all authoritatively, but only as one of the Council: and as the chief Priests shall agree so will I agree, and those who speak aright we will receive, and those who speak amiss we will expel and send into exile. And, if my own father hath perverted in the least our holy and immaculate faith, I first of all am ready to anathematize him." By God's grace we sent, and the sixth synod was celebrated in peace.

You should know, O King, that the doctrines of the holy Church belong not to Kings but to the Priests. For this purpose have Priests been set over the Church and severed from all secular affairs; and Kings, in like manner, are severed from ecclesiastical affairs, and should be solely employed in their own peculiar occupation: and the council of Christian Kings and pious Priests becomes one power so long as their affairs are pursued in peace and love.

But thou hast written to us that we should assemble an Œcumenical Synod. To us such an assemblage appears quite superfluous. Thou alone art the opponent of images, their reviler, and subvertor. Give up that point, and grant us but the favour of thy silence and all scandals will cease—the world will be at peace. Be it so that we should give ear to

thee, and Priests from all parts of the world be got together and the Assembly and Council commence its Session—where is the Christ-loving and pious Sovereign who, according to custom, ought to sit in such a Council to honour those who speak well, to expel those who turn aside from the truth, since thou, O Emperor, art so vacillating and barbarous? Know you not that the attempt in which you are engaged against holy images is one of turbulence, insolence, and pride? Cease and be quiet, and there will be no need of a Council. Write only to all whom you have scandalized everywhere throughout the world, that Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Gregory, Pope of Rome, have erred in the matter of images, and we will set you quite free from all guilt of error on your part as having received power from God to loose the things that are in heaven or on earth!

God is witness that to whatever letters you were pleased to send to the Sovereigns of the West we added our suffrage, endeavouring to conciliate them to you, praising and magnifying your goodness, so long as we saw you continuing to walk according to your former course. So they received your Laureata in such a manner as it was fit one king should honour another; and this they did so long as they had not heard of your attack upon images.

But after they had learned and were assured that thou didst send Jubinus Spatharocandidatus to Chalcopatria to destroy and break in pieces the image of the Saviour, styled "Antiphoneta," where so many miracles had been wrought, and that many women were found there full of zeal who had of old brought odours, who entreated this Spatharocandidatus, saying, "O do not such outrage!"—but as he would not listen to their petition, but did actually ascend the ladder and thrice smote with an axè the face of the Saviour's image—these women, no longer bearing such wickedness, did draw away the ladder, and, having beaten him with their fists, did there make an end of him; and that on this occasion you, emulous of evil, slew of these women I know not how many, and this in the presence of worthy men from Rome, from France, from

the Vandals, from Mauritania, from Gotthia, and, in a word, from all the Western interior: then, as these returned each to his own country, and there related thy later and childish proceedings, then they cast down and trampled upon thy Laureata and overthrew thy statues. And the Lombards and Sarmatians and other northern tribes, having declared war, overran the unfortunate Decapolis, and took its metropolis, Ravenna; and they have driven out thy rulers and set up their own, and they would gladly do the same to the provinces near us and to Rome itself—and all this while you can do nothing to help thyself—these are the fruits of thy folly and obstinacy!

But you think to terrify us and add—“I will send to Rome and break down the image of St Peter. I will bind and carry away Gregory the High Priest there, as Constans carried away Martin.” Now, you should reflect that High Priests who preside in Rome sit there for the purpose of effecting peace between the East and the West, and are, as it were, a middle and party-wall between them, and that thy predecessors were most anxious to keep and preserve this bond of peace; but if you act insolently, and send out your threats, we shall not think necessary to contend with you: the High Priest of Rome will depart four-and-twenty stadia into the country of Campania; and then you may come and pursue the winds (Eccl. xxxiv. 2). Our predecessor, Martin, was earnest in his days exhorting to peace; wherefore Constans, who thought amiss concerning the Holy Trinity, and consented with certain heretical High Priests—namely, Sergius, Paul, and Pyrrhus—having sent and seized him in a tyrannical way, carried him off to Byzantium, and, having afflicted him in various ways, sent him into banishment; and, moreover, he greatly tried the Monk Maximus and his disciple Anastasius, and at length finished with sending them also into banishment to Lazica. Constans, who banished these, did not escape vengeance, but perished in his sin; for Nezeuxius, Count of the Bedchamber, being certified by the Bishops of Sicily that his master was an heretic, slew him in the temple and he died in his sin. But of the blessedness of Martin, the very city of Cherson, whither he was banished, and of the Bosphorus,

give fullest testimony, and also the North and its inhabitants, who are accustomed to attend his tomb and there receive cures of various diseases.

As far as we are concerned, we could be well content that the Lord would grant us to go the same way that holy Martin went before us ; but, for the benefit of the many, we would yet longer wish to live : for the whole West look towards our humility ; and though we (may seem to) be nothing, yet in us they have the greatest confidence, and in him—namely, St. Peter, whose image you threatened to break down and destroy—for him all the Princes of the West look upon as an earthly deity. So, should you venture on any such rash undertaking, the Princes of the West would avenge the cause of those of the East whom thou hast injured ; but we entreat you by the Lord turn from these new and childish proceedings. You know well that you are unable to defend your Roman province, except it be the city only, on account of its contiguity to the sea ; and, as we have said before, if the Pope chose but to move four-and-twenty stadia from Rome, he need have no further dread of thee. One thing troubles us—the wild and barbarous nations are becoming civilized ; but you are, from civilized, becoming wild and barbarous.

All the West offer the first-fruits of their faith to Peter, head and chief of the Apostles, should you send any here for the destruction of St. Peter's image—see—we warn you before hand : we are free from the blood which may be shed on the occasion. On thy own head and on thy own neck be all these things.

We have lately received an earnest invitation from the remotest West—from a country called Septetus—desiring that, by the grace of God, we would visit them and bestow upon them holy baptism ; and, that none may accuse us of idleness or sloth, we intend to begird ourselves for the journey. May God put His fear in thy heart, and may God convert thee to the truth and free thee from those errors which thou hast mischievously foisted on the world, and speedily may I receive a letter from thee announcing thy conversion ; and may He who descended from heaven and entered the Virgin's

womb for our salvation dwell in thy heart, and speedily expel those that inhabit there and cause all these scandals, and so grant peace to the Churches of all Christians for ever and ever. Amen.

SECOND LETTER OF GREGORY THE SECOND, POPE OF ROME,
TO THE EMPEROR LEO, ON IMAGE-WORSHIP.

THE letters of your God-defended Sovereignty and brotherhood in Christ we have received from your ambassador Rufinus; and really it almost wearies us to death to see you thus impenitent and obstinately persisting in your former sinfulness, and that you savour not of things that be of Christ, nor care to be a follower and imitator of our holy, glorious, and wonder-working fathers and doctors. But not to speak of any foreign teachers, but only of those of your city and country, are they wiser than Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory the Divine, Basil of Cappadocia, or John Chrysostom?—not to mention the myriads and myriads of our holy and inspired fathers like to them?

But you follow mainly your own will and the passions which dwell within you, and you have written, "I am King and Priest." Such, verily, thy predecessors proved themselves to be in word and deed, who founded churches and took care of them, and, together with the Priests, with zeal and earnestness sought out the truth of orthodoxy—such as were Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, Valentinian the Great, and Constantine, the father of Justinian, who was present at the Sixth General Council. These Sovereigns reigned in a manner pleasing to God; and being one with the High Priests, in mind and council, they assembled synods, searching out the truth of the opinions laid down; and, moreover, they

built and adorned churches. These, indeed, were Kings and Priests who proved that such they were by their works. But thou, from what time thou hast received thy dominion, hast not to the end observed the definitions of the fathers; but whereas thou hast found our churches clothed, adorned, and beautified with golden vests and fringes, thou hast disrobed them and made them bare. Now, what are our churches—are they not made with hands—are they not a compound of stone, wood, straw, mud, and lime? But these are made ornamental with images and pictures of the miracles of the Saints, and of the passion of our Lord, and of His holy glorious Mother, and of the holy Apostles. Is it not on pictures and images men delight to spend their money? And do not men and women, holding in their arms their newly-baptized infants, point out to them their histories with the finger, as is also done to youths and those who are converted from the Gentiles? And thus they edify their minds and lift up their hearts to God; but you, having caused such things to cease amongst your humble people, have filled their place with gossipings, and babbling, and harpings, and pratings, and pipings, and all kind of trifling. From giving of thanks and giving of praise you have brought them to vain and foolish fables. Take up your portion amongst such fools and praters if you will. Yet hear our humility and cease, and obey the holy Church, even as you have found and received. Doctrines belong not to kings, but the chief Priests, for we have the mind of Christ. The mind fitted to regulate ecclesiastical affairs is very different from that which disposes matters in the provinces of kingdoms. Be assured that a mind so fierce and foolish, and, withal, so dull in spiritual things, as is your own, can never be sufficient to regulate ecclesiastical doctrines. I will now lay before you the difference between the Palace and the Church, the King and the High Priest. Acquiesce and be saved, and be no more contentious. If any man should strip you of your royal robes, your diadem, your purple, your vest, and take away all your attendants, would you not forthwith be looked upon as mean, vile, and worthless? And to this state have you reduced churches: you have taken from them

what you never had yourself—the robe of holiness—and hast made them vile. As then, no Priest, however exalted, hath any right of inspecting the King's palace or ordering his royal household, equally no Sovereign hath any right of overlooking the Church, either in the election of the clergy or in consecrating or handling the symbols of sacred mysteries, or, indeed, of partaking at all of them independent of the Priest. Now, let each remain in the calling to which he hath been called by God. † See you not, O King, the difference between Kings and Priests? If any one offend against thee, O King, you confiscate his goods and reduce him to poverty and do but leave him his life; or you hang, behead, or banish him, and put him far beyond the reach of his children or other beloved relations and friends. Not so act the Priests: when one offends against them and confesses his fault, instead of hanging and beheading, they put the yoke of the Gospel on his neck—they imprison him in their Church treasures—they banish him to the service of the Church—bind him among the Catechumens—make his bowels serve with fasting, his eyes with vigils, his mouth with singing lauds; and, in order to chasten him the more and the better to starve the carnal man, they bring before him the venerable body of the Lord and make him to drink His holy blood; and thus, having restored him as a vessel of election and without blame, they send him pure and spotless to the Lord. See you now no difference between the Royal and the Priestly office?

Sovereigns who have lived piously and in Chirst never disobeyed or persecuted the Priest. 'Thou, O King, hast transgressed and acted perversely; and whereas thou didst write with thine own hand in all due submission, and hast professed that he who breaks down the boundaries set up by the fathers is accursed, thou art self-condemned and hast caused the Holy Spirit to depart from thee.

You would fain avenge yourself and tyrannize over us with an armed and carnal hand; but we, unharmed and defenceless, having no earthly carnal defence, call upon the Great Commander of all creation, even Christ, who sitteth in the heavens above all armies, above all rule, that He would send

the devil into thee (as saith the Apostle) "to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the soul may be preserved." ¶ See, O King, to what a pitch of shamelessness and inhumanity you have arrived: thou hast dashed thy soul headlong amidst deeps and precipices, because thou canst not humble thyself or incline thy stiffened neck.

For when at the last great day, when all our secret things shall be made manifest, other Priests will gain great praise and glory for that then they shall be able to present their rulers to God blameless and pure from all faults and shameful falls by means of their faithful teaching and sound doctrine, then shall we be shamed before the holy angels, and we shall stand deeply awed, because that, through thy perversity, we never could make any gain of thee. The High Priests, our predecessors, will present the Sovereigns of their several periods before God greatly to the shame of our humility; since we shall not be able to present the Sovereigns of our times honourable or glorious, but inglorious and reprobate. Wherefore, we entreat you, repent, and return and come back to the truth. And as you have found and have received, so persevere, venerate, and honour the glorious fathers and doctors who, under God, have removed the blindness of our heart and eyes and have made us to see clearly.

But thou hast written—"How is it that in the six General Councils no mention was ever made of images?" Very true, O King; but neither has anything been said concerning bread and water, whether we should or should not eat. For as these things were ages ago handed down to us as means of preserving life, so have images been handed down to us, and the High Priests have ever been accustomed to take them with them to the Councils. No one who loved Christ or who loved God, when about to travel, would ever think of going on his way without images, since they are honourable and approved by God.

¶ Well then, if you will, be both King and Priest, as you have written before to us; but if you are ashamed of this, as a Sovereign, to give ground of accusations against yourself, at least write to all whom you have scandalized, that Gregory

Pope of Rome hath erred concerning images, and also Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople—we will take on ourselves the guilt and sin, as having received power from above to loose and to bind things in heaven and things on the earth, and you need have no fears on this point. We gave you this challenge before and you were not ready for it—neither now are you ready. We, indeed, as those that must give account to their Lord, have delivered to you instructions and doctrine even as we have received of the Lord; but you have turned a deaf ear to our humility, and to Germanus the President, and all our holy, wonder-working, and glorious teachers and fathers; and thou hast followed depraved and unsound teachers, who have erred concerning the truth. Well!—have your portion with such.

But we, as we told you before, are, by the grace of God, about entering on a journey to the interior of the West on behalf of those who there are seeking baptism. For though I sent them Bishops and Clerks of our holy Church, their Princes were not inclined to submit to be baptized by them, desiring that I myself should undertake the work. Wherefore, by the grace of God, we are getting ourselves ready for the journey, that we may incur no censure of apathy and carelessness. May God give thee understanding and repentance to turn to the truth which thou hast forsaken, and may He again bring back His poor people to Christ the one Shepherd, and to the one sheepfold of orthodox Churches and Priests. And may the Lord our God give peace to all the world, now and for ever and ever. Amen.

PREFACE OF ANASTASIUS THE LIBRARIAN, TO JOHN VIII.
ILLUSTRIOUS PONTIFF, ON THE SEVENTH SYNOD.

To the co-angelic Lord JOHN, chief Pontiff and Universal Pope, Anastasius the insignificant :—

Having made a version of the Eighth universal Synod for the predecessor of your blessedness Adrian II. of holy memory and reverend Pope, I thought it no less improper than inconvenient that the Latins should not have the Seventh Council also. in which your predecessor Adrian of blessed memory presided by his Legates, which was the second assembled at Nice, and was celebrated under the auspices of Constantine and his mother Irene. For by no reason can there be supposed such a thing as an Eighth where there hath not been a Seventh. Now, it is not that no translation hath appeared before ours, but because former interpreters, neglecting the idiom of each language, did so translate word by word that one could scarce ever make out what was intended; and thus, giving disgust to the reader, it fell under the contempt of all. Whence it was that many thought it utterly unworthy a reading, to say nothing of transcription. Which things having considered, I have undertaken, not sparing my own weak body, under the help of God, to translate the same for the benefit of the Latins: accounting it is an unbecoming and incongruous thing that yours, the mistress of all Churches—I mean the Roman—should be deprived of this Council; whereas it was so well adorned with that which followed,—viz., the Eighth Synod; especially seeing I am under obligation from what has been granted me from above to benefit that sacred library of which you were pleased to make me the guardian, if so be in emulation of an apostle I may aim to *magnify mine office*.

It is worthy of note that certain opinions are found in this Council, taken from the canons of the Apostles and sentences and canons of the Sixth General Council, which, though we have translated them, we neither hold nor admit. As regards the apostolic canons, we clearly know that they never gave any sanction to the same. And, more-

over, your predecessor Stephen determined that even of those (the apostolic canons) not more than fifty were to be received, although some pontifical constitutions seem derived from them. Whence, as your apostolic See hath determined, the Church hath received not only those fifty canons, but it admits also all the institutions and rules of approved fathers and holy Councils as being trumpets of the Holy Spirit, provided they be such as do not oppose the right faith or sound morals, or in any way infringe against the decrees of the Roman See; but, on the other hand, powerfully refute our adversaries—that is, the heretics. Therefore, those regulations which the Greeks set forth as enacted by the Sixth Council, to this extent the principal See allows of in this Synod, that they be such as do not in any way contradict former canons or decrees of holy Pontiffs of this See, or are opposed to good morals: although up to this time they were altogether unknown to the Latins, for that they were never translated into Latin. And moreover, they were not found in the archives of the other patriarchs, although they used the Greek language, because none of these patriarchs either did promulge or agree to them, or was even present at the time when they were enacted; although the Greeks declare the same fathers to have been present who were present at the Sixth Council itself, which they can by no means satisfactorily prove.

But, inasmuch as the Greeks very improperly in this Synod have frequently styled their Patriarch as “Œcumenical,” let your apostleship pardon their flattery, for they are accustomed thus reprehensively to flatter their superiors. While at Constantinople, I very frequently contended with the Greeks about their pride and arrogance in respect of this word; but they replied that by the word “Œcumenic” they did not mean “Universal,” as that he held a presidency over the whole world, but as presiding over that portion of it which Christians inhabit. For that which the Greeks call *οικουμένη*, means among the Latins not only *the world*, from the whole of which it may signify *universal*; but also a *habitation*, whence it merely signifies “civilized” or “inhabited” country.

This also is to be remarked, that in every place where I have used the word *subsistentia* I wish that *persona* should be meant; for the Greek word *ὑπόστασις* is interpreted both ways. Moreover, some have interpreted *subsistentia* as *substantia*; others as *persona*. I however follow those who understand by *subsistentia*, *persona*, and not *substantia*.

The holy Church, endued with such authority, cannot dissimulate: each one, therefore, may not turn aside from the worship of holy images according to his private judgment; otherwise it would needs to be taught by your pious doctrine and corrected by apostolic censure. Especially as it is lawful to no one to separate himself from his superior, or in any way to reject that which he may perceive thy See, the mistress of all, to maintain. For that which this present Synod hath set forth concerning the worship of venerable images hath your apostolic See, as the records testify, held of old, and the universal Church hath ever venerated them and doth still venerate them, with the exception of some few French Bishops, to whom, it may be, their great utility hath not been revealed hitherto. For they say that no work of men's hands ought to be worshipped; as if the Gospel, the work of men's hands, which they daily kiss, were not more worthy of veneration than a dog, which they will not pretend to say is made with men's hands. In like manner we may argue from the holy cross which all Christians everywhere confess that they worship; for we may reflect that if the cross be made of gold or silver or wood, it is not the same cross by which our salvation was wrought out, but only its figure and image. Now, why should we not worship His figure and image who wrought out the salvation Himself in the midst of the earth? For He is more worthy of worship who wrought out the salvation, than the material is, by which He wrought it out for us; and therefore, the image of Christ, who wrought out our salvation, is more worthy of adoration than the image of the cross which did but bear Him upon it.

Wherefore, O most holy Pope, ascend into the lofty mountains—stand in thy strength—lift up thy voice like a trumpet! Behold, under God's auspices, thy angel having touched thy

side, as of Peter of old, thou hast risen up—thou hast girded thy loins—thou hast lighted thy candle—thou art eaten up with zeal for God! Now, what remains?—only this, the faith which thou believest, teach us: the way in which thou walkest, show to us all.

So, with God as thy Author, thou as the son of the persecuted—viz., the Prophets and Apostles, being our leader through difficult paths—all we, the sheep of Christ, committed to thy skill by Peter, may go on with inoffensive steps, and to the pleasant pastures of eternal life may merit happy entrance, Christ Himself opening the door, who delivered the keys of the kingdom to him and by him to yourself. May grace divine, my Lord, most holy Pope, conserve your apostleship for many years for the exaltation of this Church and the common salvation of all!

SHORT SYLLABUS OF THE DIFFERENT SESSIONS.

THE First Session contains the testimony of divers approved writings, in which it is shown that heretics who return from their heresy to the orthodox faith may be received: and also those who since they have been or are now orthodox, but yet have received imposition of hands from heretics.

The Second Session contains the reading of the epistles of Adrian Pope of Rome, and the profession and declaration of agreement of all the High Priests present in the Council.

The Third Session contains the reception of the Bishops converted from heresy; the synodals of Tarasius and the answers of the Oriental High Priests; and also the subscriptions of the Bishops, who approved the letters of Pope Adrian, and the Priests of the East, and declared their agreement with them.

The Fourth Session brings forward the testimonies from holy writ and of divine fathers in defence of images.

The Fifth Session brings forward other testimonies, to show that the Iconomachi wrought and imagined things equally vile with reprobate heretics.

The Sixth Session brings forth the blasphemies of the heretics and their utter confutation.

The Seventh Session sets forth the definition of the holy Council and the subscriptions of the Bishops thereto; an epistle sent to the Emperors; another sent to the clergy of Constantinople; a laudatory sermon; and the canons promulgated by the Council. Also an epistle of Tarasius to Adrian concerning the Synod, and another of the same to the same on Heresy; also a letter to John the Anchorite on the same business.

THE SACRED* DIVALIS SENT FROM CONSTANTINE AND IRENE
AUGUSTI TO HADRIAN MOST HOLY AND MOST BLESSED
POPE OF OLD ROME.

THEY who receive the dignity of the empire, or the honour of the principal priesthood from our Lord Jesus Christ, ought to provide and to care for those things which please Him, and rule and govern the people committed to their care according to His will and good pleasure.

* The disapprobation of Charlemagne and his Divines with the Council commences with this letter, and he finds fault ("Lib. Car." i. c. 3), with the term "Divalis:"—"The error of Paganism, long since banished by the coming of Christ, seems to retain some footing with those who glory in having the highest rank in the faith and Christian religion, who introduce into the Church new and unheard-of constitutions, and who fear not, after the manner of the Gentiles, to style themselves *Divi*, and their proceedings *Divalia*. Surely their assumption is not unlike the promise of the old serpent, whereby our forefather Adam was deceived. For they who thus aspire to be higher than *they are*, are rejected by Him who beholds the proud afar off: and soon become even inferior to what *they were*. Such was the case with those angels who kept not their first estate, whose fate, if we would avoid, we must avoid their crimes. If we avoid such evil, and embrace the opposite virtue of humility, then, as instruments of good, we may even become as gods, as was said to Moses, 'I have made thee a god to Pharaoh.' Essentially none is God but Jehovah only. Speaking less strictly, men and angels are so called; and lastly, after the blasphemies of the heathen, the vain deities of the heathen bear this title. The word *Divalis* is false; for it endeavours to bolster up sinners who deserve only wrath, with the idea that they have obtained divinity. But if the lovers of this name say that it has no connection with divinity, let them hear with what it has connection—namely, with the terms in use among the heathens who called indifferently *dii* or *divi*. Let the vain assumption of such name cease: let this mark of ancient error come to an end: let this word of blind superstition perish: let this pride of insolent appellation be done away; and let the Gentile mendacity of transforming men amongst the *divi* be driven far from the faithful."

Therefore, O most holy man, it is due from us and from you that irreprehensibly we savour the things which be His, and that in these we be conversant, since from Him We have received the imperial dignity, and You the dignity of the chief priesthood.

But now to speak more to the point. Your paternal blessedness knows what hath been done in times past in this our royal city against holy images—namely, how in the three reigns immediately preceding, images were destroyed and disgraced—(O may it not be imputed to them, for it had been well for them had they not laid their hands upon the Church!)—and how they seduced and brought over to their own opinion all the people who live in these parts—yea, even the whole of the East, in like manner, up to the time in which* God hath exalted us to this kingdom, who seek His glory in truth, and hold that which has been handed down by His apostles together with all other teachers. Whence now with pure heart and unfeigned religion we have, together with all our subjects and our most learned divines, had constant conferences respecting the things which relate to God, and by their advice have determined to summon a General Council. And we entreat your paternal blessedness, or rather the Lord God entreats, who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, that it will give itself to us

* The expression "God hath chosen us who seek His glory in truth," is censured in "Lib. Car." l. cap. 2. "According to the word of truth, he who speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory; which they who are zealous for images seem so to seek and embrace that they fear not to set at nought their predecessors and parents with all their deeds. Despising and setting these at nought, they boast that themselves are seeking God's glory in truth, whom they should despise rightly enough if, indeed, they turned aside from that truth; which saith, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' But the worshippers of images are ever in error; nor is the error light when anything whatever is worshipped with the worship of adoration besides Him who said, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'

"Images, however, since they appear to be what they are not, or to do what they do not, are not the same thing with truth, of which it is said, 'and the truth shall make you free;' for that images are without sense and reason is true, but that they are men is false; but if any say they may be called *men* by law of universals, as it is said, Augustine was a great philosopher, Augustine is to be read: Augustine is in such a Church—Augustine is buried in such a place—let him consider that all these come from one original, that is, Augustine. And he alone is the true Augustine of whom it is said he was the great philosopher, and the rest are respectively—a book, an image, a corpse."

After much more of the same kind, in which he blames the Council as

and make no delay, but come up hither to aid us in the confirmation and establishment of the ancient tradition of venerable images. It is, indeed, incumbent on your holiness to do this, since you know how it is written—"Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, ye priests, saith the Lord," and "the lips of the priests shall keep knowledge, and the law shall go forth out of his mouth, for he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts." And again, the divine apostle, the preacher of the truth, who, "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, preached the Gospel," hath thus commanded—"Feed the flock of Christ with discipline which He purchased with His own blood."

As then you are the veritable chief high priest, and president in the place and in the see of the holy and superlaudable Apostle Peter, let your paternal blessedness come to us, as we have said before, and add your presence to those other chief priests who shall be assembled together, that thus the will of the Lord may be accomplished. For as we are taught

styling images *truth*, or *holy* and *true*, and not as did the fathers, images of holy and good men; and in which he much wishes to find out where is their boasted sanctity—"for it is not in the things themselves—the wood or the colours; nor is it introduced by anything afterwards done to them by imposition of hands, or any canonical consecration, and further to know when the images are worn out whence goes their holiness"—he concludes thus—"As it is a fact that they have no sanctity, whoever styles them the truth or asserts that in and by them he seeks God's glory goes very far aside from the truth. It was not in manufactured images that David saw God's glory when he said, 'Thy glory is above the heavens;' nor was it thus the heavenly army sung glory to God in the highest; nor was it in a fiction the Lord appeared to the people in the wilderness, or the glory of the Lord covered the tabernacle."

The expression, "we entreat your paternity" or rather "God, who will have none to perish entreats you," is censured in "Lib. Car." i. 4. The expression is considered to rise from the same spirit which prompted them to say, "God who reigns together with us," and to call their writing *Divalia*. The chapter is taken up with showing that to suppose God or Christ to ask anything of man is derogatory to His glory and dignity. "Adrian's Answer," p. 124, col. ii., is more than usually impertinent, alleging (2 Cor. v. 20).—"Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God. It is undoubtedly a condescension, yet it is that which God is pleased to do—to beseech those whom He might command."

The point to be doubted is—Whether God would beseech the Bishop of Rome to come to Constantinople to confirm idolatry?

As to the expression, "Per eum qui consignat nobis Deus," it is not found in the *Divalia* nor in any letter written by Ireneo, but in the close of the letter written by the Council to her, as found in the Seventh Session.

Adrian has vindicated this expression, *more suo*, in his "Answer," p. 127, col. 2.

in the Gospels our Lord saith—"When two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them"—let your paternal and sacred blessedness be certified and confirmed by the great God and King of all, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by us His servants, that if you come up hither you shall be received with all honour and glory, and that everything necessary for you shall be granted; and again, when the definition (capitulum) is made complete, which by the good pleasure of Christ our God we hope shall be done with honour and amplitude, we take upon us to provide for you every facility of return.

If, however, your blessedness cannot attend upon us (which we can scarcely imagine, knowing what is your zeal about divine things), at least, let it select for us men of understanding, having with them letters from your holiness, that they may be present in the person of your sacred and paternal blessedness; that so, when they meet with the other priests who are here, the ancient tradition of our holy fathers may be synodically confirmed, and every evil plant of tares may be rooted out, and the words of the Saviour may be fulfilled, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." And after this, may there be no further schism and separation in the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of which Christ our true God is the Head.

We have had Constantine, beloved in Christ, most holy Bishop of Leontina in our beloved Sicily, with whom your paterna blessedness is well acquainted, into our presence; and, having spoken with him face to face, have sent him to you with this our present venerable letter of invitation. Whom, after that he hath seen you, forthwith dismiss, that he may come back to us, and write us by him concerning your coming—what time we may expect will be spent in your journeying thence and coming to us. Moreover, he can retain with him the most holy Bishop of Naples, and come up hither together with him; and, as your journey will be by way of Naples and Sicily, we have given orders to the Governor of Sicily about this, that he take due care to have every needful preparation made for that honour and rest which is necessary in

order that your paternal blessedness may come to us. (Legimus). Given on the 4th of the calends of September, the seventh indiction, from the royal city.

THE EXPLANATORY STATEMENT MADE BY TARASIVS THE SECRETARY TO THE PEOPLE, ON THE DAY IN WHICH THE SOVEREIGNS SIGNIFIED TO THE PEOPLE THAT HE SHOULD BE PATRIARCH, WHO WAS EXALTED TO THAT DIGNITY IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE INDICTION THE YEAR OF THE WORLD, 6293.

“OUR faithful Sovereigns, the guardians of the immaculate faith of us Christians, and zealous in all things done for the glory of God, as having great anxiety to order all things so as best may please Him, and for the common benefit of us Christians; and, above all, most earnestly solicitous concerning the affairs of the Church, and having deliberated concerning the election of a high priest for this royal city, have taken me into their pious consideration and have commanded me to announce openly that which had been determined. But when I in return protested how unworthy I was of this honour, and would make them no promise, for that I felt quite inadequate to so great a burden—so great a yoke—they would have me present myself before you, because that ye also had been consentient in this same determination. And now, therefore, O ye men who fear God, who have Him ever in your heart, who are named with the name of Christ our true God—that is, who are Christians—hear from our emptiness and unworthiness a few words by way of apology. Whatever answer I may before this have made to our pious and in all respects orthodox Sovereigns, the same I now make before you—that I am filled with fear in respect of consenting to this your vote, and I am full of alarm, lest in the presence of God I should hold so free and unguarded a course as to expose myself to fearful condemnation. For if he who heard the words of God, who was instructed from heaven, who beheld Paradise and heard unspeakable words, and bore the

name of God before nations and before Kings—namely, Paul the divine apostle, when writing to the Corinthians, should say—“Lest by any means after I have preached to others I myself should become a cast-away”—how dare I, brought up altogether in the world, among the number of the laity and a soldier in the royal service; and moreover, without any enquiry or time for consideration, to leap into the very summit of the priesthood—how fearful the attempt—how bold the undertaking for my littleness! And another very great cause of fear to me, and of my refusal too, is this—I see and behold that Church which is built upon Christ our God divided and rent asunder, and that we at one time say one thing, at another, another; and that those Christians, too, of the East who in other respects of the same faith with us differ from us, and agree with those in the West; that we are separated from them all, and are every day anathematised by all; and an anathema is a dreadful thing: it drives us far from God—it banishes us from the kingdom of heaven—it brings us down into the outer darkness. Moreover, the law and constitution of the Church allows not of contention and strife; but, as it recognises the confession of but one baptism and one faith, so it allows but one agreement concerning every part of ecclesiastical discipline.

“Nothing, indeed, is so pleasing and acceptable in God’s sight as our union, and that we be strictly one Catholic and Apostolic Church, even as we confess in the symbol of our sincere faith. And now, my brethren, I entreat, as I dare say you do also (for I know that the fear of God dwelleth in you), of our most pious and orthodox Sovereigns, that an Œcumenical Synod may be convened; that we who are of the same God may become one—we who are united in the confessions of the same Trinity may be of one mind and one in mutual esteem—that we who are the one body of Christ our Head, fitly joined and framed together—we who are of one Holy Spirit should not be against each other, but in favour of each other—and that we who are of the truth should think and say the same thing, and that there should be no more contention or division amongst us. So may the peace of God

which surpasseth all understanding evermore preserve us. Now, if our Sovereigns, the champions of orthodoxy, give command in accordance with my most equitable request, then I consent—I fulfil their command—I yield myself to your vote; but, if otherwise, then I cannot undertake it, lest I make myself obnoxious to anathema, and I be condemned in that day by the Righteous Judge of all, when neither kings nor priests, nor rulers, nor multitudes of men, can avail to deliver me. Now, as is best and most acceptable to yourselves, make your response to my apology, or rather give an answer to my request.” And they all were well-pleased with that which had been spoken, and were quite agreeable that a Synod should be convened; only some few poor senseless persons were adverse, on which the Secretary again spoke to the people—“Since the Sovereign Lord Leo has subverted images, and this Council when it assembles hath found them subverted, inasmuch as they have been subverted by the royal power, this point demands very special enquiry; because that they have dared, as it appears, to destroy an ancient custom handed down in the Church, but the truth of God is not bound.”

Now, after he was ordained, he wrote Synodical Epistles to the Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and the holy city, which you will find in the Second and Third Sessions, together with the replies made to them.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WHICH TOOK PLACE BEFORE THE COUNCIL WAS ASSEMBLED.

PETER and PETER, Presbyters, most beloved in God, having arrived from Rome, and having brought with them diplomatic letters; and John and Thomas having arrived from the East, most pious Presbyters and Monks, and also Syncelli of the Patriarchs of those parts, and having brought with them diplomatic letters, the Princes gave command to all the

Bishops to assemble at the palace. Now, while they were thus assembled in the God-protected and Royal city, the most excellent Sovereigns themselves were delayed in Thrace. But the greater part of the Bishops still involved in the heresy of the Christian-detractors caballed, plotted with certain of the laity, many in number, that there should not be any Council, but that they might still continue in their subversion and contempt of holy images; and, having stirred up many factious and slanderous insinuations against the Patriarch, they must needs assemble their Conventicle also.

Their plots and cabals did not escape the ears of the Patriarch; but, even while they were getting together their Conventicles, he let them know that Constantinople had a Bishop, and that without his pleasure they had no right to assemble their Conventicles; and that, according to the canons, they were obnoxious to deposition, on which the Bishops withdrew, being withheld by fear from further proceedings. When, however, the Sovereigns had arrived with the authorities of the people, the *scholarii*, the *excubitores*, and the other military who kept guard in the royal city, it was determined that a Council should be held in the venerable temple of the holy and ever to be praised Apostles. Now, the day before the appointed time had arrived, about mid-day, the soldiery, filled with wrath and madness, began to mutiny, and having rushed into the baptistery of the church they cried out some one thing and some another; but the end of the clamour was one and the same—that there should not be any Council held. The Patriarch gave information of the disturbance to the Sovereigns, but they would by no means allow it to be the very slightest hindrance to his assembling the holy Bishops in the aforesaid venerable temple.

On the morrow the Bishops met there accordingly; and while certain discussions were going on between the most holy Patriarch and the Bishops beloved in God, and while they were reading certain synodical writings which declare that no General Council can take place without the agreement of all the most holy Patriarchs—while engaged in this enquiry, a great multitude of soldiers came with great noise and clamour

before the gates of the venerable temple, being excited to this by the suggestions of certain evil-minded Bishops who were in the Council.

Which things being so, the Queen sent her command to all the Synod by her chamberlain : " For awhile depart, that we may escape this insubordinate fury of the people, and after this the will of the Lord be done." And so, after the Bishops had gone out of the temple, those of them who were opposed to the truth made up their assembly with the rabble and impious, caused a recitation of the false Conventicle to be made, which they would gloss over as the Seventh Council. When they had finished their noisy clamours of their evil Council, about the sixth hour, being very hungry, they went home, and so this ebullition of sedition was laid to rest.

Then the Sovereigns commanded the soldiers to march immediately, under pretence of a campaign, against the enemy, spreading a report that the Saracens had made an hostile attack, but in reality to get them out of Constantinople. And when they had arrived at Malagena, by command of the Sovereigns, they were cashiered and dismissed : they were told to go each one to his own country, as their services were no longer needed. These things being finished in this way, the Church remained one year in quiet, except that the Patriarch proclaimed the word of truth to all. And afterwards, when the year was past, the pious Sovereigns gave order that the Synod should meet in the metropolis of Nice, and the command was obeyed by the Bishops assembling together there ; and the Patriarch with the Legates of the Eastern and Western Sees had come also to the same city, and the Synod took place by the will of God, according to the record of the several Sessions which follow.



THE SESSIONS.



SESSION THE FIRST.

The Business of the Council is opened with a short Prefatory Speech by the Patriarch Tarasius ; after which the Letter of Convocation is read aloud by one of the Emperor's officers. The remainder of the Session is occupied in hearing the Recantation of Basil, Bishop of Ancyra ; Theodore, Bishop of Myra ; and Theodosius, Bishop of Ammorium ; who were without difficulty admitted to their rank in the Council and all their former honours ; and in discussing the case of seven other Bishops, who also desired to express their penitence ; but who, having been more active in the cause of Iconoclasm, were not so readily admitted.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND MASTER, JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns, Constantine, and Irene, his mother, in the eight year of their consulship, the eighth of the calends of October (24th of September), the eleventh indiction, the Holy Œcumenic Council met together, which, by the grace of God and the decree of the same divinely established Sovereigns, had been summoned to assemble in the splendid city of Nice, the metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia : namely, PETER, most Reverend Archpresbyter of the most holy Church of St. Peter at Rome ; and PETER, most Reverend Presbyter and Abbot of the monastery of St. Sabbas at Rome, Legates of the Apostolic See, and of Adrian, the most Holy and Sacred Archbishop of old Rome ; TARASIVS, most Holy and Reverend Archbishop of the far-famed city of Constantinople or New Rome ; JOHN and THOMAS, most Religious Presbyters and Monks, Legates of the Apostolic thrones of the Eastern Dioceses. [*Here follow the names of two hundred and fifty-three other Bishops who were present on this occasion**]; and they sat before the most sacred

* The number of bishops whose names are recorded as being present at the several sessions varies greatly, but never reaches 350, the number of which the

pulpit of the nave of the most holy great church named Sophia, in the presence of the very Noble and Illustrious Princes PETRONAS, the most excellent Patrician, Ex-consul, and Count of the Sacred imperial household; and JOHN, the imperial doorkeeper and treasurer of the imperial revenue; with the most pious Archimandrites, both Monks and Abbots; the Holy and Immaculate Gospels of God being placed in the midst.†

THE VERY REVEREND THE BISHOPS OF THE ISLAND OF SICILY said: "It appears to us both right in itself, and in every respect most profitable to this our holy Œcumenic Council, that, as an introduction to the discussion of the points now about to be brought under enquiry, the most holy Archbishop who presides over the imperial city of Constantinople be requested to preface our proceedings, and to open the door to further investigation, by commencing with such address as may appear to him most suitable."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Be it according to the request of the most holy bishops."

TARASIVS, the most holy and most blessed Patriarch of Constantinople, said: "Now may we most reasonably make use of those words of the prophet—words which we have often heard as being proclaimed in the Gospel also: 'The crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain' (Isai. xl. 14;

Council is said to consist. The different enumerations are as follow:—At the commencement of the first session, 253 were present; at the close of the second, 256 were present; at the close of the third, no particular enumeration is made in the Greek, but, in the old Latin translation, 262 names are on record; at the close of the fourth are found the subscriptions of 335 Bishops, and, in addition, of 132 Abbots, who are not elsewhere particularized. In the two next sessions no enumeration is made; but at the commencement of the seventh session 324 Bishops are recorded as being present, and the subscriptions to the definition of the Council are 307.

According to Baronius, four Saints were present at the Council: S. Euthymius, Bishop of Sardis, and SS. Plato, Theodore Studites, Theophanes, Monks. This last made himself conspicuous by coming on an ass, and clothed in ragged garments.—*Baron. ad Ann. 787.*

† "In the midst, (says the author of the 'Histoire du Concile de Nice') was prepared a magnificent throne, on which was placed the holy Gospel, to hold as it were the place of Jesus Christ, and to supply the Fathers with a rule and model for their definitions." The author adds, in a note, that he has no express testimony for this assertion; but concludes that it must be so from the fact that this usage is found in the Councils of Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and the rest.—*Vide, Hist. du Conc. Nice, p. 50, and 111.*

Luke iii. 6). When God determines to accomplish any purpose, how easily is every obstacle surmounted: 'for who hath resisted His will?' (Rom. ix. 9). For though by the instigation of the arch-enemy of souls, who ever delights to confound and distract the holy Catholic Church, whilst in the beginning of August, in the year now past, we were holding our sessions in the venerable church of those trumpets (*σαλπιγγων*) of the Spirit, the holy glorious Apostles, within the walls of the God-protected imperial city, a numerous mob, full of wrath and bitterness,* under the patronage of certain notorious Bishops (whose names, as being well known to all of you, I willingly pass over), was stirred up against us to lay hands upon us, but from whose hand the Lord delivered us, and for awhile seemed to have put an entire stop to our speaking and confirming the words of truth and piety: nevertheless, our most Gracious Sovereigns, under the direction of God, as being on the one hand most determined champions of orthodoxy, and on the other no less determined opponents of heterodoxy, would 'give neither sleep to their eyes, nor slumber to their eyelids' (Ps. cxxxii. 4), till they could bring the tabernacle of God—that is, His Church—into a state of unity, and could restore to it the blessings of peace. Wherefore they have, by the council and good-will of our God, again called us together; for which good deed of theirs may they be recompensed by Christ, our universal King, who is able abundantly to repay all that they have done. Let us, therefore, O ye holy men, invoking His assistance, having His fear within our breast, and the future judgment ever before our eyes, 'gird up the loins of our mind' (1 Pet. i. 13) in truth, and, as the Apostle teaches, '*being sober*' in all things, determine that which is just; that thus without delay we may root up all innovation, whether it be in omission or superfluous addition, as tares sown among the pure wheat, opposed to the truth and hostile to the Church: for the things which have been handed down to us, in her are not

* Tarasius here alludes to the dispersion of the Fathers when assembled at Constantinople, in the year preceding, by means of the troops, who had served under Constantine V.; of which transaction an account is given in the short abstract of events which happened before the Council.

'yea, and nay'* (2 Cor. i. 19), but are *yea* in truth, and remain uninjured and undefiled throughout all ages; for faithful is 'He that hath promised the gates of hell shall not prevail against her' (Matt. xvi. 18). Now, if we be satisfied that it is pleasing to God, then let those † Bishops who last year were in opposition to the truth be brought into our presence; and if they have anything to say for themselves, whether of disputation or apology, they may be free to speak, that so every point under enquiry may be made plain to all."

CONSTANTINE, most holy ‡ Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, said: "If it seem good to this holy Œcumenic Council, let the most Reverend the Bishops who are involved in this charge be permitted to come into the presence of this holy Œcumenical Council according to the proposal of our most holy and blessed Patriarch Tarasius."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let them come in;" on which the Bishops alluded to came in; and, after they had entered, the very illustrious Princes said, "Our gracious masters commanded us to lay before all assembled in your holy Council, their precious and venerable (ΣΑΚΡΑ) § Letter of Convocation, to which we demand your attention."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "May God confirm the kingdom of our gracious lords:" on which Leontius, the most noble Secretary, having taken it in his hands, read aloud the same pious Letter of Convocation.

ΣΑΚΡΑ. [THE LETTER OF CONVOCATION.]

“CONSTANTINE AND IRENE—Sovereigns of the Romans in the

* The present state of the Greek and Roman Churches testifies against this pretended agreement, and certainly in ecclesiastical traditions. Both plead tradition for their differences: who shall decide between them?

† "The Iconoclasts appeared, not as judges, but as criminals or penitents."—*Gibbon, Dec. and Fall*, c. 49. The penitents were the first three who entered, and had but to read their libel of recantation: the other seven were arraigned as criminals, and were forced to pass the ordeal of a long discussion as to the method in which they should be received. Gregory of Neocesarea, as having been the chief of the opposing party, was not admitted till the second session, when he was charged as being a ringleader of heresy.

‡ The epithets, Ἀγιώτατος, Ευλαβεστάτος, Θεοφιλεστάτος, and the like, are appended to the name of every Bishop every time he speaks: they may, in future, be very reasonably omitted.

§ ΣΑΚΡΑ, a word not found in common Lexicons. Du Cange explains it as "Sacra, Epistola"—"diploma principis."

Faith, to the most holy Bishops, who, by the grace of God and by the command of our pious Sovereignty, have met together in the Council of Nicæa.

“ The Wisdom which is truly according to the nature of God and the Father—our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God—who, by His most divine and wonderful dispensation in the flesh, hath delivered us from all idolatrous error ; and, by taking on Him our nature, hath renewed the same by the co-operation of the Spirit, which is of the same nature with Himself : and having Himself become the first High Priest, hath accounted you, holy men, worthy of the same dignity.

“ He is that good Shepherd who, bearing on His own shoulders that wandering sheep-fallen man, hath brought him back to His own peculiar fold—that is, the company of angelic and ministering powers (Eph. ii. 14, 15), ‘ and hath reconciled us to Himself, having broken down the enmity through His flesh,’ and hath bestowed upon us a rule of conduct tending to peace [*εἰρηναίαν διαγωγὴν*] ; wherefore, preaching to all, He saith in the Gospel, ‘ Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God ’ (Matt. v. 9). Of which blessedness, confirming as it does the exaltation of the adoption of sons, our pious Sovereignty desiring above all things to be made partakers, hath ever applied the utmost diligence to direct all our Roman Commonwealth into the ways of unity and concord : and more especially have we been solicitous concerning the right regulation of the Church of God, and most anxious in every way to promote the unity of the Priesthood. For which cause the Chiefs of the Sacerdotal Order of the East and of the North, of the West and of the South, are present* in the person of their Representative Bishops, who have with them respectively the replies written in answers to the Synodical Epistle sent from the most holy Patriarch Tarasius ; for such was from the beginning the synodical regulation of the Church Catholic, which, from the one end of the earth to the other, hath received the Gospel. On this account we have, by the good will and permission of God, caused you, His most holy Priests, to meet together—you who are accustomed to dispense His Testament in the unbloody sacrifice—that your decision may be in accordance with the definitions of former Councils, and

* That this boast, more than once repeated in this Council, is far from true, is evident from the fact that, from the *North* no Bishop whatever was present : from the *West*, only the Bishops of Sicily and the Pope's Legates : from the *South*, only two Monks, who assumed the person and character of Legates from the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, the falsity of whose pretensions will be seen in notes on the Third Session of the Council : so that this assemblage of Bishops from the *North* and *South*, *West* and *East*, is confined mainly to the Bishops of the *East*.

that the splendour of the Holy Spirit may enlighten you all ; for, a our Lord teaches, ‘ No man lighteth a candle and putteth it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all that are in the house’ (Matt. v. 15) :* even so, should ye make such use of the various regulations which have been piously handed down to us of old by our Fathers, that all the Holy Churches of God may remain in peaceful order.

“ As for us, such was our zeal for the truth—such our earnest desire for the interests of religion, our care for ecclesiastical order, our anxiety that the ancient rules and orders should maintain their ground—that though fully engaged in military councils—though all our attention was occupied in political cares—yet, treating all these affairs as but of minor importance, we would allow nothing whatever to interfere with the Convocation of your most holy Council. To every one is given the utmost freedom of expressing his sentiments without the least hesitation, that thus the subject under enquiry may be most fully discussed and truth may be the more boldly spoken, that so all dissensions may be banished from the Church and we all may be united in the bonds of peace.

“ For, when the most holy Patriarch Paul, by the divine will, was about to be liberated from the bands of mortality and to exchange his earthly pilgrimage for a heavenly home with his Master Christ, he abdicated the Patriarchate and took upon him the monastic life : and when we asked him ‘ Why hast thou done this ?’ he answered, ‘ Because I fear that, if death should surprise me still in the Episcopate of this royal and heaven-defended city, I should have to carry with me the anathema of the whole Catholic Church, which consigns me to that outer darkness which is prepared for the devil and his angels ; for they

* The objection of the “ Caroline Books” (lib. ii. c. 12) to this quotation does not seem well founded ; for it is not here applied to the establishment of image-worship, but rather to that light which the Canons of the Church might be supposed to afford to the assembled Fathers, directed by which their decisions might be made according to the truth. Charlemagne understands the quotation as made against the Iconoclasts, as if they, by rejecting image-worship, had hidden their candle under a bushel. This application of these words is thus vindicated by Adrian, in his letter to Charlemagne, in answer to the censures of those books (p. 116, col. 1) :—“ Most right and proper is it to apply these words against those who despise images, since they may be said to hide *their candle under a bushel* ; for by the candle is meant our faith—namely, that of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church ; ‘ for (says St. Ambrose) the candle is our faith, as it is written, *Thy word is a lamp unto my feet* : the word of God is our light—our faith is the candle : let no one limit faith within the measure of the law,” &c. [*quid ad rem*]. And he brings forward another quotation, equally inapplicable, from St. Chrysostom :—“ I have lighted a candle for you : be it your care to keep it alight.”

say that a certain Synod hath been held here in order to the subversion of pictures and images which the Church receives, retains, and worships, in memory of the persons whom they represent. This is that which distracts my soul—this is that which makes me anxiously to enquire how I may escape the judgment of God—since among such men I have been brought up and with such am I numbered.' No sooner had he thus spoken in the presence of some of our most illustrious Nobles than he expired.*

"When our Pious Sovereignty reflected on this awful declaration (and truly, even before this event, we had heard of similar questionings from many around), We took counsel with ourselves as to what ought to be done; and We determined, after mature deliberation, that when a new Patriarch had been elected, We should endeavour to bring this subject to

* The particulars of this Conference with the Patriarch Paul are thus recorded by Theophanes (*Chronograph. an. 776*):—"In the month of August, of the seventh indiction, the Patriarch Paul abdicated the patriarchate and assumed the monastic garb *without* the knowledge of the Empress. When she knew of it, she followed him, accompanied by her son, and, with many tears and lamentations, said to him, '*Why hast thou done thus?*' And he, greatly grieving, made answer, '*O, that I had never sat in the throne of the Church of God, since it was under the influence of tyranny, divided from other Catholic Churches, and subjected to their anathema.*' After this, she summoned the patricians and the chief of the senate and sent them to him. And he said to them, '*Unless there be an Ecumenical Council, and the prevalent error be thereby corrected, ye cannot be saved.*' And they replied, '*How came it, then, to pass that, when thou wast consecrated, thou didst subscribe the decree that we ought not to worship images?*' He answered, '*It is for this I weep and have betaken myself to this penance, that I may obtain from God that He will not punish me, His priest, for keeping back and refusing to proclaim the truth through fear of your madness.*' While thus speaking he fell asleep, to the great grief of the Empress and all good men; for he was a good man, charitable beyond his means, worthy of all reverence; and both the Empress and the State had great confidence in him. After his death, men spoke with much more freedom about images than before." There are many discrepancies in the two relations of this Conference; but Theophanes wrote later than the Council, and possibly added such circumstances as made the tale more probable. There are serious objections to both the one and the other: (1). This Conference was private—no one present but the Empress and her creatures. Had this repentance of the Patriarch been real—it should have been as *public* as possible. (2). It was too late: liberty of conscience, with respect to images, had now been granted for five years. The Patriarch had had ample opportunity, if he pleased, of declaring his change of opinion. He stood in no danger from the madness of the people; and surely the Empress had power enough to have protected him without his abdicating his see or retiring to a monastery: yet he dares not divulge his sentiments till the very day of his death. (3). His death following this declaration prevented all enquiry. (4). No Church had actually pronounced any anathema but that of Rome, and the confession put into his mouth is very absurd. In the Empress's letter to the Council, he speaks as if he had but just found out, and that only by report, that a Synod had been held against images in Constantinople. Possibly, as Paul's character stood too high to admit of slander, they adopted the more convenient fabrication of a change of sentiments.—*Basmuze, Histoire d'Eglise*, lib. xxiii. c. 4, § 10.

some decisive conclusion. Wherefore, having summoned those whom we knew to be most experienced in ecclesiastical matters, and having called upon Christ our God, We consulted with them who was worthy to be exalted to the chair of the Priesthood of this Royal and Heaven-defended city; and they all with one heart and soul gave their vote in favour of Tarasius—he who now occupies the Pontifical Presidency. Having, therefore, sent for him, We laid before him our deliberations and our vote; but he would by no means consent, nor at all yield to that which had been determined. And when We enquired, ‘Wherefore he thus refused his consent?’—at first he answered evasively, ‘That the yoke of the Chief Priesthood was too much for him.’ But We, knowing this to be a mere pretext covering his unwillingness to obey us, would not desist from our importunity, but persisted in passing the acceptance of the dignity of the Chief Priesthood upon him. When he found how urgent We were with him he told us the cause of his refusal:—‘It is (said he) because I perceive that the Church, which has been founded on the rock Christ our God, is rent and torn asunder by schisms, and that we are unstable in our confession, and that Christians in the East, of the same faith with ourselves, decline communion with us, and unite themselves to those of the West; and so we are estranged from all, and each day are anathematised by all: and, moreover, I should demand that an Œcumenic Council should be held, at which should be found Legates from the Pope of Rome and from the Chief Priests of the East.’* We, therefore, fully understanding these things, introduced him to the assembled company of the Priests—of our most illustrious Princes—and of all our Christian people; and then, in their presence, he repeated to them all that he had before said to us; which, when they heard, they received him joyfully, and earnestly entreated our Peace-making and Pious Sovereignty that an Œcumenic Council might be assembled. To this their request, We gave our hearty consent; for, to speak the truth, it is by the good

* This declaration of Tarasius is set forth more at large in his apology for his uncanonical ordination found in the Ante-conciliar documents. It is somewhat remarkable that a Hierarchy consisting of at least three hundred and fifty Bishops, to say nothing of a still larger body of Priests and Deacons, of Monks and Abbots, could not furnish Irene with a man fitted for this exalted station, but she must needs have recourse to a layman and a soldier. The Pope was scandalised at the irregularity, and nothing but Tarasius's zeal for image worship reconciled him to it. Charlemagne, on the contrary, viewing his election as illegal, considered the purpose for which he was elected yet worse. “Tarasius (says he, *Car. Lib.*, b. iii. c. ii.) endeavours to expiate one error by another, and from one disease falls into another; while he is labouring by his over-zeal for images to make amends for his hasty consecration and elevation to the Episcopate.”

will and under the directions of our God that we have assembled you together. Wherefore as God, willing to establish His own counsel, hath for this purpose brought you together from all parts of the world, Behold the holy Gospels now lying before you, and plainly crying aloud, 'Judge justly' (John vii. 24); stand firm as Champions of Religion, and be ready with unsparing hand to cut away all innovations and new fangled inventions. And, as Peter the Chief of the Apostolic College (John xviii. 10) struck the mad slave and cut off his Jewish ear with the sword, so in like manner do ye wield the axe of the Spirit, and every tree which bears the fruit of contention, of strife, or newly-imported innovation, either renew by transplanting through the words of sound doctrine, or lay it low with canonical censure, and send it to the fires of the wrath to come: so that the Peace of the Spirit may evermore protect the whole body of the Church, compacted and united in one and confirmed by the traditions of the Fathers; and so may all our Roman State enjoy peace, in the peace of the Church.

"We have received letters from Adrian, most holy Pope of old Rome, by his Legates—namely, Peter, most religious Archpresbyter, and Peter, most religious Presbyter and Abbot—who will be present in council with you; and We command that, according to Synodical custom, these be read in the hearing of you all; and that, having heard these with becoming silence, and moreover the Epistles contained in two octavos* sent from the Chief Priests and other Priests of the Eastern dioceses by John, most pious Monk and Chancellor of the Patriarchal throne of Antioch, and Thomas, Priest and Abbot, who also are present together with you, ye may by these understand what are the sentiments of the Church Catholic on this point."

When the Letter was concluded, the HOLY COUNCIL said: "God preserve their kingdom—God grant them a long life—God make them abundantly to rejoice!" After which acclamations, Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, Theodore, Bishop of Myra, and Theodosius, Bishop of Ammorium, were brought forward; and, while they were standing in the midst of the holy council, BASIL, Bishop of Ancyra, said: "Having to the utmost of my ability examined the question now before you, and being perfectly satisfied in every respect, I, your most

* Quaterniones porro librorum, τετρας et τετραδιον nuncupant, quia videlicet quatuor foliis duplicatis aliumque in alio insertis constant: quæ octo folia sexdecimque paginas efficiunt.

Palseographia Græca, studio Bern. de Montfaucon, p. 26. Paris. 1708.

unworthy servant, have now approached the Catholic Church."

TARASIVS: "Glory to God, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim. ii. 4).

BASIL then read from the libel which he had in his hand: "It is an ecclesiastical regulation, canonically handed down to us from the beginning, both by the holy Apostles and our holy Fathers and Doctors their successors, and also by the six holy Œcumenic Councils, and by all orthodox local Synods, that all who return from any heresy whatever, to the orthodox confession and tradition of the Catholic Church, should deliver in writing a recantation of their several heresy, and a confession of the Orthodox Faith. Wherefore, I, Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, desiring to be united to the Catholic Church, do present this my written confession to Adrian, most holy Pope of old Rome—to Tarasius, the most blessed Patriarch—to the other most holy Apostolic Thrones—namely, of Alexandria, Antioch, and the holy City; and, moreover, to all other Orthodox Chief Priests and Priests, and I lay it before you as having received power from apostolical authority; and, at the same time, I humbly crave the pardon of all your blessed assembly for this my tardiness, for I ought never to have failed in the confession of orthodoxy, but this arose from my extreme ignorance, dulness, and want of consideration; wherefore I do the more earnestly entreat your blessedness that ye would intercede with God for me, that I may obtain mercy.

"I believe, therefore, and confess one God the Father Almighty, and one Lord Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit the Lord and Giver of life—a Trinity consubstantial and coequal, to be worshipped and glorified in one Godhead, Power, and Authority; and I confess all things relative to the dispensation of one of this Holy Trinity, our Lord and God Jesus Christ, even as the six holy Œcumenic Councils have delivered them to us; and all the unbridled licence of heresy I abominate and anathematise, even as they have anathematised it before me.* And as I ever entreat

* Basil is severely censured in the "Caroline Books," because that, in his

the good offices of our immaculate Lady the holy Mother of God, and of the holy and heavenly powers, and of all Saints, so I receive, embrace, and give honorary worship to their holy and precious relics, in the confidence that I shall obtain sanctification from them; and in like manner I embrace,

confession he inserts :—"The kissing and adoration of images and relics, saying that he has faith to expect sanctification from them, while he omits all mention of the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life of the world to come." In this chapter (lib. 3, cap. 6), the importance of each of these three Articles omitted by Basil is insisted upon, and is proved from the fact that each of them *was* taught both in the Old and New Testaments, and was accounted worthy of a place even in the short summary of the Apostles' creed, as too important to be omitted. After which it is said: "From hence it plainly appears that he (Basil) displayed no slight folly when, in his confession, he could pass by mysteries of such importance that Christianity could scarce exist without them, and instead of these brought forward other things quite unnecessary, not to say ridiculous.

"Moreover, the above-named Bishop, after confessing that the adoration and kissing of images were among the most important bulwarks of the faith, declares that he trusts that he shall obtain sanctification from them. Well may he be left to participate with things devoid of sense, destitute not only of sanctification but even of life, who, after the confession of the Trinity, declares that he hath faith in such trifles; while he carelessly omits those things which are among the greatest privileges of the Christian religion. But lastly, let it be admitted that there is some advantage in image worship, still, what would be detracted from the Christian religion, if it were omitted in the chief summaries of the faith?—and it seems, moreover, rather prohibited than encouraged by our holy Fathers. Never could such omission so injure the faith as does the omission of the remission of the resurrection of the flesh, and the life of the world to come, since they are everywhere taught throughout the holy Scripture; and, as we said before, are found united in the Apostles' creed with admirable brevity."

Adrian's defence of Basil is as follows :—"S. Ambrose, in his treatise on the faith, among other things, says there is a plenitude of divinity in the Father—there is a plenitude of divinity in the Son. But of the Holy Spirit he saith nothing, because he was speaking of the Father and the Son only. In the same manner Basil, in his recantation, makes mention of his reception of sacred images and relics, because he had all that time been in error on these points. But, concerning remission of sins, &c., he had not been in error, nor had ever in this respect opposed the Catholic Church, as did those wretched and miserable heretics who endeavoured to do away with the value alike of images and relics."

Here Adrian confutes himself; for if the Iconoclasts did deny these three articles of the creed, then Basil must in like manner have denied them, and hence would flow an additional reason why he ought not to have omitted them in his confession. After dooming the Iconoclasts to eternal destruction, Adrian brings forward several other passages in favour of relics and their worship. As they have no connection with the subject, they may be omitted. One passage from St. Basil may be here brought forward, which, if genuine, betokens no little superstition in that Father. In his comment on Psalm cxv. among other things he says, "Before this, it was said to the Chief Priests and the Nazarites that any person who touched a dead body was impure, and must wash his clothes. But now, whoever touches the lips of a Martyr shall receive some participation of sanctification from the grace which remains with the body." [Certainly Basil, of Ancyra, might be justified in his expectation, by Basil of Cesarea, unless it be some Pseudo-Basil, from whom the quotation is made].—*Adrian's Letter*, p. 120, c. 2.

salute, and ascribe the worship of honour to venerable images, both of the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in that human figure which for our sakes He adopted, and of our immaculate Lady the holy Mother of God, and of the Godlike (*θεοειδων*) Angels; and of all the holy Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and of all Saints.

“Furthermore, I reject and anathematise, with all my heart and soul, the Synod convened in all stupidity and madness, and by them styled *the Seventh*!—but by all who think aright, lawfully and canonically called the Pseudo-Synod, as being utterly devoid of all truth and piety, and as most rashly, audaciously—yea. even most atheistically—barking against the ecclesiastical tradition delivered to us from God, and as having treated with insult holy and venerable images, and given orders that they should be utterly banished from the Churches of God; over which presided Theodosius, falsely called Bishop of Ephesus; Sisinnius, Bishop of Perga, surmamed Pastillas; Basil, Bishop of Pisidia, nicknamed Tricaccabus, through whose follies the miserable Patriarch Constantine was also misled. This is my confession, and to this I declare my consent; and, therefore, with all sincerity of heart and rectitude of mind (God is my witness), I here pronounce the subjoined anathemas:—

“1. Anathema to the Christianity-slanderers* (*χριστιανοκατηγοροις*)—that is, to the Iconoclasts.

“2. Anathema to those who apply passages of Scripture, written against idols, to holy and venerable images.

“3. Anathema to those who do not salute holy and venerable images.

“4. Anathema to those who affirm that Christians pay regard to images as to gods.

“5. Anathema to those who call holy and venerable images idols.

“6. Anathema to those who consciously communicate with those who dishonour and insult holy images.

* ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΟΙ; or, “the Slanderers of Christians,” as if, in calling image-worshippers, idolators, they had brought an unjust and slanderous accusation against Christians in general.

“7. Anathema to those who ascribe deliverance from idolatry to any other than to Christ our God.

“8. Anathema to those who reject the doctrine of the holy Fathers and the Traditions of the Catholic Church, taking up the pretext and the language of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus; and affirming that, further than we are taught from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, we are bound to follow neither the doctrine of the holy Fathers, nor Œcumenic Councils, nor the Traditions of the Catholic Church.*

“9. Anathema to those who presume to say that the Catholic Church ever admitted idols.

“10. Anathema to those who affirm that the invention of images is the invention of Satanic craft, and not the tradition of our holy Fathers.

“These things I now confess, to these I assent, and these I do with my whole heart, and mind, and soul, declare; and if (but may it never happen) at any time, through the stratagems of Satan, I ever willingly or unwillingly turn aside from this my present confession, let me be anathema from the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, banished from the Catholic Church, and every Sacerdotal Order. Henceforth I shall order my ways according to the Sacred Canons both of the holy Apostles and of our inspired Fathers, avoiding all receiving of gifts and base gain.”

TARASIVS: “All this our sacerdotal assembly unite in giving thanks and praise to God for this thy confession, which has now been made by thee to the Catholic Church.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL: “Glory be to God, who hath united that which was divided.”

THEODORE, Bishop of Myra, was then brought forward, who said: “Even I, a sinner and unworthy, having made deep enquiry and research, and having chosen the better part, do entreat of God and your Holiness that among the rest I also, though a sinner, may be united to the Catholic Church.”

* This anathema is not unsuitable to a Council which had so slight a foundation in Scripture to build upon.

TARASIVS : "It is ever agreeable to our Lord Jesus Christ to receive the penitent."

THEODORE then read the same Libel which Basil had read before, beginning with: "It is an ecclesiastical regulation," and so on with the rest. And when he had finished reading,

TARASIVS said: "And now, in behalf of Theodore, the most holy Bishop of Myra, we offer thanks to Christ our God."

EUTHYMIUS, Bishop of Sardis, said: "Blessed be God, who hath united him to the Catholic Church."

THEODOSIVS, Bishop of Ammorium, was then brought forward, who said: "My most holy and reverend Lords and all this sacred Assembly: I also, a wretched and deluded sinner, who have spoken so many wicked things against venerable images, having learned, do now recognise the truth and condemn myself. And I have unhesitatingly anathematised, and do still anathematise, all things which any where in the world I have spoken or taught amiss on this subject. And I now entreat and conjure your holy Council that ye would admit me, your unworthy servant, into the company of other Christians."*

TARASIVS: "The most pious Theodosius has manifested much contrition of heart and is worthy of reception."

* This recantation of Theodosius meets with censure far more stringent in the "Caroline Books" than that with which Basil of Ancyra was visited:—"In a former chapter we showed that Basil of Ancyra deserved censure; because that, having laid the foundation of his faith, he had neglected, in his superstructure, those things which became so great a mystery, and in their place would build thereon such things as were utterly unworthy of religion at all. But, in the present chapter, we would show that Theodosius might be much more fitly blamed, since, without laying any foundation whatever, he raises an edifice of most empty and irrational vanities. If, from the edifice of the former, that which was vain were taken away, still that which was right in the foundation would remain; but if, from the latter all that was vain and frivolous was taken away, there would remain just nothing at all: for thus he begins:—'I confess, and promise, and receive, and kiss, and worship holy images.' O, wonderful confession for a Bishop!—admirable words for a Chief Priest!—most praiseworthy devotion in a Prelate! In the confession of the Most Excellent Majesty, he is silent, and is loud in the confession of a most absurd vanity! In respect of that which himself ought to confess, and to the confession of which he should exhort others, he saith nothing; while he confesses that which he ought not, and against which he should have made a stand, lest others should confess! He who should have been a defence to the house of Israel, and should have stood in the battle in the day of the Lord, of his own accord, is, alas! prepared for a disgraceful surrender: for he who, by his

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "According to the sacred canons he is worthy."

TARASIVS : "He is worthy, if there be no canonical impediment."

THEODOSIVS, Bishop of Ammorium, read the form of Recantation, which he has drawn up for himself, as follows : "I Theodosius, least of all Christians, do confess, and consent to, and receive, and embrace, and worship above all, the immaculate image of our Lord Jesus Christ, our true God, and the holy image of her who begat Him without human generation, the holy Mother of God, whose aid, protection, and intercession, I, a sinner, each night and day entreat for the help of my necessities, as having all readiness of access with Him who was born of her, even Christ our God. And likewise I receive and worship the images of the holy and illustrious Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, and of the Fathers and Ascetics of the desert, not as gods (God forbid !); but as displaying that internal ardour and affection of soul which I ever had towards them, but would more especially show forth when I, with all my heart, invoke any one of them that they would intercede with God on my behalf, that He would grant to me, for the sake of their intercessions, to find mercy with Him in the day of judgment. And in like manner I worship, honour, and salute the relics of the Saints, as being the relics of those who have suffered in Christ's behalf, and as having received power from Him to cure all diseases, to heal infirmities, and to cast out devils—even as the holy Church hath received, from the time of the Apostles and Fathers to our own. And I approve that there be represented in churches, first of all, the image of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and of the holy Mother of God, in every kind of material, in silver and gold, and every descrip-

diligence in preaching, should have reclaimed the minds of others from a depraved confession and absurd error, becomes, by the example of a depraved confession, a stumbling-block of error to others."—*Car. Lib.*, 1. iii., c. 7.

Adrian's answer in defence of Theodosius is as follows :—"That Theodosius, being fervent in zeal for the faith, made this confession, in which zeal he did but follow several very blessed pontiffs, who also, in one way or other, were most hearty in the cause : and that both he and they did but comply with the apostle's command to Timothy, 'Hold fast the traditions,' " &c.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 121, col. ii.

tion of colouring, in order that the dispensation of His incarnation may be made known to all. And, in like manner, that the conduct of the holy and illustrious Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, should be set forth, that so their conflicts and sufferings, in this compendious mode of writing, may be made known to all, for the excitation and instruction of the laity, especially of the more unlearned. For if the people go forth with tapers and incense to meet the images of Kings, when sent to any particular town or province, not intending any honour to the waxen tablet, but only to the King, how much more ought there to be painted in churches of Christ our God, for the same purpose, the images of God our Saviour, of His holy immaculate Mother, and of all our holy blessed Martyrs and Ascetics.* As saith St. Basil: 'Both historians and painters have oftentimes described the same warlike feats—the one with eloquent narration, the other with the stroke of the pencil, and each in his own way has excited many to deeds of courage.' And again, the same writer says: 'How much hast thou laboured, O man, that thou mightest find any of the Saints ashamed (*δυσωποῦντα*) of his Lord.' And Chrysostom saith: 'The grace of the Saints is not cut short by death, nor is it injured by their departure hence: on the contrary, after death, they are more powerful than when

* This comparison of the respect paid to the images of saints with that paid to the imperial effigy is censured at great length in the "Caroline Books," l. 3, c. xv.

(1). It is observed that, in order to success in any art, the model which we propose to ourselves should be good, and that it is madness to take any authority for our practice from things unlawful in themselves. (2). That heathen customs and practices are not good examples for Christians to follow. (3). That the custom of honouring the imperial effigy is itself unlawful, as is proved from Daniel lxii. 8, and Jerome's comment thereon; and, therefore, is of no authority to establish any practice. (4). That kings who would be thus adored need pictures and effigies, forasmuch as they are confined to place and cannot be everywhere; but God, who is omnipresent, cannot need them. (5). That thereby great scandal might be given to the Gentiles by this worship paid to the imperial picture, who would have a difficulty in reconciling the profession of Christians with their practice. (6). Therefore, to draw an argument hence for the worship of St. Mary, or all saints, is proved to be absurd. Moreover, no one save God either knows all the names or can preserve the images of the saints. As says the Psalmist (Psalm cxxxix. 17, sec. Vulg. and Sept.)—"How honourable are thy saints, O God!—how established is their kingdom. If I would number them, they are more in number than the sand upon the sea shore."—*Car. Lib. b. 3, c. xv.*

they were alive. And many, yea, innumerable other testimonies are there on this head besides.' Wherefore, I conjure you, O ye holy men of God, and I cry aloud, 'I have sinned against heaven and before you' (Luke xv. 18); but receive me as God hath received the reveller, the harlot, and the thief: seek me as Christ sought the lost sheep, which He bore upon His shoulders, that so, through your good offices, my most holy Lords, there may be 'joy among the angels of God' (Luke xv. 10) on my salvation and repentance.

"1. Anathema to those who worship not holy and venerable images.

"2. Anathema to those who blaspheme holy and venerable images.

"3. Anathema to those who dare to blaspheme or slander venerable images, or to call them idols.

"4. Anathema to the Christianity-slanderers—that is, the Iconoclasts.

"5. Anathema to those who teach not diligently all Christian people to worship and salute the holy, precious, and venerable images of all saints who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased God.*

"6. Anathema to those who hesitate, and do not, from the heart, confess that we ought to worship holy images."

* A censure on the incautious wording of this anathema forms the conclusion of the chapter before quoted:—"But forasmuch as he (Theodosius) anathematizes those who do not instruct ALL the people of Christ to worship the images of ALL the Saints from the very beginning of the world: let the prudent reader see how absurdly and incautiously he speaks; for, while he is preparing his anathema against others, he turns the edge of it upon himself and his fellow Bishops. Are, then, *all* to teach! What, those who have neither the office of instructing, nor the authority to preach granted to them at all! And how can he teach *all* the people of Christ, now that the whole world is filled with them! For, if agreeably to his folly, all who teach not *all* Christ's people were worthy of anathema, neither he nor any of his fellow Bishops could escape; for, however they might be qualified to give instruction to one province or another, yet none would be able to teach *all* Christ's people, dispersed as they are over every part of the earth.

Again: suppose them able to teach all people, they would be still unable to possess themselves of the images of *all* the Saints from the beginning, in the worship of which they are thus to instruct all people. For so great is the company of them that they can neither be painted nor even counted save by Him alone in whose book all their names are written. So that it is necessary for this Bishop, if he would escape his own anathema, to have and to worship all the images of all the Saints in all parts of the world, who from the beginning have pleased God; but, forasmuch as this he cannot do, he must submit himself to the blight of his own anathema."—*Lib. Cur.* iii. 7.

SABBAS, Abbot of the Monastery of Studium : "According to the Apostolic Canons and the Œcumenic Councils, he is worthy of admission."

TARASIVS : "See how those who were formerly leagued against orthodoxy are now banded in defence of the truth."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus : "The recantation of the most holy Bishop of Ammorium has drawn from me many a tear."

TARASIVS : "Are ye agreed that they should resume their seats?"

The most reverend the MONKS said : "As the six holy Œcumenic Councils received those who have returned from heresy, so let us receive them."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "We are all agreed."

After which Basil most holy Bishop of Ancyra, Theodore most holy Bishop of Myra, and Theodosius most holy Bishop of Ammorium, took their seats according to their order. When they were seated,

EUTHYMIUS, Bishop of Sardis, said : "God hath brought us the orthodox gloriously."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "Let the orthodox sit in the Council, and the Father with the Fathers. God hath brought the orthodox gloriously."

After these, Hypatius, most reverend Bishop of Nicæa; Leo, most reverend Bishop of Rhodes; Gregory, most reverend Bishop of Pessinus; Leo, most reverend Bishop of Iconium; George, most reverend Bishop of Pisidia; Nicholas, most reverend Bishop of Hierapolis; and Leo, most reverend Bishop of Carpathus, were presented before the Council.*

* These seven Bishops had, probably, a greater share in the disturbances of the year previous than the three before admitted, and so were received, not as penitents, but as criminals; and were not allowed to take their seats in the Council till after a lengthened debate on the subject. According to Mr. Stebbing, this lenity towards the lapsed Bishops afforded a lasting cause of dissatisfaction to the Monks, who could not be brought to believe that they who had a little while before been engaged with impious zeal in destroying images ought to retain their authority over the people they had laboured to mislead.—*Vide Stebbing, Church Hist.* vol. ii. p. 57. And yet no one point was so well proved in this Council as this—that heretics on repentance ought to be admitted to their forfeited honours and dignities—Traditions, Councils, Fathers, being all unanimous on this point. How little account do Monks make of Fathers, &c., if it does not suit their fancies!

TARASIVS, addressing himself to them, said: "Stirred up from what quarter, I care not to say, 'Ye took deep council, but not of God, and ye made a covenant, but not by the Lord' (Isai. xxx. 1), when, during last year, ye assembled in a secret and underhand manner, with the intention of utterly banishing and expelling the truth. Now, if ye did this from ignorance, tell us how it was that ye became so ignorant; but if, from mistaken pretensions to reason, then let your sophistical reasonings be brought forward, that all may hear them. Thus, this sacred assembly, having invincible truth as its ally, will rend to pieces, and utterly unravel, all your vain fallacies and contradictory reasonings, as bands of falsity, not having any foundation in the truth, nor any reliance upon it."

LEO, Bishop of Rhodes: "We have sinned before God, and before His Church, and before this holy Council; for we have fallen by our folly, and we can make no defence of our conduct."

GREGORY, Bishop of Pessinus: "According to the faith handed down from the holy Apostles and Fathers, so we confess and hold."

TARASIVS: "If ye have any arguments, bring them forward, as we told you before."

HYPATIUS, Bishop of Nice, with the rest: "My most holy Lord—We have no arguments at all to bring forward: we said what we said through our ignorance and folly."

TARASIVS: "What arguments brought you over to the truth?"

HYPATIUS, and the rest: "The doctrine of the Fathers and the holy Apostles."

GREGORY, Bishop of Pessinus: "In the Council of the Apostles, held at Antioch, it was said—'In order that the saved might no longer be in error about idols, the pure *Theandric* image of our Lord Jesus Christ should be prepared for them instead thereof;*' and the blessed Isidore of Pelusium saith—'That temple is of no account which an image does not crown.'"

LEO, Bishop of Rhodes:—"Though, indeed, we be sinners,

* This pretended Council was held, as Baronius and others tell us, A.D. 57,
c 2

vile and unworthy, yet the words of truth and piety, which we now speak, we have sought out for ourselves; for from the voice of the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Martyrs, we have been fully convinced that truth and religion require that holy and venerable images should be had in the Church, according to the custom handed down in former ages by the Apostles; and thus we have become obedient to the truth."

TARASIVS: "And how came it to pass that, having been a Bishop for eighteen years, you have not obeyed the truth till the present time?"

LEO, Bishop of Rhodes: "Because, that wickedness and wicked doctrine so long tarried amongst us, and as it tarried, we for our sins were deceived thereby, and turned aside from the truth; but we trust in God that we shall be saved."

TARASIVS—"As in the body, diseases of long continuance

to compose certain differences which had sprung up at Antioch. The heads of its nine Canons are given by Binius: they are as follows:—

"1. That believers in Christ, hitherto styled 'Disciples' should be henceforth called Christiana.—*Acts xi. 16.*

"2. That no baptised person should be circumcised.

"3. That admission into the Church should be granted to every nation.

"4. That avarice and base gain should be avoided.

"5. That gluttony, attendance in theatres, and oaths, should be forbidden.

"6. That scurrility and heathen manners be avoided.

"7. Confirms the decree of the Council at Jerusalem.—*Acts xv. 29.*

"8. On holy images. This Canon, Binius has given at full length:—"Let not the saved be deceived on account of idols; but let them paint in opposition the divine, human, manufactured, unmixed image of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the images of His servants, against idolators and Jews. Neither let them err about idols, nor be like the Jews.

"9. That the Jewish laws concerning meats be no longer allowed."

Du Pin says of these Canons and this Council:—"I shall add nothing concerning the nine Canons that are also attributed to the Apostles, and are reported to have been made by them at a certain Council of Antioch, *unknown to all antiquity*; because there is no question but that they are fictitious: neither are they at present maintained by any."—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 16.

Turrianus considers this citation of Gregory as affording *firmisimum testimonium* in favour of this Council of Antioch; and yet the Council, where it was brought forward, passes it by in silence, never once alluding to it, much as they stood in need of testimonies in their favour. Binius tells us that this Canon, with the rest, may be found in the "Constitutions of Clement," cap. xxv. lib. 7: fit place for them, the Constitutions being as arrant a forgery as the Canons themselves. "The Constitutions (says Jortin) are a medley of old treatises jumbled together, enlarged and adulterated without much wit or judgment, by some compiler after the days of Constantine."—*Remarks on Eccles. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 153.

do with difficulty admit of a cure, so the soul, long in the darkness of heresy, with no less difficulty admits the rays of orthodoxy."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia: "As Bishops, you ought not to have stood in need of teaching, but rather to be teachers of others."

LEO, Bishop of Rhodes: "If, under the law, there had been no mention of sin, there had been no need of grace."

STAUracIUS, Bishop of Chalcedon: "But we, brethren, are not under the law, but under grace."

HYPATIUS, and the rest, said: "We received evil doctrine from evil teachers."

TARASIUS: "Since ye say that your evil doctrines proceed from evil teachers, the Church does not choose to receive her priests from among evil teachers."

HYPATIUS: "Alas! that custom would have it so."

GREGORY, Bishop of Pessinus: "St. John Chrysostom saith, 'I delight in the wax-formed picture, replete with piety.'"

SABBAS, Abbot of Studium: "Blessed be God, who hath directed you in the paths of truth."

TARASIUS: "We have now heard all they have to say for themselves."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "We have, my Lord."

JOHN, Legate of the See of Antioch:—"Most holy Father, it is a question with many of us* in what manner we ought to receive those who return from heresy: wherefore, we request this holy and sacred Council to give order that the books of the holy Fathers may be produced, that we may search and examine them, and so obtain perfect certainty as to the manner in which these persons also should be received; for our mind is not made up on this subject.

* In the remainder of this Session the question as to the reception of these Bishops, and the mode of their reception, is discussed at large: and it is proved, from various citations of Canons, Councils, and Fathers—(1). That the Church receives all who return from heresy. (2). That, in respect of the clergy, the Church allows them to retain their previous rank, unless they have been too far committed as patrons or originators of heresy. (3). That the Church admits of the ordination of heretics, especially at those times when ordination could be had from no other source: so that, if their proofs for image-worship had been as valid as those about the admission of penitent heretics, their cause would at least have had antiquity on its side; but they fail as decidedly in the fourth Session as they succeed in the first.

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia : "We entreat your blessedness, my Lord, to give order that the books alluded to may be produced, that, being certified from them, we may make the best regulation on this head."

TARASIVS : "In compliance with the request of these most reverend men the Legates, and of the most holy Bishops, let the books be brought."

CONSTANTINE, Notary of the Venerable Patriarchate, said : "According to the command of your Holiness, we have brought hither the sacred books, taken from the library of the venerable Patriarchate of Constantinople, among which are the Canons of the holy Apostles and of the holy Councils, the works of our holy Father Basil and other holy Fathers."

TARASIVS : "Let the book of Canonical Orders be read first."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "Let it be read."

CONSTANTINE, the Notary, reads the fifty-third Canon :

"If any Presbyter refuseth to receive him that turns from his sins, but rejecteth him, let him be deposed, since he grieves Christ, who hath said, 'There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.'"

SABBAS, and the Monks with him, said : "This is manifest and admitted by all, that the Church admits every one who is penitent."

TARASIVS : "There is another Canon on this point."

CONSTANTINE, the Notary, reads the eighth Canon of the Council of Nice :

"With respect to those who call themselves Cathari,* if they come

* "By the Cathari, or Puritans, we are to understand the Novatians, who would not communicate with the Catholic Church, under pretence that her communion was polluted by admitting those to the sacred mysteries who, through infirmity, had sacrificed to idols in time of persecution, though they, on the first opportunity, expressed their repentance. The Church did not receive them till after a long penance—the Novatians, not at all. Afterwards, a humour took them that they would admit none to communion who had married a second time. Before the first Council of Nice, the main occasion of the schism ceased; for there was no further danger of men again sacrificing to idols, and the latter was never much insisted upon. By this Canon the Fathers endeavoured to open a way of return to them into the Church. They were not only orthodox in faith, but retained episcopal ordination: therefore, orders received among them were looked upon as valid."—*Johnson's Vade Mecum*: Part 2, p. 50.

over to the Catholic and Apostolic Church, the holy Council decrees that they who are ordained shall remain in the order of the clergy; but that, first of all, it is requisite that they profess in writing that they will agree to and follow the Decrees of the Catholic Church—that is, that they will communicate with those who have married again and with those who have lapsed in time of persecution—(who have a time given and a term fixed for their penance); and that they will, in every other respect, follow the doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church; and that, when in any town or village, they alone are found to be ordained, they who are among the clergy should remain in the same order," &c.

THEODORE, Bishop of Catania: "The Canon now read hath no relation to this heresy."

TARASIVS: "Nay, it refers to every heresy."

EPIPHANIUS, Deacon of Catana and Vicar of Thomas, Archbishop of Sardinia: "This Canon was enacted, then, only concerning the Cathari."

TARASIVS: "In what way, then, must we treat this new heresy lately sprung up in our times?"

JOHN, Vicar of the See of Antioch: "Heresy separates every man from the Church."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "That is very evident."

THE MONKS said: "The Canon declares that those who have received imposition of hands should be admitted."

TARASIVS: "How are we to understand this imposition of hands?"

THE MONKS: "My Lord: we entreat that you would instruct us."

TARASIVS: "Perhaps, this imposition of hands may be understood of blessing, not of ordination."

THE PRINCES said: "If there be no other impediment, let them be admitted for their penitence, according to the Canons."

TARASIVS: "Let us enquire into other Canons also, which relate to the remaining heresies."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "We request this also: let the Canons be brought forward."

CONSTANTINE, the Notary, reads the third Canon of the Council of Ephesus:—

“ We pronounce it right, that, if any of the clergy that are in any city or country have been prohibited the exercise of their sacerdotal functions, by Nestorius or his partizans, on account of their orthodoxy, that they be restored to their proper rank. And we wholly forbid any, who do now, or hereafter shall, agree with this holy Œcumenic Council, to submit in any respect to those Bishops who have apostatized, or shall apostatize, from the orthodox faith, or transgress against the holy Canons.”

TARASIVS: “ This Canon seems to bear more on the point in question; yet, let the other Canons be read also.”

STEPHEN, Monk and Librarian of the Sacred Patriarchate, said: “ We have here the letters of our Father Basil (now among the Saints) on this very subject under enquiry—namely, whether they who return from heresy are admissible to the Priesthood; and, if ye will, let them be read.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “ Let them be read.”

STEPHEN reads from the first epistle of our Father Basil, now among the Saints, to Amphilochius:—

“ We ought to consider the malignity of the Encratites,* who, in order to render themselves inadmissible to the Church, have endeavoured to be beforehand with her by a baptism of their own; and in so doing they have transgressed their own rules. As there is not at present anything openly determined concerning them, I give it as my opinion that we ought not to admit their baptism; but to baptise all who have been received by them when they come over to the Catholic Church. But if our regulation (*οικονομία*) be at all likely to interfere with the Catholic Church, we must resort again to the former custom, and follow the rules which the Fathers have handed down to us; for I am afraid, lest while we are endeavouring to discourage their baptism, we should prove any hindrance to those who might be saved, by the severity of our sentence. But if they respect our baptism, this must not

* These heretics were followers of Tatianus, a learned man, who flourished towards the end of the second century: they were styled also “ Apotactici ” and “ Hydroparastates ” (drinkers of water). They rejected, with a sort of horror, all the comforts and conveniences of life, and abstained from wine with such rigorous obstinacy as to use nothing but water even at the celebration of the Lord’s Supper: they macerated their bodies by continual fastings, and lived a severe life of severity and abstinence. Several strange opinions are attributed to them; one among which was, that Adam was not saved.—*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. 4, c. 29; *Epiph. Heres.*, 46-47; *Mosheim Hist. Eccles.*, vol. i., p. 223.

move us, since we are not bound so much to return the obligation as accurately to observe the Canons. This rule we must by all means most carefully observe—namely, that every one who comes over to us from their baptism must be anointed by the faithful and so approach the mysteries. I know that we have admitted to the episcopal chair brethren who were of the party of Izoius and Saturninus, even though they had been ordained by them; and I think, therefore, that we are no longer at liberty to separate from the Church those who have been in communion with them, since we have made a kind of order for their admission to communion by the reception of their Bishops.”

THE MONKS said: “We entreat that the letter of Saint Athanasius to Rufinian be brought.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “Let it be brought according to the request of the most religious Monks.”

During the interval, LEONTIUS, the Secretary said: “In the meantime, let other epistles of Saint Basil be read.”

STEPHEN, the Librarian, reads from the epistle of our holy Father Basil to the Evaisenians:—

“Those, whom last year they sent for from Galatia, that by their means they might obtain the confidence of the Bishop, were such as might easily be discerned on a very slight acquaintance with them.” And shortly after: “If they say that they have repented, let them exhibit in writing their repentance, and their anathema of the faith of Constantinople, and their separation from heretics, and let them not deceive the simple.”

Also, from the epistle of St. Basil to the Bishops of the West:

“There is one of them that hath caused us much vexation—I mean Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia. He was at first a Disciple of Arius, at a time when he was in the height of his celebrity at Alexandria, constructing his malignant blasphemies against the only begotten Son of God, and was attached to him as one of his most decided followers. Upon his return to his own country, however, this Eustathius offered a confession of sound faith to Hermogenes, the most blessed Bishop of Cæsarea, who had condemned him for his impious opinions; and then, though he was consecrated by him, yet no sooner was Hermogenes dead than he hastens to Eusebius, Bishop of Constantinople, who was inferior to none in the vigour with which he upheld the impieties of Arius. Being however, for some cause or

other, expelled from that place, he once more returned to his own country, and again made an apology for his conduct, veiling the impiety of his real sentiments under the guise of orthodoxy, and in this way obtained his Bishopric; but no sooner had he obtained it than it appeared that he had subscribed the anathema against the Homo-ousion at the conventicle held at Ancyra, and that from thence he had hastened to Seleucia; and what things he and his party did there every one knows: and after that, he again declared his agreement to the propositions of the heretics at Constantinople: wherefore, he was again ejected from his bishopric on the ground of a prior ejection at Melitene; and the only way of restoration which seemed left to him was an appeal to you. But what may be the determination of Liberius towards him, or what he may choose to say for himself, I do not pretend to affirm: all I know is, that he has taken with him the same letter of restoration, which, having exhibited at the Synod of Tyana, he recovered his dignity.*

There was read also another epistle of the same Father to Count Terentius, in which he declares that he had received, and communicated with, this Eustathius on his return from heresy.

STEPHEN, Deacon and Notary, reads from the definition of the third holy Council against the impious Messalians, or Euchitæ* :—

“It hath seemed good to us, and to the most reverend Valerian and Amphilochius, and to all the Bishops of the Provinces of Lycaonia and Pamphylia, that all things written in the Synodical Chart shall be in force, and shall by no means be transgressed; and that the Decrees from Alexandria also shall be in like manner confirmed. Wherefore,

* This quotation is made from a decree, framed against the Messalians, by Sisinnius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and was confirmed at the Council of Ephesus in its seventh Session, at the request of Amphilochius and Valerian. It is extant only in Latin.—*Bisii Conc. General.*, vol. I., pt. II., page 309 :—

“These heretics, called also ‘Euchitæ’ were said to affirm that the mind of every man was inhabited by an evil demon which it was impossible to expel by any other means than by constant prayer and singing of hymns: and that, when this *malignant spirit* was cast out, the pure mind returned to God and was again united to the Divine Essence from which it had been separated.”—*Mosheim Eccles. His.*, cent. IV., pt. II., c. 5, s. 24. Theodoret (*Eccles. Hist.*, lib. VI., c. 11) says that they were also styled “Enthusiasts” from believing that the Spirit dwelt within them; that they withdrew from all active labour, and, though in communion with the Church, thought very slightly of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Letoius, Bishop of Melita, burnt their monasteries and drove them into banishment.

we will that all in every Province, who actually belong to the Sect of the Messalians—that is, the Enthusiasts, or all who may be suspected of labouring under this disease (whether Clerics or Laymen)—be assembled together ; and, if they then anathematise their heresy according to the above-mentioned Synodical Chart, let those who are in orders retain their orders, and let the Laymen be received into communion with the Church.”

PETER, Notary and Reader, having the book in his hands, reads from the “ Commonitorium ” of our holy Father Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, to Maximus, Deacon of Antioch :

“ I have heard, from the beloved Monk, Paul, that your Holiness, even to this day, refuses to communicate with the most pious Bishop John, because of certain in the Church of Antioch who still uphold the doctrine of Nestorius, or who once did uphold it, though they do so now no longer. Let your gentleness carefully enquire into the case of those who are reported to coincide in opinion with Nestorius, whether they openly and shamelessly avow his doctrines and declare them to others ;* or whether, once having had their conscience seared, and having repented of their error, they as yet feel ashamed to acknowledge their fault ; for such things are very likely to happen to those who have been deceived. If, therefore, you find any, in the main, agreeing in the right faith, do not be too severe in respect of things that are past ; for we had much rather find them disavowing than shamelessly glorying in the impieties of Nestorius. And lest we should appear to love contention, let us be ready to communicate with our most religious brother John, yielding somewhat to him, and, for the sake of expediency, not being too particular in enquiry with respect to those who repent ; for this business, as I said before, requires no little management† of this kind.”-

PETER reads further from the epistle of the same Father to Gennadius, Presbyter and Archimandrite :—

“ The intensity of your zeal and ardour for religion is not unknown to me, having long been made acquainted therewith ; and I highly extol that exactness of living with which you would follow it out. At times,

* This is the marginal reading : the text has *γυμνῶς καὶ ἀναισχύντως τῆ Νεστορίῳ, καὶ φρονῶσι καὶ λαλοῦσιν ἐτέρως.*

† *ὀικονομία.*

however, the prudent management (*διοκομια*) of public affairs will compel us to deviate somewhat from the rule of right in order to secure some greater advantage ; for, as in a storm, when the vessel is in danger, the merchant will throw overboard much of the cargo to preserve the rest ; so we, in such circumstances (as we cannot have everything as we would), must be willing to connive at some things rather than to risk the loss of all. These things I write from hearing that your Holiness took deep umbrage at our most holy and religious brother Proclus, because that he had admitted to communion the Bishop of the *Æleans*, whom the laws of Palestine would not recognize as such ; for a love of vain glory, sure to lead to bad results, stirs up men to an unbridled desire of interference. Let not your Holiness, therefore, any longer refuse to communicate with the most holy and religious Bishop Proclus, since I am of the same mind with his Holiness in all things, and his policy has not alienated any of the considerate."

When this was concluded, the MONKS said : " If it be the pleasure of your holy Council, let the epistle of St. Athanasius to Rufinian be brought hither and read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : " Let the petition of the Monks be granted."

STEPHEN, the Notary, having the book in his hands, read :

" THE EPISTLE OF SAINT ATHANASIUS TO RUFINIAN.

" Athanasius to our beloved Lord and dearest Fellow-labourer, Rufinian : " and shortly after : " Since, from that love of goodness and of Church order which so greatly adorns your piety, you have put the question to me concerning the case of those who were rather drawn away by necessity than actually corrupted by a false faith, and have wished me to state in reply what I may have learned in Councils or elsewhere concerning such—Know, my dearest Lord, that immediately after the persecution had ceased, a Council was held, at which many from foreign parts were present : for it was composed not only of our fellow-servants who live in Greece, but of those also who live in France and Spain ; and this decree seemed good to those who were there and indeed every where else—namely, that they who had so fallen as to be ringleaders of impiety might be pardoned on repentance ; but should no longer have any place amongst the clergy ; but that, in respect of those who were constrained by force or violence, they should not only meet with pardon, but should retain their rank amongst the clergy, and more especially if they had a free excuse to

make for themselves ; and it seemed that they had acted thus from expediency. For some assured us that they had never actually gone over to impiety ; but that, through fear lest some really impious persons should be set over their Churches and corrupt them, they had chosen rather to yield to the stream, and to bear the weight of it themselves, than that their people should perish. And this defence of theirs did not appear to us unreasonable, especially as they furthermore alleged the example of Aaron, the brother of Moses, in their behalf,* who concurred with the transgression of the people in the wilderness, and defended himself by saying that he did so, lest the people, having returned to Egypt, should become confirmed in idolatry ; for it seemed likely that, if they remained in the wilderness, they might be weaned from their impiety : whereas, should they return to Egypt, they would continue longer, and be the more hardened therein. On this account, a dispensation was granted to the clergy, and it was determined to grant pardon to all who had been deceived, or had suffered violence. These things were written at Rome, and these hath the Church of Rome received, and these I communicate to your Holiness, in all confidence that your Holiness will readily admit all that was so determined."

After this was concluded, SABBAS, and the MONKS with him, said : " This is the word, not of Athanasius only, but also of Councils ; for the Father stated that the Romans and the Greeks had received it, and he defines, that they who return from heresy should be admitted to repentance, but should no longer have any part with the Priesthood "

TARASIVS : " It is not of every heretic who returns from heresy that this Father declares that he shall not be re-admitted ; but only of such as were heads, and chiefs, or vehement partisans, and who would choose, in the presence of the orthodox, to take on them in word the guise of truth, while

* It does not appear from Scripture that Aaron made any such defence as this which is here imputed to him. Certainly Moses saw nothing reasonable in Aaron's conduct : so far from it, that he considers Aaron to have acted as their enemy on this occasion :—" What did this people with thee, that thou hast brought so great sin upon them." And, again : " Aaron made them naked for their shame among their enemies." How evil his conduct further appears from that which Moses said afterwards. " The Lord was angry with Aaron to have destroyed him also, but I prayed for Aaron also at that time." Unless these Bishops had a better precedent than the conduct of Aaron, in making the golden calf, their case was bad, indeed.

they imagined evil in their hearts: however, let this same epistle to Rufinian be read once more."

And the following passage was read, which declares :—

"That they who had so fallen as to become very leaders of impiety should, indeed, be pardoned on repentance, but should no longer have any place among the clergy; but that, in respect of those who had not taken any leading part, but had been constrained by force or violence, that they should not only meet with pardon, but should retain their place among the clergy, especially if they had a fair excuse to make for themselves."

THE MONKS said: "See, as we said before, the Father admits none to the Priesthood who have returned from heresy."

TARASIVS: "It is not as you suppose; for the Father does admit to the Priesthood those who, not having originated heresy, were seduced or violently drawn aside; while he excludes those only who were the actual originators or violent promoters of the same, determining in this respect with equal propriety, honour, and justice. And, again, the Church well knows the peculiarity of the case of her champion, Athanasius, that at various times he was driven to Rome, having been shamefully expelled his diocese by the leaders of the Arian heresy; and that whenever he returned, and again resumed his sway over the Churches in those parts, they, who had before opposed him, united themselves to his party, shifting about according to circumstances; but that whenever he left them they took confidence, returned back to their former heresy, and commenced persecution against the righteous.* It was on this account, I imagine, that the Father forbade to

* Athanasius was four times deposed from, and four times restored to, the see of Alexandria. First, in the year 336, under Constantine the Great: he was restored in 337. Secondly, in the year 341, when he was succeeded by Gregory the Cappadocian, though absolved by a council at Rome, he was not restored to his see till the meeting of the Council of Sardica, in 347. A third time he was deposed, in 355, by the decree of the Council at Arles, backed by a previous Council at Milan. His successor was George, also a Cappadocian, who was murdered in the reign of Julian. On the death of George, he returned to Alexandria, but was banished till the reign of Jovian, in the next year. By him he was once more established in his see, in the year 363. It was at this time the Council, mentioned in his letter to Rufinian, was held. He was banished for a short time, in the year 366, by order of the Emperor Valens, but was soon afterwards restored, and spent the rest of his time in quietness. He died in 371.

such a re-entrance to the Priesthood, considering the injuries which both he and the orthodox in general had met with from their hands."

SABBAS: "Surely this Father was not mindful of injuries."

TARASIVS: "Undoubtedly not: he never returned evil for evil unto any. Nevertheless, his zeal for God and his desire for the safety of the Church, would not allow him to exercise an undisciplined kindness, for he ever considered those things which related to the honour of God to be of the first importance."

JOHN, Legate of the High Priests of the East: "This definition has been suitably brought forward for the edification of all who hear."

THE MONKS, in reply: "But since the Father admits those who were constrained by force or by violence, let these Bishops now present tell us whether they suffered such constraint and violence when they revolted from the truth."

HYPATIUS and the rest: "We were not constrained or drawn aside by violence; but, being born in heresy, we have been nourished and brought up in the same."

THEODORE, Bishop of Catania, and the other Bishops of Sicily, said: "The Canons of the holy Fathers, which have been read, were spoken of by the Encratitæ, Novatians, and Arians, with which party are we to class the leaders of this heresy?"

TARASIVS: "We find the Manichæans and Marcionites did not admit of images; and also those who confounded the natures of Christ, of whom were the heretics, Peter the Fuller, Xenaias of Hierapolis, and Severus."*

* Tarasius does not seem to have been aware that, if some heretics were opposed to the use of images, others were very favourably inclined towards them. Irenæus writes, concerning the Gnostics, "That they had many images, some painted, others wrought in gold, silver, and other material, which they affirmed to be representations of Christ made under Pontius Pilate, while Christ was yet in this world."—*Iren. Advers. Hæres.* l. i. c. 24.

Epiphanius affirms "that the Carpocratians, who were sprung of the Gnostics, had images done in colours, and some had images of gold and silver, and of other matter, which they said were images of Christ, and that they were made by Pontius Pilate in the likeness of Christ; but they kept these images secret and joined to them the images of some philosophers which they adored in common." (*Lib. i. tom. ii.*; *Hæres.* xxvii. s. 6; *Owen on Image Worship*, p. 61, 62; *Usher's Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 459). Hence we may learn that the use of images was heretical in its origin. The Gnostics had them long before they made any appearance in churches: nor can it be replied

EPIPHANIUS, Deacon and Legate of the Archbishops of Sardinia: "Is this newly-invented heresy greater or less than preceding heresies?"

TARASIVS: "Evil is ever one and the same, especially in ecclesiastical matters; for error in doctrine, whether in points of greater or lesser importance, is equally bad, since in both God's law is violated."

JOHN, the Legate of Alexandria: "This heresy is far worse than any other (Wo to the opponents of images!): it is the vilest of the vile, as utterly subverting the dispensation of the Saviour."^{*}

TARASIVS: "The letter of our Father Athanasius clearly proves that, if no other cause of hindrance be alleged against these most pious Bishops, they ought to be re-admitted to their seats."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Let the other canonical usages be now read."

Constantine, the Deacon and Notary, reads from the Acts of the Fourth Holy and Œcumenic Council of Chalcedon:—

"The Orientals, and the most reverend Bishops and their party, shouted aloud, We have all sinned—we all beg pardon." And again—"The most pious Bishops, Thalassius, Eusebius, and Eustathius cried aloud, We have all sinned—we all beg pardon." And some pages onward—"And the very reverend Bishop Juvenal having risen up, went to the other side, and the Orientals, together with the Bishops of their party, shouted, God hath rightly conducted thee, orthodox Bishop—thou hast done well in coming." And after much more—"The very reverend the Bishops of Illyria said, 'We have all sinned—we all beg pardon!'" †

that these were *idols* and not images, since they were representations, not of imaginative beings or of persons, but of Christ and His Saints, as well as heathen philosophers.

* Tarasius and the Eastern Legate seem disposed to outdo each other in absurdity. Not to worship images of Christ or the Saints is, in the judgment of the former, *as bad*, in that of the latter, *even worse*, than with Arians to deny the divinity of our Lord; or with the Manichæans, to ascribe the creation of the world and the Old Testament dispensation to the machinations of an evil spirit.

† These extracts are taken from different parts of the first Session of the Council of Chalcedon, in which Juvenal, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and others, desired liberty to recant their heresy, and were allowed so to do. Juvenal

SABBAS: "If it be agreeable to this holy Council, let us enquire about the ordination of those who have been received, whether it was from heretics or not."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Let the proposed enquiry about ordination be entered into immediately."

ANTONY, the Monk, read from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Rufinus, the Roman Presbyter: *—

"In the meantime Eusebius went to Alexandria, and there a Council of Confessors (few in number, but sound in faith and abundant in merit) was assembled; and to some of them, whose zeal for the faith was more fervent, it seemed right that none should be any longer admissible to the priesthood who had in any way whatever been defiled with heretical communion; but they who desired to imitate the Apostles, not seeking what was useful to themselves, but to the many, or rather to resemble Christ, who since He was the life of all, for the salvation of all did humble Himself even to death, so that life might be found even among the dead, replied that it were better that they should unbend a little in behalf of those who were cast down, and show some condescension in respect of the contrite, that so they might raise them up. Nor ought they to be content by the merit of purity to keep the kingdom of heaven to themselves alone; but rather to think how much more glorious it would be if they should be accounted worthy to enter there, in company with many others. And, therefore, it seemed good to them that the authors of this perfidy alone being cut off, option of abjuring the error of this same perfidy should be freely allowed to the rest of the Priests, and of returning to the faith and decrees of the Fathers, and that access should be denied to none who would return: on the contrary, they should rather rejoice in their confessiq. For when that younger son in the Gospel, the

had been President of the heretical Synod of Ephesus. Binius, in his notes on this Council (second of Nice), makes the following romance out of this quotation—"When the orthodox Bishops showed themselves very much disinclined to admit these (i.e., the Bishops who recanted), a certain Bishop, by name Juvenal, moved with pity, rose from his seat and took his place among them, as though he would share in their sentence, which he did; hoping that they might more easily obtain the pardon which they were seeking; and when the Bishops from Illyria also did so for the same purpose, their admission was appointed to take place in the next session.—See *Bini's Conc. General.* tom. iii. par. i. sect. post., p. 131. Baronius (ad. an. 787) affirms the same. This may prove how little reliance can often be placed on writers like Baronius and Binius.

* This translation has been made from the Latin, not only because Rufinus wrote in Latin, but because the Latin version is given much more at large.

waster of his father's substance, returned to himself, he was not only thought worthy to be received, but also to be admitted to the paternal embrace, and he received a ring and was clothed with a robe; by which, what else can be signified than the *insignia* of the priesthood? When, therefore, that sacerdotal and apostolic Assembly had confirmed the opinions of those who spoke last, as being sanctioned by the Gospels, they enjoined the publication of it in the East to Asterius and his friends, while the care of the West was entrusted to Eusebius. And there was added in this decree a more explicit statement concerning the Holy Spirit—namely, that the Holy Spirit should be believed to be of the same substance and divinity with the Father and the Son; for there had just sprung up certain who would separate the same Holy Spirit from the glory of the Father and the Son."

CONSTANTINE, Deacon and Notary, reads from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Socrates:—

"Photinus, formerly Bishop of Sirmium, was the disciple of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra; and he affirmed that the Lord was mere man, as did Marcellus himself." * And he read again from the same history: "They who remained at Sardica condemned those who had deserted the Council, confirmed the definition of faith made at Nice, anathematised and cast out the *ἀνόμοιον*, and restored to their thrones Paul, Athanasius, and also Marcellus of Ancyra, who defended himself by saying that what he had set forth in his books had been misunderstood, and that he had no connexion with those who counted Christ as mere man."

TARASIVS: "Many books of Canons, Councils, and Fathers have now been read, and they have taught us that we ought to admit these men who have returned from heresy, unless some other grievous charge be brought against them."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "You have succeeded well in teaching us, from the letters of the Fathers and the Decrees of Councils, that we ought allow the re-admission of those who have been heretics."

TARASIVS: "Let the letter of Saint Athanasius, which has been read, be read once more."

* The first of these passages is taken from the second book, chap. xviii., in a very garbled manner, but conveys the same sense. The second is from chap. xx. of the same book.

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "Let it be read at the request of our holy Father."

TARASIVS : "It is by request of the most religious the Monks, we would have it now read."

STEPHEN reads again the epistle of Athanasius to Ruffinian.

TARASIVS : "See the mind of the Father is just as we said."

THE MONKS : "We, unworthy servants of your holiness, have already declared that, if the holy General Councils admit any one, we also are ready to admit them, if there be no obstacle in the way."

PETER, the Presbyter and Legate of Adrian the Pope, said: "This is evident; for when Macarius the heretic was banished by the sixth holy Ecumenic Council to Rome, our Father Benedict, now amongst the Saints, gave him a space of forty days, during which he sent daily to him Boniface, his Chancellor, and he taught him with many instructive discourses drawn from the holy Scriptures; but he never would allow himself to be set right. This he did to bring him over to the truth, that so he might be received."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "If the bishops now under examination give consent to us with their whole heart, thanks be to God and to them; but, if they use dissimulation, the Lord judge them as He did Arius, Nestorius, and others like to them."

THE BISHOPS under examination laid themselves under a curse, saying: "We use no dissimulation. If we do not confess, as doth the Catholic Church, may we bear the anathema of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

TARASIVS : "Let us proceed in our enquiry."

PETER, the Presbyter and Legate of Adrian: "As historians tell us, Saint Meletius was ordained by the Arians; yet, when he ascended the pulpit and preached the consubstantiality, his ordination was never disapproved."

THEODORE, Bishop of Catana, and the Bishops of Sicily with him: "The Archpresbyter of the Apostolic Chair has spoken truly."

TARASIVS : "In no respect do we find the Fathers at variance with each other, but all, as under the influence of the same

Spirit, ever preach and teach the same thing. But, as laying down a certain rule on this head, it was that Athanasius thus decided; whence also he allowed re-admission amongst the clergy to all, save the main teachers of heresy."

THE MONKS said: "Whatever your holy Council may determine we receive."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "We hope that, after this Council, none will be again perverted, according to the tenor of the anathema under which these Bishops have laid themselves, who have said, 'If we again return to our former heresy may we be accursed and deposed.'"

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus: "If they have brought their libels (of recantation), let them give them in; but, if not, let them bring them, and thus the Council may be able to decide concerning them."

THE BISHOPS replied: "We have them, and are ready to present them."

THE PRINCES said: "They have their libels with them, and are quite ready to present them."

TARASIVS: "In the meantime let the rest of the Canons, bearing on the present question, be read."

COSMAS, the Deacon and Chamberlain, reads from the Life of our holy Father Sabbas:—

"At the fifth holy General Council, held at Constantinople, Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia, together with the speculations of Evagrius and Didymus, concerning the pre-existence and restitution of all things, were all subjected to one common and Catholic anathema, all the four Patriarchs being present and consentient thereto. And when our heaven-defended Sovereign had sent the Acts of the Council to Jerusalem, and all the Bishops of Palestine had confirmed them both in word and deed, except Alexander Bishop of Abyla (who on this account was deposed from his Bishopric, and not long after was swallowed up by an earthquake at Byzantium), the inhabitants of Nova Laura separated themselves from the communion of the Catholic Church. But Eustochius the Patriarch, for eight months together, tried with every kind of argument and exhortation to bring them back again; but, not being able to induce them to communicate with the Catholic Church, he put the Royal mandate in force; and, with the aid of Duke Anastasius, ex-

pelled the whole of them from Nova Laura, and so delivered the whole province from their pestilential presence."

TARASIVS : "You see how, even for eight months, the Archbishop persisted exhorting and forbearing with them, though he knew that all the time they were under the anathema of the Council. But we have now heard both canonical regulations, conciliar decrees, and the clear decisions of the Fathers, and we find that they all unanimously concur in receiving all who return from any heresy whatever."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "No doubt that it is so, unless any other canonical obstacle be found in the way."

TARASIVS : "Is it agreeable to all that we receive them ?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "We are all agreeable thereto."

THE MONKS shouted: "And we also are agreeable thereto."

TARASIVS : "We repeat it again, if there be no canonical obstacle to hinder any one who approacheth, let him be received ; for, in all respects, we are bound to follow canonical usages."

THE MONKS : "According to the six holy Œcumenic Councils, we admit those who have returned from heresy, unless there be some reason to forbid them."

TARASIVS : "And we determine the same as taught by the holy Fathers."

THE MONKS : "But if any of our brotherhood be absent from our holy Council, what must be done in their case ?"

TARASIVS : "We must assure them from the Canons which have been read. But wherefore is it that they are not present at this our holy Council ?"

SABBAS, the Monk, said: "I cannot say ; but they keep aloof."

EUTHYMIUS, Bishop of Sardis: "As we have requested, let the books be brought and read, that we may see whether or no we should admit those who have been ordained by heretics."

CONSTANTINE, Deacon and Notary: "As ye have given command that the usages concerning those who have been ordained by heretics should be read, we have the books here and await your further orders."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let them be read."

STEPHEN, Monk and Librarian, reads, from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Ruffinus—

"This intestine persecution, which was slight at first, greatly increased after that Macedonius was advanced to the Episcopate: but Acacius and Patrophilus, having expelled Maximus from Jerusalem, appointed Cyril in his place."*

COSMAS, the Deacon, read, from the fifth book of the "Ecclesiastical History" of Theodorus Lector:—

"Dioscorus having, contrary to the Canons, taken upon himself the ordination of the Bishop of Constantinople, raises to that dignity one Anatolius, who had previously held in that city the situation of Secretary to the See of Alexandria, having with him Eutyches also, who assisted in the sacred rites, to whom Anatolius said pleasantly (for he did not know what was to take place), 'Sanctification attends all thy steps.' These things were done in the Consulship of Asterius and Protogenes."

TARASIVS: "What say ye to Anatolius? Was he not President of the fourth Œcumenic Council, and this although he was ordained by the impious Dioscorus in the presence of Eutyches himself? May we not, then, admit those who have been ordained by heretics, since Anatolius was thus admitted? And again, it is the undoubted voice of God, 'that the children shall not die for the fathers, but each one shall die for his own sin.' And, moreover, consecration is from God. But if, by chance, any should doubt concerning Anatolius, let something further be read concerning him."

COSMAS, the Deacon, reads the preamble of the Holy and Œcumenic Council of Chalcedon:—

"The Holy and Œcumenic Council, which, by divine direction, was assembled at Chalcedon—that is, Paschasinus and Lucentius, most holy Bishops, and Boniface, most holy Presbyter, Vicars of the most

* Ecclesiastical authors are strangely at variance in respect of the ordination of Cyril; but all seem to agree that he was ordained by Acacius, the Arian Bishop of Cæsarea: if so, there was one case in favour of these Iconoclast Bishops and their ordination. Ruffinus, being a Latin, is little to be trusted in respect of the history of the Eastern Church. Cyril succeeded Maximus on his death, not on his expulsion. See *Preface to Cyril's Cath. Lectures, in Library of Fathers*—p. 111. But consult Toultees "Life of Cyril," cap. v. p. 38. Edit. Cyrill. 1848.

holy see, Bishop of Old Rome ; and ANATOLIUS, most holy Bishop of Constantinople, the illustrious—that is, New Rome.”

THE MONKS said : “ This we allow, also.”

CONSTANTINE, Deacon and Notary, reads from the Life of our holy Father Sabbas :—

“ After that the Patriarchs, Flavian and Elias, who were at Sidon, by means of letters to the King, at the same time complimentary to him and serviceable to themselves, having procured the disannulling of the Synod held in Sidon against the orthodox faith, had returned to their sees, the party of Soterichus and Philoxenus, being highly indignant, stirred up the King to unbridled fury, insinuating that he had been deceived by the craft and duplicity of these Patriarchs. Taking, therefore, what force they wished, and sufficient money wherewith to bribe the Antiochian populace, after having in various ways afflicted Flavian, and well nigh strangled him in order to force him to anathematise the Council of Chalcedon, they concluded by deposing him from his Bishopric and sending him into exile. When the King was informed of this, being much pleased, he appointed Severus, head of the Acephali, to the Bishopric of Antioch ; and this Severus, having received the Patriarchate; exhibited no little severity against all who would not communicate with him. Moreover, he sent his synodals to Archbishop Elias, and not meeting with any reception in that quarter, he excites the anger of the King against him. Again he then sends the same synodals to Jerusalem in the month of May, of the sixth indiction, with certain clergy escorted by the Royal forces. Now, when our Father Sabbas of holy memory was informed of this, he went up to the holy city, with the other Hegumeni of the desert, and drove out of the city those who had come thither with the synodals of Severus ; and then, having collected the whole Monastic multitude before holy Calvary, together with the other inhabitants of Jerusalem, they cried aloud, saying, ‘ *Anathema to Severus and to all who communicate with him.*’ And this they did in the presence and hearing of the magistrates, officials, and the soldiery, which had been sent by the Emperor.

“ For this Severus, puffed up with intolerable pride and confiding on Imperial aid, laid the Council of Chalcedon under anathemas innumerable ; and, contentiously striving for the heterodoxy of Eutyches, affirmed that the nature of our Lord Christ, the Son of God, after His birth of the Virgin, was ONE and corruptible. Moreover, being a lover of strife, he must needs contrive endless inno-

vations, in opposition to the doctrines and discipline of the Church. Thus he declared that most impious and villanous Synod, the second of Ephesus, to be in all respects equal to the Council which was held there before it; and he asserted that the divine Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, and Dioscorus who admitted Eutyches the heretic to communion, as being of the same principles with himself—and who deposed and murdered the most holy and most orthodox Flavian, Archbishop of the Royal city—were *equally sound in point of doctrine*. And the same Severus, ever growing in impiety, sharpened his tongue in blasphemy against God Himself; for, in his discourses he divided the one and indivisible Godhead which is in Trinity: for he would persist in saying that nature was *hypostasis* and *hypostasis* nature; that he knew no difference between these terms: and he dared to style the Holy, Adorable, and Consubstantial Trinity of Divine Essences a Trinity of *Natures, of Godheads—yes, even of Gods*.

“This pest and destroyer of souls, the Emperor Anastasius would force Archbishop Elias to admit to communion with him; but, as he was utterly unwilling to receive him, the Emperor being greatly enraged sent one Olympius, of Cæsarea, who had the Dukedom of Palestine, and with him the Œcumenic epistle of the Sidonian Synod, which declared that the Council of Chalcedon should be set aside in order by all means to eject this Elias from the Bishopric. Upon which Olympius, proceeding there with the Royal forces, after many plots and stratagems, and the exhibition of the above-mentioned epistle from Sidon, deposed Elias, and banished him to Aila.* And he made John, the son of Marcian, Bishop of Jerusalem, on the third of September, in the beginning of the eleventh indiction, having first obtained from him a promise to communicate with Severus, and to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon. Now, when the holy Sabbas and the Fathers of the desert were informed that John had made these promises, assembling together they conjured him not to communicate with Severus, but rather to run every risk in defence of the Council of Chalcedon, in which he might count upon them all as allies; and so it happened that John from fear of these Fathers broke all the promises he had made to Duke Olympius. Moreover, when Anastasius the Emperor found that John had violated his engagements, being enraged against Olympius who had got himself out of the way, he sent Anastasius, son of Pamphilus who held the Dukedom of Palestine, with special orders, either to compel John to communicate with Severus and to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon, or to depose him from the Bishopric. And when he came to

* See Cellarii Geograph. ii. 419. Edit. Camb.

Jerusalem, he forthwith arrested the Archbishop, and committed him to public custody, where he continued in ward; and all the inhabitants of the holy city rejoiced, because that he had plotted against and betrayed their beloved Bishop, Elias. While, however, John was thus confined in prison, Zacharias, one of the rulers of the town of Cæsarea having found his way to the prison, secretly counselled him thus:—
‘ If you wish to do well, and to preserve your Bishopric, by no means let any persuade you to communicate with Severus; you must, however, humour the Duke by seeming to come into his views; adding, that you will decline nothing which he may propose, but that you desire to be set at liberty, lest the people should say that you acted under constraint; and then that after two days, as it will be the Lord’s-day, you will be ready to do all that may be required of you. ’ In this manner the Duke, being outwitted, restored John to his Church. When the Archbishop was at liberty again, he summoned, by night, the whole Monastic force, sending for them from every quarter to come to the holy city; and, according to the computation of some, not less than *ten thousand* Monks were present on this occasion; and as no Church could contain such a multitude, it was determined that on the following Lord’s-day, they should be convened in the Basilica of the holy Proto-martyr, Stephen, since this would be much better fitted for holding so large a crowd: especially as at the same time they were desirous to meet Hypatius, son-in-law to the Emperor, who, having been liberated from the captivity in which Vitalian had held him, was coming to Jerusalem in consequence of a vow. When all the Monks and Citizens had assembled at the aforesaid venerable temple, there met them the Duke Anastasius, and the Consul Zacharias. And after that Hypatius had arrived, and with the rest of the people had entered into the temple of the Proto-martyr, and the Duke was now expecting that the will of the Emperor should be performed, the Archbishop ascended the pulpit, having with him Theodosius and Sabbas, the head and chief of the Monks. Whereat all the people for many hours cried out, saying, *‘ Curse the Heretics—Confirm the Council. ’* Forthwith, therefore, they all, with one accord, anathematized Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, and Soterichus, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, with all the rest who refused to acknowledge the Council of Chalcedon.”

TARASIVS: “ We have heard now the decisions of the Fathers—what ought we to do? Ought we to receive those who have been ordained by heretics?”

THE HOLY COUNCIL: “ Yes, my Lord: we have heard them, and we think they ought to be admitted.”

TARASIVS : " And, moreover, the greater part of those who sat in the sixth Œcumenic Council were ordained by Sergius, Pyrrhus, Peter, and Paul, prime movers of the heresy of the Monothelites, because that they, in succession, obtained the chair of Constantinople ; and from Peter, the last of these, to the time of the sixth Council, was a space of fifteen years, during which period John, Thomas, and Constantine, who were also high Priests in succession, received their orders from the heretics aforesaid, but no objection was ever raised against them on that account : now this heresy continued for upwards of fifty years. Nevertheless, the Fathers of the sixth Council scrupled not to condemn all the four above-named heretical Patriarchs, though they had been ordained by them."

THE HOLY SYNOD said : " That is evident."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia : " Proof sufficient hath been alleged, my most worthy brethren, that all who come away from heresy ought to be admitted ; but yet, if any be found to have gone over purposely to heretics for ordination, they ought not to be received."

THE MONKS said : " We have an epistle of Saint Basil to the Nicopolitans, which touches on this very point, and we request that it may be read."

TARASIVS said : " Let it be read."

CONSTANTINE, Reader and Deacon, reads from the Epistle of St. Basil to the Nicopolitans :—

" I acknowledge not the Bishop, nor will I ever rank him among the Priests of Christ, who is raised to that dignity by profane hands for the destruction of the faith. This is my determination, and, if ye would have any communion with us, surely ye will not think otherwise ; but, if ye counsel differently, each one is master of his own opinions ; but we are free from your blood. These things we have written to you, not out of any distrust, but rather for settling the doubts of certain by unfolding more distinctly our views, so that no one may be unadvisedly brought over to communicate with them ; and, again, if any should have received imposition of hands from them, he should not on that account (when peace was made) be allowed to force himself into the sacerdotal order."

THE MONKS said : " See how this Father abominates the ordination of heretics ; for he says, ' I would not rank him

among the Priests of Christ who is raised to that dignity by profane hands for the destruction of the faith.' ”

TARASIVS : “ And I also abominate those who are ordained for any such purpose as ‘ the destruction of the faith ; ’ and much more, if there were at the time orthodox Bishops from whom ordination might have been had : and this is, I apprehend, all that the Father intends. And so, after our Synodical Decree has been framed and the orthodox agreement of the Church has been established, if any should presume to go to profane heretics for ordination, let him be liable to deposition.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ This judgment is just.”

THE MONKS : “ Wherefore, in the conclusion of this epistle, is it written—‘ He should not on that account, when peace was made, be allowed to force himself on the sacerdotal order.’ See how, after that peace was made, these were inadmissible.”

TARASIVS : “ The Father did not declare them inadmissible ; but he said this, as foreseeing that opposition which might be made should they propose uniting themselves to the orthodox clergy ; for, indeed, this could scarcely be effected without some difficulty of this kind. But this divine Father, at the time when there were so many orthodox Bishops, had reason to forbid the sons of the Church to make use of Arian ordination, since they could have no reasonable ground for so doing. Again this is clear, that they who were his successors in the Church were not ignorant of the intentions of this Father ; yet they were accustomed to admit all who were ordained by heretics when they came to a better mind, as has been abundantly proved from that which has been read already. Now, the Fathers are always concordant with each other ; nor is there any opposition between them, though to those who understand not their scope and intention they may appear to be in opposition.”

THE MONKS said : “ This solution is satisfactory.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ Let the Bishops now stand forward and read their several recantations, as they now desire to enter the Catholic Church.”

TARASIVS : " Let them read, since, now, these two points in question have been fully examined—namely, the reception of those who come from the ranks of heresy to the holy Catholic Church, and also the case of those who have been ordained by heretics."

Hypatius, Bishop of Nice, read his recantation. It was the same that Basil, the most pious Bishop of Ancyra, had used. After which Leo Bishop of Rhodes, Nicholas Bishop of Hierapolis, Gregory Bishop of Pessinns, George Bishop of Antioch, in Pisidia, and Leo Bishop of Carpathus, read the same form of recantation.

TARASIVS : " As they have by their recantation made known their profession, let their reception take place at some future session, if there be no other cause of hindrance."

THE HOLY SYNOD said : " Most holy Father, be it as you have enjoined."

On which the Council, rising up, made the following acclamations :—

" Many be the years of our Sovereigns ! Many be the years of Constantine and Irene, our illustrious Sovereigns and Autocrats ! Many be the years of our orthodox Sovereigns ! O Lord, preserve the subverters of this present innovation : grant unto them a life of piety ! "

TARASIVS : " The peace of God be with you all. Amen."

SESSION THE SECOND.

Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea, President of the Synod which caused the disruption of the Council in favour of Images when it met at Constantinople, desiring to be reconciled to the Church, is brought forward; and, after some sharp rebuke from Tarasius, and some expressions of penitence in his own part, his case is deferred to the next Session. The chief Business of the Session was the Recitation of the Letters from Pope Adrian to the Emperor and his Mother, and to Tarasius the Patriarch, in answer to his Synodals.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND MASTER, JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns, Constantine, and Irene, his mother, in the eighth year of their Consulship, the sixth of the calends of October (26th September), of the eleventh indiction, the Holy Œcumenical Council assembled, by the grace of God and decree of the same divinely-protected Sovereigns, in the splendid city of Nice, metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia—that is, Peter the Archpresbyter, and Peter the Abbot, Legates of Adrian, Pope of Old Rome; Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, New Rome; John and Thomas, Legates of the Apostolic Sees of the Diocese; together with the Bishops, with the Archimandrites, Abbots, and a complement of the Monastic Orders; and with the holy and immaculate Gospels of God placed in the midst:

NICEPHORUS, Deacon and Keeper of the Records, said: "A messenger from the King is now before the door of this venerable temple, having with him the Bishop of Neocæsarea."

TARASIVS said: "Let them come in." And after they had come in, the Royal messenger said: "I have been sent by our

most gracious Lords, that I might present to your most sacred and religious Council the most holy Bishop of Neocæsarea, and I now present him before you."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "God bless our religious Sovereigns."

TARASIVS, addressing himself to the Bishop of Neocæsarea, said: "Was it from ignorance that, even to the present time, truth has escaped your notice; or did you know her, and yet make her of little account? If, then, it were from ignorance, be not ashamed now to learn what reason teaches, as in times past you did not blush at the instruction of error."

GREGORY, Bishop of Neocæsarea: "Believe me, my Lord, that it was from ignorance; but now I desire to be instructed even as my Lord and this holy Council may enjoin."

TARASIVS: "Say what is it that you would learn of us."

GREGORY: "Since all this Assembly has but one heart and voice, I feel fully convinced that it is the truth which here is enquired into and proclaimed: wherefore I beg pardon for all my past offences, and I desire, together with you all, to be enlightened and instructed. My sins and offences are, indeed, unbounded, but as God shall bring to compunction this holy Council and my most holy Lord."

TARASIVS: "It is not that desirous of concealing, under a veil of deceit, your real intentions, you now make pretensions to the truth, while you have evil designs in your heart."

GREGORY, of Neocæsarea: "God forbid! I confess the truth, nor shall I ever be found false, or to forfeit my word."

TARASIVS: "Long ere this should you have opened your ears to hear the divine Apostle Paul saying, 'Hold fast the traditions which ye have received, whether by word or by our epistle' (2 Thess. ii. 15). And again, when writing to Timothy and Titus, he says, 'Profane innovation* (*καινοφω- νιας*) avoid' (1 Tim. vi. 20). And what more profane—what greater innovation—than to say that Christians have committed idolatry?"

GREGORY, of Neocæsarea: "It was evil, and we confess that

* Tarasius changes *καινοφωνιας* into *καινοφωνιας*, in order to suit his purpose.

was evil, but so it was, and we have our part in it: wherefore, we entreat your pardon for our offences. My Lord, I confess before your most venerable Holiness, and all the brethren of this holy Synod, that I have sinned and done wickedly, and for this I again supplicate your pardon."

TARASIVS: "We propose that, in the following Session, he be present with his libel of recantation, and that we may know all that concerns him."

THE HOLY SYNOD said: "As your Holiness commands, let the Bishop now before us be present with his libel in the following Session, and let that be done which may seem best."

LEONTIVS, the Royal Secretary, said: "Your most holy and reverend Council remembers that, in the last Session, the divine epistle of our illustrious and heaven-protected Sovereigns was laid before you; in which mention was made of certain Synodical Epistles which had been sent from the most holy and blessed Pope of Old Rome, and also from the most pious Chief Priests of the East, in two octavos: these we have now brought, that from them we may gather what is suitable under present circumstances."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Let the letters of the most holy and blessed Adrian, Pope of Old Rome, be now read."

NICEPHORUS, the Royal Secretary, then read before the Council the interpretation of the Latin letter of Adrian, Pope of Rome:—

"To our most pious and gracious Lords, triumphant Conquerors, our beloved Children in our Lord and God Jesus Christ, Constantine and Irene Augusti, Adrian, servant of the servants of God* :—

"God, who hath commanded the light to shine out of darkness (2 Cor. iv. 6)—who hath redeemed us from the power of darkness by the incarnation of His Son 'the true light' (1 John i. 9)—in whom it pleased Him that all the fulness of the Godhead should dwell (Coloss. i. 19, 20)—and by Him to renew all things, and by Him to reconcile

* This letter was not only curtailed, but greatly softened, in translation, in order not to displease the Greeks, to whom all that was said in the original concerning the Roman Church and its Vicar would have been very unpalatable. Some of the most material alterations will be noticed.

all things by the blood of His cross, whether they be things in heaven or in earth : in the abundance of the riches of His goodness, having looked down on the face of His Church, hath thought fit to call the piety and pre-ordained grace of your Royal clemency to such a perfection of faith that, by means of you, He might put a veil over the wickedness of falsehood, and bring forth the truth to light. When we had perused the letter, which your Serenity and Piety was pleased to send to us, our soul did exceedingly rejoice, and we were filled with such emotions of triumph and gladness as no human tongue could easily express ; for the delight which we felt on the reception of your invitation was not less as was that grief which your past schisms and heresies caused us to suffer. Now, in respect to that which is alleged in your pious letter of invitation concerning the things which were formerly done against venerable images in your Royal city, and that your predecessors in your Empire did overthrow them, and treated them with contumely and insult, I would reply, oh, may not this sin be laid to their charge ! For well had it been for them had they not laid their hands on the Church, since thereby all the people who dwell in the East have been led into error ; and each one, according to his own will, has done as he pleased with them, even to the time that God raised you to the throne, who seek His glory in truth, and maintain the traditions handed down to us by the holy Apostles and by all holy Doctors, and who give due honour to holy and venerable images which had been set at nought by the madness of heretics. But, now, from your pious letter of invitation, having learned what is your will in these respects, praying most earnestly to God Almighty, we offered thanks and praise for your accession to the throne. Let, then, your God-exalted imperial power continue in full confidence and unwavering determination, knowing that this work which ye undertake is a great work ; but that if by your intervention it be completed, and the ancient orthodoxy be established in your country, and venerable images be reinstated in their former dignity, then shall ye be fellow-partakers with Lord Constantine and Lady Helena, your predecessors of holy memory, who first made conspicuous and firmly established the orthodox faith, and more especially exalted your holy Mother, the Roman Catholic Spiritual Church ; and, again, with all those who, in a pious and orthodox manner, ruled and held the reins of power before you. And so shall your most religious name, bestowed by God, the NEW CONSTANTINE and the NEW HELENA, be magnified with praise throughout the world, as the name of those by whom the Church is renewed. And, more especially, if ye follow the traditions of the

orthodox faith of those chief Apostles SS. Peter and Paul,* and kindly welcome their Vicar, even as your predecessors honoured each one the Vicar of his own days. And let your divinely-received power give all honour to the most holy Roman Church of these chief Apostles, to whom power has been granted by God, the Word Himself, to loose and to bind sins in heaven and on earth; for they will become the guardians of your kingdom, and will subdue all the barbarous nations under your feet, and wherever ye go they will make you victorious. Now these same holy and chief Apostles, who laid the foundation of the Catholic and Orthodox faith, have left a written law, that all who ever should succeed to their thrones should maintain the same faith, and should continue in it even unto the end, and thus it is that our Church maintains and honours holy images.† And even, from the beginning to this day, our Churches have been adorned and beautified with venerable images, as the most holy and blessed Pope Sylvester bears witness, when in the beginning of our Christian orthodox, Constantine of pious memory who then ruled was converted to the faith. The record is as follows:—‘The day had now passed away, and, night having succeeded, he gave orders that silence should be observed; and while he was sleeping, behold the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, stood by him, who thus spake, “Since, O King,‡ thou revoltest from the experiment of a bath of children’s blood for the cure of thy disease, behold we have been sent from Christ to bring thee deliverance. Hear therefore our instructions, and do all whatsoever we command thee. Send and call for Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, who hath fled from thee on account of the persecution which thou

* In the Latin the name of Peter stands alone.

† In the Latin this paragraph runs as follows—“For the proofs of his dignity are found in the sacred authors, and in that unbounded veneration paid to him by all the faithful everywhere throughout the world, for the Lord hath made Him who is keeper of the keys of heaven, Prince over all; and this privilege was conferred upon Him by the same Divine Person by whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven were granted; for He that was endued with such singular honour, had before been honoured to make that confession of faith on which the Church of Christ is founded. A blessedness of reward followed this blessed confession, by preaching of which the holy Catholic Church has been enlightened, and from which other Churches have taken the documents of their faith; for the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, who first presided in the Apostolic See, bequeathed the Principality of the Apostleship and the pastoral care to his successors who, throughout all ages, should sit in his most holy chair, to whom he left the power of authority; for just as it was bestowed on him by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, so in the same way did he hand it down by divine command to the Pontiffs, his successors, by whose tradition it is that we venerate the holy images of Christ, of His holy Mother, of the Apostles, and all Saints.”

‡ The Latin adds, “Since thou hast put an end to thy crimes,” &c.

had excited, and is at this time concealed with his clergy in the rocky caves of Mount Soracte. He shall prepare for thee the bath of righteousness in which he shall baptize thee, and forthwith thou shalt be cured of thy leprosy and all thy other diseases; and, when thou hast received this benefit, immediately give orders that in every part of the Roman Empire the churches be rebuilt: and do thou purify thyself by putting away all idolatry, and for the future worship the one true God only, and walk according to His will." And the Emperor awaking from his sleep convened all the attendants at the palace, and related to them his dream; and sent forthwith to Mount Soracte, where Sylvester and his clergy were concealed spending their leisure in sacred studies.* And Sylvester, seeing the armed company standing all around, said to his clergy†—"Behold now is the accepted time—now is the day of salvation."‡ As he was going forth he was informed by the soldiers of the purpose for which he had been sent for. Wherefore he went with three Priests and two Deacons to meet the King, and when he saw him he said—"Peace and victory be to thee O King from heaven above." And the Emperor with cheerful countenance and tranquil mind having received this address, related to the holy Sylvester all that had been revealed to him; and when he had finished his narration the Emperor asked him, saying—"Those whom I saw in my dream, Peter and Paul, what gods are they?" Then the most holy Sylvester said in reply—"They are no

* In the Latin, "Spent their time in reading and prayer."

† In the Latin, "Supposing that he was now called to undergo martyrdom."

‡ This story of Sylvester and Constantine has two great defects: it is not true—it is nothing to the purpose. As to its want of truth Du Pin observes—"It is a fabulous story, which is related in the acts falsely attributed to St. Sylvester, that the baptism of Constantine was celebrated at Rome; for all the Ancients affirm that he was baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the suburbs of that city. And, indeed, nothing can be more fabulous than the account set forth in those acts; for it is pretended that Constantine, being an enemy to the Christian religion and desiring to persecute it was smitten with leprosy; that the Soothsayers told him the only way of cure was to bathe in a bath of infant's blood; that many infants were sought to have their throats cut for this purpose; but Constantine, moved by their tears and the cries of their mothers, restored them again without putting them to death. That he was afterwards admonished in a dream by St. Peter and St. Paul that he should be cured if he were baptized by St. Sylvester, &c. What forgeries! What fables are here! What inconsistent ravings of madmen! Constantine never was an enemy to the Christian religion: he never did persecute it: he was always a Christian from his heart before he came to Rome. No historian speaks of his having a leprosy or being cured of it by baptism. How came Eusebius to forget so considerable a miracle in the life of Constantine! With what face could Julian object that baptism never cleansed any one from leprosy if his own grandfather had been cleansed by it! St. Cyril, when confuting this falsehood, never alleged so illustrious an example as this of the Emperor."—*Du Pin, Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 13.

gods, but servants and disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom He hath chosen to bring all nations to believe in Himself." And when the Emperor heard this he asked again—"Have you any pictures of them?" On which Sylvester sent a Deacon to bring the pictures of the holy Apostles. And when the Emperor saw them he cried out aloud, "These are the very men whom I saw in my dream—I no longer disbelieve. Make ready for me the bath of salvation." And when the bath was made ready he was baptized,* and immediately healed. And then mindful of the benefit which he had received, he began to raise up churches everywhere, depicting in them venerable images for the honour and memorial of Jesus Christ our Lord, who became incarnate for us, and for that of all the Saints.† Now this he did to lead Christians to light, truth, and desire of the Divine image, and to set all men free from heathen idolatry and delusions of demons. For thus, as S. Gregory, the successor of the Apostles, hath taught it is that illiterate men, not able to read, may have the histories of the Gospel set forth before their eyes, and so may they attain to the glory and remembrance of the incarnate dispensation of our Lord and Saviour

* "Eusebius, who wrote the life of Constantine, assures us (*Vita Const.* iv. 61) that he was baptized, not by Pope Sylvester, but by Eusebius of Nicomedia a little before his death. Socrates gives the same account of his baptism (*Hist. Eccles.* 1, c. xxxix). These testimonies are sufficient to detect the falsehood of Pope Adrian's story. The Pope's first argument proves no more than this—that images which are a *lie* need the support of lying stories."—*Queen on Image Worship*, p. 96. So much for the *truth* of this legend!

† In the "Caroline Books" it is shown that this legend, even if it were true, is nothing to the purpose:—"Among other examples to which they have recourse, they make use of the following to prop up their worship of images, that Sylvester Pope of the Roman Church, is said to have brought the images of the Apostles to Constantine; but he brought them for the Emperor to see, not to worship: he brought them to the Emperor, not for the purpose of worship, seeing that he was endeavouring to recall him from worship of idols to worship God alone; but he brought them that he might recognize in their pictures those whom he had before seen in his dream. He brought them, not to lead him who was fleeing from idolatry to take refuge in image worship, as if by private assassination he would destroy him who had escaped the open danger of the enemy, but rather that by things known he might direct his mind so things unknown. But, again, if he had bid him worship these images (which he did not), we must then suppose that he did so on this account, that by these visible things he might excite him who had been a worshipper of things visible to the worship of things invisible; but never, surely, to bring us down from the worship of things invisible to the worship of those which are visible; since it is not necessary for us, who are made capable of receiving strong meat, to return to the milk which nourishes infants, however suitable this food might be to one to whom, on account of the weakness of his faith, more solid food would be improper. Lastly, though this book of the Acts of Sylvester be read by many Catholics, yet it is not considered of sufficient importance to determine points of controversy, as is more fully proved in the decretal of Pope Gelasius, '*De recipiendis aut non recipiendis Libris.*'"—*Lib. Car.* lib. ii. c. xiii.

Jesus Christ. And all orthodox and most Christian Kings, with all Priests and great men who serve God, and all Christian people in general, have ever according to the ancient tradition of the holy Fathers, received and maintained, and do now have amongst them, these same venerable images for the sake of remembrance and compunction of heart, and to this present day they venerate them; so that even in your country they were most rightly worshipped up to the time of your Great-grandfather. However, he, your Great-grandfather, by the suggestions of some impious persons, abolished holy images throughout all those regions; and thus awful error spread throughout the regions of the East and great scandal throughout the whole world; but 'Wo to them by whom scandals arise in the world' (Matt. xviii. 7), as He who is the truth testifies. At this Gregory and Gregory, most blessed Pontiffs of our Apostolic Throne, were greatly grieved, and did oftentimes most earnestly beseech this ancestor of your religious Serenity that venerable images might be restored to their wonted station; but never would he give any ear to their salutary request. And after this, Zachary, Stephen, Paul, and another Stephen, our predecessors in the Pontifical Chair, did no less earnestly beseech the Grandfather and Father of your pious Royalty on the same subject of this restoration of holy images. And, now, our Lowliness (*δυστέλεια*), with great humility, earnestly entreats your Lordship that, as we have received from our most holy predecessors and most approved high Priests, so we may be allowed to paint the histories [of Scripture] in our Churches for the sake of memorial, and to set up in the temple of God the sacred image of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ according to His incarnate human form, and the images of His holy Mother, and of the holy and blessed Apostles, Prophets, and Confessors; and that, out of the regard we bear towards them, we may be at liberty to worship them. Wherefore, let your most clement Majesty exert its utmost power and influence throughout your Greek dominions to bring them back to a uniform standard of orthodoxy, that as it is written, 'there may ^{be} one Fold and one Shepherd' (John x. 16). For throughout the whole world, where Christianity is established, there, these same venerable images are worshipped by all the faithful: that by the visible image of the Saviour, according to that flesh which the Son of God was pleased to assume for our salvation, our minds may be elevated in spiritual raptures to the invisible greatness of His Godhead, and thus we may worship the Redeemer who is in heaven, and may praise and glorify Him in our spirits. For as it is written, 'God is a Spirit'

SESSION THE SECOND.

(John iv. 24) ; so we, magnifying Him spiritually, do worship divinity. But God forbid that we should exalt these images into deities as some idly prate, since all the affection and ardour which we exhibit towards them is from regard to God and His Saints ; and as our Scripture teaches, so we have images for a memorial of our veneration while we preserve the purity of our faith.*

* In the Latin it is, " And as we have the *books of holy Scripture*, so we have *these same images* for a memorial of veneration preserving the purity of our faith." As Adrian wrote in Latin, we may rather conclude that it is to this we must look for the expression of his real sentiments, rather than to the Greek translation which gives a different turn to his words, though little less erroneous ; for where does Scripture teach that Christians *ought to have images* ? To this sentiment of Adrian, as found in his own Latin original, Charlemaigne replies at great length in *Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 30. The chapter is too long to be inserted entire : the principal arguments will, therefore, be given with certain parts of the reasoning which follows on each. The first argument against this equalizing of images with the Scripture is taken from the difference of their respective original :—" The Scriptures [with the Ark of the Covenant, the Lord's body and blood, the Cross] were pre-ordained in the Sacred Councils of the Most High before the world, and were made known to us from time to time, according to His goodness ; their immediate authors, were holy and eminent men, illumined with the splendour of virtue and the glory of miracles, and above all our Lord Himself, who instituted the sacrament of His body and blood or the mystery of the Cross, as necessary for our salvation. Images, on the other hand, were the productions of Gentile vanity, and neither afford any exhibitions of salvation nor bring any prerogative of sacraments to men ; but are only of advantage to the eyes, by which, as by a kind of ambassador, they transmit the memory of things past to the soul. For, at that very time when Moses was engaged in delivering to the people in the wilderness the doctrine of the holy law and most holy ceremonial rites, Cecrops, a certain King of Athens, under the influence of Satanic poison, was equally engaged in stirring up the minds of the people to worship images, statues, and false deities : so that, while the people of God were receiving the commandments of life, he was preparing for the souls he had deluded the cup of eternal death, the seeds of lasting error, of which Sedulius writes—

' Quos letale malum, quos vanis dedita curis
Attica Cecropei serpsit doctrina veneni.'

Wherefore, the use of images, which sprung from Gentile tradition, neither ought to be equalled, or indeed can be equalled, with the books of the holy law ; for it is from *books*, not from *images*, we attain the instruction of spiritual doctrine." The second argument is taken from the sacred writings, where, though it is frequently said, *it is written*, it is nowhere said, *it is painted*. " St. Paul saith not, ' Whatsoever things were painted were painted for our learning ; but ' Whatsoever things were written were written for our learning.' Nor, saith he, Every picture is given of God ; but ' All Scripture is given of God and is useful for doctrine, reproof, instruction,' &c. And the Lord, when He descended on the Mount, gave to Moses not a *painted* but a *written* law : so Moses delivered, on tables of stone, not *images* but *letters*, the signs of words. So the same Moses did not declare the creation of the world by painting but writing ; and so, with respect to the various histories of the past or prophecies of the future which he was commissioned to declare to the world, he left these records to posterity, not in pictures, but in five written books. Nor is it written of him that he received pictures, but he received the book, and read in the ears of the people all the words of the book. So Joshua, by writing, not by painting, handed down to posterity all the wonderful transactions which took place under him. So Samuel compiled the books

“ For the Former and Creator of the world, our Lord God, having made man of the dust of the earth ‘ according to his own *image and likeness*’ (Gen. i. 26) gave him an intelligent soul, and endued him with free-will. And this first of men, being thus endued with free-will, gave names to all ‘ living things, both birds of the air and the beasts of

of Judges, Ruth, and Kings, to the time of David, not in *pictures* but in *written records*. In like manner, the histories of David and of the Kings which followed, which were collected by Jeremiah into one volume, were recorded not by pictures but by writing. In like manner, the Prophets, whose books we have, did not set forth their prophecies by pictures but by writing. Whence Daniel also learnt, not from *painted images* but from *books*, the number of the years in which God’s people would be detained in Babylon; as he saith, ‘ I, Daniel, understood by the book the number of the years concerning which the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah.’ ” Here follows a very long digression on Psalm xl. 7. In the head of the book it is written of me—*written*, not *painted*; for which an apology is made that the pleasantness of the subject had caused a wandering from the direct matter in hand. After which, the writer continues :—“ Let us come now to the Gospels, and let us see whether the Evangelists or our Lord Himself speak of pictures or of the Scriptures. The Evangelist saith, ‘ As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the Prophet.’ Observe, he says, As it is *written*, not *painted*, in a book—not in some *material* or other. So our Lord Himself, in His contention with the old enemy Satan, and in His many other discourses, takes many arguments from *Scripture*, none from *pictures*. So, when the woman was brought before Him who was taken in adultery, He is not said, to have *painted* images, but to have *written* on the ground; and, lastly, the Apostles, who went forth weeping and sowing precious seed—that is, with many temporal trials casting forth the seed of the Divine Word—are found to have sent not *pictures* but *epistles* to all parts of the world; for it was not by *pictures* they converted the Gentiles, but by the *Scriptures*, whose understanding their Redeemer opened that they might understand, not *pictures*, but the *Scriptures*. And John also, while in the isle of Patmos, he saw and heard so many mysteries by special revelation, received not command to *make paintings* of them, but to *write* them in a book; and so he admonished by means of the Seven Churches, the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, not by *painting*, but by *writing*; for it was said to him, ‘ What thou seest write in a book, and send it to the Seven Churches.’ Whence we may easily understand that it is from *Scripture*, and not from pictures, we are to obtain our knowledge of heavenly things.” The third argument against this ill-timed comparison is taken from the immense fulness of instruction to be obtained from reading the *Scripture*, while the use of images yields little or nothing in comparison :—“ Here may be found the arms with which to contend against all adversaries: here may we learn how vices may be overcome; gluttony, by vigils and compunction of heart; fornication, by mortification of the body and by prayer; envy, by brotherly love and desire of heaven which is only open to those who love one another; anger, by patience; avarice, by hope of eternal reward; sorrow, by brotherly consolation, constant reading and prayer; arrogance, by fear of losing virtue; and pride, through fear of Satan’s downfall and from the example of Christ’s humility. There also may be found the instruments of the fruit of righteousness—love, joy, peace, patience, long suffering, goodness, kindness, faith, modesty, continence. Here, too, is the great panacea by which the wise man is prevented from glorying in his wisdom or the strong man in his strength: the simple is kept from despondency, the joyful from excess of joy, the sorrowful from too great sorrow, the rich from being elated with riches, the poor from being overwhelmed by crosses. Here also is found the rule by which each in their several station may learn how to act for the best: in short, here is found the perpetual food of the soul—the learning and wisdom of this present life, which is its greatest orna-

the field, according to divine suggestion* (Gen. ii. 20). Abel, also, of his own free-will, brought gifts 'of the firstlings of his flock' to the Lord his God, concerning which we read 'that the Lord had respect to Abel and to his gifts' (Gen. iv. 4). Noah also, of his own will, after the deluge, 'built an altar to the Lord, on which he offered of every beast and of every bird a pure offering to the Lord' (Gen. viii. 20). Abraham,

ment, and all the instruction necessary for the life to come. This is a treasure wanting in no kind of good, but abounding in all, to which whoever earnestly applies himself shall rejoice that what he seeks faithfully he shall happily acquire."

The author then attempts to prove that even the rudiments of worldly wisdom and secular learning—as poetry, eloquence, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy—may be found in the Scripture, in the same manner as "wine in the vine-tree, crops in the seed corn, boughs in the roots, fruit in the branches, or the greatness of the tree in the kernel." After adding much more in praise of Scripture, the author concludes thus:—"None of these things which we have here touched upon, nor the like to these which for brevity's sake we have omitted, canst thou—O worshipper of images, O worshipper of things insensate—find in thy images, which are utterly destitute of every kind of advantage. Must we not yet more lament over thee than be astonished at thee, that thou shouldest venture to equalize such things with the books of Scripture, in which so many good things are to be found? Do ye, therefore, affirm that by images ye preserve the purity of your faith, take care to stand as suppliant before them with incense—we with careful enquiry will search out the precepts of the Lord in the books of the divine law. Do you attend on your pictures with tapers—we will be busied with the sacred Scripture. Be ye the *venerators* of dies and colours—let us be *venerators* and recipients of their hidden meaning. Sooth yourselves with your painted tablets—we will seek our consolation from the word of God. Be ye occupied with your figures of things, which have neither sight, nor hearing, taste, smell, or touch—we will be occupied with the divine law, which is without fault, wherein are found the testimonies of the Lord, the precepts of His justice, the fear of His judgments—all which things are beautifully as well as perfectly summed up in Psalm xix. 7-9" [of which we have a detailed exposition reaching nearly to the end of the chapter]: after which, it is continued thus:—"Now, if thou, O lover or worshipper of images, vexed with inward spite, art pleased to murmur, where is the use of such long digressions? Please to understand that these things are more lovely to us than any of your pictures and images, and, therefore, we delight in digressions about them. And, further: be assured that there is a refreshment and a sweetness which we and other lovers of the Scripture find both in the Scripture themselves, and in our comments upon them, which you and your companions can never find in those pictures or images by which you pretend that you preserve your purity of heart."

Adrian, in reply to this objection of the *Carolini Libri*, brings forward an extract from the often-quoted Epistle of Gregory to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles:—"It is one thing to worship a picture—another to learn, by the history represented in the picture, what is to be worshipped; for that which Scripture brings to the reader, the same does the picture bring before the unlearned when looking upon it: for in this the ignorant see what they ought to do—in this do they read who know not their letters. Wherefore to the Gentiles, pictures stand in the place of reading," &c. All this proves only a kind of historic use which very ignorant persons may make of pictures; but surely not that the one is to be put on an equality with the other, which Adrian asserted and Charlemagne disproved. The rest of the answer is evidently misplaced, and seems rather to relate to the censure passed in book iii. c. v. on the word "Contribulis," as found in Theodore's Synodals.

* The Latin adds, "With which names he permitted them to remain."

in like manner, of his own will, 'built an altar' (Gen. xii. 8), as it is written, to the praise and glory of the Lord who had appeared to him. And Jacob who, when fleeing from the face of his brother, had seen in a dream 'the angels of God ascending and descending by a ladder' (Gen. xxviii. 12, 13), and 'the Lord standing above it' and conversing with him, having risen up 'of his own will, took the stone on which he had laid his head' (Gen. xxviii. 18), and 'set it up for a pillar and poured oil upon it, and called the place Bethel,' saying, 'This is none other than the house of God' (Gen. xxxviii. 17)—this is 'the gate of heaven.* Now, God was not at all angry with him because 'of his own will he had done this;' for shortly after, in the same history, we find God saying, 'I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointest the stone and vowdest a vow unto me' (Gen. xxxviii. 13). Wherefore, my most beloved Children, ye illustrious Rulers, ye orthodox Sovereigns, it follows that all things which, according to man's imagination, are conducive to the glory of God, are undoubtedly pleasing to God.†

* Again: the same Jacob worshipped the top of his staff, ‡ which he did by the faith of love, concerning which St Paul speaks in his Epistle

* Added from the Latin.

† Adrian seems to beg the question when he assumes that all these Patriarchs did these things of their own will. Nor is his inference very logical, because some things which men imagined to be agreeable to God's will were accepted, that all that they might imagine to be so must therefore be acceptable. Cain, Saul, Nadab, and Abihu, Uzza and others, were proofs to the contrary; and that some who attempted to please God by acting according to their own minds were not accepted by Him. Was He mistaken who said—"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up?" And, again: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

"Let us (says Owen) put this argument into force. The Patriarchs offered sacrifices which God commanded and accepted; therefore, we may worship images which God forbids and abhors."

‡ This interpretation of Pope Adrian is impugned, not by vile heretics, but by the two renowned Fathers, Jerome and Augustin. Jerome, in his book of Hebrew questions, says:—"After that his son had sworn to him, the holy man, now sure of obtaining his request, worshipped God [not Joseph or his staff] before the head of his bed." Augustin, in his book of questions, on Gen. c. lxii., intimates that there was some doubt whether it was his own rod or his son's rod on which Jacob leaned; whether it were *super caput virgæ ejus*, or *super caput virgæ suæ*: he inclines, however, to the former, and thus explains the passage:—"He worshipped on the top of his rod"—that is, of his son Joseph's rod, for he had probably taken his staff from his son whilst he was swearing to him, and as he still held it when he had finished, before he gave it back, 'he worshipped [not the staff but] God.' The easiest solution of this question (he continues) is found in the Hebrew, where it is written, and 'Israel worshipped at the head of the bed.'" The Septuagint (Gen. xlvii. 31), and the New Testament (Heb. xi. 21), agree in the words *καὶ προεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ*. The Vulgate, in Genesis, translates from the Hebrew; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews it renders the passage, "*Adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus.*"

to the Hebrews—' Now, it was not the staff but its possessor which he worshipped, thereby giving proof of his affection ' (Heb. ii. 21). Thus we also, from that ardour and affection which we feel towards Christ and His Saints, make likenesses of them in their pictures, not that we honour the canvass or the colour, but only the persons whose names the pictures bear.

" Again we read that the Lord commanded Moses, saying : ' Thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold two cubits in length, and a cubit and half in breadth, and two cherubim of beaten gold on the two ends of the mercy-seat ' (Exod. xxv. 17, 18 ; 21 22). And, shortly after : ' Thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark, and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony which I command thee ; and there will I meet with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the cherubim, which are upon the ark of the testimony.* And, moreover, in the curtains and covering of the tabernacle, he commanded the work of cherubim woven in divers colours to be made. Now, it is for you to reflect, my most gracious Lords and Children, illustrious Rulers, that our Lord God Almighty did not disdain to converse with the people from the midst of the cherubim, though they were made with hands : whence it cannot be doubted that whatever things are set up in the churches of God for the praise and glory of His house, ought to be accounted sacred and holy. And we would furthermore, my most gracious Lords, add for the assurance of those who doubt and the instruction of those who are in error, that which God commanded His servant Moses, on account of a plague which had befallen the people, as we find it on record in the book of Numbers ; when he said to him, ' Make a serpent and set it up for a sign, and whosoever shall have been stricken and shall look thereon he shall live ; and Moses made a brazen serpent, and set it before them for a sign, and all who had been stricken and looked upon it were healed ' (Numb. xxi. 8, 9 ; sec. : Vulgat.) O, the madness of those who prate against the faith and worship of Christians because they have been accustomed to worship venerable pictures, wherein were found the histories of our Lord, His Mother, and all Saints, whose power upholds and saves the human race !—for do we believe that the nation of Israel was saved by looking upon the brazen serpent—[and can we doubt whether they who look upon and venerate the images of Christ our Lord and of his Saints shall be saved thereby† ?]‡ Far be it from us

* This passage is formally alleged in the fourth Session as one of the Scripture proofs of image worship : the censure of the " Caroline Books," lib. ii. c. 26, will be found there. † Added from the Latin.

‡ Charlemagne is very severe on this application of the history of the brazen

to indulge any such doubts, or to revolt from the tradition of our holy Fathers, or to turn aside from their doctrine.

“Moreover, King Solomon, in the temple which he built for God, made cherubim for the glory of God, and he adorned it with every variety of colours : wherefore we, and all the orthodox in confession of the faith, do set forth the beauty of the house of God in similar variety of colours and pictorial ornaments. Thus the Prophet Isaiah saith : ‘ In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of Egypt, and a pillar within its boundaries, and it shall be for a sign and a testimony to the Lord God in the land of Egypt, and they shall cry

serpent : and shows, by several arguments, how vain is their hope who, from this example, place their trust in images. He observes—

(1st). That to place trust of salvation in pictures is to act contrary to the Apostolic precept, which directs us to place our hopes in things which are not seen (Rom. viii. 24, 25).

(2ndly). That the serpent was set up, not to be worshipped by the Israelites, but to be a cure for the time to those of them who had been bitten by serpents : therefore, that they are deluded with vain hopes who imagine that they shall receive any benefit by looking on pictures, because the Israelites were benefitted by looking on the brazen serpent ; for the Israelite was warranted in his expectations by the express command of God, whereas not a single text of Scripture enjoins the gazing upon pictures.

(3rdly). He shows that the true application of the passage is to be learned from our Lord’s discourse with Nicodemus.

(4thly). He considers that Hezekiah did right in breaking the brazen serpent to pieces, when he found that people burnt incense to it and in otherways worshipped it. [In this Charlemagne agrees with the so-styled heretic Emperor Leo, against the orthodox Pontiff Gregory II.]

(5thly). He then concludes:—“Forasmuch, then, as they say that they expect to be saved by *looking on images*, in the same way that Israel was saved by *looking on the brazen serpent*, if any ailment befall their bodies, let them betake themselves to their images and gaze upon them ; and then, when they find they get no benefit thereby, let them return to the Lord, and expect salvation from Him alone, by the intercession of His Saints ; for He is the only Author of all our life and health.”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 18.

The mention of *the intercession of Saints* here, and in other parts of the “Caroline Books,” proves that the Churches of the North and West, though free from the error of image worship, were not altogether pure ; the mystery of iniquity operating with them in another way by a superstitious regard to departed Saints, and a tendency to depend on them as intercessors, instead of Christ the only Intercessor.

Adrian, in his reply (p. 114, col. ii.), actually quotes a long passage from his own letter to the Greek Emperor and his Mother, containing the *very passage* censured in the “Caroline Books,” which is proving *idem per idem*. Several passages from St. Augustin are next brought forward, which speak of the brazen serpent sure enough, but not a word about images. He concludes with a passage from a sermon of St. Severian, Bishop of Gabala, on the cross, which, though fanciful enough, gives no support to Adrian’s assertion. He speaks as if the law was Moses’ invention, and not from God’s inspiration : “Tell me, as a faithful servant, how is it that you do what you forbid!—that you build that which you denounce? For sayst thou, ‘Thou shalt make no graven image,’ and makest thou a brazen serpent? Yes, I gave that law that I might cut off matter of impiety, and might deliver the people from all worship of idols : now I form this serpent, that I may pre-figure in it an image the dispensation of the Saviour.”

unto the Lord against those that oppress them, and He shall send them a Saviour and Warrior who shall deliver them' " (Isaiah xix. 19, 20).

" David, the Psalmist, also saith in his Psalms:—' Confession and beauty are before Him ' (Psalm xcvi. 6) : and again he saith, ' Lord, I have loved the beauty of thine house, and the place of the habitations of thy glory ' † (Psalm xxvi. 8). And again, when he predicts the Advent and the Incarnation of our Saviour, the Son of God, he is most earnest in exhorting all to worship His face according to His incarnate dispensation, saying, ' My face sought thee ; thy face, O Lord, will I seek ' (Psalm xxvi. ; 8 ; sec. Vulg.) ; and again, ' The rich among the people shall seek thy face ' ‡ (Psalm xlv. 12) ; and again,

* " This prophecy (says Charlemagne) Josephus considers to be fulfilled in the High Priest Onias, who, being exiled to Egypt, with many other Jews, built a temple and an altar there ; but we consider it to be fulfilled, not by Onias, but by Christ the Lord, the Mediator of God and man ; who in the Egypt of this world appointed faith as a pillar, near to which a *title* is set up—namely, the Gospel or Apostolic doctrine, by which the minds of the faithful may be exiled to good works ; and by the sign and the testimony the prophet intends that the mystery of our Lord's passion should be understood. Since such is the meaning of the Prophet's words, who but he whom the darkness of his own folly blinds could ever think of applying them to the support of image worship ? And what support, even of the very slightest kind, can there be derived hence in behalf of such a practice, since it is evident that they are not considered by the faithful to be historically fulfilled in any literal altar or title, but only spiritually in the faith of Christ and in the Gospel ? But even, were they thus historically fulfilled, it could never help the cause of image worship : for *there shall be*, does not mean *there shall be worshipped* : nor does an *altar to the Lord* mean a *picture of some one* : nor does a *title on its border* mean an *image of certain materials*. Nor does the Prophet say, ' There shall be a time when none but the worshipper of images shall please God : ' nor does he say, ' So greatly shall the worship of images increase, that whosoever does not worship or honour them with incense, tapers, or other offerings, shall be accounted worthy of an anathema ; but there shall be an altar to the Lord in the land of Egypt : ' as if he had plainly said, There shall be faith in the world and the preaching of the Gospel, by which the manifestation of the Lord's passion and of our redemption shall be declared."—*Car. Lib.*, Mb. ii. c. 11. This censure is not replied to by Adrian.

† Charlemagne undertakes to show (*Car. Lib.* lib. i. c. 29), how this text, which Adrian applies to image worship, is really to be understood : " The house of God (says he) means, allegorically, *the Church* ; analogically, *Heaven* ; and, tropologically, the *Soul of Man* ; therefore, in most places of holy Scripture, where the words ' house of God ' are found, it is not walls nor a material building that is signified, but the spiritual and inconceivable habitation of Deity : of which hidden meaning their mind is utterly destitute who consider the beauty of the ' house of God ' to consist, not in the virtues of the Church, but in certain material images." After which follows a lengthened comparison between the Christian Church and the Temple of old, in which is shown that whatever formerly existed *literally* in the *one* exists now *spiritually* in the *other*.

‡ To this text Charlemagne (*Lib.* i. c. 24), objects, no less than to the former, that it gives no support to the worship of images :—" Neither can these words be understood of any countenance made with hands : more especially as faces

‘The light of thy countenance hath been stamped upon us, O Lord *’ (Psalm iv. 8) : whence St. Augustin, that great doctor, saith in his comments:—‘What is the image of God but the face of God, with which the people of God have been stamped?’†

made with hands ought not to be supplicated, since they cannot hear. All that is supplicated is, therefore, supplicated to *because it can hear* ; that which *hears* ought not to be *irrational* ; therefore, that which is supplicated ought not to be *irrational* : but if such things may not be supplicated, much less should it be worshipped, since worship is more than supplication. Now if pictures made with hands are to be supplicated and adored as they prate, we must of necessity believe that they hear those who supplicate them and favour those who worship them ; but if they may be believed to do this—to hear those who supplicate them, and favour those who worship them—then we must also believe them endowed with life and sense ; but if they have neither life nor sense, then we ought not, as they idly prate, either to supplicate them—or to worship them. After which, it is continued—

“By this text, the Prophet does not mean the face of the Son of God, but the face of the Church, which is the body of Christ. For, as he had said before—‘Hear O daughter, and incline thine ear,’ &c. ; ‘for the King hath greatly desired thy beauty :’ so now he says of her, whose beauty the King is said to desire, ‘All the rich among the people shall seek thy face.’ The face of the Church signifies the instruction of spiritual doctrine ; and, it is said, ‘The rich among the people shall seek thy face,’ because that many rich men would renounce their wealth in order to come over to her, that by her they might attain to eternal glory.” This view is further illustrated by reflections on 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18 ; Acts iii. 32 ; St. Luke xi. 1 ; St. Matt. v. 16.—“In all which (he continues) it is not the worship, adoration, or glory of images which is displayed, but the glory either of the Spouse, who is the Head, or of the Bride, who is the Body, of the Church.”

* The abuse of this verse, as well as of the verse before quoted (Pa. xxvii. 8), are united for censure in chapter xxiii. of the same book :—“Now, if this countenance—the light of which the Prophet glories as being stamped upon us”—and which he declares that he will seek, is to be understood of the countenances of images made with hands, that it behoves us by all means to enquire what is the light which they have, or how that light is stamped upon us, or where the Prophet ever sought such countenances. It was in the heart and not in pictures that this holy man sought God, as he declares, ‘With my whole heart have I sought thee, O God.’ The countenance of God is the knowledge of God—that is, the Son, by whom we come to the knowledge of the Divinity ; and He is the image of God, as the Apostle saith, who is the image of the invisible God ; and He is the face of God, because by Him the Father hath manifested Himself to men, as Jesus Himself saith, ‘He who hath seen Me hath seen the Father.’ This countenance, therefore, and not an image made with hands, is that which David declares he would seek when he said, ‘Thy face, Lord, will I seek.’ And he taught that we must seek Him by the fear of the Lord, and not by the worship of images ; and on him who would live and see good days, he enjoins not the worship of images ; but to keep his lips from evil and his tongue from guile.”

† Charlemagne will not for a moment allow that these words of St. Augustin can relate to any material image :—“Since God is incorporeal and invisible, He cannot be painted in bodily material. We must enquire, therefore, what is meant by the *image of God*, and what by its being stamped upon us. Let us ask of the illustrious preacher, St. Paul : from him we may, perhaps, learn what is the image of God. Say, O vessel of election, O teacher of the Gentiles, what is the image of God ?” [Coloss. i. 13, 15 ; Heb. i. 2, are quoted, after which he continues]. “See, from the teaching of the Apostle Paul, we learn that Christ is the image of God ; whereas they would have us find this image in their material images. He saith, the Son, who is of the same substance with the Father, is the image of God : they say that figures made by the workman’s art are His

“ Moreover, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, thus speaks in his discourse concerning Abraham : ‘ I have often seen the representation of his trial, but never could pass by the work of art which brought this history before my eyes without tears.’ And again, in his commentary on the Song of Songs, he speaks quite in accordance with the received doctrine :—‘ The material which forms the likeness of the living is in various colours ; and yet he who looks on the image which, by the painter’s art, fill the canvass, does not regard the variety of the colours, but rather, by them, is led to the contemplation of the Prototypc.’* Moreover, in the Epistle of St. Basil to Julian the Apostate, it is said : ‘ According to the immaculate faith of us, Christians, which we have received by inheritance from God, I confess, and follow, and believe, in one God Almighty—God the Father, God the Son, and God the

image. Execrable error ! Impudent madness ! Shortsighted folly ! That any should be so overflowing with love to images as not to blush to apply to them words which are spoken only of the ever-blessed Son of God. Now, let the most holy Augustin tell us what is the image of God. ‘ The condition of time (saith he) hath no place in God ; nor can God be rightly said to have begotten His Son in time, by whom He made the times. It follows that not only is He His image because He is from Him, and His likeness because His image ; but that so great was the equality that not any interval of time could elapse between them.’ And thou also, most holy Ambrose, declare what thou thinkest concerning this image. Come to the defence of thy Augustin, formerly by thee, under God, brought over to the true faith, and now calumniated by the worshippers of images. ‘ The Prophets (says he) declare that Christ, who is the image of the invisible Father and the figure of His substance, is the splendour of eternal light, and the unsullied mirror of the majesty of God and the image of His goodness.” It is in this way (might Ambrose continue) that in the Prophets and Apostles I will be a protection to my Augustin—yea, to every true worshipper of God.”

After quoting John xiv. 9, 10, he continues :—“ See the image of which he speaks. This image is the truth, the justice, the virtue of God : not *dumb*, for it is the *Word* : not *without sense*, for it is the *Wisdom* : not *vain*, for it is *Virtue* : not *void*, for it is *Life* : not *dead*, for it is the *Resurrection*. It is evident that by the word *image*, he means that of the Father, whose image is seen in the Son, since no one can be the image of himself. Having seen that the image of God has no connection with material images, as they prate, it remains to enquire how we are sealed therewith ? We have been sealed in Him, since, according to the holy Apostle, being baptized unto His death, we have been anointed with holy oil, we have received the privilege of a Christian name. We are sealed by the Spirit of God, who, according to the Apostle, hath sealed us, and given the pledge of his Spirit in our hearts, by which we are sealed to the day of redemption. We are sealed with the Holy Spirit of God, that our soul and spirit may bear the impress of God, and that we may recover that image after which we were created in the beginning, which we have neither lost entirely by sin, or it would not have been said, ‘ Although man walketh in the image, yet is he troubled in vain ;’ nor have we preserved it entire, or the Apostle would not have said : ‘ Be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind.’”—*Car. Lib. l. ii. c. 16.*

* These quotations from the Bishop of Nyssa are passed by, as the Bishop was but little known in the Catholic Church ; and, therefore, his opinions were not of sufficient weight to determine controversies of any importance.—*Car. Lib. l. ii. c. 17.*

Holy Ghost ; and these Three I worship and glorify as One God. I confess also the incarnate dispensation of the Son ; and, furthermore, I confess Holy Mary, who begat Him, according to the flesh, to be (*θεοτόκον*) Mother of God. I acknowledge, moreover, the holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, who make intercession with God ; and these I invoke, that by their mediation God, the Lover of mankind, may be gracious to me and may grant to me remission of my sins. Wherefore, I honour and openly worship their figures as presented by their images ; for these have been handed down to us by the Apostles, and must not be forbidden. Moreover, we set up their pictures in all our churches.* And, again, the same testifies in his discourse on the forty holy Martyrs :—‘ Since often both historians and painters set forth the victories and triumphs of war—the one displaying them by the beauties of eloquence, the other depicting them on the canvass, and both have excited many to deeds of bravery ; for that which the word of history presents to us in writing the silent picture teaches by imitation.’

“ Again : in the sermon of Saint John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, on the parable of the sower, it is said, ‘ If you insult the Royal garment, do you not insult him who wears it ? Know you not that, if any one insults the image which is made up of wood and paint, he is judged as having presumed, not against a lifeless thing, but against the King himself, for he does the King a two-fold injury ?’ † And,

* “ As to the Two Hundred and Fifth Letter addressed to the Emperor Julian, it is evident that it is supposititious : for (1). The title is to Julian the Apostate. Would St. Basil have directed a letter to him with such an inscription ? (2). The style is very different from that of St. Basil. (3). The letter is nothing but a confession of faith. Now, to what purpose should St. Basil send a confession of faith to Julian ? (4). He adds to his confession of faith ‘ the Invocation of Saints ’ and the worship of images. Who ever heard that these points were put into confessions of faith in the first ages ? (5). He says that he honours and adores the images of the Saints, because it is an Apostolical Tradition : would St. Basil have spoken thus ? And is it not plain that this letter is the work of some Greek, who lived about the time of the seventh Council.”—*Du Pin. Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 126.

† This quotation, together with that which follows from Chrysostom, are censured together in *Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 19. It is observed that the passages quoted do not apply, as the images mentioned are not those which are usually found in Churches, but the images of the Roman Emperors, which were paraded about in a Superstitious and Pagan manner in order to gratify their pride ; which sacrilegious impiety as no other ancient Monarchs were ever known to indulge in, so no other nation on earth was ever found more cruel and more idolatrous. Their ferocity and cruelty, it is remarked, is foretold by the Prophet Daniel, who signified the Roman Empire under the image of the most fierce and horrible Beast, having great iron teeth. Whence, it is concluded that it is most absurd to take such things in argument for that which is to be done in Christian Churches. As the latter quotation is repeated in the fourth Session, among the proofs for image-worship, it is to that Session the reader is referred for the remaining remarks contained in this chapter.

again, from the discourse of the same Father, on the fifth holy day of the Passover:—‘ All things are made for the glory of God and our use—the clouds, for the supply of rain; the earth, to abound in fruits; the sea is freely granted to the sailor—all are for the service of man, or rather the image of God in him; for, even as when the imperial pictures or effigies are paraded into the various cities, and the rulers and people go forth in great triumph to meet them, they do not pay homage to the canvass or the wax-formed pictures, but to the imperial figure—so the various creatures honour not the earthly form, but reverence the heavenly image contained therein.’ In like manner, we bring forward the commentary of the blessed Cyril on the holy Gospel, according to Matthew, which declares—‘ Faith portrays the word, who, being in the form of God, took upon Him our likeness, and became Man, that the price of our redemption might be offered up to God.’ And again, shortly after, he says, ‘ Parables fulfil the office of images, which bring the force of the thing signified, as it were, within the ken of the eye or the touch of the hand; and this in respect of things which, if they were presented in the abstract, would make but feeble impression on the mind.’*

“ Again: in the discourse of Saint Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, concerning the incarnation of the Lord, which begins—‘ Touching on a few things out of many, we have written sufficiently about them,’—it is subjoined—‘ And, in respect of those things which are engraven on wood, if the impression be obliterated by dirt from without, it becomes necessary that the same be renewed and fashioned according to that of which it is the form, so that the image may be remodelled in the same material and elements; and in this restoration of form the original material is not destroyed, but, on the contrary, is renewed together with it.’†

“ Also, in the ninth chapter of the third book of the blessed Ambrose

* Charlemagne finds fault with both these passages, taken from Saint Cyril, as very obscure, which he attributes to want of skill in the translator. After having given what he conjectures to be the meaning of them, he adds:—“ But it is beyond all doubt that no worship of images is at all intended in these words. Not only is there no confirmation of this error, but not even the slightest allusion to it or hint of it.”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 20.

Adrian, in reply, mentions the passages quoted in the fourth Session, from Cyril and Gregory Nyssen, together with a passage quoted in Councils held by his most holy predecessors from the same Cyril, which is as much to the purpose as those censured in the “ Caroline Book.” The tenour of it is as follows:—If any one looks on a certain well-painted picture, he wonders if it be the King who is painted there; and when he finds that so it is, he is as much pleased as if he had seen the King himself.—*Adrian's Letter to Charlemagne*, p. 116, col. 2.

† “ This passage of the blessed Athanasius, which they have brought for-

to the Emperor Gratian :—‘ What ! when we worship His Deity and His flesh, do we divide Christ?—or when we adore in Him both the image of God and His cross, do we divide Him? God forbid!* Again we find Epiphanius saying—‘ If any King makes an image of himself, are there, therefore, two Kings? By no means, since the King is one and the same with his image.’

“ Again : we learn the same from St. Stephen, Bishop of Bostra :— ‘ As concerning the images of the Saints (he observes), we confess that every work wrought in God’s name is good and holy. Now, an image is one thing, a statue is another—that is, an idol.† When God formed

ward here in the most irrelevant manner in defence of their error, is manifestly altogether foreign to the subject, since in it he makes not even the slightest mention of any worship of images ; but, in order to illustrate his meaning, observes that images may be restored in the same substance and material. After quoting the passage in full, Charlemagne adds—“ Now, let them tell us what support this passage can possibly afford them—let them say where he orders them to worship images ; and, since they cannot do this, it remains that, by all men of sound mind, the passage must be understood in the same sense as it is brought forward by the venerable Father.—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 14.

Adrian, in reply, complains that, whereas several sentences from this Father were brought forward at this Council, that it was not specified particularly against which of them objection was taken. Had Adrian condescended to read the chapter, as well as the title, he might have remedied his ignorance. He gives, however, a passage alleged in the Councils of his holy predecessors certainly very much to the point. It is the question of Antiochus to Athanasius about the worship of images : it contains the usual question, and answer, and example. The Pagan asks, How it is that Christians worship images? The reply is, We do not worship them as Gods, but from affection, just as Jacob worshipped the top of Joseph’s staff. Unfortunately for Adrian, but very fortunately for the reputation of the Light of Alexandria, the whole of these interrogations of Antiochus to Athanasius are proved to be spurious, and to be composed long after the time of that Saint.—*Vide Du Pin Eccles. Hist.*, v. 2, p. 39 ; *Adrian’s Letter to Charlemagne*, p. 116. c. 1.

* Charlemagne complains, first, that this quotation is not found in the third book of Ambrose to Gratian, but the ninth ; and next, that it is incorrectly quoted, some words being transposed and certain particles foisted in to make it favour the worship of images, with which it has not the least connection. But he observes, “ They who, in order to confirm their error, hesitate not to charge falsely the oracles of the divine law and the Prophets, will still less hesitate to do the same to the words of holy Preachers and Doctors.—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 14.

† Bingham says that Petavius acknowledged a difference between the practice of the ancient Church and his own—viz., “ That the ancients did not approve of many images, or statues of wood, or metal, or stone, but only pictures or paintings, to be used in churches. He proves this from the testimonies of Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople, and Stephen, of Bostra.” The passage quoted from the latter is, “ ἄλλο γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν, καὶ ἄλλο εἴδωλον, τούτέστι ζῶδιον a picture is one thing, a statue is another : man is the image-likeness of God, not the statue—ὅτι ἄνθρωπος εἰκὼν θεοῦ ἐστίν, εἴδωλον ἐστίν ; μηδαμῶν γένοιτο which shows that massy images or statues were thought to look too much like idols even by that worst of Councils.—*Orig. Eccles.*, vol. ii., p. 115, book 8, ch. 8, § xi.

man—that is, when He created him—He said, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness’ (Gen. i. 26):* and He made man in the image of God. What, then, because man is the *IMAGE* of God, is he a statue, which it were idolatrous and impious to form? God forbid!

* The application of these words to the practice of making images for worship is censured strongly in the “Caroline Books; where, it is observed, that it does not require much labour to prove how irrelevant are the proofs they would bring forward in their behalf, since the passages quoted prove this sufficiently of themselves. Yet, in order to show the real meaning of the passage so incorrectly and carelessly alleged, the explanation of the same by certain Fathers shall be brought forward. Two extracts are then brought forward—one from Saint Ambrose, the other from Saint Augustine; after which, the chapter is concluded as follows:—“Behold, how skilfully and how usefully have these holy men expounded the manner in which man was created in the image and likeness of God—namely, that the *image* was found in the *soul*, in which is understanding, will, and memory; while the *similitude* is found in the morals—that is, in charity, justice, goodness, and holiness, all which things have no relation to body.

“How far they, who would apply these words to images, differ from the sentiments and doctrine of these Fathers is rather to be left to the reader’s judgment than pointed out by further dissertation. In like manner, let his own sense, rather than our pen, determine on the greatness of their absurdity. Whoever therefore affirms that man was made in the likeness and image of God, in the same way that an artificer makes an image of man, shows that he imagines something *corporeal* in Deity, which it were sin to believe; for, if that particular after which man was made in the image and likeness of God has anything in common with images, then it is in his *body* that he is made in the image of God. And if man in his *body* is made in the image of God, God is corporeal. But God is not corporeal; therefore, that particular in which man is made after the image and likeness of God hath no connection with images made with hands.”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 7.

Adrian either artfully or ignorantly chooses to understand this censure as if it related to the mention of this verse of Genesis in the sixth Session, where it is brought forward by Epiphanius in one of the replies which he was appointed to read; and he then upbraids the authors as men who could not understand what was written. There is little doubt to what part of the Council the censure belongs—namely, to his own observation as made before, and to these of Stephen of Bostra here quoted; for the words in both one and the other case are brought forward to prove that men may have images, since God Himself made images—that is, an image of Himself in man.

A long quotation follows from Saint Augustin, treating chiefly on our Lord’s conduct respecting the tribute-money, which has nothing to the purpose but the frequent use of the word “*imago*,” which occurs several times in the accusative case. A passage, much more suitable to Adrian’s purpose, may be found in the speculations of Celsus, the Pagan. “But, if they imagine (says he) that statues are not to be considered as similitudes of Deity (for that the Deity, as say the Persians, is something altogether different), they unconsciously confute themselves; for they say, ‘God made man in His own image and in form like to Himself.’” To this Origen makes much the same reply as the “Caroline Books” do to Adrian—namely, that this likeness did not consist in the form of his body, but in his rational soul (*Adrian’s Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 118, col. 2).

This misapplied quotation gives also occasion to the dissertation (*Car. Lib.* l. c. 8) on the difference between *image*, *likeness*, and *equality*, which follows on the chapter now quoted. Of this chapter the substance is as follows:—“An *image* (it is remarked) is that which always receives its impress from another thing; admits not of more or less; but exactly answers to the thing of which it is the image, as the reflection of any one as seen in a mirror.

of Adam had been the image of the Devil, then he would have been an object of loathing and execration; but, since he is the image of God, he was worthy both of honour and regard; for every image made in the name of the Lord, or of the Angels, or the Prophets, or the Apostles, Martyrs, and other righteous men, is holy. It is not the wood which is worshipped by us, but our honour is paid to that which is seen and recorded upon the wood. Now we all reverence and salute our rulers, even though they be sinners: why, then, are we not equally bound to worship the holy servants of God?—*and for a memorial of them to set up and erect their images*, lest they should be forgotten?* But thou sayest that God Himself has forbidden us to

It is necessarily connected with likeness, but not with equality, as many things may be wanting in the image which are found in the prototype.

"Equality between two things is not that one gives the impress to the other, but that both independently have a common likeness in many particulars, and, therefore, are called by the same name; whence, it is necessarily united to likeness though not to image: it admits also of degrees—there may be a greater or lesser equality. Thus, in two *equal eggs* there is nothing in the one which is not in the other: hence the equality and hence the likeness; but still, one is not the image of the other, inasmuch as the one does not receive its likeness from the other.

"*Likeness* is that common nature which consists between two separate things, so that they are called by the same name: it admits of degrees, and is not necessarily united either to *image* or to *equality*—not to image, inasmuch as the one hath a common nature with the other but not from it; not to *equality*, for though any two eggs, inasmuch as they are eggs, may be *like to each other*, yet may equality be wanting; as in nature, between the egg of the partridge and of the hen, and also in size, as the one may be greater or less than the other. The word *necessarily* implies that, though this is or *generally* the case, it may *sometimes* be otherwise: for instance, there may be the image in which both equality and likeness are found, as between parents and children. The child may be called the image of his Parent, as his likeness was taken from his Father; and there may be also *equality*, except as the one precedes the other, in which *likeness* also is included. Equality and likeness may be without the image, as in the case of two equal eggs. Likeness and image may exist without equality, as in the reflection of any one in a mirror; and the whole three may co-exist with the exception of preceding in order of time, as in the child of parents and children."—*Lib. Car.*, lib. i. c. 8.

To this discussion Adrian replies: "Who could ever imagine that any of the faithful were in ignorance on these points, since in the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church grace has ever been given to the humble? But exactness in such mathematical niceties has ever been disdained by the faithful, even as Saint Ambrose teaches in his book about faith; where, in commenting on Col. ii. 8, he observes that the great power of philosophic poison lay in their dialectics; 'but that the kingdom of God consisted in the simplicity of faith, not in contention of words.'" As the greater portion of the chapter censured by Adrian consisted of a quotation from Saint Augustin, he thus sets Father against Father, Ambrose against Augustin.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 118 col. 1.

* This necessity for images, in order to prevent forgetfulness of the Lord and His Saints, is sharply censured by Charlemagne, who thinks that they must have a very bad memory in these respects. "To contemplate Christ, who is the power and the wisdom of God, or to contemplate in His Saints those virtues which are derived from Him, requires not that *corporeal* vision common to us with irrational animals, but rather that *spiritual sight* for which the Pro-

worship things made with hands. Tell me, O thou Jew, what is there on earth which is not made with hands, since all things have been made by God?—and, furthermore, was not the ark of God formed and framed of Shittim wood, made with hands? And the altar, the mercy-seat, the pot of manna, the table, the candlestick, the inner and outer tabernacle—were not these the work of men's hands when Solomon himself made them? How came it to pass that they should be styled the 'Holy of Holies,' since they are made with hands? Again: the cherubim and the six-winged living creatures around the altar—what are these but images of angels and things made with the hand? Wherefore were they not cast out, but because these images of angels, being made by the command of God, were holy, as were also the images of the living creatures? But the idols of the heathen, inasmuch as they were images of devils, God hath cast them out and condemned them. We therefore, for a remembrance of the Saints, make images of them—that is, of Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, Zecharias, and all the Prophets; of the Apostles and Martyrs, who bore affliction for their Lord; that so every one who sees them in their images may recall them to mind, and give glory to God who gave such honour to them. Honour, worship, and praise, proportioned to their righteousness, is their due, that all who behold may themselves be in earnest to follow such good examples. Now this honorary worship, what is it but the same which we sinners pay to each other when we reverence or salute each other from respect or affection? Thus it is that we worship the image of the Lord and glorify it with trembling, for it is the image of His likeness, and

phet prays when he says, 'Open thou mine eyes and I will consider the wondrous things of thy law.' How great, then, is the darkness in which they confess themselves to be involved!—where they declare that their memories are so depraved that, unless they have the aid of images, they are in danger of losing sight both of the service of God and of the veneration due to His Saints! But, lest they take occasion to fortify themselves from our practice of having images to record things past, we reply that it is *one thing* to have them from *fear of forgetting*, another for the sake of *ornament*; *one thing* to have them *from our own good will*, another to have them *from need*; *one thing* to look on them as things which *cannot injure if you see them not*, another to look on them as those things which, *unless they be seen do an injury*, especially as, without looking on images, men may be saved; but without the knowledge of God this is impossible." In conclusion, Rom. viii. 25; also x. 6-10, are quoted to show that our hope should be not in visible but in spiritual things.—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 22.

Adrian gives two quotations in reply: one from Saint Jerome intended as a reproof to the author of the "Caroline Books:"—"Men of this stamp, while they blame the unskilfulness of others, expose their own." The other quotation is from Saint Augustin's comment on Psalm xcvi., containing an explanation of the word "Sion," which he interprets to mean *vision* and *contemplation*—all well enough, but nothing whatever in connection with the remarks of the "Caroline Books."—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 126, col. 1.

He is depicted therein. Let not the impious and the evil doer, who cares not to remember the Saints, be any hindrance to those who would do that which is right—any stumbling-block to those who do honour the Saints, the servants of God, and who delight in the remembrance of them—for they shall receive a reward worthy of their goodness : while the impious shall meet with disgrace and destruction answerable to their sinful devices for that they have neglected that which was right and have turned aside from God.

“For the remembrance of the Saints are their images made ; and they are worshipped and revered, inasmuch as they are servants of God and offer up prayers and supplications for us. And surely it is no more than right that we should thus remember those who have gone before us, and give thanks to God in their behalf.

“And in the discourse of the blessed Jerome,* the Presbyter of Jerusalem, it is said, ‘As God hath granted to every nation to worship things made with hands, and was pleased to give to Israel those two tables of stone which Moses cut out of the rock and the golden cherubim,† so to us, Christians, hath He granted to paint and wor-

* It is thought that this writer, if ever he existed at all, flourished in the seventh century : though Basnage hints that possibly these words might be of the Pope’s own invention, and sent forth into the world under the venerable name of St. Jerome. Mistaken and erring as was this ancient Father, we cannot do him the injury to suppose that a passage so full of falsity could have come from him.

† This passage is censured in the “Caroline Books” as one of great rashness :—“Often in this work are we compelled to repeat that neither the tables of the law, nor the cherubim, nor any of the other things mentioned in the Old Testament, were ever made to be worshipped ; for while, on the one hand, they (the Bishops of the Nicene Council) would exalt them higher than they ought to be exalted by pretending that they were made for worship, on the other they sink them lower by putting them on the same footing with images. When they say, therefore, ‘While to the Jews were given the tables and the two cherubim, to us Christians has been given the cross and the images of the Saints to worship and adore,’ what do they but exalt their images at the expense of Christianity ?—more especially when they tell us that they who were under the law had the two cherubims made by Moses from the midst of which God spake ; but we who are under grace have crosses, the work of some artificer : they who follow the shadow of the law have the tables of the covenant which contain the Ten Commandments ; but we who follow the truth which is in Christ have but the works of certain workmen : that they who receive the spirit of bondage had in reverence those things which Moses made at the suggestion of the Lord ; while we, who have received the spirit of adoption whereby we cry ‘Abba, Father,’ have but the pictures which any painter, as his worldly art may have taught him, has made. But we, the spiritual Israel, rejoice that we have received from God mysteries not only superior to images which are entirely destitute of mystery, but mysteries superior even to the tables and the two cherubim themselves ; for these tables and cherubim were but figures of things to come ; and we have spiritually and in truth those very things which they had carnally and veiled under typical prefigurations. Wherefore, as far as the body exceeds the shadow—or the truth its type or the thing accomplished—the pre-

ship the cross, and the pictures of the deeds of the Saints, and so to display our works.'

"We have now, my most pious and serene Lords and dear Children, set before you in brief the above-cited passages of the holy Fathers, from which, as well as from that which the history of the divine Scriptures of the Old and New Testament testifies concerning the observation of divine worship, it is evident that whatever has been set up in churches for a memorial of deeds of piety, to the glory of God, has been set up there by express permission of God Himself. And further that they are in accordance with the tradition of the holy Fathers concerning the erection of holy images, and with the sacred Scriptures which treat on this subject, even as is found in that Apostolic summary, which with all humility and sincerity of heart we have drawn up in order to lay before the serenity of your Royal Highness. Whence it follows that we ought to abide by those testimonies thus carefully selected from various most approved Fathers confirming the use of images, which we found in their books, and have made all haste to present to your most gracious Sovereignty. Wherefore, with great affection of heart, I beseech your Clemency, and as though I were present on my knees and prostrate before your feet I beseech you, and as before God I exhort and adjure you, to decree that these sacred images shall be established and restored to their former honour, both in your Royal and Heaven-protected city and in all other provinces of your Grecian dominions; that so preserving the tradition of our most sacred and most holy Church, and rejecting with abhorrence the audacity of impious heretics, ye may be again received into the arms of our Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Immaculate ROMAN Church."*

figuration—so far does the New Testament exceed the Old. The one was dedicated by Moses with blood of bulls and goats—with water, purple, wool, and hyssop; the other by the Redeemer of the world our Lord Jesus Christ, who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, &c. In the one, the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh; in the other, the blood of Christ, who offered Himself without spot to God, purges our conscience from dead works. In the one was the Paschal Lamb: in the other the Lamb of God which taketh away sin of the world. In the one was the promise of the land of Canaan: in the other the promise of life eternal and the kingdom of heaven. In the one was the promise of the land which floweth with milk and honey: in the other the promise of that heavenly land in which is given that which eye hath not seen nor ear hath heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man." And after more of the same kind it is concluded thus—"Since these things are so, how perverse, how exceedingly perverse, is it thus to reverse the order, so that to things more excellent, inferior things are ascribed, and to things inferior, those which are more excellent; and thus, while the use of images is exalted, Christianity is in some measure degraded."—*Lib. Car.*, l. i. c. xix.

* "Only so much (says Anastasius, the Pope's Librarian) of the Epistle of the Pope is found in the records of the Greeks; for, as in the remainder, the

After the letter of the Pope to the Emperor was finished TARASIVS said to the Legates: "Did ye yourselves receive these letters from the most Holy Pope which ye laid before our pious Sovereigns?"

PETER and PETER, the Legates, answered: "We ourselves having received from our Apostolic Father these letters, have brought them to your pious Lords."

JOHN, the most honourable Secretary, said: "Our most worthy friends from Sicily can testify to this—I mean Theodore, most religious Bishop of Catana, and the most pious Deacon Epiphanius, who is here as Vicar of the Archbishop

ordination of Tarasius to the see of Constantinople from the ranks of the Laity was openly censured by the Apostolic throne, there was a danger, if it had been read, lest occasion should be given to the heretics to account him as censurable and worthy of blame, and so the usefulness of a Council where Tarasius was present should be obstructed. Wherefore, it seemed good to the Greeks to keep back all that related to the ordination of Tarasius from the Laity, and also to the title 'Œcumenical,' which, contrary to the Canons, was here conferred upon him, and which the Pope so emphatically censures; and that this should neither be read in the Council itself nor enrolled among its records. And thus this Epistle was in many parts misinterpreted, and suffered no inconsiderable alterations and mutilations. Anastasius testifies also that Adrian's letter to Tarasius met with treatment very similar, to the utter omission of many very useful passages."—Note of *Binius in loco*.

The part omitted contains the following particulars. He enjoins on the Emperor (1), to cause the Council of Constantinople against images to be anathematised in the presence of his Legates. (2), to cause the patrimony confiscated by Leo Isaurus to be returned to his see, and that the ordination of Bishops and Archbishops of his diocese shall be restored to the Roman Church. (3), to cause the Patriarch to lay aside the title "Œcumenical; and (4), states how greatly displeased he is at the promotion of Tarasius from the ranks of the Laity to the Patriarchate, to which, except for the sake of images, he would by no means have given his consent. Lastly, the letter concludes with a mention of the victories obtained by Charlemagne; and, what was infinitely more important to the Pope, his unbounded beneficence towards the see of Rome, which was shown, not only in giving up the Exarchate to him, but also large sums of money for lighting tapers and for the poor, "that so his Royal memory might remain from generation to generation."

Great reason was there that this part of the letter should not have been read in the Council. Tarasius would not choose to have his ordination called in question; and neither he nor the Eastern Bishops who made up the greater part of the Council would have tolerated Adrian's denunciation of the title "Œcumenical;" and, probably, would sooner have dissolved the Council than come over to his views. Much less would Irene be inclined to restore the Pope's patrimony, for she liked the practical fruits of her heretical forefathers too well to think of parting with them. And, indeed, when it is considered that Adrian was at this very time maintaining an usurped dominion over Ravenna and the Exarchate, which belonged by right to the Emperor of the East, and which the Lombard had wrested from that power at the instance of Gregory II., nothing but the unblushing impudence which characterises the occupants of that see could, under such circumstances, have ventured to put forth such a demand.

of Sardinia; for they both, at the command of our pious Sovereigns, went to Rome with the most pious Secretary of our most holy Patriarch."

THEODORE, Bishop of Catana, said to the Patriarch: "Our religious Sovereigns having commanded, in their most honourable mandate, that Leo, a most religious Presbyter, should be sent with me, the servant of your Holiness, with the valued letter of our most sacred master the Governor of our province in Sicily, who ever holds your Holiness in highest estimation, forwarded us to Rome with the sacred letters of our orthodox Sovereigns; and when we arrived we declared the faith and orthodoxy of our religious rulers; and the most blessed Pope, having heard us, said in reply: 'If, in the days of their sovereignty, this should be accomplished, God will magnify the reign of their piety above the reigns of any of their predecessors.' He then sent, by the hands of his Legates who now preside in this assembly, the letter which is directed to your Holiness, with that other letter which has been read, addressed to our most pious Sovereigns."

COSMAS, the Deacon, Notary, and Chamberlain, said: "Another epistle was also sent from the most holy Pope, addressed to Tarasius, our most holy and Œcumenic Patriarch, and we wait to know your pleasure concerning this also."

THE HOLY COUNCIL answered: "Let it be read."

COSMAS, the aforesaid Deacon, read as follows:

"The Epistle of ADRIAN, most holy Pope of Old Rome, to our beloved brother TARASIVS, the Patriarch: ADRIAN, servant of the servants of God:

"In consequence of those pastoral cares by which it becomes us to feed the people of God—being occupied in enquiries most profound as to the manner in which the voice of sound doctrine should be proclaimed by the preacher at all times, and how the shepherd should sympathise with his flock, and how he should conduct himself, that by his sympathy he may be dear to all and by his behaviour he may become a pattern to all—and how, by a religious compassion he may transfer to himself their sorrows and infirmities, whilst, by his exalted contemplations, he may raise their minds to heavenly things—we determined with ourselves to communicate with

your beloved Holiness ; and in sacerdotal unanimity fully to lay before you our mind.

“ Now in the synodical confession of your faith, transmitted by Leo your most religious Presbyter, to our Apostolic throne, in the very beginning of the first page we found that your Holiness had been raised to that sacerdotal dignity from the ranks of the Laity and the imperial service ; and very greatly was our soul amazed at this.* And, indeed, were it not that your faith, as expressed in aforementioned synodals, had been found sincere and orthodox, according to the rule of the sacred Symbol and of the six holy Œcumenical Councils, and furthermore sound as it respected holy images, we should never have ventured to have given such synodals a listening But, in proportion as our heart was grieved at† your former perverse division from us, so was our soul filled with joy when we found how consonant with your confession with the orthodox faith ‡ “ For we found in the above-mentioned synodical epistle of your Holiness, after the

* Whether this censure of Tarasius's ordination be altered as suggested in the last note, or whether the Pope thought it polite to write more mildly to the Patriarch than to the Emperor concerning him, certain it is that his language is much more subdued in this letter than in the suppressed portion of his letter to the Emperor. In that letter Adrian states that, though he rejoiced at the soundness of faith displayed in Tarasius's synodals, yet he was “ again greatly disturbed and confounded, because Tarasius had been suddenly raised to the dignity of the Patriarchate from the ranks of the Laity ; and (he continues) though it shamed him to speak of it, yet he could not be silent, when those who ought to be under rule and discipline, themselves did not blush to appear as teachers of others, nor had any fear in impudently taking upon them the charge of souls who were altogether ignorant of the teacher's course, and, indeed, scarcely knew how to conduct themselves aright. How mischievous and rash such a course is, even secular policy teaches. We know that no one is chosen General of an army who has not had some experience of active labour and service. What kind of Generals of souls are they likely to prove, who with reckless haste affect the highest dignity of the Episcopate ? Let them consider this comparison and hesitate to enter so rashly on labours of which they have had no experience, since themselves have not learned what they pretend to teach. Whence it is Canonical rule has ordained that no one should pass at once from the order of the Laity to the rank of Chief Priest ; so that, if it had not been for his concurrence with us in the matter of holy images, we never could have admitted his synodals.”

† In the original letter there is this addition, “ And your unlawful ordination.”

‡ Charlemagne was no less displeased with the uncanonical elevation of Tarasius to the Patriarchate than was Adrian, and so far they agree ; but in other respects they are quite at variance : for, whereas the Pope thought that Tarasius's zeal for image worship made a compensation for this irregularity, it appeared to Charlemagne that this made the case yet worse than before. In the second chapter of the third book of the *Carolini Libri* he labours to prove that “ Tarasius was endeavouring to cover error by error, and that he fell from one disease into another, while he sought to amend that which was faulty in his hasty elevation to the Patriarchate by zeal for worship of images. The skilful physician (he writes) is accustomed so to apply his remedies for the cure of one disease that they shall not be instrumental to any other complaint, since

fulness of your faith in, and confession of, the sacred Symbol and the six holy Œcumenical Councils, a paragraph concerning holy and venerable images worthy of the highest praise and reception. For you there say, 'I receive also all that was determined by the six holy Œcumenical Councils, with all the Canons, legitimately and by divine inspiration enacted therein,* among which is the following—In certain sacred pictures, the Lamb, as pointed out by the finger of the forerunner (John the Baptist) is represented which was a type of grace, and under the law prefigured the True Lamb, Christ our God. But while we duly value the ancient types and shadows, as types and prefigurations of the truth, we value more highly the grace and truth itself, receiving the same as the completion of the law. In order therefore, that the perfect image may be presented to the contemplation of all, we decree that in all pictures from henceforth, the figure of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world (John i. 29), should be portrayed in His human form, instead of the Lamb as heretofore; that we being stirred up by the sight thereof, may be led to meditate upon the depth of the humiliation of God the Word, and to the

there are remedies which, while they exhaust the strength of one evil, do sow the seeds of another. In like manner, the cultivators of the spiritual vineyard are anxious in eradicating certain vices, not to do this so as to administer to the increase of other vices; for certain vices do often gather strength in the abolition of others. In entire opposition to the excellent customs of both the skilful physicians and the cultivator of the spiritual vineyard is Tarasius shown to have acted when, by a practice altogether forbidden and of no benefit, he strives to amend another practice no less forbidden and absolutely pernicious. Now, if by a perverse worship of images, an irregular ordination may be confirmed, then what is unlawful may be confirmed by that which is unlawful; and that which is impure may be expiated by that which is impure. But as this is impossible, so neither can an irregular ordination be confirmed by the perverse worship of images. Again: if the ecclesiastical rules delivered to us by our holy Fathers are to be preserved entire, they admit of no violation; and, if they may not be violated at all, they may not be violated even for things useful; and, if they may not be violated even for things useful, how much less for things of no use at all, such as are both the worship of images and an irregular exaltation to a pontifical chair." The rest of the chapter contains a discussion against too sudden promotion to ecclesiastical dignities. A long extract is quoted from Pope Gregory I. on this head, after which he thus concludes—"As the aforesaid Tarasius, by his over-hasty elevation, has transgressed this rule, he may seem rather to confound than to govern his people: nor can we wonder if he should not preach aright who did not rightly attain to the office of preacher."

* In the Latin this paragraph is as follows: "I receive these six holy Councils with all the Canons set forth in them." The Pope here alters the words of Tarasius in order to avoid even seeming to approve the Council of Trullo, where alone this Canon is found. It is plain, from the synodals of Tarasius as found in the next Session, that he considered this Canon was sanctioned by the Fathers of the sixth Council. The Pope liked the Canon well enough, but not the source from whence it was taken: the Patriarch approved of both the one and the other.

remembrance of His conversation in the flesh ; and of His passion, and of His saving death, and of the redemption thereby accomplished in behalf of the world.'

" By this proof of the orthodoxy of your faith, your fraternal Holiness hath separated itself from, and utterly rejected, the officious meddling of wicked men and the garrulity of the heretics, even as their pernicious zeal never met with any countenance from us nor from divine grace, but was ever accounted by both as vain and frivolous. For our Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, ' girt up as to the loins of the mind ' (1 Peter i. 13), makes her confession, in heart and voice ever deciding in exact contrariety to the folly of heretics, against whose hostility and fury she hath often been forced to contend. Wherefore, as your beloved Holiness has engaged to worship and adore holy images—namely, that of Christ our God according to His human form who, like to ourselves, for us and on our account became incarnate, and that of the holy, immaculate, and very Mother of God ; and, furthermore, those of His saints : this, your orthodox determination (if only as it has begun so it continue) meets our entire approbation ; and, regarding you as it were with pastoral solitude, we advise you that both in preaching and in teaching you preserve unchanged that orthodox faith of which you have now made confession ; ' for other foundation can no man lay than is laid which is Jesus Christ ' (1 Cor. iii. 11). Every one, therefore, who retains his hold of the love of Christ, and of our neighbour who is in Christ, hath laid for himself Jesus Christ the Son of God and Man as his foundation ; for it is an acknowledged truth that, wherever Christ is the foundation, the superstructure of good works must follow. Thus it is that the truth itself teaches us, ' He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep ' (John x. 1, 2). And the same Saviour adds, ' I am the door of the sheep ' (John x. 7). He entereth the sheepfold who cometh in by the door, and he cometh in by the door who cometh in by Christ ; and he cometh in by Christ, who, being enlightened as to the truth by the Creator and Redeemer of the human race, guards and preserves from harm the rank of the pastoral dignity, and who undertakes to bear its weight not with a view to transitory glory and honour, but as having unceasingly to watch over the charge which he has received, lest the sheep of God should perish through the seductions of perverted men who speak wickedly, or through the persuasions of evil spirits. The blessed Jacob who, for his wives served

Laban his father-in-law during many years, is represented as thus addressing him, 'These twenty years have I been with thee; thy sheep and thy goats have not cast their young, and the rams of thy flock have I not eaten; that which was torn of beasts I brought not unto thee; I bear the loss of it, whether stolen by day or stolen by night. Thus I was, in the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night; and my sleep departed from mine eyes' (Genesis xxxi. 38-40). If he who kept the flock of Laban was thus laborious, thus watchful, for what labours, for what watchfulness, ought not he to be ready who undertakes to feed the flock of Christ? But may He who for our sakes became Man, condescending to become that which He Himself had made, confirm and teach you in all these things: may He shed abundantly the love and desire of His holy Spirit upon you: may He keep you from all disquieting cares and open the eyes of your mind; so that, by the labour and conflict of your love, and by the conformity of your course to our orthodox tradition of the ancient Apostolic faith, holy and venerable images may be replaced according to the ancient order throughout all the realms of our pious Sovereigns, and thus may your sacerdotal dignity remain firm and stable.* After the confession of your faith, it was furthermore signified to us that your venerable Holiness had requested of our most pious, most orthodox, zealous, and faithful Sovereigns born for the glory of God and to be most valiant champions of the truth, that there should be held an Œcumenic Council, and that they piously favouring the proposal, had declared their agreement thereto in the presence of all their most Christian people, and had determined that the Council should be held in their own Royal city. We, therefore, with most hearty affection, have sent, according to the request contained in their sacred mandate, beloved, approved, and prudent Priests, for the purpose of the restoration of holy images, that throughout all those regions they may be reinstated in their wonted honour and respect. But let your Holiness, with all earnestness, urge upon our most pious and triumphant Sovereigns that, in the first place, the false conventicle assembled without authority from the Apostolic see, most irregularly and irrationally and in direct opposition to the tradition of our most venerable Fathers against sacred images, be anathematised in the presence of our Legates; and that all tares be rooted

* Binius appends a note from Anastasius the translator on this part of the letter—"And here also has much been expunged by the Greeks, which nevertheless may be found entire in the archives of the Roman Church." Probably there is great reason to thank the Greeks for pruning away superfluities, as quite enough is left behind.

out of the Church, that the word of our Lord Jesus Christ may be fulfilled that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against her,' &c.: and again, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church, and I give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Matt. xvi. 18, 19). Whose throne, holding the pre-eminence, shines resplendent throughout the whole world and exists as the head of all the Churches of God; because that the blessed Peter, feeding the Church of God by that command of his Master, left nothing neglected, but ever hath retained and ever will retain the Primacy. To whom, as well as to our Apostolic throne, which is the head of all the Churches of God, if your Holiness would be united, and if ye be really anxious from the bottom of your heart and with all sincerity of conscience to preserve her sacred and orthodox standard incorrupt and unpolluted, as being yourself truly orthodox and pious, this must be your first offering to the Lord Almighty, prostrating yourself as in our person before the feet of our most pious and illustrious God-crowned Sovereigns, you must beseech them, and as if in the presence of God and His fearful judgment-seat, you must conjure them, that they give instant orders that, both in the Royal city and throughout all their dominions, holy images be restored to their ancient dignity; that by your conflict and labour in the faith they may hold fast the tradition of this our sacred and most holy Roman Church, and may expel with utter loathing the errors of wicked men and heretics. If on the contrary they fail to restore holy and venerable images in their country, we shall not dare to admit your ordination in any way, and still less shall we be willing to do this if you give the least heed to those who are disobedient to the truth.

"Wherefore it becomes your most venerable Holiness, with diligence the most severe, with all ardour of faith, and with the greatest earnestness in all things, incessantly to labour that the holy and venerable images of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of His holy Mother Mary ever a Virgin, and of all the holy Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and Confessors, be set up in their ancient order in all those regions, that we may worthily unite in singing the prophetic hymn (Psalm xx. 9), 'Lord, save our most religious Sovereigns, and hear us in the day in which we call upon thee; for they have loved* the beauty of thy house and the place of the habitation of thy glory' (Psalm xxvi. 8).

"With respect to Peter, our beloved Arch-presbyter of our holy

* *Lib. Car. lib. i. c. 20.*

Roman Church, and Peter Monk Priest and Abbot, who have been sent by us to the footstool of your most pious and serene Rulers, we entreat that, from regard to St. Peter the head of the Apostles, and for our sake, they may be considered worthy of, and receive at your hands, all that kindness and courtesy which is due from man to man ; and thus we shall lie under the greater obligation to you. May the Lord Almighty prosper your work of love so long as it continues stable : may He ever be present with you : may He ever preserve you, and may He cause the fruit entrusted to thy care to abound and to superabound, and may He order it to transfer thee to eternal bliss. God preserve thee in health, my beloved brother ! ”

PETER and PETER, the most reverend Presbyters and Legates of the Pope of Rome, said : “ Let Tarasius, the most holy Patriarch of the Royal City, declare whether he agrees with the letters of the most holy Pope of Old Rome or not.”

TARASIVS : “ He around whom the light of Christ did shine,* and who hath begotten us again by the Gospel, Paul, the divine Apostle, when writing to the Romans approving the earnestness of the sincere faith which they had in Christ our true God, spake in this wise : ‘ Your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world’ (Rom i. 8). This testimony we must needs follow, and it would be indeed the part of rashness to contradict the same ; since Adrian, the President of Old Rome, may be justly numbered among those to whom such testimony is due as having written so plainly and truly to our religious Sovereigns and to our unworthy selves, and so fully confirming the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church to be both right and good. We, therefore, having made our enquiry, with the Scriptures, with research, with argument, with proof, and being instructed in the doctrines of the Fathers, have thus confessed, do confess, and will confess : and we do walk in accordance with, and do persist in, and are fully confirmed in the great doctrine of these letters which have now been read, receiving holy images according to the tradition of our holy Fathers, and these we worship with relative affection, as being made in the name of Christ our God, of our holy and undefiled Lady the Mother of God, and of all the

* Ὁ περιεγραφεὶς τῷ φωτὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Acta ix. 3 ; also xxii. 6).

holy angels and of the Saints, manifestly confining our faith and absolute worship (*λατρείαν*) to the one only true God."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "All this our holy Assembly thus believes, thus thinks, thus teaches."

PETER and PETER, the aforesaid Legates said: "Let this holy Council declare to us if they consent to the letters of the most holy Pope of Old Rome or not."

THE HOLY COUNCIL replied: "We follow, we receive, we hail them with joy."

JOHN, Legate of the Eastern Dioceses: "Now is it seasonable to sing with the Psalmist, 'Mercy and truth are met together: righteousness and peace have kissed each other'*

* Charlemagne observes (*Lib. Car. l. 2, c. 4*) that this verse received its fulfillment when, after our Lord's incarnation, the two Testaments were united in one bond in Him. "In the New Testament (says he) was mercy, in which, by grace, the human race was set free: in the Old was the truth—namely, the Law and the Prophets; which two are said to have met together, not for opposition, but to fulfil the grace of the promised perfection." He further considers the latter clause of this verse but a repetition of the former in different words; and, after some remarks on the mystical language used, he next censures both the eastern Legate and his perverse interpretation of these words. "This verse John the Presbyter rashly and fulsomely brings forth on the agreement of the Venerable Pope Adrian and Tarasius the Bishop of Constantinople, which same Presbyter, however he was less in dignity than the Bishops who sat in Council with him, is found to be no less involved in error than they; and, though in rank they took the precedence of him, yet in loquacious impudence they were far outdone by him; for, however he might be surpassed by them in pontifical dignity, he took care they should not surpass him in rash garrulity; for in this application of the text he has committed a double fault—first, seeing from a superstitious bias to the worship of images he has perverted the words of the Holy Spirit, full of hidden mysteries, to mere human events: next, as if blinded by the same perverse inclination, he has fallen into the wretched vice of flattery."

Adrian, in answer, vindicates the absurdities of John the Presbyter by similar absurdities of his own. Charlemagne has said "that the verse was rashly and fulsomely applied to the agreement of Adrian with Tarasius." Adrian, on the contrary, asserts that "it was rightly applied. For (says he) God having mercy on the Church of Constantinople, had caused her to meet with the truth of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which evermore hath retained righteousness, as it is written of her, 'The seat of righteousness, the house of faith, the palace of modesty.' Which righteousness, faith, and modesty, the Church of Constantinople having embraced when she returned from heresy, caused peace to be made; for it was the see of Constantinople alone which resisted the ancient orthodox faith; for the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, held always with us the ancient traditions as their symbols, which we have evidently proved." N.B. *A lie is here proved by a forgery.* A quotation from St. Augustin follows, of a much more reasonable nature, but certainly coming far short of the glorious import of the verse in question, as if it meant only, Wouldst thou attain peace, do that which is right. There is this difference between John's flattery and the Pope's—John flatters the Pope and the Patriarch, Adrian and Irene: Adrian flatters nothing but his own see.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 116, col. 1.

(Psalm lxxxv. 10). By mercy and truth we know our Lord Jesus Christ to be signified, and from connection with Him the most holy Patriarchs and Pastors of the world are in like manner signified and called. Further, we see how mercy and truth are met together, in that Adrian most holy Pope of Old Rome, and Tarasius most blessed Patriarch of Imperial Constantinople, agree to think and confess the same thing. But 'righteousness and peace have kissed each other;' for She who bears the name of Peace (*i.e.*, *Ειρήνη*), and who, by God's decree, now reigns and holds the sway, being divinely excited and earnestly wishing and panting for the glory of the Church, hath by her letter, as it were, kissed that which bears the name of 'Righteousness,' the most holy Roman Church, and hath excited it to appear before us, to rejoice all this holy Assembly and to declare the orthodox faith. For now great joy hath followed the reading of the sacred letters of the most holy Pope Adrian, both of that which was addressed to our Heaven-defended and most serene Imperial Highnesses, and that which was sent to our most holy and thrice-blessed Patriarch, Tarasius; and we confess that for this our most hearty thanks are due to God, that He hath accounted us worthy of such joy and gladness. Blessed be God who hath raised up for us such a Sovereignty as this, exercising all care and vigilance to bring all the people to one harmonious agreement in heart and voice, and to the confirmation of the divine canons and traditions of our most holy Church. But may Christ our God, for the sake of her who begat Him, the all holy Mother of God, and of all Saints, and of you His Priests, who are agreed in the same profession, and who, devoid of all inward deceit, are earnestly desirous to fulfil all that has been written and to prove the truth of your promises, grant to our gracious Lords a long life: may He glorify them and lift up their horn: may He subdue their enemies and account them worthy in the world to come to be numbered among other holy Sovereigns; and may He grant all protection to this our holy unanimous Council!"

AGAPIUS, Bishop of Cæsarea, Cappadocia: "It is written

in our * divine Scriptures that 'God divided the light from the darkness' (Gen. i. 2). See, now, as the darkness of the heresy of evil-minded men departs, how the light of orthodoxy casts its bright beams on all; following which I receive and worship holy and venerable images, and all who think not thus I consign to an anathema."

JOHN, Bishop of Ephesus: "As it is ordained in the valued letters of the most holy Pope of Rome, so I believe, so I confess, by the grace of Christ our true God."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus: "In all respects I agree with the communication now read, which was sent to our gracious Lords by Adrian, most holy Pope of Rome; and I consent to the letter which was sent to the most holy Patriarch Tarasius. It is thus I confess, and in this faith will I go before the judgment-seat of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

BASIL, Bishop of Ancyra: "According to the letters of the most holy Pope of Old Rome and the sentiments of our most holy Father and Œcumenical Patriarch Tarasius, so I hold, so will I teach, and with views like these will I go into the world to come."

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Cyzicum: "According to the letters of Adrian, most holy Pope of Old Rome, and the publication of the confession of our most holy Patriarch Tarasius, so I hold, so I ever shall hold, and with this confession I will be carried into another world."

EUTHYMIUS, Bishop of Sardis: "I sincerely and without any hesitation, agreeing to the sentiments of the letters now read from the Pope of Old Rome and to the declaration of

* Agapius is charged in the "Caroline Books" with ignorance and arrogance in saying "It is written in our divine Scriptures," which is considered to be written in the same kind of spirit as that expression in the Emperor's letter to Adrian, "God who reigns together with us," or the title given to that Epistle—namely, *Divalia*, as if they who wrote it were *Divi*. Whereas he should have said, in "our copies of the divine Scriptures, or in the divine Scripture;" for to say our divine "Scripture" is a contradiction in terms. If they are divine they cannot be ours; if ours, how can they be divine?—*Lit. Car.*, lib. iii. c. xix.

Adrian in reply quotes from a treatise of St. Augustin, on the Proverbs of Solomon, a passage which justifies Agapius in part:—"They have our sacraments, they have our Scriptures, they have our Amen and Alleluja, and, for the most part, they have our Creed."

our most holy Patriarch Tarasius, do avow and confess that so I think, both concerning the orthodox faith and also concerning holy images: not as if I now admitted some new dogma or recent invention, but as having accurately ascertained the tradition about them, to be both of the holy Apostles and divine Teachers who left them to the Church of God. Wherefore, with my whole heart (*ὁλοψύχως*), I receive those same venerable images with honour befitting and the worship of salutation (*ὑποστατικῆς προσκυνησεως*). And those who differ or oppose, or teach anything contrary to holy images, esteeming them as aliens from the Catholic Church, I reject them and denounce them as heretics." *

* Charlemagne having, in the chapter previous, censured the declaration of Constantine Bishop of Constantia which occurs at the close of the third Session, in this chapter (lib. iii. c. 18.) censures the declaration of Euthymius, which he considers to be almost equally erroneous with that of Constantine:—

"Since Euthymius Bishop of Sardis, and Constantine Bishop of Constantia, are much alike in their confession, there is little doubt but that their faith also is nearly the same, and unless some amendment take place the same retribution awaits them both. Both of them confess that they receive images with highest honour and worship of salutation (*amplectibili adoratione*). O absurd confession of Bishops! O insane declaration of Prelates; The Church declares, 'We have received thy mercy, O God, in the midst of thy temple' Psalm xviii. 9): they say, 'We receive and worship images.' The company (of those who believe) prays that Apostles or Apostolic men may receive Christ, saying, 'Let the mountains receive the peace of thy people' (Psalm lxxii. 3): they say, 'We receive images with the worship of salutation.' Since, therefore, they place all, or almost all, their hope in images, they differ in no slight degree from the Catholic Church, which places her hopes not in the colours of a picture—not in the work of an artificer—but in God the Creator of all, and who hath Apostles or Apostolic men as assistants, who daily intercede with the Lord for her, and who, as being the higher places in the Church, pour down upon rulers and people the rain of holy teaching received by gift of the Holy Spirit from on high according to the prophecy of Joel, 'And it shall be in that day, the mountain shall distill sweetness and the hills shall pour down milk'" (lib. 18). This interpretation of the word "mountain," as signifying preachers of the Gospel, is pursued at some length, and several texts are quoted in support of it: after which it is continued:—"Because the old enemy, whose satellites are also very often styled in the Scripture 'mountains'—(for of such evil spirits Nahum undoubtedly speaks when he says 'The mountains have quaked at Him and the hills trembled,' iii. 5; of whom also the Apostle speaks, 'If I had all faith that I could remove mountains,' 1 Cor. xiii. 2)—is he that persuades to all evil and dissuades from all good; and, therefore, engages men to worship creatures that he may turn them aside from the Creator: it must consequently be attributed to his evil suasion that the worship of creatures hath so greatly increased, which under a pretext of religion and reverence due to Saints, has no small place in the breast of those who confess that they receive and worship images with their whole heart.

"But while both are nearly equal in error, as has been said, there is a variety in their errors; for while Constantine condemns all who do not worship creatures as unbelievers, Euthymius judges them as heretics. Not unlike certain of whom Sedulius speaks—"Both in error equal, though pro-

PETER, Bishop of Nicomedia: "According to the letters now read from Adrian, most holy Pope of Old Rome, so I confess, so I hold, concerning holy images, nor have I ever wavered; and I worship and adore them, as being ready in the day of judgment to give account to our God and our Judge."

ELIAS, Bishop of Crete: "According to the precious letters of the most holy Pope of Old Rome, so I confess and hold concerning holy and venerable images, never having wavered about them; for it is not now that for the first time I worship them. And those who confess not thus I anathematise."

STAURACIUS, Bishop of Chalcedon: "According to the Epistle sent from Adrian, most holy Pope of Old Rome, to our most holy Patriarch Tarasius, so I receive, embrace, and salute holy and venerable images as being the pledge of my salvation (*ὡς ἄραβῶνα τῆς σωτηρίας μου οὐσας*). And all those who think not thus I anathematise."

NICEPHORUS, Bishop of Dyrrachium: "According to the communications sent from Adrian, most holy Pope of Old Rome, to our pious Sovereigns and to the most holy and Ecumenic Patriarch Tarasius, and according to the doctrine, faith, and confession of this same most holy Archbishop Tarasius, so I think, and hold, and teach; and with this, my confession, shall I finish the short period of my life, and with this will I stand before the fearful judgment-seat of Christ."

EPIPHANIUS, Deacon of the Church of Catania and Vicar of the Archbishop of Sardinia: "A most lucid definition of

ceeding in different ways; since from the same error they belie the Church, partly as unbelieving, partly as heretical; for if, according to their sentence, all Christians who despising the worship of creatures serve God only, are therefore heretics, because they serve not images—then *they* who, whether before or after our Lord's advent have served creatures, must certainly be accounted Catholics; but if, on the contrary *they* are most manifestly unbelievers who worship the creature instead of the Creator, then we who despise all such vanities and serve God alone while we pay all fit and proper reverence to the Saints, are to be accounted and esteemed as Catholics and believers."

Adrian's vindication of Euthymius amounts to this—that his declaration is in accordance with the definition afterwards made by the Council. This might be the case; and yet the worthy Bishop still be liable all such censures for his professing to receive images with his whole heart, and condemning all who did not do this as heretics. So Adrian's *responsio* is no *responsio* at all. — *Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 122, col. ii.

orthodoxy and of Apostolic tradition has now been set before us in the letter sent from Adrian, most blessed Pope of Old Rome, to our pious and Christian Sovereigns, and also in the epistle sent to Tarasius, our most holy and Œcumenic Patriarch. With these in every respect agreeing and following in all sincerity, I honour, worship, and receive, holy and venerable images long since delivered to the Church; and whoso agrees not with these, I reject as partakers with heretics, and I give him over to the anathema."

LEO, Presbyter of the most holy Church of Constantinople and Vicar of the Metropolis of Sida: "Agreeing with the synodical letters of the most blessed Pope of Old Rome and the doctrine of our most holy Patriarch Tarasius, I receive holy images, according to the ancient tradition: and all who think differently I anathematise."

[The rest of the assembled Bishops made the same declaration with but few verbal differences. The number of those who were present at this Session was two hundred and sixty-one.

When the Bishops had all declared themselves,] the HOLY COUNCIL said: "It is proper that the most reverend Monks make their declaration."

THE MONKS replied: "If order so require that we also declare ourselves, be it as you command."

TARASIVS: "The order is that every one who is present in the Council make his own confession."

SABBAS, Monk and Abbot of the Monastery at Studium, said: "According to the ancient immaculate faith delivered to us of old by the holy Apostles and Doctors in the Catholic and Apostolic Church, so we hold; and the summary sent from Adrian, the thrice-blessed and Apostolic Pope, to our religious and Christ-loving Sovereigns, and to Tarasius our Œcumenic Patriarch, which has enlightened and dazzled our minds, we have heard with faith. It is thus I confess and believe, and all who think not thus I anathematise."

GREGORY, Monk and Abbot of the Monastery of St. Sergius: "According to the ancient rule long since delivered to us in the holy great Church of God by the holy and illus-

trious Apostles, and preserved by holy and sacred Fathers and Doctors, I mean by the six holy Œcumenic Councils, we hold ; and with most hearty affection receiving the orthodox letters sent from Adrian, the most Holy and Apostolical Pope of Old Rome, both to our religious and Christ-loving Sovereigns, and to Tarasius our most holy Œcumenic Patriarch, which have enlightened and flashed conviction upon our minds, so I confess, so I preach, and so I believe, that by this, my true confession together with my good deeds, I shall obtain the pardon of that which I have done amiss."

John, Abbot of Pagurium, Eustathius Abbot of the Monks of St. Maximin, Simeon, Abbot of Chora, George Abbot of Pega, Simeon Abbot of the Abrahamitæ, Joseph Abbot of Heraclea, Plato Abbot of Sacudeon, Gregory Abbot of the Monks of St. Hyacinthus, and all the monks present, made similar declarations.

SESSION THE THIRD.

Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea having been further examined, and read his Recantation, is permitted to take his seat in the Council, according to his rank. The same permission is granted also to the other Bishops, whose case was argued in the First Session. After this, the Synodals of Tarasius, the Answer which he received from certain who styled themselves the Chief Priests of the East, and the Synodals of Theodore formerly Bishop of Jerusalem, are read in succession. In conclusion, the Bishops declare their Agreement with the Doctrines contained in these Letters.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND MASTER JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns, Constantine and Irene, his mother, in the eighth year of their consulship, on the fourth of the calends of October (28th of September), of the eleventh indiction, the holy Œcumenic Council, assembled by the grace of God and decree of the same divinely-protected Sovereigns, in the splendid city of Nice, metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia—that is, Peter the Archpresbyter, and Peter Monk and Abbot, Legates of Adrian, most holy Pope of Old Rome; Tarasius Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, New Rome; John and Thomas Vicars of the Apostolic Sees of the Eastern Dioceses, together with the Bishops, the Archimandrites, Abbots, and a full assemblage of the Monastic Order sitting before the most sacred pulpit of the most holy Church of Saint Sophia, in the presence of Petronas and John officers of the imperial household: after that, the Holy and Immaculate Gospels were set in the midst.

DEMETRIUS, Deacon and Keeper of the Records, said: “Since, on a former day, it seemed good to this holy, great, and Œcumenic Council, in strict accordance with the rules of

the Fathers and of the Church, to receive those who have returned from heresy—and moreover to admit those who had been ordained by heretics on conforming to orthodoxy—We announce to you that those Bishops who on that occasion have agreeably to the rules of orthodoxy read their recantation, are now present before the doors, and they entreat to be admitted, and that ye determine concerning them as may seem good to you.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ Let them come in.”

TARASIVS, after they had entered, said : “ Let the most reverend the Bishop of Neocæsarea, who came last, read his libel of recantation.”

GREGORY, Bishop of Neocæsarea, then said : “ God confirm the kingdom of our Sovereigns ! May He give them joy in their holy throne : may God pour abundant blessing on the priesthood (*συναρχιερεῦσσι*) of our most holy master (the Patriarch) : may God confirm this holy Council. Pray ye for my deficiencies.”

After which, he brought forth and read his libel of recantation, which was the same with those read by the other Bishops in the first Session. And when he had finished, TARASIVS said to him : “ Do you make this confession in the sincerity of heart ?”

GREGORY, Bishop of Neocæsarea, answered : “ In the name of God, and by your holy prayer and that of these holy Fathers, in purity of conscience and in all simplicity of heart, I confess—and I entreat your blessedness and all this holy Council to pray for me a sinner.”

TARASIVS : “ Need anything more be added on this point to that we have already said ?”

THE BISHOPS of Sicily said : “ As it hath been done in other cases, so let it be done in this.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ Let it be so.”

TARASIVS said : “ A report has been spread abroad that in the time of persecution certain Bishops did most shamefully persecute the pious ; which report we shall be in no haste to believe without sufficient proof. Now it is well known by all this our holy Council that the canon of the holy Apostles re-

quires that, 'If any Bishop Priest or Deacon beats the faithful when in error, or the unbelieving when they do amiss, endeavouring by this means to terrify them, he should be deposed.'"^{*}

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "Such, indeed, is their declaration.'

TARASIUS : "That being the case, what think ye?"

THEODORE, Bishop of Catana : "According to the canons of the Catholic Church, so does this holy Council determine."

TARASIUS : Surely, then, if any Bishop hath inflicted stripes or any other kind of torture on men who feared God, who were at that time under persecution, he is unworthy of the Episcopate."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "He is unworthy."

TARASIUS : "Yes, because, like a persecutor, he hath made use of torture."

THEODORE, Bishop of Catana, and the other Bishops of Sicily with him : "The fourth Council had hardly assembled when forthwith they cried out, 'Expel Dioscorus—expel the murderer,' because in that Synod of robbers he had laid his hand upon the innocent."

JOHN, Legate of the Eastern Diocese : "Inspired by the Holy Spirit, that holy Council came to this determination."

TARASIUS : "Yet, as we said before, we cannot give heed to mere reports."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "Let each one in his turn, who hath any kind of complaint to make, lay his case before this holy Council or before your Holiness ; and then, when the truth is proved, let such punishment follow as this holy Council may determine."

GREGORY, Bishop of Neocæsarea : "No man can accuse me that I have smitten any or caused any to be beaten with stripes."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "We greatly rejoice at this."

^{*} This canon is the twentieth or twenty-eighth of the Code, styled "Apostolic." It does not seem to have been much regarded either by the West or Eastern Churches, when heretics were to be exterminated or heretics brought to submission.

GREGORY, Bishop of Neocæsarea: "Neither in the Royal city nor in the country has any man suffered any injury at my hands."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "If it be so, let him be received in his place."

SABBAS, Abbot of Studium: "The chief of the priesthood has denounced this man as the head promoter of this heresy. Your will be done; but our Father Athanasius, in his letter to Rufinian, says, 'That the principals in heresy must be satisfied to be admitted to penance only.'"

TARASIVS: "But he has declared that he has not beaten or persecuted any one."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus: "Juvenal and his party were principals in the conventicle of robbers; but nevertheless they were admitted in the fourth Council."

JOHN, the Chancellor, said: "It may be a satisfaction to your divinely-assembled Council that this Gregory of Neocæsarea, head and chief of a former impious Synod, should have been preserved to this day, in order that he may condemn his own heresy and doctrine."

JOHN, Legate of the Eastern Diocese: "We ought, indeed, to thank God that some of that Synod of malignants remain to confute and subvert their mischievous proceedings and to publish abroad their own shame."

TARASIVS: "We all know that Juvenal was Patriarch of Jerusalem, and from his rank must have been President of that Council; and yet after his transgression he was received on repentance."

EPIPHANIUS, Deacon of the Church of Catana: "But Juvenal had never persecuted any one."

TARASIVS: "And this man also hath declared that he has persecuted no man. Eustathius also Bishop of Sebaste was a principal in the Macedonian heresy, but, on his recantation, our Father Basil received him."

THE MONKS: "True; but because Juvenal remained silent, therefore have we spoken."

TARASIVS: "We give you all praise for your zeal for the canonical and evangelical usages."

SABBAS: "God preserve our gracious Lords who have vouchsafed to call this Council together for the unity and concord of the Church."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Thanks and praise be given to God."

TARASIVS: "As this holy Council has already manifested its opinion that in accordance with our holy Fathers we ought to receive those who return from heresy, unless any other cause be alleged to deprive them of the sacerdotal order, we do now again declare the same."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "We all unite in the same declaration."

JOHN, the Legate of the Eastern Diocese: "The words which have been spoken in this discussion are holy and profitable."

PETER and **PETER** the Legates of Adrian, and **JOHN** and **THOMAS** Legates of the Eastern Dioceses, said: "Let them take their seats."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "We all say the same: we all give our consent."

On which the Bishops of Nice, Neocæsarea, Rhodes, Iconium, Hierapolis, of Pessinus and of Carpathus took their respective seats.

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "God has brought in the orthodox gloriously."

CONSTANTINE, Bishop of Constantia: "In a former Session of this holy Œcumenic Council we were graciously favoured with the most religious (*ΣΑΚΡΑ*) letter of communication of our God-crowned Sovereigns, by the hands of the Royal Secretary, in which mention was made of letters which were sent from the President of Old Rome to their most serene Imperial Highnesses; and also of the two octavos sent from the Chief Priests of the East to our most holy Patriarch. The letters from the Pope of Rome we have heard, and with their contents we have been made acquainted. We therefore entreat your dignity, O most noble Patricians, that the letters which have been sent from the East may now be read before this holy and Œcumenic Council that we

may be certified whether the Pope of Old Rome and Tarasius, the most holy and Œcumenic Patriarch, who presides in this Royal city, hold the same sentiments and doctrine with the Bishops of the East."

THE ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCES answered: "Let it be according to your request."

JOHN AND THOMAS, Legates of the Eastern Diocese: "If it seem good to this holy and Œcumenic Council we request that the epistle of the most holy Patriarch Tarasius which was sent to the most holy Chief Priests of the East be first read, and then the answers made in return."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let it be read."

STEPHEN, Deacon and Notary of the Patriarchate, read as follows:—

"A Copy of the Letter sent to the Chief Priests and other Priests of Alexandria, Antioch, and the Holy City, from Tarasius, most Holy, Blessed, and Œcumenic Patriarch of Constantinople:—

"The Lord our God, who, in His great and diversified Providence, orders and directs the lives of men, and, according to His own purpose, overrules the course of each—for without Him nothing is done, and by Him the very hairs of our head are numbered—hath caused even me, who to the present time had been ranked among the laity and enrolled in the number of the Imperial household (by whose judgment I know not, He alone knows), to ascend the Archiepiscopal Throne. For having been most powerfully urged by the entreaties of those champions of the truth our most holy and orthodox Sovereigns, and the most holy Bishops and Clergy, I at length gave way to compulsion and granted them to reap the fruit of my obedience.

"Wherefore I entreat you O most holy men, that as Fathers ye would confirm our weakness with the staff of power, your paternal instructions; and that as brethren, ye would aid us with your hearty prayers, that I may be armed with the whole armour of God against the stratagems of the enemy, and that, though tossed about with the violence of the waves, I yet may so hold on my course as safely to arrive at the haven of the will (*ἐπι λιμένα θελήματος*) of our Lord Jesus Christ. For verily there is among us a war, not of iron, but of words fiercely urged from side to side; but we have with us the victorious trophy—unconquerable truth. Wherefore though these storms should still rage around, with you as our allies, we shall, after having

borne its fury awhile longer, find that Christ will rebuke them and cause our lives to hold hereafter a peaceful course. But now having said enough, by way of preface, about those things which will be more fully declared hereafter, we must direct your minds to another point of importance.

“Since it is an ancient (I may say an Apostolic) tradition in all the Churches that they who are entering on any Hierarchical dignity should lay before those who previously have attained the same Hierarchical dignity an exposition of his faith, it seemed proper that I also, in pursuance of this laudable custom, should submit myself to you and fully lay before you my confession, even as from my earliest infancy I have been learned, being taught by those trumpets of the Holy Spirit “whose sound went out into all the world and their words unto the ends of the earth” and by their offspring and upholders our divine Fathers.

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and our God, who before all time and from eternity was begotten by the Father, and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father by the Son,* and that the same is God and is acknowledged so to be.

* This portion of Tarasius's synodals gives occasion to a very lengthened discussion and confutation in the “Caroline Books,” where it is argued that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, and not from the Father *by* the Son, as Tarasius had expressed himself. This difference is one of those which separates the Eastern from the Western Church, and which not even tradition or Catholic consent can settle.

After some introductory matter, in which the author declares himself bound to notice the various errors of the Council, as far as its obscurity does not prevent his understanding its meaning, or its puerility does not render it unworthy of regard, he continues—“The Holy Spirit is both rightly believed and indeed ordinarily confessed to be from the Father *and* the Son, not from the Father *by* the Son; for He is not by the Son, either as being a creature made by Him, or as being after Him in time, or inferior to Him in power, or as if He proceeded from some other substance; but He is from the Father and from the Son, as being co-eternal, co-equal, and consubstantial with them, and of the same Power, Glory, and Godhead. The force of the preposition *ex* (from) differs much from that of *per* (by). Thus the Son of God is said to be born ‘*ex homine*,’ not ‘*per hominem*’—that is, that He was born not by human generation, but by taking flesh of the Virgin.” Again: “We may well hesitate to use this form of confession that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father *by* the Son, lest we should seem to give countenance to the error of the Arians, who blasphemously affirm that the Holy Spirit is a Creature, and like other creatures is made by the Son, and who administer baptism not according to the Catholic faith in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, but in the name of the Father, *by* the Son, *through* the Holy Ghost.” [The writer then brings forward many texts to prove that the Holy Ghost is both the Creator and God, and further appeals to the practice of the Catholic Church in all ages, and to the Creed of the Nicene and Chalcedonian Councils in favour of his own view.] After which he continues—“By the Son He appeared in fire upon

“A Trinity—consubstantial, of the same honour, of the same dignity, eternal, uncreate, the Creator of all creatures—one First Cause, one Godhead and dominion, one kingdom, power, and authority in three

the Apostles : by the Son is He given to men ; for He could be not received by all in any other way than by the Son. But to proceed from the Father by the Son is a form of confession very unusual ; for, in order to proceed from the Father, the Holy Spirit does not require the help of another, as though He must proceed by the aid of some one, since He is the Third Person in the Holy Trinity of the same power and essence with the Father and the Son.” After some other remarks it is observed as follows—“He is the Spirit of the Father, as the Lord saith, ‘It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which dwelleth in you’ (Matt. x. 20). He is also the Spirit of the Son, as St. Paul declares, ‘If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His’ (Rom. viii. 9) ; whence it is evident that He is the Spirit of both, and because He proceeds from the Father and the Son, He is proved to be of the same nature and essence. If He were said to be unbegotten then should we confess two Fathers—if He were said to be begotten then no less absurdly two Sons ; but since He is neither the Father nor the Son, He is not called unbegotten or begotten, but one proceeding from both. The Father alone is not from another : therefore He is called the unbegotten, not indeed in the Scripture, but in the language of theologians. The Son alone is born of the Father, wherefore He alone is called begotten. The Holy Spirit alone proceeds from both the Father and the Son, wherefore He is styled the Spirit of both. Now He does not proceed by birth as that He should be called the Son of both or of either, as if both had begotten Him—an idea which shocks all Christian feeling. He is not born of both, and, therefore, must proceed from both. That the Spirit proceeds from the Father our Lord taught His disciples, saying, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, He shall testify of me’ (John xv. 26). But that the Spirit is from the Son also our Lord proved when, after His resurrection, He breathed on His disciples and said, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ Now, unless the Holy Spirit had proceeded from Him, could He have communicated this gift to His disciples by breathing upon them ; and the Spirit of the Father and the Son is one ; for, as we have said, the Spirit of both is one.”

The author then silences many vain enquiries which he supposes might be raised as to the way in which the Son proceeds by being born, and the Holy Spirit without being born, and other questions of the same kind, with this admonition—“Let each one who makes such enquiries know that points like these are incomprehensible and utterly beyond the reach of the powers of man. If men cannot understand the secrets of Christ’s human nativity, how can they comprehend the mysteries of the divine nature ; but since, in this co-eternal, co-equal, incorporeal, ineffably immutable and inseparable Trinity, it is most difficult to distinguish between generation and procession, it will suffice if we believe, firmly hold, and with the whole heart confess, that the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, and the Holy Spirit, neither created nor begotten, but proceeding ; and that, in confessing the faith, all vain conjectures and innovating expressions be avoided, and that it be confirmed by these words and such modes of expression alone which have the sanction of holy and universal Councils.”—*Lib. Car.*, l. iii. c. 3.

Adrian undertakes the defence of Tarasius, and by twenty-one different quotations endeavours to prove that the Patriarch was right in saying, “From the Father by the Son.” Adrian’s orthodoxy and his infallibility would have suffered had he been an ordinary Bishop or opposed to the Romish worship of images ; but as he was a Pope he must be orthodox and infallible, and therefore some subtle distinction, unintelligible to ordinary readers, is brought forward to show that what Tarasius said and he defended, though *in words* exactly the same, is *in fact* quite different from that which the Greek Church now believes on this point. Adrian’s sense, *ex patre per filium*, is quite con-

hypostases*—indivisibly divided, and divisibly united : not of three imperfections one perfection, but of three perfections one superfection and transcendent perfection, as the great Dionysius saith ; so that while in respect of individuality of person, three are to be worshipped, in respect to community of nature, there is but one God, the Maker of all things

sistent with the Catholic *ex patre et filio*. However his orthodoxy therefore and infallibility in point of doctrine may be saved from censure, much cannot be said of his accuracy in quotation when, out of the twenty-one passages alleged in defence of Tarasius, fourteen are irrelevant—three prove exactly the contrary, and from the remaining four the support is very doubtful.

Adrian introduces his learned array as follows : "Tarasius did not of himself invent this dogma, but made his confession as being taught by the doctrine of the holy Fathers, passages of which from our great affection to your most exalted royal dignity we will now lay before you, with all brevity." After which follow his quotations. Passing by those which are irrelevant, those which bear on the subject shall be brought forward ; and, first, those passages which verbally make against the Pope and Tarasius, and for Charlemagne :—(1). From Augustin (lib. iv. c. 20, de Trinitate) "Nor can we say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son also ; for I do not see what else was intended when, breathing on them, He said—'Receive ye the Holy Ghost' : not that the corporeal blast proceeding from a body with powers of touching corporally, was the substance of the Holy Spirit : but a demonstration by a fitting signification that Son did not proceed from the Father only but from the Son also. Who is there so insane as to say that the Spirit which He gave by breathing upon them was different from that Spirit which He sent forth after His ascension ?" (2). From Saint Augustin (lib. xv. 26, de Trinitate). And that He proceeds from both may be thus proved :—The Son Himself saith, 'He proceedeth from the Father ;' and, after He had risen again and appeared to His disciples, 'He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost' that He might show that He proceeded from Him also. (3). From Saint Gregory, the Pope, in his twenty-sixth Homily on the holy Gospel :—Among other things, He says, 'When the Comforter shall come whom I will send unto you.' If 'to be sent' signifies only 'to become incarnate,' then the Holy Spirit could in no sense be said to be sent since He certainly was not incarnate : but His mission is the same with His procession, by which He proceeds from the Father and the Son." The author of the "Caroline Books" could not have found anywhere three quotations better suited to his purpose than these, which Adrian brings forward for his confutation. Infallibility seemed at a low ebb when the Pope wrote this letter. In the quotations which follow, there is an apparent agreement with Tarasius and the Pope against the "Caroline Books." (1). From Saint Athanasius, on Virginity :—"And in the Holy Spirit, which, existing in the Father and the Son, is sent forth by the Father, is given by the Son." (2). From Saith Hilary (lib. viii. de Fide) :—"The Spirit of Truth proceeds from the Father, and is sent by the Son, and receives from the Son." (3). From Saint Cyril, on the worship of the Spirit :—"As He is of God, and essentially at the same time of the Father and of the Son, He is of both—that is, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by the Son." (4). Gregory, in his Missal, teaches us to ask that the Spirit may be poured into us, and manifested, and be conformed by his Son Jesus Christ. The support which these passages give is doubtful : none of them deny the procession from the Son, and seem to say little more than is allowed in the chapter from the "Caroline Books," quoted above :—"By the Son, the Spirit appeared in fire upon the Apostles ; by the Son is He given to man, &c."—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, page 109, 110, &c.

* Binus observes on this passage :—*Locus obcurus et caute legendus.*

visible and invisible, whose providence is over all. Moreover, I confess the birth according to the flesh of One of this Holy Trinity, the Son of God, our Lord and God Jesus Christ, who, for our salvation, was in these last days born of Mary ever a Virgin, the holy true Mother of God—who was made of the same substance with us in all respects, sin only excepted—who never ceased to be what He was before, the two natures remaining in Him without confusion, and with them the two wills and the two operations—who was crucified for us in the flesh, was dead and buried—who rose again and ascended into heaven, and who will come again to judge the living and the dead. Moreover, I look for the resurrection of the dead, and for the eternal retribution of all things which have been done, whether they be good or evil. And I entreat the intercession of the altogether holy, undefiled Mary, ever a Virgin, and of the holy Angels, and of the holy and most glorious Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, Confessors, and Doctors; and I embrace their venerable images; and all heretical ribaldry I abominate together with its originators and promoters, I mean such as Simon, Marcion, Manes, Paul of Samosata, Sabellius of Libya, and their accursed dogmas. I admit also the six holy Œcumenic Councils and their sacred decrees and doctrines as having been delivered to us by divine inspiration.

“With the *first*, I believe the Son to be consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father; and I anathematise the impious Arius, Aetius, Eunomius, Eudoxius, and Demophilus; and with them those who were rightly styled ‘Anomæi’ and ‘Semirarians,’ and all their polluted crew.

“With the *second*, I acknowledge the Holy Spirit to be God, and the Lord and Giver of life; and I abominate Macedonius and his partizans, and with these the God-hated Apollinarius and his insane speculations.

“With the *third*, I believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, our true God, who was begotten of the Father, and He who in these last days was for our salvation incarnate of the holy Mother of God, Mary ever a Virgin, to be ONE person. And I utterly exclude from my confession the man-worshipping Nestorius and his inseparable pair of friends, Diodorus and Theodorus, and all who patronised their absurd doctrines, as having imagined a duality of persons in Christ.

“With the *fourth*, I acknowledge that Christ our God, one of the holy Trinity who dwelt in the flesh, to be *of* two natures and *in* two natures; and I anathematize Eutyches, Dioscorus, and all the rabble

of the Acephali, together with the frenzied Severus; and the lawless Julian of Halicarnassus, who fabled that our Lord had assumed an incorruptible body.

“ With the *fifth*, I also agree, which, as a sword of the Spirit, cut off the lawless heresies which prevailed from ancient times, and openly exposed those who originated them, as Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius—which heresies I also reject as strange and deceitful babblings—*τεραπευμάτων μυθώματα*.

“ With the *sixth* I believe that as Christ is of *two* natures, so hath He *two* wills and *two* operations—the divine and the human—as adapted to each nature; and I anathematize Cyrus, Sergius, *Honorius*, Pyrrhus, Paul, and all who were of the same opinion with them—and their dogmata I hate as the vine of Sodom and the branch of Gomorrha, which bear the grapes of gall. Moreover, I receive this same sixth holy Council with all the doctrines legitimately and divinely declared therein, and also the canons which have been issued thereby among which is found the following:—‘ In certain sacred pictures, the *us Lamb*, pointed out by the finger of the Forerunner (John the Baptist), is represented, which was a type of grace, and under the law prefigured the true Lamb, Christ our God. But, while we duly value the ancient types and shadows as types and prefigurations of the truth, we value more highly the *grace* and *truth* itself, receiving the same as the completion of the law. In order therefore that the perfect image may be presented to the contemplation of all, we decree that in all pictures from henceforth, the figure of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, should be portrayed in His human form, instead of the Lamb, as heretofore; that we, being stirred up by the sight thereof, may be led to meditate upon the depth of the humiliation of God the Word, and to the remembrance of His conversation in the flesh, and of His passion, and of His saving death, and the redemption thereby accomplished in behalf of the world.’ But, as to all those superfluous pratings and vain babblings which, after these Councils, were inconsiderately set forth by certain,* as they were not admitted by you, and were not spoken by Divine Grace, so in like manner I account them destitute of authority. Bidding these farewell, and putting them entirely out of consideration, ‘ we gird up the loins of our mind’ (1 Pet. i. 13) in truth, and, together with those pious champions of the truth our faithful Sovereigns, rise up for the union of the holy Catholic Church of God: Whom we besought, in the presence of all

* The Council assembled at Constantinople, under Constantine and Leo, is intended in these words.

their Christ-loving people, that an Œcumenic Council might be held, and to which our petition they religiously gave consent. Wherefore, we regarding you, who 'have been built upon the foundation of Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone' (Eph. ii. 20), as allies, fellow-warriors, fellow-combatants (as we said before) 'have this confidence towards God (not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God,' 2 Cor. iii. 5), that He will cause the members now broken off and split asunder 'to make increase in one body fitly joined together and compactly united' (Eph. iv. 16) and never again to be separated any more. In conclusion, I beseech your Holiness to send at least two Legates, with your divinely-inspired reply, and if anything be revealed to you by God touching this question, to communicate the same to us; for, under Synodical obligations, your legates and letter are due to us, the *one* to read, the *other* to be read, that so the scattered members may be united. We have also made the same request to the Pope of Old Rome; and I beseech you as brethren, and in the language of the Apostle, 'as though God did beseech you by us,' I entreat you that, making every research according to the powers given you by God, ye would make known the same to us; for it is written, 'The Priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at their mouth:' and we feel assured that ye preserve among you the seeds of the truth. Our religious and most orthodox Sovereigns are most anxious for the confirmation of the truth, and constantly beseech the Lord our God that according to Gregory, who bears the name of the Divine, 'we who are of *one* God may be *one*; that we, who are united in the acknowledgment of the Trinity, may be one in esteem of each other—one in soul; that we, who are of the same Holy Spirit, may not be at variance with each other, but in accordance with each other; that we, who are of the Truth, may think and speak the same thing, and that there be no contention or division amongst us: and, as we have but *one* baptism and *one* faith, so we may have but *one* harmonious agreement in every ecclesiastical matter.* 'And may the peace of God, which passeth all understanding,' conduct us to unanimity,

* Saint Gregory, successively Bishop of Sasima, Constantinople, and Nazianzum, was called "Theologus the Divine," from the depth of his theological knowledge. "He teaches knowledge (says Du Pin) in such a manner as is more suited to philosophers than the common people; but he is very sublime and very exact in the explication of mysteries, a quality which made him deserve the name of 'the Divine' by way of excellency." The passage quoted by Tarasius is taken from his first oration on peace: the occasion of those orations was the happy termination of some disputes between his father and the monks of Nazianzum.

unite the divided, heal our long-continued wounds, confirm all in the strength of faith, and of sincere and true confession, and in agreement with each other; and ever safely preserve His holy Church, and cause all scandals about her to cease for ever; which may it come to pass by the intercessions of our immaculate Mistress, the Mother of God, and of all the Saints. Amen."

PETER and PETER, Legates of Pope Adrian, said: "Our most holy Pope, having received an epistle of the same kind, sent us hither with his reply, which has been read in your presence."

JOHN, the Legate of the Eastern Dioceses, said: "This sacred letter and the piety of our Sovereigns it was which enabled us both to come hither and to escape the enmity of those lawless ones, the bitter enemies of our Church."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "God hath triumphantly brought you hither."

"CONSTANTINE, Deacon and Notary: "I have in my hands the octavos above mentioned, which have been sent from the East; and, if it be your good pleasure, I will read them to you."

The Council having signified their assent, he read as follows:—

"To the most holy and most blessed Lord and Master Tarasius Archbishop of Constantinople and Œcumenic Patriarch, the Chief Priests and Priests of the East: health in the Lord.

"When the most holy and divinely-inspired Epistle of your Paternal and Apostolic Holiness had been read by us, O most Blessed, we humble, and of all who delight to live in the desert most remote, were filled with mingled emotions of fear and joy—with *fear*, from the dread of those to whom for our sins we have been made to serve, who are verily the impious, and who, as it is written, 'walk on every side' (Psalm xii. 8); and who daily, so to speak, seek occasion against us to put us to death and to destroy us: with *joy*, on account of that integrity of orthodox faith—that most lucid exposition of doctrines taught by Apostles and Fathers—which shone upon us from your letter like the rays of the sun. Wherefore, most seasonably remembering it, we all most loudly joined in singing the hymn of Zecharias, Father of the voice of the WORD. The all-brilliant 'day spring

from on high* (Luke i. 78, 79) of a contemplative and divinely-illuminated mind, 'hath visited us, who sat in darkness and the shadow of death'—namely, of that wicked error, the Arabian blasphemy, 'to direct the feet' of our understanding into the way and paths of peace. 'Who shall rehearse the mighty acts of the Lord' (Psalm cvi. 2)? Let David, the 'father of God' (ὁ θεοπάτωρ) sing with us: 'He will make His praise to be known.' For the Lord hath pitied His afflicted people, and hath joined together that which was divided into one unity of faith; 'for He hath raised up for us a horn of salvation, (Luke i. 69) in the house and God-receiving temple of His only begotten Son our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, 'which house, O most blessed, are ye' (Heb. iii. 6); and they also who, according to the rule and order of the Church, occupy the second place, your victorious Sovereigns—chosen and crowned by God—the Lords of the world. For the priesthood is the sanctification and main support of the kingdom, and the kingdom is the strength and bulwark of the priesthood; concerning which a certain wise King, and amongst religious Sovereigns most blessed, has observed, 'The greatest gift which God has bestowed upon men are the priesthood and the imperial power—the one attending to and dispensing heavenly things, the other regulating the affairs of the world by just laws.' Now, indeed, 'the middle wall of partition hath been broken down' (Ephes. ii. 14): concord triumphs over discord—division yields to unity—dissension hath disappeared; 'and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding,' comes forth with cheerful countenance and with all confidence, and takes up its abode amongst us. Now is it that we who were once a reproach to our neighbours, and a hissing and a bye-word to those round about us and on this account were bowed down to the earth, do now again joyfully raise up our heads to the heavens and join with one accord in triumphantly singing with the Psalmist, 'By this I know that thou favourest me, because mine enemy doth not triumph over me'† (Psalm xli. 11); and when through my simplicity and inexperience I fell into error, thou hast recovered me, and having saved me, thou didst raise me up and didst fix my crippled feet upon the rock of the Apostolic Faith. To write these things and other things in accor-

* The synodals of Tarasius are here styled, "the day spring from on high"—words, it will be recollected, by which Zecharias signified Christ Himself. Was not this gross adulation, to apply to the work of an erring man that which belonged unto the Son of God?—but not one of the Bishops of this Council expressed the least disapprobation!

† Notwithstanding this boast, they dare not let the Emperor's messengers go to the Patriarchs at all; and, indeed, were forced to maintain the utmost secrecy and silence in giving the little degree of countenance which it appears they did.

dance with them, your divinely-composed epistle has excited us, which, in compliance with canonical law, and under the direction of good order received by tradition from our Fathers, ye have sent to us to whom is committed the rule of the Apostolic Thrones, by the hands of your religious, pious, and heaven-directed messengers. Who, when they arrived hither, and by special will and providence of God, had met with certain holy men, our most religious brethren—men who would give up their lives for the good order of the Church—who were recognised by their ancient and primitive habits—did exceedingly rejoice, and more especially as they found them both living in the same place, and there pursuing their godly course together. To these brethren, your messengers, having made themselves known, exhibited the godly and truly admirable epistle of your orthodoxy, and in accurate detail laid before them the God-pleasing sentiments of your Holiness and also the pious designs of our heaven-defended Sovereigns, their forethought for the common salvation of all, and their undaunted confidence in God. But our brethren, as though they had one soul in two bodies, so did they fulfil the Apostolic maxim, ‘to think the same thing;’ and under the influence of the Holy Spirit, prudently and warily concealed the brethren sent by you on account of the dread of the enemies of the cross which prevailed on all sides; and did not venture, although they were wise, either to confide in their own wisdom, or to forward the accomplishment of their purpose, the case requiring counsel and consideration the most profound and oft-repeated. ‘For good counsel (it is said) shall preserve thee and upright consideration shall keep thee’ (Prov. ii. 11, Sept.). After which, without informing those whom they had put in a place of safety, they made their way immediately to us; and having as quietly as possible called us together, they first bound our humility under pains of the most fearful condemnation to keep to ourselves that which they were about to declare to us, in this way making every provision for their own security, and then they revealed to us all that had happened to them. Amazed, and pricked to the heart and suffused with warm tears at this most wonderful narration—this change so contrary to all expectation—we rose up to pray as sinners with fear and trembling; and, having offered all due praise to Him who doeth all things and who doeth all for the best, we earnestly besought His goodness to be in the midst of us, His least ones, and, by His Holy Spirit, to cause the light of knowledge to shine into our hearts, and to grant us the faculty of consulting well for the common benefit of all, and of deciding in that which may best promote your most admirable design; and He who is good and gracious to man

granted our request. Wherefore, O most holy men, considering the hatred which the accursed nation bears to us, we determined with ourselves to keep back your messengers and entirely to forbid their going onward to those to whom they had been sent. Having therefore sent for them to come before us, we admonished them not to bring trouble or rather destruction on Churches now at peace and by God's grace enjoying some measure of quiet, and on a people already bowed down with the yoke of servitude and oppressed with a weight of most insupportable burdens. But they being much displeased said to us, 'For this purpose were we sent, to lay down our lives for the Church, so that we might effect the accomplishment of the designs of our most holy Patriarch and our most pious Sovereigns.' To whom we said in reply, 'If, indeed, the danger would exhaust itself on your lives only, your words would have weight; but, as it is likely to involve the whole body of the Church, what benefit can result, or rather what evil will not result, from your thus raising up a tottering building and destitute of proper foundation?' 'But (they rejoined) with what face can we return to those who sent us hither, having entirely failed in accomplishing that which they desired and expected from us?' At this we were not a little perplexed; but, remembering that there were with us our pious brethren John and Thomas—men who were renowned by sacred zeal for the orthodox faith, Syncelli* of the two great Patriarchs, though not on that

* Theophanes tells us that the Empress and the Patriarch sent their emissaries to Alexandria and Antioch the year before the Council was held, and that they actually reached the Patriarchs. "For as yet (he says) the truce with the Arabs had not as yet expired; and that they brought from Antioch John the Illustrious, famous both in word and in deed, who was Syncellus to the Patriarch of Antioch; and from Alexandria, Thomas, a most zealous and pious man and who had been Archbishop of the great city of Thessalonica, in Illyricum." So far Theophanes (*Chronograph. ad an. 777*). Theodore Studites, who, for some reason or other chose to decry this Council, gives quite a different account of these Vicars of the Eastern Seas. He affirms that the Orientals who appeared at the Council were *not sent* by the Patriarchs of the East, who at the time knew nothing about the Council, and indeed up to the present time are ignorant about it because of the peculiarities of their condition, but they were persuaded by our envoys to assume this office, and they did this in the hope of more easily recovering the people from their heresy, could they but have it to say that an Œcumenical Council had been held" (*Theod. Stud. lib. I. ep. 28 in Op. Sirm. t. 5, p. 319*). This latter account seems more consistent with the letter read in the Council at its third session.

The Romanists, as Maimburg and others, pretend that, as a year elapsed between this interview and the assembling of the Council at Nice, and during that year the Emperor's messengers, braving all dangers, actually reached the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and obtained the requisite sanction from them. Against this supposition is the silence of all ancient historians; the absolute contradiction of Theophanes, who makes them successful in their first mission; and, above all, the silence of the Legates and others at the Council, where it is never once hinted that any other sanction was given than

account less ardent as lovers of sanctifying solitude and silence—(ἀγιοποιοῦν ἡσυχίας)—we said to them, ‘Behold, now a time profitable for salvation—a time for things of more importance than silent retirement. Go ye with these men and make an apology for them, and declare by word of mouth to our Lords that which we hardly dare venture to make known to them by writing. For ye are well aware that on a very slight accusation, he who occupied the throne of James the brother of God has been banished to a distance of two thousand miles. And when ye have fulfilled the work of God, and have made known to our Lords the tradition which is held in all the Churches of God throughout Syria and Egypt, ye may then again embrace that which is so much desired by you.’ ‘And how shall we (they answered), obscure and unknown, and for such a purpose having neither strength nor ability, dare to venture on an undertaking which is utterly beyond our powers?’ ‘He (we replied) who wrought by means of obscure and ignorant men—namely, the Holy Apostles—and by them did reduce the whole world to the obedience of the word of His dispensation—even Christ our God, He is able to put a word into your mouth which shall fully come up to the meaning and intention of those who neither are in a condition to receive letters nor dare to write any in answer, or give the slightest intimation about any matters whatever.’ And they, as beloved of God and as children of obedience, were persuaded by our arguments and yielded to our request, whom after long and earnest prayer we dismissed, to the no small joy of those who had been sent to us, and we parted one from the other amidst floods of tears.

“But O most Holy and most Blessed, as becomes your paternal rank, give a kind welcome to our brethren; and, without hesitation or worldly fear, present them to the Lords of the world. For ye will have in them men intimately acquainted with the unanimous and concordant orthodoxy of the three Apostolic Sees, which indeed with one voice agree in acknowledging the *six* holy Œcumenic Councils; but that other, which some idly talk of as a *Seventh* in addition to these, they by no means admit: on the contrary, they utterly reject it as got together for the destruction of the tradition of the Apostles and Doctors of the Church, and for the utter extinction and abolition of holy and venerable images.

that mentioned in the epistle then read. From the whole, it appears that John and Thomas were not authorised by the Patriarchs to act in their name, and the Council of Nice had not the sanction of the Patriarchs of the East.—See *Barnage: Hist. de l’Eglise*, vol. 2, p. 1363; *Spanheim: Hist. Imag. Rest.*, p. 371-391; where this transaction is most fully discussed.

“Wherefore, O most Holy and Blessed—illuminated as ye are with sacred zeal—favoured as ye are with the good will of your heaven-defended Lords by just ordinance of God chosen to rule over you, and with the countenance of your heaven-protected and God-defended Senate—*be strong, and quit ye like men*: let your heart be strong apostolically, punishing all disobedience and reducing it to the obedience which is in Christ.

“This one thing we think absolutely necessary to suggest to the consideration of your sacerdotal Highness, that if by the good will of Christ our God—the universal King—and those who have been accounted worthy to reign with Him, our most pious and triumphant Sovereigns, ye be minded to assemble and hold a Council, that no umbrage should be taken from the absence of the Patriarchs of the three Apostolic Sees of the East and the most holy Bishops subject to them. For this arises not from any indisposition on their parts, but from dread of the horrible threats and deadly penalties inflicted by those who rule or rather tyrannize over them; and on this head we may do well to take into consideration the like case in respect of the sixth holy Œcumenic Council, at which no Bishop of those regions was present on account of the tyranny of the accursed; and yet no prejudice on this account was ever raised against, nor did there from hence arise any prohibition to, its determining and publishing abroad to all the right dogmas of piety; and more especially as the most holy and Apostolic Pope of Rome consented to it, and was as it were present himself in the persons of his Legates. In like manner may the same thing now be done by the permission of God; and as at that time the faith of that Assembly sounded forth to the ends of the world, so now may the faith of the Council, by the grace of Christ assembled together, by means of yourself and of him who sways the Apostolic throne of the chief of the Apostles, be preached wherever the sun displays his beams, as having raised up that which the hand of tyranny had destroyed, and restoring it to its ancient splendour, according to Apostolical tradition. But for the confirmation of our poor Epistle, and the satisfaction of your Lordship’s blessedness and of our victorious and triumphant Sovereigns, we have thought right to append to that which ourselves had written, a copy of the Synodals of our Father Theodore, now among the Saints, and once Patriarch of Jerusalem: which Synodical Epistle, in compliance with the established regulations of the Church, this same Theodore of holy memory wrote to the blessed and most holy Patriarchs of holy memory, Cosmas of Alexandria and Theodore of Antioch called Theopolis, and while yet living, re-

ceived from them Synodical Epistles in reply. May the Lord keep you in safety, and ever pray ye for us, O most holy and God-honoured Father."

"A Copy of the Synodals of Theodore, most holy Patriarch of Jerusalem.

"We believe, therefore, O ye most Blessed, as before time and from the beginning we have believed, in one God the Father Almighty, wholly without beginning or end of days, the Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God even the Father, and who knew no other original than the Father, and who from Him alone derived His substance:* Light of Light, very God of very God. And in one Holy Spirit, who proceedeth eternally from the Father, and who by Himself is acknowledged as **THE LIGHT** and as God, and who is truly co-eternal, consubstantial, and of

* This declaration of Theodore, that the Son "*knew no other origin than the Father and from Him derived His substance*," is censured in the "*Caroline Books*" as ambiguous:—

"We have shown, in a former chapter, that every confession of faith should be conspicuous, lucid, and free from ambiguities: since there is danger, if ambiguities be not avoided, that doubts will be excited as to the soundness of his faith who makes the confession, and that he shall seem, if not in intention, yet in word, to verge too near to heretical pravity. Wherefore, we must beware lest, from this profession of Theodore, who affirms that the Son knew no other origin than the Father, &c., we should surmise that the Father was before the Son in time; whereas He was co-eternal with Him, or was greater in substance, whereas He was consubstantial with Him, or higher in dignity, whereas He was equal to Him. No doubt the aforesaid Bishop himself believed rightly and piously what he said here, yet his words are so ambiguous as to leave room to others to doubt concerning his faith: for this is to be feared in such a profession, lest the Father should be considered more ancient than the Son because He begat Him, or lest the Son should be considered as *απρηξ* the Father because He was born of Him; whereas in the Holy Trinity none is afore or after another, for where nothing is begun from any particular period of time it follows that nothing can be completed in time: for, as the Three Persons are consubstantial with each other, so are they co-eternal; and as the generation of the Son from the Father is without time, so in like manner is the procession of the Holy Spirit from both is no less without time. The Father is the original of the Son—not by creation but by generation—not by preceding Him in time, but by begetting the ineffable Son, with whom the ineffable Father never was, ineffably co-eternal with Himself. The Son is not the *original* to the Father, but to all things which were made by Him. The Spirit in like manner is the *original* to all things made by Him; since He can by no means be separated from the appellation of the Creator. The Father and the Son are the original to the Holy Spirit—not by *generation*, because He is not the Son—not by *creation*, because He is not a creature—but by impartation, because He proceeds from both. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are *One* original to all things which have been made by them, the sole and only Creator: for though the Father be one original, the Son one original, and the Holy Ghost one original, yet are there not Three originals, but One original, One divinity, One substance, One omnipotence." The rest of the chapter is taken up with a long quotation from St. Augustin, a confutatory of the views which had been advanced above.—*Car. Lib.* l. iii. c. 4.

Adrian's answer to this censure is as follows:—That these Synodals were

the same tribe (*ὁμόφυλον*)* with the Father and the Son, and as of the same Nature and Essence so also of the same Godhead : a Trinity, consubstantial, equal in honour and dignity, united in one Deity, and

sent from Theodore of Jerusalem, Cosmas of Alexandria, and Theodore of Antioch, to his predecessor Paul, and were afterwards approved and confirmed at a Council held by his predecessor Stephen, at which several French prelates were present, and at which they anathematized all who did not adore the image of the Saviour, and that Theodore's language is justified by language of a similar nature found in the Fathers, of whose writings he brings forward very many passages. With respect to the mission of these Synodals from Theodore, &c., nothing, says Spanheim, can be further from the truth :—"For, besides that at the Council of Nice no mention was ever made of any such Legation, neither by the Legates of the Eastern Dioceses nor by the emissaries of Adrian, we have Adrian's own words in his Epistle to the Emperor read in the Second Session :—'All the people that is in the East have erred about venerable images till God raised you to the Throne.' How could this be the case if such a Legation as this had actually taken place, testifying to the adherence of so large a portion of the East to the doctrine and practice of image worship? Add to this the silence of Nicephorus and Theophanes, and the dreadful subjection of those Seas under Calif Abdallah.—*Spanheim : Hist. Imag. Rest.* p. 374, 375.

With respect to the passages alleged, none seem directly to the purpose but that of St. Sophronius, taken from a confession of faith which he presented to the Sixth General Council, in which are the very words of Theodore. The passage is as follows :—"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, who was eternally and impassively begotten of God, and who knew no other original than the Father, and who had not His substance from any other source than the Father." This would prove, not that Theodore was right, but that St. Sophronius was deserving of censure.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. iii. c 1, 2.

* The expression, *ὁμόφυλον*, "Contribulum," is censured in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 5) as both superfluous and incorrect :—"This most absurd expression, which ought never to appear in the confession of a Catholic, is rejected not merely by those who have some literary skill and experience, but even by those who have any acquaintance with letters at all. It readily occurs to us that as those are called *consanguinei* who are of the same blood, those *consortes* who are of the same company, those *co-ætates* and *co-ævi* who are of the same age, those *conformes* who are of the same form, so those are styled *contribuli* who are of the same tribe. Now a tribe signifies a multitude of persons, whether derived from one common stock, as the twelve tribes were derived from Jacob, or who fulfil any particular office, as the Roman people were divided into three ranks by Romulus—viz., Senators, Soldiers, and the Plebes; but to God, the Chief Good, One supreme, One head of all, One in substance, Three in Person, the epithet 'Contribulus,' ought not to be applied: for this name is not in other cases applied, except where some tribe exists. The Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son—not of the same tribe with them: for if He were of the same tribe with them, then is He united to the Father and the Son only by society of tribe or relationship, which it is profane to say; and then what is not only absurd but even impious to believe, if He were only united in this way to them, He would not be consubstantial with them; but He is consubstantial with them, and, therefore, not to be believed to be of the same tribe (*contribulum*), nor must be so called." In conclusion, it is remarked, that such a term is never found in any of the books of the Fathers, and that in all our disputations on sacred subjects they should be our guides.

That Adrian replied to this censure may be gathered from his answer to Charlemagne (p. 3); but his reply seems to be lost, for the passages which are found there have no kind of relation to that censure, though they do apply to another censure of the "Caroline Books"—namely, to that of the Devil and the Monk, which is found in the next Session.

conjoined in one common dominion, without any personal or hypostatical confusion or division. We believe a Trinity in Unity, and we glory in a Unity in Trinity—a Trinity in the Three Persons—a Unity in the singularity of Deity; for neither is the proper Unity confounded, nor the Trinity altogether divided, but rather the one is preserved in and by the other: for though *divided* into numerical hypostases, and numbered by the distinction of Person, it is united by the sameness of essence and nature and does not admit a complete separation. For there is one God—wherefore oneness of Deity is distinctly declared and acknowledged in a Trinity of Persons. And as God is one God and one Godhead, so neither can He be divided into *Three Gods*, which is the Arian blasphemy; and again, forasmuch as the one God is and is acknowledged as Three, and three hypostases are declared to exist in Him, and Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are spoken of, so neither can He be so united or identified as to confound these Three in one Person, which is the impiety of the Sabellians. Wherefore, it has been well defined by Theologians, that we must believe a Unity in one and singular Deity, and a Trinity in three unconfused Persons: for we acknowledge this ONE God to be no other than these THREE Persons; and these the *Three consubstantial Persons* of the Trinity—namely, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—we know to be no other than this ONE GOD. Wherefore, we affirm the ONE to be THREE, IN which the Deity exists; and we declare the THREE to be ONE, OF which the Deity consists; or, to speak more truly, which THREE are, and are acknowledged to be, the DEITY.

“ We believe also in *One* of this holy consubstantial Trinity, our Lord Jesus Christ, ‘ who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,’ as saith the Apostle; ‘ but made Himself of no reputation, and took on Him the form of a servant:’ for, though He was of the same substance and dignity with the Father, yet in these last times He did not disdain to be born of our holy and undefiled Lady the Mother of God—taking a body from her endued with a rational and intelligent soul, the first fruits of *our Mass*, conceived not by human generation, but by special operation of the Spirit. Thus, from two contrary* natures, one proceeded; ‘ for God, the Word, being perfect God by nature, the same became perfect Man in nature; and thus neither confusing the *nature*, nor taking a mere appearance of incarnation, He was without division, and without confusion, united in person to the flesh endued with a rational and immortal soul which

* *Contrary* (says Binius) in this way—the *one* visible and mortal, the *other* invisible and immortal, as he explains it himself a little afterwards.

He received from the holy Virgin, and which had been appointed an existence in Him—neither changing the nature of Deity into the essence of flesh, nor the essence of His flesh into the nature of His Godhead. Therefore, the two natures, united without change to each other, in the one person of *God the Word*, have manifested to us one *Son and Lord*, the same both *visible and invisible, mortal and immortal, circumscribed and uncircumscribed, perfect God and perfect Man*, to be acknowledged in *two* natures, and to be worshipped in *two* self-operating energies and wills. For unless He were God by nature, He could not act as God, nor again could He act as Man, unless He had become Man by nature. This person, therefore, who was truly God and Man, we confess to have been crucified for our salvation; to have tasted death in the flesh; to have remained in the sepulchre three days; to have risen from the dead after that, by the power of His own Godhead He had despoiled hell, and had set at liberty those who had for ages past been imprisoned there; to have been taken up into heaven and to have sat down on the right hand of the Father; and that He shall come again, agreeably to the words of the Incorporeal to the Apostles in His second advent, to judge the quick and the dead. And we confess also the resurrection of the dead in the last day, in consequence of the sound of the archangelic trumpet; and the retribution according to the just judgment of Christ our God awarded to those who have lived well or who have lived otherwise; and the life of the world to come which has no end.

“ We receive, consent to, and heartily embrace the six holy *Æcumenic Councils*, which were assembled at various times and in divers places by the Holy Spirit against all heresies; to which the Churches of the orthodox throughout the world, loudly declaring their adherence, are confirmed in right and divinely-inspired doctrine: and we admit those whom they admitted and reject those whom they rejected.

“ The *First* of which Councils was that assembled at Nice,* con-

* As the six General Councils are often appealed to in the Sessions of this Council, some passing general notice may here be taken of them. The first was summoned by Constantine the Great, and met at the city of Nicæa, on the 22nd of May, or 19th of June, A.D. 325, and was concluded on the 25th of August of the same year. Hosius Bishop of Corduba is generally reputed to have been the President: on this account, some Romish authors would fain make out that he was a Legate of the Bishop of Rome. Sylvester being in years, sent Vincent and Vitus as his representatives; the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Byzantium (afterwards Constantinople) were present in person. At this Council Arius was condemned; the Creed styled *Nicene* was made and agreed to; an end was put to the Meletian Schism among the Egyptians, and the controversy about Easter was finally settled. It was determined that Easter-day should always be a Sunday, in conformity with the

sisting of three hundred and eighteen Fathers, for the subversion of the insanity which took the name of Arius, and of his soul-destroying blasphemies. Whom, as endeavouring to divide and sever the one unconfused Deity, and as babbling that the Son of the Father, by whom all things were created, was Himself a creature, and was brought into existence from things which were not, together with His associates, it anathematized and drove far away from the sacred courts. Which, furthermore, did determine that our Lord Jesus Christ was born before all ages, without time, with emanation, of the substance and essence of the Father: and that He was consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Spirit; and, by its creed and confession of the true faith, did clearly teach the whole mystery relative to the dispensation of Christ.

“The *Second* was that of the one hundred and fifty Fathers which was convened at Constantinople* against Macedonius the adversary of

practice of the Western Church. Twenty canons were here passed for the regulation of Church matters: sixty others have been added to this collection, some very favourable to the Romish Church. Du Pin rejects them as spurious. The only *authentic* remains of this Council are its creed with the anathemas subjoined, the epistle of the Council to the Egyptians, its twenty canons, and its decree concerning the celebration of Easter. The records of the acts of this Council, if ever there were any, are lost. Some say the Arians destroyed them. Du Pin does not think that there ever were any such records compiled. It was at this Council that Paphnutius Bishop of Thebais prevented the imposition of the yoke of celibacy on the clergy, saying, “that the necks of the clergy and those who had entered into holy orders were not to be weighed down with so grievous a burthen.”—*Soc. Eccles. His.*, lib. ii. c. ii.

* This Council was summoned by Theodosius the Great to Constantinople to put down the heresy of Macedonius formerly Bishop of that city, who had denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost and affirmed that he was a creature. According to Du Pin, there were three assemblies of Bishops held at Constantinople at three several times, all which are included under the title of “The second Œcumenical Council.” Its first assembly was held A.D. 381, at which Meletius Bishop of Antioch presided. Maximus the Patriarch of Constantinople was deposed, and Gregory of Nazianzum was chosen in his place. The four first of the canons of the Council were framed at this Session. Its proceedings were disturbed by Timothy Patriarch of Alexandria, and closed by the death of Meletius. The second Assembly was held in A.D. 382. Gregory, finding the Eastern Bishops opposed to him, abdicated the Patriarchate and Nectarius was chosen in his room. The creed of the Council is reputed to have been made at this meeting. It is the same with the Nicene, except a few additions—viz, after “to judge both the quick and the dead,” is added “whose kingdom shall have no end.” Again: after “I believe in the Holy Ghost,” is added, “The Lord and Giver of life who proceedeth from the Father,” &c., as it now stands in our Liturgy, with the exception of the words, “and the Son.” These additions were rejected at the Council of Ephesus: they were, however, approved at the Council of Chalcedon. Some angry correspondence followed between the Bishops of the West and the East, which ended in both having their own way. The last Assembly was held A.D. 383—Nectarius presided. The letter of the Bishops of the West was read and answered: an edict was published against all heresies, and probably the three last canons of the Council were framed on this occasion. In none of these assemblies was the Bishop of Rome present, either in person or by his Legates: whatever was done there was

the Holy Ghost, and his crew of impious Semi-Arians: which holy Council, having as its guide and direction this same Holy Spirit, did determine that the Holy Spirit had its *procession*, without time and eternally from the Father, and was consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and is together with them to be worshipped and glorified. And, further, it subjected to its most awful anathemas those who had uttered unpardonable blasphemies against this same Comforter, together with the foolish Apollinarius, who, being himself without sense (*ἀνοῦν*), did foolishly assert that the Saviour as *Man* was in like manner without sense (*ἀνοῦν*).

“The *Third* Council, the first of Ephesus,* consisting of two hun-

done entirely without his aid. It was long before the Bishops of Rome would admit among the canons of the Church Catholic those framed by this Council.

The second and third canons militate against the ambition of the Romish See, and need no little Jesuitical treatment to make them palatable. Of this Council all that remains is, 1, a synodical epistle; 2, its creed; 3, its seven canons. It is remarkable that the Creed of Constantinople does not recognise the *procession* of the Holy Spirit from the Son, but from the Father only. This Council is mentioned by Socrates, l. v. c. viii.; by Sozomen, l. vii. c. vii., and l. ix. c. xii.; by Theodoret, l. v. c. viii., ix.; see also Du Pin, and Cave, *Hist. Lit.* on the second Council.

* This Council was summoned by Theodosius the Second to meet at Ephesus, A.D. 481. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria presided, and that in his *own* right, and not as Legate of the Bishop of Rome. The records of this Council, unlike those of the two former, are very full and of great length. They occupy, in the “Collection of Concilia,” by Binius, 478 pages. These records are divided into three parts—the first, treating of occurrences which took place before the Council commenced; the second, containing the acts of the Council; the third, relating to events which happened partly while the Council was sitting and partly when it had closed. Notice will only be taken here of the second of these which contains the sessions of the Council.

Session 1 was held June 22. Nestorius was then summoned before the Council; and, as he did not obey the summons, he was condemned as a heretic. This was done on the authority of Cyril only: no other Patriarch was present; for he treated the Pope's Legates with as little ceremony as he did John Patriarch of Antioch—that is, he would wait for neither. Session 2 was held July 10. The Legates of Celestine Bishop of Rome having arrived read his letters before the Council. Session 3 was held July 11. Cyril's sentence of deposition against Nestorius was read in the presence of the Council and confirmed by it. In the subscriptions Cyril's name precedes that of Celestine's Legates. Session 4 was held July 16. In this session Cyril vindicates himself against the excommunication pronounced by John Patriarch of Antioch, and cites him and his party to answer for their conduct. Session 5 held July 17. Cyril excommunicates the aforesaid Patriarch and his party. In these two sessions, as Cyril was accused and had to defend himself, he could not preside. Juvenal Patriarch of Jerusalem presided, and his signature precedes those of the Pope's Legates, so little was then thought of the supremacy of the Pope. Session 6 was held July 22. The Council, after having brought forward fresh matter of accusation against Nestorius, declare their inviolable attachment to the creed of the Council of Nice, from which they pretended that he had turned aside. Session 7, held on July 31, was occupied in matters of discipline. Six Canons, according to Du Pin and Cave—according to others, eight—were made at this closing session. A decree of Sisinnius Patriarch of Constantinople against the Messalians was confirmed. The Coun-

dred holy Fathers, shone glorious in the subversion and rejection of the man-worshipping Nestorius and his partizans, who, deluded by his own private accursed speculations, did vainly prate that the *Word*, which was before all ages, was *One* person, and that He, who, for our salvation took flesh of the holy Virgin, was *another*; and thus did this impious wretch, without intending to do so, add a fourth person to the holy and consubstantial Trinity. Nor was he content with dividing the two united natures in Christ into two persons, but this *accursed man* did further abjure the name *θεοτόκος* (Mother of God); and did wickedly ordain that she should be called (*Χριστοτόκον*) Mother of Christ, who was really the Mother of God, who, before and after His birth, was a Virgin, and was created in glory and splendour superior to every intelligent and sensible nature. Him, therefore, together with his soul-destroying follies, did this holy Council of two hundred Fathers anathematize, and did also teach that the Son, who, before all ages, did gloriously exist in the bosom of the Father, was one and the same with Him who, in these last days, took our nature upon Him, and was born of Mary the immaculate Virgin and Mother of God: and proclaimed this same Son of God to be perfect God and perfect Man—that is, the one Son to be both Christ and Lord, and the incarnate nature of God the Word to be absolutely one, which signifies the union according to hypostasis of the two natures; and decreed that holy Mary was rightly and truly to be called the Mother of God.

“And not less seasonably did the divinely-chosen Council of six hundred and thirty Fathers meet at Chalcedon,* for the subversion of

cil did not, in the first instance, conduce to the peace of the Church. The Patriarch of Antioch was still dissatisfied; and it was not till after much angry correspondence, intriguing, and threatening, that he united with Cyril in condemning the unfortunate Nestorius, which condemnation he had before considered to be most unjust.

* This Council was summoned by the Emperor Marcian, and met, A.D. 450, in the church of St. Euphemia. The records of this assembly are very full and particular, and disclose some scenes which are far from edifying. The Pope's Legates presided in all its sessions but the fifteenth, when, in their absence, the Patriarch of Constantinople presided. Notwithstanding, the decisions of that session are quite equal in authority to those of any other of its sessions. Session 1, was held Oct. 8. Dioscorus Patriarch of Alexandria, Juvenal Patriarch of Jerusalem, and some others, were deposed as having taken a part in the heretical Conventicle held at Ephesus. Session 2, held on Oct. 13, was taken up chiefly with reading the epistle of Leo Bishop of Rome. Session 3, on the same day, the deposition of Dioscorus was confirmed. Session 4, on October 17, Juvenal and others were permitted to make their recantation and to take their seats in the Council; and, after much altercation, thirteen Egyptian Bishops were permitted to do the same. Session 5, held October 22. A definition of faith was read before the Council. This was opposed by the Papal

that heretical delusion which confounded the natures in Christ, which the stolid Eutyches from his stolidity originated, who denied that the two natures were united in Christ without change, and most prodigiously asserted that *one* nature was compounded from the *two*, who, together with his patron and vindicator the infamous Dioscorus, were convicted as having misrepresented the doctrines of orthodoxy and as being the opponents of the truth. Both these, therefore, did this holy Council utterly demolish, and laid their absurd frivolities together with themselves under the weight of rigid anathemas; and, furthermore, did declare that the *two* natures in Christ were united in *one* person without confusion, conversion, or change; and that this same person was perfect both in the Godhead and in the Manhood, and is to be acknowledged to be *of* two natures and *in* two natures; and, in addition, did denounce the 'division' of the accursed Nestorius and himself also together with his partisans.

"After which followed the *Fifth** Ecumenical Council of one hun-

Legates, who were anxious to have it incorporated with the synodical letter of their master. The other Bishops would not consent, and said that, *if the Legates were dissatisfied, they might go back to Rome.* Session 6, October 25. The Emperor Marcian came into the Council and made some propositions, which were received with acclamation. Session 7, on the same day, a dispute between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem was settled. Session 8, on the same day, Theodoret was browbeaten into the condemnation of Nestorius. He was a man of more true wisdom, sense, and judgment, than all the 650 Fathers together, yet he was most shamefully treated. Sessions 9 and 10, both on the same day with the above, Ibas Bishop of Edessa was absolved from excommunication and received into the Council. Sessions 11, 12, 13, 14, were all occupied in settling private disputes among the various Bishops. Session 15 was held on October 31. Thirty canons were submitted to the Council and adopted by it in the absence of the Romish Legates, the twenty-eighth of which is very offensive to the Romish Church. The Romanists could never bear with this resolution of the Council of Chalcedon, because it grounds the Primacy of the Bishops of Rome, as well as Constantinople, on the *emissancy* of those two cities; *not* on any *divine right*, and equals the latter to the former in all respects, except only bare precedence of place, the woman's point of honour (Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, vol. 2, p. 154). Session 16 was held on November 1: the Legates of Leo tried every effort, but happily in vain, to get rid of this obnoxious Canon. "The Bishops (says Du Pin) declared that they would go on; and the Commissioners, without any regard to the Pope's Legates, declared that *all* the Synod had given their approbation to this determination."

* This Council was summoned by Justinian the Great, A.D. 553, for the condemnation of certain writings styled the "Three Chapters," which were the whole works of Theodore Bishop of Mopsuestia; a letter of Ibas Bishop of Edessa; and some writings of Theodoret against Cyril. The occasion of the condemnation was this: the Nestorians looked on the Council of Chalcedon as in some degree favourable to themselves, because these writings had not been condemned there: the Eutychians, for the same reason, looked on that Council as hardly orthodox. To depress the former and conciliate the latter was the object Justinian had in view in convening this assembly. It consisted of eight sessions, called "Collations." The records, for the most part, are extant

dred and sixty Fathers, which was assembled in the *Royal City*, and guided by the Holy Spirit confirmed the four Councils which preceded it; and, in pursuance of their orthodox decisions, anathematised Nestorius, Eutyches, and Theodore of Mopsuestia with his blasphemies;

only in Latin. Collation i. took place on May 3. Justinian's letter was read; an invitation was sent to Pope Vigilius to invite his attendance at the Council, to which he returned no answer. Collation ii., May 8. The deputation which was sent by the Council to Pope Vigilius stated their ill success, after which the magistrates who had been sent on a similar mission made a like report; certain other bishops were cited to appear but they would not come. Collation iii., May 9. The Fathers declare their exact and entire agreement with the four former Councils, and that they receive and condemn just as those Councils receive or condemn. Collation iv., May 12. A creed attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia was read, which being very unorthodox, and being taken as a sample of the rest of his works, without any further examination the Bishops cried out, "Anathema to the creed, the writings, and the person of Theodore, and anathema to all who do not anathematise him." Collation v., May 13. Testimonies of Cyril and others against Theodore were read. The question was agitated whether they could anathematise a dead man, and it was determined in the affirmative. The obnoxious writings of Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus were read and condemned in this session. Collation vi., May 12. The letter of Ibas Bishop of Edessa was read and condemned. Collation vii., May 26. Vigilius sent in to the Emperor a letter which is styled "Constitutio," in which he condemns the proceedings of the Council in a very sensible manner, and forbids all persons to say or write anything against what he had proposed therein. The Emperor causes certain letters to be read in Council, written by Vigilius, in opposition to his own *Constitutio*. Collation viii., June 2, contains the general decree of the Council and fourteen anathemas against all heresies.

"The Pope (says Dr. Crakanthorpe—Comber's *Roman Forgeries in Councils*, p. 292) changed his opinion no less than four times: when the edict was first set forth by Justinian he opposed it; when he came to Constantinople he changed his mind and condemned the 'Three Chapters'; when the fifth Council was assembled he again condemned the Imperial edict and defended the 'Three Chapters,' and actually was banished for his contumacy; and, lastly, wearied of his banishment, he finally condemned the 'Three Chapters.'" So much for his infallibility! Du Pin's judgment of this *venerandum Concilium* is as follows:—"The Church was put in wonderful confusion about an affair of very small consequence. For what was the advantage of condemning the 'Three Chapters?' Or why were they defended with so much stiffness! Those who condemned and those who maintained them professed the same faith. Had the question never been agitated the Church would have enjoyed a profound peace, and the people would not have been scandalised with witnessing such dreadful divisions in the Church."

Of Theodore of Mopsuestia Du Pin says:—"It is certain that his writings were full of harsh expressions, which seems to favour the opinion of those who admitted two Persons in Jesus Christ; but, as he wrote before the condemnation of Nestorius, it seems that these might be pardoned, especially as the like are found in other authors, and he in many other places professed to acknowledge one person and two natures in Christ. The Council was not only absurd but mischievous: by its means the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia have been lost to the world. He was held in great esteem by Chrysostom and Theodoret while living, though decried as a heretic after his death. To say nothing else, he deserves credit as a Christian author, inasmuch as (according to Photius) he despised allegorical and mystical interpretations of Scripture and insisted much on moral topics. It is probable that he wrote commentaries on the whole Bible."—See *Du Pin on the Fifth Council*, also on *Theod. Mops.*, vol. iii, p. 64.—*Rosenmuller Hist. Interpt.*, lib. sac. iii. 250.

and moreover, it anathematised Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus, and their fabulous and heathen mystifications, together with the epistle said to be sent from Ibas to Maris of Persia, and the writings of Theodoret against the twelve orthodox chapters of St. Cyril.

“ After which the *Sixth* holy Council of two hundred and eighty-nine Fathers shone forth as another sun, having found a resting place in the Royal City ;* where, having exposed those who denied the too self-operating wills and energies in the incarnate dispensation of

* This Council was summoned by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 680, and held in a hall of the palace named *Trullus*. Agatho Pope of Rome sent two Priests and one Deacon as his Legates. George Patriarch of Constantinople, Macarius Patriarch of Antioch, were there in person; the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem sent Legates to represent them; John Bishop of Thessalonica, who was present, is styled Legate of the Pope, which makes Cave say that Agatho sent four Legates. The Council consisted of eighteen Sessions. Session 1st was held Nov. 7th: the acts of the Council of Ephesus were read. Session 2nd, Nov. 10th: the acts of the Council of Chalcedon were read. Session 3rd, Nov. 13th: the acts of the fifth Council were read, and some supposititious letters were found to have been inserted. Session 4th, Nov. 15th: the lengthy epistles of Pope Agatho were read to the Council. Session 5th, Dec. 6th: Macarius the Patriarch of Antioch presented two sheets of quotations from the Fathers in favour of the Monothelite doctrine. Session 6th, Feb. 13th (A.D. 681): Macarius presented a third sheet of quotations. Session 7th, Feb. 13th: the Pope's Legates presented a sheet to the Council containing passages from the Fathers confirming the doctrine of the two wills. Session 8th, March 7th: the Patriarch of Constantinople declares his agreement with the Bishops of the West. Macarius was deposed. Session 9th, March 8th: the Council is occupied in examining the quotations presented by Macarius. Session 10th, March 18th: the counter testimonies of Pope Agatho were approved. Session 11th, March 19th: A letter of S. Sophronius Patriarch of Jerusalem was read. Session 12th, March 20th: Certain letters of the Monothelite party are read—one from Honorius of Constantinople, in which he approves of the suppression of the expressions *the one or two wills*, having found nothing of them in the Scriptures, among the Fathers, or in former Councils. Session 13th, March 28th: the letter of Honorius is read over again: on which the Council declared that he had wholly followed the impious doctrine of Sergius, and they anathematised him. What a blow for infallibility and supremacy! (*Gemani Baronii, Binni, Surii, Maimbourgii, &c.*). Session 14th, April 5th: Certain forged writings are detected and condemned. Session 15th, April 15th: Polychronius a Monothelite Presbyter declared that he was able to raise a dead man to life by laying his confessions upon him. A body was brought, he makes the trial, and fails, much to the joy of the orthodox: would the orthodox, had they tried the same plan, have succeeded any better? The poor fellow was anathematised. Session 16th, August 9th: one Constantine wished to mediate between the parties; presents his confession, he is ordered to recant forthwith, and on his refusal is driven from the Council amidst a shower of orthodox scurrilities as Manichean, &c. Session 17th, Sept. 11th: a definition of the true orthodox faith was propounded. Session 18th, Sept. 16th: the definition before mentioned is read over again, approved and subscribed by all the Bishops of the Council who were present. As Macarius was deposed, Theophanes the new Patriarch of Antioch signed in his stead. They concluded with putting up many prayers for the Emperor, and pronounced anathemas against all heretics, ancient and modern; and, among the rest, against Honorius who is always named among the Monothelite Patriarchs. The miserable shifts to which Baronius, &c., are reduced, in order to save In-

our Lord, and absurdly declared that there was but one will and operation in the Godhead and Manhood of our Saviour Jesus Christ: it anathematised them all—namely, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Peter, Cyrus, *Honorius*, Theodore of Pharan, and that old dotard Polychronius; with all who had defined, did then define, or should hereafter dare to define, that there was but *one* will and *one* operation in the *two* natures of Christ. For if, as a wise man in a certain place has observed, we leave the human nature of our Lord without a will and an operation, how can the integrity of the human nature be preserved? Therefore, having determined that there were two wills and two operations corresponding to the two natures of Christ as their natural properties, they most plainly unfolded the great mystery of the dispensation of the Saviour, and safely preserved for all who are truly wise the orthodox faith of all the Churches of God, free from ambiguity or perversion! These six holy Councils are all that we consider Œcumenic; and indeed, besides these, we wish for no other, since there is not now left anything, whether of Apostolic Tradition or of legitimate exposition of the Fathers, which needs any amendment or any addition or improvement of any kind whatever. Therefore, with our whole heart and soul we anathematise collectively and distributively all evil-minded heretics as the seed of tares, followers of Satan, and soul-destroying teachers, from their abandoned

fallibility in the person of Honorius, are ably exposed by Du Pin.—*Eccles. Hist.* vol. 6, pp. 71, 72.

The Greeks, under the title of the Sixth Council, include a Supplementary Council held in the same place as the former, and convened by Justinian II. for the purpose of discipline, A.D. 692. It is by some styled the *Quinisextine*, as being summoned to supply the defect of the fifth and sixth Councils, which had made no Canons. Here were made one hundred and two Canons, which were subscribed by the four Patriarchs of the East; and, as the Greeks say, by the Pope's Legates. In the present copies of the Council, the signatures of these Legates is wanting as well as those of certain other Bishops more immediately connected with Rome. Pope Sergius refused to receive it, and to this day it is rejected by the Romish Church. Several of its Canons were highly offensive to that Church, among which are the thirteenth Canon, which decrees that Clergymen—i. e., Priests and Deacons—may live with their wives, and that if any would separate between the Clergy and their wives that they be deposed; and likewise, if any of the Clergy put away their wives, that they be deposed; and this, notwithstanding the Church of Rome had made a Canon to a contrary effect. Also the thirty-sixth Canon, which puts the Churches of Rome on an equality in respect of jurisdiction. Also the fifty-fifth Canon, which forbids fasting on Saturdays, except on Easter Eve. Binus and that party style the Council, "Conciliabulum," "Pseudo-synodum," "Synodum erraticam," "Conventum malignantium," "Synagogam Diaboli." He tries hard to prove that all who signed it were Monothelites, notwithstanding its express approbation of the sixth Council and condemnation of the Monothelites. Cave has ably refuted this falsification.—See *Cave's Hist. Lit.* vol. i., p. 609; *Johnson's Vade Mecum*, vol. ii., p. 264; *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist.* vol. vi., p. 85.

head Simon Magus, down to their most execrable tail; and specially those whom the six holy Œcumenic Councils have anathematised. Together with these I denounce Severus head of the Monophysite Acephali,* together with his followers; Peter the Fuller, who audaciously dared to make addition to the Trisagion,† and presumed to impute suffering to the impassable Deity; and all who follow his blasphemies. Nor do we reject, but altogether receive and approve, all the various holy local Synods which have been convened, and the canonical regulations and soul-profitng ordinances which, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, have been set forth in them.

“Moreover, that Apostolic tradition of the Church, by which we are taught to honour, worship, and salute the Saints, we receive; and we embrace them, honouring them and declaring them to be servants, friends, and sons of God; for the honour displayed to the more eminent of our fellow servants is proof of affection towards our common Lord. They are the chambers and pure dwelling-places of God, and most spotless mirrors of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, ‘their souls are in the hand of God’ (Wisdom iii. 1), as it is written; and as God is light and life, the Saints, being in the hand of God, dwell in light and life. And on this account ‘Precious in the sight of God is the death of His Saints’ (Psalm cxvi. 15); and ‘They living, stand with boldness in the presence of God’ (Wisdom v. 1). And Christ our Master has granted to us their *relics*—those founts of salva-

* The Acephali were a body of Egyptian Monophysites, who forsook the communion of Peter Mongus Patriarch of Alexandria, because he had subscribed to the Emperor Zeno’s edict called “Henoticon,” which they found fault with, as not condemning in express words the Council of Chalcedon. They subsisted in this divided state for three hundred years. They joined communion with Severus Patriarch of Antioch; but, after that he was deposed and banished, they still maintained a separate existence without any acknowledged head or leader. See *Mosheim’s History of the Church*, Cent. v. part ii. s. 19, 20.

† Peter the Fuller was Patriarch of Antioch for a short time during the reign of the Emperor Zeno. In order, it may be, to favour his Eutychian notions, he added to the Trisagion the words “who was crucified for us.” This Trisagium was taken from Isaiah vi. 3, where it is said the angels sang one to another, “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts.” Proclus Patriarch of Constantinople, in compliance with some pretended revelation, added to the words of Scripture as follows: “Holy God, Holy Strong, Holy Immortal Lord God of Sabaoth.” Peter, who thought he could, in like manner, make some improvement to the words “Holy Strong,” added these, “who was crucified for us.” This addition, though now used by the Oriental Churches as perfectly orthodox, was considered on its first introduction, by the Emperor Anastasius, as replete with heresy. It well nigh cost the Emperor his crown and his life, and days were spent in robbery and bloodshed to restore the orthodox Trisagion. In addition to this civil sedition, the Emperor had to meet with the sudden irruption of Huns and Bulgarians under their King Vitallian, who had declared himself champion of the Catholic faith. Orthodoxy was at length established by the devastation of Thrace and the murder of 65,000 Christians, and the Emperor was forced to receive the Council of Chalcedon.

tion whence flow forth manifold benefits to the diseased, from which ointments redolent with sweet odours are distilled, and by which demons are driven away. For, as the great teacher who bears the surname of *Immortal* [Athanasius] declares, 'The bones of the martyrs put to flight diseases, heal the sick, cause the blind to see, cleanse the lepers, put an end to trials and sorrows, and all this from Christ dwelling in them. Wherefore, well doth the Psalmist declare, 'God is wonderful in His Saints' (Psalm lxxii. 8); and again, (*ἀνθρῶς*), 'In His Saints which are on the earth, the Lord hath magnified all His will towards them' * (Psalm xvi. 2). In addition to these we worship and embrace venerable images—namely, the image of God the Word, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who for our sakes became incarnate and took upon Him the form of a servant. Which image and figure is not intended as the resemblance of the Godhead which was united inseparably to His divine flesh; for the divine nature is invisible, uncircumscribed, and without form: 'For no one hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, He hath declared Him' (John i. 18); but it is the image of His manhood which we paint and which we worship. For though He was God and invisible, nevertheless He appeared on earth, and was seen of men, being brought up together with them, and He laboured and hungered and thirsted according to the law of our nature which He had taken upon Him. We worship therefore the image of Christ—that is, of the personal appearance which was seen among men, from which His invisible Deity was never separated—(away with the supposition!); but to which it was united from earliest conception. For though He said to the Jews, 'Why do you seek to kill me, A MAN that hath told you the truth?' (John viii. 40); he was not, therefore, mere Man, but God also; so again, when He said, 'I and the Father are one' (John x. 30), He meant not to deny our nature; for He spake these things with a human mouth and organic tongue. And we worship and honour the image of His immaculate Mother, who begat Him in a manner which cannot be spoken, the holy Mother of God, our all-

* The "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 10), censure the manner in which they suppose Theodore to have made these quotations from the Psalms, as if he had intended actually that the verses stood together and followed each other. The censure is grounded in the word "*continuo*," which was found in the translation transmitted to Charlemagne; but for which, according to our present copies, Theodore is not answerable, as the word found in his synodals is *ἀνθρῶς*, which does not answer to "*continuo*." A much more serious charge might be brought against Theodore for perverting and misapplying the Scriptures, as neither the one verse nor the other has even the slightest allusion to dead men's bones, that "*illud pulvisculum nescio quid*" of St. Vigilantius.

holy Mistress. We worship also the images of the holy Apostles, and the Prophets, and victorious Martyrs, and of holy and righteous men, as being the friends of God. Nor do we offer our worship to the paint or to the wood ; but, making use of these, we direct our minds to the prototype : to this we ascribe our praise and reverence, knowing that according to the illustrious Basil ‘the honour of the image passeth on to the prototype.’ But, forasmuch as some who contentiously set themselves against us and say that we ought not to worship the images of the Saints, because that they are made with hands, senselessly or rather impiously calling them “idols,” let such persons know that the cherubim, the mercy-seat, the ark, the table*—all which Moses prepared by the divine command—were made with hands and WERE WORSHIPPED. The Scripture condemns those who worshipped graven images, ‘and who did sacrifice to devils’ † (1 Cor. x. 9) ; for the sacrifice of the heathen is an abomination, while that of the just is acceptable. As images are a more express kind of writing, we ought to honour them for the sake of the prototypes.

“ Receiving these our Synondals with kindness, if, nevertheless, ye find anything in them which needs correction, we entreat you to impart freely to us of your heavenly wisdom in answer to this our Epistle ; that so both you and we may evermore be found to agree in the same faith, to the glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, now, henceforth, and for ever. AMEN.”

After the reading of these letters was finished, PETER and PETER the Legates of the Bishop of Rome said : “ We are fully satisfied ; for, according to the orthodox confession of faith now made by the most holy and most blessed Patriarch Tarasius, so hath Adrian our Apostolic Pope received ; and in this all his sacred Conclave have agreed, and have embraced communion with him in all points which have been here confessed. And, blessed be God, the most holy Chief Priests of the East have been found to agree in orthodoxy of faith and in the worship of images with the most holy Adrian Pope of Old Rome, and Tarasius the Patriarch of New Rome. Upon

* This argument is brought forward many a time and often in this Council ; and, indeed, by all who have written in defence of Christian idolatry, but has no force unless to a *truth* be added a *lie* : doubtless the cherubim, &c., were made with hands, but they were never *worshipped*. The censure of the “ Caroline Books ” (lib. ii. c. 26) will be noticed in the next Session, as applied to the quotations there made from the book of Exodus.

† Why did not St. Paul add a word here about the propriety of worshipping images of Christ in His human form, the true Mother of God, and the Saints

those, therefore, who do not agree in this confession, be the anathema of the Three Hundred and Eighteen Fathers who, on a former occasion, were assembled in this place."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "So be it, so be it, so be it."

AGAPIUS Bishop of Cæsarea: "Receiving as it were a standard of religion in the sacred Epistles sent from the chief Priests of the East to Tarasius our most holy Œcumenic Patriarch, I agree with them in every respect and embrace communion with them; and those who think otherwise I lay under my anathema."

JOHN Bishop of Ephesus: "To the orthodox letters sent from the East by the chief Priests of those parts to Tarasius our most holy and thrice blessed Œcumenic Patriarch I entirely assent, and embrace communion with them in all points; and those who do not confess thus, and who do not worship or admit of holy, sacred, and venerable images, I account as aliens from the Catholic Church, and give them over to my anathema."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Seeing that the letters which have now been read from the Priests of the East to Tarasius our most holy Archbishop and Œcumenic Patriarch, do in no respect differ from the confession of faith previously made by him, I, unworthy as I am, declare my agreement with them; and, being of the same mind, I receive and pay the worship of honour to holy and venerable images, while (*τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκυνήσιον*) supreme and absolute worship,* I offer to the holy life-giving Trinity only; and

* The censure contained in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 17), on this declaration of Constantine, is founded on a misapprehension; at least if the present copies of the Greek records may be depended upon. For this, he only who made the Latin translation, which was sent to Charlemagne, is to blame: it was hardly to be expected that he should question a translation which had the imprimatur of an infallible Pontiff. The difference between the Latin translation and the Greek original is very great: in the former the words of Constantine are: "I receive and embrace with honour holy and venerable images, according to that worship of adoration which I offer to the Trinity." In the Greek it is thus: "I receive and embrace with honour holy and venerable images, but the worship of adoration I reserve for the Trinity only." The mistranslation was not discovered even by the Pope himself, who labours hard to defend it, instead of showing that it was erroneous. His defence is as follows:—"They, returning from their evil heresy, used their utmost effort to give satisfaction to the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in their confession; and, therefore, they confessed such honour to be due to holy images as was determined in the definition of the holy Council"—part of which is afterwards

those who think or teach otherwise I separate from the holy Catholic Church. I lay them under my anathema, and give them over to the doom of those who deny the incarnate and bodily dispensation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra : " With the letters sent from the East from the most holy Chief Priest there to our most holy Archbishop and Œcumenic Patriarch Tarasius, I agree and to these I stand firm. All points therein confessed I receive

quoted. (*Adrian's Answer*, p. 122, col. 1.) Adrian, if his words mean anything, seems to say that Constantine's zeal exceeded his judgment, and that he meant no more than the Council said. Charlemagne, on the contrary, considers Constantine to have said openly what all the rest held secretly, and sneers at their oft-repeated vain distinction, " We do not worship images as God, nor pay to them the worship of our *Latria*," which he considers as a cloak to conceal their idolatry. This distinction of worship is nominal, as the practice of idolatrous Christendom proves: the prayer is offered to the image, take that away and their God is gone. One part of this censure is based on a mistranslation; but the other part, which is not less important, touches on some expressions of Constantine, about which there is no doubt—namely, his classifying those who did not worship images with those who denied our Lord's coming in the flesh, which, according to St. John, is the spirit of Antichrist (1 John iv. 31). " What folly ! What madness !—to endeavour to tear the people of Christ from the breasts of their mother the Church, because they will not offer worship due to God alone to things without sense. What perversity to consider in the same light those who deny the life-giving incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and those who, in obedience to the Divine command, despise the worship of creatures, and who desire to worship God alone, whom all things serve and obey: for it is one thing not to believe in the redemption of the world, another to wish to worship God alone; one thing to slight the salvation of the world, another to despise the worship of images; one thing to oppose wholesome instruction, another to resist vain and superstitious observances. The same Lord and Saviour who in the pages of the Old Testament prohibited the worship of images altogether, and who in His own person decided that the image of *Cæsar* should be given to *Cæsar*, not worshipped, gave the following precepts about faith in Himself: ' he who believeth in me hath eternal life,' and ' I am the door: if any one enter in by me, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture.' So speaks the Truth—so testifies the Salvation of the world—such is the declaration of the Redeemer of the human race. How dull, how slow of comprehension, must he be who would consider in the same light the man who presumes to despise admonitions like these, and the man who, content with Divine teaching, spurns at the adoration of images; but admit that the worship of images is a good work, can it at all be compared to faith—the foundation of good works? For no work is good or available to salvation unless it be built on faith as its foundation, and is strengthened by it as a defence. Abraham was not justified by works, but by faith; Moses became great by faith; the Saints by faith overcame kingdoms. Whence it follows that faith is above all other virtues; and although hope and charity are connected with it, yet it is by it we attain to them; nor is he accounted worthy of so great condemnation who fails in other works as he who fails in faith. Moreover, though no one can be saved without faith, by the worship of images, yet are there in the heavenly city innumerable legions who either by martyrdom, or by innocence of life, or by solitary retirement, through the observance of faith being united to the heavenly choirs, are now enjoying eternal bliss, though they neither had nor worshipped images."

with all readiness and gladness, and those who think not thus I give over to anathema.”

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Cyzicus: “With the letters now read of our most holy and most blessed Archbishop and Œcumenic Patriarch, and with the answers returned from the East in the Epistles of the orthodox chief Priests, concerning holy and venerable images, I agree, and I embrace communion with them, and those who think not thus I lay under an anathema.”

EUTHYMIUS Bishop of Sardis: “As in all things obedient to the truth, and as having been brought up amidst the traditions of the divine Apostles and Fathers, I entirely agree with the letters which have now been read of Tarasius, our most holy and most blessed Archbishop and Œcumenic Patriarch, and with the answers returned from the Patriarchs of the East; and their opinion about sacred doctrines and venerable images and my own I hold to be one and immutable. Those, therefore, who talk vainly in opposition to the one, or who prate against the other and who agree not with the holy Patriarchs, I look on as heretical and perverse, and separate them far from my communion.”

[Peter Bishop of Nicomedia, Elias Bishop of Crete, Hypatius Bishop of Nicæa, Stauracius Bishop of Chalcedon, Nicephorus Bishop of Dyrrachium, made declarations very similar to the above.]

EPIPHANIUS Deacon of the Church of Catana and Vicar of Thomas, Archbishop of Sardinia, said: “How true is it ‘that pleasant words are as honeycombs, and their sweetness is health to the soul’ (Prov. xvi. 24): for, observe how the Synodical Epistle just read of the most holy and most blessed Archbishop of imperial Constantinople, New Rome, which he sent to the most orthodox High Priests of the East, and the answers which were returned to him, redolent with the sweet and odorous honeycomb of the orthodox faith of the holy Fathers, have refreshed our intellectual senses with their delicious perfume, while with the invigorating energy of orthodox doctrine they have healed those who were halt in faith. Wherefore I, united in sentiment with these, do receive and embrace holy images according to the ancient—that is, the Apostolic

—tradition ; and that Conventicle, which some have, contrary to all law and right, vainly asserted to be the Seventh Council, together with all who adhere to its dogmas, I give over to most fearful anathemas.”

[Leo Bishop and Vicar of the Metropolis of Sida, Nicholas Monk and Abbot of the Monastery of Aper and Vicar of the Metropolis of Tyana, and Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea, made declarations of a similar nature.]

THEODORE Bishop of Catana : “ They to whom the form of piety is a subject of care are not unfrequently illustrious for the splendour of their orthodoxy. Wherefore, my unworthiness, as was proper, having directed the intellectual eye of the mind with most profound attention to the sacred Synodical Epistle of the most holy and most blessed Tarasius Chief President of the Royal city, sent by him to the Chief Priests of the East, and also to the answers sent by them in return which have now been read, hath, from the reading thereof, learned that they are in all respects consonant to the orthodox faith of the holy Fathers ; and, therefore, being of the same opinion with them, I receive and embrace holy and venerable images, and the vain innovations of the false Synod absurdly called the Seventh, together with all who agree in its doctrines, I consign to anathematisms.

ANASTASIUS, Bishop of Nicopolis, in old Epirus : “ Seeing that the Synodals of the most holy and Œcumenic Patriarch are in agreement with the answers returned from the Chief Priests of the East, I declare my assent to them, and I confess that such are my present sentiments, and such shall I preserve them inviolable to the last. I receive and worship holy and venerable images, and those that think otherwise have my anathema.”

JOHN Bishop of Tauromenium : “ As we came hither with one mind, so have we been instructed as to have but one voice ; for the synodical summary of Tarasius our most holy Œcumenic Patriarch, sent by him to the most holy Chief Priests of the East, which hath now been read, and also the answers sent by them in return, have been found to be quite in accordance with the faith of the six holy General Councils.

Thus I also think and I receive and worship holy images ; and in this orthodox faith I pray that I may stand with confidence before the judgment-seat of Christ, and those who think not thus have my anathema."

[After this follow similar declarations from all the Bishops assembled in the Council.*] When these declarations were finished, the whole Council, Bishops, and Monks, said : " All this our holy Council, assembled here by the grace of Christ our true God, and under the pious sanction of our most gracious and orthodox Sovereigns, do receive and agree to the communication here made by Adrian Pope of Old Rome to our orthodox Sovereigns ; also to the document now read containing the definition of the faith of our most holy, most blessed, and Œcumenical Patriarch Tarasius, and the letters returned to his Blessedness from the Chief Priests of the East ; and we embrace and give the worship of honour to holy and venerable images ; and, tearing up by the roots the false Conventicle convened in opposition to them, we consign the same to anathema. God preserve our gracious Sovereigns and our most holy Patriarch."

TARASIVS : " Contention hath now ceased : the middle wall of enmity is done away. East and West, North and South, are again united in one yoke, in one bond of agreement."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : " Glory be to Thee, O God, who hast made us one."

TARASIVS : " Thanks be to Christ our true God, who maketh peace, together with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever."

THE COUNCIL shouted in applause : " Long live our Sovereigns. Long live Constantine and Irene the illustrious Sovereigns and Autocrats. Long live our orthodox Sovereigns. O Lord, guard the guardians of the truth. Keep, O Lord, the champions of the Church. Eternal be the memory of the New Constantine and the New Helena. Grant them, Lord, a life of peace. Long be the lives of our Patriarchs. Long live our sacred Senate !"

* In the old Latin translation we find the names of Two Hundred and Sixty-two Bishops who were present at this Session.

SESSION THE FOURTH.

The Passages from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, together with many Legendary Tales by which it was pretended that the Worship of Images was proved and confirmed, were read before the Council and unanimously approved by all the Fathers present. The Session concludes with a Confession of Faith, in which the Worship of Images and the Anathematising of their Opponents make up the principal feature.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns Constantine and Irene his mother, in the eighth year of their consulship, on the calends of October (October 1), of the eleventh indiction, the holy Œcumenic Council assembled by the grace of God and decree of the same divinely-protected Sovereigns in the splendid city of Nicæa metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia—that is, Peter the Arch-presbyter and Peter Monk and Abbot Legates of Adrian most holy Pope of Old Rome; Tarasius Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, New Rome; John and Thomas Vicars of the Apostolic Sees of the Eastern Dioceses; together with the Bishops, the Archimandrites, Abbots, and a full assemblage of the Monastic Order, sitting before the most sacred pulpit of the most holy Church of St. Sophia, in the presence of Petronas and John officers of the Imperial household. After that the Holy and Immaculate Gospels were set in the midst,

TARASIVS said: "In the Sessions immediately preceding, the spirit of the Lord being our instructor, our throat according to the proverb did meditate upon the truth, since, from the reading of the letters of the most holy men both of the

East and of the West, we were brought into agreement with each other. But since the word of prophecy commands, saying, 'O thou that tellest glad tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountains, proclaim in strength, lift up thy voice, O thou that bringest glad tidings to Jerusalem, lift it up, be not afraid' (Isaiah vi. 9; Sept.)—in pursuance of this prophetic command, let us, O ye holy men, cry aloud—let us lift up our voice, speaking peace to the Catholic Church which is the true Zion, the city of the Heavenly King Christ our Lord. How, then, shall this be done? Let the books of the holy and illustrious Fathers be brought before us* for our hearing; and drawing from these sources let us each one water his own flock, that so our 'voice may go forth into all lands and the power of our words unto the ends of the world' (Psalm xix. 4); for we have not changed the definitions which our Fathers have laid down; but, as the Apostle has taught, we hold fast the traditions which we have received."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "According to the suggestion of Tarasius most holy Œcumenical Patriarch, I vote that the books and documents of the most blessed Fathers be now brought before us, and that they be read with a clear voice in the presence of this holy Council."

LEONTIUS the Secretary: "In obedience to the profitable and salutary command of Tarasius most holy Œcumenical Patriarch, and with consent of this Œcumenical Council, being ready to fulfil the same, we have brought hither and have laid before you the most holy and sacred books, of which chief of all is the Book inspired and written by God,

* "Tarasius the Patriarch demands the writings of the holy Fathers to be read in the Council—a very proper motion. The Bishop had no occasion for the *Scriptures* in this case, for he could not but know that image-worship was contrary to the holy Scripture. Leontius—(not Constantine, as Owen has said)—corrects the Patriarch, and desires that *the Bible* and the Testimonies of the Fathers may be read. It is observable that the Synod had expressly declared for *image-worship* before the *Bible* was produced. They first determine and then consult the Bible, in imitation of Balaam, who resolves to go with the messengers of Balak and then asks leave of God. So these gentlemen declare for images before the holy Bible was brought into the Assembly; and after the Pope's letters and those of the Eastern Patriarchs were read and approved, at length the Bible brings up the rear."—*Owen's Hist. of Image Worship*, p. 106.

which, therefore, I shall read in the first place. Let us all therefore, attentively and carefully hear and accurately consider the meaning of that which is to be spoken, that we may reap the full and entire benefit thereof.*

LEONTIUS reads: From the Exodus of the Children of Isreal—"And the Lord said unto Moses, 'Thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold: two cubits and a half shall be the length thereof, and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof; and thou shalt make two cherubim of gold: of beaten work shalt thou make them in the two ends of the mercy-seat; and make one cherub for one end, and the other cherub on the other end; even of the mercy-seat shall ye make the cherubim on the two ends thereof; and the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one towards

* No doubt it was right for the Council to consult the word of God; but to seek from it passages in support of the worship of images was but to pervert Scripture from its rightful meaning, and justly exposes the Council to the censure contained in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. c. 5), where their perversion is shown to be a sin of no small magnitude:—"Since Christ is *the Rock* from which flow waters to the parched soul, the *River* whose streams make glad the city of God, the *Fountain of Life* from whom eternal life flows to the believer, the *Heavenly Bread* which delivers the heart of the faithful from eternal famine, whosoever receives these spiritual waters and spiritual food in any other way than He bestoweth them—that is, whosoever aims at interpreting Scripture in any other manner than that which the Holy Spirit hath handed down—is thereby proved to have no place in the Lord's pastures. For he who from pride, or desire of vain praise, perverts the Scriptures to support his error, what else does he but violate the chastity of the Divine Word, and debase the pure silver of which it consists with the mixture of viler metal, of whom the prophet Hosea complains, 'I gave them silver and gold and they made Beal' (Hosea ii. 8)—that is, they have perverted the dignity of spiritual wisdom and the beauty of the divine eloquence to the absurdity of foolish interpretations and empty glory. And whereas the Legislator saith—"A fiery law went from His hand"—how great their dulness who neither regard the light which it is intended to give nor fear the fire which will destroy the presumptuous!" It is further added that they who pervert Scripture in this way imitate Satan, who, in order to add force to his temptations supported himself by Scripture; but that Satan must no more be imitated in his interpreting Scripture than in any other of his evil ways. Heretics and schismatics, his followers, have defended themselves in the same way; but Catholics, being well instructed in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, have ever resisted all their machinations. And it is further intimated that as, in the former chapters, the absurd and arrogant expressions found in the epistle of Constantine and Irene to Pope Adrian had been exposed, so in that which followed, the perversions and misapplications of holy Scripture found in the Council itself would in like manner be animadverted upon and censured.

Adrian has some obscure mystical observations, taken as usual from St. Augustin, and having little relation to the matter in hand.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 118, col. 1.

another: towards the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above the ark, and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee; and there will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment concerning the children of Israel' " (Exodus xxv. 17, 22).

Also: From the Book of Numbers—"This was the dedication of the altar, after that he had filled his hands, after it was anointed. And when Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with Him, then he heard the voice of one speaking with Him from off the mercy-seat, that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim and He spoke unto him"* (Num. vii. 88, 89).

Also: From the Prophecies of Ezekiel—"Afterwards he brought me into the temple, and measured the posts; six

* It is no less absurd than rash to endeavour to equal images with the ark of the covenant, or to assimilate that which is made by the express command of the Lord to that which is made by will and device of the craftsman. For *the one* was made at the Lord's command, *the other* by the industry of art—the *one* by that holy man Moses, *the other* by some workmen—the *one* by the Legislator, the other by some painter—the *one* superabounds with mysteries, the other with nothing but dies of paint—the *one* astonished by miracles wrought at the time and was significative of future mysteries, the other had neither miracles for the present nor prefigurations of that which is to come nor anything but memory of the past. Let, then, those who endeavour to equal images with the ark of the covenant find if they be so able a workman equal in merit to Moses; and then let him from any material make an image which may abound with as many mysteries, and be replete with so many sacraments, that from it similar tremendous oracles may be heard, and similar portents may be wrought, very many of which are afterwards mentioned, such as were wrought by the ark of the covenant." "But as no workman of such merit can be found, nor any work of equal glory, it remains that the Legislator be preferred to any men of our generation, and the ark of the Lord to any kind of images made with hands; and that they no longer endeavour to equal things vile and destitute of mystery, to that which is so illustrious in itself and so famous for its mysteries. For if, as they dotingly say, images may be likened to the ark of the Lord, it is necessary that they have a propitiatory, even as it also had, and that awful oracles be thence delivered. But no oracles have ever come from images: they may not, therefore, as they imagine, be equalled to the ark of the Lord."—*Lib. Car. lib. ii. c. 26.*

Adrian, in answer, quotes from St. Augustine's treatise on Esau and Jacob: "The Old Testament had temporal promises and spiritual significations. If the land of promise, if the city of Jerusalem, is held out to the Jews, something of a spiritual nature is meant by these expressions. As we have before quoted from the same work of St. Augustin, 'One thing is signified in many ways—nothing openly but all figuratively,' &c., (*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 120, col. 1). Does the ark of the Lord mean images of Saints?

cubits broad on one side, and six cubits broad on the other side, which was the breadth of the tabernacle, and the breadth of the door was ten cubits;" and, shortly after, "And the house and the parts near were overlaid with wood round about from the ground to the windows, and windows were opened in three places to give light; and within the inner house and without, and on all the walls both within and without, were cherubim engraven, and palm trees between one cherub and another; each cherub had two faces; so that the face of a man was towards the palm-trees on the one side, and the face of a lion was towards the palm-trees on the other side; and the house was sculptured on every side from the floor to the ceiling"* (Ezekiel xli. 1, also 16, 20).

Also: From the Epistle of the Holy Apostle Paul to the Hebrews: "Then, verily, the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the show-bread, which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the CHERUBIM of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat"† (Heb. ix. 1 to 5).

* Constantine, under whose auspices the Council against images was convened, adorned the Church of Blachernæ, where it was held, in a manner not wholly dissimilar to this description. Thus, according to Baronius, complains the so-styled Martyr Stephen (a wretched fanatic): "Having destroyed and erased from the walls all these images, that son of perdition, the Emperor Constantine, puts in their place pictures of various trees and different kinds of birds; so that we might well say, 'O God, the Heathens are come into thine inheritance.' The trees and birds which Constanstine caused to be painted have more countenance from the words of the Prophet than the images of men and women, and pictures of their works and martyrdom."

† These verses are quoted only for the sake of the fifth, which has the word CHERUBIM in it, as if the merest casual mention of such a word was sufficient foundation to build on it the monstrous superstructure of Pagan image worship. Surely these Fathers must have been hard pressed to catch at such a shadow of a shade of support! So little thought the Apostle about these cherubim that he adds, "Of which things we cannot now speak particularly;" and he tells us that these, with the rest of the Old Testament ordinances, were about to vanish away. They were but a shadow. Surely, if such a doctrine as image worship was the doctrine of the New Testament, more than one verse would have been found to support it; or, at least, if but one, *that* one far more express to the purpose than Hebrews ix. 5.

TARASIVS: "Let us observe here, O ye holy men, that the Old Testament dispensation had divine symbols—namely, the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat, and from this source the New Testament dispensation received them."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Yes, my Lord, that is the truth."

TARASIVS: "As, then, the Old Testament had the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat, let us also have the images of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the holy Mother of God, and of the Saints, to overshadow the altar."*

* This absurd proposition of the worthy Patriarch meets with the most indignant censure in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. c. 20), who is said on this account in the title of the chapter—"Non minus, sed pœne cunctis plus delirasse. It was no more than might have been expected that Tarasius, raised (as it is reported) in the most unusual manner from the life of the layman to the highest sacerdotal rank—from the military habit to the religious—from the circus to the altar—from forensic tumults to the pulpit—from the noise of arms to the celebration of the holy mysteries, should use all efforts to bring the minds of those over whom he is placed from spiritual to carnal things—from things invisible to things visible—from the truth to its image—from the body to the shadow—from the Spirit which giveth life to the letter which killeth—from the spirit of adoption to the spirit of fear. As if because that he so hastily rushed on sacerdotal dignity, unlawful to him from its suddenness, so would cause, by his preaching, the laity subject to him to make no less haste to rush from the lawful observation of spiritual mysteries to the unlawful observance of things corporeal. For despoising better things, he exhorts them to use the worse when he exhorts them that, because the ancients had the cherubim which were made by Moses, from between which the Lord spake, overshadowing the mercy-seat, therefore the faithful should have images made by some workman or other to overshadow the altar. Let him, then, make an ark; not of wood of Sethim, but of willow; covered not with gold, but lead; with rings not golden, but brazen; staves not of wood of Sethim, but of beech: in which let there be, not the tables which have the Ten Commandments, but which have an eleventh, allowing the transgression of the law; not the rod of Aaron, but the sceptre of some one or other of his anathematized predecessors; an urn in which not manna, but some either grain, is found. Let him make a candlestick of purest lead, a table of shew bread, which is not holy: let him write a book of the law which commands to lay hands suddenly on any one, approves that neophytes be promoted to the Episcopate, and teaches the worship of things made in heaven and earth. Having said thus much because Tarasius, as he was promoted amiss, so preaches no less amiss; and because he said, 'for cherubim let us have images, lest any should imagine that because we worship not images, we derogate from the holy Scripture, we will endeavour to unfold the spiritual meaning intended by the cherubim.'" The rest of the chapter is taken up with the explication of these emblematic figures. They are considered to represent—(1). The Angelic Powers, and these, both as respects the glorified state in which they stand before God, and also as respects those services which they perform in behalf of pious and holy men. (2). They are considered as prefiguring the Old and New Testaments. The parallel in both cases is drawn out with too great nicety; but, on the whole, it is well sustained, and more particularly as respects the former interpretation.

THE ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCES said : " Truly, this is the command of God."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia : " From the passage now read, it is evident that the cherubim had the face of a man. How, then, say certain who hath seen the face of the cherubim ?—for the Prophet said, ' The face was engraven.' "

TARASIVS : " All the Saints who have been accounted worthy to see Angels have always seen them in human form, as we read in many passages of Scripture. Wherefore, concerning the cherubim, God instructed Moses, saying, ' See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee on the Mount '* (Exod. xxv. 40 ; xxvi. 30 ; xxvii. 8) : and thence the servant Moses made everything according to the forms which he saw, and the cherubim amongst the rest."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia : " But, when the people seemed inclined to idolatry, then God said to Moses ' Thou shalt make no manner of likeness to serve it ' † (Exodus xx. 4, 5).

JOHN Legate of the East : " And long before this, we find that ' Jacob set up a pillar to God ' ‡ (Gen. xxviii. 8) ; wherefore, He blessed him and promised to him gifts unspeakable. And, in another place, it is said that He wrestled with him in the form of a Man, and He called him Israel, which is being

* " Moses did all things according to the pattern shewed him in the Mount. Very well : he followed the Divine Pattern, and so must we. The Patriarch should have produced some command for image worship, but that he could not do ; therefore, he is condemned out of his own mouth."—*Owen on Image Worship*, p. 109.

† Constantine seems to imagine that the second commandment was not given before the making of the golden calf ; for the inclination of the Israelites to idolatry was not manifested before that transaction : if so, the good Bishop knew but little of his Bible, and had great need to study the second canon of this Council.

‡ The loquacity of this so-called Eastern Legate exposes him to frequent censure in the " Caroline Books : " twice in this one observation of his is he called to account ; first, for bringing forward the pillar which Jacob set up as a proof of image worship ; and then for his strange interpretation of the word ISRAEL. " Surely (it is observed) it was the part of no ordinary dulness to bring forward, in support of image worship, this instance of Jacob in setting up a pillar, since that stone was never conceived to be the image or similitude of any past event. Had it had any resemblance to the past event, and had it by the Patriarch been set up for worship, it might possibly have afforded them some little support, who had not hesitated to run every risk in behalf of so great an error. But, so long as the Patriarch's doing certain things as a type of that which is to come is *one thing*, and that certain things should be

interpreted 'A mind seeing God.*' And he himself saith—'I have seen the Lord face to face, and my life is preserved' (Gen. xxxii. 28, 30). Whence, observe, not only have the intellectual essences of Angels been seen, but even God Himself, though incorporeal and invisible by nature, when He was manifested in our form."

DEMETRIUS Deacon and Keeper of the Rolls of the holy great Church of Constantinople reads from the "Encomium

painted by the painter in memory of that which is past, is *another*; while it is *one thing* to be filled by the Spirit, *another* to be endued with the art of painting; while he does *one thing* who relies on the heavenly gift, but he quite *another thing* who works from skill in his art; while Jacob's setting up a stone for a pillar is *one thing*, and the painter's making an image on a wall is *another*; while to pour oil in a typical figure is *one thing*, to adore in obedience to a vain command is *another*; it appears useless, and worse than useless, to bring forward *that* as an example which manifestly differs from the thing with which it is compared in every point of comparison. Did Jacob set up that stone that he might worship it?—or did he engrave thereon the image of any thing whatever upon it? Now, whereas pictures serve scarce any other purpose than to refresh the memories of those who look upon them, this stone, on which the Patriarch slept, is allowed to have had three important purposes worthy of highest respect:—First, it supported the Patriarch's head when he saw the ladder set up on earth and reaching to heaven, and the angels ascending and descending upon it; and, further, when he saw the Lord on the top thereof promising him all good things. Secondly, it was set up for a pillar to point out to the Patriarch on his return to his own country where that holy place was, in order that he might fulfil his vow. Thirdly, it was a type of the Saviour, who was the chief corner stone—who was anointed with the oil of gladness—whom Daniel describes as the stone cut out of the mountain without hands." The comparison of Christ to the corner-stone is continued to the end of the chapter (*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. 10). Adrian observes in reply—"He said this by way of similitude: it seems to admit of many interpretations. Augustin, in his treatise on Esau and Jacob, says, your Holiness understands that one thing—*i. e.*, the Church—is pointed out to us in many ways. And afterwards—because one thing is shown in many ways, and none of these were plain, but all by a figure,' &c. Therefore, as Jacob set up his stone for a pillar, Christians may set up images and worship them! Is this the consequence?—if not, what is!

* On this interpretation of the name "Israel," we find the following censure in the "Caroline Books:—"Nor must this escape our censure that among his other absurdities John the Eastern Legate is reported to have said—'That He contended with him in the form of a man, and He called him Israel, which is being interpreted a *Mind seeing God*,' since such an interpretation makes nothing to his purpose and is most unusual. For while some have interpreted this name as a *Man seeing God*—others, *Strong with God*—others, more correctly, a *Prince with God*—I know not of any who are received into the Canon who ever adopted this interpretation. Nor is he alone to be censured for thus neglecting all ordinary interpretations in favour of this most singular interpretation, but the whole Council merits censure no less; for not only was the speaker unproved but his words are left on record."

Adrian in his answer (p. 124, col. 2), gives two passages—one from Gregory, the other from Augustin—which, though both treating of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel, do not at all settle the point in question as to the meaning of the word *Israel*.

of our holy Father John Chrysostom on Meletius," which begins—

“ Casting my eyes everywhere around on this assembly, and seeing almost all the city present before me, I know not whom I shall declare as happy ;” and then, after other things, he continues—“ And that which was done was to the furtherance of piety ; for being constantly forced to have his name in memory, and the Saint himself ever before your mind, that name was found as a refuge from every unlawful passion and evil thought ; and to such a degree did this feeling prevail that everywhere—in high roads, in the market, in the fields, in by-paths—his name might be heard to resound. Nor was it only for his name that ye had this regard, but also to the form of his person ; and that which ye had before done in respect of *his name*, ye afterwards did in respect of *his image*. For very many had that sacred image depicted on rings, on cups, on bowls, on the walls of their chambers, and everywhere else ; so that not only might ye hear everywhere his holy name, but also see everywhere the image of his body, and thus ye had a two-fold source of consolation for his departure.”

PETER Bishop of Nicomedia : “ If John Chrysostom saith such things in favour of images, who dare advance a word against them ? ”

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra : “ Truly, he received them himself ; and such a desire had the pious of that day for the image of Meletius that they would have it engraven everywhere : on which account this father praises them exceedingly.”

TARASIVS : “ And we also have the authority of the fathers when we style images *holy, venerable, and sacred*.”

THEODOSIVS Abbot of the Monastery of St. Andrew of Nesion offered another book of St. John Chrysostom, and entreated that it might be read ; on which the Monk Antony read—“ The Sermon of our holy Father John Chrysostom, proving that there is one Lawgiver of the Old and New Testament,* and touching on the vestment of the Priest,” which begins—

* Neither of these quotations from Chrysostom say one word about worship, whether of *latría* or *douleia*. The Homily on the one Lawgiver is judged by

“The prophets preached beforehand of the kingdom of Christ;” and after other things, he continues—“I have delighted in the picture formed of wax, replete with piety; for I saw an Angel in a picture dispersing the legions of the barbarians—I saw the barbarians trampled under foot and David’s words fulfilled, ‘Lord, in thy city thou shalt bring their images to nought’” (Psalm lxxiii. 20).

TARASIVS: “When he, who had a mouth far more precious than gold, speaks words like these, ‘I have delighted in the picture framed of wax,’ what must we say of those who hate them?”

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: “When he affirms, ‘I have loved,’ who dare to venture the contrary?”

JOHN Legate of the East: “And who is this Angel but He of whom it is written, ‘that the Angel of the Lord slew in one night one hundred and eighty-five thousand of the Assyrians who were encamped round about Jerusalem’”* (2 Kings xix. 25; 2 Chron. xxxii. 21).

NICEPHORUS Bishop of Dyrhachium said: “May the Lord be gracious to us for the transgressions we have committed in respect of holy images.”

Du Pin to be spurious. He observes, concerning it (1), that the style is quite different from St. Chrysostom’s. (2). The order and disposition of the Homily differ much from those of St. Chrysostom. (3). It is full of allegories which are very rare in this author. (4). Most of the thoughts are very unworthy of him. (5). There is great confusion. (6). It begins and ends in a different manner from the homilies of St. Chrysostom. (8). The blessed Virgin is there often called *θεοτοκον*.—*Du Pin, Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iv. p. 22.

* The “Caroline Books” (lib. iii. c. 20) contain a censure, not only on this remark of the Eastern Legate, but a severe criticism on the quotation made from this discourse of St. Chrysostom which it cannot be imagined that this father ever wrote. It is observed that as they who were of this Council have, for the sake of supporting image worship, distorted the words of Prophets and Patriarchs, and have misrepresented them as doing that which they never did, so may they falsely charge John Chrysostom with saying words which he never said. The words are censured as ambiguous and in every way unworthy of so great, so eloquent, a writer. It is supposed that he meant to say (if the words are his) that he had seen a picture of an angel pursuing the troops of the barbarians; though the words might mean that he saw the angel in a picture who pursued the armies of the barbarians, or that he saw an angel in a picture actually pursuing them—both equally false and absurd. But it is observed that learned and eloquent men, in the course of their disquisitions, as they have made mention of other things so make mention of images and pictures also; which casual mention, these men, in their zeal for images, actually pervert into so many express precepts in favour of worshipping them.

GREGORY Deacon and Notary read from the "Sermon of St. Gregory of Nyssa preached at Constantinople, concerning the Deity of the Son and Holy Ghost, and about Abraham," which begins—

"What they experience at the flowery meadow;" and after other things, he continues—"Often have I seen in pictures the representation of his trial, and never could I view the spectacle without tears, so powerfully did the work of art present the history to my eyes; for there you might see Isaac before his father on the altar, his knees bent, his hands bound; while the father from behind approaching, inclining with his left hand the head of the lad towards himself, looks compassionately on the countenance of his son now directed towards him, but at the same time his right hand armed with the sword is directed to inflict a deadly stroke; and now he almost touches the body with the edge of the sword, when the voice from heaven forbids him to proceed any further."

THE PRINCES said: "See how greatly the father was affected at this picture, even so as to shed tears."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "Oft times the father had read this history, and yet perhaps he never wept; but no sooner does he see the picture than he can no longer forbear."

JOHN Legate from the East: "If a picture thus caused tears of edification to flow from so illustrious a teacher, how much more likely is it to bring compunction and edification to the uninstructed and ignorant?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "In many places have we seen this picture of Abraham as this father hath represented it."

THEODORE Bishop of Catana: "If the holy Gregory, ever watchful* in divine contemplations, wept on seeing the picture of Abraham, how much more ought the image of the incarnate dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who for our sakes became Man, to cause edifying tears to flow forth from all who behold it?"

* Theodore here plays upon the name "Gregory"—*εἰ ο ἅγιος Γρηγόριος ὁ γρηγορῶν*, &c. These quotations from Gregory 'Nyssen, and Cyril of Alexandria, prove no more than that Christians had pictures of Old Testament histories, but not that they worshipped them.

TARASIVS : " And if we now saw a picture before us representing our Lord as crucified should we not all weep ? "

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : " Yes, greatly ; for we should therein contemplate the depth of the humility of God who was crucified for us. "

STEPHEN, Deacon, Monk, Notary, &c., read from " the Epistle of St. Cyril Bishop of Alexandria, to Acacius Bishop of Scythopolis, concerning Apompæus, " which begins—

" Having met with the communications lately sent from your Holiness I was greatly delighted ; " and after other things, he continues— " We say, therefore, that the law is a type and shadow, or like a picture which is set forth for the inspection of those who look into other things. The first part of the painter's skill is seen in the outlines of his picture, to which, when afterwards the richness of colouring is added, then its beauty shines forth resplendent. " And shortly after, he adds—" It is written in the book of Genesis, ' And it came to pass after these words that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham, Abraham ; and he said, Here am I. And He said, Take now thy beloved son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and go into the mountainous country, and offer him up for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains of which I will tell thee. And Abraham rose up early in the morning and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him and Isaac his son, and he clave the wood for a burnt offering, and rose up and went unto the place of the which God had told him. And on the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off. And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass, and I and the lad will go yonder, and having worshipped will return again to you. And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and laid it upon Isaac his son ; and he took fire and the sword in his hand and they went both of them together ' " (Gen. xxii. 1-6). And after other things—" ' And Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order ; and, having bound Isaac his son, he laid him on the altar upon the wood, and Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the sword to slay his son ' (ix. 10). Now, if any one of us would wish to see this history of Abraham painted in tablets, how would he have the painter to represent him, as under one form doing all these things, or in part under one, in part under another form—that is, by repeated representations of the same person ? As,

for instance, in one place he would be seen sitting on the ass, his son with him, his servants following him; in another, as having left the servants and the ass below, while Isaac was carrying the wood and himself the fire and the sword: then, again, in another part, the same would be seen in another form, binding Isaac on the wood and arming his right hand with the sword to take away his life. Abraham is not, therefore, so many different persons because seen so often in different positions; but the same everywhere, the countenance of the painter being directed by the peculiarity of the case; for it is not possible that Abraham could be represented as doing all those things in one figure only."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "See, St. Cyril speaks in perfect accordance with St. Gregory of Nyssa."

COSMAS the Deacon read: "From the Poems of St. Gregory the Divine," a passage of his poem on Virtue, which begins:—"I first invoke God the cause of all," and after other things he continues:—

" — Nor shall Polemon be pass'd by in silence,
 For he was a wonder much spoken of by many;
 For, whereas formerly he was not among the temperate;
 But, on the contrary, a slave of pleasure exceedingly degraded;
 When afterwards he was swayed by a love of virtue,
 Having found some good counsellor, I cannot say who,
 Whether some wise man or his own conscience, all at once
 He rose so superior to all vile affections,
 That I look on this as one of his most illustrious deeds:—
 A certain debauched youth invited a harlot;
 But when she drew near to the gate (as they say).
 Where was a picture of Polemon looking downwards,
 Having beheld it awhile (for it was very remarkable)
 She went back forthwith, being overcome by the spectacle,
 Being abashed before the picture as though it had been alive."*

* "It is hard (says Du Pin) to understand how they could draw a convincing argument for image worship from this instance mentioned in the poems of Gregory. Did they believe that Polemon's picture deserved any religious worship? Is it true St. Gregory says that the picture was venerable (*σεβασμία*); but he means no more than that it was well done, and did inspire some kind of respect for the manner of painting; which shows that this kind of epithets, 'holy, venerable,' &c., were used elsewhere concerning the pictures of the

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "Our father, the divinely-eloquent Gregory, has recounted wonders, indeed, about this picture of Polemon."

TARASIVS: "Ay: for by it a spirit of continence was produced within this woman: for unless this courtesan had seen this picture of Polemon, she would never have left her evil courses."

NICEPHORUS Bishop of Dyrhachium: "Wonderful, in-

Saints, that would not come up to an invincible proof that they ought to be honoured, but only that what was represented in them did inspire some reverence and devotion. Antipater of Bostra (he continues) speaks thus of the statue which the woman cured of the bloody flux erected to Christ. But this does neither prove the worship of images nor the common use made of them in churches."—*Du Pin, Eccles. Hist.*, vol. vi. p. 135.

The "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 21), contain a charge against the Council, which, according to the existing records, cannot be substantiated—namely, of instituting a comparison between the woman who was abashed on seeing the statue of Polemon, and the woman with the bloody flux, mentioned immediately afterwards. These relations are mentioned in close succession, but quite independently, and not with any idea of comparison. Adrian imputes this to malice, which more probably was the result of carelessness. The former part of the chapter is superfluous, as combating an error which did not exist; but that which follows is worthy of notice. "Be it so (it is observed) that it was fact, and that it may be credited that virtue from this image of Polemon did withhold some from adultery, are therefore all images to be worshipped? What, then, because the tongue of a brute animal speaking with man's voice restrained the perverse intention of the soothsayer who wished to curse the people that was blessed, or because an irrational animal was the means whereby a rational man was made to escape the stroke of the angel's sword, are we, therefore, to worship brute and irrational animals? Or, because that troop of young persons who dared to mock the man of God was torn in pieces by ferocious wild beasts, must we therefore adore the fury of bears? And not unfrequently it happens that men are restrained by some accidental cause from the perpetration of some wickedness which they have in their hearts; but, surely, reason will not allow that therefore these accidental causes are to be worshipped. If, therefore, that which they say of Polemon and his image be true, by which they would fain support their error, it cannot hence be inferred that images are to be worshipped, as by the examples alleged above it has been sufficiently proved; but if, after all, it should not be found to be true, as we are rather inclined to think, since it does not seem to rely on any very satisfactory authority, how much less can their most vain worship of things void of sense receive any support from it—for that which is in itself rational and true can never need the support of falsities and mendacious examples." The rest of this chapter is devoted to a mystical interpretation of the history of the woman with the bloody flux, which is supposed to be an allegorical adumbration of the call of the Gentile nations to the faith: this interpretation is followed out with the most fanciful, not to say absurd, application of the various particulars.

Adrian, in his reply, vindicates the Council from the charge of comparing these two relations, but leaves to its own merits the use of this story of Polemon as an argument for image worship; and well he might, seeing that nothing could be said to any purpose.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, page 122, col. 2.

deed, must have been this picture, and most worthy of record, since it had power to deliver this silly woman from such a depth of vice."

GEORGE Deacon and Notary read from the "Discourse of Antipater, Bishop of Bostra, on the woman with the bloody flux," which begins thus: 'The Scripture hath taught us that the Jews were first called;' and after other things, he continues:—'These things said the woman with the bloody flux, while taking hold of the hem of the Saviour's garment, clinging to the Lord as the King of nature, and laying before Him the power of her disease; and when she had obtained the gift she raised up an image in honour of her Lord, and thus having spent much of her wealth on physicians she made an offering of the rest to her Saviour.'

TARASIVS: "He, therefore, who depicts an image on a pillar offers it to God, just as this woman with the bloody flux offered the statue which she made."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "To speak truly, this father commands the practice, and receives most fully those who make images."

THOMAS Monk of the Monastery of Chenolaccus said: "I have here a book of the blessed Asterius, which I lay before your Council and await your commands thereon."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let it be read."

CONSTANTINE Deacon and Notary, having received the book, read:—

"The narration of the blessed Asterius, Bishop of Amasca, concerning the Martyr Euphemia. Not long since, O men, I had in my hands the great Demosthenes, and was particularly engaged with that oration in which he overwhelms Æschines with such bitterly sarcastic reflections. Having spent some time in the perusal, and finding my mind confused therewith, I felt my need of the relaxation of a walk, so that it might be in some manner released from the oppression. Having left my apartments and spent a little time in the forum, walking there with some that I knew, I withdrew to the house of God to employ part of my leisure in prayer. And when I had finished my devotions, my course led me into one of the porches of the church where I saw a certain picture the sight of which greatly attracted my

attention. You would have declared that it was the work of Euphron himself, or of some other of those ancient painters who raised the art to such a degree of excellence as to make their paintings come but little short of life itself. Give me, if you please, your attention, as now there is some spare time for this narration, and I will describe the picture to you; for we sons of the Muses have resources in no way inferior to those of the painter.*

“There was a certain woman an undefiled virgin, who had consecrated her virginity to God, whose name was Euphemia, who, as the faithful at that time were exposed to severe persecution, most cheerfully underwent the perils of death. Her citizens, therefore, partakers of the same faith for which she died, in admiration of the piety and constancy of the virgin, built for her a shrine near to the church. Here they placed her coffin and here they hold a yearly feast to her memory, to the celebration of which a general invitation is given to all, at which time those holy men whose office it is to dispense the mysteries of God are accustomed to speak much to her honour in their discourse, and earnestly to impress on the assembled multitudes how she accomplished the conflicts of her passion. A certain painter piously and to his utmost ability, having depicted all her history on fine linen, placed this sacred spectacle near her shrine; and this masterpiece may be thus described:—The judge, seated aloft on his judgment-seat, scowls bitterly and angrily upon the virgin: for art, when it pleases, can rage in lifeless material. Many of the body-guard and soldiers of the Governor stand around, and near are the clerks of the records with their tablets and styles: of which, one having raised his hand from the tablet, is looking sternly on the accused, and having turned his whole person towards her seems in the act of bidding her speak more loudly, lest, not hearing well, he should make an inaccurate and censurable report. There, too, was the virgin standing, clothed in a dark vest and cloak, signifying her philosophy, and, as it might seem to the painter, beautiful in person, but, as it seemed to me, adorned with the inward graces of the soul. And two soldiers were seen conducting her to the Governor, one dragging her before, the other urging her behind. The

* “Asterius Amasenus (says Comber) lived after the year 400, and he only oratorically describes the picture of Euphemia's passion which he saw in one of the porticos of the church, and says that the painter was piously employed while painting this piece; still we do not find that the father prayed to this figure; and this is the first instance they can bring of a picture hung up in or near a church, so that probably about this time they came to be used to adorn churches.”—*Comber in Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. p. 291.

virgin unites in her deportment both modesty and firmness ; for though she looks down upon the ground as blushing to be seen in the presence of men, yet she stands undaunted, not exhibiting the least symptom of fear as to her future sufferings. I have, indeed, admired the works of other painters, and more specially the picture of the tragic scene of the Colchian princess, whose countenance bore the mixed expression of rage and anguish when about to slay her children ; for while with one eye she glares only wrath, the other betokens her as hesitating and ready to spare. But now I have transferred all my admiration from that composition to the picture I am describing ; and nothing so much pleased me in it as that judicious mixture of colouring by which the painter had so happily described the union of modesty and firmness, passions naturally in opposition to each other. But the painting described yet more. Certain executioners, stripped to their shirts, were now beginning their work ; and the one seizes the head of the virgin, and bending it backward towards himself holds it in a posture best fitted to receive the torture which the other was about to inflict : on which the other, standing by, dashes out her teeth. And the hammer and the awl, instruments of torture, appear. My tears on this began to flow, and my feelings put an end to further description ; for indeed, so vividly had the artist represented the drops of blood that had you seen it you had declared that they really came from her lips, and yourselves would have gone away in tears. But, again, there was the prison and there was the venerable virgin in her dark robes, alone, raising up her hands to heaven and calling on God for aid in her trial ; and to her, while thus engaged in prayer, above her head, appears that sign which Christians are wont to reverence, and of which they make the form a symbol, as I think, of the sufferings that awaited her. Not far distant the painter has as it were kindled a fire, embodying the flame as here and there it blazes forth with strokes of vivid red, and the virgin he has placed in the midst with her hands spread towards heaven. No marks of agony appear on her countenance : on the contrary, those of joy only as now she is about to depart to an incorporeal and happy life. Here the painter stayed his hand, and here I finish my description ; but it now remains for you, if you would have the picture more fully presented to you, to go and see it for yourselves, lest we should have fallen short of its merits in our description."

THE ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCES said : " It is evident that the art of the painter is religious, and not such as some calumniously

vituperate it to be; for the father himself affirms that the painter *acted piously*.*

* This observation of the Princes was levelled at that which had been said by the Fathers of the Council against images—namely, that the painter's art was "lawless," "an insane invention," "a strange thing," by which was meant merely that application of the art which made pictures objects of religious worship. They are, however, censured in the "Caroline Books," as extolling this art above its right and proper bounds:—

"When some pestilent humour assails the citadel of the body, the head, it obtains easy access to the other members. In like manner, as the image worshipping mania has infected the minds of Constantine and Irene his mother, of Tarasius the Patriarch, and the other Bishops of those regions, we must not wonder if it finds its way into the minds of the inferior Princes and the common people. Also, as saith the Prophet, 'The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it.' After much more of the same kind, in which the perversity of the clergy is censured more than the ignorance of the laity, it is continued as follows:—"They tell us that the painter's art is pious; as if it had not just the same connection with piety and impiety as have any other of the manual arts. What greater piety is there in the art of the painter than in those of the smith, the sculptor, the founder, the embosser, the lapidary, the carpenter, the agriculturist, or any other of the same kind—all which arts, in themselves considered, have neither piety nor impiety. The one or other of these exist in the persons who exercise them, according as they are under the influence of vice or virtue. If the painter's art is called pious, because by it the deeds of good men have been represented by them, then ought it also to be called impious, seeing that in the same way the deeds of evil men—wars, murder, and rapine, &c.—have been represented. But as no one on that account would style painting a wicked art, so neither, merely because good actions are represented thereby, can it be styled a pious art; for just as iron is not called impious iron, because men are destroyed by it; nor, on the other hand, pious, because men are thereby shielded from danger, or because from it instruments of healing are made; so neither is the painter's art impious, because deeds of cruelty are set forth by it; nor pious, because deeds of mercy are in like manner set forth by it. But forasmuch as they intimate that certain unwise persons had improperly detracted from this art, there can be no doubt but there may be folly in this way as well as in the opposite. No man who is really wise would either decry the images themselves, or the art by which they are made, however he might abominate the madness of those who worship and honour them: just as no one would decry wine though some be made drunk by it; or woods, though at times thieves may find shelter there; or fire, though many have been destroyed by it: since, notwithstanding, many benefits are conferred on men by means of these things." In that which follows there seems to be a misunderstanding of the words of the Princes; as if in saying the "father affirms," they had meant God the Father, whereas they meant only Asterius. Thus it is said:—"But why the 'Father' commends the painter, or, indeed, where it is written that the 'Father' does so, is beyond their power to tell us, and beyond ours to believe, seeing the praise of painters is nowhere found in the sacred oracles." It must be confessed that the author or authors of these books do at one time or other fall into error, allowance for which will be made when it is considered that the translation of the records of the Council which they had were so very imperfect.—*Lib. Car. lib. l. iii. c. 22.*

Adrian, in his reply (p. 125, col. ii.), begins with a pointless observation and continues with three irrelevant quotations:—"Blessed Asterius (he observes) had made a sermon on St. Euphemia, in which he gives all the particulars of her martyrdom as he had seen them set forth in a certain picture. Wherefore the Princes also praised that picture in opposition to the heretics, saying they absurdly decry it." Now, for the quotations, in reading which let us re-

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Moreover, also he styles it a *sacred* offering. By Gregory images are called *venerable*; by Chrysostom, *holy*; and, by the father now cited, *sacred*. Who shall henceforth dare to contravene these testimonies?"*

THEODORE Bishop of Myra: "On hearing these testimonies of the teaching of the holy fathers, we have been cut to the heart and do bitterly mourn over the years now gone by; but, nevertheless, we thank God that by this teaching of the holy fathers we have come to the knowledge of the truth."

THEODOSIUS Bishop of Ammorium: "Most holy and God-honoured Lord, we and all this holy Council having heard the doctrines of our holy fathers concerning holy images do believe and confess, and do call them holy and sacred, and let him who doth not agree with us be anathema."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let him be anathema."

NICHOLAS Bishop of Dyrrhachium: "The skilful painter can always by his art make that which he represents to be as it were present with you, even as he did who made this picture of the Martyr Euphemia; wherefore, in this respect also, the father praises the art of painting."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Yes; especially when he says, 'Formerly I praised the picture of the Colchian Princess until I met with that of the Martyr.'"

member that the point to be proved is, whether it is right to call the painter's art pious or not. (1). Gregory the divine in his sermon, and Gregory Nyssen says:—"Do you think I have been too brief? If, then, as the painter who adds strength to his colouring, you would have me fill out my description, I will go on, &c. (2). Chrysostom, in his Sermon on the Lord's Supper, among other things observes—'As the painter first makes his outline and afterwards fills it up with colouring, so did Christ.' In the table he first describes the Passover of the type, and next displays the Passover of the truth. (3). And, lastly, we have from Augustin what must convince, seeing it is so *much* to the point! Our mouth is opened unto you, O ye Corinthians. He opens his mouth with gravity and speaks according to rule, praising the creature as the creature, the Creator as the Creator, angels as angels, heavenly things as heavenly things, and earthly things as earthly things. What, then, is the conclusion—*ergo*, the painter's art is pious!" Adrian did not shine in his logic, though he might in his politics.

* Constantine alters Asterius's words, from *ἱερὸν θεῶμα*, into *ἱερὸν ἀναθημα*. It should also be remembered that Gregory the divine is not speaking of a picture of a Christian Saint, when he uses the epithet "*σεβασμα*," but of a Pagan image of a Pagan philosopher. Is this to be worshipped with *doulia* or *doulia secundum quid*?

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Which, when he saw, he was pricked to the heart."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "The father now cited had the same feelings as the most holy Bishop Gregory, for both shed tears on the sight of images."

TARASIVS: "The father, in the conclusion of his discourse, commands and gives fullest license to all who are willing to represent the conflicts of the Martyrs: for, says he, 'But now it remains for you, if you would have this picture more fully presented to you, to go and see it for yourselves, lest we should have fallen short of its merits in our description.'"

JOHN Legate of the East: "It seems that pictures have more power than words, which, no doubt, is ordered by Providence for the sake of unlearned men."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "If holy images could work such compunction, even on holy men, how much more ought they to affect us?"

THEODORE Bishop of Myra: "After all we have heard from the holy Fathers, we can object nothing."

JOHN Legate of the East: "Painters do not contradict the Scriptures; for what Scripture saith this they represent, so that they may be looked upon as actually confirmatory of that which has been written."*

* The "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. cap. 23) contain a needlessly lengthened answer on these words of the Eastern Legate. After having observed that to notice all the absurdities of this John Legate of the East would almost require a volume by itself, and therefore only few can be animadverted upon, they proceed to consider his first proposition, "that painters do not contradict the Scriptures." They suppose him to mean, though his words are ambiguous, the holy Scriptures, and then proceed at some length to the refutation. In this part much useless labour seems to be expended, since the Legate, however absurd, did not mean to say that no painters contradicted the Scripture; but merely that those which professed to be representations of Scripture facts did not contradict the Scripture, but on the contrary commended it. The Legate's observations were aimed at the Iconoclasts, who might have said that pictures in churches contradicted the Scriptures read in churches—that is, by the opposite effect which they had; that whereas the Scriptures exhorted to a *spiritual* worship, pictures had the tendency to bring men down to a low, grovelling, carnal superstition: the Scriptures teach us to worship the Creator—pictures make us to worship the creature. The next proposition considered is this—"That which Scripture saith, this they represent." This is considered as no less absurd than the former proposition. "For (it is observed) how can all the precepts of the law, such as 'Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord,' of which no representation is ever made, be illustrated by the painter?" The last proposition is also considered, which is this—"That pictures confirm the

THEODOSIUS Bishop of Ammorium: "The divine Apostle teaches us, saying, 'Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning' (Rom. xv. 4). Now, holy and venerable images, whether on canvass, on wood, or in mosaics, were also written and are for our instruction, emulation, and pattern, that we may exhibit the same example and zeal towards God: so that He may account us worthy of a place amongst them and a portion with them, and may make us fellow-heirs of His kingdom."*

THEODORE Bishop of Catana: "The blessed and God-bearing Doctor Asterius, as a shining star, hath enlightened all our hearts; wherefore, we are convinced that the holy Catholic Church has not gone beyond the rule of right in receiving holy images, but has therein acted in strict accordance with the doctrine of our holy fathers."

GREGORY Deacon of the holy great Church of the far-famed Apostles read from the "Martyrdom of the holy Martyr Anastasius† the Persian," which begins—"The only begotten

Scriptures." "This (it is said) is silly and absurd; for what agreement is between the Scriptures of truth and pictures of falsity," &c.; to which it might be replied that the Legate only meant that scriptural pictures confirmed the Scripture relations which they were meant to represent—not that *all* pictures confirmed the Scriptures. Protestants may think that Scripture can stand well enough on its own ground and needs no such assistance.

Adrian replies by two quotations, as usual little to the purpose—the first from Gregory's letter to Serenus, where it is said that "pictures are for the edification of the unlearned—that they who cannot read may by the contemplation thereof learn that which is spoken." To which it may be replied, Could the unlearned ever learn any of the Ten Commandments in this way, or any of the precepts or doctrines of our Lord and of His Apostles? The next passage is from Chrysostom:—"And by art he represents the Emperor on his throne, the barbarian subdued, the sharpened sword, the flowing river, and fields adorned with various colours, and other things of the same kind; which, as they strike the eye of him who beholds, afford to him an admirable kind of relation." But could the painter represent the precept of any teacher, or could any picture of him as teaching give information of that which he said?

* "Who (observes Comber) can sufficiently admire the deep reach of Theodosius, who proves the worship of images by that place of St. Paul (Rom. xv. 4); for he observes that holy and venerable images as well as material writing are for our learning? But doth St. Paul bid us adore these old writings? Doth he enjoin us to offer incense, gifts, and prayers to them? As for the historical use of pictures, we do not deny it; but we cannot allow that it was any part of the Apostle's meaning here, where he speaks of Old Testament examples which God left in writing, not in painting or carved work, and he took *writing* to be the far better way of instructing us."—*Gibson's Pres.*, tit. 6, p. 288.

† Anastasius was by birth a Persian, and flourished in the reign of Chosroes II., under whom he fought against Heraclius. His original name was Margadat: he took the name of Anastasius after his conversion. After that

Son and Word of God by whom all things were made;" and, after other things, it is said:—

“ And, as the desire of being enlightened increased, he made many entreaties of the man before-mentioned that he would count him worthy of the grace of holy baptism. But he, from dread of the Persians fearing lest he should bring himself into trouble, deferred his request; nevertheless, Anastasius went together with him into the various churches, and prayed and looked upon the pictures of the holy Martyrs, and enquired of him what these meant. And when he heard of the miracles of the Saints, the intolerable torments inflicted on them by the tyrants, and their more than human patience, he was amazed and confounded. Remaining, therefore, a short time with the before-mentioned Christian brother, he formed within himself the most glorious purpose of going up to Jerusalem and there of being dignified with holy baptism.”

THEODORE Bishop of Myra: “ Here is another proof of the lawfulness of the tradition of holy images.”

EUTHYMIUS Deacon and Monk and Notary of the Bishop of Gotthiæ read from the “ Miracles of the holy Martyr Anastasius,” which begins—“ I propose to give some account of his miracles;” and shortly after it is continued thus:—

Choeroes had been defeated by Heraclius, he left the Persian camp and went to live among the Christians, having heard previously something of the Christian religion and being desirous to know yet more. He sojourned some months with a goldsmith, working with him at his trade, after which, being quite convinced of the truth, he desired the goldsmith to procure him means to be baptised. This the goldsmith was unwilling to do from fear of the Gentiles, but the Martyr was allowed to attend the church with him and to pray. And here it was that, having seen the pictures of the Martyrs and being informed of their meaning, he formed the resolution of going to Jerusalem and there obtaining Christian baptism. Having accomplished his purpose, he was baptised and changed his name to Anastasius. The next seven years he spent in a convent at Jerusalem, acting in all mockery of humility as *cook, gardener, &c.*, never omitting the hearing of *Mass*. Not content with this, he must needs go back to Persia, not as a Missionary but as a Martyr, and all went quite to his mind: he was arrested, threatened, persecuted, and tortured. He was mighty particular about his habit, for when he was to be beaten he requested that he might put it off, that no irreverence should be done to that. In his prison he was visited often by Monks—still more often by Angels, among which one actually offered incense to him. After having suffered a great variety of tortures, he was put to death together with twenty-three other Christians. They were all left unburied, and certain very discerning dogs came and devoured the rest, but left the Saint's body entire and kept watch over it. A star also was seen hovering over the Saint's body, and his habit and image became in after times as miraculous as himself.—*Ribadeneira's Lives of Saints*, Jan. 22. Possibly he really was a pious man, but his history is sadly disfigured with Romish legends and Romish falsehoods.

“ And now will we relate, to the best of our ability, those things which were wrought by the Saint in Cæsarea of Palestine. When the sacred relics were now very near to the Holy City, it quickly became known to all the people, who were filled with the greatest joy ; and they all rising up and striking the sacred wood,* were assembled together at the holy temple of the Mother of God, which is called the ‘ *Nev* :’ and there, with crosses and litanies, they awaited the coming of the sacred relics, and rejoiced and exulted in hymns of thanksgiving : and being by the presence of the martyr refreshed, and recovered from that weakness of their faith which oppressed them, and from their other iniquities, they received no small consolation. But while they were thus praying, and embracing and prostrating themselves before the coffin, and paying all due honour to the relics and to the memory of the Saint, a certain woman of rank in Cæsarea (if, indeed, she deserves to be so accounted, and not the very reverse, as events will prove)—whose name was Arete (Virtue), but whose conduct was the exact opposite to her name—this woman, yielding to unbelief, cried out, ‘ I pay no honour to the relics which came from Persia.’ O, miserable and infatuated soul ! Never sure had that wretched woman heard how the holy Psalmist David rebukes the rashness of the wicked, saying, ‘ Keep thy tongue from evil and thy lips from speaking guile’ † (Psalm xxxiv. 13). But now what things God, who honours them that honour Him, laid upon her I will here unfold. After that the relics had been brought into the city, the rulers in public council determined to raise an oratory for the Martyr in the midst of the city near to the Tetracylon, and there they set up also his picture. While this oratory was yet in the course of erection, the Martyr, in his monastic habit, appeared to this most miserable woman in a dream, and said to her, ‘ Feel you no pain in your loins ?’ And she replied, ‘ No, my Lord ; I have no disease—I am quite well.’ ‡ No sooner had she spoken than she awoke, and found that a dreadful disease had, indeed, fallen upon her ; and she began to cry aloud and to groan, and to be seized with most violent pangs—yea, so intolerable were her suffer-

* Anastasius says that the Orientals strike pieces of wood together in the place of bells.

† Had the author of this legend read his Bible, instead of his Mass Book, he would have seen that these words were addressed, not to the wicked, but the righteous.—See also 1 *Pet.* iii. 10.

‡ Ribadeneira (*ubi supra*) reports these words with some variation :—“ The Saint appeared and said, ‘ Thou art wicked,’ but she replied, ‘ No, I am good.’ Indeed the Saint appears but little to advantage when first he is so pettish as to revenge such a trifle so severely, and next tells Lady Arete that the only way of cure is to worship himself—‘ Go (says he), invoke St. Anastasius !’ ”

ings that she could scarcely breathe. And now, being at full leisure, she began to reflect and to enquire with herself what this sudden disease might be, and from what cause it proceeded, and in such enquiries she spent four days. But, when the fifth day dawned she saw the same holy man standing over her, and saying, 'Go down to the Tetracylon, and there call upon the holy Anastasius and you shall be made whole.' And, having risen up, the ill-omened words which she had uttered against her own head now came to her memory, on which she called her servants, and said, 'Bear me, bear me, hence: let us haste to the oratory of the holy Anastasius: now have I been taught that I ought to worship and honour his relics though they came from Persia, and not to account that common which God hath cleansed.' Her servants, therefore, having placed her on a litter, went on their way; and, as they were now approaching the place, she, having lifted up her eyes and seeing from afar the image of the Saint, began with a loud voice, amidst floods of tears, to cry out, 'That is, indeed, the very man whom I saw in my dream, who told me before of the pangs which were coming upon me.' And when she had prostrated herself on the floor and wept a sufficient time and had propitiated the Saint, she rose up entirely healed: and thus she who but little before was carried by others, and had been reduced to the greatest extremities, went back to her house on her own feet, now harmoniously with the rest praising and glorifying God and magnifying the Martyr."

PETER and PETER the Legates of Adrian said: "This same picture of the holy Anastasius, even to this day, is preserved in a monastery at Rome with his precious head."

JOHN Bishop of Tauromenium: "The most reverend Legates have spoken truly; for there was a certain woman in Sicily who, being possessed with an evil spirit, was wont to give oracular answers; but she, on coming to Rome, was perfectly cured by this above-mentioned most holy image."

JOHN Legate of the East: "In addition to that which has been said, the history which you have just heard abundantly proves that holy images of Saints work miracles and cure diseases."

PETER Bishop of Nicomedia said: "I have here a book of the holy Athanasius, and I now propose to this holy Council that it be read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : " Let it be read."

STEPHEN the Deacon, having taken the book, read, " The Discourse of our Father Athanasius of holy memory, concerning the Image of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ our true God, and the Miracle wrought by it in Berytus* :"—

" Lift up now the eyes of your minds, and behold this new prodigy which hath recently taken place, reflect on the infinite wonder-working of God and give glory to Him : consider His ineffable love to man and the greatness of His dispensation, and mingle tears with your joy. To God nothing is strange ; for being God He can do all things : but forasmuch as it was done amongst us and in our days let the heart of all that hear be filled with amazement. Truly, the heavens were aghast at this awful deed !—the very depths were troubled !—the sun was darkened !—and the moon and stars, in like manner, at that which was done ! But yet, on the other hand, all the powers of heaven rejoiced in the completion of the wonderful dispensation of the Lord. Hear and be amazed at that which was done in our days : understanding, understand ye : incline your ear, that inlet to the heart, and hear.

* It is worthy of remark (says Mr. Stebbing's " Church Hist." vol. ii. p. 52), that Fleury, after mentioning that in one of the Sessions of the Council the authority of the Fathers was cited in support of image worship, acknowledges that the discourse ascribed to St. Athanasius *was probably not genuine*. It would have been still more worthy of remark had he asserted that it *was* genuine ; for, not only would he be in opposition to Protestants but to Romanists also. Du Pin (" Eccles. Hist." vol. ii. p. 39), declares it to be full of fables and quite unworthy of St. Athanasius. Even Baronius cannot allow it to be the work of this Saint, and gives several good reasons for his opinion (Ad. 787, s. 47). Though Fleury doubts of its being genuine, he says nothing of its authenticity ; or he might have added that *probably it was not true*. Of its truth the worthy annalist stands in no doubt. So far were the Fathers of the Council from making any objection that they were affected by it even to tears, as though they had heard a lesson from the Gospels. As of its truth (according to Baronius) there can be no doubt, it only remains to determine at what time it occurred. The annalist quite gives up the idea of its being in the times of the great Athanasius ; for (says he), had it occurred in his days or been written by him, the Fathers of the Council must have heard of it before ; but their tears must have showed that the history was quite new to them, and therefore it must have been a recent event. Sigebert, a writer of the twelfth century, would fix it for the year 785, about twenty years before the Council ; but the annalist prefers the account given in the ancient Lectionaries of the Church, which suppose the event to have occurred in the reign of Constantine and Irene. Having settled the time, he concludes with the following profound observations :—" At that critical period, when the impiety of the Iconoclasts was at its height, it pleased God to work this astonishing miracle, which, occurring as it did amongst adversaries, was thereby secured from all charge of imposture, by which it was hoped that their impiety might be overthrown and their heresy brought to nought ; and that it

"There is a city called Berytus, situated within the boundaries of Tyre and Sidon, in the province of Antioch. In this city of Berytus there was a great multitude of Jews. Near to their synagogue, which was very great, a certain Christian had hired a chamber, and while living there he had placed opposite to his bed a picture of the Lord Jesus Christ: it was painted on a tablet of boards and contained the image of our Lord and Saviour at full length. After a short time the Christian, feeling a need of it, sought out a larger abode; and this, as I

would, as it were, be washed out by the blood of Christ crucified again in His image. But, alas! experience has proved that Jewish perfidy has been surpassed by heretical malignity; for while the former (though implacable enemies) yielded themselves to Christ, the latter were more than ever confirmed in their impiety, rushing into the profound abyss of obstinacy, impiously blaspheming." In such impiety—i. e., that of not worshipping images—we Protestants gladly unite with them, as unmoved by the pious legend as by the Cardinal's doleful lamentations. The question next occurs as to the actual author of this history. It was not the great Athanasius—who was it? "It cannot be (says Owen) Athanasius the Monothelite, who flourished A.D. 629. The Nicene Bishops would not have called him their father whom Baronius styled a wretched impostor. He mentions another Athanasius, Bishop of Naples, who died A.D. 872. This Athanasius was scarce born when the Second Nicene Council was celebrated, which was in the year 787. Baronius mentions another Athanasius, nephew to the Neapolitan Bishop, who flourished A.D. 831. Nor could this man be the author of this story by reason of the distance of years. Therefore, since Baronius can produce no such man as this Bishop Athanasius mentioned in the Council, I must charge the Council with an imposture in *fathering* the story on Athanasius the famous Alexandrian Bishop. If they meant another Athanasius, they ought to have given him some character of distinction. They style him *Father* Athanasius of holy memory." The Council represent it as the work of the great Athanasius; but his it certainly was not, and so they be open to the charge of *gross ignorance* or *shameful imposture*. The Cardinal rejects certain marvellous additions to this tale which are found in the old Latin version of the Council: the rest (says he) was added by the transcriber who mixed apocryphal things with truth. If truth be the criterion, the whole story must perish together with that which is rejected. Possibly, the glaring absurdities and the palpable untruths of the latter part rendered it advisable not to patronise it, lest it should endanger the former also; but, in fact, the *one* is as true as the *other*—that, is both are false. Harding was not so nice, in his answer to Jewell ("Jewell's Challenge," p. 372): he alleges these very rejected additions as a proof that images of Christ and His Saints have been greatly esteemed, and used in houses, churches, and places of prayer, from the Apostles' time forward; and that this is so *evident* that it cannot be denied. The substance of the rejected additions is as follows:—The Bishop of Berytus asked the Jews where they had found this image. They replied, "In a house in which a Christian had lodged who, on going away, had left the image behind him." The Bishop sends for the Christian and asks him about the image—how he obtained it? To which he gives the following answer: "Nicodemus made it and gave it on his death-bed to Gamaliel. Gamaliel, when he was about to die, left it to James. James left it to Simeon and Zaccheus, among whose successors it was preserved till the destruction of Jerusalem. Two years before the destruction of Jerusalem all the Christians left it, and betook themselves to the kingdom of Agrippa. At which time, among other things belonging to the Church, this image also was carried away and ever since remained in Syria: this, I having received as my birth-right from my parents when dying, have had in my possession till the

verily believe, happened through the over-ruling providence of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, who displays His wonders to the pious, and to those who believe in Him, for the confusion of the wicked and the confirmation of the true believer. The Christian, as I said before, sought for a larger house, and he found one in another part of the city, and thither he removed from the house which was near the synagogue of the Jews; and in removing his goods, he through forgetfulness, or rather by the over-ruling providence of God, left behind him the aforesaid picture of our Lord. And a certain Jew then hired the house where was this image of our Lord Jesus Christ; and, having brought thither all his goods, he continued in the house without ever perceiving that the image was there at all, for he had not noticed the place where it was, but having taking up his abode in it there he remained. One day, however, this Jew invited another of his own nation to dine with him, and while they were at dinner the Jew who had been invited, lifting up his eyes, saw this picture of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he said to his host: 'How is it that thou, being a Jew, should have such a picture as this in thine house?' And he uttered besides many profane and unlawful blasphemies against the Lord which I dare not write. God forbid it me to record the things which he that was invited then vented against the Saviour! When the Jew who had given the invitation saw the image of the Lord, he endeavoured to persuade his guest of his innocence, saying: 'Until this present moment I have never seen this picture.' To this he who had been invited made no reply, but went his way to the Chief Priests, and accused the Jew who lived in the house where the image of the Lord was, saying: 'There is a certain Jew has in his house a picture of the Nazarene.' When they heard this they said: 'Shew us where, if you can.' And he said more confidently: 'Ay, I will show it you in his house.' And they were filled with wrath. For that evening they remained quiet, but as soon as it was morning the Chief Priests and Elders took with them the Jew who had made the accusation,

present time." Surely the Christian ought to have had a very severe penance for being so careless about so invaluable a relic. But this was not all; the good Bishop was now greatly perplexed what to do with the great quantity of blood which flowed from the side of the image. Night and day he was troubled about it: at last he hit upon a most satisfactory device, which was to send small vials filled with it everywhere throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa, and with a small Tract giving the whole history whence it flowed, &c.; and it is added, "*Hæc est VERA et vehementer credula relatio de cruore lateris Domini.*" Moreover, the Bishop gave orders that the 9th of November should be kept in memory of this wonderful event no less holy than Christmas-day itself.

and a great number of their people, and went to the house of the man where the image of the Lord was. And when they were now at the place, the Chief Priests and Elders, together with the man who had given information, burst in, and there they saw the image of the Lord; and, being greatly enraged, they put the Jew who lived there out of the synagogue and drove him away from the house. After which, laying hold of the picture, they said: 'As our Fathers of old insulted Him, so will we now insult Him.' Then they began to spit in the face of the holy image of the Lord, and they buffeted it in the presence of those who were assembled: and now on this side and now on that, they would strike the picture of the Lord, saying: 'Whatever our fathers did to Him in person that will we also do to His image.' And they said: 'We have heard that they mocked Him—we also will do the same:' then with unbounded mockeries they insulted the image of the Lord, such as we dare not even to mention. Then they said: 'We have heard that they nailed His hands and His feet—this will we do also:' and they drove nails through the hands and through the feet of the Lord's image. Again they said: 'We remember to have heard that they gave him gall and vinegar to drink with a sponge—we also will do the same:' and they did so, and put a sponge filled with vinegar to the mouth of the image of the Lord. Again they said: 'We have understood that our fathers struck Him on the head with a reed—this also will we do to Him:' and taking a reed, they struck the head of the image of the Lord. Last of all they said: 'As we have certainly learned that they pierced His side with a spear, let us omit nothing—this also will we do as well as the rest:' and, having commanded a spear to be brought, ordered one of their party to lift it up and to pierce the side of the image of the Lord; and immediately there burst forth from it a large quantity of blood mixed with water!

"Glory be to thee, O Christ! Glory be to thee, O Incomprehensible! Who is like unto thee, O Lord? Who besides thee is there who doest fearful and wonderful things? O miracle of the greatness of the Saviour! Verily, upon this the heavenly powers stood aghast! O Lord, how great art thou in thy love to man! How great in thy long suffering! How abundant in mercy! Long since, for us and for our salvation, thou who wert without flesh becamest Incarnate of the Virgin Mary, and in that flesh wert crucified, because that in thy Godhead thou wert impassible; and now, again, O Lord, wert thou crucified in thine image, for the confusion of the impious and of all unbelievers, and for the confirmation of those who in truth

believe upon thee. Glory be to thee, O Lord, who alone art Almighty with our blessed God the Father, and with the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“But now, my children, hear the rest, how all was ordered by the Lord Himself; for the event was brought about by Him. When the Priests and Elders saw the blood and water gushing from wounds inflicted in the side of the image of the Lord, they said, ‘Since they who venerate Him set forth that He wrought many miracles, let us take this blood and water and go to the synagogue, and there getting together as many sick persons as we can find, let us anoint them with it; and so we shall see if that which has been said hath any truth in it.’ They took, therefore, a basin and applied it to the side of the picture of the Lord which had been struck by the spear, from which the blood and water gushed forth, and they quickly filled the basin from the place of the stroke of the spear; and they took it away with scoffs that they might, in the presence of all, insult the Lord of all. And when they had got together all who were diseased, they selected, in the first place, one who was a paralytic from his birth and they anointed him, and immediately he stood on his feet and leaped, being entirely healed: they then brought the blind, and they, in like manner being anointed recovered their eyesight and unnumbered demoniacs were immediately cleansed. Then did the utmost excitation prevail throughout the city. All the people ran together at the fame of these unheard-of miracles, and the whole multitude of the Jews was stirred up, for there were very many who dwelt in that city. And they all ran together, bringing with them those of their families who were in any way diseased, whether paralytic, maimed, halt, withered, or lepers; all, I say, ran together, so that the synagogue, though of the largest size, could not contain, nor could the surrounding precincts contain, the innumerable multitudes of those who flocked together to witness these most astonishing miracles. And the Chief Priests and Elders, and all the people of the Jews, both men, women, and children, believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, crying out, ‘Glory be to thee, O Christ, whom our fathers crucified, and who hast now been crucified by us in thy image! Glory be to thee, O Son of God, who hast done all these wonders! We believe in thee, be gracious to us and receive us.’ These things they all cried aloud in bitter sorrow; and their cries sounded aloud and wonders were wrought, the Priests continuing to anoint, and the diseased to be cured, and to receive new life. And after that all had been healed, immediately the whole multitude ran to the Bishop of the most holy Church there, who had already been apprized of that which was done, and cried

aloud, 'There is one God the Father, one Son His only begotten, one Christ, even Him whom our fathers slew. We acknowledge Him to be God. In Him we believe.' With many acclamations of this kind they glorified God, showed the image to the Bishop, and told him what they had done to the image of the Lord, and how the blood and water burst from the side of the image, and all the unnumbered miracles which were wrought thereby; and, then with one accord, they all entreated to be accounted worthy of holy baptism. These therefore, the Bishop with his clergy received; and having instructed them during certain days he baptized them, and consecrated their Synagogue as a Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. At their request, also, he turned their other Synagogues into Martyria. And so there was great joy in that city, not only because the bodies of many were healed and restored to temporal life, but rather because so many souls were raised from death to eternal life. These things having come to my knowledge I have made all haste to communicate the same to you, my most beloved brethren, for the benefit of your souls, that ye knowing by this the power of our God and Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, might be more fully confirmed in the faith which is in Him, and might rejoice in His wondrous works which have now been done amongst us. Give glory to Him, with joy mingled with compunction and sorrow. Rejoice and give thanks that He hath accounted you worthy of faith and of the knowledge of Himself. To whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit be glory now and evermore, throughout all ages. Amen."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "See how He who is named from immortality, hath caused all this holy Council to be moved unto tears; for not only hath he declared images to be holy, but able even to work miracles of healing."

TARASIVS: "If any one should say, why do not images in our days work miracles?—to him we answer that the Apostle hath said, 'That signs are not for them that believe, but for them that believe not' (1 Cor. xiv. 22). Now, they who made their attack upon the image were unbelievers: wherefore, God wrought a miracle among them by means of this image in order to bring them over to the faith of us Christians. 'A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and no sign shall be given them' † (Matt. xii. 39).

* "Athanasius," from *αθανάσιος*, "immortal."

† The Patriarch allows the objection of the Iconoclasts to be true, though

THEODORE Deacon and Notary reads from "the Epistle of the blessed Nilus to Heliodorus, the Silentiary:"—

"By miracles continually wrought in divers places and at various times, the Lord invites those who have little faith, and those who have none, to steadfast faith; whilst He yet more increases the faith and hope of those who believe already, and manifests His fixed immutable designs. I will, therefore, relate to thee one instance out of many thousands in which our triumphant Martyr, Plato, has proved, not in our own country only, but in every other city and district, how readily He grants grace and displays His wonderful might to all who, by *him*, make requests to God.*

"In the Mount called Sinai, where Moses received the law from the hand of God, and where many Monks, both natives and strangers dwell, a certain man of Galata with his son, having embraced the Monastic life, sojourned some time in that desert, there performing the exercises of ascetic discipline. On a certain day, certain barbarians, heathens in religion, made a sudden irruption on the aforesaid mountain: they seized all the Solitaries whom they could readily lay hands upon and carried them away captives, among whom was the son of the old man before-mentioned. Having bound their hands behind

he affects to consider it unreasonable. Now, if no miracles were wrought by images in his days, how comes it that Manzoni and others had so many wonderful tales to relate? Were they impostors? Or did Tarasius speak unadvisedly with his tongue? The Patriarch was right as to the fact: miracles there were none, but wrong in his reasoning, the Pharisees asked for a sign, having seen many miracles wrought by Christ, the Iconoclasts ask for a miracle, never having seen any at all: the latter were reasonable, the former quite unreasonable in their request. Tarasius alters one quotation, and cuts the other short; but what may not be done by a Catholic Patriarch?

* St. Nilus flourished under the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius, and lived to the reign of Marcianus. He was a Governor of Constantinople, but he withdrew from that office and left his wife, and spent the remainder of his life in the desert. Here he suffered an inhuman persecution by the incursions of the barbarians, who carried away his son Theodulus captive. Possibly, the following story may be about himself. He wrote some treatises and very many letters, in the last of which is found the history here recorded—"a history which (says Du Pin) proves that the intercession and invocation of Saints was not in use at that time." Among all the excellencies (says the same author) that we have taken notice of in St. Nilus's letters there are some false notions, forced allegories, impertinent comparisons, and apocryphal stories. St. Jerome laughs at one of these; but this letter in the eyes of Protestants will be considered as yet more worthy of blame than laughter. Not to mention the apocryphal nature of the story, surely to speak of Plato as *granting grace* to all that make requests to God by him is indeed a false notion and as censurable as it is false; for it is very much like the language of the Apostle, "He saves to the uttermost all that come to God by Him" (Heb. vii. 25). We read in Scripture of the mighty powers of the Saviour—tradition alone tells of those of the Saints. With all its faults the story does not either teach or prove that images ought to be worshipped.—*Du Pin, Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iv. pp. 17, 19, 20.

their backs, they forced them away from their now empty cells, driving them onwards naked and fasting. And without any shoes to their feet they were made by force and cruel necessity to run over those parched, rugged, inhospitable regions, worn out with a thousand fears. But the old man hidden in a dark cave, overwhelmed with grief on the loss of so pious a son, earnestly besought the Lord Christ, by Plato, the Martyr of his own country, that he would in mercy condescend to hear his prayer. The very same petition, the son now in bonds, entreated of God, by the same immaculate Martyr—namely, that He would have mercy upon him and would work a miracle in his favour. And both the old man in his cave on the mountain, and the son in his captivity were heard. For, behold, on a sudden our Martyr Plato himself on horseback, and also having with him another beautiful horse, appeared to the young man as he was watching, who at once recognised his person because he had often seen his likeness in his image. The Saint commands him to rise forthwith from the midst of the other prisoners, to take hold of the horse and to mount it. Immediately his chains were broken like a spider's web; and he, the only one liberated for the sake of his invocation, by the permission of God rose up and mounted the horse, and with great confidence and joy, followed the guidance of the holy Martyr. And as quickly and swiftly as if they had wings, the Martyr Plato and the young solitary presented themselves at the cell of the old man still praying and weeping. And now that the illustrious Martyr had restored to the broken-hearted father his beloved son, he vanished out of their sight.

“So that it is plain that in every place the venerable and illustrious champions of the Church are able to accomplish everything, however wonderful or amazing, in behalf of those who call on God by them. These things have I written to you as being a lover of Martyrs, and as one who never can hear too much in memory of these thrice blessed Martyrs.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “It is evident that it was from previous acquaintance with the Martyr's image that the young man knew the Saint when he appeared for his deliverance.”

THEODORE Bishop of Myra: “I myself have experienced something not unlike the history just now related;* for when

* This dream of the Archdeacon of the Bishop of Myra, thus retailed by the

I was suffering under the injurious treatment of some of our great men, my Archdeacon, a religious man and one that fears God, said to me—' I have seen the Patriarch in a vision, who said, Let the Metropolitan come up to us, and all his affairs shall be arranged to his satisfaction.' On which I asked him again—' In what form or appearance did the Patriarch manifest himself to you.' And he answered, ' That his face was ruddy and his hair like that of an old man.' ' I replied, this is not the description of the Patriarch, but answers well to the image of St. Nicholas.' ' But was the

Bishop at the Council, is severely censured in the "Caroline Books," lib. iii. c. 26—" In that farrago of vanities which is given out by some as the Seventh Council, where all was fantastical and dreamy, with a yet more special absurdity, Theodore Bishop of Myra must needs bring forward the dreams of his Archdeacon, that so their errors, which could find no support from the Scripture or from the teaching or example of any of the fathers, might not lack the delusive aid of dreams; and that for so absurd, so frivolous a practice, a support equal in vanity and absurdity should be applied. Now, to confirm doubtful points we ought to have, not the sportive vanity of dreams, not the impertinence of apocryphal tales, not the futility and vanity of unprofitable discussions, but the sure authority of the Sacred Books or of the Catholic Fathers. Wherefore the Bishop aforesaid ought by all means to be censured, who ought to have contended against dreamers and such trifles with the arms of the divine law, because, instead of this, he must needs bring forward the dreams of the Archdeacon to establish so useless a practice. Not only do we find these things set at nought in the oracles of the divine law, but even in the writings of the Gentiles; for thus speaks Cato the Philosopher—

" Care not for dreams; for that which the human mind desires
Awake it hopes for, but in dreams perceives."

Adrian's reply is as follows:—" Who doubts that, both in the Old and New Testaments, future things have been revealed to many by dreams? Out of many instances to take one: Ambrose, in his discourse on the discovery of the relics of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, among other things says, ' On the third night, my body being exhausted with fasting, there appeared to me (not asleep but in a reverie) a third person like to the blessed Apostle Paul, whose likeness I had learned from his picture,' &c. This testimony was brought forward by Sergius Archbishop of Ravenna, by means of his Deacon John, at a Council held by my holy predecessor Stephen." Concerning the testimony of St. Ambrose, it might be asked when was St. Paul's likeness taken? Or was the painter inspired to paint it after his death? Or did the painter make a picture, and the Apostle appear in the likeness of the painting? " Gregory (continues Adrian in his sermon on his brother Cæsarius) says—' Then shall I see my brother Cæsarius splendid, glorious, and exalted, such as I saw him in a vision.' And Pope Gregory in his dialogues speaks of certain most blessed men, religious women, and even girls, who at their departure saw holy Mary, Peter, and Paul, and other holy Martyrs. Now, how could they have recognized them but from their pictures, just as Ambrose said that he did?" But neither Ambrose, Gregory, or the Pope spoken of, alleged these visions to settle doubtful points in a Council, as did the Bishop of Myra; and, therefore, these testimonies absurd as they are will not vindicate him from the censures of the "Caroline Books." As for Sergius and his Deacon John, even if that were true which is said of them, it would only follow that they were wrong, not that the Bishop of Myra did rightly; but the Council spoken of is a mere fabrication.—*Adrian's Answer to Charlemagne*, p. 123, col. ii.

person whom you saw exactly such as you have described him ?' And he answered, ' Yes : the man whom I saw speaking to me was exactly such as I have described.' Then I knew that it was St. Nicholas who had appeared to him from the likeness of his description to the image of the Saint. Confiding, therefore, in his words, I went up immediately to the Royal and God-preserved city, and there all my business relative to my bishopric was settled just as I would have it."

THOMAS Legate of the Eastern Sees : " Some have insinuated that St. Nilus* wrote against holy images. We have in our hands a book written by the father, and, if you please, let it be read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : " Let it be read."

COSMAS the Deacon and Chamberlain read " The Letter of our holy Father St. Nilus to Olympiodorus the Prefect :"

" You write to ask me whether in the great temple you propose to raise, in honour of the holy Martyrs and also of Christ, to whom they, by the conflicts, labours, and toils of their martyrdom bore witness, it would be proper to adorn the sanctuary with pictures, and to fill up the walls on the right hand and on the left with paintings of the hunting of wild animals ; so that on the one side might be seen a landscape where ropes extended, and hares, goats, and the like, fleeing away ; while after them should be seen the hunters with their dogs eagerly pursuing ; and on that side a sea view with the net cast forth, and every kind of fish caught therein and brought to land by the fishermen : and, further, that every other form which could give pleasure to the eye be wrought on the stucco in the house of God, just as in any ordinary house, a thousand crosses should be set up, and that pictures of birds, beasts, and reptiles, and various plants painted there.

" In answer to what you have written I would reply, that to me it appears quite childish and infantine thus to divert the eyes of the faithful in the manner which you have proposed ; and all that a sound and manly judgment would require is, to have in the sanctuary which is

* This letter of St. Nilus gives no countenance to any kind of worship of pictures : indeed, the Saint does not seem inclined to allow them either in the chancels of churches or private houses, but only on the walls of the nave of the church ; and this not for worship, but to teach those who, being ignorant of their letters, could learn in no other way. Most undoubtedly he, with many others, comes in for the Patriarch's censure, as (*ημιφαιλος*) half wicked, approving the making of images but not the worship.

to the east of the most sacred church, ONE cross only ; for by one salvation-bringing cross the race of man has been saved, and hope has been everywhere preached to those who were without hope. Fill the other part of the church of the Saints at proper intervals with histories of the Old and New Testaments, the work of some excellent artist, that they who know not their letters, and so are not able to read the Scriptures, by contemplating that which is represented, may be enabled both to call to mind the fortitude of those who have served God in sincerity, and may be excited to emulate those illustrious and venerable deeds, by means of which they, who preferred the things which] are not seen to those which are seen, exchanged earth for heaven. In a private house, divided into many and various apartments, it will be quite sufficient to have one cross set up in each, and all that is more than this may, as I think, be dispensed with. But I exhort and admonish you to continue in fervent prayer, in unwavering faith, and in the giving of alms ; and that by humiliation of self-perpetual trust in God, meditation in the sacred oracles, sympathy towards your kindred, kindness to your domestics, and by attention to all the commands of our Lord Jesus Christ, to provide for your own protection, and for the protection, peace, and well-being of your wife and children, and all that belongs to you."

THEODORE Bishop of Myra : " This epistle, when we heard it before being falsified, deceived and destroyed us, for we imagined that it had been genuine and without fraud."*

THE BISHOPS who had recanted said : " If we had then heard that which the father says—namely, ' At proper intervals adorn your house with paintings from the Old and New Testaments,' we should not thus have given heed to vanity ; but they, instead of this, ' At proper intervals make paintings ' (*ιστόρησον*) substituted the word 'whiten over' (*λευκανον*), which most powerfully deceived us."

* As we have no other testimony of this alleged mutilation of St. Nilus's letter but that of the recanting Bishops—very unfit witnesses in themselves and who do not make their own story good—it seems not improbable that the whole paragraph about pictures was an addition made by the image worshippers. The letter would read extremely well without it and its insertion appears unnatural. As for the substitution of the word *λευκανον*, for *ιστόρησον*, it seems so absurd in itself that its very absurdity must have undeceived those who said they were deluded by it ; for the letter would read thus : " Whiten over the pictures from the New and Old Testaments, for they are books whereby the ignorant may learn," &c. Surely if they had been inclined to mutilate, they would have left out the whole passage.

PETER and PETER Legates of Adrian said: "Constantine of holy memory formerly made a building of the same kind; for, having erected a church at Rome to the Saviour, on the walls he caused the histories of the Old and New Testaments to be painted; so that in one place you might see Adam going out of Paradise, and in another the thief entering into Paradise, and so forth."

TARASIVS: "If those prime champions of the Christianity-slanderers had been men of truth, why did they not exhibit in their conventicle the very books of St. Nilus for the satisfaction of all? But let the most religious Bishops Gregory of Neocæsarea, and Thodosius of Ammorium, declare whether they did bring forward the books in the Council."

GREGORY and THEODOSIVS replied: "No, my Lord; but, instead of books, they brought forward extracts (*πιττακια*), and by them deceived us."

EUTHYMIUS Bishop of Sardis: "And how was it that ye, being High Priests, did not demand the unmutilated testimonies of the book themselves?"

GREGORY Bishop of Neocæsarea: "Believe me, Brother, we had no care or trouble of this kind; but as it is written—'Our foolish heart was darkened, and professing ourselves wise we became fools.'"

THEODORE Bishop of Myra (to the Bishops Gregory and Theodosius): "Beyond all doubt it was those same extracts, which ye brought forward, that undid us. God knows how this passage of the holy Nilus, being mis-cited, deceived all and myself more especially. But now that the genuine passage hath been read it has converted, corrected, and saved us."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "If you have another copy of the same book, let it be read."

CONSTANTINE the Deacon and Notary read another book, having the above-mentioned epistle of St. Nilus in it.

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Behold, it hath now been most plainly proved that this holy and inspired Father Nilus does admit of holy images; whereas, he was accused by that false conventicle as though he had spoken

against them. Whence these wretches are not only proved to be Christianity-slanderers, but Saint-slanderers and parricides, in thus bringing these false charges against our divine fathers."

EUTHYMIUS Bishop of Sardis: "I have here the book of Maximus Saint and Confessor, and I lay it before you that it may be read."

CONSTANTINE Deacon and Notary, having taken the book, read, "From the Dogmas which were Discussed between Maximus of holy memory and Theodore Bishop of Cæsarea with the Consuls of his Party," which begins—

"The disquisitions which are made concerning the faith of us Christians." And, after other things it continues, Maximus said, "My Lords, since it has been decreed that it should be thus, let there now take place the accomplishment of that which hath been determined; for wherever ye command, thither will I follow. Upon this, all arose with joy and tears: they did penance and joined in prayer. And each of them embraced the holy Gospels, the venerable Cross, and the images of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour, and of our Lady who begat Him, the immaculate Mother of God, in confirmation of the things which had been spoken." And, shortly after, "The Abbot Maximus, having turned to the Bishop, said to him with tears, 'O, my illustrious Lord, we are all expecting the day of judgment, do you know what things were sealed and determined upon over the holy Gospels, the life-giving Cross, the image of our God and Saviour, and the image of Her who begat Him, His immaculate Mother, ever a Virgin?'"*

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "This expression, 'they embraced,' the father uses to imply worship; for it is evident that he worshipped the life-giving Cross and the holy Gospels: and with these were associated the venerable images of the Saviour and of His immaculate Mother."

* "The next order of testimonies are out of authors living six hundred years after Christ, in an age when ignorance and superstition grew apace, and, therefore, they are no good evidence for a tradition preserved from the times of the Apostles. Maximus died not much above one hundred years before this Council; and in him we first meet with kissing the Cross and image of Christ, as well as the Gospels in the taking of an oath. But the fathers of this Council stretch this too far when they affirm that this was adoration; for those who deny any adoration is due to the Gospels will yet kiss the book when they take an oath.—Gibson's *Preservative*, tit. vi. c. v.

TARASIVS: "Venerable images have ever been numbered among the consecrated vessels."*

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "That is evident."

THE SICILIAN BISHOPS said: "As holy, they are numbered with holy things."

PETER Bishop of Nicomedia: "We have also another copy of the book of Maximus; and if ye please let the passage be read again."

COSMAS the Deacon read the passage over again.

TARASIVS: "Consider, my brethren, how he said, 'they embraced:' now this is just what we ought to do in honorary

* Tarasius is accused, in the "Caroline Books," of presumption and ignorance on account of this futile comparison of pictures with the consecrated vessels:—

"He who is easily led astray in great matters is still more likely to be deceived in lesser matters. Nor must we wonder if he be pierced with innumerable points of lesser errors who has not been able to escape the stroke of those greater errors which are so much easier to avoid! Wherefore, we feel little astonishment that Tarasius and his Council should endeavour to equal images to the consecrated vessels when he had already equalled them to the ark of the Lord and all things connected with it, to the mystery of the Cross of the Lord, and to the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ. The superiority of consecrated vessels to images is taught us in the old law; for both in the tabernacle under Moses, and in the temple raised by Solomon, these were made and dedicated to God by His express command. But images (except the cherubim, the lion, and oxen which were made, not for worship, but to signify things to come), were not only not formed or dedicated by any of the Saints of old, but were expressly condemned throughout the whole of the Scripture. Again: the sacred vessels are absolutely necessary for the celebration of the sacred mysteries relative to our redemption; for it is in *vessels*, not in *pictures*, that sacrifice is offered up to God—in vessels, not in pictures, are the incense lights and other things used in the sacred offices dedicated to Him: and, if certain images be found on these, it is not that they may be worshipped or that the offering would be less acceptable if they were not there, but merely to add a value to the material on which they are impressed.

"Again, without images the waters of baptism and the unction of the sacred stream may be received, incense may be burned, holy places be purified with tapers, and the consecration of the body and blood of our Lord may be completed; but none of these things can be done without the consecrated vessels.

"Again, when the Author of our salvation put an end to the Old Testament, and laid the foundation of the New, He is said to have taken *the Cup*, not to have taken *an image*. Again, the Lord saith by His Prophet (Isai. lii. 11) not 'Be ye clean ye that bear images,' but 'Be ye clean ye that bear the vessels of the Lord.' Lastly: it was not for any injury done to *images* that the King of Babylon lost his life and his kingdom, but for his wanton abuse of the vessels used in the sacred service of God."—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 29.

Adrian replies, "That the usage of our Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church has been, and is, whenever sacred images and histories are painted, they are first anointed with chrism, and then they are venerated by the faithful, as the Lord spake unto Moses (See Exod. xxx. 25-30).—*Adrian's Answer*, page 117, col. 1.

worship (*τιμητικῇ διαθέσει*), for our absolute worship has reference to God alone."

JOHN Legate of the East: "If images had not been necessary, they had not embraced them as a security. Wherefore venerable images are equal in power and authority to the Gospel and the life-giving Cross."

PETER Bishop of Nicomedia: "And as it was not a common man who did this, but the heaven-instructed Maximus, the equal of the holy fathers, who was, moreover, a confessor and a defender of the truth, it may suffice us that we are imitating such an one when we worship holy images."

ELIAS Archpresbyter of the most holy Church of our Lady the Mother of God at Blachernæ read, from a "Roll which contained the Definitions of the Holy and Œcumenical Sixth Council, the Eighty-second Canon of the same Œcumenical Council:"—

"In certain venerable pictures, the lamb as pointed out by the finger of the forerunner is represented, which was a type of grace, and under the law prefigured the true Lamb Christ our God. But, while we duly value the ancient types and shadows as types and pre-figurations of the truth, we value more highly *the truth and the grace* itself, receiving the same as the completion of the law. In order, therefore, that the perfect image may be presented to the contemplation of all, we decree that in all pictures from henceforth the figure of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'the true Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,' should be portrayed in His human form, instead of the lamb as heretofore; that we, being stirred up by the sight thereof, may be led to meditate upon the depth of the humiliation of God the Word, and to the remembrance of His conversation in the flesh, and of His passion, and of His saving death, and the redemption thereby accomplished in behalf of the world." *

* The "Caroline books" have the following remarks on this Canon:—"After having cited a portion of it, it is observed, that though they used this Canon in a sense different from that which its framers intended, yet could they not find in it the very least mention of the worship of images: wherefore, though it be wanting in sound sense, elegance of words, or even at times right reason, it affords not the very slightest support to their error" (*Car. Lib. l. ii. c. 18*). To this Adrian replies:—"Therefore they brought forward this testimony from the Sixth Council, that they might clearly show that when that Synod was convened they had long been accustomed to venerate images and historic pictures." After which follows part of the Canon. Adrian gives a quotation from St. Augustin, which has the word *similitudo* two or three times over,

After that he had finished reading the Canon he turned to the Council and said : " Venerable and holy fathers, no one felt a stronger inclination to have engaged in this late persecution than, for my sins, did I ; but this roll which I have here, which was subscribed by the fathers of the Sixth Council, became to me as it were a divine hook (*ἄγκυρα*), and drew me back to the orthodox faith, in addition to which the most holy Patriarch used his influence with me ; whom may God reward for my sake."

SABBAS : " Wherefore is this read from a roll, and not from the book ? "

TARASIVS : " Because that is the original roll which the fathers themselves subscribed."

PETER Bishop of Nicomedia said : " I have here another book, which contains the Canons of the Sixth Holy Council."

NICETAS Deacon and Notary took the book and read over again the same Canon.

TARASIVS : " Some persons, labouring under the malady of ignorance, have taken offence at these Canons, and ask, ' Are these really the Canons of the Sixth Council ? ' Let all such know, therefore, that the sixth holy Œcumenic Council was assembled under Constantine against those who maintained the one will and operation in Christ ; and that after these fathers had anathematized the heretics, and clearly set forth the orthodox faith, they returned home in the fourteenth year of Constantine. Four or five years after that event the same fathers were again assembled by Justinian, the son of Constantine, who then laid down the above-mentioned Canons. Let no one have any scruple about them, since the same fathers who subscribed under Constantine were the very same who subscribed in this roll which you see under Justinian, as is evident from the exact similarity of the hand-writing ;

together with *adoras* and *adora*, which he fancied might help forward the cause of image-worship, for they have no other connection with the matter under consideration. This Canon would prove, if anything, that images of Christ in a human form were not very ancient or very common up to the year 690 A.D., when the Council Quinisext was held ; for, if it had been usual to represent Christ as a man, wherefore needed there a Canon for this purpose ? This Canon speaks only of making a picture of Christ—not one word about worship.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 116, col. 1.

and it was but right that they who had presented to the world an Œcumenic Council should also enact Ecclesiastical Canons.* Now, they affirmed that by means of holy images 'we are led to the remembrance of His conversation in the flesh and of His life-giving death.' If, then, these are the means by which we are led to the consideration of the dispensation of Christ our God, what must we think of those who have abolished venerable images?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "As Atheists, Hebrews, and enemies to the truth."

TARASIVS: "But the Lord our God is good, who receiveth us all; for He hath not left the rod of the wicked to rest on the lot of the righteous †" (Psalm cxxv. 3).

LEO Bishop of Rhodes: "See how it is evident, from the holy Scripture, that our Church hath for so many years been ravaged and despoiled; but, thanks be to Christ, who hath stirred up our most reverend Lord for its restoration."

PETER and PETER the Legates of Adrian said: "We have in our hands the book of the blessed Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus, and we propose that it be read."

STEPHEN the Deacon and Notary took the book and read from the "Fifth Discourse of the Apology of Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus." in behalf of Christians against

* Binius in his notes on this Council observes—"That what was said in the fourth Session concerning the Canons of the sixth Council was not said by the Council, but by the Greek Tarasius; and so they must be understood and explained according to our notes upon that Council. That Council, as it did not please the Romish pontiffs, is therefore styled by his party as *non solum Pseudo-synodum verum etiam conventum malignantium, Synagogam Diaboli*" (*Bin. Concil. General. Tom. 3. Part 1. Sect. 1. p. 313*). And yet not only the Greek Tarasius but the Roman Adrian, as above, affirms this Canon to be "DE SANCTA SEXTA SYNODO: and again, *Sexta Synodus fideliter per Canones orthodoxe statuens, ita,*" &c. How strange, that the Papal legates could hear their Pontifical master charged with ignorance, and yet offer not a word in his defence!

† The use of this text is censured as inapplicable in the "Caroline Books" (lib. ii. c. 7); for that it was an unwarrantable assumption in them to conclude that because they worshipped *images* they were righteous, while, forsooth, they were pleased to style *sinner*s those who despised them. That the text has no connection with the subject under consideration is evident not only to be unlearned reader but to the most ignorant.

"Very rightly (says Adrian) did they use these words of the prophet, for heretics are the *rod of sinners*, while the orthodox are *the lot of the righteous*." *Are image-worshippers orthodox? Or will they be the sheep whom Christ will set on his right hand!*—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 117, col. 2.

the Jews, and more particularly in the matter of holy images :*—

“Come now, and let us, in conclusion, make an apology in behalf of holy images, that the mouths of all who speak wickedly may be stopped. This tradition is of the law, in proof whereof hear God commanding Moses, ‘Make two cherubim of gold to overshadow the mercy-seat’ (Exod. xxv. 17-22); and again, in the temple which God showed to Ezekiel, he speaks of the ‘appearance of palm trees, lions, men, and cherubim, from the floor to the ceiling’ (Ezekiel xli. 1, 2). Truly the command is terrible which forbade Israel to make any graven thing, image or likeness of things in heaven or of things which are on the earth; and yet He commanded Moses to make graven images of living cherubim, and He showed to Ezekiel the temple full of graven images, and likenesses of lions, palm-trees, and men.† Whence, also, Solomon having taken his plan from the

* Leontius Cyprus (says Comber) is an obscure author, and some think this Tract was never heard of before this Council: however, he lived but in the year 620 A.D., and, therefore, is too late for an evidence in this cause. He seems, indeed, to speak most home to the adoration, but his *authority* weighs not against many elder and learned fathers, and his *arguments* will not abide examining (Gibson’s “Preservative.” Tit. 6.c. 5. p. 291-295). The manifold absurdities of this letter afford abundant material for the censures of the “Caroline Books,” no less than *ten* chapters being written in confutation of them. The letter was dear to the Popes; Gregory II. borrows a long piece from it, with which he concludes his letter to Germanus: it is here brought forward by the Papal legate, and is defended by Adrian, *summa vi*, in every point in which it is censured by Charlemagne.

† “The cherubims in the tabernacle being made by God’s special order, and forbid to be adored by His express command, will not prove that images of Christ and the Saints, not made by God’s direction, are allowed to be adored, since the commandment stands still in force against making the likeness of anything to worship or bow down to it” (*Comber ubi supra*). This example is censured in the “Caroline Books” as rash and absurd. “The holy Moses is said to have made, at God’s command, a propitiatory—the ark of the Testament—and also to have hewn two tablets of stone: yet he never gave any command to worship these things; nor did he make them as memorials of the past, but as a most sacred pre-figuration of future mysteries. How great their folly and madness who endeavour to put their images in comparison with these most sacred and honourable things made at the express command of God; for, while pictures teach nothing else but the manner in which events have occurred, these (the ark, &c.) are ever splendid with holy and excellent mysteries, and glisten with sacraments.” A lengthened dissertation follows as to the significant meaning of the cherubim, &c., which seems very well sustained; after which the chapter is concluded thus: “These things—the ark, propitiatory, and cherubim—we seek not to see in painted tablets or walls, but to behold with the eye of the mind in the hidden shrine of the heart; for, according to the Apostle, ‘We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of God; not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but in the manifestation of the truth:’ which *truth* let us not now

law, made a temple full of images of lions, oxen, palm-trees, and men in brass, both sculptured and molten; nor was he reproved by God for doing this.* If therefore you condemn me about images, condemn God Himself, who commanded that such things should be made to be a memorial of Himself amongst us. But, replies the Jew,† these likenesses were never worshipped as gods, but were intended for the sake of memorial only. Thou hast well said, rejoins the Christian: neither are our images, pictures, or likenesses of the saints, worshipped as gods, for if they worshipped the wood of an image as God, why then they would worship all other wood. Again, if they worshipped the wood on which an image is painted as God, they would never dare to burn that wood after that the image which was upon it had been obliterated‡. Whereas, on the contrary, as long as the two beams of the cross are united together, I worship them for the sake of Christ, who was crucified thereon; but, after they are separated, I throw them aside and burn them as any other wood.

seek by pictures and images, since it is by faith, hope, and charity, we have come, with His assistance, to Christ, who is the Truth."—*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 15.

Adrian replies: "We have before most meekly laid before you how our most holy predecessors were wont to allege in their Councils the example here taken from the law as an argument in favour of images." After which follows a passage from Pope Gregory I., treating about the cherubim, but in no way confirming image-worship by them.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 118, col. i.

* The example of Solomon's lions and oxen is considered no less absurd than that of the cherubim in the "Caroline Books," lib. ii. c. 9. After some prefatory observations, the question is asked in a rhetorical manner. Why, O Son of David—why, O King of Israel—why, O wisest of the wise, hast thou made these things? "I made them, not to be worshipped, but to signify certain mysteries: not to favour error, but to adumbrate things as yet kept secret: not to be a stumbling-block to the darkened mind, but to point out things of importance to the careful enquirer." After some other observations, the meaning of the lions and oxen which Solomon placed in the temple is explained of that mixture of gentleness and anger which distinguished the Apostles of our Lord; for, according to the opinion of Gregory, "they were, from humility, the companions of those who did well; while, from zeal for righteousness, they were in arms against the sins of those who did amiss, as if, one while, the gentleness of the ox supported them; while, at another, they were filled with the anger of the lion:" both which may be seen in the example of Peter, who showed such kindness to Cornelius—such anger and indignation against Ananias and Sapphira. To this Adrian replies, that his most holy predecessors had always been accustomed to take examples of this kind as arguments for image-worship; and he concludes: "Nimirum constat eorum Apostolicam censuram apud nos observandam, ac venerandam existere" (whether it be right or wrong). Augustin is quoted for show; for what is quoted is nothing to the purpose.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 123, col. i.

† Leontius's Jew is made to say that which it suits Leontius's Christian to answer: for any real Jew would declare that none of these things were ever worshipped at all—no prayers were said to them, such as Christians offer to their images—no incense was offered to them, nor were the people required to fall down and worship them, as do those who are called Christians do to their Panagias, &c.

‡ This supposition of Leontius is contradicted by Isaiah xlv. 19.

“Again, as he who receives the mandate of a king and kisses the seal does not intend thereby any honour to the wax, the letter itself, or the lead, but only a demonstration of respect and reverence to the king—so we, the sons of Christians, when we worship the type of the cross, honour not the wood of which it is formed; but looking on it as the seal, the ring, the image of Christ, by means of it we worship Him who was crucified upon it. Again, as when the lawfully begotten children of any father who for a season is absent from them, out of their great affection towards him, whenever they see in the house his staff, his coat, his chair, embrace them with kisses and tears, and this not intending to honour the things mentioned, but to show their respect and affection to their father*—so all we, the faithful, worship the cross of Christ as His staff—His all holy tomb as His throne and couch—the manger, Bethlehem, and holy places where He abode as His house—the holy Apostles, Martyrs, and other Saints, we honour as His friends—as His city we venerate Zion—as His country we reverence Nazareth—Jordan we embrace as His divine bath; and, further, from the ineffable love we bear towards Him, the very spots whence He ascended, where He sat down, where He appeared, which He touched, or over which His shadow passed, *we venerate as the place of God*; † and yet we honour not the place, the house, the country, the city, or the stones; but Him alone who sojourned there and there appeared, and was made manifest in the flesh, even Christ our God who hath set us free from all error. And for the sake of Christ

* “Since they accounted their images religious things and used them in religious worship, it is very impertinent to justify this kind of adoration by children’s affectionate kisses given to their absent father’s staff, or chair, or his coat; and to think to defend it by parents kissing their children, or children saluting their parents, or subjects bowing to their prince; for these are only marks of civil love and respect, and differ vastly from that religious veneration which he would establish; and he would have us pay this veneration for Christ’s sake, not only to the cross, but to His tomb, to His manger; yea, to Bethlehem, Zion, Nazareth and Jordan; and why not to any other tomb or manger if we cannot come at or find these—to any other town, if those be demolished—or to any other river, since that water which Christ touched is run away long since, if it but be done for Christ’s sake, it is well enough. At this rate, nobody can tell where this gross and ridiculous superstition will stop.”—*Comber ubi supra*, p. 295, vol. viii. p. 8, edit. 1848.

† The author of the “Caroline Books” (lib. iii. c. 27), is rather hard upon Leontius, who does not say, *we venerate images as the place of God*; but we venerate the spots where Christ walked, sat down upon, &c., as the place of God.

Adrian replies by two quotations from St. Augustin, and one from St. Chrysostom; but as neither of them prove that images are the place of God, or that any particular spot should be so styled, they seem brought forward more for show than use, by way of saying something rather than proving anything.—*Adrian’s Answer*, p. 128, col. i.

it is that we represent the sufferings of Christ in churches, in houses, in markets, in pictures, on veils, in private chambers, on our garments, and in all other places, that having these things continually in view we may never forget as you have forgotten the Lord your God. Again, when you worship the book of the law, you worship not the parchment or the ink, but the words of God found therein; so, in like manner, when I worship the image of God, I worship not the wood or the colours—(God forbid!); but, laying hold upon the lifeless image, I seem by means of it to lay hold on and to worship Christ Himself.*

“Again, as Jacob, when he had received from his sons Joseph’s coat of many colours, now covered with blood, kissed it with tears, and placed it over his eyes†—and yet he did this, not out of affection

* Did any Jew ever pray to, fall down before, incense, or light tapers before the law, as Leontius and the Papists are taught to do to their images!

† This example is censured in the “Caroline Books,” not only as being quite inapplicable as an argument for image-worship, but as making additions not warranted by the language of Scripture. “We must not wonder if they should accuse Jacob of kissing his son’s coat and placing it upon his eyes, when they had actually accused him of worshipping Pharaoh himself: for he who is once deceived may be often deceived again. Now, neither in the Hebrew original, nor in the Latin version, do we find that Jacob did kiss Joseph’s coat or place it over his eyes; and, even if he did, image-worship could not in the very remotest manner be encouraged thereby; since it is one thing to *worship*, another to *kiss* (though they most illogically account these actions to be the same); it is one thing to *adore a painted image*: another, from affection, to *place on eyes full of tears the vest of a dear son, now supposed to be no more*; it is one thing to bow the neck to an image: another to kiss the garment of a son beloved more than his brothers from internal regard; but, from Scripture, we learn that he neither kissed the garment, nor placed it upon his eyes, but simply that he looked upon it, and knew it to belong to his son Joseph.”

The rest of the chapter is taken up with an allegorical interpretation of the passage, in which it is pretended to prove that the death and passion of Christ are thereby typically and mystically signified.—*Caroline Books*, lib. i. c. 12.

Adrian has much to say in reply. First, he brings forward a passage from the oration of St. Gregory the Divine, in which he speaks in an oratorical manner. “A wild beast, he exclaimed, hath seized Joseph—a most vile and horrid beast; and bringing near to him the blood-stained vest of his son he kissed it, as if he were kissing the flesh of the lad.” Next we have a passage from Ambrose, in which he makes mention of Uriel, on which Adrian remarks: “Observe that in our *Codices*, which are made from the Hebrew verity, the name of Uriel is nowhere found.” Again: St. Ambrose makes mention of a third book of *Esdra*s: “now, we have but two books of *Esdra*s translated from the Hebrew verity. But that most excellent Pope Gregory in his epistle to Theochita (lib. ix., epist. 39), observes, that the history of the death of John the Baptist testifies that after his death his body was burned by his persecutors. Now (adds Adrian) we read in the Gospels that the body of John the Baptist was buried by his disciples; and yet blessed Gregory tells us by history that the body of this same John the Baptist was burned. Wherefore, as we have said, the sayings of Saints ought never to be rejected: for who could ever pretend to understand the whole of the sacred Scriptures?” [Possibly St. Matthew was mistaken, and St. Gregory’s history, from Catholic tradition, was the correct account! Or did the burial of his body by disciples MYSTICALLY signify that it was burned by persecutors!] Adrian has proved Gregory, Ambrose, and

or regard to the garment, but because thus he seemed to kiss Joseph himself and to have him in his hands—in the same manner all Christians, when they lay hold on and in the flesh salute the image of Christ or of any Apostle and Martyr, do seem in the spirit to lay hold on and to salute Christ Himself or the Martyr so represented. Tell me, O thou who considerest, that nothing made with hands, or, indeed, that no created thing whatsoever, should be worshipped, hast thou not, when in thy chamber thou hast seen the garments or some ornament belonging to thy wife or children now deceased, taking them up in thine hands, covered them with kisses—made them moist with tears? And wert thou ever condemned for this? No; for thou didst not worship these garments as gods, but thy kisses were only intended to show the regard which thou bearest to the person who at one time or other did wear them. And have we not often embraced our parents or our children, though created beings and even sinful? And we were never condemned for this; for we do not salute them as gods, but by this, our salutation, we display the natural affection which we bear towards them; for, as I have often said, the intension of every salutation, and of every act of reverence, should be enquired into. But if you accuse me for worshipping the wood of the cross, why, in like manner, do you not accuse Jacob who worshipped the top of Joseph's staff? Now, as it is evident that he did not worship

his predecessors, to be in error, not Leontius to have spoken rightly—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 114, col. i.

* The argument, grounded upon this perversion of Heb. ii. 21, is a great favourite with the Council, and, indeed, with all Romish writers, when treating on image-worship: it meets, however, with no favour in the "Caroline Books." The title of lib. i. c. 13, begins this—*De eo quod indocte et inordinate dicunt*, &c. "Neither must we pass by that which they affirm, that Jacob worshipped the top of the staff of Joseph; particularly as they imagine they obtain thence an admirable argument in favour of their image-worship. In no Latin codex is it read, '*Adoravit summitatem virgæ Joseph;*' but, in certain of them, '*Adoravit super caput virgæ;*' though, in the Hebrew original, on which we may securely rely, there is no mention made of the staff at all, but it saith only, '*Adoravit Israel Dux conversus ad lectuli caput.*'" [Here follows a quotation from St. Augustin upon this text, of which notice was taken in the notes made on Adrian's letter, where he had amused himself with the same misquotation]. After which the chapter is thus continued: "Now let them declare—let them declare if they can, what reply they can they make who had no scruple in their zeal for images to criminate so great a Patriarch, and actually to pervert Scripture for that purpose? See how the Hebrew verity declares that this Patriarch worshipped on the head of his bed! See the Latin Bible affirms that he worshipped *super caput virgæ*, or *in capite*, or *in cacumine*, or *super cacumen virgæ*. See, moreover, how Augustin, after careful enquiry, affirms that, on the top of his own or of his son's Joseph's staff, he worshipped neither the staff nor his son, but God alone. Then let them inform us, what translator of the sacred law would ever interpret that he worshipped the top of his son's staff or that by that staff he worshipped his son; or what studious enquirer into God's law did ever expound that he worshipped his son's staff, or

the wood on which he looked, but rather Joseph by the wood, so in like manner, is it evident that by the wood of the cross we worship Christ. Again, Abraham worshipped the impious men who sold him a burial place and bowed his knee to the earth before them, yet he did not worship them as gods. Again, *Jacob blessed Pharaoh*, though an impious man and an idolator, but he blessed him not as God.* Again, he fell down and worshipped Esau, but not as God. See you not how many instances of salutation and worship we have laid before you from the Scripture, and none of which ever met with any condemnation.

his son instead of God? And, forasmuch, as such an one they can never discover, let them consider that their interpretation is rather the perverter and opponent of the divine Scripture than its useful expositor; but, since the whole series of sacred writ is mutilated or perverted by them in order to favour their image-worship, why, then, they had better procure a new writing of the law to take the place of that of Moses—a new renovation thereof instead of that of Ezra—a new translation to succeed that of the Seventy and Jerome, which may so far gainsay the Scriptures that all who despise the worship-images may be bound with the fetters of an anathema. Moreover, the difference of the cross of Christ and painted pictures—how far the cross exceeds them in mystery, or how the human race was redeemed, not by images, but by the cross of Christ, which two things they are pleased to account equal—we shall show in the sequel, if the Lord favour us.”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 13.

Adrian's reply is brief but quite irrelevant. “Blessed Augustin hath admirably explained the rod or sceptre to be a type of the cross; saying (among other things), on Psalm xxxvii. :—“Verily, we rejoice that this hath taken place in the name of Christ: for now they who wield the sceptre are subject to the wood of the cross: now that hath taken place which was foretold ‘All the kings of the earth shall worship Him, all nations shall serve Him.’ Now, the sign of the cross in the foreheads of kings is more precious to them than the gem of their diadem.”—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 114, col. i.

* “We have before (lib. i. c. 14), proved that the Patriarch Jacob did not worship Pharaoh, but blessed him. We would now shortly discuss this, that in this synod *blessing* is considered the same with adoration: for that they may confirm the worship of images, in which their whole soul is wound up, and in which they would make all holiness to depend, they aim at perverting many words and sentences which have quite a different meaning to the support of this adoration. For instance, when it is said that this Patriarch blessed Pharaoh, they do not understand it to relate to that blessing which exiles are wont to bestow upon citizens—the laity to their prelates—the poor on the rich—or, more specially, the old to those who have in any way benefitted them, but to a worshipping of I know what pictures and images, which is so absolutely unprofitable that they can tell no one good which can result from it. For they say, ‘Jacob blessed Pharaoh, but he blessed him not as God!’ We worship images, but we worship them not as gods. O absurd comparison! O vain conjecture! O most stolid observation! Do you pretend that there is any similarity between that blessing which the holy Patriarch bestowed on the King—who had conferred the highest dignity on his beloved son and had granted to himself and all his children to inhabit a rich district—and that worship which you pay to images, which can do no more for their worshippers than record to their minds the events which they represent? Jacob blessed Pharaoh, but not as God, whom every creature blesses and praises—no, nor as a picture which is made by the hand of the workman; but as a man to whom, on account of the greatness granted to him by God, the honour due to such power should be displayed. He blessed him (I say) not as a senseless image, but as a rational man—not as

And you each day kiss your wife though it may be wanting both in modesty and goodness, and are not for this condemned although God hath never enjoined upon you this carnal salutation of womankind; but when you see me kissing the image of Christ, of His immaculate Mother or of any other Saint, you are quite indignant, vent insulting blasphemies, and call me an idolator. Tell me, are you not ashamed?—do you not tremble?—do you not blush?—when you see how every day throughout the world I am destroying the temples of idols and raising in their place the temples of the Martyrs? Now, if I worship idols, how can I any more worship the Martyrs who destroyed idols? If I honour and glory in wood as gods, how is it that I honour and worship the Martyrs who destroyed wooden images? If I worship stones as gods, how is it that I worship and magnify the Martyrs and Apostles who broke them to pieces and destroyed their statues of stone? * Why do I honour and praise, build temples for, and institute festivals in honour of the three young men in Babylon who would not worship the golden image? Verily, great is the blindness of the Jews—great is their impiety. Truth is set at nought by them—yea, God Himself is reproached by the tongues of these graceless Jews. By the relics and images of Martyrs demons are expelled; and yet these cursed men treat them with every kind of contumely, insult, and disgrace. How many have been the obumbrations—how many the emanations—how many the flowings of blood—from the images and relics of the Martyrs? But they being void of understanding, though they see, are not persuaded, but still account such things fables and old wives' tales. *Nor are they convinced*, though they daily see, how, throughout the world by Christ and His cross, the impious and lawless, the idolator, murderer, fornicator, and robber are brought

a thing put together by the wit of the painter, but as one made after God's image and likeness—not as a thing immovably fixed to walls, but as one conferring blessings on himself and his offspring. This kind of blessing, given in return for benefits received, hath no similarity to the worship of images, which can neither reward those who worship them, nor avenge themselves on those who despise such worship altogether."—*Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 14.

To this Adrian replies: "Holy Scripture teaches us always to bless—'Bless and curse not.' Again, 'O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord.' Again, 'God shall bless us, and all the ends of the world shall fear Him.' Indeed, if we were to attempt to bring forward all that Scripture saith in favour of blessing, our paper would fail before that we had finished our work."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 114, col. i. All this does not prove that blessing and worshipping are the same things.

* Our Lord's words (Luke xi. 47, 48), seem to be an answer to this challenge of Leontius—"Ye build the tombs of the Prophets, and your fathers killed them: truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers, for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres."—See also *Romans* ii. 21-23.

to compunction, learn to renounce the world and to practice every virtue. Say, how can we be worshippers of idols who honour and worship the bones, the ashes, the rags, the blood, the tombs of the Martyrs, who became martyrs for no other cause than that they would not worship idols? The Jew saith—Why, then, throughout the Scripture, hath God commanded us to worship no creature? The Christian replies—Tell me, are not the *earth* and the *mountains* creatures of God? Certainly. Then, says the Christian, how is it that He teaches us thus—‘Exalt the Lord our God* and worship His foot-stool, for it

* The application of this verse to the support of image-worship is severely censured in the “Caroline Books” (lib. ii. c. 5). After a short introduction of a rhetorical nature, it is continued as follows :—“Because we are commanded by the Prophet to worship the foot-stool of the Lord, is, therefore, the worship of images to be established? What similarity, then, is there between the foot-stool of the Lord and material images? What community is there between the unspeakable works of God and images the work of the workman? Or what agreement between so excellent and illustrious a mystery and senseless figures, the work of human ingenuity? Or where is it ordained that *images should be worshipped* as it is ordained that *the foot-stool of the Lord be worshipped*? David does not say, *Worship the images of certain Saints*, but ‘*Worship the foot-stool of the Lord*’; neither doth the Lord say, *The work of men’s hands is my throne and images are my foot-stool*, but ‘*Heaven is my throne, and earth is my foot-stool*.’ Hear, then, thou most absurd, or rather most insane, error!—hear O thou incomparable madness!—hear O thou most ridiculous stupidity!—hear the blessed Ambrose teaching what is meant by *the foot-stool of the Lord* and how it is to be worshipped; for He saith—‘The Apostles worshipped the Lord, and so also did the Angels. But they adore not only His Divinity, but also His foot-stool, for it is holy.’ And shortly after—‘But lest the proposed example seem to be beyond the comprehension of some, let us consider in what way the words of the Prophet, ‘Worship the foot-stool of His feet,’ apply to the incarnation of our Lord. We must not understand the word as it is in use amongst men, as if God needed any foot-stool for His support. Nor are we to worship any thing besides God, for it is written, ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.’ Now, no Prophet would ever enjoin any thing contrary to the law, and, therefore, we must enquire further as to the word *foot-stool*. We read elsewhere, ‘The heaven is my throne and the earth is my foot-stool’; but neither must we worship the earth, because it is a creature. Let us see, therefore, whether it is not that earth which our Lord assumed in His incarnation which is to be worshipped. Therefore, by the *foot-stool*, ‘earth’ is meant, and by ‘earth’ the flesh of Christ, which we now worship in the mysteries, and which, as we said before, the Apostles worshipped in our Lord Jesus.”

It is afterwards observed that Augustin took the same view with Ambrose, and understood the *foot-stool of the Lord* to mean the flesh which our Lord assumed of the Virgin Mary.

Adrian’s reply is remarkable, consisting of one passage from Augustin, in perfect accordance with Ambrose, the “Caroline Books,” and the Iconoclasts; but in perfect opposition to Leontius and himself. Blessed Augustin, in his explanation of Psalm cviii., says—“I fear not to worship the *foot-stool of my Lord*, for the Psalm saith to me—‘Worship His footstool’; and shortly after—‘I turn me to Christ, for Him I seek here, and here I find how earth may be worshipped without impiety—how the *foot-stool of His feet* may be adored without impiety; for He took earth from earth; for flesh is of earth, and He took flesh of Mary.” Hence, we may conclude that the Christian of Leontius was of a very different mind from those great Fathers of the Church, Ambrose, and

is holy' (Ps. xcix. 5) ; and, 'Worship in His holy mountain' (Ps. xcix. 9). Again : He saith—'Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool' (Isaiah lxxv. 1). The Jew replies—'We must not adore them as gods, but rather by them we must worship Him who made these things. The Christian rejoins—True is the word which you have spoken ; but be it known to you that I also by heaven, by earth, by the sea, by wood, by stones, by relics, by temples, by the cross, by angels, by men, and by every creature visible and invisible, offer my worship and adoration to the Creator, Lord and only Framer of them all. For the creature does not glorify the Creator by itself, but through some medium : wherefore *by me* the heavens declare the glory of God ; *by me* the moon worships God ; *by me* the stars glorify God ; *by me* the waters, the showers, the dew—*by me* every creature worships and glorifies God. If some good Sovereign should with his own hands make for himself a curiously-wrought very precious crown, would not all who were sincerely attached to him salute and do reverence to the

Augustin : and that his, "I worship, but not as gods," would have found no favour with them.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 115, col. 2.

* This passage is justly considered in the "Caroline Books" as having as little connection with image-worship as that which preceded. "Neither can the worship of images receive any support from the words of the Prophet 'Worship in his holy mountain,' since the holy man does not teach us to worship the mountain, but rather the Lord in the mountain. Indeed, had He taught us thus to worship the mountain, all sound minds would have understood, not that images should be worshipped, but our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is the mountain which is above all mountains—that is, whose dignity and excellence far exceeds the dignity and excellence of any Saint whatsoever ; of whom it is written by the Prophet Isaiah (Isaiah ii. 1). "Let it, however, stand thus—'Worship the Lord in His holy mountain ;' for the Prophet does not here bid us worship the mountain, but the Lord in the mountain, for this doubtless refers to Mount Zion—that is, the Church, which is the mount of mountains and the holy of holies, of which Christ is the inhabitant. Wherefore, he does well to enjoin that the holy Lord be worshipped in a holy place ; for, as His praise sounds not well from a depraved mouth, so, in like manner, not every place becomes the sanctity of His worship. Let us then worship in His holy mountain, not images or such like superstitious vanities, but that Lord who is the Head of that mountain, and who, that He might obtain that mountain, condescended not only to be born, but even to lay down His life : concerning which it is said by the Prophet (Pa. lxxviii. 54)—'He brought them to the mountain of His holiness—the mountain which His own right hand had obtained.'—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. vi.

Adrian replies by a quotation from Saint Augustin's exposition of this Psalm, in which he says, "The heretics do not worship in that mountain, for that mountain hath filled the face of the whole earth : they stumbled at some part—they have lost the whole. If they acknowledge the Church, then will they worship in that holy mountain with us ; for that stone cut out of the mountain without hands, see how it hath increased—what regions it hath reached—among what far distant nations hath it not arrived." The quotation is much longer, but equally irrelevant ; for it has not in it one word either to confirm the misapplication of Leontius, or to answer the censure of the "Caroline Books."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 115, col. 2.

crown, not honouring thereby the gold or the jewels, but rather the head of the Sovereign and the ingenious hands which had formed it? Thus it is, O man, when Christians embrace crosses or images: they worship not the wood, or the stones, or the perishable image, or the chest, or the relics; but by means of these they offer their glory, reverence, and worship to God the Creator of them and of all things. How often have they who have destroyed or insulted the royal image suffered capital punishment, who were judged as having injured a Sovereign, and not a picture merely?

“ Now, the image of God is man,* who was created after the image of God, and specially those who have received the indwelling of the Spirit. Justly do I honour and worship the image of the servants of God and glorify the abode of the Holy Spirit; ‘ for (saith He) I will dwell in them and walk in them ’ (2 Cor. vi. 16). Let the Jews who have worshipped Kings, both their own and those of the Gentiles,† blush with shame if inclined to revile Christians as Idolaters. We Christians, in every country and city, do daily and hourly take up arms against idols—against idols we sing, against idols we write, against idols and devils we pray. How, then, dare the Jews to call us ‘ Idolaters? ’ Where are now the sacrifices of sheep, of oxen, and of children, which they were accustomed to offer to their idols? Where are their odours, their altars, their effusion of blood? We Christians know nothing either of altar or sacrifice.‡ The Gentiles dedicated temples and idols to adulterers and murderers—men impure and accursed—and made gods of them; but never did they dedicate either altar or temple to Prophet or holy Martyr. We know that the Jews in Babylon had harps and organs and other musical instruments, even as had the Babylonians; but those of the *one* were for the glory of God, while those of the *other* were for the service of devils: so let us distinguish between the Gentile and Christian images—theirs are for the service of Satan; ours for the remembrance and the glory of God. Moreover, God hath made us to hear of many miracles wrought by wood: thus, He called one tree the *Tree of Life*; another, the *Tree of Knowledge*; another, *Sabek* the *Tree of Forgiveness*.§ Again: by the *rod* He

* *Vide Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. vii., quoted above in the Second Session.

† It does not appear from the Scripture that the Jews ever worshipped either their own kings or the kings of the Gentiles; but it suits Leontius to say so, and possibly he had it from tradition!

‡ Surely, Leontius was somewhat oblivious, when he forgot both the sacrifice of the Mass and the unbloody sacrifice which others talk about.

§ The two first trees we read of in the book of Genesis; but, for the third, I fear we have no better authority than unwritten tradition.

overwhelmed Pharaoh, He divided the sea, made the water sweet, lifted up the serpent: He opened the rock and brought forth water. The rod also which budded fixed the priesthood in Aaron; and thus Solomon saith—' Bless ye the wood whence cometh righteousness '* (Wisdom of Sol. xiv. 8). So also Elisha, having cast the wood into the water of Jordan, brought back the iron, a type of the redemption of Adam, from hades; and, further, he commanded his servant to raise up the son of the Shunamite by means of his staff.† Has, then, God wrought so many wonders‡ by means of wood, tell me why He cannot work miracles by means of the wood of the Holy Cross?

“ And, if it be impious to do honour to bones, why were the bones of Joseph brought with so much care from Egypt? How came it to

* Leontius, it seems, could mutilate Scripture as well as others; for he leaves out the last part of this verse as being opposed to his views. That which is left out is as follows:—*τὸ δὲ χειροποίητον ἘΠΙΚΑΤΑΡΑΤΟΝ αὐτό, καὶ ὁ ποιῆσας αὐτό*—that which is made with hands is *αὐθεντικὸν* and *ἔσται* also that made it.

† Elisha's sending Gehazi with his rod to raise up the Shunamite's child is little to the Bishop's purpose, inasmuch as no miracle at all was wrought thereby (2 Kings iv. 31).

‡ This argument, which Leontius labours to establish in favour of image-worship as supported by the miracles said to be wrought by Moses's rod, &c., is confuted at great length in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 25); the title of which is, "That images are not to be worshipped, because, as they say, certain signs have been wrought by them, since not all things are worshipped by which or in which miracles have appeared."

“ This argument is very common with them in order to establish their error, that by certain images miracles have been wrought. Now, as no such thing is to be found in the pages of the Old or New Testament, if such signs have been seen or heard, there is too much reason to fear lest it should be the work of the old enemy, who can transform himself into an angel of light.” The point is then discussed how far such miracles might be wrought by Satanic agency; and, from passages in Gregory and Augustin, it is considered quite within the bounds of probability. But, as the records of such miracles are not very authentic, it is further observed that possibly such miracles were never wrought at all, and the whole account of them is mere fabrication: in such case they are utterly unworthy the notice of the servants of the truth. But, admitting that such histories are true and that the miracles recorded were wrought by the divine agency, since God as He is omnipotent can work miracles by means of any creature which He is pleased to use for that purpose, still He never wrought them on this account that the images themselves should be worshipped, for He hath commanded us to worship and serve Him only. “What (it is continued)! because God appeared to Moses in the bush, are bushes to be worshipped? No: He appeared not in the bush to authorise the worship of the bush, but that by its thorns might be signified the sins for which the law had come. As the root of the bush has no thorns, but only its higher parts, we understand thereby that sins are not by natural creation. The bush was not burned with fire to show that sins are not destroyed by the law, but only exposed by it. The law displays sin: the grace which is given in Christ alone cures the sins which the law had manifested. Because the Lord appeared in the fire, He did not, therefore, mean that fire should be worshipped; but He chose to appear in that element whose nature is always to ascend. Nor because He was pleased to descend upon a mountain, it is to be thought that He

pass that a dead man came to life again on touching the bones of Elisha? And, if God work miracles by bones, He can do the same no less by images, by stones, and many other things of the same kind. Moreover, Abraham did not choose that the body of Sarah should be buried in the tombs of the aliens, but only in his own sepulchre, for the sake of honour. Jacob also by a stone honoured God, having set it up and poured oil upon it as a type of Christ the chief corner-stone* (Gen. xxxi. 43-49). And, again, he called a heap of stones a witness against Laban. Joshua the son of Nave also testifies in our favour who set up twelve stones for a memorial.†

intended that we should worship mountains; but He chose a high rather than a low place to signify that He is the Most High, and to teach His followers to aspire after lofty things. Because the Legislator used sharp stones in circumcision, are stones to be worshipped? Or because the rod was so often turned into a serpent and again converted into a rod, and typified Christ's passage from life to death and His return from death to life again, are rods to be adored? Because the tree cast into the water made the water sweet, must we therefore worship trees? Because the people were healed by looking on the brazen serpent, must we therefore worship serpents and brass? Because the well being struck sent forth streams for the refreshment of the people, are we to worship rocks or water? Must we worship rods, because the rod of Aaron budded?—or barn floors and fleeces, because the floor and fleeces of Jerubbaal were alternately made wet or dry?—or jaw-bones and teeth, because with the one Samson destroyed a thousand men, and from the other sprang the stream which refreshed him when fainting from thirst? Because Elisha divided the river with a cloak, are therefore cloaks to be adored?—or because Naaman the Syrian was cured of his leprosy in a river, must we on that account worship rivers? Because Elisha received not the Spirit till a minstrel was brought to him, must minstrels be worshipped?—or because the woman in the Gospel was cured by touching the hem of our Saviour's garment, are the hems of garments to be honoured?—or because the shadow of Peter cured many, must we therefore worship shadows? From all which it follows, that not all things by which or in which God has been pleased to work miracles are therefore certainly to be worshipped. But if those things in which miracles have appeared are not therefore to be worshipped, how much less ought images to be worshipped, concerning which we have no authentic account that they have the least connection with miracles whatever."

Adrian replies—"We have shown before, concerning the worship of images, that they in their definition defined it to be a kissing and salutation of honour, and not our true worship, which is according to the faith which belongs to God alone." Augustin saith, on Psalm lxxvi., "Thou, O God, art truly great, doing wondrous things, in soul and body, and doing them by thyself alone:" and shortly after, "Moses wrought, but not alone; Elijah wrought—Elisha wrought—the Apostles wrought—but none of them wrought alone. When they wrought thou wroughtest with them," &c. ("Adrian's Answer," p. 119, col. 1). Can any one discern in this passage of Saint Augustin the very slightest connection with the worship of images, with Leontius's letter, or the censure of the "Caroline Books?"

* Adrian brings forward this instance as one of his arguments in favour of image-worship in his letter to Constantine and Irene: it is censured in *Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. x.

† This example of Joshua is attributed in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. c. xxi.) to John the Eastern Legate: numerous and flagrant as are his absurdities in this instance, he stands acquitted; and the censure belongs to Leontius and

“ And since, O Jew, thou hadst in thy temple two graven images of Cherubim overshadowing the mercy-seat, if any Gentile idolater had come in, and, when he saw these things, had blamed the Jews as themselves being worshippers of idols, tell me, what defence you would have made in behalf of the two molten cherubim, the lions, the oxen, and palm-trees, which, being graven images, were in the temple? You could have said nothing else, in truth, but this—that we have not these cherubims in the temple as gods; but for the remembrance and for the glory of God we have them there. Now, if it be so, wherefore do you blame me in the matter of images? But you will say to me that God *commanded* Moses to make those graven images in the temple: but I say this, that Solomon, having taken his pattern from the tabernacle, made many more images for his temple which neither God had commanded nor were seen in the tabernacle of the testimony nor in the temple which God showed to Ezekiel; and yet he never was condemned for this, since he made those figures for the glory of God even as we do now.* Thou hadst, O Jew, other things

not to him. “ Never (it is observed) did the members of that Synod bring forward any testimony from the sacred writings which had any relation to that which they wished to support; and this which is here brought forward by John the Presbyter (it should be *Leontius*) is as little to their purpose as any of the rest—namely, that Joshua set up twelve stones for a memorial of God. Now, if the fact be considered historically, and the enquiry be made why these stones were brought out of the river and set up, it was not to teach Israel in after ages the worship of images, but to be a memorial of the wonderful miracle of the drying up of the river while the children of Israel passed over. But if it be considered typically, then it points out the twelve Apostles whom our new Joshua, even Jesus who brings us into the celestial Canaan, chose when he would establish baptism as the sacrament by which we enter into that heavenly land; to whom also He said—‘ Go and teach all, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ By the other twelve stones, which were left in the midst of the river, must be understood the Patriarchs and Prophets, who, as being under the law, could not openly preach the sacrament of baptism, but rather hinted at it under certain dark and mystical figures, like the stones covered with water; for though they did not manifestly institute baptism, yet they may not be supposed to be altogether destitute of this mystery. In the place of which fathers, *sons* have been born to the holy Church—that is, the Apostles whom he hath made princes in all lands, that by them the Church being filled with heavenly gifts, and well instructed in right doctrine, may never cease to seek the Lord, and that not by the colouring of images and such like superstitious vanities, but by faith and good works.

Adrian replies—“ In the book of Joshua, it is written — ‘ But Joshua rent his garments, and fell prone on the earth before the ark, even to the evening, even he and all Israel; and they put dust upon their heads: and the Lord said, Why dost thou lie prostrate? Israel hath sinned: arise, sanctify the people.’ See how Joshua prostrated himself before the ark and was heard. And the holy doctor Pope Gregory, in his letter to Secundinus, admonishes him thus:— ‘ And we do not prostrate ourselves before it as a divinity, but we worship Him whom we by means of the image remember as being born, or suffering, or sitting on a throne,’ ” &c.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 125, col. 1.

* *Vide* 1 Chron. xxviii. 11-19. Had Leontius read these verses, he would have

for the glory and praise of God—the rod of Moses, the tables written with the finger of God, the bush that was not burned, the rock which gave forth water, the pot which contained manna, the ark, the altar, the leaf which bore the name of God, the ephod which manifested God, the tabernacle in which God dwelt.* Well had it been for thee if of old thou hadst been contented by these things to worship and call upon God who is over all, and by these inferior types and images had kept Him in remembrance; and, if thou hadst not preferred thy calf and flies to the tablets framed by God, I would that thou hadst regarded thy golden altar, and not the calves of Samaria—I would that thou hadst chosen the rod which budded, and not Astarte which desolated thy city. O, that thou hadst embraced the rod, which by divine command gave forth water (*ἀμβρόθειον πέτραν*), and not thy god Baal; † but, O Ancient Israel, the reason that thou didst not worship these things was that thou hast not loved the Lord thy God with all thy heart. ‡ As he who loves his friend, his Sovereign, and above all his benefactor, when he sees his son, his staff, his throne, his crown, his house, or his servant, lays hold of them and embraces them, and by means of them honours him whom he regards: much more in this way will any one honour God who loves Him. When, therefore, you see Christians worshipping the cross, know that their worship is offered to Christ who was crucified thereon, and not to the wood of which it is made; for if they worshipped the nature of the wood, why, then, they must worship all trees and all wood, just as thou, O Israel, didst in times of old, saying, ‘to the tree and to the wood, thou art my God, thou hast begotten me’ (Jer. ii. 27). Again: we never speak thus of the cross or of the images of Saints, ‘Ye are our gods;’ for they are not our gods, but images and likenesses of Christ and of His Saints, which are set forth and worshipped for the sake of reminiscence and for the honour and glory of the Church; for he who honours a Martyr honours God—he who worships the Mother of God worships Him—and he who honours an Apostle honours Him that sent him. Would that thou hadst made images of Moses and the Pro-

seen that Solomon made nothing in the temple after his own mind as he pretends, but everything after a divinely-appointed pattern.

* The Greek is—*τὸ θεώνυμον πέταλον, τὸ θεόκληλον ἐφεύδ, τὴν θεόσκη-
νον σκηνήν.*

† Gregory II. was so pleased with this vain tirade that he gives it at full length, in his letter to Germanus, a specimen of those exalted and sublime reasonings, of which he thought the Emperor Leo quite unworthy.

‡ Was Hezekiah guilty of not loving God, wh, not only did not worship the brazen serpent himself, but actually broke it in pieces because he saw his people worshipping it?

phets, and daily by means of these hadst worshipped their God and Master, instead of worshipping the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar ! But, as this was not the case, are you not ashamed thus to be excited and stirred up against me with calumnies about the worship of images and the cross ? If Abraham worshipped idolaters—if Moses worshipped the idolater Jethro—if Jacob worshipped Pharaoh, and Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar *—if these, being just men and prophets,

* The argument attempted to be drawn from these examples is considered and censured at great length in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. c. 9), in which two points are considered:—(1). How we must understand such passages as this—"Abraham worshipped the Children of Heth," and "Moses worshipped Jethro." (2). That Jacob did not worship Pharaoh, nor Daniel Nebuchadnezzar, as Leontius pretends:—"They who were full of zeal for images have been wont to make frequent and familiar use of the examples of Abraham's worshipping the sons of Heth and of Moses bowing before Jethro. But their reverence differs as much from the reverence paid to a painted image as a real man differs from a painted image of a man; for in what proportion a true man exceeds a picture of one, or a rational being from one destitute of reason, or a sensible being from one destitute of sense, or an animated being from an inanimate, in their several definitions, to the same extent does the adoration of images exceed the worship paid by the Patriarchs of old. It is one thing reverently to salute, from respect and affection, one of our fellows; but another to worship, with I know not what worship, a picture made up of various colours, which can neither walk nor speak and is destitute of every other sense. That exhibition of love to the brethren, respect to a neighbour, or of humility towards a superior, which we display in our mutual salutations, is taught in many parts of holy Scripture; but the adoration and worship of images or regard to such senseless trifles is forbidden rather than commanded in every part of the same sacred volume: for instance, St. Peter saith, 'Love the brotherhood'—not love images; and be ye subject, not to pictures, but to every human creature; and he commands us to sanctify the Lord God, not in images, but in our hearts.

"Most insane and contrary to all sound reason is it, to allege these examples of Abraham and Moses as authorities for image worship: since, though often, from that humility by which they pleased God, they paid these outward marks of respect to their fellows; and though, from the same humility, they no less unfrequently refused that same respect when paid to themselves—though at times erect, from the rigour of their sanctity, they refused any such respect towards the proud—yet never has any one of them ever been recorded to have paid, even in the very slightest way, any worship to images. Now, if Moses and Abraham are found to have done reverence to humble men, whilst Mordecai disdained to do the same to the proud Haman—this did the one to encourage humility—that did the other to manifest aversion to sin, or to lead to repentance. But from those instances in which the Angel forbid John to worship him, and Peter forbid the worship of the Centurion, saying, 'Arise, brother, I am a man as thou art'—and Paul and Barnabas with greatest indignation spurned the adoration of the Lycaonians—we may understand that the adoration, which is due to God only who alone is to be worshipped, is to be paid to no other creature whatsoever, and that no other respect is to be paid to the creature than that which humility and proper regard to others might seem to demand. (2). Nor must we pass by in silence that which they say further—namely, that Jacob worshipped Pharaoh and Daniel Nebuchadnezzar, which we find neither in the Hebrew nor in our Latin codices translated by the blessed Jerome. Jacob is said in the Scripture to have been in Pharaoh's presence but once, of which we find in the following account (Gen. xlvii. 7-10). Now, in these words Jacob is said not to have worshipped

did, for the sake of some benefit received, worship on the earth those who were idolaters, do you rise up against me because I worship the cross and the images of the Saints by whom I obtain ten thousand blessings from God through them? He who reverences his sovereign does not dishonour his son; and he who fears God honours equally, and worships and reverences (as the Son of God) Christ our God,* and

Pharoah, but to have blessed him; and, even had he worshipped him, it would not have been to afford countenance to the worship of images, but to display the humility of the holy Patriarch who feared God and honoured the King. From their way of arguing they seem to imagine that in divine Scripture their most favourite style of speaking, which some style *acyrologia*, is made use of; and so that there also to *bless* means to *worship*; for so common is this with them that they make these words, to *have*, to *embrace*, to *kiss*, to *reverence*, to signify the same thing—that is, to *worship*; and, indeed, almost all words of a similar kind are treated by them in a similar way. But as holy Scripture rejects other errors, so does it this inaccurate mode of speaking, ever using pure, appropriate, and accurate words, as the Prophet declares—“The law of the Lord is unblameable.” Now, if it had put ‘to *bless*’ for ‘to *worship*,’ it would have employed improper words: if it had employed improper words it would not have been unblameable; but it is unblameable—therefore, it never by the words to *worship* meant to *bless*. Say, therefore, O holy Daniel, O Man of Love, O thou who not only foretold things to come but also the time when they should come, tell us, whether as they prate, thou ever didst worship Nebuchadnezzar! Never do you read this of me, in the volume which I wrote. I proposed in my heart, not to be polluted with provisions from his table; and do they say that I worshipped him? When he fell on his face and revered me, and commanded me to offer oblations and sweet odours to the God of gods and King of kings, he might rather seem to worship me than I to worship him; and, even had I bowed before him, I had not revered a senseless thing; but from a sense of humility I, as a subject, had revered a higher power, knowing that there is no power but of God. And, further, since I was cast into the den of lions because I would not violate the commands of my God, and now I am accused of worshipping one whom I never worshipped: even I may cry out with David, ‘False witnesses have risen up against me: they laid to my charge things that I knew not.’ Forasmuch then, as from love for images they are fain to slander Daniel and Jacob, to pervert the sense of Scripture to strange meanings, to treat their parents with contempt, it remains that they glory in the patronage and defence which these same images may confer. And let them glory in their images if they will: our glory shall be in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to us and we unto the world.”

Adrian replies by two quotations from Augustin (1). From his exposition of Psalm xlvi.—“The Lord our God has diffused in many and various ways that faith by which we live, throughout His book the holy Scriptures varying the sacrament of words, but commending unity of faith. On which account it is that one and the same thing is spoken of in many ways, that, while to suit fastidiousness, the mode of speaking is varied on account of the harmony which prevails, one faith may be held.” (2). From his exposition of Genesis xxii.—“The two servants left behind and not brought to the place of sacrifice signify the Jews: the *ass* signifies something further, I know not what, relative to the Jews. Wonder not that one thing is pointed out in so many ways,” &c.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 113, col. 1.

Though one thing be taught in many ways, yet bowing to pictures and images is not proved to be taught by any of the examples adduced by Leontius and defended by Adrian.

* This closing argument of Leontius, being quite consistent in folly and

the type of His cross and the images of the Saints. To whom be glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and evermore, world without end. Amen."

absurdity with those which have preceded, is censured in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. c. 28) as being "Inutile et demens, et errore plenum dictum." The Greek as it stands in the "Concilia" of Binius—(καὶ ὁ τὸν Θεὸν φοβούμενος τιμῆ πάντων καὶ σέβει καὶ προσκυνεῖ ὡς Υἱὸν θεῶ Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸν τύπον τῆ σταυρῶ αὐτῆ, καὶ τὰς χαρακτῆρας τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῆ)—warrants the version censured in the "Caroline Books" as *inutile et demens*—namely, "That he who fears God honours *as* the Son of God both the cross and the images of the Saints;" though, if it were differently pointed, it might bear another meaning—viz. "He who fears God, honours Christ our God as His Son, and the type of His Cross, and the images of the Saints." This sentence, though less grossly absurd than the other, still contains the senseless proposition. "All who fear God worship images." The authors of the "Caroline Books," after stating that the superiority of the cross of Christ to images, and that the worship due to God differs from that worship which is offered to pictures, had been duly animadverted upon before (*vide* lib. ii. c. 28; and lib. iii. c. 17 and 18), add further, that the censure of this chapter would chiefly be confined to this point—"How immensely more important is the fear of the Lord than the worship of images." "For (say they) he who fears God by all means worships images. What, then, must all the Patriarchs and Prophets who have despised the worship of images be considered on that account as not fearing God? Or the Apostles, because they are nowhere said to have worshipped images, must they also be considered to have lived without the fear of God? In like manner as we to look upon the holy Martyrs, the Anchorites, the whole body of Ecclesiastics, who most devotedly combated in God's service, are they to be judged as not having the fear of God, because they are nowhere recorded to have joined in the worship of images; for David, the most holy of Prophets, said, not that he would teach the worship of images, but the fear of the Lord, saying, 'Come, ye children, hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord.' Nor does he ever style the worship of images holy, but he testifies this concerning the fear of the Lord, saying, 'The fear of the Lord is holy and endureth for ever.' Nor does he declare any one who worships images to be blessed but only the man who feareth God, saying, 'Blessed is the man who feareth God and delighteth greatly in His commandments.' Observe, he saith not, 'He who fears God worships images,' as they most ridiculously prate; but 'He who fears God delights in His commandments.' Whence it is evident that the fear of God consists, not in the worship of images, but in the will and desire to keep His commands. The same holy man saith, not that the eyes of the Lord are on those who worship images, but on those that fear Him: nor saith, Worship images, for there is no lack to them that worship them; but 'Fear the Lord ye His Saints; for there is no lack to them that fear Him:' nor, saith he, The worship of images is the beginning of wisdom; but 'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.' Which precept of the Lord we find thus enforced by Moses—'Ye shall walk after the Lord your God and fear Him'; ye shall keep His precepts, and obey His voice, and cleave unto Him.' Among all these beneficial precepts we find no mention of the institution of image worship. As, therefore, the worship of images is found in the divine oracles to be forbidden, it never can be accounted equal to the fear of God which everywhere in those sacred oracles is commended." After adducing many more texts, in order to show in what the fear of the Lord really consists and some few observations on a twofold fear of God, the chapter is thus concluded—"He, therefore, truly fears God who, despising such vanities, exhibits his adherence to Him by faith and good works."

Adrian replies by a quotation from St. Augustin, on Genesis xxii.—"Nor were ye improperly excited when I said the cross hath horns; for it is thus

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "The father now read lived with great reputation for sanctity in one of the cities of Cyprus. We have many of his encomiastic and panegyric discourses, and, amongst the rest, a discourse on the transfiguration. He wrote also the lives of Saint John Archbishop of Alexandria the Almsgiver, and of Saint Symeon the Simple,* and some others beside. All his writings display his orthodoxy. He flourished in the time of the Emperor Maurice."

JOHN Legate of the East: "That all which has now been said in praise of the above-mentioned father is manifestly true; wherefore the Legates of the most holy Pope have brought his book to this Holy Council, and more specially because he is so full on the subject of the reception and worship of images." John said further, after having exhibited another book which he had with him before the Council:—"This book, venerable Fathers, I found in the Royal City, in the library of my Lord Procopius the Silentiary; and I rejoiced much on finding it, since we have a copy of it in the East in all respects similar. In it the blessed Anastasius teaches concerning the distinctions of worship; and, if the Holy Council pleases, let it be read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let it be read."

STEPHEN the Monk, taking the book, read: "The Epistle of Saint Anastasius Bishop of Theopolis to a certain Lawyer, in which he replies to certain doubts laid before him by the same," which begins:—

the two beams are fastened together that they may have the form of a cross. As we see everywhere in the image of a cross the horns on which the hands are fastened, so I behold, in the ram caught by his horns, the Lord crucified" ("Adrian's Answer," p. 124, col. 1). This fanciful interpretation seems to have very little to do with the matter under enquiry.

* Concerning this Saint, the reader may consult Evagrius, lib. iv. cap. 33. His holiness consisted in his acting like a fool—hence his name, *τὸ σαλῆ*; whereas he was accounted very wise—and in obtaining the reputation of a wicked man, while he was reputed to be very holy. He made his great care, being esteemed to be very religious, to appear without any religion at all; and nothing offended him so much as any external token of respect. Absurd as was this conduct of his, he wanted not followers, or at least one follower; for in the very next chapter Evagrius mentions one Thomas, a Monk, who played the fool in the same way that Symeon had done before. His dead body is said to have wrought great miracles. We cannot but think that "Simple Symeon" has met with a very suitable biographer in "Simple Leontius." *Σαλῶς* Græcis recentioribus est *μωρὸς*, importune et stulte nugax.—*Hæmet. in Stephani Thes. Gr.*

“If to him alone who seeks after wisdom, wisdom be imputed:” and, after other things, he continues: “Let no one be offended at the mention of worship, for we worship both men and angels; but we do not serve them. For Moses saith ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve’ (Deut. vi. 13; x. 20; Matt. iv. 10; Luke xl. 8). And mark, too, in the expression, ‘Thou shalt serve’ (*λατρεύσεις*), he had added the word ‘only;’ while to the expression, ‘Thou shalt worship’ (*προσκυνήσεις*), he has not done this. So that it is lawful to worship other things; for worship is the token of respect: but we must by no means serve them; wherefore we must not pray to them. This may serve, in some respects, as an answer to the first; but the second lies subject to the opinions of the generality, not having as yet received the benefit of deep enquiry.”*

TARASIVS: “Observe here what the father saith concerning worship.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “He proves a diversity in worship; for he says, ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.’ To the expression ‘Thou shalt serve,’ he hath added the word ‘only;’ while to the expression, ‘Thou shalt worship,’ he hath not done this. Now, the false Conventicle took this passage as in favour of themselves; but it is manifest that they did this most impiously.”†

TARASIVS: “But observe further how the learned father explains himself on this point: for that which we find in the middle of the passage quoted constrains us all—aye, even those who have been most contentiously opposed—to receive

* This author was called *Sinaita*, from having lived as a Monk on Mount Sinai. He was made Patriarch of Antioch A.D. 561, but was deposed by Justus II. in 572: he was again restored by Maurice in 595, and died 599. “The style of this author (says Du Pin) is very indifferent: it is dry, scholastical, barren, and tedious.” The work cited in the Council is found nowhere else, and the extract given justifies the censure of Du Pin. Sophistical and quibbling as is his criticism on the difference of *worship* and *serve*, the passage, taken altogether, seems rather against the Council than in their favour. “He allows (says Dean Comber) no more worship to be given to angels than we give to men; and expressly declares that we must not pray to them, that being a service due to God only—*λατρεύειν δὲ οὐδαμῶς. οὐκοῦν ἔδὲ προσεύξασθαι*. How this will agree with the praying to Saints and Angels in and by images, as the Romanists daily do, I cannot imagine.—*Gibson's Pre-servative*, tit. vi. p. 292, vol. vii. 398, edit. 1848.

† The *ἔδὲ προσεύξασθαι* of Anastasius certainly gave some support to the opposing Council held under Constantine: for, if angels are not to be prayed to, how much less are images? and praying to or before images is part of the worship given to them.

and to worship images; for he there says, 'Worship is the token of honour.' So that all who profess to honour images, but refuse to worship them, are by this holy father convicted of hypocrisy: and, indeed, they who admit not of worship, which is the symbol of honour, must be obnoxious to the charge of doing the opposite, which is to dishonour them."*

LEO Bishop of Phocia [one who had recanted]: "Now, indeed, is it fitting for me to say, with the Prophet, 'Thou hast turned my mourning into joy; thou hast taken away my sackcloth and girded me with gladness' (Psalm xxx. 12). For the divine Scriptures have turned away our minds from all impiety, and have filled us with divine knowledge and understanding."†

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia gave a volume of the works of Saint Anastasius Bishop of Theopolis into the hands of Stephen the Deacon and Notary, who read "The

* Tarasius condemns here Saint Gregory the most holy Pope of Rome, who expressly says, "Adorare imagines vero omnibus modis devota;" and, indeed, all the fathers up to his time lie under the same condemnation; for not so much as one of them has been proved to be a worshipper of images, although they might have allowed of them in other respects.

† On this misapplication from the thirtieth Psalm we find the following remarks in the "Caroline Books," lib. i. c. 25:—"Since, in this Council, it scarcely ever happens that any testimony from the sacred oracles is properly applied, it is evident the text here cited by the Bishop of Phocia is as irrelevant as any of the rest. And, indeed, had he said anything seasoned with salt, or in the least appropriate, he had been utterly unlike his fellows and in direct opposition to them all; but when he confesses that he wept because he had not worshipped images, and that he rejoiced because he had turned aside to the worship of them, his infatuation proves him to be quite worthy of the company with which he was united. This verse, which he so perversely applies to himself, was spoken by the Prophet in the person of the whole Church, which, so long as it sojourns amidst the mortality and troubles of this life, may be said to mourn; but, when it shall come to receive its eternal reward, shall then be girded with joy. Then shall our sackcloth be taken away, and we shall be surrounded with joy, when, according to the Apostle, 'This corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality, and the saying that is written shall be brought to pass—Death is swallowed up in victory.'

Adrian says, by way of reply—"Every Christian man should pray with the Psalmist, that when, by the grace of Christ, he shall come from darkness to light, he may justly say, 'Thou hast turned my mourning into joy; for, when he is delivered from heresy, then his sackcloth is taken away. But when he knows the truth of the right faith, then he is surrounded with the joy of the orthodox believers of the Holy Catholic Church.'" The only question is, did Leo, when he became a worshipper of images, turn from darkness to light, or had he any greater knowledge of the truth than before?—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 115, col. 1.

Discourse of holy Father Anastasius to Symeon Bishop of Bostra concerning the Sabbath," which begins—

"If, according to the proverb, and as you yourself say, it becomes fathers and also elders to make enquiry;" and shortly after, "For though, when any Sovereign is absent, his image is revered instead of himself, yet, when he is afterwards present, it would be vain and idle to leave the prototype and to turn to the image. Nevertheless, though the image is no longer revered, because that he was present for whose sake it receives honour, yet it must not be dishonoured."* And a few lines onward—"And as he who insults the King's images suffers justly as having done dishonour to the King himself; although the image is nothing else but wood, and colours mixed and impounded with wax: thus, in like manner, he who does despite to the image of any one actually insults the persons whose image it bears."†

JOHN the Legate of the East: "The father has shown us that when a Sovereign is absent his image is honoured, and even when he is present, it is not therefore dishonoured: so now, since Christ the Lord of all is not sensibly present with us (for though, as God, He is present everywhere, yet is He invisible to our bodily eyes), His image is therefore to be honoured, as the aforesaid father has expounded concerning the image of a Sovereign.‡

* "This father (says Comber) makes it ridiculous to adore the Emperor's image when he himself is present; yet Christ hath assured us that He is present always when we assemble in His name, and has promised to be with us to the end of the world; and therefore it is ridiculous to adore his image." And again he adds—"From whence I infer that to worship an image of Christ is to deny His omnipresence; and is as ridiculous as to bow and talk to the King's image when he both sees and hears you, and when you are bid to direct your addresses to himself. Besides, we do not see any that bow or kneel to the King's picture or statue, much less that offer up any petitions or praises to such dead figures; and, if any did so, they would be thought distracted: yet these are the honours which the Romanists and Greeks do to the images of Christ and his Saints"—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. p. 296.

† Such an one might justly be punished as having acted mischievously in injuring or defacing that which was not his own, or as having acted treasonably and with a sinister intention; but in no other way could he do the King any injury by defacing his image. "There is a story (says Jortin) about Constantine in Chrysostom, tom. i. orat. 20, related by Flavian, which is much to his credit—that some visitors having done outrage to one of his statues, and being told amongst other things, that his face had been pelted with stones, he put his hand to his face and said that he did not feel it."—*Ibid.* tom. ii. 258, edit. 1834.

‡ This comment of the Eastern Legate is pronounced in the "Caroline Books," lib. iii. c. 29, to be, *dementissimum et ratione carens*. "Concerning the argument which they attempt to draw from the practice of the people

GREGORY Monk and Abbot of the Monastery of Hormisdas brought forward a book of the blessed Sophronius, which the Monk Stephen having received, read:—

“The Encomium of our holy Father Sophronius Archbishop of Jerusalem,* on the Saints Cyrus and John. Let all, some in one

making the imperial images—that the images of the Saviour or of his Saints ought in like manner to be adored—we say that it has been proved before, by the words of the blessed Jerome that such imperial images ought not to be worshipped. Now we come more particularly to discuss the words of John, who is found in this affair to have spoken much more frequently than the rest, and not at all to have come behind them in absurdity; for, while he falls into the common error of the rest, he must needs add some special absurdity of his own, as if he considered the general conglomeration of vanities set forth by the rest as quite insufficient without it. Plain reason forbids us to think that, like an earthly Emperor, God is local; and so that, while He can be in one place only, He must send His image to be worshipped, just as the Emperor would do in like case. God is absent nowhere; for, if He were absent anywhere, He must be local; and, if local, then He contains not all things and does not fill all things. But He does fill all things, therefore He is absent nowhere; and, since it is so, He is not to be sought in material images, but is evermore to be possessed by the pure in heart. As it is a perverse thing to worship the image of an Emperor at all, and as it is doubtless a profane thing to liken the image of one who is confined to place to the image of God who is not confined to place, so is it both perverse and profane to attempt to establish one forbidden thing by another, and by successive steps of shame ever to be advancing to that which is worse.” The rest of the chapter is spent in discussing the conclusion of the speech of the Eastern Presbyter, which, in the old Latin, runs thus—“Christi imaginem honorandam sicuti et imaginem Imperatoris Pater sensit.” Several attempts are made to search out the meaning of these words; and, after all, that which John said, does not appear to have been understood: for the word “Pater” is not understood of Anastasius, which was the Presbyter’s meaning, but of God the Father; and some needless discussion follows thereupon. Some allowance should be made, considering how very faulty was the copy transmitted by Pope Adrian to Charlemagne.

Adrian replies: “John the Presbyter of the East did not say these things of himself, but from the book of Saint Anastasius read in the same Council.

* St. Sophronius was elected Patriarch of Jerusalem A.D. 629: he was one of the chief opponents of the Monothelite heresy, and was the first Patriarch that condemned it. Du Pin hesitatingly ascribes to him the life of St. Mary of Egypt, and this encomium on the lives of SS. Cyrus and John. He attributes the “Spiritual Meadow” to John Moschus. Cave inclines to think that this latter was the work of both conjointly. Upon the “Spiritual Meadow” Du Pin pronounces the following judgment—“It is full of an infinite number of relations and miraculous strange stories of apparitions, visions, and miracles wrought by hermits: such as foretelling things to come, discovering men’s thoughts, healing the sick, commanding lions and wild bears. Death itself did not hinder them from working miracles: they spoke to the living and wrought miracles in their behalf. Among these wonderful stories, for the most part of little credit, may be found inimitable examples of virtue, extraordinary austerities, excessive fasts, wonderful poverty, and such a simplicity and humility as would sometimes pass for sottishness, an immoderate zeal against heretics, fierce conflicts with devils, and some witty and holy answers.”—*Du Pin, Hist. Eccles.* vol. vi. p. 18 and 20.

For the honour of the Patriarch of Jerusalem it is to be hoped that the “Spiritual Meadow” is not his.

way some in another honour the Saints, at sundry periods sounding forth their gifts, and in divers manners proclaiming their benevolence. Let some do this by the erection of lofty temples—others by the ornament of variegated marbles : some by curious gilded mosaic—others by the splendid production of the painter : some by offerings of gold and silver—others with tapestry of silks and satins ; and, in short, let each be most earnest in respect of honouring the Saints, according as he hath the ability and the will ; and let each desire to excel his neighbour in this contest, both as thereby showing the affection which he hath towards the Saints, and as thereby securing, instead of corruptible things, things incorruptible—instead of temporal things, those which are eternal ; for with such blessings are these godlike persons wont to repay those who love them.”

In the same book of this father the following miracle of the afore-mentioned Saints is found, which begins :—

“ I hear that Alexandria is the Metropolis of Libya and Egypt.” And a few lines onward—“ We came to a temple perfect in its kind, in appearance fearful and exceedingly splendid—in height reaching to the very heavens, and when we had entered we saw a picture vast and wonderful. In the midst was painted the figure of Christ our Lord, having on the left hand the Mother of Christ, our Lady Mary, the Mother of God, and ever a Virgin ; but on the right John the Baptist of this same Saviour and His forerunner, who before announced His coming by leaping within the womb ; for had he then spoken he would not have been heard : and certain of the glorious company of Prophets and Apostles, and of the sainted assembly of the Martyrs, among whom were the Martyrs Cyrus and John. And they having placed themselves before the image of the Lord, bending their knees, bowed down before it, and, touching the ground with their heads, they interceded for the cure of the young man.” And shortly after—“ And coming before the image a third time they used the same words and postures as before ; and, after they had long prayed and prostrated themselves, crying out only this, ‘ Lord, if thou dost command ?’—Christ as being full of mercy pitied them and granted their request ; and He said by His image, ‘ Bestow it upon him.’ And the Martyrs having risen from the ground, in the first place, returned thanks to Christ our God, because that He had heard their prayer, and with joy and exultation they said, ‘ Behold, to us God hath granted His grace : go to Alexandria and sleep in the great temple fasting ; take a little

of the oil in a bottle from the lamp which burns before the Saviour's image and bring it hither ; and then, having anointed your feet therewith, you shall obtain the gift of health." And, after other things— "And he having risen up from his sleep took the oil from the lamp and goes with it to the Church of the Saints, and there, as it was charged upon him, he anointed his hands and his feet and immediately he got rid of his disease and recovered strength."

TARASIVS : "He declares that all things offered are to be received, whether the work of the painter or any other artist, for the decoration of consecrated abodes."

THOMAS Legate of the East : "This very image, venerable fathers, stands in the great Church of Alexandria even to the present time and heals all kind of diseases."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "Glory be to thee, O God, who hast wrought miracles by means of holy images."

EUSTATHIUS Monk Presbyter and Abbot of the Monastery of Maximin said : "I also, holy fathers, have brought thither a book of the same father containing the lives of many holy men ; and if it be agreeable to your holy Assembly let it be read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "Let it be read."

STEPHEN the Monk, having received the book, read a passage from the "Spiritual Meadow" of St. Sophronius :—

"Theodore Abbot, of Ælia, said there was a certain recluse in the Mount of Olives a perfect champion. This man was sorely assaulted by the demon of fornication.* One day, when the demon was more

* This history is so great a favourite with this Council that it is narrated a second time in the next Session. It is intended in both to serve very important purposes—in this Session to teach that no wickedness is so great as the neglect of image-worship, and that no oath tending to the renunciation of this worship is to be regarded : in the next, it does not appear for what purpose it is brought forward except to show that the Devil was an Iconoclast. In the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. cap. 31) it is treated according to its merits as being *Deliramentum errore plenum* :—

"Often in the course of this our work we are compelled to declare that no example should be taken from things really bad in themselves ; and we are compelled so often to repeat this caution because we find them so ready to act thus in order to confirm their error. Nor is this wholly inconsistent ; for, as the example of good acts do form evermore a support to good acts, so they, from erroneous acts, seek a support for their erroneous doings. Thus, to support their error, they bring forward the example of a certain recluse, who, if he really did that which in the history he is said to have done, was guilty of no less than three signal faults—viz., (1). That he should voluntarily have en-

than usually hard upon him, the old man began to lament and to cry out to the demon, 'Why wilt thou not spare me—leave me for the

gaged in a conference with the devil; (2). That he should have been beguiled by the same to bind himself under an oath; and (3). That he should violate that oath: all which things, so far from being any example to a Catholic, should by him be utterly renounced as being forbidden by many testimonies of the divine law." Here follow the texts which are condemnatory of each of these faults; after which it is continued as follows—"The recluse having committed these three faults, his Abbot, so far from correcting what he had done amiss, actually points out to him a way still worse, saying, 'It were better for thee to go into every brothel in yonder city than to refuse to worship the image of our Lord or that of His holy Mother.' O incomparable absurdity! O pestilent evil! O folly surpassing many follies! He declares that it were better to *do* that which is forbidden alike by the Law and in the Gospel than to *abstain* from that which is not commanded either in the Law or in the Gospel! He declares that it is better to *perpetrate* crime than to *abstain* from crime! He declares that it is better voluntarily to plunge oneself in the mire than to walk unblameably in the right path! He declares that it is better to defile the temple of God than to despise the worship of things without sense! He declares that it is better to take the members of Christ and to make them the members of an harlot than to despise the worship of the work of some artificer! Let him then tell us (if he can) where the Lord hath said, Thou shalt not refuse to worship images, as plainly as He hath said, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' Let him then tell us if he can anywhere find that the Lord hath said, If thou seest an image and dost not worship it thou hast sinned, as plainly as he hath declared, 'If thou lookest on a woman to lust after her thou hast committed adultery with her already in thine heart.' And if he can never discover anything of this kind, let him reflect how great his error is in granting a licence to do that which is absolutely disgraceful rather than to omit that which is altogether unprofitable; for, while the Lord in the Law and in the Gospel commands us in many ways to the observance of chastity, nowhere is there found any such injunction relative to the worship of images. As this same Abbot, who ought to have led this recluse into the way of salvation, did, on the contrary, give the rein to his lust—as he who ought to have recovered his fellow from the snare into which he had fallen in having sworn to the devil did rather rush together with him into the abyss of error by telling him that it was better for him to commit a grievous crime—beyond all doubt he hath fulfilled that saying in the Gospel, 'If the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch.' And any one who would endeavour to prove any argument by any such example as this would manifest that his madness was of no ordinary kind, but even surpassing that of others."

It could not be supposed that Adrian could allow this "golden link" (as Constantine styles it) to be thus shamefully handled without a few words in its defence. His reply is as follows—"This testimony (saith he) was brought forward from the book of that eminent Doctor St. Sophronius; and no orthodox Christian (as we think) will dare to reject either the godlike dogmas or any fragment of explanation which may be found in them." To this it may be answered that, if this story were really the work of St. Sophronius, which is doubtful, its intrinsic absurdity can never be compensated by the sanctity of its author.

"Also (continues Adrian), we find in St. John Chrysostom on the beheading of John the Baptist, among other things, this—'For it behoved him not to forbid the worship of holy images.'" Daille ("de Imagg.," p. 274) affirms that neither in the homily spoken of, nor in any other of Chrysostom's are any such words to be found.

"Again (he continues), in the Epistle of St. Gregory the Pope, directed to Januarius Bishop of Caralis, which we have laid before you already as proof on this point." This Epistle has been very satisfactorily proved by Du Pin, Dr.

future: thou hast grown old with me.' On which the demon, having made himself visible, said to him, 'Swear to me that thou wilt tell no man that which I am now about to say unto thee, and I will trouble thee no more.' And the old man swore to him, saying, 'By Him who dwells above, never will I tell to any what now you may declare to me.' Then the demon said to him, 'Worship that image no more, and I will no more contend with thee.' Now, he had there a picture representing our Lady, the holy Mary, Mother of God, bearing in her arms our Lord Jesus Christ. The recluse gave answer to the demon, 'Go, and I will consider of it.' On the morrow he revealed the whole matter to Theodore Abbot, of Æliota, then living in the Laura of Pharan, for the Abbot came to him and he told him all. And the aged man said to the recluse, 'Verily, father, have you been so imposed upon as to swear to a demon? However, you have done well to consult me about it; *for it were better for you not to pass by a single brothel in yon city without entering into it, than that you should refuse to worship our Lord and God Jesus Christ with His own Mother represented in a picture.*' Having confirmed and strengthened him with many other exhortations the aged man went to his own abode. Again the demon appears to the recluse and says to him, 'What now, thou aged sinner, didst thou not swear to me that thou wouldst tell no man? How hast thou dared to tell all to him who came to thee? I tell thee, thou vile old man, thou shalt for this be judged in the day of judgment as a perjurer.' The recluse answered him, saying, 'What I have sworn, I have sworn; and that I have forsworn myself I know; but I have not forsworn my Lord and Maker; and, therefore, for thee I care not.'

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Like to links in a

James, and others, to be interpolated, especially in that part on which Adrian relies for proof."

So much for the reply found in page 123 of Adrian's "Answer to Charlemagne:" there are besides some other testimonies which by some accident have been misplaced and attached by some mistake as an answer to a censure to which evidently they do not belong. On page 111 we find the following—"Also, St. Sophronius himself saith, but whereas he forswore himself, he did quite right to perjure him by whom he had been deceived. In the choice of evils it is better to choose those which are more profitable," &c. Does St. Sophronius mean to say that it was better to commit fornication than not to worship images? But, lastly, we have a quotation from St. Augustin's preface to Psalm xxxi.—"We ought to allow of no good works before faith—that is, no one before he believes can be said to have done good works; for those works which are said to be before faith, although they seem to men praiseworthy, yet are they vain; and they appear to me as great strength misapplied or great swiftness out of the way." Unless Adrian intended faith and image-worship to be one and the same thing this quotation will not apply.

chain of gold, so harmonious are the testimonies brought by our God-inspired fathers in favour of images."

JOHN Legate of the East: "The discourse of our Father Sophronius teaches us another lesson also—namely, that it is better for him that hath sworn to forswear himself rather than to regard any oath tending to the destruction of holy images; and this we say because there are some to-day who feel unsettled on account of the oath they have taken."*

TARASIVS: "Because the old man knew the goodness of God and also how ready He is to receive the penitent, therefore he determined to violate his sinful oath. Whence it appears that those who have taken an oath in favour of this heresy (if they have no other sin laid to their charge), have a reasonable precedent, and may plead this in their own defence; but, should they have fallen into other sins, they must for these endeavour to propitiate God for them, as well as to supplicate Him for the remission of this their unlawful oath."

THEODORE Bishop of the Subritenses: "Peter, chief of the Apostles, denied his Master; but, having repented, he was received again into favour."

TARASIVS: "Herod observed his oath and perished; but

* The Emperor Constantine had bound the clergy with an oath not to worship images, and most of the bishops had assented thereto, and had pledged themselves. Though many of those bishops were at this time removed and their places supplied by others, there might be some still remaining, who, however they were now convinced of the apostolicity, &c., of image worship, felt some reluctance to violate their oath. John had these in view when he deduced this instruction from the history cited: indeed, how could they any longer doubt when it came from St. Sophronius, that it was better to commit the most profligate acts of fornication rather than not worship images? The third Council of Lateran has applied the instruction of the Presbyter of the East more generally to the extermination of those who are styled heretics. Thus, in cap. 16, of that Council it was decreed:—"Non autem dicenda juramenta, sed potius perjuria quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam, et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta." So thought the Council of Constance, and burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague, notwithstanding the safe conduct given to them by the Emperor Sigismund.

Charles V. was advised to act in the same way towards Luther; but he replied to those who advised him—"I should not choose to blush with my predecessor Sigismund." According to Sandoval, however, he regretted in his after-life that he had not done this when he had Luther in his power at Wittenburg:—"I acknowledge (says he) that I committed a great mistake in not putting Luther to death. I was not bound to keep my promise: that heretic had offended a Master greater than me. I might, I ought, to have forgotten my pledge."—*D'Aubigny's History of the Reformation.* vol. ii. p. 313..

Peter, though he denied his Master with an oath, yet, because he went out and shed tears, he was saved; for God forgives every sin if we repent of it with our whole heart."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Even so, my lord, for so holy Scripture teaches."

TARASIVS: The great head of theology John has said, 'My son, if we say that we have no sins, we deceive ourselves' (1 John i. 8-9); but, if we entreat God for our sins, He will be gracious to us and pass by our offences."

NICEPHORUS Bishop of Dyrrachium: "My lord, our fears are great, because our sins are so numerous: we entreat speedy penance and confession."

LEO Bishop of Phocia: "It is written, 'Love ye not the false oath' (Zech. viii. 17); wherefore our false oath may be quite set aside as having no validity."

JOHN Legate of the East: "If ye are willing, we might now enquire something more about oaths."

TARASIVS: "Enough has been said on that subject at present: anything more on this point may be enquired into at another time; but now let us attend to the matter under consideration."

THEODOSIVS Deacon and Notary, reads: "From the miracles of SS. Cosmas and Damian* :—

"Another man of very amiable character had a fistula in his thigh; and though he had tried many remedies, and had submitted himself to

* Cosmas and Damian, natives of Arabia, were martyred in the reign of Diocletian. They were physicians and were called "Anargyri"—that is, without money, because they took none, not receiving any fees. This is marvellous, for how could they live? The account of their martyrdom is yet more marvellous, for it seemed as if they could not be put to death, so many methods were tried and all in vain. First, they were thrown into the sea, but an angel brought them safe to land. Secondly, fire was tried, but to no purpose: it would not burn them though it burnt many of the bystanders. Thirdly, they were stretched on the rack—again an angel interfered and they were not the worse for that. Fourthly, they were tied to two crosses and stoned, but the stones, strange to say, only broke the heads of those who threw them. Fifthly, they were shot at with arrows: still with no success, as the arrows did the same as the stones before—came back on the persons of those who discharged them. But, sixthly and lastly, they were actually beheaded, and three other brothers in addition. If we may believe Gregory of Tours, Nicetas, Metaphrastes, Surius, Ado, Baronius, Ribadeneira, and the seventh Œcumenical Council, it should seem that these Saints kept up their medical practice after their death no less than before, and no doubt upon the same liberal and generous footing of taking no fees.—*Ribadeneira, Lives of Saints.* Sept. 27.

the lancet of the surgeon, yet he was afflicted with the disease for fifteen years, and it continued to gain ground upon him to such a degree that it made no less than four orifices, through which the virus was discharged; and, not unfrequently, the drink which he took passed from his body by those vents. At last the physicians declared that his disease had so far the mastery that no human skill could be of any further avail to him. At length, in sheer despair, he determined to yield to the advice given him by many, and to betake himself to the house dedicated to those holy servants of God, Cosmas and Damian. While deliberating on this point (for necessity is full of deliberation), he beholds the Saints in a dream, who said to him—'Come hither to us, and thou shalt be healed.' Confiding, therefore, in the assurance given by the Saints, he betakes himself to their glorious abode, and there he failed not every day to beseech the Saints for the cure of his disease. And he remained some time without receiving any benefit, till going on one occasion into the porch which was attached to the abode of the Saints, his eye was arrested by a picture of the Saviour, which was on the right-hand side of it. In it was also represented Mary the holy Mother of God, and those holy servants of God, Cosmas and Damian, and a certain nobleman named Leontius. Here, having made earnest prayers, and having for some hours wept bitterly, and besought the Saints most earnestly, he then retired to the place where his couch was. In the night he beholds the servants of Christ, Cosmas and Damian, coming towards him, having between them the Virgin full of all grace, who said to them—'See, this is he; heal him with all speed.'

THEODORE read also from the same miracles about the wife of Constantine of Laodicea* :—

* To this and similar tales, both which follow and which precede, may be applied the censure of the "Caroline Books" (lib.iii. cap. 30). "De eo quod apocryphas et derisione dignas nsenias suis locutionibus inter posuerunt." "If any one in making a house of wood should endeavour to adorn the walls with marble or variegated glass, but finding that he could by no means make them unite would be found to put them aside and finish as he began with wood—or, as when any would make a vessel of tin, if he wanted metal to complete it, would not piece it out with any of the more precious metals which would not unite with tin, but would complete it with the same metal with which he began—he resembles exactly the patrons of this Council, who, having been convened to get up a defence of image worship, they first made trial of Scripture; but, when they find these not at all adapted to their purpose, they turn aside after apocryphal and ridiculous fables; for, as the testimonies of the divine law, being improperly applied, would by no means give them any support, they next made use of arguments such as were more consistent and appropriate; for as a most precious jewel inserted in an iron ring or a piece of golden texture on a garment of hair would be by no means suitable, so the

‘ It came to pass that a certain man, who was a soldier of the name Constantine, one full of faith and who never failed in his attendance to those illustrious Saints Cosmas and Damian, was absent from this royal and Christ-loving city, on account of some expedition in which he was engaged. He, in every such journey, was accustomed in faith to take with him a likeness of these Saints in a small picture for his own safety. Having reached a city of the Laodiceans named Trimitaria, in pursuance of the orders given to him, he remained there some time, during which period he was united in the bands of lawful matrimony. Not long after his marriage his wife had a painful disease in her left cheek which broke out into an irruption, and being greatly distressed with it she gave her husband no slight uneasiness. And he, having had great experience of the Saints, would console her by saying—(for he had forgotten that according to his custom he had them about him)—‘ What shall I do for thee? Here I am a stranger: were I now in my own city, I would apply to the waxen images of my lords the Saints Cosmas and Damian, and forthwith they would put an end to thy grief and heal thy disease.’ And she believing and filled with wonder at the speedy cures wrought by the Saints, and having prayed that on her return she might be counted worthy to worship in their glorious and far-famed temple, for from merely hearing of them she was pierced to the heart with affection towards them, silenced her griefs. On the following night, while fallen into deep sleep, she sees those

holy Scriptures were utterly out of place when used in support of such a work as theirs. But a grave question can never be settled by apocryphal absurdities, but only by the oracles of the divine law, or the salutary teaching and clear exposition of those doctors whose authority is admitted by the Catholic Church. But some pertinacious defender of their trifles may please to reply that these apocryphal tales are not intended to confirm their own doctrine, but rather to deride the madness of certain heretics, to which we find not at all difficult to reply.

“ In what way does the unauthentic story of Polemon serve this purpose? Some of these stories are certainly intended to establish their own doctrine, and some may be intended to deride the folly of their opponents; but, however that may be, they are so involved and intermingled together that it is next to impossible to distinguish what is uttered in mockery and what is sober truth. And though some learned men may be able to make this discrimination, the unlearned are far more likely to be offended by them than to find out their true meaning.”

Adrian replies:—“ For the derision and confusion of the heretics who had celebrated their pseudo-synod, they exposed the apocryphal absurdities of which they had made use, showing by these how great an error they were endeavouring to bring into the Catholic Church.” A quotation follows from Gregory against the heathen and their mysteries (Adrian’s “ Answer,” p. 119, col. 2). Certainly, all the tales and stories found in the fourth Session, however apocryphal or ridiculous, were brought forward by their various patrons with all seriousness as so many irrefragable proofs of the sanctity of images and their worship.

great and terrible physicians and servants of Christ, Cosmas and Damian, in the form in which they are commonly painted, standing near her bed and saying to her—‘What would you have? Why do you complain? Why do you add affliction to your husband? We are here with you—you need have no further anxiety;’ and having said thus much they left her. And when she awoke, she made many enquiries of her husband as to the figure of the glorious Saints Cosmas and Damian—how they are represented, and in what manner they were wont to appear when visiting the infirm? And when her husband had informed her of their usual appearance, and further had narrated their graces, she in turn related to her husband the forms of the Saints which she had seen in a vision and the words which they had spoken to her. From what she said, her husband now recalled to mind that he had under his arm-hole the image of the Saints in a small picture, which he produced forthwith and showed to his wife. And she having gazed upon it worshipped, and was convinced that the Saints did really dwell with them, even as they had spoken, and immediately the woman was healed of her disease.”

JOHN Legate of the East: “It has been most clearly proved to us that the Saints do appear and work wonders by means of their images, for by an image they were manifest to this woman and healed her.”*

MANZON Bishop of the Procanensians: “Last year, after I had left the royal city, and had arrived at the poor town in which I, your humble servant, live, I fell into so dangerous a disease that I actually called my friends together in order to make my will. And while thus engaged, the disease constraining me, I laid hold on a venerable image of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and said—‘O Lord, who givest grace to thy Saints, look upon me also.’ After which, I applied the image to the suffering member and the disease was immediately expelled and I was made whole.”†

* How many errors in this tale! The Saints heal those who pray to them: they must be approached by means of images: they are wherever their images are and not elsewhere. The woman worships an image—is healed by an image. The church dedicated to them is called the house where they live. Peculiar holiness is required to enter there. Such is the degrading, debasing effect of image worship—the worship of the Romish and Greek Churches!

† Tarasius had given, in answer to a query put by the Iconoclasts—viz., why images did not now work miracles—his reason why miracles were not now to be expected, because it was an evil and adulterous nation which sought after a sign and no sign should be given them. But it now appears that he was mis-

THEODORE Bishop of Seleucia rose up and said : " We can vouch for the truth of this fact, for we live near to him."

THEODOSIUS Deacon and Monk and Keeper of the sacred vessels read from the same Miracles, " about the woman who was cured of the gripes :"—

" Well does that oracle of wisdom—that pillar and teacher of the Church, Paul—declare that ' hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in the breast '* (Rom. v. 5). A believing woman possessed of this hope, who had at various times been delivered from grievous maladies by those glorious Saints, Cosmas and Damian, in order to make the remembrance of her obligations to them indelible, was most assiduous in her attendance at their most wonderful abode and in paying them all due honour : nor was she content with having these great and wonderful Saints, Cosmas and Damian, every day in her mind, but she must needs have their pictures painted on every wall in her house, as if she could never be satisfied with gazing upon them. From this, her superabundant affection, the following event took place ; and let no one deem it unworthy of belief, for want of faith is everywhere to be condemned as injurious to the interests of the soul. It happened that this woman was afflicted with an internal disease and was confined to her house with unmitigated pains : and she rolled in her bed in incessant agonies, nor had she a moment's rest from her pangs. On one occasion she found herself for a short time alone ; and, as she reflected on her danger, she contrived to drag herself along and to descend from the bed. And making towards that part of the wall where the images—these all-wise Saints—had been painted, using her faith as a crutch, she raised herself up ; and, having scratched off a little of the paint with her nails

taken : Manzoni, and afterwards some others, had numerous signs to bring forward to convince the sinful and adulterous generation. Was Tarasius incredulous or ignorant ? It must be confessed, however, that it is the Pope of Rome, not the Œcumenic Patriarch of Constantinople, who is gifted with infallibility ?

* How could the author of these absurd fabrications dare to profane so beautiful a text as this by an application so monstrous ! Had St. Paul written—Hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of Saints and their images is shed abroad in the breast, then the application had been more appropriate ; for the story has very little to do with the love of God, though very much with the love of images. Why should this woman honour these Saints above the Apostles—above Mary—yea, above Christ Himself ? Is not this to put the servant above the Master ? One merit the story hath—to display the wretched superstitions and degradation to which the worship of images brings it votaries, or rather the awful consequences of neglecting Scripture for Tradition.

and cast it into water she drank up the mixture, and immediately she was made whole—her internal pains ceasing at once on the entering in of the Saints! When sufficiently recovered, she betook herself to their great house, and there gave thanks to the Lord God who had granted such gifts to His Saints: and she told every one the cure which had been wrought in her by these Saints.”

SYMEON Monk Presbyter and Abbot of the District presented a book, which Nicetas Deacon and Notary took and read “ from the Discourse of our holy Father John Chrysostom, on the Laver of Purification* :”—

“ All things are made for the glory of God and for our use—the clouds to minister rain, the earth for the abundance of fruits, the sea for the service of the merchant—all things are for thy service, O man, or rather for the image of God in thee; for, when the imperial images or pictures are brought into any city, and the governors and the people meet them with shouts of joy, they honour not the canvass nor the waxen-formed tablet, but the royal image; thus, in like manner, the creature honours not the earthly dress but reverences the heavenly image.”

TARASIVS: “ The books which have been read are taken

*“ This first place (says Comber), cited out of Chrysostom, is not to be found in the best edition of his works; but, if it were, his arguing that all creatures have a natural reverence for man, as he is the image of God, will be little for the credit of their images which dogs and birds will defile—yea, which mice and worms will make bold with.—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. c. v. p. 292.

This passage with another were cited above by Adrian in his letter to the Emperor and his mother: they are censured together in the “ Caroline Books ” (lib. ii. c. xix.) as being very obscure—hardly worthy of Chrysostom and quite inapplicable to the worship of images. That part of the censure which refers to the argument drawn from the reverence paid to imperial images when brought to any city was quoted in the note on “ Adrian's Letter :” in the remainder of the chapter we find the following remarks :—“ This quotation (it is observed) is defective in eloquence or accuracy, and utterly inapplicable to the purposes for the which they would use it; neither brings any support to them nor any obstacle to us; nor need it excite any doubt in the mind of the Christian, since, if they are the words of any Catholic, they are not spoken of any manufactured and irrational image, but either of Christ who is that image of God to whom every knee shall bow; or of man, who, as being made in the image of God, was preferred above every other visible creature.”

Adrian replies—“ Many passages of St. John Chrysostom have been quoted in this oft-named Council of Constantinople; and they have not told us which of them it is which they think not to apply.” If Adrian had taken the trouble to read somewhat more than the title of the chapter, he would have found both the passage which was censured and the reason why it was censured.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 125, col. 2.

from the temple of the holy *Anargyri*, which is in the sacred and royal city ; for the Clergy who were there brought them to us and conjured us that we should read them in the holy Council."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : " And very suitable was it, my lord, that they should be read, since they have contributed much to the edification of us all."

PETER Reader and Notary of the sacred Patriarchate read " from the Fourth Discourse of Saint Athanasius against the Arians," which begins—

" The Ariomaniacs having once determined to apostatize : " and after other things, " This it may be easier to understand by taking the image of the Sovereign as an example. In the picture of the King there is his shape and form ; and in the King there is the same image which there was in the picture. And the likeness of the King in his image is so far unchangeable that he who looks on the image sees the King in it : and again, he who sees the King recognizes him to be the same which he saw before in the image. And from this immutable likeness the image might say to him who wished, after seeing the image, to see the King himself—' I and the King are one ; for I am in him and he in me : and that which you see in me you see in him : and that which you have seen in him you see in me.' He, therefore, who worships the image worships in it the King, for it is his image and figure."

TARASIVS : " The very nature of things teaches us that ' the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype ; ' and in like manner the dishonour, which caused the father to take for example that which has now been read in the passage before us."

EPIPHANIUS Deacon and Legate of Thomas Archbishop of Sardinia said : " Examples are generally taken from things confessedly allowed, and, therefore, our divine father brought forward the example of the image of the King."

NICETAS the Deacon and Notary read " from the Thirty Chapters of Saint Basil to Saint Amphilochius, on the Holy Spirit—a passage of chapter the seventeenth :"—

" Because the King's image is called the ' King,' and yet there are

not *two* Kings, neither is the power divided nor the glory parted, because one kingdom and one power ruleth us, so is our doxology one and not multifold; for the honour paid to the image passeth on to the prototype.*

* This assertion, quoted from St. Basil and so often repeated in this Council, is thus reviewed in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iii. cap. xvi.) :—"Nothing is more common or more readily familiar with those whose zeal for images is so very ardent than this—to assert and to believe that the respect paid to the image passes on to the same person of whom it is the image; and yet how this can be done, or whether it can be done at all, neither does reason teach nor is there any Scripture to prove it to us. Can it be imagined that the Saints who have obtained a seat in the heavenly kingdom, whose images they are so perversely zealous in worshipping, are really ambitious of such vain, such empty, honours? Would they have permitted themselves to be worshipped when some of them desired rather to be humbled that they might obtain favour in the eyes of the Lord, of whom was he who said, 'I had rather be cast down in the house of the Lord than to dwell in the tents of ungodliness;' while others were willing rather to be beaten than worshipped, as he who said, 'I am ready not only to be bound for Christ but even to die with Him?' And, after more of the same kind, he continues:—"It is true that a proper and becoming respect paid to the bodies of the Saints, their relics, or basilicæ, is agreeable both to God and His Saints; but that which is unsuitable and improper is agreeable neither to God nor to His Saints. For which reason Joseph commanded that his bones should be brought up out of the land of Egypt to that of Canaan, lest the Egyptians, in commemoration of the great benefits which they had received under his government, should be induced to pay a useless veneration to them. So he who, during his life, lived humbly and ever faithfully served God, after his death provided that no improper respect should be paid to his ashes. Since, then, holy men have ever avoided the vain obsequiousness of their fellow-men, as Paul and Barnabas, who forbade the superstitious regards of the Lycaonians—or Peter, who would not allow the profound veneration of Cornelius—or the Angel in the Apocalypse, who prohibited the Apostle from worshipping him—who can believe that they are delighted with the worship paid to their images or pleased with the obsequious attention offered to pictures? Or how can the honour shown to their pictures reach to them, which neither was ever any part of themselves or of their garments, but which are made according to the fancy of the artist? They who reign in heavenly places with Christ need not to be delineated by the work of the painter; nor are they who have been thought worthy by Christ to be enrolled in the book of life ambitious to be painted on walls or on tablets. Let, then, those whose familiar saying it is, 'that the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype,' inform where they have read this or by what testimonies they can prove it; for our Lord does not say, Inasmuch as ye have done it to images, but 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' He saith, Not he who receiveth images, but 'He who receiveth you receiveth me;' nor saith the Apostle, Let us love images, but 'Let us love one another, for love is of God.'" After some other remarks, it is continued as follows:—"Now, whereas, while we reject nothing in images except the worship of them, and we retain them in the basilicæ of the Saints—not, indeed, for adoration but as a memorial of past deeds and for the sake of decoration and ornament—they, on the other hand, place almost all their credulous hopes on these same images; let us, therefore, venerate the Saints in their bodies, or rather the relics of their bodies, or in their garments, according to the tradition of our fathers of old, and leave them to worship their walls and their tablets and to conceit themselves on the great advances they have made in the faith, because, forsooth, they become subject to the workmanship of the painter. Though, indeed, by some of the more learned, the evil which attends the worship of

JOHN the Legate of the East: "This book which we have in our hands we brought from the East, and we request that it may be read."

CONSTANTINE Deacon and Notary reads "from the Discourse against the Sabellians, Arians, and the Anomai," which begins:—

"Judaism is opposed to Paganism, and both of them to Christianity." And, after other things—"The word of truth avoids contradictions on all sides; for when the original is one, that which is from it is one also: if the archetype be one the image is one also, and the rationale of the unity is not violated. Wherefore, the Son being born of the Father and by nature exhibiting in Himself the image of the Father, inasmuch as He is the image He hath unchangeableness, and inasmuch as He is born He preserves the consubstantiality; for if any one looking on the Emperor's image in the forum should say, 'That is the Emperor,' he would not mean to insinuate that there are two Emperors, as if the image were *one* and the archetype were *another*; nor does he when he calls an image the Emperor mean to affirm that the archetype is not the Emperor; but, on the contrary, by this kind of language to express the regard and respect which he hath for the Emperor himself."

JOHN Legate of the East: "That false Conventicle muttered that he who worships Christ in a picture divides Christ into two, and that he who sees an image, and says of it, or writes upon it, *This is Christ*, divides Christ, which is absurd; for the God-fearing Basil, as being a light and master of the Church of God, and also instructed in divine things by the

- images may be avoided because they worship not what they are but what they represent, yet, to the unlearned, they beget a scandal who worship and adore in them nothing beyond that which they see before them. Let those, then, who have offended so many of Christ's little ones take heed lest they fall under the Gospel woe pronounced against such; for, if he lies under this fearful sentence who offends even *one* of His little ones, how great, how fearful, the indignation which they shall bear who would impel all the Church of Christ to worship images, and actually lay under an anathema those who despised such worship."

Adrian replies—"He who dares contradict this, contradicts the exposition of St. Basil, against whose orthodox faith we believe that none of the faithful ever made any exception; for this he wrote in his most religious epistle which he sent to Amphilochius."

A long quotation from St. Severianus Bishop of Gabala follows, containing the oft-repeated sentiment that, if any one injures the Emperor's statue, he is condemned as having insulted the Emperor himself.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 122, col. 1.

Spirit of God, declares that the honour of the image passeth on to the prototype, and that he who looks upon the picture of the King sees the King in it, and that he who worships it does not worship or look upon two kings, but only one; for the father says expressly that the King's image is styled the 'King'—not that there are two kings. He, therefore, who worships an image and says, 'This is Christ,'* does not sin.

* In the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. c. 1) this declaration of the Eastern Legate is most severely censured as being *falsissimum et risu dignum*:—"John the Presbyter and Legate of the Eastern Seas has afforded us no small matter of discussion in this work, who has neither avoided error himself, nor hesitated to lead others into error, nor has been ashamed himself to tell lies and to exhort others to do the same. Error on his own part he has not avoided: since, having left the paths of Scripture which teach us to worship and serve God only, he hath turned aside his foot to those wild and dangerous ways which lead to the adoration of things devoid of sense: neither hath he hesitated to mislead others, since with so many rash and vain assertions he has endeavoured to induce others to wander with him. Neither hath he been ashamed himself to tell lies and to exhort others to do the same, inasmuch as he has affirmed that he who does an unlawful thing and adds falsehood thereto does not commit sin; for, says he, 'He who worships an image and says, This is Christ, does not sin.' Which vanity may most easily be refuted; for if to say the thing which is not be not a falsity, neither it is true to say the thing which is; and so if to lie be not a vice, neither is it a virtue to speak the truth; but if it be a virtue to speak and to follow after the truth, so beyond all doubt it is a vice to tell lies and to follow after them. Wherefore, when any one affirms that a picture is Christ the Son of God he lies, and when he lies he does amiss, and when he does amiss he sins: wherefore, he who declares a picture to be Christ the Son of God does sin. It was not a picture that became man for our sakes, or that suffered and was crucified for us; nor was it some image that despoiled death and the grave and rose again; nor was it the work of some artificer which ascendeth into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God. These things were not done by any picture, but by Christ the only begotten Son of God, begotten before all worlds. Wherefore, if any worship an image and says 'This is Christ,' he not only sins, but is most madly impious in daring to give the most excellent name of so sublime a thing (if so we may style it and not rather the cause and original of all things) to a thing so vile and abject, not only destitute of all mysteries, but even of life itself! Since, therefore, no image can be equal with Christ by nature, so neither ought it to be made equal to Him in name. But if any one imagine that the category of equivocal names might hold here, let him know that the sentence we now discuss hath nothing of this kind in it; for it is one thing to speak of a painted man and a real man, of a painted lion, a real lion, and the heavenly lion, and to affirm that a picture is the Son of God: for, in the former case, there is but a calling them by the same name; in the latter, a full profession of a thing clearly believed; the principle of equivocal lies in the community of name, which agreement that it is in name only is most clearly proved by the definition. Wherefore, it is a different, a widely different, thing to style a picture by the name of that which it represents according to the principle allowed in equivocal, and to worship a thing destitute of sense, and, in plain terms, to declare the same to be Christ, saying, 'This is Christ the Son of God.'" After some other remarks it is continued—"Now, if all falsehoods uttered with the intent of deceiving are sinful, how much more is this falsehood to be accounted sinful which affects to honour a thing so vile with the application of a name so holy, and would fain apply that confession which the pastor of the Church

We know that Christ is the true Son of God and sits together with His Father which is in heaven in His own body; yet, by means of the picture illustrated by colours, His majesty is worshipped and glorified, and we attain to the memorial of His manifestation upon the earth.* Wherefore, this father

preferred to the Redeemer, which daily the whole Church applies to Him, by which it is saved and whence it obtains a token of salvation, to a thing utterly destitute of sense. And, therefore, whosoever shall comply with the advice of this same John, and shall worship images, and shall call the same 'Christ the Son of God,' he will but exercise a wicked officiousness and prove himself destitute of sacred discipline." After some quotations against lying and some other remarks, the chapter is concluded thus—"The worship of adoration is to be paid to God alone; and the confession, This is the Son of God, is to be made to the Son of God only, who is truly essential with God and not merely His adopted Son. If, however, the particle *hic* is to be understood, not of the pronoun but the adverb, the same reasoning will still hold good, because God is everywhere."

Adrian replies by a quotation from St. Augustin on Psalm lxxxvi.—"Bodies are evermore confined and cannot be everywhere or always. The Divinity is everywhere at hand, and from every quarter may similitudes be applied to Him, and he may be altogether in similitudes because that none of them are realities. What—is Christ a door such as is made by a carpenter?—and yet He saith, 'I am the door.'" &c.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 125, col. 2; and p. 126, col. 1.

* These words of the Legate are censured at greater length, but not with equal severity, in the second chapter of the fourth book, the title of which is "De eo quod idem Johannes non recte dixit per Imaginem," &c.—"John the Presbyter so often named by us has added another absurdity to his former frivolities in asserting 'that the majesty of the Lord is to be adored by means of the image which is manifested by colours,' as if the Lord stood in need of anything, and must, by means of some other thing, make His majesty which has no defect to be adored. Must we, then, think that the Angels who, from the beginning of their creation are believed to have praised and worshipped God, did neither worship nor praise Him, because there were no men to make images, or, indeed, any material of which they might be made? The Scripture saith, 'When all the stars were created, then all my Angels praised me together:' whence it is certainly proved that the majesty of the Lord is not praised by the picture manifested by colours, but by its own ineffable power. Again, after that man was created, when as yet the art of painting was little known in the world, are we to suppose that the majesty of God was not adored by His Saints; and, further, neither may we believe that righteous Abel, Noah, Enoch, or indeed any of the Saints of that age worshipped God's majesty by means of pictures, since the world was too little instructed to have much knowledge of the arts at that period; and, as there are many parts of the world where men know nothing of the pictorial art, are we therefore to imagine that the majesty of the Lord is not worshipped there? The majesty of the Lord is adored, not by means of the picture made up of colours (as he dreams), but by that ineffable power by which the worlds are framed. His majesty is adored, not by means of certain materials, but by the Word—that is, His Son whom He begat ineffably before the worlds, by whom and in whom He made all things, who is the right hand and the Majesty of the Father. Therefore, the holy Catholic Church does not teach that by images formed with colours (as the oft-named John has nauseously repeated), either men or angels are to worship God, but rather by Christ our Lord; when, in celebrating the mysteries of her redemption, she declares that 'it is meet, right, and profitable that we at all times and in all places give thanks to Him, by whom Angels praise the unspeakable majesty of the Father, and the heavenly powers do adore, and

proves that the worship of the image and of the prototype of which it is the image is not twofold but one."

PETER AND PETER the Legates of Adrian brought forward a book which Demetrius having received read, "from the Epistle of our Father Basil to Julian the Transgressor:"—

"According to the immaculate faith of us Christians, which we have received by inheritance from God, I confess and profess to believe in

the powers of darkness do tremble, and the heavens and all the army of the heavens in sweetest strains do modulate their hymn of glory mingled with humble confession.' His majesty is adored, not by His colour-bearing image, but by His most sacred and life-giving incarnation: His power is adored, not by means of His picture, but of His works, by His taking upon Him the form of a servant, His being born of a virgin, His miracles, His triumph over death, His resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven. These form the medium by which Catholics adore the majesty of the Lord—these are the bulwarks by which the faith of the Church is defended—this is that confession from which he who dissents is exposed to danger, which if any retain in his heart he gains eternal salvation—this is that eternal memorial by which the minds of the faithful do continually look upon Christ with the eye of the soul and to the full knowledge of which we come, not by pictures, but by faith, hope, and charity.

"But inasmuch as this same John, from his want of skill as it seems, says one thing while he wished to say another, we have now sufficiently replied to what he has said, and will now direct our pen to the discussion of that which probably he wished to have said. When, therefore, he says, 'By the image manifested by colours the majesty of the Lord is adored,' he possibly intended to say this, 'That when the image formed of colours is seen, the majesty of the Lord is worshipped,' which seems to be his meaning by that which he says afterwards, 'And we come to the memory of His presence in this world.' To which proposition, we have this ready reply, that neither in the words of sacred Scripture, nor by the examples of the fathers, has it been ordained that we are to seek God in images made with the hand. 'In my heart' (says David), not in images, 'have I hidden thy words: with my whole heart have I sought thee, O God;' and Moses exhorts, 'Lay up the words of the Lord in your hearts;' and the Prophet, 'Turn unto me with your whole heart:' from all which we may understand that God is to be sought, not in visible objects, not in manufactured things, but in the heart; and that He is to be beheld, not with the eye of the flesh, but with the eye of the mind. Oh, what madness to speak thus—'By images we come to the memory of His presence on earth!' Unhappy memory!—which, that it may remember Christ, who never ought to be absent from the mind of a good man, must needs have the sight of an image for this purpose, and cannot realise the presence of Christ in any way than by looking on pictures painted on walls or on other materials. As such remembrance is excited by images, it arises, not from the love of the heart, but from the force of vision; for it is not inward affection which excites such to the remembrance of Christ, but that same necessity by which when we see any painted thing, however hateful it may be, it is forcibly brought home to our minds. Now, it is to be feared concerning those who are so straitened that, except they can look on a picture, they can scarce keep Christ in their memory, lest if they should lose their eyesight, or some mischance they should be parted from their images which they cannot have always by them, they should quite lose sight of Christ, who ought at all times to be before their eyes."

Adrian's only reply to this censure consists in quoting again that which he had so often quoted before—a passage from an interpolated letter of Gregory I. to Secundinus.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 124, col. 1.

One God the Father Almighty, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and these Three I glorify and worship as One God. I confess also the incarnate dispensation of the Son, and furthermore I confess holy Mary who begat Him to be the Mother of God. I acknowledge also both the holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, who make intercession with God: these I invoke that, for their sake, God who loves man may be merciful unto me and may grant unto me remission of my sins. Wherefore I honour and worship their likenesses in their pictures, and more especially because these have been handed down to us from the Apostles and never prohibited by them; and, moreover, they have been painted in all the Churches.”*

GREGORY Deacon of the Church of the Holy Apostles reads from “The Life of Symeon Stylites,” written by Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, which begins, “Symeon was verily the astonishment of the whole world;” and, after other things, it is written:—“They say that this man became very famous in the illustrious city of Rome; so that they were accustomed to set up little images of him in the porches of their workshops, hoping thereby to secure to themselves both safety and protection.”†

JOSEPH Monk and Abbot of the Monastery of Heraclia said: “I, a sinner, have with me the book which contains the ‘Life of Symeon of the Wonderful Mount;’ and wait your commands.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL: “Let it be read.”

COSMAS Deacon and Chamberlain read the “one hundredth and eighteenth chapter of the ‘Life of Symeon of the Wonderful Mount,’‡ concerning a woman of Rosopolis who was

* This letter is, by Romanists themselves, accounted spurious. It was quoted before in Adrian’s letter to the Emperor and his mother, which was read in the Second Session. The observations of Du Pin are there given in the note upon that letter.

† “The testimony of Theodoret (says Comber) about setting up the image of Symeon Stylites over their shop-doors at Rome, hoping for protection from thence, confutes the pretence of Pope Gregory and the Council that they did not hope or trust in images: no doubt it was a crime in the people who did so, if the story be true; but let it be remembered that Theodoret brings it in with *they say*, as being only a report: and he lived a great way from Rome, and so might easily be imposed on in this matter.”—*Gibson’s Preservative*, tit. vi., p. 292.

‡ The austerities to which this personage submitted form a remarkable instance of the absurdities which men will practise under the name of religion when they leave the path of Scripture for that of their own fancies. Having

barren and under the influence of a malignant spirit; who, having been cured, and brought forth children, set up the image of the holy man in her house, which wrought the most astonishing miracles:—

“There was a certain woman of Rosopolis, in Cilicia, named Theoteana who, though she had lived with her husband twenty years, yet had no child. Moreover, it happened that she had from a child been vexed by an evil spirit which made her to gnaw her tongue; and her husband, being no longer able to bear with the trying circumstances of her affliction, dismissed her from his house; and though for four years

spent considerable part of his life in caves and monasteries, where he almost killed himself by his penances, he spent the remainder on the summit of various pillars, from any one of which he never descended but to ascend another much higher. On the first pillar which he erected, which was nine feet high, he remained four years; on the second, which was eighteen feet high, he remained three years; on the third, which was thirty-three feet high, he continued ten years; and on the fourth, which was sixty feet high, he continued twenty years. His pillar was only three feet in diameter at the top, which would not admit of his lying extended upon it, neither would he allow himself a seat. His holiness was further exemplified in his taking no food but on Sunday: in his bowing his head so low as to touch his feet, and so often as to weary out those who attempted to enumerate his obeisances: all this had its reward in the great esteem and veneration which these foolish and fanatical practices procured for him. Moreover, he wore skins of beasts and an iron collar; neither would he allow any woman, not even his mother, to come within the inclosure where his pillar stood; and here he far exceeded our blessed Lord, who allowed any that were willing to draw near to Him; who approved that His feet should be washed by the tears of one woman and His head anointed with oil by another; who commended a third who sat at His feet to hear His discourse; on whom women waited and ministered to Him of their substance during His life; near to whose cross they were found at His death, and were earliest at the tomb to witness His resurrection. How different the holiness of the proud, self-righteous Symeon and the meek and lowly Jesus! His wisdom, if we may judge by his approval of the Council of Chalcedon, was not very great: “for (said he) if it be written that ‘where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,’ how much more would His presence be amidst the numerous throng of holy bishops assembled at Chalcedon.” This argument, if followed out, must have justified the previous second Council of Ephesus, now styled “Latrocinium,” since there was also a goodly concourse of Bishops. His notions of morality were not very exact; for when Theodosius II. would have compelled some Christians to restore certain synagogues to the Jews, which they had taken away by force, he so sharply rebuked the Emperor that he desisted from his righteous purpose. He had some few imitators down to the twelfth century, when this silly practice was totally suppressed. This folly was confined to the East; for it was checked on its first appearance in Europe, the Latins having too much wisdom and prudence to approve of such absurdities. One Vulfilac, a Monk of Lombardy, had a pillar erected for him at Treves, and stood upon it barefoot in winter. The neighbouring Bishops ordered him to come down and live like other Monks, and his pillar was demolished. He obeyed their command with tears and reluctance. Thus was this species of superstition nipped in the bud. Strange that folly like this should have ever met with admirers and defenders amongst Protestants! Yet, alas! there have been such, and will, as it appears, be such again.

he remained separate, he did not take any other in her place. She having met with a party of travellers betook herself with them to the holy man, and when the devil saw him immediately he foamed and was tormented in his presence; for he, with the woman, beheld the spiritual image of the Saint, saying to him in a human voice: 'I will separate thee from her, thou wicked and unclean spirit! and she shall return to her husband, and in the year following she shall have a son.' At this the devil was horribly vexed, and cried out, 'O what violence is done to me! It is not in thy province to effect divorces; and, wherefore, hast thou granted her a child when she never had one to me? What harm have I done to thee that thou separatest me from my woman? If you had bought me as a slave you would, belike, bring me in bondage to men.' Symeon replied, 'And a vile slave you are! Accursed wretch, remember what you are! Run quickly in flames of fire, and bring hither water and fetch wood!' And immediately, like a whirlwind and in flames of fire, the devil, in the woman, took up the water-pot and rushed forth; and he filled it and collected the wood, bellowing and roaring out, 'Woe to me! Woe to me! vile slave as I am and inventor of evil! What have I not endured! And now this holy Symeon forces me away from this woman, and what then I shall do I know not!' Thus he spake in the presence of the people now assembling together; but when he had fulfilled his appointed task he roared out, bellowing loudly on seeing the fiery lightning directed against him; and, being greatly and horribly tormented, he ran his round through every part of the woman: in this way at length he came out of her. And the woman being restored, Symeon sent her away, saying, 'Return, my good woman, to thy own house and live with thy husband; behold, the Lord has disposed the heart of thy husband to receive thee with great joy.' And so it happened, for, on her return, immediately the heart of her husband was filled with love for her, and he went in unto her and she conceived. And when a year had now passed away, they brought the child to the man of God, praising and giving thanks to Him. And after that they had fulfilled their vow, and had returned to their own country, the woman, excited by faith, set up in her private apartment an image of the Saint; and it wrought miracles, because that the Holy Spirit which dwelt in him overshadowed it; and many demoniacs were cleansed there, and many sick were healed of divers diseases. Among the rest, was a woman who had an issue of blood *fifteen* years who, coming in faith to look upon the image, found that her issue of blood was stanch'd immediately; for she said within herself, 'If I may only

behold his face I shall be healed.* And when she perceived that the fountain of her blood was dried up, she went forthwith to the man of God, and worshipped before him, singing hymns and praises to God, and declaring the wonderful work which had been done in her."

COSMAS reads another miracle of our holy Father Symeon :

"It came to pass in those days that there was a certain lawyer of the city of Antioch who was dreadfully afflicted with an evil spirit, and from time to time he was so distressed by it that he was well nigh choked with contractions of the windpipe. This man having betaken himself to the Saint, and by his intercession obtained a cure and now being as well as if he had never ailed anything whatever, when he returned home, by way of thank-offering, he set up an image of the Saint over the door of his office, which was in a public and well-frequented part of the city. And when certain who believed not saw this image, made glorious with tapers and veils, being filled with furious rage, they stirred up some other disorderly persons, like to themselves, and thus it was a mob was gathered together who tumultuously shouted aloud, 'Away with the man who made this—throw down the image!' It happened, by the special providence of God, that the man was not to be found in his own house, as they undoubtedly would have dispatched him : some crying out one thing and some another. Their malice was, indeed, exceedingly great before God, and their ill-will was immeasurable. Being now wrought up to any purpose, they thought it a good opportunity to show their dislike to the Saint and to revenge themselves on him by insults, because that he had oftentimes rebuked the ill faith and deceit of those who lived as heathen among them. When, therefore, they could no longer restrain their great fury, they bid one of the soldiers ascend the steps of the ladder and throw down the image. He ascended the ladder, but as he was stretching forth his hands to do their bidding he was struck down from above and fell to the ground ; and the clamour amongst the crowd was immense, and, being enraged, they prevailed on another to ascend. No sooner did he put forth his hand than he was dashed to the ground in like manner, and on this, through fear, they all began to sign themselves with the sign of the cross ; but the unbelievers being

* These stories are to the praise and glory, not of God, but of Symeon, or, rather, of Symeon's picture : a woman is healed by looking on the face of Symeon's picture, just as the woman in the Gospel was healed by touching the hem of the Saviour's garment, and of a similar disease and in exactly the same way, and with something of the same words. Cannot any one see in all this an Antichristian perversion of a Gospel narrative ?

only the more enraged, made a third to ascend the ladder for the same purpose; and when he stretched forth his hands to throw down the image he also, like the others, was hurled to the ground. Then great fear fell on all the faithful who were standing around, who, in utter astonishment at the obduracy and audacity of these unbelieving and unholy men, worshipped the image with prayer and went their own way."

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Those things, venerable fathers, which have been read we have heard and believe; but I, your unworthy brother, will now relate certain like miraculous events which have come to my personal knowledge. A certain man of Cyprus, of the city of Constantia, had been driving his team, and having left his work awhile had betaken himself to an oratory of the Mother of God to pray; and, when he had prayed, he saw an image of the holy Mother of God painted on the wall; and he said, 'What's this to do here?' And he took up his ox-goad and dug out the right eye of the image; and after he had gone out of the temple he struck his team with the ox-goad, and, the ox-goad snapping asunder, a splinter of it flew into his right eye and put it out. This man I myself have seen and I know that he has but one eye. Another man, of the city of Citium, went on the day of the holy Mother of God, the 15th of August, into her temple to adorn it with hangings. In doing this he took a nail and drove it into the forehead of an image of Saint Peter which was on the wall; but when he had attached his ropes and fixed up the hangings, in the same hour a most intolerable pain seized him in his head and forehead, and he continued during the two days of the feast lying in torments. When the Bishop of Citium was made acquainted with the facts he reprimanded the man, and bid him go immediately and draw out the nail from the image, and while he was doing this, as he drew out the nail, so he lost his head-ache. [Hereupon the Bishop of Citium, being questioned about the fact, declared upon oath, in the presence of the Council, that it was so. After which Constantine continued his narration.] About two years ago, certain men of Citium sailed in two boats to a city of Syria named Gabula,

and while they were there (as was frequently the case), the Saracen soldiers came to the sea coast, and certain of them, on going into the city of Gabula, turned aside to one of the temples of that city; and one of these Saracens, having seen on the wall an image made of small stones, asked a Christian who was at hand, 'What profit is there in this image?' To whom the Christian replied, 'It benefits those who honour it, but those who dishonour it it injures:' on which the Saracen said, 'See, I will dig out its eye, and I will see what harm it will do me;' and, having said this, he took up his pike and struck out the right eye of the image. Immediately his own right eye leaped out and fell to the ground and he was seized with a burning fever; and his companions, seeing how ill he was, took him up and carried him to their own city. These things the men, who were thirty-two in number, told me on their return to Cyprus."

THEODORE Bishop of Catana presented a book which Gregory the Deacon of the Church of the Apostles received, and read from the "Sermon of Saint Basil, on the blessed Barlaam the Martyr," which begins—

"And first the deaths of the Saints." And after other things he continues: "Come forth now, O ye who are eminently skilled in painting the combats of the Athletæ, magnify with your art the mutilated image of the warrior: set forth, with the glowing colours of your craft, the conqueror, whose praise is so feebly described by me. To you must I yield the palm in describing the conflicts of the Martyrs: nor shall I this day grieve to be overcome by your superior powers. O let me see the conflict of the hand in the fire,* as more powerfully described by you: let me see the combatant in that lustre in which he will shine in your picture: let demons now howl as being con-

* This Saint was a Martyr in the persecution of Dioclesian. Among various other methods to induce him to offer incense to the gods the following was tried, to which Saint Basil especially alludes. Barlaam was brought out of prison, and an altar with burning coals upon it being made ready for sacrifice the Martyr's hand was held forcibly over the flames, and incense with live coals was laid upon it, that, if he shook the coals off his hand, he might be said to offer sacrifice by throwing incense into the fire upon the altar. The Saint, fearing the scandal and very shadow of crime (though by throwing off the fire to save his hand he could not reasonably be esteemed to offer sacrifice), kept his hand steady whilst the coals burnt quite through it, and so with the incense dropped on the altar.—*Buller's Lives of Saints*, Nov. 21.

founded at the noble deeds of the Martyr, and let his burning and yet triumphant hand be again exhibited before them; and in your picture let the great President of the combat, even Christ, find a place, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen."

CONSTANTINE Deacon and Notary read an extract from the "Life of our Father John the Faster, of holy memory, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, by Photinus most reverend Presbyter and Ecclesiastical Advocate of the most holy Great Church of Constantinople."*

"Neither may this miracle be passed by in silence, nor can we consent to keep it in secret, however greatly our inspired father might desire it. It was night, and we were going with all haste to meet the Emperor Mauritius on the opposite coast—Mauritius, then our most righteous most gracious Lord, but now a Martyr. This glory that infernal dragon, the Tyrant, conferred on him against his own will. But we were marching on in great haste when a certain woman, very beautiful in her dress, in her person, and in her mind, and moreover very rich (though, on account of her present calamity, she did not appear to be so), was seen by me at a distance, surrounded by a great crowd of our poorer brethren; and when she was repulsed by those who had the charge of the rest, she would not give way; for though modesty suffused her countenance with blushes and tears, yet, on account of her necessity, she was importunately troublesome. When I saw this I quitted the company with which I was entrusted, and,

* Binius disapproves of this long fable, and observes, in a note, that it was not to be found in many copies of the Council, and possibly, like some other additions of the same kind, might be spurious.

The tale is, as Cave observes, *putidissima fabula*, but not much more absurd than some which precede and others which follow, and quite as much to the point, in proving the miraculous powers of images, as any of them. Why does Binius, who never hints a doubt before, become on a sudden so squeamish? Possibly because so much credit is here given to John the Faster, who, however celebrated at Constantinople, was no Saint at Rome. This John was the first Patriarch who assumed the title "Œcumenical," to the great annoyance of his contemporary Gregory I.; and, notwithstanding all his fulminations against the name, as being *fumosum seculi typhum*, and against the Patriarch who had assumed it as the "forerunner of Antichrist," John kept it still: and, what is more, his successors could never be induced to part with it, notwithstanding all the efforts of the Roman prelates, and notwithstanding that, on this account (if we may believe Baronius), the see of Constantinople has been delivered into the hands of the Turks.

Though pictures could work miracles, as this Council has proved, not all have this power, but only those of very holy men. It must not be supposed, then, that the picture of one who affronted a Pope would be holy enough for such a purpose.

laying hands on the woman, I demanded of her what she would have? To this she replied, 'I have a husband who now for these three years has been afflicted with an evil spirit, and though I have (so to speak) had him to ten thousand holy places and holy men, hitherto all has been in vain; and now I have just come from the desert, for he who has the greatest name in all parts for working miracles of this kind declared that he could do nothing for me; but (said he) go to John the Great Patriarch, and thence thou shalt take away, with the blessing of the High Priest of the Lord Almighty, an image of the Virgin the Mother of God; and thou shalt bear it, and take it away to thy house which thou hast built in thine own land; and thou shalt send away thy husband and confine him within the walls of thy house, and he shall not see the great city of the King, to which now you must make your way; and thou shalt set up the image and dedicate it, and it shall be sanctified in thine house, and it shall be that whosoever shall dwell therein shall be blessed with blessings; and behold the evil spirit shall flee away in flight and be banished from thee, neither shall he any more return; for the Lord is near, and His glory shall last for ever. Amen.' These things she said, and the next day I waited with her on the Patriarch. He was then just on the point of entering into the temple of the Mother of God, as was his custom on the passover-day: before him I laid the whole affair—now with greater vigour and rhetoric, and now with all humility and tears—and I rejoiced as certain of success, and moreover as expecting to meet with commendation as being the bearer of such pious proposals. But while I was still urging my suit and saying with all freedom—'O, my Lord, the hermit said, under the inspiration of God, that you should expel the evil spirit,' he cut me short, and in great anger he cried out with a loud voice, 'Yea, O Lord—yea, O Lord—yea, the hermit hath given it out that I, O Lord, that I cast out devils—that I should say, I command thee, O evil spirit, go out of that creature, and depart hence and be no more seen. Dost thou command such things—that I, vile and sinful as I am, should trifle thus? Oh, if ye be such workers of miracles, cast the evil spirit out of me! Nay, brother Photinus, by the prayers of the Saints, you stand much in need of prayer yourself.' Being thus repulsed in a manner so contrary to my expectations, I went away covered with confusion; and silently hastening onwards I was carried just as chance might happen, running against every one as if I had been demented. At last, however, I reached one end of the church; and now I was greatly enraged (for my grief by this time had given way to anger at being thus rejected by the Priest of the great God),

and I made many complaints in silence with myself; for, thought I, little good can be expected by any of the sheep, when our shepherd himself assumes the nature of the wolf. While I was thus reflecting and hesitating what to do, a sudden thought came into my mind. I sent home one of my servants, and procured from the consecrated things which were there, a very beautiful image of our Lady, and having adorned it as handsomely as I could, that it might appear to the best advantage, and be more readily esteemed to come from our great Patriarch (as if, at length, he had been inclined to listen to my petition), I then gave it to the woman, and enjoining on her to pray for us and to be very thankful to the Patriarch, I bid her to depart in peace. She left me almost dancing, not understanding what was done. The joy of both the one and the other of us was but superficial. I appeared to rejoice, but did not really rejoice: she both appeared to rejoice and did rejoice; and yet the accomplishment of her object was as far off as ever. While endeavouring to console myself for the despondency which had now seized upon me, I did but increase it the more as I considered and reflected in what way, and where, and when, and by what, and how and through what medium, I had deceived and beguiled the wretched woman, so truly pitiable, and who had reposed so great confidence in me; and I was the more grieved as having put her out of the way of the protection of my betters, and the possibility of her obtaining by their means, from our wise father, that which she needed. In addition I could not but reflect on the occasion which I had given to the evil spirit to talk and to howl about this imposition of mine; and that I might, contrary to my intentions, have established and confirmed the hold which the demon had upon the man, and that I might afford him matter and pretext for just accusation—I say not against myself only, but against all Christians in general and Priests in particular; for they would say, ‘The Priest hath afflicted the poor wife with another pest, with another demon—namely, that of lies;’ which, after all, is nothing more nor less than clearly this, to endeavour to cast out devils by Beelzebub. Such and similar reflections continually rushing in upon my soul dreadfully harrassed and disquieted me, and made me to apprehend great evils, both from man and God; but I again pondered the matter and imagined for myself a kind of subterfuge, whence I gained an appearance of consolation, which was this—God only knows what will take place; and that in the mean time it might be, that the woman might die, or the man himself, or some one else; or I might die over and over again, and so that which troubled me would come to an end: for I felt

that if, by reflections like these, I could liberate myself from the qualms which I had about this wretched woman, I should be eased of a very great burthen. About three years as I think after this transaction I was standing at the sacred doors of the great church, and behold a woman, lifting up her eyelids, panting and speaking in the greatest agitation, looked intently upon me, and questioned one who was near to her—‘Is that he?’ or ‘Which is he?’ And on being answered, ‘Yes, that is the very person,’ she ran and fell down at my knees, and stooping yet lower she embraced my ankles, and kissed them as she lay prostrate upon the pavement. This I allowed her to do and in some sort rejoiced, and I looked with great complacency this way and that way on the multitudes, and I gave them full opportunity of seeing her prostrate; and I did this in order to show that, in some respects, I might be considered among those who have some influence. Now, among other things usual to supplicants which she then said was this, which she repeated very often, ‘I venerate the Lord, for He was there.’ At last, embracing me too closely, she caused me to fall with violence upon her, and my fall excited no small mirth amongst the bystanders; and being scarcely able to rise for shame I gave her a smart blow and called the Deans and commanded them to take the irreverent woman to the vestry.* When, however, on looking at her more particularly, I was beginning to conjecture that it was her whom I had seen before, she added this—‘The Lord give thee a reward for my house;’ and then I saw how the whole matter stood, and with mingled emotions of joy and anxiety I asked no more than this—‘Did you obtain a cure?’ and ‘How did you obtain it?’ Afterwards, when at leisure, she told me of her departure to her own country, and that she carried the image to her own house and that it was set upon high, being with all honour and veneration affixed to the walls of her chamber; and that the evil spirit, having for a long time raged against it, spurned it, barked at it, and indeed almost torn it to pieces, was at last forced to depart. ‘And it was (added she) a cordial for all our former sufferings.’ And for all those who suffer the like, the abode, or rather the image of the Virgin Mother, is equally efficacious (ὁ τόπος, ὁ τύπος δὲ μᾶλλον τῆ παρθένου μητρὸς ἐξιάται). This is the end of our narration.”

LEO Bishop of Phocæa: “It is written: ‘In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established;’ and

* *δικανικὸν*—a prison connected with the church.—*Du Fresne, Com. in Paul. Silent. (Byz. Hist., vol. xiv. p. 235).*

the many sacred books which have been this day laid before us, have both refreshed our minds and fully satisfied us concerning the restoration of holy images."

PETER the Reader read an extract from "The Life of Blessed Mary of Egypt,"* which begins thus: "It is good to conceal the secrets of a King, but the works of the Lord it is glorious to reveal." And after other things it proceeds:—

* Of this Saint we have the following account in Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints." "One Zozimus, about the year 30 A.D., went on an expedition into the wilderness in hopes of meeting with some hermit of still greater perfections than any he had hitherto seen or conversed with. After a journey of twenty days he saw so strange a figure that at first he took it for some illusion of the enemy; but on closer examination, perceiving that it was flesh and blood, and supposing it to be some holy anchorite, made all the haste he could to overtake him. Having come as he thought within hearing, he cried out to the supposed hermit to ask his blessing, on which the supposed hermit made answer, 'Abbot Zozimus, I am a woman: throw your mantle over me that you may come nearer.' With this he readily complied, and the Abbot conjured her to relate her history and how long she had lived in that desert, to which she consented. Her statement was as follows:—When twelve years old she left her parents without their consent to go to Alexandria, and there she continued seventeen years to live a wicked and abandoned course of life. In her twenty-ninth year she saw some persons going to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of the exaltation of the cross: she went with them, only making fresh occasions for sin, which she found both on her voyage and after her arrival at Jerusalem. (It was at this time that the event took place which is recorded in the extract from her life read here in the Council.) After she had left the church she bought three loaves and went towards Jordan, over which she passed the next day, *having recommended herself to the Virgin*, since which time she had carefully avoided meeting any human creature. She further told Zozimus that she had been in the wilderness forty-seven years, and had lived only on such food as she could procure there; that she suffered severely from heat and cold and still more from most violent internal temptations and perpetual conflicts with inordinate desires. *Prayer to the Virgin*, weeping, and bruising her body with blows, were her usual remedies in such cases and they were generally effectual; for *the blessed Virgin* never failed to show herself a faithful protectress, and to *the blessed Virgin* her heart continually ascended. (Thus it seems that Christ was not so much as thought of in her scheme of salvation). Though she often used Scripture phrases, yet she could not read and had never conversed with or seen any human creature since she came into the desert; but it is God, said she, that teacheth man knowledge. Having told all her story, she requested Zozimus to come to the other side of Jordan next Maundy Thursday with the body and blood of Christ. On the appointed day he came to the Jordan as was appointed, but did not go over. At night she appeared on the other side, and making the sign of the cross over the river *walked upon it as though it had been dry land*. Being come to Zozimus, she received from his hands the holy sacrament; and having thanked him for his pains desired him to return the next Lent to the place where at first he saw her, after which she walked over the river as she came. Zozimus, faithful to his engagement, returned to the place appointed, but found only her corpse stretched on the ground, with an inscription bearing her name, Mary, and the time of her death. Zozimus, having some difficulty in preparing a grave for her, seeing he had not expected to find her dead and therefore had no tools with him, was assisted by a good-natured lion, who performed the part of sexton on that occasion, and, instead of eating up the corpse and Zozimus, actually dug a grave for her and materially assisted the old man."—*Butler's Lives of Saints*, April 8th.

“Others, indeed, the Church received without any hindrance, but me, unhappy wretch, it would not admit; for, as if there had been some military troop stationed for this purpose to preclude my entrance, so did some combined power withstand me and again I stood in the porch. Having done this three or four times with the same ill-success, I at length gave up any further attempt, no longer able to continue the struggle; for my strength was quite exhausted by the opposition which I had met with. At length I retired and stood in a niche of the porch of the church, and there I came after some time to perceive the reason why I was not permitted to behold the life-giving wood. For a saving truth had touched the eyes of my heart, which showed to me that it was the filthiness of my doings which prevented my entrance there. Then I began to mourn and lament—I smote upon my breast and groaned from the very bottom of my heart. While weeping I perceived above the place where I was standing an image of the immaculate Mother of God; and having fixed my eyes steadfastly upon her I said, ‘O Virgin Mistress, who according to the flesh hast begotten God the Word: I know, I know, indeed, that it is neither right nor proper that I, utterly defiled and abandoned as I am, should presume to look upon thy image, who art ever a Virgin, ever chaste, in body and soul equally pure and uncontaminated. It were indeed but right, that my impurity should be loathed and abominated by thy purity; but, as I have heard that He whom thou didst beget was for this end born into the world, and took our nature upon Him that He might call sinners to repentance, O grant thy assistance to me, now deserted and having no other helper. Command that entrance into the Church should be granted to me also: shut me not out from beholding that life-giving wood, on which God, whom thou didst beget according to the flesh, was crucified, did give His own blood as a ransom for me. Command that even to me, O my Mistress, the door may be opened for the holy adoration of the cross. Behold I give thee, as my veritable security (*ἐγγυητήν ἀξιοχρεών*), to that God who was born of thee, never again to abuse my body by any licentious practices; but when I shall have seen the wood of the cross of thy Son, to bid farewell to the world, and all that are in the world, and to depart wherever thou, us being my saving pledge, mayest suggest and lead me.’ Thus I prayed, and as having received a kind of assurance in fervour of faith and in reliance on the clemency of the Mother of God, I move away from the place where I had been standing and praying, and I go and join myself with those who were going in. And now there was no longer any to resist and

to be resisted by me—none to hinder my approach to the door by which they went into the temple. Fearfulness and astonishment overwhelmed me! I was in the utmost confusion and agitation; for when I reached the door, which up to that time had been as it were barred against me, it seemed as if the same mighty influence which before had hindered my progress had now prepared an entrance for me, so easily did I then enter. Thus was I brought into the holy of holies, and I was counted worthy to behold the wood of the life-giving cross, and I saw the mysteries of God and how ready He is to accept of repentance. Having prostrated myself on the ground and adored that holy pavement, I went out and hastened with all speed to her who had been pledged by me. And now I was once again in the place where the configuration of my pledge was depicted, and having bent my knee before the immaculate Virgin the Mother of God, I used these words: ‘O my Mistress, lover of goodness, thou hast shown in me thy love to man! Thou hast not abominated the prayer of the unworthy! I have seen that glory from which we licentious persons are justly excluded. Glory be to God, who, by thee, hast admitted the repentance of the sinner. But what more have I a sinner to think of or to say? It is now time, O my Mistress, for me to fulfil the terms of the agreement of which thou hast been the pledge. Now direct me whither thou wilt have me to go—now be still more the preceptor of salvation to me by conducting me into the paths of penance.’ And while I was yet speaking I heard the voice of one crying out from afar, ‘Pass over Jordan, and there thou shalt find a blessed rest.’ When I heard this voice, believing that it was intended for my direction, I cried out with tears and called aloud upon the Mother of God: ‘O Mother of God, my Mistress, forsake me not;’ and, having said this, I went immediately from the porch of the church, and have continually wandered ever since.”

JOHN Legate of the East: “A similar image I have seen in the holy city of Christ our God, and have often worshipped it.

STEPHEN Deacon Notary and Referendary read: “From the Martyrdom of St. Procopius,” which begins, “At that time Dioclesian the Tyrant reigned.” And after other remarks it is continued as follows:—

“The young man being filled with great joy became bold in the faith; and so, in like manner, did all his companions, and in the same

hour of the night he went back with the soldiers and came to Scythopolis. Here having privately assembled all the workers of gold and silver he demanded of them, 'Can you make for me an article after the pattern which I will give you?' They being awe-struck at the severity of the man's countenance, having consulted together, put forward one of their best artificers, whose name was Mark, saying, 'This man will make for you whatever you wish, my lord.'" And shortly after the history continues: "But Mark was unwilling to obey him: he was, however, persuaded by the young man who said, 'Even until death I never will reveal your secret to the King.' On which, the other being persuaded, began by night to make a cross of silver and gold in mysterious secrecy. And it came to pass that, when the cross was finished and set up, then there appeared three images upon it and there was inscribed in the Hebrew dialect over the one in the midst, *Inmanuel*, and over those on each side, *Gabriel* and *Michael*. Mark, being in a fright, was anxious to have wiped out the images; but he could not, for his hand was as it were withered. At cock-crowing came the leader (ὁ δῆξ), the young man spoken of to the house of Mark to take away the cross, and when he saw it he worshipped; and he said to Mark, 'What are these figures, and what is this superscription?' He replied, 'My lord, in the same hour that this work was finished these images made their appearance; but I know not of whom they are the images nor what is the inscription.' The young man, however, knew that some virtue was in the cross: wherefore he worshipped it and wrapped it in purple, and went on his way rejoicing, having rewarded the artificer (Mark) handsomely. And he entered with the two bands into the city."

STEPHEN Monk and Librarian read: "From the Life of our Father S. Theodore Archimandrite of the Sicensians," which begins, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." And then proceeds as follows:—

"When he was now about twelve years old there was an epidemic disease in the groin raging in the place where he lived, with which he was so afflicted as to be in great danger of death. They took him, therefore, to an oratory of St. John the Baptist which was near at hand and laid him at the entrance of the sanctuary. Now, above him in the receptacle of the cross (σταυροδόχῳ), there was an image of our Saviour Jesus Christ standing; and as he lay groaning from the power of his malady, on a sudden tears of dew distilled upon him from the

image. Immediately by the grace of God being relieved he was made whole, and went back to his house." And shortly after, "Wishing to imitate David in the godly singing of hymns, he began to learn the Psalter: with great pains and labour he learned as far as the sixteenth, but the seventeenth Psalm he could by no means retain in his memory. Being in an oratory of St. Christopher near the place where he lived, he was meditating thereupon, but not being able to learn it; having prostrated himself on the pavement, he entreated of God that He would grant him greater success in his endeavour to commit the Psalms to memory. And God, who is gracious to man and who hast said, 'Seek and ye shall find,' granted his request. For after he had risen from the floor and had supplicated the image of the Saviour, a sweetness surpassing that of honey filled his mouth. And he, recognising the grace of God in the sweetness of which he was partaking, returned thanks to Him on this account; and from that hour he was enabled with the greatest ease to learn and to retain in his memory the whole Psalter."

COSMAS Deacon and Chamberlain read: "The Letter of Gregory, Most Holy Pope of Rome, to Germanus, Most Holy Patriarch of Constantinople:—

"What pleasure, what delight, did ever so rejoice my soul as did that most gratifying communication which has been by thee transmitted concerning thyself, who art to me a name and a glory ever venerable, ever precious, my most religious, my God-directed brother! * Inspired with these glad tidings, as now I read your invaluable letters I grew warm in spirit and almost danced from excess of joy. Then lifting up my eyes to heaven, I returned most hearty thanks to God the Sovereign Ruler of all, who hitherto hath approved of thee, and to the end will co-operate with thee and bring all thy works to light. This, indeed, is my prayer night and day, nor (I speak boldly in Christ) shall I ever cease from such affection towards you. The constant remembrance which I have of thy super-eminent excellence, O thou most worthy of all praise and ever beloved by God, bears witness to my words; which having ever on my lips and no longer being able

* This Pope, in his epistle to the Emperor Leo Isaurus, had declared, "We are forced to write to thee things gross and unlearned, for that thou thyself art so gross and unlearned" (*παχέα και ἀπαιδευτα ὡς περ εἰ ἀπαιδευτος και παχὺς*). Is this letter to the orthodox, sanctified, and enlightened Germanus, to be considered as containing the entire doctrines of the Church and as a specimen of his own elevation of mind and learning? There is, indeed, not so much abuse; but ignorance, perversion of Scripture, and misapplication of the fathers, is no less glaring and egregious in the one than in the other.

to bear the burthen thereof I have once more addressed myself to you by letter; for I feel it a duty, and a duty surpassing all others, to hail and address thee, my brother and champion of the Church, and to laud and magnify the motives which impelled thee to the conflict. But if any will speak (and well they may), let him the rather cry aloud—the forerunner of impiety, he who now suffers, who in thy triumph hath exchanged good for adverse fortune. For whereas, like one who fell from heaven, he thought to lift up himself against religion and to prevail against her, he was bound in fetters from above, being utterly despoiled of his expectations, and he heard from the Church that which of old the Egyptian tyrant heard from Moses when triumphing over him, ‘The enemy said, Pursuing I will seize, I will divide the spoil, I will satiate my soul’ (Exodus xv. 9): yea, and against him was denounced the same prophetic curse which was denounced against the devil himself, ‘God shall destroy thee for ever: He will pluck thee out and drive thee from thy dwelling-place, and thy root from the land of the living’ (Psalm lii. 5). Thus, contrary to his hopes, utterly foiled in all his endeavours, did he perish; the infernal conflicts of the warfare of the apostate against God being utterly prostrated before the firmness of celestial prowess, so that the Christ-opposing arrogance of the enemy was driven to the very verge of entire extermination; and in his case also were the words of Scripture fulfilled which declare, ‘The bows of the mighty are broken, and the weak are girded with strength’ (1 Sam. ii. 4): for the ‘strength’ of the wickedness of those who fight against God is as nothing compared with the weakness of God; and it is written, ‘The whole world shall fight with God against the unwise’* (Wisdom of Solomon, v. 20). Aided thus by God, why should you cease to carry on your warfare, O most holy, against these atheistical opposers of God?—who have at length discovered that it is He (though unperceived by them) against whom they have been contending, or, to speak more truly, who hath been fighting with you, and hath defeated their hostile attacks; and the more especially as you have entered on this contest under the direction of God. For foremost in the camp of the kingdom of Christ, you ordered that there should be set up the truly glorious and illustrious *labarum*—I mean the life-giving cross, the great trophy of his prowess over death, in which he engraved in letters the four ends of the world; and next in order the sacred image of the Mistress of us

* Possibly Gregory may here refer to the death of Jubinus Spatharocandidatus, who was slain by some infuriated females, because, in obedience to the Emperor Leo, he persisted in destroying the image of the Saviour styled “Antiphoneta.”

all, who is verily the chaste Mother of God, 'whom the rich among the people shall supplicate' * (Psalm xliv. 12); for she is holy, as the fathers have testified; and who, having been honoured by you as such, hath not left you without a recompense, and the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype, according to the great Basil.† Moreover, the doctrine of holy images is replete with piety, according to Chrysostom, who declares, 'I have delighted in the picture formed in wax, and filled with piety; for I saw in a picture the Angel pursuing the troops of the barbarians, and the words of David verified, Lord, in thy city thou shalt bring their image to nought.'‡ The Church hath by no means been in error, though some have imagined that it has—God be gracious to us! Nor is our tradition at all in imitation of Gentile error—far be it from us! And let not the things which may be done be considered, but rather the intention of him who does them.§ Thus when, in the city of Paneas, the woman with the bloody flux was disposed piously to commemorate the miracle which was wrought in her behalf, she was not rejected; for at the feet of the statue which she raised of our Lord a herb sprung up of strange and unusual form, which was open to all, through the condescension and goodness of the same our God and Saviour, as a cure for every kind of disease. Such setting up of images in the name of God is, as we may rather say, according to the law; but, since grace and truth are more exact than types and to be honoured above the shadow, therefore, holy men assembled in Council, by the direction of God, have delivered this

* In the Septuagint, Psalm xliv. 12, it is—τὸ πρόσωπόν σου λιτανεύσουσιν οἱ πλούσιοι τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς. These words are altered by Gregory into ΗΣ τὸ πρόσωπόν λιτανεύσουσιν οἱ πλούσιοι τῷ λαῷ, and as he alters the words so he quite perverts their meaning, making that which the Psalmist spake of Christ to relate to the Virgin, or rather to her picture! Is this a specimen of the learned and exalted sentiments which Gregory would address to his God-directed brother Germanus? What heretic could gloss more perversely?

† *Lib. Car.*, lib. iii. c. 16.

‡ For the spuriousness of the homily from which this extract is taken, which was suspected in the "Caroline Books," and proved by Du Pin, *Vida Du Pin's Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v., p. 23; and *Lib. Car.*, lib. iii. c. 20.

§ The great maintainers of this worship (says Comber) would prove it no idolatry, by this maxim, *that in everything we must look not at the fact that is done, but at the intention of him who doth it.* Now, the worshippers of images, they say, do not intend to commit idolatry. I reply, the Heathen, when they bowed down to idols and offered incense, prayers, and gifts to them (as some Christians do to their images), did not intend either to worship a false God or to commit idolatry, and yet God calls and counts them idolaters. If we apply this maxim to other sins, Noah did not intend to be drunk; those who went out with Absalom in the simplicity of their heart did not intend to be rebels; nor Ahab to kill Naboth—yea, Pilate himself seems to have no design to condemn our Saviour. But can any man say all these were innocent?

canon* to the Church, in order that the greatest cause of salvation should ever be in the sight of all—namely, that the holy and venerable image of Him who takes away the sins of the world should be set forth by the colours of the painter according to His human form; that we, being stirred up by the sight thereof, may be led to meditate upon the depth of the humiliation of God the Word, and to the remembrance of His conversation in the flesh, and of His passion, and of His saving death, and of the redemption thereby accomplished in behalf of the world, and in all this there is nothing incongruous with the divine oracles. For, if the predictions of the Prophets have met with no fulfilment, then let not pictures be made for the illustration of that which has never taken place—that is, if the Lord never was incarnate, let not His sacred image, according to the flesh, be painted—if He were not born in Bethlehem of the all-glorious Virgin Mother of God—if the Magi did not bring any gifts—if the holy Angels did not appear to the shepherds—if the multitude of the heavenly host did not sing a hymn in praise of Him who was born—if He who bears the weight of the whole universe was not carried in His Mother's arms as a babe—or if He, who gives food to all flesh, was not nourished by her milk—then let no representation of such events be made. If the Lord of life and death was not taken into the arms of the aged man who recognized Him, and, at the same time, proclaimed Him as the Lord of all and besought of Him dismissal from this life—if to fulfil the appointed dispensation He who now sits above 'did not go into Egypt on a light cloud' (Isaiah. xix. 1)—namely, His Mother, who is all light, strong in goodness and in holiness—and return again from Egypt and dwell at Nazareth—let not these events be represented by colours. If He never raised the dead, restored the paralytic, cleansed the leper, gave sight to the blind, made the tongue of the dumb to speak, caused the lame to walk, or cast out devils—if He never opened

The primitive Martyrs (had they known of this device) need not have died rather than have offered incense to the Emperor's image, or to those of his gods; for, if their instructions had been to serve God that way, they might have saved their lives, and by this doctrine have been very innocent. But the maxim is extremely misapplied by these image-worshippers; for, since God hath forbidden this way of worship, no intention of ours can annul that law or give us license to break it.—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. c. 5, p. 296.

* The holy men whom Gregory describes as speaking thus by the counsel of God are, according to Binius and Baronius, Monothelites: their Canons are *spurii* and *illegitimi* and their Council *reprobatum*. And Binius adds further—*Non tantum Pseudo-synodum, verum etiam conventum malignantium et Synagogam Diaboli eandem rectissime appellaveris* (Binii "Concil. General." tom. iii., pars. i., scet. i., p. 313). So the only Canon which speaks expressly in favour of images was decreed by a Council styled by Romish writers "a Devil's Synagogue."

the ears of the deaf—if He wrought not things beyond all expectation—if He fulfilled not the heavenly oracles—then never let such things be painted. If He who shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead did not voluntarily undergo suffering—if He spoiled not hell and did not, having risen again, ascend into heaven—let not the histories which record these events be written—let not the pictures which represent them by colours be painted. But if all these things have been accomplished, and ‘great is the mystery of godliness’ (1 Tim. iii. 16) I, would, if it were possible, that the heavens, the earth, and the sea—that every animal, plant, and every other creature—should publish them abroad by words, by writing, or by pictures.

“It is the configuration of those things which have no existence which is idolatry—namely, such as Gentile mythology has invented, vainly pretending to make the outward form of that which has no actual being.* Certainly, the Church of God has no agreement with idols†—far be it from us. We have never worshipped calves—we have not made a brazen calf in Horeb: neither has any creature been accounted by us as God. We have bowed down to no graven image—we have not been initiated in the mysteries of Belphegor—we admit not of the slaying of children or any secret rites—we have not offered our sons or our daughters to devils, and, therefore, that which was spoken by Solomon against idolatry can never be made to apply to us. Have we ever stained the earth with blood?—or have we set up an image in a temple with four faces and worshipped it?—or have we pourtrayed upon the wall of the temple the abomination of creeping things and of beasts?—or has Ezekiel seen us weeping for Adonis, or offering up incense to the sun, concerning whom the Apostle says, ‘They served the creature above the Creator’ (Ezek. viii. 14; Rom. i. 25)? Have we made images of the two harlots of Egypt, Oola and Ooliba (Ezek. xxiii. 4),‡ and worshipped them? Have

* If this be a true definition of idolatry, then those who worshipped the images of Hercules, Romulus, Julius Cæsar, and others, were not idolaters, since the images they worshipped were similitudes of things which *did exist*. But farther, it bears hard upon not a few images and pictures of Romish and Greek Saints, who had never any other existence than in the inventive brain of some Monk. And certainly, Grecian mythology never invented more fables than the various authors of the “Lives of the Saints.”

† This is true: but the Church of Christ is one thing—the Church of Rome is another; and, though the Church of Christ has no connection with idols, these have their most favoured abode in the Church of Rome. Idolatry is of various kinds: molten calves were worshipped by Israel of old: waxen, wooden, brazen, golden, silver, and stone images, are worshipped by the members of the Greek and Roman Church now.

‡ Oola and Ooliba, or as in our translation Ahola and Aholibah, were not, as Gregory imagines, names of Egyptian idols, but typical names given

sacrifices been offered by us to Bel in Babylon, or to Dagon in Palestine?—or have we fallen down before any of the gods of the nations? It is not so—it is not so. Let no one slander us; for the people of Christ—that name which is above every name even to this day—have never worshipped or served any created thing: they have served only the holy and life-giving Trinity. God forbid! The nature of idolatry is manifest to all; but to Christians and those who fear God the Lord of all is the supreme object of worship. But if any, like a Jew, ready for cavils, urges against us that which was denounced against idolaters of old, and ascribes idolatry to the Church because of that godlike and truly admirable guidance to better things which her venerable images supply, count him as no other than a barking dog, and whirling him far from you, as it were from a sling, say to him as if he were a Jew indeed*—‘I would that Israel, by those visible things which were ordained, had offered his worship to God and by his typical things had kept his Creator in remembrance; that he had not cleaved to the calf and flies rather than to the tables of the law: would that he had desired the holy altar rather than the calves of Samaria: would that he had preferred the rod of Moses to the idol Astarte.’ It had been well for him, and at the same time right, to have embraced the rock which, by divine commission, gave forth water instead of Baal. Oh, that he had paid more regard to the rod of Moses, the golden urn, the ark, the mercy-seat, the rod which budded, the ephod, the table, the inner and outer tabernacle—all which were made for the glory of God: and although they were made with hands yet were they called the holy of holies; and, moreover, that he had regarded the cherubim which were carved, of which the Apostle makes mention, saying, ‘The cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat,’ between which, as we learn from Scripture, the divine glory was wont to dwell; for, if he had adhered to these, he would not have fallen into idolatry,† for every work done in the name of the Lord is precious and holy.

to Samaria and Jerusalem (*vide*, Ezekiel xxiii. 4):—“Aholah, the name given to Samaria, signifies ‘his tent’ or tabernacle; and implies that the whole of the religion established in Israel was a human invention. Aholibah, the name given to the city of Jerusalem, signifies ‘my tent in her,’ and implies that the worship established in Judah was from God.”—*Soott's Comment., in loco.*

* Gregory has copied without acknowledgment a portion of the long diatribe of Leontius, which discourse, it may be remembered, was brought to the Council by the Pope's Legates. The Emperor Leo was far too dull to comprehend arguments like these, which were reserved for the penetrating soaring genius of the image-worshipping Germanus.

† No doubt the Israelites of old were sinful in worshipping as they did, at one time or another, the molten calves, Belphagor, Astarte, &c.; but would they have been free from idolatry by changing the objects; or if, instead of worship-

“ But why should I make my letter more prolix, especially when writing to a man beloved of God—a chosen vessel to God—one who has received the grace of the Spirit—able to penetrate into the profundity of the divine teaching, and, under God’s guidance, to soar to the sublimity of sacred knowledge? Having said thus much, let us return to our main design, extolling the wonderful deeds of thy defender, O most holy, the Mistress of all Christians, and beholding with admiration how in all things you have by her been directed, saved, and made victorious over your enemies;* for they, who for so long a time treated her with insults, found her not less able to contend with than ready to oppose them: nor is this to be wondered at; for, if Bethulia was saved by the hands of an Israelitish woman, whose great feat was the killing of Holofernes, and she by her contemporaries was announced as the Saviour of Israel, how much more may not your transcendant Holiness, with the aid of such an ally conquer all the enemies of the faith, and crown with victory those who are subject to you! But may our God, powerful in battle, strong and patient, who hath led thee like a sheep even more than Joseph, by the intercessions of the Virgin and of all the Saints, preserve thee, O most holy, for many years, to benefit the whole Christian commonwealth—to guide, and at the same time to exhort all to walk according to the divine canon, and keep the traditions which we have received from the fathers and to bring back those who for a while have been turned aside. Thou art our continual joy and a blessing and benefit to all!—O, most holy—O, thou who art dear to all Christians!”

ping God, they had embraced, saluted, incensed, fallen down before, or prayed to, the rock in Horeb, Aaron’s rod, the Ephod, the Cherubim of glory, &c. ! Well might he rail at Hezekiah for breaking in pieces the brazen serpent. “Ozias (says he in his letter to the Emperor) was thy brother and had thy obstinacy, and tyrannised over the priests as thou dost now. For that serpent was put into the temple together with the holy ark by the holy David.” The Pope’s knowledge of Scripture does not seem to be very great: he might be more learned in tradition, especially that which was unwritten.

* Compare what Gregory here speaks concerning the aid of the Virgin with the words of St. Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 11, and iv. 17, 18, where deliverance out of trouble and strength under it is ascribed, not to the Virgin or Saints, but to Jesus only. Whence we may learn that tradition teaches one doctrine and the Scripture another: the Bible teaches us to seek deliverance, strength, wisdom from God by Jesus Christ—tradition informs us that it is from the Virgin that we are to expect all these things. Nor was Gormanus at all less extravagant in his idolatrous regard for the Virgin, for thus speaks he—“Nobody is replenished with knowledge of God but by thee, O most holy!—nobody is saved but by thee, O Mother of God!—nobody is delivered from danger but by thee, O thou beloved of God!”—(Gibson’s “Preservative,” vol. ii, tit. 6, p. 215). If Gormanus represented the sentiments of the Eastern and Gregory those of the Western Church, in this century at least, the Church was in error; and truth was to be found among the Iconoclasts of the East, or the semi-Iconoclasts of France and Germany, or the persecuted sect of the Paulicians.

TARASIVS: "This blessed father has rivalled the divine Apostle Peter in thus sounding the trumpet of truth from Rome."*

THEODORE Monk and Notary read "The Epistle of Germanus most blessed Patriarch of Constantinople to John Bishop of the Synadensians:"—

"Tarasius the most noble Patrician hath delivered to us the Epistle of your Piety, concerning our beloved in God the Bishop of Nacolia. In reply to which we answer that, before we had received the letters of your Reverence, the aforesaid pious Bishop having come hither we had held a conference with him, in order that we might know his mind and what were his real feelings in respect of those things which had been reported concerning him. And this was the defence which he made for himself—(for I wish to lay everything clearly before your Reverence)—' Because (said he) I heard the sacred Scripture declaring, "Thou shalt make no manner of likeness to worship it, neither of things in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath" (Exod. xx. 4); therefore have I affirmed that we ought not to worship things made with hands—that is, things made by men; and this, though we have ever accounted the holy Martyrs of Christ, the true jewels of the Church, worthy of all honours and do evermore invoke their intercessions in our behalf.' In answer to which we made the following reply—' The faith, supreme veneration, and worship of Christians is directed to One God only, as it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. iv. 20); and this our giving of praise and our supreme worship (*λατρεία*) is offered to Him alone, both by the holy, intellectual, incorporeal powers which are in heaven, and by all in earth who have known the way of truth. For thus in all the Churches of Christ, the Trinity in Unity, in Lordship, and in Deity, is praised and glorified: in accordance therewith One God is confessed by us, and that there is no other beside Him who rules in all ages according to His will, and who brought all things, whether visible or invisible, into existence from things which did not exist; by which we mean the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the holy, consubstantial, and life-giving Trinity. Believing

* If, indeed, image-worship and the worship of the Virgin be true and sound doctrine, then Gregory has far exceeded St. Peter, who, in neither of his epistles nor in any of his discourses, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, has given the very slightest hint of either the one or the other. Indeed, Gregory's trumpet gives a widely different sound from that of St. Peter: the one proclaiming the vain traditions and commandments of men; the other sounding forth the wisdom of God: the one publishing abroad Anti-Christian error; the other declaring the oracles of God.

in which and confessing which we have been baptised, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, even as our Lord Jesus Christ, very God the Word, who was made man, Himself one of this holy, incomprehensible, sacred Trinity, hath delivered to us. We worship no created things—God forbid! Nor do we offer the service due only to the divine Majesty to our fellow-servants. For when we bow down in reverence to the earth before kings and rulers, we do not mean the same worship which we offer to God. Thus the prophet Nathan bowed down to the earth before David, who, though a king, was but a man, but he has never on this account been charged with worshipping man more than God.* Neither do we admit the formation of those images in wax and colours which would at all tend to derogate from the perfection of that reverence which we owe to the Divine Being, on which account we never pourtray any image, form, or likeness of the invisible Godhead; since this even the most exalted order of holy Angels themselves have no power to comprehend or in any way to delineate.† But since the only begotten Son who was in the

* This allusion to the reverence paid by Nathan to David is censured in the "Caroline Books," lib. i. c. 22:—

"It does not require much argument to prove that the reverence which the Prophet Nathan paid to that most religious King David differs widely from the worship which they pay to their images. Common sense seems to determine the point at once without further discussion. Still, not to pass it by altogether, we will make a few short observations. The Prophet Nathan worshipped King David, not as image made up of various colours, but as the power set up by God as supreme in the kingdom. This he did as being imbued with the same Spirit as he who afterwards wrote, 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers,' &c. The Prophet, therefore, worshipped the King as one filled with the Holy Spirit would worship another filled with the Holy Spirit; or as one endued with the gift of prophecy would worship another endued with the gift of prophecy; or as one illustrious for his merits would worship another no less illustrious for his merits; for he did not in worshipping David worship a thing destitute of sense with the reverence of a superstitious vanity, but the man who was found to be after God's own heart—one anointed with sacred oil—one who prophesied more fully than any other concerning the incarnation, suffering, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus—who was not only a Prophet but a type of Him of whom he prophesied; and not only a type but who was the progenitor of that form of a servant which Christ assumed for us. How absurd, therefore, is it to count that worship with which Kings ought according to the Apostle's injunction to be honoured the same thing with that which they so dotingly offer to their images! And still more when it is further considered that the Prophet worshipped a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit—a mount of God, while they in their images worship nothing else but the material of which they are formed."

Adrian replies by two quotations from Pope Gregory on the book of Job, commending allegorical interpretations of Scripture history. Thus David means our Redeemer and His gift the Church, &c.; but, except the name "David," there is not the slightest connection either with the allusion of Germanus to Nathan and David or the censure of the "Caroline Books."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 125, col. 1.

† That this was the general feeling of even those corrupt ages, concerning

bosom of the Father, in order to recall the work of His own hands from the judgment of death, did, with the good will of the Father and the Holy Ghost, condescend to become man, and like us was made partaker of flesh and blood, even as saith the great Apostle, 'being made in all respects like to us, yet without sin:' we making the image of His human figure and of His form according to the flesh, and not of His incomprehensible and invisible Godhead, are thereby led to confirm more fully the right faith. And thereby we demonstrate that He did take not upon Him our nature in mere external and shadowy appearances, as some of the older heretics had erroneously dogmatized;* but that, indeed and in truth, He became perfect man in every respect, sin alone excepted, that which was sown in our nature by the enemy. In this view of sound faith concerning Him, having made the likeness of His holy flesh in images, we embrace and account them worthy of all veneration and becoming honour, as from this source we come to the remembrance of His divine, life-giving, and ineffable incarnation. Also, in the same manner, we portray the likeness of His immaculate Mother according to the flesh—the holy Mother of God, in order

Images of Deity, Stillingfleet has proved by quotations made from several most zealous Image-worshippers who lived about the same period—viz., Gregory II., John Damascen, Stepuanus Junior, and the author of a book on the use of images, who goes so far as to say "that no images are to be made of God, and if any man go about it, he is to suffer death as a Pagan. By which (he continues) it appears that, according to the sense of this Council (the second Nicene), the making any images of God was looked upon as idolatry. But, when a breach is once made, the waters do not stop just at the mark which the first makers of the breach designed: other men thought they had as much reason to go a little farther as they had to go thus far. Thence, by degrees, the images of God the Father and the Holy Trinity came into the Roman Church, and the making of these images defended upon reasons which appeared to them as plausible, as those for the images of Christ on His appearing in our nature; for so God the Father might be represented, not in His nature, but as He is said to have appeared in the Scriptures."—*Stillingfleet's Defence of his Discourse on Idolatry*, p. 556.

"Molanus and Thyrsæus mention four sorts of images of the Trinity used in the Roman Church. (1). That of an old man for God the Father, and of Christ in human nature, and of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. (2). That of Three Persons of equal age and stature. (3). That of an image of the blessed Virgin, in the body of which was represented the Holy Trinity. This John Gerson saith he saw in the Carmelites' Church; and Molanus saith he had seen such a one himself among the Carthusians. (4). That of one head with three faces or one body with three heads, which Molanus saith is more common than the other, and is wont to be set before the office of the Holy Trinity."—*Stillingfleet's Defence*, p. 568.

* Why may not the image of a phantom be made as well as that of a real body? Why might not a Gnostic or Manichean say, This is the image of a body which Christ seemed to have? The early fathers did not make use of these to confute those heretics; and, indeed, the use of images did not come into the Church till most of those heresies had disappeared, and long after they had ceased to be formidable. And yet more we learn from St. Augustin that the parties who first made use of images were these very heretics themselves!

to show that she, being by nature a woman and in no respect different from ourselves, did, nevertheless, in a manner surpassing all thought, whether of men or angels, conceive in her womb the unseen God who rules over all, and did bring Him forth being incarnate of her ; for we venerate and magnify her as rightly and truly the Mother of the true God, and we account her as exalted above all creatures visible or invisible. We admire and count as blessed the holy Martyrs of Christ, the Apostles and Prophets, and all other Saints, our fellow-servants, who were made servants of God both by their deeds of goodness and by their preaching of the truth, and were manifested as proved and tried friends of God by their patience under sufferings for the cause of God, and have obtained great confidence in respect of Him—and we make images of them for a memorial of their fortitude and of their unfeigned obedience to God.* Not, indeed, that we mean to offer to them that honour and worship which is due to the divine power and glory as though we counted them partakers of the divine nature ; but thus we show the love which we have towards them, by desiring that those things concerning them which we believe already from hearing may be more powerfully brought home to our minds by the representative picture ; for, as we are compounded of flesh and blood, it is by sight that we are brought to a more certain assurance in respect of the things of the soul. For as the Saints of God, because they would reserve for Him only their supreme adoration, worship, and honour, and because they called on all others and taught them to do the same, poured out their own blood and were honoured with the crown of a true confession, so it is with us also in respect of our images : like them, we by no means allow the worship due to the incomprehensible unapproachable Godhead to be bestowed on images made with hands or any work of man's skill and device—no, not even to any of those things which God hath made, whether they be visible or invisible ; but we take this method of displaying the affection which we justly entertain towards those who were true servants of our God ; because by honouring them, we venerate and honour Him also who was glorified by them and who gave them glory in the confession of His majesty ; and, further, that so we may learn to manifest our imitation of their fortitude and love towards God, by our

* Yet it would be difficult to say what greater honour men could offer to God than was offered, for instance, to the images of SS. Coomas and Damian, and others, as appear by the stories of the famous cures they wrought in behalf of their votaries, read in this Session and approved by all the Bishops who were present.

good works and resistance of evil passions. Let everyone, therefore, feel assured that it is after this manner that the making of images is conducted in the Church of Christ, and that we look for the things which accompany salvation, whether in this world or in the world to come, from no other source than from the only begotten Son, who together with the Father and the Holy Spirit dispenses the divine gifts; 'for there is none other name under heaven given among men wheroby we may be saved' (Acts iv. 12). But though we embrace the images, both of our Lord and Saviour, of His immaculate Mother, the true Mother of God, and of His Saints, yet it is not that we have the same feeling or the same faith in one as in the other; for *Him* we recognise as God without beginning or end, who holds all things in His hand, who made us and all creatures, as the true God and our Saviour, who has all power in heaven and earth, and who for the human race became truly incarnate; and *her*, as His handmaid and His Mother, and thus of right exercising the most powerful interference in behalf of our race: *He*, as Lord dispensing all things necessary for our salvation—*she*, as a Mother requesting the same in our behalf; and all the *Saints*, as our fellow-servants and as partakers of the same nature with ourselves; but who (as was said before) have become well-pleasing to God, and thereby have obtained highest boldness and blessedness with Him, and have received grace from God to minister to us the blessings which are with Himself, as in the healing of diseases and in the deliverance from dangers, when we invoke our God for their sake and ascribe honour to them as far as we are capable and delight in singing hymns to their praise; 'for the memory of the just (as the Scripture declares) is blessed' (Prov. x. 7). All this we plainly laid before the foresaid Bishop of Nacolia, and he both agreed to it and declared, as in the presence of God, that such was his belief, and that he would neither say or do anything to scandalize the people or afford any further cause of disquiet. As your Reverence has now been made acquainted with the merits of the case, do not, we entreat you, trouble your God-beloved Council any further in this matter, nor take any offence against him yourself on this account; but, sending for him, read this our letter to him and obtain from his own mouth an assurance of his agreement with its own contents. Pray ye further for long, happy, and victorious life in behalf of our most excellent lords our Emperors, and entreat in behalf of all Christian people that peace of God which passeth all understanding."

TARASIVS: "Our father, Saint Germanus, is quite in accordance with all the most holy fathers who preceded him."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Yes, my lord, he agrees with them in everything."

TARASIVS: "This letter the Bishop of Nacolia concealed, and did not show to his Metropolitan; wherefore the blessed Germanus was forced to write to him of Nacolia again: for, indeed, this heresy began with him."

THEODORE Monk Deacon Notary and Keeper of the Records read: "The Epistle of our Father Germanus, of holy memory, to Constantine Bishop of Nacolia."

"John, most beloved in God, Metropolitan of the Synadensians, has written to us that your Reverence has not presented to him our letter, at which we were greatly grieved concerning you, that you should, as it seems, treat us of minor consequence, both the fear of God and the love and respect due to the members of Christ between each other.

"By this our present epistle we enjoin your Reverence to present in person the aforesaid letter of ours to the beloved in God your Metropolitan, and that you pay him all due respect and submit yourself to him according to his sacerdotal rank: and, further, that as your Reverence has received our words and declared that in all things you would follow them, that you continue steadfast and be not puffed up with your own imagination. For your Reverence is not ignorant—(has not forgotten, as we suppose)—that you once advised with us about the resignation of your bishopric, pretending that an attack was intended against you about such things as yourself declared that you were utterly unconscious; for that you protested that you neither did or said anything against our Lord or His Saints on account of their images, but that you had merely urged the Scripture doctrine that no created thing was worthy of divine worship, which we also have taught and which we firmly hold and profess: and that we then read to you the letter which we had written to the above-mentioned God-beloved Metropolitan, and that you declared your consent to that which was written and that we gave to your Reverence a copy of the same. Beware, then, how you cast a stumbling-block before your people hitherto untried by evil, remembering the fearful judgments of the Lord which He hath denounced against those who offend one of His little ones (Luke xvii. 2). But, let your Reverence know this, that, until you have delivered our epistle into the hands of the most beloved in God your Metropolitan, by the authority of the holy consubstantial Trinity, you have no power to perform any part of the sacerdotal ministry. For it belovéd us rather to act a somewhat austere part towards you than

to leave you without correction, to be obnoxious to the vengeance of God."

TARASIVS: "As we said before, my honourable brethren, the origin of this foreign innovation is to be attributed to him who has been already mentioned, the Bishop of Nacolia."

CONSTANTINE Deacon and Notary read: "The Epistle of Germanus Bishop of Constantinople to Thomas Bishop of Claudianople":—

"The wise Solomon in a certain place in his discourse has observed that, 'A brother assisted by a brother is like a strong and lofty city, and powerful as a castle fortified with bars' (Prov. xviii. 19).^{*} Now, though I do not account myself amongst the number of those who are able to assist others, but rather as among those who need the assistance of others, yet have I been compelled to write this my present epistle to your Reverence, being no longer able to keep back the inward commotions of my thoughts concerning you. For I have heard that certain things have been done by your Reverence, which rumours, if they be false, why, then, according to Gregory the Divine, let the winds disperse them: but, suppose them to be true, perplexity on every side assails my mind. Can it be that you imagined that we had, according to the thoughtless manner of many, endeavoured to impose on you with the pleasing outside of affection which is in the lips and that you had no place in our heart—or, in other words, that our love and regard towards you was not sincere? Or, as this cannot be the case, was it that your Reverence was displeas'd at any want of learning in us, or any negligence or sloth on our part respecting that which God requires of us, as if we did not bestow sufficient care and research into the divine will, according to the holy command delivered to us in the sacred Scriptures? Or, as this supposition seems hardly admissible, must we not be led to conclude that being favoured with some superior revelation—(I would not say fancy or opinion; for, as the Apostle declares, 'Charity thinketh no evil'), (1 Cor. xiii. 5)—you arrived at a certainty so satisfactory that you felt no necessity in conferring with us upon the subject? And, surely, we have reason enough to justify such suspicions; for, though your Reverence was long time with us, and though we lived together and were accustomed from

^{*} In the English translation it is:—"A brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city, and their contentions are like the bars of a castle."

time to time to discuss the words of Scripture or questions connected with it, never once did you question with us about images—whether those of holy men, or of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or of His holy Mother according to the flesh the true Mother of God ; nor, as one enquiring and desirous to arrive at some certainty, did you ever ask what was our opinion in this matter, or reflect that, if what was in them had been according to reason, it could never bring down any judgment from God against those who had been engaged therein ; nor, as if you yourself were fully certified about the propriety of their abolition and destruction, did you think it at all necessary to confer and consult with us, so as to bring us over to the same views : but, having constantly maintained a studied silence on all these points towards us, no sooner had you arrived at your own city, than, as if it had been determined by mutual agreement between us, or as if it were a question about which there could be no doubt, you have (as we have heard) made an entire clearance of images—at least (as we say again) if the report be true ; for we are not ready to give ear without enquiry to those reports which are so frequently circulated to a neighbour's discredit. Having, however, considered as a necessary thing, by way of investigation and fraternal disquisition, to lay down our sentiments on this head, we have come to the determination to enter on the discussion with the utmost care. Of this, however, we would first remind you that, above all, we must be on our guard against innovation, and more especially if any scandal or stumbling-block is likely to be thereby cast in the way of those who are in the faith of Christ ; and, again, if the custom has long maintained its ground in the Church : for if, according to the Scripture, ' we must drink wine with caution ' (Prov. xxxi. 3. Sec. lxx), much more ought we to use deliberation and counsel in things of so much greater importance, lest we should be obnoxious to the fearful judgment prepared by God for those who offend even one of His little ones ; and, in general, we must at once put down all arguments or facts advanced by unbelievers to the injury of the Church of Christ and exhibit to them her stern and godlike immutability. . . . And it is worthy of our more special observation that not now only, but very often, reproaches of this kind have been urged against us by Jews and by the actual servants of idolatry, whose intention was to cast a blot on our immaculate and sacred faith, not to prevent men from adhering to the worship of things made with hands ; for all their zeal and religion amounted to this—to have no notion of anything higher than things seen and palpable to the senses and in every way to degrade the divine nature, either confining His universal providence

to certain localities or representing Him under a gross corporeal form. These our predecessors, with a spirit worthy of themselves, drove away from the sheepfold of Christ, as (to speak scripturally) dumb dogs, who bark in vain, whose performances we do not now possess.* And, moreover, the word of truth stops the mouth of such by the mention of their own peculiar abominations, branding with infamy the heathen with the wickedness and abominations of Gentile sacrifices and fables, making the Jews to blush, not only by reminding them of the frequent lapses of their fathers into idolatry, but, further, of their own opposition to the divine law which they made such a boast of holding. For whereas, the law gave command that they should offer their typical sacrifices only in some specified place, they make no scruple of doing this in every part of the world—thus displaying their accustomed disobedience to the Holy Spirit after the manner of their fathers, and their sacrificing to devils and not to God.† For the true worship and service of the true God is exactly regulated by the preservation of a holy confession concerning Him, and the careful conservation of the laws and mysteries given to us by Him, whether compendiously or more at large. But with respect to the Saracens, since they also seem to be among those who urge these charges against us, it will be quite enough for their shame and confusion to allege against them the invocation which even to this day they make in the wilderness to a

* This assertion of Germanus is disproved by facts. Julian attacked Christianity, and brought all the accusations against it which he was able; yet he says not a word about the images of Christ or the Saints. Porphyry did the same, but never mentions this most obvious argument which must arise from the images possessed by Christians. Celsus, so far from finding fault with Christians in the matter of images, actually blames them for not having any. "Celsus objects, says Origen in his book against him (lib. viii., p. 389-404), that we avoid the making of images;" and again (lib. vii., p. 373), "In this that they would not make, much less endure, images, they are like unto the Scythians and other lawless nations, who dedicate no image to their gods and count them fools who do." To this dumb dog, vainly barking against the sheepfold of Christ, Origen replies (lib. vii., p. 373), "It is true that both they and Christians were averse from images; but then the Christians rejected them on better grounds than Heathens did—viz., because they would not violate the commandment forbidding the use of them; and because they dreaded to debase the divine worship by bringing it down to matter shaped in such a manner and figure." In fact, Germanus makes pretensions to that which never existed: well might he add in conclusion, *ὡν οὐκ ἐν χερσίν ἡμῶν τὰ πονήματα*. Leontius, the earliest writer who notices objections against the images of Christians, lived A.D. 600.

† This censure of the Jews is contradicted by fact; for since the destruction of Jerusalem they have ceased to offer sacrifices, being withheld from doing so by regard to some of the precepts of the ceremonial law which seemed to forbid them. If sacrifices in places not prescribed in the law is sacrificing to devils, then Onias, who built a temple in Egypt, sacrificed to devils—nay, even Samuel and Elijah.

lifeless stone—namely, that which is called ‘Chobar,’ and the rest of ‘their vain conversation received by tradition from their fathers’ (1 Pet. i. 18); as, for instance, the ludicrous mysteries of their solemn festivals.*

“ But the distinguishing characteristic of all Christians throughout the world, who serve God as the Prophet declares under the one yoke of the Gospel is, their faith in, and confession of, One God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—a Trinity uncreated, eternal, incomprehensible, invisible—of the same substance and of the same dignity; and, furthermore, their confession of the perfect incarnation of the Son of God, and of all those other articles which are according to the tenor of the sacred symbol, which the people of Christ with one mind offer to God before the mystic and holy oblation; and the spiritual regeneration, which is perfected by divine baptism, in the name of the Three Supreme Persons; and the Theurgic reception and communion of the life-giving symbols of the unbloody sacrifice, by which the illumination of the truth is made resplendent, and the darkness of impiety with the atheism of Polytheism (*τὴν τῆς πολυθεΐας ἀθεότητα*), the most appropriate symbol of its own error, is utterly dispelled; for ‘these things are (to use the Apostle’s words) contrary the one to the other’ (Gal. v. 17)—even as ‘in the beginning God divided between the light and between the darkness’ (Gen. i. 2). Let the blessed John join with us in saying, ‘This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith (1 John v. 4): and let this furthermore be added by us—‘This is the rock on which Christ hath built His Church’ (Matt. xvi. 18), not to be shaken, not to be subverted, by the gates of hell—that is, by hostile attacks of opposing powers.† Hence, we have obtained a new name which Isaiah declares shall be blessed, for he speaks thus—‘They shall bless the true God’ (Isaiah lxxv. 16), declaring the incomprehensibility and the inscrutability of His ineffable nature—proclaiming in unwavering certainty: that He is invisible, un-circumscribable, and in all respects immutable—contemplating ‘His eternal power and Godhead’ (Rom. i. 20), as according to the most holy Apostle Paul they may be understood by the things which are made from the beginning of the world. Thus have we been accounted worthy to serve the living and the true God—thus have we been ho-

* According to Reland, what is here asserted about the Mahometans worshipping this stone called “Chobar” is false. They did this till the time of Heraclius, but Mahomet taught them to detest all idolatry.—*Reland on Mahomedanism*, Book ii. sec. 5.

† Germanus makes the faith of Christians or the Church the Rock, not St. Peter; but he was a Greek!

noured and glorified 'with the liberty with which Christ has made us free' (Gal. v. 1). For we have been set free from all idolatrous errors and impieties, of which it was a leading characteristic to say, 'To the stone thou hast begotten me, and to the wood thou hast brought me forth' (Jerem. ii. 27); and not as the Prophet Isaiah cries aloud *to look* to the heaven and to enquire, 'Who hath displayed all these things who bringeth out the worlds by number—who calleth them all by their names from His great glory in the multitude of His strength' (Isaiah l. 26)? Or, as another of the Prophets hath said, 'Whose hands have made the whole army of heaven?'* Or to consider in their minds and analogously to conclude, when they beheld the harmonious order of all creation, that the Word is the great original of all, and by Him to worship the Father, who is verily the true God, as the blessed Athanasius in his treatise against idolatry most clearly teaches.

"Since, therefore, 'there is no communion between light and darkness—no agreement between Christ and Belial' (2 Cor. vi. 14, 15)—so there can be nothing in common between Christians who worship One God dwelling in unapproachable glory and splendour, and those who make gods for themselves, and therefore accounted wretched by the Prophet, as it is written 'Their heart is ashes' (Isaiah xlv. 20). Of whom *some* imagined that when, by their own craft, they had made an idol they had now a new Deity made of that which was not one before; and, in consequence, if any mischance should happen to their idol and it be destroyed thereby, they would firmly maintain that they had no God at all, unless in the same way they manufactured another for themselves. This the divine Scripture clearly teaches in the account therein given of the calf made in the wilderness by the Israelites; for they came in a rebellious manner to Aaron, saying, 'Make us gods who shall go before us' (Exod. xxxii. 1)—thereby manifesting that they thought that they had no God at all, whether true or false, unless the idol which they sought should be made for them; † to which, after it was made, they ascribed their deliverance from Egypt—thus displaying the excess of their absurdity and of their impiety. And when afterwards others would introduce the abomination of heathen idolatry and were desirous to establish the same under the name of the

* It does not appear where this is quoted from.

† Something not wholly unlike this is found in the account of the miracle wrought on the wife of Constantine of Laodicea read at this Session. Constantine says to his wife—"Were I but at home, I would apply to the waxen images of SS. Cosmas and Damian, and they would speedily cure you." Being without his images, he seemed to have no idea of any God to whom he could pray for healing.

deities worshipped by them, they laboured much in the preparation of statues, whether of Jupiter whom they called Father and Governor, and above all whether gods or men, or of the rest whose names are not unknown to most of us : whose solemnities and rites at their appointed sacrifices were fornication, licentiousness, and a display of all kinds of impurity.* It were, indeed, little to speak of their lewd and profane conversation, when even human sacrifices were offered by them in honour of their deities, and an open glorying in the display of obscenity was accounted acceptable to those who were worshipped ; for, as they themselves had done such things, they might be supposed to take pleasure in those who did the same.

“ But the *images* of holy men in use among Christians, whether of those who, as the Apostle declares, ‘ resisted unto blood ’ (Heb. xii. 4), or those who ministered in the word of truth—I mean the Prophets and Apostles or of those who by the piety of their lives and rectitude of their conduct have been proved to be true servants of God, are nothing else but the exemplification of their fortitude, the delineation of their sanctified conversation and virtues, and a stimulation and an excitement to glorify God, to whom in this life they became well-pleasing.† The discourse which treats about the actions of good men profits those who hear and often provokes them to zealous imitation : right reason would infer that similar results should follow on the contemplation of images : † ‘ for what things history unfolds to the ear the same does the silent picture by its imitative powers illustrate,’ cries aloud the great Basil ; who says, further : ‘ That by both the one and the other they who give heed thereto may be excited to deeds of virtue. For there is in the image (as one may say) a short and summary narration of things which have been done by him who is portrayed therein, and a resemblance to him becomes imitable by us who gaze thereupon ; even as in the idolatrous representations of their falsely named deities, their evil deeds do also appear. Contemplations like these compel him who has already been made acquainted with holy men and their deeds to recall to mind that which he has heard, and disposes him who is ignorant to make enquiry, and when he has learned the history of any Saint, it powerfully

* A modern author says—“ To my mind, it is the Carnival (a Christian festival) which is real practical idolatry, as it is written the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play.”

† From the various stories brought forward at this Session, we find that images were for *worship* as well as *instruction*—that they wrought miracles in favour of those who bowed down to them—and punished those who injured them.

‡ That pictures cannot teach to any extent is well disproved in the “ Caroline Books ” (lib. i. c. 18) ; and even if they could teach it does not follow that we ought to worship them in any way.

excites him to lively affection for the Saint and to give glory to God ; so that in either case they who see the good works of the Saints may, as the Gospel teaches, ‘ glorify our Father which is in heaven ’* (St. Matt. v. 16 ; Num. xv. 38, 39). Again, if the law of Moses enjoins the people to put a ribband of blue in the fringes on the border of their garments [that they might remember to observe the commandment given], how much more are we bound by means of the pictures and images of holy men ‘ to consider the end of their conversation, and to follow their faith according to the Apostolic doctrine ?’† (Heb.

* Our Lord said, “ Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works,” &c.—not, Let your pictures be displayed before men. After all, here is but an argument for having images, not for worshipping them.

† This argument is censured at great length in the “ Caroline Books ” (lib. i. cap. 17). “ This passage must be considered member by member ; for it is not only erroneous as a whole, but as each particular of which it is made up is erroneous in like manner.

(1). “ We must enquire why they say here, *purple hyacinth*, which, inasmuch as they are different colours, is the same as to speak of white redness, or red whiteness.” The remarks on this head apply only to the Latin translation, not to the Greek original, where there is no word for *purple*.

(2). “ Next, we must enquire how they came to establish the use of images by the example of these fringes of hyacinth, since the law commands that the latter shall be put on the borders of their garments ; but neither in the Old or the New Testament is it anywhere enjoined that the former be put in holy places to be worshipped. . Nor can they escape thus, as if by these fringes some hidden meaning was intended, for such absurdity could never have any connection with that which was rightly commanded, rightly performed. The Lord commanded these fringes, either to distinguish His people, Israel, that they might be a peculiar mark on their garments, even as circumcision was on their bodies ; or that we, who are His spiritual Israel—who are clothed with righteousness and a holy conversation for a garment—should have the extremes of this garment adorned with fringes of hyacinth—that is, that our life be directed by testimonies drawn from holy writ. This is the right use of these fringes, which was well intended by the great legislator, whether considered as given to Israel after the flesh or to us the spiritual Israel : but which by them has been abused to ill purposes, rather than properly received, for of such the Truth speaks in the Gospel, ‘ They make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments.’ For whose example (I ask)—whose example do these men follow, except that of the Pharisees, who, while they deserve to be called of men Rabbi, and love greetings in the market-places, &c., and chief seats in their synagogues ; and while, from greediness after empty praise commit their sayings and doings to the memory of posterity, do both themselves perversely worship those images which others had rightly set up in churches as ornaments, and by their absurd and useless synods compel others to do the same. The one, from vain-glory, enlarged their fringes ; the other, no less through vain-glory, worship their images ; the one make broad that which was rightly constituted by an evil amplification ; the other exalt, by an evil adoration, things well ordained in themselves ; the one hope to obey the precepts of Moses by enlarging their fringes ; the other think to please the Saints by worshipping their pictures : and so, though they run in different roads, and pursue different things in divers ways, yet they come in the end to the absurdity of one error : and not improperly, since love of vain-glory and arrogance is the leading motive in both.

3. “ But (say they) if it were commanded to the people to have purple hyacinth

xiii. 7). Moreover, the pouring of the form of our Lord according to the flesh, in pictures, may serve for the confutation of the here-

fringes, much more is it to us to have pictures of holy men, &c. Now this, that they say here *much more*, which relates to the words, *it is commanded*, and so may be understood. *If it were commanded to the people, much more is it commanded to us*, has not the slightest pretensions to sense: for not only is the error not *much more commanded*, but not even *equally*—indeed, it is nowhere commanded at all.

(4). "But as to this which they add, 'That by the representative picture we may see the end of the conversation of holy men,' it were endless labour fully to expose the folly and absurdity of the assertion: since, in a picture it is not the virtue of a holy conversation that can be seen, but only the material of which the picture is made. Can we discern in their pictures that wisdom or eloquence which so many of the Saints possessed? Can we see in these their prudence, by which they arrived at the acknowledgment of the true faith and knowledge of divine truths? Or can we behold in these that righteousness by which the Saints feared God, venerated religion, did good to all, did evil to none, were united in the bonds of brotherly love, took part in each others danger, gave help to the wretched, made conscience to repay good received, and were most exact in the performance of justice? Or, can we behold in painted pictures their fortitude, by which they so magnanimously bore adversity, suffered with patience, boldly withstood allurements to things unlawful, avoided corroding wealth and ambitious desires, were neither overcome by adversity, nor too much elated with prosperity, were ready for all labours, undaunted amidst dangers? Or, can we see in their images their temperance, by which their lusts were regulated, their desires controlled? And as we can see none of these things above-mentioned in pictures, surely it is great temerity to say that in the representative picture we behold the end of the conversation of the Saints.

(5). "And it is furthermore asserted in that most absurd paragraph, 'And to imitate their faith according to the tradition of the Apostles.' What, then, can that faith, which works by love, be imitated in pictures? Surely not, for as the end of their conversation cannot be seen in them, so neither can their faith be imitated: for that which is wanting in them cannot be seen in them, nor be imitated by them. Now, since faith, hope, and charity are invisible and incorporeal, they are not to be seen even in man himself, except as exemplified in works having their seat in the soul, which we know to be invisible. If, then, they cannot be seen in a real man, how much less in a painted man? And if they cannot be seen how can they be imitated?

(6). "But, as they add, according to Apostolic tradition, let them inform us where it is taught, either by word or example of the Apostles, that by images we are to see the end of their conversation and to imitate their faith. The Apostle describes the end of their faith in this manner, 'These all died in the faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims upon earth.' The same Apostle no less clearly teaches us what we should imitate when he exhorts: 'Be ye imitators of God as dear children.' And again, 'Be ye imitators of me even as I am of Christ: whence it is evident that the tradition of the Apostles is this, that we must look not to pictures but to virtues for the end of the conversation of the Saints, and that their faith must be imitated, not in the colours of pictures, but in good works.'

Adrian replies:—"We suppose that ye are not ignorant of that which Gregory hath said in one of his epistles—'And also it is not without reason that antiquity hath granted that histories of the Saints be portrayed in holy places.' And, again, in his commentary on the Prophet to Ezekiel he hath added—'Holy Scripture is our meat and drink.' In obscurer places, which cannot be understood without exposition—'It is our meat, for that which is expounded that it may be understood is, as it were, chewed that it may be swallowed.' In its

tics, who have vainly taught that He became man in appearance only and not in reality; and furthermore, as a manual of instruction for those who, not being able to attain to the sublimity of pure spiritual contemplation, need some corporeal object for the confirmation of that which they have heard: since as it is most useful in itself, so is it to be sought with greater earnestness.* For the mystery which veils even the heavens with majesty, 'which was hidden from eyes and generations in God the Creator of all' (Ephes. iii. 9), did not obtain credence only by hearing, according to the words of the Apostle—'Faith cometh by hearing' (Rom. x. 17)—but also was impressed by actual vision on the minds of those who beheld, and did most powerfully proclaim, that 'God manifest in the flesh, believed on in the world' (1 Tim. iii. 16), was of all things most conducive to holiness and salvation. Wherefore, that which was written in the evangelical record, concerning His conversation according to the flesh with men upon earth, was that it might never be obliterated from the memories of men further-more described in pictures, that the worship due to His majesty, for the goodness shown to us, might be more clearly taught, more duly celebrated.† Now, it is not the composition of wood and of colours that

plainer parts it is drink:—'Drink we swallow without chewing; so we imbibe plainer commands—that is, we understand them without expositions,' &c. Whence, also, it has been expounded by my most holy predecessors in their sacred Councils, among other things which have been set forth concerning the ancient histories, that, if these are to be received, why then these images ought also to be received, since they also are made according to God."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 125, col. i.

* As to the arguments here used, that images are for the confutation of heretics and the instruction of the ignorant, it may be remarked, that as heretics had images before the Church made use of them they cannot be *very* efficacious to the confutation of heresy; and, with respect to the ignorant, experience has abundantly proved that they are far more likely to be led into the error of worshipping created things by them than to receive any beneficial instruction from them.

† Dean Comber, in his remarks on this Council, notices several of these arguments as follows:—"Another argument (he observes) is, that pictures set out the actions of Christ as well as writings or discourses; and though the Apostle saith, 'Faith cometh by hearing,' one of these says it comes as well by *seeing*; so that he fancies heretics, who denied the reality of Christ's body, might be convinced by images, and the dullest souls raised by them into spiritual contemplation. In answer to which it must be noted that no pictures can set out the words of Christ, and these are the most heavenly part of the Gospel and the most useful to us who do believe; and since St. Paul affirms that 'Faith cometh by hearing,' it is very saucy in these men to contradict him, or to pretend to find out as good a means as the Holy Ghost; and it is ridiculous to expect that an image of Christ should make a heretic believe that Christ's body was real if he disbelieve the words of the four Evangelists. Nor can an image, which represents only our Saviour's meanest and mortal part, raise the mind to spiritual contemplation, because it cannot set out His divinity nor His present glorified state; and experience teaches us, that none have meaner or grosser thoughts of Christ than such whose minds dwell on His

is worshipped by us, but the invisible God who is in the bosom of the Father: it is He who receives the worship that is in spirit and in truth, who by Himself procures for us access to the Father and who is worshipped together with Him. Thus Jacob is said 'to have worshipped upon the top of the staff' of Joseph (Heb. i. 21); not thereby offering any reverence to the wood, but thus showing his regard to him that possessed it. In the same manner it is that the image of the holy and all-glorious Mother of the Lord has been regarded and worshipped by all Christian people. Thus it is that these things have been handed down to us by the Presidents of the most holy Churches even from the beginning; and never before did they encounter any objection. For, from the time that the persecutions ceased and the faith was everywhere professed in all confidence, General Councils have been held even to our own times which made Canons of many points of far inferior moment to that of images: they surely would never have left this point without discussion as being an undisputed matter—if, according to the suspicion of certain persons, this our custom, held by us from ancient times, was in any way connected with idols and other abominations denounced in holy Scripture; or if, like such things, it tended to seduce our hearts from God.* For He who said to the Apostles that He would be with them even to the 'end of time' (Matt. xxviii. 20), made the promise evidently to those also who, after them, should have the oversight of the Church; for He was not about to remain with them in the body till the period spoken of;† and as, moreover, He declares, 'Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of you' (Matt. xviii. 20), He never would have

figure in a senseless image: yet, after all, supposing an image did set out the acts of Christ as well as a picture, it doth not follow that we should adore an image, because we do not adore the very Gospels themselves nor did God ever command us to worship them."—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi., c. v. p. 297.

* Leo the Emperor, from this silence of Councils about images, was led to an inference of an opposite description, and enquires: "How is it that in the six Œcumenic Councils no mention was ever made of images?" To which Gregory replies—"Very true, O king; but neither has anything been said in them concerning bread and water, whether we should or should not eat, drink or not drink; for as these things have of old been handed down to us as a means of preserving life, so have images been handed down, and all the Chief Priests always took images with them to the Councils!" Germanus honestly confesses that the Councils had made no Canons about images. Anastasius, his translator, thought otherwise, and, therefore, mistranslates his author. Germanus had said: *καὶ περὶ πλείονων κεφαλαίων πολὺ τοῦ περὶ τῶν εἰκονῶν λόγου καταθεστέων κανόνας ἐκθέμενον*. Anastasius makes him to say, *Quæ plurimorum capitulorum super imaginibus regulæ exposuere!* The answer to Anastasius is—where are they?

† 'Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐκεῖνοι σωματικῶν παραμένειν ἤμελλεν. This seems to bear hard upon Popish Transubstantiation; for if that doctrine be true, Christ is constantly present in the same body which was crucified on the cross.

left so many multitudes united in zeal for the piety which is in Him so destitute of divine inspiration and guidance as to overlook anything necessary for the perfection of that Church which we believe that He formed for Himself, 'not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing' (Ephes. v. 27). For it is not in some few places, and those of no note, that this custom hath prevailed; but, as we might almost say in every place and certainly in all the most flourishing and renowned Churches.* That the custom is ancient, frequently to describe the events recorded in Scripture in pictures, the discourse of St. Gregory of Nyssa, which is entitled 'On Abraham,' evidently proves, in which he teaches us that the history of the sacrifice of Isaac was set forth in a picture.† Now, if this was done in respect of the sacrifice spoken of, how much more ought the miracles and sufferings relative to our Lord's dispensation, as also the fortitude of the holy Martyrs in their conflicts, which excite the beholders to zeal for goodness to meet with a similar testimonial? For this was manifestly shown to have been the case in the conflicts of that illustrious and admirable Martyr for the truth—Anastasius ‡

"But perhaps some one may say this—that we ought to reverence the commands of holy Scripture; such as, 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing which is in heaven above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters which are under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, neither shalt thou worship them' (Exodus xx. 4, 5): and again, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain' (*Ibid.* 7): and in Deuteronomy, 'Ye shall not transgress, nor make to yourselves a graven image' (Deut. v. 16): and other passages like to these. But all these have one evident meaning—namely, that the divine nature must be considered as without form and incomprehensible; and that we should not, being influenced by conjectures and fancies to carnal conceptions, account it to be like to any of those things which are seen: for, having said before, 'Ye saw no manner of similitude in the day in which the Lord spake unto you from the midst of Horeb' (Deut. iv. 15), he immediately adds, 'Ye shall not transgress, nor make to yourselves a graven image'

* The use of pictures and images for historical purposes was, no doubt, very general, but the worship of them was resisted for some centuries by the Churches of the West and of the North.

† The passage referred to proves that Gregory Nyssen wept at seeing a picture, not that he worshipped it. He adopted the use of them on the dangerous pretext, that, by having the images of Saints presented to them, they might be more easily drawn away from the worship of idols.

‡ Anastasius was confirmed in his purpose of becoming a Christian by seeing pictures of the martyrdom of the Saints; but it is not said that he embraced, incensed, or offered worship of any kind to them.

(*Ibid.* 16), and that which follows. Thus, in the first place, reminding them of what had been done in the making of the calf, and then giving a caution lest they also, imitating the manners of the Egyptians with which they were acquainted, should fall into the same impiety of thinking the Deity to be like unto such things. This also the great Apostle taught in the public Assembly at Athens, saying, 'Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device' (Acts xvii. 19). And to the same purpose we find this also, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord our God in vain' (Exodus xx. 7)—that is, Thou shalt not call or esteem as God that which is not so in truth, but has been vainly dignified with the idea and name of Deity. Now, to us, as says the great Apostle, 'There is but one God the Father, from whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things' (1 Cor. viii. 6), and one Holy Ghost, in whom are all things; not bringing in any difference of nature by this change of prepositions—God forbid! For the three Persons, considered with each other, are one God, as the wise Gregory teaches us. Never therefore, even to this day, have the people of Christ applied either the name which is above every name, or their absolute worship or service, to any other than to this holy and life-giving Trinity—God forbid! For the divine Scripture, having universally united our highest worship (τὸ λατρεύειν) with these Divine Beings, marks our entire freedom from connection or participation with any errors of this kind, for the nature of idol worship is evident enough. As with us there is but one God who is to be worshipped—as our faith in Him is one—and as we have but one baptism to salvation, so by us is but one worship and service offered to Him, even such as has been delivered to us by the holy Apostles and ever since preserved—namely, 'the sacrifice of praise (which the divine Apostle declares) to be offered by Christ to God (and the Father)—that is, the fruit of the lips of those who confess to His name' (Hebrews xiii. 15); and the most sacred tradition of the life-giving mysteries of which the Prophet Malachi predicted, having spoken as in the person of God, that 'From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my name shall be glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering' (Malachi i. 11). 'Never can there be, therefore, any agreement between the temple of God (that is, the Church) and idols—God forbid! For she, according to the Apostle, is 'the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. iii. 17); but 'the names of the idols shall be de-

stroyed from off the earth,' exclaims the Prophet Zechariah: 'for every place shall be opened for the house of David'* (Zech. xiii. 2)—that is, to the Church, 'whose house we are' (Heb. iii. 6), by the reception of the true faith. To these testimonics may be well added that which is written in the book styled 'the Wisdom of Solomon,' and also that is found in the sublimely eloquent Isaiah. In the first we read 'The invention of idols is the beginning of fornication and the devising of them is the corruption of life: for neither were they from the beginning, neither shall they be for ever: for by the vain glory of men they entered into the world, and therefore they shall come quickly to an end' (Wisdom xiv. 12-14): and much more of the same kind. In the Prophet it is said, 'All who make or carve out a God shall be ashamed, and all who originated them shall be consumed away: and the deaf have been made by men'† (Isaiah xliiv. 9-10) And he declares that the things they had with them were only the invention of the carpenter, and the transformation of wood given for the service of men into the shape of a man, and as it were the publication of the folly of those who worshipped such things; to which he adds, 'See, will ye not say there is a lie in my right hand' (*ibid.* 20), which he intended for the subversion of the above-mentioned impiety.

"But we who know and believe on the Son of God, who is the truth and the right hand of the Father, are evidently quite beyond the scope of the denunciations of the Prophet here mentioned. And here I may seasonably bring forward the words of the Prophet, 'What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?' (Jerem. xxviii. 28.) For what comparison can be instituted between the unsubstantial vanities wafted by the spirits of wickedness, which belong to those who serve the creature more than the Creator, and the nourishing words of the true knowledge of God which is found in all the people of Christ? ‡ For they of whom Isaiah speaks, 'sacrifice on the tops of the hills,

* The Septuagint differs here from the Hebrew and the Vulgate, which agree with the English translation.

† The Septuagint in these verses differs from the Vulgate, but the quotation here made is curtailed and altered from the Septuagint itself. The passage, according to Lowth, is very difficult: he observes. "I do not know that any one has ever yet interpreted these words to any tolerably good sense. The Vulgate and our translation have rendered them very fairly." "And the workmen they are of men," he translates in these words—"Even the workmen themselves shall blush."

‡ Certainly there is no similitude between *the vanities* of the Heathen and the truth of the word of God; but a comparison may not unfairly be made of the vain inventions of the Heathen and of the no less vain inventions of those who teach for doctrines the commandments of men; and, after all Germanus can say, there is a striking resemblance between worshipping images and worshipping idols.

and offer victims on the tops of the mountains' * (Isaiah lxxv. 7); or, as another Prophet contemporary with Isaiah says, 'Under the oak, the poplar, the wide-spreading tree, for the shadow thereof is good' (Hosea vi. 14). But the people of Christ adore 'the King of ages eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God' (1 Tim. i. 17), in His own dwelling, 'worshipping Him in spirit and in truth' † (John iv. 24); and continually offering all praise, honour, and glory, to the life-giving Trinity. The speedy destruction of idols spoken of in the Book of Wisdom—that is, their extinction and their not remaining for ever—was effected in no other way than by the appearing of 'the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ' (Titus ii. 13); which His Church, from one end of the world to the other, being bought with His blood, everywhere piously confesses and glorifies. The people of Christ, the true and genuine worshippers of the Trinity, do not bring upon themselves any of the above-mentioned denunciations against idols, because they have the images of holy men for a memorial of their virtue, any more than it brought any blame or censure against the blessed Paul, who had forbidden circumcision according to the flesh, and severely rebuked those who wished to be justified by the law; that Timothy was circumcised, or that he was shorn according to the law, or that he offered sacrifice in the temple. ‡ For we must not consider simply the things which are done, but in every case the intention of the agent should also be taken into consideration. For it is the cause of the action which on the one hand justifies, or on the other condemns, the doer of any action. And, indeed, if this distinction be not carefully borne in mind, it may be that the command of God will hardly escape the cavils of the unbelieving; for, though the law condemns images, whether graven or molten, yet the Cherubim of glory, as the Apostle terms them, which overshadowed the mercy-seat, were prepared in one or other of these ways. § And that the

* This quotation is incorrectly made from the Septuagint, which here agrees exactly with the English version.

† Do they worship God in spirit and in truth who pray to images to be cured of their diseases?

‡ This example will not hold good; for St. Paul never forbade circumcision to the Jews, but only to the Gentiles. Timothy, being the son of a Jewess, was circumcised (Acts xvi. 1); but Titus, who was altogether of Gentile extraction, was not circumcised on that very account (Gal. ii. 3). Again: St. Paul being a Jew was free to do as did the Jews while that dispensation still existed: it is certain he did not seek to be justified thereby, but at this time, by a lawful conformity, to provide for his own safety. In all this he did not act inconsistently with himself, contrary to his own decisions, or those of the Church. Germanus, on the other hand, and his partizans, did that which was forbidden no less in the Law than in the Gospel—viz., made images for the purpose of worship.

§ God never at any time gave command to worship images. God gave the

Divine glory was borne up by these, we have not only the testimony of the Scripture but also of Saint Athanasius, who, in his interpretation of the words of the Psalm, 'O thou that sittest between the Cherubim shew thyself' (Psalm lxxx. 1), gives the following explanation:—'And, indeed (he observes), the archetypes of the Cherubim, as to their nature, are altogether unknown to men, for they are spirit and fire, and entirely diverse from any corporeal form or nature; and all which is said in the Prophets, which seems to have any relation to body, has a symbolical and emblematical signification, and cannot be understood in any other way, in accordance to pious reasoning, and that which becomes incorporeal beings.' It is necessary also to state this, that Christians never make images of their relations according to the flesh, or their acquaintances or friends, or worship or account them worthy of any honour: neither have they, in subservience to the commands of kings, contrived such things for the which they were justly blamed, 'Who, declaring that they were wise, became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man' (Rom. i. 22, 23), as the Apostle speaks: who thus plainly shows how utterly inapplicable to us are any of those charges taken from Scripture. If, indeed, we could be proved from this our usage to have exchanged our religious conceptions of Deity for those of a carnal nature, or to have deserted that high reverence and supreme worship which we pay to God, or in the slightest degree to have declined from it, then, indeed, it would be right that those things which had made us backward to, or seduced us from, our reverence for and attendance on the one true God, should be utterly done away with.* But now we see quite the contrary thing to take place; for when any one looks with understanding upon an image of any of the Saints he says (as it is proper), 'Glory be to thee, O God of'—adding the name of the Saint whoever it may be; and thus in this way is fulfilled that which we say in prayer, 'May the all holy name of Christ be glorified by

sixth command, and yet ordered Abraham to sacrifice his son. Are there any others at liberty without any such command to do the like, if only their intention be good, and they mean to do honour to God thereby? No doubt, if God enjoin such a thing, we ought both to make and to worship images of the Virgin and the Saints; but His command to Moses to make Cherubim, as emblematical types of better things, is no sufficient warrant for Christians, *without* any such command, to make and to worship images.

* It would not be difficult to prove that Image-worship and Saint-worship *does* powerfully tend to debase the spirituality of Christian worship, and to degrade that which should be done in spirit and in truth into the most abject and grovelling superstition: that it has a contrary effect is affirmed, and not proved, by Germanus. The stories of image-worship set forth in this Session prove that they who looked on the pictures of Saints did so *as expecting to be healed by so doing*, not otherwise to gain instruction from them.

things visible and invisible.' Neither are we allowed to call any one of the holy men 'God,'* even though this name was given by Him who is rightly and truly God to those who had pleased Him, as we find it on record in the Book of Psalms. Nor do we, because we have these images, imagine ourselves to have attained such certainty in respect of religious knowledge as that we should on that account neglect the frequent attendance in the churches of God and to be present there both day and night—or, in the words of the Psalmist, 'evening, morning, and at noon-day to bless God' (Psalm lv. 17), and chiefly at the time of the sacred mysteries and liturgical services. But, as we are certainly assured that we can attain the hope of salvation in no other way than from the pious *faith* and *confession* of the one true God to be worshipped in Trinity—the one having its seat in the heart, the other manifested by the mouth, 'for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation' (Romans x. 10)—so all the people of Christ, evermore having the praises of the God who made them in their mouth, 'and His glory in their hearts' (Psalm cxlix. 6), are stirred up to the participation of His most holy body and blood, by which we celebrate the memorial of His death and resurrection, according to His own tradition, with a desire more ardent and a diligence more earnest than that 'of the stag for the fountains of water' (Psalm xli. 1). Nor let this be a cause of scandal to any, that tapers should be lighted or that sweet smelling incense is offered before the images of the Saints; † for these things are designed sym-

* It matters little whether they be *called* gods or not if they are considered as such; or if like Mary of Egypt, or Gregory of Rome, or Germanus of Constantinople, we are to look for that aid, help, and deliverance from the Virgin which in Scripture is said to come from God only.

† On this caution we find the following censure in the "Caroline Books," (lib. iv. c. 3):—"But now this Council, which would persuade to many things to which no one of sound mind could assent, which dissuades from many things which no man of sound mind would decline; which censures many things which are really praiseworthy, and praises many things that are really censurable; admonishes us that no one ought to be scandalised because that tapers are lighted and incense burnt before images, as if themselves had not rather been scandalised who light tapers before things which cannot see and offer incense to things which cannot smell. For they are scandalised who offer these things which might most rightly be offered to God, to things destitute of sense, and teach others to do the same; and then they vapour about our being scandalised whom they not unreasonably dread as deriding their folly; and, while they expect that we shall reprove them, give out that they are mighty zealous for our conversion. Forsooth, they dread lest we should stumble in this respect, and imagine that they shall abound in goodness thereby; but our stumbling in this way will just as much hurt us as their superfluous obsequiousness on such things will benefit them; for the nature of things requires that the images spoken of may be expected to recompense favours received in proportion to their knowledge of the honour which has been done to them. But not improba-

olically to pay honour to those whose rest is with Christ, which honour redounds to Him, according to the learned Basil, who declares that 'The honour paid to the good amongst our fellow servants gives a proof of right feeling towards our common Master.*' Moreover, the material lights are a symbol of the immaterial and divinely inspired illuminations, and the incense of sweet odours of the pure and complete inspiration and fulfilling of the Holy Spirit.

"Thus much we have thought it our duty to write against these insidious objections—these contradictory reasonings—which carry the vain pretension of being taken from the Scripture: and we beseech you by all means to pursue a course for the future free from scandal and tumult, more especially when the Lord commands us not to despise even one of His little ones, and, furthermore, not to scandalize them; and He threatens intolerable and most awful judgments against those who shall presume to do this. But now whole cities and tribes of people have been on this account thrown into a state of the greatest confusion, of which we shall use our utmost endeavour to make it appear that we have not been the occasion. But, above all, we must guard

bly they may reply by asking what is our reason why we deride them for lighting tapers and burning incense before things destitute of sense; when, at the same time, we ourselves light tapers and burn incense in our churches which are equally destitute of sense with the other? To which it is not difficult to reply, since it is *one thing* to illuminate with tapers places set apart for divine worship and there to offer the odour of our prayers and our incense to God, and another thing to light tapers to an image which has eyes and cannot see, and to burn incense to that which has a nose and cannot smell: it is *one thing* to do honour to the house of the Lord's majesty, erected by some of the faithful, and dedicated by God's High Priest; and another and a widely different thing absurdly to honour with gifts and offerings pictures made by some painters. 'My house (saith the Lord) shall be called the house of prayer;' and again, elsewhere, 'Offerings shall be made upon mine altar, and my house of prayer shall be honoured.' With highest honours should that place be exalted where the faithful meet together from all quarters, and their prayers are heard by a God who pities them, and the mysteries of our salvation are celebrated and the sacrifice of praise is offered to God; where also the Angels meet together to bear before God the sacrifice of the faithful offered through the hands of the Priests—where also the sweet-sounding harmony of those who chant to His praise is heard to re-echo—where resound the waves of the divine word so refreshing to the weary soul. And, lastly, in those same countries where they boast themselves so highly, because they offer their lights and their incense to images, and look down on us as scandalised who despise such practices, we learn from our ambassadors—(both those who were sent thither by my illustrious father and those who have been sent by ourselves)—that many churches in those parts not only want tapers and incense, but have not any roof to shelter their worshippers from the weather. On the contrary, in the kingdom given to us by our God, our churches through His aid who has vouchsafed to preserve them abound in gold and silver and the most beautiful ornaments; for we who reject the lighting of tapers and the burning of incense to images adorn the places set apart for divine worship with our most precious ornaments."

* "Homily on the Forty Martyrs."

against this—a thing which much agitates my own mind—that the enemies of the cross of Christ may not find cause of exultation from this cause, and say, even to the present time, Christians have been in an error; for they had never thus cast away their images made with hands unless they had been convinced that it were idolatrous to have them: and who but must confess how greatly this must have turned to the injury and subversion of the faith? For what is more likely than that they should say, As they have once been in error, we need pay no heed to them whatever, for the truth is not among them.* And what more need I add; for our in all respects most pious and Christian Sovereigns having raised up that which is verily a monument of their own love for God (I mean the picture before the Royal palace in which were represented the forms of Apostles and Propiets, and in which were written their words concerning the Lord) did thereby proclaim the saving cross to be the glory of their confidence.

“But as the sum of all we have advanced is this (Heb. viii. 1),† that God hath wrought miracles by divers images, concerning which many have been pleased to write at large—such as the healing of the diseased, of which we ourselves have had some experience; the disso-

* “A rare argument (says Comber) why no man should forsake any error that he had once embraced; and this was the great reason why the Roman Church at Trent would not reform any practice nor rectify any error, though complained of by her own members, lest they should wound their pretended infallibility, choosing rather to err always than to be thought capable of being once mistaken. Arnobius tells us that the very same thing was the main hindrance of the Pagans' conversion, ‘That they resolved to defend their most unreasonable actions lest they should be thought ever to have been ignorant, and they counted it more glory not to be overcome than to yield to the most manifest truth.’ But is this a thing for the disciples of the humble Jesus to glory in? Would it not be more for the credit of their religion to reform the abuses which superstition had brought in than to resolve to keep them right or wrong? And were not Jews and Saracens (who in the very acts of this Council pinch them very close with arguments) more like to censure them for obstinacy and for standing in an error which they could not defend than for inconstancy when they embraced a manifest truth? Besides, it was not the whole Christian Church who had thus erred: the greater part of them (in Germanus' time and long after) held the contrary opinion. To conclude, their adversaries might read in histories and other authors that the primitive Christians had no images at all, and they must needs know that the *adoration* of them was never defined before. So that, if they did censure them for inconstancy, it was more like to be for their *altering a primitive practice* and for establishing a new doctrine after the Gospel had been preached for near eight hundred years.”—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit 6, c. 5, p. 297.

† With these words the Apostle commences the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews, but how different the Gospel of Christ from that of Antichrist! St Paul writes—“Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum. We have such an high priest who is on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty of the Heavens.” Germanus on the other hand says—“Now of the things spoken this is the sum: God hath wrought miracles by various images.”

lution of spells and charms;* and the frequent apparition, in visions of the night, of those who in pictures have been made: and yet, most remarkable of all, and that which never met with any contradiction or suspicion, is the image of the immaculate Mother of God, formerly at Sozopolis in Pisidia, which poured forth a defluxion of ointment from its painted hand, of which miracle there are many witnesses.† But if the image is not now seen to work similar miracles, we must not on this account disbelieve those which have been wrought formerly, any more than we are at liberty to refuse credit to the signs and divers gifts of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of the Gospel, which are on record in the Acts of the Apostles, because that no such miracles are now performed.‡ For God, who loves man, by this kind condescension, caused that those who were weak should become strong in faith, which is concerning Himself, and at the same time hath displayed His own power thereby even as it was in the days of the Apostles. For at one time we read that their *shadow*, and at another that *handkerchiefs*, which had touched their garments, wrought cures in the diseased (Acts v. 12, 15, 19). As then, at that time, not every shadow but only that of St Peter healed the sick, and not the handkerchiefs which had touched any garment, but only those which had touched the garments of St. Paul, healed the sick—for the full assurance of faith in that God who was preached by them, and who displayed His peculiar grace even by things which had no life—so hath it pleased God that it should frequently be the case with images, for it is not every image or picture which can display this kind of benevolence to the faithful,

* “*Charmes rompus.*”—(Fleury “*Eccles. Hist.*” vol. ix., p. 223). “Germanus (as Owen observes in his ‘*Book on Images*’) pretends to some night visions of images, but does not tell us what they were or how they operated against *witchcraft*, which I suppose he means by his *περιεργεια*” (p. 44).

† “This defluxion of ointment out of the picture’s hand is an odd sort of miracle. What became of the ointment?—what effects did it produce? We hear nothing of this. It is much that this precious ointment was not preserved in *perpetuam rei memoriam* and produced in the Council as a famous eye-salve to give sight to the blind image-breakers. It was an easy thing for the superstitious Monks to convey some liquid stuff from behind the image into the hand of it.”—*Ibid.* p. 144.

‡ “Germanus, therefore, cannot be excused from gross blasphemies in comparing the fabulous miracles of idolatrous and superstitious Monks with those of the holy Apostles, as if there were no difference between the real miracles of the Apostles who sealed the truth with their blood and the fictitious wonders of lying Monks: those of the Apostles were done in public, and attested by all sorts of persons—the miracles of the Monks were done in a corner, without evidence but what was given by themselves: the miracles of the Apostles were wrought for the confirmation of the truth of the Christian religion—those of the Monks to confirm the apostacy of the latter days from the truth and purity of it: the apostolical miracles were foretold in the Old Testament as signs of the kingdom Christ—those of the degenerate Monks in the New Testament as the signs of the kingdom of Antichrist.”—*Ibid.* p. 247.

but only the images of the Saints or of the Lord Himself: whence it may be perceived that it is not from any inherent power that images work such miracles, but only by the grace of our God.* And I think it right not to leave unnoticed that to which Eusebius hath given a place in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' that in the city of Paneas (which in the Gospel is called Cæsarea Philippi), is said to be the house of the woman who had the bloody flux, and who was healed by touching the hem of our Saviour's garment as it is written in the Gospels; and that opposite the door of her house is placed (as they say) a brazen statue which bears the likeness of the Lord, and before it the image of a woman on her knees, with her hands stretched out after the manner of a suppliant; and that this she raised in memory of the miraculous cure wrought upon her; and that at the feet of this image, made in the name of the Lord, a certain herb of strange form and appearance sprang up which was a means of cure for all kinds of diseases: this Eusebius states that he saw with his own eyes.† It is evident that the Saviour did this of His own grace in condescension to the faith of this woman, which proves that which we have said before, that it is not simply the thing which is done which is to be considered, but the intention of the agent must also be enquired into. And in the same place Eusebius states that he had seen the images of Peter and Paul, and of our Lord Himself, painted in colours. Now, we do not mention this as though we would commend the making of statues of brass; but only to show that though this were done according to a heathenish custom our Lord would not reject it, but was actually pleased for a long time together to display in it the wonders of His goodness; and, therefore, it cannot be right to revile the yet more holy custom

* According to Scripture, God wrought miracles by the shadow of St. Peter, and the handkerchiefs which touched the garments of St. Paul—not that man should worship shadows or handkerchiefs, but that they might be led to believe in Christ as the Son of God. According to Germanus, God works miracles by images—not that those who witness such miracles may worship Christ or believe in Him, but that they may worship images and believe a breach of the second commandment necessary to salvation.

† When Eusebius writes against images then he is condemned as an Arian, a Theopaschite, &c.; but when a testimony can seemingly be gained from his history in their favour, then he is an orthodox divine who is by all means to be believed. Eusebius, after all, delivers his testimony doubtfully. It is reported that the woman who touched our Lord was of this city—the picture of the man they report to be the image of Jesus: he does not say that he had seen it, but that it was to be seen of travellers. And it is not that Eusebius considers statues of brass to be a heathenish custom, as Germanus pretends; but any images made in any way; for, speaking of the images of Christ, of Peter, and Paul, painted in colours, he says—"Men in old time, after the manner of the Heathen, were wont to honour in this way such as they counted Saviours."

which has been established amongst us.* With this let the words of our memorial conclude; and may the God of truth—He who has led us into all truth and who disperses from our minds every occasion of difference—every ground of disquietude—count us, who with one accord in one spirit glorify Him, worthy of His heavenly kingdom.”

TARASIVS: “The guardians of the holy Catholic Church our holy fathers have shouted aloud: ‘They who keep watch on her intellectual battlements have repelled every assault, every argument of vanity: having preserved her entire, they have routed every phalanx of the enemy; and, together with the heresies of old, they have slain with the sword of the Spirit the heresy of this modern vanity of the Christianity-slanderers.’ Let us, therefore, all with one voice sing aloud, in the words of our master the divine Apostle Paul, ‘Christ is our peace who hath made both one (Ephes. ii. 14), to whom be glory, honour, and adoration, with the Father, and the all holy, the good, the life-giving Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.’”

THE HOLY COUNCIL shouted aloud: “The doctrine of our divine-voiced fathers hath set us right: drawing from this source we have drank in the truth—following these we have put to flight falsehood—taught by these we embrace holy images.† The fathers preach: ‘We are the sons of obedience, and we glory in the face of our mother, in the tradi-

* Germanus seems to consider brazen statues as altogether a heathenish custom, not to be commended; and Bingham observes that Petavius proves from this passage that the Council did not approve of many images or statues of wood, metal, or stone, but only pictures; for that the former were thought to look too much like idols. Binius has appended, therefore, a long note in Greek and Latin, in which it is attempted to save the orthodoxy of Germanus and the gods of brass at the same time, and to show that his words must have a different meaning from that which appears: “The Greeks, in order that sacred things might not be manifest to all, surrounded the holy altar with railing, within which they set up images by which they conceal the altar, and at the same time they have them ready for the purposes of worship.” It is to this Germanus alludes in this passage—“For as statues would have been out of place here,” and he styles the use of images as somewhat more holy, because they both are more commodious as well as more usual for this purpose:—“For the use of holy statues is both pious in itself, and hath been received by the Church, as is abundantly proved both by the discourses of the Bishops themselves, as well as from the express decision of this holy Council itself.”

† Not any of the *fathers* quoted in this Session have taught the *worship* of images, though some seem to approve the *making* of them and the historical use of them. Gregory, Leontius, Germanus, and the authors of the various tales recited there are not *fathers*.

tion of the Catholic Church. Believing one God to be worshipped in Trinity we embrace holy images. Let those who hold not thus be anathema—let those who think not with us be driven far from the Church. We hold for the ancient legislation of the Catholic Church :* we hold to the laws of the fathers : we anathematise those who add anything to, and those who take anything from, the Catholic Church : † we anathematise this newly-adopted innovation of the Christianity-slanderers : we embrace venerable images : we lay beneath our anathema all who hold not with us. Anathema to the Christianity-slanderers—that is, the Iconoclasts. Anathema to those who apply passages of the holy Scripture which denounce idols to holy images. Anathema to those who do not salute holy and venerable images. ‡ Anathema to those who call holy and venerable images idols. Anathema to those who assert that Christians look on their images as gods. Anathema to those who consciously communicate with those who insult and abuse holy images. § Anathema to those who ascribe deliverance from idolatry to any other than Christ our God. Anathema to those who presume to say that the Catholic Church did ever admit of idols! ”

After that the above-mentioned anathemas had been proclaimed according to the written form, the Holy Council, by the mouth of EUTHYMIUS Bishop of Sardis, made the following declaration:—

“ Fulfilling the command of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, our holy fathers have not hid under a bushel the candle (Matt.

* Not one Canon is there of any Council about *making* of images before that called *In Trullo*, A.D. 692 ; and not one Canon in any Council whatever, up to this Nicene, about *worshipping* them. When, then, was this *ἀρχαία θεομωβεία* to be found ?

† Then they anathematise themselves, since most clearly they have added to the doctrine of Scripture and the primitive Church the new doctrine of image-worship.

‡ This anathema includes all Christians of the three first centuries, and the great part of the Church in the three centuries which follow, amongst the rest Gregory the Great, who says : “ Adorare imagines vero omnibus modis devita.”

§ Epiphanius tore in pieces a veil on which a *holy image* was painted : therefore, this anathema includes all those fathers who communicated with him.

v. 15) of divine knowledge which has been entrusted to them by Him, but have placed on the candlestick of the most edifying doctrine that it may give light to all that are in the house—that is, the Catholic Church—in order that none of those who piously confess the Lord may at any time dash their foot against the stone (Psalm xci. 12) of heretical pravity; for they expel all heretical error, and the gangrened member (if by any means it prove incurable) they cut off. Having the fan they purge the floor (Matt. iii. 12); and the wheat, the nourishing word which confirms the heart of man, they shut up in the garner of the Catholic Church; but the chaff of heretical pravity, having cast out, they burn with fire unquenchable.

“Wherefore, this Holy and Œcumenic Council which by the grace of God and the goodwill of our pious and most faithful Sovereigns, Irene the new Helena, and the new Constantine, the God-preserved offspring of the same, assembled now for the second time in the illustrious metropolis of Nice—having by reading been fully made acquainted with the doctrines of the venerable and blessed fathers, gives glory to God Himself by whom that word was given to them which was written for our instruction and for the confirmation of the Catholic Church; but against those who think not with them, but are endeavouring to darken the truth by their novelties, they unite with the Psalmist in singing, ‘How have thine enemies done evil in the holy place,* and have boasted, saying, There is not a teacher any more,

* On this quotation the “Caroline Books” animadvert as follows:—“Here again no ordinary fatuity has been displayed, in that they should interpret predictions delivered long before concerning those who overturned the city of Jerusalem to those who despise the worship of images, since it is one thing to plunder the temple of its brazen sea, its two cherubim, its other vessels and ornaments, and another not to worship images—one thing to consign the glory of the temple to the devouring flames, another to avoid the worship of images—one thing *cruelly* to devastate the holy of holies, another thing *prudently* to forbid to bow the neck in the service of images.” After some other observations, in which the true meaning of the passage is shown, the chapter is concluded as follows:—“But if any one should enquire more deeply as to its mystical sense and should consider the holy Church as signified thereby, and the evil done therein as the mischief done or attempted by heretics, still by no one having sound or sober understanding could it be understood of those who despise the worship of images. In proportion, therefore, as their absurdity is great who vapour this text as spoken of, such so is their judgment sound and vigorous who decline this worship altogether.”—*Lib. Car.*, lib. ii. c. 1.

Adrian not having the *sanum sobrium que intellectum* above mentioned maintains the great propriety of the application of this passage:—“Very rightly have they said this on account of the heretics; for as blessed Augustin saith in his explanation of the same Psalm, ‘What evil hath the enemy wrought in thy holy places—that is, in those which were especially thine—in thy temple, against thy priesthood, against all the sacraments of that dispensation;’ so now in like manner the enemies of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, having raged against the ancient orthodox tradition for sacred images, being brought down, are reduced to nothing.” A quotation from St. Gregory

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20315
 REPORT OF THE
 COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION
 OF THE ARMY
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
 I. INTRODUCTION
 II. THE ARMY'S CURRENT ORGANIZATION
 III. THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IV. CONCLUSIONS
 V. RECOMMENDATIONS
 VI. APPENDICES
 VII. REFERENCES
 VIII. INDEX

THE ARMY'S CURRENT ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 REMAIN A
 SINGLE SERVICE
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 BECOME A
 MULTISERVICE
 ORGANIZATION
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 BECOME A
 MULTISERVICE
 ORGANIZATION
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 BECOME A
 MULTISERVICE
 ORGANIZATION
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 BECOME A
 MULTISERVICE
 ORGANIZATION
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

THE ARMY'S FUTURE ORGANIZATION
 IS BASED ON THE
 ASSUMPTION THAT
 THE ARMY WILL
 BECOME A
 MULTISERVICE
 ORGANIZATION
 WITHIN THE
 DEPARTMENT OF
 THE ARMY.

and they shall not know that we handled the word of God deceitfully* (Psalm lxxiv. 3-9). But we, in every particular, maintaining the decrees and ordinances of our God-bearing fathers, speak with one heart and one mouth, neither adding anything to or taking anything from that which has by them been handed down to us; but in these we are confirmed—in these we are fixed: thus we confess—thus we teach, even as the six Œcumenic Councils have defined and ratified.

“We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son and His Word, by whom all things are made; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and His co-original Son—a Trinity uncreate, undivided, incomprehensible, unincircumscribable; which altogether and alone is to be adored with *latría*, worshipped, and served. One Godhead, one Lordship, one Dominion, one Kingdom, and Power, which in hypothesis is individually divided and in essence is dividually united.

“And we confess that One of this same holy and consubstantial Trinity, even our Lord Jesus Christ the true God, did in these last days for our salvation become incarnate and was made man, and by the saving dispensation, both of His passion, His resurrection, and ascension into heaven, did save our race and deliver us from idolatrous error. And, as the Prophet declares, it was ‘not an ambassador, not an Angel, but the Lord Himself, who hath saved us’ (Isaiah

of Nanzianzum follows, containing nothing to the purpose.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 112, col. 1.

* “This verse is inappropriately brought forward in their Council, since it is not our complaint who worship God in spirit and in truth, nor is it theirs who endeavour to worship God and His Saints in images; for we have a great Prophet, even Jesus Christ our Lord, whom daily we behold with the eyes of our mind and by whose prophecies we are carefully instructed; but it relates solely to the awful calamities which have befallen the Jews, among which is the loss of prophecy and of the knowledge of God according to the prediction of Hosea, ‘That the sons of Israel shall abide many days without a King, without a Prince, without a sacrifice, without an altar, without an ephod, without Seraphim.’—*Lib. Car.*, lib. ii. cap. 2.

Adrian replies—“They used these words of the Psalmist against the heretics, who in their Conventicle, held in the time of their heretical Emperor Constantine, fancied that they knew and understood somewhat; wherein they liken them to the Jews, of whom Augustin in his comment on the same Psalm observes, ‘Behold these Jews who say that are not now acknowledged.’ And shortly after, ‘Now ye see not your signs how there is not a prophet, and thou sayest, And as yet he will not know us, it is because as yet ye will not acknowledge him. Now there is not a prophet, and he will not know us as yet, even until the Lord hath rebuked the enemy.’ Just so it was with the heretics: until their Prince Constantine the Heresiarch was rebuked they understood nothing, and therefore were they reduced to nothing.”—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 113, col. 1.

lxiii. 9).^{*} So with him we agree, and his words we appropriate, loudly proclaiming it was not a Synod, not the power of Kings, not God-hated conspiracies which delivered the Church from idolatry, as that Jewish Conventicle which barked against venerable images has frivolously asserted; but it was He, the Lord of Glory, the God, who became man: He hath saved us—He hath delivered us from all idol errors: to Him, therefore, be glory, to Him be grace, to Him be giving of thanks, to Him be praise, to Him be greatness in word and work ever ascribed. Of Him comes redemption—of Him comes salvation, who alone is able to save for ever, and not of other men whose origin is of the dust. He hath fulfilled the predictions which were of old declared by His Prophets amongst us, on whom the ends of the world are come (1 Cor. x. 11), by His incarnate dispensation having dwelt among us and associated with us, and, having wiped out the names of the idols from the earth (Zech. xiii. 2), even as it had been written. We reverently embrace the words of our Lord, of His Apostles and Prophets,† by which we have been taught to honour and magnify first of all the true and very Mother of God, who is higher than all the heavenly powers; the holy Angelic powers, the blessed and illustrious Apostles, the glorious Prophets, the victorious Martyrs who contended in behalf of Christ, the holy and God-bearing Doctors, and all the Saints; and we entreat their intercession as being able to commend us to God, the universal King of all—at least, while we keep His commandments and endeavour to live virtuously.

“ We salute, moreover, the type of the venerable and life-giving Cross and the holy relics of the Saints, and we receive, embrace, and salute holy and venerable images, according to the ancient tradition of the holy Catholic Church of God and of our holy fathers, who both received them and determined that they should be in

^{*} The Septuagint differs here from the Hebrew and the Vulgate which agree with our version. Lowth has adopted this version in his new translation, which requires a very slight alteration from the Hebrew text. After their idolatrous worship of the golden calf, when God said unto Moses, ‘ I will send an Angel before thee: I will not go up in the midst of thee, the people mourned ’ (Exod. xxxii. 2-4). God afterwards comforts Moses by saying, “ My presence—(that is, I myself in person, and not by an Angel)—will go with thee ” (verse 14). *αυτος προπορευσομαι σοι*, as the lxx. renders it.

† By what words, either of our Lord, of the Prophets, or of the Apostles, are we taught to magnify and honour the Virgin or Angels?—or where do we learn that the Virgin Mary has been made superior to the heavenly powers, or that the Saints do intercede for us? St. Paul bids us beware “ of being beguiled into a worship of Angels.” He speaks also of our Lord’s being made superior to Angels and His interceding for us, but nothing about Mary or the Saints. Unwritten tradition, not Scripture, is the great source where we must look for doctrines like these.

all the Churches of God, and in every place of His dominion. These holy and venerable images (as we said before) we honour and salute, and worship with the worship of reverence—namely, the image of the incarnation of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the immaculate and very Mother of God, of whom He was pleased to become incarnate, that he might save us and deliver us from all impious madness after idols; also the images of the holy and incorporeal Angels in that form in which they have appeared to righteous men of old; also the images and pictures of the divine and far-famed Apostles, the divinely eloquent Prophets, the crown-bearing Martyrs and all other Saints; that, by their pictures, we may possibly be led to the remembrance and memorial of the prototype, and in measure may be made partakers of their sanctification. These things we have been taught to hold, and have been confirmed in holding by our holy fathers. ‘Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift, that He hath not left us for ever; nor hath He suffered the rod of the wicked to rest on the lot of the righteous lest the righteous put forth their hand unto wickedness;* and He hath done good to the upright in heart,’ as the Psalmist David has sung, with whom in that which follows let us also unite in singing, ‘But they who turn aside to their crooked ways the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity, but peace shall be upon the Israel of God’”† (1 Cor. ix. 15; Psalm xxiv. 3; *ibid.* 4; *ibid.* 5).‡

* “Car. Lib.” lib. ii. and “Adrian’s Reply,” p. 117, col. 2: notice above.

† In the “Caroline Books” it is objected that this verse has no connection with those who despise the worship of images. “They who turn aside to the bond—(*ad obligationem: vulg., ad obligationes. lxx., εἰς τὰς σπαραγαλίαν*)—is not to be understood of those who despise the superstitious worship of images, but of those who, being ensnared in the toils of the old enemy, are ready for any iniquity, and in proportion as they sin so are they involved more inextricably in his folds. Whence it is said by the wise man, ‘Each one shall be holden with the cords of his own sins.’ They who turn aside to this bond the Lord will lead forth with the workers of iniquity; for as with them they sin in this life with them shall they be condemned in that which is to come. From which bond may He set us free who hath redeemed us into liberty and hath showed us who sat in darkness the great light of His brightness!”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. ii. c. 8.

Adrian replies—“They spoke concerning heretics: as the blessed Augustin on the same Psalm observes among other things—that is, whose deeds they have imitated, because they have loved the joys of the present time and have not believed in the judgment to come.” And shortly after:—“Therefore, because Christ the Son of God is our peace, He comes to collect His own and to separate them from the unjust. From what unjust? From those who hate Jerusalem—who hate peace—who wish to rend asunder unity—who trust not to the peace,” &c.—*Adrian’s Answer*, p. 115, 116, col. 2, col. 1.

‡ Here follow the subscriptions of all who were present at the Council, both Bishops and Abbots, or Hegumeni, according to their rank. The Pope’s Legates subscribe first and with a longer formula, though divers other Bishops

enlarged according to their fancy. The greater part contented themselves with the following—"I, _____, unworthy Bishop of _____, entirely concordant with all that is herein written, have subscribed."

The number of the Bishops, including the Pope's Legates and the pretended Legates from the East, &c., who subscribed, was one hundred and thirty-five. The number of Monks, Abbots or Hegumeni, who subscribed, was one hundred and thirty-two. The names of the Abbots, &c., are not found in any of the Sessions but this, though there were more or less present at all of them.

SESSION THE FIFTH.

Certain Extracts from the Writings of the fathers and others are cited to prove that Samaritans, Jews, Pagans, Manichæans, Eutycheans, and others, rejected Images ; and, therefore, the Iconoclasts, who rejected Images, must be numbered with the rest and accounted Heretics. In conclusion, the Pope's Legates propose that all the Writings of the Iconoclasts shall be burnt, and that an Image shall be brought into the Assembly, that all the Members of the Council may pay to it all due honour and reverence.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns Constantine and Irene his mother, in the eighth year of their consulship, on the fourth of the nones of October (October 4), of the eleventh indiction, the holy Œcumenic Council assembled by the grace of God and decree of the same divinely-protected Sovereigns in the splendid city of Nicæa metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia—that is, Peter the Arch-presbyter and Peter Monk and Abbot of St. Sabbas at Rome Legates of Adrian most holy Pope of Old Rome ; Tarasius Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, New Rome ; John and Thomas Vicars and Legates of the Apostolic Sees of the Eastern Dioceses ; together with the Bishops, the Archimandrites, Abbots, and all the fulness of the Monastic Order, held their Session before the most sacred pulpit of the most holy Church of St. Sophia, in the presence of Petronas and John Officers of the Imperial household. And after that the Holy and Immaculate Gospels had been set in the midst,

TARASIVS said : “ God, who, by His Prophet, hath declared beforehand that which shall hereafter come to pass, hath, by Jeremiah the Prophet, declared, concerning all those who

make innovations in the Catholic Church, 'that they have committed two evils: they have left ME, the fountain of living water, and have hewn out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water' (Jerem. ii. 13). The broken cistern is heretical reasoning, from which source the promoters of the heresy of the Christianity-detractors have drawn and have made the more simple to 'drink the deadly poison'* (Hab. ii. 15), against whom a woe is denounced by the voice of the Prophet; for, in their endeavour to take away the right of venerable images (a custom which has been handed down from old times in the holy Catholic Church of God), they have imitated Jews and Saracens, Pagans and Samaritans, and also Manichæans, Docetæ, and Theopaschites, as shall be proved by reading the books now before you "

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Let them be read for the confutation and exposure of that, their Christianity-detracting and Pseudo-synodical conventicle."

LEONTIUS the Royal Secretary said: "At the request of your holy Council, we have brought hither the holy books which it will be necessary to read; and besides, we have brought certain others, written by false heretics, who, in former ages, rejected images."

COSMAS the Deacon reads from the "Second Catechetical Lecture of St. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem," which begins—

"Sin is a dreadful thing, and transgression is a most cruel disease of the soul." And, after other things towards the close, he adds—"What think you of Nebuchadnezzar? Have you not heard from the Scriptures that he was fierce in his manner, having a lion-like temper of mind? Have you not heard that he exhumated the bones of the Kings? Know you not that he led the people into captivity? Have you not heard that he put out the eyes of the King, having first shewn him his children slaughtered? Have you not heard that he laid his hand on the Cherubim?—I mean not the spiritual and the heavenly, but those which were made for the temple—which were about the mercy-seat of the ark, from the midst of which the Lord spake." (17)

* "Ὁ ὀπιζῶν τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἀνατροπῆ θολερᾶ."

TARASIVS: "Let us consider how greatly Nebuchadnezzar is here censured for destroying those Cherubim and what retributory punishment he endured."

The HOLY COUNCIL said: "Great was his fault—great his punishment."

TARASIVS: "Therefore, every one who casts that which is sacred out of the Church and destroys it is obnoxious to the same vengeance."*

PETRONAS the Patrician said: "Truly great was the punishment of Nebuchadnezzar, for he was driven from the kingdom and remained seven years in the wilderness eating grass like an ox" (Dan. iv. 33. *et seq.*).

* On this comparison of the Iconoclasts with Nebuchadnezzar the "Caroline Books" contain the following observations:—"Either contemptuously to break down images on the one hand, or to adore them with tapers and incense on the other, is not enjoined by any authentic testimony or sanctioned by the example of any Saint whatever, more especially since to break them in pieces and to worship them have been condemned by certain fathers. They affirm that they who despise images are guilty of a crime equal to that of Nebuchadnezzar in destroying the Cherubim. Even if this were the case, surely we cannot be thus guilty who retain them for the beauty of our churches, though we refuse them any worship, but rather their own fathers who break them in pieces. But whereas they condemn their ancestors because they abolished images, and mightily commend themselves because that they worship them, it may be observed that, as they may not be compared in merit with the builders of that venerable temple, so neither are their ancestors equal in guilt to those who destroyed it. Indeed, as far as the temple of the Most High God is superior to certain images made by some artificer, so far beyond all doubt does the guilt of those who overthrew the temple exceed that of those who destroyed images. It remains therefore that we show how far the guilt of the one exceeds that of the other." In order to show the guilt of those who destroyed the temple many passages are brought forward from Psalms lxxiv., lxxxix., xliii., and cxxxvii., after which the chapter is concluded in the following manner:—"From all which it is most evident that, however imprudent their ancestors may have been in casting images out of churches, they are by no means to be equalled to the subverters of that most holy and sacred temple, since among the former was *inconsideration*, among the latter atrocious guilt—among the former want of judgment, among the latter open wickedness—the one thinking to serve God thereby took away images out of the churches—the other provoking the Lord who was angry with His people to anger against themselves outrageously destroyed His house; both of which, however, we with God's help intend to avoid, while we adorn those places which are set apart for divine worship and offer our worship and service to God alone."—*Lit. Car.*, lib. iv. c. 4.

To this Adrian replies—"We have shown already from the Epistle of St. Gregory the Pope that images are not to be despised but worshipped; wherefore our predecessors the most holy Pontiffs, so often cited, in their sacred Councils, have issued this decree, 'If any one refuse to worship the images of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of His Mother, and of all Saints, according to the doctrine of the holy fathers, let him be *Anathema*.'"—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 124. c.

COSMAS Deacon Notary and Chamberlain read the "Fifth Epistle of St. Symeon Stylites of the Wonderful Mount to the Emperor Justin the Younger"*:—

* The author of this epistle was the second of the name who spent his life on the summit of various pillars. He commenced this absurd practice from childhood, and there he spent sixty-eight years of his useless life. Evagrius ("Ecclca. Hist." lib. vi. c. 22), gives some account of him, with plenty of ridiculous confabulations. That he became a better *ascetic* by living on the top of a pillar need not be questioned, but most certainly he did not become a better Christian thereby. He is said to have *hated* a Nestorian or Eutychian worse than a dog or a serpent (Cave's "Hist. Litt." vol. i. p. 508); and, if that speaks little for his charity, this letter speaks yet less, breathing as it does far more of the spirit of the ferocious and blood-minded Dominic than of the meek and lowly Jesus. In the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 5), this letter meets with the severest reprobation; but it is patronised, just as might be expected, by Pope Adrian, seeing it expressed exactly the spirit and temper of that See against all contumacious opponents.

"Heretics (it is observed) not unfrequently bring forward their wicked and artful errors under the name of some or other of the Saints, in order thereby to elude the unwary; and it is to be feared that this letter, which they declare to be the writing of a certain Saint Symeon, which they bring forward to establish their error, does not contain the words of that holy man, but of some plotting contriver. Doubts of this kind are excited in our minds, and in the minds of other orthodox persons, because that it is in opposition to the sacred Scripture; nor should we dare to make use of it in argument to determine any doubtful point, conscious (as we are) how contradictory it is to the institutes of the divine law." After quoting certain portions of the letter it is continued thus: "In which most absurd verbiage, deficient in eloquence, destitute almost of common sense, a composit of I know not what barbarisms and solecisms, these errors deserve most unqualified censure; that, when speaking of Justinian (*sic*) the Emperor, a man mortal, passible, and obnoxious to every accident common to man, he uses the phrase *your divine ears*, and further that he prohibits the Emperor from the exercise of mercy; that he manifests a proneness to return evil for evil, being in his eagerness to accomplish his purpose utterly forgetful of mercy and kindness; and that, whereas he ought from anxiety to save the souls of the lost—to have put what check he could upon the Emperor's anger—he, on the contrary, did his utmost to increase it; and, instead of regarding His example who will have no one to perish, roused him to the most ferocious vengeance; and, instead of watching how he might save souls, he denounced his anathemas and maledictions against them; and further, that he declared that *God did reign together with this same Emperor*. With respect to the expressions, *your divine ears*, or *that God did reign together with him*, we have in a former part of this work (lib. i. cap. 1, 2, 3, 4), sufficiently replied, in noting the folly of those who still make use of such frivolities: we shall now, in due course, touch on the other topics contained in the same letter, fortifying each step of our discussion with the testimony of the divine word, as the Lord shall grant us power. When, therefore, he forbids the Emperor to exercise mercy, what other thing does he than run counter to the whole current of Scripture which enjoins upon us that we have it? Surely it were dangerous to follow the precepts of such letters, which appear to be indirect opposition to holy writ."

After which he quotes from the New Testament several of the injunctions of our Lord and His Apostles in favour of mercy and kindness, and then continues as follows:—"Now if, according to the instruction of this eminent Preacher, we are not to avenge even *ourselves*, what madness, what absurdity, would it be to avenge the injuries done to things which have no sense, according to the tenor of the letters sent to Justinian; and that these works of piety, which no injury done to ourselves must make us forget, we must

“Who, my ever-venerable my most gracious lord, will give to my eyes fountains of tears, that I may weep and lament most bitterly and inconsolably all the days of my wretched life; because, notwithstanding the divine zeal of your God-crowned and most Christian im-

quite lose sight of, for the sake of injuries done to pictures which cannot feel them.” And after quoting some other texts it is added: “Wherefore, if any wishes to be accounted a child of the Most High, and desires to obtain mercy from God and to be purified from the impurities of his sins, let him rather follow these most wholesome precepts than the savage perversity of that epistle. But further, inasmuch as he endeavoured to excite the Emperor to *wrath*, in this also he acted a savage part, and in this as well as in the other parts of his letter he contradicts the holy Scripture.” And, having brought forward a few texts against *wrath* and anger, he continues: “Now, as *wrath* is forbidden by so many and such express testimonies of the Gospel and the Law, we may easily gather that an epistle, which would with adjuration bind the Emperor to the exercise thereof, cannot be considered as in any way fitted to determine points about which questions may be raised.”

“The author of this epistle ought to have exhorted those whom he perceived to be in danger to repentance; and, if they had despised his exhortation, he might have supplicated the Emperor to use force for their *conversion*: for, probably, they might under compulsion have followed the good which when left to themselves they despised, since God is *not willing that any should perish, but that all should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth*. Now, had he been anxious to gain souls, he ought rather to have excited those whom he saw to be in error to *penitence* than to have stirred up their Sovereign to shed their blood; since the virtue of *penitence*, so far from being considered of less importance than others, is to be put on an equality with the very best of them; for, like some medicine, it makes whole the broken, heals the diseased, restores the lost, and not unfrequently brings back sinners who have fallen to their pristine condition.” After quoting many texts showing the importance of repentance it is added: “In proportion, as this virtue which he has so entirely neglected is pre-eminently efficacious to salvation, so this ferocity beyond all other wickedness is eminently noxious; for thereby he not only prohibits the Prince the use of mercy, but actually binds him under adjurations to revenge. Now if, according to our Lord, it be a great crime to offend one of His little ones, how great the crime of offending, not any little one, but an Emperor, the head of his people. Moreover, as the writer of this epistle, in addition to his former atrocities, has made use of *maledictions*: in this also he is found to contravene the sacred oracles, as it is written, *Bless and curse not*; and elsewhere, ‘They who curse shall not enter the kingdom of God.’

“But lest any one should imagine that we are sitting in judgment upon and condemning a man with whose merits we are unacquainted, let it be understood that we are not here discussing the life or merits of any righteous man, but only winnowing with the fan of the divine Scripture those words of his which have been perversely brought forward to establish error, because they are in every way tacked together with bands of error. Neither are we speaking of any other of the works of this same Symeon, which have not come under our notice, but only those which have been presented to us in their records; and while we confess that we know not whether they actually are the words of this same Symeon or of some other person who has taken his name, this we know, that without all doubt they are utterly opposed to the sense of Scripture; and, as such, may most deservedly be excluded from all art in determining what are, or what are not, the doctrines of the Church.”

It was not to be supposed that a letter framed so exactly according to the persecuting spirit of the Romish Church should want a defender and upholder in its head and president. Adrian vindicates the supposed or real Symeon

perial sway, such inconceivably audacious impieties have been perpetrated by those atheistic, impure beyond all impurity, and abominable Samaritans, who inhabit the district named Castra, near the city of Porphyreon, in the venerable house which your God-pleasing Sovereignty was pleased to give command to be built in that place. All which your God-preserved Serenity may fully understand from the communications made to our humility by Paul the most holy Bishop of this same city Porphyreon, and which have been forwarded to us by the most holy Patriarch of the East, who himself was most deeply afflicted on the same account. And how could it be otherwise, O most gracious Sovereign, since impieties such as those which the aforesaid most holy high Priest saw with his own eyes would cause the very stones to cry out; for it appeared to our humility worse than death and destruction even to hear of the exceeding outrageous and blasphemous atrocities which they have perpetrated against the Divine Word who became incarnate for us—against the immaculate glorious Mother of God—against the venerable and precious Cross and against the Saints. We would, therefore, venture to suggest to your divine

Stylites, at least with great zeal, if not ability. First he vindicates the flattering style of the epistle and next its persecuting tone. "Did (says he) St. Ambrose, when dedicating to Gratian a work on the orthodox faith, act at all amiss in addressing him thus, 'O holy Emperor?' And what more did this man when, in writing to the most Christian Emperor Justinian, on account of his zeal for the faith, he used the expression, 'Your divine ears?' And he therefore wrote, 'To your divine ears,' because by them he received divine discourse which in all faith and orthodoxy he observed; and rightly does he say 'divine ears,' because he is shown to have had the hearing of divine things. But, in respect to his prohibiting the exercise of mercy, that is a mistake: the holy man demanded that no delay should take place before that proper punishment had been inflicted (*sed fieri decentem vindictam poposcit*); for he was not without mercy as they have been pleased to say: but such a regard for the images of Saints seemed to possess him that he would make the impious wretches to fall under the stroke of his anathema. Moreover, we have good reason to believe that your God-inspired Excellency is acquainted with a fact recorded in the dialogues of St. Gregory concerning St. Boniface, how by his discourse he brought down with sorrow to the grave the miserable wretch who, coming with his axe, struck the cymbala. Whence shortly after St. Gregory adds: 'The anger of holy men is so much the more to be dreaded in proportion as it is evident that He who dwells in their hearts is not weak in executing whatever revenge may please them.' Thus, also, the same St. Gregory in his comment on the blessed Job when he, treating on the valiant teachers of the Gospel, observes: 'Whence the Lord saith to the Prophet concerning good teachers—"They shall devour and cast down with the stones of a sling" (Zech. ix. 15). For holy doctors who teach others the way of virtue do devour enemies—that is, by the force of conversion, they change them into their own body. Brave men also go forth from her, the Church, who strike the hearts of the wicked, as it were, with the stones of a sling. Whence also fierce Goliath is overthrown with a stone from a sling, because the pride of Satan is overcome by the corner-stone of the holy Church."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 112, col. 1. Such a letter as that of St. Symeon Stylites well deserves such a defence as that which Adrian makes. The blind lead the blind!

ears that, if the most pious laws of your victorious imperial rule demand that when the image of the Emperor is abused they who have dared this venturous deed should be delivered over to the utmost extremity of the law, of how much more severe a doom unto death are they worthy who have dared, against the images of the Son of God and of the holy glorious Mother of God, with a shamelessness and an impiety hitherto unheard of, such things as those which, from their excessive atrocity, I cannot describe, putting them quite beyond the reach of mercy or compassion? We, therefore, entreat your most victorious Sovereignty to have no mercy on those who have dared to do this nor to spare them, nor to receive any supplication from them or to admit any defence on their behalf, that they may not again do anything of this kind; for I have discovered indications of this sort, which I signified in the month of August to our most holy and God-honoured Patriarch, hinting to him that in the meantime he should keep my communication to himself, for God hath not concealed their plots from us.

“Wherefore I feel assured, my ever-venerable rulers, that your hearts fixed on God, resplendent with their own greatness, can never tolerate these outrageously disgraceful proceedings of theirs; the like to which neither we nor, perhaps, any other Christian even to this time ever heard of before. But, my lord, I adjure you, by the Emmanuel of the Most High God, not to delay even for a moment the vengeance which is their due; but give instant command that enquiry be made as to that which was done in the secret cave by their exceedingly outrageous abominations, according to the tenor of the epistle which has been addressed to our humility. Nor let your most gracious Highness delay, lest, by any means, some should insinuate unseasonable words, as if they had the sanction of your imperial Highness, especially since it is to you that God, who has been so impiously insulted by them, has committed the power; that thus the rest of them may spend all the days of their accursed and schismatical existence in fear, whom also their cognate darkness will receive to the vengeance of that future unquenchable and dark fire which shall consume them for ever! And the Holy Almighty Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, which proceedeth from the Father, shall accurse them to the lowest depths of the abyss, to destroy them with a never-ending destruction.

“This zeal if, O ye victors crowned in God, ye display towards Him who reigns together with your piety, God, the only begotten, ye shall be accepted even above the sacrifice of Abraham by the all-seeing Deity, and your most Christian reign shall be blessed and magnified in

the power of its strength above all former reigns ; for to him be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

TARASIU8 : " Perceive ye what was the mind of this father ? "

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra : " He judged them unworthy of any indulgence. "

JOHN Legate of the East : " This is evident to all, that the Samaritans are worse than other heretics,* and their heresy is exceeding abominable and base, and alien from grace ; and from this history we may infer that they who subvert holy images are as bad as these—wherefore they may well be styled Samaritans. "

* On this comparison of the Iconoclasts with the Samaritans the " Caroline Books " make the following observations :— " Not satisfied with casting off their ancestors and parents with the most fearful anathemas or lacerating their memory with every kind of reproach, they must now make them out to be far worse than ordinary heretics : for, they say, the Samaritans are worse than other heretics, but they add that they who destroy images are worse still. Now, it is evident that their ancestors destroyed images. Now, if they who break images are worse than the Samaritans, who are worse than other heretics, then it is evident that their ancestors are worse than any other heretics. Now, if as they assert from those who were worse than other heretics they received their birth, or their religious education, or their consecration to the performance of the sacred offices, surely it is wonderful that they should account themselves more eminent than other Catholics, in determining what were the traditions of the Church, and that they should glory in having a prerogative of authority to which neither their own acts or documents nor the example of their ancestors can give them the least pretension. " A dissertation here follows on the creed and origin of the Samaritans and some peculiarities of their sect, from which it is proved that they are not Christian but Jewish heretics ; after which the interview of our Lord with the Samaritan woman is treated of at great length, and its supposed mystical and typical meaning is pointed out in a variety of particulars, some fanciful enough, as for instance, this :— " She said that she had five husbands, which points out the five carnal addresses which she made to Christ : first, if thou bring a Jew, &c. ; second, for the well is deep, &c. ; third, give me of this water, &c. ; fourth, I have no husband ; fifth, our fathers worshipped in this mountain. In her sixth reply she mentions Messiah. With this spiritual reply she had no connection as yet : it was not her own ; for she believed that He was to come, not that He was present. " After which digression the chapter is concluded as follows :— " That the Samaritans, being really Gentiles and only in appearance holding to the Jews' religion, are not more really opposed to the Church than any other sect of unbelievers ; while they, considering them as Christian heretics and having declared that they are worse than any other heretics, conclude with showing them some favour in declaring that their own ancestors are yet worse. "—*Lib. Car.*, lib. iv. c. 6.

Adrian justifies this comparison by several quotations, all more or less irrelevant. 1. From Gregory Theologus—" Do you stumble at the flesh, so did the Jews. If you will call him Samaritan, to say nothing else, you do not believe in the Godhead. Even devils believed this, O thou more unbelieving than Jews and worse than devils. " 2. From an edict of Justinian we have the

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "I indeed consider the Iconoclasts to be far worse than the Samaritans; for they being unacquainted with Christianity did this in ignorance, but the others knew what they were doing, and therefore are unworthy of defence: for as it is written, 'He who knew the will of his Lord and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes' " * (Luke xii. 47).

NICOLAS Bishop of Cyzicus: "I, the least of you all, present this book of our Father John Bishop of Thessalonica, and I request that it may be read."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let it be read."

DEMETRIUS the Deacon read from the "Discourse of John Bishop of Thessalonica," which begins, "Even now the enemy continues to tempt our Lord and God Jesus Christ in the desert." And shortly after he continues thus:—

"The Gentile said, 'Do ye not make images for your Saints in your churches and worship them?—and not only for the Saints, but for God Himself? In the same way we would have you consider that when we do homage to our images, we worship not them, but the incorporeal powers which are served in and by them.' The Saint replied, 'But we make images of those who once were men—namely, of those who were holy servants of God, and had bodies like ourselves,

following—"But neither Theodore of Mopsuestia who surpassed Jews and Gentiles in his impiety," &c. 3. A longer extract follows from the "Comment of Pope Gregory on Job," the substance of which is that heretics, by seeking to know more than they ought, become vain, and in proportion to their ambitious desire for knowledge actually lose the knowledge they already have; of which Adrian makes this application to the Iconoclasts—"Therefore, their ancestors magnifying themselves to know more than they ought and contriving the imposition of novelties, became the worse heretics, and in consequence were brought to nothing."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 112, c. 2.

To know that images ought not to be worshipped is it seems to know too much. Wisely did Rome forbid her members the use of the Scriptures which teach knowledge such as this. If the Iconoclasts are worse than other heretics, then it must be better to deny Christ's divinity than, acknowledging it, not to worship His image!

* "The idol Bishop should have proved it to be the will of the Lord that we should make and worship images of Christ before he had condemned the opposers of them to be beaten with many stripes; but neither he nor the Council ever attempted the proof of this. They should have produced some command from Jesus Christ for worshipping images; but they knew it to be impossible, and therefore never offered it. Since there is no law in the New Testament for images and since there is a law in the Old and New Testament against images, the image-breakers were so far from opposing that they fulfilled the will of the Lord in destroying images."—*Owen on Image-Worship*, p. 119.

to recall them to mind and to do them honour; and we do nothing absurd, for we represent them such as they were; and we do not invent forms after your fashion, nor do we exhibit bodily appearances of things which have no body at all.* And when we worship we honour not the image as you say, but those who are presented to us by the picture;† and these again we worship not as gods (God forbid), but as genuine servants and friends of God, and who have confidence to intercede for us. We make also images of God—I mean of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—depicting Him as He was seen upon earth, and as He was conversant among men, and not in the nature of His Godhead. For what is the likeness or what the form of the Word of the Father, who is without body and without form? For God—(that is, the Nature of the holy consubstantial Trinity)—is a Spirit, as it is written. But since, through the good will of our God and Father, His only begotten Son, God the Word, came down from heaven, and for our salvation was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the immaculate Virgin Mary the Mother of God, we paint His humanity

* There appears from hence a striking likeness between Christian image-worship and Pagan idol-worship. Both worship superior powers by means of images and things sensible. But, says the Saint, our Martyrs were once living men—your gods are creatures entirely of your imagination. To which it may be replied that some Catholic Saints never existed, and many of the deities of Greece and Rome even deified men, such as the hero-gods, Hercules, Saturn, Vulcan, and others. That the Pagans did worship in their images those who once lived on earth is proved by many express testimonies of the Fathers.—See *Tertullian's Apologetic Discourse*, sec. 10, 11, and 13; *Min. Felix*, sec. 21.

† The Saint's next defence is that the images are not worshipped as God, but as representatives of those who can intercede with Him. The heathen in like manner worship not the stone or the material of the image, but by it the spirit supposed to reside in it. In both cases the image is representative of some other being worshipped thereby. But, as in the case of the Pagans, the great majority worshipped only that which they saw, so among Christians, the picture which the more learned considered as representative, the less learned considered as divine. Lactantius thus upbraids the heathen of his day—"What madness is this, either to make those things at which hereafter they may fear, or to fear that which they have made? But, say they, we fear not those things which we have made, but those beings after whose image they have been formed, and in whose name they are consecrated." And thus also the Saint in this conference declares—"We honour not the image, but only those who are represented to us thereby."

"But (continues Lactantius), if ye believe the gods (the Saints) to be in heaven, why should you not look up to heaven where they really are than to temples and statues (images) where they are not? How are your gods (Saints) to be considered? If among the *dead*, who so foolish as to worship them?—if among the *absent*, then they ought not to be worshipped, since they see not what we do, nor do they hear if we pray. But if as being gods they cannot be absent, but are in all parts of the world and can see and hear everything, then all images are superfluous, since they are present in all places, and it must be quite sufficient to invoke the names of those who hear by our prayers."—*Lactantius de Origine Erroris*, lib. ii. c. 2.

though not His incorporeal Godhead. The Gentile said again—‘ Let it be so : ye make pictures of the Son of God because He was incarnate : now what say ye concerning Angels ; for ye paint them as men, and worship them though they are not men ; but are, and are called, intellectual and incorporeal ? So think that the gods we worship are, in like manner, served by means of images, and that we are guilty of no greater absurdity than are ye in respect of the Angels which ye paint.’ The Saint replies—‘ Concerning Angels, Arch-Angels, and other holy powers superior to these, and I will add also the souls of us men, the Catholic Church acknowledges them to be *intellectual* ; but not *altogether incorporeal or invisible* as ye Gentiles say. For they have spiritualised bodies, both of air and of fire, as it is written—‘ He maketh His Angels wind, and His ministers a flame of fire.’ And in this sentiment we find many of our holy fathers to agree, among whom are Basil the Great, Athanasius of holy memory, the illustrious Methodius and their companions.* For, indeed, God alone is incorporeal and uncircumscribable, but intellectual creatures are not altogether incorporeal or invisible, as is the Deity ; wherefore, as they are in particular places, they must also be circumscribable. Whenever, therefore, you find that Angels or devils or souls are styled *incorporeal*, understand it as meant to signify that they are not compounded of any of the four material elements ; and that they have not gross material bodies such as those with which we are clothed ; for, in fact, it is only as compared with us that they are invisible, for they have oftentimes been sensibly apparent to many in the form of their own proper bodies ; for they have been seen by those whose eyes the Lord hath opened. And further, as being circumscribed in place, they are proved not to be altogether incorporeal as is the divine nature. We, therefore, in painting Angels and worshipping them, not as gods, but as intelligent creatures and ministers of God, and

* A Latin note in the margin signifies that the Saint here spoke of his own private judgment ; for the Council (Act iv.) in its confession declares that Angels are incorporeal. The word there used is *ἀσώματους* ; but how can it be known that in using this word they did not use it in the sense which the Saint gives lower down, where he explains it as *not compounded of any of the four elements*—as not *absolutely* incorporeal—but *comparatively* with ourselves. Binius in his notes tells us that the Council adopted his conclusion, “ that Angels might be painted,” but not his premise, because they were “ in some measure corporeal.” But his conclusion depends on his premise, and Tarasius has adopted both, nor do the Council object anything. If it were a great error, ought a charge to have been brought against Athanasius, &c., of patronising this error, and not one Bishop out of three hundred and fifty, or one Monk out of one hundred and fifty who were present, to rise up to give the least hint that it was an error ?

not absolutely incorporeal, do not err. We paint them moreover in the human form, because that they have constantly appeared in that form to those to whom they were sent by the only God."

TARASIVS: "Let the words of the father meet with due attention; for, as in a former citation we found that Samaritans had subverted the images of our Lord and Saviour and of His immaculate Mother, so in this extract we find Pagans would do the same.* The father has proved that it behoves us to paint Angels because they are circumscribed and have appeared to many in the human figure."

THE HOLY COUNCIL replied: "Very true, my lord."

STEPHEN the Monk read from the "Dispute between the Jew and the Christian." The Jew says:

"I am convinced in every respect, and I believe in Christ Jesus who was crucified that He is the Son of the living God; but I am scandalized at you Christians because ye worship images, for Scripture everywhere commands us not to make to ourselves any graven image or likeness."†

The Christian replies:

"The Scriptures command you not to worship any new God, nor to worship any image as God; but the images which you behold some of them are painted for the memorial of the philanthropic and benevolent salvation of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and signify to us the form of His humanity; while those of the Saints are intended to signify of each one of them their conflicts with the devil, their victories, and

* This conference does not prove that Pagans were opposed to the use of images among Christians, but only that they wished to find in them some excuse for themselves and their worship of idols. "O major, tandem parcas, insane, minori." This is evident, that the striking similarity of idol-worship and image-worship proves that both the one and the other have a common original—"Corruption of the truth." The Idolater corrupted the religion of the Patriarchs—the Image-monger that of the Gospel.—See *Epiiscopii Responsio ad P. Wadingi Epist. de adorat. Imagg. cap. iv.*

† "He (says Owen) that believes Jesus Christ to be the Son of God is a Christian, not a Jew, as to his religion; but according to this Council faith in Jesus does not make a Christian except he worship graven images. According to the Gospel he that believes in Jesus Christ shall be saved; but according to these men it is not faith in Jesus Christ, but in graven images, that makes a Christian. This is a new notion of Christianity not to be found in the writings of the New Testament. By this new Gospel, to be a Christian is to be a worshipper of images, and to believe in a crucified Jesus is to be a Jew."—*Owen on Image-Worship*, p. 126.

their crowns. Neither, as you imagine, do Christians make gods of their images and worship them; but, filled with zeal and faith, they gaze upon the images of the Saints, recalling to mind how they worshipped God; and then worshipping they invoke the God of Saints, saying, 'Blessed be the God of this Saint and of all Saints, who granted to them patience, and hast accounted them worthy of thy kingdom: make us partakers with them, and save us by their prayers.' And also when we contemplate and reverence the image of the Saviour with spiritual eyes, the eyes of the heart, we give thanks to God the Lord of all, who condescended to take upon Him our nature in the form of a servant in order to save the world, and to be made like us in all things, sin only excepted. We do not therefore worship and adore the wooden or painted image,* but we give glory thereby to the Lord of all. Moreover, my brother, I will shew you how that that Moses has actually in the law ordained like things; for he was commanded (as it is written), and in consequence made two Cherubim of carved work, with their wings stretched out above the ark of the testimony, one on this side the other on that side, where it was not lawful for any one to enter except the high Priest, who went in once a-year into the holiest of all to offer incense: and in like manner, having made a serpent of molten brass, and having hung it up in the midst of the camp, he said, 'Whoever has been bitten by serpents let him look upon this brazen serpent, and let him believe that this serpent is able to heal him, and he shall be healed.' See you, how Moses himself, who gave command not to make an image, did make an image."

JOHN Legate of the East: "See how our most holy fathers† most clearly affirm that they who deny the incarnate dispensation of the Saviour have rejected holy images—such as, for instance, the Hebrews and the Samaritans: therefore all who reject holy images are like to these.

The HOLY COUNCIL said: "They are like."

* If this be the same Saint who is represented as conferring with the Pagan he varies his belief according to his auditor. To the Pagan he says, "We worship images of Saints, but not as gods:" here he says, "We only look on their images, we do not worship or reverence them (*ὁ προκαταυόμεν ἢ σέβομεν*), but, recalling to mind their goodness, we worship God." No great proof of the unity of sentiment on this point.

† What most holy father? He who imagined Angels to be corporal, and affirmed Athanasius, Methodius and Basil to be in the same error? After all, images are in this instance rejected by one who declared his belief in our Lord's incarnation.

EPIPHANIUS Deacon and Legate of Thomas Bishop of Sardinia reads from the pretended "Itinerary of the Holy Apostles:"

"The painter on the first day, having sketched him in outline, ceased : on the following day he filled up the picture with the colouring, and gave the image to the joyful Lycomedes, which having placed in his own bedchamber he set a crown upon it; which when John afterwards knew he said to him, 'My beloved son, what meaning have you in thus going from the bath to your bedchamber by yourself? Am not I to pray with you and the rest of your brethren; or would you shut us out?' Having said this in a sportive manner he entered with him into his bed-chamber, and he saw there the image of an old man crowned, and tapers and altars set before it, on which he addressed him thus—'Lycomedes, what have you to do with this image? Which of your gods is it that is painted here? I see you still live like an heathen!' And Lycomedes answered him—'He alone is my God who hath rescued me and my wife from death; but if after God we may call men who have done good to us gods, then thou art the god who is represented in that picture, whom therefore I crown, and love, and reverence, as having been a good guide to me in the way.' But John, never as yet having seen his own face, said to him, 'My son, you are mocking me: am I so superior to my Lord in form? How can you make me believe that this picture is like to me?' On which Lycomedes brought a mirror, and John having looked at himself in the mirror, and having steadfastly examined the image, said, 'May the Lord Jesus Christ live: the image is like, but you have done amiss in making it.'"^{*}

EPIPHANIUS went on to read from the same book where it begins, "At one time wishing to lay hold of Jesus." And shortly after—

"They laid hands on a gross material body, but at other times when I felt Him, that which I touched was immaterial, incorporeal, and as though nothing at all was there. And when at any time being

^{*} Respecting this story it may be observed that we have no evidence as to the manner in which it was applied by the Iconoclasts. It forms part of the Acts of their Council which have been destroyed, not of their definition or the result of those several acts. It proves *this*, that the first who made use of images among those who bear the Christian name were heretics, as Tertullian and Augustine also state expressly. The story wants authenticity and genuineness no doubt, but so do many of their image-worshipping fables.

invited by some Pharisee He accepted the invitation, we went together with Him, and each of us received the appointed loaf from those who had invited us. And among the rest He also received one which, having blessed, He divided amongst us all, and from the very small portion which each received he was satisfied: our own loaves were in this way preserved entire, so that those who invited Him were much astonished. I oftentimes, when walking with Him, wished to see if any mark of His footsteps appeared; but, though I saw Him raise Himself up from the ground, yet never did I see any footsteps. These things I now relate to you, my brethren, as it were for the sake of your encouragement in the faith; but of His great things, of His wonderful things, let deep silence be preserved, since they are unspeakable—such as could not be uttered, could not be heard. For before He was seized by the lawless Jews—they who had received their law from the lawless serpent—He assembled us together and said, ‘Before that I am delivered up to them let us sing a hymn to the Father, and so let us enter on that which is ordained.’ When He had commanded us to make a circle round Him by holding each other’s hands, He Himself being in the midst, He said this, ‘Amen, obey me.’ He began to sing a hymn and to say, ‘Glory to thee, O Father,’ and we who were around Him answered the ‘Amen—glory to thee, O Word: glory to thee, O Grace: Amen—glory to thee, O Spirit: glory to thee, O Holy One: glory to thy glory: Amen—we praise thee, O Father; we give thanks to thee: the Light with whom darkness does not dwell (Amen), in which also we give thanks, saith I wish to be saved and I wish to save: Amen—I wish to be bound and I wish to loose: Amen—I wish to be wounded and I wish to wound: Amen—I wish to eat and I wish to be caten: Amen—I wish to hear and I wish to be heard: Amen—I wish to be understood being altogether Mind: Amen—I wish to be washed and I wish to wash: Amen—grace leads the dance, I would play the lute, dance ye all: Amen—I wish to be lamented, lament ye all: Amen.’” And after other things it is continued thus: “In this manner the Lord having, my beloved, joined in the dance with us went out, and we as in a maze or in a dream fled some one way some another. But I, seeing Him suffering, could not endure to behold His passion, but fled to the Mount of Olives, weeping at that which had taken place. And when the command was given, ‘Raise up,’ He was suspended thereon about the sixth hour of the day, and darkness was over all the land. But my Lord having stood up in the midst of the cave, and having shed light round about me, said, ‘John, by that rabble beneath I am

crucified at Jerusalem ; I am wounded with spears and reeds ; I am made to drink vinegar and gall ; but it is I that speak to thee, and that which I speak hear thou. It was I that suggested to thee to ascend into this mountain, that thou mightest hear that which it becomes the scholar to learn from his teacher, a man from God.' Having said this, He showed me a cross of light, fixed, and around the cross a great multitude not having one form, but on the cross was one form and a like similitude : above the cross I perceived the Lord, not having any form but only a voice—a voice, not that which was ordinary with Him, but one that was truly sweet and delightful, and indeed of God Himself, saying unto me, 'John, it was necessary that one of you should hear these words from me. I would have one to hear of that should come. The cross of light is for your sakes called by me at one time the *Word*, at another *Mind*, at another *Christ*, at another the *Door*, at another the *Way*, at another *Bread*, at another *Seed*, at another *Resurrection*, at another *Jesus*, at another the *Father*, at another the *Spirit*, at another *Life*, at another *Truth*, at another *Faith*, at another *Grace*.'

TARASIVS : " See how the whole of this writing contradicts the Gospel ! "

THE HOLY COUNCIL : " Yes, my lord, it affirms the incarnation to be mere appearance. "

TARASIVS : " In the ' Itinerary ' it is written that He neither eat nor drank, nor walked on the earth with His feet, just as the Phantasiasts teach ; but in the Gospel it is written of Christ that He did both eat and drink, and that the Jews said concerning Him, ' Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber ' (Matt. xi. 19). Again—if, as they fable, He did not touch the earth with His feet, how is it written in the Gospel, ' Jesus being weary with His journey sat thus on the well ? ' " (John iv. 6.)

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia : " And this, forsooth, is the book which confirmed that false conventicle. "

TARASIVS : " Really, the whole of it is quite ridiculous. "

THEODORE Bishop of Catana : " See the book which overthrew the beauty of the Catholic Church. "

EUTHYMIUS Bishop of Sardis : " It became that conventicle of mischief to have its support from such a book. "

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia : " What blasphemy to

assert that John the Apostle took refuge in a cave at the hour of the crucifixion, when the Gospel expressly declares that John 'went in with Him into the hall of Caiaphas' (John xviii. 15), and that 'he was standing by the cross of Christ with His holy Mother' (John xix. 25).

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Every heresy seems connected with that book."

TARASIVS: "Alas, alas! by what heretical books do they confirm their heresy."

GREGORY Bishop of Neocæsarea: "This book is worthy of all pollution and disgrace; and yet from this we have their testimony against images in this history of Lycomedes."

JOHN Legate of the East: "He introduces Lycomedes crowning the image of the Apostle just as the Heathens crown their idols."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "God forbid that St. John the Divine should say anything contrary to the Gospel."

TARASIVS: "Are the sentiments which have been read to you those of the Gospel?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "God forbid! We receive neither that which precedes, nor that which follows, about Lycomedes."

TARASIVS: "He who receives that which comes last must admit that which goes before, just as did that false Conventicle."*

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Anathema be to it from the beginning to the end."

JOHN Legate of the East: "Behold, most blessed fathers, it has been clearly proved that the patrons of this Christianity-detracting heresy are partakers with Nebuchadnezzar and the Samaritans, with Jews and Pagans; and, not only so, but furthermore with the atheistic and accursed Manichæans, a testimony from whom they have here brought forward; for these things are spoken by those who maintain the incar-

* Then he who admits that Angels may be painted must admit that they are corporeal, as did the Seventh Council! He who admits with Eusebius the history of the woman of Paneas must admit also his Arian views—his Theopaschite speculations! St. Paul quotes Epimenides, Aratus, and Menander: is he, therefore, chargeable with all the errors of these men, or even of the works whence his quotations were taken? According to Tarasius he was.

nate dispensation of God the Word to be mere appearance; but anathema be to them and to their writings.”*

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “Let them be anathema.”

PETRONAS the Patrician said to Tarasius: “My lord, if it is your pleasure, let us ask the Bishops of Ammorium and Neocæsarea, were the books themselves read at that false Conventicle?”

GREGORY Bishop of Neocæsarea and THEODOSIUS Bishop of Ammorium answered: “No, by the Lord, no book was brought forward there, but by false extracts they deceived us.”

TARASIUS: “Following their own private views, they brought forward whatever suited their purpose.”

PETRONAS: “And, moreover, they did everything with the imperial suffrage.”

GREGORY Bishop of Neocæsarea: “I have often said it, and I repeat it again, that no book or writing of the fathers appeared in our Assembly: nought but false extracts were brought forward; and so this same story about Lycomedes defiled our ears.”

JOHN Legate of the East: “If it seem good to this Holy and Ecumenic Council, let there be an injunction restraining all henceforth from making any copy of this cursed book.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “Let it be no more transcribed. Nor is this all—we furthermore decree that the present copy shall be committed to the flames.”

PETER the Reader cites St. Amphilochius “on the False Inscriptions of the Heretics,” which begins:—

“We account it right to expose in its true colours all their impiety and to publish abroad their deceit, especially as they put forward certain books having the superscriptions of the Apostles, by which they deceive the more simple.” And, shortly after, he continues—“But we will prove that these books, which the Apostates

* In the same manner it might be proved that the fathers of this Council were partakers with Nebuchadnezzar who set up a golden image; with the Israelites who worshipped the golden calf; with the Jews who worshipped the brazen serpent and the Queen of Heaven; with the Gnostics who first had images in the Church, and with the Heathen Emperor Alexander Severus who had images of Jesus Christ, Socrates, Orpheus, and Abraham.

from our Church bring forward, are not the work of the Apostles, but the writings of Devils." And, after other matters, he continues—"These things the Apostle John would not have said, having written in the Gospel that the Lord said from the cross, 'Behold thy Son' (John xix. 26, 27): so that from that hour the holy John took Mary to his own house. How, then, could he say that he was not present? But this is not to be wondered at; 'for, as the Lord is truth, so is the devil a liar; for he is a liar and the father of it, and when he speaketh of a lie he speaketh of his own' (John viii. 24). Thus far concerning their falsities."

TARASIVS: "Our Father Amphilochius is great, and we shall attend to his words concerning this pretended "Itinerary," and, therefore, need not be swayed by its title.

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "Nothing can be more opposed to the Gospel than is this impious compilation. Very fitting was it that such a book should hold opinions contrary to holy images."

"TARASIVS: "The father clearly exposes over the disgraceful and vain prating of this volume."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "He does, indeed, my lord."

NICEPHORUS Bishop of Dyrrachium: "My lord, this ought to have been read for the full satisfaction of all; but not the other, for it contaminates our ears."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Yet, by way of warning, it was not amiss that even this should be read."

TARASIVS: "They who were so garrulous against holy images have brought Eusebius forward in their favour in a letter which he wrote to Constantia the wife of Licinius. Now, let us see what were the sentiments of this Eusebius."*

* "When (says Comber) they are pressed with a clear evidence out of Eusebius against making or keeping the image of Christ's humanity, they have nothing to reply but that Eusebius was an Arian, which charge is made out to be very false; and, if it were true, it doth not lessen his credit in a point that hath no affinity with Arianism. He might give as good an account of the faith and practice of the Church about image-worship as the most orthodox can do. But, indeed, Pope Adrian was so far from thinking him an Arian that he quotes him against Arian opinions ('Epist. ad Car. Mag.,' p. 916, D). This Council also cites an history out of him for an apostolic tradition. Germanus took him for good evidence when he cites him for images, and so doth Pope Gregory. Now, though both of them cite him impertinently as to their point, yet it argues great partiality to allow a witness when we think him on our side, and take exceptions when we find him against

STEPHEN the Monk reads "the Letter of Eusebius Pamphilus to Euphratation," which begins:—

"I confess all things to my Lord." And, after other remarks, he continues—"We say that the Son was not co-existent with the Father, and that the Father existed before the Son; for, if they were both co-existent, how can the Father be the Father, or the Son the Son? How can the one be the First, the other the Second; the one Begotten, the other Unbegotten? For if the Two Persons were to be considered equally, in like manner, co-existent and equal in honour, then, as I said before, both must be Unbegotten or both Begotten; but neither of these is true, that both were Unbegotten or that both were Begotten: it follows that the First be accounted superior in dignity and in rank to the Second, as having been the cause of existence to the Second, and of His existence in such a manner."

TARASIVS put the question: "Can we admit this?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "By no means, my lord: this man is more hateful than themselves."

BASIL Bishop of Ancyra: "Far be it from any Christian man to speak thus."

STEPHEN read from the same "Epistle:—

"He teaches that the same is the only true God in that he saith, 'That they might know thee, the only true God' (John xvii. 2): not as if there were only *one* God, but only *one true* God—only one with that most emphatic addition of the epithet *true*; for the Son Himself is God, but not *the true* God. There is one only *true* God, for that none existed before Him; and, moreover, as the Son Himself is *true* and as He is the image of God, He must also be God; as it is said, 'The Word was God,' and yet not such as the only true God."*

us; and it would puzzle any man to give a good reason why Eusebius should be a good authority for images and of no credit when he speaks against them."—*Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. p. 294.

* Du Pin observes "that, though Eusebius' doctrines could be justified concerning the Son, yet it will be much harder to defend what he says of the Holy Spirit; for he asserts, not only in his books of 'Evangelical Demonstration and Preparation,' but also in his books of 'Scholastic Theology' that He is not truly God. 'The Holy Spirit (saith he) is neither God nor the Son of God, because He does not derive His original from the Father as the Son does, being of the number of the things which were made by the Son.' What we have said concerning the opinion of Eusebius on the Trinity does plainly demonstrate that, on the one side, Socrates, Sozomen, and some late authors are to blame who do boldly excuse him; and, on the other hand, that it is a

CHRISTOPHER Bishop of Saint Cyriaca: "Most holy lord and all this holy and sacred Assembly, as on our side are the divinely-written books of the Apostles, Prophets, and other Saints, so it was but consistent that their false Conventicle should have works of this kind for their testimony and support."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "Anathema to such books and to all who make use of them."

PETER and PETER Legates of Adrian, Pope of Old Rome, said: "That which has been read proves that his inclination was Arian; but this book of Eusebius has also other blasphemies which this Council could never endure to hear."

TARASIVS: "We reject the writings of this man."

THE HOLY COUNCIL: "We reject and anathematize them."

STEPHEN the Monk read "The First Book of the Confutation of Eusebius's Defence of Origen, by Antipater Bishop of Bostra," which begins:—

"I, indeed, thought that I had written sufficiently, and that which fully came up to the injunctions of your Holiness, O most beloved in God, most holy father John." And shortly after he continues: "As he was a man well versed in history, and had searched and enquired into all the books and writings of the ancients, and had set forth the opinions of almost all of them, and had left behind him many books written in his lifetime, of which some are worthy of the reception of all, they endeavour to entrap certain by making use of the opinion of this man, in this manner: *Surely Eusebius would never have been of this mind unless he had known that all the ancients admitted the same.* Now, I agree with them and confess thus much, that he was a man well versed in history, and that no work of those older authors escaped his notice; for, using the imperial authority, he could easily make collections of this kind from every quarter. Still, I affirm that he never attained to any accuracy of doctrine, whence, though we must concede to him the praise of great learning, still we cannot allow that he possessed the knowledge of doctrine: on the contrary, we well know how deficient he was in accuracy on this head." And shortly afterwards he continues: "So that without intending any

great piece of injustice to call him Arian, and the very head of the Arians as St. Jerome hath done, whom many others have followed, since he rejected the principal errors of Arius, which are, that the Word was made of nothing; that He is not of the substance of the Father; that He is unlike the Father, and that there was a time when He was not."—*Du Pin Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 7.

direct attack on a man about whom it is not our concern at present to speak, we shall, in examining carefully the apology which is presented to us, prove both to be heretics—namely, he who makes the apology and he also for whom the apology is made.” Again, after other remarks, he continues : “ Show us one plain and unambiguous passage of any of the illustrious Doctors of the Church which expressly defines that the souls of men had any previous existence, and do not attempt to foist in certain sophistries of your own for the proof of this. But that you should have laboured hard to prove the subjection of the Son to the Father no less than did Origen himself, first, we say that we are not surprised at it, for this opinion belongs to thee, and to such as thou art ; and then that in our present discourse we need not touch upon this point, as it has already been canvassed and condemned by an Œcumenic Council. Neither need we yield obedience thereto, nor make enquiry into it, for their sake for whom these things have been proposed to us. But to lay any charge to the simple expression, *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, was never heard to have been done by any even to the present time, O thou indefatigable Advocate of the perversities of Origen.”

TARASIVS : “ The writings of Eusebius, by the voice of this father, are proved to be alien from the Catholic Church.”

DEMETRIUS Deacon and Keeper of the Sacred Vessels read from the “ Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus Lector :”

“ There was a certain Persian named Xenaias, whom, when Callendion, in the time of his sacerdotal sway, discovered to be adulterating the doctrines of the Church, and perverting the country people, he expelled from his diocese. Concerning whom, having carefully enquired into the many things which I had heard from a variety of persons, I will relate somewhat. Having run away from his own master in the land of Persia”—and, shortly after, he adds : “ This man, Peter appoints Bishop of Hierapolis instead of Cyrus. No long time after, the Bishops from Persia charged him with having been a domestic slave, and as never having partaken of the divine baptism ; which when Peter knew, not caring to do what was proper, he made reply, that the ordination of the Bishop would in his case supply the place of the divine sacrament.”

STEPHEN Deacon and Notary reads from the “ Ecclesiastical History of John the Separated” * (*Διακρινομένη*) :—

* This historian is said to have been a Nestorian Priest at Antioch : he com-

“Xenaias said that it was not lawful to make bodies for Angels, since they are without body—that is, we ought not to make corporeal representations of them in the form of men. Nor ought we to think this, that any image made by the art of the painter could bring either glory or honour to Christ; for that he was assured that nought but the worship which is in spirit and in truth was acceptable to Him.” And, after other things, it is added: “He said also that he felt assured of this—that it was childish to represent, under the image of a dove, the all-holy and adorable Spirit; for, indeed, the holy Gospels have never taught that the Holy Spirit became a dove, but that He was once seen in the form of a dove: because He, therefore, once appeared in this way, according to the divine plan, and not in His essence, this can never make it right for the pious to represent Him in a bodily form. Philoxenus having taught such things as these acted quite in accordance with His teaching; for oftentimes, having taken down the images of Angels, he would obliterate them from the canvass, while, if he discovered any pictures of Christ, he would conceal them in secret places.”

TARASIVS: “Hear, ye sacred men, what kind of persons they are who have refused to admit holy images—unbaptized persons!—Manichæans!—they who teach that the dispensation of Christ was mere appearance! And it was from such polluted sources as these that the patrons of the Christianity-detracting heresy took its origin.”*

posed an ecclesiastical history, beginning with the reign of Theodosius the Younger, and ending with that of Zeno. He was called *Διακρινόμενος*—Segregatus: being a name which the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus took to themselves. That he should take this name, and praise the second Ephesine Council (all which is said of him by Du Pin and Cave) is, very inconsistent with his being a Nestorian, and go far to prove that he was on the contrary, a Eutychian.

* This mode of censuring the Iconoclasts, by identifying them with all the sects who did actually, apparently, or, as they choose to say, oppose images and their worship, is censured as involving a breach of the fourth commandment in the “Caroline Books” (lib. iv. cap. 7). The title of the chapter is as follows:—“The more they bring forward the examples of heretics, who despise or disregard images, the more they dishonour their own parents with insults and reproaches, who undoubtedly in this particular did imitate them.” As all that is important in this chapter is included in a much longer chapter of the same nature (lib. ii. cap. 81), it will not be necessary to take any further notice of it. From the title of the last chapter of the second book we learn that four particulars will be discussed. 1. That it is contrary to our Lord’s command to anathematize our parents. 2. That the disgrace of their parents’ heresy reflects upon themselves, as being born of them, &c. 3. That we ought not to judge the dead. 4. To enquire in what particulars their own error was diverse from that of their parents. The chapter contains a lengthened discussion on each of these heads. On the second of these, which is the chap-

SABBAS Abbot of the Monastery of Studium : " Let us give thanks to God, and the kind consideration of our good Sove-

ter they discuss first, it is remarked :—" That while on the one hand they, from love of these same images, presume to compare them to the body and blood of Christ, and on the other, from similar zeal, they hesitate not to anathematize their parents who despised them, they unite error to error : for while towards the one they pay a most improper and unbecoming worship, against those from whom they receive their being, or those from whom they receive their consecration, baptism, and other gifts, they bring a most ill-timed excommunication. For if, according to their madness, all who do not worship images are heretics, it follows that their own ancestors are heretics (for they did not adore them) ; and if they were heretics, they had neither power to consecrate or to ordain ; and if they had not this power, they who imagine that they received consecration or imposition of hands from them, have actually neither the one or the other. Again, if their predecessors were under anathema, they would neither bind nor loose : all that they did in the Church was null and void, and, therefore, the dignities they conferred and their ordinations are, in like manner, null and void. For our Lord did not give power to bind and loose to schismatics and anathematized persons, but to Catholics and suitable persons." This point was argued at great length in the first Session of this Council, and proved by extracts of fathers, decrees of councils, &c., to be quite otherwise, and that all who came over from heresy to the Catholic Church were to be admitted, and their ordinations allowed, though it might be received from an heretical source.

2. On the honour due to parents which the Council, by their anathemas, &c., seem utterly to have set at nought, it is remarked, that since to give honour to parents is taught in the law, by Prophets, by Apostles, and in the Gospel, how great is their arrogance, their temerity, not to say their wickedness, who venture to anathematize their parents, and more especially since he who ventures to do this himself lies under a curse. The law says, " Thou shalt not unveil thy father's shame ;" and the Apostle, " Children obey your parents ;" but they, in opposition to both these precepts, neither hide their shame or give them honour due.

3. In the third place, it is suggested that instead of anathematizing them they should pray for them. " Moreover, it is a most wholesome custom, delivered to the Church by our holy fathers, to pray to the Lord in behalf of the souls of the dead, which we, with the whole Catholic Church receiving, do entreat the most clement goodness of our Lord, in behalf not only of our parents, but of all our blessed friends who have departed hence in the fear of the Lord : which venerable constitution of the Church they seem in no light manner to contravene, who, so far from aiding the souls of their deceased parents by their prayers, endeavour to bring them under the bond of an anathema ; and whereas by Apostolic injunction they are bound to pray for their enemies, they refuse to do this even for their parents. *We*, according to ecclesiastical usage, by alms, by prayers, entreat pardon for our parents : *they*, by convention of foolish Councils, demand the punishment of theirs : *we*, by the solemnities of Masses, entreat rest for our parents : *they*, by their ill-timed synods, heap reproaches on theirs : *we* make mention of ours in prayer : *they* renounce and anathematize theirs : *we* desire that the souls of ours may rest in the bosom of Abraham : *they* would have theirs to be damned with Arius, Sabellius, Dioscorus, Nestorius, and Eutyches : *we* would have our parents to be placed among the number of the blessed : *they* would have theirs to be numbered among the troops of obstinate heretics—from all which we may learn that they have committed two evils ; first, they have not, according to our Lord's injunction, honoured their parents ; and then, contrary to the mind of the Apostles, they have ventured to judge rashly concerning the dead." (In confirmation of which latter view a quotation is made from Romans xiv. 7-13. The verse alluded is probably the 10th : " Why doth thou judge thy brother, or why dost

reigns, that we have obtained the victory over the lying promoters of this lying Conventicle, together with the heretics who favour them."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Anathema to them."

CONSTANTINE Reader of the most holy great Church read from the "Life of our Holy Father Sabbas :"—

"After that the Patriarchs, Flavian and Elias, who were at Sidon, had, by means of letters to the King—at the same time complimentary to him and serviceable to themselves—procured the annulling of the Sidonian Conventicle which had been convened against the orthodox faith, and had returned to their sees—the party of Soterichus and Philoxenus, being highly indignant, stirred up the King to unbridled fury, insinuating that he had been deceived by the craft and duplicity of these Patriarchs. Having taken, therefore, what forces they desired, and sufficient money wherewith to bribe the Antiochian populace, after that in various ways they had afflicted Flavian and well nigh strangled him, in order to force him to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon, they concluded by deposing him from his Bishopric and sending him into exile. When the King knew of this, being much pleased, he appointed Severus, head of the Acephali, to the Bishopric of Antioch."

then set at nought thy brother, for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God.")

4. The difference between their fathers' error and their own is illustrated in a variety of particulars. The one would have images torn down and cast out of the church for ever : the other must not only have them, but must venerate them with suppliant adoration : the one gave them over to crackling fires : the other honour them with odoriferous incense : the one refuse to look on them : the other cease not to embrace them : the one would erase from the walls the pictures put up there, for the sake of ornament, by their elders : the others must light tapers in honour of them now lately restored : the one would have them altogether abominated : the other have entirely sanctioned the kissing of them. The one would anathematize all who had them : the other would anathematize all who had them not : both which evils, as they are remote from the right path, we must avoid by walking in the royal way, according to the Prophet, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, neither deciding with the one that they should be altogether abolished, nor decreeing with the other that they should be worshipped ; but while we worship God alone, and venerate His Saints according to the ancient custom of the Church, we feel ourselves at liberty to have their pictures in our churches, both for the sake of ornament and in remembrance of things past : with justice contemning the cruel severity of the one (*the Council in anathematizing their parents*), and the flattering words of the other (*the Iconoclasts who ascribed deliverance from idolatry to the Emperor*) : with Prudence turning away from the sophistry of the one, and the dull perception of the other : with Temperance despising the licentious desires of the one, and the insensibility of the other ; and with Fortitude avoiding the timidity of the one, and the audacity of the other : with the fathers who allowed them in churches, but only for the sake of ornament, turning away

ANTONY a Monk read from the "Petition of the Clergy and the Monks of Antioch, the Great City of the Holy Church of God, which was presented to the Holy Council which was assembled in this Royal City, against Severus the Heretic and Head of the Acephali," which begins:—

"Now if ever it is time, O ye most holy." And, shortly after, it continues:—"With the fame of his atrocious deeds at the fountains of Daphne, how then he made use of magic arts and with accursed incantations worshipped demons, all that city resounds. Nor hath he spared either the sacred altars or the holy vessels: the former he scraped as if they were profane things: the latter he melted down and appropriated to himself and his comrades; and, further, O ye most blessed men, he has dared even this—to take for his own the gold and silver doves which were suspended over the divine founts and altars, saying that doves ought not to be called the Holy Ghost."

TARASIVS: "If the fathers allowed these doves to be suspended in the name of the Holy Ghost, how much more would they have allowed images of the Word who was incarnate and was seen by us? But could ye believe it—Anastasius, who presided at Constantinople, appropriated to his own use gold and silver images, as did Severus before him."

equally from those who abominate and those who adore, we hold on in the way of the Lord's commands, as hoping by His gracious assistance to come even to Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

Adrian replies:—"They who wrote this, from their private judgment, would do well to attend to the magniloquent Prophet Ezekiel, saying, 'Behold, all souls are mine.....the soul that sinneth, it shall die.....when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, he shall save his soul alive.'" Unless the Prophet meant, when a man turns from contempt of images to worship them, this quotation can have no meaning.

Two quotations follow: one from St. Gregory's dialogues, the other from St. Augustin, on the eighty-fourth Psalm; but neither of them at all pertinent to the matter in hand.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 118, col. 2; 119, col. 1.

In reply to the censure contained in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 7), Adrian remarks as follows:—"Behold how in this capitular they continually harp on one string, that they (the favourers of images) have despised their parents and have insultingly scoffed at them. Wherefore, in accordance with what we have said before we add somewhat more here—that neither can good parents benefit evil children, nor good children benefit evil parents, but each one must answer to God for himself. Wherefore, they are all the more praiseworthy who do not follow their parents in grievous error, but return to the orthodox faith of the Catholic Church." A passage from St. Augustin confirming this view is next quoted. But how will this justify the sons in anathematizing and hereticising their fathers for so trivial a thing as the breaking and otherwise destroying of senseless images!—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 119, col. 2.

STEPHEN the Deacon read from the "Life and Conversation of Severus the Heresiarch," written by John Bishop of Gabala, which begins—

"If Severus was desirous even of the same life." And, shortly after, he adds—"Neither did he leave the honour of Angels uninjured; for constantly when he stood on the *bema* he would hold long arguments about them; and often even in the very chapel of the most holy Michael he would endeavour to persuade the people that not purple but white garments became Angels; not but that he knew well enough that the sacred powers have no care about garments, but he wished to create schisms on this point also, and to make the many who entertained various opinions on this subject to dispute and contend with each other."

TARASIVS: "Let us consider, in addition to other charges, this also was brought against him, that he affirmed that not purple but white garments became Angels."

DEMETRIUS Deacon and Keeper of the Records said: "On searching into the library of the great church of Constantinople, of which I have been appointed Keeper of the Rolls, I found two books which had been adorned with silver images deficient, and, on enquiry, I discovered that the Heretics had thrown them into the fire and burnt them. I found also another book, written by Constantine Keeper of the Records, which treated on holy images; and the deceivers had actually cut out all the leaves on which anything was written relative to images! This book I have now in my hands, and I exhibit it before your holy Council."* On which Demetrius

* The Iconoclasts are censured for this in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. c. 8) as being deficient in moderation. "For (it is observed) if all books in which the mention of images occurs are therefore to be burned, then many portions of the Scriptures themselves would perish. Now, each thing should first be proved and then decided upon; which course of acting, as it is approved in all laws, human and divine, so is it confirmed by the practice of rhetoricians, who first have the deliberation, next the demonstration, and lastly the judgment. The first enquires whether a thing is or is not to be done; the second demonstrates whether it be praiseworthy or otherwise; and the third, in accordance with the testimony of the others, determines reward or punishment; for, if the two former do not precede the latter, our judgment is very likely to be the reverse of that which is right. In all things we should observe moderation, and to keep in mind the philosophic adage—'Necquid nimis;' which moderation is ever to be united to proof; for the Apostle saith not—Burn all

opened the book and showed to all where the leaves had been cut out.

LEONTIUS the Secretary: "But there is another thing about this book worthy of remark. Observe how its covers are of silver; and each of them is everywhere adorned with images of the Saints; and so, while they have suffered the things themselves to remain—that is, the *images*—they cut out *that which was written about them* [a laugh]—the very acmé of absurdity!"*

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Anathema to those who cut out and to those who falsify."

LEO Bishop of Phocia: "This book has lost some of its leaves; but, in the city where I live, more than thirty volumes have been burnt in the fire."

SABBAS Abbot of Studium: "My lords, it is the manner of blind men not to look to the light, and, therefore, these being blind in soul have continued in darkness."

DEMETRIUS Deacon and Keeper of the Records read, "The Discourse of Constantine Deacon and Keeper of the Records of the most holy great church of God in Constantinople on all the holy Martyrs," which begins—

"The festivals of Christ." And, after other matter, it continues—
"And can ye think (said the Judges) that we put our trust in brass and in stones, and that we do not look to some providing, some protecting, powers, by whose aid all things may be ordered for the best to us? Why, then (replied the Martyrs), do your artizans and statuaries make such crowds of images, fashioning them in various forms, and fixing them up in your temples? And why do ye honour these

things without moderation and without proof, but, 'Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.'

To this, Adrian replies, that this is the proper work of Heretics; and he quotes in proof a passage from a letter of Cyril to Successus, in which he charges some one with altering an epistle to favour the heresy of Nestorius with some passages from the sixth Council, in which Macarius was accused of falsifying portions of the fifth ("Adrian's Answer," p. 124, col. 1). If, however, mutilating, corrupting, destroying, and burning books be a mark of heresy, never was Church more heretical than that of Rome! For never did any body of Christians destroy, corrupt, and mutilate more books than she has done—witness her "Indices Expurgatorii et Prohibitorii."—See *James's Corruption of the Fathers; Mendham's Literary Policy of Rome.*

* This remark of Leontius gives occasion to another chapter, in which, having animadverted on his absurdity, they contrast, in numerous particulars,

things with sacrifices, expecting from them deliverance out of your difficulties? What is your own custom (rejoined the tyrants)? Do not ye depict that which ye style the Divinity? Wherefore do ye reproach us, when yourselves are still more superstitious in the same practices? The Martyrs replied—Since, O ye Judges! ye make your attack on our painting of images with such groundless censures, allow us to set you free from all error and doubt on this point. We do not assimilate the Divinity, which is simple and incomprehensible, to any form or shape; nor have learned to honour in wood or wax the Essence which is supersubstantial and without beginning. As the first man was overcome by the transgression, and as the apostatical power which had overthrown him became bold, his nature needed one who should renew it. Now, it was not likely that the Nature, which had before been vanquished, should be able to renew the contest and recover the defeat, now that the enemy had been made superior by the fall; nor was it at all more likely that the tyrant would be deprived of the fruits of his victory, except by a second contest. He, therefore, the

the errors of the Iconoclasts and their opponents. It is enquired—“Are, then, all books which happen to have images on their covers or to treat of them in their pages to be mutilated by the one party or to be worshipped by the other? Must all vestments, cloaks, &c., in ordinary or in sacred use, because there may happen to be images painted upon them, be burnt or destroyed by these or be worshipped by those? Must all metal or wooden vessels made for various uses, because the images have been wrought upon them, be burnt or broken in pieces by the one or be adored by the other? Unhappy minds!—ever on the ferment, either in renouncing things which may be had without offence or in worshipping things which cannot without offence be worshipped—ever excited in execrating on the one hand or on the other in adoring images. Unhappy the custom which, having set at nought the right path of mediocrity, and destitute of any fixed rule, ever verges to the one extreme or the other, now inordinately renouncing that which need not be renounced at all, now unhappily adoring that which ought not to be worshipped at all—now beyond all bounds degrading that which ought not to be contemned, now beyond all bounds extolling that which should not be so highly extolled—now omitting that which is necessary, now insisting on that which is not necessary—assembling synods now for the abolition, now for the adoration, of images, neither of which are necessary, as if the Christian religion could receive any damage in either the mere having or in the not worshipping of images; for, if they are not had, they in no respect do any injury to Christianity; and, if they be had, they hinder no good: whereas, to cast them off seems to bring the charge of incautious levity; while, to worship them, brands her with positive faultiness.”—*Car. Lib.*, lib. 4, c. 9.

Adrian's reply contains some additional matter about the unfaithfulness of Macarius in falsifying the fifth Council, but nothing in the least applicatory to the above observations.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 124, col. 2.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that this conference had no existence in reality; for, during the first three centuries—the centuries to which Pagan persecutions were confined—the only image ever mentioned was that of the Saviour and the woman at Paneas. The Pagan reproach, then, was not why have ye so many images; but why have ye no images at all!—and it is curious that the Pagans are here quoted to make the same excuse which Christians do when the worship of her images is condemned.—*See Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive*, pt. i., ch. ii., sec. 12.

Framer of His own work, one of the sacred Trinity, even God the Word, as before in the formation of this nature, He had employed no subordinate agent—so now, when He was about to renew the perishing image, He would not intrust that renewal to any other than Himself. Making use, therefore, of His own creative power, He entered on the contest for us in the nature of man; and this was necessary that He might enter on the conflict on equal terms with the adversary. For every one who enters in any contest endeavours to obtain the victory in one of these three ways—by deceit, by law, or by arbitrary authority. Two of these our Champion dismissed at once as unsuitable and improper for Himself and devoid of benefit or advantage in behalf of those for whom the contest was undertaken. Deceit has but a vain pretence to victory—the adversary having never fairly been overcome. Arbitrary authority prevails by irrational violence and does not engage the enemy on equal terms. Disapproving of these, He comes to the contest according to law. Wherefore, having taken flesh of our fallen mass, endued with a soul and that also intelligent, still remaining where He was and never having left His dignity, He became in all things (sin only excepted) just as man now is, and did not take on Him a body in appearance only.” And, shortly after, he continues thus—“This Person, therefore, in the form in which He appeared and was conversant amongst us, we represent in pictures, making the sacred image as a memorial of the salvation which is by Him; but we do not, after your custom, imagine and carve out various forms and shapes after our own fancy.”

TARASIVS: “The Pagans condemned the Martyrs on account of their own idols, and said to them—Wherefore do ye contend with us, or find fault with our images, when ye yourselves have similar images? The Saints answered—We make no idolatrous forms of devils, but we make images of God the Word who became man, and of His Saints: neither do we make Gods of these.”*

COSMAS the Deacon and Chamberlain said: “The book which I have here from the Patriarchal Library is the Old Testament with accompanying scholia, and it had a scholium in defence of images; but they who lay wait against truth have erased it. Behold it, for it still appears though faintly

* The Pagan Judges said just as much for their idols—“We do not put our trust in brass and stones, but in some protecting power.”

—behold it, venerable fathers !” Cosmas then opened the book and handed it round to all who were present, pointing out the place of the erasure, after which he read as follows, for it was still apparent :—

“ Thou shalt have no other gods but me. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water that is under the earth : thou shalt not worship them, neither shalt thou serve them.

*Scholium.**—“ If we make images of men who served God, it is not that we should worship them as gods, but that looking upon them we may learn to imitate them ; and if we make an image of Christ, it is not that we should worship the image, but that our minds by looking thereon may ascend on high. We do not worship the corruptible image of corruptible men ; but, because God has condescended to become man inconvertibly (*ἀτρέπτως*), we make His image as man : and, although we know Him to be God by nature, we do not call the image itself God,† but we acknowledge Him to be God who is represented in the picture, whose likeness the picture hath : but the Gentiles, having erred, glorify their images as gods, to which also they sacrifice.”

On this another book was brought containing the interpretation of Scripture, in which the scholium was found entire, which Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea beloved in God, having received, read that which was written and that which had been erased from the former copy.

TARASIVS said : “ This is the work of those who were called ‘ Patriarchs’—the heretics Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas.”

THEODORE Bishop of Myra : “ Oh, had this treasure been open to us at that time, not one of us would have been injured ; but God requites those who concealed the truth in that day.”

* This worthless scholium was, indeed, well worthy of erasure, being a specimen of the instruction that causeth to err. The Pharisees had their scholium on the fifth Commandment, and our Saviour tells them, ‘ Ye have made the law of none effect by your traditions,’ or scholia. The Commandment declares—“ Thou shalt not worship :” the scholium interprets, “ Thou shalt not worship them as gods.”

† Though they may not choose to call an image “ God,” they have no hesitation in calling it “ Christ ;” and John the Eastern Legate declared that they who called an image “ Christ ” did not sin !

THEODORE Bishop of Catana: "These men deserve the anathema who have falsified the truth and belied the fathers; while they, whom they presumed to anathematize, are deserving of high honour."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Woe to their souls for having concealed the truth!"

PETER Bishop of Geremia: "Let their names be wiped out of the book of the living, and not be written amongst the righteous" (Psalm lxxix. 28).

CONSTANTINE Bishop of Constantia: "Blessed be God, who, notwithstanding all this burning, mutilation, and erasure, hath preserved these things to us.

THEODORE Bishop of Myra: "They who acted thus, my lord, put their candle under a bushel; but, blessed be God, who hath shed the light of salvation on those who were in darkness."

COSMAS the Deacon and Chamberlain: "We have found also this book in the archives of the sacred oratory of the Patriarchate: it contained the conflicts of various Martyrs, and besides, some account of the image of the Camulenses,* not made with hands; but all that related to the image they have cut out, and here it is for you to look for yourselves."

MICHAEL Bishop of Synada: "Pastillas, my most holy lord, was pleased to say anathema to those who pervert and belie the holy Scriptures."†

TARASIVS: "Their mischief shall fall upon their own heads" (Psalm vii. 16).

JOHN Legate of the East: "To say the truth, the malevolence of these book-burning Iconoclasts has made the truth more resplendent."

TARASIVS: "They have not only made away with holy pictures, but also the Gospel‡ and other holy things; but

* The only image made without hands mentioned in the Scripture is the image of the great goddess Diana, which, as the town clerk of Ephesus observed, fell down from Jupiter. All the emblematical images amongst the Jews were made with hands; the Christians of the New Testament had none. So we see no type of this image of the Camulenses mentioned in Scripture but the image of Diana of the Ephesians!

† Sisinnius Bishop of Perga, the Metropolis of Pamphylia, and one of the presidents of the Council against images, was called also Pastillas.

‡ Here Tarasivus was most probably breaking the ninth Commandment: the

thus it is: truth hath ever shone the more brightly after persecution."

STEPHEN a Monk said: "We have here another book mutilated by these Christianity-detractors; and, if ye please, I will show it to you all."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "Let it be shown." On which the book was exhibited to the Council, having two pages blotted out.

GREGORY Presbyter and Abbot of the Monastery of Hyacinthus: "My lords, I have another copy of the same work; and, if it be your pleasure, let it be read."

STEPHEN a Monk having taken the fourth book read from the "Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius."*

"For when Chosroes attempted to take this city, after innumerable assaults—after having made an enormous embankment so as to out-top the walls of the city, and having tried many other warlike engines against it—he was forced to make his retreat without having accomplished his purpose. How this came to pass I will now declare. Chosroes commanded his men to collect a vast pile of wood, whatever might come first to hand, for the seige: this order being executed

Gospels have nothing whatever about images in them. Why should the Iconoclasts destroy them?

* Procopius, a writer of the same age with Evagrius, relates this retreat of Chosroes very differently, and says—"That Chosroes did not besiege Edessa at all, being terrified by some divine signs; but he raised sums of money from several of the cities which he passed by, and from Edessa amongst the rest (Procop. "Persic. in Phot. Cod." 63, quoted by Owen on Image-worship, p.132.) Fleury ("Eccles. Hist." vol. vii., p. 417) follows Procopius and deserts Evagrius. Where did Evagrius get his information? From Procopius he learned that Chosroes had determined to take Edessa, because there had been a report spread abroad concerning it, that no man had been able to take it; but Procopius had not this fable of the image. What sources of information had Evagrius that he should leave his author and give so different an account from him of this event? Possibly the inhabitants of Edessa, wishing to raise the importance of their pretended treasure, ascribed to this image what really was the effect of their extorted tribute. But, alas for the image and the city, and the report that Edessa could never be taken! It was besieged by Saracens, and the image proved a worthless idol. For awhile (says Gibbon) Edessa braved the Persian assaults; but the chosen city—the spouse of Christ—was involved in the common ruin, and His divine resemblance became the slave and trophy of infidels (Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," cap. xlix). Thus were the words of the Prophet fulfilled (Isa. xlvii., 2). "They could not deliver the burthen, but themselves are gone into captivity." Gibbon adds in a note that *Pagi* does not determine whether the image of Edessa reposes at Rome or Genoa; but its repose is inglorious, and the ancient object of worship is no longer famous or fashionable.—*In Baronii Annales Critice*, ad an. 944, § 6.

almost as soon as given, he had some of it arranged over against the walls in a circle, the middle of which was filled up with earth : on this he placed another and another circle of wood, filling the interior as before with earth ; and thus he raised it, close to the city, to such an height as to over-top the walls, so that from above they could pierce with their darts those who were on the walls hazarding their lives in defence of the city. When the besieged saw that this enormous embankment, like to a walking mountain, was making such close approach to their walls, and that the enemy seemed likely to enter the city on foot, as early as possible they contrived to dig a counter-mine—that which the Romans call ‘Agesta’—underneath this mount, in which they kindled a fire, in order that the wood being consumed in the flames, the whole structure might be levelled with the ground. They succeeded in completing their preparations ; but, when they would have set fire to the pile, they failed in their purpose, because that the fire had no vent, by which, on admitting the air, it might lay hold on the super-incumbent mass. Being now in the greatest perplexity, they bring the image made by God,* and not by the hands of man, which Christ our God sent to Abgarus,† when he desired to see him. This immaculate image they now brought into the mine which they had made : having poured water upon it, they

* The story runs thus : Abgarus being sick sends to Christ to come to him or to send His image : the painter, who attempted to make a picture of Christ being so dazzled with the brightness of His countenance that he was unable to do it, Christ Himself applied the canvas to His face, which received the impression of it, and this was sent to Abgarus.—See *Seymour's Pilgrimage to Rome*, p. 400, edit. 1849.

† In the “Caroline Books” this history of the image sent to Abgarus is rejected as fabulous (*Lib. Car.*, lib. iv., c.10). After some prefatory remarks on the various excellencies of the Scripture, it is added—“Here are streams of truth which cannot deceive or be deceived. In the vast rivers which flow thence, and which contain so many of the wonderful works of the Lord, no mention is made of any letter sent from a certain king Abgarus to our Lord, nor of any answer which our Lord returned to him: These two epistles, inasmuch as they are not found in the Scripture, and as, moreover, they are by the blessed Gelasius high-priest of the city of Rome, and other equally orthodox and Catholic writers, considered as apocryphal, are not such, as should be brought forward either for or against any point which is under question, any more than any other apocryphal writings.” It is further observed, that these apocryphal letters would be of little avail in establishing the worship of images, since it is not said in them either that Abgarus sent to our Lord for any image to worship it, or that our Lord sent him any image to worship. To this chapter Adrian vouchsafes a longer reply than usual, as these letters and the image alluded to are one grand prop on which Antenicene image-worship is founded:—“Our predecessor, Stephen, most holy Pope, presiding in Council, among many other veracious testimonies, alleged the following in this manner:—‘Nor must this be passed by, which we have learned from the relations of the faithful, who so frequently come from the East : concerning which, though the Gospel be silent, yet must it not therefore be considered incredible,

took of this water and applied it to the pile of wood ; and, as the divine power accompanied their faith, that which before seemed impossible was now accomplished forthwith ; for immediately the wood was in a blaze, and the burning ashes in a moment communicated the fire to the upper stories, so that the whole was soon enveloped in flame."

LEO Reader of the great Church of Constantinople said : " When I, your unworthy servant, was last at Edessa, with the Royal Secretaries, I saw that this holy image, which was not made with hands, was honoured and worshipped by the people."*

especially as the Evangelist saith, " And many other signs did Jesus which are not written in this book." Now, it is reported by them that the Redeemer of mankind sent this answer to a certain king of Edessa who desired to see Him in the flesh : " As you desire to see my face in the flesh, I transmit to you the exact image thereof on a piece of linen, by which you may refresh the ardour of your desire, and may be led to consider nothing that you have heard concerning me to be impossible. After that I shall have completed all that is written of me, I will send to you one of my disciples who shall heal you and your people, and lead them to the sublimity of the faith," &c. Also, in the Synodical letter of the three Patriarchs—that is, Cosmas of Alexandria, Theodors of Antioch, and Theodore of Jerusalem, which was found in the above-mentioned Council, and there was received with honour by all, Theodore Bishop of Jerusalem, after alleging many other testimonies of the fathers, adds—" I might here speak of Abgarus of Edessa, and other like things of the holy fathers, which ye know yet better than myself" (with some of the usual flatteries about the Rock and Peter, &c., and a conclusion expressing agreement with the Bishop of Rome, but nothing more about the king of Edessa)"—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 112, col. 2.

The first part of this answer seems to be no more than an interpolated version of the pretended letter of our Lord to Abgarus, as found in the history of the so styled heretic Eusebius : and, as the infallible Gelasius condemned these letters as apocryphal, we may be well excused from paying any attention to strangers from the East, or what Adrian recommends because Stephen approves of it. But, as to the Synodical letter in the last part of the answer, there are many reasons for believing that it is spurious :—(1) That the so-called Legates of the East knew nothing about it nor ever mentioned it at the Council. (2) That the Papal Legates were equally ignorant of it and were equally silent. (3) That in the existing state of affairs in the East such a Synodical letter could never have been transmitted. (4) That Adrian in his letter to Constantine and Irene seems then at least not to have known of the Synodical letter ; for he there states, that from the time of Leo, all the people of the East have erred about images, even to the time that God placed you on the throne. But Adrian wrote this letter thirteen years before he sent his answer to Charlemagne : during that time his Holiness might be oblivious, or in writing to the Emperor of the West, he thought that he could more easily impose on him than on the Emperor of the East, who, if such a Synodical assembly had taken place, must have known of it—*Spanheim de Imagg.*, pp. 375-375.

* " The style and sentiments of a Byzantine hymn will declare how little their worship was removed from the grossest idolatry :—' How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image, whose celestial splendour the host of heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in heaven descends this day to visit us by His venerable image. He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by His picture ; which the Father has delineated with His imma-

TARASIVS : “ Yesterday, the very Reverend the Abbot of St. Maximin laid before us the ‘ Limonarium,’ and it was read to your Assembly. Now, we have found in our library a copy of this work, which has had all those leaves cut out which relate to the matter of images.”

CHRISTOPHER Bishop of Saint Cyriaca : “ Most holy lord, I, your unworthy servant, am about to take on me to speak in the presence of this holy, sacred, and Ecumenic Assembly. The word of prophecy declares, that ‘ The wicked is entrapped in the work of his own hands’ (Psalm ix. 16). For what, when leagued together in their false conventicle, they aimed to accomplish against us, this has come upon themselves. Thus, some writings they mutilated and some they falsified, that so their impiety might be made more glaring when the truth appeared.”

STEPHEN Monk and Librarian said : “ The book given to us by the Abbot of Maximinus contains the discourse which was cut out of the other book concerning images. After saying which he read from the same, ‘ Certain of the elders said,’ &c. [Here follows the history of the Devil and the Monk, which was recited in full in the last Session, and which, as being the same word for word, need not here be again repeated.]

STEPHEN read further from the same “ Spiritual Meadow:”—

“ The same fathers related to us the following : saying, ‘ That a certain Christ-loving woman in the region of Apamæa, dug a well ; and, though she had been at great expence and had dug to a great depth, she found no water. The woman was greatly distressed on account of the labour and cost which had been expended. One night, however, she saw in a dream a certain woman coming to her, and saying to her—“ Send and procure the image of the Abbot Theodosius, who lives in Scopelus, and God will give thee water.” And the woman sent two of her servants and procured the picture, which, when she had let down into the well, immediately the water sprang up and half filled it ! And they gave us of the same water, and we drank thereof and praised God !” [He read also] : From the same ‘ Spiritual

culate hand ; which He has formed in an ineffable manner, and which we sanctify by adoring it with fear and love’”—*Gibbon's Decline and Fall*, c. 49.

Meadow: "Dionysius Presbyter of the Church of Ascalon, gave us the following account of John the Anchoret: " This man (said he) was great in this present generation, and as a proof of the favour in which he stands with his Maker take the following miracle. The old man (he continued) had his abode in a cave in the region of Soccho, about twenty miles from Jerusalem. Now, the old man had in his cave an image of our holy immaculate Lady, Mary the Mother of God, and ever a Virgin, having in her arms Christ our God. As often, therefore, as he wished to be absent, whether on a journey into the wilderness or to Jerusalem to worship the holy Cross and the holy places, or to Mount Sinai to pray in that place, or to the shrines of the Martyrs who lived at a greater or lesser distance from Jerusalem—(for the old man was a very great lover of Martyrs, and at one time would visit Saint John at Ephesus, at another Saint Theodore of Euchaita, at another Saint Thecla at Seleucia, at another Saint Sergius at Araphæ) —he made ready his candle and lighted it, as was his usual custom; and then, standing as a suppliant that his journey might be prosperous, he thus addressed our Lady, waiting before her image: ' Holy mistress, Mother of God, since I have a long distance to travel, likely to occupy many days, take charge of thy own taper, and keep it according to my desire unextinguished, for I am going away relying on thy gracious aid as my fellow-traveller: ' and when he had said this he set off on his journey. Whenever, therefore, having completed his proposed expedition, he came back again, after a month's absence, or after two or three months or even five or six months, he always found his taper in order and burning just as when he set out upon his journey; nor did he ever find that his taper was extinguished, either when he awoke up from sleep or when he came back from the wilderness into the cave. '*

* The "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 12), contains the following remarks on this absurd tale:—"It is brought forward, just as the other stories were at that synod, for the confirmation of image-worship; but from this, no more than from the rest, can this same practice obtain any establishment, since we may altogether hesitate as to the confidence we may have in him who reported the fact, or whether it ever took place at all—then of the time when, the place where, or the manner in which it was done. For if it could be proved to have taken place, we ought still to make deepest enquiry as to the manner in which it is stated to have taken place: since at times miracles have been wrought by wicked persons and the powers of the air, though most generally by Saints and the ministry of good Angels. Now, should it be found to be wrought by the art of the old enemy, not only can the worship of images receive no support from it, but must, with its author, be most decidedly renounced. On the contrary, if it is to be considered as the work of angelic power, still it is not for the encouragement of the worship of things irrational, since we must rather think that the miracle was wrought in favour of the sanctity of the place than out of regard to any images, if, indeed, it were wrought at all. For 'basilicas' are more sacred than images, and places set apart for sacred worship than

· **BASIL** Bishop of Ancyra : " It has been abundantly proved that the usage of worshipping holy images is an ancient tradition."

· **TARASIVS** : " We have now had abundant testimonies from the fathers, and we are certified that the setting up of holy images is an ancient tradition. We are, therefore, followers of the holy fathers."*

pictures, as the Lord declares—' Greater is the altar than the gift which is offered upon it, and greater is the temple than the gold which is in it.' Thus we read in St. Gregory that on one occasion, when a violent flood had reached to the windows of a church, the waters were by some divine power prevented from coming in, and by the same power the tapers which had been extinguished were lighted again ; but this miracle was not wrought for the sake of any images which were there, but rather on account of the sanctity of the place itself. And, lastly, if this miracle were true, which is recorded by the Presbyter of the Church of Ascalon, it would not follow that images ought to be worshipped ; since not all things in which miracles have been wrought are, on that account, to be worshipped : on which head as we have said enough in a former part of this work, we need not here add anything further."

* The " Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 11) condemn the use of testimonies drawn from such books as are not well authenticated as arguments on points of dispute :—" The Apostolic preaching admonishes us to ' prove all things and to hold fast that which is good.' This must mainly be understood of differences in doctrine, which we are to prove and to taste with the spiritual palate, and to retain those which being set forth by men of most approved piety refresh our minds with inward satiety, but to reject the rest together with their authors. This rule ought more especially to be observed in respect of the books which record the deeds of the fathers : since, on many accounts, the faithful may hesitate to receive what is said of them, in proportion as they are ignorant of the authors of their history : wherefore, not all such histories can be admitted as testimony sufficient to decide questionable points. From the blessed Gelasius we learn and from other holy fathers that such lives as were compiled by the blessed Jerome or by him translated from the Greek, or are written by any other of those learned doctors whose works are generally admitted into the Catholic Church, are to be received with all honours ; but that all other histories whose authors were unknown were to be classed amongst apocryphal writings. Now, when they attempt to establish their image-worship, at one time by passages of Scripture improperly applied, at another by the words of persons unknown, and at another by the trifles of apocryphal scribblers, they ought to consider whether they are not undertaking that which is impossible ; for neither may the Scriptures be wrested to a forced sense, nor ought the doctrines of unknown teachers, nor apocryphal trifles and frivolities, to be admitted as argument. For if we are not at liberty to give a false colouring to the words of any man whatever, how much less may we take this liberty with the sacred Scriptures which are pure words as silver tried in the fire ; and, again, if in the ordinary affairs of men vile or unknown persons are not admitted to bear their testimony concerning doubtful points, much less in heavenly things ought the testimony of unknown teachers or apocryphal writers be admitted. Now, that all writings which are brought forward as proofs on questionable points ought carefully to be tested, proved, and confirmed by the testimony of the holy fathers, we learn from the case of the idle servant in the Gospel who was censured by his Lord because that he had not given his money to the money-changers. Unless we would share in His rebuke we also must give our money to the changers, which thing we do when we submit writings of any kind to

THE HOLY COUNCIL : "We follow them : we are concordant with them."

STEPHEN a Monk said : "We have still fifteen more books on the subject of holy images, and we wait your pleasure therein."

TARASIVS : "We have had enough and are satisfied."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "And we also are satisfied."

TARASIVS : "Since, in the course of our present enquiry, it has been made manifest that it is by Jews, by Heathens, by Samaritans, Manichæans, and Docetæ, that the Church has been accused on account of venerable images in times past, and we have agreed in this, it will now be right for us to hear our brother and beloved Lord John Legate from the Apostolic Thrones of the East ; for he has with him a writing which will explain how the subversion of images commenced on the present occasion."

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : "We should like much, my lord, to hear about this."

JOHN the Legate of the East read from his Roll :—

"I, your unworthy brother and humblest of you all, am desirous of laying before this your holy and sacred Council, with all truth, how, when, and where, this vilest and most God-detested heresy of the Christianity-detractors and Iconoclasts had its rise ; and being anxious to use what brevity I could, I have determined to read to you from a written document, that so, at the same time, I might

the test of the doctrine of the fathers. Now, the money-changers examine money in four ways—Is it assayed ? Is it pure ? Has it the image of a King or a Tyrant upon it ? And is it in full weight ? All which qualities are required in the money of the great Master of the house—that is, in the doctrines of our blessed Redeemer, by the money-changers—that is, by learned and holy men by means of fire from above. It is required that every coin of writing shall be assayed—that it be such as shall reflect the splendour of a spiritual understanding calculated to illustrate the divine law and make the beauty of the Church more prominent. Next : it is enquired whether it be pure, having no perverse hidden alloy, by which he who imagines that he has the heavenly coin should find the pest of destructive evil. Then, whether it has the right stamp upon it, whether it leads us to seek the health of the soul or to follow some hurtful snare of the old enemy. Lastly, it is enquired whether it be of the right weight—that is, whether it agree in all respects with the doctrine of Apostles and Prophets. From all which considerations we may learn that those doctrines, those writings, those works, will alone be allowed in the holy Church by the true Legislator—the Mediator between God and Man—which are allowed by the weights of the sanctuary : that is the rule of the fathers. All such writings as these, whether found in books entitled 'Gesta Patrum,'

make no mistake or omission in my account.* The Caliph or Ruler of the Atheistic Arabians, whose name was Soliman, being dead, Omar succeeded him: he, when he came to the throne, encountered

or in other works and treatises, may be confidently brought forward to examine and confirm points which may be questioned."

* The intention of this history is to show that the so-called heresy of the Iconoclasts had its origin, not from the obedience which Constantine Bishop of Nacolia desired to pay to the words of Scripture, but from some inexplicable desire of imitating Jews and Mahometans; and, as a tale, it was quite as authentic as many others which passed current in this Assembly; but that it was not agreeable to truth the great discrepancy found in both ancient and modern writers from its details fully proves.

Theophanes in his "Chronographia" (A.D. 715) tells us that a Jew of Laodicea (he drops the name Tassaraconta-pechys, or *Forty Cubits*) obtained an edict from Jezid the Caliph to destroy all the images in his Empire on promising him a reign of forty years; that this Jezid did issue such a decree, but died before it was put into execution; and that Leo, being of the same mind with Jezid, became the cause of similar evils among Christians, having as his assistants Beser and Constantine the Bishop of Nacolia—a man full of all impurity and passing his life in his native ignorance of discipline. Theophanes varies from John the Legate in several particulars: he states the Jew to be of Laodicea—John states him to be of Tiberias. Theophanes's Jew promises forty years' life—John's Jew but thirty. Theophanes tells us that, by the grace of Christ and the intercessions of His Mother and all Saints, Jezid died the very year in which he issued his edict, before his Satanic decree had been fully published. The Legate, on the contrary, declares that Jezid survived at least two or three years. Theophanes ascribes the origin of the evil to Leo the Emperor—John to Constantine Bishop of Nacolia. Zonaras, who lived some centuries later, tells the tale with yet greater varieties: according to him it was not one but two Jews who persuaded Jezid to issue the edict—that they were not put to death, as the Legate related with such glee at the Council, but fled into Isauria: and there they met with Leo, then a young man, to whom they foretold the Empire, and made him promise when he came to it that he would do one thing for them, which thing was the destruction of images. Cedrenus, who lived about the same time, differs from Zonaras in representing it, not as two Jews, but some Jews. Stillingfleet has amusingly summed up these varieties in the following manner—"It was one Jew, saith the Vicar of the Oriental Bishops: they were two Jews or more, say the Greek historians. It was a Jew of Tiberias, saith John: no, saith Cedrenus, they were two Jews of Laodicea; but one, saith Theophanes. These Jews met with Leo when he was a young man and foretold the Empire to him, say Zonaras, Manasses, and Glycas; but a few years before the reign of Leo, saith Cedrenus—nay, saith Theophanes, it was the seventh year of Leo: in the eighth year, says Baronius, for Jezid did not reign before." Binius adopts this absurd tale in his introductory history prefixed to the second Nicene Council.

"Some modern historians, observing these contradictions, have invented fresh plans of reconciling them. One writer states that there were two Jezids, each persuaded by Jews: the one by two Jews who escaped—the other by Mr. Forty Cubits who was put to death. Another gets rid of Jews altogether, and says that these men who obtained the edict were Samaritan Heretics, who were more precise than the rest of the Jews, and were much troubled at the Cherubim in the Temple," &c.—*Stillingfleet's Defence of his Discourse concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome in Answer to Dr. Golden*, pp. 544-549; *Goldasti Imperialia Decreta*, pp. 20, 21.

How Jews should have such influence with Leo is not a little strange, seeing he is said by Theophanes to have burnt their synagogues, and they who could not prevail with the Emperor to save their own synagogues could actually prevail with him to destroy the images of Christians!

and drove out of the country Anascaphus Masalman our inveterate foe, who, by the grace of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of her who begat Him, the holy Mother of God, was forced to return with disgrace and the entire loss of his own army of Saracens to Syria, having utterly failed in all his plans. On the death of Omar, Jezid succeeded him—a man of a weak and frivolous turn of mind. There was at the same time in Tiberias a ringleader of the abandoned Jews, a wizard, an instrument of soul-destroying devils, whose name was *Tessaracontapechys*, a bitter enemy of the Church of God. Having been made acquainted with the weakness of character which was in the tyrant Jezid, this atrocious Hebrew began to practice upon him with predictions and charms. When, by this means, he had paved the way to frequent and easy access to the tyrant, he said to him—‘O Caliph, out of the regard I bear towards thee, I am anxious to suggest to thee a method very easily and speedily accomplished by which length of life shall be added to thee, and thou shalt remain thirty years in thy kingdom if thou wilt but give ear to my words.’ And that senseless tyrant being quite beside himself from his desire of long life (for he was luxurious and dissolute) answered—‘Whatever you may suggest to me that I am ready to do, and, if I obtain my desire, I will recompense you with highest honours.’ On which the Hebrew wizard said to him—‘Give orders that without any demur or delay a circular epistle be written and sent throughout all thy dominions, which shall enjoin the taking away and utter destruction of all kinds of images and pictures, whether on canvas, in mosaics, on walls, or on sacred vessels, and altar coverings, and everything of this kind which may be found in the churches of Christians, and in like manner everything of the same kind set up for the ornament and decoration of the forums of the various cities in your empire.’ Now, the false prophet with Satanic cunning added this ‘every image,’ contriving thereby to display his hatred against us without being suspected. The abandoned tyrant gave very easy credence to this man: wherefore he sent and destroyed in every province holy images, and all other things of the same kind. And in this manner he, for the sake of this Jewish wizard, unsparingly desecrated all the churches which were under his power before that the evil reached this land at all. But since Christians, as being most dear to God, themselves could not be brought to lay hands on holy images, certain Ammorites who were commissioned for that purpose compelled the God-hated Jews and vile Arabians to undertake this service: and so they burnt the venerable pictures which they found; and, in respect

to the churches, the walls of some they scraped, of others they daubed over. Now, when the false Bishop of Nacolia and his party heard of these proceedings, they, too, in imitation of lawless Jews and impious Arabians, desecrated the churches of God. But I think it worthy the attention of your sacred audience to mark the end of the wretched Monarch and the Hebrew Magician. After that the Caliph Jezid had done this he lived not more than two or three years: then he died and went into everlasting fire, while the images were restored to their accustomed place and honour; and Walid his son, being angry with the magician, caused him to be put to death in the most disgraceful manner, as having been the murderer of his own father. Thus was he made to reap a worthy reward for his lying prophecies."

THE BISHOP OF MESSANA said: "I was then a lad living in Syria when the Caliph of the Saracens destroyed the images."

SABBAS Abbot of Studium: "My lord, we unworthy servants of your holiness entreat that sacred images may be set up in their usual places, according to the former usage, that pious Christians may celebrate their Litanies with them."*

TARASIVS: "And what say ye, my venerable Brethren?"

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: "We all agree in this."

PETER the most holy Archpresbyter and Legate of the most holy Bishop of Old Rome then read from his Roll as follows:—

"To Tarasius most holy Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and *Œcumenic*† Patriarch, and to this Holy and *Œcumenic* Council, Peter Archpresbyter of the most holy Church, of the holy and illustrious Apostle Peter, and Peter Presbyter and Abbot of the Monastery of Saint Sabbas, both of us Legates of Adrian most holy Pope of Old Rome:—We think it right to propose that, in accordance with the common sentiment of us all, or rather in accordance with the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church, as we are taught by all our holy fathers, a venerable image be brought in the midst of us, and

* Sabbas forgets the rights of the Holy See in making his proposition, not to the Papal Legate, but to Tarasius! To say the least, he displays sad want of discipline.

† Anastasius could not persuade himself to insert this heretical title in his translation, and Binius would fain have us imagine it to be interpolated. After all, it is very possible that it was a Papal *lupus lingue*. As many other of the Bishops used the title they caught the infection, and joined in the general custom.

that we pay it due reverence ; and do ye, O holy men, declare how far this is agreeable to your wishes.

“ We have yet another proposition to make, that all treatises written against holy images be destroyed with anathemas or delivered to the flames : concerning this also, we entreat your holy Council to declare themselves as it may appear to them.”*

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ Let it be brought : so let it be done.”

PETER Archpresbyter Legate from Rome said : “ Then, if it please your holy Council, to-morrow let the image be set up, and let us pay our reverence to it.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said : “ So be it!—so be it !”

JOHN Legate of the East : “ Blessed be God, who has glorified this Christ-loving city of the Nicæans, in the days of our most Christian Sovereigns Constantine and Irene. Blessed be God, who has counted the same worthy of double honour, for here it was at first that Christ made clear the faith concerning Himself ; and now, by this holy Council, He has made manifest the symbols of His dispensation to all. Here was the infamous Arius deposed—here also the heresy of the God-hating Iconoclasts has been annihilated. Blessed be God who, by His Apostle John, declared, I am Alpha and Omega. Blessed be God, who here at the first, and here also in these last days, has confirmed the orthodox faith.”†

* Worthy proposal to emanate from the Vicar of Christ's Church sojourning at Rome ! The absurdity of the first proposition seems equalled only by the mischief and wickedness of the other. How absurd to see three hundred and fifty Bishops incensing, prostrating themselves, praying before, kissing, embracing a piece of wood or canvass with some oil and paint upon it ! This folly has passed away with its actors, but the mischief of the second proposition remains still ; and we have, in consequence, to deplore the writings of all who contended for the purity of the Church in these centuries against this vilest of corruptions. Nor is this all, but we have lost the names of the authors themselves ; for not one Greek Iconoclast writer stands on record among ecclesiastical writers : yet such must have existed, for writings imply authors : not, impossibly, the great paucity of ecclesiastical authors in this country may be owing to the fact that the lovers of idolatry destroyed their works and their names together. It was well that the authority of the Romish and Greek Patriarchs did not extend over the whole Church or we might have lost the “ Caroline Books” among the rest. Yet these wretched idolators—these miserable destroyers of books—are, forsooth, Catholic Bishops, Orthodox Prelates, and so forth, of the Church of Christ !

† As we are about to take leave of the loquacious Legate of the East, for no other speech of his is recorded in this Council, we cannot better do this than

THE HOLY COUNCIL shouted (repeating each sentence thrice): "The doctrines of the divine-tongued fathers have corrected us; drawing from these, we have drank in the truth;

in the words of the "Caroline Books," which, as they have often adverted to him before, so they here censure his complacent and flattering comparison of the first and second Councils of Nice—Councils which, as they assert and provc, will by no means admit of such comparison:—"Although this Council was held at Nice in Bythinia, it never ought, according to their vain pretences or according to the flattering address of John the Presbyter of the East, to be put into comparison with the holy Nicene Council, since in many things it differs from it *in toto* and even in its symbol of faith does not altogether agree with it; for this Council admits into its Creed certain novelties not found in the Creed sanctioned by the Council of Nice, on which we have animadverted in the beginning of the third book of this work." [These novelties, it must be remembered, are found only in the synodals of Tarasius and Theodora, but not in the definition of the Council itself, except that the procession of the Spirit from the Son is omitted even there]. "It hath (in the form of recantation prepared for the lapsed), after the confession of the Trinity, a confession foisted in of worshipping of images, which neither in the oracles of the Prophets, the thunders of the Gospel, the dogmas of the Apostles, the histories of former holy Councils, or the doctrines of any of the orthodox fathers, can anywhere be found. *Far*, and beyond all that may be called *far*, does the former differ from the latter; for, while the one brought back the Church from error, the other leads her into error; the one saves her from the most dangerous shipwreck of Arianism, the other impels her into the shipwreck of image-worship; the one taught that the Son was consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father, the other bids her adore things destitute of sense; the one declares that the Son as concerns the Divinity is equal with the Father, the other dotingly declares that certain pictures are equal to the ark of the covenant, the cross of the Lord, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and other most holy things besides; the one did most beneficially teach the co-equality, co-essentiality, and co-eternity of the holy Trinity, the other taught that images should be worshipped as we worship the holy Trinity; in the one were condemned the errors of Arius, in the other their own parents are condemned with equal rigour; in the one the blasphemy of those was execrated who obstinately refuse to believe and confess that the Son was co-essential with the Father, in the other their purity was held up for abomination who, despising the worship of images, profess that with heart and soul they will serve God alone: in the one, after the confession of the holy Trinity, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh and the life of the world to come, were taught by the Pontiffs—in the other, after the confession of the same holy Trinity, the worship of images is most inappropriately foisted in; in the former, as well as in other synods, the sacrifice of God in behalf of the faithful departed was never prohibited—in the latter anathemas were launched against their departed parents and predecessors by their sons and successors; and, to leave out other points of comparison which it might be too long to enumerate, in the one were three hundred and eighteen Bishops collected, in the other but three hundred and six, as themselves declare." [On the difference of these two numbers follows three or four pages of theological mystical trifling, in which all the mysteries connected with the number Twelve are set forth at large: the following is a specimen]:—"In the number Twelve are four times three, and three times four—a mystery which teaches how the Trinity is taught in the four Gospels; while the four Gospels emanate from the sacred Trinity: and all this to shew how much more orthodox the one Council than the other, because the number of Bishops in it exceeded those in the other by this mystic number Twelve. And were these profound speculations of any force, they rest on a very sandy foundation—the number of those whose signatures are appended to the definition of the Council, should they

following these, we have banished falsehood; taught by these, we embrace holy images; guided by these, we pay them the worship of honour. The fathers preach—We are the children of obedience, and we glory in the face of our Mother in the tradition of the Catholic Church. Believing in One God to be praised in a Trinity of Persons, we embrace venerable images. Let those who think not thus be anathema: let those who differ be drawn far from the Church. We follow the ancient rule of the Catholic Church: we keep to the laws of the fathers: we anathematize alike those who add, and those who take away, anything from the holy Church: we receive holy images: we anathematize this newly-introduced innovation of the Iconoclasts: we overwhelm with our anathema all who think otherwise. Anathema to the Christianity-detractors—that is, the Iconoclasts: anathema to those who apply the words of the divine Scripture spoken against idols to venerable images: anathema to those who call holy and venerable images idols: anathema to those who say that Christians approach their images as if they were gods: anathema to those who, with knowledge, communicate with those who insult and dishonour holy images: anathema to those who as-

have been three hundred and eight, then all the argument is at an end. One circumstance which renders the number three hundred and six suspicious is, that it differs from the enumeration of those present at the commencement of the seventh Session, which is three hundred and twenty-four: and there is no reason why any who were present to hear the definition should have refused to sign afterwards: and it is very unlikely that the recusants should not have been noticed had there been any.

It is next observed that the two Councils have nothing in common but identity of name; but this by no means implied any similarity of excellence, which is proved by much superfluous labour and the induction of many instances in which the same place which at one time was honoured by the transactions of good and righteous men was at another desecrated by the wickedness of the impious. The last point noticed in this Chapter—namely, the simile of the six golden coins and the brazen coin by which the Nicene divines intended to rebuke those of the former Council of Constantinople—belongs to the next Session and will be noticed there.—*Lit. Car. iv.*, 13.

Adrian replies—"We have before shown that the divine decrees of this Council are irreprehensible, as the works of the principal holy fathers do wonderfully testify. Wherefore, if any declare that he dissents from the symbol of the above-mentioned holy Council, seems in like manner to dissent from the symbol of the other six holy Councils, because they spake not of themselves but according to the constitutions of their holy dogmas." An extract follows from the sixth general Council, and another from St. Augustin; but they need not here be brought forward as they are perfectly irrelevant.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 120, col. 1.

cribe deliverance from idolatry to any other than to Christ : anathema to those who presume to say that the Catholic Church hath ever admitted idols. Long live our Sovereigns : long live Constantine and Irene, those illustrious rulers, our absolute Sovereigns : long live our peace-making Sovereigns. O, Lord, strengthen the subverters of this newly-introduced innovation : grant them, O Lord, a life of piety."

SESSION THE SIXTH.

The Definition of the Council of Constantinople against Images, or at least such portion of it as the Nicene Fathers thought that they could refute, was read by Gregory Bishop of Neocæsarea, period by period; and a Pretended Refutation was read in answer by Epiphanius the Deacon and Chamberlain. The Definition and its Refutation are divided into Six Sections.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns Constantine and Irene his mother, in the eighth year of their consulship, on the third of the nones of October (October 5), of the eleventh indiction, the holy Œcumenic Council assembled by the grace of God, and by the decree of the same divinely-protected Sovereigns in the splendid city of Nice metropolis of the Eparchy of Bithynia—that is, Peter the Arch-presbyter and Peter Monk and Abbot of St. Sabbas at Rome Legates of Adrian most holy Pope of Old Rome; Tarasius Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, New Rome; John and Thomas Vicars and Legates of the Apostolic Sees of the Eastern Dioceses; together with the Bishops, the Archimandrites, Abbots, and all the fulness of the Monastic Order, held their Session before the most holy pulpit of the most holy Church of St. Sophia, in the presence of Petronas and John officers of the Imperial household. And after that the Holy Gospels had been set in the midst,

LEONTIUS the most noble Secretary rose up and said: “Your holy and blessed Council is aware how that in our former Session we took into consideration various passages from the impious heretics, who had accused the holy and immaculate Church of Christians on account of her usage in

the setting up of holy images. To-day we have brought hither the written blasphemy of the Christianity-detractors itself—I mean the absurd, easily-confuted, self-confuted, definition of their false Conventicle*—a definition in every respect concordant with the impious sentiments of other God-hated heretics. And further, we have also here with us a most elaborate and irrefragable confutation of the same, with which the Holy Spirit has favoured us; for it required that we should triumph over it with sound argument, and rend it in pieces with most powerfully convincing replies, both of which we now submit to your good pleasure.”

THE HOLY COUNCIL said: “Let it be read.”

JOHN Deacon and Chancellor of the Great Church of Constantinople read as follows:—

“*The Refutation of the Patched-up and falsely so-called Definition of the Disorderly Assembled Crew of the Christianity-detractors.*”

“SECTION THE FIRST.

“It is ever a grateful thing to the devil, the hater of mankind, to separate from God, man, who was created in the image of God, and to ensnare him with multifarious deceits; and in no respect is he more earnest than in contending against religion, and in unsettling and disturbing the peace of the Church; which he hath manifested in our days also by means of a certain assembly, at which they who were present became the framers of the ‘Definition’ laid before you, and falsely assumed to themselves the title of the ‘Seventh Council.’ For,

* “All authors (says Binius, in his short notice of this Council) who have written anything about General Councils, either omit this Council altogether, or at least openly and plainly reprobate it; but the heretics of our times, with no small praise from many, extol it and proclaim it abroad to the utmost of their power, reprobated and condemned as it is by the true and genuine Seventh Council of Nice, by which themselves and their dogmas about the worship and invocation of Saints, on the merits of good works, on the verity of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, are expressly anathematized. And this they do by the secret providence of God, in order that they may betray their own incredible stupidity and impudence in thus, by their own confession, making it appear that these ancient Iconoclasts are superior to modern Innovators. For if you compare our worthies with the followers of Copronymus you will find them to be twice or thrice as bad: for these Copronymiani, though they rejected images, retain the worship of the venerable cross: our Innovator-iconoclasts cast off all images together. Copronymus and his party still kept up the worship of the most sacred body and blood of Christ: the pestilent sect of the Innovators calumniously abominate this also.” —*Binni Concil. General.* tom. iii. para. 1, sec. 1, p. 396. Binius quotes here from Baronius’ “*Annales*,” ad. an. 754.

having laid hold on the common and universal aversion to idols and used it as a bait to cover their hook, they covertly introduced their own abomination against pictures and images, and thus ensnared the more unwary. Wherefore, they recalled a word long since obsolete and forgotten—I mean ‘Idolatry’ (from which they who worship the devil and his apostate crew by means of demoniacal images, and thus ‘served the creature more than the Creator’—Romans i. 25—were justly named ‘Idolaters’); and this they endeavoured to affix to those who have been made the ‘royal priesthood, the holy nation’ (1 Peter ii. 9)—to those ‘who have put on Christ,’* and by His grace have been rescued from idols and have been preserved from their error. Oh, would that their words, like an untimely birth, had perished as soon as they came into being! as being sure to generate pollutions in the Church! But, forasmuch as their absurdities have been cherished by certain—even though they have not reached a full growth—it becomes a duty incumbent on us to slay them with the sword of the Spirit. But may Christ our true God, ‘who enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world’ (John i. 9), be our leader—He who alone is the *Mind* of those who think piously and of that which is thought of by them—the *Word* of those who speak and of that which is spoken, who is and who is made all things to all, who hath given us to know the word of instruction when it is necessary for us to speak, for the manifestation of His word enlightens and gives understanding to babes—that the falsehood may be driven away, and truth, shining brightly and clearly, may find admission to the hearts of all; which the champions of religion having embraced, recalling to mind the words of the divine Apostle, ‘Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel’ (1 Cor. ix. 16), feel themselves bound to protect and defend, and to rebuke falsehood, and to strike it down by stones from the sling of the Spirit.

“Wherefore, advancing with the Scripture, with the fathers aided by deep research and sound argument, to combat these vain babblings, we shall, like Phineas, with the javelin of the Spirit, by one stroke of confutation, pierce through with ease the squadrons of those who have been leagued together in behalf of this impiety; and by proof most evident we shall make known to all the falsity of their tongues, as having been lifted up against the ‘knowledge of the only begotten

* The Galatians were a royal nation, &c.; yet St. Paul charges them with having fallen from grace, as turning again to weak and beggarly elements: and, though by baptism they had put on Christ, as seeking to be made perfect in the flesh, as foolish and not obedient to the truth. The Saviour styles the Church of the Laodiceans, though a royal nation, and one that had put on Christ by baptism, ^a or and miserable, blind and naked.

Son of God* (2 Cor. x. 5) and of His Church, and having spoken injuriously against the great mystery of His incarnation. And then, with 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God' (Ephesians vi. 17), 'having burst their bonds asunder, and having cast away the yoke'† (Psalm ii. 3) of their ignorance, we shall lay open all the prettexts of their perfidy. 'For the Lord hath laughed them to scorn: He hath had them in derision' (*Ibid.* 4), and 'He shall speak unto them in His wrath' (*Ibid.* 5), saying, 'Depart from me, I know you not'‡ (Matthew vii. 23). Concerning whom He hath spoken by the Prophet Jeremiah, 'These have prophesied lies in my name, for I sent them not, neither have I commanded them; they have spoken false visions, prophecies, and divinations, the inventions of their own hearts. Wherefore they shall be cast out in the streets of Jerusalem,' (Jeremiah xiv. 14, 16)—that is, of the Catholic Church, and they shall be trampled under foot of all those who piously confess to the Lord. For a man's own lips shall be a snare unto him, and he shall be taken in the words of his own mouth, and the recompence of his lips shall be given to him, the rebuke of his impiety: for He saith, 'I will reprove thee, and set before thy face the things which thou hast done' (Psalm l. 21).

"Thus much by way of preface: nor will we lengthen our discussion by any further introduction, but entering on our proposed course we shall commence our work of refutation with the very title. For in what other mode can we display how weak and full of calumny their vain argumentation is than by meeting them at every point with convincing refutation inspired by wisdom from a higher source, ever preserving to ourselves one unfailling principle—to allow of no innovation being admitted amongst us in any matters relative to religion, but on the contrary to yield implicit obedience to the doctrine of the Apostles and Fathers, and to the traditions of the Church.§ And we exhort all

* In what way does the doctrine that men should worship Christ without sensible images militate against the knowledge of God or the mystery of the incarnation?

† The good fathers here make use of the language of the enemies of Christ, and most certainly they burst the bonds and cast off the yoke of the second commandment.

‡ And yet it is not written, Depart from me ye that break images, but "ye workers of iniquity," under which description some very orthodox worshippers of images might be included.

§ "Lib. Car." l. ii. c. 25, shows the vanity of this appeal to the Apostles. Most certainly image-worship cannot be found in their writings: indeed, most of the ancient fathers are very barren and meagre on this point, as the testimonies given in the fourth Session prove. Possibly it might be taught by unwritten tradition; for, as a very ancient tradition was found by which a breach of the fifth commandment was excused, if not enjoined (Mark vii.

persons who may hereafter meet with this our treatise to read it with great care, and not in a cursory manner ; that, having fully and clearly comprehended how complete and satisfactory this refutation is, they may ascribe the victory to the Church of God."

They make their commencement as follows :—

GREGORY Bishop of Neocæsarea reads :

"THE DEFINITION OF THE HOLY GREAT AND ŒCUMENIC SEVENTH COUNCIL."*

EPIPHANIUS† the Deacon of the Great Church of Constantinople reads the "Refutation:"—

"Commencing with falsehood, by falsehood supported throughout the whole of their innovating argumentation, in falsehood these Christianity-detractors have brought their labours to a close. How can it be *holy*, not in the least comprehending what holiness is, being as it is accursed, profane, and execrable? For they who were assembled therein, to use the Prophet's language, 'made no difference between the holy and the profane'‡ (Ezekiel xlv. 33) ; for they gave the name of *idol* equally to the image of God the Word who was incarnate, even our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and to the image of Satan. Again, how could that be *Great* or *Œcumenic*,§ which the Presidents of

10-11), so there might be a tradition of like character to do away with the second.

* Binius thinks it necessary to warn his readers that his use of the italic letter, in which type the citations from the Iconoclastic Council are printed in Latin (or, as he styles them, 'cursivæ litteræ'), is not intended out of any honour to the words of the Iconoclastic Council, but merely for the sake of distinction. This remark might be of some importance to Romanists, who attach a great deal to such trifles.

† The name in the original is John ; but, as this name is only used to two paragraphs, and that of Epiphanius to all the rest, it appears likely that it was a mistake, as there is no reason for the change.

‡ A picture of Satan is not an idol unless men worship it: an image of Christ is an idol if men worship it, and the making of such a thing for purposes of worship is idolatry, contrary to the second commandment.

§ "There is no good ground (says Cave in his remarks on this Council) for this objection; for, in respect of the Eastern Patriarchs, every one knows how greatly they groaned under the tyranny of the Saracens, so that it was impossible in the nature of things that they should be present at that Council. Neither on account of their absence is anything wanting in the universality of this Council; since at the Sixth General Council, which by these very Nicene Fathers is styled 'Œcumenic,' none of the Patriarchs of the East or any of the Bishops could be present on account of the tyranny of the impious Arabs; and yet this circumstance was not in the least thought to prejudice that holy Synod, as the Monks of Palestine observe in their letter read and approved in the third Session of the Nicene Council. As for the Roman Bishop not being present, who can wonder at that? He was at the time too busily engaged in adding the archbishopric of Ravenna to his See to think of anything else: nor

other Churches have never received or assented to; but which, on the contrary, they have anathematized? It had not as its fellow helper the then Pope of Rome, or his conclave: neither was it authorized by his Legate, nor by Encyclic Epistle from him, as the custom is in Councils. Neither do we find that the Patriarchs of the East, of Antioch, Alexandria, and the holy City, did at all consent thereto, nor any of their great doctors or high-priests. Verily their word was a smoke full of darkness, blinding the eyes of the simple, and not 'a candle set on a candlestick, that it may give light to all that are in the house;' for it was spoken in secret—privately, and not upon the high mountains of orthodoxy: neither 'did their voice go forth into all lands' as did that of the Apostles, 'nor their words unto the ends of the world' as did those of those six holy Œcumenic Councils. Again, how can it be the *Seventh*, since it has no agreement with the six holy Œcumenic Councils which were before it? For anything which is accounted as seventh ought always to be of the same nature with the rest of the things with which it is numbered; and, if it has nothing in common with them, neither ought it to be numbered with them. Just as if any one should set in a row six golden coins, and then to these should add one of brass:* he could not style it the

was it likely that he would be present, in person or by Legate, at a Council assembled against a cause which he and his predecessors had so earnestly laboured to uphold." It may be added further, that at the Second General Council the Pope was not present in person or by his Legates, nor was it summoned by his authority or any Encyclic Letter from him; and, so far from being confirmed by him, was established in spite of his remonstrance: and yet it is and has been ever accounted the Second Œcumenic Council. Cave further adds in conclusion, that "This Council might rightly be styled 'Œcumenic,' and that such it really was, no one, except he was blinded with image-mongering prejudices, can for a moment doubt. And certainly if legal authority of convocation—that is, an Imperial mandate sent to all parts of his empire—if a competent number of Bishops convoked on all sides for this purpose—if the dignity and importance of the thing to be treated of, namely, the establishment of the worship of God alone—if the reclamation of the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church from the immoderate superstitions of latter days—if the mode of proceeding, so grave, so solemn, so worthy the Session of so many assembled Bishops—if synodical decrees framed with greatest care and exactest judgment, and matured not in a few days, as was done in the Nicene Council, but for the space of six months together—if, lastly, the Imperial subscription, confirmation, and public promulgation can make a Synod Œcumenic, then who can with any face deny the title of 'Œcumenic' to the Council now under consideration?"—*Cave Hist. Litt.*, vol. i. p. 647.

* In the latter part of that chapter of the "Caroline Books" in which the comparison of the two Nicene Councils is censured we find this illustration of the brazen coin used by these Nicene fathers against those of Constantinople made to bear against themselves with no little point. After observing that both they and their predecessors were very anxious to get up a Council to which they would give the name of *seventh*, and that neither the one or the other had succeeded in their purpose, it is further remarked as follows:—"That they (the Nicene divines) being earnest to abolish that which was incautiously

seventh on account of the difference of the materials ; for gold is valuable and of great worth, while brass is vile and of little account in comparison. Thus, in like manner, this Synod, having no gold or worth in its decrees, but being in every way counterfeit, adulterated, and full of deadly poison, can never be accounted worthy to be numbered with the six most holy Councils, resplendent as they are with the golden words of the Spirit. Having, however, the pride of him who said, 'I will set my throne above the clouds' (Isaiah xiv. 13), it sends forth such sounds as these."

GREGORY of Neocæsarea reads :

"The Holy Great Œcumenic Council, which by the Grace of God

and injudiciously done by their predecessors, and equally anxious to establish that, which was no less absurdly and stolidly done by themselves, brought forward for this purpose the following illustration. Their predecessors they suppose to act as the man who would add a seventh to six golden coins, but who instead of a coin of gold has substituted one of brass, while they conceal themselves to have taken away this brazen coin, and to have added a golden coin to the rest : but if they would carefully examine they might perceive that, instead of replacing the brazen coin with one of gold, they had substituted but one of *tin* ; and that same number *seventh*, which their predecessors would complete with the synod of *brass*, they analogously would fill up with their synod of *tin* : but that from this mysterious number *seven* the coins of *brass* and that also of *tin* being set aside, *six* alone remain, which both the perfection of number and the splendour of Catholic erudition render illustrious—in which, while the purest gold shines forth in the purity of faith, the glory of perfection remains in the number." Here follows some theological trifling on the number six, showing the various perfections thereof, of much the same kind, though much shorter, with that which was found in a former part of the chapter on the number twelve : after which it is continued—"But, if they must needs number themselves with ancient Councils, it may not be amiss to unite them with the ancient Council of Rimini ; for as in that, the confession of the *ουόσιος* was rejected, so in this the adorers and true worshippers of God alone were execrated : and as in that the most pernicious dogma of a diversity of Persons in the sacred Trinity was established, so in this the worship of divers things and the adoration due to God alone were set forth on equal terms. Let the order of these Councils be as follows : *first*, the Synod of Rimini ; *second*, that which their predecessors held for the destruction of images ; *third*, that which they assemble at Nice to promote the worship and adoration of them. Thus the first is the *brazen* coin, the second the *tin*, and the third that of the *lead* : for, although in point of time they are so far apart, yet there is a kind of agreement between them. But if their pride and fastidiousness made them reject the second—to which we have no objection—let the Council of Rimini stand first, and their own in the second place—that is, first the *brazen* coin ; and second (since they reject the other), let their own *lead* coin take its place. But we, rejecting them all, and content with the Six General Councils and those other local Synods which are in accordance with these in faith and preaching, by the integrity of our faith and the increase of good works, shall prepare ourselves for the awful approach of the tremendous tribunal of the last day, which shall be celebrated at His glorious return of whom the Angels said to the Apostles, 'This Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven shall so return in like manner as ye have seen Him ascend into heaven.'—*Lib. Car. iv. 13.*

and the most pious sanction of our God-owned and orthodox Sovereigns, Constantine and Leo, has been called together in this Heaven-defended and Royal City, in the venerable Church of our holy immaculate Lady Mary the Mother of God, ever a Virgin, which is named Blachernæ, has defined that which is here subjoined."

EPIPHANIUS reads :

" Had this assembly of theirs been summoned by *divine grace*, it would have been adorned with words spoken according to the grace of God, and it would moreover have been made resplendent with truth ; since grace is evermore united with truth, they are fellow-labourers—they dwell together. To this John, the great chief of theology, is witness, saying, ' Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ' (John i. 17). But as they have deserted the truth, in which the writer of the Proverbs glories, saying, ' My throat shall sing aloud in the truth ' (Proverbs viii. 7), and having embraced falsehood, it is evident that they have fallen from grace also : wherefore neither have ' their words been seasoned with the divine salt ' (Col. iv. 6), ' that they may give grace to those that hear ' (Eph. iv. 29). But as to the fact of their being assembled in the venerable church of our Lady the Mother of God it is not to be wondered at ; neither will this give any colour to their proceedings, even as it availed not Annas and Caiaphas, and that Jewish synod which plotted against Christ, that their illegal consultation against Him was held in the temple. Yea, they seem to be the more worthy of condemnation on this very account, because that in places so holy they should frame decrees unholy and hateful to God. Oh, would that, as they have in their commencement made use of the paternal voice of the hierophant Dionysius,* they had preserved inviolate those traditions

* Du Pin gives the following reasons for considering the works attributed to St. Dionysius the Areopagite as spurious :—First, their late appearance in the Church, the first mention of them occurring A.D. 532, neither Eusebius nor Jerome knowing anything about them : second, the style, being too lofty and figurative : third, the contents of the books are not conformable to the age in which he lived. In his treatises against heretics he rejects the errors of the Nestorians and Eutychians, which did not appear till the fifth century, he living in the first : he cites the book of Revelation, which could not be written when he was alive : he speaks of ancient tradition ; also of several ceremonies not in use in those days. But, supposing the work genuine, these Nicene fathers make not one quotation from it to show that he approved of images ; so that we have only their assertion that this was his tradition. Adrian proves an historical use of images from his works, which will be considered afterwards.

which he in common with the rest of the holy fathers held ; but they had nothing of this kind in them, as in the subsequent discussion will more fully appear. Inconsistently enough with themselves, like wolves in sheep's clothing, they made their preface from his theology, speaking as follows :—

GREGORY reads :—

“ The cause and consummation of all things is God, who, having of His own goodness made all things to exist, from things which were not before, determined that they should be directed in a beautiful and regular order ; so that, according to the grace of the perfection which had been given to them, they might preserve the continuance of their true position, not perverted, not drawn aside, to deviations either on this side or the other.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ Truly every creature which is formed by God, and hath received hypostatic power from non-existence to come into existence, being still moved and directed by the same ordinance, knows how to observe the will of the Creator, as being under His providential care, and this whether they be animate or inanimate. These men, however, have dared to anathematize the tradition which was given to us by Christ in His holy Church,* for the remembrance of His saving dispensation : not knowing, that of the things which are in her, none are there without Him ; and thus they are proved more senseless than stones, more irrational than the brutes ! Nor is this all ; but imagining that they speak to the purpose in giving vent to vain words and foolish doctrines, they falsely assert that the holy Church of God has been adorned with idols ; and, making lies their confidence, they say to her, ‘ we wish not to know thy ways ’ (Job xxi. 14), nor do we choose to follow the tradition which was from the beginning. Verily, they shall hear from Christ, who laid her foundations, ‘ I know you not ’ (Matt. vii. 23). But now they make pretences of a triumph over the devil, speaking thus.”

* And yet nothing was known in the Church of this tradition given by Christ for the sake of His remembrance till after Constantine, in the commencement of the fourth century. The only exception is the supposed instance of the woman of Panens, who, being a Gentile, set up, not in a church but in a street ; not of a Christian but a Heathen city ; not after a Christian but after a Gentile manner.

GREGORY reads:—

“But because he who, on account of his former splendour was called Lucifer and had his proper station near to God—laid in his pride exalt himself against his Maker, and thenceforth with all his apostate crew did become darkness, and by his own act and deed having fallen from the exceeding glorious light-giving kingdom of God more resplendent than light itself, being convicted as the author, contriver, and teacher of all evil, was for ever stripped of all his glory—he therefore, not enduring to behold man created by God, brought in his stead into possession of that glory in which he once had a place, poured out upon him all his malice, and by deceit caused him to be banished from the glory and brightness of God, having seduced him to worship the creature more than the Creator.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Had their words been directed against that idolatry and creature-worship denounced and abominated by holy Apostles who were endued with power from on high, by sacred Prophets who spake as inspired by the Holy Ghost, and, lastly, by those who followed them, our divinely-inspired fathers, it had been well for them to have committed their discussion to writing, for then all the guardians of the Church would have agreed with them.* But since, disregarding this, they came forward in defence of falsehood, and under pretence of triumphing over the devil, the father of lies, they were in truth only sharpening their tongues against the immaculate Church, and since, like vinters, ‘they have mixed their wine with water’ (Isai. i. 22), and have not hesitated ‘to make their neighbours drink their deadly poison’ (Hab. ii. 15), justly shall they hear the voice of God as it were specially directed against them, by the mouth of David the sacred Psalmist, ‘Why do you teach my judgments, and take my covenant into your mouth? Whereas ye have hated instruction and have cast my words behind your backs’ (Psalm l. 16, 17): thus ap-

* No doubt the Pharisees, Elders, and Scribes, the guardians (τροφίμοι) of the Jewish Church, would have been well satisfied had our Saviour enlarged on the ignorance of the Gentile world, the corruptions of the Samaritan heretics, the wickedness of publicans and sinners, or the heterodoxy of the Sadducees; but that He should presume to censure *their* traditions, *their* righteousness, their vain practices—this enraged them beyond measure, made them often to plot against Him, and to reject the Holy One and the Just, and to desire that a murderer should be given to them. The Iconoclasts did not censure the Church, but only a corrupt party and portion of it.

pointing them their portion with those who adulterate the doctrine of truth, but hypocritically pretending to truth they say."

GREGORY reads :—

" But God, his Maker, not enduring to behold this work of His own hands involved in utter ruin, after that efforts had been made for his salvation by means of the Law and the Prophets, and it was found that he was not by these enabled to attain his primitive glory, was pleased to send His own Son, the Word, into the world in the last days fore-ordained by Himself. He, by the good will of the Father, and the co-operation of the Life-giving co-equal Spirit, having dwelt in the Virgin's womb, did of her holy and immaculate flesh, in His own person or hypostasis, take flesh consubstantial with ours, and by means of a reasonable and intellectual soul having constructed and fashioned the same, He was born of her in a way surpassing all word and thought : He having voluntarily endured the cross, and submitted to death, rose again on the third day from the dead, and accomplished the whole economy of our salvation."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

" Divine Scripture declares, in its account of the formation of the world, that God said, ' Let us make man in our image after our likeness ' (Gen. i. 26) : great indeed was the dignity, that one born of earth should be honoured with the image of God. But because man fell by deceit, and did not preserve the dignity of his first formation, the human race lapsed into idolatry. God, therefore, and the Word of the Father, who became without change of nature perfect Man, having recovered him from the fall and delivered him from the errors of idolatry, reconstructed him for immortality, and bestowed on him the gift which is without repentance. This gift was more God-like than the former, the reconstruction exceeded the original formation, and the benefit is eternal. They, however, not caring how they bedim the greatness of these gifts, shamelessly assert that a *new* idolatry has been brought in by the making of images, and they as boastfully vaunt a *new* redemption wrought out by themselves. Piecing out this expression of their sentiments with words of various kinds, they condemn the Church of God as being in error : they make their discourse smoother than oil, and intersperse some passages of Scripture ; but their words are deceitful, a piercing dart is under their lips. For they speak the words of peace, having hatred in their hearts, when they add as follows."

GREGORY reads :—

“ He rescued us from the destructive doctrine of devils—that is, from the error and worship of idols—and delivered to us the worship which is in spirit and in truth.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ Against your will, most worthy Sirs, are ye constrained to acknowledge the truth. For all the sacred company of the apostles, and the holy multitude of the fathers, declare that the Word, the Son of the Father, came among men to deliver us from the errors of idolatry. We have, moreover, the words of the Prophets proclaimed long before, which thus cry aloud, ‘ Behold the days come, saith the Lord, in which I will wipe away the names of the idols from off the face of the earth, neither shall they be remembered any more ’ (Zech. xiii. 2). And so it is that even ye are constrained to confess that Christ our God hath delivered us from the errors of idolatry. Now, if He hath delivered us, how can they who believe in Him again become idolators? Cease your absurd prating. Hath God incarnate redeemed us, and shall we again be enslaved? Shall we again fall under the power of Him who hath tyrannized over us in times past? Hear ye the divine Scripture declaring, ‘ His kingdom is an eternal kingdom, and His dominion from generation to generation. The Lord shall reign for ever and ever. Thy God, O Zion, is from generation to generation ’ (Psalm clxv. 13; cxlvi. 10). And God is not like the kings of this world, who at one time are victorious and at another are vanquished, but His victory remaineth for ever. ‘ For God is not man that He should be suspended, nor as the Son of man does He suffer threats ’* (Numb. xxiii. 19; *sec.* lxx.): with this also the Apostle agrees, when he declares ‘ That the gifts and calling of God are without repentance ’ (Rom. xi. 29). These things, they say, thinking thus to set themselves off; but now, in manifest contradiction to themselves, they add.

GREGORY reads :—

“ And when with His assumed body He had ascended to heaven, He left behind Him His holy Disciples and Apostles as teachers of this His saving faith. These having adorned our Church as His bride,

* Our version, which agrees with the Hebrew and the Vulgate, renders the passage thus: “ God is not a man that He should lie, nor the son of man that He should repent.” Cyprian, in order to make this text prophetic of our Saviour’s sufferings, adopts the strange version of the Septuagint.—*See his Testimonies against the Jews*, book ii. sect. 20.

with the various resplendent doctrines of piety, have rendered her most beautiful and glorious, and as it were clothed and decorated with a robe fringed with gold ; the beauty of which our illustrious fathers and doctors and the six holy Œcumenic Councils, having received into their care, have preserved without any diminution."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

" Ignorant and undiscerning, the underhand plotters of this new-fangled innovation did not perceive the drift of their own surreptitious exposition ; for, wishing to disguise their real sentiments under a veil of craft, through heedlessness they have made themselves truly ridiculous. For they say many and great things in praise of ecclesiastical order, and, whether they will or not, are constrained to confess that the six holy Œcumenic Councils have preserved it entire ; thus in words at least they take the garb of religion, while in their hearts they do wickedly : with their lips they honour her, while in their hearts they depart from her ; for they refuse to receive the tradition which has been held throughout all preceding ages by so many holy men. O, would that they had shown some reverence both for the multitude of the present generation of Christians, and, indeed, of all the Christians who have existed from the first preaching of the Gospel, before that they had thus cast out and denounced the illustration thereof by means of images ! Now, from the time of the convocation of the sixth holy Œcumenic Council to that in which they were convened against holy images, there was not more than seventy years. That it was not during this period that the usage of pictures and images was delivered to the Church is evident to all : it must therefore have originated previous to that event. Indeed, to speak the truth, they came in with the preaching of the Apostles,* as we learn from seeing the holy churches which have been built up in every place ; and, as our holy

* Possibly the use of images, and even some worship of them, existed prior to the assembling of the sixth Œcumenic Council ; and, so far, the inference of Epiphanius may be correct enough, but it was bold, indeed, to assert that it must have existed from the times of the Apostles ; but boldness of assertion is not proof : he does, indeed, allege some grounds of support, among which are the existence of churches, the testimony of fathers and historians. As to the first, the existence of churches by no means implies the existence of images in those churches. As a proof of this, is the fact narrated by Lactantius (" de Mort. Pers." c. 12), that on the breaking out of the tenth persecution, the Prefect and Officers broke open the doors of the great church of Nicomedia, and sought for an image of their God, but in vain. How long would they have to seek such an image in a Popish church or cathedral ? With respect to the testimonies of fathers there is none at all, the earliest mention of any use of images being the fourth century ; and as for historians, we have no other instance but that of the image, which a heathen woman set up in a street of a heathen city !

fathers have testified, and as historians relate, whose writings are with us, even to this present time. In the year of the world five thousand five hundred and one, Christ our God having come amongst

In the "Caroline Books" (lib. ii. cap. 25), this assertion is censured in the most indignant manner. The title of the chapter is—"Quod nusquam ab Apostolis, verbis aut exemplis, ut illi garrunt, imagines adorare institutum sit." After observing that Scripture was the great rule and authority of all Church ordinances, and among other things of this, that all worship of any creature is forbidden (except the civil respect which we pay to each other), and that we must worship God alone, it is continued as follows:—"When, therefore, these men, out of their zeal for images, declared that image-worship has been handed down to us from the Apostles, it is absolutely necessary that they also inform us from what examples it was established, or in what documents it was promulgated. Was it, then, Peter who instituted this worship due to images, who gently restrained Cornelius from worshipping himself? Or was it John who, when about to worship an Angel, was admonished not to do this, but, on the contrary, to worship God? Or was it Paul, who was filled with horror when the Lycaonians would have offered worship, in a superstitious way, to himself? Or Barnabas, who rejected the same with no less indignation than Paul? Since both Angels and Apostles forbid others to worship themselves, who so mad, who so absurd, as to assert that they originated the worship of images—more specially when, even if they had allowed worship to be paid to themselves (they would nevertheless have forbidden the worship of images), since the merit and nature of Angels and men is very different from that of images! But if neither Angels nor men are to be worshipped, except with that civil courtesy which the one pays to the other, how much less are images to be worshipped, which, being alike devoid of sense and reason, are nor worthy of even outward respect and courtesy! Now, if they are not to be worshipped, then these men are guilty of a double fault—first, in worshipping them at all, and then in making false pretence that such worship was an apostolical tradition, in order to do this as it were under their sanction." Having shown that there was no example of image-worship to be found amongst the Apostles in the New Testament, it is next proved that this worship is not taught in any of the Epistles; and as the Apostle Paul is the largest writer of that part of the sacred volume, the appeal is made more specially to his writings, amongst which, had any such thing been taught, we might expect to find it mentioned. It is remarked that neither in the Epistles to Timothy or Titus, where so many express directions are given about various things, not one word is said in favour of image-worship; and in his other Epistles sent to different Churches in the world, not the slightest mention is made of them: that the contempt of them is not inserted among the works of the flesh, mentioned by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. v. 19, 21); nor is the worshipping of them placed amongst the graces of the Holy Spirit, mentioned in the same chapter (21-24); and, lastly, among the various virtues recommended in 2 Cor. vi., is there the slightest allusion to any such worship. "Surely this illustrious preacher would have here inserted the worship of images had he conceived it to be beneficial to the Church; but, as he makes no mention of it here, it must be because he saw no benefit resulting from it."

Adrian introduces his proof that the Apostles did teach the worship of images with no small pomp, but as nothing of the kind was to be found in the Epistles of St. Paul, he is fain to make his quotation from the spurious works of Dionysius the Areopagite:—

"St. Dionysius the Areopagite (he writes), who also was Bishop of the Athenians, was very highly extolled by Pope Gregory, who proved that he was an ancient father and doctor. He lived in the times of the Apostles, as may be learned from the Acts of the Apostles: whence also his truthful sentiments in favour of image-worship have been confirmed in the sacred Councils of our

men, and having dwelt amongst them for thirty-three years and almost five months, and having accomplished the great and saving mystery of our redemption, went back again to heaven, ascending evidently thither, whence He had descended, having given charge to His Apostles to teach all things which were appointed them to teach. From this time, to the reign of Constantine the first Christian Emperor, elapsed about three hundred years, before whom none but heathens ruled, during which period the greater part of Christians, having fought the good fight and boldly protested against idolatry, obtained the Martyr's crown. In his days, the Christian public, inspired with godly zeal, raised many temples, some in the name of Christ and others in honour of the Saints; and in these they depicted both the things relative to the incarnate dispensation of our God, and also the combats and conflicts of the Martyrs. Others again, wishing ever to have about them the memorial of some much beloved Martyr or of Christ Himself, would have their images delineated on their garments. And, moreover, these images were wrought on the sacred vestments and on precious stones, both by our holy fathers and other religious men, and in these they offered the unbloody sacrifice: and from their time to the present all these things have been manifestly proved to continue, and they shall continue for ever."

most holy predecessors the above-named Pontiffs, amongst which records we find the following:—'We embrace also that which was said in the Epistle of St. Dionysius, Bishop of Athens, to St. John the Evangelist: and, afterwards, 'What wonder if Christ be true, and the wicked cast the righteous out of their cities? They, judging consistently with themselves, forbid those who departed any participation in sacred rites: in truth, visible things are manifestly images of invisible.'" The word *images* certainly occurs here, but what else Adrian and his most holy predecessors could possibly find in favour either of the use or worship of them does not appear.

Adrian has another passage more to the point from the treatise "De Cœlesti Militia:—"The above-mentioned incorporeal troops are set before us in various colours, and material figures and painted images; so that as we are enabled we may each one with pious mind, by means of these most sacred images, attain to the comprehension of abstract and incorporeal essences. For it were impossible with our mind to attain to that incorporeal vision and imitation of the celestial army, except as we make use of some material manufaction proportioned to its powers, and having visible forms and odours, as images of invisible beauty and intellectual diffusion."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 116, col. 2.

(1). This last sentence does but commend a historic use of images, but says not a word about any *worship* of the same. (2). Whatever be its merits as a composition, it was not written by Dionysius the Areopagite, and, therefore, fails to be a proof that image-worship was taught by the Apostles; and this is all the proof on this head that Adrian or his most holy predecessors could find! It is remarkable that neither Adrian nor his most holy predecessors in their sacred Councils, nor the Bishops of this Council of Nice, ever make the slightest allusion to the eight Canon of the pretended Apostolic Council of Antioch, though, had it been genuine, it must have been decisive on the point—a plain proof that that it was considered too barfaced a forgery to be seriously brought forward.

“ Again : when from time to time certain Heretics sprang up full of gall and bitterness against the Church, and when, for the subversion of the same, the six holy Œcumenic Councils were convened in succession by the good will of God, these confirmed and established all that had been delivered to the Catholic Church, whether written or unwritten, from the most ancient periods, among which things was the setting up of holy images. This was especially the case with the sixth holy Œcumenic Council : for, after its decision had been pronounced against those who maintained the one will in Christ our God, and, indeed, after that Constantine, then Emperor, by whose order, under the good providence of God, the Council had been assembled had departed this life, and his son Justinian had assumed the government, that the same fathers who had been assembled therein, met together again under the divine approbation after a lapse of four or five years, and then they issued forth one hundred and two canons for the better regulation of the affairs of the Church ; in which canons we find the following regulation about holy images in the eighty-second.” [Here follow the words of the canon at length ; but, as this is the *fourth* time it has been brought forward, it may be sufficient to refer the reader to other places where it is to be found. It was recited in the second Session, in Adrian’s “ Letter to Tarasius ;” in the third, in the “ Synodals of Tarasius ;” in the fourth, among the testimonies in favour of image-worship ; and a portion of it may also be found in Gregory’s “ Letter to Germanus.”] “ Whence we may all see and understand that, both before these holy Councils and after these holy Councils, the delineating of images has been handed down to the Church equally with the publication of the Gospels. For, as from reading, we receive the report thereof in our ears and thus transmit it to our minds, so when we look on the representative picture with our eyes we are in like manner enlightened as to our understanding ; and thus, by two different modes mutually illustrative of each other—I mean the reading of the word and the looking on pictures—we attain to the same knowledge by bringing to our minds events which have taken place. Hence, we find the co-operation of these two leading senses united together in the Song of Songs spoken of thus :—‘ Shew me thy face, and make me to hear thy voice, for thy voice is pleasant, and thy face is beautiful’* (Sol. Song ii. 14); concordantly with which we may

* This verse is quoted by Epiphanius as if it were an address of the Church to Christ that He would make her hear His voice in the reading of the Scripture and to see it in pictures and images ; whereas, it is an address of Christ to the Church, as is evident from the first part of the verse here carefully omitted—“ O, my dove, thou that art in the clefts of the rocks—in the secret places of

say with the Psalmist—'As we have heard so have we seen'* (Psalm *xlvi.* 8). Since, therefore, these things are so, it is not unsuitable to declare of those who prated against holy images. 'Each one hath

the stairs"—a description in no way applicable to Christ though very suitable to the Church, especially after seasons of affliction. The Septuagint commences the verse thus—" *συ περιστερα μου,*" making its unsuitableness to Christ yet more striking.

This misapplication is noticed in the "Caroline Books" (lib. ii. c. 10) :— "The face of the Church (it is observed), which Christ addresses with such gracious appellations as *dove, beautiful, beloved,* is not of a bodily but spiritual nature, even as the rest of the Song of Solomon is to be understood not carnally but spiritually. The face of the Church is the knowledge of her virtues, in the beauty of which the Spouse delighteth, as it is well said by the Prophet, 'For the King hath desired thy beauty.' Christ, therefore, exhorts the Church that she would discover her face to Him—that is, that she should ever more contemplate Him by faith and works, so as to be able to say with the Prophet Elisha, 'As the Lord liveth in whose sight I stand;' and may not be as those whom He points out by His Prophet, saying, 'They have turned their back on me and not their faces.' He exhorts her also to let her voice resound in His ears, since He is ever ready to hear His Saints. He declares her voice to be sweet and her face comely, because the prayers of the Saints are ever more acceptable to God, and their presence also is agreeable to Him who have received light from Christ, that they may persist in the beauty of righteousness."

It is further observed that, though even if the words, "Show me thy face," might apply to images, and the sight of them might be said to be beautiful, yet how could it be said of them—"Let me hear thy voice, for thy voice is sweet?" This objection is hardly fair, since the whole verse is not applied to images but only the first part; while the latter words are referred to the hearing of the Scripture.

"Very rightly (says Adrian, in reply), have they brought forward this verse; for the sight of images relates to the beautiful form of our Lord, of His Mother, and of the Saints. In various works of the fathers the book of Canticles has been explained as in the person of Christ and His Church; and if any wish to know how this verse may be understood, we bring forward to them the exposition of St. Epiphanius Bishop of Cyprus, in which, among many other things, he has the following :—'Show me thy face and make me to hear thy voice—that is, not only speak to me by the law and the Prophets, but show thyself to me altogether, just as when Moses was filled with such a desire, he said to God, Show thyself to me, that I may see thee.' At that time, however, He said to Moses, 'No man shall see my face and live.' In order, however, to show Himself to the Spouse, He displayed Himself to her, having become incarnate. He showed His face to her when conceived by the Virgin, the Mother of God, He made her to hear His voice when He taught His disciples in Mount Olivet, and again when by them He sent forth the doctrines of His Gospel throughout the world." The passage goes on to illustrate in many ways how the voice of Christ was sweet ("Adrian's Answer," p. 113, col. 1). It may be observed that, in this exposition, there is nothing in the least relative to images; and, further, that it seems doubtful whether this work is genuine: neither Cave nor Du Pin make the slightest mention of it. And, after all, it would not prove how the verse is to be understood, but rather how a learned father was mistaken in his interpretation.

* The misapplication of this text is noticed in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. c. 30) :—"Since they are so well pleased with their images that they would fain accommodate these words to them—'As we have heard so have we seen'—let them declare where it is that they have heard before of that which they now see in images—let them tell us which of the Patriarchs or Prophets ever

spoken vanity to his neighbour: their deceitful lips have spoken evil in their double heart* (Psalm xii. 2):† from which may we be delivered by the grace of Christ our Saviour the true God."

SECTION THE SECOND.

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Forgetful of the promise made to the Church by the Lord, who cannot lie, 'that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her,' with

revealed that, to their hearing, which now is evident to their sight—let them tell us who it was that predicted the privilege to them, not only of seeing images but even of worshipping them, on which prophecy laying hold, they can justly say, 'As we have heard so have we seen.' We, however, do not understand these words of any images made with hands, but of those more illustrious and eminent mysteries which once were subject of prophecy; thus, as in the Law we heard of the coming of Christ, we see it in the Gospel: as in the Prophets, we found that which related to the incarnation of Christ, we see the fulfilment in the pages of the New Testament; and as in the Hagiographa, and other holy writings of old, we saw His nativity, passion, death, and ascension mysteriously prefigured, so in the Gospel have we beheld them as actually performed. Again: when, by the providence of God, we have arrived at the eternal country, and there shall see that glory and happiness of which we here have heard, we shall then say, 'As we have heard so have we seen'—that is, as we heard when mortal so we see now we are made incorruptible; as we heard while on our wearisome pilgrimage, so we see in the most happy region of the living; as we heard amidst the storms and tempests of life, so we see in this most delectable safety of Paradise; as we heard while fearful of shipwreck, so we see now arrived at our long wished-for port."

* Literally, with a heart and a heart.

† In the "Caroline Books" (lib. 1, c. 26), this verse is retorted upon themselves and their Council in favour of image-worship. It is observed:—"Where there is no utility there is no gain; and where there is no gain then all is vanity: so, when there is no utility, there is greatest vanity. As then, therefore, in the worship of images is no profit, no utility, no advantage, we must think there is nothing but vanity. They, therefore, who have assembled Councils and Synods together to establish and confirm this vanity, and then decree that we must by all means worship images, have undoubtedly 'spoken vanity each one to his neighbour.'"

The remainder of the chapter is taken up with explaining what is the real meaning of the verse; and it is interpreted to mean the Council of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and others against Christ, by which they often plotted against His life, and at length succeeded in putting Him to death. It is considered also that the verse may point out the worldly and vain wisdom manifested by Heretics and Schismatics in their speculations.

To this Adrian replies, like one scarce awake from a sound nap, "It is not so that they despised that which the Psalmist wrote—'They have spoken vain things,' &c.—but, despising the madness of Heretics, they say with the Psalmist concerning them, 'They have spoken vain things each one to his neighbour,' &c.: and from blessed Augustin, in the explanation of the same Psalm, among other things we find"—nothing to the present purpose.—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 115, col. 1.

open and unabashed front, and with a mouth filled with contradictory dogmas, they carry on their warfare against her; and thus, having stolen their words from the fathers and setting them forth as their own, they speak as follows."

GREGORY reads:—

"Again: the above-mentioned author of evil, not enduring to behold such comeliness, never ceased, at various times and by various modes of sinful machination, to endeavour to bring mankind into subjection to himself by his stratagems; wherefore, under the guise of Christianity, he secretly introduced idolatry, having persuaded by his sophistries all who would pay any regard to them not to cease from the creature, but still to worship, still to adore it, and to consider that which is made, as God, if it be called by the name of Christ."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"They who wage war against the spiritual Jerusalem—that is, the Catholic Church—are in a manner prefigured by those who once fought against the earthly Jerusalem, for they would fain use the language of the fathers in the same way that Rabshakeh made use of the Hebrew language against Israel*—that is, they would set the language of the fathers and the doctrine of the Church in array against the fathers and against the Catholic Church; but 'by their fruits shall ye know them' (Matt. vii. 20), saith the Lord. For 'they are like unto whited sepulchres which outwardly appear beautiful to men' (Matt. xxiii. 27)—that is, these Christianity-detractors are as it were concealed under expressions used by the fathers, 'while inwardly they are full of bones and all impurity'—that is, of dead and putrifying dogmas. But we will break up their tomb and unveil all their impurities; we will show how they pervert, according to their own lusts, that which our holy fathers† have delivered to the Church; and, while they use the very same words, craftily give to them a different sense: and that in this way these men have applied to the formation of holy images

* Rabshakeh used the Hebrew tongue to speak blasphemous things against God: the fathers of the Iconoclastic Council adapted the words of Gregory Nyssen against the Arians to images: even if they were faulty in doing this, they could not be equally guilty with Rabshakeh, unless images are as sacred as is God Himself.

† These Nicene divines should be the last to speak of perversion, who have perverted and misapplied Scripture and the fathers equally; as the "Caroline Books" have abundantly proved (*Vide Car. Lib.*, lib. i. c. 21, 22, 23, 24, and many more besides).

that which our fathers brought forward against the Arians.* Thus, the venerable Gregory Bishop of the Church of Nyssa, in his 'Epitaph on the holy Basil,' his brother, both in the flesh and in the spirit, has urged against the Arians that very passage which these men have applied to images. This we may easily see if we consider the beginning of this same paragraph, which is as follows:—'No one can be altogether ignorant as to the reason of the manifestation of our great master at this particular period. For, when the madness of men after their idols was well nigh extinguished by the preaching of the Gospel; and throughout the world all such like vain superstitions were at the very verge of destruction from the proclamation of the doctrines of true piety; so that the great master of human error, pressed on all sides by the name of Christ, was driven from the face of the earth: the inventor of evil, to evil only wise, never desisted from any wicked artifice whereby he might again through deceit bring the world under subjection to himself. Wherefore, under the guise of Christianity, he secretly introduced idolatry, having persuaded by his sophistries those who would pay any regard to them not to cease from the creature, but to worship and to adore it, and to reverence that which is made as God if it be but called by the name of *Son*. Now, if any creature sprung from things which did not exist and did not in its own proper nature participate with Deity, no respect ought to be paid to it: but they, having given the name of Christ to a creature, did both worship it and serve it, and on it they placed their hopes of salvation and from it awaited the judgment to come † And thus the Arch-apos-

* If this argument hold good in all cases, then even the Apostle Paul must be condemned, who often adapts passages from the Old Testament to a scene somewhat parallel, but by no means exactly the same, and actually changes some words to meet his purpose. Thus, in Rom. x. 6-8, the same words are used in respect of the Gospel, which Moses, in Deut. xxx. 11-14, used concerning the law. And the expression in the Old Testament, *τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τόπῆραν τῆς θαλάσσης*, is changed into *τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*. Other instances of the same kind might be brought forward. As the spirit of the text is not altered, who would think of charging the Apostle with falsification? As the passage from Gregory was professedly adapted, the question is how far the adaptation applies: possibly, Protestants may think that worship paid to a picture is quite as idolatrous as worship paid to a super-angelic being.

† If the addition of the name "Christ" to any created being, however exalted, could never render such a being worthy of worship, because after all it still was a created thing, and if to worship such created thing would be a kind of idolatry, so the addition of the name "Christ" to a certain picture could never render it worthy of worship, for it is but a picture still, and, therefore must leave all who do in any way worship it obnoxious to the charge of idolatry.

tate having infused all his impieties into the minds of men well fitted to fall in with them—I mean Arius, Ætius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius, and many more besides—by means of these brought back again idolatry, now on the decline, under the garb of Christianity, as I said before. And this disease of worshipping the creature more than the Creator so prevailed that, by the aid of the then Emperors, this deceit had the mastery, and all the most illustrious kingdoms were overwhelmed with the same malady. When, therefore, almost all men had passed over to the dominant opinion, then was the great Basil manifested, as Elijah to Ahab, who, coming to the aid of the Priesthood now in a manner fallen, made, by the grace which dwelt within him, the word of the faith which was like the dying taper to shine forth in its former splendour.* You may now see how the case really stands: the whole scope of the argument of the father is directed against the Ariomanites; for he declares that Saint Basil was raised up at the very time when Arius, Eunomius, Eudoxius, Macedonius, and all their Semirian and Anomæan crew, who affirmed that the Son and the Word of our God was a creature, flourished. These, therefore, worshipping a creature as God, were by him and by the whole Church called idolators, for they declare that which they worship to be made of nothing even as all other creatures. But, with respect to holy images, Christians never called them gods, nor have they ever worshipped them as gods; neither have they set their hopes upon them or expected from them the future judgment: and if for the sake of memorial or record they retain them, or if out of regard to their prototype they embrace them and pay them the worship of honour (*τιμητικῶς προσέκυνησαν*), they have never served them with *λατρεία* (*ἐλάτρευσαν*) or ascribed divine

* To confute this vain distinction we need go no further than to the pages of this Council itself. Take the instance of the miracle wrought on the wife of Constantine of Laodicea. The woman neither looks to God nor prays to Him for help; and all the husband's confidence is in the waxen images of SS. Cosmas and Damian. He produces them, his wife worships them, and is healed—so in the story immediately preceding. The diseased person is told to go, not to Christ but to His Saints, Cosmas and Damian—that is, to their images, to which he prayed every day. So Mary of Egypt prays to the Virgin's image for that which God alone could give—pardon of sin—"I look to thee and seek no other aid but thine." Adrian applies Psalm lvi. 12 to the image of Christ; and Gregory II. applies the same verse to the image of the Virgin. When, then, the Psalmist said—"Whose face the rich among the people shall worship," what did he mean but that men should worship Christ with supreme worship? Adrian and Gregory, by their misquotation, evidently direct the same worship to be given to the images of Christ and of Mary. And, as the Council received these tales and expositions with express attestations and subscriptions, they are guilty of the same errors, and did not observe their own sophistical distinction. Indeed, it is hard to say which degrade

honours to them—away with the calumny! Nor have they ever done this* to anything whatever that was accounted amongst creatures. Now, the Arians, though they accounted the Son and Word of God to be a creature, gloried in expecting from Him their hopes of salvation, and in asserting that the future judgment should be administered by Him: wherefore, the inspired father confuting them, says ‘they worship it—that is, the creature—they serve it, they place on it their hopes of salvation; from it they expect the judgment.’ Wherefore, the patrons of this innovation are proved to be adulterators of the truth, and, according to the Prophet, vintners mixing wine with water. Nor is this all; but they are also found to be absolute falsifiers of the traditions of the fathers; for, whereas the father said, ‘If called by the name of Son,’ they wishing to adapt the phrase to the case of images, instead of by the name of Son, have falsely inserted ‘by the name of Christ.’ For it is evident that, when he says ‘by the name of Son,’ that he means to speak of the Arians who blasphemed the eternal, uncreated, and divine generation of the Son; wherefore he also gives the names of the great leaders of that heresy, saying, ‘I mean Arius, Eunomius, Eudoxius and Ætius.’ But these men, by the substitution of the word *Christ* instead of *Son*,* have endeavoured to make the blasphemy applicable to the formation of images. Hereby they are proved evidently to be both falsifiers and mendacious, and to be introducers of that which is unlawful.”

GREGORY reads:—

“Wherefore, as of old, Jesus the Author and Finisher of our salvation sent forth His Disciples and Apostles in the power of the most Holy Spirit for the destruction of idols throughout the world, so also now hath He stirred up our faithful Sovereigns, His servants, and of like spirit with the Apostles, endued with wisdom by the power of the same Holy Ghost, for our confirmation and instruction—for the demolition of the strongholds of Satan, exalted against the knowledge of God and the utter confutation of all devilish wiles and errors.”†

Christ most, the Romanists, &c., with their superstitions, or the Arian, with his vain reasonings.

* This charge of falsification is done away with, by their own quotation; for Gregory himself makes the very charge so much complained of, writing thus:—“But they having given to a creature (*Χριστου ὄνομα*) the name of Christ,” not of the Son.

† This language may seem harsh, yet when the magnitude of the corruption is considered is it not justifiable? Is it more harsh than our Lord's own word to Peter (Matt. xvi. 23), or to the Jews (John viii. 44), or of St. Paul to

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Who ever reached such a height of impiety before? What more outrageous than this impiety? O, their shameless, their abominable blasphemy! O, the hidden artifice, the multifold craftiness! Truly they have been instructed in devilish wiles when they speak thus, and have the unparalleled audacity to call that vision and sight which so clearly and evidently lead us to glorify God, by which also we contemplate the depth of the humility of God the Word, and recall to mind His conversation in the flesh, His passion, and His life-giving death—*strongholds of Satan exalted against the knowledge of God.* ‘Verily, they have bent their bow to shoot out bitter words that they may privily wound the upright in heart’ (Psalm lxiv. 3). Since they have confessed that, for the overthrow of idols, holy Disciples have been sent forth endued with power from on high, the Holy Ghost having descended upon them, surely they ought not to speak of others also being stirred up, after that their tradition and doctrine had maintained its ground for near eight hundred years, and our holy fathers had confirmed and established the same as a safe anchor! Once entirely redeemed by Christ from idols, we can never be obnoxious to censure on account of idols now, unless they dare to say that a transformation has taken place in the Church; and that other rules and ordinances have been delivered to her,* urging against us unreasonable charges full of contradiction. And, whereas these worthy persons have been pleased to speak thus, ‘as formerly, *Jesus the Author and Finisher of our salvation,*’ they ought in all consistency to add, ‘Everything which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away’ (Heb. viii. 13). ‘The doctrine of the Apostles is now grown old, and we are selected to raise a new doctrine in place thereof.’ For Moses and Aaron were priests; but when grace came in their stead the

Elymas? For errors of much less importance Nestorius was stigmatised by the Council of Ephesus as the “New Judas!” But we have for this language the authority of one who was both a father and a saint, Epiphanius, who says “Hæres,” 79:—“Προφάσει δικαίου αἰεὶ ὑπεισδύνων τὴν διάνοιαν ὁ διαβολὸς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀνδροείκελα ἀγάλματα διὰ ποικιλίας τεχνῶν διέγραψε.” And Agobard observes, “De Imag.,” sect. xxxi.—“Agit hoc nimirum versutus et calidus humani generis inimicus, ut sub pretextu honoris sanctorum rursus idola introducat, rursus per divinas effigies adoretur.”—See *Whitby's Treatise in Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vi. p. 261., vol. vii. 322.

* Do these Nicene fathers pretend that all the rules and regulations in force amongst themselves existed in the times of the Apostles, or, indeed, in the first six centuries after Christ? They have entirely failed in proving any kind of worship of images before the sixth century.

Apostle declared that ‘another priest was raised up’ (Heb. vii. 15) : wherefore these ought in consistency to bring in a greater grace still exceeding that of the Apostles.* But they add this also, ‘for our confirmation and instruction.’ Now, as they of that Synod were Bishops and had with them the perfection of the Apostolic order, they ought to have *confirmed* others, and not to have been *confirmed* by others, and this the more especially when they would reject the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles and Fathers. Whence it is evident that they were not partakers of their doctrine and instruction, because they walk not according to their tradition : and it is of them also that David speaks, saying, ‘The Lord shall destroy the deceitful lips and the tongue that speaketh proud things’ † (Psalm xii. 3). Let the Psalmist David say for us, or rather let us say with him in truth, ‘The sword of the enemy hath failed for ever, and thou hast destroyed ‡ their cities’ (Psalm ix. 6). At what time, then, did the sword of the enemy fail in his cities—that is, his stronghold? Was it not at the incarnation of Christ? Concerning whom it is written that ‘He shall

* The Iconoclasts brought in no new Gospel, but merely endeavoured to restore the old doctrine to its primitive purity. The law was intended to last but for a time : it was to be superseded in its old age by the younger doctrine of Christianity; but Christianity being the last revelation, when it is corrupted, is not to be superseded by any other, but corruptions of it are to be removed.

† In the “Caroline Books” (lib. i. cap. 27) this quotation is censured as inappropriate :—“This verse (it is remarked) which the Psalmist wrote concerning the deceitful lips of those who took counsel to slay the Saviour of the world, they, in their Synod, apply to their own parents, who, though they were somewhat rash in prohibiting images as ornaments of churches, yet were not to be compared in rashness or cruelty with those who crucified the Lord. They had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, when they altogether rejected images; but the others, under pretence of zeal for the law, had only the zeal of malignity and most perfidious iniquity in fixing the Saviour to the cross : they indiscreetly broke to pieces the ornaments of the church, but the Jews most contemptuously mangled the Lord Himself.” For the rest of the chapter, the verse is illustrated from the proud sayings of Jews and Pharisees recorded in the New Testament; and, in conclusion, it is remarked that nothing but a disgraceful love of images could have made them apply to citizens that which was intended by the Prophet for the enemies of the Church—yea, of Christ Himself.

Adrian’s reply contains nothing worthy of notice.—P. 117, col. 1.

‡ In the “Caroline Books” (lib. i. cap. 28) the meaning of this verse is explained, and is shown to have no connexion with the overthrow of Iconoclastic opinions. But the intention of the Council seems to have been mistaken; for they do not intend thereby the overthrow of their adversaries, but rather the subversion of Paganism by the coming of the Saviour, and it is brought forward thus—“If the swords of the enemy have failed for ever at the coming of Christ, how should the Iconoclasts pretend to have the enemy to contend with now.”

Adrian’s reply consists of an assertion and a quotation as usual irrelevant.—P. 117, col. 1.

divide the spoil with the strong* (Isaiah liii. 10)? Surely, it was not of their pseudo-Synod and the factions connected with it that, by means of it, 'the sword of the enemy failed for ever!' And if *for ever*, and in every way, 'the sword of the enemy failed for ever and the cities of iniquity have been destroyed,' how is it that these men should prate about their being rebuilt and renewed? Is it that they may ascribe the destruction of them to themselves, and declare that the redemption † of the human race is their work? Thus derogating from the great mystery of our redemption, the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed for evermore. Now, with gross flattery to the reigning power, they add:—

GREGORY reads:—

“Who stirred up by the divine zeal which was in them, and not enduring to behold the Church of God made a prey through the deceit of devils” ‡—

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“They who talk thus could not know the promises which the Catholic Church has received from Christ who founded her, nor do

* To interpret this prophecy or that of the Psalmist immediately preceding, as absolutely fulfilled even now, is to make prophecy stand in opposition to fact. Rather a commencement of this *destruction* and this *division of spoils* was made at our Saviour's first coming, which destruction and division will not be entirely completed till His second advent. In the meantime the destroyed power of the enemy may revive and require a renewed overthrow. It was not till three hundred years after Christ that this prophecy was fulfilled in the Roman Empire; but Rome, large as it was, was not the world. The sword of the enemy still prevailed in Persia, and the cities of Pagan impiety were still standing in populous regions unknown to Rome at all. Again: in Africa and the East the sword of the Pagan enemy was revived in still more hostile Mahomedanism; and the Christian city of Constantinople has become the head quarters of the Arabian impiety. The sword of the enemy shall fail, his cities shall be destroyed, though as yet it is not so. However, the enemy has not only swords to destroy, but deleterious mixtures to poison; so that, even where professed Paganism was rooted out, concealed idolatry might come in its place: wherefore, it was not unreasonable to think that, as Christ had established Christianity by Constantine I., He might purify it by means of Constantine V.

† The fathers of this Council seem to limit redemption to the deliverance from Pagan idolatry, and thus they put a part for the whole. In this sense of converting nations the Apostles redeemed the human race; but no such incorrect language is found in the New Testament. Redemption is the work of Christ only, but conversion from error is committed to human instruments; and, in like manner, the reformation of the Church.

‡ Similar flattery appears in the letter in which Tarasius detailed the performance of the Council to Constantine and Irene:—“ἀλλὰ πάντην τῇ ἀνρα τῷ θεοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκοῦντος ἀφανίσαι προεβυμήθητε.”

they confess that the human race has been saved by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; for those whom Christ has redeemed, they, as it were, sell back again to the devil, and those whom He hath quickened by His own death they destroy with the deleterious poison of their own lips and plunge them into the infernal lake. Let them listen to the Canticles singing plainly of the Church as in the person of Christ—‘Thou art all fair my beloved, and there is no fault with thee’ (Sol. Song iv. 7). Behold how they hear that she is all fair and that she is beloved of Christ, and that there is no fault in her; and, besides, it is said by Isaiah—‘I have engraven thy walls in my hand, and thou art continually in my sight’ (Isaiah xlix. 7), How can she who hath received such promises become a prey from the hostile power of devils? And as according to the Apostle, Christ is the Head, who can make a spoil of her? ‘Hath He presented her unto Himself not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing’ (Ephes. v. 23), and can she again be defiled? What a supposition! It is evident that the denial of His dispensation is involved in such an assertion! Their aim has been to bring to nought the Church of Christ: * wherefore the Lord shall bring them to nought, and they shall be set at nought and anathematised by all who are born in her; but she hath ever remained undespoiled, unshaken, and immoveable. They, however, having filled their mouth with flattery, now proceed with much boasting to give an account of the great things which they have accomplished.”

GREGORY reads :

“—have therefore called together the whole sacerdotal company of God-beloved Bishops, that, being assembled synodically and having made scriptural inquisition concerning this seductive art of image-making, which has turned aside the minds of men from that exalted worship which is suitable to the divine nature to a grovelling and material worship of creatures, they might, under the direction of God, decide as it seemed right to them, knowing that it was written in the Prophet—‘The Priest’s lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts’” (Malachi ii. 7).

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“Forgetful, as it appears, of the birth of God the Word from the

* Is the Church one and the same thing with image-worship, for this is all that the Iconoclasts would bring to nought?

Virgin and of the great and saving mystery which He having dwelt in the flesh hath bestowed upon us, who hath delivered us from error of idols and the insane worship of them, they would fain attribute this work of salvation to themselves. But while they thus glorify themselves they are ingloriously trampled under foot by the Church. To such Christ our God speaks most opportunely by His Prophet—‘The priests have disregarded my law—they have profaned my holy things—they have not separated between the holy and the profane—they have not separated between the clean and the unclean’* (Ezek. xxii. 26). Thus they have made no distinction between the image of Christ and His Saints, and the images of devils, giving them one and the same name of *idols*, thus calumniating the Church which Christ our God purchased with His own blood. Wherefore, they have doctored this publication of the Gospel as *that deceitful art of image-making*, which the faithful, who look not on that which is seen so much as on that which is signified thereby, speak of and name, as venerable and holy. For when they hear with the ear, they say, ‘Glory be to thee, O Lord,’ and when they see with the eye they unite in the same doxology. For by both we are led to remember His conversation amongst men, and whatever narration teaches by writing, the same also does painting make equally plain to us.

“But now let us advert to the remainder of their shameless and bombastic pratings; for they add, ‘*which has turned aside the minds of men from that exalted worship so suitable to the divine nature to a grovelling and material worship of creatures.*’ O the stark madness! Having their tongue as a sharp sword whetted with lies, they give out that the immaculate faith of us Christians has been exchanged for a *reverence of images*, and they speak calumniously in styling this a *grovelling and material worship of creatures* (κτισματολατρείαν). No Christian under heaven ever served (ἐλάτρευσεν) any image.† This is a heathen fiction—a devilish invention—a device of Satanic cunning! This was destroyed by the sojourning of Christ amongst us.

* If, like the Mahomedans or Jews, the Iconoclasts had rejected Christianity altogether because of its corruptions, then they might justly be accused of not having made this separation between the holy and the profane; but their endeavour to separate holy worship of God from the corrupt additions and sinful inventions of men proves that the censure of the text belongs not to them, but rather to their adversaries who received the holy and profane alike, scriptural worship and anti-scriptural additions, without any endeavour to separate the one from the other.

† Many, notwithstanding this assertion, who are called Christians, have worshipped and served their favoured image with the utmost of their power and with all the ignorance of an Heathen.

Worship is now in spirit and in truth: nevertheless, the Church hath in store many things * which are offered to God for a memorial of Himself and of His Saints, amongst the rest is the making of images. But now see how they convict themselves, saying, '*That they should decide as it might appear good to them.*'† Surely, they never adverted to the word written from the mouth of the Lord, 'He who speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory' (John vii. 18). Now, they themselves bear witness that they speak of themselves, and not from the Holy Spirit. Who, then, would give any heed to them except such as are in like manner destitute of the Holy Spirit? But now, not glorying in the Lord but in their own tongues, they add."

GREGORY reads:—

"Our holy Synod, therefore, which has been assembled together to the number of Three Hundred and Thirty-Eight Bishops, following the usual synodical regulations, joyfully receives and heartily proclaims the decrees and traditions which former Councils, having firmly established, have transmitted to us to hold in like manner."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Having got together a goodly crowd, they make a great parade with their vaunted numbers, and bringing up their motley crew against the Church, they have given unbounded license to their tongues, babbling forth that which they ought not, until they reached the very summit of iniquity; and thus, like to the people of the Hebrews, 'they were increased and became vile ‡ (Exodus i. 7). But the Lord was not well pleased with them, and why? Because, having put themselves out of the pale of the Church, 'they wandered in the desert in a dry place' (Psalm cvii. 4), not having that spiritual wine 'which maketh glad the heart of man' (Psalm civ. 15.) But, again, they say the same things concerning themselves, and pretending in word to follow synodical regulations while in works they deny them. They thus enumerate the six Œcumenic Synods in the following manner."

* This store is unwritten tradition: the Pharisees of old had similar stores, but what said the Saviour of them—"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up" (Matt. xviii. 18). Image-worship is among these strange slips.

† In order to make the charge of self-sufficiency and pride more evident against the Iconoclasts, the word *θεοκινήτως* is omitted by Epiphanius: such omissions argue great unfairness.

‡ This translation is according to the Septuagint: the Vulgate and the English have, "They multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty."

GREGORY reads:—

“And, first of all, was the holy great and Œcumenic Council* assembled at Nice under Constantine, that great Emperor of holy memory, which deposed the most impious Arius from the sacerdotal rank—because that he had taught that the uncreated Son of God, consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and in all respects equal in glory and honour with them, was a creature—which also framed the divinely-dictated symbol of our saving faith; and, after that, the Council of one hundred and thirty holy fathers, who were assembled in the royal city under Theodosius the Great, which condemned Macedonius, the enemy of the Holy Ghost, for having blasphemed the immaculate and uncreated Spirit, and for having impiously taught that he was not consubstantial with the Father and the Son; which also made more full and clear the symbol of our saving faith, having therein defined that the Holy and Almighty Spirit was God.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“These two holy Œcumenic Councils the impious Nestorius and his heretical partizans received; and, like him, their own tumultuary Conventicle has, while admitting former Councils, introduced a new heresy, from which its partizans have received the name of Christianity-detractors from the holy Catholic Church of God. And really they are just like to foolish men who, when the sun shines, say to each other, ‘By the brightness of the sun the stars are hidden,’ or ‘It is day and not night;’ so idly do they declaim about things evident and well known to all,† adding as follows.”

* In this review of the Councils it may be remarked that the authority of convening each in succession is ascribed to the Emperor in whose reign it was assembled. This was done in order to show that no prejudice should be taken against the Council about images, because it was convened by order of the Emperor Constantine the Fifth. And further, we find no objection made to this by their adversaries—a pretty plain proof that Emperors, not Popes nor Patriarchs, were at that time and up to that time considered to possess the authority of convening such assemblies. In this agrees our Twenty-first Article—“General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes.”

† Why this enumeration of the Councils should be more childish or trifling than those which are found in the synodals of Tarasius or Theodore, against which no exception was made, does not appear. Some fault must be found and, as no real fault can be discovered, pretended blemishes must be brought forward.

GREGORY reads:—

“After these was the Council of two hundred holy fathers, the first of Ephesus, assembled under Theodosius the younger, which condemned the Jewish-minded man-worshipping Nestorius for having declared that Christ the Word of God subsisted apart, and that Christ who was born of a woman was another person: thus making God the Word to exist apart and by Himself, and the man Christ to exist by Himself; and thence dogmatising that there were two hypostases in the one Christ, and denying the hypostatical union, according to which He is worshipped not as one person with another; but, as being considered one Jesus Christ the only Begotten, He is honoured together with His own body with one worship.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Eutyches, Dioscorus, and the other *Confusionists* (*συγχυτικοί*) received this Council, but still they have been accounted heretics because they introduced another heresy; and, therefore, these men also shall be numbered together with them, because of the new-fangled innovations which they have brought into the Catholic Church. And just as children in a sportive manner say and do amongst their fellows what has been said and done by their fathers, so do these men affect to bring forward and commit to writing in a didactic manner that which is very well known to all the world, and thus become a laughing-stock to all. But continuing the same empty verbiage they add.”

GREGORY reads:—

“Then follows the illustrious and far-famed Council which met at Chalcedon under the God-beloved Emperor Marcian, which anathematised Dioscorus and the unhappy Eutyches, who taught that Christ who, with His flesh, is one and the same Lord, after the complete hypostatic union, did no longer subsist in two natures; but that of the two natures an union was effected whereby one nature mixed and compounded of the two was produced.

“In addition to these was the Council of one hundred and sixty-four holy fathers which was convened at Constantinople under Justinian of sacred memory, which condemned Origen surnamed Adimantius, Evagrius and Didymus, together with their Pagan writings; Theodore Bishop of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus the precep-

tor of Nestorius ; Severus, Peter, Zoonas, with their impious opinions ; and the epistle said to be written by Ibas to Maris the Persian, and which confirmed the pious decrees of the holy great fourth Council."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"These holy Œcumenic Councils and those which preceded, Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, Honorius of Rome, and their Monothelite party, received ; but, nevertheless, they have been anathematised as heretics by the Catholic Church, as having brawled out vain things in the Church by their heresy : so these men, though they receive these same holy Synods, yet, on account of their peculiar heresy, have they been cast out of the Church. Indeed, all they say about them is vain, idle, and unworthy of any notice ; for though they style these Councils holy yet do they oppose and controvert them.* Now, if they have done this in ignorance it proves their want of discipline and of sense ; but, if consciously, it argues impiety and conscience altogether perverted. Either let them point out to us one Council in opposition to another, unless it be of the number of those which having no part in the Catholic Church have been anathematised by her, like their own ; or let them follow those which are holy and approved, and what these permitted to be in the Church let them receive. Had they admitted images they would have acted in accordance with the Catholic Church, since these have been admitted in the six holy Œcumenic Councils ; but, as they follow not the Catholic Church, let no one give any heed to those who turn aside from her holy traditions."

GREGORY reads :—

"In like manner, also in the times of the pious Emperor Constantine, a Council of one hundred and seventy holy fathers was assembled in this royal city, which anathematised and denounced Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Honorius of Rome,† Sergius, Paul,

* Nothing was easier to say than that the Iconoclasts owned these Councils in words and denied them in fact ; and then, taking this assertion for proof, to go on gravely arguing as to the degree of criminality of which they have been guilty ; but they have not made it at all appear in what way the Iconoclasts disbelieved the divinity of the Son or the Holy Spirit, maintained the two persons with Nestorius, or the one nature and one will with Eutyches and the Monophysites. Did they think they were to be believed without any proof at all ?

† In one point both these adverse Councils agree : both consider Honorius Bishop of Rome as a Monothelite heretic. Baronius and others have wasted a

Pyrrhus, and Peter, successively Patriarchs of Constantinople; Macarius of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen; for having taught that there was but one will and operation in the two natures of our Lord Jesus Christ."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"To this trifling we make no further answer, having sufficiently replied to it before. But, again, with artful intention they bring, before our notice these holy Councils in the following manner."

GREGORY reads:—

"These six holy Œcumenic Councils, piously, and as it pleased God, having expounded the dogmas of the immaculate faith of us Christians, and being under the influence of the Spirit of the God-delivered Gospels, have handed down this to us that in one Christ our Lord and God is one Person in two natures, in two wills and operations, and have taught that the miracles and the sufferings were of one and the same person."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"O, the conceit, the insufferable arrogance, of these men!—who, as if the Church were unlearned and had no acquaintance with holy doctrines, must needs undertake to instruct her! Whereas she has been declared to be full of all wisdom, as with the great voice of the Spirit, the divine Apostle her mystical instructor cries aloud saying— 'That to the principalities and powers might be made known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God'* (Ephes. iii. 10). They have not determined wisely but very dangerously, when they brought forward for discussion points which need no enquiry; for the Church hath received and set her seal to these doctrines as a safe anchor, and stands in no need of their sanction. But our fathers, together with these sacred dogmas, received also holy images, counted them worthy of a certain reverence and worship, set them up in the venerable temples which were built by them, and, indeed, had them painted in every convenient place and embraced them. These men, on the other hand, have dared to exalt themselves above all that holy company, and

volume of sophistical arguments to extricate him for the sake of the See; but alas! he remains where he was. That he inclined to the Monothelites there is no doubt; and consequently, if they were sad heretics, he was one.

* The words *ἐν τοῖς ἐκουφανίοις* are omitted in this quotation.

have set up a throne in opposition to theirs, like to the devil the father of lies, lifting up their heads on high, and these holy things they have polluted and insulted, and even cast them into the fire. O the atrocity! O the audacious madness! Let their mischievous imagination perish: may the Lord save His people from their deadly impieties. Henceforth may all obey the Catholic Church—may they receive all pictures, whether of evangelical narration or of the conflicts of the Martyrs—and may they embrace them even as the holy Church of God has received from the beginning. Still with the same artifice they continue their idle pratings.”

GREGORY reads:—

“Into which things we, having by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, examined and enquired with much care and thought, have found that the unlawful art of the painter blasphemes against this important doctrine of our salvation—that is, the dispensation of Christ—and also that it subverts these same six holy Œcumenic divinely-assembled Councils.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Their care and their thought has been for evil; for as Absalom cared much and thought deeply when plotting with Ahitophel against his own father, so have these men plotted against the holy fathers. And as Ahab seemed to himself to be under the divine guidance when he received the predictions of the false prophets, and was disappointed in his expectation, so it is with them. The writer of Proverbs has said, ‘There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof is the way of death’ (Prov. xiv. 12), which end will be their own, since overcome with the desire of pleasing men; and, speaking from their own belly,* they conceive those ways of theirs to

* This expression, which occurs more than once, is censured in the “Caroline Books” (lib. iv. cap. 17) as being *ridiculosissimum*:—“Though this expression (it is remarked) may not be prejudicial to the faith and neither forwards nor obstructs the work in which they were engaged, yet as being unlearned and absurd we could not altogether pass it by. Language like this does not befit the constitutions of the Church, since she admits nothing but that which is irreprehensible. This expression, ‘they have spoken from their own belly,’ not only is offensive to learned but even to unlearned ears, and is rejected by all as an anile folly. That which the mind expresses by the tongue comes from the *heart*, and as the heart cannot *digest food* so neither can the belly conceive thoughts or give utterance to them by words. Each member has its proper office, and the five senses have each their appropriate member except the touch, which though it be considered to have its special seat in the

be right, which will bring all who give heed to them to the lake of hell.* For how does the making of images blaspheme against this most important mystery (as they call it) of the dispensation of Christ; or in what way is the art of the painter subversive of the doctrine of the six holy Œcumenic Councils? Or how is it contrary to their meaning that images have been set up in churches, when the very fathers themselves, who thus magisterially and spontaneously unfolded the mystery of our salvation, caused representations of it to be made in holy temples, employing for this purpose the art of the painter? It cannot be as they affirm; for which of our sacred fathers has ever proved that he considered the art of the painter as unlawful in respect of the important doctrine of our salvation—that is, the dispensation of Christ? For that which any one admits, He will not readily censure. So it seems they would make vain assertions easily enough, but were not so well able to prove them! Or it may be they supposed that no one would ever know how deceitfully they had dealt with the truth. All mechanical arts whatever, which tend to draw us aside from observance of the commands of God, are to be denounced as evil; but others not of this nature, which are found useful for this present life, and have nothing evil connected with them, were never rejected and cast away by our holy fathers. And thus, the art of the painter,† if any one use it for base purposes, must be considered

hands is nevertheless generally diffused over the other members as well. According to the philosophers, fear is situate in the heart; joy in the spleen, pleasure in the liver; sense in the anterior portion of the brain towards the face; motion in the hinder part towards the neck; and in the intermediate part, memory: to the lungs is given the office of breathing and of modulating the sound of the voice, while the belly serves only for the digestion of the food. But if they think to support themselves by such expressions as these, 'My belly trembled,' 'my bowels are troubled,' it may be remarked that the expression is never used to signify speaking, but it is used in various senses of which we cannot here speak. The Prophets speak metaphorically—but they inaccurately: by the one the truth is allegorically administered—by the other the purity of sense is mutilated: the one is splendid with mysteries—the other deformed with absurdities. But if they would here allude to the manner of sorcerers, who are called ventriloquists, still this will not entirely save them from censure, since they speak as if some certain man 'had spoken from his own belly,' whereas in the case of sorcerers it is not a man who speaks from his belly, but *evil spirits* who make use of him as their instrument."

* In Rev. xxi. 8, and xxii. 15, are enumerated those who shall be cast into the lake of fire, in which number we find no mention made of those who worship images, nor even of those who break them in pieces or cast them into fire; but in the first passage mention is made of liars, and in the next "whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Now, when it is considered how many lies were told in this Council—how many forgers of miracles were present in this Council—is there no reason to fear that the doom they have here denounced on others fell upon their own heads?

† Then undoubtedly the painters' art ought to be so denounced, since by

as noxious and hateful, as if any one should paint licentious or indecent scenes, the feats of dancers, or of the race course ; and if there are anything similar to these to be produced by this art, such use of it may well be censured as base. But if, in order to represent the lives of holy men, the combats of the Martyrs, their recorded sufferings—if to depict the mystery of the dispensation of the great God and our Saviour we then make use of the painter's art, we shall be most amply justified in doing so. Just as when any painter depicts a cross, no one who thinks aright will reject this painted cross, or divest it of divine grace, because that it be the work of some painter. And so again must we argue in respect of books—if any one write base or vile things in books, such must be considered as abominable and to be rejected and unfit for Christian ears ; but if they contain divinely-inspired words and words which tend to piety, they are to be recommended and received and are worthy of the Church of God. In the same manner as we have said already, ought we to reason concerning the images of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Saints. If any one makes a harp or pipes, the work is base ; but, if he be a maker of sacred vessels, his work is to be approved. No one who judges aright will censure any art if it be found useful in respect of anything necessary for the present life. We must, therefore, always consider the end and manner in which the perfection of any art consists : if it tends to promote religion it is to be received—if for any vile purpose, it is to be hated and abhorred. But they adhering to their calumnious strain speak as follows."

GREGORY reads :—

"That it establishes Nestorius, who divided the one Son and Word of God who was incarnate for us into two Sons."*

means of it so many thousands have been led into actual idolatry. The Council of Constantinople did not mean to proscribe the art of painting simply as an art, for the very church in which it was convened was adorned with paintings of various kinds, but merely the use of it as applied to the formation of objects of religious worship.

* Dr. Waddington, in his "History of the Church" (p. 188), has the following remarks on the Council of the Iconoclasts :—"They decreed the destruction of images, and the decision which has sometimes been attributed to their loyalty may with equal justice be ascribed to their sense and piety." This praise is very much qualified in a note subjoined to this remark :—"Some of the arguments seriously advanced on this occasion by the Iconoclasts seem intended to surpass the absurdity of their adversaries. According to them, even the painter is convicted of several and even the most opposite heresies. They may be found in Fleury, liv. xliii. sect. 7." Yet, if the acts of this Council be fairly examined, will it not appear that it is only the painter considered as

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Again, as we have said before, they only assert—they do not prove. How does he who paints an image of Christ establish Nestorius? Nestorius brings in two sons—one the Word of the Father, the other the Son of the Virgin; but true Christians confess one and the same Son to be both Christ and Lord, and when they paint His image in the fashion in which ‘the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us’—that is, as perfect man—they do very right. For God the Word who dwelt among us was circumscribed in the flesh, and never did any one attempt to depict His deity; for He says, ‘No man hath seen God at any time.’ He is as God uncircumscribed, invisible, incomprehensible, but he is circumscribed as to His manhood. We know that Christ is both *of* two natures and *in* two natures without division—that is, the divine and the human—and that the one which is uncircumscribed and the one which is circumscribed are seen in one Christ. Moreover, a picture is not like to its prototype in essence, but only in name and in the fashion of the depicted members. When any one makes the picture even of a man he does not attempt to represent his soul in his drawing, and between the human soul and the divine nature how vast the difference—the one uncreated, the Creator of all, and without time—the other created, made in time, made by the former! And would any one in his senses, if he saw the picture of a man, argue that the painter had made a separation of the man from his soul? * For not only is the picture of a man without a soul but without the essence of body—that is, flesh, muscles, nerves, bones, and the elementary parts, blood, phlegm, chyle, and gall, to introduce which into a picture is impossible: and indeed, if they were found, then we must say it was the man himself and not his image. This

the maker of things for worship which ought not to be worshipped who that is censured, and his participation with heresy is solely confined to this view? And with respect to the diversity of heresy with which picture-making or rather picture-worshipping is charged, will it not arise from that diversity of view which the worshippers themselves have? For while one looks on the image as a mere representation the other looks on it as invested with some kind of divinity: to one the image of Christ is a representation of His human nature only—to another of His human and divine nature in union. Two opposite evils are stated in our 17th Article to result from distorted views of predestination—despair and utter want of all care whatever.

* This is true enough; but who talks to a painted man, or bows before it, or says prayers to it, as men called Christians bow down before and pray to images of Christ? The question is this—if men bow down before an image of Christ, of what nature is this image? If of the human nature only, then are the worshippers liable to the charge of Nestorianism, as worshipping the human nature apart from the divine.

present vain speculation must have its part with the rest of their crudities. That which follows is perfectly ridiculous."

GREGORY reads:—

"And in like manner Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and Severus, who taught the confusion and mixture of the two natures of the one Christ."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"O, what vain assertions!—what old wives' fables!—what concealed artifice! It seems quite a point with them to waste time in such absurdities. Was it that they did not know the contrariety of these heresies which they have here enumerated, or that they took pleasure in talking absurdly? The heresies of Arius, Dioscorus, and Eutyches, are both opposed to Nestorius and to each other, though all equally tending to impiety.* Arius, having taught that the eternal and uncreate Word of God and the Father came into existence from nothing, added another heresy to his former impiety, declaring that Christ had no reasonable soul, but that the Deity was in the place of a soul, to which also he ascribed suffering. Dioscorus and Eutyches, in opposition to Nestorius, who had declared that there were two natures and persons in Christ, were led no less vainly to confound the natures and to assert that but one remained, and wandering far from the royal road which turns neither to the right hand nor to the left they have turned aside from the doctrine of the Apostles and Fathers. Now what agreement, what communion, can there be between the Church and Arius, Dioscorus, and Eutyches, because of her illustrative pictures? Verily their words are vain and corruptible, utterly diverse from that command of the Apostle which enjoins us—'Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt' (Col. iv. 6). They are such as the much afflicted Job abominated, saying—'Can bread be

* The similitude between picture-worshippers and these heretics here enumerated it is not difficult to illustrate. As Arius worshipped what he considered as a created thing, so they worship created things: as Nestorius imagined the human nature apart from the divine and so (as they say) worshipped a created thing, so do some worship the picture of Christ's human nature, and therefore worship the picture of a created thing. As Eutyches imagined the divine and human nature to be one, so others in like manner look on an image of Christ as the image of His divine and human nature conjoined and confounded. The Eutychian view of images seems more common amongst Greek and Roman Catholics, for they seem to consider their images as having something divine in them.

eaten without salt, or is there any savour in vain words'* (Job vi. 6)? It is evident, therefore, that in vain and to no purpose do they calumniate the Church of God, at one time affirming that, because she has images of the humanity of the Lord, she is like to the impious Nestorius, who divided the persons—at another, to Eutyches and Dioscorus the accursed Confusionists—heresies which it is manifest have been proved to be opposed to each other and both in opposition to the Church. For if we grant that (as they say) the Church has followed Nestorius, then they are false in asserting that she agrees with Eutyches and Dioscorus. If, on the other hand, we allow that she coincides with Eutyches and Dioscorus, even here we shall be able to prove them false; for, as we have already shown, Eutyches and Nestorius were opposed to each other in their impieties. And thus their argumentation is proved equally vain and superfluous."

SECTION THE THIRD.

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Since they have sown among thorns and scattered abroad seed utterly diverse from that of the Apostles, and reap the harvest of the tares of heresy, the Lord by His prophet cries out against them, 'Many shepherds have destroyed my vineyard; they have defiled my inheritance;' for thus they speak" (Jer. x. 12).

GREGORY reads:—

"We have thought it right, therefore, in this our present definition clearly to point out the error of those who make and those who worship such things. All our God-fearing fathers, together with the holy Œcumenic Councils, have thus delivered to us our pure, undefiled, and heavenly faith and confession, that no one may imagine any kind of division or confusion whatever in that union which, beyond all imagination and conception, is unspeakable and incomprehensible—that is, of the two natures in the one hypostasis of person most strictly proved to be but one."

* This translation is according to the Septuagint: in our version it is, "Can that which is unsavoury be eaten without salt, or is there any taste in the white of an egg?"

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ Verily, these pretended wise men have clearly pointed out their own error. For whereas, all our holy fathers* who were assembled in the six holy Œcumenic Councils set up venerable representative pictures in holy temples, and had them besides in other suitable places, and received and approved them, they, on the contrary, have abominated them, and, from certain fallacious sophistries of their own, have

* In Adrian's letter to Charlemagne containing his reply to the strictures of the “ Caroline Books ” (p. 126, col. 1, or as it is numbered, cap. 19) supposes the following question to be put to him, “ Let them be pleased to tell us where, either in the Old or New Testament or in the six general Councils, are we commanded to make images or to worship them when made ? ” To this question he makes the following reply—“ We, in that which is subjoined, make it plain (as we have made it plain before) that both in the Old and the New Testaments and in the six holy Councils images are to be worshipped, and when made are counted among the holy of holies ; but they ought rather to tell us in which of the six general Councils images have been censured. In the first Council it has been often shown that Saint Sylvester the Pope and the most Christian Emperor Constantine venerated holy images, and with the name of Christianity wonderfully and faithfully displayed them openly and before all ! And we have now churches of wonderful beauty, adorned with sacred images by the holy Pontiffs, Sylvester, Mark, and Julius. In the second holy Council Saint Damasus, that most elegant Pope, made a church for himself called after the name of its founder, the Church of Saint Damasus, which, in like manner, from that time to this has been adorned with sacred histories and holy pictures. Again, in respect of the third general Council, St. Celestine Pope adorned his cemetery with pictures, and St. Sextus, his successor, built a basilic to the holy Mother of God called ‘ St. Marie Major,’ or ‘ St. Maria ad Presepe,’ which was adorned with divers sacred histories and holy pictures. At his request Valentinian Augustus made a golden image adorned with gems ; and from that time to this it has been greatly venerated by all the faithful. In the fourth holy Council Leo, that great and wonderful preacher, built many churches, which he adorned with pictures, images, and mosaics ; and in the basilic of St. Paul he depicted the Saviour in mosaic with the twenty-four elders, which, from that time to this, has been faithfully worshipped among us. In the holy fifth Council the most holy Vigilius made a basilic in the Lateran Patriarchium, which he adorned with pictures, holy histories, and images. The same was done in yet larger measure by his successors, Pelagius and John. And St. Gregory made a beautiful oratory in his monastery, where he had pictures painted and images set up : here he, with St. Eleutherius, who had the stomach-ache, prostrated themselves before these holy images and were both heard alike. Time, he continues, would fail us to tell of all the churches which were built, adorned, and filled with images by his predecessors.” In speaking of the sixth Council he tells us, not of what the Popes of that period did, but of the doings of the Council itself—“ There (he says), so far from daring to despise images, on the contrary, venerating them, they appointed that, instead of the Lamb as heretofore, our Lord should henceforth be drawn in human figure.” The argument runs thus : The Popes, in whose several Pontificates the six general Councils were assembled, erected churches and adorned them with images, and these images have been worshipped from that time to the present : therefore, the several Councils which were assembled enjoined that they should be made and worshipped. Some very lengthy quotations follow, but as they do not at all form any answer to the question proposed, they may be left with a notice to those who please to read for themselves.—*Vide Adrian's Answer*, p. 126, col. 2 ; p. 127, col. 1, 2.

declared that such things are an error, and pretend that there is another idolatry besides the worship of demons. And, whereas, the two things are absolutely opposed to each other, they have made no distinction between them. For the things which are prepared for the glory of Christ our God, and the remembrance of His conversation in the flesh—and the things made for the remembrance and glory of devils by certain Jews and Heathens—have but one and the same appellation in their mouths, and they have not been ashamed to commit the same to writing, mingling together that which should be kept separate and framing pretexts for sin. Wherefore, they murmur out their frivolities about the *confusion* and the *division*—against the theological knowledge of the Catholic Church, and prate thus—saying, “that we ought not to imagine any kind of division in the hypostatical union of God the Word in the flesh.” Now, one might think that they had never read the fathers at all, or that they read them in a cursory manner, not with any attention; for Gregory the Divine demolishes their vain theory at once, saying, ‘Since the notions are divided in conception,* the names are divided together with them.’ And all our holy fathers, not admitting the *confusion*, did declare that the natures were separable in thought by way of distinction though not of division. Whence it is evident that in this respect, either that the right knowledge of their doctrine was unknown to them, or that they bring a false charge against our holy fathers in asserting that they say that there was no kind of division whatever in the union of the two natures of the dispensation which is in Christ. Nestorius did actually divide the natures, saying that the Word of God was one, and that He who was of the Virgin was another, and that God was apart and man apart. But the Catholic Church, confessing a union without confusion, in thought alone, without division divides the natures and acknowledges Emmanuel after the union to be one and the same. But they, breathing out their sneers through their nostrils, add—”

GREGORY reads:—

“What senseless invention of the foolish artist is this, who, for wretched filthy lucre, makes what ought not to be made?—that is,

* Is there any real opposition between the assertion of the Council of Constantinople *μηδενά τρόπον διάρσεως ἐπινοεῖν*, and Gregory's *δι φύσεις διάστανται ταῖς ἐπινοήσιν*? The one argues against any idea of actual separation such as the contemplation of images would tend to produce: the other only for a distinction which must necessarily take place in the mind.

✓ who fashions with profane hands the things which are to be believed on with the heart, confessed with the mouth" (Rom. x. 9).

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"—It is stark madness to say and think thus! Neither is it the part of any man in his senses in this way to accuse the guiltless! Oh, what invention of vain words is this, thus to imagine such futilities against things hallowed by the Church! If the painter who makes images of our Lord in His human form, or of His Saints, is said to do so for vile lucre, equally may they also who transcribe the Gospels be accused! And we are at liberty to call those who make a picture of a cross foolish artists, and to affirm that they do this for vile lucre! What, then, shall the carpenter who fashions a cross be styled a foolish carpenter? Shall the stonemason who polishes or fabricates a holy table be called a foolish stonemason? And the goldsmith, the silversmith, the weaver, must they be treated in the same way? Why, at that rate, according to their sophistries, we must part with every art, every invention, given us by God, whether for His glory or for our benefit! * Since, then, they have attained to such an excess of ignorance and perversity, let them listen to the words of holy Scripture and of our holy fathers spoken in praise of the wisdom implanted in our nature by the all-bountiful Deity who created us. Thus Job, when speaking of God, says, 'Who gave to women the art of spinning' † (Job. xxxviii. 26)? Holy Scripture declares also that wisdom was given by God to Bezaleel for every art of the workman; for it speaks thus—'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Behold, I have called by name Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Or, of the tribe of Judah, and I have filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and

* It is to be remembered that this censure of the quotation is not applied to the painter or his art simply considered, but only as applied to the making of idolatrous objects of worship. The language of the Apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon strikingly resembles the censure of the Iconoclast fathers. The making of idols is there styled *ἀνθρώπων κακότεχνος ἐπινοία*, as here it is styled, *ἀνοήτου ἐπινοία σκαιογράφου*: it is also styled there, *σκαιογράφων πόνος ἄκαρπος* (Wisdom xv. 4). As the painter is only a foolish painter (*σκαιογράφου*) when he paints things to be worshipped, so the carpenter is (*σκαιοτέκτων*) a foolish carpenter when he makes a wooden idol: the stonemason is (*σκαιολιθίργου*) a foolish stonemason when he makes a deity of stone.

† In the English version it is, "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts."

brass [in hyacinth, in purple, and in scarlet work, and in fine woven linen*], in cutting of stones to set them, and in carving of timber to work in all manner of workmanship. And I have given him Eliab the son of Ahisamach of the tribe of Dan, and in every wise-hearted person have I given understanding, and they shall do all things whatsoever I have commanded thee † (Exod. xxxi. 2, 3). In

* This is added by the lxx.

† The application of this instance to the support of image-worship is censured in the "Caroline Books" (lib. i. cap. 16). After some remarks on the spirituality of the law and of its being a light to direct our steps in our present dark and dreary pilgrimage, and also how destitute these fathers were of such light, as appears from their constant custom of perverting the law to their own views, it is continued as follows:—"Because that Bezaleel was chosen by the Lord to do works in silver and gold, and was filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding in all works of silver and gold, they would fain make this also to serve their purpose, as if forsooth those things which were made by him at the command of the Lord and which abounded in types of mysteries were intended to be worshipped." Then follows a fanciful explanation of the names, Bezaleel, Uri, and Judah, from all which Bezaleel is made to be a type of Christ. After which, it is remarked—"Since, then, this Bezaleel, of whom we have said that he prefigured Christ, was adorned with the possession of such virtues that he was chosen by God, called by name, filled with the Holy Spirit, his parentage and race peculiarly pointed out, in vain is he brought forward by them as an instance in favour of image-worship; for he was far more excellent than any painter—far superior to any maker of images. For, if their pictures and images are to be assimilated to his works, then the painters and artificers of them may be assimilated to him; but if they are to be assimilated to him, then both they and their works must be typical of things to come; but all painters, artificers, or their works, do not prefigure things to come: therefore, pictures and images made by every workman are not to be compared to his works." After this, to the end of the chapter, we find an extended and very fanciful parallel drawn out between our Saviour Jesus Christ and Bezaleel, of which the following is a sufficient specimen:—"As Bezaleel was filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, much more was Christ—as Bezaleel wrought in silver and gold, so does Christ prepare holy men and women as ornaments for the heavenly tabernacle, adorned with the gold of the understanding within or with the silver of divine eloquence—with the gold of faith in the heart—with the silver of confession in the mouth. Achisama, who was given as an assistant to Bezaleel, is considered as prefiguring the Apostles and apostolic men who assisted in the work of preaching the Gospel."

To this censure Adrian makes a reply longer but certainly not more conclusive than usual:—"In behalf of these most certain examples our most holy predecessor, my Lord Gregory II. the Pope, in his own sacred Council (a Council approved by my Lord Pope Stephen in a Council which he held together with High Priests from Italy and France), in which he presided, spake as follows—"If conversion unto salvation had happened to those who are of opposite sentiments, the instances we have alleged already from the testimonies of the fathers and holy documents would have been sufficient. But as we see (and we say it with tears), that the greater part are labouring to disturb things established in the Church, therefore, my dearest brethren, our discourse must be lengthened, and we must bring further proofs from the ancient records, and it may be they will repent." In the book of Exodus it is written [here follows the usual example of the cherubim in the tabernacle, and of the continuance of the same images in the temple built by Solomon; after which he continues thus]—"Behold, dearest brethren, see what Moosa made

accordance with which that eminent theologian Gregory says, 'And the Lord descended and directed them, and the spirit of knowledge filled Bezaleel the artificer of the tabernacle.' Wherefore, they who decay and condemn the arts which have been given by God to men are, and are said to be, of the heresy of those who despise God, adding, as it is written, 'sin to sin.' But they who are not bastards but legitimate offspring of the white robe spouse of Christ—that is, the Catholic Church, which has neither spot or wrinkle or any such thing—who offer their reasonable sacrifice and worship (*λατρεία*) to God alone—when, by the sense of vision, they contemplate the venerable images of Christ, or of our very and true mistress the holy Mother of God, or of the holy Angels and of all the Saints, are sanctified thereby, and learn to fashion their own soul after the remembrance they have of them; 'and with the heart they believe' in one God, 'for righteousness and with the mouth they confess unto salvation'—in the same way also that, when they hear the Gospel, it fills the mind of those that hear with truth and grace, and with the heart they understand the sense of the words which have been written. But what now is it that these vain glorious men have to say?"

at the command of God; what also Solomon, the wisest of men, made at the same divine command, &c. How much more ought we with pure heart and mind to worship and adore Christ our God, His Mother Mary ever a Virgin, the Apostles, and all the Saints of God, by their sacred pictures and images, and to seek that propitiation be made for us and that our sins be forgiven! We make images in no other name than in the name of the Word of God incarnate for us. If all things made with hands are to be rejected, neither ought the ark of the testimony nor its golden embossed cherubim to be received which were made by Bezabeel and Ooliab at the command of God Himself. But if they have been received, these images ought most fitly to be received, since they are made according to God! Wherefore, like the ark, they work many miracles! Now, the ark and cherubim, like our images, were without soul, made with hands and graven. As God then wrought and was glorified by those things, so have these been evidently made in colours according to visions and revelations of the Prophets. Such were the words of Gregory II., and his use of the instance of Bezaleel and Aholiab, in which the good Pope convicts himself in many ways, and proves his Pontifical Holiness to be a very sorry divine; but, leaving him, we must allude to some further instructions Adrian is pleased to bestow upon us:—"Lest any should take upon them to bark about this adoration which is taught by our predecessors, the most holy Presules, let them know that they have taught no other adoration than that which our predecessor St. Gregory, that illustrious Doctor and Pope, hath taught in his epistle, brought forward by Herulphus, a Bishop of a city in the province of Gaul, at the above-mentioned Council of my Lord Stephen, which was written to Secundinus, a servant of God, a recluse of Gaul." After which, the words of the epistle follow at full length. This epistle is known to be spurious; and, if it was not known till it was brought forward by this Herulphus, there is good reason to think that he made it himself, or, at least, interpolated that part which relates to images. Gregory's undoubted words about image-worship are—"Adorare imagines vero omnibus modis devita."—*Adrian's Answer*, p. 123, col. 1.

GREGORY reads:—

“Such a man makes an image and calls it Christ: now the name Christ signifies both God and Man—therefore it is the image of God and Man; and accordingly it follows that, according to the working of his vain imagination, he has either circumscribed, within the limits of created flesh, the uncircumscribed nature of God, or confounded the unconfused union, and thus has fallen into the heresy of the confusion. Consequently, two blasphemies are hereby applied to God—the circumscription and the confusion: in the same blasphemies is the worshipper also involved. Woe to both equally, for they have erred alike with Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and the Acephali.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“The formation of images is no invention of the painter, but the approved ordinance and tradition of the Catholic Church. According to the divine Basil, reverence is due to antiquity;* and both the antiquity of the practice bears witness in its favour and the doctrine of our inspired fathers. For when they saw these in venerable temples they joyfully received them, and also when they themselves built venerable temples they set up images there, where also they offered to God the Lord of all, their pious vows and the unbloody sacrifice. Verily, to *them* belongs the invention and tradition, not to the painter: the workmanship alone is the painter’s—the peculiar application belongs to the fathers who raised these edifices.

“The name *Christ* is significative of the *Deity* and the *Humanity*—the two perfect natures of the Saviour. Christians, however, have been taught† to paint His image after that nature which is visible, not after that which is invisible, for that cannot be circumscribed, for ‘no man hath seen God at any time’ (John i. 18), as we have heard from the Gospel. Christ, therefore, being depicted in His human nature, it is evident that, as truth has proved, so Christians confess that the image which is seen participates with the prototype in *name* only, and not in *essence*; but they being utterly darkened in mind affirm that there is no difference between the image and the prototype, and that identity of essence is found in diversity of essences. Who will not laugh at their ignorance? Or, rather, who will not weep over

* ‘De Sanct. Spirit. ad Amphil,’ c. xxix.

† How confidently do these Bishops affirm Christians are taught! Where, in the Scriptures, they have been taught to make any image of Christ? Still more, where have they been taught to worship images?

such impiety? 'Given over to a reprobate mind, they speak that which is not convenient' (Rom. i. 18); murmuring out that the holy Church of God lies open to the charge of 'confusion,' and of attaching to Deity 'a form of circumscription,' because of her formation of images;* then adding sin to sin they issue out their 'woes' also; but their labour shall fall upon their own heads' (Psalm vii. 16). For if he who cursed ancient Israel was accursed, and he who blessed him was blessed, how much more shall he be filled with the curse who curses new Israel, who contemplates God with the mind (Num. xxiv. 9).† Who will not abominate them for saying, 'That she hath erred with Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and the Acephali:' whereas these very men are the main support of their own odious heresy! For, in the sequel, Eusebius Pamphilus is brought forward by them as a witness, who is noted throughout the whole Catholic Church as a patron of the heresy of Arius;‡ which heresy is to be found in all his writings and treatises, in which he teaches thus—'That the Son is to be worshipped in the second place; that 'he is the servant of the Father, and occupies a rank inferior to Him;' dissenting from the glory of the *homousion* (consubstantiality), and affirming a change of the holy flesh of our Lord into the nature of Deity. From such sentiments he enforced 'the confusion,' and would allow of no image, as neither would any other of the hateful crew of the Ariomaniacs: for they maintained that our Lord took flesh without any reasonable soul, and that the Godhead was to Him in the place of a soul, that they might attribute suffering to it, as Gregory the theologian testifies; and thus, as theopaschites,§ they admit no image. Moreover, the Confusionist Severus, would not admit any image of Christ our God in the church, as most historians tell us. That they should presume to say that the Catholic Church, because she has received pictures and images, has followed Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and the heretic Acephali, is truly astonishing!—thus belching away, and pouring forth into the air nothing else but blasphemous absurdities from their unbridled tongues. Let them, therefore, hear the truth: the divine nature, as we have said, is beyond all circumscription; but the human nature is

* It is not the Church which was censured by them, but only that corrupt part of it which approved of image-worship. The Church, as a whole, never enjoined the making of images—never approved the worship: nor was it the simple making of images that was censured, but the making of them as objects of worship.

† This seems to be in allusion to the interpretation given by the Legate of the East of the name "Israel"—i. e., a mind seeing God.

‡ Cave and others have proved his innocence in this respect.

§ Those who ascribe suffering to the Deity.

circumscribed. No man who judges aright, when he asserts that the human nature is circumscribed, would circumscribe with this, that which cannot be circumscribed. Now, the Lord, inasmuch as He was very Man, when he was in Galilee He was not in Judea : this He Himself makes evident when He says, ' Let us go into Judea again ' (John xi. 7-15) ; and also when discoursing with His disciples about Lazarus, he added, ' I am glad for your sakes that I was not there ; ' but at the same time, inasmuch as He was God also He was in all places of His dominion at once, being in all respects uncircumscribed. How, then, dare they, in their vain discourse, vent themselves in such intemperate absurdities as the following :—' He, according to his vain fancy, has circumscribed, within the limits of created flesh, the uncircumscribed nature of the Godhead ' (Luke ii. 12) ? If, when lying wrapped in swaddling clothes in the manger, the nature of the Godhead was circumscribed in the humanity, then His uncircumscribed nature may be circumscribed in the painted image. In like manner, if on the cross the nature of the Godhead was circumscribed within that of the manhood, then also His uncircumscribed Deity may be circumscribed in the painted image ; but if, on the one hand, this was not the case, neither can it be in the other.* Well would it have been for them had they been acquainted with the words of the God-fearing Dionysius as found in his discourse on the Hierarchy—' The resemblance of effects to their causes is not absolutely complete ; for though the effects have an impress corresponding to their causes, yet the causes themselves are superior to the effects caused by them, and they are more important in proportion to the ratio of their own original.' Thus have we proved, even to the meanest capacity, that their patchwork argumentation is but an attempt to bring in new-fangled innovation, and that its real aim is directed against the Church and not against the painter ; but, persisting in impudence, they add as follows"—

GREGORY reads :—

" Condemned by all who judge aright, for having endeavoured to depict the incomprehensible and uncircumscribed nature of Christ, they

* " But what doth this answer signify, unless there be an equal presence and union of the divine nature of Christ with the image, as there was with the human nature?—which union was the reason of the adoration given to the Person of Christ, and what ground can there be of giving divine worship to the image of Christ, unless the same union be supposed? If the human nature, without the union of the divine, could yield us no sufficient reason of divine worship being given to it, how much less can an image deserve it which at the best represents but the external lineaments of human nature!"—*Stillingfleet's Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, pp. 70, 71.

immediately take refuge under another defence of evil contrivance, saying, we paint only the image of that flesh which we have seen and have handled, in which He Himself dwelt amongst us, which is the impious invention of frenzied Nestorianism."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

" Still continuing the same artifices, these forgers of lies against the truth have fallen into the most shameless contradiction, but quite consistently with themselves—they have fallen into the snare of blasphemy. First, having in words of folly brought accusations against Christians, about the incomprehensible and uncircumscribed nature of Christ, saying that they would circumscribe the same, they next craftily assume another false guise, saying, 'That we paint only the image of that flesh which we have seen and which we have handled, and in which He was conversant among us,' that in this way they may bring the Church under the imputation of the blasphemies of Nestorian impiety ; wherefore they add, 'which is the impious invention of frenzied Nestorianism.' Wherefore, let them hear the truth, Christians, knowing that Christ our Lord is Emmanuel, depict Him in that form in which the Word was made the flesh, thus depelling far from them absurd charges of various kinds, receiving with simplicity of heart all that has been delivered to them in the Church ; and when they behold any pictures they consider only that which is represented in them : for when they look upon a picture of the Virgin, who brought forth, and the Angels standing around with the shepherds, they are led to reflect on God becoming Man and being born for our salvation ; and they confess, saying, He who was without flesh has taken flesh upon Him, the Word has been made into substance, the uncreate has been created, the impalpable has been handled ; and they confess one and the same to be both perfect in Deity and perfect in humanity, truly God and truly Man.* But it has been already stated, about the accursed heresy of Nestorius, that the painting of images give no countenance to that : sufficient was said then on that point, and, if need be, it may be repeated ; but, conceiting themselves to understand something, they add."

* " Alas for them (the Nicene Fathers) !—that they should ever be charged with the worship of images. They plead for nothing now but a help to their profound meditations upon them ; but the controversy was about worship whatever they may think, and their adversaries' argument did not lie against images as an object of perception, but of worship—i. e., if the image can only represent the human nature of Christ as separate from the divine, and in that respect be an object of worship to us, then the charge of Nestorianism follows

GREGORY reads:—

“ This ought also to be considered, that if, according to the orthodox fathers, where is the flesh there is the flesh of God the Word, admitting not even the idea of division, but altogether assumed into the divine nature, and entirely deified—and that it can not be severed or made to have a separate existence by those who impiously endeavour to do thus—thus is it also in respect of his holy soul. For as the Deity, in His own peculiar Person, assumed the nature of the flesh, the soul acted as mediator between the Godhead and the grossness of the flesh; and as, where is the flesh there is the flesh of God the Word, so, where is the soul there is the soul of God the Word and both together, the soul being no less taken into the Godhead than the body, and from these the Godhead is inseparable. For even in that disunion of soul and body, which took place at his voluntary passion, where the soul of Christ was there was the Godhead—where the body of Christ was there was His Godhead.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ When they who would subvert the Catholic Church are about to handle some impious dogmas, they take as their preface certain points allowed by all that by the allowed excellence which is found in these they may obtain credit for the rest. So these men, having laid down certain things, well enough mix up pebbles with their jewels; and, quickly returning to their own vomit, talk of Christ being divided and made to have a separate existence by those admit of holy pictures and images. And they speak calumniously when they say, ‘ Not admitting the idea of division;’ for, as it appears, the voice of the fathers was unknown to them, since all clearly teach a division in thought, as was said before, though not according to the blasphemous assertion of Nestorius: in fact, there is, therefore, no ground for the charge of division, disunion, or separation; or, again, on the other hand, of confusion, as they have so often falsely asserted, because we make the image of our Lord as He became perfect Man. The *image* is one thing and the *prototype* another; and no one in his senses expects to find in an image the peculiar properties of the prototype.* For in the image

but this they very wisely pass by, and their distinction of the image from the principal cannot serve their turn, since the image receiving the worship due to the principal must not only have the name (as they say) but the reason of worship common with the principal it represents.”—*Stillingfleet's Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, p. 72.

* Yet these properties (*ιδιωματα*) are the reason why the prototype—that

right reason discerns only a community in name, and not in essence with him of whom it is the image. This we have often said before, compelled by their cavillings. For they, in default of any just charge against the Catholic Church, repeat the same things about the same over again, brawling out vanities—providing abundant absurdities for all who will hear them. And they have made themselves a laughing-stock to all, one time talking of the division, at another of the confusion. With a tongue ever ready to speak amiss, they add as follows.”

GREGORY reads:—

“ If, therefore, even in the passion the Godhead remained inseparable from these, how foolish and devoid of reason are they who would separate the flesh now united to the Godhead and deified, and thence endeavour to depict the image, as it were, of mere man? In doing this, they have fallen into another abyss of iniquity ; for, having separated the flesh from the Godhead, and made it to have an existence apart from it, and having introduced another person in the flesh, of whom they affirm they can depict the image, it is evident that they thus add a fourth person to the Trinity. And, further, that they paint that which was taken into God as without God—from all which it may be concluded, concerning those who think that images of Christ may be painted, either that they consider the divine nature as circumscribed and confused with the flesh, or that the body of Christ may be without God and divided from Him, and that a person subsisting apart in the flesh must be granted, thus assimilating themselves to the Nestorian theomachy. Let those who have fallen into such blasphemy and impiety be ashamed and blush !—let those who make, those who desire, those who worship, that which is made and falsely called by them ‘ the image of Christ,’ cease to do so any longer ! So may the division of Nestorius and the confusion of Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and Severus, alike cease from the midst of us—evils diametrically opposed, but equally effective of impiety.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ These promoters of the Christianity-detracting heresy never hold to one path, as is the custom with the orthodox, who, in respect of

is, why the Saviour should be worshipped ; and the absolute want of these is no less a reason why pictures should not be worshipped.

sacred doctrines, adhere to the royal way only and never turn aside to the right hand or to the left. These men, on the other hand, perverting the right ways of the Lord, collect together the most contradictory opinions, puffed up in their own minds and imagining that they know all things! But let them hear Isaiah boldly declaring, 'Woe to them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight.' Thus, they pretend those things to be confessed by Christians which are not so much as named by them; and then, reasoning sophistically, they accuse the Church and advance against her with insults, and reproaches, and impieties besides. For, whatever Diodorus, Theodore of Moponestia and Nestorius, or Eutyches, Dioscorus, and Severus, may have advanced when raging against the truth, they ascribe to the Catholic Church; and, complicating evil with evil, they give it out that she is defiled with these impious heresies, holding forth words full of absurdity and folly. As vintners, they mix their wine with water—that is, truth with error, and infuse the gall of bitterness through the whole. Now, the heresy of Dioscorus and Eutyches is (as we have said before) opposed to that of Nestorius; and that opposite heresies should be united in the same opinion and profession, is an impossibility, just as it is impossible that we should see the same material at one and the same time to be white and black, or warm and cold; and, again, do we ever find heat in snow or cold in the fire?*

"But we have yet a stronger proof of their drunken stolidities: these ready slanderers affirm that the image and the prototype are the same thing; and on this they ground their charge of division and confusion against those who depict the histories of the Gospel. Now, in respect of the Eutychians—that is, those who affirm the one nature in the hypostatic union of Christ and hence teach the confusion—their perversion of the truth consists in this, that they define nature and hypostasis to be the same thing which we the sons of the Catholic Church know to be different things. For hypostasis we affirm to be essence with certain peculiarities from the word 'ὑφαιστανάει' (to subsist in another). Nature (φύσις) is that which is self-subsisting, not needing any other thing for its existence, and is derived from the word 'ἡφικάναι' (to be). In the same manner these men assert that Christ and the image of Christ are not in essence diverse the one from

* "Images of Christ (says Owen), as they are inconsistent with the truth, may introduce inconsistent and contrary heresies, as they have contrary significations put upon them: one, while they make them to signify the human nature of Christ only, which is to introduce Nestorianism; another, while they say they are images of Christ's person, and so they confound the two natures of Eutyches. In words they deny these heresies, but in fact they establish them.—*Owen on Image-worship*, pp. 178, 179.

the other ; since, had they been aware of this difference, they had never uttered such prodigious vanities. For it must be plain to all that the image is one thing and the prototype another—this endued with life, that devoid of it. Inasmuch, therefore, as they have prated about the circumscription of the divine nature in a picture, it is evident they have turned away from right reason, being given over to a reprobate mind. Peter and Paul are seen in their images, but their souls are not present in them ; and, even if the body itself of Peter were present, his soul could not be seen : and because it can not be seen, will any of those who follow the truth declare that the flesh of Peter is any otherwise separated from his soul except, it may be, in imagination ? How much more must this be the case between the uncircumscribed nature of God, the Word, and the circumscribed body which was assumed by Him ? For neither when wearied with His journey He sat on the well and asked of the woman of Samaria water to drink, nor when the Jews would have stoned Him, must it be supposed in the one case that the Godhead was weary, or, in the other, that it was in danger of being stoned.* Away with such blasphemies ! Such are the complicated perversities which the loud-talking folly of the Christianity-detractors in their desire to asperse images and pictures have brought forward. Nor is this all ; but, with unrestrained tongues, they must add others besides : wherefore, adding sin to sin, they have absurdly spoken of ‘the union of a fourth person to the holy Trinity. But they who have been born in the Catholic Church as dear children, admitting everything relative to the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and abominating Arius, Nestorius, and Apollinarius and their followers, Eutyches and Dioscorus, receive also venerable images, knowing them to be images and nothing more, and, as such, having the name of the prototype only and not the essence. But they, sidling along like a crab, strike out into a new path of blasphemy, saying”—

GREGORY reads :—

“ Let them rejoice and be glad—let them speak with all confidence—who, with hearts most sincere, make desire, and venerate the true image of Christ, offering it up for the salvation of soul and body,

* Yet, when Christ was worshipped by the Magi, by Angels, by Jairus and others, the Divinity was worshipped, not the human nature only, and why ? The divine nature was united to the human : unless, then, the divine nature be united to the human in the picture of Christ, it ought not to be worshipped at all, just as Christ’s human nature, if it had been without divinity, ought not to have been worshipped. It is not a little remarkable that, while a very long

which He, our Priest and God, who took our nature wholly* upon Him did, at the time of His voluntary passion, deliver to His Priests as a most emphatic type and memorial of Himself. For, when He was about to be given up to His ever-memorable and life-giving death He took bread and blessed it; and when He had given thanks He brake it, and dividing it to them He said, Take, eat, for the remission of sins: this is my body. In like manner, having given the cup, He said, This is my blood: this do in remembrance of me; thus showing that no other form or type from things under heaven was selected by Him as being fitted to represent the image of His incarnation. See, then, in this the image of His life-giving body made in a manner honourable and becoming to Himself. For what did the all-wise Deity intend by

answer is made as to the charge of Eutychianism, the charge of Nestorianism is passed over without notice: the good fathers had nothing to say for themselves!

* In the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. c. 14) this paragraph of the definition of the Iconoclastic Council is noticed at great length; and no slight censure is passed upon it. The first objection is made against the words with which the extract begins as being veiled in clouds of obscurity and absurdity. In the translation sent to Charlemagne, they stand thus—"Lætentur et exultent et præsumant." It is remarked that the two first words may be understood, but that no meaning can be attached to the "et præsumant" in connection with them. The second objection is against the words "true image," which, if understood of any painted or sculptured image or of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is considered as equally exceptionable. The objections to calling the sacrament of the Lord's Supper an image of Christ are as follows:—"He did not offer to God as a sacrifice any image or prefiguration, but He offered up Himself; and He who, in legal shadows, had been before figuratively offered up in the sacrifice of a lamb, now, fulfilling the types and prophecies, offered Himself to God the Father as the saving victim; wherefore, He did not give to us a typical memorial as in the transient shadows of the law, but the sacrament of His body and blood. This sacrament, therefore, is not to be called an image but the truth—not a shadow but a body—not an image of things to come but the substance of things prefigured. Nor does He say, This is the figure of my body and my blood; but, 'This is my body which is given for you: this is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' The third objection is taken against the expression, 'Having taken our lump wholly and entirely on Himself.' This is censured as very incautiously spoken, since it seems to imply that our Saviour took our nature infected with original sin, for in what other way could He be said to take our nature wholly upon Him?"

It is further to be remarked on this chapter, that the author attributes to the Nicene divines that which was actually spoken by their Iconoclastic predecessors. "This (says Dallæus) is no small error; yet not such as that the author is, therefore, to be accused of slander or meet with such severe reprobation. For, in his preface, the author confesses that he had not read the 'Nicene Council' itself, but only certain extracts which might be supposed to treat of the principle matters contained therein, among which extracts the selector (whoever he might be) imprudently made choice of this on the eucharist, and from carelessness might have attributed to the Nicene fathers that which really belonged to the Iconoclasts." The mistake seems to belong rather to him who made the extracts than to the authors of the "Caroline Books."—*Dallæus de Imaginibus*, pp. 396, 397.

this?—nothing else than plainly and evidently to display to us, men, the mystery which was accomplished by His dispensation. For as that which He took of us was only the material of human essence, perfect, indeed, in all respects, yet not formed with the image of any actual person, lest there should be an addition of that person to the Godhead, so He commanded select materials—that is, the substance of bread—to be offered as His image, and that not wrought into the form of man, lest any occasion might be given thereby to the introduction of idolatry. As, therefore, the body of Christ, which is by nature holy, as being deified, so it is evident also concerning that body which is His by adoption—that is, His image—that it is holy as being deified by the grace of sanctification. This, therefore (as we have said), our Master Christ plainly intended that, as He had deified the nature which He had assumed with that peculiar natural sanctification which arose from the union itself, so was He pleased that the bread of the eucharist, as being the true image of His natural flesh, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit, should become a divine body, in which the Priest mediates, making by an offering that which was common consecrate to sacred use. Lastly: as the animate and intelligent flesh of the Lord which was by nature anointed with the Holy Spirit as to the Deity, so in like manner the God-delivering image of His flesh, the divine bread, together with the cup of the life-giving blood from His side, is replete with the Holy Ghost. This, therefore, has been proved to be the true image of the incarnate dispensation of Christ our God, as was said before, which He, the true Giver of life and the Framer of our nature, with His own voice delivered to us” (Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19-20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25).

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“The whole of this passage now before us makes it manifest that when men once turn aside from the truth, they are brought, under the guidance of error, into many most dangerous absurdities: which, indeed, has been the experience of the patrons of this innovation; for, having deserted the truth in respect of the formation of images, they have fallen into another extremity of outrageous madness.* They have,

* Mr. Stebbing, in his “History of the Church,” vol. ii. p. 25, informs us, that “on arriving at that article in the definition which stated that no other image of Christ was to be acknowledged but that which He had left of Himself in the eucharist, the whole assembly expressed its horror in murmurs of execration; and the doctrine of the real presence being proclaimed it was triumphantly asked, ‘How there should be an image of Christ in that which was

indeed, delivered, as from a Delphic Tripod, their perverse and destructive dogmas; but let them listen to the words of the proverb, 'A man's lips shall be a snare to him, and he shall be taken in the words of his mouth' (Proverbs vi. 2); for they have heaped together 'wood, hay, and stubble, whose end is to be burned.' For none of those trumpets of the Spirit, the holy Apostles—none of our venerable Fathers ever styled the unbloody sacrifice made in remembrance of the passion of our God, and of His whole dispensation, 'the image of His body;' for they have not received of the Lord to speak or confess in this manner. But let them listen to Him speaking in the Gospels, 'If ye eat not the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood (John vi. 53), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven:' and, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him' (*ibid.* 56). And again, 'Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins' (Matthew xxvi. 26-28). Now, He did not say, Take and eat the image of my body. Moreover, Paul the divine Apostle, having drawn from the sacred words of the Lord, said, 'For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks He brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner He took the cup when He had supped, saying, This cup is

Christ Himself!'" Where Mr. Stebbing gained his information does not appear, but it may easily be believed: for, as the good fathers imagined piety when there was none—that is, in falling down before a picture, which was done by the advice of the Roman Legates at the beginning of this schism—so they might equally be alarmed at the idea of impiety when there was none, in the styling bread and wine the image of the body and blood of our Lord. But they were mistaken in asserting that none of the fathers called the sacred elements *an image*, and also in their assertion that they were never styled *antitypes* but before consecration.

As a proof that some fathers call the bread and wine in the eucharist *an image* of Christ's body, Bishop Patrick quotes Gelasius, in his tract "De Duabus Naturis," who says, "Surely the *image* (*imago et similitudo*) and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is therefore evidently shown us that we must think of our Lord Jesus Christ the same which we profess, celebrate, and take in *His image* (in ejus imagine)." Also Procopius of Gaza, on Genesis xlix. 12, when he says, "For He gave the *image of His own body* (*εἰκόνα τῆ ἰδίου σώματος*) to His disciples." Also Eusebius, in his "Evangelical Demonstrations," lib. 8, says, "Christ delivered to His disciples the symbols of His divine economy, requiring them to *make an image of His body* (*εἰκόνα τῆ ἰδίου σώματος*)."

the new testament in my blood : this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until He come.' This, therefore, clearly proved that neither our Lord, nor His Apostles, nor our Fathers, have ever styled the unbloody sacrifice offered up by the priests *an image*, but *very body*, and *very blood*. It is, indeed, true that it seemed good to some of the fathers that before the completion of the sanctification they might be called 'Antitypes,'* among whom were Eustathius the undaunted champion of the orthodox faith and the subverter of the Arian fatuity, and Basil the destroyer of the same superstition, who on a polished base set up every orthodox dogma under the sun. For, speaking from one and the same spirit, the former, when interpreting the words of Solomon in the Proverbs, 'Eat my bread and drink my wine which I have mingled for you,' speaks thus, 'By the wine and bread he points out the antitypes of the bodily members of Christ :' the other, having drawn from the same source, as all who minister in the sacred priesthood well know, thus expresses himself in the prayer of the divine oblation, 'We approach with confidence the sacred altar, and there offering up the antitypes of the holy body and blood of thy Christ, we entreat of thee, we supplicate thee :' and the sequel makes the mind of the father yet more plain—that before the sanctification they have been called 'Antitypes,' but that after the sanctification they are called, and are, and are believed to be indeed and in truth, 'the body and blood of Christ.' But these brave men, in their desire to do away with the contemplation of venerable images, have brought forward another image, which is no image at all, but body and blood. Involved in wickedness and deceit, and misled by their own artful subtleties, they have affirmed this divine oblation to, be made by adoption : but, as to say this is stark madness, so to call the body and blood of Christ an image partakes of no less insanity, and implies impiety arising from entire want of discipline. But, for awhile leaving their lies, they bring forward a frag-

* Bishop Patrick, in the same treatise, produces many other passages in which the fathers style the bread and wine *types*, *antitypes*, and *a figure*. As to the other assertion, that the fathers called the elements antitypes before consecration only, those who have published the General Councils, as Binius, Labbe, &c., have added this note in the margin :—"The holy gifts are often found to be called antitypes, even *after* they be consecrated, as by Gregory Naz. in the funeral oration upon his sister, and in his 'Apology ;' by Cyril of Jerusalem, in his 'Fifth Cateches. Mystagogic.' and by others." So after all this charge of falling into *εσχάτην ἀποπληξίαν μανίαν*, of uttering *λοξὰ καὶ ὀλέθρια λόγια*, of *μανίας σαφούς*, of *ποροινίας*, *ἀσέβειας ἀμαθίας*, lights on the heads of Procopius, Gelasius, Eusebius, &c.—See *Gibson's Preservative*, tit. vii. p. 223.

ment of truth, saying that it is 'a divine body;' but if it be 'the image of a body,' it cannot be admitted to be 'a divine body' at the same time. As they themselves are carried up hither and thither, that which they have muttered amongst each other can have no weight or authority: for, just as the diseased eye cannot see clearly, so they, having distracted and made turbid their own minds with the confusion of wicked reasonings, experience the same thing; and like madmen, who imagine all things different from what they really are, they style the holy offering of the sacred body of Christ at one time an image, at another His body by adoption. This has befallen them, as we said before, from their desire to take away the sight of sacred pictures from the churches, and because they took pleasure in the demolition of ecclesiastical traditions."

 SECTION THE FOURTH.

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Again, holding to the same calumnies, they move their tongues, having sharpened them to the injury of the Church of God."

GREGORY reads:—

"The abomination of images falsely named* has not its origin from any tradition of Christ, or of His Apostles, or of the Fathers; neither has it any holy prayer for its consecration, that by this it may be separated from common to holy purposes: but it remains common and without honour, in the same state as it was when the painter finished it."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Having a tongue full of vauntings, they cease not to aggravate evil, being destitute of the fear of God. Imagining vain things with the most intemperate audacity, they have affirmed images made in the name of Christ to be an abomination and falsely named! Had they ventured to be thus free in speaking of the Royal images they would most likely have paid the penalty with their lives, a doom which they

* *ψευδωνύμων*. Images being called by the names of Peter, Paul, Mary, &c., were falsely named, for they were not the persons whose names they bore—i. e., the image called Paul might have been called Peter, James, John, &c. It was as much one as the other—that is, it was none of them.

will most certainly meet if there be any retribution for evil words and deeds. Among the many other things handed down to us without being written,* the making of images has been most widely diffused from the very preaching of the Apostles. As a proof there is the history of the woman with the bloody flux attested by so many historians†—namely, how she set up an image of our Lord and of herself touching the hem of His garment: as, moreover, the Gospel teaches that she obtained a cure, and that between her and the image, of the Lord a certain herb sprang up from the feet of the image, a remedy for every disease!‡ But very many of our Fathers have delivered to us in writing how these have been commonly used among Christians.§ Basil

* Here we find this practice traced to its proper source. Not Exodus, Numbers, or the Epistle to the Hebrews—not to Chrysostom, Gregory, or Basil; but to unwritten tradition. It is among the *ἀγράφως ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα!*—a reservoir, or rather cesspool, for all the rubbish and absurdities with which the Church has been defiled.

† These many histories of many historians, when examined, are found to be *own only*; and that written, not by a holy Father, but an Arian, worse than Arian, Theopaschite, &c.

‡ In the "Caroline Books," lib. iv. cap. 15, we find the following remarks on this favourite instance of the image worshippers. After some censure passed on Epiphanius for the obscurity of his language, a fault which rather belongs to the translation made by the Pope's divines, it is remarked that "By this transaction (if ever it did take place at all) image-worship is not commended. For, though this woman, from that hastiness and want of judgment which marks the female sex, on obtaining the blessing of a cure, as being desirous to have the constant presence of her Lord, and ignorant it may be that He was in every place alike, did therefore set up an image of Him, yet who that had enjoyed the graces of our holy faith, and was well certified that He is in every place, would be so senseless as to set up and worship an image that he might enjoy His perpetual presence! And though she, when the world was not as yet liberated from the worship of idols—when statues of certain dead men, whether for memorial or worship, were everywhere set up, endeavoured to do the like as far as she was able—yet what man of good sense would consent to her, and, believing as he does that the Lord is in heaven and not in things made with hands, would care to do the same as she did? Or, because she had in this superstitious proceeding a zeal for God but not according to knowledge, what Catholic confirmed in the faith would take example from her acts in this respect and do the like? Or, because she in the first beginning of her conversion, and not yet able to take solid food, did therefore make use of lighter food, that by degrees she might grow and be able to take solid food also—that is, she made use of things visible that she might go on to attain the worship of Him who is invisible—is this any reason why any one should become her imitator, and, despising solid food, should desire to go back and be reduced to the food of infancy?"

"But as to the miracle about the herb, if we may believe anything about it, still it makes nothing in their favour, since this is not related to have been done that herbs or images should be worshipped, but that the minds of unbelievers might be taught to despise their idol vanities and to turn to the instruction of the true faith; since, according to the Apostle, signs are given not to the faithful but to the unbeliever: for the Catholic Church required the nourishment of miracles for its increasing faith, and that its young plantations might grow must be watered with constant irrigation."

§ What an imposing enumeration of holy fathers is here set forth! Alas,

the Great, whose doctrine has sounded to the ends of the earth, has made mention of them in divers of his discourses; Gregory Bishop of Nyssa, brother to the former both in flesh and spirit, has spoken of them in his discourses upon Abraham; Gregory surnamed the Theologian also, in the verses which he composed, among which is one on the praises of virtue. John also, who had a mouth more precious than gold, in his epitaph on Meletius Bishop of Antioch, and in his discourse entitled, 'That there is one Lawgiver in the Old and New Testaments:' Cyril, the subvertor of Nestorius, in his first epistle to Acacius Bishop of Scythopolis, Anastasius of Theopolis, Sophronius, Maximus. But why make mention of these by name? ALL our holy fathers admitted the making of images, and they speak falsehoods in affirming as they do that 'it is not the tradition of the fathers.' Aye, and it was most fitting that it should be so: for if they had not given us the Gospel to read, neither would they have made pictures of it; but if they did the one the other must follow. For the representation of the painter is consequent upon the narration of the Gospel; and this again follows on pictorial representation; and both are excellent and precious, unambiguously illustrative and mutually confirmatory of each other.* For if we say the sun is upon the earth no doubt but it is day, and equally if we say it is daytime no doubt the sun has risen upon the earth: and in like manner if we see in a picture the Angel preaching the Gospel to the Virgin, the evangelical narrative comes immediately

that when examined they should disappear one by one till not one credible witness is left. First we have the great Basil; but of the four extracts made from his writings in the Fourth Session, three are irrelevant and one is spurious. Gregory of Nyssa says no more than that he shed tears when he saw a picture of Abraham sanctifying Isaac. Gregory the Theologian speaks of the picture of a heathen philosopher, and how some woman was abashed on seeing it. From John of the Golden Mouth three passages are cited, one genuine, one doubtful, one spurious, but all irrelevant. Cyril helps them not: an Iconoclast might have said just the same by way of illustration. Anastasius makes a frivolous untenable distinction about worship; but after all speaks of angels, not of images. Maximus' testimony is strained, and he lived six hundred and fifty years after Christ—rather late for an apostolic tradition. One witness remains—Saint Sophronius; but who can believe the ridiculous tales put forth under his name?

* This argument has just as much validity as the previous assertion has of truth; for the necessary connection between making pictures and publishing the Gospel is as doubtful as the fact that the Apostles enjoined the making of them is untrue. The Church of Rome has dissolved this connection, which these Nicene divines declare to be so important: for, while her pictures are everywhere set forth, the Scriptures are taken away and concealed. Thus our Homily speaks indignantly—"Shall God's word, by God commanded to be read unto all and known of all, for danger of heresy as they say, be shut up? And idols and images, notwithstanding they be forbidden by God, and notwithstanding the danger of idolatry from them, shall they be set up, suffered, and maintained in churches and in temples? O, worldly and fleshly wisdom!

to our remembrance which declares that 'The Angel Gabriel was sent by God to a Virgin, and when he came in unto her he said, Hail thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women:' so when we have heard from the Gospel of the mystery transacted between the Virgin and the Angel, we lay it up in our memory, and then when we see it represented in pictures we understand that which was done more clearly.* Now, turning off to a new path of ignorance, they say as follows.

GREGORY reads in repetition:—

"Neither has it any holy prayer for its consecration, that thereby it may be separated from common to holy purposes; but it remains common and without honour, in the same state that it was when the painter finished it."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Now let them listen to the truth.† Many of those things counted sacred amongst us admit of no sacred prayer, since, from their very name, they are full of sanctification and grace: wherefore we honour and embrace them as being venerable in themselves.‡ Thus the form

* Reading God's word can teach without pictures. Can pictures teach without reading? Can pictures teach anything but history? Can it illustrate or enforce doctrine or precept, or a thousandth part of that which a Christian can only know by hearing and reading!

† This reply of Epiphanius is censured at great length in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. c. 16), in which chapter a reply is made to each period in succession. Passing by the censure on Epiphanius himself as a man hasty in his words, which belongs rather to the authors of the so styled refutation than to him who was the mere reader of it, and the oft-repeated remark on the obscurity of the style—a fault for which Pope Adrian and his party were to be blamed—we come to the censure in the first paragraph.

‡ "How this can be is not very evident; since whatever things are counted sacred in the Church, whether they be ecclesiastical degrees, or dedications of temples, or other constitutions of the same kind, they are all made such by sacerdotal consecration, after the manner of the Church; and we come to our first step in the Christian life by which we enter on the rest by imposition of the hands of the Priest and by prayer to God; but if he speaks of places, vessels, and other things necessary and set apart for divine service, even in this his words may be confuted, for there is scarce anything among the things we have mentioned which is not consecrated by the prayers and consecration of the Priest; and the Church is accustomed to use exorcisms and the sprinkling of salt and water for this purpose, all which have been handed down by the rulers of the Church from the very beginning, and are found on record in the books of the Priests. Therefore, when this deacon would associate his images with the consecrated vessels, by alleging that, as these latter were consecrated without prayer, so may the others in like manner be consecrated, his argument may be demolished thus: that the written order for the consecration of

of the life-giving cross is counted holy without any sacred prayer of consecration,* and we are content from this type to receive sanctification, and by the worship we do to it, and by making the sign of it in our foreheads, and by doing the same with our fingers in the air, we hope to drive away demons;† and thus in like manner in respect of images, by the signification of the name, we are led to the honour of the prototype,‡ and, embracing them, and giving them the worship

sacred vessels is found in the sacerdotal books and is practised by the priests, but that there is no mention either of consecrating or worshipping images in any of the appointments of the Church."

* "In this assertion no slight insanity is displayed, since the sign of the cross requires no other sanctification than that which has been made by the Mediator between God and man."

† "That the sign of the cross has in it a great mystery, and that images might by no means be compared therewith, we endeavoured, as far as the Lord enabled us, to prove in a former part of this work (lib. ii. cap. 28). For while images, as we have said before, are neither consecrated by prayer or the laying on of hands, the sign of the cross, wherever it is made, is made with the invocation of the name of God; and while images neither have nor admit of any consecration, *this* was so abundantly consecrated by the Redeemer of the world, so far from needing any further consecration, that when used with the invocation of God, it can consecrate and bless other things also."

‡ "How absurd and abhorrent from reason this assertion is is clear enough. He has told us that the image, by the signification of the name given to it, may be invested with the veneration due to the prototype—that is, of the Saint whose name it bears. Now, this assertion has not even the shadow of a reason for its proof. For if the inscription of the name is all that is required to invest images with the honour which belongs to the Saints in whose name they are inscribed, then anything whatever on which the name of a Saint is inscribed may attain the honour due to that Saint. Therefore stones, wood, garments, or animals, if but the names of Saints are inscribed upon them, pass on to the honour due to the Saints after whose names they are inscribed; but as names inscribed on such things as we have mentioned cannot invest them with the honours due to them after whose names they are inscribed, so the inscription of names upon images can never invest them with honours due to the Saints whose names they bear.

"Suppose, for sake of argument, two images of beautiful women, but without superscription, be brought to some worshipper of images, which he, thinking little of, suffers to be neglected, and that some one say to him, 'One of these is the image of St. Mary—it ought not to be cast aside; while the other, being the image of Venus, is unworthy of regard;' upon which he turns to the painter to tell him (for they are exactly alike) which is the picture of St. Mary and which of Venus; and then the picture which bears the name of the Mother of God is set up, honoured, and kissed; but the other, having the name of Venus, is thrown aside, dishonoured, and execrated; the colour, figure, and materials being exactly alike, and no other difference being found than the superscription—let Epiphanius the deacon tell us where was the holiness of the one before the inscription was placed upon it, or where the infamy of the other before that its name was conferred? The superscription placed on images may convey information, but certainly can give no sanctification to them. For sanctification is granted to rational creatures by the exhibition of good works and in the prerogative of merit; but it is conferred on irrational things and those destitute of sense: as, for instance, things set apart for divine service, not by consecration, but by sacerdotal consecration and invocation of the name of God. And it is plainly proved that no sanctification can attach itself

of honour, we become partakers of sanctification;* even as also we kiss and in the same way embrace the various other sacred vessels which we have amongst us, hoping thereby to partake of some sanctification from them: wherefore they ought to prate that the cross and other sacred vessels 'remain common and without honour, just as when the artificer, the painter, or weaver, finished them; for they have no sacred prayer for their consecration,† or they must receive venerable images as holy, sacred, and precious; but now, desirous of sowing more of their tares, as if from Satanic inspiration, they add."

GREGORY reads:—

"But if any of those who had hitherto been involved in this heresy should confess that in what we had said, in respect of the abolition of images which bear the name of Christ, we had spoken rightly and piously, because of the indivisibility and the unconfused union of the two natures in one Person; but should be at a loss to understand why we forbid the images of the immaculate, exceedingly glorious, and very Mother of God, or of the Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, since they have but a human nature, and are not of two natures—the God-head and the Manhood—in one person, as in the one Christ."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"None of those who have been brought up in the Catholic Church

to images from any superscription, from this fact, that the image which might have the luck to obtain the superscription of St. Mary the Mother of God, which before was neglected, but now is set up and honoured, has just as much power to benefit those who worship and honour, as it had to injure those who before slighted and despised it: and the other can do just as much harm to those who cast it aside as it could do good to those who should set it up and worship it."

* "This is pretty much as if he had said, we embrace and give it the worship of honour, expecting to obtain a sanctification from it which it neither possesses itself, and, therefore, cannot impart to others. For, in the same proportion as it can give sight to the blind when itself cannot see: or the sense of smelling to those who have it not, while themselves cannot smell: or hearing to the deaf when they cannot hear: or speech to the dumb when they cannot speak: or touch to the maimed when they can feel nothing: or walking to the lame when they cannot walk: or life to the dead while they are without life—in the same proportion can they confer sanctification to others of which they themselves are altogether destitute."

† "Sanctification does not come to men by vessels, but to vessels by means of men—that is, by invoking the name of God, and by the celebration of the sacred mysteries. Nor are images to be equalled to the sacred vessels, since it is in vessels and not in images that the sacrifice is offered to God. Now, if sanctification cannot come to men from vessels, how much less can it come from images, which can neither sanctify nor be sanctified?"

would ever imagine or confess that they had determined rightly or piously anything concerning this innovation : on the contrary, all the chief Priests, and other Priests of the East and West; North and South, have given up to anathema all who hold such opinions. True, indeed, they have perverted, and cut off from the body of the Church, some small portion of the neighbouring parishes, either ignorant of or despising the word of the Lord, which declares, ' Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he be cast into the sea ' (Matt. xviii.) But as they have shown no reverence for Him, being outrageous against His image, so neither have they any regard for His Saints, but have sharpened their tongues against them, also speaking thus."

GREGORY reads:—

" But should we be at a loss to know why we forbid the images of immaculate, exceedingly glorious, and very Mother of God, of the Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, since they have but the human nature only, and are not of two natures—the Godhead and the Manhood : to such it may be replied that, if the former be taken away, there can be no need of the latter."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

" But, in respect of the former, they have not subverted the use of that, either by the Apostles or the Gospels, by the Scriptures, by the Fathers, or by sound argument, or, in short, at all piously ; but, speaking from their own belly, they have set themselves in opposition to the Church of God. Neither have they a word of truth or piety to advance against the images of our immaculate Lady the Mother of God, or of the Saints, as, according to the ability which God giveth, we have proved. For we, having drawn from the sources of the holy fathers, have said already that the honour done to the image passes on to the prototype;* and, again, ' that he who beholds an image beholds the King in it, so he who worships an image worships the King in it, for His figure and shape is in the image ; and thus he who insults the image of the King is justly exposed to punishment as having actually injured the King Himself ; and this, though an image be nothing more

* Allusion is here made to the proofs brought forward in the fourth Session.—*Vide* p. 209 ; also, p. 208. *Lib. Car. iii. cap. 16. Leontius's Letter, p. 184.*

than wood and colours mixed and compounded with wax, in the same manner he who dishonours the image of any one insults the person who is the prototype thereof; and the very nature of things teaches us that if the image be insulted the prototype is equally disgraced. This all men know, and they know further that these men are in arms against the fathers, in opposition to the Church, and in direct contradiction to the very nature of things."

GREGORY reads:—

"But we will now add somewhat for the subversion of these also. Since the Catholic faith of us Christians holds a middle course between Judaism and Heathenism, and does not participate in the sacred rites of either the one or the other, it treads the new path of piety and mysterious discipline received from God; and, while on the one hand it admits not the bloody sacrifices and holocausts of Judaism, on the other it abominates not only the sacrifices of Heathenism, but their whole system of idol-formation and idol-worship together. For of this shameless invention Heathenism has been the originator and inventor, since not having the hope of the resurrection it has devised this absurdity worthy of itself, that in this illusory mode it might seem to make those things to be present which are not present. If, then, no strange thing shall be in her, let this art also be put away from the Church of Christ as being a strange thing and the invention of men under the influence of Satan."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"This record of their immeasurably absurd jargon, most plentifully furnished with prating garrulities, is not more shameless than it is ridiculous. In their past speculations they were brought by their sophisms amongst precipices and crags, but now they have plunged into the lake of hell, exhibiting, as they have done, the Church as holding a middle course between Judaism and Heathenism.* In strange opposition to themselves, they next add that she participates in the sacred rites of neither the one or the other. Either their first proposition is false or their second is false—in fact, they give the lie to themselves,

* "A little skill in ethics would have taught these Nicene doctors to distinguish between *medium negationis*, which partakes of neither extreme, and *medium participationis*, which partakes of both. The Church is the medium in the former sense, and, therefore, ought not to partake of Judaism or Paganism, as the Constantinopolitans well argue."—*Owen on Image-worship*, p. 188.

for falsehood is not only opposed to the truth but even to itself, according to David, the sacred Psalmist, who says, 'Iniquity hath deceived itself'* (Psalm xxvii. 12, sec. lxx. et Vulg.) Basil Bishop of the Cæsareana, whose voice went forth into all the world, in the beginning of his treatise against Sabellius, speaks thus—'Judaism opposes Heathenism, and both are opposed to Christianity;' but they, looking on themselves as far wiser than the fathers, have represented Christianity as holding a middle course between these two contraries—namely Judaism which leads to contracted views of Deity, and Heathenism which brings in many deities. Gregory, surnamed 'the Theologian,' when setting both the one and the other aside, speaks thus :—'When I say of God, I mean the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Godhead not being extended beyond these, that we may not bring in a crowd of deities, nor being defined within this number, lest we should determine a poverty of deity, avoiding alike the monarchy of the Jews and the polytheism of the Heathen, for the evil in both is equal though found in opposing extremes!†

"The sacrifices of the Old Testament, of which the people of Israel were partakers, were a tradition from God, while those of the Heathens were derived from devils; wherefore, they have confounded and coupled together rites delivered by God and devilish ordinances in the same way that before they declared the image of Christ to be an idol equally with the images of devils.‡ Let them, therefore, accuse Abel, Noah, and Abraham, on account of the sacrifices of living animals which they offered to God—yea, let them accuse Moses, Samuel, and David, and the rest of the Patriarchs, for that they offered up strange and Gentile sacrifices to God,§ although Scripture expressly

* In the received version, it is "such as breathe out cruelty:" in the Prayer Book, "such as speak wrong."

† ἢ διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν Ἰουδαίζοντες, ἢ διὰ τὴν ἀφθονίαν Ἑλληνίζοντες. τὸ γὰρ κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις ὅμοιον, καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐνρίσκηται. Surely, Gregory the Theologian speaks very unguardedly when he declares the acknowledgment of the One true God of the Jews to be an equal evil with the many false gods of the Heathens.

‡ The Constantinopolitan fathers seem carefully to make a distinction between rites once appointed by God but now abrogated, and those of the Pagans which came from Satan. They do not say as Gregory, in the passage just quoted, that the evil in both is equal: they say not that Christianity abominates both; but, while she admits not (*μὴ παραδεχομένη*) the former, she abominates (*βδελυσσομένη*) the other. St. Paul (Gal. iv. 8, 9), seems to class Pagan rites and Jewish ceremonies together, and certainly comes under the censure of these divines, and might have been asked whether Abel, Noah, and Abraham turned to beggarly elements when it was said of Noah's sacrifice the "Lord smelled a sweet savour;" for it was not Gentile practices but Jewish ordinances which the Apostle termed "beggarly ordinances."

§ This challenge to the Iconoclasts and its inference in favour of image wor-

declares, concerning their sacrifice, 'The Lord smelled a sweet savour' (Gen. xviii. 21). Would that they had acknowledged the truth that the things that are offered to God are acceptable to Him, for it is

ship is thus noticed in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 18):—"As far as we can judge from the rest of their reasonings, they seem to intend this argument, that as though the Heathen were accustomed to offer sacrifices of slain beasts to devils, there was still no hindrance to holy men under the law, but that they might also offer up slain victims to God—so, in like manner, no objection ought to be taken against the worship of images in the holy Church because that idols have been worshipped by the Heathen: but this, like the other arguments which in this affair they have vainly brought forward, may easily be demolished. It is manifest that of old sacrifices of slain beasts have been offered up by holy men to the Lord Almighty, and also that by the priests of the Gentiles they have been offered up to devils; and, further, that anciently the images of infamous men were by satanic suggestion set up in temples, and also that the pictures of certain Saints have been placed by Catholics in their basilicæ both as a memorial of things done by them and as an ornament to the building. But, as the use of slain beasts in sacrifice was practised by the *holy fathers* before the law, and in the law was delivered by the Lord to *Moses*, let them show when the custom of worshipping images was instituted either by the Patriarchs before the law, or by the Legislator under the law, or by our Lord and Saviour in the New Testament, or by the Apostles or apostolic men, their successors. That whereas, the celebration of these fathers has so authentic a tradition, they may tell what support they have for their adoration of images. And, whereas, they cannot do this, let them blush for the useless endeavour—let them repent and acknowledge their folly in endeavouring to assimilate their image-worship to the oblation of holy sacrifices.

"How can it be supposed that images were made by Catholics for the purpose of worship when in the first instance they were not made even by the Gentiles themselves for this purpose? The use of images began thus:—Out of regard for the dead, whether they were kings, founders of cities, or inventors of certain arts, they who loved and respected them made pictures or effigies of them that their grief on account of their loss might find some consolation in contemplating their images. But by degrees, by the suggestion of devils, this error found its way among their posterity, that they should look on those whom their parents had caused to be depicted solely for the memorial of their name, as gods, and to worship them accordingly, that, in these, the demons might consider the wretched men as seduced to worship themselves. After this example, we see the use of images is so greatly on the increase: so that those pictures and images which were made only for the ornament of buildings, and the memorial of things past, are now, from the insensible progress of evil custom, so extolled by some Catholics that they are actually worshipped—tapers are lighted before them, incense, first fruits, and other offerings are made to them; and, what is yet worse, we find that it is the case in the regions of Greece, that Pontiffs, who ought to teach that God alone is to be worshipped—that He alone should be adored—that they should serve Him only—confess that they shall serve images, and worship and adore them, and should pretend to judge those who despise them—who worship and adore God only—as Heretics because of their contempt of such things, and on this account to bring them under their anathema. For much in the same way as this most sinful way of worshipping idols, or rather devils, crept in amongst the Gentiles, so with sorrow we add has this most absurd custom of worshipping images gained ground, and things made for one purpose are seen to be used for another. We do not call the images, which we set up in our basilicæ, idols; and that others may not call them idols, we refuse to worship, adore, or to offer them any service; for it is not the thing itself but the purpose to which it is applied that makes it sinful or otherwise; for evidently there are many things which may

written, 'They sacrificed unto the Lord God' (Deut. xxxii. 17). But the things which are offered to devils are execrable and abominable; for, saith the Scripture, 'They sacrificed to devils and not to God' (1 Cor. x. 20). From us and by us is the good or evil, and not in the subject. 'For (saith the Apostle) is the idol any thing?—or is that which is offered to idols any thing? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God.' But now egregiously mistaken, interweaving calumny and falsehood, they deliberate and add as follows."

GREGORY reads:—

"Let, therefore, every mouth cease any more to utter unjust and contemptuous speeches against this opinion and decision which by us has been received from God. The Saints who have pleased God and who have been honoured by Him with the grace of sanctity live ever with God, although they are removed from us. He, therefore, who, by an art dead and hateful, and which never can confer life, would endeavour to raise them up among us again, is thereby proved to be a blasphemer."

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"By what they have now said they have proved themselves to be strangers and aliens from the peace of God which the Lord hath left to those who believe in Him in sincerity and without deceit, saying, 'Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you' (John xiv. 27). For how can they have peace when the Catholic Church, holding to and confirmed by her traditions, is decided against their opinions and decision? They who, under the influence of divine zeal, are ever more concordant with the fathers and with the tradition of ecclesiastical

be rightly made use of, but being used amiss are sinful to us; and thus one and the same thing which to those who use it aright brings no ill consequence with it, to those who use it amiss is fraught with greatest danger. Whereas, they furthermore prate that the holy fathers, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Samuel, and David, are to be accused, we feel no inclination to accuse but rather to praise them, as it is said in Ecclesiasticus, 'Let us praise famous men and our fathers in their generation,'" &c. [Here follows a particular mention of each of these holy men, with reasons why they should be praised rather than censured, which is somewhat superfluous, as the Nicene divines had no intention of censuring them, but only of excusing themselves by their example. Neither did they intend to say that the Patriarchs offered up Pagan sacrifices, but only that, if they were to be accused of idolatry because of their images, their fathers might be accused of offering to God Gentile sacrifices because they offered sacrifices of slain beasts.]

order, flee from and avoid those who maintain the contrary as enemies. These therefore, the true worshippers, who serve God in spirit and in truth, and have pictorial representations only for the sake of illustration and memorial, and in spite of their opinion and decree which was never received by God, do embrace and salute them—being armed with the breastplate of truth—will never cease to pierce with the sword of the Spirit, as having cut themselves off from the whole body of the Church. The Saints who pleased God in former ages have left written records of their lives for our profit and salvation, and also have, by pictorial representations, handed down the deeds which they wrought in the Church for the awakening of our minds by remembrance and to excite us to follow their manner of life. Thus, St. Basil, in his panegyric on the forty holy Martyrs, says, ‘Come, let us by our commemoration set them, as it were, in the midst of us, and exhibit them for the common good of all now present, displaying, as in a picture, the glorious deeds of these men. For the feats of war have been often set forth both by the historian and by the painter—the one adorning them in the beauties of language, the other by the powers of the pencil; and both the one and the other have excited many to deeds of bravery. For what the discourse of the historian presents to our ears, that the silent picture displays by imitation. But now, with craft and praise commingled, they continue.’

GREGORY reads :—

“How, then, shall any one dare to portray with this vain heathen art the ever-to-be-praised Mother of God, whom the fulness of the Godhead overshadowed—by whom the unapproachable light shone upon us—who is more exalted than the heavens—more holy than the cherubim? * Again: who will not blush to depict by this same Gentile contrivance those who hereafter shall reign together with Christ—who shall be assessors together with Him—who shall judge the world—who shall be conformed to His glory?—‘of whom (as say the oracles) the world was not worthy’ (Heb. xi. 38). It is not lawful for Christians who have the hope of the resurrection to make use of the customs of the Gentiles who worship devils, or to insult in inglorious and lifeless material those who shall hereafter shine in such glory. We receive not the proofs of our faith from aliens; for, when the devils called

* These unscriptural praises, echoed from East to West, from North to South, prove a very general prevalence of error over all the Christian Church at this period. How do we know that Mary is more holy than the Cherubim? Our Lord (St. Matt. xii. 50) gives a very different notion.

Jesus the Son of God. He rebuked them, not choosing to have the testimony of evil spirits" (Mark i. 25 ; Luke iv. 41).

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

" In order to entrap the simple into agreement with their vanities, they commence with panygerics. They, however, who have the wisdom of the serpent, and instead of his craft the innocence of the dove, are accustomed to honour in discourses and in panygerics the undefiled, immaculate, the true and rightful Mother, God, and the Saints, and by means of books to call their virtues to mind—and they further are accustomed, by means of pictorial representations, to make known their conflicts and their fortitude, to magnify them with highest honour, and to recognize them, according to the divine Apostle, ' as having departed, as being with Christ '* (Philip. i. 23), and as making intercession for us ; and this, while they offer their sincere and unfeigned faith and the worship which is in sincerity and truth, to God alone, and not to any creature under heaven whatever. Why should they calumniate truth by assuming matter to be a base thing ? It behoved them rather to avoid the evil and choose the good. They should have remembered concerning the sacrifices of old, which, when offered to God, are commended in Scripture, but when offered to devils, though the material were just the same, are accounted full of all pollution. But they, taking only the material into consideration, accuse the Church of having symbols of heathen invention. But, since matter may be applied to the most opposite purposes, it is not to be denounced as evil, nor is its utility to be despised. For, if this their way of reasoning and arguing be admitted, all that is consecrated to God among themselves must be renounced—that is, the holy garments and consecrated vessels ; for the Gentiles made their idols of silver and gold, and offered libations of wine, and they among the Hebrews who would bring in idolatry, offered cakes of barley to the Host of heaven. It is evident, therefore, that they slander the Catholic Church. The Gentiles praise their God and Demons in books of history ! And shall we not praise our God or His Saints in books of history, lest we be as the Gentiles or lest we receive testimony from aliens ?† Oh ! perversion !—oh ! mad-

* St. Paul speaks of himself departing and being with Christ, which is far better ; but not one word of his interceding for them after his death : that work he ascribes to Christ and to Him only (Rom. viii. 34 ; Hebrews vii. 25). The intercession of Saints is found only in unwritten tradition.

† The use of images for purposes of worship is forbidden to Christians not so the use of books. Books are absolutely necessary for us : we may do very well without any pictures.

ness! Verily, because we are men endued with senses, therefore we use sensible objects for our instruction,* and for the remembrance of every divine and pious tradition. But now, as adulterators of the truth, perverting the ways and the thoughts of God, they say"—

GREGORY reads:—

"In addition to this our carefully examined and well considered decision, we have brought forward, both from the divinely-inspired Scripture and our accredited fathers, plain testimonies consentient with us and corroborative of our pious design; which he who has any acquaintance with them will not controvert, and but let him who is ignorant learn and retain them as being from God. Our first testimony shall be from the mouth of the Lord Himself, saying, 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth' (John iv. 24). Again, 'No man hath seen God any time' (*ibid.* i. 18): 'Ye have neither heard His voice, nor seen His shape' (*ibid.* v. 37). Again, He declares them 'blessed who had not seen, and yet have believed'" (*ibid.* xx. 29).

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"When any undertake to pervert right doctrines according to their own fancies let no one be surprised if they make use of the words of Scripture; for every Heresiarch has gathered from the divinely-inspired Scripture some occasion for their peculiar error, perverting by their own misinterpretation that which was rightly spoken by the Holy Spirit. Of this Peter, the chief trumpet of the Apostles, spoke beforehand, saying, 'Which things the unlearned and unstable wrest† according to their own lusts' (2 Peter iii. 16). And truly it is the great characteristic of Heresiarchs to pervert the knowledge of divine and true doctrines according to their own lusts. Thus, while the fathers universally held these words, 'The Lord created me in the beginning of His ways among His works' (Proverbs viii. 22), to relate to the dispensation of the humanity of Christ, Arius, Eunomius, and their party, applied it to the divine generation which was from above, and thus turned aside from the paths of knowledge. Again, Apolli-

* Were not the Apostles and primitive Christians men, &c. † How was it they never felt any need of such objects for the remembrance of sacred truths? The Church, for three hundred years at least, felt no such need. The only persons who felt anything of this kind were Gnostic Heretics and the Gentile woman of Panæa.

† This quotation is made incorrectly. The Apostle says, They wrest the Scriptures, not according to their own lusts, but to their own destruction.

narius, misunderstanding the words of the Gospel, 'No man hath ascended up into heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven' (John iii. 13), fell into the absurdity of supposing that God the Word descended from heaven with that flesh which He had even when in heaven, co-eternal and consubstantial with Himself. He brought forward also these words of the Apostle, 'The second Man, the Lord from heaven' (1 Cor. xv. 47). Thus was he deceived by his peculiar notions.* It is therefore no wonder if the Heresiarchs of this empty absurdity should also bring forward passages from the divine Scripture, since they have learned this way of attack from the same teachers. Thus, words spoken of the invisible incomprehensible Godhead they have applied to the incarnate dispensation of our Lord and Saviour, one of the holy Trinity. For what man of common sense is there who does not know that this, 'No man hath seen God at any time' (John i. 18), is written concerning the divine nature; and that if any imagine this, 'Ye have not heard His voice nor seen His shape' (*ibid.* v. 37), to apply to the humanity, he subverts the whole Gospel. For how shall we understand this, 'The Lord spake to His disciples,' and 'the Lord spake to the Jews who came to Him,' and 'the Lord said, Woe unto you, Pharisees,' and 'the Lord opened His mouth and taught them?'—evidently as pointing out His humanity: while this, 'Ye have not heard His voice nor seen His shape,' must be understood of the divine essence. Inasmuch as God the Word became perfect man, as we said before, 'We have both heard His voice and seen His shape:' and this even after the resurrection; for He was handled, and being seen of His disciples spake to them concerning the kingdom. But further, they have made the divine service (*λατρείαν*), and worship which Christians with true and sincere faith have in themselves, to be the same thing with relative and honorary worship (*τῆ σχετικῆ καὶ τιμητικῆ προσκυνῆσαι*).† In these two points lies their perversion, whence they are, and are denomi-

* Might we not fairly add as follows:—And Adrian, perverting the words of the sacred Psalmist, "All the rich among the people shall seek thy face," and "Thy face, Lord, will I seek," and "The light of thy countenance has been marked upon us," and "Lord, I have loved the beauty of thine house," concluded both that in the very face of the second commandment the Jews did worship images, and that Christians were at full liberty to do the same. So Tarasius, because Moses made Cherubim overshadowing the mercy-seat, perversely reasons, "Much more shall not we have the image of our Lord, of His Mother, and of the Saints, to overshadow the altar?" So Leontius vainly concludes, because it is written, "Jacob blessed Pharaoh," that therefore Christians may worship pictures, &c.: thus bringing in a portentously absurd worship of pictures and images contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture.

† A distinction which may be made in theory, but very difficult to maintain in practice, as the records of this Council prove.

nated 'Christianity-slanderers:' for they declare that Christians offer to holy and venerable images the worship and service due to God only,* and that they circumscribe the uncircumscribable nature of the God-head. O, the perversity, the stolidity, and everything else that is absurd! Their arguments have no foundation, but are made up of reproach and calumny! For Christians have neither offered up at any time the worship which is in spirit and in truth to images nor to the sacred type of the cross, nor have they ever made any image of the nature which is invisible and incomprehensible; but, inasmuch as the 'Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us,' they made the picture or image of His incarnate dispensation. Knowing, indeed, that 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth,' they offer the worship and service of faith to that God alone who is above all, and who is celebrated in a Trinity of Persons; while, out of desire and affection for their prototypes, they embrace and offer the worship of honour to the sacred type of the cross and to venerable images. Their sophistical arguments have therefore been proved by the truth to be vain, void, and worthless. In like manner in what follows, having meditated things beside the truth, they say"—

GREGORY reads:—

"And in the Old Testament He saith to Moses and the people, 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in the heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth (Exodus xx. 4; Deut. v. 8).....For in the mount from the midst of the fire ye have heard the voice of words: ye saw no likeness, only ye heard a voice'" (Deut. iv. 12).

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Hence, forsooth, taking occasion for their impiety, they would with their sophisms scare Christians as though they were children—as if, because they had the illustration of pictures for the remembrance of Christ and His Saints, they were in danger of relapsing into idolatry! And these worthy men, intending all iniquity by their harangues, take refuge in this, 'Thou shalt make no manner of similitude;' and 'thus holding the truth in unrighteousness,' and 'seeking to establish their own righteousness,† they train themselves in impiety; and, vaunting

* And they say right, for very many Christians do act thus.

† In what sense do they hold the truth in unrighteousness who refuse to bow down before pictures and images? Or in what way do they who obey the second commandment set up their own righteousness?

themselves in the emptiness of falsehood, they have become aliens to the truth. With theatrical pomp they right solemnly set themselves to adapt to the general assembly of the Christians, the words of the law given of old to the people of Israel, who had served the golden calf and had too much acquaintance with Egyptian abominations; and in doing this they are taken in the words of their own lips. Would they had reflected that it was when God was about to bring His people into the land of promise, because that there dwelt therein nations which served idols, and worshipped demons, and the sun, the moon, the stars, and other created things—yea, even birds, beasts, and creeping things, and not the living and the true God—that He gave this command, ‘Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or under the earth:’ and He added also, in order to exclude idolatry, ‘Thou shalt not worship them, nor serve them.’* But when Moses, His faithful servant, by the command of God, made the tabernacle of the testimony in order to shew how all things serve Him, he made of gold palpable figures of Cherubim in the form of men, antitypes of intellectual beings, to overshadow the mercy-seat, which mercy-seat prefigured Christ, ‘For He is the propitiation for our sins’ (John ii. 2), as saith the Apostle. Therefore, in two different ways he would lead them to the knowledge of God, first saying, ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve,’† then making the molten Cherubim of gold overshadowing the mercy-seat—that is, worshipping it—thus, by sight‡ as well as by hearing, leading them to worship the Lord their God and to serve Him only. But they, with

* The new edition of the second commandment, according to the most approved unwritten traditions, must run thus—Thou, O Israel, who art just come out of idolatrous Egypt and art about to enter into idolatrous Canaan, shalt not make any graven image, &c.; thou shalt not worship nor serve them: but the spiritual Israel—that is, Christians, who by prophecy cannot possibly become idolaters—may make likenesses of things both in heaven and on the earth, and may worship them—that is, may bow down to them, offer incense to them, light tapers before them, &c.: for Moses, by God’s command, made golden Cherubim; therefore Christians, without any such command, may both make images of Saints, and fall down before them and worship them! Do not these Nicene *γεννάσαι* lie open to their own charge of holding the truth in unrighteousness?

† Comparing Matthew iv. 10. with Deuteronomy vi. 13, we find the words of our Lord are, “*Κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου προσκυνήσεις:*” in Deuteronomy it is, “*Κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου φοβήθησθαι.*” If one is equivalent to the other it is evident that the distinction made between “Latria” and “Doulia” has no place in Scripture—that the word “worship” is as much limited to God only as the word “serve:” for who would “fear before” pictures of Christ or the Saints?

‡ How the Israelites were to be instructed or taught by the sight of that which they never saw does not easily appear.

minds replete with perversity, now bring forward certain words of the Apostles also."

GREGORY reads :—

" ' And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of sinful men, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator' (Rom. i. 23-25). And again, ' If we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more' (2 Cor. v. 16); ' we walk by faith and not by sight' (*ibid.* 7). And as the same declares most convincingly, ' So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God "' (Rom. x. 17).

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

" To say the truth, it is they that are like the Heathen who changed the glory of God and serve the creature more than the Creator, who thus change and pervert the Apostle's words after their own lusts.* For every one knows that the Apostle is deriding the Gentiles when he says, ' They changed the glory of God into the likeness of corruptible man ;' for he adds further, ' and of birds, and beasts, and creeping things ;' but in their craft they would not allow the whole passage to appear, that in this way they might seduce the more simple to imagine that the Apostle was directing his discourse against the pictures and images used in the Church. Now, it is these words which follow which make the meaning of the passage clear; for he had made mention of birds, and beasts, and creeping things; and that so they served the creature more than the Creator. They who have any acquaintance with history are well aware that the Egyptians of old worshipped oxen and other four-footed creatures; also various kinds of birds, flies, and wasps, and creatures yet more vile than these; and that the Persians worshipped the sun and fire: the Greeks beside these worshipped every creature, as also did certain of the Hebrews, as we learn from the books of Kings and the writings of the Prophets.

But now let them declare to us when it was that the nations became vain and that their foolish heart was darkened—was it before or after that they had believed? No doubt it was before they believed;

* How they who would have no images at all are like the Heathen, whose religion consisted in making and honouring them, is not very clear! All idolatry is not equally gross; nor did all Heathen nations, or the same Heathen nations at all times, worship birds and beasts. To change the glory of God into the likeness of corruptible man, though not the worst form of idolatry, was nevertheless idolatry; and it was to this kind of idolatry that the worship of Christians was then tending.

for that is clear enough. But if they say in reply that the Heathen after they have believed have served the creature and idols, then I say that, according to them, the predictions spoken by the Prophets concerning the Church to take place after the dispensation of Christ our God are devoid of truth. For it is written, 'Jerusalem shall be holy, and strangers shall no longer pass through her' (Joel iii. 17); and 'My mercy I will not separate from her, neither will I profane my covenant, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips' * (Psalm lxxxix. 33, 34). But if it were altogether before the coming of Christ, that men separated themselves from the knowledge of God and, having served Satan, were delivered over to a reprobate mind, it is in vain now to bring these words forward as a charge against Christians. Against these the Prophet Isaiah cries out aloud, saying, 'Woe to those who write wickedness, for writing they write wickedness' (Isaiah x. 1); for, having craftily and perversely laid hold of the words of Scripture and of the Apostles, they have endeavoured to subvert the great mystery of our salvation—namely, the dispensation of Christ our God by which we were delivered from idolatry, in order to transfer this glory to themselves! No Christian would ever believe them; for we all confess that Christ our true God, by His dwelling amongst us in the flesh, delivered us from idolatrous error and all Pagan worship; and if any agree not in this confession they have no calling from Him.† To them might the Apostle say, 'What hast thou which thou hast not received?' If, then, they have received this redemption, they ought to confess it and to allow of images, by which the glory of the Church is presented to our age and which imprint on

* If this be understood literally, it has not been fulfilled; for strangers—i.e., Mahomedans—have had it in possession for nearly one thousand two hundred years. If it be meant spiritually of the Church, it certainly is not true of the Churches of the East and West. The greater part of the former has been utterly destroyed, and what remains is in a state of most abject subjection to strangers. The Churches of Abyssinia and Egypt, and other Eastern countries, have fallen into Eutycheanism and lie under the ban of the Fourth Council. The Churches of Greece and Rome look on each other as schismatics, and many provinces of the Western Church have become Protestants; so that, in the view of that Church, strangers bear the rule. This text, then, no more implies safety from idolatry than from division.

† To consider the redemption of Christ as merely relating to being turned from idols to the service of one God is a narrow view. Christians who were never idolatrous at all stand in need of redemption as much as others. Christ by His death laid the foundation of this great work, the bringing of all nations to the knowledge of the truth; but, in the superstruction, human instruments were used. And as they were required in building up, so in repairing that which was broken down, or in building up aright when others had built amiss; and the work of recovering the Church from Arianism by Athanasius and others might be said quite as much to interfere with the work of Christ as the efforts of the Iconoclasts to recover the Church from idolatry.

our minds evangelical transactions, ministering to the remembrance and illustration of the history of the Gospel, as we have often said before.* And since they have brought forward these words of the Apostle, saying, 'If we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforward know we Him no more,' and 'We walk by flesh and not by right,' let us bring forward also our illustrious Doctors as interpreters thereof. John was endowed with doctrine more precious than that of gold and precious stones in his interpretation of this passage of the Apostle, 'Henceforth know we no man after the flesh, and if we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we Him no more,' speaks thus, 'We know none of the faithful after the flesh: how is this, if they are yet in flesh? Because their carnal life is at an end, and we have been born again from nature by the Spirit, and we are acquainted with another citizenship and conversation, another life, and disposition, even that which is heavenly' (Hom. xi. on 2 Cor.) And, again, of this itself, he shows Christ to be the Author: wherefore he adds, 'If we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we Him no more.' What, then, tell me, hath He lain aside His body? And is He now without the body? Away with the notion! For even now He is in the flesh. 'For this Jesus who was taken up from us into heaven shall come again in like manner' (Acts i. 11). In like manner? How? In the flesh with the body. Why, then, does he say 'If we have known Christ after the flesh we shall know Him no more?' Because that if we have known Christ subject to suffering (*παθητόν*) we shall know Him *thus* no more. In respect of us to be *after the flesh* is our being in our sins, and not to be *after the flesh* is not to be in our sins. In respect of Christ to be *after the flesh* is to be exposed to the sufferings of nature, such as thirst, hunger, weariness, and sleep; 'for He did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth' (1 Pet. ii. 22). Wherefore also He saith, 'Which of you convinceth me of sin' (John viii. 46)? And, again, 'The Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me' (xiv. 10). For Christ not to be *after the flesh* means that henceforth He is not free from all such circumstances, and not that He is without body; for with this body, free from suffering, free from corruption, He is coming to judge the world, to which glory we also

* Strange reasoning!—because Christ has redeemed them from Heathen idolatry, therefore they are at liberty to have a sort of semi-Pagan idolatry called image-worship to display the glory of Him who declares, "I will not give my praise to graven images" (Isaiah xlvii. 8). Certainly, we ought to do whatever is commanded in the Gospels or the word of God; but against the traditions of men, the great source of image-worship, the Apostle warns us Col. ii. 8).

are tending ; ' for our body shall be made like unto His glorious body' (Phil. iii. 12).

"Cyril of Alexandria, the champion of our pure faith, when interpreting the same passage, explains it thus: ' Since the only-begotten Word of God became Man, a second root of our race has appeared, not according to the first from Adam, but which is to be considered better. We are transformed beyond all comparison in things to life ; for we are not under death, but under the Word Himself, who giveth life to all ; and no one is any longer in the flesh—that is, in carnal weakness, which is destruction. Paul does not affirm this, that Christ was not in the flesh ; for though he says ' that we know no one according to the flesh,' it is not this that he means, for, otherwise, how could He have died, for this is a weakness belonging to the flesh ? What he intends therefore is this : the Word became flesh and died for all, and in this manner we have known Him according to the flesh, but henceforth know we Him no more ; for though even now He be in the flesh (for He rose again the third day and ascended into heaven), yet is He now to be considered as superior to the flesh, for He died no more, nor does He endure any infirmity of the flesh, but is above all things as being God. See, therefore, ye of the opposite party, that not only do ye pervert the words of the Apostles, but set yourselves in opposition to the sentiments of the Fathers also. For they, from the above-mentioned words of the Apostles, prove that Christ, after His resurrection, was made free from suffering, and would teach us as being conformed to the body of His glory that we should not walk according to the flesh—that is, that we should not affect the pursuit of carnal pleasures. But ye, not enduring to tread in their steps, as holding opinions directly opposed to the fathers, must needs bring in some novel interpretation, and, walking in untrodden paths, leading yourselves and your followers over precipices and abysses, ye drag them with you down to the lake of hell ; but none will give any heed to you, because ye follow not the doctrine of our holy fathers.*

* Unless these expositions of Chrysostom and Cyril are intended to foreclose every other (and other fathers may have interpreted in a different way), the Iconoclasts might make use of them in opposition to Christian idolatry, without intending to oppose or contradict anything that they said. Certainly they who need pictures for their devotion and religious worship do walk by sight. Faith enabled the Apostles and Primitive Christians to worship without any such helps ; and certainly it must be the mark of a declining Church to have need of those things which, in the first instance, were never so much as thought of at all. Indeed, faith seems by this means to be banished, as many never believe themselves in the presence of Christ but when they are before His picture.

“ But with respect to the words, ‘ We walk by faith and not by sight, the above-mentioned John thus interprets them—‘ But lest any should say, what then? When thou savest Being at home in the body we are absent from the Lord ’ (Hom. x. on 2nd Cor.) Why do you speak thus? Are we banished from Him because we are here? He anticipates the objection by saying, ‘ We walk by faith and not by sight.’ Even here we know Him, but not entirely, as he says elsewhere, ‘ Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.’ These are the interpretations of our two inspired fathers. And, moreover, the Apostle himself in other of his writings clearly explains his meaning, as when he says, ‘ That which a man sees, why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it ’ (Rom. viii. 24, 25). It is evident that we walk by faith and not by sight; for here, though we see not God, yet do we believe in Him. In like manner, by faith, we say that all His creatures were the work of His hand, even as with the sublime voice of the Spirit the same divine Apostle declares, ‘ By faith we understand that the heavens were made by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear ’ (Heb. xi. 3); and thus we, contemplating the well-ordered motion of all things, come to the knowledge of that God who hath created all in wisdom.* This is, then, the meaning of the words ‘ We walk by faith and not by sight,’ and it is not as they would interpret the passage who, from the want of discipline, would pervert the Apostle’s sentiments as if they were against the worship of images. Having heard the doctrines of the fathers, these have we followed, and this present innovation we have abominated, saying, ‘ I have hated the assembly of those who do evil, and I will not sit together with the wicked ’” (Psalm xxvi. 5).†

SECTION THE FIFTH.

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ That their feet running towards evil have been caught in their

* If, by seeing the natural creation, we may come to the knowledge of God, as they confess, *without images*, why may we not, from the hearing of the divine word, come to the knowledge of Christ *without images*? How, then, is it necessary to have pictures for us to worship Christ by? Or, how do we come to the knowledge of Him through them? Christians walk by faith in that Saviour whom they *see* not: not by looking on His picture, much less by worshipping it, but by believing in His promises, and by conforming themselves to His holy image, by taking up their cross, and by diligent and faithful obedience to His promises.

† No notice taken of the passage from Romans x. 17.

own snares, and that none of those brought up in the Church have changed the glory of God for the making of images, or for the worship of any created thing whatever, has been proved already. Let us, then, now proceed to the subversion of the remainder of their arguments, having invincible truth as our ally: for they, not unwilling by every addition to make evil abound, must bring our holy fathers also into the arena, and absurdly represent them as having spoken against the making of venerable images, proceeding thus:—

GREGORY reads:—

“In a similar way have the disciples and successors of the Apostles, our divinely-speaking fathers, taught. Wherefore he who was illustrious among the champions of the Church, the far-famed Epiphanius Bishop of Cyprus says, ‘Take heed to yourselves and hold fast the traditions which ye have received, and turn neither to the right hand nor to the left:’ after which he adds, ‘In this respect be mindful, my beloved children, not to introduce images into the churches nor into the cemeteries of the Saints; but labour by memory ever to have God dwelling in your hearts. Neither should they be brought into private houses; for it is not lawful for a Christian to wander hither and thither after the sight of the eyes and the vagaries of the imagination.’ And he made also other discourses against the formation of images, which the studious enquirer may easily find on seeking after them.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“The studious enquirer into ecclesiastical matters knows this, that he ought not to look on those as brethren who hold sentiments diverse from the Church, and who, wishing to establish their own righteousness and to set themselves in opposition to the righteousness of God, place their confidence in ambiguous and superstitious documents, since they are bastards and not the legitimate offspring of the Church. He therefore will repel such from him, saying, ‘Ye are the seed of Canaan and not of Judah’ (Susanna 56); knowing also the words of the Evangelist, ‘They went out from us, but were not of us; for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us’ (1 John ii. 19). And again that the divine Apostle has said, ‘There shall come after my departure grievous wolves, not sparing the flock, to draw away disciples after them’ (Acts xx. 29-30). And again, ‘Beware lest any despoil you through philosophy and vain deceit’ (Col. ii. 8). And again the same advises, ‘Believe not every spirit’ (1 John

iv. 1). It becomes every Christian, therefore, when such supposititious works are read to him, to reject them with the greatest contempt and not to admit them at all. Thus, in some collections of the apostolic epistles is found a forged epistle of the divine Apostle to the Laodiceans, which our fathers rejected as having nothing to do with him. The Manicheans brought forward a Gospel according to St. Thomas, which the Catholic Church religiously rejected as being spurious. Just in the same way we find here a passage attributed to Saint Epiphanius which is none of his: for the same divine father, having made a treatise of eighty chapters, utterly triumphs over every heresy, whether Gentile, Jewish, or such as have sprung up since the establishment of Christianity, and he passes by none: had he therefore considered the making of images to have been against the mind of Christ, he no doubt would have placed that also in his catalogue of heresics.* Again, if the Church had ever admitted these extracts

* This argument is sharply censured in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 25):—"They who adore and worship images conceit themselves to have attained no slight defence from this—that if one Epiphanius, who had made eighty chapters of distinct varieties of heresies, had considered the worship of images to be a heresy, he would have counted those who worshipped them to be heretics. And if he who made a general treatise concerning all heresies had considered this to be a heresy, he surely would have given it a place amongst other heresies; but he did not place it among those which he enumerated: it therefore must not be considered as heretical. To which we reply on our part—If this same Epiphanius had considered those who despise the worship of images as heretics, he would without doubt have included them in his general treatise on heretics; but he did not count such among heretics: it is therefore to be believed that they are not heretics. But that this same Epiphanius not only despised the worship of images, but would not allow to images any place in churches at all, we have the following proof: for, in an epistle which was sent by him to John Bishop of Jerusalem, which has been translated by Jerome from Greek into Latin, he writes as follows:—'I hear that certain murmur against me because, on going into a church at Anabathla, I found hanging before the doors a veil, dyed and painted, and having an image of Christ or of some Saint (I do not remember very well of whom it was the image); and that when I saw, quite contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, this image of a man hanging up in the church of God, I tore it, and strongly advised the guardians of the place to take it and use it as a winding-sheet. They, on the other hand, murmured and said—As he has chosen to tear this veil, it is but right that he should give us another. Which when I heard I promised to give them another in its place, and to send it to them immediately. Some time has elapsed while I was seeking for a veil good enough for this purpose, and I determined to send it from Cyprus. And now I have sent the best I could find; and I entreat you to issue orders to the Presbyter of the place to receive the veil which I have sent from the bearer, and furthermore to command that no veils of that kind, so contrary to our religion, be hung up in the Church of Christ: for it becomes your honour to exercise that vigilant and scrupulous caution which is worthy of the Church of Christ and of the people entrusted to your care.' Such we have found to be the sentiments of Epiphanius, which, whether they are to be blamed or commended, must be left to the judgment of the reader. But let us come now to the blessed Augustine; and let us enquire of him whether any heresy ever made use of image-worship.

here cited against holy images, sure these same venerable images would never have been depicted as they have been, whether for the ornament of churches or our reminiscence. Indeed, the very passages of which the patrons of this vanity speak as an evidence in their favour contain their own confutation. For St. Epiphanius flourished in the time of Theodosius and Arcadius; between that period and the rise of the present heresy is about four hundred years; and no Christian ever admitted these books against images except the false promoters of this late innovation. If, therefore, for so long a period they had found no admittance into the Church, neither shall they now be admitted for that they never were admitted before. Another epistle which some of them have brought forward falsely inscribed, as from this same St. Epiphanius Metropolitan of Cyprus to the Emperor Theodosius, having fallen into our hands, we having read the same with great attention and not in a cursory manner found towards the close a sentence of this kind, 'Having frequently spoken to my fellow-labourers about the taking away of images, I could not prevail with them, nor could I obtain any hearing from them on the subject.' Let us, then, consider who were the venerable doctors and indomitable champions of the Church who lived in the age of our Father Epiphanius.

This same venerable doctor made a treatise on eighty-nine heresies, among which two at least approved the worship of images—viz., the Simonians and the Carpoctratians. And to make this more evident the words of this same doctor concerning them shall be here brought forward; for he observes as follows:—'The Simonians are named from Simon Magus, who, having been baptized by Philip the Deacon, as it is read in the Acts of the Apostles, wished to purchase from the holy Apostle for money that the Holy Spirit might be given to those on whom he laid his hands. He deceived many by his magical arts: he taught also the execrable abomination of a community of women, and denied that God made the world: he denied also the resurrection of the flesh, and declared that he was Christ: he gave to his disciples the images of himself and his female companions to worship, which he set up at Rome as images of gods by public authority; &c. As, therefore, the heresy which had its origin with this Simon, and is styled 'the Simonian,' is utterly despised by the faithful, so ought the custom of worshipping images to be altogether set at naught. There is also another heresy which admits of this error, which the same doctor describes thus:—'The Carpoctratians began from Carpoctrates, who taught all base works, every invention of evil, and that only by the commission of these could we escape the principalities and powers who delighted in such things or attain to heaven above. Of this sect a certain Marcellina is said to have been a partizan, who used to worship the images of Jesus and Paul, Homer and Pythagoras, by bowing before them and offering incense to them.' If, however, any should object that blessed Augustin counted the worship of images as heretical because that these worshipped the images of certain Gentiles, as Simon and Silena, or Homer and Pythagoras, let him consider further that they are said to have worshipped also those of Jesus and of Paul, and that this also was counted heretical by him. Now, if this excellent man had considered that images of our Lord or His Apostles made with hands were to be adored, he never would have counted the adoration of Paul and Jesus as heretical."

nus here mentioned. Basil, great in work and word, Gregory who is surnamed the Divine, Gregory Primate of Nyssa, who is called by all a father of fathers, John, from whose tongue flowed a stream sweeter than honey, and who was on this account styled Chrysostom, and in addition to these Ambrose, Amphilochius, and Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem. If, therefore, he who wrote this diatribe against holy images declares that he could gain no hearing from any of these holy fathers, his contemporaries, how can it be expected that we of these latter days, so far deficient in word and in knowledge as scarce worthy to be accounted their disciples, admit these false writings against the Church which these fathers themselves have not admitted? Away with these accursed and audacious comments! These men, in their attack on the Church, seem to want common sense! Let the word spoken by the Apostle ever continue among us who love Christ, 'Hold fast the traditions which ye have received, and shun profane and vain babblings,' and we shall then discover passages like these to be both false and spurious.

"The works of our holy father, Epiphanius, as that called 'Anchorates,'* and the rest, have been proclaimed throughout all the world: their voice hath sounded far and wide, and they are to be found in almost every part of the Church: but of those other absurd productions, which they vauntingly set forth against holy images, but two or three copies have ever been heard of in all the world besides those which they have but lately transcribed for themselves.† Now, had

* "The Anchorate, so called from 'Ἀγκυρα,' an anchor, because, says Epiphanius, I have collected all those passages of Scripture which are calculated to establish our faith; that this book may, like the anchor of a ship, establish believers in the orthodox faith. This treatise is an epitome of the Christian faith."—*Clarke's Succession of Sac. Lit.*, vol. i. p. 339.

† "A truly ridiculous argument (observes Daille.) Who knows not how various the fate of different works of the same author, that while some of these are read by all and are in high favour, others are left unnoticed and disregarded, according either to their own actual merits or to the different views which men have concerning them? Is it not very astonishing that the 'Panarium' and 'Anchorates' of Epiphanius should have been much more diligently transcribed than his 'Letters'? During this last hundred years how many volumes have been published and transcribed on the faith of two or three codices, some even from one only, concerning the genuineness of which no one doubts because of the paucity of the then existing copies? And, indeed, against this testimony of Epiphanius there is no other objection than the *ipse dixit* of those Nicene divines who deny it to be his. Their mere denial in their own favour can be of no weight, and may justly be opposed by the counter affirmation of the three hundred and thirty-eight fathers assembled in council at Constantinople. Consider also that these are the men who attributed a false opinion to Eusebius in order to defame that father more freely—these are the men who fathered on St. Athanasius that most absurd and senseless tale of the miracle at Berytus—these are the men who filled their Synod with fables the most ridiculous, with testimonies utterly unknown and unheard of in early antiquity, such as the canon of the

these ever been known in the Catholic Church as the above-mentioned Ancyrotos of St. Epiphanius, they would have been diffused amongst the Churches even as his works have been diffused: but, as being strange, foreign, and spurious, they never have been received by the Catholic Church or made any appearance there; neither shall they now be received, that so the peace of God may rest on all the Churches, and the tradition which was from the beginning may evermore flourish. Let not those slanderers who calumniate the orthodox make such proud boasting, as if those who received the ancient order of the Church were in opposition to St. Epiphanius. No, no!—we reject the document; but the holy father we recognise as a teacher of the Catholic Church. For the divine fathers who were assembled in the fourth holy Œcumenic Council held at Chalcedon anathematized the letter said to be written by Ibas Bishop of Edessa to Maris the Persian, as agreeing with Nestorius; and they of the fifth Council did the same: but they did not anathematize Ibas, for it was never sufficiently proved that it was his at all: whence it is evident that they did not level their anathemas at Ibas, but at the letter which was said to be written by him—that is, it was attributed to him, but his it was not. Just in the same manner these false writings against venerable images are by certain set forth as the works of St. Epiphanius; but never—no, never—were they written by him, as we have proved. Again: the disciples of this father built a temple in the island of Cyprus, which they called after his name; and there, among many images which they painted therein, they set up one in the memory of the father himself. Now, had he abominated the use of images for contemplation, would his disciples have made an image of him? Judge, therefore, all ye that hear, and distinguish between

pretended Apostolic Council of Antioch, the spurious letter of Basil to Julian, and a thousand things of the same kind, of which no vestige can be found in the Scriptures or any ancient author. Is it on the mere assertion of such men as these that we are to reject as false and supposititious a testimony which had met the approbation of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops but a few years before—which they themselves confess was to be found in one ancient codex or another—which is plainly agreeable to the mind of St. Epiphanius, as is manifest from his letter to John Bishop of Jerusalem, and from those two passages from his 'Panarium,' in one of which he censures the Carpocratians for having and worshipping the image of Christ: in the other he blames certain for doing the same to the image of Moses."—*Daillee de Imaginibus*, lib. ii. cap. 4.

* This argument is confuted in the "Caroline Books" (lib. iv. cap. 19) on the following grounds:—First, many things are painted which are not worshipped: second, and not unfrequently had scholars come from good masters. "They mightily congratulate themselves on having obtained this as a safeguard for their errors, that a basilic in the isle of Cyprus was adorned with images by the disciples of one St. Epiphanius; as if, forsooth, nothing was painted but it must be worshipped. Now, as the custom of having or not

truth and falsehood : for these extracts belong not to this father, but are more likely the production of some Manicheans, which we must flee from as filled with gall and bitterness. For they, as well as the Confusionists, never would admit this use of pictures, because they maintained that God the Word did not truly take our nature upon Him, but only the appearance and phantom of a body. And in like manner these, misled by phantoms, mistaking one thing for another, add as follows :—

having images in no way prejudices the purity of the Catholic faith, it might be that this Epiphanius was neither a destroyer nor a worshipper of images ; and that his disciples were accustomed to ornament basilics with pictures, not that the pictures might be worshipped, but that the walls might be beautified and the memorials of transactions past might thereby be impressed on the beholders. Images are made we know of metal on gems, on marble, wood, mosaic work, on garments of silk, woollen or linen. Because, therefore, the disciples of St. Epiphanius adorned a place set apart for divine worship with divers materials, are the faithful therefore to come before these same materials which have been mentioned, because of the pictures which may be upon them, with bended knees—with necks bowed down—with oft-repeated sighs—with eyes upraised and generally half closed !

“ Again : if these disciples of St. Epiphanius did determine to worship the pictures they had painted on the walls of the basilic, their determination will have no force ; since not unfrequently many disciples well instructed by good teachers have, from neglect of the instructions given by their masters, turned out very ill. This we may prove from Scripture itself. Not all the teaching of Eliaba, endued as he was with a double portion of the spirit of Elijah, nor all the portents which he beheld, nor his constant dwelling with so great a prophet, could cure Gehazi of the dreadful pest of avarice. Judas, of whom it was said, ‘ Thou wert my guide, mine own familiar friend, who took sweet food together with me,’ slighting the good instructions of so good a teacher, was not restrained, instigated by the rage of avarice, from betraying his Master ; whom neither heavenly words, nor the full tide of the fountains of life, nor the exhibition of miracles, nor the society of the Apostles, nor even the dignity of the Apostolic name, could at all restrain from the commission of so great a crime ; of whom saith Sedulius, ‘ He, once an apostle, now became a vile apostate.’

“ Thus also Nicolaus, who was the disciple of the Apostles, and who was consecrated to the office of deacon together with the blessed Stephen, did afterwards neglect the doctrine of good teachers, and the society of his good fellow-deacons, became an Heresiarch, and in the place of teaching good works taught nothing but his own evil heresy. If, therefore, the wicked scholar of a good prophet be reprobated for avarice—if the disciple of the good Master, our Lord and Saviour, be abominated as a thief and a traitor—if the perverse-minded pupil of the Apostles be execrated on account of the impiety of his doctrine, what wonder if the disciples of Epiphanius, a good teacher, should have proved themselves perverse by this institution of worshipping images ? Not that we judge them absolutely, but we say conditionally—if they taught men to worship pictures in this, they taught that which was erroneous. We see also that Novatus and Arius, though both the disciples of Catholics, yet set at nought their doctrine, and sowed the seeds of pestiferous heresy. But why speak we of individuals, since almost all Heresiarchs have been the disciples of Catholics ? Whence we may understand that the sanctity of the master could not at all profit the disciples of Epiphanius, if they are to be believed to have deserted the constitution of the Church in contempt of the instructions of so good a master.”

GREGORY reads:—

“In like manner Gregory the Divine in his poems remarks, ‘It is disgraceful to have confidence in colours and not in the heart: that which is in colours is easily effaced, but that which is in the depth of the heart the same is dear to me.’”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Perversely misunderstanding it, they bring forward their next passage from Gregory the Divine. By that father it was written thus:— ‘It is a disgrace to have confidence in colours and not in hearts; for they may easily be obliterated, but depth it is which is dear to me.’ By these falsifiers it is written—‘It is disgraceful to have confidence in colours, and not in the heart; that which is in colours is easily effaced, but that which is in the depth of the heart the same is dear to me.’”

“They have stopped their ears—their eyes have they closed!—and they are not willing to understand aright in their opposition to ecclesiastical tradition! They have heard with the ear, and have not understood—they have seen, but have not perceived; and, being hardened in heart, they have wrested the doctrines and traditions of the fathers according to their own lusts. For St. Gregory the Divine, in that part of his poetical works whence they have selected this passage, introduces a kind of moral discourse tending to the reforming of our lives, teaching us to abstain from temporal and worldly matters, and from carnal pleasures, and to choose that spiritual life which alone leads to heavenly joys; and that we must not attach ourselves to this world or place confidence on transitory things, and those which abide not, which also he styles *colours* (χρῶματα); but rather to attach our-

* The passage, as in the poems of Gregory (tom. ii. 586), is as follows:—

Υβρις πίστιν ἔχειν ἐν χρώμασι μὴ καρδίῃσι.
Ρεῖά κεν ἐκπλυτ' εἶσι. βένθοι ἔμουγε φίλον :

as altered by the fathers of the Council of Constantinople, it stands thus—
Υβρις πίστιν ἔχειν ἐν χρώμασι καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐν χρώμασιν εὐχερῶς ἐκπλύνεται. ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ βάθει τῶ νοοῖ, ἐκείνη ἐμοὶ προφιλήν.
This alteration does not seem to affect the sense: in the first line it is verbally the same; in the second it seems a very fair paraphrase: at the same time it must be allowed that it has little to do with image-worship except by inference. But if misapplied passages prove a darkened understanding and a hardened heart, surely the Nicene divines fall under their own censure, who have not one perversion to answer for, but many—who have not only misquoted one father, but have not quoted so much as one passage from any father which they have not misapplied.

selves to those things which are spiritual and true, which have their fixation in the heart and abide for ever. For, saith he, life flows away apace; our continuance here is but a sojourning; and, as the colour or ink is easily obliterated, or as it is changed by the painter, so is it in this life; and as the same declares 'a kind of cycle of events is ever running its course, sometimes in one way, sometimes in another: every day, every hour, brings its changes with it: all human affairs pass away like a shadow—all the swellings of the power of man are like a bubble easily dispersed. Every man is as grass and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass; but the manifestation of spiritual deeds is immoveable and has its reward in the things which continue.' Now, had he been speaking against holy images, he would have said, 'it is a disgrace to put confidence in colours and not in God;' but whereas, he says, 'but not in hearts,' he means that we work the firm and stable works of the kingdom of heaven, and not those of this world, which, being subject to continual alteration and change, afford no such ground of confidence.

"But, again, allegorizing amiss and making all things to suit their own notions, they bring forward in their favour the words of the great Hierophants (*μυστηπόλων*), Basil and John, as follows"—

GREGORY reads:—

"But John the Chrysostom thus teaches us—'We enjoy the presence of the Saints by their writings, thus having the images, not of their bodies, but their souls; for the words they have spoken are the images of their souls.' And the great Basil observes—'The most effectual way to the attainment of that which is fitting to us is diligent application to the inspired Scriptures, for by these are the principles of good actions discovered; and the lives of blessed men being written herein are handed down to us, being, as it were, certain living images of the conversation which is according to God, by their imitation of the works which are according to God.'"

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"—None of those who think aright ever has imagined, nor ever will, that these extracts are at all subversive of the use of holy images. It is evident enough to all that, when we hear of the fortitude of the Saints and their noble deeds, we bless the firmness and magnanimity of their souls; and also that, taking the Scriptures in our hands and there reading the lives of holy men, and no less from looking upon their images as described in pictures, we recall to mind the

same godly works *—‘For the same things which history presents to us by means of the ear, the silent picture points out by its imitative powers,’ as the great Basil observes in his ‘Encomium on the Forty Martyrs.’ John Chrysostom also, in his discourse entitled, ‘That there is one Lawgiver of the Old and the New Testaments,’† and ‘On the Garment of the Priest,’ which begins—‘The Prophets also proclaim the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ’—after other things continues—‘I have delighted in the picture drawn in wax for the sake of its piety; for I saw in a picture an Angel dispersing the troops of the Barbarians. I saw also the tribes of the Barbarians trodden under foot, and the words of David verified, Lord, in thy city thou shalt bring their images to nought.’ It is evidently proved that what things these holy fathers have well spoken, they, as separated from that divine company, have wrested for their right meaning. Still they hold on their malicious course, and next they bring forward the words of our holy Father Athanasius against idols for the subversion of images and pictures.”

GREGORY reads:—

“Again, Athanasius the light of Alexandria writes—‘How can we but pity those who worship creatures? For they who see pray to those who see not, and they who hear pray to those who hear not: the creature never can be saved by the creature.’”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Heavens, what madness! Into what novel way of blasphemy have they now turned while intriguing against the truth? The father, indeed, spake these things of idols; but they calumniously assert that Christians, after the acknowledgment of the truth and the pure confession and the divine regeneration, do worship (*λατρείειν*), besides the one God who is over all, certain created things, and that they are thereby proved to be idolators. Spare thy people, O Lord, and grant that none may be turned aside by their blasphemy. For all we who have been called by thy name confess that thou hast redeemed us from the errors and deceit of idols! And never have we, who have

* Can the image of the souls of Saints be seen in pictures? They may set forth some one particular event of their lives, but how can they display the hidden principles which work within? A picture may represent Paul preaching, but how can a picture represent what he taught? And it is not the fact that he preached, but the doctrines which he taught, that are of importance.

† This Homily is spurious.—See *Du Pin, Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v., p. 32.

been accounted worthy of the divine regeneration, turned aside after our acknowledgment of Thee, to offer thy sacred worship to any creature under heaven, but we offer it to Thee our Redeemer alone, and we sing, 'Beside Thee, O Lord, we know no other God; we call on thy name only' (Isaiah xxvi. 13). Let Him be our witness, and the armies of the holy Angels, and the sacred assembly of Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and inspired Fathers. We have, moreover, for the quickening of our bodily senses to thy glory,* and that we may be led to a sense of thy greatness, the type of the life-giving cross, the evangelical histories, and the representations of images, and many other sacred vessels besides; and these we embrace because made in thy name and offered to thee.

"But they who have thus been working out for themselves treasures with the tongue of falsehood, have followed after vanity; for all their empty harangues have come to nought; and, as when the light shines the darkness is dispersed, so when truth appears the falsity of their tongues is cut off by the sword of the Spirit. But now, having laid hold of the remnants of an isolated passage, they bring them forward thus"—

GREGORY reads:—

"To the same purpose speaks Amphilocheus Bishop of Iconium—'We need not to be anxious about portraying the carnal images of the Saints by colours on tablets; for we need not such things as these, but rather to imitate their good deeds by our virtues.'"

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"—It is the characteristic of Heretics to bring forward isolated passages in their favour. Now, if any one will carefully examine, he will find that the meaning of the father here was by no means to forbid the formation of holy images; but rather that it is in praise of the

* The discourse between Saul and Samuel (1 Kings xv. 13-15) seems here to have its parallel. These Nicene Fathers say—"We have kept the commandments of the Lord—we are no idolators—we worship God only." To which an Iconoclast might reply—"What means, then, this kneeling before images?—this worshipping, incensing, and praying to them, so expressly forbidden in the second commandment?" "Oh (say they in answer), it is true that we have these things and worship them; but then we salute and embrace them because made in thy name, O Lord, and set apart for thy service." To which it might be further replied, "Hath the Lord as great delight in self-invented uncommanded services as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" Images made in God's name for the purpose of worship are no less a violation of the second commandment than any other images whatever.

courage and firmness of the spiritual disposition of the Saints, and as signifying his preference of the operation of such virtues that the father thus speaks, and further in order to induce us to the imitation of their good conduct.* For it is not from any carnal regard that we either set forth their praises in writing or make pictures of them; but, being desirous to have their virtues before us for our imitation, we have their histories recorded in books and their persons set forth by painting: not that they would desire either that their deeds should thus be recorded or their persons thus delineated; but we do this, as we said before, for our own benefit. And thus, not only are the conflicts of the Saints conducive to our salvation, but the description of those conflicts and their being set forth by imitation of painting, as also is the yearly commemoration of them. The whole character of the discourse supports this view; and nothing here said by the father at all tends to the repudiation of images, or, indeed, bring the least charge against them. For though he may say, 'We need not be careful about painting their carnal images on tablets with colours,' it is only with reference to their virtues that he thus speaks; for he adds immediately, 'that we ought to imitate their good conduct by our virtues.' Now, it ought to be our care to make choice of the virtues of the good, to imitate their deeds, and to emulate their excellence; for, otherwise to be constantly occupied in raising temples to their honour, or in delineating their form in pictures, while we neglect their virtues, is by no means praiseworthy. Nor would any commend that man who, while he daily dedicated images to the praise, made no account of the virtues, of the Saints; or, while busied in the erection of many temples and in providing sacred vessels for them, failed to adorn his own temple with heavenly virtues.

"To persons of this kind God spake by His Prophet Isaiah:— 'When ye bring your offering, your incense is vain; it is an abomination unto me;' and, 'When ye stretch out your hands unto me, I will turn away mine eyes from you,' and when you make many prayers I will not hear; 'but what is it that ye should do? Wash ye, make you clean: put away the evil of your souls from before mine eyes: cease from your evil works, learn to do well, seek judgment,

* "These Nicene Fathers (says Daille) complain that an unfair extract is here made. Why, then, did they not themselves bring forward the true elucidation of his sentiments by stating what followed or what preceded this passage? They bring forward nothing but that which the Constantinopolitan fathers had alleged before—a pretty plain proof is this that they could find nothing in the whole discourse which would help their cause in the least."—*Daille de Imag.*, p. 220.

relieve the oppressed, judge the orphan, avenge the widow (Isaiah i. ; *sec. lxx.*, 13, 15, 16, 17).^{*} When, therefore, we have ordered these things aright, all our offerings will be acceptable to God, whether they be holy temples, sacred vessels, or venerable pictures.† It is, therefore, most suitable that we should so bear the Saints in memory as thereby to be led to imitate their virtues to the utmost of our power. For this is that which confers glory on the Martyr, the influencing of multitudes to virtue, as the great Basil observes in his moral discourses. Endued with these virtues, if any raise temples, make images, or offer sacred things to God, it is an action worthy of commendation, as the word of truth teaches us—‘ These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone ’ ‡ (Matt xxiii. 23).

“ For no one can attain to virtue unless he frequent the courts of the Lord, and by means of the reading apprehend the divine oracles, and by vision of pictures be led to the perception of the history and doctrine of the Gospels, and also of the histories and conflicts of the Martyrs. But in every season, in every place, each day and hour, it is a duty ever incumbent upon us to be occupied in doing virtuous deeds : for we ought ever and at all times to be conversant with the sufferings of Christ, and to bear about His dying in our body ; and it is profitable to us to be diligent in doing this, for it is this which brings us near to the kingdom of heaven. But to be making many crosses in one apartment, while we despise the commands of Christ and conformity to His sufferings, is very foolish, ‘ for without works faith is dead ’ (James ii. 20) ; and the Lord declares in the Gospels : ‘ Not every one who

^{*} They here pretend that Amphilochius did not speak absolutely but comparatively ; not that he condemns images, but merely intends to show that they are of less importance than virtuous and good conduct ; just as we find in the prophecies of Isaiah mention made of a rejection of sacrifice, incense, and the various festivals of the law, by which is not meant that in themselves they were actually worthless, but that they were only made so by the wickedness of those who engaged in the celebration of them. The two cases are not, however, parallel Isaiah speaks not simply of the mere offering of sacrifice, but of those who do this while living in wickedness—Amphilochius, on the contrary, speaks of *all* Christians, whether righteous or wicked, when he declares of images, ‘ We have no need of these.’ God by His Prophet did not declare to the Israelite, Ye have no need of these ; but that while they were sinful these sacrifices, though of His own appointment, could not avail them. Amphilochius says not, These are of no avail to the sinner, but of no avail to any Christian whatever.

† The conclusion is not the Prophet’s, but their own, for certainly under the old law nothing was acceptable to God in His worship but that which Himself had appointed ; and under the New Testament dispensation no excellence of intention, no holiness of person, can make that acceptable to Him which He has expressly forbidden as the worship of venerable images.

‡ Where does it appear that the making images or the worship of images is one of those things which we ought to have done ?

saith to me, Lord Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven '* (Matt. vii. 21). In continuance of our present argument we will add another proof to those which we have already advanced. It is not uncommon with those who have made known to us the saving will of God—our holy fathers—to lay very great stress on the observance of the commandments; and thus, when they would draw the attention of the hearer to any particular command on which they intended to dilate, to describe it as of great and supreme importance that, adhering to this as a sure anchor, we should not neglect any of the rest.

“ Not, on account of the length, to mention every instance, we will here adduce only Asterius, Bishop of Amasea. For, in his sermon on the rich man and Lazarus, delivering his sentiments at large on the duty of taking care of the poor and against the heaping up of riches, he exhorts the rich to be fruitful in almsgiving, and not to affect a splendid and luxurious style of dress; and he introduces a kind of moral address to certain who, while pretending to great religion, were, nevertheless, too eager about the riches of the present life, saying thus: ‘ Do not paint Christ on your garments, but rather lay out the amount of such expences on the poor.’ And then, anxious to cut off all eagerness after wealth, he adds: ‘ The one humiliation of His incarnation is sufficient for Him’—that is, it is not pleasing to Christ our God to display the mysteries of His dispensation by worldly attractions† and the workings of avarice. For neither is it pious in itself nor acceptable before Him, for the sake of evangelical reminiscence, to heap up riches for ourselves, and to frame excuses for sin, while we overlook the poor who stand in need of bread, clothing, and lodging: since this is the characteristic of the love of money, not of religion. As, therefore, there is no ‘ communion between light and darkness,’ nor ‘ any fellowship between righteousness and unrighteousness’ (2 Cor. x. 14), so neither can there be any between the lust of wealth, and wearing of luxurious clothing, and the pictorial representation or historical narration of the Gospels. For while the one conduces to salvation, as clearly teaching the history of the dispensation, the other is denounced as miserable, as being obnoxious to punishment; as James the brother of God declares: ‘ Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl for the miseries that shall come upon you—your riches are corrupted—your garments are moth-eaten—your gold and

* Is, then, making images the same thing with faith, or our saying, Lord Lord? If we have good works, will our worship of images be more acceptable than before?

† What are pictures and images but worldly attractions?

silver is cankered, and the rust of them remains for a testimony against you' (James v. 1-3). Wherefore (as we have said) all things done in the world from love of money come to nought. For a little expense we may secure house, and food, and raiment, with which we should rest content, for whatever is procured for display rather than necessity lays us open to the charge of vain-glory, as the great Basil observes:—'Let us be content with that which our necessities require, and from our stores let us give to the poor what they need, and hold out our hands to them, that thus we may follow the words of the Lord, which say to us: 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy;' and again, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me' (Matt. v. 7; *ibid.* xxv. 40).

"But as we have mention of Asterius, come let us now prove from his own words that the tradition of images is the ancient rule and ordinance of the Church Catholic; for he, having contemplated the passion of Euphemia, gives the following glowing description of it [The narration which follows is given word for word in the citations from the fathers in the Fourth Session, to which the reader is referred]. Thus far Asterius; and, indeed, on considering the words of Scripture we find that it was from thence the above-mentioned father had learned the things which he affirmed. For when God gave directions to His servant Moses about the tabernacle, having ordered many works of various kinds for the same, He added: 'Thou shalt make curtains of fine twined linen, of blue and of purple, and cherubim of woven scarlet: thou shalt make them with the work of the weaver' (Exod. xxvi. 1). Now, this commandment teaches us that in things offered to God no expense need be spared. In respect to the things of men it is not so, for it was said to the people, 'Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts' (Deut. xxii. 11); and most clearly does the divine Apostle confirm the same sentiment when he enjoins 'that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shame-facedness and sobriety, not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, but which becometh women professing godliness with good works'* (1 Tim. ii. 9, 10).

"Knowing, therefore, these things, we, who offer to God alone the worship which is in spirit and in truth, do also salute and embrace all things which are offered and consecrated to Him, whether it be the

* These good fathers seem to be lost in the mazes of their own reasoning: they began with the images of the Saints, and end with the dress and ornaments of women. It was not, however, of the latter that Amphilocheus spake, but of the former, when he said, "We have no need of these."

divine type of the precious cross, or the holy Gospels, or venerable images, or the sacred vessels, as hoping to obtain sanctification from them;* and we pay to them the worship of honour: 'For (says he) worship at the footstool of His feet, for it is holy † (Psalm xcvi. 5). Gregory the Divine, in his sermon on the birth of Christ speaks thus: 'Honour Bethlehem, worship the manger; ‡ for the things which are offered to God are holy by the presence and participation of Himself, as all divine Scripture declares, and the honour of holiness cannot be preserved to that which is sacred otherwise than by our relative worship.§

"But they, still breathing out lies and tacking on something utterly foreign to the Catholic Church, say—

GREGORY reads:—

"Concordantly with the rest, Theodotus of Ancyra, the fellow-combatant with Cyril, thus teaches about the same things. We have been taught to make the figures of the Saints, not in pictures of material colours, but rather by copying their virtues as they stand on record in that which is written of them—thus framing as it were certain living images of them—thus being stirred up to a zeal rivalling theirs. For let those declare who set up forms of this kind what benefit they gain from such things? Or to what spiritual contemplation are they led by remembrance of them? Too evident is it that this device is a vanity and an invention of Satanic cunning.

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

"Were Theodotus but alive, with the blessed Susanna, he would cry aloud to God, saying—'O eternal God, who knowest the secrets, and knowest all things before they be, thou knowest' (Susanna 42,

* Reading, hearing, and meditation, is the way to obtain sanctification from the Scriptures, not kissing or embracing them. Our Saviour said, "Search the Scriptures," not *kiss* them.

† This perversion has been noticed before in the Fourth Session. If by *His footstool* be understood the earth, who was ever required to worship the *earth*?—if the Temple, what pious Israelite ever worshipped that building?

‡ This passage (says Binius) is found near the end of the Homily. It surely must be a rhetorical flourish: we cannot think either Gregory himself would prostrate himself before a thing made up of boards and nails, or that he would have any others do the same.

§ Where does Scripture teach us that images of Christ, the Virgin, or the Saints are holy by the participation of God Himself?—but we do find this expressly taught by God Himself. "I am the Lord; that is my name, and my glory I will not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."

43), that the promoters of this soul-destroying innovation, emulating these elders of the Babylonian confusion, have accused me falsely; for, wishing to set themselves forth as men of consequence and importance, they vociferate certain vanities, but the pen of their writing is manifested to be false, and themselves are found to be adulterators of the truth.* For whereas many amongst ourselves have searched and carefully enquired into the works of this same Theodotus concerning this passage, to see if he had written any such words, we could by no means find them anywhere; for never did he say anything of the kind, and it is manifestly proved that the passage belongs not to Theodotus. For the language is full of wrath and bitterness, and the absurd assertion that the invention of venerable images is the invention of Satanic cunning † is the audacity of an unrestrained tongue and of impure lips: consequently, this is the private feeling and the invention of the Christianity-detractors, and not the language of Theodotus. And if, as they affirm, they brought forward this testimony from him, they were bound most clearly to point out from which of his works the passage was taken; but, as if conscious of its falsity, they send forth the lie in silence.

“For, having collected together his works—namely, the six books written to Lausus against Nestorius—his exposition of the Creed of the holy Nicene fathers, his discourse on the birth of our Lord, that on the lights, that on Elias and the widow, that on the Saints Peter and John, that on the lame man who sat at the beautiful gate of the temple, that on those who received the talents, and that on the two blind men—we could by no means discover the words which they brought forward. No, nor when the false conventicle had got together its rabble, and inserted it in their lying dissertation, was the passage taken from any works of the Bishop of Ancyra; but from some mendacious extract it made its way like a pestilence, which, indeed, the

* “The fathers of the second Council (observes Du Pin) say that this passage of Theodotus is supposititious. Perhaps, it had been more to the purpose to observe that the first part belongs to Theodotus, but the second is a conclusion which their adversaries drew from this passage of Theodotus, to which they might easily have returned the same answer which they had done to that of Amphilochius” (Du Pin’s “Eccles. Hist.,” vol. vi., p. 138). The same author observes, that “Although Epiphanius makes mention of several of the works of Theodotus which we have not, yet we cannot say that he forgot none. Nicephorus attributes to him a sermon upon the Virgin and St. Symeon. F. Combefis assures us that he had four more sermons of this author.”—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iv., p. 46.

† If the latter part of this quotation be not the language of Theodotus, we have still no proof that the Constantinopolitan fathers ever represented it as such. Not improbably it was united by the Nicene divines to the former part, to bring a reader discredit on the whole.

more simple readily received ; but all who had any sense,* and were obedient to the truth, ever held it to be false. But, as a prime leader of their pestiferous heresy, they bring forward, lastly, the protector of Arius, the coadjutor of Eusebius Bishop of Nicomedia, Theognius of Nice, and Maris of Chalcedon, the great leader of those who plotted against the holy Council of Nice, saying"—

GREGORY reads:—

“ In like manner Eusebius Pamphilus, in answer to Constantia Augusta, who had desired him to send to her an image of Jesus Christ, thus declares himself—‘ Whereas, you have written to us concerning an image, as it were of Christ, desiring that we should send such an image to you—what, or of what nature, is this image which you style an image of Christ? Is it that true and unchangeable image which bears the peculiar characteristics which are His by nature? Or that which He assumed for our sakes, when He took upon Him the garb of the form of a servant? But, concerning the form of God, I cannot for a moment imagine that you are enquiring for this. Having been instructed by Himself that ‘ No man knoweth the Father but the Son, neither does any man know the Son worthily, except the Father who begat Him.’ Again, after other remarks, he continues : ‘ Unquestionably, therefore, you are seeking after *the form of the servant*,’ and that body of humility (*σαρκιον*) with which He was clothed for our sakes ; but this we know to be absorbed in the glory of the Godhead, and that His ‘ mortality has been swallowed up of life ’”† (2 Cor. v. 4). Again, shortly after, he adds : “ Who, then,

* All who received the eighth canon of the pretended Council of Antioch, the fable of the image of Berytus, falsely ascribed to St. Athanasius, the pretty tales from the miracles of SS. Cosmas and Damian.

† “ As to the reasons of his refusal (to send the image of Christ asked for by Constantia) it is not easy to comprehend the solidity of them. All that can be said is that he endeavours to take her off from contemplating the humanity of Christ, and to induce her rather to consider His divinity. But he seems to go so far as to say that His humanity had ceased after His ascent into heaven, and he hath been accused of entertaining this opinion. The enemies of holy images have made use of this letter, and they who have refuted them have allowed it to be genuine, but maintain that it was of no authority and weight as coming from an Arian. It is certain that Eusebius seems not much to approve the use of images ; and yet himself gives us reason to think that God approved of them when he speaks of the miracles which were said to be wrought by the statue of Christ that was at Paneas ; for he dares not maintain that what was related concerning it was false” (Tillemont, H. E. 7-43, as quoted by Jortin). Not much reason in favour of image-worship is to be gathered hence. Eusebius saw not the miracles, and his whole account is founded on mere report. *They said* that a statue was erected by the woman who had the bloody flux : *they said* that a herb grew at the foot of it : *they said* that many

dare undertake to delineate the all-bright and dazzling splendours of dignity and glory, like to this, with dead and inanimate outlines and colouring, when even the inspired disciples on the mount could not endure to gaze upon Him, but fell on their faces, confessing that what they saw was more than they could bear (Matt. xvii. 6)? If even, then, His mortal body attained such glory, being transfigured by the indwelling Godhead, what must we say of Him, now that having laid aside all that was mortal, and having purged Himself of all that was corruptible, He has transformed the appearance of the form of a servant into the glory of Lord and God—that is, after His victory over death, after His re-entrance into heaven, His sitting down on the royal throne on the right hand of the Father; and after His resting in the incomprehensible and ineffable bosom of the Father, to whom as He ascended and again returned the heavenly powers glorified, singing aloud: ‘Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in’” (Psalm xxiv. 9).

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Well does the word of the Prophet apply to these men, which God spake by the Prophet Jeremiah when rebuking the Jews, ‘They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and have hewn out to themselves broken cisterns which can hold no water’ (Jerem. ii. 13). For these choice bands of prevaricators, having deserted the doctrine of the accredited fathers, and having addicted themselves to those who have been swept away by the fan of divine judgment from the Lord’s floor—that is, from the Catholic Church—bring them forward for the confirmation of their heresy. For who among the faithful of the Church who has any knowledge of true doctrine is ignorant that Eusebius Pamphilus, being given over to a reprobate mind, was of the same opinion and sentiment with those who follow the superstition of Arius, and that in all his historical works he styles the Son and Word of God a creature, a servant, and to be worshipped as in the second place?*

miracles were wrought by it; and what *they said* Eusebius did not care to deny, though he by no means approved of the erection of the image; for, adds he, they acted indiscreetly and according to Pagan custom (*ἀπαραφύλακτως, εθνικῇ συνηθείᾳ*).

* “Ask (says Cave) their reasons and their proofs for this assertion, and you will find that they have none, only some trivial expressions, arguments from ‘*Posse*’ to ‘*Esse*,’ as if because Eusebius might understand thus or act thus he did actually understand thus or act thus.” Cave, in the same epistle, advances the following arguments to clear Eusebius from the charge of Arianism:—

scribed in the Council (of Nice), we grant that he did so; but his writings and all his letters prove that he honoured the truth with his lips only, while his heart was far from it. And if at one time or another, as seasons and opportunities might require, he could alter and change, now favouring the partizans of Arius, now hypocritically pretending to the truth, he is proved to be (as James the brother of God expresses it) 'a double-minded man, and unstable in all his ways: and let not such an one think that he shall receive anything from the Lord' (James i. 8, also 7; Rom. x. 10). For if with the heart he had believed unto righteousness, and if with the mouth he had confessed the word of truth unto salvation, he would have asked pardon for his writings, and have corrected what was amiss in them, and in like manner he would have apologized for his letters. But never did he do anything of this kind, and he continued to be like the Ethiopian who cannot change his skin.

"Thus, in the interpretation of the words, 'I said to the Lord, thou art my Lord' (Psalm xvi. 2), having departed from the knowledge of

(1). "The cause why the Nicene Fathers are so enraged against Eusebius is this—his letter in opposition to images. For, not being able to refute what he had advanced, they are most anxious to bring the imputation of Arianism upon him that his authority as a father might be destroyed thereby.

(2). "The passages which the Nicene Fathers here bring forward are mutilated and curtailed, so that one cannot judge as to what were his real sentiments, on what occasion, or on what grounds he wrote: possibly, if more were known, we might be able better to vindicate him from this charge. It is, however, much more equitable to judge of Eusebius from his unamutilated remains than from a few mutilated and imperfect fragments.

(3). "It is very certain that Arius and his party, by their ambiguities and artifices, wonderfully imposed on many Bishops for a time, so that they entertained a somewhat favourable opinion of him and his sentiments. The letter to Alexander, quoted in this Council, may be taken in proof of this assertion: from which it follows, either that Alexander misrepresented them: or, what is far more probable, that they imposed on Eusebius by disguising their real sentiments.

(4). "Whatever Eusebius might have said before that the Arian heresy had made its appearance, while words were as yet undefined and before that the definition of the Nicene Council had been promulgated, when he might have spoken with too little caution—(a circumstance which happened to other anti-Nicene fathers besides himself)—it is certain that he fully declared his views in that Nicene Council and freely subscribed its decrees. With respect to the prevarication charged on him by the Dextero-Nicene fathers, it is mere assertion without proof. It is most evident that the letters which they quote were written before, not after, the first Nicene Council. It is true that he never made use of the word *ομοουσιος* in any of his epistles after that period; but his reason might be that this word was at that time the cause of so much controversy. This caused much altercation between Eustathius Bishop of Antioch and himself. Both agreed in the confession 'that the Son of God had His own proper Person and Being, and that One God was to be confessed in Three Persons'; yet so it was that they never could agree together. When, however, Eustathius objected to Eusebius, as if he wished to adulterate the Nicene faith, Eusebius on his part declared 'that he in no respect dissented from the Nicene faith.'—*Cave, Epist. Apologetica*, pp. 81-83.

the truth, he speaks thus:—‘ By the laws of Nature, the father of every son is his lord also: wherefore, of the only begotten Son of God—God who begat Him—was in like manner His God, His Lord, and Father.’ Again: in his epistle to Saint Alexander, the instructor of the great Athanasius, of which this is the beginning—‘ With what grief, with what deep anxiety, have I entered on this correspondence with you ’—most manifestly blaspheming, he thus speaks of Arius and his associates, saying—‘ Thy letters calumniate them as saying that the Son was made of that which was not, just as any one of the rest of the creatures.’ But they showed me the letter which they had laid before thee, in which, having set forth their belief in their own words, they made this confession—namely, ‘ that the God of the Law, and the Prophets, and of the New Testament, having begotten the only begotten Son before eternal ages, by whom He made the worlds and all things else, having begotten Him, not in appearance but in reality, did by His own will constitute Him (*ὑποστήσαντα ἰδίῳ θελήματι*) unchangeable, unalterable, a perfect creature of God, and not as one of the rest of the creatures. If, therefore, this letter of theirs may be depended upon, then the same writing must have been presented to thee, in which they confess “ that the Son of God was before eternal ages, by whom also He made the worlds, and that He was an unchangeable and perfect creature of God, and not as one of the rest of the creatures.” But thy epistle accuses them of having said that the Son was made just as one of the rest of the creatures; whereas, their epistle says no such thing, but clearly makes the distinction that He was not made as one of the rest of the creatures. Beware, then, how you give them occasion of censuring and reviling you according to their good pleasure. Again: thou hast charged them with affirming that (*ὁ ὦν*) “ He that was hath begotten (*τὸν μὴ ὄντα*) Him that was not.” Indeed, I wonder who could say anything else. For if (*ὁ ὦν*) He who was be One, it is evident that every thing which is of Him is after Him. But if (*ὁ ὦν*) He who was be not One only, but the Son also be (*ὁ ὦν*) He who was, then, how could (*ὁ ὦν*) beget (*τὸν ὄντα*) Him who was, for thus there would be two who always were.”* Such was the letter of Eusebius to the venerable Alexander. There are also many other letters of his to this same holy man, in which are found many blasphemous things in favour of Arius and his partizans.

“ In like manner, when corresponding with the Bishop Euphrasion,

* “The question is (says Jortin) what Eusebius meant by *ὁ ὦν*—whether the Self-existing or the Eternal. If he means the Eternal, he denies the past eternity of the Son—if only the Self-existing, he denies only His self-existence.”—*Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 104.

he is no less blasphemous. The epistle commences thus :—‘ To my Lord I acknowledge my obligation in all things :’ in the course of which he adds—‘ We affirm that the Son was not co-existent with the Father, but that the Father was pre-existent to the Son. And, moreover, He who understood better than any other—the Son of God Himself—knowing that He was another Person less than the Father and inferior to Him, teacheth us the same most religiously, saying, “ My Father is greater than I ” ’ (John xiv. 28). And, after other remarks, he adds—‘ For the Son Himself is God, but not very God ’ (*ἀληθινὸν θεόν*).

“ From these letters of his it is proved that he taught the same dogmas with Arius and his party. Moreover, in addition to this apostatical heresy, the inventors of the Arian insanity taught also the one nature in the hypostatical union, and set it forth that our Lord in His salvation-bringing dispensation assumed flesh without a soul, affirming that the Deity did supply both the volitions and movements of the soul in order that, as Gregory the Divine observes, ‘ they might ascribe suffering to the Godhead ’ (‘ Epist. 1. ad Cledonium ’).^{*} But it is evident that they who ascribe suffering to the Godhead are Theopaschites ; and they who had any connection with heresy could never bring themselves to admit the use of images, as we see in the case of the impious Severus, Peter the Fuller, Philoxenus Bishop of Hierapolis, and the rest of their many-headed and no-headed hydra. Eusebius being of this faction, as is proved in his historical writings and his letters as a Theopaschite, rejects the image of Christ : wherefore, he writes to Constantia the wife of Licinius that no such image was found with him ; and in his letter he affirms ‘ that His incarnate form had been changed into the nature of the Godhead.’ But none of our holy fathers ever thought or spake in this manner, for this statement is not agreeable to the truth. Let us, then, listen to Athanasius the subverter of the Arian madness, and hear what he affirms in his epistle to Euppsychius Priest of Cæsarea ; and in like manner let us hear what Cyril says both in his first letter to Successus Bishop of Diocæsarea and in his discourse against the Synousiastæ. For as both had the same earthly, the same heavenly, citizenship, and as both were under the inspiration of the same Spirit, they will be found to speak quite consistently with each other. Athanasius, in the above-mentioned epistle to Euppsychius, of which this is the beginning, ‘ On those points in which you considered that we, O most reverend,’ after other remarks, says —‘ The fruit of the sheep is common—that is, the wool, the harvest

^{*} Epist. c. 1, tom. ii. 87 edit. Paris 1840.

of their backs, lies open for the general use of all ; but, when it has imbibed the dye, like to that of the sea, it is called *purple*, its name answering to its colour, and its use being by way of eminence applied to Kings. Then it is wool and not wool, in nature remaining what it was before, but not its use ; for it no longer is common as before on account of the dignity of him who makes use of it. And thus, in like manner, flesh being assumed from a nature common to all, since it has become the clothing of a King, is accounted worthy of the same glory as he who has made use of it, although by nature it is not so accounted. He is, therefore, rightly styled the Lord of Glory even in respect of His manhood, the nature which He assumed admitting the suffering, but the injury passing on to Him who had made use of the flesh as a garment. For as the man who has rent the purple undergoes punishment just as if he had lifted his hand against the King—for though the King has met with no injury, the injury done to the garment is considered to reflect upon him—so though God the Word does not actually suffer, yet the sufferings of the flesh in respect of insult reflect upon Him also ; and, therefore, Paul declares his Master Christ to be even as man, the Son of God : and before this Gabriel the Archangel, announcing the miraculous incarnation to Mary, said, ‘ Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord be with thee. Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bear a Son, and shalt call His name Jesus, and He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest ’ (Luke i. 30-31). Jesus, then, is called the Son of God, not from any change of the flesh into the divine nature, but because that in consequence of union with God the Word it receives an homonymous dignity.

“ Cyril, in like manner, in the above-mentioned epistle to Successus, of which this is the beginning, ‘ Having perused the Commonitorium which was sent to me from your holiness ;’ after other remarks, thus continues :—‘ After the resurrection, the body which had suffered continued the same, except that it was no longer liable to human infirmities, for we affirm that it could no more admit of hunger, or labour, or any thing of this nature, but that from henceforth it is incorruptible. Nor was this all, but that it was also life-giving, for it is the body of life—that is, of the only Begotten, and had been made resplendent with the most God-like glory, and is considered as the body of God. If, therefore, any should call the same *divine*, as beyond all doubt that which is of man is *human*, he would not err from right reason. Hence it is, I conceive, that the most wise Paul said, ‘ If we have known Christ after the flesh, henceforth know we Him no more ’

(2 Cor. v. 16). For the body being, as I said, appropriated to God, must far surpass all things that are human; yet the body, which is from the earth, cannot admit of change into the nature of Deity, for that is impossible; for then we must affirm of Deity as though it were made or as taking something into itself which by nature does not belong to it. Again: it is no less absurd to assert that the body is changed into the nature of the Deity than to assert that the Word is changed into the nature of flesh. For, as the latter is impossible, because that the Divine Nature is inconvertible and unchangeable, not less so is the former; for it is among things inadmissible that any creature should avail to pass into the essence—that is, the nature of Deity—and the flesh is a creature. We affirm, therefore, that the body of Christ is Divine, inasmuch as it is the body of God, and moreover that it is resplendent with ineffable glory, incorruptible, holy, and life-giving; but that it was changed into the nature of Deity: neither have any of the fathers thought or spoken thus, nor are we at all inclined thereto.

“ Again: in his discourse against the Synæsiastæ, which begins, ‘ A long treatise on the doctrines of the truth has lately been composed by us,’ he adds, after other remarks, as follows:—‘ If, therefore, His flesh did pass into the nature of Deity and He ceased to be the Son of Man, it is manifest that from henceforth we have lost the glory of the adoption, as not any longer having the “ First-born among many brethren ” (Rom. viii. 29), as when He was made in our likeness.’ And, shortly after, he continues:—‘ What then?—have we unexpectedly lost our hold on the glory which had been bestowed upon us? By no means; for we have never been led by the most ridiculous and absurd inventions of certain to a reprobate mind that we should “ think beyond what we ought to think ” (Rom. xii. 3). But having received the sacred and divinely-inspired Scriptures as the rule of a right and unperverted faith, we affirm that the only begotten Word of God, who was made the First-born of us men, did never cease to be, and to be called at the same time very God, being God and the Son of Man. But never was He seen to have transformed the flesh which, without conversion or confusion, was united to Him into the nature of Deity; but He may with more reason be said to have made it resplendent with His own glory and to have fulfilled it with dignity suitable to Deity, and thus in due season shall it be made manifest to all who dwell on the whole earth, when He shall again descend from heaven. For when, after having fully accomplished the mystery of the dispensation in the flesh, He went up again into heaven, they who were beholding this event were greatly astonished, for a cloud received Him out of their

sight: then one of the holy Angels, as they were lost in wonder, thus addressed them—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking up to heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts i. 9, 11). Did they, therefore, to whom this message was sent, behold the Word returning to the Father without flesh?—that is, having put off our likeness, and no longer in a body which might be seen and touched, but rather transformed into a nature which could not be seen or touched? And is there any who would dare to assert this? * Then, "if He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven," how can it be otherwise than true to say that the Word shall come in the body and not alone and without flesh? And, shortly after, he continues:—"Understand, therefore, that in order before to manifest to them of what kind His appearance would be, as His coming again at the end of the world, He was transfigured. And this form of His transfiguration was not wrought, as the inspired Evangelist declares, by change of form—that is, the putting away of the likeness of Man, but only by an increase of glory; for, says he, "that His face did shine, and did send forth light like to the beams of the sun." Again, after other things, he adds—"And the all-wise Paul has written concerning Christ, "Who shall change our vile body that it may be like unto His glorious body." What will they say to this who affirm that He changed His flesh into the nature of the Word? Will the bodies of Saints, in like manner, be changed into Deity in order that their bodies may be made like unto His glorious body? Is not their frigid argument full of the utmost ignorance? For, if the flesh be altogether changed into the nature of the Godhead, what body will God the Word make use of?—for the Deity is without body, and it is certain that "No man hath seen God at any time" (John i. 18). And again, more expressly, as if the inspired father was writing against Eusebius himself, he adds, in the same discourse, 'Now, there is another argument which is improperly pressed into their service—namely, that the

* A modern divine *has* ventured on this assertion. Commenting on St. John vi. 62-63, he speaks thus:—"It is the Spirit that is the Life-giver: the flesh profiteth nothing, as if He said, 'You being flesh understand me to speak of mere flesh, material, mortal flesh; whereas, when I speak of my flesh, though I do speak of my body and blood, yet it is not of anything carnal or earthly—it is not of what you see with your eyes; but of this my body and blood, when having passed through its state of humiliation, and having been perfected upon the cross, it shall ascend into heaven in a new way, the same and not the same, by the power of the Spirit. Then it shall no longer be a substance which can be seen and handled—it shall be a spiritual body.'"—*Newman on Justification*, pp. 241, 242.

inspired Paul is known to have written thus—"If we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more." For (say they) if Christ be no more known according to the flesh, it follows that His flesh has been changed into the nature of the Word that He may be known as God. I think one might easily reply to this argument thus—When, therefore, it is said, concerning ourselves, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God; but ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 8, 9)—did he mean to assert that we were without flesh and blood? Did he make this address to disembodied spirits? And is it not most absurd to think and speak thus? The Apostle uses the word *flesh* in respect of us to signify the disorderly and ungovernable propensities of the flesh; but, in respect of Christ the Saviour of us all, inasmuch as He was altogether holy and knew no transgression, for He did no sin, we must understand the expression, "according to the flesh"—namely, that He is not, nor ever will again, be subject to the infirmities of the flesh.'

"Plainly, therefore, do we perceive from the God-speaking fathers that the patrons of this vain scoffing have not drawn from the fountains of Israel that they might have eternal life, but they have taken their draught from the waters of evil and sterile fountains; and that, having followed strange guides, they have been led aside to precipices and abysses. Now, they ought as genuine sons of the Church to have brought the great Basil * affirming 'that the honour paid to the type passes on to the prototype;' and Gregory of Nyssa saying, 'I have seen the picture of the Passion, but I never could pass by it without tears, so powerfully did this work of art bring the whole history before my eyes;' or John declaring, 'I love the picture formed on wax and replete with piety;' and others who were fellow-companions and teachers of the same doctrines with these.

"But now, so far from correcting their perverted sophistries, they make the evil yet worse by speaking as follows"—

GREGORY reads:—

"These testimonies from Scripture and from the fathers we have inserted in this our present definition, having chosen but few out of many, lest it should be extended to too great a length; for there being many besides we willingly pass them by on account of the greatness of their number. Being, therefore, firmly built up by means of

* Basil's testimony is misapplied: that said to be of Chrysostom is spurious, and neither these nor that from Gregory Nyssen make the slightest mention of image-worship.

the above-cited testimonies of the God-inspired and blessed Scriptures and fathers, and having fixed our feet on the rock of divine worship which is in Spirit, we all being invested with the dignity of the Priesthood unanimously and with one voice determine, in the name of the Holy, Super-substantial, and Life-giving Trinity, *that every image, of whatever material or colour it be formed by the evil art of the painter, be cast out of the Christian Church as strange and abominable.*"

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"— Not enduring to submit their necks to the yoke of ecclesiastical tradition, but blinded as to their choice of good and comprehension of the truth, having set at nought all pious tradition, these doughty babblers of this innovation have disdained to drink of the torrent of delight that it might be within them 'a fountain springing up to everlasting life' (John iv. 14); but, being watered from broken cisterns, they have sent forth an ill-savoured stock, having for its fruit the gall of bitterness. And now, adding lie to lie, they give it out that '*there were very many other testimonies which we willingly pass by.*' But we have already made it evident that, in respect of all the passages from accredited fathers which they brought forward to establish their own righteousness, these they understood amiss; but, in respect of passages of an opposite character, that these were not of the Holy Spirit. Wherefore, the blessed David, making melody in the Holy Ghost, thus addresses them, 'They have spoken evil each one to his neighbour; deceitful lips have spoken evil in a double heart' * (Psalm xii. 2). The undaunted (ὁ παρρησιαστής) Isaiah also rebukes them, saying, 'The council of the wicked deviseth wickedness: they know not how to act wisely; for they have darkened their eyes so that they cannot see' (Isaiah xliv. 18). For abandoning sound definitions and laws, in words they make a pretence to piety, and some affect religiously to say something that, by means of the goodness of these, they may gain some credit for what follows; and thus they commence, 'In the name of the Holy, Super-substantial, and Life-giving Trinity.' In their hearts, however, they intend only evil; for, speaking and defining from their own private feelings, they bring forward impiety open and undisguised; and, not bearing in mind the judgment of God, nor reflecting on the word of the Lord which cries aloud, 'Whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that

* Literally, "In a heart and a heart."

he were cast into the sea' (Matt. xviii. 6); but, like swine trampling on jewels—that is, the traditions of the Church—they have clamorously set forth, 'That every image, of whatever material composed, should be cast out of the Church as abominable: thus taking counsel, but not of the Lord, making covenant, but not by His Spirit' (Isaiah xxx. 1): thus, like grievous wolves, laying waste the fold of Christ.

"But the brightness of truth and the splendour of light possess a confidence which cannot be shaken. Who knows not that, if an image be dishonoured, the whole dishonour passes on to him of whom it is the image? This, however, is the truth, and the very nature of things teaches this; and to this agree our divine fathers, the holy Basil affirming, 'That honour done to the image passes on to the prototype;' and Athanasius,* 'He who reverences the image reverences also the King in it;' and Chrysostom, 'Know you not that, if you insult an image, you offer an insult to the dignity of the prototype.' Now, these our fathers followed the nature of things, but these men are opposed alike to the Church and to truth; for not only are they filled with blasphemy, but their discussion displays the most excessive folly and absurdity. It behoved them to have used the accustomed language of the Church, and not a language discordant from her, and to confirm and diligently to cultivate that ancient tradition which the whole multitude of the faithful have ever held and confessed as being handed down to them by the Apostles and Fathers, and not to bring in an innovation upon, and the taking away of, a custom which has so piously prevailed amongst us. The traditions of the Catholic Church admit neither of addition or diminution. The heaviest doom awaits him who adds or takes away anything; for it is said, 'Cursed be he that removes the landmarks of his fathers' † (Deut. xxvii. 7). But they had no inclination to know the truth: wherefore the words of Wisdom shall be applied to them, 'He who getteth treasures with a false tongue pursueth vanity and shall fall into the snares of death'" (Prov. xxi. 6).

* All these passages are spoken of God's image as seen in the person of His Son Jesus Christ.

† It is most certain that very large additions have been made to the traditions of the Greek and Roman Churches. They first removed the landmarks of the fathers who brought images into the Churches, and set them up to be worshipped. The Iconoclasts only placed the landmarks where they were at the first.

SECTION THE SIXTH.

OF THE PRETENDED REFUTATION OF THE COUNCIL AGAINST IMAGES.

EPIPHANIUS reads :

“I would they have had taken into consideration the word which the Lord said to Peter the chief of the Apostles : ‘Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church, and the GATES of HELL shall not prevail against it.’ But having no part with the erection of this building, they bubble out things worthy of derision, defining thus” —

GREGORY reads :—

“Let no one, whatever be his rank or condition, henceforth presume to follow up so unholy, so impious a pursuit. And whoever, after this time, shall dare to make for himself an image, or to worship it, or to set it up in a church, or in his own house, or in any way to conceal it: if he be Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, let him be deposed, but if Monk or Laic let him be anathematized ; and let him be obnoxious to the Imperial laws, as being opposed to the commands of God and hostile to the doctrines of the fathers.”*

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“Having slandered the whole Church of God, and not satisfied with this, or as yet satiated with impiety, contrary to all law and justice, they go on to determine that no one after this shall dare to make any image whatever. Now, who that thinks or lives at all religiously can obey laws like these ? Since so deeply hath the manifestation of venerable images been grafted into the Church, that from the very first

* This decree, involving in it a kind of persecution, is abhorrent to our feelings ; yet it is no more than had been decreed by former Councils against those who were declared Heretics by them. Thus, in the seventh canon of the Council of Ephesus, we find the following :—“If any be found teaching and maintaining the filthy and impure sentiments of Nestorius, let them lie under sentence of the holy General Synod—that is to say, that the Bishop be removed and deposed from the Episcopate, and that the clergyman be degraded from the clergy ; but if any be a layman let him be anathematized.” Why might not the Council of Constantinople as rightfully issue their decree against idolatrous picture-worship as that of Ephesus against the presumed heresy of Nestorius ?

† Where is any mention of the erection of images to be found in the New Testament ?

preaching of the Gospel, even to the present time, they have been evermore set up in them; and all reverence ought to be paid to antiquity: for what beside this doth the Apostle command the Thessalonians,* saying; ‘Hold fast the traditions which ye have received;’ and again he saith to Timothy† and Titus, ‘Avoid profane innovations.’

“All we Christians, as having been born in the Catholic Church, do hold the traditions which we have received, and are confirmed in them: and vain innovations we avoid, in obedience to the divine Apostle.

“Whatever things from time to time it has seemed good to our holy fathers to build upon the foundation of Prophets and Apostles we receive; but all that is of a contrary description we reject as hateful and hostile—namely, all the frivolities of base and impious heresies, amongst which we abominate and utterly execrate this newly-constructed heresy of the Christianity-slanderers as unbridled licentiousness most hateful to God.

“Desirous of extending their iniquity, not only did they sharpen their own tongues for wickedness, but taught the hand of rulers to wrest the laws and to do violence, saying, that ‘All who do not obey them shall be obnoxious to the Imperial laws.’‡ From this decree evils of every kind were spread throughout the world,§ and the most unceasing cruelties were exercised by the rulers, their great men, and their heretical Bishops. What|| tongue can worthily relate the

* 2 Thess. ii. 15. The word is, in the original, “Corinthians.” This, possibly, was an error on the part of the transcriber.

† 1 Tim. vi. 20; Titus iii. 9.

‡ Would not the Canons and Anathemas issued by the fourth, fifth, and sixth General Councils have made all that were condemned by them obnoxious to the Imperial laws? Was not Nestorius banished and tormented in various ways till he died? “His followers (Bishop Parker tells us) were debarred of all meeting places, either in public or private, with the penalty of proscription of goods upon all offenders against any branch of this law.” This law was made by the Emperor Theodosius, A.D. 435. What more did Constantine by his law against image-mongers than Theodosius by his against the Nestorians?

§ This so-styled *world* was a portion of the Greek empire.

|| In this enumeration of the woes which followed on the Emperor’s edict, there is more rhetorical pomp and show than reality. Let the long catalogue be sifted, and what do we find?

1. The imprisonment, banishment, &c., of Monks, which they brought on themselves by their never-ceasing rebellions. Some were put to death rather for treason than for image-worship, as Stephen and Andrew, who both one and the other insulted the Emperor to his face. What would have been thought or said by Papists had any Protestant dared to do the same to Louis XIV?

2. The secularization of monasteries, which were hotbeds of superstition, idolatry, and rebellion. This has been done in many countries besides, and by parties reputed orthodox. No great ceremony was made with monasteries of so-styled Heretics when they fell into Catholic hands. As for churches, they were no otherwise maltreated than by the removal of foolish and superstitious idols and pictures, for which no true Protestant could find fault with them.

dire tragedy? Whence or how shall I follow out each sad detail? How shall I enumerate the conturbations, the flights, the persecutions, the imprisonment and beating of Monks in the city, their long captivity for many years, the chains which bound their feet, the abstraction of the sacred vessels, the burning of books, the profanation of holy temples, the impious transformation of sacred monasteries into worldly houses of resort?—so that the holy men who dwelt in them, seeing their goods now plundered, went away into barbarous countries: after the manner of the Apostles, accounting it better to live amongst the Heathen than to endure the profane conversation of their own countrymen, acting in obedience to the precept of the divine Apostle, ‘That with such they should not eat.’

“And, what is most dreadful of all, is this impious profanation of holy monasteries, which impiety among certain is kept up most lawlessly, even to the present time, when, instead of sacred hymns and the voice of rejoicing in the tabernacles of the just, is now heard only satanic and impious songs; and instead of the frequent genuflexion, nought but the licentious contortion of the dancer is now to be seen.

“And with this profanation we must enumerate the dangers, the disturbances, the confusion, the cutting out of tongues, the putting out of eyes, the slittings of the nose, the disgraceful banishments which befell these holy men, so that they have been scattered over the face of the earth. Again, the branding of their faces, the burning of their beards, the lawless and compulsory unions of virgins after they have been consecrated to Christ, and, worse than all the rest, the murder of certain. These are the fruits of their wild opposition to the Church: this is manifest in sanity and not just judgment; so hath God seen it to be, and from all these long-continued evils He hath at length delivered His Church, to whom be glory. AMEN.

3. The punishments mentioned are barbarous enough, but not more so than those inflicted by kings and rulers who are reckoned both Catholic and Orthodox: they belong more to the times than to any heresy. It is remarkable that not one Bishop is recorded as having been subjected to any kind of degradation or punishment. Gregory the Bishop of Neocæsarea challenged the whole Council to prove against him that he had persecuted any one whatever. Let this enumeration be compared with the work of the Empress Theodora, in the murder of ten thousand Paulicians—of Pope Innocent and his crusading worthies against the calumniated Albigenses—and how will all sink to nothing in the comparison? Constantine reigned thirty-five years: in this period, if fifty were put to death this was the outside. Take the same period of time under the Spanish Kings and Inquisition, from 1481 to 1516, and what do we find?—17,376 burnt alive; 9,901 burnt in effigy—that is, who would otherwise have been burnt alive if it could have been accomplished; and 178,382 sent to galleys. The orthodox Duke of Alva boasted that he had been the death of 15,000 Protestants.—See *Llorente's History of the Inquisition*.

“ But even by the decrees of their own lawless Council are they convicted as having erred from the truth, while they speak as follows”—

GREGORY reads:—

“ Moreover, we determine this also: that none of those who have the charge of any church or other sacred edifice, shall, under pretext of destroying this error of image-worship, lay hands on any of the sacred vessels consecrated to God, to apply them to other uses, because that they are graven with idolatrous figures.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ Words like these are the ejections of mouths that fear not God: for who that hath his mind fixed in the fear of God would presume to style anything that has been dedicated to Him* by an appellation which belongs to IDOLS: not even if he were ever so unlearned and ignorant, unless, indeed, he had utterly forgotten the great and saving mystery which God the Word wrought out for us when He dwelt with us in the flesh and liberated us from idolatrous error: for it is well known that the religious among the Gentiles styled their idols ζῶδα. Verily, these are the pratings of those who speak of the earth—these are the words of their belly which, having received garbage for food, sends up ill-savoured vapours to the mind, and hath made them mad, frantic, and most ridiculous, and so they continue.”

GREGORY reads:—

“ Neither on vestments, or veils, or any other thing which has been consecrated to holy purposes, that they be not abused.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

First, having calumniated holy images, and having defined that the holy Church of God did very wrong to admit them, and having given them the names of vile and εἰ ζῶδα and idols, they next, as if oblivious of their accursed opinion, determine that such things must remain in the Church of God as having been consecrated to Him. Now, if they have been consecrated for God, how can they at the same time be vile and the production of satanic art?

* St. Paul styled the whole of the ceremonial law, its temple, sacrifices, and ritual, beggarly elements: surely pictures which had been idolatrously worshipped might well be styled idols.

“ It is manifest that their sentence is like that of Caiaphas ; for he, in malice, caused Christ to be put to death, while, ignorantly speaking the truth, he confesses Him to be the Saviour of the human race : and these men are exactly like to him. In their malice they revile holy images as an error, and ζῶδα, and base, and the invention of satanic art ; but, anointed by the truth, they, against their wills, are forced to confess them to be sacred and offerings made to God, and so fall into the snare of their own perverse trifling ; and so, in derision of their followers, they add ”—

GREGORY reads :—

“ If any of those who have obtained authority from God would apply to a better use any of the aforesaid vessels, garments, or veils, let him not venture so to do without the advice of the most holy, blessed, and Œcumenic Patriarch, and the permission of our most pious and Christian Sovereigns, lest on any such ground, from such pretences as these, the devil should humble the Churches of God.

“ Moreover, let none of the Nobles, or any of the Laity under their directions, dare on any such grounds to lay hands on sacred edifices or retain them as their booty, as hath been already done by some who have acted disorderly.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ Who can but laugh at legislation such as this ? Or, rather, who can but mourn over it ? Encouraged by their vain words, the many presumed to lay their Briarean hands on the sacred vessels, no doubt following the example of the law-makers themselves : for wickedness is a very slippery thing. For when they saw these most blessed Bishops as they say, but as truth declares these false Bishops, appropriating the silver and gold of the sacred offerings as well as the images which were in mosaics, they did precisely the same things themselves, and transferred them as they pleased to private houses, to the baths, or the theatres ; and thus it is, even in their own judgment, things holy have been profaned. But now they add vauntingly ”—

GREGORY reads :—

“ Having, therefore, by the grace of God, satisfactorily arranged and determined all these things, we judge it right also in this our Catholic and God-pleasing treatise to lay down the following capitular

definitions; for we think that we speak according to the mind of the Apostles, and we believe that we have the Spirit of Christ.

“Wherefore, as of old, they who were agreed in the same faith have spoken the things which were synodically defined by them. So we being agreed in the same faith do in like manner speak: in the first place laying down certain definitions before determined by the fathers, and then ourselves defining certain other things which seem to us consistent with and consequent upon them.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“— After multifold and varied dotages, in which nothing was so dear as their own wickedness, which is displayed in many sections, they would fain endeavour to assimilate themselves to the Doctors of the Church, and arrogantly equal their own accursed definitions to their sacred declarations, as if they would confound truth with falsehood, or as it were mingle poison with honey. But they who are under the guidance of God’s Spirit can distinguish the better from the worse, and what things are defined piously in the spirit of our holy fathers they receive; but what things are defined perversely as being spoken of themselves they reject. For these prevaricators confess that they know God, and yet from the path which leads to the King’s high-road they turn aside. The words of our pure and holy faith they would infect with the poison of their own pravity; and thus they display the same lack of instruction which other Heresiarchs have displayed before them. For they did, indeed, agree in very many respects with the Catholic Church; but, because in one or two particulars they erred, they fell under her anathema, with whom these also must have their portion: notwithstanding they do speak as follows”—

GREGORY reads:—

“*Definition 1.**—If any one confess not, agreeably to the traditions of the Apostles and Fathers, that in the Father, Son, and Holy

* These anathemas, harsh and discordant as they must sound in Protestant ears, are quite in accordance with the practice and temper of the Catholic Church in that and in former ages. The first five definitions or decrees with their anathemas are taken from the third and fifth General Councils. The sixth anathema takes the sense of the definition of the sixth General Council. The seventh includes certain other particulars which none but Heretics denied. To this extent the Bishops of the Council of Nice declare their agreement with those of the Council of Constantinople. The anathemas which follow are added as being legitimately consequent on the definitions before laid down, because, as it appeared to them, the worship of the image of Christ must involve either Nestorian or Eutychiean error.

Ghost is one and the same Godhead, Nature and Essence, Will and Energy, Kingdom and Power, in three Hypostases—that is, in three glorified Persons—let him be ANATHEMA.*

“*Definition 2.*—If any one confess not, One of this Holy Trinity—that is, the Son and Word of God and the Father our Lord Jesus Christ—to have been before all worlds with the Father in respect of His GODHEAD; but in these last days that the same Person for our salvation did come down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was born of her in a way surpassing all human conception, let him be ANATHEMA.†

“*Definition 3.*—If any one confess not EMMANUEL to be God in truth, and, therefore, the holy Virgin to be the Mother of God; for she begat, after the flesh, the Word of God who was made flesh, let him be ANATHEMA.‡

“*Definition 4.*—If any one confess not that the Word of God the Father was hypostatically united to the flesh, and that Christ was one with His own flesh, and that the same was at the same time God and Man, let him be ANATHEMA.§

“*Definition 5.*—If any man confess not the flesh of our Lord to be life-giving and to be one with the Word which was from God the Father, but to be of some other person united with Him in rank and as only having a divine cohabitation; and not rather, as we have said, to be life-giving because One with the Word who giveth life to all, let him be ANATHEMA.||

“*Definition 6.*—If any one confess not that in one Christ, our true God, are two natures, two natural wills, and two natural energies existing interchangeably, inseparably, indivisibly, unconfusedly, according to the doctrine of the fathers, let him be ANATHEMA.¶

“*Definition 7.*—If any one confess not that our Lord Jesus Christ did, after the assumption of the flesh together with a rational and intellectual soul, sit together with God the Father, and that in like manner He will come again in the glory of God the Father to

* The same with Definition 1 of the fifth General Council.—*Bin. Conc.*, tom. ii., part ii., page 115, col 1, E.

† The same in substance with Definition 2 of the fifth General Council.—*Bin.*, *ibid.*

‡ Cyril's first anathema against Nestorius.—*Bin. Conc.*, tom. i., part ii., page 343.

§ Cyril's second anathema against Nestorius.—*Ibid.*, p. 346.

|| Cyril's eleventh anathema against Nestorius.—*Ibid.* p. 362.

¶ Substance of the definition of the sixth General Council.—*Bin. Conc. Gen.*, tom. iii., sect. i., part i., pp. 183, 185.

judge both the quick and the dead, no longer flesh nor yet without body, but in that fashion of Godlike body which He alone knoweth; and that He will be seen by those who pierced Him and remain for ever God without carnal grossness, let him be ANATHEMA."

ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΥ reads:—

"So far they speak well enough, in exact accordance with the doctrine of the fathers; or rather they would claim their doctrines as their own, in order to gain credit to themselves by them. In that which follows they vomit forth the bitterness of their envenomed tongue and viperous dogmas full of deadly poison."

ΓΡΕΓΟΡΙΟΥ reads:—

"*Definition 8.*—If any one endeavour to set before him the express image (χαρακτήρα) of God the Word according to His incarnation by means of material colours, and does not with the whole heart worship Him, as seeing Him with the eyes of His understanding more resplendent than the brightness of the sun sitting on the right hand of His Father on the throne of His glory in the highest, let him be ANATHEMA."

ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΥ reads:—

"Most paradoxical expositors have they proved themselves to be by this fantastical exposition of theirs.

"The Apostle, indeed, had declared the Son to be the express image of the Father on account of the immutability of essence; but they have made a transfer of this expression to the flesh which was assumed by God the Word in their perverse minds, and from their senseless brains set forth a new exposition, saying, 'If any endeavour to set before Him the (divine impress) express image of God the Word according to His incarnation by means of material colours.'

"Now, that the flesh which He assumed is of another essence from the nature of God the Word we are well aware, being taught both by the truth itself and by the heads and chiefs of our holy Church, the holy Apostles and inspired Fathers. The divine Apostle Paul, who saw things that may not be uttered, being desirous, as was said before, to declare the consubstantiality of the Lord God the Word with God and the Father, found no other expressions more suitable than to assert that the Son was the 'express image of the Father's substance.'

“But they would turn truth into a lie, in order to help forward their empty and sophistical arguments which they would maliciously urge against holy images.

“Whence they fall into declarations of a blasphemous nature; for, being given over to a reprobate mind, they go on to say”—

GREGORY reads:—

✓ *Definition 9.*—If any one attempt by material colours in images made after the fashion of a man to circumscribe the uncircumscribable essence and person of God the Word because of His incarnation, and does not theologize that, after His incarnation, He was no less uncircumscribable than before, let him be ANATHEMA.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“They speak thus because they are incurably diseased concerning the right sense of ecclesiastical tradition, and have imbibed some pestilential malady by which their senses are utterly confused. The wickedness of their deceit they would attach to sound words; and the deception consists in this—they confound the uncircumscribable nature of God the Word with the circumscribable nature of that flesh which He assumed for our sakes. This, indeed, is evident from their own words—‘After His incarnation it was no less uncircumscribable.’

“Now, whence did these wiseacres gain this frivolous argument? For it is sheer blasphemy to say that Jesus Christ the Lord of all and our true God was, after His incarnation, uncircumscribable. Now, when He said to His disciples, ‘Lazarus our friend sleepeth, and I am glad for your sakes that I was not there,’ the expression, ‘I was not there,’ does not this denote circumscription? Certainly it does. But not further to notice that which is said of Him in the Gospels before His passion, let us speak more particularly of that which occurred after the resurrection. Surely, He was not uncircumscribable when He appeared to the women.* The manifestation to the two disciples in like manner proves this circumscribability.

* The Godhead of Christ was still uncircumscribable and unconfined to place, though essentially united to a body which was circumscribed. Now, it was because of this union of Deity to His human body that worship was paid to Him in the nature of His humanity. Had there been no such union, then no worship would have been due to Him. Now, if worship is paid to a picture, ought it to be so paid unless united to that picture which was the uncircumscribed nature of Deity, for this is the only ground why the human nature of Christ was worshipped! Either, then, with the humanity they must have pre-

Again : to be touched by Thomas—to enter while the doors are thus—what is this but circumscription ? So ‘ to go before the disciples into Galilee, there to be seen of them and to be worshipped by them,’ this also is the same. Again : that He should be taken up into heaven while the disciples are looking upon Him, and that the Angel should stand near and say, ‘ This Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven shall so come again in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven ’—are not these circumstances proofs of circumscription ? Certainly they are. And so have our inspired fathers taught.

“ It is evident, then, to all who reason aright that, inasmuch as Christ is God and the Word of the Father, He is invisible, uncircumscribable, incomprehensible, and in all parts of His dominion at the same time. But, inasmuch as He took the nature of Man, He became visible and circumscribed, as is proved by His saying to the disciples, ‘ I was not there.’ And that may be comprehended as the case of Thomas hath certified us. Into * how many sinful errors have these patrons of this soul-destroying deceit of the Christianity-slanderers fallen by means of this one blasphemy of theirs !

“ And again they slanderously add ”—

GREGORY reads :—

“ *Definition 10.*—If any one endeavour by a picture which he calls Christ to describe the indivisible and hypostatic union of God the Word with the flesh—that is, the one undivided, unconfused, union which springs from the two natures, for by the name ‘ Christ ’ is understood both God and Man—as thus introducing the monstrous figment of the confusion of the two natures, let him be ANATHEMA.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ The abomination of lies knows well enough how to unite itself with sound speech. Thus, these men falsely and maliciously represent the making of images and pictures as opposed to the undivided hypo-

tended to depict the Deity, or the worshippers must have worshipped the human nature by itself—a species of Nestorian error.

* What are these errors ? The Constantinopolitan fathers did not deny the visibility and circumscription of the human nature or the invisibility or un-circumscription of the Divine. What soul was ever destroyed by praying to Christ without the intervention of images ?

static union which is in Christ and as bringing in the confusion of the two natures. But the truth of God is not bound.

“Now, the name ‘Christ’ is significative of two natures—the one visible, the other invisible. The holy Church, therefore, as she hath received of the Fathers and the holy Apostles, doth portray the form which was visible to men and doth not divide Christ, according to their trifling calumny. The pictured image agrees with its prototype in name only, and not in its definition, as has been said before oftentimes; since it is without soul which, as it is invisible, admits not of representation. Now, if any one would feel it to be impossible to paint the figure of a soul although it be a created thing, how much more impossible must it appear to any one to make a representation perceptible to the senses of the incomprehensible and untraceable Godhead of the only begotten Son, even were he ever so far gone from a right mind. Their pains have fallen on their own heads; and the anathema which they have rashly ventured upon will abide with them for ever; but still they go on.”

GREGORY reads:—

“*Definition 11.*—If any one shall in his mind divide the flesh which has been united to the essence of God the Word, and having it in his mind thus separated shall endeavour to make an image in representation thereof, let him be ANATHEMA.”†

* Heb. x. 20.—Was Christ ever seen of men apart from the Divinity? Ought any image of Christ to be worshipped which was not in the same state with His human nature united to His divinity?

† The former definitions relate to the Eutychian view of the divine nature which the worshipping of an image of Christ involved—that is, the human and divine natures made one. These which follow relate to the Nestorian view which the worshipping of Christ's image might involve in respect of others—that is, of worshipping the human nature apart from the divine. Now, if Nestorius be called a Heretic because he is affirmed to have worshipped the human nature apart from the divine—because of some theoretical speculations which he set forth—how much more may they be judged Heretics who, by worshipping a picture of Christ, gave a most practical exemplification of the same!

“There are two things (says Stillingfleet) blamed by the Church in Nestorianism—firstly, its heretical opinion; secondly, the idolatrous practice consequent on the separation of the two natures in Christ. Now, the argument of the Constantinopolitan fathers proceeds not on their opinion as though they really believed the principles of Nestorianism who worshipped images, but they were guilty of the same kind of worship; for, since an image can only represent the human nature of Christ, if even lawful, that image on account of

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ Saint Gregory, who is styled the ‘ Divine,’ speaks thus :—‘ Since in our thought the natures may be divided, so in like manner do the names admit of a separate division.’ And most of the fathers have agreed in this opinion, for this indeed seems agreeable to the truth.

“ But they, deserting alike the truth and the traditions of the fathers, say, ‘ If any man even in thought divide the flesh which has been united to the substance of God the Word.’ In this respect they are proved most clearly not to agree with the fathers ; and, further, most evidently they are shown to contend against the truth when talking thus they calumniously assert that the holy Catholic Church holds the same opinions as did Nestorius. But, consistently enough with themselves, they add ”—

GREGORY reads :—

“ *Definition 12.*—If any one divide the ONE CHRIST into two Persons, placing apart the Son of God, and apart the Son of Mary, and so not confessing Him as One and the same, but allowing only a relative union of the two natures, he therefore ventures to make a representation of the Son of the Virgin as subsisting alone, let him be ANATHEMA.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“ Over and over again, repeating the same things about the same, their paltry absurdities become almost innumerable. And now they

Christ, then, upon Nestorian principles, it would be as lawful to worship the human nature of Christ although it had no hypostatical union with the divine.

“ Could not the Nestorian say that, when they considered Christ as a human person, yet that human person did represent to them the divine person who was a proper object of worship. For if a bare image of the human nature be a proper object of worship, much more is the human nature itself. And if on account of such representation the worship of Christ may be directed to His image, with much greater reason may it be towards Christ, as ‘ Homo Deiferus,’ in regard to that human nature which had the divine nature present though not united.

“ Upon this ground the Constantinopolitan fathers do justly charge the worshippers of images with Nestorianism in their worship ; and they could not defend themselves, but they must absolve the Nestorians.

“ For there is a greater separation between the image of Christ and Christ than the Nestorians did suppose between the divine and human nature ; for they supposed a real presence though not a real union. But, in the case of images, there is not so much as a real presence but only by representation ; therefore, if the Nestorians were to blame in their worship, how much more those that worship images ?—*Stillingfleet's Idolatry of the Church of Rome, in answer to Dr. Godden, p. 845.*

devise the impious theory of Nestorius, and make that to belong inseparably to the formation of images, thus patching together paradoxical and contradictory argumentations which, as we have often replied to them before, we shall now pass by in silence.

“But now they disgorge the following :”—

GREGORY reads :—

✓ “*Definition 13.*—If any one pourtray the flesh which was made God by union with the divine Word, as thus separating it from the Godhead, which assumed it and made it God, and as making hercafter devoid of Deity, let him be ANATHEMA.”

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

“Though the Catholic Church doth pourtray Christ in the form of man, yet it doth not, therefore, separate this human form from the Godhead—yea, it doth rather confirm its deification, or, as Gregory the Divine and the truth declare, that it is one with God. And by no means is the flesh of Christ in this way made devoid of Deity, as they, like ignorant and uninstructed barbarians, do vainly talk.

“Just as if any one paints a man, he doth not make the man to have no soul ;* but he hath a soul as much as before, and it is called his image from its likeness. So, when we make an image of our Lord, we do still confess His flesh to be deified, and the image to be no more than an image displaying the likeness of the prototype from which it hath its name—in which alone it hath any thing in common with the prototype : wherefore, it is venerable and holy, just as, on the other hand, if it had been the picture of a sinful man or devil, it would be sinful and polluted as is its prototype. Wherefore, having laboured in vain, they shall reap a harvest of vanity and receive the anathema from the truth, which certainly they will not escape who dare to speak as follows :”—

GREGORY reads :—

✓ “*Definition 14.*—If any one dare to represent by material colours God the Word, who, being in the form of God, did add to His own

* No doubt the man has a soul, but what has the picture ?—therefore, to do that to the picture of a man which is done to the man himself—that is, to talk to it, to show things of one kind or another to it, to offer good to it, is about as reasonable as to do to a picture of Christ that which we do to Christ Himself—that is, kneel before it, or sing hymns to it, or pray to it.

substance the form of a servant, and so was made like to us in all things, sin only excepted, as mere man, and so as separate from the inseparable undivided Godhead, as thereby bringing in a quarternity into the ever-blessed and life-giving Trinity, let him be ANATHEMA."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"Oh, their folly and madness! Are they not ashamed thus to heap up anathemas? Like the worm who lives by rolling in the mire, so do they seem to involve themselves in this word as if they could never have enough of it: while they endeavour to bring down curses on the holy Church of God, being most deserving thereof themselves. Now, the Scripture saith, 'They who bless her shall be blessed, and they who curse her shall be cursed'* (Genesis ii. 3). But to imagine Christ as mere man—to separate Him from the Godhead and to bring in a quaternity by means of representative paintings—who can forbear a broad laugh at such jargon; or rather, who could forbear to weep at such blasphemy? For, does any one who makes an image of Christ on that account believe in a quaternity? Does he not rather thereby confess God the Word to be incarnate in truth, and not in appearance only? The insane Nestorius, having asserted that as there were two Natures in Christ so there were two Persons, was justly charged with bringing in a quaternity. But the holy Church of God, rightly confessing one Person in the two natures of Christ, hath been divinely instructed† to make representations of Him in pictures for a memorial of His saving dispensation.

"Desirous of maintaining a fair appearance, they now add a word of truth, thus speaking :"—

GREGORY reads :—

"*Definition 15.*—If any confess not Mary ever a Virgin, rightly and truly Mother of God, to be above every other creature, visible or invisible; and does not with sincere faith entreat her intercession as having confidence before our God who was born of her, let him be ANATHEMA."‡

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"Being well confirmed and established in these points, the Catholic

* This was spoken of Abraham and his posterity: not of image-worshippers.
 † By whom? Not by the Scripture of the Old or New Testaments; not by the fathers of the first three centuries. To what must we look for this teaching but to ecclesiastical tradition?

‡ Here we must confess this Council, so manifestly in the right about images,

Church needs not to be instructed in them by those who hold not with her in her divine traditions. For, as the Lord, though confessed by devils,* did notwithstanding drive them away—and as Paul and his fellow labourer, though by the same they were declared to be ‘servants of the most high God who taught the way of salvation,’ yet did drive them from them—so even, if these men do say some truth, yet by the holy Church of God shall they be cast out. But now, as the dog returns to his vomit again, and as the sow that was washed returns to her wallowing in the mire, so they grunt out as follows (*γρῦξουσι τὰς*):—

GREGORY reads:—

“*Definition 16.*—If any one spend his labour in setting up the figures of Saints in lifeless and deaf images made of material colours which cannot do any good (for the devising of them is vain and an invention of devilish craft), and hath no care to represent in himself their virtues as he finds them on record in the Scriptures—and so make living images of them, as being thereby excited to zeal similar to theirs, even as our inspired fathers have said—let him be ANATHEMA.”†

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Our inspired fathers never said nor taught any such thing as this: but these prevaricators would shield themselves under these venerable names, while the whole vain argumentation belongs to themselves. Such trifling pretensions are usual with them, as we shall find in what follows that they style themselves the ‘Seventh General Council.’

“A certain wise man hath said, ‘Let thy neighbour praise thee and not thy own mouth, a stranger and not thy own lips’ (Proverbs xxvii. 2): but these, as they are taught by none so are they praised by

to be in error. We read in Scripture of only one who was above all creatures visible and invisible, and that one was not Mary, but Christ (Col. i. 15-19; 2 Cor. iv. 4).

* So Mariolatry is not enough if Idolatry be not conjoined with it. Not only must Mary’s intercession be sought, but it must be sought by means of her images; otherwise it is no better than Satan’s acknowledgment of Christ.

† This anathema, harsh as it is in our ears, is not more severe or rigid than the eleventh anathema of the fifth General Council, which anathematizes all who do not anathematize Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Origen, and their writings. Surely it is worse to make images and pictures for idolatrous purposes than not to anathematize Origen and his writings.

“Si quis non anathematizat Originem, cum impiis conscriptis, et usque ad mortem in impietate permanet talis, ANATHEMA sit.”—*Binni Conc. Gen.*, tom. ii. part. 2, p. 116.

none, wherefore they must needs praise themselves : and they would fain be called by men ‘RABBI,’ ambitiously affecting to be the fathers of the Church.* But her they calumniate, saying that she hath deserted Christ our God, and hath been wedded to idolatry. But God hath said to her by His Prophet, ‘I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many nations’ (Isaiah lx. 15); and by the royal Preacher he saith, ‘Thou art all fair : thou art all fair, my neighbour, and there is no ault in thee’ (Cant. iv. 7).

“But consider the folly of those who say that the Church is idolatrous and that of the same they boast to be the teachers. Now, do they mean to confess themselves to be fathers of idolators? But of this idolatrous Church they are teachers, either of some portion or of the whole. Now, if it be of a portion only, then surely they ought to have had respect to the fulness of the Catholic Church. By this they should have been justified, and from this they should have reaped the harvest of the truth ; for it was thus our fathers corrected the errors of heretics, and united that which was divided. But, forasmuch as in this tradition the Church shines so glorious—they being separated from her in this, do seem to condemn the whole Church as having erred. And, awful as it is to say it, yet it were censurable to be silent : for, according to them,† ‘The true confession in Christ is perished, and destruction hath seized on all.’ Away with such profanities ; they are spoken in vain, proclaimed in vain, never shall they maintain their ground, for the painting of venerable images has of old been delivered to the Church, and by her authority has it been introduced into each sacred temple. This our holy fathers, this the whole company of Christians, hath received and handed down to us. But not only have they revolted from the concurrent testimony of all these, but, what is most dreadful and most terrible, the cry of their anathemas‡ hath, after the manner of the sin of Sodom and Gomorrhah, waxen great. Wherefore their iniquity is of the deepest dye. Who can tolerate the outbreakings of this insanity—the masqueradings of such assemblages of buffoons? Oh, that they had known the truth ! For most plain is

* This reasoning might be retorted upon themselves. Were they an Œcumenic or a Provincial Council? If the latter, how came they to make laws for the whole world? If they appear in the former they misrepresent themselves ; for the whole Church even in that age was not agreed about image-worship, and with the Church of the Apostles they had no connection.

† The true confession of Christ is grievously obscured by saint and relic-worship, and still more by image-worship. To this day half Europe worships Mary more than Christ, and Mary’s image more than herself.

‡ These anathemas are not more censurable than those of the third and fifth General Councils ; and certainly not so absurd as their own who anathematize those who even doubt about the worship of holy images.

it to all who will think religiously, that if on the one hand by the records of the Saints we are reminded of their passion and are stirred up to zeal for the like, so, on the other hand, when we view the same conflicts and passion as set forth by the hand of the painter, we come equally as before to the remembrance of their courage and of their life in God. But now again they think and speak aright, saying:—

GREGORY reads:—

“*Definition 17.*—If any one confess not that all Saints from the beginning of the world to the present time, whether before the law, under the law, or under the Gospel, have been accepted with God, and to be honourable before Him both in soul and body, and does not entreat their prayers as having boldness to intercede in behalf of the world, according to the traditions of the Church, let him be ANATHEMA.”*

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“Since they have made mention of the ‘Traditions of the Church,’ they ought to have added, ‘If any one admit not images and pictures let him be ANATHEMA.’ For verily this is the general tradition of the Church, and very rightly acknowledged by us in remembrance of their prototypes. But they, having shamelessly rejected this instruction, do in effect say to her, Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. Whence also it came to pass that after they had made this definition they rejected ‘the acceptable offering of their intercession,’ blotting it out from their writing; and this all know. And, indeed, this is but the way of all heretics; who, if on one point they disregard the rule of piety or diverge from the right road, fall into many and divers errors.†

“Thus the Arians, having said in the first instance that the divine Word is a creature, after this infamous blasphemy of theirs, absurdly

* Here again the fathers of the Const. Council are in error. St. Paul, who entreats the prayers of the very humblest saints in Philippi, Colosse, or elsewhere, who was alive to read his own Epistles, never once, by precept, or allusion, or example, ever commends himself to the intercession of Stephen the Protomartyr, James the Brother of John, or others who had departed this life. It is remarkable here that the Council appeals not to Scripture, but to the traditions of the Catholic Church.

† This confusion of the Arians with the Apollinarians is far from candid. Apollinarius was a vehement opponent of Arius and Eunomius. Possibly he speculated too much on things beyond his reach; and his errors, being made the worst of, have procured him a bad name. Theodoret declares that he was a Trinitarian, and Vincent of Lerins that he was no Sabellian.—*Du Pin*, vol. ii. p. 101.

declared that He took man's nature without any soul. And the wretched Eutyches, having taught the one nature in the dispensation of our Lord, was led afterwards to the blasphemous assertion that He took on Him a certain more divine kind of nature not consubstantial with our own. So the patrons of this heresy, emulating these, being ill-satisfied with one innovation, as though in one was not evil enough, have embraced another which was near akin to the former. That which follows, as they wish to be equalled with the holy fathers, they bring forward under the semblance of piety."

GREGORY reads :—

"*Definition 18.*—If any one confess not the resurrection of the dead, the judgment to come, the retribution of each one according to his merits in the righteous balance of the Lord, that neither will there be any end of punishment, nor indeed of the kingdom of heaven—that is, the full enjoyment of God ; for the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink, but righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost, as the divine Apostle teaches—let him be ANATHEMA."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"This is the confession of the patrons of our true faith—the holy Apostles, the divinely-inspired Fathers : this is the confession of the Catholic Church, and not of heretics. That which follows, however, is their own, full of ignorance and absurdity, for thus they bluster :"—

GREGORY reads :—

"*Definition 19.*—If any one receive not this our holy seventh General Council, or endeavours in any way to detract from its authority, or who does not with his whole heart embrace all things that have been defined therein according to the doctrine of the divinely-inspired Scripture, let him be ANATHEMA from God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and from the seven General Councils."

EPIPHANIUS reads :—

"The rejection of the truth is the darkening of the mind and understanding. This sentence of theirs has yet more of folly and ignorance than it has of impiety. For, wise only to absurdities, while they style themselves the seventh General Council, actually word their anathema as though there were several other Councils independent of their own, as they say, 'Let them be anathema from the seven holy General Councils.' And we can scarcely say whether they are more to be derided for their folly or lamented for their impiety.

“ Having left the truth and turned aside from the royal road they have wandered amidst crags and pits and fearful abysses. To them belong the words of the Proverb (ix. 12), *see* lxx., ‘ They have made their plough to wander from their own fields and have reaped barrenness.’* Wherefore, they who love the truth and seek after righteousness shall cause the arrows they have sharpened and the bows they have bent against the Church to pierce their own hearts; and they shall take up the words which David sang in the Spirit against them, saying, ‘ The patrons of this new pravity have opened and dug out a ditch, and have fallen into the midst of it themselves: their mischief shall fall upon their own head and their iniquity shall fall on their own pate.’† For they call bitter sweet and sweet bitter, and put darkness for light and light for darkness,‡ as follows”—

GREGORY reads:—

“ *Definition* 20.—These things having been defined by us after most laborious and diligent investigation, we determine that from henceforth no one shall be allowed to set forth any other faith—that is, to write, compose, or teach any other.

“ If, therefore, any one shall presume after this time to set forth any other faith, either themselves openly bringing it forward and teaching it, or putting in the way of those who would return from heresy to the knowledge of the truth, or would introduce any innovating or sophistical cavilling of words to the injury of that which here we have determined: if he be a Bishop, let him be deposed from his Bishopric; if a Cleric, let him be deprived of his orders; if a Monk or Laic, let him be anathematised.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ — Misguided by their utter ignorance of discipline they have stolen these words from our divinely-inspired fathers, and have turned them to their own purpose. But their words are equally vain and foolish and undeserving of reply.”

* This verse according to the Septuagint is as follows:—“ My son, if thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself and for thy neighbours; but if thou shouldest prove wicked thou alone shalt exhaust the evil. A son instructed shall be wise: he shall make the foolish his servant. He who stays himself upon falsehood he rules the wind, and the same shall pursue the bird in its flight: he hath left the ways of his own vineyard and hath caused the axles of his own husbandry to go astray: he goeth through a dry place and into a land appointed to drought, and gathers barrenness with his hands.”

† Psalm vii. 15, 16.

‡ Isaiah v. 20.

GREGORY reads:—

“The most sacred Emperors Constantine and Leo said, ‘Let this holy General Council declare if the definition which has now been read hath been determined upon with the full and entire consent of all the most holy Bishops now present.’

“The Holy Council shouted—‘We all believe thus—we all think the same thing—we all unanimously and freely subscribe—we all spiritually worship a Spiritual Being. This is the faith of the Apostles—this is the faith of the Fathers—this is the faith of the Orthodox. Thus all who serve God worship Him.

“‘Long live our Sovereigns: Lord, grant them a life of holiness: eternal be the memory of Constantine and Leo: ye are the peace of the world: may your faith preserve you: ye do honour Christ and He will preserve you: ye have confirmed orthodoxy: Lord, grant them a life of holiness. Let all ill-will be banished from their rule: God preserve your power: God grant peace in your reign: your life is the life of the orthodox: heavenly King, protect the kings of the earth: by you the Œcumenic Church hath obtained peace: ye are the lights of orthodoxy: Lord, preserve the lights of the world: eternal be the memory of Constantine and Leo. To the new Constantine the most pious of Emperors be many years: Lord preserve him, that was orthodox from his birth: Lord grant him a religious life: may his reign be free from envy. Many be the years of the most pious Augusta: Lord preserve her piety and orthodoxy: envy and ill-will be banished from your kingdom: God protect your power: God, give your reign the blessing of peace. Ye have confirmed the **INCONFUSEDNESS*** of the natures in the dispensation of Christ: ye have more fully established the **INDIVISIBILITY** of the two natures: ye have confirmed the doctrine of the six holy General Councils: ye have destroyed all idolatry: ye have vanquished the teachers of such errors: ye have branded with disgrace all who thought otherwise.†”

* *Tò 'Ασύγχυτον* against the Eutychians. *Tò 'Αδιάπτειον* against the Nestorians.

† Suchlike praises were not unprecedented. In the eighth Session of the sixth General Council we find the following in praise of the Emperor Constantine—“Thou hast made clear the perfections of the two natures in Christ our God: Lord, protect the light of peace! By thee the Church throughout all the world is at peace! Thou hast confirmed the orthodox faith!” Would not the Bishops of this Council have been obnoxious to the censure of these divines? But the Council of Nice itself wants not flattery. Thus, John the Legate of the Eastern Sees declared that righteousness and peace had kissed each other because Adrian and Irene were agreed together: thus applying the work of Christ to the consent of these two in the establishment of idolatry. So in the letter of the Chief Priest of the East the letter of Tarasius was styled

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ In these customary acclamations made to Emperors it would seem as if they were all on fire with love of lying, and under teaching of the devil, when they dared to say, ‘Ye have destroyed all idolatry.’ O, would our ears were deaf than that we should have heard such soul-destroying words as these. For, saith the Proverb* (v. 2), ‘Have no connection with an harlot.’

“ Desiring to destroy the saving doctrine of our dispensation they have plunged into the very abyss of blasphemy. What, then, can we reply to such grievous ravings—what, but that which was suggested to David by the Holy Spirit, ‘The poison of asps is under their lips: their throat is an open sepulchre. With their tongues they have spoken deceit; but they have fallen by their own counsels,† being judged by Him who hath delivered us from all idolatrous error—by Christ our God. For He having for our sakes condescended to become Man hath ‘destroyed all idolatry’ (Zech. xiii. 2). For, by His Prophet, He saith, ‘Behold the days come when I will take away the names of idols from off all the earth; neither shall there be mention of them any more.’ Evidently this prophecy speaks of Him only, and not of the power of Kings or Monarchs, as they say. It is the part of apostacy to assign this gift to others. Let Christians cry aloud, as taught by the eloquent Isaiah (lxiii. 9, see the lxx.), ‘It was not an Envoy, not an Angel, but the Lord Himself who hath saved us.’ Now, if it be as they say, that a Conventicle of Bishops and Presbyters and the power of Kings hath delivered us from idolatrous errors, then the human race hath been deceived concerning the truth: one having saved it, and another vauntingly ascribing this salvation to themselves; for, whereas it was Christ our God who delivered us from all idolatrous error, they vaunt this redemption to be of themselves. Oh, what arrogance! What vain conceit! Having deserted the truth they have become dark both in mind and understanding; and being immersed in their empty fantasies and vain conceits their flatteries are all tintured with error. For, putting from them in their acclamations all those praises which rightly and properly belong to Kings, they have applied to them such things as belong only to Christ our God. Now, they ought rather to have praised their courage, their

“The day spring from on high;” yet the Council was not shocked at this: it was not the praise they disliked, but the person to whom it was given and the reason for which it was bestowed upon him.

* According to the Septuagint. These words are not found in the Hebrew.

† According to the Septuagint.

victory over the enemy, the destruction of the barbarians—which have been painted in pictures and on walls for a memorial of the fact and to excite the beholder to similar zeal—their clemency to the vanquished, their councils, their trophies, their earthly pomps, their civil enactments, their political management—these are the praises suited to Kings, and such as lead their subjects to regard and respect them.*

“ But having their tongues still sharpened, and breathing out rage and slander, they would privily shoot at the upright in heart, speaking thus—

GREGORY in conclusion:—

“ Ye have utterly destroyed the imagination of the perverse-minded Germanus, George, and Mansur.

“ To Germanus the double-minded, the worshipper of wood, ANATHEMA.

“ ANATHEMA to George, his fellow, who falsified the doctrine of the fathers.

“ To Mansur, of evil name and Saracen in heart, Anathema. Anathema to Mansur the image-worshipper and writer of falsehoods. Anathema to Mansur who belied Christ and plotted against his Sovereign.

“ To Mansur the teacher of impiety, and perverter of the sacred Scripture, Anathema.

“ The TRINITY hath deposed these THREE.”

EPIPHANIUS reads:—

“ To all this we say with the Prophet (Jer. iii. 3): ‘ Thou hast an whore’s forehead, acting impudently before all.’ For we know that such persons, bedecking their own vileness and wickedness with a fair appearance, are accustomed to revile those who lived reputably. For piety is an abomination to the sinner; and thus these men, having lips full of deceit, have spoken evil of the just in proud and haughty contempt; but the Lord hid them in ‘the secret of His countenance; from the strife of men He covered them in His tabernacle from the contention of tongues; for they shone like lights in the world, holding forth

* It does not appear that these Nicene Bishops followed this method any more than those whom they blamed. There is much to the praise of Irene and her son; but it turns altogether on the immense benefits they have done to the Church by the restoration of images.

the word of life' (Psalm xxxi. 20). GERMANUS,* indeed, was nourished and brought up in sacred learning. Like to Samuel—devoted to God from a child, the equal of the divinely-inspired fathers, whose words demand our attention, being famous throughout the whole world—the praises of God were in his mouth, and a two-edged sword to strike down all who reject ecclesiastical tradition.

“GEORGE, also, whose country was Cyprus, who lived according to the Gospel, and who, in close imitation of Christ our God who hath left His own life as our rule, did neither contend nor cry aloud; when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not; to him who struck him on the one cheek he turned the other; with him who compelled him to go one mile he would go twain; he bore the yoke in his youth with the Prophet, counting it a good thing to sit alone and to be silent.

“And, lastly, JOHN, who by them has been contemptuously styled MANSUR: he, emulating the Evangelist Matthew, left all and followed Christ, counting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Arabia, and choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of his for a season.†

* Germanus was made Patriarch of C. P. A. D. 715. “In the year 726 he obstinately opposed the edict of the Emperor Leo and the decrees of the Council held at Constantinople, impertinently alleging the pretended authority and example of seven centuries, with some idle tales of images of the Virgin painted by St. Luke, of the picture of Christ sent to King Abgarus, with other trash of the same kind, to excuse his contumacy. The clement Emperor bore with the pertinacity of this man for four years. When at length he could by no admonitions or arguments be brought to a sound mind, or to yield obedience to decrees of the Emperor and the Council, in the year 730 he was by Council deposed. He lived afterwards a retired and peaceful life at his own house at Platanium. He died about the year 740.” Baronius will have it that he was a Martyr, in which he contradicts Theophanes, Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius, Cedrenus—Maimburg adopts the same falsity.

† Hebrews ii. 26. He was styled “Chrysoorroas,” from his eloquence. His life was written by John Patriarch of Jerusalem, who lived about one hundred years after him. It is a compilation stuffed with absurdities and old wives’ tales, amongst which is the following narration:—Leo, being enraged against John because of his letters in favour of images and their worship, caused the Sultan to cut off his hand, by pretending that John had sent to him treasonable letters; but soon the Virgin caused that his lost hand should be restored to him as before. For John having worshipped the Virgin’s image, and having poured forth many prayers to her [not to God] fell asleep, and in his sleep he heard the voice of her image, sweetly smiling, granting his request, on these terms—“that Chrysoas should keep his promise, and by his writings should utterly subdue the Iconoclasts.”—*Spanheim, Hist. Imag. Rest. sect. ii. p. 116.* John has the candour to own that the worship of images cannot be established from holy Scripture, and that it is authorized by the tradition of the Church only. Lastly, he confesses no image ought to be made of the Trinity or of things purely spiritual.

He, therefore, having taken up his own cross and that of Christ and having followed Him, for Christ and the people of Christ in the East, did by Christ sound aloud the trumpet of the Gospel: for he could not endure the innovation which took its rise amongst aliens, nor the lawless intrigues and the frenzied madness which were in arms against the holy Catholic Church of God. Having utterly overthrown the same, by exhortations and by admonitions he laboured to prevent any from being led away with those who work iniquity. Earnestly desirous that the ancient regulations be held firm, and that peaceful order maintained which the Lord gave to His disciples as the distinctive characteristic of those who call upon His name, saying: 'My peace I give unto you: my peace I leave with you.' Now, is it against these venerable men, so worthy of the confidence of the Church, that such horrible, such intolerable calumnies and slanders have been raised?

"Surely these wretches knew not their own ignorance when thus disgracefully they made naked their own tongues in styling Germanus the Hierophant, Sacrificer and Priest of Christ, double-minded and worshipper of wood, or, in like manner, reviling George and Mansur. Who amongst the low and vile ever hurled such reproaches before against those of the same faith with himself?

"True, indeed, from Jews, Saracens, and other Infidels, Christians have often had to bear with such reproaches on account of the sacred type of the cross, and of venerable images and of holy things offered to God. But never before did Christian bring such a charge against those who were of the same faith with himself; but the just is obnoxious to the wicked even as the sun to the blear-eyed. But they, having fled from the truth and by ecclesiastical rule being expelled, have been given up to falsehood and calumny; wherefore they could find no better employment than to slander Christians and the Priests of God, as having forsaken the loving and the true God, and having been given over to the loving of images—so, proving themselves mere slanderers and revilers, speaking without judgment, and speaking sinfully. Who, then, that fears the Lord can restrain the loud laugh, or, rather, who would not veil himself in deepest grief, or in the darkness of night, on account of such impiety?

"But since 'these inventors of evil things' (as saith the divine Apostle), searching them out, have left behind them their researches—by the which frivolities (as they say) they have not been a little strengthened—we also, having prepared arguments fitted by God's grace for the entire demolition of the vain reasonings of their knowledge falsely so called, and having set the error of this new pravity

on the same ground as the older heresies, have utterly cut them off by the sword of the holy Spirit. Come now, let us now apply ourselves to the instruction of those who hear; for thus saith the Proverb, and to this truth also assents: 'All things are plain to those who understand, and right to those who seek knowledge' (Prov. viii. 8).

"THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH OF GOD, in various ways and in divers manners, endeavours to lead all who are born within her pale to repentance, and to the knowledge and the commandments of God, and endeavours to direct all our senses to the glory of Him who is over all. And by sight, no less than by hearing, she would effect this correction by bringing before the eyes of all who come near that which hath been done.

"Thus when SHE would deliver any one from covetousness and love of money she points out to him the picture of Matthew, who, from a Publican became an Apostle, and left the madness of avarice to follow Christ; or Zaccheus, who climbed into a sycamore tree to see Jesus, and who agreed to give half his goods to feed the poor, and if he had obtained anything by false accusation to restore fourfold. And thus the continual contemplation of these pictorial representations becomes a means for the conversion of such an one, and an unfailling monitor to prevent him from turning back again to his own vomit.

"Again, is another entangled in unlawful desires, she sets before him the picture of the chaste Joseph, who, abominating fornication and having vanquished it by his chastity, preserved the same in the manner which the picture represents, of which they become partakers who are lovers thereof; or, at another time, she sets before him the blessed Susanna adorned with chastity, stretching out her hands and invoking help from above, and Daniel sitting as a judge and delivering her out of the hands of the lawless Elders; and the remembrance of the fact arising from pictorial representations becomes the safeguard for a life of chastity.

"Again: she hath often rescued one or another who was wasting his substance in luxuries, clothed in soft raiment and spending in such kind of clothing that which he should bestow upon the poor—who, in fact, was altogether given up to a life of ease and effeminacy—by setting before his eyes Elias clothed in a sheepskin, fed with food just sufficient; or John clothed with camel's hair, whose meat was locusts and wild honey: he who pointed out Christ with his finger, and did before declare of Him that He should take away the sins of the world.

"And with these she shows also to him Basil the Great and the whole multitude of Monks and Ascetics attenuated and mortified in

body. Not to extend our discourse too far, we have brought forward but these few instances, leaving it to our hearers to find out others of the same kind for themselves. For we have, indeed, the whole Gospel history in pictures leading us to the remembrance of God and filling our hearts with joy. For these pictures being before our eyes, the heart of them that fear the Lord is made joyful—their countenance is made bright—despondency is changed into confidence—and they sing with David the FATHER of God (Psalm lxxvii. 3), ‘I remembered God and rejoiced.’ Again: by these we may at all times be brought to the remembrance of God. For there must be seasons in which the sacred lessons are not recited in the venerable temples. But the pictures there set up never cease to teach us, whether it be evening, morning, or at noonday, the verity of past transactions.

“Let us receive the traditions—let us honour the ancient rule of the Church—let us not be scrupulously inquisitive into so holy, so pious, a practice—let us not intermeddle with the ancient ordinances; for everything which leads to the remembrance of God must be acceptable to Him. They, therefore, who are without this tradition, of which all who are legitimately born in the Catholic Church are partakers, are bastards and not sons.* Wherefore, we feel that this setting up of holy images in the Church is good and right, and that by them we areed spiritually to remember their prototypes; and that, therefore, on account of the worthiness of the prototype, we are bound to salute, embrace, and bestow all suitable honour upon the image. If any is pleased to style it ‘salutation’ (*ἀσπασμὸν*), or ‘worship’ (*προσκύνησι*), it is the same in effect, unless by chance a person should consider this worship to be worship of the highest kind (*τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκύνησι*); for this is quite a different thing, as we have often proved.

“Let him be worthy of this worship who comes thereto; and, if he be not worthy, let him first be purified, and so let him approach the venerable and holy image. Let there be no satanic objection against such worship—no timorous scruples having such evil pretexts as the following:—‘If I go and salute an image, then I am chargeable with having offered to it the worship which is in spirit and in truth’. Away with such scruples! These are the things which they who fight against

* Heb. xii. 8.—St. Paul’s words are—“But if ye be without chastisement whereof all are partakers:” they turn it, If ye are without images and pictures and their worship of which all are partakers, then ye are bastards and not sons. Are they not of those many who, as saith the Apostle (2 Cor. ii. 17), corrupt (*κατηλεύοντες*) the word of God.

God and speak vanity prate about, just like the old serpent. We know how he came to the woman and gently insinuated his lies. What hath God said? 'Of every tree in the garden ye may freely eat; but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden ye shall not eat of it.* Just so they deceive the hearts of the weak, telling them that he who worships the image of our Lord, or of our immaculate Lady the true Mother of God, or of the holy Angels, or any of the Saints, offers to it the worship which is in spirit and in truth.† Let us not be deceived by any such words: such admonitions and instructions come from the Devil. Gregory the Divine utterly subverts all such fables when he exhorts all thus—'Venerate Bethlehem—worship the manger.' Again: the venerable Maximus, whose praise is in all the Churches, when on one occasion, being in conference with certain persons about ecclesiastical matters, having commanded the divine type of the venerable cross, the holy gospels, and a sacred image to be set before them, together with his friends, he embraced these in confirmation of that which had been spoken. And still more clearly does He that is named from immortality teach the same truths in his epistle to Marcellinus, prefixed by him to his treatise on the interpretation of the Psalms, where he speaks thus:—'Each one taking up the book of the Psalms, admiring and adoring, reads there the prophecies concerning the Saviour, as also in other Scriptures.' Do you observe?—the inspired father enjoins us to worship the prophecies of the Saviour.‡ Now, if it be pious to worship these, how much more the fulfilment of those as developed in pictures?

* Gen. iii. 1-2, incorrectly quoted.

† According to some later Roman authorities, Christians may do that which is here so sharply censured.

‡ Does Athanasius intend us to worship the words of Prophets?—if so, in what way—by bowing down to them or offering incense to them? Rather, did not the father mean that we are to read the prophecies, admiring and worshipping the God who inspired them? Of course, if Athanasius did mean that our worship was to be paid to the ink and parchment of which the written prophecy was composed, he could not consistently refuse like adoration to a picture. But, as we cannot conceive he meant anything so absurd, so we cannot gather from his words that pictures ought to be worshipped.

Charlemagne comes forward again, after long silence, in refutation of this absurd argument ("Lib. Car." iv. 21):—"The prophecy which proclaims that a virgin shall conceive and bear a son is not to be sought in things ambiguous and doubtful, but to be retained in the heart. Nor are its secret mysteries to be sought in pictures, but in the sacred Scriptures, and the expounders of the same, the Apostles and their successors; and is rather to be perceived by faith than gazed upon with the eye. For that most illustrious Prophet Isaiah, who speaks the language of the Gospel rather than of prophecy, saith not, Unless ye paint and worship images ye shall not be established; but, 'Unless ye believe ye shall not be established.' Whence, it is plain, that he who would be established in the divine command by the integrity of his faith, and would at-

“ Now, one of these prophecies is, ‘ A virgin shall conceive and bear a son.’ Now, when we see in a picture the fulfilment of this

tain to an eternal reward, ought to have the means whereby he would accomplish this, not in pictures, not in things visible, but in his *heart* by faith, in his *mouth* by confession, in his *deeds* by the exhibition of good works ; and that he should believe that the Virgin who brought forth the Saviour of the world is to be found, not in the works of certain artificers, but in the work of the ineffable Artificer, that is in the abode of heaven. Now, whereas they say, When we see the fulfilment of this prophecy in a picture, how can we forbear to kiss, prostrate ourselves, &c., we use against them almost their own words, and reply in opposition, When we see this picture on a wall or a tablet—namely, of a virgin bearing in her arms a young child—how shall we presume to worship a senseless thing—to kiss the work of some artificer ? What man is so ill-taught as to venture so far as to give to creatures the worship due to the Creator alone, and, from his love of pictures, to act contrary to the Scriptures ? Be it so, that the image of the holy Mother of God is to be worshipped, how are we to know which is her image, or by what marks it is to be distinguished from other images ? When we, therefore, see a beautiful woman painted with a child in her arms before the superscription is made—or if, by any chance, it should be erased—how shall we know whether it may not be Sarah holding Isaac, or Rebecca carrying Jacob, or Betsabce dandling Solomon, or Elizabeth nursing John, or, indeed, any other woman holding a young child in her arms ? Or, if we turn to Heathen stories, whether it might not be Venus carrying Æneas—or Alcmena, Hercules—or Andromache, Astyanax ? Now, if instead of the one the other should be worshipped, it is folly ; but, if she is worshipped who ought not to be worshipped at all, it is absolute madness.

“ Moreover, this same blessed Virgin is painted as carried upon an ass, bearing a child in her arms, and Joseph going before : whether intended to represent the going down into Egypt or the return from Egypt into the land of Israel (for this history is set forth in various material, and not always in churches, but at times on eating and drinking-vessels, on silken garments, and very commonly on curtains)—are then all these things to be worshipped ? Now, when by means of any of these the pictures of the sacred virgin holding the child and seated on the back of the brute animal is worshipped, is not the image of the brute worshipped together with herself ? For evidently no separation in worship can be made between the virgin and the animal, as they are both of the same material and put together by the wit of the same artificer. Wherefore, either we must reject the worship of both or we must needs be worshippers of both.

“ But some prig will say this assertion about the worship of the ass may be confuted easily : since, to a man sitting in a chair or leaning on a stick we pay our civil respect, we do not thereby reverence the chair or stick as well as the man ; but, while we pay respect to the man, we mean nothing to the chair or the stick. This sophistry may be shaken to pieces thus :—the definition of man differs much from that of a chair or a stick : man is endued with life, sense—the chair or stick is destitute of both ; whence it follows clearly enough that to salute with civil respect a rational man is one thing, and another thing to leave the chair disregarded as being a thing destitute of sense. ‘ But in the definition of an image of the Virgin and of the brute animal—since both are equally without life and sense—both made of the same material and formed by the same workman, so mutually united that without a division of the material in which they are found they cannot be actually divided—there can be no difference in definition. In such case, as so great is the equality between them, so entire the association, such the union in material, we are compelled either to worship both or to turn away from both. Since, then, the one cannot be separated from the other without tearing and both must not be worshipped lest we worship the image of the ass, it is evident both must be left unworshipped and only keep their place in churches as ornaments and as memorials

prophecy—that is, the Virgin carrying in her arms the Son whom she hath brought forth—who could refrain from worshipping and saluting it? And who so ill-instructed as to dare to censure such salutation? Let us make ourselves worthy of this worship, lest coming unworthy we meet the same doom as did Uzza. For he, having touched the ark, perished in that very hour because he had approached unworthily. Now, this was adorned with various figures and made of wood, just as are our images.

“With respect to those who think it quite enough to have pictures and images for remembrance only, and not for worship, receiving the one and rejecting the other, they are half wicked and truly false and falsely true, in one way acknowledging the truth, in another despising it. Oh, the madness of such! Wherefore, it is that we, who once were calumniators of the truth, have now become its supporters. Yet, for our past disregard of ecclesiastical tradition, let us entreat earnestly the pardon of our sin.

of events which have taken place. As, therefore, the worship of images would in so many ways lead us to error, sound reason teaches that it should not by any means be retained in the Church.

“But they exhort one another to make themselves worthy to kiss and worship these senseless things, saying, Let us make ourselves worthy of this salutation, lest, like Uzzah, we suffer for coming amiss. Let us, on the contrary, make ourselves worthy to worship the divine Majesty—or, rather may we be made worthy by Him from whom it cometh, that we both will and accomplish that which is good—that, as true worshippers, we may worship the Lord, not after their vanity in some picture or other, but in spirit and in truth, even as the truth enjoins us to do.

“But forasmuch as they advise each other to make themselves worthy worshippers of images, lest they share the doom of Uzzah, let them consider still how far, as being partakers of presumption like to his—for as he imagined that without his help the ark must fall, so imagine they that without the support of images divine worship must come to nought)—they meet the same awful doom. For as his support was not required to prevent the ark from falling, so neither are pictures necessary for the support of true religion; and as the ark was carried free from fall without Uzzah’s support, God not allowing it to need anything, so under the direction of the same God may the Church be preserved from shipwreck quite independent from any support to be derived from images. For what more like to this uncalled-for putting forth the hand to keep the ark from falling which is upheld by God than the wish to introduce image-worship into the Catholic religion lest it should fall, seeing it is no less under the protection and guidance of God; or to whom may Uzzah be more likened who acted without advice of the Priests or of his fellow Levites in thus putting forth his hand than to those who, without the teaching of the holy fathers or the consent of their fellow-pricists everywhere established throughout the world, with such self-conceit and arrogance, would endeavour to foist upon the Church the novel worship of images? As he, therefore, lost his life who presumptuously affected to prevent the ark of God from falling, so let them beware who conceit that God, who is altogether in every place, stands in need of anything in which He may be worshipped; and so worship Him in things visible, lest he also perish while thus, with insolent forwardness, he resists the divine commands.”

“ In conclusion, let us keep the commandment of ordinances—let us walk according to the word of the Prophet (Mich. vi. 8)—‘ Should he tell thee, O man, what is good and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice, to love mercy, and to be ready to go with thy God.’ Wherefore, let us restrain anger—let us keep our tongues from lies, reproaches, and revilings—let us be modest with our eyes—let us restrain our appetites—let us watch with prayer and fasting—let us give thanks to God for all that He has bestowed upon us—let us not accustom our mouths to oaths, but rather listen to Him who said, ‘ I say unto you, Swear not at all ’ (Matt. v. 34)—let us despise the glory which is of the earth. But, as the greatest of all good things, let us embrace mercy and love, but these, nevertheless, united in the fear of God. For without such fear of God, love is not approved. It was thus Jehoshaphat loved Ahab ; but he was thus reproved—‘ Shouldest thou love them that do wickedly ?—shouldest thou help them that are hated of the Lord ’ (2 Chron. xix. 2) ? Let us then do all in the fear of the Lord, seeking the intercession of our immaculate Lady Mary, ever a Virgin, and by nature the Mother of God, and of the holy Angels, and of all Saints, saluting their venerable relics, that we may be partakers of their holiness. So may we be established in every good word and work in Jesus Christ our Lord : to whom be honour, glory, power, and blessing, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and evermore, world without end. AMEN.”

SESSION THE SEVENTH.

The Definition of the Council is read at length: it is approved and subscribed by all the Bishops present. Two Letters also were composed on this occasion, one to be sent to Irene and Constantine, the other to the Priests and Clergy of Constantinople.

[“ And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they might believe a lie.”—2 THESS. ii. 11.]

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND MASTER JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our most pious and Christian Sovereigns Constantine and his mother Irene, in the eighth year of their consulship, on the thirteenth of October, the holy General Council held its Seventh Session* in the city of Nice, the metropolis of Bithynia, in the great Church of Saint Sophia. And after that the Holy and Immaculate Gospels had been set forth in the midst,

THEODORE most holy Bishop of Tauriana in Sicily, taking the book in his hands, read from it the “Definition” of the Council as there laid down.

“ THE DEFINITION OF THE HOLY GREAT AND ŒCUMENIC COUNCIL, THE SECOND ASSEMBLED AT NICE.

“ The holy Great and Œcumenic Council, by the grace of God and the command of our most Christian Sovereigns Constantine and Irene

* Here follows the names of the three hundred and twenty-four Bishops who were present at the commencement of this Session. The number differs from that of those who subscribed the “Definition” of the Council at the close of the Session.

his mother, the second assembled in the splendid metropolis of Nice, in the Eparchy of Bithynia, in the holy Church of God named Sophia, having in all things followed the traditions of the Catholic Church, hath determined as follows :—

“ He who hath bestowed upon us the light of the knowledge of Himself, and who hath delivered us from the darkness of idolatrous madness, even Christ our God, having espoused to Himself His holy Catholic Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, hath Himself promised to preserve her, and hath confirmed this promise to His holy disciples, saying, ‘ I am with you even to the end of the world ’ (Matthew xxviii. 20), which promise He made not only to them, but to us also who by them do believe on His name. But some, making no account of this gift, as being under the influence of the seducing enemy, have revolted from right reason ; and, having set themselves in opposition to the traditions of the Catholic Church, have not attained to the understanding of the truth. As saith the proverb, ‘ Their plough hath wandered from their own field, and with their hands they have reaped barrenness* ’ (Prov. ix. 12). For the God-becoming beauty of the sacred offerings they have dared to slander, being called ‘ Priests,’ while such they are not : for of such as these is it that God cries aloud in the Prophet, ‘ Many shepherds have destroyed my vineyard ; they have defiled my portion ’ (Jeremiah xii. 10). For, having followed unholy men who were ruled by their own lusts, they have slandered this holy Church which has been united to Christ our God ; and, making ‘ no distinction between the holy and the profane, (Ezekiel xxii. 26), have put on the same footing the image of our Lord and of His Saints and the statues of Satanic idols.

“ Wherefore God our Master, not enduring to see His people who obey Him destroyed by a pest like this, hath by His own good will, and by the sacred zeal and consent of Constantine and Irene our most faithful Sovereigns, summoned us together from every quarter, the chiefs of the Christian priesthood, in order that the divine tradition of the Catholic Church might be established by our common vote—we, therefore, having with all exactness made the most careful and diligent enquiry, and having followed truth as our great aim, neither taking away anything nor adding anything, have endeavoured in all things to preserve all that belongs to the Church complete and entire. Wherefore following the Six Œcumenic Councils—in the first place, with the Council which was assembled in the splendid city of Nice, and with the Council which after that was convened in this God-protected royal city—

* This version is after the Septuagint, not the Hebrew.

~~X~~ WE BELIEVE in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible :

“ And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made ; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate ; He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; and He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end :* ”

“ And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is to be worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. AMEN.

“ We abominate and anathematize Arius, and all who agree with him and are partakers of his insane perversions ; Macedonius and his partisans, who rightly have been styled ‘ Pneumatomachi.’ † ”

“ We confess, moreover, our Lady the holy Mary to be rightly and truly the Mother of God, as having begotten in the flesh, out of this Holy Trinity, even Christ our God—even as the Council the first in Ephesus hath defined, which drove from the Church Nestorius and his partizans as endeavouring to introduce a duality of persons.

“ Furthermore, we confess the two natures of Him who was for us incarnate of Mary ever a Virgin, the undefiled Mother of God, acknowledging Him to be at the same time perfect God and perfect Man, as the Council of Chalcedon hath defined, which drove out the blasphemous Eutyches and Dioscorus from the sacred courts, and with these we class also Severus and Peter ; and their chain of variously-blaspheming and discordant fellows.

“ With whom we also anathematise the fables of Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus, in accordance with the fifth General Council assembled at Constantinople.

* Here ended the creed of the Nicene Council : that which follows was added at the second General Council of Constantinople. The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is here omitted. Binius adds in a note that Cardinal Julian, in the fifth Session of the Council of Florence mentions that the *Latins* had at that time a very old copy of the second Council, in which this addition, “ from the Son,” was found.

† Those who contend against the Spirit of God.

“And, moreover, we declare the two wills and the two energies, according to the propriety of the two natures in Christ, as the sixth Council hath proclaimed aloud, which drove out Sergius, Honorius,* Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Macarius, and their partizans, as being without will † for piety. And, to be brief, we affirm that we preserve all the traditions of the Church which have been handed down to us in her, whether written or unwritten, without innovation: of which one ‡ is the formation of representative images, which is perfectly concordant with the history of the Evangelical preaching in the confirmation of the true and not the imaginary incarnation of God the Word, and which conduces no less to edification than the other.§ For those things which are mutually illustrative of each other have mutually their impressions from each other.

“These things, therefore, being so, as proceeding in the royal road and following the sacred doctrine of our holy fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church—for this we acknowledge to be from the divine Spirit that dwelleth in her—we with all exactness and care do define that, in the same manner as the holy and life-giving cross, so shall holy images, whether formed of colours or of stones, or any other material, be set forth in all the holy Churches of God, and also on sacred vessels and garments, on walls and on doors, in houses and by the highways—whether images of Christ Jesus our Lord, our God and Saviour, or of our immaculate Mistress the holy Mother of God, or of the holy Angels, or of the Saints and other holy men.|| For, in proportion as these are continually seen in images and pictures, so are the minds of the beholders aroused to the remembrance of and affection for their prototypes.

* In every enumeration of the Councils, whether by friends or foes of image-worship, Honorius Pope of Rome is found amongst the list of the Monothelite Heretics: no discredit to his piety, for he seems to have been a lover of peace; but a sad blow to the pretended infallibility of the Roman see.

† *Ἀθελήτες*, a play on the word *Μονοθελήτες*. They maintained only one will in Christ: their adversaries affirm that they have no will at all for piety.

‡ An unwritten tradition, doubtless.

§ Pictures and the Scripture are here put on the same level: to this may apply the censure of the “Caroline Books,” lib. ii. c. 30. A quotation from this chapter is to be found in a note on Adrian’s letter read in the second Session.

|| Charlemagne answers this decree as inconsistent in itself. “Here (he observes) they unite two things which mutually oppose each other; for, after having declared over and over again that images are holy and venerable, they decree that they are to be set up in streets and highways, which are for the most part polluted. Now, is there no connection between light and darkness, or cold and heat?—or ought there to be none between sanctity and defilement, purity and impurity? Hence they greatly err who style images holy, and yet set them up in unholy places.”—*Lib., Car.* lib. ii., c. 26.

“And, further, we define that there be paid to them the worship of salutation and honour, and not that true worship which is according to faith and which belongs to God alone. And in the same way as to the holy Cross or the sacred Gospels—so to these also shall be made offerings of light and incense, as was the pious custom of those of old. For the honour of the image passes on to the prototype, and he who worships an image worships in it the person of him who is represented thereby. Thus is confirmed the doctrine of the fathers—thus the tradition of the Church which in every place hath received the Gospel. Thus we follow Paul speaking in Christ and the whole company of the Apostles and Fathers, holding fast the traditions which we have received. Thus we write in the hymns which spake in prophecy of the Church—‘Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Israel: be glad and rejoice with all thine heart. The Lord hath taken away [the wickedness of thine enemies]: He hath redeemed thee from the hand of thine adversaries. The Lord thy King is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more, and peace shall be upon thee for ever’” (Zeph. iii. 14).

“Those who dare to think or teach otherwise, or after the manner of accursed Heretics to reject ecclesiastical tradition, or to imagine any innovations, or to cast out any of those things which have been brought into the Church—whether it be the Gospel, the type of the cross, or any picture, or any relic of a Martyr; or to reason perversely or craftily for the subversion of any of the legitimate traditions of the Church, or to use any of the precious things or of the sacred monasteries as profane things: if they be Bishops or Clergy let them be deposed; or if Monks or Laics let them be separated from communion.” [Here follow the subscriptions of all the Bishops and others present: the number of Bishops is three hundred and nine.] X

THE HOLY COUNCIL shouted aloud:—“We all believe thus: we all think the same thing: we all agreeing thereto have subscribed. This is the faith of the Apostles: this is the faith of the orthodox: this faith hath confirmed the world.

“Believing in One God, celebrated in Three Persons, we salute venerable images. Let those who think otherwise be anathematised: let those who think not with us be driven far from the Church. We follow the ancient order of the Church: we observe the laws of the fathers: we anathematise those who add anything or take anything from the Church: we anathematise this lately introduced innovation of the Chris-

trianity-detractors. We embrace holy images ; and all who do not so we lay under our anathema. Anathema to those who apply the words spoken in Scripture against idols to holy and venerable images. Anathema to those who do not salute holy and venerable images. Anathema to those who call holy and venerable images idols. Anathema to those who say that Christians look on holy and venerable images as gods. Anathema to those who say that any other except Christ hath delivered us from idolatrous error. Anathema to those who say that the Church ever allowed of idols.*

“Many be the years of our Sovereigns : many be the years

* To the anathemas here and elsewhere poured forth with such zeal by these Nicene Fathers may be applied the censure contained in the “Caroline Books,” lib. iii., c. 11, 12.

In chapter the eleventh they are charged with anathematising the Catholic Church because it sanctioned not the adoration of images. In the twelfth they are censured because they seemed to have cast away all moderation and patience, by not restraining their mouth from inordinate speaking.

Concerning the anathemas, we find the following remarks :—“What madness, what insanity, that one part of the Church should undertake to anathematise all the Churches in the world in the vain endeavour to establish a thing which was ordained neither by the Apostles nor their successors ! Surely, their most insane anathema will hurt themselves rather than us ; for the Apostle declares ‘that (*maledici*) they who curse shall not enter the kingdom of God.’” He further attributes it to the same pride which expelled Satan from heaven and man from paradise that they should venture to call together a synod for the worship of images to which the greater part of God’s Church had not consented, or that they should anathematise so many Churches, which had not agreed with them, no less pious than themselves, or to have established the worship of things destitute of sense ; and they are admonished to beware, lest, in anathematising the body of Christ, they do injury to Him who is the head of that body, as did Saul of Tarsus.

Adrian replies in defence—“That the fathers of the Council did not anathematise the Catholic Church : on the contrary, having themselves returned to her communion, they anathematised the pretended Council, together with those Heretics who had consented thereto, who presumed to take away images which had been set up in the Church from time immemorial and even to burn them. And, therefore, they having returned from heresy, did, according to the traditions of the Catholic Church, anathematise those specially who held those peculiar heretical opinions from which they had returned. Thus Gregory exhorts Eusebius Archbishop of Thessalonica to compel those whom he suspected of heresy to anathematise, amongst other heresies, most specially Severus and Nestorius.”—*Adrian’s Answer*, p. 119, col. 1.

In the twelfth chapter of lib. iii. of the “Caroline Books” we find the following judgment pronounced against this Council :—“It is impossible to yield obedience to their decrees and to the instructions of our fathers, since as much as light differs from darkness, life from death, sight from blindness, honesty from dishonesty, purity from impurity, health from sickness, so do the latter differ from the former : wherefore, despising the worse, we are content with the better ; and, despising all fallacious turnings, we desire to hold on the true and royal path.”

of Constantine and Irene : many be the years of our victorious Sovereigns. God preserve their power : King of heaven protect these earthly Sovereigns.

“ Anathema to all Heretics. Anathema to the Council which roared against holy and venerable images. Anathema to all who receive the impious reasonings of Heretics. Anathema to Theodosius pretended Bishop of Ephesus. Anathema to Sisinnius surnamed Pastillas. Anathema to Basil nicknamed Tricaccabus. The Holy Trinity hath subverted the teaching of these three. Anathema to Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas, who in succession held the see of Constantinople, as to the new Arius, Nestorius, and Dioscorus. The Holy Trinity hath subverted the doctrine of these three. Anathema to those who receive and follow the threefold depravity of the above-named Heresiarch Patriarchs. Anathema to Theodore Antonius, and John, as to Manes, Apollinarius, and Eutyches, the Phantasiasts and Docetæ. Anathema to Theodore of Syracuse surnamed Crithinus and his fellow-apostates. Anathema to John Bishop of Nicomedia and Constantine of Nacolia, Heresiarchs : they set at nought the image of our Lord and His Saints : the Lord hath set them at nought. If any one defended any of the Christianity-accusing heresy, whether alive or dead, let him be anathema. If any one confess not Christ according to the flesh to be circumscribed, let him be anathema. If any approve not the representation of the history of the Gospel in pictures, let him be anathema. If any one salute not such images, as being made in the name of the Lord and His Saints, let him be anathema. If any one sets at nought ecclesiastical tradition, written or unwritten, let him be anathema.

“ Eternal be the memory of Germanus the Orthodox. Eternal be the memory of John and George. Eternal be the memory of these heralds of the truth. The Trinity has glorified these three, whose doctrine may we have grace to follow, through the tender mercy and grace of our first and great High Priest, Christ our God, our undefiled Mistress the holy Mother of God, and all the Saints interceding for us. Amen.’

LETTER FROM THE COUNCIL TO THE EMPRESS IRENE AND HER SON.

To our most pious and peaceful Sovereigns, Constantine and Irene, his mother, Tarasius the unworthy Bishop of your divinely-protected city New Rome, and all the Holy Council which, by the good will of God and with the approbation of your most Christian Sovereignty, hath been assembled in the splendid metropolis of Nice this second time:—

“CHRIST our GOD the Head of the Church is now glorified, most excellent Sovereigns, because that your heart which is preserved by His hand hath caused the good word to flow forth: inasmuch as ye commanded us to meet together in His name that we might preserve unshaken and immortal the sacred authority of the doctrines of the Church. For, as your heads have been adorned with gold and most resplendent jewels, so have your hearts been no less illustrious with the doctrines of the Gospel and of the fathers.* For, as true disciples and fellow-partakers with those ‘whose word is gone into all the earth,’ ye have become guides to all Christian people in the paths of religion: ye have in yourselves delineated the word of truth: ye have in yourselves set forth the image of piety and orthodoxy. Like splendid lamps your refulgence hath been shed upon the faithful. To our endangered Churches ye held out your hand; confirming sound doctrine, and promoting concord between those that were divided: so that we may boldly say, the great work of religion, under the goodwill of God, hath been perfected by you. Wherefore, our mouth is filled with joy and our tongue with singing. And by this our written voice, we declare to you our proceedings; and what more illustrious, what more conducive to true joy, than to be the means of preserving the Church on a firm basis.

“CERTAIN men have, indeed, risen up, having the form of piety, and clothed with the dignity of the Priesthood, while they denied its power,† and thus becoming obnoxious to the reproach of the Priests of Babylon, over whom prophecy (Susanna i. 6) triumphs, saying, ‘That wickedness went out of the Priests of Babylon.’ These men having set up a Council, like that of Caiaphas, have become originators

* Here the good fathers indulge themselves in some adulatory strains, which, no doubt, would have been described as shocking to pious ears had they come from the Iconoclastic Council of Constantinople. How had Irene and her little boy done all this? Forsooth, by setting up idols and ordering that they should be worshipped.

† By not worshipping idols, painted, and wooden, things.

of impious dogmas; and having a mouth full of cursing and bitterness they counted it a glory to confirm themselves in evil. Moreover, having a tongue delighting in evil, and a pen ready to act in accordance with it, fighting against God* with words which were from themselves, they uttered the portentous declaration that the Royal Priesthood,† the holy nation, those who had put on Christ, and who had been saved by His grace from idolatrous error, were IDOLATORS; and being filled with evil designs, they laid their lawless hands on all pictures and images, intending entirely to destroy them. Those which were wrought in mosaics they tore up: those which they found made of wax and colours on the walls of churches they scraped off, thus changing their beauty into deformity; and those which, even wrought on veils or garments in memory of Christ our God, they cast into the fire. And, so to speak, they brought utter devastation and confusion into our churches. The HIERARCHS became HERESIARCHS: instead of peace they preached contention to the people: instead of wheat they sowed tares in the field of the Church. Their wine they mixed with water, and made their neighbour drink this deadly poison. Being Arabian ‡ wolves, they hypocritically put on sheep's clothing—despising the truth they embraced lies: 'They have hatched cockatrice eggs; they have

* By exhorting people to keep the second commandment.

† Nestorius was one of the Royal Priesthood—the holy nation—one who had put on Christ; yet was he styled a new Judas, though he had no intention of dishonouring his Lord. As, then, one of the Royal Priesthood may become a new Judas, so may others of the Royal Priesthood become idolators.

‡ This tirade against their opponents is censured with great severity in the "Caroline Books," lib. iv. c. 22. It is considered as far more applicable to themselves than to their fathers, and the comparison is followed in each particular. If their fathers may be said to have sown tares instead of wheat, because they condemned the use of images in churches as ornaments, they may be said to have sown thorns instead of wheat by enjoining the worship of them. Again, if their fathers might justly be said to have made the wine of the sacred oracles insipid by the water of their own comments when they took away images from churches, they may be said to have mingled their wine with poison rather than water when they decreed that they should be worshipped, and laid all who despised such worship under their anathemas, and both the one and the other were guilty of making their neighbour drink of this polluted mixture. With respect to being wolves in sheep's clothing, this belongs to one as well as the other: the one, by pretence to great purity casting all images out of churches, lest they should be worshipped, which were never brought into them for any such purpose: the other, from their over-regard to the sanctity of the same, must needs have them made objects of worship, and assert that without this worship the other gifts of the Church would be incomplete; and thus, under the pretext of great sanctity, both have displayed their wolfish nature by endeavouring to tear each other to pieces by the teeth of their own anathemas.

And, as to the cockatrice eggs, the spider's web, &c., this is most strikingly descriptive of themselves. As being born from them whom they censure, or instructed by them, or ordained by them, they are the eggs of the cockatrice, which the others have hatched: they weave the spider's web of new constitutions, and laws suited to betray souls: he, therefore, who eats of these eggs

woven the spider's web: he who would eat of their eggs when he hath broken them findeth rottenness, and within a basilisk full of poison and deadly exhalations' (Isaiah lix. 5).

"But since such was the sad posture of affairs, and truth was consumed by lies, ye most clement, O most powerful Sovereigns, could not endure that in your days this so pestiferous, so soul-destroying a heresy, should any longer continue. This, therefore, ye were, by the inspiration of the holy Spirit that dwelleth within you, most eager to demolish, that so the constitution of the Church and welfare of all your subjects might be rendered stable; and that your kingdom, in accordance with your name (IRENE), may be ruled in peace; for ye accounted it neither tolerable or supportable that we in all other respects should be agreed and consistent; but, concerning the main point of our existence—that is, the peace of the Church—should be rent into schisms and divisions, and this, too, when Christ is our Head, and we the members in particular, and one body, by the sameness of faith and sentiment which we have towards each other.

"WHEREFORE, ye have commanded our holy and fully-attended company to meet in this metropolis of Nice, that, having put away all that caused difference between our Churches, we should unite that which was divided, and should rend and tear to pieces their ill-assorted patchwork of thorny threads lately put together—that is, their false doctrine—while at the same time we should carefully display the garment of orthodoxy. Wherefore, having followed the traditions of the Apostles and Fathers (or, as I may venture to say), being by similar inspiration of the Spirit made of the same mind with them; and, being quite in agreement with each other—having with us the concordant tradition of the holy Church—we have declared our consent to the recorded decisions of the six General Councils; and we anathematize the madness of Arius, the frenzy of Macedonius, the absurd vagaries of Apollinarius, the man-worship of Nestorius, the confusing insanity of Eutyches and Dioscorus, and the many-headed hydra which followed them; the trifling confabulations of Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius; and with these the ONE WILL, or rather the BAD WILL, of Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and their partizans; and the innovation, quite on a par with the rest, which after these have been vainly and absurdly set forth against holy and venerable images: this, since their day, we, with one voice and soul, taking our words from the Spirit and from that source having drawn pure water, with the sponge of di-

finds but the basilisk of a deadly tradition, and in place of the word, whereby he would comfort his soul, finds only that which will tend to his undoing.

vine doctrine have utterly wiped out, and the inventors of this modern vanity we have driven far from the fold of the Church.

“ And as the hands and feet are moved in harmony with the motions of the soul, so we having received grace and strength from the Holy Spirit, and having the concurrence of imperial power as our ally, have unanimously set forth piety—have preached the truth—namely, that venerable images, whether of our Lord Jesus Christ in His human form, or of such things as are recorded of Him in the Gospel history, or of our undefiled Lady the holy Mother of God, or of holy Angels (for they were manifested in human shape to those who were worthy of such manifestation), or of all Saints and of their martyrdom and conflicts, are in all respects to be received and to be painted on veils and on walls, on sacred vessels and garments, even as the Church of God has received from ancient times, and as it was ordained for us by the holy patrons of our doctrine and those who succeeded them, our sacred fathers: and, further, that they are to be worshipped or saluted,* which both mean pretty much the same thing. For *κυνεῖν*

* The whole of this discussion upon the identity of salutation, worship, and embracing, is considered as both *inutilis* and *inerudita*. In the twenty-third chapter of the fourth book of the “Caroline Books,” it is confuted at very great length:—

“ We need not labour much to show the difference between to kiss and to worship, which they account to be one. For the difference of the two things is as great as that of the names, and that which is worshipped is not kissed, and that which is kissed is not worshipped. God is worshipped, but He is not saluted. Saints departed this life are venerated, but neither worshipped with divine worship or kissed: on the contrary, wives, children, and even servants, are kissed, but not worshipped. It is evident, therefore, that kissing and worshipping are two different things. For how could there be any union of the words in sense when there is such diversity in the understanding of the thing signified? Or how can the words but differ in sense when the original of these words differ so widely in their action? For things are not made for the sake of names, but names for things; nor is it to be imagined that things are adapted to names, but, on the contrary, names are adapted to things.” He then illustrates this point by an appeal to the example of Adam enjoining names to all cattle; and by further appeals to Plato and Aristotle, who defines a name to be “a significative sound according to agreement without time.” A long discussion follows on the three things of which all conversation or disputation must consist—the subject matter, the understanding, and words. After which, it is continued as follows:—“Moreover, they add to these two things a third, and thus make to worship, to kiss, to embrace, the same; but, as the two former have no connection with each other, so has the third no connection with either of the former. And, as we said before that many things were kissed which were not worshipped, and on the other hand that many things are worshipped which are not kissed, so are many things embraced which are neither kissed nor worshipped. We may embrace a piece of wood or a stone which we do not mean to kiss, much less to worship—we may kiss a superior whom reverence and respect would forbid us to embrace. In proportion, therefore, as these things can be shown to differ one from the other, so must all arguments which would make them to be the same differ from right reason.” A censure next follows on the etymological argument as derived from the word “*προσκυνῶ*.”

in the ancient Greek language signifies to salute, to embrace. *πρὸς*, the preposition which is added, implies a certain extension or enlargement of the affection, as in the case of *φέρω* and *προσφέρω*, *κυρῶ* and *προσκυρῶ*, so in respect of *κυνῶ* and *προσκυνῶ*. This latter signifies

The Latin translation which is censured is so obscure that no good English can be made of it. It is intended to convey the same meaning as the original—viz., that a preposition added to a verb does not alter its signification; but, while keeping the same meaning, adds intensity and emphasis, as *κυνῶ* and *προσκυνῶ*. The most unbounded contempt is testified at this criticism—viz., *O, sensus confundens potius quam ordinans! O, acumen omni pistillo retusius! O, machœa plumbea! O, ensis mallei potius referens tusionem quam gladii sectionem! O, argumentatio nil affirmare præter suos auctores dementes esse valens!*

"They endeavour, from the example of *fero* and *effero*, to make out that, in like manner, *adorare*, *oscularare*, and *amplectare*, are one; whereas, prepositions added to the original word sometimes augment, sometimes diminish, and sometimes altogether alter the force of the original. For who knows not that even the various compounds of *fero*, as *effero*, *affero*, *infero*, *confero*, *aufero*, *desero*, *refero*, *suffero*, *differo*, *profero*, *prafero*, *perfero*, although all derived from the original word '*fero*,' do most widely differ from each other in sense and meaning? In like manner, who can see the least portion of agreement between *participio* and *adoro*." [The Greek original is not answerable for this, but the ignorant translator, who translated *κυνῶ* and *προσκυνῶ* as if it were *κυνῶ* *προσκυνῶ*.] "*Firmo* and *confirmo*, though alike in sense, differ as to their application. To notice everything of this kind, it is added, could scarcely be contained in any one book. But we must not pass by that they finish their foolish argumentation by a no less foolish conclusion, by making a convertible proposition of the following—that which any one worships he loves, and, therefore, that which any one loves he worships. Now, they should know that such-like propositions cannot be converted, simply because they are not of equal extent; for to love can be carried out much further than to worship. For a man loves his wife and children, but does not worship them: he loves, it may be, his servant, his dog, horse, or hawk, but does not worship them. Wherefore, though it be true, that which a man worships he loves, it is not true to an equal extent that what a man loves he worships."

A long logical disquisition follows, the intention of which is to shew that universal affirmative propositions can not be converted simply unless the subject and the predicate are of equal extent in signification. These may be converted simply "a horse is a neighing animal;" "a man is a visible animal." For equally all neighing animals are horses, and all visible animals are men. But these propositions which follow cannot be converted. He is drunk, therefore, he has been drinking, *into* he has been drinking, therefore he is drunk; or, he is a learned man, therefore he has studied, *into*, he has studied, therefore he is a learned man; or, he worships, therefore he loves, *into* he loves, therefore he worships. For in each case the subject of these propositions is of wider extent than the predicate, since we may drink and yet not be drunken; we may study and yet not become learned men; we may love and yet not worship. The inconclusiveness of the argument is shown by the canons of logical opposition—that where the contraries are false, the sub-contraries, being also contradictories, are true. Thus, a man worships everything that he loves, is contrary to this—a man worships nothing that he loves; but both are false. Therefore, the sub-contrary—a man worships something that he loves, being the contradictory of this—a man worships nothing that he loves, is true; and, in like manner, a man does not worship everything that he loves, being contrary to that a man worships everything that he loves, is true. And so, by logical rules, it is proved, though a man loves everything which he worships, he does not worship everything which he loves.

the friendship, love, or regard, mentioned in the former, taken in its largest extent. Every one who kisses worships, and he who worships certainly kisses, as the common practice which is amongst us testifies when friends meet together, for they do both the one and the other of these things. And not only do we see this done amongst ourselves, but we find the same on record in the sacred Scripture as having been done of old. Thus, in the first book of Kings (of Samuel) xx. 42:— ‘And David arose and fell on his face and worshipped (προσεκύνησε) Jonathan three times and kissed (κατεφιλήσεν) him.’ Again: what saith the Lord in the Gospel concerning the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 6)?— ‘They love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats at the synagogues, and (ἀσπασμοῖς) greetings in the markets.’ It is manifest that our Lord means worship (προσκύνησις) by the word (ἀσπασμός) salutation. For the Pharisees, having a high opinion of themselves, and accounting themselves righteous, desired to be worshipped by all and not to be saluted by the mouth, which would be a mark of humility very different from Pharisaical vauntings. Again: * we find the same in the case of Paul the divine Apostle, as St. Luke relates in the Acts concerning him (Acts xxi. 17-19):— ‘When we came to Jerusalem, the brethren received us joyfully; and the following day Paul went in with us to James, and all the elders were present. And when he had saluted them (ἀσπασάμενος), he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry.’ Now, does not the Apostle, by the word *salutation*, mean that honorary worship which we pay the one to the other. As he also says, concerning Jacob, ‘He worshipped the top of his staff,’ in the same way also Gregory the Theologian says, ‘Reverence Bethlehem—worship the manger.’

“Who that judges at all rightly or sincerely of that which is written in Scripture, could ever determine that such things were said of the worship which is in spirit and in truth? Surely, none but those who were altogether without sense or utterly destitute of all knowledge either of the Scriptures or of the Fathers.

* They indicating of image-worship by examples taken from the civil, respectful, or affectionate respect paid by them to each other is censured in the “Caroline Books,” lib. ii. c. 24.

None but God ought to be worshipped; and it is one thing to perform the office of civility, respect, or affection to our neighbours, and quite a different thing to do the same to images made with hands.

In the chapter which follows, it is shown that such respect is due to man as created by God and redeemed by Christ; while, on the contrary, no such respect is in any way due to images or pictures which God did not make, neither has given any command or endowed with any privilege whatever. In the end of this chapter, a caution is given to the Nicene divines not to disturb the Church by exciting intestine commotion in their zeal for the worship of images.

“ Did Jacob worship the top of his staff with (*λατρεία*), or did Gregory command us (*λατρείειν*) to honour with latria the manger?—by no means.

“ Again :* when we embrace the life-giving cross, we all sing with

* As mention is here made of the worship paid to the cross as justifying a similar worship to images, it is here we would affix the censure in “ Lib. Car.,” ii., c. 28, against those who attempt to put the cross and images on the same footing, and showing how far the one is beyond and above the other:—“ How far by prerogatives of excellence—how far by the tokens of virtue the cross exceeds their images which they would put on the same level—is quite worth while to prove in brief, though conscious how little justice can be done to this subject by any labour of ours. By this standard, not by images, was the old enemy overcome. By these arms, and not by paints and colours, was the devil defeated. By this, not by pictures, were the gates of hell brought to nought. By this, not by those, was the race of man redeemed! This, and not an image, was the instrument by which the death, after the manner of the servant, was completed—this, and not some picture, is the ensign of our King; that to which our legions unceasingly look—this, and not a picture, is the standard of our commander which our cohorts follow to the battle. By the wood of the cross, and not by images, is the stain of that old crime done away which was contracted by man’s eating the forbidden fruit—by the hook of the cross, and not by a picture, has the author of sin been captured; and more by name than controul—more by justice than power—being bound, has been compelled to disgorge his prey which, having swallowed, he knew well enough how to hold fast. Not by a picture but by the cross has it been displayed that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, or that the wisdom of God was stronger than men.”

Appeal is next made to the writings of St. Paul, several passages of which are quoted which have express mention of the cross or some reference to it; while none of them have any mention of pictures or any reference to them. Amongst other texts alluded to is Ephes. iii. 18, which is applied to the cross, in which follows a long allegorical explanation of each of the several parts of which it is composed. The exposition is taken from the books of St. Augustin “ De Doctrina,” and is in substance as follows—By the breadth is to be understood the cross beam on which the hands were fixed, and it signifies readiness and cheerfulness in working in the midst of difficulties; by the height is to be understood that part to which the head is fixed, and it signifies the expectation of an eternal reward from the justice of God; by the length that part on which the body was extended is to be understood, and it signifies patience and long suffering; by the depth is to be understood that portion of the holy cross which is fixed deep in the ground, and it signifies God’s inscrutable judgments and His ways of wonder-working. “ But why do we delay in the apostolic discourses only? Let us come to our Lord—let us sit with Mary at His feet—let us hear the word from His mouth—let us hear them from Himself whom so long we have heard from the mouth of an Apostle, speaking thus, ‘ If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow me.’ O, wonderful precept! O, salutary exhortation! O, life-giving thunder! This thou hast spoken, O fountain of light—this thou hast spoken, O original of all goodness, to the intent that each one, laying aside the old man with his deeds, should be crucified to the world while the world is crucified to him, that thus, by the crucifixion of the flesh and by the mortification of our members which are upon the earth, we might live in thee, or rather thou mightest live in us..... Tell us what thou hast commanded concerning images, which some would affect to equal with thy cross? ‘ Render to Cæsar the things which be Cæsar’s, and to God the things which are God’s.’ If, then, we are to take up our cross and to follow thee who hast by the cross caused earthly things to triumph amidst the heavenly, and if we are to give the image of Cæsar to Cæsar, then images

one voice—'We worship thy cross, O Lord, and we worship the spear which pierced the side of thy goodness;' by which worship is meant salutation, as is manifest by our touching these things with our lips.

"But if it be often found in the sacred Scriptures and in our eloquent holy fathers, that by the word '*προσκύνησις*' is meant the worship which is in spirit and in truth, it is no more than this, that, being a word of many meanings, one of its meanings is the worship according to latria.

"Again: this worship may be paid for the sake of honour through affection or from fear. Thus, we worship your victorious and most peaceful rule. There is a worship given from fear only, as Jacob worshipped Esau. Again, by way of thanks, we find Abraham, when he had received the field from the sons of Heth for a burying-place for Sarah his wife, is said to have worshipped them. And again: when men expect to obtain some advantage from their superiors they worship them: thus Jacob worshipped Pharaoh.

ought not to be accounted equal to the cross: they are not to be adored—they are not to be worshipped—but to be left to this world with things of like worldly nature; and thou alone art to be adored—thou alone art to be followed—thou alone art to be worshipped who reignest for ever in unity of substance with the Father and the Holy Spirit."

To this censure Adrian replies as usual with passages quite foreign to the purpose. Two are from St. Ambrose, which treat of the divinity and humanity of Christ, which have some relation to the Arians, but none whatever to the cross, to images, or their worship. Also a passage of St. Gregory to the Consul Leontius—a passage which, if St. Gregory was the writer, shows him to have been either immoderately superstitious or a barefaced deceiver. We have received the oil of the holy cross and the wood of aloes; the one that by its touch it may bless—the other as yielding a sweet smell in incense. It became him, therefore, as a good man, to send those things to us which might appease the anger of God for us." And, shortly after: "Moreover, we have sent to you the blessing of the Apostle Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the key of his most sacred sepulchre in which this blessing has been inserted: that the same which bound his neck to the stake, the same may RELEASE YOU FROM ALL YOUR SINS" (Adrian's "Answer," p. 127, col. ii.) So oil appeases God's anger by its touch, and a key releases men from all their sins!

From such miserable drivelling, it is refreshing to come to the more manly sense of Du Pin, whose objections against this chapter have far more reason in them. His words are: "As to this article he is in the wrong, and all his reasons are mere sophisms; for the cross, the sacred vessels, and the sacred books, are no less inanimate than images, and deserve neither more nor less adoration. If we may pay an outward veneration to the cross because it puts us in mind of that whereon Christ suffered, why should we not honour with outward worship the images of Jesus Christ and the Virgin?" (Du Pin, vol. vi. p. 146). It follows not, however, that it is right to worship pictures, but that it is wrong to adore or worship crosses. But it was the weakness of the Iconoclasts in the east, as well as of Charlemagne and his divines in the west, while they overthrow the superstition of picture-worship, to cling to that of cross-worship. We, Protestants, are emancipated from the one as well as the other.

“ Wherefore it is that the sacred Scripture gives this instruction, ‘ Thou shalt WORSHIP the Lord thy God, and HIM only shalt thou SERVE.’ The worship (*προσκύνησις*) is spoken generally, and not confined to God alone, because under this word many different meanings are contained ; but this ‘ Thou shalt serve ’ (*λατρεύσεις*) is meant to be confined to God only. For to God alone we offer our (*λατρεία*) absolute worship.

“ These things being in this way fully proved without doubt or hesitation, we declare it to be acceptable to God that the pictures and images of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, of our undefiled Lady Mary the Mother of God and ever a Virgin, of holy Angels, and of all the Saints, are to be worshipped and saluted. If any one agree not with us, but entertains any doubt or scruple concerning the worship of holy and venerable images, him our Holy and General Council, confirmed by the Holy Spirit and by the traditions of the holy fathers and of the Church, anathematizes ; and what is this anathema but separation from God ? And if there be any who rebel against the yoke and refuse to yield obedience to that which has been here defined, and thus kicks against the pricks, and coming into collision with Christ sins against his own soul—and while highly pleased with his calumnies against the Church is found engaged in an insane warfare against the Church—let such be regarded as fellow-companions of former heretics, and as no less leagued than they in the promotion of wickedness.

“ We have, therefore, sent Bishops beloved in God, our brethren and fellow-labourers, with the Abbots and Clergy, that they may bring to your divine hearing all that has been here done by us ; and for the sealing and confirmation of that which have been defined by us and for the fuller satisfaction of your pious sovereignty, we have submitted to you certain testimonies from the fathers—a few selected out of very many, but such as from the splendour of the truth contained in them can but cause the most certain assurance to follow.

“ And may the Saviour of us all and He who rules together with you, and who by your means has been pleased to bestow on His Church the blessing of peace, cause you to reign for many years, and preserve you and your Senate, your Princes, your most faithful army, and all your subjects. May He make you ever victorious. He Himself has said, *As I live, saith the Lord, them that honour me I will honour.* He it is that binds you with power. And your enemies shall lament and your subjects shall rejoice.

“ Rejoice, therefore, O City! Rejoice thou new Zion, the tower of the Lord! In Zion did David once rule. Here religious Sovereigns like to David sway the realm. The Lord is in the midst of thee, and may His name be blessed for evermore. Amen.”

TO THE MOST BELOVED IN GOD THE PRIESTS AND CLERICS
BOTH OF THE MOST SACRED THE GREAT CHURCH, AS WELL
OF ALL OTHER CHURCHES IN YOUR GOD-PROTECTED AND
ROYAL CITY, THE HOLY COUNCIL, THE SECOND ASSEMBLED
IN NICE, SENDETH GREETING :—

“ CHRIST our God, the truth, the light, and glory of the fathers, who hath called us out of darkness into the marvellous light—who hath delivered us from all idolatrous error—who hath wiped away the name of idols from the earth—who promised that there should no more be any mention of them, hath been pleased to grant, by the order of our pious and most orthodox Sovereigns, that we should be assembled together in the splendid metropolis of Nice, as ye well know—that we might change the discord of those who differed into harmony—that the middle wall of enmity might be taken away—that the ancient order of the Church might receive confirmation.

“ We, therefore, having met together by the inspiration and operation of the Holy Spirit, have spoken the same thing east and north, west and south, and have come to the one unity: the peaceful constitution of the holy Churches hath been established by that mutual sameness of opinion and faith which directed the paths of our feet.

“ The trunk of heresy which sprung from the tares sown by the arch-enemy, prime originator of evil, hath been utterly rooted out. And behold, we, standing on the high mountain, announce to you the joy of ecclesiastical peace to be celebrated in a popular festival. And what more beautiful than this?—as Isaiah who (of old) spake boldly, said—‘ How beautiful are the feet of them who bring good tidings of peace, who bring glad tidings of good things!’

“ Truly, it had been a right thing in itself, desirable to us, and no doubt a subject of glory and rejoicing to your priestly and venerable devotedness to God, that your whole sacred fraternity should have been found together with us; and that you should have been spectators and witnesses of the power of the things said and done by us, as

well for the confirmation of the lawful traditions of the Church Catholic as for the utter subversion of those who rebelled against the truth, who perverted the apostolic and paternal tradition of the Catholic Church, and as appeared to them accomplished its entire extermination.

“But, forasmuch as your journey hither was partly by sea and partly by land—and you would have required both vessels for your convoy and beasts for your march, and as neither of these things had been prepared for you—so it was that your sacred company could not be present with us. In mind and spirit doubtless ye were present with us, thinking the same thing, which is the fulness of the Catholic Church. Yet, inasmuch as we are members one of another, and Christ our God our Head, we thought it right to send you an account in brief of the things which, by God’s permission, have been done amongst us. By letters, therefore, we communicate with you, and present before you events in such wise as if yourselves had witnessed the same.

“Now, when we had assembled together, then, by the doctrine of the splendid effulgence of the fathers, we were confirmed in one thing: we spake one thing—of the song which Moses spake we were not forgetful, which saith—‘Ask thy father and he shall tell thee, and thy elders and they shall declare to thee.’ In this spirit we followed exactly the traditions of the Catholic Church: we made neither diminution or addition.

“Taught by the apostle, we held fast to the traditions ‘which we had received;’ and so we received and embraced whatever the Catholic Church hath from the beginning of time received, whether written or unwritten: among which things we recognized the representations of images and pictures. Again, whatever our divine fathers were found to have rejected that we also rejected, and declared to be hostile to the Church: among which we considered this lately-sprung up innovation of the Christian-detractors which, like a gangrene, was devastating the pastures of the Church. But the Lord our God did not for ever overlook it; for, truth being unveiled, orthodoxy was made glorious in the sight of all, and falsehood, with its cognate darkness, for ever vanished away. Now if, as has been frivolously urged, the formation of images has any similarity to the making of idols, then the mystery of our redemption is done away, which the Son of God accomplished for us by His presence while He lived among us without sin. The prophetic promises, in like manner, have come to an end—the one which declares ‘that we should serve in holiness and righteousness before Him all the days of our lives;’ the other, which declares—‘But the Lord awakened as a man out of sleep, and as a mighty man

refreshed with wine ; and He smote His enemies in the hinder parts, and put them to a perpetual shame.' If, then, eternal shame was, by His resurrection, put on His enemies—that is, the power of darkness—how then can Christians any more serve idols ?

“ Oh, their ignorance, their impiety ! Oh, had they reflected that even to offend one of the little ones that believe in Christ hath His unbearable indignation, how much more then will, the perversion of the world ? But they, rejecting ecclesiastical tradition, have set at nought the word of the Lord : wherefore the Lord also hath set them at nought, and with Arius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Sergius, and Honorius, and their heretical fancies (He) hath numbered the turbulent assemblage of their faction : for, as in imitation of those who have spoken foolishly, so, together with them, have they been stoned with the sling of a true confession, and their cabal has been broken up ; for the Lord will not alway allow the rod of the wicked to rest on the lot of the righteous. Like the Jews, they imagine vain things, and their Council obtains the place nearest to that of Caiaphas, which in all respects it resembles. That Council meditated vain things against the Lord : this hath roared against *His image*. This Council hath arrogated to themselves and others the redemption wrought out for us by Jesus Christ : this Council took deep counsel, but not of God ; and made a covenant, but not by His Spirit : wherefore they deprive holy temples of their beauty. In this Council no man was found made after the likeness of God, because they dishonoured and broke to pieces the images of our Lord and His Saints and burned them with fire : this Council in its madness and frenzy made a declaration of Satanic words : this Council had only the name of ‘ sacred,’ but was in knowledge vile and accursed : this Council had an unrestrained mouth—a spirit imbued with falsehood : it took truth as its mask, while it laboured to bind up lies : this Council the Catholic Church has winnowed, like tares with fans, from the Lord’s floor—that is, the Catholic Church ; and, with the fan of divine judgment, hath cast them out : their vain fancies have been utterly swept away from the Catholic Church, and have been completely confuted ; for the true and strict judgment of the Catholic Church allows nothing to be innovated—nothing to be taken away.

“ We, therefore, having followed the laws of the fathers, and being partakers of one Spirit with them, have preserved all that belongs to the Catholic Church without innovation, without diminution—even as the six holy General Councils have delivered unto us that which they allowed to be honoured in the Catholic Church, we also receive with-

out doubt or hesitation ; and among the rest, as we have before said is the making of holy images, the honouring and embracing them ; for both come to the same thing : he who makes this confession is a genuine son and partaker of the Catholic Church.

“ Thus all scandals are done away—all have vanished : truth hath flourished—falsehood is cast out—the sower of tares hath entirely failed ; but the people who love Christ have been brought into the one granary of the Catholic Church : the light of orthodoxy hath arisen—the darkness of error hath set for ever. Despondency is changed for exultation—grief for joy : your mourning is turned into triumph : all things have turned out for the better ; wherefore, we address you in the apostle’s words—‘ Rejoice in the Lord ;’ and, again, I say, Rejoice. The Trinity hath granted us a threefold joy ; to whom be all honour, glory, worship, and power, for ever and ever. Amen.”

THE CANONS OF THE COUNCIL.

CANON I.*

That the Canons of all former Councils are strictly to be observed.

CANON II.

That every Bishop, on his consecration, ought to promise that he will observe strictly the Canons ; and, if he did not promise, he ought by no means to be consecrated.

Since, in singing the Psalter we promise to God—“ *I will meditate in thy righteousness, I will not forget thy word.*” As it behoves all Christians to observe this most salutary resolution, much more does it press itself upon those who have obtained any ecclesiastical dignity.

Wherefore, we determine that every one who aspires to the episcopal dignity should know the Psalter, that from this he may be able

* These Canons seem rather to belong to this Session than the next, which was but a ratification at Constantinople of what had before been done at Nicea. Some of those which seemed more important have been translated at length—of the rest the titles only have been given.

refreshed with wine ; and He smote His enemies in the hinder parts, and put them to a perpetual shame.' If, then, eternal shame was, by His resurrection, put on His enemies—that is, the power of darkness—how then can Christians any more serve idols ?

“ Oh, their ignorance, their impiety ! Oh, had they reflected that even to offend one of the little ones that believe in Christ hath His unbearable indignation, how much more then will, the perversion of the world ? But they, rejecting ecclesiastical tradition, have set at nought the word of the Lord : wherefore the Lord also hath set them at nought, and with Arius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Sergius, and Honorius, and their heretical fancies (He) hath numbered the turbulent assemblage of their faction : for, as in imitation of those who have spoken foolishly, so, together with them, have they been stoned with the sling of a true confession, and their cabal has been broken up ; for the Lord will not always allow the rod of the wicked to rest on the lot of the righteous. Like the Jews, they imagine vain things, and their Council obtains the place nearest to that of Caiaphas, which in all respects it resembles. That Council meditated vain things against the Lord : this hath roared against *His image*. This Council hath arrogated to themselves and others the redemption wrought out for us by Jesus Christ : this Council took deep counsel, but not of God ; and made a covenant, but not by His Spirit : wherefore they deprive holy temples of their beauty. In this Council no man was found made after the likeness of God, because they dishonoured and broke to pieces the images of our Lord and His Saints and burned them with fire : this Council in its madness and frenzy made a declaration of Satanic words : this Council had only the name of ‘ sacred,’ but was in knowledge vile and accursed : this Council had an unrestrained mouth—a spirit imbued with falsehood : it took truth as its mask, while it laboured to bind up lies : this Council the Catholic Church has winnowed, like tares with fans, from the Lord’s floor—that is, the Catholic Church ; and, with the fan of divine judgment, hath cast them out : their vain fancies have been utterly swept away from the Catholic Church, and have been completely confuted ; for the true and strict judgment of the Catholic Church allows nothing to be innovated—nothing to be taken away.

“ We, therefore, having followed the laws of the fathers, and being partakers of one Spirit with them, have preserved all that belongs to the Catholic Church without innovation, without diminution—even as the six holy General Councils have delivered unto us that which they allowed to be honoured in the Catholic Church, we also receive with-

out doubt or hesitation ; and among the rest, as we have before said is the making of holy images, the honouring and embracing them ; for both come to the same thing : he who makes this confession is a genuine son and partaker of the Catholic Church.

“ Thus all scandals are done away—all have vanished : truth hath flourished—falsehood is cast out—the sower of tares hath entirely failed ; but the people who love Christ have been brought into the one granary of the Catholic Church : the light of orthodoxy hath arisen—the darkness of error hath set for ever. Despondency is changed for exultation—grief for joy : your mourning is turned into triumph : all things have turned out for the better ; wherefore, we address you in the apostle’s words—‘ Rejoice in the Lord ;’ and, again, I say, Rejoice. The Trinity hath granted us a threefold joy ; to whom be all honour, glory, worship, and power, for ever and ever. Amen.”

THE CANONS OF THE COUNCIL.

CANON I.*

That the Canons of all former Councils are strictly to be observed.

CANON II.

That every Bishop, on his consecration, ought to promise that he will observe strictly the Canons ; and, if he did not promise, he ought by no means to be consecrated.

Since, in singing the Psalter we promise to God—“ *I will meditate in thy righteousness, I will not forget thy word.*” As it behoves all Christians to observe this most salutary resolution, much more does it press itself upon those who have obtained any ecclesiastical dignity.

Wherefore, we determine that every one who aspires to the episcopal dignity should know the Psalter, that from this he may be able

* These Canons seem rather to belong to this Session than the next, which was but a ratification at Constantinople of what had before been done at Nicea. Some of those which seemed more important have been translated at length—of the rest the titles only have been given.

Inasmuch as some clergymen, despising ecclesiastical order, leave their own parish and run into those of others—and this more especially in this royal city, where they take Princes as their patrons and perform services in their private oratories—such must not be admitted into any house or church without the permission of their own Bishop and the Patriarch of Constantinople. Those moreover, who, by the permission of the above-mentioned Priests are admitted, must by no means meddle with secular or worldly business, as this is forbidden by the Ecclesiastical Canons. And if any of those who are called Seniors be found to be occupied in any such concern, let him give it up or let him be deposed. Let him rather engage in the instruction of servants or children, teaching them the sacred Scriptures, for to this was he appointed in the priesthood.

CANON XI.

That Stewards must be appointed in bishoprics and monasteries.

CANON XII.

That no Bishop or Abbot is at liberty to alienate any of the possessions of the Church.

CANON XIII.

That they who secularise monasteries are worthy of aggravated condemnation.

Since during the late calamity, which for our sins hath befallen the Church, certain holy houses, episcopal dwellings, and monasteries, have been violently seized by some for private and common habitation; if those who have them are willing to restore them, so that they return to their ancient use, this is right and well; but if otherwise, should the offenders be of the sacerdotal order, let them be deposed: if Monks or Laics, let them be suspended, as being condemned by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and let them be doomed to that place *where the worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched*; for they are acting in opposition to the voice of the Lord, which saith—“*Ye shall not make my Father's house an house of merchandize.*”

CANON XIV.

That without imposition of hands it shall not be permitted

Surely we have more reason to complain of the entire destruction of all that Iconoclasts did ever say or urge in their defence, of the mutilated Council held at Constantinople, and the other, utterly lost, held under *Leo Isaurus* and *Leo Armenius*, and others. As for puerile babblings, the Nicene Council and Adrian's and Gregory's letters seem to include no small quantity!

to read from the desk. *Some young persons were accustomed to do this, because they received the tonsure when young.*

CANON XV.

That no clergyman ought to preside over two churches.

From the present time let no clergyman be appointed to two churches; for this has been done from love of base and sordid gain, and is quite foreign to all ecclesiastical order. We have heard from our Lord's own words that no man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one, or he will cleave to the one and despise the other. Each one, therefore, according to the Apostle, where he hath been called, there he ought to remain, and to be fixed in one church: the things which in ecclesiastical matters are done from bargain are quite contrary to that which is appointed by God; and, as for necessary subsistence, there are other means of obtaining it. For, says the Apostle—*“Ye know that these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them which were with me.”* This Canon, however, is intended more especially for the royal city; but in the more distant parishes, on account of the want of men, it need not be enforced.

CANON XVI.

That it becomes not a clergyman to be clothed with garments of various colours.

All effeminate ornamenting of the person is quite unsuitable to the sacred order. Such Bishops or Clergymen as adorn themselves with splendid and glittering attire need to be corrected; and, if they persist, should be censured. In like manner should they be treated who make use of various perfumes. Since, however, that root of bitterness springing from beneath hath pestered the Church, the Christianity-detracting heresy, and they who have received it, not only abominate pictorial representations, but have laid aside reverence altogether, and have taken umbrage at all those who lived in humility and piety, making good the proverb—*“Piety is an abomination to the sinner:”* should, therefore, any now be found to deride those who wear homely and sober attire, let them be taught better by censure.

For of old every Priest was wont to dress in sober and grave attire: since everything put on for the sake of ornament, and not for use, laid the wearer open to the charge of pride, as the great Basil says:—*“Let no one be clothed in garments curiously wrought in silk, nor let him add fringes of another colour to the borders of his garments, since*

they have heard from the voice of the Divine tongue—' *They who wear soft garments are in Kings' houses.*' "

CANON XVII.

That no one undertake to build an oratory who has not funds to complete the same.

Because certain Monks desiring to rule, and not caring to obey, are in the habit of leaving their own monasteries, and undertaking to build oratories which they have no funds to finish—when any one commences an undertaking of this kind, let him be restrained by the Bishop of the Diocese, till, on enquiry, it be found he has sufficient to defray the cost, and then let the work go on to its conclusion. The same rule holds in respect to both the Laity and Clergy.

CANON XVIII.

That no women should be allowed to live in a Bishop's residence in monasteries of men.

" *Be without offence towards them that are without,*" saith the divine Apostle ; but for women to live in Bishops' palaces, or in monasteries, is cause of all kinds of scandal.

If any one be found to have in a Bishop's palace or monastery any female, bond or free, for the performance of any service whatever, let them be censured ; and, if they persist, let them be deposed. But if there happen to be women in any of the outer courts, and any Bishop or Abbot have occasion to go thither, let them not on any account go on with any work there so long as the Bishop or Abbot be present ; but let them go away to some other place till the Bishop or Abbot depart, so that they be not blameable.

CANON XIX.

That admission to the priesthood or monasteries be unaccompanied with presents.

CANON XX.

That monasteries for both men and women together ought not to be made.

CANON XXI.

That Monks ought not to leave their own monasteries to go into others.

CANON XXII.

That if it so happen that Monks do sit down at the same table with women, they do so with giving of thanks with all moderation and piety.

To give up everything to God, and in no respect to live after our own will, is no small attainment. "*Whether ye eat or whether ye drink, do all to the glory of God,*" says the divine Apostle. Christ our God in the Gospels has commanded to cut off the very beginning of evil. Not only is adultery rebuked by Him, but the very motion of soul which inclines to the act of adultery is condemned. Thus, we find, whoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart: whence we learn we must purify our thoughts. Again: "if all things are lawful, all things profit not," saith the Apostle. It is necessary for every man to eat in order to live; and, amongst married people and families of the Laical order, it is quite an irreprehensible thing for men and women to eat together. Only let them give thanks to the great Giver of all good, and let not their feasts be celebrated with *bacchanalian songs*, Satanic odes, harps, and lascivious gesticulation. Against whom cometh the prophetic curse, which says—"Woe to them that drink wine with the sound of the pipe and harp; but they regard not the Lord, and consider not the works of His hands." And if such things occur among Christians, let them be restrained; but if that cannot be done, then let those regulations which have been canonically ordained by our predecessors remain in force against them.

But, in respect of those who have chosen the quiet and retired life, as having covenanted with God to take on them the solitary state, it becomes them to sit down in perfect silence; and, moreover, in respect of any who have assumed the priesthood, it is by no means proper that they should associate with women alone, though they may with some very pious men and women, so that the conversation may tend to spiritual edification.

Let the same rule be observed in respect of relations also.

And if it happen that any Monk or Clergyman be on a journey, and have not sufficient provision, and on account of his necessity wishes to stop awhile either at an inn or a private house, he hath liberty to do so, if the case be of sufficient urgency.

NEW ROME. He therefore, having received this mandate, lost no time in fulfilling the desires of his Sovereigns; and as now all that had been appointed for consideration had been fully discussed, and had most profitably been concluded, taking with him all the God-beloved Bishops, they went on their way and made their entrance into the heaven-protected city, and when they arrived they were most kindly received by the Sovereigns.

And the God-preserved Empress, most happily resplendent, having taken good counsel, appointed a certain day on which, with the Bishops, she would have her place in the Council, and this took place in the palace which is called "Magnaura." And on this appointed day, the holy Gospels of God having been placed in the midst, the empress and her son who reigned together with her, and the whole Council having taken their seats, the Patriarch, being ordered by them to say what was fitting in the Council, fulfilled their command. After this, they also, as being taught of God, harangued the assembled Council in a discourse alike becoming and gracious; so that all the God-beloved Bishops with the Patriarch joined in favourable acclamations.

After these were published, the Sovereigns gave command that a proposition should be made to the Council in the following manner:—"Let the Definition set forth by you be read in our hearing, and in that of all our Christ-loving people." And the whole Council having signified their assent, Cosmas the God-beloved deacon and chamberlain having received the book read the Definition. When the reading was finished the Sovereigns enquired as follows:—"Let the Holy Œcumenic Council declare whether the Definition now read meets with full assent from all now present." And they shouted aloud—

"Thus we believe: we all think thus. In full agreement, this we have all subscribed. This is the faith of the Apostles—this is the faith of the fathers—this is the faith of the orthodox—this is the faith which hath confirmed the world.

"Believing in one God, to be praised in Trinity, we embrace His holy images. Let all who think otherwise be ana-

SESSION THE EIGHTH.*

The Bishops of the Council of Nice, summoned to Constantinople, with the Patriarch, confirm the decree of the Council in the presence of the Empress and her son.

IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD AND MASTER JESUS CHRIST, OUR TRUE GOD. In the reign of our pious and Christ-loving Sovereigns Constantine and Irene his mother, in the eighth year of their Consulship, the tenth of the calends of November (October 20th), in the eleventh indiction.

Our Sovereigns the allies of orthodoxy, as being illustrious heralds and guardians of the truth, influenced with sound affection, counting it a thing not to be borne that they should never have sat in the Council in person, issued their commands to the Patriarch, to bring all the God-beloved Bishops with him to their royal and heaven-defended city,

* All that follows (says Binius), under the title of the "Eighth Session," is found in the Greek Codices; but not in the Translation of Anastasius or the common Latin Version. The Canons belong rather to the Seventh Session than to this. This supplementary part gives occasion to a mistake made by the French Divines of the Council of Frankfort, that the Council itself was held at Constantinople, by which name it is cited in the famous Canon of that Council. Romanists have made much of this mistake. It occasioned surprise in Charlemagne that Irene should sit as President at all the preceding Sessions of the Council; whereas she was present at none but this. It gave occasion to the censure contained in *Car. Lib. iii. c. 13*:—"That a woman ought not to preside in Council, as Irene is said to have done in this Council." Adrian defends the practice from the example of Constantine the Great, who sat in a certain Council with his mother Helena, when twelve Scribes and Pharisees disputed with the Christians in the presence of Pope Sylvester; in which dispute, as well by miracles as by the word of God, the Christians gained the victory. The mention of miracles alone would be sufficient to cast a doubt on this Council: it is altogether fabulous. The second instance is taken from the case of Pulcheria at the Fourth General Council. Pope Leo sent his letters in behalf of this Council to her; whence she, in her own person, together with the most faithful Emperor Martian, sat in the Council. From instances we are brought to Scriptures allegorically interpreted: then to Augustin:—"The earth produces grass, and the herb, and the fruit-bearing tree; and men in the Church produce works of mercy; for after those works which were exhibited to our Lord, not only by men such as Zaccheus, but even by women, who ministered to him of his substance."—*Adrian's Answer*, page 119, col. 1; in *Labbe's Collection*, vii. 939.

NEW ROME. He therefore, having received this mandate, lost no time in fulfilling the desires of his Sovereigns; and as now all that had been appointed for consideration had been fully discussed, and had most profitably been concluded, taking with him all the God-beloved Bishops, they went on their way and made their entrance into the heaven-protected city, and when they arrived they were most kindly received by the Sovereigns.

And the God-preserved Empress, most happily resplendent, having taken good counsel, appointed a certain day on which, with the Bishops, she would have her place in the Council, and this took place in the palace which is called "Magnaura." And on this appointed day, the holy Gospels of God having been placed in the midst, the empress and her son who reigned together with her, and the whole Council having taken their seats, the Patriarch, being ordered by them to say what was fitting in the Council, fulfilled their command. After this, they also, as being taught of God, harangued the assembled Council in a discourse alike becoming and gracious; so that all the God-beloved Bishops with the Patriarch joined in favourable acclamations.

After these were published, the Sovereigns gave command that a proposition should be made to the Council in the following manner:—"Let the Definition set forth by you be read in our hearing, and in that of all our Christ-loving people." And the whole Council having signified their assent, Cosmas the God-beloved deacon and chamberlain having received the book read the Definition. When the reading was finished the Sovereigns enquired as follows:—"Let the Holy Œcumenic Council declare whether the Definition now read meets with full assent from all now present." And they shouted aloud—

"Thus we believe: we all think thus. In full agreement, this we have all subscribed. This is the faith of the Apostles—this is the faith of the fathers—this is the faith of the orthodox—this is the faith which hath confirmed the world.

"Believing in one God, to be praised in Trinity, we embrace His holy images. Let all who think otherwise be ana-

thema. Let those who think not thus be thrust out of the Church. We have followed the ancient rule of the Catholic Church: we anathematize alike those who add anything to, or detract anything from, the Catholic Church. Anathema to the newly adopted heresy of the Christianity-slanderers. We receive venerable images: we load all who hold not as we do with anathema.

“Anathema to those who apply to images the Scriptures written against idols. Anathema to those who call holy images idols. Anathema to those who affirm that Christians look on their images as gods. Anathema to those who assert that any other has delivered us from idolatry than Jesus Christ. Anathema to those who presume to say that the Catholic Church ever allowed of images. Anathema to all heresies. Anathema to the whole conventicle which roared against holy and venerable images. Anathema to those who receive the writings of these heretics. Anathema to Theodosius, false Bishop of Ephesus. Anathema to Sisinnius, surnamed Pastillas. Anathema to Basil, nicknamed Tricacabus. The Trinity has subverted the dogmas of this triad. To Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas, who in succession presided in the chair of Constantinople, anathema; as to the new Arius, Dioscorus, and Eutyches. Anathema to the heresiarchs John Bishop of Nicomedia, and Constantine Bishop of Nacolia. Anathema to those who confess not that Christ as man was circumscribable. Anathema to those who admit not of pictures of the Gospel history. Anathema to those who salute not holy and venerable images. Anathema to those who receive not all the traditions of the Church, whether written or unwritten.”

When these acclamations had ceased, the Patriarch, having brought the Book of the Definitions which had been read to the Sovereigns, requested them, together with the whole Council, that they would be pleased to seal and ratify the same with their own sacred subscription. On which the most pious Empress, most graciously resplendent, subscribed the document; and then she gave it to her son, who reigned together with her, for him to subscribe it also. And when this was

done, the book was returned to the Patriarch by Stausarius, the illustrious patrician and master of the Hippodrome. And all the Bishops, with one accord, joined in the following acclamations to our Sovereigns:—

“Many be the years of our Sovereigns. Many be the years of Constantine and Irene his mother. Of our orthodox Sovereigns, many be the years. Of our triumphant Sovereigns, many be the years. Of our peace-loving Sovereigns, many be the years. Eternal be the memory of the New Constantine and the new Helena. God preserve their dominion. Lord grant them a life of peace. O Lord, preserve their empire. King, protect those of this world !”

After these acclamations were finished; the Sovereigns gave order that passages from the fathers which had been recited in the metropolis of the Niceans, and even written in the Fourth Session, should be read—that is, of John Chrysostom on Meletius Bishop of Antioch; of Asterius Bishop of Amasca on the martyr Euphemia; of the discourse written by John Bishop of Thessalonica against the Gentiles; the epistle of the holy Symeon the Stylite to the Emperor Justin; the epistle of the blessed Nilus the Ascetic to Olympiodorus the Prefect; and the eighty-second canon of the Sixth General Council. And when these were read in the audience of the Sovereigns, of the illustrious Princes, and of all Christ-loving people, all being pricked to the heart, embraced the truth. And again, the God-beloved Bishops joined with the people in acclamations of praise. And the whole of the before-mentioned royal palace was filled with men; for the whole city, with the military orders, were all present. And they broke up the Session, and they glorified God, and with joy gave thanks to Him by whose good pleasure the whole was brought about.

TO OUR IN ALL RESPECTS MOST HOLY AND BLESSED BROTHER
AND FELLOW-MINISTER THE LORD ADRIAN POPE OF OLD
ROME, TARASIVS BY THE MERCY OF GOD BISHOP OF CON-
STANTINOPLE, NEW ROME—HEALTH IN THE LORD:—

“THE saving dispensation of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ is amply sufficient for peace, oneness of mind, and concord of all Christians. For He, after His resurrection from the dead, having breathed on His Apostles, said—‘My peace I give to you, my peace I leave to you.’ To the same purpose hath he who was caught up to the third heaven and entered into Paradise and heard unspeakable words (2 Cor. xii. 4), Paul the divine Apostle, testifying, has declared to all, ‘Christ is our peace, who hath made of both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, the enmity in his flesh (Ephes. iv. 14, 15). And, again, when writing to the Thessalonians, he commands—‘Wherefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught whether by word or by our epistle’ (2 Thess. ii. 15). But since the enemy, the author of evil, the Devil, hath never ceased from time to time to lacerate and divide the Church built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, intruding himself by means of certain wicked men his followers, and thus to sow tares in the same country which has been husbanded by those trumpets of the Spirit, the holy Apostles; for they having been endued with power from on high, and having ploughed up the same with the furrows of a divine energy, left the food of eternal life to be reaped by those who, by them, have believed their divine doctrine—they who from time to time were its shepherds and guardians—namely, our holy fathers, who having received them cut up by the roots all tares—that is, all heresies and innovations secretly and unawares introduced—and so preserved a harvest pure in the field.

“Your Pontifical, Fraternal Holiness, associated these by means of the same divine teaching, and from them having received the word of truth and in harmony with the truth of our most faithful and Christ-loving Sovereigns, has made all haste to extirpate, with the sword of the Spirit, the thorny plants of modern growth—having sent in answer to our request to your Holiness men of the same name with Peter, the chief of the Apostles, to get together an Œcumenic Synod; who, when they arrived, were by our pious and most serene Sovereigns most graciously welcomed, and by their command were sent on to us, from

whom we received your epistles. And when we had said what was fitting for the occasion, we invited to conference those priestly men from the east, John and Thomas, men endued with knowledge and eloquence, and adorned with piety and gravity; for they having come from a distance were present at that time. And when all the God-loving Bishops of our diocese had met together, by the express will and the divine zeal of our most faithful Sovereigns, the Sessions of the Council commenced. But certain persons, stirred up by their frenzied imagination, having made a cabal amongst themselves, hindered us from holding our Session, and we remained under constraint quietly for one year. But, that time having passed over, our God-loving Bishops were once more assembled by command of our pious Sovereigns in the splendid metropolis of the Niceans in the eparchy of Bythinia. And we having taken as fellow companions both the God-beloved men your vicars, and those who had come from the East, went to the same metropolis. And when we were all seated we took Christ for our Head; for there was placed on a holy throne the *sacred* Gospels, which cried aloud to all our priestly assemblage which had met together '*Judge, just, judgment: judge ye between the holy Church of God and of this present innovation.*' And first we determined on reading the epistles from your Holiness with which we were all in ecstasy, being filled with delight with the spiritual food, as from a royal supper, which Christ had prepared for us who feasted on your letters, and which were as the eye guiding the whole body into the path of truth and recitude. Thus were the severed members even again firmly united—thus did the harmony of truth prevail—thus has the Catholic Church recovered her unity.

“After which followed the reading of the letters sent from the Eastern dioceses, which displayed the unsullied beauty of patristical tradition. And the power of truth was furthermore confirmed by the bringing forward for reading of very many passages from the fathers. All these things being done, the right and unblamable confession was confessed by all who were by God's will assembled together, which by us has been sent to you, and has by relation been made known to our pious Sovereigns. And all the Heresiarchs of that wicked heresy, with all their followers who had continued thus to spend their lives without change, were condemned to similar expulsion from the Catholic Church with former heretics; but those who were still alive confessed the salvation by written libels. For Christ our God, the Rock on which we have been fixed, never hath permitted the coat which was woven from the top throughout—that is, the Church which has

been built upon Him—to be divided and torn asunder, and its members directed the way: and now that, wherefore with former heresies, the error of this new pravity of the Christianity-alanders which raged against holy images, He has subverted with the word of His grace and slain with the sword of the Spirit. And we have been fully satisfied, and we know from experience, that truth prevaileth over all and conquers according to Him who speaks the truth, and all that is opposed to her is as nothing; and it is very strong, so as to overcome every enemy and disperses the phalanxes of the opposers. For behold, behold, the lips of those who spoke falsely are put to silence and the mist of senseless vituperation is dispersed: the beauty of the doctrine hath shone forth, heretical wickedness being everywhere cast out. The Church hath inherited the world and hath obtained rest from the trials which assailed her; for thus immoveable and invincible, and against her the gates of hell and unbelief shall not prevail, as we have heard from our Lord's own words; and our mouth is filled with joy and our tongue with rejoicing, and we are made joyful in that Church over which the Lord has made us overseers.

“All this has been brought about, even as it pleased Christ our God who is over all, by means of our orthodox and most courageous Sovereigns; for they have set up images in every place, as well in the most illustrious temples as in the halls of their own palaces. To whom may the Lord our God grant a recompense, exalting the horn of their kingdom, as well for the peace of the Church as for the salvation of all Christians, and be their name blessed from generation to generation.—AMEN.”

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER,
Printer, Publisher, Engraver, Bookbinder, &c.
 "CHURCH AND STATE GAZETTE" OFFICE,
 342, STRAND, LONDON.

SPECIMEN OF PICA TYPE.

MR. PAINTER, in acknowledging the Patronage he has received from the Clergy and others, assures them that he will spare neither labour nor expence in conducting his business to the satisfaction of those who may favour him with their commands in PRINTING and PUBLISHING.

SPECIMEN OF SMALL PICA TYPE.

W. E. PAINTER is constantly increasing his Stock with the Newest FOUNTS of TYPE from the first Foundries; and, aided by Machinery, he undertakes Printing, in all its branches, to any extent, and upon terms as eligible as any other House.

SPECIMEN OF LONG PRIMER TYPE.

W. E. PAINTER respectfully offers his services to Authors and others desirous of Publishing, and will forward Estimates for Printing, Engraving, Lithography, Binding, Publishing, Advertising, &c.

SPECIMEN OF BOURGEOIS TYPE.

W. E. PAINTER, to assist Authors, has prepared a SPECIMEN SHEET OF SIZES OF TYPES, together with a Scale of Prices per sheet 8vo., 12mo., 18mo., &c.; so that by fixing the size of the type, and estimating the number of pages in the intended volume, the number of sheets required will be ascertained, and the probable expence of Printing and Paper. [TO BE HAD GRATIS.] Further particulars furnished on application.

SPECIMEN OF BREVIER TYPE.

W. E. PAINTER announces to CLERICAL AND LAY AUTHORS, that he undertakes to Print and Publish VOLUMES, SERMONS, &c., on condition of the parties taking not less than two hundred and fifty copies and upwards, at Trade price, for cash on delivery; W. E. P. incurring all risk, gratis copies, advertising &c.

Cost of Printing 500 Copies per Sheet, Demy, including good Paper.

CASH ON DELIVERY.

Size of Type.	16 pages 8vo.	24 pages 12mo.	35 pages 18mo.	64 pages 32mo.
Pica	£4 0 0	£4 4 0	£4 10 0	£4 18 0
Small Pica ...	4 4 0	4 10 0	4 17 0	5 5 0
Long Primer..	4 10 0	4 16 0	5 5 0	5 15 0
Bourgeois.....	4 16 0	5 5 0	5 12 0	6 0 0
Brevier.....	5 5 0	5 12 0	6 0 0	6 16 6

☉ Notes and Extracts in smaller type will be extra, according to quantity.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

History.

The Elements of the British Consti-

tion: intended to meet the Present Crisis, and to exhibit in their due relation the Legislative, Judicial, Ecclesiastical, Executive, Kingly, and Checking Powers of the State; with the Grounds on which the Constitution is founded. By the Rev. J. DUFF SCHOMBERG, of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Vicar of Polesworth, Warwickshire; Author of "The Theocratic Philosophy of English History," &c. &c. A New Edition, corrected, and double the size of the former Edition. In demy 12mo. cloth, 5s.—*This book has been adopted at King's College, London.*

The Moral Phenomena of Germany.

By THOMAS CARLYLE, Esq., of the Scottish Bar. 18mo. cloth, 4s.
CONTENTS.—Introduction—Government—Nobility—Society—The Learned—The Church—Conclusion.

The History of the Reformation in

SWITZERLAND. By ABRAHAM RUCHAT, Minister of the Gospel, and Professor of the Belles Lettres in the Academy of Lausanne. The First Four Volumes, to the year 1537. Abridged by the Rev. J. COLLINSON, M.A., Rector of Boldon, and Honorary Canon of Durham Cathedral. From the Edition of M. L. Vulliemin, in Seven Volumes, at Nyon, Switzerland, A.D. 1838. In one vol., demy 12mo. cloth, price 7s.

Questions on Church History, from

the earliest period to the present century. Addressed particularly to Young Persons. By EMMA M. KING. Demy 18mo. Second Edition, 2s. 6d.

The Druid's Talisman: a Legend of

the Peak: with other Poems. By the late Rev. JOHN MARSHALL, A.B., Curate of Long Whatton, Leicestershire. In one vol. 8vo. cloth, price 10s.

The History of England, in Amusing

Conversations between a Mother and her Daughter. By ANNE WOOTON. 12mo., price 4s. With a fine Engraving of her Majesty the Queen.

Life in Athens, in the Time of

PERICLES; illustrative of Ancient and Modern Democracy. From the German of J. H. Van Wessenberg. In small 8vo. cloth, price 6s. 6d.

Life of James Arnold, the Chartist.

18mo., 1s. 6d. paper; cloth 2s.

The Authority of the Services for the

Fifth of November—the Thirtieth of January—the Twenty-ninth of May—the Accession of the Sovereign, considered. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. Demy 8vo., in a neat wrapper, price 1s.

Parliamentary Errors: being a Short

Series of Letters addressed to the Editor of the *Church and State Gazette*. By the late JOHN POYNTER, Esq. 6d.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Prophecy.

NEW WORKS BY REV. JOHN HOOPER,
RECTOR OF ALBURY, SURREY.

Catholic Doctrine; or, a Word in SEASON. A New and considerably Enlarged Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, 12s

By the same Author,

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ; or, the Revelation of Jesus CHRIST; Minutely Interpreted, and Considered in Relation to the Church's Expectation of the Nearness of the Lord's Appearing and Kingdom. Also, AN INTERPRETATION of the WHOLE BOOK of DANIEL, showing its Connexion and Analogy with the REVELATION of ST. JOHN. A NEW EDITION. Demy 8vo., cloth, 10s.

The Ecclesia; or, the Called according to Christ Jesus. Also a DISSERTATION on the TIMES and SEASONS. 12mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ; or, the Kingdom of God in its PRESENT STATE and FUTURE MANIFESTATION. Demy 8vo. 1s. 4d.

The Translation; or, the Changing of the LIVING SAINTS, and their Deliverance from the Judgments which are Coming on the Earth. In demy 8vo., price 2s. 6d.; or bound in cloth with the "Kingdom," 3s. 6d.

The Advent; or, the Revelation, Appearing, and Coming of the Lord. 12mo., price 2d., or 12s. per hundred. Post free 4d.

Girdlestone's Notes on the Apocalypse. An Enquiry into the MYSTERY of the SEVEN STARS and SEVEN LAMP BRANCHES of the APOCALYPSE: whether the Seven Epistles to the Seven Angels have a Prophetic Sense, and whether the Sites of the Seven Churches have a Symbolic Signification: Illustrative, the one of the Chronology, the other of the Geography, of the Apocalypse. By HENRY GIRDLESTONE, B. A., Rector of Landford, Wilts. Demy 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Six Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse. By E. B. DENISON, M. A. Demy 12mo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

Dedicated, by permission, to the Duke of Newcastle, K.G., &c.

The Downfall of Popery is Founded on PROPHECY: a Sermon for the People of Great Britain. By A CLERGYMAN of the ESTABLISHED CHURCH. In 8vo., price 1s.

The Mystery of God's Dealing with the JEWS. By A. C. BARCLAY, Esq. In 18mo. cloth, price 2s.

By the same Author,

The Four Dispensations. Demy 12mo., price Fourpence. Post free Sixpence.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office orders for price as listed

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Prophecy.

Complete in Three Volumes octavo cloth, 12s. each; also in Fifteen Parts, 2s. 6d. each.

THE RETROSPECT.

The attention of the whole Catholic Body of the Baptised is earnestly directed to the fact that the calamitous year 1847 was predicted in THE RETROSPECT as far back as 1845, when the First Number of that publication issued from the press. The work consists of a connected Series of Interpretations from various parts of the Scripture Prophecies, all tending to prove that the awful judgments of the present year are the immediate precursors of the Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"THE RETROSPECT" contains an Enquiry into the Fulfilment of Prophecy during the last Twenty Years, and also how far the Church is thereby furnished with any good grounds for expecting the instant Coming of the Lord: being most earnestly addressed to every baptized man in Christendom, of every grade, class, and denomination, but most especially to those who are expecting the immediate appearing of their Lord. The argument of the Work will consist in the endeavour to prove that the Seventh and Last Vial of Wrath commences at the expiration of the celebrated prophecy of Daniel of the 2,300 years, when the Lord Himself appears; and that, as the 490 years (or 70 weeks) of that prophecy contained the prediction of the time of Christ's coming in humility, the 2,300 years mark the period of His coming in glory; and that the former prophecy of 490 years was given to Daniel, and to the Church through him, as the pledge and assurance of the latter, *for the vision is one.*

The work also contains a description of the condition of the Church after the translation of the Saints and during the pouring out of the Seventh and Last Vial, from A.D. 1847 to A.D. 1867. Also an endeavour to pourtray, from Scripture, the rise, growth, and final destruction of the last mystery of iniquity—the triple confederacy of the Dragon, the Infidel Antichrist, and the False Prophet, who, combined, shall succeed in deceiving the nations of Christendom. And, moreover, to submit to the consideration of the Church, that neither of the two parties who advocate the two extremes of the year-day and the literal-day system are sound apart and isolated from each other, but that both are true, if combined and taken together as one and indivisible truth. There is no interpretation like the interpretation of the truth itself; and surely the time is now come when the vision speaks too "plainly" to be misunderstood; so that "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."

Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy:

or, A DISSERTATION on the PROPHECIES, which treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times, and especially of its Second Moiety, or the Latter Three Times and a Half. By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital and Prebendary of Salisbury. Three vols., demy 12mo. price 24s.

A NEW EDITION, REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—Book I. Preliminary Matter. Book II. Preliminary Arrangement of the Prophecies which respect to the Great Period of the Seven Times.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—Book III. An Exposition of the Four Prophecies recorded by Daniel, which relate to the Period of Seven Times. Book IV. An Exposition of the First Portion of the Sealed or Larger Book of the Apocalypse.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.—Book V. An Exposition of the Little or Open Book of the Apocalypse. Book VI. An Exposition of the Second Portion of the Sealed or Larger Book of the Apocalypse. Appendix I. The Chronology of the Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. Appendix II. The Last Tribes of Israel.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Prophecy.

Tracts for the Tribulation ; or, a Last

Word to Christendom. Demy 8vo. Parts I, II., and III., 2s. each sewed.

CONTENTS :

- I. Introduction.
- II. Why have the Baptised not gone on to Perfection ?
- III. The Power of Word in Christian Men.
- IV. The Family under the Three Dispensations.
- V. The Family under the Three Dispensations.
- VI. The Family, a Garment to Meet the Lord in.
- VII. The Clergy and the Families of Christendom in their Mutnal Relations.
- VIII. The People—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.
- IX. The Church—Ministry, Priesthood, and Kingship.

“ The title of these ‘ Tracts ’ may require an explanation, and the authors are willing to give it, trusting that their readers will exercise Christian charity in their judgment, and pardon them for adding, with the writers of early times, that ‘ the judgment of a book is according to the capacity of the reader.’ ”

“ ‘ The Tribulation,’ or ‘ Time of Trouble,’ in the books of Daniel (xii. 4) and St. John (vii. 13), evidently point to a period of time in the Christian dispensation still future, although, we believe, at our very doors.

“ The authors are of no sect or party, and believe themselves to be in charity with all men, baptised and unbaptised, and apply the term ‘ Christian ’ to all baptised men, by whomsoever that holy rite has been administered.

“ Of the Jews they may, perhaps, have much to say by and bye ; but, for the present, Christendom will engage their attention—the baptised—the house of God—where judgment ever begins, and that without assigning geographical limits ; although, it is probable, Europe will be the stage on which ‘ The Tribulation ’ will be more especially seen to be manifested.

“ Although we plainly discern the imminence of that tempest before which all existing institutions must be uprooted to make way for better, it is not our part, nor the part of any of the children of God, to help on or encourage the catastrophe. That is the work of the Infidel, whose wages shall be that he perish in the wreck he has brought about. We had not even taken on ourselves to address our brethren, had it been only to tell them of our fears. Warnings of evil to come, without we can at the same time point out a way of escape, if they have any weight, only frighten men from their propriety and incapacitate them for the right use of their judgment. This is not our object ; but, because we believe that when clergy and kings—the means appointed of old for God to communicate with the baptised—as one corporation, shall be permitted for a time to succumb to the wicked one, there yet remains one and one only sanctuary within the reach of every man, rich or poor, learned or unlearned, against which that evil one shall never prevail : therefore we are bold to bespeak the attention and time of all those who honour the name and presence of the living God to what we have to propound in the following ‘ Tracts.’ ”

“ This new world, which we desire to explore with our readers, is that of man standing by faith in his family as the image of God ; and therein using all those means, appliances, and ordinances—all those powers and that experience which he has seen in the ages past pictured in the ministries of the Church and prized by the rulers of the State—we would see the baptized literally a society of kings and priests—‘ a peculiar people.’ We are levellers, but not radicals—we would level upwards, but not downwards—build up, but not destroy.”—*Introduction, Easter, 1847.*

Part IV. nearly ready.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Sermons.

Shepherd's Family and Parochial SERMONS. By the Rev. W. SHEPHERD, B.D., Rector of Margaret Roding, Chipping Ongar, Essex. Demy 8vo., embossed cloth, 10s. 6d.

Myers' Conciones Basilicæ: on the SECOND ADVENT. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. By the Select Preacher, the Rev. THOMAS MYERS, M.A., Late Scholar of Trinity College; Curate of Trinity Micklegate, York; and Chaplain to the Lord Viscount Lorton. 12mo. cloth, price 5s.

Mayd's Village Sermons. By the Rev. WILLIAM MAYD, M.A., Rector of Withersfield, Suffolk. In demy 8vo., cloth, price 7s.

Bailey's Duties of the Christian MINISTRY; with a View of the Primitive and Apostolical Church, and the Danger of Departure from its Doctrine and Discipline. By the Rev. B. BAILEY, M.A., Senior Colonial Chaplain of Ceylon. 12mo., cloth 8s.

A Series of Discourses on Practical and DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS. By the Rev. WILLIAM DOW, A.M. 8vo., price 10s. 6d. cloth.

Allport's Sabbath Sanctification and its Blessedness. A Sermon preached in St. James', Ashted, Birmingham. By the Rev. J. ALLPORT. 8vo., price 1s.

Rational Conviction the Ground-work of Faith; Good Works its Superstructure. A Course of Four Sermons. By a GRADUATE of OXFORD. 8vo., 3s.

Loyalty and Religion the Safeguard of the Nation: a Sermon preached before the Members of a Friendly Society, on Tuesday, August 1, 1848. By the Rev. B. BANNING, M.A., Vicar of Wellington, and Rector of Eyton, Salop. Demy 8vo., price 1s. 6d.

Apostolic Doctrine and Fellowship. A SERMON. By the Rev. CHARLES CAULFIELD, A.B., T.C.D. 1s.

Emerton's Church Extension—Sermons on Church Building. By the Rev. J. A. EMERTON, D.D., late Curate of Hanwell, Middlesex. In 12mo. cloth, 3s.

Also, by the same Author,

The Discipline of the Church in the CHOICE OF HER MINISTERS. In octavo, price 1s.

Irons' Received Faith; a Farewell Sermon, preached at St. Peter's, Walworth. By the Rev. W. J. IRONS, M.A. Octavo, price 1s. 6d.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Sermons.

Day's Sermons. Preached in the Parish Church of Mendlesham. By the Rev. H. T. DAY, LL.B., Clare Hall, Cambridge. Small octavo, cloth, price 5s.

Holmes' Mystery of the Lord's Supper EXPOUNDED. Being a Sermon, with Preface and Notes. By the late Rev. WILLIAM A. HOLMES, D.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Cashel, and Rector of the Union of Templemore. Demy 8vo., price 1s. 4d.

Horn's Exhortation to the Belief and PRACTICE of REAL RELIGION. Revised by the Rev. T. HORN, M.A. Demy 18mo. cloth, 2s.

Gee's Zeal for the Lord of Hosts : a Visitation Sermon preached in the Abbey Church of St. Alban's, at the Visitation of the Venerable C. P. Burney, D.D., Archdeacon of St. Alban's, May 28, 1845. By the Rev. RICHARD GEE, A.M., Vicar of Abbot's Langley, Herts. Published at the request of the Clergy present. Octavo, 1s.

Leger's Profession of the True Faith. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Norwich. By WILLIAM NASSAU LEGER, A.B., Incumbent of St. Mary's at the Tower, Ipswich. In 8vo., black glazed paper cover, price 1s.

Evans' Christ's Prayer for Christian UNITY : a Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary, Builth. By the Rev. ALFRED BOWEN EVANS, Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, St. George's in the East. 8vo. 1s.

Bowstead's Village Wake, or the Feast of the Dedication : its Religious Observance a Bond of Union between the Higher and Lower Classes : a Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Messingham. By the Rev. JOHN BOWSTEAD, M.A. 8vo. 1s.

Burnet's Act conducive to Religion : a Sermon preached at St. James', Galick-Hythe. By the Rev. THOMAS BURNET, D.D., F.R.S., Rector. 8vo., 1s.

Dedicated, by permission, to the Right Hon. the Earl of Ellesmere.

Home ; or, the Friend of his Family the FRIEND of GOD. By the Rev. EDWARD GIRDLESTONE, M.A. In demy 18mo., cloth, 2s.

Jackson's Scriptural View of the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. By the Rev. JEREMIAH JACKSON, M.A., Vicar of Elm-cum-Emneth. Cambridge. 8vo., price 1s.

The Bread of Life ; the Sacramental Mystery Unveiled. The Sixth Chapter of the Gospel by St. John the Evangelist Illuminated. Demy 18mo., 2s. 6d.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Popery, Tractarianism, and Dissent.

Horne's Popery Delineated in a

brief Examination and Confutation of the Unscriptural and Anti-scriptural Doctrines and Practices Maintained and Inculcated by the Modern Church of Rome, in the unrescinded Decrees of her Councils and Canon Law, and in her acknowledged Formularies of Faith and Worship. Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. Demy 18mo. cloth, 3s.

By the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B.D.,
Canon of St. Paul's, and Rector of the United Parishes of Saint Edmund the King and Martyr, and Saint Nicholas Acons, Lombard-street.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

Popery the Enemy and Falsifier of

SCRIPTURE; or, Facts and Evidences, illustrative of the Conduct of the Modern Church of Rome, in prohibiting the reading and circulation of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue; and also of the Falsification of the Sacred Text in translations of the Bible executed by Romanists. A New Edition, corrected and enlarged.

Second Edition, demy 18mo. cloth, price 2s.

Mariolatry; or, Facts and Evidences

demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome, derived from the testimonies of her Saints and Doctors, and from her Breviary, and other authorized Books of Devotion.

Second edition, corrected, with additions, in small octavo, cloth boards,
price 3s. 6d.,

Faber's Provincial Letters from the

County Palatine of Durham, exhibiting the Nature and Tendency of the Principles put forth by the Writers of the Tracts for the Times, and their various Allies and Associates. Second Edition. Two vols. 12mo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D.,
Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury.

Roman Fallacies and Catholic Truths.

By the Rev. TOWNSEND POWELL, A.M., Vicar of Stretton-on-Dunsmore.

Containing, Preface—Roman Tactics. Angel Worship; Saint Worship; Canonization of Saints; Worship of the Virgin Mary; Image Worship; Relic Worship; Adoration of the Cross; Adoration of the Host. Appendix—Answer to all Objections. Supplement—the Catholic the Old Religion, or the Fallacies of Pope Pius's Creed. 12mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

England under the Popish Yoke,

from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1534.

By the Rev. C. E. ARMSTRONG, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford:
Master of Hemsworth Hospital, &c. 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

Papists Saved or Damned? A Dia-

logue between a Protestant and a Catholic. Extracted from the works of W. Cooper, Bishop of Galloway, 1623. Revised by the Rev. C. Marshall, Curate of St. Thomas's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool. 2L, or 12s. per 100. Post free 4d.

The above Books sent post free at the prices affixed, paid by a post office order.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Popery, Tractarianism, and Dissent.

Lateinos: proved to be the only so-

lution of St. John's Enigma and Vision, Rev. xiii. 16, 17, 18, and xvii. (accompanied by a pictorial Chart); showing the Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Papal Kingdom: the whole being a refutation of the opinions of Daubuz, Wrangham, Faber, Bishop Burgess, Clarke, Elliott, Professors Lee, Ewald, Benary, Stuart, Dr. Thom, Cardinal Bellarmine, Bishop Wiseman, &c. By the Rev. REGINALD RABETT, M.A. Demy 8vo., 12s.

The Revolutions of 1848: a Recom-

mencement of the Judgments upon the Papacy. By CHARLES CAMERON, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, Vicar of Swaby, Lincolnshire. 18mo. 2s.

English and German Seceders; or,

the Friends and Foes of Rome. By A CLERGYMAN. 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

Archbishop Murray's Douay and

Rhemish Bible, and the Bordeaux New Testament. Four Letters addressed to the Rev. Theobald Mathew (commonly called Father Mathew): containing Strictures on Some passages in the above-mentioned Publications; with Remarks on certain extraordinary features in the Romish System hitherto little noticed; with an Appendix, containing a Transcript of the Title-page and Authorisations of the Copy of the Bordeaux Testament, in the Library of the Dean and Chapter, at Durham. By PHENIX, author of "Letters in the Churchman's Magazine." Demy 18mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Church of England Independent

of the CHURCH of ROME in all AGES.

By the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, M.A., Curate of Llanfor, Merionethshire. "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." Demy 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

Dedicated, by Permission, to the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, M.A., Incumbent of St. Jude's, Liverpool.

Popery not "the Old Religion." By

A Member of the Church of England; Author of "Puseyism, or Anglo-Catholicism, Briefly Considered." &c. In demy 8vo., price 6d., or 20s. per hundred. Post free 8d.

Dissent and its Inconsistencies. A

Manual for all Classes. By ALFRED BOWEN EVANS. 12mo., price 3s.

Unity! or, A Word to My Dissent-

ing Parishioners. By A CLERGYMAN. 18mo. cloth, 1s. Post free 1s. 2d.

Modern Miracles Condemned by

REASON and SCRIPTURE. With Strictures on Three Pamphlets recently published, viz.:—1. THE HAUNTED HOUSE at WILLINGTON. 2. MIRACULOUS CASE of MARY JOBSON. 3. THE ENTRANCED FEMALE. LETTERS from Dr. CLANNY; the Rev. GEO. CUBITT, Editor of the *Wesleyan Magazine*; and the Rev. R. YOUNG, in justification of his book. 18mo., price 1s. 6d.

The above Books, on receipt of a post office order, sent free at the prices affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratia.

Hopery, Tractarianism, and Dissent.

Dissenting Statistics in England;

showing that the Voluntary System has not and does not supply the means of Public Worship to one-fortieth portion of the whole Population. These Statistics are taken from the Figures and Facts of the Dissenters themselves, carefully compared with the Parish and Township Statistics of the Poor Law Commissioners, and the Population Returns of 1841. Demy 18mo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.

Reply to Mr. Baptist Noel's Essay

against the UNION of CHURCH and STATE. By the Rev. C. GILLMOT, M.A., Vicar of Dartford. Second Edition, enlarged, cloth, 5s., sent post free for 5s. 6d., remitted in postage stamps.

A Guide to Family Devotion, in a

Series of Supplications, Prayers, and Thanksgivings. By the Rev. EDMUND BAKER. Second Edition. Post 8vo., price 2s. 6d.

The One Hope of All Believers,

as set forth in the Holy Scriptures; a Word for Warning and Strengthening in an Evil Day. From the German. By C. P. P. 12mo., 6d. Post free 8d.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's

Sister not contrary to God's Law. A Letter addressed, by permission, to the Lord Bishop of Worcester, in reply to the Rev. E. S. Foulkes' three Letters on this subject. By the Rev. G. D. WHEELER, M.A., late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, Rector of Bancheston, and Vicar of Wolford, Warwickshire. 8vo. 1s.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's

Sister. A Letter to the Rev. E. S. Foulkes, in reply to his "Few Words." By the Rev. G. D. WHEELER, M.A. 8vo. 2d.

An Enquiry into the Currency; in

which the Measures of 1819 and 1844 are fully considered: the Schemes of Lord Ashburton and Mr. Caley examined; and Suggestions made towards an Improvement of the System. By J. D. SCHOMBERG, B.A., Vicar of Polesworth, author of "Elements of the British Constitution." 8vo., 1s.

The Scrip; or, Smooth Stones out

of the BROOK for the forehead of ISM, the modern Goliath, and his Sons—Sch-ism, Roman-ism, Liberal-ism, Auto-ism, Despot-ism, Nepot-ism, and Eupheu-ism. By SIGMABETAPHILUS. Demy 8vo. 2s.

New Principles for the Poor. By the

Rev. HENRY HARDINGE, Rector of Theberton, Suffolk. Foolscap octavo, cloth, price 3s.

Contents: Introduction—Locality—Education—Manners—Subordination—Marriage—Parental Obligations—Religion—Politics—Conclusion.

Immanuel; or, the Mystery of the

Incarnation of the Son of God. Unfolded by JAMES USHER, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh. Reprinted from the folio edition of 1647. 18mo., cloth 2s.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price a fixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

On the first day of January, April, July, and October, price 6s., **THE Church of England Quarterly Review.**

The Publisher of **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW**, in calling the attention of the Clergy and the Public to the present number of that Review, which completes the **TWENTY-FOURTH** Volume, desires to offer his thanks for their continued and increasing support. During the last **TWELVE** years in which the Review has been established, the opinions of the press have been beyond example favourable, and it is to be hoped that a Periodical, professing sound constitutional principles of liberty and order, will continue to receive that patronage which it well merits, *at this crisis*, from all true lovers of their country. The principles of **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW** are derived from those truths which, based on the oracles of the Lord, are in the keeping of our Apostolical and Episcopal Church. To save that revered Establishment from the subversion meditated by open and covert enemies, many of the most eminent Literati of the day, both Lay and Clerical, have resolved to devote all their energies, and the pages of **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW** present to the world indubitable evidence of their zeal, ability, and, under God's blessing, their **TRiumPH**.

When it is considered that **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW** is patronized by the highest Dignitaries in the Church, and comes under the notice of persons of rank, opulence, and respectability, it must be acknowledged to be an excellent medium for publicity to Advertisers of all classes.

A few perfect sets of **THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW** remain on hand, in Twenty-four Vols., cloth boards 12s., or in half calf extra, 15s. each.

. Back numbers may be obtained to complete sets.

Lord John Manners' Speech on the LAWS OF MORTMAIN. In Demy 8vo., price 6d. Post free 8d.

Lord John Manners' Monastic and MANUFACTURING SYSTEMS. In octavo, price 1s.

Sir Thomas More—"And which, Montesinos, would, in your eyes, be the more melancholy object of contemplation—the Manufactory, or the Convent?" *Southey's Colloquies.*

Lord John Manners' Plea for NATIONAL HOLY-DAYS. In octavo, price 1s., Second Edition.

Lord John Manners' Question to LORD EDWARD HOWARD—"What are the English Roman Catholics to Do?" Octavo, price 1s.

Mr. Disraeli's Speech on the New Parliamentary Reform Motion of Mr. Hume. 8vo., price 2d.

Mr. Disraeli's Speech on the Labours of the Session. 8vo. price 6d. Post free 8d.

Letter to Lord John Russell on CHURCH REFORM; with reference to the Convocation, the Bishops, the Chapters, and the Clergy; showing also how 700,000*l.* per annum may be obtained for supplying the wants of the Church. By a Curate of the Diocese of Exeter. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

The above Books sent post free on receipt of a post office order for price affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Miscellaneous.

A Voice from the Holy Land; purporting to be the Letters of a Centurion, written in the days of the Emperor Tiberius. Edited by the Rev. EDWARD MANGIN, M.A. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 4s.

Sacred Geology; or, the Scriptural ACCOUNT of the WORLD'S CREATION MAINTAINED; and Reasons assigned for Questioning that Geological Hypothesis, concerning the Sedimentary Formation of Strata, from whence the Inference has been drawn that inconceivably long Periods of Time elapsed between each of these Formations, and before the Creation of Man. 12mo., cloth, 7s.

The Doctrine of Baptism, as maintained by the Church of England. By the Rev. J. D. SCHOMBERG, B.A., Vicar of Polesworth. In 8vo., 2s.

The Ceremony of Turning to the ALTAR, during the Repetition of the Creeds only, condemned, as being unauthorized by the Rubrics, and inconsistent with the usage of the Ancient Church. 1s.

The Church not yn Dayngere.
A Boke about ye Queene's Majestie: ye verie goode Lorde Joban Roussele: the Lordis Bysshops yn doloure: ye famouse Universtie offe Oxforde: and Paradyse offe foolis menne: ye goode People of Englande, in sine wyse troubled: norre dismaied: Ywrytten yn ye Italyenne Cloysterre at Oxford: for ye Queene; Eider-menne; Abbottes and Knightes offe these royaumes. In demy 8vo., pice 1s.

The Principle and Direction of SOCIETIES for PROMOTING RELIGIOUS and USEFUL KNOWLEDGE. By the Rev. JOHN GARBETT, M.A. In 18mo. cloth, price 2s.

Hints from a Schoolmistress to Mothers, Daughters, and Governesses, on the Practical Application of the Principles of Education. In small octavo, price 4s. 6d.

Thoughts on the Litany, Edited by the Rev. GEORGE HEATON, M.A. Demy 12mo. cloth, 6s.

Remarks on Orthodox Preaching As regards Modern Objections and Misrepresentations. Demy 8vo. 8d.

Remarks on Evangelical Preaching As exhibited in a Published Sermon of the Rev. Henry Melvill. 6d.

Faith and Works. The former does not, *per se*, necessarily beget the latter: both are necessary to Final Justification. Demy 8vo. 6d. Post free 8d.

The above Books, on receipt of a post office order, sent free at the prices affixed.

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

Poems.

Miscellaneous Poems : comprising

Hymns, Odes, and Rhymes; Religious and Secular, on Passing Events in the Life of an Old Sailor. By a RETIRED NAVAL COMMANDER, Aged, LXXV. 18mo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

Poems by the Rev. John Collinson, late Incumbent of Lamesley, in the County of Durham. Demy 18mo. 2s. 6d.

Dedicated, by permission, to H. R. II. Prince Albert.

Verses by a Poor Man. In foolscap 8vo., embossed cloth, price 3s.

Mount Grace Abbey. a Poem commemorating some of the Illustrious Acts of Edward III., the Black Prince, and other Founders of the Order of the Garter. By the Rev. JAMES HOLME, A.B. Foolscap octavo, price 5s. Dedicated to the Queen Dowager.

Pilgrim's Progress of John Bunyan VERSIFIED, in the Spenserian Stanza. In demy 12mo. cloth, price 5s.

Barbauld's Hymns in Prose, for Children. A New Edition, with ADDITIONAL HYMNS by a CLERGYMAN'S WIFE. Royal 18mo., price 1s. 4d.

Psalms and Hymns. A New Selection, designed for the use of Congregations, Schools, and Families. Royal 32mo. cloth, price 2s. (A liberal allowance to Clergymen taking a quantity).

Plain Hymns, with Supplementary POETRY: the latter containing Paraphrases on several Fundamental Portions and Passages of Scripture. By A ZION TRAVELLER. 18mo. cloth, 3s.

The Seasons Moralised. A Poem, in Four Parts. By J. C. 18mo., covers, 6d. Post free 8d.

The Second Temple. a Dramatic Poem. Small octavo cloth, price 4s.

Athanase: A Dramatic Poem. In demy 12mo., 2s. 6d.

Poems of Girlhood. By Anne Garton. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4s.

Green Leaves; or, Lays of Boyhood. By the Rev. C. COLLINS, M.A. Foolscap 8vo., cloth 3s.

Tracts for the Last Days. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 9s.

The above Books sent, post free, for the prices affixed, by post office order

Painter's Specimens of Types and Prices for Authors sent Gratis.

The Largest Church of England Newspaper.

UNDER EPISCOPAL PATRONAGE.

THE CHURCH AND STATE GAZETTE.

(THE CHURCHMAN'S FAMILY NEWSPAPER).

Published every Friday Evening, in time for Post, price Sixpence.

In professing a desire to maintain the union of Church and State, we exclude all principles and views hostile to the Established Institutions of the empire. We have no sympathy either with the Adversaries of the Reformation, or with the Champions of the Reformation, in opposition to primitive truth. We war against all doctrines the tendencies whereof are, on the one hand, to *Popery*, and, on the other hand, to *Dissent and Sectarianism*. We support the *State* as the nursing-parent of the *Church*, and the *Church* as the guide and counsellor of the *State*. We believe that the empire has prospered, under Divine Providence, in proportion as *Church* and *State* have understood and fulfilled these their respective functions—in proportion as they have appreciated the design of their union—in proportion as each has strengthened each—and especially in proportion as the *State* has become religious.

The Conductors—grateful for the support received from the Clergy and Laity of the *Moderate* or *Via Media* portion of the Church of England during the last seven years—have the pleasure to announce that their steady and firm advocacy of sound *Church and State* principles has secured for them the patronage of some of the Highest Dignitaries in the Church. The List of Subscribers now contains upwards of TWENTY ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.

Our influence depends upon our circulation—as the latter extends, so will the former increase. Every Subscriber who induces but *one friend* to add his name to our list makes an effort, which, fully carried out, would alone double our present circulation. We, therefore, call on the Clergy to assist us in upholding the Church against enemies on all sides.

The *Gazette* contains Original Articles on all Matters relating to Church and State, and the Leading Topics of the Day—Dissenting Tactics—Proceedings of the Romanists—Foreign and Colonial Intelligence—an Analysis of PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES—Correspondence of the Clergy—EPISCOPAL CHARGES—Ecclesiastical and University News, and all matters interesting to the Clergy and Laity—Reviews of Books, &c.—Charitable and Religious Societies—and a Miscellaneous Department replete with the most interesting facts.

† A few Sets may be had in cloth boards.

Terms, 26s. per year on credit—24s. if paid in advance, may be transmitted by a Post-office order, made payable at the Branch Post-office, 280, Strand, to William Edward Painter, 342, Strand, London.

A Specimen Copy will be sent, to post-paid applications, Gratis.

MR. PAINTER respectfully announces that—in consequence of the New Postal Arrangements, issued by the Postmaster-General, “that Books, Magazines, Reviews, and Pamphlets, may be transmitted, through the Post-office, to all parts of the United Kingdom, at the rate of Sixpence per pound”—all Books published by him will be forwarded, by return of post, direct from his Office, 342, Strand, London, FREE OF ANY CHARGE, to applications accompanied by Post-office Orders, payable to WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, at the Post-office, 280, Strand, for the published price of the Books required.



3 2044 019 278 563

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-2413

WIDENER
WIDENER
FEB 10 1999
SEP 20 1999
BOOK DUE
CANCELLED

WIDENER
WIDENER
OCT 05 2002
OCT 09 2002
MAY 22 2001
APR 20 2001
BOOK DUE
BOOK DUE
CANCELLED
CANCELLED

WIDENER
WIDENER
APR 29 2000
APR 29 2000
BOOK DUE
BOOK DUE
CANCELLED
BL
ED

