

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
HISTORICAL

**HISTORY OF THE
COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH
VOL. 5**

by Charles Hefele

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Version 1.0 © 1997

A HISTORY
OF THE
COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH,
FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.
BY THE
RIGHT REV. CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, D.D.,
*Late Bishop Of Rottenburg, Formerly Professor Of Theology In
The University Of Tubingen.*
VOLUME 5.
A.D. 626 TO THE CLOSE OF THE SECOND
COUNCIL OF NICAIA, A.D.. 787.

Translated from the German, with the Author's approbation, and Edited by

WILLIAM R. CLARK, M.A., HON. LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.,

*Professor Of Philosophy In Trinity College, Toronto; Hon.
Professor In Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y.*

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

IT is now more than a quarter of a century since the present Editor proposed the publication of an English translation of a part of Hefele's great *History of the Councils* to Mr. T. Clark (now Sir Thomas Clark, Bart.), who was at that time senior partner of the publishing firm which has done so much for the promotion of theological learning in Great Britain. Mr. Clark readily recognized the importance of the historical method in the study of theology, and the supreme place held by the Church Councils in the development of Christian doctrine; and, without any great hope of financial success, consented to publish the first volume. It is quite intelligible that this should have obtained the largest circulation; but the sale of the later volumes leads to serious doubts as to the nature of the contemporaneous study of theology. It is true that most of our leading British scholars are acquainted with German, and that a French translation of the earlier volumes (only of the first edition, however) has been published. Still, it would appear that a great many who have some pretensions to be theologians are contented with second or third rate authorities on these great subjects.

It is with much thankfulness that the Editor is now able to send forth the completion of the original design, by bringing the work down to the close of the second Council of Nicaea, the last which has been recognized alike by East and West. In closing the work at this point, neither the Editor nor the Publishers wish to imply that the subsequent Councils are unworthy of study. There is no break in history, civil or religious; and if any other translators or publishers should undertake to bring out the history of the Mediaeval Councils, they will have the best wishes of those who have carried the work thus far. But it will be apparent that we have arrived at a convenient period for the suspension of our own work.

It was pointed out in the Preface to the third volume, that the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies were not mere strifes of words, which the Church might have evaded without loss. The toleration of either of these heresies would have involved the surrender of the Nicene faith. Whether the Monothelite controversy was of equal importance may be a matter of doubt; but at least it was not a mere logomachy. The contending parties knew perfectly well what they were fighting about; and a careless reader

who pronounces the controversy to be either unmeaning or unintelligible, will be wiser if he takes a little more trouble to wrestle with the terms and phrases in dispute before he finally adopts this conclusion.

To many readers, the most interesting portion of this volume will be that which deals with the difficult case of Honorius, which caused some embarrassment to the Fathers of the Vatican Council. Whatever our own judgment may be in regard to the orthodoxy of Honorius, it can hardly be denied that Hefele has dealt quite fairly and consistently with the subject. The claim which he makes in the Preface which follows will be allowed by all careful readers of the volume.

Some critics of previous parts of the history have expressed surprise that the Editor has not more frequently annotated the statements of the Author. Such a temptation has frequently occurred; but it was thought better, where no question of fact was involved, to leave the Author to speak for himself, his point of view being quite well understood. Moreover, we believe that history is the best controversialist. When we compare the letter of S. Leo to the fourth Oecumenical Council with that of Pope Agatho to the sixth, it becomes quite clear that an explanation of the difference must be attempted from two opposite points of view.

The Iconoclastic Controversy is perhaps that part of the history in which the Author shows most of bias. A short postscript has been added, giving some further particulars, and continuing the history of the conflict to its virtual conclusion in the Greek and Latin Churches; but this also, as far as possible, in a purely historical spirit.

It is with much satisfaction that we have found room, in this volume, for the corrections which the Author introduced into the second edition of the first volume. The bishop complained that this was not done in our own second edition; but the reason was very simple: this was printed before the sheets kindly forwarded by the Author reached us. The reader will now possess the whole history, as far as it goes, with the latest corrections and improvements of the Author.

In conclusion, the Editor must acknowledge the generous recognition in many quarters of the work which has been accomplished. Those who have labored on the translation have done their best to make it exact, accurate, and readable. The last two volumes have been brought out in the midst of many other engrossing occupations; yet it is believed that few slips will be

discovered. For any notice of these we shall be thankful, as in the past. In this connection we desire gratefully to acknowledge a very careful, learned, and just review of the fourth volume in the *Church Times*, and another, no less scholarly and helpful, in the New York *Churchman*.

The Editor again acknowledges the help of the same accomplished friend who assisted in previous volumes. For words and phrases within square brackets, the Editor alone is responsible.

And now our work is done; and we commit it to the Church, with the sure hope that it will lead men to a better understanding of “the Faith once delivered to the saints,” and so will help forward the time when we shall “all attain unto the unity of the faith, and unto the knowledge of the Son of God.”

W.R.C.

Advent, 1895.

NOTE ON INDICTION.

THE frequent designation of dates in this volume by the word *Indiction* seems to require a few words of explanation. The word signifies primarily, a “declaration,” and in particular, “a declaration or imposition of a tax,” and finally, “a space of fifteen years.” It appears in this sense for the first time about the middle of the fourth century, followed by a numeral from 1 to 15. Originally it meant a “notice of a tax on real property,” an assessment. From this it came to mean the year on which the tax was assessed, beginning September 1, the epoch of the imperial fiscal year. “It seems that in the provinces, after Constantine, if not earlier, the valuation of property was revised upon a census taken at the end of every fifteen years. From the strict observance of this fiscal revaluation there resulted a marked term of fifteen years, constantly recurrent, the *Circle of Indictions*, which became available for chronological purposes as a ‘period of revolution’ of fifteen years, each beginning September 1, which (except in the Spanish peninsula) continued to be used as a character of the year, irrespectively of all reference to taxation.” See *Dict. of Antiquities*, s.v., where authorities are given. What is further necessary will be found in the text of the History.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

A MERE glance at the number of pages in this new edition (800 instead of 732) will show that it may be properly called an *enlarged* edition of this portion of the *History of the Councils*. Whether I am justified also in designating it as an *improved* edition, my respected readers will be in a position to judge after they have examined sections 284, 285, 289, 290, 296, ^{fi} 298, ^{fi} 314, 1 324, ^{fi} 360, 362, 366, 367, 368, 370, 374, 375, 378, 383, 384, 399, and 406-408. Several ancient councils not previously known have now been inserted in their proper place, many new investigations have been made use of, many earlier mistakes and defects have been rectified. The most important alterations are introduced into the sections which refer to Boniface, the apostle of the Germans, and to Pope Honorius I Occasion for the former was given by the recent investigations of H. Hahn, Dunzelmann, Oelsner, Alberdingk-Thijm, and others. With regard to the modifications made in reference to Pope Honorius, I have thought it fair to distinguish clearly every departure of the second edition from the first, which was in any way important. Even in the first edition, as well as in the Latin memorial [prepared for the Vatican Council], *Causa Honorii Papoe*, I laid down as my conclusion: That Honorius thought in an orthodox sense, but unhappily, especially in his first letter to the Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, he had expressed himself in a Monothelite manner. This position I still hold firmly; but I have also given repeated fresh consideration to the subject, and have weighed what others have more recently written; so that I have now modified or entirely abandoned many details of my earlier statements; and, especially with regard to the first letter of Honorius, I now form a more favorable judgment than before.

It remains incontestable that Honorius himself made use of the Monothelite expression *una voluntas* (in Christ), and that he disapproved the shibboleth of orthodoxy, 350 duo egergeiai (*duoe operationes*), but he did both under a misunderstanding, since, at the beginning of the great dogmatic conflict, he had not clearly enough comprehended the two terms. That, in spite of the unhappy, heretically sounding expression, he *thought* in an orthodox sense, as already remarked, I maintained before; but I must now add that, in several passages of both his letters, he did not endeavor to *express* the orthodox thought.

When, for example, in his first letter, he ascribes to Christ; the *Lex Mentis*, he, in accordance with the Pauline manner of speech (~~cf.~~ Romans 7:23), which he followed, meant nothing else than the incorrupt *human* will of Christ, so that *eo ispo* he maintained two wills in Christ — this *human* will and also the divine.

If, nevertheless, Honorius would allow only *unam voluntatem* in Christ, he understood by this the *moral* unity of the incorrupt human will with the divine will in Christ. No less do we find, even in the first letter of Honorius, indications that he himself assumed two energies or *operationes* in Christ [†](see below, p. 40); but he expresses himself much better on the subject in his second letter, when he writes: “The divine nature in Christ works that which is divine, and the human nature accomplishes that which is of the flesh,” *i.e.*, there are two energies or *operationes* to be distinguished in Christ. As, however, Honorius himself made use of the Monothelite expression *una voluntas*, and disapproved of the orthodox *due ejergeiai*, he seemed to support Monothelitism, and thereby actually helped to promote the heresy.

As in the first edition, so also now I hold firmly that neither the letters of Honorius nor the Acts of the sixth Oecumenical Council, which condemned him, have been falsified; but also, notwithstanding the objections of the Roman Professor Pennacchi (see sec. 324), for whom personally I have a great respect, I still maintain the Oecumenical character of those sessions which pronounced anathema on Honorius; and I come to the conclusion, that the Council kept to the mere words of the letters of Honorius which they had before them, to the fact that he himself made use of the heretical term and disapproved of the orthodox phrase, and on this ground pronounced his sentence. In earlier times, tribunals generally troubled themselves much more with the mere *facts* than with psychological considerations. Moreover, it did not escape the sixth Oecumenical Council, that some passages in the letters of Honorius were in contradiction to his apparent Monothelitism (see sec. 324). With greater accuracy than the Council, Pope Leo II. pointed out the fault of Honorius, showing that, instead of checking the heresy at its very beginning by a clear statement of the orthodox doctrine, he helped to promote it by *negligentia* (cf. sec. 324). ^{f2}

CONTENTS.

BOOK 16

THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSIES AND THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

CHAPTER 1

THE OCCURRENCES BEFORE THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

Sec. 291. Rise of the Monothelite Heresy

Sec. 292. Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 626, and Transactions at Hierapolis, A.D. 629

Sec. 293. Cyrus of Alexandria unites the Monophysites

Sec. 294. Sophronius comes to the defense of Dyothelitism

Sec. 295. The seeming *Juste Milieu* of Sergius. He writes to Pope Honorius

Sec. 296. First Letter of Pope Honorius in the Monothelite Affair

Sec. 297. Synod at Jerusalem, A.D. 634, and Synodal Letter of the Patriarch Sophronius

Sec. 298. Second Letter of Honorius. His Orthodoxy

Sec. 299. The Ecthesis of the Emperor Heraclius, A.D. 638

Sec. 300. Two Synods at Constantinople, A.D. 638 and 639. Adoption of the Ecthesis

Sec. 301. Death of Pope Honorius. The Ecthesis is rejected at Rome

Sec. 302. The Synods of Orleans and Cyprus. Pope Theodore

Sec. 303. Abbot Maximus and his Disputation with Pyrrhus

- Sec. 304.** African and Roman Synods for the Condemnation of Monothelitism
- Sec. 305.** Paul of Constantinople writes to Pope Theodore
- Sec. 306.** The Typus
- Sec. 307.** Pope Martin I and the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649
- Sec. 308.** Letters of Pope Martin I
- Sec. 309.** Pope Martin I becomes a Martyr for Dyothelitism
- Sec. 310.** Abbot Maximus and his Disciples become Martyrs. The Doctrine of Three Wills
- Sec. 311.** Pope Vitalian

CHAPTER 2

THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

- Sec. 312.** The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus wishes for a Great Conference of Easterns and Westerns
- Sec. 313.** Western Preparatory Synods, especially at Rome, A.D. 680,
- Sec. 314.** The Deputies from Rome and the Letters with which they were furnished
- Sec. 315.** First Session of the Sixth Oecumenical Synod
- Sec. 316.** From the Second to the Seventh Session
- Sec. 317.** The Eighth Session
- Sec. 318.** Ninth and Tenth Sessions
- Sec. 319.** Eleventh and Twelfth Sessions
- Sec. 320.** Thirteenth Session
- Sec. 321.** From the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Session
- Sec. 322.** The Eighteenth Session
- Sec. 323.** The Pope and the Emperor confirm the Sixth Oecumenical Synod
- Sec. 324.** The Anathema on Pope Honorius, and the Genuineness of the Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council

BOOK 17

THE TIME FROM THE END OF THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL COUNCIL TO THE BEGINNING OF THE DISPUTE RESPECTING IMAGES.

Sec. 325. The Synods between A.D. 680 and 692

Sec. 326. Examination of the Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council

Sec. 327. The Quinisext or Trullan Synod, A.D. 692

Sec. 328. Judgment of Rome on the Trullan Canons

Sec. 329. The last Synods of the Seventh Century

Sec. 330. The Western Synods in the First Quarter of the Eighth Century

Sec. 331. In the East, Monothelitism is renewed and again suppressed

BOOK 18

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT IMAGES AND THE SEVENTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

CHAPTER 1

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT IMAGES UP TO THE CONVOCATION OF THE SEVENTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

Sec. 332. Origin of the Controversy about Images

Sec. 333. The first Synods in the Controversy about Images

Sec. 334. John of Damascus

Sec. 335. The Emperor Constantine Copronymus

Sec. 336. The Mock-Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 754

Sec. 337. Carrying out of the Synodal Decrees. Abbot Stephen

- Sec. 338.** The States of the Church threatened from the beginning by the Greeks
- Sec. 339.** The Cruelties of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus
- Sec. 340.** Three Patriarchs in the East are in favor of the Images
- Sec. 341.** The Franks and the Synod of Gentilly, A.D. 767
- Sec. 342.** Contests for the Holy See
- Sec. 343.** The Lateran Synod, A.D. 769
- Sec. 344.** The Emperor Leo IV.

CHAPTER 2

THE SEVENTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD AT NICAEA, a.d. 787.

- Sec. 345.** The Empress Irene makes Preparations for the Convocation of an Oecumenical Synod
- Sec. 346.** The First Attempt at the holding of an Oecumenical Synod Miscarries
- Sec. 347.** Convocation of the Synod of Nicaea
- Sec. 348.** The First Session of Nicaea
- Sec. 349.** The Second Session
- Sec. 350.** The Third Session
- Sec. 351.** The Fourth Session
- Sec. 352.** The Fifth Session
- Sec. 353.** The Sixth Session
- Sec. 354.** The Seventh Session
- Sec. 355.** The Eighth Session
- Sec. 356.** The Canons of the Seventh Oecumenical Synod
- Sec. 357.** The rest of the Synodal Acts
- Sec. 358.** Sketch of the Occurrences in the East until the beginning of the Reign of Leo the Armenian

POSTSCRIPT ON THE ICONOCLASTIC cONTROVERSY

APPENDIX.

Corrections and Additions to the First Volume of the *History of the Councils*, taken from the Second German Edition;

Errata to Volume 4

Alphabetical List of the Synods

BOOK 16

The Monothelite Controversies And The Sixth Oecumenical Synod.

CHAPTER 1

The Occurrences Before The Sixth Oecumenical Synod.

SEC. 291. RISE OF THE MONOTHELITE HERESY.

IN order to preserve entire the two natures in Christ, the divine and the human, the Nestorians had sacrificed the true unity of the Person. But in order, again, to save the latter, the permanent duality of the natures was given up by the Monophysites, and the proposition was maintained, that Christ was *of* two natures, but that after the union of these at the Incarnation we should speak only of one nature. In opposition to both these errors, it was necessary to maintain both the duality of the natures and the unity of the Person, and the one as strongly as the other; and this was done by the Council of Chalcedon, by the doctrine, that both natures were united in the *one* Person of the Logos without *confusion*, and without *change*, without severance and without separation (vol. 3, sec. 193).

The Council of Chalcedon had spoken only in general of the two natures which are united in Christ, and a series of new questions necessarily arose, when the two natures came to be considered apart in their elements and in their powers, and an attempt was made to determine their special character in Christ. A standard for this inquiry was indeed given *implicite* in the words of the Council of Chalcedon: "The property of each nature remains"; and in the passage of the celebrated dogmatic epistle of S. Leo to Flavian: "Agit enim utraque forma (nature) cum alterius communione, quod proprium est." But only a part of the orthodox understood how to draw the proper conclusions from this statement. The others did not penetrate into the sense of the words, and however often they repeated them, they remained for them a fruit, the shell of which they did not break so as to reach the kernel.

The question concerning the special character of the two particular elements and powers of the natures united in Christ was, chronologically, first raised by the Monophysites, in their controversies as to whether the *body* of Christ had been corruptible, and whether His (human) *soul* had been ignorant of anything. For Monophysites who had let slip the human nature of Christ, it was obviously not admissible to inquire respecting the *human soul* of Christ, and the Agnoetae were therefore excommunicated by their former associates, because the hypothesis of *ajnoein* must lead, as a consequence, to the acceptance of the two natures. It was, however, natural that the orthodox should also take notice of the controversies of the Monophysites, and resolve them from their own point of view. From the question respecting the *knowledge* of Christ, however, there is only a step to that respecting His *willing* and *working*: and we can well understand that, apart from all exciting cause from without, and apart from all foreign aims, *e.g.*, those which were eirenical, the dogmatic development would of itself have led to the question: “What is the relation between the divine and human wills in Christ?” If an eirenic aim came in, and it was thought that, by a certain solution of this question, the long-wished-for union between the orthodox and the Monophysite might be brought about, the interest in this inquiry must naturally have been infinitely increased. But this influence of the practical element, on the other hand, destroyed the dispassionateness and calm of the inquiry, and gave occasion to the Monothelite controversy, the course of which must now engage our attention.^{f3}

Heraclius, Byzantine Emperor since 610, soon after the first years of his reign, was forced to see how the Persians renewed the expeditions which they had begun under his predecessor Phocas; how in repeated aggressions they seized and plundered many Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, laid waste Syria and Jerusalem, sold 90,000 Christians to Jews, bore the Patriarch Zacharias of Jerusalem into captivity, and plundered immense quantities of valuables, among them a part of the holy cross (A.D. 616). Soon afterwards (A.D. 619) they plundered Egypt, wasted Cappadocia, and besieged Chalcedon within sight of Constantinople. Heraclius wished to conclude a peace, but the Persian King Chosroes II. gave to the Greek ambassadors the insolent answer: “Your master must know that I will hear of no conditions, until he with his subjects shall abandon the crucified God and worship the Sun, the great God of the Persians.” Heraclius, on this, took courage, and, concluding a peace with the Avari, etc., put himself at the head of a great army, and set out for the East against the Persians, on

Easter Monday, 622, and, taking Armenia first, attacked them with success in their own country.^{f4}

Whilst he was in Armenia, as Sergius of Constantinople relates in his letter to Pope Honorius, “there came to him Paul, the leader of the Severians (Monophysites), and addressed to him a discourse in defense of his heresy, whereupon the Emperor, who, by God’s grace, was well versed in theological questions, opposed the heresy, and confronted the impious subtlety with the unadulterated dogmas of the Church, as their faithful champion. Among these he mentioned the *mia ejesgeia* of Christ, our true God, *i.e.* that there were not in Christ two kinds of activities or operations to be distinguished, one divine and one human.^{f5} This was the utterance of the Shibboleth of Monothelitism, consisting in this, that the human nature of Christ, united with the divine, possessed indeed all the *proprieties* of manhood, as the Council of Chalcedon teaches, but that it does not *work*, but that all the operation and activity of Christ proceeds from the Logos, and that the human nature is only its instrument herein.

Pagi (*ad ann.* 622, n. 2 and 3) and Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 19 and 103) have so represented the matter as to make it appear as though the doctrine of the *mia ejesgeia* had not been uttered by the Emperor in opposition to Paul, but that Paul himself had given expression to it, and had won the Emperor to that side. This is incorrect, and is derived from an erroneous explanation of the authorities. Entirely without foundation, therefore, is the reproach brought by Walch (S. 103) against Combefis, who rightly understood the matter, and concluded from what happened that the formula of the *mia ejesgeia* must have been known to the Emperor *before* his interview with Paul, and this undoubtedly through Sergius.

Even later writers, *e.g.*, Mosheim, not infrequently assert that the doctrine of the *mia ejesgeia* was put forth for the first time on his arrival in Armenia, and that here we are to seek for the first beginning of Monothelitism. But, as Pagi long ago remarked (*ad ann.* 616, n. 6), the celebrated disputation of Maximus with Pyrrhus (see below, sec. 303) takes us several years further back, and shows that Sergius (since 610 patriarch of Constantinople) had given expression to this doctrine in letters *before* the year 619, and had secured patrons for it in several provinces. In that disputation Pyrrhus maintained that the monk Sophronius (since 636 patriarch of Jerusalem) had very unseasonably begun the whole strife concerning the energies in Christ. Maximus, the champion of the orthodox

doctrine, replied: “But tell me now, where was Sophronius (*i.e.* he was not until long afterwards on the stage of the conflict) when Sergius wrote to Bishop Theodore of Pharan (in Arabia), sent him the alleged letter of Mennas (of this later), tried to gain him over to the doctrine contained therein of *one* energy and *one* will (~~kai edox qel hmatov~~), and Theodore answered, agreeing? Or where was he when Sergius at Theodosiopolis (Garin in Armenia) wrote to the Severian, Paul the one-eyed, and also sent to him the letter of Mennas and that of Theodore of Pharan? Or where was he when Sergius wrote to George, named Arsas, the Paulianist,^{f6} requesting that he would send him passages in proof of the *mia ejesgeia*, that he might thereby reconcile them (the Severians) with the Church?” This letter was received by Bishop (~~papav~~) John of Alexandria from the hand of Arsas. And when he was about to depose him (Arsas or Sergius) for this, he was prevented by the invasion of the Persians into Egypt.^{f7}

It is known that Egypt was ravaged, A.D. 619, by the Persians, and that the patriarch, S. John Eleemosynarius of Alexandria, in consequence fled from hence to Cyprus, and died there in 620. Hence it is clear that Sergius had entered into union with the Monophysite Arsas, on the subject of the *mia ejesgeia*, before 619, and had intended, by the application of this formula, to bring about the union of the Monophysites with the orthodox.

In what year Sergius had recourse to Theodore of Pharan is not mentioned by Maximus; but it lies in the nature of the case that he first conferred with *orthodox* bishops on the admissibility of the *mia ejesgeia* before he introduced the subject to the Monophysites. It was necessary that an approval should come first from the orthodox side, if Sergius was to hope for anything from his project of union. If, however, Theodore of Pharan had, at so early a period, given an affirmative answer to the question of Sergius respecting the admissibility of that formula, we can understand how his contemporary, Bishop Stephanus of Dor (in Palestine), who played an important part in the Monothelite controversy, could designate him as the *first* Monothelite.^{f8} The sixth Oecumenical Synod said, on the contrary: “Sergius was the first to write of this (the Monothelite) doctrine”;^{f9} and as, in fact, by his letter to Theodore of Pharan, he gave him an impulse towards this heresy, it can hardly be doubted that he first conceived the thought of turning the formula *mia ejesgeia* to the purposes of union. He says repeatedly that he found it used by Cyril of Alexandria, and in the letter of the former patriarch of Constantinople, Mennas (†552), to Pope Vigilius.^{f10} He says that a whole collection of

such passages occur later on; but as Sergius has not adduced one of them, we must content ourselves with the supposition, that the most important of them were those to which Pyrrhus afterwards appealed in his disputation with Maximus. At the head of them, as the banner of the Monothelites, stands the passage from Cyril (Tom. 4 *In Joannem*): “Christ set forth **mi an suggenh-di jajmfoin ejerŕgeian**.”^{fl1} This certainly has a Monothelite sound. But even Maximus showed (see below, sec. 303) that the great Alexandrian used these words in another sense and connection. “He was far removed,” says he, “from ascribing only *one fusikh-ejerŕgeia* to the Godhead and manhood, for he teaches quite differently: ‘No reasonable person will maintain that the Creator and the creature have one and the same energy.’ Rather does he mean to show that the divine energy is one and the same whether *without* union with the manhood or *in* union with it, just as the energy of fire is one and the same whether *in* or *without* union with **u[h]**. S. Cyril, then, did not speak of *one* energy of the two natures in Christ, but said that the *divine* energy was one and the same, alike in the Incarnate Son as in the Father, and that Christ worked His miracles, not by an almighty command (= divine energy), but asomatically; for even after His Incarnation He is still **omŕergox** with the asomatically working Father; but that He also worked them somatically by bodily touch (**ajfh**), and thus **di jajmfoin**. The raising of the maiden and the healing of the blind, which took place through the word and the almighty will, was united with the healing which was accomplished somatically by touch. The divine energy did not do away with the human, but used it for its own manifestation. The stretching out of the hand, the mixing of the spittle and earth (at the healing of the blind), belonged to the **ejerŕgeia** of the human nature of Christ, and in the miracle God was at the same time acting as man. Cyril did not, therefore, overlook the property of either nature, but saw the divine energy and the **zwtkh** (i.e. bodily energy worked by the human soul) as united **ajŕugcutwv** in the Incarnate Logos.”

As a second witness for their doctrine, the Monothelites quoted repeatedly a passage from Dionysius the Areopagite (Epist. 4 *ad Caium*), and certainly this was also adduced in the letter of Mennas, although Sergius (*l.c.*) did not expressly refer to it. It is known that the Severians, at the Religious Conference, A.D. 633, for the first time brought forward the books of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, maintaining that there also only *one* nature of Christ was taught (see vol. 4, sec. 245). The Acts of that Conference do not show to what passages in these books they

appealed. If their contention was correct, and pseudo-Dionysius was a Monophysite, he would naturally have taught only one energy in Christ. But in truth, pseudo-Dionysius expresses himself repeatedly in a sense opposed to Monophysitism. Thus he says (*De divinis nominibus*, c. 2, sec. 3): “We must separate (distinguish),

(a) the perfect unaltered human nature of Jesus, and

(b) the essential mysteries which are found in it”

(i.e. the Godhead united with it); and *ibid.* sec. 6: “The supernatural Logos takes His nature (human nature) entirely and truly from our nature.” So, in sec. 10, he teaches: “The Godhead of Jesus, which transcends all, assumed the substance of our flesh, and God, who is over all, became man: without mixture or change He communicated Himself to us. But even in His manhood His supernatural and transcendent nature shines forth; and He was supernatural in our natural.” And in the fourth letter to Caius:” You ask how Jesus, who is exalted over all in His nature, has come into the same order with all men. For not merely as Creator of man is He named man (the Areopagite thus teaches that all the names of His creatures belong to God), but because according to His whole nature He is a truly existing man. ... The supernatural has assumed a nature from the nature of men; but is nevertheless overflowing from a transcendent nature.” As the Areopagite, in his theology, proceeded from the fundamental principle, “God is the true being of all things: He is in all creatures, and yet far above them, perfect in the imperfect, but also not completely in the perfect, but transcendent,” in a similar, and yet again in another manner, he considered that Christ was true man, and yet far above man.

If in these passages he recognized the true human nature in Christ, so in that which immediately follows he passes on to the question respecting the **εἰσῆλθον**. “Therefore the transcendent, when He entered into the existent, became an existence above existence, and produced humanity above human nature. To this also testifies the Virgin, who bears supernaturally, and the otherwise yielding unsteady water, which bears the weight of material, earthly feet, and does not yield, but stands solid in supernatural power. We might adduce much besides by which we understand that that which is said of the manhood of Jesus has the power of transcendent negation. In brief, He was not *man*, as though He had *not* been man, but: *From* men He was exalted above men, and whilst far transcending them He truly became man. *Moreover, Christ did not produce the divine as God, and the human as*

man; but He has shown us the divine-human operation of the Incarnate God” (kai τοῦ οἰονᾶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ θεῖα δραςά, οὐτὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὰ θεῖα ἐπεδείκνυται ἐν τῷ ἐνανθρωπήσαντι θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ). In another passage, too (*De div. nom.* c. 2, sec. 6), Dionysius speaks of the “human divine-working,” by which Christ had done and suffered all.

Superficially considered, these passages might be thought to teach that the two natures in Christ had only one common composite will, and that both together had only *one* operation. But in truth, Dionysius has in view only the concrete activities or functions of Christ during His earthly life, and says that they are not purely divine nor purely human, but divine-human. Earlier, before Christ, it was either God or man who worked; there were only purely divine and purely human activities; but now in Christ there is shown a *new*, wonderful manner of operation: the transcendent God works in a human manner, but so that at the same time the superhuman shines through, and the human is raised above itself. He walked, *e.g.*, on the water, and this is, in the first place, a human action; but the bearing up of His body by the water was divinely wrought. He was *born* — that is, human; but of a Virgin — that is superhuman, and is divinely wrought. On the question, however, as to whether we are to recognize in the God-man a *divine* will identical with that of the Father, and, on the other hand, a *human* will to be distinguished from that, Dionysius gives no opinion.

In the same manner, S. Maximus, in his disputation with Pyrrhus, explains the celebrated passage of the Areopagite, and thus deprives the Monothelites of the right to appeal to it. He asks whether Pyrrhus explains the *kainh-qeandrikh-ejersgeia* as something quantitatively or qualitatively new. Pyrrhus first thought it *quantitatively* new. Thereupon Maximus said: “Then we must assume a third nature, *qeavdrikh* in Christ, for a third energy (and it would be such, if it were quantitatively new) presupposes a third nature, since the element of proper essential activity belongs to the notion of nature. If, however, the new is *qualitatively* new, this cannot express *mia ejersgeia*, but the new mysterious way and manner of the human activities (energies) of Christ, which is a consequence of the mysterious union and perichoresis (reciprocal movement) of the two natures in Christ.^{f12} Indeed, proceeds Maximus, in the expression *qeandrikh-ejersgeia*, as he adduces the (duality of the) natures numerically, at the same time also the duality of the energies is periphrastically (mediately) taught. For if we take away the two opposites

(divine and human in Christ), there remains nothing between. And provided there were only a single energy in Christ, the **qeandrikh<**, then Christ, as God, would have a different energy from the Father, for that of the Father cannot possibly be divine-human.” ^{f13}

As we have seen, Sergius also appealed, for his formula, **mi a qeandrikh< ejersgeia**, to a letter of his predecessor Mennas to Pope Vigilius; but the examination of this at the sixth Oecumenical Council (see below, sec. 321) made its spuriousness more than probable (cf. vol. 4, sec. 267), and not a few have supposed that Sergius had himself manufactured this document, which no one knew of before. ^{f14} The introduction of *unam operationem* into two letters of Pope Vigilius could not have been accomplished at that time (see vol. 4, secs. 259 and 267), otherwise Sergius would certainly have also brought forward Pope Vigilius as a witness on his side. There is, however, no doubt that he thought in all seriousness that he had found, in the formula **mi a ejersgeia**, the precious means of bringing about the long-wished-for union; and even if it were true, as Theophanes and those who followed him declared, that Sergius came from Jacobite, and so Monophysite parents, ^{f15} it would not therefore follow that he had intentionally and craftily put forth a formula in the interest of Monophysitism, which in its consequences should lead back to this heresy. On the contrary, it is very probable that, after he had made the supposed discovery, he immediately made the Emperor acquainted with it, and thus gave occasion for Heraclius’ reference to the **mi a ejersgeia** in his intercourse with the Monophysite Paul in Armenia. Statesmanlike prudence demanded of the Emperor to make zealous use of that which appeared so valuable a means of union; for, if the attempt succeeded, millions of minds which had been estranged by Monophysitism from the throne and the State Church would have been restored, chiefly in those provinces which the Emperor was now meditating to seize again, particularly Egypt, Syria, Armenia, and the countries adjoining the Caucasus. In Egypt the Melchitic party, that is, the orthodox and those who were well disposed to the Emperor, now numbered about 300,000 heads, whilst the Coptic, *i.e.* the National-Egyptian and Monophysite party, was between five and six millions strong. ^{f16} The proportions were similar among the Jacobites in Syria. No wonder if the Emperor, at the beginning of his campaign against the Persians, having in view the ecclesiastical reunion of the Oriental provinces, recommended the formula **mi a ejersgeia**. He did so naturally with still greater urgency and energy after the successful termination of the

campaign, and after he had, by the peace of the year 628, received back the lands which he had wrested from the Persians.

The next certain chronological point in the history of Monothelitism is the stay of the Emperor Heraclius in Lazia (Colchis), and his interview there with Cyrus, metropolitan of Phasis, A.D. 626. Theophanes says (page 485) that Heraclius, in the year of the world 6117, corresponding with September 1, 625-626, of our reckoning ^{f17} (see above, p. 3, note), had tarried for a considerable time in the country of Lazia, on a new expedition against the Persians. The same date, 626, for the interview with Cyrus, may be inferred from a passage of the thirteenth session of the sixth Oecumenical Council, where it is said that Cyrus had written to Sergius fifty-six years before. ^{f17} But an event still more important for the history of Monothelitism had preceded this of the year 626, as we learn from Cyrus himself, who in his letter to Sergius declares: "When I met the Emperor, I read the decree which he sent to Archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus against Paul, this head of the bishopless ([ajepiskopwn](#)). The orthodox doctrine is therein accurately set forth. As, however, I found that in this decree it is forbidden to speak of two energies of our Lord Jesus Christ after the union (of the two natures in Christ), I did not agree to this point, and appealed to the letter of Pope Leo, which expressly teaches two energies in mutual union. ^{f18} After we had further discussed this subject, I received the command to read your (Sergius') honored letter, which, as was said, and as inspection showed, was a reply ([ajtigrafon](#)) to that imperial decree (to Arcadius); for it also referred to that evil Paul and a copy of the decree against him, and approved of its contents. I received command in the first place to be silent, no longer to contradict, and to apply to you for further instruction on this point, that after the [efwsiv](#) of the two natures we should accept only [mian hgoumenikhā ejēgeian](#)." ^{f19} Sergius repeats the same in his letter in answer to Cyrus, and then refers to Paul as chief of the Acephali, ^{f20} explaining for us more fully the [ajepiskopwn](#) in the letter of Cyrus, a matter which Walch (*l.c.* S. 25 and 105) has quite misunderstood.

From these communications we learn that the Emperor, after that vain attempt in Armenia to win the Monophysite Paul for the Church, issued a decree against him to Archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus; for no one doubts that it was aimed at Paul, since the Severians were only a division of the Acephali (opponents of the *Henoticon*), so that Paul might be designated sometimes with one and sometimes with the other of those names.

If it is certain that the Emperor had an interview with the Monophysite leader Paul, in the year 622, during his longer stay in Armenia, in order to gain him over to the union, we may with probability suppose that at the same time the union of the Monophysite Armenians at large was attempted, and for this purpose the Synod of Garin or Theodosiopolis was held. We have already spoken of it (vol. 4, sec. 289), and remarked that it has generally been assigned to the year 622, but by Tschamtschean preferably to 627 or 629. Some chronological data are lacking; but we regard it as contemporaneous with the interview between the Emperor and Paul, held for the same purpose and at the same place.^{f21} It cannot properly be objected that it would, in that case, be strange that nothing should be said at the Synod of Garin of the *mia ejhergeia*, when that was done at the interview with Paul. We reply,

(a) our information respecting that Synod is so scanty and imperfect, that we cannot with certainty infer from its silence that the Emperor did not there employ the new formula for the purposes of ration. Besides,

(b) it is possible that the Armenian Patriarch Esra consented to accept the Council of Chalcedon without the bait of the *mia ejhergeia*. Finally,

(c) it is clear that the omission to bring forward the formula *mia ejhergeia* at Garin, in the later years 627, 629, or 632, would be still more strange than in 622,

since the Emperor, in the course of time, gained increasing faith in its serviceableness, from the year 626 recommended it with increased energy (as we learn from the case of Cyrus of Phasis), and presented himself more and more decisively as patron of Monothelitism. By removing the Synod of Garin to the year 622 we clear up several difficulties, and it becomes easier in this way to construct the early history of Monothelitism.

We know (vol. 4, sec. 289) that the Emperor also brought Greek bishops with him to the Union-Synod of Garin. But who could have been better suited for the purpose, and whom could the Emperor have thought more of, than the bishop of his principal city, Sergius, who had made a special study of the union, and believed that he had discovered a universal means of securing it. Now, that Sergius was present in Garin, we learn from the disputation of Maximus with Pyrrhus, where it is said: "Where was Sophronius when Sergius, at Theodosiopolis (*i.e.* Garin), wrote to the

Severian Paul, the one-eyed, and also sent to him the letter of Mennas and that of Theodore of Pharan?"[†] (See above, p. 5). If, however, Sergius was at Garin, or in Armenia generally, in the train of the Emperor, it is natural to believe that he took part in the transactions with Paul, and suggested to the Emperor the idea of the *mia eĵergeia*. That, in his letter to Pope Honorius, he said nothing of his participation, and represented the matter as though the Emperor had independently, as a great theologian, invented the formula in question, was dictated by prudence in regard to Rome and also to the Emperor.

That Paul was from Cyprus we infer from the decree of the Emperor to Arcadius. If, however, we assume that the Synod of Garin falls at the same time as the transactions with Paul, this explains his presence in Armenia, — he too was invited to the Synod, — and thus too we can better understand the decree to Archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus. We know that there were *Armenian, i.e.* Monophysite, congregations in Cyprus.^{f22} The union of the Armenian patriarch at Garin drew on, as a consequence, the union of the churches affiliated to him. This was opposed by Paul, the head of the Monophysites in Cyprus; hence the imperial decree to Arcadius, and along with this the demand that, in his position as metropolitan, he would forward the union throughout all Cyprus by the application of the formula *mia eĵergeia*.

Whether Paul, the one-eyed, to whom Sergius wrote, is identical with this Paul of Cyprus, may remain undecided; but it is quite possible that, after the Cypriote Paul had departed from the Emperor and left Cyprus without entering the union, Sergius made another attempt to gain him for the *mia eĵergeia*, and so for the union, by sending him the letters of Mennas and of Theodore of Pharan. The imperial decree to Arcadius would in that case have come after the failure and in support of this attempt. Sergius, however, had in the meantime departed from Armenia, and therefore could only in writing further communicate his view to the Emperor on this decree and on the stiff-necked Paul, probably *before* the actual publication of the decree.

SEC. 292. SYNOD AT CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 626, AND TRANSACTIONS AT HIERAPOLIS, A.D. 629.

After the transactions with Paul, says Sergius in his letter to Pope Honorius, there passed some time before the Emperor met Cyrus of Phasis

(A.D. 626) in the province of Lazia, and that took place which we have related above ^{f23}(p. 12). In accordance with his command, Cyrus in a letter asked Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, for further explanation on the *mia ejersgeia*, and we possess his deliberate answer given at a Synod in Constantinople, ^{f23} among the Acts of the sixth Council. The principal contents are as follows: 1. In the great holy Synods this subject of *one* or *two* energies was not at all touched, and we find no decision given on this subject. But several of the principal Fathers, particularly Cyril of Alexandria, have in several writings spoken of a *mia zwopoiox ejersgeia Cristou*. Mennas, also of Constantinople, addressed a letter to Pope Vigilius of Old Rome, in which he, in the same manner, taught *eh to tou Cristou qe lhma kai mian zwopoiox ejersgeian*. I forward to you a copy of this *logov* of Mennas, and append to it several other patristic passages on this subject. As regards, however, the letter of the most holy Leo, and the passage: “Agit utraque forma,” etc., of the many opponents of Severus (the Monophysite), who have appealed to this letter, the common pillar of orthodoxy, not one has found in it the doctrine of two energies. I will mention only one, Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria (†608), who wrote a whole book in defense of this letter (extracts from it are found in Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 226). I have also added this to the patristic testimonies mentioned. Generally, no one of the divinely enlightened teachers up to this time has spoken of two energies; and it is quite necessary to follow the doctrines of the Fathers, not only in their meaning, but also to use the very same words as they did and in no way to alter any of them. ^{f24}

Of this, his answer to Cyrus, Sergius also speaks in his letter to Pope Honorius, adding that he had sent to him the letter of Mennas, but had not expressed his own view, and from that time the question in regard to Energy had rested, until Cyrus had become patriarch of Alexandria. ^{f25}

This last assertion is contradicted by the Greek historians Theophanes, Cedrenus, and Zonaras, and also by an old anonymous biography of Abbot Maximus, when they assign to the year 629 (according to the chronology of Theophanes, 621) a transaction which the Emperor Heraclius had at Hierapolis in Syria (Zonaras, by mistake, says Jerusalem) with the Jacobite Patriarch Athanasius, and at which he had held out to him the patriarchal chair of Antioch, if he would accept the Synod of Chalcedon. The sly Syrian had consented, on the condition that he was accustomed to teach only one energy. The Emperor, to whom this expression was new, (?) had

thereupon written to Sergius of Constantinople, and had immediately called Cyrus of Phasis to come to him; and as the latter by word of mouth, and the former in writing, declared in favor of the *mia eĵesgeia*, Heraclius gave his approval to this formula, and made Pope John of Rome acquainted with this, without, however, requesting his assent.^{f26} That this narrative contains inaccuracies cannot be doubted. It is impossible that the formula *mia eĵesgeia* should have been new to the Emperor in the year 629, and that he should have been under the necessity then, for the first time, of questioning Bishop Sergius on this subject. It is impossible that he should, for the first time, in the year 629, have asked Cyrus of Phasis his judgment on this formula, since three years before he had himself made Cyrus acquainted with it; and it is a gross anachronism to make the Emperor address a question to Pope John in 629, since John did not come to the papal chair until 640. Forbes of Corse, a celebrated professor at the Scotch University of Aberdeen, supposed that the Jacobite Athanasius and the Severian Paul were one and the same person;^{f27} but how would this agree with Pope John and the year 629, since Paul had already had his interview with the Emperor, A.D. 622? And it was not Paul who made the Emperor, but the latter who made Paul acquainted with the *mia eĵesgeia*; whilst, in the case of Athanasius, according to the account of Theophanes, it was the reverse. Pagi declares (*ad ann.* 629, n. 2-6) the whole account in regard to Athanasius to be erroneous; Walch, on the contrary (*l.c.* S. 80 and 89 ff.), makes it credible, from Oriental sources, that a Severian Bishop Athanasius certainly met the Emperor Heraclius, along with twelve other bishops, that they presented to him a memorial (confession), and were required under threats to accept the Synod of Chalcedon. This Athanasius, Walch thinks, was the same whom Sophronius, at a later period, excommunicated in his synodal letter. We may add that the year 629 appears quite suitable for a discussion in Hierapolis; for, in fact, after Heraclius had made peace with the Persians, A.D. 628, and had got back the portion of the cross of Christ which had been carried off, as well as the provinces which had been seized by Chosroes, he spent a considerable time in the East, in the years 628 and 629, for the purpose of restoring order in those provinces.^{f28}

SEC. 293. CYRUS OF ALEXANDRIA UNITES THE MONOPHYSITES.

After the death of Joannes Eleemosynarius, the monk John, the author of a still extant biography of S. John Chrysostom, was raised to the chair of Alexandria (A.D. 620), and had to endure much persecution during the Persian rule over Egypt, but survived until the recovery of the country by the Emperor Heraclius, A.D. 628. At his death, some years afterwards (630 or 631), the Emperor raised Cyrus of Phasis, of whom we have already heard, to the patriarchal chair of Alexandria, in order, as the biographer of S. Martin declares, to soil this city with Monothelitism.^{f29} There were not only very many Monophysites here, but they were split into parties among themselves. We have already seen (vol. 3, sec. 208) that both the **fqartol aṭrai** (Severians) and the **afqartodokhtai** (Julianists) had their own bishop in Alexandria; the bishop of the former, about the middle of the sixth century, being Theodosius, that of the latter Gaianus. The former got the name of Theodosians from their bishop, and they were united by the new patriarch, Cyrus, on the basis of the **mia ejesgeia**. On this subject he tells Sergius of Constantinople: "I notify you that all the clergy of the Theodosian party of this city, together with all the civil and military persons of distinction, and many thousands of the people, on the 3rd of June, took part with us, in the Holy Catholic Church, in the pure holy mysteries, led thereto chiefly by the grace of God, but also by the doctrine communicated to me by the Emperors,^{f30} and by your divinely enlightened Holiness, ... at which not only in Alexandria, but also in the whole neighborhood, yea even to the clouds and above the clouds, with the heavenly spirits, there is great joy. How this union was brought about, I have sent full information to the Emperor by the deacon John. I pray your Holiness, however, that, if in this matter I have committed any error, you will correct your humblest servant therein, for it is your own work."^{f31}

The information appended respecting the union relates: "As Christ guides all to the true faith, we have, in the month Payni of the sixth Indictim (633), established the following (9 **kefabaiā**):^{f32} —

"1. If anyone does not confess the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the consubstantial Trinity, the one Godhead in three persons, let him be anathema.

"2. If anyone does not confess the one Logos of the Holy Trinity, eternally begotten by the Father, come down from heaven, made flesh

by the Holy Ghost and our Lady, the holy God-bearer and ever Virgin Mary; who was made man, suffered in His own flesh, died, was buried, and rose on the third day, — let him be anathema.

“3. If anyone does not confess that the sufferings as well as the wounds belong to one and the same Jesus Christ, our Lord, let him be anathema.

“4. If anyone does not confess that, in consequence of the most intimate union, God the Logos, in the womb of the holy God-bearer, ... has prepared for Himself a flesh consubstantial with ours, and animated by a reasonable soul, and this by physical and hypostatic union (cf. vol. 2, secs. 132, 158); and that from this union He has come forth as one, unmixed and inseparable, — let him be anathema.

“5. If anyone does not confess that the Ever Virgin Mary is in truth the God-bearer, in that she bore the Incarnate God, the Logos, let him be anathema.

“6. If anyone does not confess: From (!) two natures, *one* Christ, one Son, one incarnate nature of God the Logos, as S. Cyril taught, [ajreptwv, ajal l oiwtwv](#), or *one* united Hypostasis (see vol. 4, sec. 270), which our Lord Jesus Christ is, one of the Trinity, let him be anathema.

“7. If anyone, in using the expression, The one Lord is known in two natures, does not confess that He is one of the Holy Trinity, *i.e.* the Logos eternally begotten by the Father, who was made man in the last times; ... but that He was [eferov kai eferov](#), and not one and the same, as the wisest Cyril taught, perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, and therefore known in two natures as one and the same; and (if anyone does not confess) that one and the same, on one side ([kat jal l o](#)), and suffered, on the other, is incapable of suffering, *i.e.* suffered as man in the flesh, so far as He was man, but as God remained incapable of suffering in the body of His flesh; and (if anyone does not confess, *that this one and the same Christ and Son worked both the divine and the human by ONE divine-human operation*, as S. Dionysius teaches ([kai dox aujox efa Cristox kai uiox ejergounta ta qeotroph kai ajqrwpina mia qeandrikh ejergeia kata dox ej ajioiv Doinusion](#)), ... — let him be anathema. ^{f33}

“8. If anyone does not anathematise Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches, etc., and all who opposed the twelve chapters of Cyril, and has not amended, let him be anathema.

“9. If anyone does not anathematise the writings of Theodoret, which he composed against the true faith and against Cyril, and also the alleged letter of Ibas, and Theodore of Mopsuestia with his writings, let him be anathema.” ^{f34}

We can see what efforts Cyrus made to render this **kefabaion** acceptable to those who had previously been Monophysites, in that he anathematized every form of Nestorianism in the sharpest manner; whilst he brought back those expressions so dear to the Monophysites, **ek duo fusewn, efwsiv fusikh>** and **mia fusiv tou-Logou sesarkwmenh**, after the example of Justinian (vol. 4, sec. 270), certainly adding those phrases which set aside Monophysitism. Theophanes professes to know that Cyrus, in combination with Theodore of Pharan, brought about that union (**thx Udrobafh-efwsin** = watery union), whereby the Synod of Chalcedon was brought into such contempt, that the Theodosians boasted that “the Synod of Chalcedon has come to us, and not we to that.” ^{f35} To the same effect speak Cedrenus and the *Vita Maximi*. ^{f36} The Synodicon maintains that the union in question was brought about at an Alexandrian Synod, A.D. 633. ^{f37} But Cyrus, Sergius, Maximus, the sixth Oecumenical Synod, and all the ancients who refer to this union, are silent on the subject of a Synod.

As was natural, this intelligence from Alexandria produced great joy with Heraclius and Sergius, and we still possess a letter in reply from the latter to Cyrus, in which he highly commends him, and repeats the principal contents of the **kefabaia**. The meaning of the seventh he expressed in the words: **Kai twn autwn efa Criston egergein ta-qeotroph-kai < ajqrwpina mia|egergeia| pasa gar qeia te kai <ajqrwpih egergeia ek edox kai <ou-autou-sesarkwmenou Logou prohsceto**. This doctrine, Sergius falsely maintains, is contained in the well-known words of Leo: *Agit utraque forma* ^{f38} († see p. 2).

SEC. 294. SOPHRONIUS COMES TO THE DEFENSE OF DYOTHELITISM.

About the same time when the union was accomplished in Alexandria, the saintly and learned monk Sophronius from Palestine was present there; and

Archbishop Cyrus, out of respect for him, permitted him to read the nine **kefabāia** before their publication. Sophronius disapproved the doctrine of *one* energy, and thought that it was necessary to hold fast *two* energies. Cyrus, however, endeavored to sustain his doctrine by patristic passages, and remarked on this, that the old Fathers, in order to win souls, had here and there yielded in the expression of doctrine, and at the present moment it was especially unsuitable to contend about words, since the salvation of the souls of myriads was at stake.

Sergius relates this in his letter to Pope Honorius, which we shall give presently. But Maximus adds that Sophronius fell at the feet of Cyrus, and adjured him with tears not to proclaim that article from the pulpit, since it was plainly Apollinarian (*i.e.* Monophysite, see vol. 3, sec. 170).^{f39} That Sophronius immediately wrote on this subject also to Sergius of Constantinople is a mere supposition of Baronius;^{f40} whilst, on the other hand, it is true that, not suspecting that Sergius was not only entangled in the new heresy, but its actual originator, Sophronius now came to Constantinople in order to find here support against Cyrus. He wanted to gain over Sergius, so that the expression **mia eḡergeia** might be struck out of the instrument of union. As he brought letters with him from Cyrus, it appears as though the latter had made the proposal to Sophronius to appeal to the patriarch of Constantinople as umpire; and there is no reason, that we know of, for finding with Walch (*l.c.* S. 117) the conduct of Cyrus especially noble, for he imposed upon his opponent, and, instead of directing him to an impartial umpire, sent him to the zealous supporter of his own party. If Cyrus gave Sophronius another letter to Sergius, besides the one mentioned above[†] (p. 18), it has been lost.

SEC. 295. THE SEEMING JUSTE MILIEU OF SERGIUS. HE WRITES TO POPE HONORIUS.

Naturally Sophronius did not succeed in gaining over the Patriarch Sergius to himself and the doctrine of two wills, yet he succeeded so far that Sergius would no longer allow the **mia eḡergeia** to be promulgated, so as not to destroy the peace of the Church, and in this direction he gave counsel and instruction to Cyrus of Alexandria, that, after the union had been established, he should no longer give permission to speak either of one or of two energies. At the same time he exacted from Sophronius the promise henceforth to be silent; and they both separated in peace. We learn this more exactly from the letter which Sergius addressed to Pope

Honorius soon after this incident, and immediately after the elevation of Sophronius to the see of Jerusalem (A.D. 633 or 634), and which is preserved for us in the Acts of the sixth Oecumenical Council. ^{f41} This letter, from which we have already drawn so many details, after a very polite introduction, relates first what had taken place in Armenia between the Emperor Heraclius and the Severian Paul, and how then the Emperor had made mention of the *mia ejhergeia*. “This conversation with Paul,” he further remarks, “the Emperor referred to later on, in Lazia, in presence of Bishop Cyrus of Phasis, now occupant of the throne of Alexandria, and as the latter did not know whether *one* or *two* energies should be maintained, he asked us and requested that we would give him passages from the Fathers on the subject. This we did as well as we could, and sent him the (probably spurious) letter of Mennas to Pope Vigilius, which contains such passages of the Fathers on *one* energy and *one* will [†] (see p. 14), without, however, giving any judgment of our own. From this time the matter rested for a while. ^{f42}

“A short time before this, however, Cyrus, now patriarch of Alexandria, sustained by God’s grace and encouraged by the Emperor, summoned the adherents of Eutyches residing in Alexandria, Dioscurus, Severus, and Julian, to join the Catholic Church. After many disputations and troubles, Cyrus, who displayed great prudence in the matter, at last gained his end, and then were dogmatic *kefabaia* agreed upon between the two parties, on which all who called Dioscurus and Severus their ancestors united with the Holy Catholic Church. All Alexandria, almost all Egypt, the Thebaid, Lydia, and the other eparchies (provinces) of the Egyptian diocese (see vol. 2, sec. 98, c. 2), had now become one flock, and those who were formerly split into a number of heresies were, by God’s grace and the zeal of Cyrus, one, confessing with one voice and in unity of Spirit the true dogmas of the Church. ^{f43} Among the famous Kephalaia was that of the *ejhergeia* of Christ. Just at that time the most saintly monk Sophronius, now, as we hear, bishop of Jerusalem (we have not yet received his synodal letter), found himself at Alexandria with Cyrus, conversed with him on this union, and opposed the Kephalaion of the *mia ejhergeia*, maintaining that we should teach decidedly *two* energies of Christ. Cyrus showed utterances of the holy Fathers, in which the *mia ejhergeia* is used (yes, but in another sense), and

added that often also the holy Fathers had shown a God-pleasing pliancy (*oikonomiā*) towards certain expressions, without surrendering anything of their orthodoxy; and that now especially, when the salvation of so many myriads was at stake, there should be no contention over that Kephalaion, which could not endanger orthodoxy; but Sophronius altogether disapproved of this pliancy, and on account of this affair came with letters from Cryus to us, conversed with us on the subject, and demanded that, after the union, the proposition respecting the *miā ejēergeia* should be struck from the Kephalaia. This seemed to us hard. For how should it not be hard, very hard indeed, since by that means the union in Alexandria and all those eparchies would be destroyed, among those who hitherto had refused to hear anything either from the most holy Father Leo, or from the Synod of Chalcedon, but now speak of it with clear voice at the divine mysteries!

“After we had long discussed this with Sophronius, we requested him to bring forward passages from the Fathers which quite clearly and literally require the recognition of two energies in Christ. He could not do this.^{f44} We, however, considering that controversies, and from these heresies might arise, regarded it as necessary to bring this superfluous dispute about words to silence, and wrote to the patriarch of Alexandria, that, after accomplishing the union, he should require no one to confess *one* or *two* energies, but that confession should be made, as laid down by the holy and Oecumenical Synods, that one and the same only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, worked (*ejergein*) both the divine and the human, and that all Godlike and human energies went forth inseparably (*ajdiaretwv*) from one and the same Incarnate Logos and referred back to the same. The expression *miā ejēergeia* should not be employed, since, although it was used by some of the Fathers, it seemed strange to many, and offended their ears, since they entertained the suspicion that it was used in order to do away with the two natures in Christ, a thing to be avoided. In like manner, to speak of *two* energies gives offense with many, because this expression occurs in none of the holy Fathers, and because there would follow from thence the doctrine of two contradictory wills (*qel h̄mata*) in Christ (a false inference!), as though the Logos had been willing to endure the suffering which brings us

salvation, but the manhood had opposed it. This is impious, for it is impossible that one and the same subject should have two and, in one point, contradictory wills.

“The Fathers teach that the human nature of Christ has never, separately and of its own impulse (**ofmh**), fulfilled its natural movement in opposition to the leading (**neumati**) of the Logos which is united with it, but only when, and as, and in the measure in which the Logos willed it; and, to put it plainly, as with man the body is guided by the reasonable soul, so in Christ the whole human nature is by the Godhead of the Logos; it was **geokinhtov** *i.e.* moved by God. ^{f45} ... Finally, we decide that in future Sophronius shall speak neither of one nor of two energies, but shall content himself with the doctrine of the Fathers; and the saintly man was therewith content, promised to keep to this, and only requested us to give him this statement in writing (*i.e.* the definition of the faith given by Sergius, contained in this letter), so that he might be able to show it to any who might inquire of him respecting the point in dispute. We granted him this willingly, and he departed again from Constantinople by ship. Shortly, however, the Emperor wrote from Edessa, requesting us to extract the patristic utterances contained in the letter of Mennas to Vigilius on the **mia ejergeia**, and **ef qelhma**, and send them to him. We did so. Yet, having regard to the alarm which had already been caused by this matter, we represented to the Emperor the difficulty of the subject, and recommended that there should be no more minute discussion of the question, but that we should abide by the known and the universally acknowledged doctrine of the Fathers, and confess that the one and the same only begotten Son of God worked both the divine and the human, and that from the one and the same Incarnate Word all divine and human energy proceeded indivisibly and inseparably (**ajmeristwv kai ajdiairetwv**). For this was taught by the God-bearing Pope Leo in the words: ‘Agit utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est.’ ... We held it then as suitable and necessary to make your fraternal Holiness acquainted with this matter, enclosing copies of our letters to Cyrus and the Emperor, and we pray you to read all this, and to complete what you find defective, and to communicate to us your view of the subject in writing.” ^{f46}

We see that Sergius was willing to give up the open victory of his formula *mia eĵeŕgeia*; but the error contained in it was not to be suppressed, and thus he managed that the opposite orthodox doctrine of two energies, Dyothelitism, should be set aside. ^{f47}

SEC. 296. FIRST LETTER OF POPE HONORIUS IN THE MONOTHELITE AFFAIR.

Honorius, sprung from a distinguished family of Campania, after the death of Boniface V., ascended the Roman throne, October 27, 625. Abbot Jonas of Bobio, his contemporary, describes him as *sagax animo, vicens consilio, doctrina clarus, dulcedine et humilitate pollens*) ^{f48} He may have had all these fine qualities, and especially may have possessed a good acquaintance with theology, and have fully understood the development of dogma up to this time; but new questions now emerged, which at first, at least, he did not see through quite clearly, and certainly his friendliness and amiability (*dulcedo* and *humilitas*) towards others, especially towards the Emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople, contributed to land him in error.

The letter which he wrote in answer to Sergius is no longer extant in the Latin original; but we still possess the Greek translation which was read at the sixth Oecumenical Council, and then compared by a Roman delegate with the Latin original then extant in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople, and found to be correct. From the Greek translation the two old Latin versions were made, which are printed in Mansi and Hardouin, ^{f49} and of which the first must have been prepared by the Roman librarian Anastasius. ^{f50}

The letter of Honorius is as follows: "Your letter, my brother, I have received, and have learnt from it that new controversies have been stirred up by a certain Sophronius, then a monk, now bishop of Jerusalem, against our brother Cyrus of Alexandria, who proclaimed to those returning from heresy *one* energy of our Lord Jesus Christ. This Sophronius afterwards visited you, brought forward the same complaint, and after much instruction requested that what he had heard from you might be imparted to him in writing. Of this letter of yours to Sophronius we have received from you a copy, and, after having read it, we commend you that your brotherliness has removed the new expression (*mia eĵeŕgeia*), which might give offense to the simple. For we must walk in that which we have learned. By the leading of God we came to the measure of the true faith,

which the apostles of the truth have spread abroad by the light (*Lat.* rule) of the Holy Scriptures, confessing that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, worked the divine works by means (*mesiteusashv*) of the manhood, which was hypostatically united to Him, the Logos, and that the same worked the human works, since the flesh was assumed by the Godhead in an unspeakable, unique manner, *ajliairetwv, ajreptwv, ajugcutwv, tel eiwv*. And He who shone in the flesh, through His miracles, in perfect Godhead, is the same who worked (*ejeghsav Lat.* patitur) the conditions of the flesh in dishonorable suffering, perfect God and man. He is the one Mediator between God and men in two natures. The Word became flesh and dwelt among us. He is the Son of Man, who came down from heaven, and one and the same is the Lord of glory who was crucified, whilst we still confess that the Godhead is in no way subject to human suffering. And the flesh was not from heaven, but was taken from the holy God-bearer, for the Truth says in the Gospel of Himself: ‘No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven’ (S. ^{<AR>}John 3:13), teaching us clearly that the flesh which was susceptible of suffering was united with the Godhead in an unspeakable and unique manner; on the one hand distinct and unmingled, on the other unseparated; so that the union must be wonderfully thought of under the continuance of both natures. In agreement with this, says the apostle (^{<AR>}1 Corinthians 2:8), ‘They crucified the Lord of Glory,’ whilst yet the Godhead could neither be crucified nor suffer; but on account of that unspeakable union we can say both, *God has suffered*, and the *Manhood came down from heaven with the Godhead* (S. ^{<AR>}John 3:13). Whence, also, we confess *one will* of our Lord Jesus Christ (*oŋen kai ef qełhma othol ogoumen tou-kurion j Ihsou-Cristou* = *unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*), since our (human) nature was plainly assumed by the Godhead, and this being *faultless*, as it was before the Fall. For Christ, coming in the form of sinful flesh, took away the sin of the world, and assuming the form of a servant, He is *habitu inventus ut homo*. As He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, so was He also born without sin of the holy and immaculate Virgin, the God-bearer, without experiencing any contamination of the *vitiata natura*. The expression *flesh* is used in the Holy Scripture in a double sense, a good and a bad. Thus it is written (^{<OR>}Genesis 6:3): ‘My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh;’ and the apostle says (^{<AS>}1 Corinthians 15:50): ‘Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.’ And again (^{<UT>}Romans 7:23): ‘I see another law in my

members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.’ Many other passages must also be understood of the flesh in the bad sense. In the good sense, however, the expression is used by Isaiah (~~263~~ 66:23): ‘All flesh shall come to Jerusalem to worship before Me.’ So Job (~~1826~~ 19:26): ‘In my flesh shall I see God;’ and elsewhere (S. ~~4186~~ Luke 3:6): ‘All flesh shall see the salvation of God.’

“It is this, as we said, not the *vitiata natura* which was assumed by the Redeemer, which would war against the law of His mind; but He came to seek and to save that which was lost, *i.e.* the *vitiata natura* of the human race. In His members there was not another law (~~4173~~ Romans 7:23), or a *diversa vel contraria Salvatori voluntas*, because He was born *supra legem* of human condition; and if He says in the Holy Spirit: ‘I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me’ (S. ~~4168~~ John 6:38), and (S. ~~4146~~ Mark 14:36): ‘Nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt,’ and the like, these are not expressions of a *voluntas diversa*, but of the accommodation (*oikonomiav, dispensationis*) of the assumed manhood. For this is said for our sakes, that we, following His footsteps, should do not our own will, but that of the Father.

“We will now, entering upon the royal way, avoid the snares of the hunters right and left, in order that we dash not our foot against a stone. We will go in the path of our predecessors (*i.e.* hold fast to the old formulae and avoid the new). And if some who, so to speak, stammer, think to explain the matter better, and give themselves out as teachers, yet may we not make their statements to be Church dogmas, as, for example, that in Christ there is one energy or two, since neither the Gospels nor the letters of the apostles, nor yet the Synods, have laid this down. That the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son and the Word of God, by whom all things were made, the one and the same, perfectly works divine and human works, is shown quite clearly by the Holy Scriptures; but whether on account of the works of the Godhead and manhood (*opera divinitatis et humanitatis*) it is suitable to think and to speak of one or two energies (*operationes*) as present, we cannot tell, we leave that to the grammarians, who sell to boys the expressions invented by them, in order to attract them to themselves. For we have not learnt from the Bible that Christ and His Holy Spirit have one or two energies; but that He works in manifold ways (*pol utropwv ejergounta*). For it is written: ‘If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His’ (~~4180~~ Romans 8:9); and again: ‘No one can say, Lord Jesus,

but in the Holy Ghost; the gifts are diverse, but there is *one* Spirit; and the offices are diverse, but there is one Lord; and the operations are diverse, but it is one God that worketh all in all.’ If, however, there are many diversities of operations, and God works them all in all the members of the great body, how much more does this prevail in the Head (of that mystical Body), Christ the Lord? ... If the Spirit of Christ works in His members in many ways, how much more must we confess that, by Himself, the Mediator between God and man, He works most perfectly, and in manifold ways, through the communion of the two natures? We, however, wish to think and to breathe according to the utterances of Holy Scripture, rejecting everything which, as a novelty in words, might cause uneasiness, in the Church of God, so that those who are under age may not, taking offense at the expression *two energies*, hold us for Nestorians, and that (on the other side) we may not seem to simple ears to teach Eutychianism, when we dearly confess only *one* energy. We must be on our guard lest, after the evil weapons of those enemies are burnt, from their ashes new flames of scorching questions may be kindled. In simplicity and truth we will confess that the Lord Jesus Christ, one and the same, works in the divine and in the human nature. It is much better if the empty, idle, and paganising philosophers, who weigh out the natures, proudly raise their croaking against us, than that the people of Christ, simple and poor in spirit, should remain unsatisfied. No one can deceive the scholars of fishermen by philosophy. They follow the doctrine of these (the fishermen). All the arguments of cunning disputation are crushed in their nets. This will you also, my brother, proclaim with us, as we do it with one mind with you; and we exhort you that you, fleeing from the new manner of speech of one energy or two, with us proclaim one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, true God, in two natures working the divine and human.” ^{f51}

We feel bound clearly to indicate every considerable departure of this second edition of our history from the first *in causa Honorii*, that everyone may understand how we have previously judged, and what we now think on this subject. For this reason we repeat, first of all, the remarks with which we accompanied this letter of Honorius in the first edition: “We see that Honorius started from the dogma, — The two natures in Christ are hypostatically united in the *one Person* of the Logos. If, however, there is only one Person, then is there but one Worker present, and the *one* Christ and Lord works both the human and the divine works, the former by means of the human nature.

“Honorius did not grasp the subject aright at the very beginning. He ought to have put the question thus: From the one personality of Christ there follows necessarily only one energy and one will, or is energy and will more a matter of nature (than of person), and, in that case, has not the duality of natures in Christ also the duality of wills and operations as a consequence? Now, this question he could have solved by a glance at the Trinity. In this there are three Persons, but not three wills, but one nature (essence) and, accordingly, only one will. But not considering this, he argues briefly, but inappropriately, ‘Where there is only one Person there is only one Worker, and therefore only one will.’ But however decidedly Honorius, from this premiss, maintains the *efi qeþhma*, he yet decidedly rejects the *mia ejheʒgeia*. This one Worker, Christ, he says, works in many ways, and therefore we should teach neither *mian ejheʒgeian* nor *duo ejheʒgeiav*, but *ejheʒgei-pol utropwv*. Honorius has here misunderstood, or wished to misunderstand, the significance of the technical terms. He takes them as identical with the *concrete* workings, instead of with the *ways of working*.

“These expressions, *mia ejheʒgeia* and *duo ejheʒgeiai*, he proceeds, are, moreover, approved neither by the Holy Scriptures nor by the Synods; and they should be avoided, because their use produces new controversies. But why was there in Christ only one will? Because, says Honorius, He assumed, not the human nature which was corrupted by the Fall, but the uncorrupted nature, as it was before the Fall. In the ordinary man there are certainly two wills — a will of the mind and a will of the members (^{cf. Romans 7:23}); but the latter is only a consequence of the Fall, and therefore could not exist in Christ. So far Honorius was quite on the right way; but he did not accurately draw the inferences. He ought now to have said: Hence it follows that in Christ, since He was God and man at the same time, together with His divine will, which is eternally identical with that of the Father, only the *incorrupt human will*, which never opposes the divine will, could be assumed, and not also the opposing will of the members.

“This would have been the natural and necessary inference; but instead of drawing this, he leaves the incorrupt human will either entirely out of account, or more accurately, he identifies it with the divine will. Because the incorrupt human will of Christ is always subject and conformed to the divine, Honorius exchanged this *moral* unity of both with unity in general, or *physical* unity, with the latter of which we have here to do. Even the

clear passages of Holy Scripture, in which Christ distinguishes His human will from that of the Father, could not decide him to recognize this human will. Exchanging difference for opposition, he thought it inadmissible to have two *distinct* wills in Christ, lest he should be forced to admit, in a heretical sense, two opposed and mutually contradictory wills in them.” ^{f52}

To this criticism we will add what we remarked before, in the first edition, on the second letter of Honorius: ^{f53} “He now says quite correctly, *the divine nature in Christ works the divine, and the human nature performs that which is of the flesh*, and we proclaim the two natures, which work unconfused, in the one Person of the only-begotten Son of God, that which is proper to them. In this Honorius pronounces the orthodox doctrine, and it would be quite incorrect to charge him with heresy.” It is thus clear that we always were of the opinion that Honorius was quite orthodox in thought, but, especially in his first letter, he had unhappily expressed himself in a Monothelite fashion. The same fundamental thought we also placed at the head of our pamphlet composed during the Vatican Council in Rome: *Causa Honorii Papae*, the first sentence of which runs thus, *Non ea res agitur utrum Honorius Papa in intimo corde suo heterodoxe senserit, nec ne*. Still more clearly we explained ourselves there [†] (p. 14): *Eum (Honorium) itaque in corde hoereticæ non sensisse, at tamen reapse terminum specificæ orthodoxum (duo ejergei ai) damnasse, et terminum specificæ hoereticum (efi qeḇhma) sancivisse*.

This fundamental position I must still retain, that Honorius at heart thought rightly, but expressed himself unhappily; even if, in what follows, as a result of repeated new investigation of this subject, and having regard to what others have more recently written in defense of Pope Honorius, I now modify or abandon many details of my earlier statements, and, in particular, form a milder judgment of the first letter of Honorius.

That Honorius did in fact *think* in an orthodox sense is unmistakably plain from the following. In his first letter he placed himself exactly on the standpoint of the Council of Chalcedon and the *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo the Great, and starts quite correctly with the dogma: In Christ there are two natures, the divine and the human, hypostatically united in the divine Person of the Logos, and this ~~ajliairetwv, ajreptwv, ajugcutwv~~. Christ is accordingly perfect God and perfect man (*plene Deus et homo*). This one Person, the Incarnate Logos, works both the divine and the human (there is only *one Worker*), — the divine by mediation of the

manhood, the human ... without detracting from the Godhead (*plena Deitate*), and, on account of this ineffable union of the divine and human nature, we may say (*per communionem idiomatum*): “God suffered,” and “Man came down from heaven.”

On this Chalcedonian standpoint Honorius wished to remain, and again to cover up in silence the questions which had recently been cast up, and which had disturbed the peace of the Church. Instead of solving these questions, as was possible, by correct inferences from the decisions in regard to the faith laid down at Chalcedon, Honorius wished to stifle them. It might have been well, perhaps, if he had succeeded in this; but he did not succeed, and his attempt to put them down was injurious to him and to the Church. As with the Council of Chalcedon, he confessed so energetically the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, and added that each of these had remained in its perfection (*plene Deus et homo* and *plena divinitate, plena carne*), also that the differences of the natures had remained, he ought to have inferred from this, that there were only two energies and two wills (the divine and the human) in Christ; for a nature without will and energy is not a perfect one (*plena*), indeed, scarcely a nature at all. But this inference, which resulted from his premisses, he did not set forth clearly either in regard to the wills or the energies.

In the first respect (in regard to the wills), he seems even to maintain the opposite. Speaking of the *ineffabilis conjunctio* of the two natures, he proceeds: *Unde (open) et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. It is this very *unde* which occasioned our saying in the first edition: “Honorius inferred that as there was only *one who willed*, therefore there was only *one will*”; and “*he* laid the will on the side of the *person* instead of on the side of the *nature*.” These statements we can no longer fully maintain; on the contrary, even in the first letter of Honorius, the words *opera divinitatis et humanitatis* show that the *humanitas* and the *divinitas*, and thus *each nature*, works and wills. In the second letter of Honorius, as we shall see, the will is still more clearly placed on the side of the nature.

Let us now consider in what connection the unhappy sentence, *Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, stands, which literally taken is quite Monothelite. Honorius intended to reply to the remark of Sergius, who had written: “The admission of two energies would also lead to the admission of two wills in Christ, *of which the one is opposed to the other*, since the Logos is willing to endure suffering, but the

manhood opposes. This is, however, quite inaccurate, for in one subject there cannot be two *contrarioe voluntates*.” Entering upon this, Honorius says: *Unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. This means at the first glance: “You are right, Sergius; we cannot admit *two* wills in Christ.” As reason, however, why we should admit only *unam voluntatem* in Christ, Honorius proceeds: “Christ did not assume the *natura vitiosa* with its corrupt will (*lex membrorum et carnis*), but the uncorrupted human nature, as it was before the Fall.” Quite correct. Hence follows, however, not *una voluntas in Christa*, but *DUAE voluntates*, the divine and the incorrupt human.

Honorius ought, partly agreeing with Sergius and partly correcting him, to have answered:

(a) “You are quite right in saying that we must not ascribe two *contrarias voluntates* to Christ, for He did not assume the *natura humana vitiosa*;

(b) but, nevertheless, there are in Christ *two wills*, the divine and the incorrupt human.”

Honorius in his answer neglected the latter side. The former he set forth in the words: “We acknowledge only *one will* in Christ, because He did not assume the *vitiosa natura*. If he thus, to the ear, uttered the primary Monothelite proposition, yet it is clear from his own words that he in no way regarded the *incorrupt* will of human nature as lacking in Christ, if he did not expressly assume it. He says, *e.g.*, “Christ did not assume the *vitiosa natura, quae repugnat legi roentis ejus*.” He thus recognizes in Christ the *lex mentis*; and this, according to the Pauline usage (~~41723~~ Romans 7:23), with which Honorius is in accord, is evidently nothing else than the incorrupt human will.

The Monothelites, however, clung simply to the phrase, *unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, and the fact that the Pope gave utterance to this their primary proposition must have given essential assistance to their cause. Professor Pennacchi of Rome.^{f54} has indeed denied[†] (p. 282), in opposition to me, that the Monothelites might have appealed to Honorius for their doctrine of only *one* will in Christ; but it comes out quite clearly from the disputation of Maximus with Pyrrhus, that the Monothelites adduced that passage in the first letter of Honorius as on their side (see below, sec. 303); and the Jesuit Schneemann says quite

accurately, in his *Studien über die Honoriusfrage* (Herder, Freiburg 1864:, S. 16): “It is certain that the conduct of Honorius was at least a mischievous error, and gave the greatest assistance to the Monothelite heresy. Encouraged and supported by his letters, the Greek Emperors put forth the *Ecthesis* and the milder form of it, the *Typus*, and endeavored to give effect to those decrees by force. ... Nor can we say that the error of Honorius was quite excusable. If he had gone to work with more consideration and examination, the endeavor of the Monothelite patriarch could not have remained concealed from him; and, in fact, Sophronius had sent envoys to Rome with this very purpose.”

We shall shortly see that the second successor of Honorius, Pope John IV. (see sec. 298), tried to explain and justify this *unam voluntatem*, by saying that Honorius, in opposition to Sergius, had only to speak of the will of the human nature, and therefore quite correctly said, we recognize only *one human will* in Christ.^{f55} As, however, we do not find this kind of defense satisfactory, as will be seen, we believe that we can in another way explain how Honorius was led to this now ominous phrase, *unam voluntatem*. With perfect right he denied that there could be two CONTRARIAE *voluntates* in Christ, and was convinced that the *lex mentis* in Christ was in constant harmony with his *voluntas divina*, that it was always *morally* one with it, and this *unitas moralis* he wished to bring out clearly. His words, *Unde unam voluntatem fatemur Domini Jesu Christi*, thus have the meaning: “On account of the *ineffabilis conjunctio* of the two natures in Christ, there are in Him, not *two mutually opposed* wills, but only *one will*, taken *morally*; i.e. only one will-tendency, one *moral* unity of will, since in Him the human *incorrupt* will was always in conformity with the divine, and was always harmonious with it.”

That Honorius meant, in fact, by his *unam voluntatem*, to express this *moral* unity of will, is clearly seen from the words which immediately follow, in which he assigns the reason why there is only *una voluntas* in Christ, namely, that He had assumed only the *faultless* human nature, as it were, before the Fall. Thus falls away of itself what we thought ourselves justified in saying in the first edition (S. 138): “Honorius interchanged the *moral* unity of will with the *physical*.” We added there: “Even the clear passages of Holy Scripture, in which Christ distinguishes His human will from that of the Father, could not decide him (Honorius) to recognize this human will.” These are the passages: “I came down from heaven, not to do

Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me” (S. ~~413~~ John 6:38); and, *Non quod Ego volo, sed quod Tu vis, Pater* (S. ~~414~~ Mark 14:36).

Honorius adduces these passages because an opponent might infer from them, that Christ Himself said that there was in Him a will contrary to the divine, and thus *duas contrarias voluntates*. In opposition to this, Honorius remarks: *Non sunt haec diversae (= contrariae) voluntatis, sed dispensationis humanitatis assumptae, i.e.* “These passages do not refer to a will in Christ which is opposed to the divine, but to an accommodation of the human nature assumed. For our sakes has Christ thus spoken, to give us an example, that we, following in His footsteps, should ever subject our will to the divine.” It is clear, then, that he thus denied in Christ only a human will which was *opposed* to the divine, but not the human will generally. But, it may be asked, what are we to understand by the words *dispensationis (oikonomiav) humanitatis assumptae*. In the first edition (S. 135), we translated: “(Christ spoke those words) from economy (accommodation) with respect to mankind, whose nature He assumed.” How this is to be understood we did not explain, but Schneemann contests the accuracy of this translation, since under *suscepta humanitas* we are plainly to understand the *singular* human nature which Christ assumed, ^{f56} and, by comparison of patristic passages, arrived at the result: “The meaning of the incriminated words of Honorius is as follows: The passages of Holy Scripture in which the will of Christ is opposed to the will of the Father do not point to a will which is in opposition to the divine will, but to an accommodation of the human nature assumed; *i.e.* to a quite voluntary condescension to our weakness, in consequence of which the assumed (human) nature of Christ had those volitions of sorrowfulness and fear in presence of the suffering willed by His Heavenly Father” (S. 46). And (S. 47) Honorius says: “Those affections in which Christ recoiled from suffering, and which He described, in the passages quoted, as acts of *His* will in opposition to the will of the *Father*, proceeded not from desire, were not in opposition to His divine will, because they were aroused by voluntary permission in His human nature.” No less (S. 50): “The Savior, according to Honorius, said these things, not on His own account, as if the movements of His will, which received their description and theft expression in those words (the unwillingness to suffer, etc.), had followed *of necessity* from His human nature, but for our sakes, in order to give us an example, He assumed that fear and sorrowfulness, and spoke those words in which He submitted those movements of His will to the divine

will.” The accommodation consisted, then, in this, that the opposition of will to the suffering willed by the Father was not a *natural necessity* in Christ (because He assumed human nature), but that HE voluntarily condescended to our weakness, and allowed His human nature to receive those movements of will. I will not be answerable for this exposition of *Schneemann’s*, and I find the same thought in the beautiful synodal letter of Sophronius of Jerusalem, which meets us in the following paragraph, and in which it is said, “He suffered, and acted, and worked as man, when HE Himself willed, and when He regarded it as useful for the onlookers, but not when the physical and carnal movements wished to be physically moved to activity,” *i.e. non ex diversa voluntate*.

Thus we have again the result: Honorius denied only a will in Christ which *opposed* the divine, and was constrained by His own promises to recognize, along with the divine, the will of the uncorrupted human nature in Christ, which was ever in conformity with the divine. He did not, however, say this plainly, but instead, put forth the unhappy phrase with the Monothelitic sound, *unam voluntatem fatemur in Domino*.

In regard, then, to the question of the *Energies*, Honorius, at the beginning of his first letter, commends the Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople for having got rid of the new expression, *mi a ejerſgeia*, “which might give offense to the simple.” He disapproves, then, the Monothelite *mi a ejerſgeia*, which of necessity seemed offensive, not merely to the “simple,” but to all the orthodox. But he does not rise to seeing clearly that, from the orthodox point of view, the opposite *mi a ejerſgeiai* should be taught; but, on the contrary, towards the end of his first letter, advises them to use this expression just as little as the opposite *mi a ejerſgeia*. (*Hortantes vos, ut unius vel geminæ novæ vocis inductum operationis vocabulum aufugientes*, etc. ¹⁵⁷) Here again we see that he had only to draw the proper inferences from his own words in order to discover the truth. From the fact that he held, with the Council of Chalcedon, two *perfect* natures in Christ, there follows of necessity the admission of two *energies* or *operationes*. A nature without energy is a dead one, not a *plena*. Honorius, moreover, said, at the end of his letter: *Christum in duabus naturis operatum (esse) divinitus et humanitus*. And similarly, at the beginning of it: *Coruscavit miraculis* and *thv sarkov tax diaghseiv toi x ojei dis moi v tou paqouv ejerghsav*. The Latin translation is weaker: *Passiones et opprobria patitur*.

About the middle of the letter, however, we read: *Opera divinitatis et humanitatis*. What does this mean but that the divine nature in Christ worked, and also the human, *i.e.* that we are to admit two energies or *operationes* in Christ? If Honorius, nevertheless, thinks that we should speak neither of one nor of two operations, this shows that, when he wrote the first letter, the expression so often employed afterwards, *operatio* and **ejeŕgeia**, was not yet clear to him. This is evident also from his statement, that Christ works in many ways (**pol utropwv**). By **ejeŕgeia** and *operatio* he understands, then, the *concrete* workings of Christ, instead of the *kinds* of working. In the second letter, on the contrary, as we have seen [†](p. 33), he expresses himself quite correctly.

Moreover, when Honorius, in his first letter, wished to know that the phrase “one or two operations or energies” was avoided, he was influenced by his desire for the peace of the Church, and by the fear lest, under the *una operatio*, Monophysitism might be foisted upon the Church, or, under *duoe operationes*, Nestorianism. And we must not, in fact, forget that, at the beginning of the Monothelite controversies, men were much less in a position to estimate correctly the range of the terms **mia ejeŕgeia** and **duo ejeŕgeiai** than at a later period.

SEC. 297. SYNOD AT JERUSALEM, A.D. 634, AND SYNODAL LETTER OF THE PATRIARCH SOPHRONIUS. ^{F58}

Now at last appeared the *Epistola Synodica* of the new patriarch, Sophronius of Jerusalem, whose long delay had already been blamed by Sergius [†](p. 24). This is almost the most important document in the whole Monothelite controversy; a great theological treatise, which expatiated on all the chief doctrines, especially the Trinity and the Incarnation, and richly discussed the doctrine of two energies in Christ. It brought out the nature of the subject, and Theophanes, as well as the *Vita S. Maxtrot*, testifies ^{f59} that of the portion on the principal subject, similar copies were sent to all the patriarchs. The copy which was sent to Sergius has come down to us among the Acts of the eleventh session of the sixth Oecumenical Council.

^{f60} In agreement with Theophanes and the author of the *Vita Maximi* (*ll. cc.*), the *Synodicon* says, Sophronius, on ascending the throne, held a Synod in Jerusalem (634), and here the rejection of Monothelitism and the solemn proclamation of Dyothelitism were decreed. ^{f61} Walch ^{f62} holds the opinion that, at that time, when Palestine was so grievously oppressed by the Saracens, Sophronius could hardly have held a Synod, and even

although his epistle had been named in the sixth Oecumenical Council,^{f63} this proves nothing, as it had been the fashion to call epistles written on a bishop's enthronization (**sul labai-ejqronitikai**) by the name of **sunodika**.^{f64} The learned man did not consider that at the consecration of each new bishop, especially of a patriarch, several bishops had to be present and take part, that on such occasions, and also at the consecration of new churches, it was customary to hold Synods, and an **ejqronistikon** for this very reason was called a **sunodikon**.

The letter of Sophronius begins with the assurance that, in his high position, he longed for his former peace and lowliness, and that he had undertaken the bishopric only when constrained or even tyrannically compelled. Therefore he commends himself to his colleagues, and prays that they will support him like fathers and brothers. It was an old custom that a bishop, at his entrance upon office, should lay his creed before the other bishops. This he also did, and they could examine his confession, and amend it where it was defective.

After this Introduction follows the kernel of the whole letter in the form of a Creed. The first passage treats of the Trinity without touching upon the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. The second part, which is much more complete, is dedicated to the doctrine of the Incarnation, and speaks, in the spirit of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters (vol. 4, sec. 263), of a **mia upostasiv Cristou-sunqetov**, repeats Cyril's expression, **mia fusiv tou-Qeou-Logou sesarkwmenh**, and opposes Docetism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism. After bringing out very clearly the unity of the person and the duality of the natures, Sophronius passes on thus to the new question: "Christ is **efi kai duo**. He is ONE in hypostasis and person, but two in natures and in their natural properties. Of these HE is permanently one, and yet ceases not to be dual in nature. Therefore one and the same Christ and Son and only-begotten is recognized undivided in both natures, and HE worked **fusikwv** the works of each nature (**oujsia**), according to the essential quality or natural property belonging to each nature,^{f65} which would not have been possible if He possessed only one single or composite nature as well as one hypostasis. He who is one and the same could not then have perfectly performed the works of each nature. For when did the Godhead without a body perform the works of the body **fusikwv**? Or when did a body, unconnected with the Godhead, perform works which belong essentially to the Godhead? Emmanuel, however, who is one, and in

this unity two, God and man, did in truth perform the works of each of the two natures: one and the same, as God the divine, as man the human. One and the same HE acts and speaks divinely and humanly. It is not one who worked the miracles, another who performed the human works and endured the sufferings, as Nestorius thought, but one and the same Christ and Son performed the divine and the human, but *kat ja] lo kai x] lo*, as S. Cyril taught. In each of the two natures he had the power (*ejxousian*, *i.e.* for natural working) unconfused, but also unseparated. In so far as He is eternal God, He performed the miracles; but in so far as, in the last times, He became man, did He perform the humble and human works. As in Christ each nature possesses its property inviolable, so each form (nature) works, in communion with the other, what is proper to itself. ^{f66} The Logos works what belongs to the Logos, in communion with the body; and the body accomplishes what belongs to the body, ^{f67} in union with the Logos, and yet in one hypostasis, far from any separation; for not as separated did they (the two *formoe*) work that which was proper to them, so that we cannot think of a separation of them (the *formoe*). Therefore Nestorius has no cause for rejoicing; for neither of the two natures worked by itself, and without communion with the other, that which is proper to it, and we do not teach, as he did, two working Christs and Sons, although we recognize two forms working in communion, each of which works according to its own natural property. Moreover, we say, there is one and the same Christ who has physically accomplished the lofty and the lowly according to the physical and essential quality of each of His two natures; for the unchanged and unmingled natures were in no way deprived of those (special qualities and properties). Nor have Eutyches and Dioscurus reason for rejoicing, those teachers of the divine mingling; for each nature has in communion with the other accomplished that which is proper to it, without separation and without interchange, preserving its distinction from the other. Therefore, as on the one side we teach that one and the same Christ and Son works both, so on the other side, by the proposition that each form works in communion with the other what is proper to itself, whilst there are in Christ two forms working naturally what is proper to them, so we, as orthodox Christians, indicate no separation, rejecting both the Eutychians and the Nestorians, who, although opposed to each other, yet take common part in the impious war against us.

“Not regarding these, we recognize the special energy of each nature, and a physical energy which belongs to their essence, and which has

communion with the other, which proceeds unseparated from each essence and nature according to the physical and essential quality which dwells in it, and at the same time takes with it the unseparated and unmingled energy of the other nature (is united with it). This makes the distinction of energies in Christ, as the existence of the natures makes the distinction of natures. For the Godhead and the manhood are not identical in their natural quality, although they are united in one hypostasis in an ineffable manner, ... for God the Logos is the Word of God, and not flesh, although He has also logically (through the reason) assumed living flesh, and united it with Himself by hypostatical and physical **ἑνωσiv** (in the sense of Cyril. Cf. vol. 4, sec. 263); and the flesh is logically made alive, but it is not Logos, although it is the flesh of God the Logos. Therefore they have not, even after the hypostatic union, the same energy undistinguishable the one from the other; and we do not confess one only natural energy, belonging to the essence and quite undistinguished in both, so that we may not press the two natures into one essence (**ουσία**) and one nature, as the Acephali do.

“As, then, we ascribe an energy of its own to each of the two natures which are united unmingled in Christ, in order not to mingle the two natures which are united but not mingled, since the natures are known by their energies, and by them alone, and the difference of the natures from the difference of the energies, as those who have understanding in these things declare; so we maintain all the speech and energy (activity, action) of Christ, whether divine and heavenly or human and earthly, proceed from one and the same Christ and Son, from the one compound (**συνγετοῦ**) and unique hypostasis which is the Incarnate Logos of God, who brings forth **ἑκ τῆς** from Himself both energies unseparated and unmixed according to (**κατὰ**) His natures. According to His divine nature, by which HE is **ὁμοούσιος** with the Father, (He brings forth) the divine and ineffable energy; according to His human nature, by which He became **ὁμοούσιος** with us man — the human and earthly; and the energy is ever in accordance with the nature to which belongs. ... By this, that one and the same Christ and Son works both, He (Christ) opposes Nestorianism; but by this, that the properties of each nature remained unmingled, and He (Christ) produced the two energies of the two natures equally, ... He has set aside Eutychianism. Therefore, born in the same manner as we, He is fed with milk, grows, passes through the bodily changes of age up to manhood, felt hunger and thirst like us, and like us grew weary by walking, for He put forth the same energy in walking as we do, which is an

ajqrwpiaww ejergoumenh, and, going forth in accordance with human nature, was a proof of His human nature. He went then, like us, from one place to another, as He had truly become man; and as He possessed our nature without diminution, He likewise participated in the outline (form) of the body, and had a form similar to ours. This is the bodily form to which HE was shaped in His mother's womb, and which He will for ever preserve inviolate. Therefore HE ate when HE was hungry, drank when HE was thirsty, and drank like a man; therefore He was, when a child, carried in the arms of the Virgin and lay on His mother's bosom. Therefore He sat down when He was weary, and slept when He had need of sleep; experienced pain when He was struck, suffered from scourging, and endured pains of the body when He was nailed by His hands and feet to the cross; *for He gave and granted to the human nature, when HE would, time to work (ejergein) and to suffer, which is proper to it, that His incarnation should not be regarded as mere appearance. Not unwillingly or by constraint did He undertake this, although He let it come to Him physically and humanly, and worked and acted in human movements.* Such a shocking opinion be far from us! For HE who endured such sufferings in the flesh was God, who redeemed us by His sufferings, and thereby procured for us deliverance from suffering. *And He suffered and acted and worked humanly, when HE HIMSELF willed, and when He regarded it as profitable for the onlookers; and not when the natural and carnal movements willed to be naturally moved to operation;* although His impious enemies sought to accomplish their malice — (He suffered only when HE willed). He had assumed a passible and mortal and perishable body, which was subject to natural and sinless feelings, and to this He appointed that, in accordance with its nature, it should suffer and labor until the resurrection from the dead. For then He released our passible and mortal and perishable part, and granted us deliverance from this. So HE voluntarily manifested the humble and human as **fusikwv**, yet remaining God in this. *He was for Himself ruler over His human sufferings and actions, and not merely ruler, but also Lord over them,* although He had become physically flesh in a passible nature. Therefore was His humanity superior to man, not as though His nature was not human, but in so far as He had *voluntarily* become man, and as man had undertaken sufferings, and not by compulsion and of necessity and against His will, as is the case with us, but *when and how far* He willed. To those who prepared sufferings for Him He gave permission, and He yielded approval to the physically worked sufferings. His divine acts, however, the glorious and

exalted, which far transcend our poverty, namely, the miracles and signs, wonder-rousing works, *e.g.*, the conception without seed, the leaping of John in his mother's womb, the birth without fraction, the inviolate virginity, the heavenly message to the shepherds, the announcement by the star to the magi, the knowledge without having learnt (S. ~~John~~ John 7:15), the change of the water into wine, the strengthening of the lame, the healing of the blind, etc., etc., the sudden feeding of the hungry, the stilling of the wind and the sea, the bodily walking on the waters, the expulsion of unclean spirits, the sudden convulsion of the elements, the self-opening of the graves, the rising from the dead after three days, unhindered going forth from the watched grave in spite of stone and seal, the entering through closed doors, the miraculous and corporeal ascent into heaven, and all of the same character, which is above our understanding and above our words, and transcends all human thought, all these things were recognisable proofs of the divine being and nature of God the Logos, if they were performed by flesh and body, and not without the body quickened by reason. ... He who, in hypostasis, is the one and unseparated Son with two natures, by the one worked the divine signs, by the other undertook the lower, and therefore, say those who are taught of God: If you hear opposing expressions on the one Son, distribute them according to the natures; the great and divine ascribe to the divine nature, the low and the human to the human. ... Further, they say, in regard to the Son: *All energy belongs to the ONE Son; but to which nature that which is wrought is proper must be learnt by the understanding.* Very finely do they teach that we must confess one Emmanuel, for so is the Incarnate Logos named; *and this one* (and not an **α | ο υ κ α ι α | ο υ**) *works all, the high and the low, without exception,*... all words and deeds (energies) belong to one and the same, although the one are Godlike, others manlike; and, again, others have an intermediate character, and have the Godlike and the manlike together. Of this kind is that **κοινη <kainh> kai <Qeandri kh> epergeia** of Dionysius the Areopagite, which is not one, but of two kinds, so far as it has at once the Godlike and the human, and, by a compound naming of the one and of the other nature and essence, completely discloses each of the two energies."

The third division of the letter of Sophronius refers to the creation of the world: "The Father made all things through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The sensuous creatures have an end, the intellectual and supersensuous do not die; yet are they not by nature immortal, but through grace, as the souls of

men and the angels.” Then the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls is rejected, and this and other errors of Origen condemned, especially the doctrine of the **apokatastasis**, against which Sophronius quotes the doctrine of the Church on the end of the world, on the future life, on hell and heaven. Further, he declares his adhesion to the five Oecumenical Councils and their declarations of faith; also, that he recognizes all the writings of Cyril, especially those against Nestorius, his synodal letters with the twelve anathematisms; also, his letter of union (see vol. 3, sec. 157), and the writings of the Orientals agreeing therewith; further, the letter of Leo to Flavian, and all his letters; generally, he says he accepts all that the Church accepts, and rejects all that she rejects. In particular, he pronounces anathema on Simon Magus, etc., etc., mentioning by name a great number of heretics and heresies from the earliest times up to the different Monophysite sects and their latest leaders. At the close, he prays his colleagues again to correct what is defective in this synodal letter of his, which he will very thankfully receive, and commends to their prayers, himself, his Church, and the Emperors, to whom he wishes victory, especially over the Saracens, who at this time so grievously afflict and threaten the Roman Empire. ^{f68}

SEC. 298. SECOND LETTER OF HONORIUS. HIS ORTHODOXY.

What results the synodal letter of Sophronius produced is unknown. We only know that Sergius, as one of the speakers at the sixth Oecumenical Council asserts, did not receive it; and if Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 137), ^{f69} in opposition to Combefis, maintains that none of the ancients knew anything of this, he has overlooked the passage in question in the synodal Acts just mentioned. Moreover, he is wrong in thinking that Sergius made another attempt to avert the threatening storm, and therefore turned to Cyrus and Honorius. In favor of this he appeals to two still extant fragments of a letter from Pope Honorius to Sergius, preserved among the Acts of the thirteenth session of the sixth Oecumenical Council; ^{f70} but these only show that the Pope, and not Sergius, made repeated attempts to secure peace.

The first fragment from the letter of the Pope says: “We have also written to Cyrus of Alexandria, that the newly invented expression may be rejected, one or two energies, ... for those who use such expressions, what else do they want than the term: Copying *one or two natures*, so to introduce one or two energies. In respect to the natures, the doctrine of the

Bible is clear; but it is quite idle to ascribe one or two energies to the Mediator between God and man.”

The second fragment, at the close of the letter, runs: “This we wished to bring to the knowledge of your fraternity by this letter. Moreover, with regard to the ecclesiastical dogma, and what we ought to hold and teach, on account of the simplicity of men and to avoid controversies, we must, as I have already said, assert neither one nor two energies in the Mediator between God and men, but must confess that both natures are naturally united in the one Christ, that each in communion with the other worked and acted (*operantes atque operatrices*; Greek, *ejergousav kai < praktikav*); *the divine works the divine, and the human performs that which is of the flesh* (these are the well-known words of Leo I), without separation and without mixture, and without the nature of God being changed into the manhood, or the human nature into the Godhead. For one and the same is lowly and exalted, equal to the Father and inferior to the Father ... Thus keeping away, as I said, from the vexation of new expressions, we must not maintain or proclaim either one or two energies, but, instead of one energy which some maintain, we must confess that the one Christ, the Lord, truly works in both natures; and instead of the two energies they should prefer to proclaim with us the two natures, *i.e.* the Godhead and the assumed manhood, *which work what is proper to them* (*ejergousav ta- ϵ thia*, *propria operantes*) *in the one Person of the only-begotten Son of God, unmingled and unseparated and unchanged*. This we will make known to your brotherly Holiness, that we may harmonize in the one doctrine of the faith. We also wrote to our brethren the Bishops Cyrus and Sophronius, that they may not persist in the new expressions of one or two energies, but proclaim with us the one Christ, the divine and the human by means of both natures (we did this), although we had already emphatically impressed upon the envoys whom Sophronius sent to us, that he should not persist in the expression *two energies*, and they promised it to us fully on the condition that Cyrus would also desist from proclaiming *mi α ejer ϵ geia*.”

On this point we remarked in the first edition (S. 147): “If we compare this second letter with the first, we find

(a) before all, the like sharp accentuating of the leading proposition: Notwithstanding the duality of the natures in Christ, there is yet only one Worker, the Lord Jesus Christ, who works the divine and human

by means of both natures. There, as here, the willing and working are incorrectly regarded as proceeding from the Person and not from the nature. That we do not now maintain this latter assertion we have already remarked; and even if the first letter does not justify the assumption that Honorius, from the correct premiss, there is only one Worker, drew the false inference, therefore there is only one will, for the will lies on the side of the person, not of the nature; the second letter certainly shows more clearly that Honorius, too, sought the will on the side of the nature. We said, therefore, even in the first edition,

(b) “In this second letter, however, Honorius deserts this error (with which we charged him), whether the beautiful and clear explanation of Sophronius helped him to this, or a deeper consideration of the classical words of Leo I, to which he had recourse (*agit utraque formam cum alterius communione, quod proprium est*), led him to it.

“Setting aside the unsavory **pol utropwv ejergei** (of the first letter), he now says quite correctly: We confess that the two natures are naturally united in the one Christ, that each *works* and *acts* in communion with the other, — the divine nature in Christ works the divine, and the human performs that which is of the flesh; and, “We proclaim the two natures which work unmingled in the one Person of the only-begotten Son of God that which is proper to them (*propria operantes*). In this Honorius pronounced the orthodox doctrine, and it would be quite wrong to charge him with heresy.”

Thus we wrote even in the first edition. We now add that Honorius in this passage declares for two natures in Christ, and to each of the two natures he ascribes its own **ejergein**, and therewith also a will. He there speaks of the two natures as **ejergousav kai praktikav** and *propria operantes*. But we must with all this repeat what we said in the first edition: In contradiction to these his own utterances, Honorius yet demands again the avoidance of the orthodox phrase, **duo ejergeiai**. After himself saying, “Both natures *work what is proper to them*,” it was inconsistent to disapprove of the phrase, *two energies*.

The most offensive thing in the first letter of Honorius, the expression **efi qe-thma**, is no longer expected in the fragment of the second letter.^{f71}

A defense of Honorius was undertaken, A.D. 641, by his second successor, Pope John IV., in a letter to the Emperor Constantine (son of Heraclius),

entitled *Apologia pro Honorio Papa*. When Pope John learnt that the Patriarch Pyrrhus of Constantinople appealed to Honorius in defense of the doctrine of one will, he wrote to the Emperor: “The whole West is scandalised by our brother, the Patriarch Pyrrhus, proclaiming, in his letters which are circulated in all directions, novelties which are contrary to the rule of faith, and referring to our predecessor, Pope Honorius of blessed memory, as of his opinion, which was entirely foreign to the mind of the Catholic Father (*quod a mente Catholici patris erat penitus alienum*). The Patriarch Sergius communicated to the said Roman bishop that some maintained two *contrarias voluntates* in Christ. When the Pope learnt this, he answered him: As our Redeemer is *monadicus unus*, so was HE miraculously conceived and born above all human way and manner. He (Honorius) taught that HE was as well perfect God as perfect man, born without sin, in order to renew the noble origin (*originem*) which had been lost by sin. As second Adam, there was in Him no sin, either by birth or through intercourse with men. For when the Word was made flesh, and assumed all that was ours, He did not take on the *vitium reatus* which springs from the propagation of sin. He assumed, from the inviolate Virgin Mary, the likeness of our flesh, but not of sin. Therefore had Christ, as the first Adam, *only one natural will of His humanity*, not two *contrarias voluntates*, as we who are born of the sin of Adam, ... In such wise our predecessor Honorius answered Sergius, that there were not in the Redeemer two *contrarioe voluntates*, *i.e.* also a *voluntas in membris*, as HE had assumed nothing of the sin of the first man. The Redeemer did indeed assume our nature, but not the *culpa criminis*. Let, then, no unintelligent critic blame Honorius, that he speaks only of the human and not also of the divine nature, but let him know that *he answered that concerning which the patriarch inquired. Where the wound is, there the healing is applied*. Even the apostle has sometimes brought forward the divine, and sometimes the human nature of Christ alone.” ^{f72}

As second defender of Honorius, the Roman abbot, Joannes Symponus, is brought forward, and first by S. Maximus in his disputation with the Patriarch Pyrrhus of Constantinople (see below, sec. 303). Honorius had made use of Joannes in the composition of his letter. When Pyrrhus offered the objection: “What have you to answer for Honorius, who quite plainly traced out to my predecessor *one will* in Christ?” Maximus answered: “Who is the trustworthy interpreter of this letter, he who composed it in the name of Honorius, or those who spoke in Constantinople what was

according to their own mind?" To which Pyrrhus replied: "He who composed it." Then Maximus: "He, then, has expressed himself on the subject, in the letter to the Emperor Constantine, which he prepared by commission of Pope John IV. (the reference is to the above letter, the contents of which are repeated here substantially, although not verbally), as follows: We have (in that letter) maintained *one* will in Christ, not of the Godhead and manhood together, for we spoke of the *one* will of the *manhood* alone. Since Sergius had written that some were teaching two contradictory wills in Christ, we answered, that Christ had not two mutually contradictory wills, of the flesh and of the Spirit, like us men *after* the Fall, but only *one* will, which ~~fusikw~~ *carakthrizei* His manhood. If, however, any one would say: "Why have you, treating of the manhood of Christ, been quite silent respecting His Godhead?" We reply: "In the first place, Honorius answered that about which Sergius inquired; and, in the second place, as in everything so also here, we have kept to the custom of Holy Scripture, which sometimes speaks of the Godhead, and sometimes of the manhood alone." ^{f73}

We have already pointed out, in passing, that there is here not a second *Apologia pro Honorio*, but only that of Pope John IV., since the Abbot Joannes Symponus had also composed the letter of John IV. to the Emperor (*Apologia pro Honorio*), as he was also the composer of the letters of Honorius to Sergius. What Maximus here makes the Abbot Joannes say, is nothing else than what this abbot had conceived by commission of Pope John IV., and what we therefore have adduced as *Apologia* of John IV. The thoughts are the same, only that Maximus quoted *ex memoria*, and not with perfect verbal accuracy (this remark is wanting in the first edition).

If we said in the first edition, "This interpretation of the letter of Honorius given by Pope John and Abbot John appears to us *suavior quam verior*," we can even now not regard it as quite admissible. We allow that Honorius spoke of the *una voluntas* in such a manner that he excluded only a *corrupt* human will in Christ; and it is also correct to say, as does Pope John IV., that the whole West understood the letter of Honorius in an orthodox sense. But that is not correct, which is made so prominent in this apology, that, in answering Sergius, he had *only of the manhood of Christ to speak*, and had no occasion to speak of anything else than of the *human* will of Christ. The apology says: "It should be known that he answered that which Sergius asked." But Sergius did in no way ask whether we should admit in

Christ, along with the natural human will, also that of the *natura vitiosa* or the *lex membrorum*. He asked nothing at all on this subject, but quite definitely maintained “that in Christ there can be only one will”; for two wills Sergius regarded only as *contrarias*. Nor is it correct to say that Honorius, as the apology declares, wrote: “Christ, as the first Adam, had only ONE natural will of HIS MANHOOD.” The words “of His manhood” are an addition of the apologists. The corresponding words in Maximus, “one will which **fusikwv carakthrizei** His manhood,” are likewise not found in the letter of Honorius. If Honorius had really, as the apologist says, “applied the healing where the wound was”; if he had answered correctly what Sergius laid before him, he must have said, “There are certainly not in Christ two *contrarioe voluntates*, because HE did not assume the *vitiosa natura humana*; but also, not merely one will, but along with the *divine* stands the uncorrupted *human* will, which is always in conformity with the divine. That would have been the correct reply to the false assertion of Sergius.”¹⁷⁴

The celebrated Abbot Maximus, of whom we shall speak more at large further on, has also defended Honorius in his tome to the Priest Maximus, and, in a manner similar to our own, has drawn from his own words the conclusion, that he had himself recognized two wills in Christ, the divine and the incorrupt human. Maximus, however, added: “The excellent Abbot Anastasius, returning from Rome, related that he had spoken with and inquired of the most distinguished priests of that great Church, in detail, on the **grafeisan epistol hn** to Sergius,”¹⁷⁵ Why and in what way one will in Christ had been asserted in that letter. Anastasius found them troubled and apologetic on the subject (**ajscab| ontav ej| toutw| kai < ajpol ogoumenouv**). Besides, he spoke with the Abbot Joannes Symponus, who had prepared that letter in Latin by command of Honorius. He asserted: “Quod nullo modo mentionem in ea per numerum fecerit omnis omnimodae voluntatis;” *i.e.* that there was not a *numerical unity* of will in Christ asserted in the letter, but this had been done by those who had translated the letter into Greek. It was not the human will generally, but only the corrupt will in Christ that was denied.”¹⁷⁶ It is quite possible that the Monothelites, in their translations and copies of the letter of Honorius, introduced slight alterations, so as to give a complete Monothelite significance to the phrase, *unam voluntatem*, etc. But the Greek text which we have still before us cannot be regarded as falsified; for, when this Greek translation was read aloud in the twelfth session of the sixth Oecumenical

Council, it was compared by the Roman deputy, Bishop John of Portus, with the Latin original which lay in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople, and was found correct.^{f77} Moreover, the successors of Honorius in the Roman see never contested the genuineness of these letters, although they knew that the Monothelites appealed to them, and that the sixth Oecumenical Synod wanted to pronounce, and did pronounce, an anathema upon Honorius on account of these letters.^{f78}

Thus there remains for us the result: The two letters of Pope Honorius, as we now possess them, are unfalsified, and show that Honorius, of the two Monothelite terms **efi qeþhma** and **mi a eþerþgeia**, himself used (in his first letter) the former; but the latter, and also the orthodox expression **duo eþerþgeiai**, he did not wish to be used. If, in his second letter, he repeated the latter (the disapproval of the expression **duo eþerþgeiai**), yet here he himself recognized *two* natural energies in Christ, and in both letters he so expressed himself, that it must be admitted that he did not deny the human will generally, but only the *corrupt* human will in Christ; but although orthodox in his thought, he did not sufficiently see through the Monothelite tendency of Sergius, and expressed himself in such a way as to be misunderstood, so that his letters, especially the first, seemed to confirm Monothelitism, and thereby *practically* helped onward the heresy.^{f79}

In this manner is settled the question respecting the orthodoxy of Pope Honorius;^{f80} and we hold, therefore, the middle path between those who place him on the same grade with Sergius of Constantinople and Cyrus of Alexandria, and number him with the Monothelites,^{f81} and those who, allowing no spot in him, have fallen into the misfortune of *nimum probantes*, so that they would prefer to deny the genuineness of the Acts of the sixth Oecumenical Council and of several other documents,^{f82} or even to ascribe to the sixth Council an error in *facto dogmatico*.^{f83} In opposition to the latter, the appellants (Jansenists) came forward with the argument: If you maintain that the sixth Oecumenical Council fell into an *error facti*, we may maintain the same also in regard to Pope Clement XI. and his Constitution *Unigenitus*. But there is a great difference between the appellants and those apologists of Honorius. The latter proposed

(a) their view out of *reverence* of the holy see, and

(b) from this proceeded to the view that the letters of Honorius, or even the letter of Sergius, which Honorius answered, were afterwards falsified, and in false copies were laid before the sixth Oecumenical

Synod, so that this formed a quite correct judgment in rejecting the (certainly pseudo-) Honorius.^{f84} Or

(c) they contested, like Pennacchi, the Oecumenical character of the sentence of the sixth Council against Honorius. See below, sec. 324.

The middle path, which we hold to be the right one, and have explained above, is, however, essentially different from that which Garnier supposed he had discovered,^{f85} and on which so many distinguished theologians and scholars followed him. According to this, it is conceded that the sixth Oecumenical Synod did really and properly anathematize the letters of Honorius, but not as containing anything heretical, for they were entirely free from this, but only *ob imprudentem silentii oeconomiam*, because Honorius, by requiring this silence, had given powerful assistance to the heresy.^{f86} In opposition to this we maintain,

(a) Honorius gave assistance to the heresy, not merely by requiring silence, but much more by the unhappy expression, *unde unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, as well as by his disapproval of the orthodox term *duo ehesgeiai*. The Monothelites rested upon this, and not upon the silence enjoined.

(b) At the same time, the letters of Honorius, especially the first, are not so entirely without fault as this hypothesis assumes; they contain, at least in their literal meaning, erroneous teaching.

(c) Finally, we shall see (sec. 324) that the sixth Oecumenical Synod pronounced anathema on Honorius by no means merely on account of an *imprudens silentii oeconomia*.

Gfrorer (*Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. 3 pt. 1 S. 54) supposed that the letters of Honorius were the stipulated return for the great complacency shown to him not long before by the Emperor Heraclius. None of the previous Popes, not even Gregory the Great, had succeeded, in spite of repeated efforts, in uniting again with Rome the metropolitan see of Aquileia-Grado, with its ecclesiastical province, which had been in a state of schism since the controversy of the Three Chapters. But Honorius, more fortunate than his predecessors, had carried through the great work, had expelled Fortunatus, the schismatical archbishop of Grado, and had placed Primogenius, “a partisan of Rome,” on the metropolitan chair of Istria — by means of armed assistance from the Greek exarch. “Can it be doubted

for a moment,” exclaims Gfrorer, “that the subjection of the Istrian Church under the see of Peter was the price for which Honorius entered the Monothelite league? One hand washes the other.”

I cannot bestow upon this hypothesis the commendation which it has received from Kurtz in his *Manual of Church History* (1853, Bd. 1 S. 181). Apart from the fact that Primogenius is very inaptly named a partisan of Rome (he was a subdeacon of the Roman Church), the substructure of Gfrorer’s edifice is untenable; for it is not correct to say that none of the Popes before Honorius had succeeded in uniting the see of Grado. Such a union, in fact, took place in the year 607. The see of Aquileia-Grado received in Candidian an orthodox metropolitan; and all the bishops of this ecclesiastical province, whose sees lay in the imperial territory, forsook the schism.^{f87} What, then, happened under Pope Honorius? The schismatic Fortunatus had, with the help of the Longobardi, possessed himself of the see of Grado, and endeavored to renew the schism. His suffragans were indignant at this, and the imperial governor (exarch) at Ravenna also threatened him, so that Fortunatus found it well to flee into the country of the Longobardi, first stealing the treasure of the Church (629 or 630). Pope Honorius now placed the Roman subdeacon Primogenius in the see of Grado, and demanded of the Longobardi, vainly, indeed, the surrender of those valuables of the Church of Grado. We still possess^{f88} his letter on this subject to the bishops of Istria, at the close of which the passage occurs which Baronius misunderstood: “In similar cases the fathers of the *Christianissima respublica* would do the like,” *i.e.* give up stolen goods that had been brought into their country. Baronius thought that by *Christianissima respublica* Venice was to be understood; but Muratori, long ago, correctly remarked (*History of Italy*, vol. 4) that quite commonly this expression is used to designate the Roman Empire. From what has been said, however, it is clear that the union of the see of Grado and its suffragans was earlier than the time of Pope Honorius, and that under him only a temporary disturbance of the union was ended. This disturbance, in itself untenable through the opposition of the suffragans, did not need to be bribed with the blood-money of the consent to heresy.

We have already seen, to some extent, from the apology of John IV., what judgment was formed of Honorius at Rome. In agreement with this, Martin I and his Lateran Synod, A.D. 649, and so Pope Agatho and his Synod in 680, did not reckon Honorius among the Monothelites, but rather held his memory in honor, and expressed themselves as though *all* previous Popes

had been opponents of the heresy. We shall see more fully (sec. 324) how they spoke of Honorius in Rome after the sixth Oecumenical Council.

On the question: Whether the two letters of Honorius were put forth *ex cathedra*, as it is called, or not, the views among his defenders are very different. Pennacchi maintains that they were put forth *auctoritate apostolica* (*l.c.* page 169 sqq.), whilst Schneemann (*l.c.* S. 63) holds the opposite opinion. For my own part, I confess myself here on the side of Pennacchi, since Honorius intended to give first to the Church of Constantinople, and *implicite* to the whole Church, an instruction on doctrine and faith; and in his second letter he even uses the expression: *Ceterum, quantum ad DOGMA ECCLESIASTICUM pertinet, ... non unam vel duas operationes in mediatore Dei et hominum definire debemus.*^{f89}

SEC 299. THE ECTHESIS OF THE EMPEROR HERACLIUS, A.D. 638.

The answer of Constantinople to the synodal letter of Sophronius was the Ecthesis (setting forth of the faith) of the Emperor Heraclius. The successor of Sergius, Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, says on this subject in his disputation with Maximus: "The unseasonable letter of Sophronius has rendered it necessary for us (in Constantinople), against our will, so to act," *i.e.* to put forth the Ecthesis.^{f90} That Sergius was its composer is uncontested, and is by the Emperor Heraclius himself declared. In order to separate the discontent of the Westerns, on account of the Ecthesis, from his person, he wrote in the beginning of the year 641 to Pope John IV.: "The Ecthesis is not mine, and I have not recommended its promulgation, but the Patriarch Sergius drew it up five years ago, and on my return from the East petitioned me to publish it with my subscription."^{f91}

For the authorship of Sergius, moreover, there is the testimony of the great inner relationship between the Ecthesis and his letter to Pope Honorius[†] (see above, p. 22) Maximus professes to know that Sergius and his friends had obtained the publication of the Ecthesis by means of presents to the Emperor;^{f92} and the biographer of S. Maximus appears to indicate that the consent to the marriage of the Emperor with his niece Martina was the price at which the patriarch bought the Ecthesis.^{f93} But this uncanonical marriage was concluded in the year 616. When Walch adds (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 142), it was designated by Sergius as incest, it is certainly true that

the patriarch disapproved of it; but it is still undeniable that he showed himself weak, and crowned Martina.^{f94}

That the Ecthesis was drawn up in the course of the twelfth year of indiction was declared by Pope Martin I at the Lateran Synod of the year 649.^{f95} That twelfth year of indiction began with September 1, 638; and as Sergius died in the December of the same year, the Ecthesis must necessarily be placed between September and December 638, and not in the year 639. Pagi showed this (*ad ann.* 639, n. 2 and 8) in opposition to Baronius. It is preserved for us in the third *secretaries* (session) of the Lateran Synod already mentioned,^{f96} bears the form of a creed, explains first the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, then passes on to the Incarnation, treats this in the sense of Chalcedon, and then proceeds to the principal subject, namely,

(a) the prohibition of the expressions *mia* and *duo ejh̄sgei ai*, because both were explained in a heretical sense, and

(b) asserting one single will (*qēlh̄ma*) in Christ.

The principal passages run: “In regard to the mystery of the Person of Christ is the *efwsiv kata sunq̄sin* (see vol. 4, sec. 263) to be confessed without *sugc̄siv* and *di aīresiv*. It preserves the property of each of the two natures, but shows *one* hypostasis and one person of God the Logos with (united with) the reasonably quickened flesh; whereby not a Quaternity is introduced instead of a Trinity, since there is not a fourth Person added to the Trinity, but the eternal Logos thereof has become flesh. And not another was HE who worked miracles, and another who endured sufferings, but we acknowledge one and the same Son, who is at the same time God and man, one hypostasis, one person, suffering in the flesh, impassible in the Godhead; to Him and the same belong the miracles and the sufferings, which HE voluntarily endured in the flesh ...

“All divine and human energy we ascribe to one and the same Incarnate Logos, and render *one* worship to Him, who, for our sake, was voluntarily and truly crucified in the flesh, and rose from the dead, etc.; and we do not at all allow that any one should maintain or teach *one* or *two* energies of the Incarnate Lord, but demand that there should be confessed, as the holy and Oecumenical Synods have handed it down, that one and the same only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, works both the divine

and the human, and that all Godlike and manlike energy proceeds from *one* and the same Incarnate God the Logos without mixture and without separation, and refers back to one and the same.

Because the expression, *one energy*, although some of the Fathers use it, yet sounds strange to the ears of some, and disquiets them, since they are made suspicious lest it should be used in order to set aside the two natures which are hypostatically united in Christ; and (since) in the same way many take offense at the expression, *two energies*, since it is not used by any of the holy Fathers, and then we should be obliged, as a consequence, to teach two mutually contradictory wills, as if God the Logos, aiming at our salvation, was willing to endure suffering, but His manhood had opposed itself to this His will, which is impious and foreign to the Christian dogma — when even the wicked Nestorius, although he, dividing the Incarnation, introduced two Sons, did not venture to maintain two wills of the same, but, on the contrary, taught the like willing of the two persons assumed by him; how can, then, the orthodox, who worship only *one* Son and Lord, admit in Him two, and those mutually opposed wills? — therefore must we, following the Fathers in everything and so also in this, confess *one* will of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true God, so that at no time His rationally quickened flesh was separated, and, of its own impulse (*ofmh*), in opposition to the suggestion of God the Logos, hypostatically united with it, fulfilled its natural motion (that of the flesh), but only at the time and in the manner and in the measure in which the Word willed. These dogmas of piety have been handed down to us by those who from the beginning have themselves seen the Word, and have been with Him, serving Him; and also by their disciples and successors and all later God-enlightened teachers of the Church, or, which is the same, the five holy and Oecumenical Synods, etc. And we ordain that all Christians shall thus think and teach, without adding or taking away anything.”

We see that the Ecthesis, in its contents, agrees with the letter of Sergius to Honorius; and the patriarch of Constantinople did not, therefore, first come to these views in opposition to the *Synodica* of Sophronius, but had done so a considerable time before its appearance. On the contrary, the agreement of the Ecthesis with the two letters of Honorius is only apparent. The latter certainly also disapproves of the expressions *mia* and

duo ej̄er̄gei ai; ^{f97} but he stumbles only at the word, not at the thing; for in his second letter he says himself: “The divine nature works in Christ the divine, and the human accomplishes the human.” He thus teaches, in fact, two energies, although he objects to the employment of the term. And so his phrase, *Unam voluntatem fatemur* is, in its meaning, essentially different from the like-sounding thesis of the Ecthesis [†] (see above, p. 35).

SEC. 300. TWO SYNODS AT CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 638 AND 639. ADOPTION OF THE ECTHESIS.

It was naturally the wish of the Emperor that the Ecthesis should be universally received, and there was a prospect of this, especially as Sophronius, the chief representative of Dyothelitism, was prevented from taking part in the controversy on account of the siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs, A.D. 637, and died before the appearance of the Ecthesis, and his chair had come into the hands of the Monothelite Bishop Sergius of Joppa. ^{f98} It was also hoped that the other patriarchs would assent. Macedonius of Antioch, whom we have not hitherto met, was uncanonically appointed and consecrated by Sergius. His episcopal city, threatened, and in the year 638 actually taken by the Arabs, he had not entered, but had remained in Constantinople, and had here taken his stand on the Monothelite side. ^{f99} Sergius, however, held, in the last months of A.D. 638, a Synod at Constantinople (perhaps *ej̄dhmoussa*), which approved the Ecthesis, as harmonizing with the apostolic doctrine, and ordered its universal acceptance, threatening that, if any one should, in future, teach one or two energies, if he were a bishop or cleric, he should be deposed; if a monk or a layman, he should be excluded from the holy communion, until he amended. ^{f100} Soon afterwards Sergius died, in the December of the same year. His successor, Pyrrhus, who ascended the throne in January 639, was a Monothelite, and held also a Synod at Constantinople in the year 639, which not only confirmed the Ecthesis anew, but provided that even the absent bishops should be required to accept it. ^{f101}

In Alexandria, Cyrus with great joy read the Ecthesis which the patriarch of Constantinople had sent to him accompanied by a letter, and had hymns sung, because God had sent His people so wise an Emperor, as he relates in his still extant answer to Sergius. ^{f102}

SEC. 301. DEATH OF POPE HONORIUS. THE ECTHESIS IS REJECTED AT ROME.

When the copy of the Ecthesis sent to Italy arrived there, Pope Honorius had already died, in October 638. We must even conclude, from the letter of Cyrus to Sergius just referred to, that the intelligence of the death of Honorius and the election of Severinus had come to Constantinople before the sending out of the Ecthesis. The election of Severinus took place soon after the death of Honorius, and the representative of the imperial exarch Isaac seized the opportunity of taking possession of the papal Lateran palace, in order to plunder it. The newly elected Pope and others in vain offered opposition; Isaac now himself came to Rome, had all the gold and valuables removed from the palace, and shared them with the Emperor. ^{f103} In order to obtain the imperial confirmation of the election which had been made, the Roman clergy sent several representatives to Constantinople. They were detained there for a considerable time, and at last received the declaration that the confirmation of the new Pope was not to be obtained, unless they promised to persuade him to the acceptance of the dogmatic document (the Ecthesis), which was handed to them. In order to draw themselves out of the snare, they pretended to agree, and promised to inform the Pope of this demand, and to bring him that document. The imperial confirmation of the election was now drawn up, and an order given for the consecration of Severinus. ^{f104} It took place May 28, 640; but the Pope died two months and four days afterwards, after he had rejected Monothelitism, and had, as is supposed, held a Roman Synod for this purpose, A.D. 640. ^{f105} What is certain is, that his successor, John IV., who was consecrated December 24, 640, soon after his elevation, and even before the death of the Emperor Heraclius (†February 11, 641), at a Roman Synod, pronounced anathema on Monothelitism. The Acts of this Synod have not come down to us, but Theophanes and the *Synodicon* speak of it. ^{f106} The latter professes to know that their anathema was pronounced upon Sergius, Cyrus, and Pyrrhus, at Rome. As, however, Pope John IV., in a somewhat more recent letter to the Emperor, refers to the departed Sergius with the words *venerandoe memorioe episcopus*, and in the same way the succeeding Pope, Theodore, calls Pyrrhus *sanctissimus*, we must assume that the Synod pronounced anathema on the heresy, and not on certain persons.

Pope John IV. is said (by the *Synodicon*) to have acquainted the two sons of the Emperor, David and Heraclius, with the decision of this Roman

Synod, and sent them a statement (тупов) of the orthodox doctrine. It seems to me that this must mean the letter to be next described, which the Pope, after the death of the Emperor Heraclius, addressed to his sons. The *Synodicon* also says that “he sent this *later*.” On the other hand, he gave the Patriarch Pyrrhus of Constantinople immediate notice of his sentence against the Ecthesis, and thereby occasioned the Emperor Heraclius to shift the fault of its composition from himself on to the departed Sergius, in that letter to which we referred above [†](p. 61). Soon afterwards the Emperor Heraclius died of dropsy, February 11, 641 (Pagi, *ad ann.* 641, 2), and there succeeded him, in accordance with his arrangement, his two eldest sons, Heraclius Constantinus (from his first marriage), and Heraclius the younger, or Heracleonas (from his second marriage). Both were required to do honor to Martina, the mother of the latter, as mother of both. ^{f107}

When Pope John IV. received intelligence of this change in the throne, he sent a letter of some length, which is still extant, to the two young Emperors, in order to explain to them the true doctrine on the energies and wills in Christ, and, at the same time, to vindicate the orthodoxy of his predecessor, Honorius. Pyrrhus of Constantinople, he says in this letter, circulated, as he heard, in the whole of the East, a letter in which new doctrine was taught and maintained. Pope Honorius had also been said to be of the same view. After John IV. had opposed this, and had sought to vindicate Honorius in the manner explained above [†](p. 52), he proceeds: “The doctrine of one will is heretical. Ask only the defenders of this doctrine, which this one will is, whether the human or the divine?” If they say the divine, they are contradicted by the true manhood of Christ, and they fall into Manichaeism. If, however, they maintain that the one will of Christ is human, they will be condemned with Photinus and the Ebionites as deniers of the Godhead of Christ; if, again, they adopt a mingled will, they at the same time mingle the natures, and with the expression *una operatio* they, like Eutyches and the Severians, say, *unam naturam Christi operari*. I have learned, he says in conclusion, that the bishops have been required to subscribe a document with new doctrines (certainly the Ecthesis), to the prejudice of the *Epistola* of Leo and the Synod of Chalcedon; but the Emperors will certainly have this foisted-in document torn away, and restrain the innovators, for the report of this has troubled the West and the faithful of the chief city. ^{f108}

What impression this letter made we know not, but Zonaras rightly maintain ^{f109} that the Emperor Heraclius Constantinus was orthodox, and

had not inherited his father's error, and this must have had important consequences, if he had not died seven months afterwards. It was believed that his stepmother Martina had him poisoned, in order to obtain the empire exclusively for her own son, Heracleonas. The Patriarch Pyrrhus is also said to have been implicated in this crime.^{f110} But Heracleonas was himself, after six months, overthrown by a revolution, his nose and his mother Martina's tongue being cut off, and both exiled. The Patriarch Pyrrhus fled to Africa, and the throne was taken by Constans II., named also Constantinus, the son of Heraclius Constantinus, a grandson of the elder Heraclius, who soon gave a friendly answer to the letter of the Pope to his father, mentioned above, with the assurance that he was orthodox, and that he had ordered the condemned document to be removed.^{f111}

SEC. 302. THE SYNODS OF ORLEANS AND CYPRUS. POPE THEODORE.

Pope John IV. had rightly asserted that the West rejected the Monothelite view. Outside Italy this was now shown already in France and Africa, whilst other provinces of the West, *e.g.* Spain, took notice later of the new heresy. In France it was rejected by a Synod at Orleans even before the year 640. A foreigner, *pulsus a partibus transmarinis*,^{f112} had come to the city of Autun, and had endeavored to disseminate the Monothelite doctrine. When this came to the ears of S. Eligius, then master of the mint at the Frankish Court at Paris, he discussed the subject with his friend S. Audoenus and other orthodox men, and procured the summoning of a Synod at Orleans by King Chlodwig II. Like a serpent, the heretic, for a considerable time, was able to escape from the arguments of the orthodox, until, to the general joy, Bishop Salvius overcame him and convicted him. Upon this the sentence of the bishops against him was published in all the cities, and he was banished from Gaul. Thus relates S. Audoenus (Ouen), in the biography of his friend Eligius (in Surius, *ad* December 1); and as, according to his account, all this happened before Eligius became bishop of Noyon, and Audoenus archbishop of Rouen (both were consecrated May 21, 640), the Synod, with respect to the date of which so many mistakes have been made, must be placed before the year 640, probably in 638 or 639.^{f113}

John IV. died in Rome, October 11, 642, and his successor, Theodore I., like him, opposed decidedly the heresy, without allowing himself to be imposed upon by Greek cunning. The new Patriarch, Paul of

Constantinople, raised to the throne after the banishment of Pyrrhus, had recourse to Rome in order to obtain recognition of his election. His letter is lost, but we still possess the answer of Pope Theodore, and see from this that Paul wished the Romans to believe that he was different and better and more orthodox than the banished Pyrrhus, whilst practically the *Ecthesis* remained in force in the East, and the promise given by the Emperor, to have it everywhere suppressed, had not been fulfilled. The Pope writes: "We inform you that we have received the synodal letter of your fraternity. It appears from this that you have entered upon the episcopal office with a mingled feeling of fear and hope, and rightly, for that is a great burden ... That which Pyrrhus undertook against the true faith is deprived of power, as well by the declaration of the apostolic see under our predecessor as by command of the Emperor (in having the *Ecthesis* suppressed). Why, then, has not your fraternity removed that document which was posted up at public places, since it is now quashed? If you say yourself that the undertaking of Pyrrhus is to be rejected, why, then, have you not removed this paper from the wall? No one ever honors that which he abhors. But if you, which God forbid, receive this document, why have you been silent on this subject in your synodal letter? ... Moreover, we wondered that the bishops who consecrated your fraternity called Pyrrhus *sanctissimus*, and remarked that he had resigned the Church of Constantinople because the people hated him and rose up against him. We thought, therefore, that we should postpone the granting of your request (the confirmation) until Pyrrhus has been formally deposed. For hatred and a riot of the populace cannot deprive one of his bishopric. He ought to have been punished canonically, if your consecration was to be faultless and valid ... You must, therefore, hold an assembly of bishops, in order to examine his affair, and our archdeacon Sericus, as well as our deputy and deacon Martin, will be our representatives there. Pyrrhus need not himself be personally present, as his fault and his heretical writings are universally known; and for these he may certainly be condemned. For he heaped praise upon Heraclius, who anathematised the orthodox doctrine, subscribed his sophistical edict (the *Ecthesis*), seduced other bishops to the same, and allowed that document to be posted up to the disparagement of the Council of Chalcedon ... In case, however, your fraternity should apprehend that the adherents of Pyrrhus might hinder such a judgment in Constantinople, we have petitioned the Emperor by letter to send Pyrrhus to Rome, that he may be judged here by a Synod. A number of contentions may spring up on account of your elevation, unless they are cut at the roots by the canonical

sickle ... That document, however (the Ecthesis), we declare, with all our powers, as invalid and anathematised, and we abide by the old doctrine ... Your fraternity, in agreement with us, will teach and proclaim the same by word and deed.” ^{f114}

A second letter which Pope Theodore sent at the same time to Constantinople bears, in Anastasius, the superscription *Exemplar propositionis*, and it is nowhere said or indicated for whom it was destined. But from the expression *Fraternitatis vestro*e, which is in the context, we must conclude that it had been addressed to bishops, or at least to clergy, — perhaps to the clergy of Constantinople, or to the bishops present there. Possibly it was an Encyclical to all the bishops of the East, and it contains the demand, that what Pyrrhus had done in opposition to the Chalcedonian Council should be rejected, even as the Pope abhorred his rash innovation, and anathematized the document which was posted up in public places. ^{f115}

Finally, the Pope wrote also to the bishops who had consecrated Paul. He rejoices that he has come in the place of Pyrrhus, but he cannot conceal that the latter ought to have been deposed in a canonical manner, so that objections should not afterwards arise, and divisions be occasioned. And, in fact, good grounds would be alleged for his canonical deposition, inasmuch as he commended Heraclius, who yet anathematized the Catholic faith, confirmed the sophistical heterodox document, led astray other bishops to subscribe it, and posted it up in public. What should now be done was contained in the letter to Paul. ^{f116}

As a consequence of this energetic action, the metropolitan Sergius of Cyprus, in his own name and in that of his brethren, as it appears, despatched to the Pope a letter resolved upon at a Cyprian Synod (of May 29, 643), to the effect that his, the Pope's, orthodox ordinance left nothing to desire; that the Cyprian bishops acknowledge with Leo: *Agit utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est*, and that they, supported by the Pope, were ready to endure martyrdom in behalf of the orthodox faith. On the other hand, all that had been written in opposition to the Council of Chalcedon, to the letter of Leo, and to the wisdom of the present Pope, should be annulled. Hitherto they had been silent, as their former metropolitan, Arcadius of blessed memory, who was quite orthodox [†] (see p. 12 f.), was in hope that those who had erred would still come to a better mind; but now they must no longer look on while tares were being sown. “This,” says the metropolitan at the close, “is the mind of

the holy Synod assembled around me (**thv kaq jhmav idrav sunodou.** ... I and all who are with me greet you in the Lord.” ^{f117}

SEC. 303. ABBOT MAXIMUS AND HIS DISPUTATION WITH PYRRHUS.

In the meantime the Abbot Maximus, who was henceforth to be the most valorous champion, and even a martyr for the cause of Dyothelitism, indignant at the progress of the heresy in the East, had left Constantinople in order to go to Rome. Although the name of this remarkable man has already been frequently mentioned, still it is yet in place to recall the earlier events of his life. Born about the year 580 of an old and distinguished family of Constantinople, he had by his remarkable talents and bearing attracted the attention of the Emperor Heraclius, and became his chief secretary, a man of influence and consideration. But in the year 630 he forsook the path of worldly honors, and became a monk in the convent at Chrysopolis (now Scutari), on the opposite shore from Constantinople, as it is thought, both from love of solitude and from dissatisfaction with the position which his master took in the Monothelite controversy. When Sophronius first came forward (A.D. 633) against the new heresy in Alexandria, Maximus was in his company, as he says himself in his letter to Peter. ^{f118} The incompleteness of the *Vita Maximi*, written by one of his admirers, ^{f119} leaves it doubtful whether he was abbot at that time. It does not mention this first journey to Africa, and speaks only of the second, which drew after it the disputation with Pyrrhus, A.D. 645, and the holding of several African Synods, A.D. 646. On the authority of the Chronicle of Nicephorus (Pagi, *ad ann.* 642, 1), it is believed that the Patriarch Pyrrhus was formerly abbot of Chrysopolis, and so the predecessor of Maximus, so that when Pyrrhus in the year 639 ascended the patriarchal throne, Maximus became his successor as abbot. ^{f120} But apart from the fact that the *Vita Maximi* (c. 5) speaks of his predecessor in such a manner that we can see he has died, and refers to him in the most respectful manner, which it would not have done in reference to Pyrrhus, — apart from this, Pyrrhus says expressly, at the beginning of his disputation with Maximus, that “previously he had not known him by sight.” Pyrrhus, then, could not have been the abbot of Maximus nor his predecessor in the rule of the convent.

When the Monothelite heresy spread more and more in Constantinople, Maximus resolved to betake himself to Rome, and on the way thither came for the second time to Africa. During a protracted residence there he had

much intercourse with the bishops of those parts, and also found a patron in the imperial viceroy, Gregory, ^{f121} and gave general warnings against the Monothelite heresy. To this time also belongs the remarkable disputation between Maximus and the deposed and banished Patriarch Pyrrhus of Constantinople, which, according to the superscription, took place somewhere in Africa, in July 645, in presence of the imperial viceroy and many bishops. The complete Acts have come down to us, ^{f122} and contain a very complete discussion both of the orthodox Dyothelite doctrine and of the objections from the other side. Maximus showed in this much dialectical ability and great superiority to Pyrrhus, whom at times he treated with scant courtesy.

Pyrrhus opened the discussion with the words: "What have I, or what has my predecessor (the Patriarch Sergius), done to you that you everywhere decry us as heretics? Who has honored you more than we, although we did not know you by sight?" Maximus replied: "The latter is correct; but since you have violated the Christian dogma, I was forced to place your favor behind the truth ... The doctrine of one will is contrary to Christianity; for what is more impious than to maintain that the same will by which all things were created, after the Incarnation, longed for food and drink?" Pyrrhus: "If Christ is only one person, this one so willed; thus there is only one will."

M. "That is confusion. In truth, the one Christ is God and man at the same time. If, however, He is both, then HE willed as God and as man, and, particularly, that which was suitable to the particular nature; no nature dispensed with its will and its energy. If the duality of the natures does not divide the one Christ, no more is this done by the duality of wills and operations."

P. "But two wills presuppose two willers."

M. "That you have certainly maintained in your writings; but it is absurd. Assuming that it were so, that two wills presuppose two willers, then it must be, *vice versa*, that two willers should have two wills. If you apply this to the Trinity, you must either say with Sabellius, that because in God there is only one will, there is therefore only *one Person* (one Willer) in the Godhead; or you must say with Arius, because there are three willing (persons), there must therefore be in God three wills, and so three natures,

— for the difference of wills, according to the teaching of the Fathers, comes from the difference of natures.” ^{f123}

P. “But it is not possible that there should be in one person two wills that do not contradict each other.”

M. “By this you will allow that there may be two wills in one person, only it is necessary that they should contradict each other. But whence comes then the contradiction? If from the natural will (in itself), then it would come from God, and God would be the Author of the conflict. But if it comes from sin, then this contradiction could not be in Christ, because He was free from all sin.”

P. “The willing is then a matter of nature.”

M. “Certainly the simple willing.”

P. “But the Fathers say the saints had one will with God; are they, then, of the same nature as God?”

M. “Here is a lack of distinction, and you interchange the object of the will (the thing willed) with the will in itself. The Fathers, by that expression, had only the object of willing in view, and used the expression *will*, not in the *proper* sense of the word.”

P. “If the will is a matter of nature, then we must often change our nature, for our will changes often, and we must be of a different nature from other men; for they often will differently from ourselves.”

M. “We must distinguish the *will* (as such) from the concrete *willing* of a definite thing, as we must distinguish sight from the seeing of a definite thing, *e.g.*, whether right or left, upwards or downwards, etc., etc., they are *modi* of the use of the will or of sight, and by these *modi* one is distinguished from another.”

P. “If you confess two natural wills in Christ, you take away His freedom; for what is natural is necessary.”

M. “Neither the divine nor the human rational nature of Christ is other than free; for the nature which is endowed with reason has the natural power of rational desire, *i.e.* the **qelbhsiv** (the willing of the rational soul). But from the proposition, “the natural is necessary,” there follows an

absurdity. God is *natura* good, *natura* Creator, then was it of necessity that HE should be Creator and good. And were he not free who has a natural will, then, conversely, he must be free who has no natural will, therefore that which is lifeless.”

P. “I concede that there are in Christ natural wills; but, as of two natures **ef̄ ti sunqeton** is acknowledged by us, so must we also of two wills admit **ef̄ ti sunqeton**; and therefore they who acknowledge two wills, because of the duality of nature, should not contend with those who assume only one will because of the closest union, — it is only a strife of words.” ^{f124}

M. “You are mistaken, because you do not perceive that unions (syntheses) take place only in things which are immediately in the hypostasis (as the natures), but not in things which are in another (as the wills in the natures). If, however, we assume a union of the wills, we should also be forced to assume a union of all the other properties of the natures, thus, *e.g.*, a union of the created with the uncreated, of the limited with the illimitable, of the mortal with the immortal, and so come to absurd assertions.” ...

P. “Have not, then, the properties of the natures something in common, like the natures themselves?”

M. “No, they have nothing in common (*i.e.* the properties of the one nature have nothing in common with those of the other), but the one hypostasis.”

P. “But do not the Fathers speak of a communion of glory and a communion of humiliation when they say, the communion of the glory has one source, and another that of the ignominy?” (Thus said Leo the Great, see vol. 3, sec. 176, c. 4, where he speaks of this, that the common honor of the Godhead and manhood in Christ has a different source from the common ignominy of both.)

M. “The Fathers speak here after the manner of **ajptidosiv** (of the *communicatio idiomatum*). This, however, presupposes two dissimilar things, since that which naturally belongs to the one part of Christ (*e.g.*, to Him as God) is ascribed to the other part (the Son of man). And if, after the manner of the **ajptidosiv**, you call the **qebhma** of Christ a **koinon**, you confess thereby not one but two wills.”

P. “How? Was not the flesh of Christ moved by the suggestion of the Logos united with it?”

M. “If you say this, you divide Christ; for by His suggestion also Moses was moved, and David, etc. But we say with the Fathers that the same highest God who unchanged became man, not only as God willed that which was suitable to His Godhead, but the same also as man willed that which was suitable to His manhood. As all things have the **duamiv** of the existent, and this naturally is the **otmh** (the inclination) to the profitable, and the **aformh** (drawing back, escaping) from the destructive, so also the Incarnate Logos had this **duamiv** of self-preservation, and showed His **otmh** and **aformh** through His energy: the **otmh** in the use of physical things (yet without sin), and the **aformh** when He shrunk from voluntary death. Does the Church, then, do something unsuitable when it holds fast in the human nature also the properties innate in it, without which the nature cannot be?”

P. “But if there is fear in the nature, then there is something evil in it, and the human nature (of Christ) is yet free from all evil.”

M. “You deceive yourself by similarity of sound. There are two kinds of fear, one according to nature and one not according to nature. The former serves for the preservation of nature, the other is irrational. Christ showed only the former; I say *showed*, because with Him all that was physical was voluntary. He hungered and thirsted and feared in truth, but yet not as we do, but voluntarily.”

P. “We should avoid all subtleties, and simply say, Christ is true God and true man, and abstain from everything else (i.e. the properties and wills of the natures.)” ^{f125}

M. “That would be a rejection of the Synods and Fathers, who have made declarations respecting not only the natures, but also their properties, teaching that one and the same is visible and invisible, mortal and immortal, tangible and intangible, created and uncreated. They also taught two wills, not merely by use of the number two, but also by the opposition of **a] lo kai a[lo** and by the relation of divine and human.”

P. “We should speak neither of one nor of two wills, since the Synods have not done so, and the heretics misuse these expressions.”

M. “If only the expressions of the Synods were to be used, then they would not say, *mia fusiv tou-geou-I ogou sesarkwmenh*. Moreover, even if they would only hold by the Synods, they would be compelled from the two natures and their properties (which the Synod of Chalcedon taught) to infer two wills, and to recognize them. Among the properties of a nature we understand that which physically belongs to it, and to each nature of Christ there is a will akin to the nature (*fusikwv ejnpefuken*). And if the Synods anathematized Apollinaris and Arius, each of whom taught only one will, the former, because he declared that the *sarx* of Christ was of like substance with the Godhead, and Arius, because he, lowering the Son, ascribed to Him no truly divine will; how, then, can we hesitate to teach two wills? Further, the fifth Synod declared: ‘We recognize all the writings of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory,’ etc. Now, in these, two wills are clearly taught.”

P. “Does not, then, the expression *natural will* seem objectionable to you?”

M. “There are three kinds of life in creatures, — the life of the plant, the life of feeling, and the life of thought. It is the proper nature of the plant, to grow, etc.; of the creatures that feel, to desire; of the creatures that think, to will. All that is rational, then, must by nature be voluntary. Now, the Logos has assumed a rationally quickened humanity, therefore must He also, so far as He is man, be voluntary.”

P. “I am convinced that the wills in Christ belong to the natures, the creaturely will to His created nature, etc., and that the two wills cannot combine into one. But those in Byzantium who oppose the natural wills maintain that the Fathers had said that the Lord had a human will *kat j oikeywsin* (appropriation).” ^{f126}

M. There are two kinds of appropriation, namely, the essential, by which everyone has what belongs to his nature, and the relative, when we in a friendly manner appropriate something foreign to ourselves. Which appropriation is here meant?”

P. “The relative.”

M. “How unsuitable this is will soon appear. The natural is not acquired; so, too, will is not acquired, consequently man has by nature the power of willing ... If, now, those persons maintain that Christ has assumed the

human will only as something foreign, they must in consistency say that He also appropriated the other properties of human nature merely as something foreign, by which the whole Incarnation becomes an appearance. Further, Sergius anathematised everyone who admits two wills. Now, even the teachers of that *oikeiwsiv* assume two wills, even if one of them is only the appropriated one, thus anathematising the friends of Sergius themselves. And when they, falsely indeed, maintain that two wills render two persons necessary, then the teachers of that *oikeiwsiv* themselves bring two persons into Christ.”

P. “Did not, then, the Fathers teach that Christ had formed our will in Himself, *ej eautw|ejupwse*?”

M. “Yes, they also taught that HE had assumed our nature, but by that they did not mean *kat joikeiwsiv*.”

P. “But when they say, Christ formed our will in Himself, can a natural will be meant by this?”

M. “Certainly; since Christ is also true man, He has in Himself and by Himself subjected the human to God, set up for us a pattern to will nothing but what God wills.”

P. “But those who admit only one will mean it not ill.” ^{f127}

M. “Even the Severians say, they mean it not ill, when they admit only one nature. But which, then, should this one will be?”

P. “They call it the gnomish, and *gnw̄mh* is, as Cyril says, the *tropov zw̄hv*, that we live virtuously or sinfully.”

M. “The manner of life is matter of choice; but by choice we will, therefore *gnw̄mh* is the willing of a real or supposed good. How can we now say, the will is gnomish, *i.e.* of a *gnw̄mh*? That means nothing else than that the will goes out from a will, which is not possible. Moreover, if one ascribes to Christ a *gnw̄mh* (a choice), He is thus made a mere man, as though HE, like us, had not known what to do, had hesitated and deliberated. ... Should we not rather say, as His personality was divine, He possessed, in His very being, the natural good?” ^{f128}

P. “Are, then, the virtues something natural?”

M. “Certainly.”

P. “But why, then, are not all men equally virtuous, since all are of one nature?”

M. “Because we do not develop the natural in like measure, nor in like measure strive after that for which we are born.”

P. “But yet we acquire the virtues by discipline?”

M. “Discipline and the efforts following upon it only serve to drive away the deceptions of sin. When these disappear, the natural virtues come of themselves.”

P. “It is, then, blasphemy to assert one **gnw̄mh** in Christ.”

M. “The Fathers use **gnw̄mh** in a different sense, *e.g.*, as counsel, as Paul, when he says: ‘Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment (**ghw̄mhn**),’ or as advice, or as sentence, as opinion, view. I have found, in the Bible and in the Fathers, twenty-eight meanings of **ghw̄mh**. ... Those, then, who maintain a gnomish, or choosing will, etc., must give it out for either a divine or angelic or human will. If they explained it as divine, they assume only a divine nature of Christ; if angelic, only an angelic nature; if human, then only a human nature.” ^{f129}

P. “In order to escape all this, they say the will is neither matter of nature nor of gnome, but it is in us matter of dexterity (**epithdeiōthv**, *habilitas*).”

M. “This dexterity is either **katafusin**, and then that expression only leads back by a roundabout way to the natural will, or the dexterity is a matter of acquisition. In the latter case, they must maintain, in opposition to the Scriptures, that Christ did not know until HE learnt, and so fall into Nestorianism, which admits only one will in the two persons invented by it. If, however, they call that one will of Christ the hypostatic, then it belongs only to the person of the Son, and they maintain thereby that the Son has another will than the Father. If they call it **parafusin**, they thereby destroy the natures in Christ. I should like to ask them: Does God the Father will as God or as Father? If He wills as Father, then His will is different from that of the Son, which is heretical. But if He wills as God, then it follows that the will is a matter of nature. Further, as the Fathers

teach: Two, who have only one will, have also only one substance, so that the Monothelites are forced to maintain that the Godhead and the manhood in Christ are one and the same substance. Further, as the Fathers teach: Two kinds of substances (**oujsiai**) have not a common will, yet may they necessarily not maintain that the two natures of Christ had a common will; or if they do maintain it, they contradict the Fathers.”

P. “But they appeal to the Fathers.”

M. “Only the Nestorians and Monophysites, although opposites, teach one will, but not the recognized Fathers.” ^{f130}

P. “But Gregory the theologian (Orat. 2, *De Filio*) says: His will was in nothing contradictory to God, quite deified. Does not this speak against two wills?”

M. “On the contrary, as the kindled presupposes a kindler, so the deified a deifier. Moreover, the same Gregory similarly speaks of the human nature of Christ as deified. Must we therefore deny the two natures?”

P. “You are right, but they also adduce Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. 1, *De Resur.*), who says of Christ: The soul of Christ wills, the body (of the sick man) is touched, and through both the sickness is driven away (S.

^{<108>}Matthew 8:3). Here, they maintain, Gregory teaches that the human soul of Christ willed through the divine will of the Godhead hypostatically united with it.”

M. “If one should say that the willing of the **yuch** comes from the Godhead, then we might also say with equal right, that even the bodily touch comes from the Godhead, which is absurd.”

P. “You are right. But they appeal also to Athanasius, who (Orat. major, *De Fide*) says, the (human) **nouv** of the Lord is not the Lord Himself, but His will, or His **bouhsiv** or His energy upon anything.”

M. “This passage is evidence against them. For if the **nouv** of Christ is not the Lord Himself, then it is evidently not divine **fusei**, but hypostatically united with the Lord, and therefore His **qebsiv**, **bouhsiv**, or **ejegeia**. Athanasius speaks here according to the usage of Clement of Alexandria (*Stromat.* lib. 6), according to which **qebsiv** = **nouv** (desiring spirit), **bouhsiv** = rational desire; the expression **ejegeia provti**, however,

was used by S. Athanasius because the Lord, in all His godlike acts (acts belonging to His divine nature), made use of the reasonable human soul hypostatically united with Him.”

P. “You are right; but Athanasius says further: The Lord was born of woman, but without carnal **qel h̄mata** and **logismoui aḡqrw̄p̄inoi**; the **qel̄hsiv** was only that of the Godhead.”

M. “Athanasius does not here at all speak of the will of Christ, but of this, that the Incarnation resulted purely from the divine will, without the will of the flesh, without the action of a man. Generally, the Fathers teach, like the Holy Scriptures, that the Lord willed and effected our salvation in His two natures.”

P. “Have the great kindness to show this.” ^{f131}

M. “According to S. ^{<614>}John 1:43, Jesus purposed to go to Galilee. He purposed to go where He was not yet. He was, however, only in His manhood, not in Galilee; for as God He is everywhere. He purposed, therefore, to go to Galilee as man, not as God, and consequently had a will as man. So in S. ^{<672>}John 17:24, HE willed as man that where HE was His disciples should also be; for only as man is He in a certain place. In S. ^{<618>}John 19:28 and S. ^{<173>}Matthew 27:34, Jesus said: ‘I thirst,’ and would not drink the wine mingled with gall; but evidently it is only the manhood that can thirst, and therefore it was only this that willed not to take the unsuitable draught. Also in S. ^{<101>}John 7:1; S. ^{<102>}Mark 9:29; 7:24; ^{<131>}2 Corinthians 13:4; S. ^{<158>}Mark 6:48; S. ^{<157>}Matthew 26:17; and Philippians (not Hebrews, as Maximus says) 2:8, is the human will of Christ referred to. In Psalm 39:[40] 7, 8, it is said: ‘Sacrifice and meat-offering Thou wouldest not; but; mine ears hast Thou opened [in the text, as in ^{<105>}Hebrews 10:5, a body hast Thou prepared me]. ... ‘Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, that I should fulfill Thy will, O my God. I am *content* to do it.’ That this refers to Christ as man no one denies; and accordingly this passage ascribes a will to Him also as man. According to ^{<102>}Genesis 1:26, man is made in the image of God; and therefore human nature must have the power of freedom, like the divine. And if Christ did not assume a human will, as they maintain, then did He not save it, and we are not partakers of a complete salvation. But that the Lord had also a divine will is clear from S. ^{<134>}Luke 13:34 and S. ^{<151>}John 5:21.” ^{f132}

P. “This certainly proves two natural wills. But why did Pope Vigilius accept the letter of Mennas, which teaches only one will, after it had been shown to him in the cabinet of the Emperor (Justinian), and in the senate?”

M. “I am surprised that you and your predecessors, being patriarchs, should venture to lie. Sergius said in his letter to Honorius, that Vigilius had received information respecting that letter, but not that it was shown him or delivered to him; but you say, in your letter to Pope John, that it had been shown and delivered to him. Which of you is one to believe?”

P. “But Pope Honorius, in his letter to Sergius, maintained only one will.”

M. “The drawer-up of that letter of Honorius, who was afterwards commissioned by John IV. to write to the Emperor Constantine, gives the assurance that he only said in the letter, that as man Jesus had only one will (the law of the Spirit), and not at the same time also the will of the members.”

P. “My predecessor understood it differently.”

M. “Nothing placed me at such a distance from your predecessor as his inconstancy. At one time he approved the expression, *one divine* will of Christ; at another, one **boul eutikon qełhma**; at another, one **upostatikon**; at another, **exousiatikon** again, **proairetikon**; again, **gnwmikon**; again, **oikonomikon**. Moreover, by those documents (the Ecthesis) he has caused division.” (In that which follows, Maximus opposes the statement of Pyrrhus, that Sophronius of Jerusalem had begun the controversy.)

M. “We will now, after ending the inquiry into the two wills, pass on to the two energies.” ^{f133}

P. “As the will is a matter of nature, so must also, *per synecdochen*, the operation be a matter of nature, and I recall my previous assertions in opposition.” ...

M. “In your writings I have found that you ascribe to Christ, as whole, only one energy. Now, as His whole being is His hypostasis, then this, His one energy, must also be hypostatic. But then, would it be different from the energy of His Father and His mother, as He is hypostatically different from both?” ^{f134}

P. “If you maintain two energies on account of the difference of natures in Christ, and not one only on account of the unity of His person, then you must assume two energies in man on account of the substantial difference of body and soul, and consequently there would be in Christ three energies.”

M. “What you here allege against the properties of the natures (in Christ), the Monophysites turn against the natures themselves, and that which the Fathers have opposed to them we bring against you. You admit with us two natures in Christ, and not merely one on account of the unity of His person. If, however, you maintain two *energies* in man, because of the substantial difference of body and soul, you must also assume two *natures* in man, and accordingly *three* in Christ. But if you do not admit three natures in Christ, you have likewise no right to reproach us for not maintaining three energies. Moreover, that which is one in respect to the species (*ειὸς*) of man, is not also one by substantial unity of body and soul. Human nature is one because it is common to the whole species, and not because body and soul were one. So it is in regard to the energy. When we ascribe to Christ one *human* energy as such, we oppose the alternative of either ascribing the energy to the personality (hypostasis), or of recognising *three* energies in Christ, because the energy works according to the nature.” ^{f135}

P. “Nestorius says that the persons correspond with the energies; therefore, by the doctrine of two energies, you fall into Nestorianism.”

M. “Above all, Nestorius taught, along with two persons, only one will. But even if what you say were true, that the persons correspond with the energies, then conversely, the energies would have to correspond with the persons, and you would then, on account of the three Persons, have to recognize three energies in the Trinity, or, on account of the one energy, only one Person. ... So, too, we should have to say, because there are several Persons in the Trinity, there are also several human energies, whilst there is, in fact, only one human energy (*катъ жеидов*), and the Fathers (Gregory of Nyssa) say: That which has the same substance (*ουσια*) has also the same energy. Further, if they maintain that persons correspond with energies, and if they themselves (elsewhere) say, Christ has many energies (the words of Honorius), it would follow that they would be forced to ascribe many persons to the one Christ. Further, if persons correspond with energies, then the latter cease when the former is

removed. The Monothelites, however, now wish to remove the expression one or two energies, and therewith would, if they could, remove Christ Himself. ^{f136} If we consider ourselves, we find that each of us can walk and think at the same time without, for this reason, becoming two men, and without mingling the energies corresponding to his two natures (body and soul). In the same way, a sword which is made red hot preserves its two natures (iron and fire), and their natural operations, — it cuts and it burns at the same time; but it is yet only *one* sword, without its natures being mixed.”

P. “But there is (in Christ) only one Worker, and therefore only one operation, energy.”

M. “This one in person is twofold in natures, and therefore worked in a twofold manner as one, so that with the multiplicity of energies there was not also a multiplicity of persons brought in. If, however, we ascribed the energy, not to the natures but to the person, we should arrive at follies which have already been rejected. What would you say if another maintained: Because Christ is one person, He had only one nature? Yet, if you admit only one energy, which shall this one be? — the divine or the human, or neither? If the divine, then was Christ pure God; if the human, then only man: if neither, then He was neither God nor man.”

P. “If we speak of one energy of the Godhead and the manhood, we do not mean that it is present in Him **logw|fusewv**, but **tropw|edwsewv** (by the union of the Godhead and manhood).”

M. “If He has the energy, as you say, through **efwsiv**, then was HE *before* this **efwsiv**, without energy, and thus created the world without energy and with constraint. Further: As the Father and the Holy Spirit are not also hypostatically united with the flesh, then would they, in consequence, have no energy, and would not also be Creator of the world? Further, you must call the energy either created or uncreated, for there is no third kind. If created, then it points to only one created nature in Christ; in the other case, only to one uncreated: and how could the energy of a created nature be an uncreated, and conversely?”

P. “Do you agree, then, with those who understand the **apotelesma** (effect) of the actions accomplished by Christ under **mia ejergeia**?” ^{f137}

M. “Different actions have different effects, and not one. Although, in the red-hot sword, the energy of fire and that of iron are united, yet the effect of fire is burning, that of iron cutting, even if they do not appear separated from each other in the burning cut or in the cutting burn. We cannot speak of one effect unless where there is one action. As, then, there are many actions of Christ, so you must admit countless effects; or if you will hold fast *one* effect, then must you also assume *one* action of Christ. But we have not to speak of the actions of Christ, nor of that which is **eḵw Cristou**, but of that which is **ej Cristw**, of the physical relation of the substances (**ouḣiai**) of Christ, whether it was encroached upon by the union of the Godhead and manhood or not. ... Moreover, you have not (as you would make believe) spoken with respect to the action (**to-eḡgon, apotelesma**), but with respect to the physical relation of the united natures of one energy, and so have produced the fabulous animal, the goat-stag. This is shown clearly by the capitula of Cyrus, which you have received, in which it is taught that Christ worked the divine and the human by the same energy. This contradicts Scripture and the holy Fathers, and even the nature of the thing; for no thing can have, along with its natural working, another opposed to it, — fire cannot make warm and cold at the same time. So one nature cannot work miracles and endure suffering.” ^{f138}

P. “Yet Cyril says, Christ revealed **mi an suggenh-di jajmfoin ejerḡeian**.” ^{f139}

M. Cyril was far from ascribing to the Godhead and the manhood only one **fusikh-ejerḡeia**, for he teaches elsewhere: ‘*No rational person will assert that the Creator and the creature have one and the same energy.*’ On the contrary, he wished to show that the divine energy is one and the same, both apart from union with the manhood and in union therewith, just as the energy of fire is one and the same, whether with or without union with a **u[h]**. The Father Cyril has not thus spoken of one energy of the two natures in Christ, but said that the *divine* energy was one and the same, — the same in the Incarnate Son as in the Father; and that Christ worked His miracles, not by an almighty command (= divine energy), but *asomatically*, — even after the Incarnation He is **omoergov** with the asomatically working Father, — but He also worked them somatically by bodily contact, **afh**, and thus **di jajmfoin**. The reviving of the maiden, accomplished by the word and the almighty will, and the healing of the blind, was connected with the healing which was accomplished somatically

by contact. The divine energy did not dispense with the human, but made use of it for its own manifestation. The stretching out of the hand (at the healing of the blind), the mixture of spittle and earth, etc., belonged to the energy of the human nature of Christ, and God as well as man was acting in the miracle. Cyril, then, did not make a mistake about the property of each nature, but saw the creative divine energy and the *zw̄tikh* (i.e. the bodily energy worked by the human soul), as *aj̄sugcut̄w* united in the Incarnate Logos.”

P. “You have well shown that S. Cyril did not contradict the doctrine of two energies, but, on the contrary, harmonised with it; but S. Dionysius the Areopagite speaks of a *kainh̄qeandrikh̄ej̄er̄geia*.” ^{f140}

M. “Do you hold this *kainh̄qeavdrikh̄ej̄er̄geia* as something quantitatively or qualitatively new?”

P. “As quantitatively new.”

M. “Then there must have been assumed in Christ a third *nature*, *qeavdrikh̄*; for a *third* energy (and it was that, if it was *quantitatively* new) presupposes a third nature, since the element of proper essential energy belongs to the idea of nature. If, however, the new is qualitatively new, this does not express a single energy, but the *new* mysterious way and manner of the human activities (energies) of Christ, which is a consequence of the mysterious union and *perichoresis* (= mutual interchange of movement) of the two natures in Christ. Even in the expression, *qeandrikh̄ej̄er̄geia*, the duality of the energies is also taught periphrastically (mediately), because it specifies the natures numerically. For if we remove the two opposites (divine and human in Christ), there remains nothing intermediate. And provided there were only a single energy in Christ, the *qeavdrikh̄*; then Christ, as God, would have a different energy from the Father, for that of the Father could not possibly be divine and human.”

P. “The proposition, ‘That which is of like nature has also the like energy (as the three Persons of the Trinity), and that which is distinguished in the energy is also distinguished in the nature,’ — this proposition has been adopted by the Fathers only in respect to the theology (nature of God), and not in respect to the economy (Incarnation).”

M. “Thus, then, according to you, the Son, after His Incarnation, would not be of the same theology with the Father; He could then be no longer invoked with the Father, He would not be of one substance with the Father, and the passages of the Bible would be untrue which ascribe to Him the same energy as to the Father (S. ~~<RS17>~~ John 5:17, 19, 21; ~~<RS25>~~ 10:25, 38). Further, the continuous government of the world is the business of God, not only of the Father and of the Spirit, but also of the Son. Consequently, the Son, even after the Incarnation, has the same energy as the Father.”...

P. “When we speak of one energy, we do not mean to take away the human will of Christ, but in distinction from the divine energy it is called *suffering*.”

M. “Things are not known from their opposite by mere negation, otherwise we should have to call, *e.g.*, human nature evil because the divine is good. And in like manner, we may not say that because the divine movement is energy (*working*), therefore the human is a *suffering* [active and passive]. The Fathers do not call human action mere suffering (passion), but also *dunamiv*, *ejergeia*, *kinhsiv*, etc., etc., not in opposition to the divine activity, but after its own way and manner which it has received from the Creator. So far as, *e.g.*, it works holding, it is called *dunamiv*; so far as it is the same in all beings of the same species (*ejh pasi toiv onseidesin*), it is called *ejergeia*, etc., etc. And also, when the Fathers called the human action a passion, they did this, not in opposition to the divine action, but in respect to the way and manner of human working, itself implanted by the Creator. And when (Pope) Leo says, ‘Agit utraque forma,’ etc., this is nothing else than if it was said: ‘After HE had fasted forty days, He was an hungered.’ He granted, in short, to nature, when He would, that it should work that which was proper to it.”

P. “You have shown that it is improper to speak of one energy in whatever way that may be done. But forgive me and my predecessors. We have failed only from want of insight. Spare the memory of my predecessors.”

M. “We must anathematise the heresy, but be silent about persons.”

P. “But in that case I should have to reject Sergius and my own patriarchal Synod” (see sec. 300).

M. “It was not a regular Synod.”

P. “If it must be, I will do it (anathematise the heresy), but I should like first to visit the graves of the apostles and the Pope, and transmit to the latter a statement on my error.” Thus ended this disputation, and the information is added, that Maximus and the Governor Gregory agreed to this, and Pyrrhus with Maximus soon afterwards went to Rome, where Pyrrhus cast off his error, and by an orthodox confession united himself again with the Church. ^{f141}

SEC. 304. AFRICAN AND ROMAN SYNODS FOR THE CONDEMNATION OF MONOTHELITISM.

The biographer of S. Maximus relates (c. 14) that, on his admonition and counsel, the bishops of Africa and the neighboring islands held Synods for the rejection of Monothelitism. ^{f142} He evidently thinks that this took place at the same time with the Roman Council held by the Pope. As, however, the African Synods took place in the fourth indiction, so in the year 646, ^{f143} a Roman Synod at that time is not known. Of the African assemblies in question, we have three synodal letters, and a fourth by Archbishop Victor of Carthage, among the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649. The first of these is a united memorial from the three ecclesiastical provinces of Numidia, Byzacene, and Mauritania, to Pope Theodore, resolved upon at a general assembly of the deputies of those provinces, and drawn up in the name of all by the three metropolitans (*primarum sedium episcopi*), Columbus of Numidia, Stephen of the Byzacene province, and Reparatus of Mauritania. The *provincia proconsularis*, with the supreme metropolitan see of Carthage, is not named in it, because Fortunatus of Carthage, himself a Monothelite, was not yet deposed; or at least his successor Victor was not yet elected. This Fortunatus we shall meet again in the history of the sixth Oecumenical Council. ^{f144}

After a very express recognition of the Roman primate, the African bishops go on: “The innovation which has arisen in Constantinople has become known to us also. We have hitherto kept silence, because we believed that the tares had already been plucked up by the apostolic see. When, however, we understood that it was obstinately spreading, and had read of the recantation of Pyrrhus, the former bishop of Constantinople, which he handed to you, we held it for necessary to write to Paul, the present bishop of Constantinople, beseeching him with tears to remove from his Church and himself the new heresy which one of its originators, Pyrrhus, had himself rejected, and to cause to be taken away the documents (copies of

the Ecthesis) which had been publicly posted to the distress of the people. ... Because, however, Africa had been brought into a certain suspicion at Constantinople by malevolent people (see below, in this section), we have sent to you first the letter to Paul already mentioned, and pray you to have it delivered in Constantinople by your representatives (*responsales*). If Paul perseveres in his error, the holy see will cut off the unsound member from the sound body. As we held special Synods in each province, we should have liked to despatch a *plena legatio*. Because, however, circumstances occurred to hinder us, deputies of the different provinces of Africa have taken the resolution to make you acquainted with the present state of things.” ^{f145}

The second African synodal letter, by Stephen, bishop of the *prima sedes* in the Byzacene province, and his forty-two suffragans, addressed to the Emperor Constantine (Constans II, see sec. 301 *ad fin.*), first commends the care of the Emperor for the Church, and his orthodox zeal, and then prays, in the name of all the bishops of Africa, that he would extinguish the scandal of the new heresy, and admonish Bishop Paul of Constantinople to fidelity towards the orthodox doctrine. They said they had written to him, and had asked the bearer to deliver to the Emperor a copy of their letter to the Bishop. ^{f146}

It may seem surprising that this letter is subscribed only by the bishops of the Byzacene provinces, and yet is addressed to the Emperor in the name of the *cuncti Africoe sacerdotes*. Perhaps it was drawn up at the provincial Synod of the Byzacenes, and afterwards approved by the rest of the African bishops. Such, too, might be the case with the third document still extant, the letter to Paul of Constantinople, which, although subscribed only by the sixty-eight bishops of the proconsular province (at the time of the vacancy of the see of Carthage), was, like this, regarded as a general letter from the whole of Africa. ^{f147}

In the synodal letter to Paul of Constantinople, it is said that the apostles had proclaimed only one, the true doctrine of Christ, but that the wicked enemy had sown tares, *i.e.* heresies. Even in Constantinople there had been published a poisonous document contrary to the doctrine of the Fathers and Councils, and they wonder that Bishop Paul has not immediately annulled it. They entirely reject the new doctrines proclaimed since Sergius, and give the assurance that, by God’s grace, they will preserve inviolate what the holy Fathers had proclaimed, and the universal Church

confesses, namely, that the one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, took true human flesh with the rational soul, without loss or diminution of the Godhead, that He is God and man together, and as God has the divine nature, divine will, and divine *operatio*, and so also as man, the nature, will, and full operatio of man, but without sin and concupiscence, *i.e.* that in Christ there are two natures and two natural wills, as the Catholic Church has always taught. In proof of this, they adduce passages from Ambrose and Augustine. ^{f148}

The fourth African letter, finally, somewhat later than the three mentioned, is that of Victor, the new bishop of Carthage, to Pope Theodore. It informs him that he had been raised to the see of Carthage on the 16th of July (646), then passes on to the Monothelite affair, explains his faith in two wills and operations, petitions the Pope for the suppression of the new heresy, and closes with the remark that he has not written to Paul of Constantinople, because Africa had been, by means of slanderers at Constantinople, brought into evil and false suspicion, as though this land had been guilty of some wrong (see below). But the Pope might have the synodal letter (mentioned above) presented to Paul by his *responsarii*. ^{f149}

African Synods are also mentioned by the *Libellus Synodicus*, which enumerates a Byzacene, Numidian, Mauritanian, and a Carthaginian synod. ^{f150}

But it not merely interchanges the names of the metropolitans, but also makes the mistake of stating that, along with Sergius, Pyrrhus was anathematized here, whilst the genuine synodal letters show that Pyrrhus was commended, and the African bishops had as yet no information of his relapse into heresy. This took place some time afterwards at Ravenna, upon which Pope Theodore assembled the bishops and clergy in a kind of Synal in S. Peter's Church, at the grave of S. Peter, took some drops of the holy blood from the chalice, mixed it with ink, and subscribed with it the condemnation of Pyrrhus. ^{f151}

Both in the letter of Victor and in the united African memorial, mention is made of a wicked suspicion to which Africa is exposed. This evidently refers to the rebellion of the imperial viceroy, Gregory, who came out, A.D. 646, as a usurper and Emperor of Africa, but was beaten by the Saracens in the very next year. ^{f152} Victor and the other African bishops meant to say, either that they and the clergy generally had taken no part in the insurrection of Gregory, or that their assemblies and letters had preceded the formal outbreak of the insurrection, so that the evil rumors which had

penetrated to Constantinople, respecting a revolt which had taken place in Africa, were untrue.

SEC. 305. PAUL OF CONSTANTINOPLE WRITES TO POPE THEODORE.

In accordance with the wish of the Africans, Pope Theodore addressed a letter of counsel to Paul of Constantinople, but only the answer of the latter is still extant. He boasts of his humility, will not answer hard words with hard words, and then says: “Your representatives have had long contentions with us, and have demanded that we should explain the notion of one will of Christ, and send this explanation to your reverence. ... We present our view in the present letter. ... We, *i.e.* the **dikaiodosia** (tribunal), and the Synod of our Church, confess one Son and Lord, ... perfect in the Godhead, and perfect in the manhood, one person, one compound hypostasis, in two natures after the union, recognising the difference of the natures in their properties. In the one Christ are preserved the two natures, and they remain within the proper bounds of the substances, also in the ineffable connection of the hypostatic union. The Logos remained what HE was, and became what He was not. Therefore we say that all godlike and all manlike energy proceeds from one and the same Incarnate God, and refers back to one and the same. Thus no separation is introduced, and the mixture is avoided. ... We confess that one and the same Incarnate God, the Logos, worked miracles and endured suffering in the flesh voluntarily for our sakes; so that we can say: *God suffered, and the Son of man came down from heaven*, on account of the inseparable union in the hypostasis. *Therefore we also recognise also only ONE will of our Lord, in order not to ascribe to the ONE Person a contradiction or a difference of wills, or think of that Person as conflicting with Himself, and so as not to be forced to admit two willers.* We do not this in order to mingle the two natures, or in order to remove one of them, but in order to show that the rationally quickened **sarx** of Christ is enriched through closest union with the divine, has acquired (**ekekthto**) the divine will of the Logos inseparably united with it, and is in all ways led and moved by it, so that it is at no time separated, or of its own impulse fulfils its natural movement in opposition to the spirit of the Logos hypostatically united with it, but at the time and in the manner and in the degree in which the Logos willed. Far be it from us to bring in a movement of the manhood in Christ constrained by physical necessity, such as is indicated by the words

of Christ to Peter in S. ~~4218~~ John 21:18 (far be it from us to admit such a thing); although, literally taken, He referred to suffering in a similar manner as Peter.” At the close, Paul seeks to explain in a different sense the passage: “I came not to do My own will, but the will of Him who sent Me,” and appeals to Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Cyril, and Honorius. ^{f153}

Upon this, Pope Theodore pronounced the deposition of Paul, ^{f154} and at the same time nominated as apostolic vicar over Palestine, Bishop Stephen of Dor (in Palestine), whom Sophronius, years before, had sent as his envoy to Rome, in order to depose the Monothelite bishops who had been appointed by the intruded Patriarch Sergius (see above, sec. 300, and below, sec. 307), if they did not amend. ^{f155} Maximus, too, proceeded to oppose Monothelitism; ^{f156} whilst, on the other hand, Paul took vengeance on the papal representatives in Constantinople (sec. 215), and brought it about that the Emperor Constans II put forth the unhappy *Typus*, A.D. 648. ^{f157}

SEC. 306. *THE TYPUS.*

As this imperial decree of the faith has come to us among the Acts of the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649, it lacks the title and superscription, but it is called unanimously *τύπος* and also *τύπος περι πίστεως* by the ancients and by the Lateran Synod, and was undoubtedly published under that title. It runs: “As we are accustomed to do everything and to have regard to everything which can serve to the welfare of our Christian State, and especially whatever concerns the unfalsified doctrine upon which all our happiness depends, we perceived that our orthodox people had been greatly agitated because some, in regard to the economy (Incarnation) of God, recognized and maintained only one will, namely, that one and the same works the divine and the human, ^{f158} whilst others admit two wills and two energies. The former defend their view by this, that the Lord Jesus Christ is only one person in two natures (and therefore) willing and working, without mixture or separation, both the divine and the human. The others (say): While in one and the same person two natures are united without separation, yet their difference from each other remains, and in accordance with the quality of the nature (*προσφύω*), the one and the same Christ works both the divine and the human. ... We believed that, under God’s guidance, we were bound to extinguish the flame of discord which had been kindled, and not allow it further to destroy souls. We declare, therefore, to our orthodox subjects that, from the present moment, they no longer have permission in any way to contend and to quarrel with

one another over one will and one energy, or two energies and two wills. This we ordain, not to take away anything from the pious doctrines of the holy recognized Fathers in regard to the Incarnation of God the Word, but with the view that all further strife in regard to these questions should cease, and that we should follow only the Holy Scriptures and the five deliverances of the five holy Oecumenical Synods and the simple utterances and confessions of the approved Fathers, ... without adding or taking away anything, and without explaining them in a manner opposed to their proper meaning. Moreover, there should everywhere be observed the form of doctrine (*schma*) existing *before* the controversies referred to, as it was when no such controversy had come into existence. But none of those who hitherto have taught one will and one energy, or two wills and two energies, shall for this reason be exposed to blame or accusation ... But in order to the complete union and communion of the churches, and that no further occasion may remain for the litigious, we ordain that the documents (the *Ecthesis*) posted up in the narthex [vestibule] of the great church of our residence city for some time, in regard to the controversies in question, be taken away. Whoever ventures to transgress the command now given is subject, above all, to the judgment of God, but he will also be liable to the punishment of the despisers of the imperial commands. If he is a bishop or cleric, he shall be deposed; if a monk, excommunicated, and banished from his place of abode (monastery); if he is a civil or military official, he shall lose his office and dignity; if he is a private person, he shall, if of the upper class, be punished in his property; if lowly, be chastised with corporal correction and permanent exile.” ^{f159}

As Sergius drew up the *Ecthesis*, so did his second successor, Paul, draw up the *Typus*; but whilst the former gave to his work, not the form of an imperial edict, but the theological form of a creed, Paul showed himself more adroit, and gave to the *Typus* the external appearance of an imperial decree. That; Constans hoped by this new edict to restore the peace of the Church, he tells us himself, and there is no reason to doubt it, for by withdrawal of the *Ecthesis* he visibly wanted to quiet the Westerns and those who held their opinions. It is also clear that, whilst the *Ecthesis* forbade the controversy on one or two energies, it yet proclaimed, inconsistently, the one will, and so Monothelitism, the *Typus* now consistently rejected the *efi qebma* along with the *mia ejesgeia*, and therewith wanted to be more impartial. This supposed impartiality is also the principal difference between the *Typus* and the *Ecthesis*, for in the

fundamental thought, that the dogmatic development shall stop where it has been brought by the five Oecumenical Councils, and that further questions shall not be brought up, they are like each other. Moreover, that impartiality is only a false *juste milieu* which places orthodox Dyothelitism on one and the same line with the heresy, and prohibits the one as well as the other. Another difference between the Ecthesis and the Typus is shown in this, that the former required obedience only in general, whilst Constans threatened every transgression of his Typus with the severest civil penalties. That he also actually carried them out with all harshness the sequel will show.

SEC. 307. POPE MARTIN I AND THE LATERAN SYNOD OF A.D. 649.

Soon after the promulgation of the Typus, and perhaps without having seen it, Pope Theodore died, May 13, 649; and on July 5, Martin I. was elected. He had been formerly a Roman priest, before that legate of the holy see at Constantinople, a man distinguished for beauty, virtue, and knowledge, destined by providence as martyr for the Dyothelite faith. The *Acta S. Audoeni* declare that the Emperor in a friendly manner requested the new Pope to agree to the Typus, but that he had rejected this request with all decision, and petitioned the King of the Franks to send wise and able bishops to Rome, so that the Pope, with them and the bishops out of all Italy, might prepare an antidote for the heresy. They relate that the King agreed to this, and assembled the bishops of his kingdom, in order to select deputies who should be sent to Rome. The election had fallen unanimously upon Audoenus of Rouen and Eligius of Noyon, but an accident hindered their journey. ^{f160}

According to this, we should be forced to believe that Pope Martin had been required to receive the Typus immediately after he had taken possession of the see, and that, in order to be able to take more decisive steps, he had summoned a great Synod. But the *Acta S. Audoeni* are a very dubious source, and in one of the points adduced are corrected by S. Audoenus himself, since he relates that it was after the Synod that the Pope made that request to the King of the Franks. ^{f161} Bower and others maintain that the Emperor Constans II. immediately confirmed the new Pope, in order the more easily to gain him over to himself and the Typus. ^{f162} Muratori, ^{f163} on the contrary, supposes that, this time in Rome, they did not await the imperial confirmation, and consecrated Pope Martin without

such approval. This comes out clearly, that the Greeks maintained subsequently that he *irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum subripuisse*. ^{f164}

The first great act of the new Pope was the holding of that famous Synod, in importance almost oecumenical, which was opened on the 5th of October 649, in the Basilica of Constantine (*Ecclesia Salvatoris*) in the Lateran. It lasted until October 31, fell into five sessions, here called *secretarii*, ^{f165} numbered 105 bishops, chiefly from Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia, with some Africans and other foreigners. There was no one present from Longobardian Italy, for Maximus of Aquileia, who was there, had his see at Grado, which belonged to the Byzantines [†] (vol. 4, page 364, note 2). The Pope presided, and had the Acts immediately translated into Greek, that he might be able to send them to the Emperor and the Oriental bishops. They have come to us in all completeness and in both languages, and it hardly needs to be said that, of the Greek documents received there and read at the Synod, *e.g.* the *Ecthesis* and *Typus*, the Greek text here presented to us is not a translation back from the Latin, but the original.

First of all, the first notary of the Roman see, Theophylact, as master of the ceremonies, spoke and invited the Pope to deliver an address. He spoke as follows: — “Christ has commanded the shepherds to be watchful. This applies also to us; and especially must we watch over the purity of the faith, as some bishops, who do not deserve this name, have sought of late to corrupt the Confession by newly invented expressions. All the world knows them, for they have come publicly forward to injure the Church, namely, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople, and his successors, Pyrrhus and Paul. Cyrus, eighteen years ago, taught in Alexandria *one* operation of Christ and proclaimed nine *capitula* from the pulpit. Sergius approved of this, somewhat later sent out the *Ecthesis* under the name of the Emperor Heraclius, and taught *one* will and *one* operation, ^{f166} which leads to one nature of Christ. By the Fathers it is quite clearly taught (passages in proof from Basil and Cyril) that the *operatio* corresponds with the nature, and he who has like *operatio* must also be of like nature. As now the Fathers teach two natures in Christ, it follows hence that in one and the same Incarnate Logos two wills and operations are united without mixture or separation. That both are *naturaliter* one is not possible. Pope Leo, too, taught two wills (proof passages), and the Holy Scriptures (proofs) point to the same. *He worked thus the divine corporeally, for He manifested it by His rationally quickened flesh: the*

human He worked divinely, because, for our sakes, He voluntarily took upon Him human weaknesses, but without sin.

“These men contradicted the doctrine of Leo and of the Council of Chalcedon, since Cyrus set forth the nine capitula, and Sergius the Ecthesis. Pyrrhus and Paul have spread the heresy more widely. Pyrrhus, in particular, by threats and flattery misled many bishops to subscribe that impiety. Later, to his shame, he came here and presented a letter to our holy see, in which he anathematised his earlier error. But he is like a dog returned to his vomit, and therefore is properly deposed. Paul, however, has outbid his predecessor, confirmed the Ecthesis, and opposed the true dogma. Therefore he has also been deposed by the holy see. In particular, imitating Sergius in order to hide his error, he gave the Emperor the counsel to send out the Typus, which annuls the catholic dogma, denies to Christ properly all will and all operation, and therewith also each nature, for the nature shows itself through its activity. He has done what no heretic has previously dared — destroyed the altar of our holy see in the palace, Placidia, and forbidden our envoys to celebrate there. He has persecuted these envoys, with other orthodox men, because they exhorted him to abandon his error, assigning to some imprisonment, to others exile, to others flogging. As these men (Sergius, etc.) have disquieted almost the whole world, there have come to us from different sides complaints in writing and by word of mouth, with the request to destroy the falsehood by the apostolic authority. Our predecessors exhorted these men to amendment, in writing and by their representatives, but without result. Therefore we have thought it necessary to call you together, in order, in consultation with you, to consider their case and the new doctrine.” ^{f167}

At the request of the two representatives of Archbishop Maurus of Ravenna, his letter to the Pope was now read, as follows: “He had been requested by the Pope to appear at the Synod, but the garrison and the residents of Ravenna and the neighborhood (Pentapolis) had earnestly entreated him not to leave them, on account of the invasions of the barbarians, and as no imperial exarch was present. He would therefore ask to be excused, and to be considered as present. He thought in no way differently from the apostolic see and the orthodox Church, condemned and anathematised the Ecthesis, and that which had been recently put forth

in its favor (the Typus), acknowledged two operations and two wills, since one and the same, God and man, in one person worked both, the godlike and the human; he honored the five holy Synods, and had sent deputies whose subscription against the Ecthesis, etc., he would recognize as valid.”

After this letter had been embodied in the Acts, Archbishop Maximus of Aquileia-Grado (see vol. 4, secs. 267 and 283) showed that the denial of two wills and operations necessarily led to the denial of the difference of the two natures in Christ, and thus to the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, and proposed to have the heretical writings of Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul read aloud, and to set up one or two public accusers against them. Bishop Deusdedit of Calaris supported this proposal; and the Synod, in the interest of thoroughness, agreed to it, although it was clear that any one who maintained only one will and one operation violated the doctrine of the Fathers and Synods.^{f168} With this closed the first session.

In the second, on October 8, 649, Bishop Stephen of Dor (see above, sec. 305), at his own request, was introduced to the Synod, and his memorial addressed to it read. He says herein: “Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, Sergius and his successors, have put forth false doctrines, and have distracted the Church. On account of the primacy of the Roman Church, Archbishop Sophronius of Jerusalem sent me to Rome, in order to give information respecting the erroneous doctrines of those men, and to obtain their condemnation. On Mount Calvary he bound me to this by a solemn oath, and I have fulfilled this commission immediately and faithfully. To-day I appear for the third time before the apostolic see, in order to pray for the condemnation of those heresies. On this account I have drawn the hatred of the opponents upon me, so that the (imperial) command has gone into all the provinces, to arrest me and to send me in chains (to Constantinople). Yet God protected me and awoke the apostolic bishops, so that they admonished those men (Sergius, etc.), although in vain. God awoke anew Pope Martin, who summoned this Synod for the preservation of the doctrines. I adjure you to bring the work to an end. The holy faith endures no defilement by innovation. If Christ is perfect God and perfect man, HE must also have a divine and a human will, otherwise His Godhead and manhood were imperfect, and He would be neither true God nor true man. If we admit two natures, then we must, in consistency, teach also two wills and operations, and whoever denies this assails the Council of Chalcedon. Quite recently the opponents have invented something new, and Paul of Constantinople has persuaded the pious Emperor to publish the

Typus, which prohibits the doctrine of the Fathers (of two wills) equally with that of the heretics (of one will). The same people who formerly taught one will now demand that we should not confess one, and declare Christ neither for God nor for man, as they would bring about the denial both of the human and the divine will. In the East, the heresy has carried destruction round it. Bishop Sergius of Joppa, after the departure of the Persians, has uncanonically, by secular power, taken possession of the see of Jerusalem, has ordained other bishops, and these, to maintain themselves, have acceded to the innovation. I acquainted the late Pope Theodore with these things, and was by him named as his representative in Palestine, with the commission to depose the bishops who would not amend. At my request, some of them gave a written declaration that they would adhere to the orthodox faith. I conveyed their documents to Pope Martin, and he confirmed several of them. I and the Orientals repeat now the petition of S. Sophronius, that you will condemn and root out the errors of Apollinaris and Severus, which have been renewed by the men whom I have named, and rejoice the world by a declaration of the genuine faith.” ^{f169}

Thereupon thirty- seven Greek abbots, priests, and monks, who had resided for several years in Rome (probably driven into exile by the Saracens), were, at their request, brought before the Synod. At their head stood John, abbot of the Laura of S. Sabas at Jerusalem; Theodore, abbot of a (Greek) Laura (of S. Sabas) in Africa; Thalassius, abbot of the Armenian monastery of S. Renatus in Rome; and George, abbot of the Cilician monastery *Ad aquas Salvias* at Rome. They handed in a Greek memorial, which, read aloud in a Latin translation, requested the assembled bishops to condemn Monothelitism, and to pronounce anathema on Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and their adherents, and also on the Typus, and to confirm synodally the true doctrine of the duality of the wills. With this was connected the petition that the Pope would immediately cause the Acts of this Synod to be accurately translated into Greek. ^{f170}

It was naturally of interest for the Lateran Synod to collect these and all other writings of complaint against Monothelitism which were presented to them, and to use them as material for their own decision. Therefore the letter of Archbishop Sergius of Cyprus to Pope Theodore (sec. 302), and the four African letters mentioned above were read. ^{f171}

The third session, on October 17, had to bring up from the writings of the Monothelite leaders passages in proof of their heresy; and they began with Theodore of Pharan, because that doctrine had been first uttered in his writings. There were read eleven passages, which had already been noted from two letters of his (to Bishop Sergius of Arsinoe, and on the explanation of patristic utterances), each of which contains the thought: “The Godhead and the manhood in Christ had only one, and this the divine energy.” Some of these fragments bring out this thought more fully, thus: “All that Christ did and spoke, that He hungered and thirsted, etc., proceeded from the Godhead, and happened under mediation of the rational, human soul, through the services of the body. The Logos is *opifex* of the *operatio*; the human nature is only the organ.” Theodore started from the correct thought, “that Christ had voluntarily allowed hunger and thirst, and human *paqh* in general” (which is quite correct, see secs. 296, 297, 303), but it was an erroneous *saltus* when from that he inferred the *mia ejerŕgeia*. Christ certainly did not hunger or thirst involuntarily, as we do, nor through the constraint of nature, but only when and as the Logos allowed it; but the hunger or the thirst was yet not an *ejergei n* of the divine, but of the human nature.

In the discourse which the Pope delivered after this reading, he endeavored to point out the heresy of Theodore, and reproached him first with Arianism, arguing thus: “Theodore says, the Godhead and manhood of Christ have only one operation; in another place he calls it *condita*, created (in the words: The Logos is its *opifex*); thus the divine in Christ, to him as to Arius, is something created, *conditum*.” Then he convicts him of Docetism, Manichaeism, and Apollinarism, because, in support of the *mia ejerŕgeia*, he says in the tenth fragment: “In man the soul is certainly not master of the grossly material body; but with the divine and quickening body of Christ this was different, since it came forth, not in a grossly material manner (*apŕkwv*), but, so to speak, *ajŕwmatwv*, from His mother’s womb, and subsequently out of the grave and through closed doors.” From the *ajŕwmatwv* the Pope infers that Theodore had denied the true Incarnation of the Logos, and adduces a series of patristic passages to show that the orthodox Fathers had maintained a true humanity of Christ, with a material body subject to gravity. What he evidently wanted to do with him, as later with Bishop Maximus of Aquileia (below, in this sec.), was to show that Bishop Theodore of Pharan was already anathematized by the anathema on Arius, the Docetae, etc., to the proof, however, that

Dyothelitism is the true doctrine, and the necessary consequence of the Chalcedonian dogma, he does not here proceed. ^{f172} Then were read:

- (1) The seventh capitulum of Cyrus of Alexandria (sec. 293);
- (2) The letter of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus (sec. 293); and
- (3) The passage from Dionysius Areop. *Ad Caium*, to which the seventh capitulum of Cyrus appealed. Pope Martin remarked on this, that the heretics were ready to creep under patristic passages, and that Cyrus on this point had falsified the passage of Dionysius the Areopagite, and made him assert a *una operatio deivirilis* instead of a *nova*. Sergius, in his answer to Cyrus, had carried the falsification further, since he, repeating the words of Cyrus (sec. 293), said not only, like him, *una* instead of *nova*, but also omitted the word *deivirilis* (**qeandrikh>**), as if Dionysius had taught merely the **mia ejesgeia**. ^{f173} Then were read:

(4) Several passages from writings of the Monothelite leader Themistius, founder of the sect of Agnoetae (see vol. 3, sec. 208), in proof that more than a hundred years ago the Monothelites, particularly Themistius and Severus, maintained the **mia ejesgeia qeavdrikh>** and the former opposed Colluthus (also a Monophysite, but an opponent of the Agnoetae), because the latter rejected the **qeandrikkh>** on the supposition that this expression involved the recognition of two energies. ^{f174} The Pope showed what absurdity resulted from understanding only one **ejesgeia** under **qeandrikh>** and (as we saw above, sec. 128) showed very well what Dionysius the Areopagite meant to say in the passage in question: “Nec enim nuda Deitate (Christus) divina, neque pura humanitate humana, sed per carnem quidem intellectualiter animatam ... operabatur sublimer miracula, et iterum per potestatem validissimam ... passionum sponte pro nobis experimentum suscipiebat.” ^{f175} He added that Leo the Great also fully agreed with this doctrine (of two operations), and that Sergius and Cyrus had grossly misinterpreted his words.

Bishop Deusdedit of Calaris is of the same view, and declares that, along with Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus must also be condemned. He had thoroughly approved of their heresy, and had excused Cyrus for the falsification of the passage of the Areopagite, by saying that **kainhæ** must necessarily be taken in the sense of **mian**. ^{f176}

Finally, the Pope caused to be read:

(5) The Ecthesis (see sec. 299);

(6) The fragments of the Synods of Constantinople of 638 and 639 under Sergius and Pyrrhus (sec. 300); and

(7) The letter of Cyrus to Sergius containing the approval of the Ecthesis (sec. 301), when the Pope remarked that now the heresy of these men was as clear as day.^{f177}

In the fourth session, October 19 (or 17), the Pope resumed the proofs for the heterodoxy of Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and the Ecthesis, and pointed to the changeableness of the Monothelites, who at first had taught the *mia eþþergeia* so zealously, and yet in the Ecthesis had forbidden its being asserted. They had anathematized themselves, and their threats to anathematize others (the Dyothelites) were wrong and powerless. In order, however, to show most clearly that they were heretical, before the Synod should give their sentence, the declarations of faith of the holy Fathers and of the five Oecumenical Synods, bearing on the subjects, should be read aloud and compared with the Monothelite doctrine. As, however, Bishop Benedict of Ajaccio made the proposal that the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople should be associated with the heretics named, and that judgment should also be pronounced upon him, they read next the proofs against him, namely, his letter to the departed Pope, Theodore (sec. 305), and the Typus of the Emperor, composed by him, and afterwards the documents which had first been used as witnesses against the Monothelites generally, the creeds of the old Synods of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, together with the twelve anathematisms of Cyril (under the title of Symbol of Ephesus) and the fourteen anathematisms of the fifth Synod.

At the close of the session, Bishop Maximus of Aquileia delivered an address, in which he commended the zeal of the Pope, and showed that Sergius and Pyrrhus, etc., could in no way appeal to the five Oecumenical Synods, that, on the contrary, their teaching was implicitly anathematized by these in the anathematisms against Arius, Apollinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, who had also taught only one will and one operation.^{f178} Also that Monothelitism led to the denial of the full Godhead and manhood of Christ, thus to the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. Sophronius had already, in opposition to Sergius, collected testimonies of the Fathers for the two wills, and the doctrine of the Monothelites was only

a renewing of the Severian heresy, in the foundation of which they had misinterpreted the words of Leo: *Agit enim utraque forma*, etc. ^{f179}

In the fifth session, October 31, there was first read a passage from the Confession of Faith of the fifth Oecumenical Synod (sess. 3; see vol. 4, sec. 268 *ad fin.*), in which every one who opposed the doctrines of the earlier Synods is smitten with anathema, and then a previously prepared rich collection of patristic testimonies in favor of Dyothelitism was read. The first division of these, taken from Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril, and Amphilochius, treats of this, that where there is *una essentia* or *natura*, there also there is *una operatio* and *una voluntas*, and conversely, and that the will lies on the side of the nature, is **subdromov** with the nature. Father, Son, and Spirit therefore, as they had only one nature, so had only one will. The second series, from Hippolytus (*sanctus episcopus et martyr*), Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom and his two opponents, *Sanctus Theophilus* and *Beatus Severianus* of Gabala, gives testimony, that these Fathers ascribe to the divine nature of Christ a divine will, to the human nature a human will and human *passiones*, which, however, Christ had assumed voluntarily. The third section shows the same in reference to the two natural *operations* of Christ, by passages from Hilary, Leo, Dionysius the Areopagite, ^{f180} Justin, ^{f181} Athanasius, ^{f182} Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, etc. The Synod remarked: From this it is clear that Cyrus and Sergius contradicted the holy Fathers, since these most decidedly taught not only two natures, but also two natural wills and operations. It now remains only to show that the innovators agreed with heretics already condemned; ^{f183} and this was shown by forty-one utterances from the Arian Lucius, from Apollinaris, Severus, Themistius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, ^{f184} Colluthus, Julian of Halicarnassus, etc., who all acknowledged only one energy and one divine will in Christ. ^{f185} Immediately afterwards the Pope interposed, in order to draw the conclusion that the new doctrine of Sergius and Cyrus was identical with the heresies read out, which he showed still more clearly and forcibly by comparing the leading propositions on both sides. He closed with the words: "The innovators therefore deserve the same anathema as the old heretics, since they not only have not been alarmed by the anathema pronounced on the others, but, going still further, have maintained, to the

deceiving of the people, that the Council of Chalcedon and the holy Fathers were upon their side.” After that, Maximus of Aquileia and Deusdedit of Calaris delivered addresses to show that the doctrine of two wills and energies was the only true one; and after the Pope had, in a short address, finally done the same,^{f186} the Synod put forth a *Symbolum* and twenty anathematisms or canons.

The Lateran symbol is, in the first place, a repetition and translation of the Chalcedonian, from *ἐφ' ἃ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν* (vol. 3, sec. 193, page 350) down to *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*.^{f187} To this is added that which, for the present, is the most important, the new passage: “Et duas ejusdem sicuti naturas unitas inconfuse, ita et duas naturales voluntates (sc. credimus), divinam et humanam, in approbatione perfect et indiminuta eundem veraciter esse perfectum Deum, et hominem perfectum (the Greek text has the addition, *μόνην δικά θῆν ἀμάρτιαν*), eundem atque unum Dominum nostrum et Deum J. Chr., utpote volentem et operantem divine et humane nostram salutare.”^{f188}

The same doctrine is developed more explicitly in the twenty canons; but they are not confined to this point alone, but extend, in precise and clear exposition, over the whole christo-logical question, and anathematise the opposed heresy with its adherents, and with the Ecthesis and the Typus.

Can. 1. Si quis secundum sanctos partes non confitetur proprie et veraciter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, Trinitatem in unitate, et unitatem in Trinitate, h.e. unum Deum in tribus subsistentiis consubstantialibus et aequalis gloriae, unam eandemque trium deitatem, naturam, substantiam, virtutem, potentiam, regnum, imperium, voluntatem, operationem inconditam, sine initio, incomprehensibilem, immutabilem, creatricem omnium et protectricem, condemnatus sit.

2. Si quis secundum S. partes non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem ipsum unum sanctae et consubstantialis et venerandae Trinitatis Deum Verbum e coelo descendisse, et incarnatum ex Spiritu Sancto et Maria semper Virgine, et hominem factum, crucifixum carne, propter nos sponge passum, sepultumque, et resurrexisse tertia die, et ascendisse in coelos, atque sedentem in dextera Patris, et venturum iterum cum gloria paterna, cum assumpta ab eo atque animata intellectualiter carne ejus, judicare vivos et mortuos, condemnatus sit.

3. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem Dei genitricem sanctam semperque Virginem et immaculatam Mariam, utpote ipsum Deum Verbum specialiter et veraciter, qui a Deo Patre ante omnia saecula natus est, in ultimis saeculorum absque semine concepisce ex Spiritu Sancto, et incorruptibiliter eam genuisse, indissolubili permanente et post partum ejusdem virginitate, condemnatus sit.

4. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem ipsius et unius Domini nostri et Dei Jesu Christi duas nativitates, tam ante saecula ex Deo et Patre incorporaliter et sempiternaliter, quamque de sancta Virgine semper Dei genitrice Maria corporaliter in ultimis saeculorum; atque unum eundemque Dominum nostrum et Deum Jesum Christum consubstantialem Deo et Patri secundum Deitatem, et consubstantialem homini et matri secundum humanitatem; atque eundem passibilem carne, et impassibilem Deitate, circumscriptum corpore, incircumscriptum Deitate, eundem inconditum et conditum, terrenum et coelstem, visibilem et intelligibilem, capabilem et incapabilem; ut toto homine eodemque et Deo totus homo reformaretur qui sub peccato cecidit, condemnatus sit.

5. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem unam naturam Dei Verbi incarnatam, per hoc quod incarnata dicitur nostra substantiae perfecte in Christo Deo et indimute, absque tantummodo peccato significata, condemnatus sit.

6. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem ex duabus et in duabus naturis substantialiter unitis inconfuse et indivise unum eundemque esse Dominum et Deum Jesum Christum, condemnatus sit.

7. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem substantialem differentiam naturarum inconfuse et indivise in eo salvatam, condemnatus sit.

8. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem naturarum substantialem unionem indivise et inconfuse in eo cognitam, condemnatus sit.

9. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem naturales proprietates Deitatis ejus et humanitatis indimute in eo et sine deminoratione salvatas, condemnatus sit.

10. Si quis secundum sanctos partes non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem duas unius ejusdemque Christi Dei nostri voluntates cohaerenter unitas, divinam et humanam, ex hoc quod per utramque ejus naturam voluntarius naturaliter idem consistit nostrae salutis, condemnatus sit.

11. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem duas unius ejusdemque Christi Dei nostri operationes cohaerenter unitas, divinam et humanam, ab eo quod per utramque ejus naturam operator naturaliter idem existit nostrae salutis, condemnatus sit.

12. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos unam Christi Dei nostri voluntatem confitetur et unam operationem, in peremptionem sanctorum patrum confessionis, et abnegationem ejusdem Salvatoris nostri dispensationis, condemnatus sit.

13. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos in Christo Deo in unitate substantialiter salvatis et sanctis patribus nostris pie praedicatis duabus voluntatibus et duabus operationibus, divina et humana, contra doctrinam patrum, et unam voluntatem atque unam operationem confitetur, condemnatus sit.

14. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quae ab haereticis impie confitetur, et duas voluntates pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quae in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvantur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso praedicantur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit.

15. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos deivirilem operationem, quod Graeci dicunt **qeandrikha**, unam operationem insipienter suscipit, non autem duplicem esse confitetur secundum sanctos patres, hoc est divinam et humanam, aut ipsam deivirilis, quae posita est, novam vocabuli dictionem unius esse designativam, sed non utriusque mirificae et gloriosae unionis demonstrativam, condemnatus sit.

16. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos in peremptione salvatis in Christo Deo essentialiter in unitione, et sanctis patribus pie praedicatis duabus voluntatibus et duabus operationibus, hoc est, divina et humana, dissensiones et divisiones insipienter mysterio dispensationis ejus innectit, et propterea evangelicas et apostolicas de eodem Salvatore voces non uni eidemque personae et essentialiter tribuit eidem ipsi Domino et Deo nostro

Jesu Christo secundum beatum Cyrillum, ut ostendatur Deus esse et homo idem naturaliter, condemnatus sit.

17. Si quis secundum sanctos patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem omnia, quae tradita sunt et praedicata sanctae catholicae et apostolicae Dei ecclesia, perindeque a sanctis patribus et venerandis universalibus quinque conciliis usque ad unum apicem, verbo et mente, condemnatus sit.

18. Si quis secundum sanctos patres consonanter nobis pariterque fide non respuit et anathematizat anima et ore omnes, quos respuit et anathematizat nefandissimos haereticos cum omnibus impiis eorum conscriptis usque ad unum apicem sancta Dei ecclesia catholica et apostolica, hoc est, sanctae et universales quinque synodi, et consonanter omnes probabiles ecclesiae patres: id est, Sabellium, Arium, Eunomium, Macedonium, Apollinarem, Polemonem, Eutychem, Dioscorum, Timotheum AElurum, Severum, Theodosium, Colluthum, Themistium, Paulum Samosatenum, Diodorum, Theodorum, Nestorium, Theodulum Persam, Origenem, Didymum, Evagrium, et compendiose omnes reliquos haereticos, qui a catholica ecclesia reprobati et abjecti sunt, quorum dogmata diabolicae operationis sunt genimina; et eos qui similia cum his usque ad finem obstinate sapuerunt et sapiunt, vel sapere sperantur; cum quibus merito, utpote similes eis parique errore praeditos, ex quibus dogmatizare noscuntur, proprieque errori vitam suam determinantes, hoc est, Theodorum quondam episcopum Pharanitanum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium Constantinopolitanum, vel ejus successores Pyrrhum et Paulum, in sua perfidia permanentes, et omnia illorum conscripta, et eos qui similia cum illis usque in finem obstinate sapuerunt, aut sapiunt, vel sapere sperantur, hoc est, unam voluntatem et unam operationem Deitaris et humanitatis Christi; et super haec impiissimam Echthesim, quae persuasione ejusdem Sergii facta est ab Heraclio quondam imperatore adversus orthodoxam fidem, unam Christi Dei voluntatem, et unam ex concinnatione definientem operationem venerari; sed et omnia, quae pro ea impie ab eis scripta vel acta sunt; et illos qui eam suscipiunt, vel aliquid de his, quae pro ea scripta vel acta sunt; et cum illis denuo scelerosum Typum, qui ex suasionem praedieti Pauli nuper factus est a serenissimo principe Constantino Imperatore contra catholicam ecclesiam, utpote duas naturales voluntates et operationes, divinam et humanam, quae a sanctis patribus in ipso Christo vero et Salvatore nostro pie praedicantur, cum una voluntate et operatione, quae ab hereticis impie in eo veneratur, pariter denegare et taciturnitate

constringi promulgantem, et propterea cum sanctis patribus et scelerosos haereticos, ab omni reprehensione et condemnatione injuste liberari definientem, in amputationem catholicae ecclesiae definitionum seu regulae. Si quis igitur, juxta quod dictum est, consonanter nobis omnia haec impiissima haereseos illorum dogmata, et ea quae pro illis aut in definitione eorum a quolibet impie conscripta sunt, et denominatos haereticos, Theodorum dicimus, Cyrum et Sergium, Pyrrhum et Paulum non respuat et anathematizat, utpote catholicae ecclesiae rebelles existentes; aut si quis aliquem de his, qui ab illis vel similibus eorum in scripto vel sine scripto, quocumque modo vel loco aut tempore temere depositi sunt aut condemnati, utpote similia eis minime credentem, sed sanctorum patrum nobiscum confitentem doctrinam, uti condemnatum habet aut omnino depositum; sed non arbitrantur hujusmodi, quicumque fuerit, hoc est, sive episcopus, aut presbyter, vel diaconus, sive alterius cujuscumque ecclesiastici ordinis, aut monachus, vel laicus, pium et orthodoxum, et catholicae ecclesiae propugnatorem, atque in ipso firmius consolidatum, in quo vocatus est a Domino ordine, illos autem impios atque detestabilia eorum pro hoc judicia vel sententias vacuas et invalidas atque infirmas, magis autem profanas et execrabiles vel reprobabiles arbitrat, hujusmodi condemnatus sit.

19. Si quis ea quae scelerosi haeretici sapiunt, indubitanter professus atque intelligens, per inanem proterviam dicit haec pietatis esse dogmata, quae tradiderunt ab initio speculatores et ministri verbi, hoc est dicere, sanctae et universales quinque synodi, calumnians utique ipsos sanctos patres, et memoratas sanctas quinque synodos, in deceptione simplicium, vel susceptione suae profanae perfidiae, hujusmodi condemnatus sit.

20. Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos quocumque modo, aut verbo, aut tempore, aut loco terminos removens illicite, quos posuerunt firmius sancti catholicae ecclesiae patres, id est sanctae et universales quinque synodi, novitates temere exquirere, et fidei alterius expositiones, aut libellos, aut epistolas, aut conscripta, aut subscriptiones, aut testimonia falsa, aut synodos, aut gesta monumentorum, aut ordinationes vacuas et ecclesiasticae regulae incognitas, aut loci servatores, i.e. vicarios incongruos ^{f189} et irrationabiles; et compendiose, si quid aliud impiissimis haereticis consuetum est agere, per diabolicam operationem tortuose et callide agit contra pias orthodoxorum catholicae ecclesiae, hoc est dicere, paternas ejus et synodales praedicationes, ad eversionem sincerrimae in Dominum Deum nostrum confessionis; et usque in finem sine poenitentia

permanet haec impie agens, hujusmodi in saecula saeculorum condemnatus sit, et dicat omnis populus, fiat, fiat. ^{f190}

The whole was subscribed, first by the Pope, by all the members, and somewhat later also by three other bishops who had not been present: John of Milan, Malliodorus of Dortona, and John of Calaris (Cagliari) in Sardinia, probably the successor of Deusdedit, whom we have seen active at our Synod.

The Acts of the Lateran Synod were now sent into all the countries of Christendom, and an Encyclical from the Pope and Council in common was sent to all bishops, priests, deacons, abbots, monks, ascetes, and to the whole Church, in which, after a complete relation of the whole process of events, the readers are requested, like the Lateran Council, to confirm in a written document the doctrine of the Fathers, and to pronounce anathema upon the new heretics, with their propositions, and with the Ecthesis and the Typus and their adherents. It closes with an exhortation, accompanied with many Scripture passages, on no account to accede to the heresy and the Typus and the Ecthesis. ^{f191}

The second letter issued by the Pope and the Synod in common is that addressed to the Emperor Constantine (Constans II.), in which he is very politely informed that the Synod has confirmed the true doctrine, and has condemned the new heresy, which ascribes no will to the human nature of Christ. Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul had attacked the perfect humanity of Christ, and for the confirmation of the heresy had surreptitiously put forth the Ecthesis and the Typus, and deceived the Emperor. Requested on all sides no longer to tolerate this, the apostolic see had summoned the Synod, and there was now sent to the Emperor a Greek translation of its Acts, so that he also might condemn the heretics and the heresy, for along with the orthodox faith the empire would also flourish, and God would then grant it victory over the barbarians. ^{f192}

To the copy of the Encyclical and the synodal Acts intended for Turgern, the Pope added a special letter to Amandus, the bishop of that place, asking him to bring it about that Synods should be held in the kingdom of Austrasia for the condemnation of the new heresy, and that some Frankish bishops should be sent to Rome by King Sigebert, in order to go with the papal embassy to Constantinople, and deliver the decrees of the Frankish Synod, together with those of the Lateran Council, to the Emperor. ^{f193}

The same request was made by the Pope to the bishops of Neustria and

King Chlodwig II.; and Archbishop Audoenus of Rouen and Bishop Eligius of Noyon were chosen to be sent to Rome for this purpose; but their departure was hindered, as Eligius relates in his biography of Audoenus. ^{f194}

SEC. 308. LETTERS OF POPE MARTIN I.

How greatly Pope Martin endeavored to obtain the universal rejection of the new heresy, is shown by several letters written by him soon after the end of the Lateran Synod, particularly that addressed to the Church of Carthage, and the bishops, clergy, and laity subject to that Church, that is, to the Christendom of Latin Africa. In this he commends the synodal letters which the Africans had sent to the holy see on the subject of Monothelitism (see sec. 304); they had there shown themselves to be a lamp of orthodoxy, and the Holy Spirit had made them this by the glorious orator of their Church, Augustine. The Pope now sent to them the synodal Acts and the Encyclica; they would there recognize their own doctrine. Finally, he exhorts them to steadfastness in orthodoxy, and foresees conflicts for them. ^{f195}

In another letter, the Pope named as his vicar in the East, Bishop John of Philadelphia, who had been strongly recommended to him by Stephen of Dor and the Oriental monks, commissioning him to put an end to disorders, and to appoint bishops, priests, and deacons in all the cities of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem. He was to carry through that which had been previously committed to Bishop Stephen of Dor, which, however, he had been unable to accomplish on account of hindrances from others. ^{f196}

He was to advance worthy men in ecclesiastical positions, and bring back, by constant admonition, the deposed to the right way. If this succeeded, he might then, if they were otherwise upright, reinstate them in their offices, and require of them a written confession of the orthodox faith. Those bishops who, during the patriarchate of Sophronius, had been appointed without his knowledge or will, must be deposed; those, on the contrary, should be confirmed who, either before the entrance of Sophronius on office or after his death, through force of circumstances, had been appointed uncanonically. Macedonius of Antioch, however, and Peter of Alexandria, had been intruded quite irregularly, and at the same time were heretics. That Bishop John might understand the right faith and promulgate it elsewhere, the Pope sent him the synodal Acts and the Encyclica.

Moreover, he would be supported in his new office by Bishop Theodore of Esbus and others, to whom the Pope had written, to this end.^{fa1} These letters, addressed to the distinguished layman Peter, to the Archimandrite George in the monastery of S. Theodosius, and to the bishops Theodore of Esbus and Anthony of Bacatha (in Arabia, but belonging to the ecclesiastical province of Palaestina III.), are also still extant.^{fa2} We learn from these that the two bishops had been on the side of the heresy, but had sent to the Pope an orthodox declaration of faith, and thereby had obtained his confirmation.

To the same class belongs also the papal letter to Pantaleon (more about this is not known), who had unjustly accused Bishop Stephen of Dor with the Pope. Martin regrets that the documents had been withheld from Stephen, whereby he had been empowered to appoint bishops and clergy, whilst he had obtained authority to depose others. By this means there had come about a lack of clergy in those parts. The Pope had now appointed a new vicar, and had prescribed to him whom he was to confirm and whom not. He closes with an exhortation to hold fast the orthodox doctrine.^{fa3}

Pope Martin, further, sent forth an encyclical letter to all the faithful of the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch, in which he acquaints them with the decrees of the Lateran Synod, warns them against Macedonius and Peter, the unsanctioned bishops of Antioch and Alexandria, who had accepted the Ecthesis and the Typus; and requires adhesion to the orthodox doctrine and to the new papal vicar.^{fa4}

Immediately after the close of the Lateran Synod, finally were dispatched the two papal letters to Archbishop Paul of Thessalonica and his Church. Even before the opening of the Lateran Council, Paul of Thessalonica had expressed himself in a heterodox manner in his *Synodica*, which he sent to Rome. As, however, his deputies gave the assurance that he had certainly no heretical meaning, and would immediately correct himself on the Pope's admonition, the latter sent him a formulary of faith for his acceptance. Paul, however, put this aside, and by an artifice induced the papal representatives to accept from him a different declaration of faith, also in the form of a synodal letter, in which the expressions *will* and *energy* were entirely avoided, and much else was added in the interest of Monothelitism. This new document arrived at Rome November 1, 649, just as the Lateran Council was closed, and Martin I. immediately anathematized and pronounced the deposition of Paul, and informed him of this in writing,

remarking that he could avoid this judgment only through *acceptance* of the Lateran decrees. In a second letter, he informed the clergy and laity of Thessalonica of this, so that the faithful might abstain from all intercourse with the deposed bishop until he amended. If he did not so, then another bishop must be elected. ^{fa5}

SEC. 309. POPE MARTIN I. BECOMES A MARTYR FOR DYOTHELITISM.

Whilst the Lateran Synod was still assembled, the Emperor sent his chamberlain, Olympius, as exarch to Italy, with the commission that he should obtain the subscription of the Typus by prudence and force, and should overthrow the Pope. In case, however, he should find that the multitude were not favorably inclined in this matter, he should say nothing of his commission, and first seek to gain the attachment of the troops, and especially of those in Rome and Ravenna. When Olympius came to Rome, he found the Church there united with the Italian bishops, *i. c.* assembled in Synod. He had a mind to have the Pope murdered by his sword-bearer, whilst he was administering the communion to him; but by a miracle his esquire could not see the Pope, either at the communion or at the kiss of peace, and this made such an impression upon Olympius, that he came to an understanding with the Pope, and disclosed to him the intentions of the Court of Constantinople. He afterwards went with his troops to Sicily, in order to oppose the Saracens who had settled there, and found death there in consequence of a plague which had broken out in his army. Thus relates Anastasius. ^{fa6} From another side we learn that Olympius was accused of rebellion, and the Greeks reproached the Pope for not having restrained him from his crime. ^{fa7}

Hard times for Pope Martin began with the arrival of the new exarch, Theodore Calliopa, who entered Rome with an army, June 15, 653, commissioned by the Emperor to cast the Pope into prison. What took place in consequence we learn chiefly from Pope Martin himself, who through all his misfortunes preserved a lofty mind, so that he wrote to a friend, *exsultem potius quam fleam*, and hoped at least this gain from his sufferings, that his oppressors would thereby be brought to repentance. ^{fa8} After Martin's letter, the second source for us is the treatise written by an admirer of the Pope, — *Commemoratio eorum quae saeviter et sine Dei respectu acta sunt...in sanctum et apostolicum novum revera confessorem et martyrem Martinum Papam*, etc., ^{fa9} and here, as elsewhere, it is a

relation of shocking occurrences given with a bleeding heart, yet with such objective treatment that the fidelity of these documents has never been doubted.

The Pope saw beforehand what was about to happen, and therefore, on the arrival of Calliopa, on Saturday, June 15, 653, he betook himself with his clergy into the Church of the Savior, or *Basilica Constantini* (Lateran), which lay in the neighborhood of the *Episcopium*, or bishop's residence. Politeness required that he should send a deputation of the clergy to convey a greeting to the exarch; but he was himself unable to meet him, as he had been sick for eight months. The exarch pretended friendship, and declared, when he did not see the Pope amongst those who had arrived, that he would himself go to him on the morrow and pay his respects. On the following day, however, he put off his visit, excusing himself on the plea of great fatigue, but really for the reason that many of the faithful had on this Sunday gathered round the Pope for divine service, and therefore an act of violence did not seem advisable. On the following Monday the exarch sent his secretary, Theodore, with a retinue to the Pope, to ask him why he had collected weapons and stones in his dwelling. To deprive this false accusation of force, the Pope allowed the envoys to go round the whole episcopium, and as they nowhere discovered weapons, etc., he made the complaint that false charges were allowed to be made against him, as, *e.g.*, that he had offered armed opposition to the *infamis Olympius*.

The Pope had caused his bed to be placed in front of the altar in the Lateran church; and at midnight the military forced their way into the church with lances and swords, bow and shield. Lamps and tapers were overturned, and a noise like thunder arose through the clash of weapons. Calliopa immediately communicated to the priests and deacons a decree to the effect that Martin had acquired the bishopric *irregulariter et sine lege* (see above, sec. 307), and was not worthy of confirmation in the apostolic see; but he must be conveyed to Constantinople, and another must be elected in his stead.^{fa10} Pope Martin further relates that he was then accused, with respect to the faith, as though he had not taught correctly in regard to the Holy Virgin, and had, together with many, sent a *tomus* to the Saracens, as to what they should believe, all of which was untrue, and he had only given alms to some Christians^{fa11} who came from a Saracen country. The Pope would make no opposition to violence, was not subjected to constraint, and voluntarily surrendered himself. He was unwilling that blood should be shed on his account. At his request he

obtained the assurance that he might take with him the clergy whom he wished, and he was led into the palace, whilst the populace cried: “Anathema to every one who maintains that Martin has violated the faith, and anathema to him who does not continue in the true faith.” In order to appease them, the exarch declared that there was no question of the faith, and in this respect there was no difference between Greeks and Romans. ^{fa12}

On Tuesday, the Pope was visited by the assembled clergy, and they almost all wanted to accompany him to Constantinople. But in the night between Tuesday and Wednesday he was violently separated from all his friends, conveyed out of the city, and brought to the harbor. Only six servants and a *calculus* ^{fa13} were left to him. Moreover, the gates of the city of Rome were closed, so that no one could follow him. Immediately afterwards they set sail, and after three months reached the island of Naxos, where the Pope had to remain a whole year as a prisoner. The only recreation was that he bathed two or three times, and was permitted to lodge in a *hospitium* in the city; but the presents which the faithful brought him were taken by his warders. ^{fa14} They sent the news of his arrest to Constantinople beforehand, and described him as a heretic and rebel. On September 17, 654, they landed at last at Constantinople, and from morning to evening, the Pope, lying in bed on the ship, was mocked, insulted, and persecuted. Towards sundown there came at last a writer, Sagoleva by name, with a guard, and had him conveyed to the prison Prandearia. He was very carefully locked up, and the warders were forbidden to say who was there hidden. He had to remain there ninety-three days. ^{fa15} In this time falls the composition of his second letter to Theodore, in which he complains that for forty-seven days he has not been allowed to use either a cold or a warm bath, that he was entirely deprived of bodily strength, that he has suffered long from diarrhea, and been without ordinary food. What was allowed him of this kind he had left off eating from nausea. ^{fa16}

After ninety-three days he was placed before the tribunal; or, to be more exact, he was, on account of his sickness, carried on a chair, and the fiscal (*Sacellarius*) had the cruelty to order that he should stand, which he was able to do only by supporting himself on two beades, and with much pain. He now asked the Pope insolently: “Say, unhappy man, what harm has the Emperor done you?” The Pope was silent, and the witnesses against him were now called, partly former subordinates of Olympius and soldiers. They had been told beforehand what they were to say, and several were browbeaten. The first accuser was Dorotheus, a patrician of Cilicia (or

Sicily), who asserted that Martin had made common cause with Olympius against the Emperor, and had distracted the West, that he was an enemy and conspirator against the Emperor. Another declared: "tie took part in the insurrection of Olympius, and induced the soldiers to conspire." When asked to explain, Martin was about to tell how the matter was, but as he spoke the first words, "When the Typus was put forth and sent to Rome," the Prefect Troilus interrupted him, and cried: "You are not here to speak of the faith, you are examined respecting rebellion. ^{fa17} ... You saw what Olympius undertook against the Emperor, and did not hinder him, but agreed with him." Martin replied: "And you did not hinder when George and Vaientinus made insurrection against the Emperor, ^{fa18} and that which happened you and your companions allowed to happen. And how could I have gone against a man who had the whole military power of Italy under him? Further, I adjure you by the Lord, finish quickly what you intend with me. Any kind of death will be a benefit to me."

There were several witnesses present, but they were not heard, and the interpreter was reviled because he had translated the striking words of the Pope so accurately into Greek. Upon this the president of the tribunal rose up, and informed the Emperor of what had happened. The Pope had been taken out into the public court as a spectacle to the people, and then exposed on a platform, that the Emperor might see from his chamber what further happened. Many people stood in the neighborhood. The fiscal then came from the Emperor's chamber, stepped before the Pope, and taunted him with the words: "You have contended against the Emperor; what have you now to hope for? You have forsaken God, and God has forsaken you;" then ordered his patriarchal garments to be torn off, ^{fa19} and transferred him to the prefect of the city, with the words: "Have him immediately hewn in pieces, limb from limb"; and required all present to anathematize him, which, however, was done only by a few. The executioners deprived him of his upper garments, and even tore his undermost tunic from top to bottom into two pieces, so that the naked body came through at many places. Around his neck they hung iron chains, and thus dragged him, bearing a sword before him, through the city to the praetorian. Here he was first imprisoned in company with murderers, after an hour east into another prison, that of Diomede, and with such violence that his legs and knees were wounded, and his blood stuck to the steps of the prison. Martin suffered unspeakably from the cold, for it was the depth of winter; and all day he was at the point of death. Only a young cleric was allowed to

remain with him as attendant. On the other hand, he was attached to the executioner's servant, as was generally done with those who were to be put to death. Two women, mother and daughter, who belonged to the establishment of the warders, had compassion upon him, and wanted to cover the half-naked and half-frozen man; but did not venture to do so at once, on account of the governor of the prison, and accomplished their wish only when, some hours after, he was called away. Until towards evening the Pope uttered not a syllable. The Prefect Gregory now sent him some victuals, adding, "We hope to God that you are not dying." He sighed, and now his iron chains were taken off. Next day the Emperor visited the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople, now sick unto death, and told him what had taken place. The latter cried out, "Woe's me! must this also come before God for me to answer for?" and adjured the Emperor to let this suffice, and no further to punish the Pope. When Martin heard this, he was sorry, for he hoped for death. Soon afterwards the Patriarch Paul died, and Pyrrhus forced himself in again. As many were discontented with this, the Emperor sent an officer of the palace, by name Demosthenes, into the prison to the Pope, to ask what had taken place in Rome with regard to Pyrrhus. The Pope informed him that Pyrrhus had, of his own accord, and under no constraint, come to Rome, and had voluntarily presented his declaration of faith; that Pope Theodore received him as bishop, because, before his arrival, Paul, who had been intruded into his see, had not been recognized, and that Pyrrhus received his maintenance from the Roman patriarcheion. Demosthenes *professed* to know that Pyrrhus had not acted freely, and had suffered imprisonment in Rome. The Pope appealed to witnesses, who were then in Rome and now in Constantinople, and added, "Do with me what you will, let me be hewn in pieces, as you commanded. With the Church of Constantinople I will not come into communion."

Martin remained in the prison of Diomede for eighty five days, and during that time took a dignified and touching farewell of the friends who visited him, was imprisoned two days longer in the house of the secretary, Sagoleba (above, Sagoleva), and then was privately conveyed (March 26, 655) on a ship to Cherson.^{fa20} Here also he endured much hardship, even to want of bread, and died, September 16 of the same year, with the glory of a martyr,^{fa21} and was interred in the neighborhood of the city of Cherson, in the church of the Holy Virgin of Blachernae.^{fa22} We still possess two of his letters which he wrote from Cherson shortly before his death,^{fa23} and in which he describes the great need in which he finds

himself. He complains also that his friends, and especially the Roman clergy, have quite forgotten him, and had sent no provision for his maintenance, not even in corn and wine, which the Roman Church possessed in abundance. Finally, at the close of his last letter, he earnestly commends the Roman Church, and especially its present pastor (*pastorem qui eis nunc praeesse monstratur*), to the divine protection. Along with this he gave, in addition, his approval to what had taken place in Rome. When Martin was removed, the imperial exarch demanded that another Pope should be elected, but the Roman clergy opposed this request; and Martin wrote from Constantinople towards the end of the year 654, that he hoped this would never be done, as, in the absence of the Pope, the archdeacon, archpresbyter, and primicerius^{fa24} were his legal representatives. At the time when he wrote this, however, the Roman clergy had already (September 8, 654) elected Eugenius I, an able and orthodox man of a distinguished Roman family; and this step they took, after more than a year's resistance, from the fear that the Emperor would otherwise place a Monothelite on the see. Baronius (*ad ann.* 652, n. 11, and 654, n. 6) thought that, until the death of Martin, Eugenius had only acted as his vicar. This assumption was opposed by Pagi (*ad ann.* 654, n. 4), who shows that even in the Roman archives the years of Eugenius are numbered from September 8, 654, and not from the death of Martin. Even if this is correct, yet only from the death of Martin can Eugenius be regarded as fully legitimate Pope.

SEC. 310. ABBOT MAXIMUS AND HIS DISCIPLES BECOME MARTYRS. THE DOCTRINE OF THREE WILLS.

Besides Pope Martin, there were other bishops of the West, who had taken part in the Lateran Synod, who were severely punished;^{fa25} but Abbot Maximus and his disciples were the objects of special cruelty (see above, sec. 303). On this subject we possess copious sources of information in the Acts on the trial of Maximus in his own letters, and in those of his disciples, and in the minutes of disputation between him and Bishop Theodosius of Caesarea.^{fa26} We also hear of it from the old historians and the *Vita S. Maximi*. We learn from hence that Abbot Maximus, with two disciples, who both bore the name of Anastasius, and of whom the one was a monk, the other a representative of the Roman Church, was brought from Rome to Constantinople at the imperial command at the same time as Pope Martin, *i. e.* A.D. 653. J. C. Assemani professes to show^{fa27} that he

had arrived there in 653, and thus before Pope Martin, but it is certain only that the examination with respect to Maximus and his friends did not begin until the year 655, after the judgment on Pope Martin had already been given.^{fa28} The imperial *Sacellarius* (fiscal) reproached him with hatred against the Emperor, adding, it was his fault that Egypt, Alexandria, Pentapolis, and Africa had been seized by the Saracens. The witness John said also that, twenty years ago, when the Emperor Heraclius had recommended the Prefect Peter of Numidia to march against the Saracens with the army in Egypt, Maximus had counseled the prefect not to do so, because God did not support the government of Heraclius (on account of his Monothelitism). Maximus declared this to be a falsehood; and so also the assertion of the second witness, Sergius Maguda, that Pope Theodore, nine years ago, had conveyed to the patrician Gregory that he should venture upon the insurrection courageously, for Maximus had seen in a dream angels who cried: "Emperor Gregory, thou conquerest." Another witness, Gregory, the son of Photinus, distorted an expression which Maximus, during his residence in Rome, had uttered in opposition to him, namely, that the Emperor was not also a priest. Maximus was then taken out, and one of his disciples was asked whether Maximus had treated Pyrrhus badly (sec. 303). As he did not speak against his master, he was beaten and taken away with the other scholar. The Abbot Menhas then, in presence of the Senate, brought against Maximus (Maximus must now have been brought back to the hall of judgment) the further accusation, that he had misled the people into Origenism. Maximus rejected this with an anathema on Origen, and thereupon was sent back to prison. On the same day, towards evening, the patrician Troilus and the imperial table-officer Sergius Eucratas came to Maximus, in order to interrogate him respecting the doctrinal discussions which he had in Africa and in Rome with Pyrrhus. Maximus gave them complete information, and concluded with the words: "I have no doctrine of my own, but am in agreement with the Catholic Church." On being further interrogated, he added: "With the Church of Constantinople, however, I cannot agree, because it has infringed on the four OEcumenical Synods by the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus*." They answered him: "But the Romans now agree with Constantinople. The Roman deputies came here yesterday, and to-morrow they will communicate with the Patriarch." As a matter of fact, the deputies whom Pope Eugenius I. had sent to the Court of Constantinople had shown themselves disposed to enter into communion with the Patriarch there, on condition that in Christ a hypostatic and two natural wills should be

recognized, i.e., considering Him as a person, we should speak of only one will, but if we have the two natures, in view, we should ascribe a proper will to each of them. This middle way had been invented by Peter, a clergyman of Constantinople, and recommended for acceptance to the Patriarch Pyrrhus, but also the Roman deputies agreed to this. When, however, Abbot Maximus heard of this, he refused to believe in it, and remarked: "Even if the Roman envoys do so, they yet do not prejudice the Roman see, because they have brought with them no letter from the Pope to the Patriarch (but only to the Emperor)." The reproach that he was insulting the Emperor, because he spoke against the Typus, etc., Maximus put away from him with great testimony of humility, saying that, above all things, he could not insult God, and he answered the question, Whether the anathema on the Typus was not an anathema on the Emperor himself? by the remark that the Emperor was merely misguided by the rulers of the Church of Constantinople, and he might now do as Heraclius did, who, in a letter to Pope John, declared that, not he, but Sergius, was the author of the Ecthesis, and renounced it (sec. 299). Thus ended the first examination.

Some days afterwards occurred something not mentioned in the Acts of the trial, but by Maximus himself in the letter to his disciple, the monk Anastasius, namely, on the 18th, the Feast of the *Media Pentacostes*, the Patriarch caused it to be said to him: "The churches of Constantinople, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem are now united; if you wish, then, to be a Catholic, you must unite with them." On nearer interrogation, the deputies of the Patriarch remarked that all the united churches now confessed two operations on account of the difference (of the natures), and one operation on account of the unity (of the Person). When Maximus refused to accede to this doctrine, the deputies replied: "The Emperor and the Patriarch have resolved, in accordance with the papal decision (*per praeceptum Papae*), to punish you with anathema and with death if you do not obey." Maximus still remained steadfast.^{fa29} Pagi (*ad ann.* 657, n. 6, 7) showed that by *media Pentacostes* was meant the middle day between Easter and Pentecost, which in the year 655 fell on the 22nd of April. Therefore, in the letter of Maximus, instead of 18, we must read the 22nd day of the month. This transaction was also placed by Pagi after the first examination. This was contested by Assemani, who thought that it went before it, because, on the 22nd of April 655, Pyrrhus still occupied the see of Constantinople (he died in June or July 655); but in the Acts of the Examination he is spoken of as dead in the words of a cleric to Maximus:

Tibi reddidit Deus quaecunque fecisti BEATO Pyrrho. ^{fa30} Assemani here overlooks the fact that at the time of the transaction on April 22, the union of the Roman deputies with the Church of Constantinople must have been already concluded; for it was often appealed to. It is also incorrect to say that *makariov* (*beatus*) is used only of the dead. Living bishops were also thus entitled (cf. below, sec. 314). But even if we were willing to grant that the *tw|makariw|Purjw|* referred to his death as having taken place, yet it is not necessary that we should agree with Assemani and place the transaction on April 22 before the first examination of S. Maximus, for the Acts of Examination plainly fall into two parts. The first part, from which we have already made extracts, in no way speaks of Pyrrhus as of one who is dead, but refers to him repeatedly with the addition of *beatus*, naturally because Pyrrhus had then, after the death of Paul, been again restored to the patriarchal see. Only in the second part of the minutes of the trial can the *makariov* refer to Pyrrhus as already dead, and this second part begins with the words: *Et rursus alio sabbato*. Between this *aliud sabbatum* and that which had gone before several months may have elapsed, just as between the arrival of Maximus in Constantinople and his first examination, whilst the Acts, as we have already remarked, give all these events in near connection.

After the Roman deputies had been fooled by Byzantine cunning, they were sent back to their home, with a letter to the Pope, in order to gain him also for the doctrine of the three wills. So we are informed by the monk Athanasius in his letter to the monks of Cagliari in Sardinia, in which he requests them to go immediately to Rome and encourage the good and steadfast Christians there to oppose the new heresy. ^{fa31} The letters which had been communicated to the papal deputies had not been drawn up by the Patriarch Pyrrhus, but by his successor, Peter. That the latter addressed a letter to Pope Eugenius is stated by the *Vitae Pontificum* of Anastasius, ^{fa32} with the remark, that he expressed himself very obscurely, and that on the operations and energies in Christ he gave no explanation. ^{fa33} We are told that the people and clergy of Rome were greatly provoked by this, and the people would not allow divine service to be held in the chief church of S. Mary, at the manger, nor suffer the Pope to leave the church until he promised to condemn that letter. The same fate may have befallen also the letters given to the deputies; indeed, it is probable that the incident just mentioned had reference to them as well as to the letter of the Patriarch

Peter. That Pope Eugenius defended himself well, a passage (p. 134) from the transactions of Bishop Theodosius with Maximus will show.

In the meantime another examination had been held in Constantinople with Maximus and his scholars (*alio sabbato*), in the summer of the year 655, after the death of Pyrrhus. First, one of the scholars was led into the palace of judgment, where also the two Patriarchs, Peter of Constantinople and Macedonius of Antioch (see sec. 308), were present. Constantine and Abbot Mennas appeared again as accusers; but the disciple of Maximus objected to the former, because he was neither monk nor cleric, but an actor and the keeper of a brothel. At the same time he confessed publicly that he anathematized the Typus, and had even written a book against it. Maximus himself was now brought in, and Troilus spoke to him thus: "Speak the truth, and the Emperor will have compassion upon you. If, however, it comes to a judicial examination, and only one accusation is proved to be well grounded, the law condemns you to death." Maximus declared most decidedly that all the other accusations were lies, only one was well founded, that he had anathematized the Typus, and indeed often. Troilus remarked: "If you have spoken anathemas on the Typus, then you have done so on the Emperor." Maximus replied: "No, not on the Emperor; but only on a document which did not proceed from him." After some other questions had been proposed to him, why he loved the Latins and hated the Greeks, etc., a cleric shouted to him the words already mentioned: *Retribuit tibi Deus, quaecunque fecisti beato Pyrrho*. When the discussion on the Lateran Synod came up, it was asserted that it had no authority, because one who was deposed (Pope Martin) had assembled it; this was contested by Maximus, and he was thereupon sent back to prison. The two Patriarchs had not spoken a word during the whole transaction.

On the following day, which was Sunday, they held a Synod ([synodov ejdhmousa](#)), and gave the Emperor (as decree of the Synod) the advice, that he should send Maximus and his disciples into a severe exile, each one to a different place. ^{fa34} Maximus was banished to Byzia in Thrace. Of his disciples, the one was banished to Perberis, the other to Mesembria, in great misery, almost without clothing or food. ^{fa35}

On August 24, 656, ^{fa36} Bishop Theodosius of Caesarea came into Bithynia as envoy of the patriarch of Constantinople, with two plenipotentiaries of the Emperor, to Byzia, in order to confer anew with Abbot Maximus. We still possess the Acts of this conference. ^{fa37} The way and manner in which

Bishop Theodosius made inquiries for the discovery of Maximus gave occasion for the latter first to speak of divine prescience and predestination: that the former had relation to our free acts of virtues and vices; predestination to these things *quae non aunt in nobis*, to our destinies (!). After he had ended, Theodosius asked him, by commission from the Emperor and the Patriarch, why he would hold no Church communion with the see of Constantinople. Maximus pointed out that what held happened since the chapters of Cyrus of Alexandria, particularly the Ecthesis and the Typus, had made such communion impossible to him, since the assertion of one energy and one will was in opposition to the genuine doctrine of Theology and Economy (Trinity and Incarnation), and the Typus forbade what the Apostles and Fathers had taught. Theodosius gave the assurance that the Emperor would withdraw the Typus if Maximus would come into union with the Church of Constantinople; but the latter demanded still further the acceptance of the decrees of the Lateran Council, and would not allow the objection that this Synod was not valid because it was held without the assent of the Emperor.

To the question, why he did not recognize the letter of Mennas (see sec. 303, and vol. 4 p. 290), Maximus alleged only its heretical character, without asserting its spuriousness; but the other patristic testimonies, which Theodosius brought forward on behalf of Monothelitism, he declared to be spurious, saying that these were passages from Apollinaris, Nestorius, etc., and had been falsely ascribed to Athanasius and Chrysostom. At another passage, supposed to be taken from Cyril (see sec. 291), Theodosius would not allow Maximus to interpret it, and maintained that one hypostatic energy in Christ must be recognized. Maximus pointed out to what errors this would lead, and that, along with two natures, it was necessary also to teach two natural wills and energies. The objection, that by this means a conflict was made in Christ, he refuted, and proved from the Acts of the Lateran Synod, that even the ancient Fathers had spoken of two wills and operations in Christ. Theodosius proposed: If that were so, he would draw up a written acknowledgment of the two natures, wills, and energies, if in that case Maximus would come into church communion (with him and the see of Constantinople). The latter replied: It was not his place, as a mere abbot, to receive such a written acknowledgment; the ecclesiastical rule required that the Emperor and the Patriarch, with his Synod, should apply with this to the Roman Bishop. Theodosius then went in and requested Maximus that, in case he were sent as envoy of

Constantinople to Rome, Maximus would accompany him there. Maximus promised this, and all present wept for joy, and thanked God on their knees for the hope of peace. Immediately afterwards Theodosius asked whether Maximus would accept, in no manner: whatever, the expression “one will and one energy;” and Maximus explained to him in six points the entire inadmissibility of the expression. As, however, Theodosius had thought that the union of the two natures had necessarily, as a consequence, the unity of the will, Maximus also unfolded the doctrine of the *Communicatio idiomatum*, and showed that will and energy belong to the nature and not to the person. Thereupon the deputies of the Emperor departed, with the hope that they would be able to determine their master to arrange for an embassy to Rome, and left behind them some money and clothes for Maximus.

On September 8, 656, ^{fa38} by command of the Emperor, he was conveyed to the monastery of S. Theodore at Rhegium, and by the commission of the Emperor there came again to him the patricians Epiphanius and Troilus, together with the Bishop Theodosius, to notify him that the Emperor offered him a most solemn reception in Constantinople if he would unite with him on the Typus, and would receive with him the sacred Synaxis (communion). Maximus reproached Bishop Theodosius, that the assurances given to him in Byzia had not been fulfilled, and answered naturally declining the imperial suggestion. For this those present struck him, ill-treated him and reviled him, only Bishop Theodosius offered him protection. The renewed attempt to bring forward the Typus as a means of peace was rejected by Maximus, with the remark that silence with regard to the truth was not the restoration of true peace. Threats could not intimidate him. Next day, on the Feast of the Elevation of the Cross (September 14, 656), he was conveyed to Salembria, and told that, if they had some repose from the barbarians, they would deal with the Pope, who now also showed himself obstinate, and with all the spokesmen of the West, as well as with the disciples of Maximus, just as they had dealt with Pope Martin. We see from this that Pope Eugenius had rejected the union of his envoys. During his residence in Salembria, Maximus defended himself, in controversy with the military there, against the false accusation that he denied the [qeotokov](#) and won over many minds by his devout and powerful discourse. His wardens therefore removed him again as soon as possible, and brought him to Perberis, where one of his disciples was

already in exile. How long Maximus remained here is unknown. The ancients reckoned his residence there as a second exile.

With these statements the text ends, as it is found in the Collectanea of Anastasius. Combefis, however, discovered the appendix already mentioned (p. 131, n. 1), which relates that Maximus and his disciples were subsequently brought to Constantinople, and anathematized, along with Pope Martin, Sophronius, and all the orthodox, by a new Synod held there. Maximus and his two disciples were then handed over to the prefect, with the instruction to flog them, to cut out their blasphemous tongues from the roots, and to chop off their right hands. Thus mutilated, they were to be taken round through all the twelve parts of the city, and then they were to be banished and imprisoned for life. The prefect accomplished this, and they were banished for the third time to Lazica (in Colchis on the Pontus Euxinus).^{fa39} A letter which one of them, the Deputy Anastasius, addressed from Lazica to the priest Theodosius, gives the information that they had arrived there on June 8 of the fifth Indiction (*i.e.* A.D. 662); had been immediately separated from one another, robbed of their property, and disgracefully treated. Maximus was first imprisoned in the fort Schemarum, and the two disciples in the forts Scotonum and Buculus. After a few days, these, although half dead, were dragged farther, and one of them, the monk Anastasius, died on the 24th of July 662, either on the way to the fort Sunias or immediately after his arrival there. His companion, the deputy Anastasius, could not accurately learn, for they had been separated from one another on the 18th of July 662. Maximus died at Schemarum, as he had foretold, August 13, 662.^{fa40} Much longer did the sufferings of the deputy Anastasius last. He describes them himself in the letter referred to. He also died in exile, October 11, 666.^{fa41}

SEC. 311. POPE VITALIAN.

In the meantime Pope Eugenius I. died in Rome, and Vitalian succeeded him, A.D. 657. He immediately sent delegates with a synodal letter to Constantinople, in order to give information of his elevation. It was received in a friendly manner, the privileges of the Roman Church were renewed, and the Emperor sent to S. Peter's golden books of the Gospels, which had been set round with precious stones of marvelous size. So it is related by the *Vitae Pontificum* of Anastasius.^{fa42} From the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Synod, it appears^{fa43} that Vitalian then also addressed a letter to the Patriarch Peter of Constantinople, and that the latter had

inferred from it their unanimity. We see that Vitalian was on his guard, in his synodal letter, against expressly rejecting the Typus of the Emperor. The Emperor Constans, however, put on the appearance as if he himself were quite orthodox, and at the same time those presents were likely to propitiate the Roman people, who had been disaffected to the Emperor since the times of Martin I. ^{fa44} The mutual dissimulation produced, as a fact, the restoration of Church communion between Rome and Constantinople. Vitalian's name was inscribed on the diptychs of Constantinople, ^{fa45} which, until now, had happened to none of the Popes since Honorius; and when the Emperor Constans came to Rome in July 663, he was not only received in the most ceremonious manner, but also the presents which he made to several churches, were accepted without hesitation, and himself treated completely as a member of the orthodox Church. The Pope was so friendly that he said nothing even when the Emperor took away many Church treasures, among them the brazen roof of the Church of *S. Maria ad martyres*, i.e. *Maria Rotunda* (the Pantheon): From thence the Emperor proceeded to Syracuse, where he resided: because Constantinople was hostile to him, until, in the year 668, hated for his numerous extortion's, he was treacherously murdered in his bath. ^{fa46} To him succeeded, after the overthrow of the usurper Mesecius, his son Constantine Pogonatus, so called because he had left Constantinople with his father unbearded, and now returned thither as Emperor with a strong beard.

CHAPTER 2.

The Sixth Oecumenical Synod.

SEC. 312. THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE POGONATUS WISHES FOR A GREAT CONFERENCE OF EASTERNS AND WESTERNS.

WITH the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus there commences a turningpoint in the history of Monothelitism. The new Emperor had no intention of sustaining the Typus of his father by force, and this encouraged Pope Vitalian to break his previous silence and publicly to make a stand for orthodoxy. That he did so we see from this, that the Monothelites at Constantinople, after his death, took the trouble to remove his name again from the diptychs, ^{fa47} Vitalian died in January 672, and after Adeodatus had reigned, without any remarkable incidents, for four years, ^{fa48} under his successor, Donus or Domnus (676-678), the Emperor came forward with the plan of restoring again the broken peace of the Church by an assembly of the East and the West. Leisure for this work of union was given to him by the advantageous peace which, in the year 678, he had concluded with the Calif Muavia, and immediately afterwards with the King of the Avari (in Hungary). That he at that time regarded himself as completely orthodox and a decided friend of Dyothelitism, cannot be proved. On the contrary, at that time he professed to belong to neither of the parties, and even allowed himself to be misguided to several false steps by the Monothelites.

In Constantinople, Bishop Peter, whose acquaintance we have already made, was followed by the Patriarchs Thomas, John, and Constantine, in respect to whom the thirteenth session of the sixth OEcumenical Synod decreed that their names should be left in the diptychs, because their synodal letters contained nothing heterodox. ^{fa49} The succeeding Patriarch, Theodore (since 678), showed that he was so, by the fact that he wished to strike the name of Pope Vitalian entirely from the diptychs (see below, p. 139), as a friend of heresy, he also hesitated to send his Synodicon or Enthronisticon to the Pope, fearing that, like those of his predecessors, it might not be received, and preferred to dispatch to Rome a [protreptikh](#)

epistol h>i *e.* an exhortation to the restoration of ecclesiastical communion.

Immediately afterwards the Emperor himself addressed Pope Donus in a very courteous letter, of August 12, 678, in the introduction of which he entitled him **oijkoumenikov**. He tells him in this letter how, from the beginning of his reign, he would have gladly brought about the union between Rome and Constantinople by means of a universal conference (**kaqol ikh-sunaqroisiv**) of both thrones, but had been hindered in this by passing events, and then relates what we have already brought forward on the letter of the Patriarch Theodore to the Pope. After the dispatch of this patriarchal letter, he (the Emperor) had questioned Theodore and Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, as to the foundation of the disunion between Rome and the East, and had learnt that some expressions which had not formerly been customary were to blame for all.... There should be no perpetual disunion on account of such lamentable disputes, so that the heathen and heretics might not exult. Because, however, no time could be found for the holding of an OEcumenical Synod, the Pope should send deputies, well instructed and armed with all authority, to Constantinople, that they might have a peaceful examination in communion with Macarius of Antioch and Theodore of Constantinople, and, under the protection of the Holy Spirit, discover and accept the truth. As security, this imperial *Sacra* should avail. He himself, the Emperor, was thoroughly impartial, and would compel the papal plenipotentiaries to nothing; but, on the contrary, would receive them with all distinction, and in case no union should come to pass, would let them depart in peace. In respect to the deputies to be sent, he proposed, if the Pope so pleased, to select three or more clerics from the Roman Church (*in specie*), from the rest of his patriarchal diocese some twelve archbishops and bishops, and add to them four monks from each of the four Greek monasteries (in Rome). ^{fa50} Thus, he hoped, would truth come to light, and he should have held it a great sin to be silent when he considered the disunion among the bishops. Macarius of Antioch and Theodore of Constantinople had pressed him earnestly to have the name of Pope Vitalian struck from the diptychs, that Honorius should remain there in honor of the Roman see, but that his successors should not be mentioned until both thrones had come to an understanding with respect to the contested expressions. He, however, the Emperor, had not consented, because he regarded both parties as orthodox, and because Vitalian had supported him greatly in his victory over the usurper. Finally, he had given

orders to his exarch in Italy to support the deputies of the Pope in question in every way, with ships, money, and all that they wanted, and, if necessary, to let them have fortified (armed) ships **kastel la t̃ouv karabouv**) for security. ^{fa51}

When this imperial letter was dispatched, Pope Donus was no longer alive (April 11, 678), and Agatho was already elected (June 27, 678). He without delay fell into the plan of the Emperor, and made the preparations necessary for carrying it out. He wished the whole of the West to express itself on the controversy, and that this should be done especially by the bishops in the districts of the barbarians, — Lombardi, Sclaves, Franks, Goths, and Britons, — that they might not afterwards bring reproaches, and that controversies might not break out in the West itself. ^{fa52} The delay rendered necessary for the sending of the papal deputies was made use of by Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius, and finally they requested the Emperor to give his assent to the blotting of Vitalian out of the diptychs, ^{fa53} Probably they represented the matter as if Rome wanted no arrangement and would send no deputies.

SEC. 313. WESTERN PREPARATORY SYNODS, ESPECIALLY AT ROME, A.D. 680.

The Pope, in order to draw in the whole of the West to this affair, summoned bishops from all countries to Rome. This we learn from his letter to the Emperor, and from the Synod Which he himself held at Rome. Similar assemblies were also to take place in the provinces, so that the episcopate everywhere might speak its mind. From such a Synod at Milan, under Archbishop Mausuetus, we still possess a letter to the Emperor, in which Constantine the Great and Theodosius the Great are presented to him as models; at the same time, adhesion to the five OEcumencal Councils is declared, and the orthodox doctrine is set forth in a new creed, at the close of which they speak of the two natural wills and operations of Christ. ^{fa54} Paul the deacon mentions the priest Damian, afterwards Bishop of Pavia, as having composed this creed. ^{fa55}

Another Synod of the same kind was held, A.D. 680, by the celebrated Theodore of Canterbury with the English bishops at Heathfield. The orthodox faith, with adhesion to the five OEcumencal Councils, as well as the Lateran Synod under Pope Martin, was pronounced, and Monothelitism condemned. At the same time the Synod expressly

confessed the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost also from the Son. ^{fa56} That a Gallican Synod also took place at the same time, many inferred from the words with which the Gallican deputies accompanied their subscription at the Roman Synod held by Agatho, e.g. *Felix humilis episcopus Arelatensis, legatus venerabilis synodi per Galliarum provincias constitutae*. ^{fa57} But under *synodus per Galliarum provincias constituta* is here meant, as Hardouin rightly perceived, the collective Gallican episcopate, and not a Gallican Synod. It is the same with the subscription of Archbishop Wilfrid of York, who was also present at the Roman Synod, and designated himself as *legatus venerabilis synodi per Britanniam constitutae*. The only difference is that Felix of Arles was really a deputy of the French [Frankish] episcopate, whilst Wilfrid was at Rome on his own business (see vol. 4 p. 492), and was qualified to testify to the faith of England, but not as deputy of the English episcopate. ^{fa58}

Following the lead of Pagi (*ad ann.* 679, 15), many transfer to the year 679 the Roman Council of 125 bishops, which Pope Agatho held, in accordance with the wish of the Emperor, in order that they might send fully instructed deputies to Constantinople. Pagi saw rightly that this Council was different from the one which restored S. Wilfrid of York (see vol. 4 p. 492), and followed soon after this. He also rightly showed that it took place at Easter, but his reason for preferring the year 679 is no other than this, that an old document says ^{fa59} that the Synod at Heathfield was held in the year 680 after the return of Wilfrid (from Rome), and he had been present at the Roman Synod of the 125 bishops. But this document, containing the *Privilegium Petriburgense*, is of very doubtful authority, and in any case considerably interpolated. Its statement respecting Wilfrid, therefore, cannot be accepted as historically true. According to this, Wilfrid was present at the Synod of Heathfield as restored Bishop of York, whilst, as a matter of fact, he was put in prison after his return, and subsequently was banished, and did not return to his diocese until the year 686. ^{fa60} Our reason for placing the Roman Synod of Agatho, this precursor of the sixth OEcumenical Council, rather at Easter 630 than in 679 is the following:

- (a) The Pope and the bishops assembled around him say themselves that at the opening of the Synod they waited for a long time in the hope that more bishops would arrive;

(b) the deputies whom this Synod sent to Constantinople arrived there on September 10, 680, ^{fa61} so that we naturally refer the Synod that sent them to the same year.

SEC. 314. THE DEPUTIES FROM ROME AND THE LETTERS WITH WHICH THEY WERE FURNISHED.

The deputies were furnished with two letters. The one, very comprehensive, was from Pope Agatho alone, ^{fa62} was addressed to the Emperor and his two brothers whom he had raised to be his co-regents, and was intended to form a counterpart to the celebrated *Epistola* of Leo I to Flavian. The Pope in his letter above all commends the zeal of the Emperors for the true faith, and that they wished to secure its universal acceptance not by violence and by terrorism. Christ did not use violence, but demands voluntary confession of the true faith from His people. He, the Pope, soon after the reception of the imperial letter addressed to his predecessor Donus, had begun to look round for suitable men, in order that he might be able to respond to the command of the Emperor. But the wide extent of his diocese (*concilium*) had caused delay, and a considerable time had elapsed before the bishops had come from the different provinces to a Synod at Rome, and he had selected the proper persons partly from the city of Rome subject to the Emperors, and partly from the neighborhood; moreover, he had waited for the arrival of others from distant provinces to which his predecessors had sent missionaries. He had now selected three bishops, Abundantius of Paterno, John of Reggio, and John of Portus, ^{fa63} also the priests Theodore and George, the deacon John, and the sub-deacon Constantine from Rome, also the priest Theodore as deputy of the Church of Ravenna, as envoys, ^{fa64} more in order to fulfill the will of the Emperors than from any special confidence in their learning. With people who live among the barbarians (*nationes*), and have to earn their maintenance by bodily work, and this in great uncertainty, comprehensive learning cannot possibly be expected. But that which former Popes and the five holy Synods had expressed is held fast by them in simplicity. He had communicated to them also the testimonies of the Fathers, together with their writings, so that, with the Emperor's permission, they might be able from these to prove what the Roman Church believes. Moreover, they had the necessary authority, but they must not presume to increase or diminish or alter anything (in the faith), but must simply explain the tradition of the apostolic see, *which came down from the predecessors of the Pope (ut*

nihil profecto praesumant augere, minuere, vel mutare, sed traditionem hujus apostolicae sedis, ut a praedecessoribus apostolicis pontificibus instituta est, sinceriter enarrare). The Emperors would be pleased to receive them graciously. That, however, the Emperors might know what the faith of the Roman Church is, he will explain it as he has received it through the tradition of his predecessors (Honorius also?), and he does it in the form of a symbol, at the end of which the doctrine of two natural wills and operations is asserted. ^{fa65} This is the apostolic and evangelical tradition, which the apostolic (Roman) Church holds fast, this the Holy Ghost taught by the prince-apostles, this S. Peter handed down under whose protection this apostolic (Roman) Church *never swerved from the way of truth (nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est)*. This is the true rule of faith which the apostolic Church, the mother of the empire, in good and bad fortune has always held fast, *which by the grace of God has never erred from the way of the apostolic tradition, now submitted to heretical innovations. As she received from the beginning the pure doctrine from the apostles, so it remains until the end unfalsified*, according to the promise of the Lord: “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not and do thou, when once thou art turned again, establish thy brethren” (S. ~~4228~~ Luke 22:31, 32). This the predecessors of the Pope, as every one knew, had always done, and so will he also do. Since the Bishops of Constantinople had endeavored to introduce the heretical innovation, the predecessors of the Pope had never failed to exhort them, and to adjure them to keep away from the heretical dogma, or at least to keep silence, so that there should be no assertion of one will and one operation of the two natures in Christ, by which discussion should arise in the Church. In that which follows, the Pope explains the orthodox doctrine of two wills and two operations in Christ in detail, and adduces in support many Scripture passages with their exposition by the Fathers of the Church. He shows also that the will is a matter of nature, and that one who denies the human will of Christ must also deny His human soul; he further shows that Dyothelitism is contained already in the decrees of the faith of Chalcedon and of the fifth OEcumenical Council, that the Monothelite doctrine offended against these decrees, and took away the diversity of natures in Christ. To this Pope Agatho adds many patristic testimonies for Dyothelitism, partly the same which had already been adduced by the Lateran Synod (sec. 307), and, again imitating the Lateran Council, selects several passages from the books of older heretics in order to prove that

Monothelitism has a relationship with these. He also gives a short history, of the new controversies, and shows how the innovators, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, had often contradicted themselves, sometimes maintaining one will and one energy, and sometimes forbidding to speak of one or two energies and wills. From the error of these teachers the Church must be delivered, and all bishops, clerics, and laymen must accept the orthodox doctrine which is founded on the firm rock of this Church of S. Peter *quae ejus gratia atque praesidio ab omni errore illibata permanet*. For this Emperors Should be active and drive away the heretical teachers. If they were, God would bless their government. If the Bishop of Constantinople received this doctrine, then there would be one heart and one mind; but if he preferred to hold by the innovation against which the previous Popes had given warning *indesinenter*, he would take upon himself a huge responsibility before God. At the close, the Pope again entreats and adjures the Emperors to bring the matter to a good end. ^{fa66}

In this letter there are three points quite specially worthy of consideration:

- (1) The certainty and clearness with which Agatho sets forth the orthodox Dyothelitic doctrine;
- (2) the zeal with which he repeatedly declares the infallibility of the Roman Church; and
- (3) the strong assurance, many times repeated, that all his predecessors had stood fast in the right doctrine, and had given exhortation to the Patriarchs of Constantinople in the correct sense.

Agatho was then far removed from accusing his predecessor Honorius of heresy, and the supposition that he had beforehand consented to his condemnation entirely contradicts this letter. ^{fa67}

The second document which the deputies at Constantinople had to present was the synodal letter of the Roman Council. It is also addressed to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus and his two brothers and co-regents, sent by Pope Agatho *cure universis synodis* (= provinces) *subjacentibus concilio apostolicae sedis*, and subscribed by all present, the Pope and one hundred and twenty-five bishops. At the beginning these speak as though they were all subjects of the Empire; but the subscriptions show that there were present also a good many bishops from Lombardy, two bishops and a deacon as plenipotentiaries of the Gallican episcopate, and Wilfrid of York from England. By far the majority came from Italy and Sicily, and they

subscribed, as it seemed, without any definite order. In their synodal letter they thank the Emperors for the trouble they take to help the true faith to full splendor, and hope that the rare fortune may be allotted to the government of the Emperors, that through them the light of “our Catholic and apostolic true faith (the Roman) might shine in the whole world, which light, rising from the source of all light, was preserved by the prince-apostles Peter and Paul, and their disciples and apostolic successors up to the present Pope, *nulla haeretici erroris tetra caligine tenebratum, nec falsitatis nebulis confoedatum, nec intermissis haereticis pravitatibus velut caliginosis nebulis perumbratum,*” etc. They then speak of the difficulty of the present times of confusion and war, when the provinces were everywhere attacked by the barbarians, and the impossibility, when the Church had lost her property and the clergy had to earn a living by manual labor, of finding among the clergy men of learning, eloquence, etc. But they were strong in the faith: and that was their best possession. This faith they now declare in a formal creed, in which also the doctrine of two natural wills and operations is received. This creed, they proceed to say, the Lateran Synod under Pope Martin proclaimed. The Emperors should make this creed prevail everywhere, and take care that the tares were rooted out. The originators of the tares were Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, and all who had remained like-minded with them to the end (of their life). They had not only swerved from the truth, but had also spoken against it. The Synod further excused itself for sending the deputies so late. In the first place, the sees of many members of the Synod were far removed, by the ocean, and therefore the journey to Rome had required much time. Moreover, they had hoped that Theodore of Canterbury, the archbishop and philosopher of the great island of Britain, and other bishops of that region, would arrive and join the Synod. So also they had been forced to wait, for many members from different districts of the Lombards, Selaves, Franks, Gauls, Goths, and Britons, that their declaration might go forth from them collectively, and not merely from one part of them and remain unknown to the other, especially as many bishops, whose sees were among the barbarians, were much interested in this matter. It would be a great gain if they were to agree. On the other hand, it would be very bad if they, taking offense at a point of faith, should assume a hostile attitude towards the others. The Synod wished and strove that the Empire in which the see of S. Peter, which all Christians venerate, is set up, should, for Peter’s sake, have a rank above all other nations. The Emperors would please to

receive the deputies graciously, and, when the business was completed, let them return again peacefully to their home. Thus would they reap glory, like Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, Martian, and Justinian. They should labor for this, that the true faith, which the Roman Church had preserved, should prevail universally. Whoever of the bishops should acknowledge this faith was to be regarded as a brother; whoever should refuse it should be condemned as an enemy of the Catholic faith. The adoption of this faith would bring a great blessing. ^{fa68}

When the Western deputies arrived in Constantinople, they were received by the Emperor with great honor, and exhorted to settle the controversy in a *peaceful* manner, without dialectic, purely according to the utterances of Holy Scripture. Their maintenance they received from the Emperor, and the Placidia Palace was assigned to them as a residence. On a Sunday they took part in a very solemn procession to S. Mary's Church in the Blachernae suburb. ^{fa69}

If the chronological statement in the imperial edict now to be described is correct, Constantine Pogonatus, on the same day on which the deputies landed at Constantinople, published *a Sacra* to the Patriarch George ([makariwtaw|ajciepiskoŭ|kai oikoumenikw|patriarch](#)), who in the meantime had succeeded the banished Theodore, ^{fa70} to the effect that he meant to summon all the metropolitans and bishops belonging to his jurisdiction to Constantinople, that, under God's assistance, the dogma on the will and the energy of Christ might be carefully examined. He would also make Archbishop Macarius of Antioch acquainted with it, that he too might send metropolitans and bishops from his diocese to Constantinople. For the same purpose the Emperor himself had, a considerable time ago, applied to the most holy Pope Donus of Old Rome, ^{fa71} and his successor, the holy Agatho, had sent as his representatives the priests Theodore and George, together with the deacon John. On the part of the Roman Council, there were three bishops with other clerics and monks appointed. They had arrived in Constantinople, and had delivered to the Emperor the letters which they had brought with them. The Patriarch George should now make haste to summon his bishops. ^{fa72}

In the old Latin translation, but not in the Greek original, this decree bears the date: 4 *Idus Sept. imperante piissimo perpetuo Augusto Constantino imperatore anno 28, et post consulatum ejus anno 12*. But Pagi showed that, instead of 28, we must read 27 (*ad ann. 680, 4*). Constantine became

co-regent with his father before the 26th of April 654, so that his twenty-seventh year began in April 680, and in fact the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council also give the number 27. The imperial edict was accordingly published on September 10, 680. ^{fa73} This also agrees with *ann. 12 post consulatum*, for Constantine became *consul perperseus* towards the end of the year 668, so that the 10th of September 680 falls into the twelfth year of his consulate.

SEC. 315. FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD. ^{FA74}

As we saw, the Emperor, at first, having regard to the circumstances of the time, had intended no OEcumenical Synod; but that which actually took place, at its first session and with his consent, called itself an *oikoumenikh*. How this alteration took place is unknown. Perhaps it arose from the fact that, contrary to expectation, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem also sent their representatives, and thus had given the possibility of an OEcumenical Council. The Acts are still preserved for us in the Greek original, and in two old Latin translations, printed in Mansi, t. 11: pp. 195-736, and pp. 738-922. Hardouin, t. 3 pp. 1043-1479 and 1479-1644.

^{fa75} The question, whether these Acts were falsified, we shall discuss later on. The collective meetings of the Synod were held, as the Acts state, *ejh tw|sekre|w|tou qeioy palatiou, tw|ou|w legomenw|Trou|l w|* Pagi (*ad ann.* 680, n. 8) knew that the splendid cupola which covers the church of S. Sophia at Constantinople, a work of the Emperor Justinian, was called sometimes *trou|l ion*, sometimes *trullum* or *trulla*. He concluded from this that the sixth Council had been held *in eo aedificio*. But *trulla* or *trullum* (= mason's trowel, scoop) was *terminus technicus* for all cupolas or domes, ^{fa76} and the words of the Acts point to a hall (or chapel), with a vault like a cupola, in the imperial palace. With this also Anastasius agrees in the *Vitae Pontificum*, when he says that the Synod had been held *in basilica quae Trullus appellatur, intra palatium*. ^{fa77} The transactions lasted from November 7, 680, to September 16, 681, and the sessions are said to have been eighteen. The number of persons present during this long period differed; at the beginning it was smaller, subsequently larger. The minutes of the last session were signed by 174 members, and first by the three papal legates, the Roman priests Theodore and George, with the deacon John. After them came the Patriarch George of Constantinople, and the other Patriarchs or their representatives, then the metropolitans and the

rest of the bishops. The bishops representing the Roman Council were placed among the metropolitans and after the Patriarchs.^{fa78} The minutes of the other sessions enumerate considerably fewer numbers, so that at the first session there were only 43 bishops or episcopal representatives and a few abbots. Theophanes, however, speaks of 289 bishops being present.

^{fa79} Besides the Roman clergy, the legates of the Pope in *specie*, and the three Italian bishops, there appeared also several Greek bishops as *legati* of the Roman Synod. John Archbishop of Thessalonica, subscribed as ~~ἱεραρχὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως~~ *ἱεραρχὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Stephen of Corinth as ~~ἐπίσκοπον τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως~~ *ἐπίσκοπον τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Basil of Cortina in Crete as ~~ἐπίσκοπον τῆς ἐκκλησίας συνόδου τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως~~ *ἐπίσκοπον τῆς ἐκκλησίας συνόδου τοῦ ἀποστόλου κωνσταντινουπόλεως*. These three bishops belonged to *Illyricum Orientale*, and so, until the year 730, to the Roman patriarchate and the *Synodus Romana*;^{fa80} and even if they did not personally appear at the Roman Synod of the year 680, yet they could have obtained full authority from this Synod. Moreover, the Archbishop of Thessalonica had been for a considerable time vicar of the Pope for Illyricum, and when the Emperor Justinian separated the provinces of Achaia and Hellas from Illyricum, they received a Roman vicar of their own in the Archbishop of Corinth.^{fa81}

The place of president was occupied by the Emperor in proper person, surrounded by a number of high officials (patricians and ex-consuls). On his left the deputies of the Pope had their place,^{fa82} then the priest and legate Theodore of Ravenna, Bishop Basil of Gortyna, the representative of the patriarchal administrator of Jerusalem, the monk and priest George, and the bishops sent by the Roman Council. To the right of the Emperor sat the Patriarchs George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch, next the representative of the Patriarch of Alexandria, the monk and priest Peter, with all the bishops subject to Constantinople and Antioch. The Holy Gospels were placed in the midst. At the end of the eleventh session, the Emperor declared that business of the Empire would prevent his being henceforth personally present, but that he would send representatives. He was again personally present only at the last session.

As to the presidency of the Emperor and his representatives, the case is the same as at the fourth OEcumenical Synod (see vol. 3 sec. 188). Their conduct of the business had to do only with the external, with, so to speak, the economy and business of the Synod. With the inner affairs they did not mix, but left the decision of these to the Synod alone, and distinguished

steadfastly and expressly between themselves and the Synod. In the minutes of each session the Emperor and his attendants or representatives are first mentioned, and then they go on with the words: *Conveniente QUOQUE sancta et universali synodo*, etc. At the head of the latter, the Synod proper, stood the papal legates; therefore they subscribed *before* all the bishops, but the Emperor *after*, all the bishops; and the Emperor, not with the formula employed by all the members of the Synod, *οἱ σὺν ὑπεγράψα*, but with the words, *ἀνεγνωμεν καὶ συνήψαμεν* (*legimus et consensimus*), clearly showing that he did not regard himself as a member, much less as the proper president of the Synod.^{fa83} His attendants, and his representatives who presided at sessions 12 to 17, did not subscribe, at all.

After all the members had taken their places at the first session, November 7, 680, the papal legates opened the transactions with the request: As the new doctrine of one energy and one will in the incarnate Lord Jesus Christ, one of the Holy Trinity, had been introduced for about forty-six years by the Bishops Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter of Constantinople, in union with Cyrus of Alexandria and Theodore of Pharan, and all the attempts of the apostolic see to remove the error had hitherto proved ineffectual, it should now be shown, from the side of the Constantinopolitans, whence this innovation came. They clothed this demand in the form of an address to the Emperor, and all the speakers proceeded in the same manner, just as in many parliaments the speakers address their words to the president. The Emperor, as director of the business, then invited the Patriarchs George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch to answer the papal legates; and Macarius, the monk Stephen, and the Bishops Peter of Nicomedia and Solomon of Claneus (in Galatia), declared in the name of the two patriarchates: “We have not invented these new expressions, but have only taught what we have received by tradition from the holy OEcumenical Synods, the holy Fathers, from Sergius and his successors, and from Pope Honorius and from Cyrus of Alexandria, in regard to the will and the energy, and we are ready to prove this.” At their request the Emperor had the Acts of the older Synods brought from the patriarcheon, and the monk and priest Stephen, a disciple of Macarius of Antioch, read aloud the minutes of the third OEcumenical Synod at Ephesus. When he came to the passage in the letter of Cyril to the Emperor Theodosius II.,^{fa84} in which it is said of Christ, “His will is almighty,” Macarius endeavored to discover a testimony for Monothelitism there; but the Roman deputies, and with them

some bishops of the patriarchate of Constantinople, and also the imperial commissioners (*indices*, cf. vol. 3 sec. 188), replied promptly, that Cyril was speaking here only of the will of the divine nature of Christ, and in no way of the one will of the two natures. The other Acts of the third Synod were read by deacon Solomon without any remark being made. ^{fa85}

SEC. 316. FROM THE SECOND TO THE SEVENTH SESSION.

At the second session, November 10, the Acts of the fourth OEcumenical Council were read, and among them the celebrated *Epistola dogmatica* of Pope Leo. When they came, in the letter, to the well-known words, *Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium habuit: Verbo quidem operante quod Verbi est, carne autem exsequente quod carnis est, et horum unum cornscat miraculis, aliud vero succumbit injuriis* (see vol. 3. sec. 176), the papal legates remarked, “Leo here teaches clearly two *naturales operationes inconfuse et indivise* in Christ, and this letter of his was declared by the fourth OEcumenical Synod for the *firmamentum orthodoxae fidei*. Macarius of Antioch, and those who held his opinions, should express themselves on this subject.” Macarius replied: “I do not speak of two energies, and even Leo has not used this expression.” The remark of the Emperor, “Do you mean then that Leo in those words asserted only one energy?” brought him into a corner. He slipped out, however, with the words: “I use no word of number (one or two) in regard to the energy, but teach, with Dionysius the Areopagite **qeandrikhæ ejerſgeian**” (without a word of number). In the same way he evaded the second question of the Emperor, “How do you understand the **qeandrikh-ejerſgeia**?” by saying, “I form no judgment on the subject;,” i. e. I do not endeavor to define this notion more closely.

After this digression, the reading of the Chalcedonian Acts was again continued, and brought to an end at this session. ^{fa86} In the third, November 13, the Acts of the fifth OEcumenical Council came in their turn. At the head of the first book of these there was found the often-repeated **l ogov** of Mennas, then Patriarch of Constantinople, to Pope Vigilius, in regard to the **efi qeþhma** in Christ (see vol. 4 sec. 267). The papal legates immediately protested against the reading of this document, remarking, “This first book of the Acts is falsified: the **l ogov** of Mennas was in no way entered upon their Acts by the fifth Synod: this was done at a later period, at the beginning of the present controversy.” A more careful examination of the Acts, accomplished by the Emperor, his officials, and

some bishops, showed, in fact, that there had been introduced, before the first book of those Acts, three unnumbered quaternions (parts of four sheets), and that the fourth (originally the first) quaternion was still marked No. 1, and the fifth, No. 2, etc. Moreover, the handwriting of those quaternions inserted at the beginning was quite different from that of the rest. The Emperor therefore ordered this document to be left out, and the rest of the Acts of the fifth Council to be read. No further opposition was made to any part of the first book. When, however, in the second book, two pretended letters of Pope Vigilius to the Emperor and Empress were brought forward, which were said to belong to the minutes of the seventh session of the fifth OEcumenical Council, and contained the doctrine of *una operatio* (see vol. 4 sec. 267), the papal legates exclaimed: "Vigilius did not teach that, and this second book of the Acts has been falsified like the first; those are not letters of Vigilius. As the fifth Synod recognized him, then that must have taught, as he is supposed to have done, *unam operationem*. But read only its Acts further, and nothing of the kind will be found." So it was also in fact, and the Emperor ordered a search to be made for the pretended letters of Vigilius. He also proposed to the Synod and the *Judices* the question: Whether anywhere in the Acts of the Synod, which were read, the doctrine of one will and one energy was found, as Macarius and his friends had asserted. The Synod and the *Judices* answered in the negative, and demanded of Macarius and his companions to bring forward, at a later session, the second part promised of their patristic proofs for Monothelitism, from the writings of the Fathers. At the close, the Patriarch George of Constantinople and his suffragans petitioned that they should have read the letters sent forth by Pope Agatho and his Synod, and the Emperor promised that this should be done at the next session. ^{fa87}

The reading of these two extensive documents, which we already know (see above, sec. 314), occupied the whole of the fourth session, November 15. ^{fa88} At the fifth, December 7, Macarius and his friends presented two volumes of patristic testimonies for the Monothelite doctrine. ^{fa89} In accordance with their request, the Emperor allowed these to be read, and sanctioned their being permitted subsequently to bring forward further proofs from the Fathers if they wished. Accordingly, at the sixth session, February 12, 681, they presented a third volume, and after it had been read aloud, and they, on being interrogated, declared that there was nothing more that they wished to add, the Emperor had all the three volumes sealed up by the *Judices* and by a deputation of the Council and the papal legates.

The latter hereupon declared: Macarius of Antioch, his disciple Stephen, Bishop Peter of Nicomedia, and Solomon of Claneus, have in no way, by the patristic passages collected by them, proved anything in regard to the one will or the one energy. On the contrary, they have mutilated these passages, and that which was said of the unity of the will in the Trinity they have referred to the incarnate Christ. We pray, therefore, to be allowed to bring from the patriarcheion of this residence city genuine copies of the Fathers in question, so that we may be able to prove the deception. Moreover, we have prepared a collection both of passages from the Fathers who speak of two wills, and of passages of heretics who, agreeing with Macarius, teach one will and one operation. We pray your Piety (the Emperor) that these also may be read.^{fa90}

On the following day, at the seventh session, the Roman deputies presented their collection with the title: *Testitmonia sanctorum ac probabilium patrum demonstrantia duces voluntates et duas operationes in Domino Deo et salvatore nostro J. Ch.*; and those patristic passages, together with the heretical passages opposed to them, were read aloud by the priest and monk Stephen (from the monastery *domus Arsicia*), who belonged to the suite of the legates.^{fa91} George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch received transcripts of this collection, in order that they might be able to examine the testimonies adduced in it more thoroughly. The original presented by the papal delegates was sealed up in a similar manner with the three volumes of Macarius.^{fa92}

SEC. 317. THE EIGHTH SESSION.

At the eighth session, March 7, 681, the Emperor requested the two Patriarchs, George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch, to express themselves on the two letters of Agatho and the Roman Synod. The Patriarch George declared that he had compared the patristic passages therein adduced with the copies of his own patriarchal archives, and found them fully in agreement; and therefore he came over to them and to the doctrine Dyothelitism) pronounced in them.^{fa93} The same thing was asserted by all the bishops subject to him, one after another. An interruption of the vote was occasioned only by Bishop Theodore of Melitene (on the borders of Cappadocia and Armenia), who, declaring himself to be a *cwrikov*, (= a rustic, not scientifically educated), presented a writing, and requested that it should be read. It contained this thought: Since both parties brought forward patristic passages on their side, and

since by the five OEcumenical Synods, in the doctrine of the Incarnation, no number was determined except the duality of natures and the unity of the person, they ought to stand fast here, and neither side make the other heretical, whether they teach two energies and wills or only one. ^{fa94} To a question of the Emperor, Bishop Theodore declared that the Abbot Stephen of Antioch, the disciple and most zealous friend of Macarius, had delivered this writing to him, and that, besides, the Bishops Peter of Nicemedia, Solomon of Claneus, and Anthony of Hypaepa (in Asia), with five clerics of Constantinople, had taken part in the composition of it. After the disavowal and acclamation was over, these three bishops and five clerics declared the statement of Theodore in respect to them to be an untruth, since the writing in question had been prepared without their knowledge; and the Emperor required them, as they had come under suspicion, to present a written declaration of faith at the next session.

The Patriarch George of Constantinople then prayed the Emperor to be allowed to restore the name of the former Pope Vitalian to the diptychs, from which he had been recently struck out, on account of the late arrival of the Roman legate, on the proposal of Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch (see sec. 312). When the Emperor immediately gave his assent, the Synod exclaimed:” Long live (many years to) the preserver of the orthodox faith, to the new Constantine the Great, to the new Theodosius the Great, to the new Marcian, to the new Justinian many years. We are **dou-oi** of the Emperor. To the orthodox Pope Agatho of Rome many years, to the orthodox Patriarch George many years, to the holy Senate (the imperial Council) many years!” At the wish of the Synod, the Emperor requested the Patriarch Macarius of Antioch to give a more definite explanation of his faith; and, whilst several bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate publicly declared for Dyothelitism, Macarius renewed his opposition to the doe-trine of two wills in Christ. The Emperor now caused to be brought forward the three collections of patristic testimonies presented by Macarius, which had been sealed up, and Macarius acknowledged that they had remained without falsification. Before, however, they were read and examined, Macarius put; forth his view in a short formula of confession, in which he repeated the doctrine of Chalcedon with the addition of one will, because there could be in Christ no sin and no sinful (=human) will. As he at the same time referred to a lengthy confession, already drawn up by him in writing, that had also to be read. ^{fa95} This confession bears, in the Acts of the Synod, the

superscription: “Ecthesis or Confession of Faith of the Heresiarch Macarius,” and it unfolds with considerable fullness the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharist In connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation, in particular, those points are also brought forward of which Dyothelitism is the consequence, namely, that the Logos took from Mary a flesh quickened by the **yuch<logikh** and **noera>** that the difference of the natures (**h<diafora<twā fusewn**) was not taken away by their **efwsiv** in Christ, but, on the contrary, that the peculiarity (**ipiothv**) of each nature was preserved in the unity of the person. That which prevented Macarius from advancing from these propositions to the orthodox doctrine was the specter of Nestorianism. The admission of two wills and energies, he thought, would have for its inevitable consequence the rending of the one Christ in two. He is right when, in opposition to all Nestorianism, he holds fast to the proposition: “All godlike and all manlike actions went forth from one and the same Christ”; but he concludes from this erroneously and inconsequentially the **mia ejergeia qeandrikh>** He is right when he denies the possibility of admitting two self-contradictory wills in Christ, but he then wrongly rejects the duality of the wills generally. We can see that all the explanations which Sophronius had long ago given on the subject were by him not known or ignored. The principal proposition in his confession runs: “Christ has worked **oujkata-qeox ta< qeia, ouj< jau-kata-ajqrwpon ta-ajqrwpina**, but the Incarnate God the Logos showed **kainha tina tha qeandrikhā ejergeian** (the words of the Areopagite), and this is **ogh zwopoiov**” (the words of Cyril of Alexandria: see above, sec. 292).... One and the same has worked our salvation, and one and the same has suffered in the flesh:, and one and the same has worked miracles. Suffering is a matter of the flesh, but this was not thereby separated from the Godhead, although suffering is not a matter of the Godhead” (quite correct, but here follows the false conclusion): “the energy of God has, although through the medium of our manhood, accomplished all this through the one and only divine will, since in Him (Christ) there was no other will striving against and opposing His divine and powerful will. For it is impossible that there should be in the one and the same Christ our God at the same time two mutually contending or even similar wills (**ejantia h<kai-omoia ufestanai qelhmata**). For the saving doctrine of the holy Fathers teaches us that the flesh of the Lord, quickened by a rational soul, never fulfilled its **fusikh<kinhsiv** for itself alone and from its own impulse (**kecwrismenwv kai-ek oikeiav otmhv**), *in opposition to* the Logos which was hypostatically united with it, but

only at the time and in the manner and strength in which He as God willed.” This is, he says, the doctrine of the holy Fathers, and of the five OEcumenical Councils; this he accepted. On the other hand, he rejected all the heresies from Simon Magus up to the present time, particularly those of Arius,...Nestorius, Eutyches,...Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius, and those also whom the fifth OEcumenical Synod anathematized, namely, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the accursed teacher of the heresy of Maximus (he thus sees in the father of Nestorianism at the same time the father of Dyothelitism, for he means here our holy Abbot Maximus), certain writings of Theodoret, and the letter to Maris; finally, also the accursed Maximus, with his impious disciples and his impious doctrine of the separation. “This doctrine,” he proceeds, “our holiest Fathers have already rejected before us: Honorius, Sergius, Cyrus, and their successors.” The Emperor Heraclius also condemned the heresy of the Maximians, and the same was done, by command of the previous Emperor, by the Synod under Peter of Constantinople, Macedonius of Antioch, and Theodore the administrator of Alexandria (sec. 310), since they anathematized Maximus and banished him with his impious disciples.^{fa96}

When Macarius, in answer to repeated questions from the Emperor, rejected most decidedly the doctrine of two natural wills and energies, adding that he would rather be torn in pieces and cast into the sea than admit such a doctrine, the Emperor ordered the collections of the patristic passages presented by him to be read and examined. The first passage was taken from Athanasius (*Contra Apollinar.* lib. 2 cc. 1, 2), proved not the least against Dyothelitism, and could only be so far used by Macarius when, along with the duality of wills and energies, there seemed to him to be introduced a dividing of Christ. The passage says, “Christ is at the same time God and man, but not by the division of the Person, but in indissoluble union.”^{fa97} Without discussing minutely the meaning of this passage, the Synod explained that it was torn from its connection, and set another passage from c. 6 of the same book over against it, in which it is said: The sinful thoughts (*i. e.* the evil will which opposes the divine) of man are only a consequence of original sin, but Christ assumed incorrupt human nature as it was before original sin, therefore His manhood was without evil thoughts (*i. e.* without a human will opposing the divine).^{fa98} This declared plainly against Macarius, and when the Emperor asked him why he had not brought this forward, he replied that he had naturally collected only the passages which suited him.

The second passage was taken from cc. 9 and 10 of the same treatise of S. Athanasius, and runs: “God, who originally created Utah, has assumed humanity, as it was originally, Flesh without carnal desires and without human thoughts, for *His will was only that of the Godhead* (hʒgar qełhsiv qeothtov moħv).” This appeared to testify on the side of Macarius. But the Synod placed the words of the saint immediately following over against them, in which it is said:” The new Adam possessed all that the old possessed (therefore also a human will), but from all that was sinful HE had been free, and therefore there could be manifested in Him the *kaqara dikaioσunh thv qeothtov*.” Athanasius by this intended only to say: “In the God-man ruled only the divine will, and not also the sinful will of the flesh”; but he does not deny the *natural* human will of Christ, rather his words involve it: “that which was in the old Adam was also in the new.” Macarius and his pupil Stephen then had their attention drawn to this, but they would, even in the case of Adam, admit of no *natural* will, but maintained that, before the Fall, man had been *sunqel hthv* (of like will) with God. Several bishops and also the papal legates declared this to be blasphemy, adding: “The divine will was creative: if then Adam was *sunqel hthv* with God, he also created the world with Him.” We see that Macarius interchanged the moral unity of the will of Adam with the divine for a natural unity; and inasmuch as he would not acknowledge a natural will in Adam, he gave his opponents a right and reason to reproach him with the folly named. They could also show from patristic passages that will is a matter of nature, and that Adam had a natural will.

Two other passages in the collection of Macarius and Stephen, taken from Ambrose (*Ad Gratianum*), certainly spoke of one will in Christ, but it meant the identity of His divine will with that of His Father. The Synod showed this from other words of Ambrose, in which also it was said that Christ had assumed a human will, and a reference was made to this in the words:” Not what I will, but what Thou wilt.”

One passage which Macarius had taken from Dionysius the Areopagite (*De div. nom.* c. 2, sec. 6; see above, sec. 2 91) spoke of the “human God-working” (*ajqrwpiāh qeourgia*) of Christ, and thus *seemed* to point to a mixture of the divine and human energy; but the Synod directly ordered the words of the Areopagite immediately following to be read, and these showed that he quite distinguished the operation of the Logos from this *ajqrwpiāh qeourgia*, and thus made two kinds of operations in Christ,

and that by the latter, the **ajqrwpiñ georgia**, he understood the human operation of Christ which allows the divine to shine through (see sec. 291). The eighth session was closed by the reading of a passage from the discourse of S. Chrysostom on “Father, if it be possible,” etc., in which he certainly speaks of one will, but, as above with S. Ambrose, of the unity of will of the Son with the Father. The Synod sets forth another fragment from the same sermon, in which the discourse is of the human affections of Christ, of His hungering, eating, sleeping, and of His (human) wish not to die (*transeat calix iste*).^{fa99}

SEC. 318. NINTH AND TENTH SESSIONS.

In the ninth session, on March 8, the reading was continued; and then came, in the series, a passage from the treatise of S. Athanasius, **peri < triadov kai <sarkwsewv Logou**. We know this treatise under the title, *De Incarnatione contra Arianos*; and it may surprise us that Macarius should borrow a passage from it (c. 21) which, in plain words, speaks of two wills, which came out distinctly in the cry:” Not My will be done, but Thine.” But Macarius must have transformed this as if, in the opinion of Athanasius, Christ had spoken here, not *in propria persona*, but *ex mente* of His adherents. But the Synod had the following sentence read, which, in opposition to this assumption, ascribes the *recusare* of the cup to the proper human will of Christ; and Bishop Basil of Corrina remarked that the passage of S. Athanasius adduced by Macarius spoke clearly against him and of two wills.

Before they went on to further reading, Abbot Stephen, the disciple of Macarius, appealed to Gregory of Nazianzus, who spoke of a “quite deified” will of Christ. But Bishop Basil, just mentioned, replied rightly that the predicate “deified” could only refer to the *human* will of Christ, and not to His will which was already in itself divine, and therefore it was a testimony in favor of Dyothelitism.

An earlier fellow-disciple of Stephen, the monk George, now expressed his conviction, in answer to the Emperor, as follows:” The assertions of Stephen (and Macarius) are in conflict with the Fathers.” Then a passage from Cyril, in the collection of Macarius, was read, in which he seemed to teach a transformation of the human will of Christ into a **pneumatikh < eujol mia**.

An expression of Cyril's, which was presented to the Synod, testified, however, to the two wills, and the Synod now gave the sentence:" You two, you Stephen and your master Macarius, have, by your collection, not proved Monothelitism, but have brought forward passages which speak plainly of two wills, although you have mutilated them. Because you are proved to have falsified the dogma and the teaching of the Fathers, and also to have adhered to the statements of heretics, we depose you from all priestly dignity and function. Those, on the contrary, who amend their previous error, and agree with us in the faith, shall remain in their offices, and shall present the promised written confessions at the next session." By this were meant Theodore of Melitene and the bishops and clerics denounced by him, whose case was considered before (p. 157), and who, at the beginning of this session, had asked and Obtained permission to appear again. The session closed with acclamations in honor of the Emperor, and to the execration of Stephen and Macarius. ^{fa100}

At the tenth session, March 18, 681, the rich collection of patristic and heretical passages for and against Dyothelitism presented by the Roman envoys was unsealed, read, compared with the copies of the works quoted which were found in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople, and discovered to be correct and unfalsified. These were, in the first series, extracts from Leo the Great, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, pseudo-Justin (see p. 107), the Emperor Justinian, Archbishop Ephraem of Antioch, Anastasius of Antioch, and John of Scythopolis.

The second shorter division contained extracts from writings of heretics: Themistius, Anthimus, Severus, Theodosius, etc., in order to show that Monothelitism had been already held by these false teachers, and had already been condemned in them. We recall only that the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649 made a similar collection in two parts, and embodied it in their Acts (see p. 107 f.). The present naturally has much in common with the earlier collection, but is more extensive, and gives the particular passages in proof with less abruptness, but more in connection with what went before and followed.

At the conclusion, the Roman legates wished that an expression of the heretic Apollinaris from a manuscript in the patriarchal library, which was lacking in their collection, should be read. It was done, and the passage showed that Apollinaris had taught only one energy in Christ.

After this was finished, Bishop Theodore of Melitene and his associates presented the confession of faith required of them, which declared Dyothelitism decisively, and their agreement with the doctrinal epistle sent by Pope Agatho. ^{fa101}

SEC. 319. ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH SESSIONS.

At the request of the monk Gregory, who was representative of the patriarchal administrator of Jerusalem, there was read, at the eleventh session, March 20, 681, the celebrated synodal letter of S. Sophronius of Jerusalem to Sergius of Constantinople, to which we referred above in sec. 297. ^{fa102} The Emperor then asked the papal legates what further had now to be done, and they wished that some of the writings composed by Macarius and his disciple Stephen, which were in the patriarchal archives of Constantinople, should be communicated. The Emperor ordered them to be brought by the deacon George, the keeper of the archives (~~cartofubax~~); and they were:

- (a) A letter of Macarius to the Emperor, which was already known to the Synod from the previous transactions (a copy of the confession of Macarius addressed to the Emperor; see p. 158);
- (b) A ~~logov profwnhtikov~~ of the same to the Emperor, which, however, he had not received;
- (c) A letter of Macarius to the priest and monk Luke in Africa, in which the Dyothelites are described as new Manichaeans;
- (d) A further treatment of the same subject.

Some pieces were, at the request of the Synod, read entire, others only partially, the objectionable passages brought out of them, and compared with utterances of acknowledged heretics. In one of these passages, Macarius reckoned the departed Pope Honorius as decidedly belonging to the Monothelites. At the close the Emperor communicated to the Synod that business prevented his personally taking part at the further sessions; but the two Patriarchs, Constantine and Anastasius, as well as the two ex-consuls, Polyeuctus and Peter, should be present, in his stead, at the transactions of the OEcumenical Council. The principal matter was, however, transacted. ^{fa103}

Immediately after the opening of the twelfth Synod, March 22, 681, an imperial court official, the patrician John, by commission of his master, brought over several further documents which Macarius had presented to the Emperor, but which he had not read. The first of these was only another copy of the *logov profwnhtikov* read in the previous session. In the appendix to this there was found the relation of several Isaurian bishops which Macarius had sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople. ^{fa104} Being unimportant, they were not read in full. The manuscripts of Macarius contained a series of other pieces known to us:

- (1) The letter of the Patriarch Sergius to Bishop Cyrus of Phasis in Colchis; ^{fa105}
- (2) The alleged letter of Mennas to Pope Vigilius, found to be spurious at the third session, which, on the repeated protests of the papal legates, was not read;
- (3) The Acts of the seventh and eighth session of the OEcumenical Council, at which the imperial representatives (*Judices*, see p. 153) and the Synod remarked that the two letters contained therein of Pope Vigilius to the Emperor Justinian and the Empress Theodora were later insertions (see pp. 154 and 170). Next followed:
- (4) The letter of Sergius to Pope Honorius (p. 22); and
- (5) The first letter of Honorius to Sergius (p. 27).

In order to thoroughly understand the case, these documents presented by Macarius were, as far as possible, compared with the originals, which were found in the patriarchal archives, and Macarius himself was asked whether the letters of his which were found there really *proceeded* from him. The deputies of the Synod met him in a chamber of the Patriarch's abode, and he acknowledged the genuineness of all the documents. Moreover, the comparison of some of them with the originals in the patriarchal archives led only to favorable results. Finally, the imperial representatives asked whether Macarius, if he repented, could again be restored to his dignity; and after the Synod had answered this in the negative, the bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate petitioned that the plenipotentiaries of the Emperor would prevail with their master, so that another bishop might be appointed for Antioch. They promised this, and requested the Synod to

give its judgment, at the next session, on Sergius, Honorius, and Sophronius. ^{fa106}

SEC. 320. THIRTEENTH SESSION.

This was done in the thirteenth session, March 28, 681, and the Synod declared: “After we had read the doctrinal letters of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis and to Pope Honorius, as well as the letter of the latter to Sergius, we find that these documents are quite foreign to the apostolic dogmas, also to the declarations of the holy Councils, and all the Fathers of repute, and follow the false teachings of the heretics; therefore we entirely reject them, and execrate them as hurtful to the soul (*basque invenientes omnino alienas existeve ab apostolicis dogmatibus eta definitionibus sanctorum conciliorum et cunctorum probabiliū Patrum, sequi veto falsas doctrinas haereticorum, eas omnimodo abjicimus, et tamquam animae noxias exsecramur*). But the names of these men must also be thrust forth from the Church, namely, that of Sergius, who first wrote on this impious doctrine; further, that of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, and of Theodore of Pharan, all of whom Pope Agatho rejected in his letter to the Emperor. We anathematize them all. And along with them, it is our unanimous decree that there shall be expelled from the Church and anathematized, Honorius, formerly Pope of Old Rome, because we found in his letter to Sergius that in all respects he followed his view and confirmed his impious doctrines (*Cum his veto simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia simulque anathematizari praevidimus et Honorium, qui fuerat Papa antiquae Romae, eo quod invenimus per scripta, quae ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est, impia dogmata confirmavit*). We have also examined the synodal letter of Sophronius, and have found it in accordance with the true faith and the apostolic and patristic doctrines. Therefore we received it as useful to the Catholic and apostolic Church, and decreed that his name should be put upon the diptychs of the holy Church.”

If we examine this decree more closely, it is clear that the Synod could appeal to Agatho only for the anathema on Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, and Theodore of Pharan, for only of these had he spoken with condemnation (p. 144). The anathema on Honorius was the exclusive act of the Council, and at this place, at least, was not influenced by an appeal to Agatho. Certainly the Council expressed itself differently, as if Pope

Agatho had taken the lead in the condemnation of Honorius; so particularly in the letter of the Council to Agatho, in which it is said that, in accordance with the sentence previously given by the Pope, they had anathematized Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, *Honorius*, etc., etc. (see p. 188). As Pope Agatho had condemned the Monothelites in general, the Council assumed that Honorius was also among them, although Agatho had not at all mentioned his name. ^{fa107}

The imperial *Judices* (representatives) hereupon declared: “The Council has responded to our request (at the twelfth session), that they would give judgment on Sergius, Honorius, and Sophronius; but there is also a question about Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, as well as about Cyrus of Alexandria and Theodore of Pharan, therefore let the deacon George bring the writings of these men from the patriarchal archives, so that we may be able to gain an insight into them. With regard, however, to the petition (also presented at the twelfth session) for the filling again of the see of Antioch, the Emperor has commanded that a **yh̄fisma** (a motion carried by a majority of votes) be taken.” The bishops replied that the presentation of the writings of Pyrrhus, etc., was superfluous, because their doctrine of one will was universally known, and Pope Agatho had already exposed their error, had shown their agreement in opinion with Sergius, and had condemned them in his letter. ^{fa108} There were now read aloud:

- (1) The first letter of Cyrus of Phasis to Sergius (see above, p. 12);
- (2) The much more important second letter of Cyrus to Sergius, after his elevation to the see of Alexandria, in reference to the union brought about by him there, communicating the nine Kephalaia of union (see above, p. 18 ff.);
- (3) Passages from the *Logos* of Theodore of Pharan to the former Bishop Sergius, of Arsinoe, in Egypt, containing the doctrine of one energy and one will;
- (4) The dogmatic tome of Pyrrhus against Sophronius, asserting that Cyrus (in **kefabaion 7**), in the passage of the Areopagite, **kainh< qeandrikh-ejergeia** had not deceitfully, but merely as explaining the sense, put **mia** instead of **kainh<**

(5) A letter of Paul of Constantinople to the former Pope, Theodore, from which a passage with a Monothelite sound is made prominent; fa109

(6) A letter of the Patriarch Peter of Constantinople to Pope Vitalian (see p. 135), in which different patristic passages were brought forward. As the papal legates declared these to be mutilated, the reading of the letter was not further continued.

The Judges were satisfied with the proof alleged, and drew attention to the successors of Peter, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas, John, and Constantine. Of these, too, letters and synodal epistles were presented (they are not received into the Acts), but the Synod found in them nothing contradictory to the orthodox doctrine, and George, the keeper of the archives at Constantinople, finally declared that he had discovered in the archives no document which could make the bishops named suspected of Monothelitism. It was therefore resolved to retain their names in the diptychs. Finally, the keeper George made over all further documents found in the patriarchal archives, letters and confessions of several, among them the Latin original of the second letter of Honorius, from which some fragments were now communicated (see above, p. 49). Further, there was a fragment from a letter of the Patriarch Pyrrhus to Pope John, and something else read, and the Synod caused all these documents, even the letters of Pope Honorius, to be burnt, as hurtful to the soul. fa110

SEC. 321. FROM THE FOURTEENTH TO THE SEVENTEENTH SESSION.

At the fourteenth session, May 5, 681, the new Patriarch, Theophanes of Antioch, assisted, and the examination of the genuineness of the Acts of the fifth OEcumenical Council, begun at the twelfth session, was now resumed, in order to discuss the matter thoroughly. Hitherto the Synod had used only two copies of the Acts, taken from the patriarchal archives, namely:

(1) a parchment MS. in two books; and

(2) a paper MS., which contained only the seventh session of that Synod.

The keeper of the archives, George of Constantinople, now presented a third codex, which in the meantime he had found also in the patriarchal archives, and swore upon the Holy Gospels that neither himself nor any other, with his knowledge, had made any alteration in these three MSS. The bishops then compared these three MSS. with one another, and with others at their disposal, and it was found:

- (a)** That the two first agreed with one another, and uniformly contained the pretended letter of Mennas to Vigilius, and the two books of the latter to Justinian and Thedora;
- (b)** That, on the other hand, in the newly discovered third MS. these documents were lacking.

The Synod now gave the sentence: “These additions, as the papal legates correctly remarked before, were not written at the time of the fifth OEcumenical Council, but were inserted by a later hand, and in the first book of the parchment MS. three quaternions, in which was the letter of Mennas; and in the second book, between the fifteenth and sixteenth quaternions, four unpagged leaves, containing the two pretended letters of Vigilius. In the same manner, the second codex had been falsified in the heretical interest. These additions must be quashed in both MSS., and marked with an obelus, and the falsifiers smitten with anathema” (of. vol. 4 sec. 267).

In order to indicate the persons and the party who had dared to falsify the documents, Bishop Macrobius of Seleucia in Isauria related: “The Magister Militum Philip made over to me a MS. of the Acts of the fifth OEcumenical Council. I found that it was falsified in regard to the seventh session, and I learnt from Philip that he had lent it to the Abbot Stephen, the friend of the Patriarch Macarius, and that the forged passages were from the hand of the monk George, another scholar of Macarius. Upon this I visited my Patriarch Macarius himself, found the monk George with him writing, and satisfied myself by multiplied comparison that he had also written that.” The monk George, who was already at the Synod, and now was asked for an explanation, told them: “When Macarius and Theodore of Constantinople had negotiations together respecting the faith, there were MSS. which contained the letters of Vigilius, brought from the patriarchal archives of Constantinople, copied by us, and sent by Macarius and Stephen to the Emperor. Soon afterwards the Magister Militum Philip, already mentioned, showed to Abbot Stephen a MS. belonging to him of

the fifth OEcumenical Council, and asked whether it was good. Stephen replied, there was something lacking in it; and, at the request of Philip and at the command of Stephen, I was required to insert the letters in question of Vigilius. The like happened with all the other copies which Macarius and Stephen could bring forward. But what was the case with respect to a Latin MS. which they bought, the priest and Latin grammarian Constantine would know better.” At the request of the Synod, the latter asserted: “At the time of the Patriarch Paul, Bishop Fortunius (Fortunatus) came from Carthage (a Monothelite; see p. 90) hither to Constantinople, and the question arose whether he should have his seat before or after the other metropolitans present. As then the Patriarch Paul sought in the library for the Acts of the fifth Council, in order to learn from them the order of sitting, he found, among other things, a Latin translation of the synodal Acts, and commissioned me to compare this MS. in regard to the seventh session with the authentic copy and to supply what was lacking, in union with the deacon Sergius, who was a good writer. What we then added were the two letters of Pope Vigilius translated from the Greek into the Latin.” ^{fa111}

This statement was confirmed by the deacon Sergius mentioned, who was also present, and the bishops exclaimed: “Anathema to the pretended letters of Mennas and Vigilius; anathema to the forger of Acts; anathema to all who teach one will and one energy in the Incarnation of Christ, who is One of the Trinity! Eternal honor to the four holy Councils; eternal honor to the holy fifth Council; many years to the Emperor Constantine!”

Finally was read a discourse of S. Athanasius in a MS. brought by the Cypriote bishops as proof for Dyothelitism, and information was given by Bishop Domitius of Prusias, that the priest and monk Polychronius, an adherent of Macarius of Antioch, had seduced many of the people to heresy. ^{fa112} The examination of his affair was put off to the next session; before, however, this took place, the honor was done to the papal legates, that one of them, Bishop John of Portus, was allowed to celebrate divine service in a solemn manner, according to the Latin rite, in the Church of S. Sophia at Constantinople, in presence of the Emperor and the Patriarch, at the Easter Festival, (April 14) 681. At the same time, the Emperor reduced the tax which the Popes had to discharge at their ordination, did away with the practice according to which the imperial exarchs of Ravenna claimed to confirm the papal election, and required that the petitions in reference to this should henceforth be laid before the Emperor himself. ^{fa113}

After the close of the festal days of Easter, the Polychronius mentioned above was, at the fifteenth session, on April 26, 681, placed before the Synod. He engaged to prove the truth of his teaching in this way, he would lay his written confession of faith on a dead person, and would thereby call him back to life. If this did not succeed, then the Council and the Emperor might deal with him at their pleasure. His confession of faith, drawn up in the form of a letter to the Emperor, declared that the doctrine of one will and of one divine human energy had been revealed to him twice in a vision. The Judices as well as the Synod gave permission that he should make the proposed trial outside the palace in the open air, and in the presence of them and of the people. A corpse was brought on a bier. Polychronius laid his confession upon it, and for two whole hours whispered all kinds of things into its ears without producing the least effect. The people present exclaimed: "Anathema to the new Simon (Magus); anathema to the seducer of the people!" The Judices and bishops returned into the hall of session; and, after the Synod had again exhorted Polychronius in vain to the acceptance of the orthodox doctrine, he was deposed from his dignity and his office as priest, and along with Macarius and Stephen smitten with anathema. ^{fall14}

In the sixteenth session, on August 9, the priest Constantine of Apamea in Syria prayed for admission, and laid before the Council with great personal feeling a mediation doctrine invented by himself, to the effect: "That there were two energies, since these belonged to the properties of the two natures of Christ; but there was in Christ only one *personal* will, that of the Logos, and with this a *natural* will, the human; and the latter the Lord had drawn out, when HE drew out flesh and blood on the cross" (an entirely new heresy, which denies the perpetuity of the *God-man*). He thought that this was also the doctrine of Macarius; but the Synod exclaimed: "That is Manichaeism and Apollinarianism: Anathema to the new Manichaean; anathema to the new Apollinarian!" He was expelled.

As they were about to proceed to the customary acclamations and anathemas, the Patriarch George of Constantinople wished that, in the latter, they would pass over the names of his predecessors, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul; but he was out-voted, and the Synod exclaimed: "Many years to the Emperor,...many years to the Roman Pope Agatho, many years to the Patriarch George of Constantinople, many years to the Patriarch Theophanes of Antioch, many years to the orthodox Council and Senate; anathema to the heretic Sergius, to the heretic Cyrus, to the heretic

Honorius, to the heretics Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, Macarius, Stephen, Polychronius, Apergius of Perge, and to all heretics and their friends!" The drawing up of a declaration of faith was to be reserved for the next, the seventeenth session. ^{fa115}

This did not take place until September 11, and the short minutes of the session are extant only in Latin. The decree of faith, which had in the meantime been drawn up, was read, and was adopted in the following and last session. ^{fa116}

SEC. 322. THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION.

At the eighteenth session, on September 16, 681, the Emperor was again personally present, and, at his command, a notary read the full decree of faith, which was subscribed by the papal legates, by all the bishops and episcopal representatives, 174 in number, and, last of all, also by the Emperor (see p. 151). The Synod declares in this, before all, its adhesion to the five earlier Synods, ^{fa117} repeats the symbols of Nicaea and Constantinople, and proceeds thus: "These creeds would have sufficed for the knowledge and confirmation of the orthodox faith. As, however, the originator of all evil always finds a helping serpent, by means of which he can diffuse his poison, and therewith finds suitable instruments for his will, we mean Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, the former Bishops of Constantinople, also Honorius, Pope of Old Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch and his disciple Stephen, he did not delay, through the trouble in the Church, by the dissemination of the heretical doctrine of one will and one energy of the two natures of the one Christ, who is one of the Holy Trinity, to assert that which agrees with the heresy of Apollinaris, Severus, and Themistius, and thus serves to take away the full Incarnation of Christ, and to represent His rationally quickened flesh as without will or energy. But Christ our God awoke the faithful Emperor, the new David, ...who did not rest until this assembly found the perfect proclamation of orthodoxy. This holy and OEcumenical Synod has received **pistwv**, and with uplifted hands has greeted the letter of the most holy Pope Agatho to the Emperor, in which are particularly brought forward and condemned, those who taught one will and one energy. So also they accepted the synodal letter of the 125 bishops assembled under the Pope (see p. 145), since the two letters agree with the holy Synod of Chalcedon, the tome of the holy Leo to Flavian, and with the synodal letters of Cyril against Nestorius and the bishops of the East. Following the

five holy and OEcumenical Synods and the Fathers of repute, and confessing that our Lord Jesus Christ, one of the Holy Trinity, is perfect in the Godhead and perfect in the manhood, etc. (Repetition of the creed of Chalcedon; see vol. 3 p. 346 ff.). We also declare that there are two natural **gel hseiv** or **gel hmata** and two natural energies, **ajdiairetwv**, **ajreptwv**, **ajmeristwv**, **aj Sugcutwv**, in Christ, according to the teaching of the holy Fathers. And the two natural wills are not opposed to each other, — God forbid, — as the impious heretics said, but His human will followed, and it does not resist and oppose, but rather is subject to the divine and almighty will. The will of the human nature (**sarx**) necessarily moved, but also subjected itself to the divine, as the most wise Athanasius says: As the flesh (manhood) of God the Logos is called flesh, and is, so also is the natural will of His flesh the proper will of the Logos, as He Himself said:” I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of the Father who sent Me.” He calls here the will of His **sarx** His own, since the **sarx** was also His own. Just as His all holy and blameless (sinless) **sarx** (humanity) was not taken away by the deifying, but remained in its limitation and fashion, so also His human will is not taken away but divinised, it rather remains, as Gregory the theologian says: *His will, namely that of the Savior, is not opposed to God, but quite divinised.* We teach further, that there are two natural energies, **ajdiairetwv**, **ajreptwv**, **ajmeristwv**, and **aj Sugcutwv**, in our Lord Jesus Christ, namely the divine and the human energy, as *Leo* says: *Agit enim utraque forma*, etc. (vol. 3 p. 230). We do not allow that God and His creature (the humanity of Christ) had one and the same energy, so as not to introduce the creature into the divine substance (**ousia**), and press down the transcendent to the creaturely. As well the miracles as the sufferings we ascribe to one and the same, each according to the difference of His natures; and we assert two natures in one hypostasis, of which each in communion with the other wills and works what is proper to itself. Therefore we confess also two natural wills and operations (energies) going together harmoniously for the salvation of the human race. A different faith no one may proclaim or hold; and those who venture to do so,...or will introduce a new formula for the destruction of our definition of the faith, shall, if bishops or clerics, be deposed from their clerical office, but if monks or laymen, shall be anathematized “ ^{fa118}

The question of the Emperor, whether this decree had received the assent of all the bishops, was answered with loud acclamations’ so also his

declaration that, in the summoning of the Synod, he had had in view only the purity of the faith and the restoration of unity. Then the **logov prosfwnhtikov** of the Synod, drawn up in the usual manner, was read to the Emperor. It contains, first, the praise of the Emperor, especially for the calling of this Synod. The Pope of Rome and the other bishops had followed his command, and had appeared, some personally and some by representatives, in Constantinople. As the earlier five OEcumenical Synods had become necessary on account of heresy, so also the present; and in agreement with the letters of Pope Agatho and his Roman Synod of 125 bishops, the Synod taught, that one of the Trinity, our Lord Jesus Christ, was made man, and is to be worshipped in two perfect natures undividedly. "If, however, we assume," it goes on, "two natures, we must also recognize two natural wills and two natural energies of the same; for we do not venture to declare one of the two natures in Christ to be without will and without energy, lest in taking away the properties we take away the natures themselves. We do not deny the natural will of His humanity or the energy which corresponds with this will, while at the same time we also do not deny **to swthriav hōwn oikonomikov kefabaiōn |**, or ascribe the sufferings to the Godhead, as was attempted by those who confessed only one will and one energy, in unholy innovation, renewing the heresies of Arius, Apollinaris, Eutyches, and Severus. If we were to assume the human nature of our Lord as without will and without energy, where would then be His perfect humanity? For nothing else makes the human substance (**ousia**) perfect, but **to~~ou~~siwdev qe**h**ma**, whereby the power of liberty is stamped upon us. So it is with regard to energy. How can we ascribe to Him (Christ) perfect humanity, if He did not work and suffer in a human way?...Therefore we punish with excommunication and anathema Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, also Cyrus, and with them Honorius, formerly Pope of Rome, as he followed them (**wj ekeinōiv ej toutōiv akolou**h**santa**), but especially Macarius and Stephen,...also Polychronius, the childish old man, who wanted to awaken one who was dead, and because he could not, was derided; and all who asserted or assert one will and one operation (energy) in the Incarnate Christ. And no one must blame the zeal of the Pope and of this Synod, for we did not begin the conflict, but, on the contrary, have only offered opposition to the aggressors....On our side fought the Prince of the Apostles, for his imitator and successor is our patron, and declared to us in his letter the secret of theology." The close is composed of commendations of the Emperor, and good wishes for him. ^{fa119}

This **logov profwnhtikov** was also subscribed by the members of the Synod, the papal legates at the head; and they requested the Emperor to give his subscription and his confirmation of the decrees. He immediately consented, and wished that Archbishop Citonius of Sardinia, who had come into suspicion of high treason, but had been acquitted, should now also be received by the Synod, and allowed to subscribe its decree. After this was done, the Synod requested that the Emperor would be pleased to send five attested copies of the decree of the faith, signed by himself, to the five patriarchal sees, which also was immediately accomplished. ^{fa120}

Finally, the Synod addressed another letter to Pope Agatho, “the physician for the present sickness of the Church,” leaving to him as the **prwtoqronov** what was to be done — to him who stood upon the firm rock of the faith. The Synod, they said, had destroyed the tower of the heretics, and killed them by anathemas, in accordance with the sentence given before by the Pope (**kata toiv idroiv ufasin |**), namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter. Besides these, also Macarius and Stephen. Enlightened by the Holy Ghost, instructed by the Pope, and protected by the Emperor, they had rejected the impious doctrines, and pronounced the dogma of two wills and energies. The Pope would be pleased to confirm their decrees in writing. ^{fa121}

SEC. 323. THE POPE AND THE EMPEROR CONFIRM THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD.

Immediately after the end of the Synod, the Emperor caused to be posted in the third atrium ^{fa122} of the great church in the neighborhood of Dicymbalon the following edict: “The heresy of Apollinaris, etc., has been renewed by Theodore of Pharan and confirmed by Honorius, who contradicted himself (**o~~j~~thv ai~~t~~esewv bebai~~o~~thv kai ~~a~~uto~~x~~e autw~~t~~ prosmacomenov**). Also Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter; more recently, Macarius, Stephen, and Polychronius had diffused Monothelitism. He, the Emperor, had therefore convoked this holy and OEcumenical Synod, and published the present edict with the confession of faith, in order to confirm and establish its decrees. (There follows here an extended confession of faith, with proofs for the doctrine of two wills and operations.) As he recognized the five earlier OEcumenical Synods, so he anathematized all heretics from Simon Magus, but especially the originators and patrons of the new heresy, Theodore and Sergius; also Pope Honorius, who was their

adherent and patron in everything, and confirmed the heresy (~~tor~~ ~~kata~~ ~~panta~~ ~~toutoiv~~ ~~sunairethn~~ ~~kai~~ ~~sun~~ ~~doromon~~ ~~kai~~ ~~bebaiwthn~~ ~~thv~~ ~~aiteseuv~~); further, Cyrus, etc., and ordained that no one henceforth should hold a different faith, or venture to teach one will and one energy. In no other than the orthodox faith could men be saved. Whoever did not obey the imperial edict should, if he were bishop or cleric, be deposed; if official, punished with confiscation of property and loss of girdle (~~zwsh~~); if private person, banished from the residence and all other cities. ^{fa123}

Pope Agatho had survived until the end of the sixth OEcumenical Council, but the news of his death (January 10, 682) reached Constantinople before his legates had left the city, and the Emperor therefore gave them, at their departure, a letter to the new Pope, Leo II, who was elected soon after the death of his predecessor, but was not ordained until August 17, 682. ^{fa124} The Emperor relates in this letter the whole progress of the affair, how all the members of the Synod had assented to the doctrinal letter of Pope Agatho, with the exception of Macarius of Antioch and his adherents. These had been deposed by the Synod, but had requested in writing that they should be sent to the Pope, which the Emperor now did, and left the decision of their affair to his Holiness. The Pope would now take the sword of the Word, and with it beat down all heresy, etc. Finally, he was requested to send the representative already promised to Constantinople. ^{fa125}

A second imperial letter was addressed to all the ecclesiastical provinces (*Concilia*) of the Roman patriarchate, and similarly related how all the bishops, Macarius excepted, had assented to the orthodox doctrine of Pope Agatho. ^{fa126} The persons anathematized by the sixth Council are not named in either of these letters of the Emperor, and thus not Honorius.

Pope Leo II responded to the wish of the Emperor in a letter addressed to him, which at the same time contains the papal confirmation of the sixth OEcumenical Synod. The Pope in this letter first commends the Emperor as indeed worthy of commendation, and then remarks that the legates who had been sent by Agatho to the Synod had arrived in Rome in the July of the past 10th Indiction, *i. e.* in the July of 682. From this it is clear that the concluding note of this letter, as found in one of the two old Latin translations, representing it as written *Nonis Maii Indict. 10, i. e.* on the 7th of May 682, cannot possibly be genuine; for the Pope wrote after the return of his legates.

Further, Leo II says that the legates had brought the letter of the Emperor and the Acts of the Council with them. He had carefully examined the latter, and found them quite in agreement with the declarations of faith of his *predecessor* Agatho and the Roman Synod. He confirmed and recognized, therefore, the sixth OEcumical Council in the same way as the five preceding, and anathematized all heretics, Arius, etc.; also the originators of the new heresy, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, etc.; also Honorius, *qui hanc apostolicam sedem non apostolice traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana prodicione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est* (according to the Greek, **parecwñse** = *subverti permisit*), *et omnes, qui in suo errore defuncti sunt*. Finally, of Macarius and his adherents it is said, that the Pope has given himself much trouble to lead them again into the right way, but hitherto they have remained stiff-necked. ^{fa127} The close of the letter is composed of laudations of the Emperor. ^{fa128}

As Pope Leo II in this document confirmed the sixth OEcumical Council, so did he zealously endeavor to bring about its recognition throughout the entire West. We see this from his letters to the Spanish bishops still extant, to Bishop Quiricius in particular, ^{fa129} to the Spanish King Ervig, ^{fa130} and to Count Simplicius. ^{fa131} As the whole Acts of the Council had not yet been translated into Latin, the Pope could send to the Spaniards only some principal parts of them, with the request that the decrees of this Synod should be received and subscribed by them all. The Roman notary Peter was commissioned to deliver these letters, and to urge on the affair; that he accomplished his end we shall learn later on, when we consider the thirteenth and fourteenth Synods of Toledo.

SEC. 324. THE ANATHEMA ON POPE HONORINS, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE ACTS OF THE SIXTH OECUMICAL COUNCIL. ^{FA132}

If we have so far given extracts from the Acts of the sixth OEcumical Council, we are now required to examine more closely the question respecting the anathematizing of Pope Honorius. It is in the highest degree startling, even scarcely credible, that an OEcumical Council should punish with anathema a *Pope* as a heretic! In order to get rid of all the difficulties resulting from such a fact, Baronius and his followers have maintained that the Acts of the Council which speak of the anathema on Honorius are *forged*, whilst others have thought that the Acts indeed are genuine, but that the Council condemned Honorius, not for heresy, but for

negligence (because he was silent at the wrong time). Both of these attempts at explanation have recently been quite decidedly opposed by Professor Pennacchi in Rome, the most distinguished of the later *defenders* of Pope Honorius. He has most distinctly maintained that the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council are genuine, and that in than Pope Honorius was anathematized as a real heretic (formalis). ^{fa133}

That, however, the sixth OEcumenical Synod actually condemned Honorius on account of *heresy*, is clear beyond all doubt, when we consider the following collection of the sentences of the Synod against him.

(1) At the entrance of the thirteenth session, on March 28, 681, the Synod says: “After reading the doctrinal letter of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis (afterwards of Alexandria) and to Pope Honorius, and also the letter of the latter to Sergius, we found that these documents were quite foreign (omnino alienas) to the apostolic doctrines, and to the declarations of the holy Councils and all the Fathers of note, and follow the false doctrines of heretics. Therefore we reject them completely, and abhor (**bdel luttomeqa**) them as hurtful to the soul. But also the names of these men must be thrust out of the Church, namely, that of Sergius, the first who wrote on this impious doctrine. Further, that of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, and of Theodore of Pharan, all of whom also Pope Agatho rejected in his letter to the Emperor. We punish them all with anathema. But along with them, it is our universal decision that there shall also be shut out from the Church and anathematized the former Pope Honorius of Old Royce, because we found in his letter to Sergius, that in everything he followed his view and confirmed his impious doctrines (**kata panta th|ekeinou** [of Sergius] **gnw|h|ejakol oughsanta kai ta autou aseb|kurwsanta dogmata**).” ^{fa134}

(2) Towards the end of the same session the second letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius was presented for examination, and it was ordered that all the documents brought by George, the keeper of the archives in Constantinople, and among them the two letters of Honorius, should immediately be burnt, as hurtful to the soul (see p. 169).

(3) Again, the sixth OEcumenical Council referred to Honorius in the sixteenth session, on August 9, 681, at the acclamations and exclamations with which the transactions of this day were closed. The

bishops exclaimed: “Many years to the Emperor, many years to the Roman Pope Agatho, many years to the Patriarch George of Constantinople, etc. Anathema to the heretic Sergius, to the heretic Cyrus, to the *Acretic Honorins*, to the heretic Pyrrhus,” etc., etc. (see p. 173).

(4) Still more important is that which took place at the eighteenth and last session, on September 16, 681. In the decree of the faith which was now published, and forms the principal document of the Synod, we read: “The creeds (of the earlier OEcumenical Synods) would have sufficed for knowledge and confirmation of the orthodox faith. Because, however, the originator of all evil still always finds a helping serpent, by which he may diffuse his poison, and therewith finds fit tools for his will, we mean Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, former bishops of Constantinople, *also Honorius, Pope of Old Rome*, Cyrus of Alexandria, etc., so he failed not, by them, to cause trouble in the Church by the scattering of the heretical doctrine of one will and one energy of the two natures of the one Christ” (see p. 173 f.).

(5) After the papal legates, all the bishops, and the Emperor had received and subscribed this decree of the faith, the Synod published the usual *logov prosfwnhtikov*, which, addressed to the Emperor, says, among other things:” Therefore we punish with exclusion and anathema, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter; also Cyrus, and with them *Honorius, formerly bishop of Rome, as he followed them*” (see p. 176 f.).

(6) In the same session the Synod also put forth a letter to Pope Agatho, and says therein: “We have destroyed the fort of the heretics, and slain them with anathema, in accordance with the sentence spoken before in your holy letter, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, *Honorius, Cyrus*,” etc. (see p. 178).

(7) In closest connection with the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Synod stands the imperial *decree* confirming their resolutions. The Emperor writes: “With this sickness (as it came out from Apollinaris, Eutyches, Themistius, etc.) did those unholy priests afterwards again infect the Church, who before our times falsely governed several churches. These are Theodore of Pharan, Sergius the former bishop of this chief city; *also Honorius, the Pope of Old Rome* (*εἰ δὲ καὶ Πωριὸν οὐτὼ*

presbuterav Rwmhv papav genomenov), the *strengtheners* (confirmors) of heresy who contradicted himself (oJthv aijesevw bebaiwthx kai aJtoxeJutw|prosmacomenov). ^{fa135}

“We anathematize all heresy from Simon (Magus) to this present,... besides, we anathematize and reject the originators and patrons of the false and new doctrines, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius,...also Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome, who in everything agreed with them, went with them, and strengthened the heresy (eJi de kai <Jnwvion toJ thv presbuterav Rwmhv papav genomenon, toJ kata-panta toutoiv sunairethn kai <sundromon kai bebaiwthx thv aijesevw” (see p. 178 f.).

From all this it cannot be doubtful in what sense Pope Honorius was anathematized by the sixth OEcumenical Council, and it is equally beyond doubt that the Council judged much more severely respecting him than we have done above. We were obliged to allow that Honorius disapproved of the Monothelite term ef qeJhma, uttered literally *nude crude*, and the orthodox term duo ejesgeiai; but we also proved and showed from his own words that it was only in the expression that he erred, whilst in truth his opinions were orthodox. The Council, on the contrary, simply gave attention to the incriminated, unlucky expressions, which were misused by the Monothelites, and pronounced its sentence on these, on their sound, on the mere fact that Honorius had so written.

With greater precision than the Synod, however, Pope Leo II pointed out the fault of Honorius, when, in his letter to the Emperor, confirming the decrees of the sixth OEcumenical Council, he says: “Pariter anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, id est Theodorum Pharanitanum episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum Constantinopolitanze Ecclesia subseorsores magis quam praesules, *necnon et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profunda proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est* (in the Greek, *subvevti permisit, parecwshse*), *et omnes qui in suo errore defuncti; sunt*” (see p. 180). From this it is clear that Pope Leo II also anathematized Honorius, because he did not bring the apostolic doctrine to light, *i.e.*, did not speak out as a teacher, and so, by the violation of his sacred duties, allowed the falsification of the faith (the Greek, th|bebhw|prodosia|mi anqhhai parecwshse, etc., is not only *milder*, but also more *accurate*, and consistent with the expression of Leo

in his letter to King Ervig, whilst the Latin text (a mere translation from the Greek) plainly does wrong to Pope Honorius).

In like sense, Pope Leo II expressed himself in his letter to the Spanish bishops: “Qui veto adversum apostolicae traditionis puritatem perduelliones exstiterant...aeterna condemnatione mulctati sunt, i.e. Theodorus Pharanitanus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus Constantinopolitani, *cum Honorio qui flammam haeretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovxit.*” (See p. 182.) And so, in fact, it was. Honorius ought; to have suppressed the heresy at its beginning by a clear exhibition of the orthodox doctrine, but he fostered it by his negligence, by his unhappy words to Sergius (in his first letter especially).

Once more Leo n. speaks of the anathematizing of Honorius, in his letter to the Spanish King Ervig, thus: “Omnesque haereticae assertionis auctores venerando censente concilio condemnati, de catholicae ecclesiae adunatione projecti sunt, i.e. Theodorus Pharanitanus episcopus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius, Paulus, Pyrrhus, et Petrus, quondam Constantinopolitani praesules; *et una cure eis Honorius Romanus, qui immaculatam apostolicae traditionis regulam, quam a praedecessoribus suis accepit, maculavi consensit*” (i. e. he allowed the *maculari*, (a) from negligence, since he did not come forward against it, and (b) since he used an expression which the heresy turned to its own use). Whether this letter proceeded from Pope Leo himself, or from his successor Benedict II, is here indifferent.

Of the fact that Pope Honorius had been anathematized by the sixth OEcumenical Synod, mention is made by the Quinisext or the Trullan Synod, which was held only twelve years after. The Synod says in its first canon: “Further, we confess the faith which the sixth Synod proclaimed. That taught that we must accept two natural wills and operations in Christ, and condemned (**katadikasasa**) all who taught only one will, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Cyril of Alexandria, *Honorius of Rome*, Sergius, etc., etc.” ^{fa136}

Like testimony is also given repeatedly by the seventh OEcumenical Synod; especially does it declare, in its principal document, the decree of the faith: “We declare at once two wills and energies according to the property of the natures in Christ, just as the sixth Synod in Constantinople taught,

condemning (**apokhruxasa**) Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, etc., etc.” ^{fa137}
 The like is asserted by the Synod or its members in several other places. ^{fa138}

To the same effect the eighth OEcumenical Synod expresses itself:
 “Sanctam et universalem sextam synodum suscipientes...anathematizamus
 autem Theodorum, qui fuit episcopus Pharan, et Sergium, et Pyrrhum,...
 atque cum eis *Honorium Romae*, una cum Cyro Alexandrino.” ^{fa139}

That the name of Honorius was found among those anathematized in the Roman copy of the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council, is also quite clear from Anastasii *Vita Leonis II*, in which he says: “Hic suscepit sanctam sextam synodum...in qua et condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, *Honorius*, et Pyrrhus, Paulus et Petrus, nec non et Macarius cum discipulo suo Stephano.” ^{fa140}

In the *Liber Diurnus*, i. e. the Formulary of the Roman Chancery (from the fifth to the eleventh century), there is found the old formula for the papal oath, probably prescribed by Gregory II (at the beginning of the eighth century), according to which every new Pope, on entering upon his office, had to swear that “the recognized the sixth OEcumenical Council, which smote with eternal anathema the originators of the new heresy (Monothelitism), Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc., together with Honorius, *quia pravis haereticorum assertionibus fomentum impendit*.” ^{fa141}

Finally, not to mention still later witnesses, e.g. Bede, Pope Hadrian II (867-872) writes: “Licet enim *Honorio* ab orientalibus post mortem anathema sit dictum, sciendum tamen est, quia fuerat super haeresi accusatus, propter quam solam licitum est minoribus, majorum suorum motibus resistendi, vel praevis sensus libere respuendi, quamvis et ibi nec Patriarcharum nec ceterorum antistitem cuiquam de eo fas fuerit proferendi sententiam, nisi ejusdem primae sedis Pontificis consensus praecessisset auctoritas.”

This utterance of Hadrian was read and approved at the seventh session of the eighth OEcumenical Council; ^{fa142} but Pope Hadrian started with the opinion that the anathematizing of Honorius by the sixth OEcumenical Council had been preceded by his condemnation by Pope Agatho. Hadrian was here misled by some turns of speech of the sixth OEcumenical Council, where it is said: “The Synod has destroyed the fortress of the heretics, and slain them by anathemas, in accordance with the *sentence previously given by the Pope*, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius,

Honorius, etc., etc.” (p. 178). Here it was quite natural to infer that Agatho had condemned Honorius as well as Sergius. Similarly in the thirteenth session (see above, p. 167). In fact, however, so little had Pope Agatho condemned Honorius as a heretic, that he, on the other hand, maintained, as we have seen (p. 3.67), that *all* his predecessors had held fast the true doctrine in opposition to the Constantinopolitans.

We have explained above (p. 185) the startling phenomenon, that a Pope (Honorius) was anathematized by an OEcumenical Council for heresy, in this way, that the Synod attended to the incriminated passages in the letters of Honorius, which certainly had a heterodox sound (particularly in the first), and to the *fact* that Honorius had thus written and given great help to the heresy, and for these reasons pronounced their sentence.

Another solution of the difficulty was attempted by Pennacchi in his often quoted work, *De Honorii I Romani Pontificis causa in Concilio VI* (see p. 37 and 181).

(1) He maintains, first of all, that the letters of Pope Honorius were put forth *auctoritate apostolica*, or, as we say, *ex cathedra* (Pennacchi, *l. c.* pp. 169-177); and have come down to us unfalsified (*ibid.* p. 75 sqq.), that they are thoroughly orthodox; and that when Honorius said *unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (see above, p. 27), he meant only the will of the uncorrupted human nature of Christ (as Pope John IV. asserted, p. 52), and that he dissuaded from the use of the orthodox term **duo ej̅er̅gei̅ai** only because it became a stumbling-block to many, and might be misunderstood in a Nestorian sense (*ibid.* pp. 112-169).

(2) He maintains, further, that Honorius was anathematized at the sixth OEcumenical Synod in the proper sense as *haereticus formalis* (*ibid.* p. 177 sqq.), and that the Acts of the Council, as they lie before us, are unfalsified (*ibid.* p. 193).

(3) But that sentence pronounced against Honorius rested upon an *error in facto dogmatico* (*ibid.* p. 204 sqq.), since the Fathers of the Council had *erroneously* regarded the letters of Honorius as heretical; and therefore that

(4) This sentence was not that of an OEcumenical infallible Council, but that of a number of *Orientalis*, prejudiced beforehand, on the character of the letters of Honorius. That this sentence stands

(a) in contradiction with the decree of the contemporaneous Pope Agatho and his Western Synod, who maintained of all previous Popes, that they had not erred *in fide* (see above, pp. 143 and 146). Thus only the *Orientalis*, and not the Pope and the Westerns, had declared Honorius to be heterodox.

(b) The papal legates had certainly subscribed the decree of the Synod against Honorius, but they had no authority to do so (*ibid.* p. 220 sqq.), and it was

(c) their own step, so far that the sentence of the Synod was not confirmed by the *Pope*, not by Pope Agatho, who died before receiving the Acts of the Synod, nor yet by his successor, Pope Leo II

On the contrary, the latter abrogated the sentence of the Synod, and replaced it by another, in which Honorius is condemned, not for heresy, but on account of *negligentia* (*ibid.* pp. 235-252. (d) If Pope Hadrian II, in the passage quoted above (p. 187), maintained that Honorius had been censured by the *Orientalis* for heresy, after the *auctoritas primae sedis Pontificis* had preceded, this rests simply upon an historical error, and Hadrian was misled by the Acts of the Council.

The last point we have ourselves often maintained (p. 187), and will not now discuss whether the papal legates had authority to subscribe the sentence of Honorius. We cannot, however, agree with the principal points in Pennacchi's argument. As is clear from all that has been said, we find the letters of Honorius by no means so correct as he represents them, ^{fa143} and just as little do we hold ourselves justified in denying to the sixth Council, in its sentence on Honorius, the character of an OEcumenical Council. The opposition which, according to Pennacchi, Pope Leo. II is supposed to have made against the Synod, is not confirmed by this Pope's own letters, but contradicted. In the letter to the Emperor, in which *Leo II* confirmed the doctrine of the sixth Synod, he calls it repeatedly, "sancta et universalis et magna sexta synodus, sancta et magna synodus, sanctum sextum concilium." He then says of Honorius: "Pariterque anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, i.e. Theodorum Pharanitanum, etc., necnon *et Fonorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis*

doctrina lustravit, sad profana prodizione immaculatam fidem maculari permisit, et omnes qui in suo errore defuncti sunt. Similiter anathematizamus et abominamur imitatores eorum et complices,... i.e. Macarium, etc., quos et sancta universalis supra memorata sexta synodus abdicavit.” ^{fa144} Thus, with direct reference to the sentence against Honorius, etc., he calls the Synod (Ecumenical).

So also Pope Leo II, in his letter to the Spanish bishops, entitles the Council the *universale itaque sanctum sextum*, and informs them that the Council had condemned Theodore of Pharan, etc., *cure Honorio, qui flammam haeretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam dignitatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligende confovit*, and requests of the Spanish bishops that they will subscribe, in a translation, the *definitio venerandi concilii* (i. e. the decree of the faith of the eighteenth session, in which the anathema on Honorius is contained). ^{fa145} The same is further contained in Leo's letter to the Spanish King Ervig (see above, p. 185). He transmits therewith to the Spaniards the *definitio* of the Council and the *logov profswnhtikov*, both of which contain the anathema on Honorius, and requires the subscription of the *definitio sacrae synodi*. ^{fa146} How any one can say, on the ground of these documents, that Pope Leo II did not (in all respects) confirm the sixth OEcumenical Synod, but, on the contrary, abrogated its sentence on Honorius, is to me not intelligible; *on the contrary, it is true that Pope Leo II. estimated with greater precision the fault of Honorings, and thins gave the sense in which the sentence of the Council published against him is to be understood.* ^{fa147}

But is it then correct to say that the sixth OEcumenical Synod pronounced anathema on Honorius? Following Pighius and others, Baronius negated this question with a great expenditure of words, and some have followed him. ^{fa148}

The passages in which the sixth OEcumenical Synod pronounces anathema on Honorius, are partly such as consist of only a few words, partly longer and made up in part from several propositions. To get rid of the first of these, Baronius assumed that some words had been *erased* from the genuine minutes, and others introduced in their place. In order, however, to set aside the longer passages, he united with the first hypothesis a second, that several forged leaves had been inserted in the genuine minutes. Erasure and interpolation were assumed, and Archbishop Theodore of Constantinople wits declared to be the author of this great falsification.

If we put the scattered fragments of Baronius closely and clearly together, we get the following result: Shortly before the beginning of the sixth OEcumenical Council, Theodore of Constantinople, on account of his leaning to Monothelitism, was cast from the patriarchal chair, and George was raised to it (see p. 148). But after George's death, soon after the end of the sixth Council, Theodore succeeded in getting reinstated, after he had set forth a confession which — in appearance was orthodox. Certainly this Theodore was not passed over in silence by our Synod, but, like his *predecessors*, Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc., he was smitten with anathema. Only *three* among the later patriarchs of Constantinople, Thomas, John, and Constantine, were exempted from anathema in the thirteenth session; from which it follows that they pronounced the same upon Theodore, whom they did not exempt. But after Theodore had again become Patriarch, he naturally planned to remove his name, from the Acts of the Synod, and as he had control of the original of the Acts, ^{fa149} he was in a position to carry out his plan. He found, then, his own name anathematized along with that of Sergius in four places: in the minutes of the sixteenth and eighteenth sessions, in the **logov prosfwnhtikov**, and in the letter of the Synod to Agatho (see above, p. 183, Nos. 3-6). As there were only a few words, which testified against him, he erased these from the original, and instead of his own name inserted the name of Honorius, which was about the same size, and in the uncial writing looked very much the same, **ONWRION** instead of **QEODWRON**. He could at the same time, by this means, give satisfaction to his hatred against Rome. But the anathema on Honorius must not be allowed to fall into the Acts like a Deus ex machina. On the contrary, as foundation and introduction, a kind of examination must be inserted before it, and with this end in view Theodore invented the fiction, that, in the twelfth session, the letters of Honorius were presented for examination (read), and then the condemnation followed at the thirteenth. This fiction could best be introduced into the minutes of the eleventh session, for towards the end of this session a passage was read from a writing of Macarius, the Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, in which he declared that the departed Pope Honorius held his opinions. Against this assertion the papal legates certainly protested immediately; but Theodore struck out this protest, rewrote the Acts of the twelfth and thirteenth sessions, added his fiction to the genuine part thus treated, and then inserted the new leaves or sheets in the synodal Acts, instead of the genuine ones which he cut out.

Thus Baronius. But, apart from the synodal Acts, as we know, many other ancient documents testify of the anathema on Honorius. And these, too, must be set aside. First of all, among these are found the two edicts of confirmation, the imperial and the papal (see pp. 184 and 185). Of the former, that of the Emperor, Baronius says not a syllable; he seems not to have known it. That of Pope Leo, on the other hand, he declares spurious, and in the same way all the other letters of Leo that refer to this matter (see above, p. 185).

But the *Quinisextum* also, of A.D. 692, the seventh and the eighth OEcumenical Councils, and different Popes and other authorities, speak of the anathema on Honorius (see p. 186). Certainly, says Baronius; but Theodore practiced his deception so early, that even the first copies of the synodal Acts which were sent out from Constantinople were falsified, particularly the copy which the papal legates took back to Rome. Thus those later Synods and Popes had merely falsified Acts before them, and, not suspecting the deception, they drew from these the information respecting the anathema on Honorius.

I admit that one might believe that not Baronius, but a great master of the new *critica mordax*, must have invented this highly complicated and more than bold hypothesis, this great and heavy structure standing upon such weak feet. A series of learned men of name have already exposed its groundlessness, particularly Combefis,^{fa150} Pagi,^{fa151} Garnier,^{fa152} Natalis Alexander,^{fa153} Mamachi,^{fa154} the Ballerini,^{fa155} Joseph Simon Assemani^{fa156} Palma,^{fa157} Chmel,^{fa158} and others. On account of the importance of the subject, however, the following new examination may not be superfluous, which will make use of the material brought together by previous scholars, bring out that which is important and striking in a condensed form, point out the objections with greater exactness, and add some useful new contributions.

(1) To begin, it is suspicious that Baronius is unable to bring forward a single witness from antiquity on his side. In no single Greek MS. of the Acts of the sixth Council, in m, single ancient version, are the passages relating to Honorius lacking, and not one scholar, not one critic, not one prince of the Church, not one defender and commender of the Roman see, before Baronius and Pighius, has even dreamt that the Acts of the sixth Synod and the letters of Leo n. have all, conjointly and severally, been shamefully falsified.

(2) The foundation-stone on which Baronius builds is not merely rotten, it is only apparent; for the assertion that “the letters of Honorius are thoroughly orthodox, and therefore an anathema upon them would not be possible,” — this fundamental assumption is inadmissible, and we have already pointed out the truth of this matter (see above, p. 55).

(3) Apart from this, Baronius opines that, on the old principle. *Prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam*,^{fa159} such a condemnation, especially of a Pope who was dead, could only be the result of an extended and thorough examination. Even in the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia, it was thought necessary to hold an OEcumenical Synod (the fifth), and to have very full discussion at this, before they pronounced anathema upon him after his death. As, however, the matter is represented in the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Synod, Honorius appears to have been condemned almost *en passant*, after his letters had been read, and without careful examination of their contents. Indeed, the first anathema on him was pronounced in the thirteenth session, even before his second letter had been presented. Besides, it was not credible that the Roman legates should have concurred in the condemnation of a Pope without protest. That would certainly have rendered necessary lengthy negotiations, at least between them and the holy see, of which there is nowhere any trace. Besides this, the Synod, in the thirteenth session and in the letter to Pope Agatho, as well as the Emperor in his letter to Leo It., represented the matter as though, with the exception of Macarius, only those men had been anathematized whom Pope Agatho had designated in his letter as deserving condemnation, and among those the name of Honorius was certainly not found. On the contrary, Agatho said that his predecessors had *sempe* strengthened their brethren in the faith, and when some bishops of Constantinople had introduced the innovation, they had never failed (*nunquam neglexerunt*) to admonish them.^{fa160}

To this we answer —

(a) That the proposition *Prima sedes*, etc., which occurs in a forged synodal Act of A.D. 303, had universal prevalence in antiquity, is a statement which is greatly in need of proof. Pope Hadrian II himself allows that in the matter of heresy the higher may be judged by the lower (see p. 187); and there has actually happened, in the course of centuries, much which does not agree with that principle. How they

thought and acted in this respect at Pisa and Constance, it is not necessary to discuss.

(b) When Baronius speaks of a condemnation of Honorius *en passant*, he forgets that the public sessions, whose Acts we possess, were preceded by many preliminary discussions. The result of these appeared in the public sessions. Thus there was certainly much debate held on the subject of the decree of the faith, which seems to have been accepted at the eighteenth session without any consultation, and in consequence of this *the* formula, on which they agreed, was presented in the public session. This was the practice at many Synods, and, as is well known, at Trent.

(c) Baronius maintains that the papal legates at the sixth Synod could not possibly, without permission from Rome, have consented to the condemnation of Honorius; but it does not follow, because the synodal Acts give us no information on the point, that the legates had no authority. In fact, several scholars are of opinion that Pope Agatho had, in his private instructions to the legates, imparted to them this authority. ^{fa161} Moreover, as is well known, it has often happened that papal legates overstepped their authority, thus, e.g., in a very remarkable manner in the negotiations with Photius, A.D. 861, and in the case of the marriage of King Lothar of Lotharingia, A.D. 863, nay, only a few years before the sixth OEcumenical Council, Roman legates twice overstepped their powers, A.D. 649 and 655 (see pp. 113 and 128 f.). If, however, the legates made no attempt to ward off the anathema from Honorius, that probably was because the Greeks had also wanted to free from anathema their departed patriarchs, who were more guilty than Honorius. They certainly attempted this at the sixteenth session.

(d) Moreover, it is by no means surprising, as Baronius thinks, that the name of the deposed patriarch, Theodore of Constantinople, is not found among those anathematized by the Synod. This anathema extended *nominatim* only to the dead, and to those among the living who now still decidedly opposed the orthodox doctrine. Who can, however, assert this of Theodore, of whom we know that soon after this he was restored to the patriarchal chair, and gave in an orthodox confession of faith? The Emperor declares, in his letter to Leo II.: "Solus cum iis, quibuscum abreptus est, deficit Macarius", ^{fa162} thus only

Macarius of Antioch and his associates fell decidedly away. The names of the latter are repeatedly specified, also by Anastasius, in his *Vita Agathonis* (Mansi, t. 11 p. 168), to which Baronius willingly appeals. But Theodore's name is not found there. They were sent to Rome, and delivered to the Pope for their improvement, as the same Anastasius tells us; and again, Theodore is not there 'We may surely assume that the former patriarch of Constantinople, being higher in rank, would hardly have been included among the mere adherents of one lower in rank, the (former) patriarch of Antioch, without special mention of his name.

(4) The assumption that several leaves or sheets were inserted between the minutes of the eleventh and fourteenth sessions is thoroughly arbitrary, a mere imitation of that which happened with the Acts of the fifth OEcumenical Synod. Into these, two entirely or partially forged letters of Pope Vigilius, representing them as favorable to the Monothelites, had been inserted by later hands.^{fa163} Although so long a period as one hundred and thirty years had elapsed since Vigilius, the papal legates protested directly at the sixth Council quite energetically against these two letters, and obtained their rejection. The same would certainly have happened at the seventh OEcumenical Synod in regard to the documents regarded by Baronius as spurious; for

(a) The honor of Pope Honorius was thereby much more assailed than the memory of Vigilius by those two letters; and nevertheless the papal legates at the seventh OEcumenical Council did not raise the slightest scruple against them when the anathema on Honorius was renewed. If they had not been convinced of the historical fact, they would certainly have contested, they would have been obliged to contest, the statement, that a hundred years ago even a Pope was anathematized.

(b) In the case of Vigilius, the question was concerned with two brief letters, each with one false word, *unam operationem*, with letters written far away (at Constantinople), and yet they knew at Rome, after one hundred and thirty years, so many had elapsed between the fifth and sixth OEcumenical Synods, that these had been falsified. Now, however, the question had regard to a quite different and more significant fact, whether the Pope had been anathematized; and, in connection with this, is it possible that so soon they should have been without accurate information at Rome? Baronius supposes that the

falsification of the Acts took place soon after the close of the sixth OEcumenical Council, and that falsified Acts were even given to the Roman legates to take home with them. Certainly the oral testimony of the returned legates would immediately have brought the forgery to light; but no! the Romans believed the falsified Acts and not the legates, and good-naturedly accepted the hoax, that last year the Pope had been anathematized! What would Baronius have said if anyone had in the same way expected him to believe that Pope Leo 10 was anathematized at the Council of Trent?

(5) As it is with the insertion of Acts, so also is it with the pretended erasures. The one is as pure an invention as the other, and nowhere is there even the slightest trace of a [ro]of or testimony for it. Here, too, the oral information of the legates must have discovered the deceit.

Besides, the erasure would not have extended merely to a single word, as Baronius represents the matter, but to sentences. In the eighteenth session we have it once, *ἐπι καὶ τῶν ὄντων τῶν γενόμενον Πάπῃ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ Ῥωμῇ*; in the; other passage, *καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ὄντων τῶν τῷ Ῥωμῇ γενόμενον προέδρον, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἐν τοῖς ἀκόλουθῶσι*; and in the, edict of confirmation of the Emperor, “he anathematized the originators and patrons of the new heresy,... *ἐπι δεκα< ὄντων τῶν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ Ῥωμῇ πᾶσι γενόμενον, τὰ κατὰ< πάντα τοῖς συναίρεθιν καὶ σὺν δρόμον καὶ βεβαιωθῆ τῷ αἰτεσεῶν.*” Almost the same words are found in this letter of confirmation once more (see p. 177). here an alteration from *ΟΕΩΔΩΡΩΝ* to *ΟΝΩΡΙΩΝ* was by no means sufficient.

(6) In the interest of his hypothesis, Baronius makes the falsifier Theodore to be restored to the chair of Constantinople about a year earlier than this actually took place (682 instead of 683), ^{fa164} so that he may have time to exercise his act of erasure and interpolation before the departure of the papal legates. If this chronology is incorrect, and it is so according to the testimony of the Chronography of Theophanes (*ad ann. 676, secundum Alexandrinos*), which relates that the Patriarch George lived after the sixth OEcumenical Synod, even into the third year, and so into the year 683, then the hypothesis of Baronius falls of itself. The papal legates returned to Rome with the Acts of the Council in the year 682, *before* the restoration of Theodore. But even if the chronology of Baronius were true, the *oral* testimony of the legates

would have brought the falsification to light. Yes, even if the legates had all been faithless, and had helped the deception, information as to the truth would have found its way into the world by the many other members of the Synod, Greeks and Latins. Or if they all, about two hundred, and also the excellent Emperor, had unanimously agreed to the deception, that would not have availed them! Even if the truth had found nothing but enemies, and the falsifier nothing but friends and helpers of helpers, not only in all Asiatics, Egyptians, Greeks, etc., but even in the Latins present! Combefis, moreover (*l. c.* p. 145), attaches importance to this, that even before the multiplication of the whole contents of the Acts of the sixth Synod, five copies of its decree of the faith were signed in the presence of the bishops by the Emperor, and were sent to the five patriarchs (see above, p. 177). These copies, however, were older than the restoration of Theodore, and yet there is found in them the anathema on Honorius. ^{fa165}

(7) Baronius was not acquainted with the [επι λογον](#) of the Constantinopolitan notary and deacon Agatho, first published by Combefis (see p. 177, note 2). This official declares that, about thirty-two years before, he had served the sixth OEcumenical Synod as secretary, and had written the minutes and the five copies of the decree of the faith intended for the five patriarchs. He is now urged to draw up this paper by the rage with which the new Emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, persecuted orthodoxy and the sixth OEcumenical Synod. He had also ordered that the names of Sergius and *Honorius*, and the others *anathematized* by the *sixth OEcumenical Synod* ([και των λοιπων συναυτοιων υπο των αυτων αγιων και οικουμενικων συνόδου εκβληθεντων και αναθεματισθεντων](#)), should be restored to the diptychs. ^{fa166} This notary who drew up the minutes of the sixth OEcumenical Synod must have known whether the Synod anathematized Honorius or not. His book was composed long after the death of Theodore, and so was certainly not falsified by him.

(8) A principal evidence against the theory of Baronius is given 'by the letters of Leo II. He was obliged, therefore, to declare them to be falsified, piling up chance upon chance, castle in the air upon castle in the air. Why he also objected to the letter of the Emperor against Leo ^{fa167} is not quite clear. There is nothing said there of Honorius, and it could embarrass him only so far as the letter of Leo to the Emperor, which he was positively obliged to set aside, is an answer to it. Against

the letter of Leo to the Emperor, however, the passage in which testifying against Honorius we gave above (p. 179), Baronius (683, 13-17) brings two objections:

(a) In a Latin translation from the Greek text of the letter there is added at the end the chronological note: *Datum Nonis Maii indictione 10* (= May 7, 682). In the letter itself, however, it is said that the papal legates who were at the Synod had come back in July 682 to Rome. This is plain contradiction, and therefore the letter is spurious. But it is more probable that there is a slip of the pen in that chronological note, and that Indict. 11 should be read instead of 10; indeed, it were better to pay no attention to it, as it stands only in one translation.

(b) In the same letter it is twice said: “We anathematize Honorius, etc., and all who died in their error.” This, exclaims Baronius, is clearly a mark of falsification, for that Honorius did not die in heresy is proved by the solemn celebration of his funeral in Rome. But Honorius died before the final decision on the theological controversy was arrived at: he died as legitimate Pope, accused of heresy by no one; on the contrary, justified and commended by his contemporaries, especially in Rome (see pp. 52-60).

(9) Against the *Epistola Leonis n. ad Hispanos* (see p. 185), Baronius remarks (638, 18): The Pope says therein: “*Archiepiscopi sunt a nobis destinati*,” in order to be present at the sixth OEcumenical Synod. As a matter of fact, however, it was Agatho, and not Leo, who sent the legates, and among these there was no archbishop. We answer:

(a) *Nobis* is not to be translated, “I in my person,” but, We = *the Roman sec.* Quite in this manner does Gregory II write to the Emperor Leo the Isaurian: “The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus wrote to us on the holding of the sixth Synod.”^{fa168}

(b) It is incorrect to say that no archbishop was present as deputy of the Pope and of the West at the sixth Synod. Among the legates proper there was certainly none such, but besides them Archbishop John of Thessalonica and Stephen of Corinth subscribed the Acts, the former as *bikariov* and *I hgatariov*, the latter as *I hgato tou apostol ikou-grouou Bwμhv*; and Archbishop Basil of Gortyna in Crete subscribed as *I hgaton thv agiav sunodou tou apostol ikou-grouou thv*

presbuterav Bwmhv. ^{fa169} All these three bishops belonged to *Illyricum Orientale*, thus to the patriarchate of Rome, and therefore to the Roman Synod (until Leo the Isaurian), and if they did not *personally* appear at the Roman Synod of 680, which preceded the sixth OEcumenical Council and appointed legates for it, yet they might have received authority either from this Synod or from the Pope *in specie*. In the case of Basil of Gortyna, the former seems to have been the case, hence his subscription, **I hgaton thv sunodou**, the latter with the two others, particularly as, without this, they were permanent vicars of the Pope, the archbishop of Thessalonica a long time back for Illyricum, the archbishop of Corinth for Hellas and Achaia, since the Emperor Justinian I had separated those provinces from Illyricum. ^{fa170} The statement objected to is now freed from all fault, if we will only read: “*Archiepiscopi et episcopi*.” If we do not, we may either hold that *archi* is an addition of the *librarius*, or assume that the title of archbishop is not used here in the sense of metropolitan, but in the wider meaning, and one which at an early period was very common, of a *specially venerable bishop*. To this day there is a clear distinction in the Greek Church between archbishop and metropolitan. The former is only a title of honor.

Baronius further (693, 22) throws suspicion upon the letter of Leo *ad Hispanos*, for this reason, that in it is said that the Pope temporarily sent to the Spaniards only some passages of the Acts of the sixth Council, the decree of the faith, the **logov profwnhtikov**, and the Emperor’s edict of confirmation. The rest was not yet translated into Latin. The fourteenth Synod of Toledo, however, says distinctly ‘The Pope sent a transcript of the gesta *synodalia*. — But might not the three principal documents of the sixth OEcumenical Council be named the gesta *synodalia*? There is nothing said of “*integra gesta*,” although Baronius represents the matter as though the Synod of Toledo had used that expression. ^{fa171}

(10) Finally, the letter of Leo I to the Spanish Ervig is declared to be spurious by Baronius (*ad ann.* 683, 20, 21), because it asserts that the Emperor wrote in Indiction 9 to Pope Agatho respecting the summoning of the sixth OEcumenical Synod. It was not to Agatho, but to his predecessor Donus that the imperial letter was addressed, and it belonged, not to the 9th, but to the 6th Indiction. — This objection has already been answered by Combefis and Pagi (a) The chronological error is easily explained by a slip of the pen; (b) the naming of Agatho,

however, instead of Donus is only a so-called *compendium historicum*, since Donus was no longer alive when the imperial letter was dispatched, so that it was delivered to Agatho, and by him answered.
fa172

(11) Assemani is surprised fa173 that Baronius has not brought in a striking utterance of Pope Nicolas I in defense of his hypothesis. Nicolas writes, in his eighth letter to the Emperor Michael III of Constantinople: “His (the Emperor’s) predecessors had for a long time been sick with the poison of different heresies, and in regard to those who wanted to bring them deliverance, they had *either made them participators in their error, as at the time of Pope Conon, or had persecuted them.*” fa174

The allusion here made by Pope Nicolas, Assemani supposes, must have been to the Synod of Constantinople held by Justinian II., in the year 686, at which Justinian, in the presence of the papal representative and many patriarchs and archbishops, etc., had the original minutes of the sixth OEcumenical Synod read, and sealed by them. fa175 On this occasion, Assemani supposes, a deception might well have been practiced, as Baronius assumes. — But Baronius saw quite correctly, when he did not use this as favoring his hypothesis; for a falsification of the Acts in the year 686 was for him about *four* years too late. He would then have had to allow that the genuine Acts had come to Rome before, even four years before, — that is, he would have annihilated his own hypothesis.

(12) What has so far been said in opposition to Baronius is also partially valid against Boucaut, fa176 who felt compelled to introduce a modification into the hypothesis of Baronius. After the eleventh session, he supposes, the Synod ceased to be a *legitimae*, and therefore the condemnation of Honorius did not result from the sentence of a valid OEcumenical Synod. In proof he adduces these facts:

(a) After the eleventh session the papal legates left; and

(b) after the end of the eleventh session, one of the papal legates, Bishop John of Portus, in the presence of the Emperor, etc., celebrated in the Church of S. Sophia a solemn Mass, according to the Latin rite, in thanksgiving for the happy ending of the Synod.

Both assertions are entirely groundless; for

(a) it is a fact, and a glance at the synodal Acts show, that the papal legates were also present at the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, in short, at all the eighteen sessions until the close of the Synod, and at the last subscribed the Acts;

(b) what Boucaut says of the high celebration of the papal legate John, he borrowed from the *Vitae Pontificum* of Anastasius; ^{fa177}

but here it is expressly said that the solemn service was celebrated at the Easter festival, and thus, not after the eleventh, but after the fourteenth session. ^{fa178} That it was supposed to be a service of thanksgiving for the happy ending of the Synod — of this Anastasius knows not a syllable; but he certainly says: In order to do honor to the Roman legates, one of them was permitted to celebrate the Easter festival divine service.

(13) More recently, Damberger has suggested a way of his own, yet one which in its chief principle is akin to that of Baronius, in his synchronistic history of the Middle Ages (Bd. 2 S. 119 ff.). The first half of the synodal Acts, he says, which are fairly (!) beyond suspicion, extends only to the ninth session *inclusive*. The Acts of the later sessions have been falsified. The Greeks could not bear that a number of patriarchs of proud Constantinople should be anathematized, and therefore in order, so to speak, to restore the equilibrium, *plainly without the knowledge of the papal legates* (!), inserted the name of Honorius into the anathematizms of the Acts. As the Acts now lie before us, they show, onwards from the tenth session, everywhere “the cunning of the Byzantine spirit of falsehood,” and Damberger “is *astonished* that Western Church writers, and not mere compilers of compendia but genuine investigators, accepted the Acts in question as genuine.” Only Gallicans, he thinks, have contended for the genuineness of this “Greek chaos of Acts,” because they could nowhere else find proof for the superiority of an OEcumenical Council over the Pope. ^{fa179} In the further development of his view, Damberger departs very widely from Baronius, maintaining that

(a) the genuine Acts of the sixth Synod were certainly sent to Rome, but the present Acts are a falsified extract from the genuine;

(b) the seventh and eighth Synods, and the Popes Leo II and Hadrian II, had certainly lauded the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council, i.e.

the genuine Acts which lay before them; of this, however, that the sixth OEcumenical Synod had pronounced anathema on Honorius, nothing was known to them;

(c) indeed, this was never mentioned until Michael Cerularius renewed the schism in the eleventh century;

(d) the genuine Acts have been lost in Rome; but Leo n. and Hadrian II still possessed them.

We have now a series of surprises. — The seventh and eighth OEcumenical Synods knew nothing of the anathema on Honorius! But in the decree of the faith of the seventh Synod, it is said: “We therefore declare two wills and energies according with the properties of the natures in Christ, as also the sixth Synod in Constantinople taught, *anathematizing* Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, etc.” (*apokhruxasa Sergion, Onwision, Kufon, k.t.l.*).^{fa180} And the eighth OEcumenical Synod says: “*Sanctam et universalem sextam synodum suscipientes...anathematizamus...Theodorum, qui fuit episcopus Pharan, et Pyrrhum, et Sergium,...atque cum eis hronorium Romae, una cum Cyro Alexandrino, etc.*”^{fa181}

Whether Pope Leo II and Hadrian II knew anything or nothing of the anathema on Honorius, everyone can answer who has read their utterances (pp. 180-185). They speak in the most forcible manner of the anathematizing of Honorius, and lived several hundred years before Michael Cerularius. If Damberger finally asserts that Leo II and Hadrian II had before their eyes the genuine Acts of the sixth Council, Baronius will never forgive him, for everything in the past has taught us that, if Leo II and Hadrian II possessed the genuine Acts of the sixth Synod, then not the slightest doubt can be raised as to the anathema on Honorius.

BOOK 17.

*The Time From The End Of The Sixth Oecumenical Council, To
The Beginning Of The Dispute Respecting Images.*

SEC. 325. THE SYNODS BETWEEN A.D. 680 AND 692.

AS we, know, shortly before the opening of the sixth OEcumenical Council, a Roman Synod, in October 679, had decided in favor of S. Wilfrid, the banished archbishop [bishop?] of York, and Pope Agatho had sent envoys to England in order to bring about the reinstatement of Wilfrid and the pronouncing of anathema on Monothelitism at an English general Synod (vol. 4 p. 492). In order to respond at least to a part of the papal request, as far as it concerned Monothelitism, Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury held the Synod of Heathfield, already mentioned (p. 140); but he remained, as before, prepossessed against Wilfrid, and when he, after being present at the Roman Synod at Easter 680 (p. 140 f.), returned home, Theodore did so little for him, that, on the contrary, King Egfrid of Northumbria was able, unhindered, to assemble the grandees and prelates of his kingdom in a kind of Synod, A.D. 680 or 681, and to condemn Wilfrid to a hard imprisonment.^{fa182} He remained nine months in prison, until, at the intercession of the Abbess Ebba, a relation of the King, he was set free on the condition that he would not enter Northumbria. He now became the apostle of the still heathen inhabitants of Sussex, and after King Egfrid's death (685), and after Archbishop Theodore had, in a remarkable manner, become reconciled to him, he became, under King Alfrid of Northumbria, reinstated in his property, his monasteries, and bishoprics — Hexham, Lindisfarne, and York. That he soon became involved in new disputes, we shall find out later on.

When we last encountered (A.D. 675) one of the numerous Synods of Toledo, the eleventh, the great King Wamba sat upon the Spanish throne, and Archbishop Quiricius upon the metropolitan throne of Toledo. The year 680 brought great changes. The archbishop died in January and S. Julian became his successor, and King Wamba resigned. One of his palatines, Count Ervig, a very able man but extremely ambitious, made an effort to reach the throne, and brought to the old King, October 14, 680, a bad draught, to deprive him, not of life, but of reason. Wamba immediately

fell into a state of stupefaction, and, after the fashion of the time, they cut his hair off, as from a dying man, in order to remove him into the order of penitents (vol. 4 p. 79). By means of powerful restoratives, Wamba, after twenty-four hours, came back to his senses, but voluntarily remained among the penitents, retired into the monastery at Pampliega, and, not suspecting Ervig's guilt, recommended him as his successor. The grandees agreed, and Archbishop Julian anointed the new King, October 22, 680. To secure himself in the possession of the throne, as what he had done had partly got abroad, Ervig convoked the bishops and grandees of the kingdom to a national Synod, the twelfth of Toledo. It lasted from January 9 to 25, 681, and there were present, in the Church of SS. Peter and Paul, — under the presidency of Julian of Toledo, 35 bishops and archbishops, 4 abbots, 3 representatives of absent bishops, and 14 secular *viri illustres officii palatini*. The King opened the assembly in his own person with a short speech, in which he thanked the bishops for their presence, and requested them to find out remedies for the evils of the times. After he had withdrawn, by his command a lengthy royal address, a tome, was read to the Synod. In this the bishops were requested to establish good ordinances in general, but specially to examine two laws:

(a) the new law in reference to the Jews by King Ervig; and

(b) the older law of Wamba, that all (noble men) who withdrew from service in war, or deserted (in Wamba's war against his General Paul in Navarre, who had rebelled), should be declared civilly degraded.

As by this means nearly half of all the Spaniards, says the tome, are affected and incapacitated from bearing witness and the like, the bishops were requested to consider whether an alteration of this law was not necessary. Generally, they were required to examine and improve all the laws of the State, and the *rectores provinciarum* and *duces Hispaniae* then present should introduce in their provinces the improvements recognized by the Synod. ^{fa183}

(1) In the first of their 13 Capitula the Synod declared, first of all, their agreement with the faith of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and recited the Creed which, as they remarked, is also used in the Mass (the Niceno-Constantinopolitan with the *filioque*). It is the same which the eighth Synod of Toledo also placed at the head of their decrees (vol. 4 p. 470). Moreover, in this

chapter the elevation of King Ervig was confirmed and all the people required to be loyal to him, after the Synod had seen the original documents, in which the grandees of the kingdom testified that King Wamba had received the sacred tonsure, and had himself, with his own hand, selected Ervig as his successor, and requested Archbishop Julian to anoint him. The subsequent chapters run as follows:

(2) It has often happened that those who in health have desired the fruits of penitence have become so sick that they could no longer speak, and have lost their senses. Out of compassion, those belonging to them then took the vow in their stead (*fraternitas talium necessitates in fide sua suscepit*), so that they might be able to receive the viaticum. When, however, they recover their health, they defend themselves against the act of their friends, so as to make themselves free again from the tonsure and from the religious habit, asserting that they were not bound by that vow, because they had not themselves asked for penance and had not received it knowingly. They ought, however, to consider that they did not ask for baptism, nor did they receive it knowingly, but only *in fide proximorum* (i. e. since those belonging to them made the promise for them). As, then, their baptism is valid, so also is the *donum poenitentiae* (cf. cc. 7 and 8 of the Synod of Toledo, vol. 4 p. 471). Whoever, then, has received penitence in any way may no more return *ad militare cingulum* (said with reference to King Wamba, in case he should regret what had been done). The cleric, however, who gives penance to anyone who is not in his senses, or unless, at least, he has requested penance by clear signs, is excommunicated for one year.

(3) In accordance with the ancient canons, the right to pardon civil offenders stands only with the King. Whoever, then, is pardoned by the King shall be received back into Church communion.

(4) Archbishop Stephen of Merida complains that King Wamba compelled him to raise the monastery of Aquis, where the body of S. Pimenius reposes, to be a bishopric. The bishops declare that Wamba (of whom they use strong language) had allowed several similar acts of violence, and they resolve, with reference to older canons, that the new bishopric shall fall into disuse, and that Aquis shall remain a monastery. The Bishop Cuniuldus of Aquis, who was uncanonically elevated, shall not, however, be punished, because he did not seek the bishopric, but

only accepted it from obedience to the King. In requital, another vacant bishopric shall be given him.

(5) Some priests, when they offer the sacrifice (of the Mass) several times in one day, receive the holy communion only at the last celebration. This must no longer take place, under penalty of excommunication for a year for every omitted communion; and as often as a priest offers the sacrifice he must receive. (On the saying of several Masses in one day, cf. Binterim, *Denkwurd.* Bd. 4 Thl. in. S. 261.)

(6) If a bishop dies, the see often remains vacant for a very long time, until the King hears of the death, and the other bishops can give their assent to the new election made by the King. Therefore, in future, the archbishop of Toledo, saving the rights of the other metropolitans, may place in his see (ordain) any bishop newly named by the King, to whatever ecclesiastical province he may belong, if he holds it to be necessary.^{fa184} The bishop ordained must, however, present himself before his own metropolitan within three months, under penalty of excommunication, in order to receive instructions from him. The like applies also in regard to the other rectors of churches.

(7) The too severe law of Wamba in regard to those who avoid service in the army shall, with consent of the King, be softened, so that those who have thereby lost the qualification of being able to testify, in case they have offended in nothing else, may again become capable of testifying.

(8) Whoever separates from his wife, except for the cause of fornication, will be excommunicated until he returns to her. If he does not do so after repeated admonition from the bishop, he shall lose his dignity of palatine and noble so long as he remains in his fault.

(9) The twenty laws put forth by King Ervig against the Jews (received into the *Leges Wisigoth.* tit. 12, 3) are approved, and shall henceforth have validity forever, namely,

(a) The law in regard to the renewal of the old laws against the Jews;

(b) The law against the blasphemers of the Trinity;

(c) That the Jews shall withdraw neither themselves nor their sons and servants from baptism;

- (d) That they shall not celebrate the Passover after their manner, practice circumcision, or dare to alienate a Christian from the faith;
- (e) That they may not celebrate their Sabbaths and feasts;
- (f) They must abstain from work on Sundays;
- (g) They must make no difference between meats;
- (h) nor marry relations;
- (i) nor attack our religion, nor defend their sects, nor go abroad that they may be able to apostatize again;
- (k) That no Christian may receive from a Jew a gift that is injurious to the faith;
- (l) That no Jew may read the books which are rejected by the Christian faith;
- (m) nor have any Christian slaves; further,
- (n) The law relating to the case that a Jew gives himself out for a Christian, and therefore will not emancipate the Christian slave;
- (o) The law relating to the confession of faith of converted Jews, and the oath which they have to take;
- (p) The law relating to those Christians who are slaves of Jews, and do not confess themselves as Christians;
- (q) That no Jew, unless he have authority from the King, may rule or punish a Christian;
- (r) That slaves of Jews, if they become Christians, shall be free;
- (s) That no Jew may rule as *villicus* or *actor* (steward) over a Christian family (of servants);
- (t) That every Jew who comes into the kingdom must present himself immediately before the bishop or priest of his locality, and that the bishop shall call the Jews before him on appointed days, and so forth.

(10) With assent of the King, the right of asylum in churches is renewed, and thirty steps before the gates of the church declared to belong to the place of asylum.

(11) The relics of heathenism shall be rooted out. Servants who still addict themselves to idolatrous worship shall be beaten and placed in irons. If their masters do not punish them, these shall be excommunicated. If a freeman practices idolatry, he must be punished with excommunication and severe banishment.

(12) In every province the bishops shall annually assemble, on the 1st of November, in a provincial Synod.

(13) These decrees shall for ever remain in force. May God the Lord, to whom be honor, and who inspired the Synod, grant to the King a happy reign!

King Ervig confirmed and subscribed the Acts of the Synod on January 25, the closing day of the assembly, with the remark, that all their decrees, from that day onwards, should come in force. ^{fa185}

The biographer of S. Ansbert, archbishop of Rouen, the monk Aigrad assigns to the year 682 a Synod held at Rouen (*Rothomagensis*), under the presidency of the said archbishop, which drew up many beneficial decrees, and accorded to the monastery of Fontenelle a privilege with regard to the free election of its abbot. Nothing is known more exactly on the subject; and moreover, the date of this assembly is very doubtful. Sirmond assumed the date of 682, which certainly is only interpolated in the old biography of Aigrad; Labbe, on the other hand, decided for 692; Mabillon, for 689; Bessin, the editor of the provincial Synods of Rouen, wavered between 689 and 693. ^{fa186}

Still less do we know of a Synod at Arles, which Mansi, reckoning from probability, ascribed to the year 682. ^{fa187}

At the invitation of King Ervig of Spain, already mentioned, a great special national Synod, the thirteenth of Toledo, was opened on November 4, 683, again in the Church of SS. Peter and Paul. Like the twelfth, this was also a *concilium mixture*, Synod and Parliament (Diet) at once. Under the presidency of Julian of Toledo, there were present 48 bishops and archbishops from the provinces of Toledo, Braga, Merida, Seville, Tarragona, and Narbonne, 27 representatives of bishops, several abbots,

and 26 secular grandees. Again the King began with a short address, and then presented to the Synod a tome, in which the points were indicated which he wished to be handled. In particular, he laid before the Synod, for its advice, several sketches of laws respecting matters of State. The Synod, first of all, again recited the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Symbol, and then drew up the following thirteen *Capitulos*: —

(1) In regard to those who, under King Wamba, attached themselves to the rebellion of General Paul (p. 208), and therefore were punished with loss of position and confiscation of goods, the Synod decrees, in agreement with King Ervig, the restitution of them and their children. Also, the goods of which the royal exchequer took possession shall be restored to them, with the exception of those which the King has already presented to others. The same avails for those declared to be degraded under King Chintila.

(2) In agreement with the King, it is ordained that no palatine and no cleric shall be deprived of his office, chained, flogged, or deprived of his goods and thrown into prison, as has often happened hitherto, by an arbitrary act of the King. On the contrary, he must be placed before the assembly of bishops, seniors, and guardians (belonging to the highest officials of the palace; see Du Cange, *Gloss.*, s.v.), and be judged by these. Also, the other nobles, who have not the dignity of palatine, are to be judged in a similar manner; and even if the King, as is the custom, strikes them, they shall not for that reason be deprived either of honor or of goods. If in future a King violates this decree, he becomes liable to excommunication.

(3) The Synod confirms the royal edict by which the taxes long due to the State, up to the first year of the reign of Ervig, are remitted. (The royal decree referred to is given as an appendix to the synodal Acts.)

(4) On the second day the Synod confirmed the edict of Ervig for the safety of his own family; and decreed: Eternal anathema shall strike him who shall persecute, rob, strike, injure, or forcibly remove into the state of penance, the sons of the King, the Queen, or any one belonging to the royal house.

(5) No one, not even a King, may marry the widow of the departed King, or have intercourse with her, under penalty of exclusion from all communion with Christians and eternal damnation; for the Queen, who

was mistress, shall not serve the desire of one of her subjects; and as wife and husband are one body, the body of the dead King must not be defiled in his widow.

(6) As it previously happened that slaves and freedmen were raised to the office of palatine, through favor of the King, and then persecuted their former masters, such elevation may not take place in the future. Only the slaves or freemen belonging to the exchequer may henceforth be promoted to such offices (because they previously had no other master than the King, and were not in the position of private servants).

(7) Some clergy have a mind to revenge themselves on those who oppose or injure them by stopping divine service, stripping the altars, extinguishing the lights. This (and so an interdict) is henceforth forbidden, under penalty of degradation and deposition. Only one who does so (stops divine service) from fear of the desecration of the sanctuary, or on account of hostile attacks or siege, or because in his conscience he knows himself to be unworthy to celebrate divine service, is free from such penalty.

(8) If a bishop is summoned by the metropolitan or King, whether to the celebration of a festival, as Easter, Pentecost, or Christmas, or for the transaction of business, or for the ordination of a new bishop, etc., and does not appear on the appointed day, he will be excluded from the communion of those whom he neglected (King or metropolitan). If he was sick or the roads impassable, he must prove this by witnesses.

(9) The decrees of the twelfth Synod of Toledo are confirmed anew, particularly also that *de Concessa Toletano pontifici generalis synodi potestate, ut episcopi alterius provinciae cum conniventia principum in urbe regia ordinentur* (see above, p. 209).

(10) On the third day it was decreed: If a bishop or priest has, in a sickness, entered the state of penitents, but in so doing has known himself guilty of no *crimen mortale*, he shall, after recovering again, return to the priestly office, after he has received, through the metropolitan, the usual reconciliation of penitents.

(11) If any one receives a foreign or escaped cleric or monk, *remotum se a suis officiis noverit esse* (i. e. he falls under the *suspensio latae sententiae*. Cf. Kober, *Die Suspension*, 1862, S. 48 f.).

(12) If any one takes proceedings against his own bishop, he *may* appeal to the metropolitan. A bishop, however, who thinks himself aggrieved by his metropolitan, may bring his cause before a strange metropolitan. If two strange metropolitans have refused him a hearing, he may appeal to the King.

(13) These decrees shall remain permanently in force. Honor to God. Thanks to the King.

All present subscribed the minutes, and the King confirmed the Synod in a document of Nov. 13, 683. ^{fa188}

Pope Leo II died, after reigning not quite a year, on July 3, 683, and his successor, Benedict II, immediately instructed the notary Peter to require the Spanish bishops, as Leo II had recommended, to recognize and subscribe the decrees of the sixth OEcumenical Council. As we saw above (pp. 185, 201), it is possible that the letter which is generally ascribed to Leo II may belong to Pope Benedict. King Ervig did not, remain inactive. It was not, indeed, possible to convoke a Spanish general Synod, as Ervig wished; but he requested the particular metropolitans to respond to the wish of the Pope at provincial Synods. The ecclesiastical province of Toledo (here called Carthaginian; see vol. 4 sec. 239) was commanded to take the lead, the other provinces were to accept the decrees of Toledo, and for this reason every metropolitan had to send a vicar to the Synod of Toledo. This was done, and the fourteenth Synod of Toledo assembled in November 684. There were present seventeen bishops of the province of Toledo (Archbishop Julian at their head), six abbots, and the vicars of the metropolitans of Tarragona, Narbonne, Merida, Braga, and Seville, also representatives of two absent suffragans of Toledo.

(1) In the first Capitulum the bishops mention the convocation of this Synod by King Ervig, *ob confutandum Apollinaris dogma pestiferum* (thus they describe Monothelitism).

(2) That Pope Leo had sent them a transcript of the *gesta synodalia* of the Council of Constantinople (the sixth (Ecumenical) with a letter, and had requested their recognition of these *gesta*. ^{fa189}

(3) That the documents sent from Rome had reached them, when they had ended a general Synod (the thirteenth). This and the bad weather had rendered an early new general Synod impracticable. But they had,

in separate assemblies, read those documents, and had approved the doctrine contained in them of two wills and operations in Christ.

(4) That a Spanish general Synod should have examined and adopted these *gesta synodalia*.

(5) As, however, such a Synod was not possible, another way had been chosen; and first, the bishops of the Carthaginian (Toledan) province, in presence of the vicars of the other metropolitans, had compared those *gesta* with the decrees of the earlier Councils, and found them fully, and almost literally in agreement with the faith of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.

(6, 7) The Acts of the new Council were therefore, in so far as they agree with the old Synods, honored by them, and the new Synod placed in order after that of Chalcedon (the fifth OEcumenical Synod was not at that time fully recognized by the Spaniards: see vol. 4 p. 365).

(8-11) The bishops exhort their flocks immediately to acknowledge in simplicity the true faith in regard to the natures and wills in Christ, which they present in brief, *neque enim quae sunt divina, discutienda sunt, sed credenda*.

(12) Glory be to God. God save the King! ^{fa190}

To the same year, 684, belongs another Irish Council, of which we merely know *that* (but not *why*) it was held, and an English at Twyford, under the presidency of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury. At the latter, Bishop Trumbert of Hexham was deposed, for reasons not known to us, and the pious hermit, Cuthbert of Farne, who long resisted, was raised to be his successor. At a French [Frankish?] Council at Villeroi (Villa Regia), in the year 684 or 685 (according to others, 678), several bishops were deposed through the violence of the Major Domus Ebroin. S. Leodegar (Leger) of Autun did not dare to appear at the assembly, but was separated by King Theoderic, tried, and condemned to death. ^{fa191}

An old authority in Galanus gives a short notice of an Armenian Conciliabulum at Manaschierte which sanctioned monophysitism, about the year 687. ^{fa192}

In the year 687 died King Ervig of Spain, and on his deathbed designated as his successor his daughter's husband Egiza, a nephew of Wamba. The palatines consented, and Egiza was solemnly anointed by Archbishop Julian on November 20, 687. He convoked the fifteenth Synod of Toledo, a Spanish general Council, at which sixty-one bishops, several abbots and representatives of bishops, also seventeen secular grandes, were present. The assembly, presided over by Julian of Toledo, was celebrated in the principal Church of SS. Peter and Paul, and began on May 11, 688. King Egiza opened it in his own person, spoke a few friendly words, and presented a tome, and then departed. This tome represented to the Synod that the King had taken two oaths, which, he feared, could not be kept together. First, he had sworn to his predecessor Ervig, when he gave him his daughter Cixlona to wife, in all things to protect the sons of Ervig. But a second oath Ervig had exacted from him on his deathbed, namely, to be just towards every one. But the case might arise that he, in order to be just to every one, might have to decide here and there against Ervig's sons. On this subject, and also on other points, the Synod was requested to give its advice.

After the reading of the tome, the Synod again recited the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, and then passed on to some doctrinal points. In order to declare their agreement with the orthodox doctrine of the sixth OEcumenical Council, the Spanish bishops had, two years before, sent to Rome a memorial drawn up by Archbishop Julian of Toledo (*Liber Responsionis fidei nostrae*, also entitled *Apologia*, now lost). It consisted of four chapters, and Pope Benedict II, who thought he discovered some objectionable expressions in it, requested an alteration of the passages in question. The Spaniards, however, showed so little inclination to respond to this wish, that, on the contrary, they defended the inculcated expression in a manner by no means courteous. In the first chapter of their memorial, the Pope had found fault with the words: *Voluntas genuit voluntatem* They now say, he had read it too hastily, and had had too much in view the analogy of man. In the case of a man, certainly, we could not say, The will begets the will, but The will goes forth *ex mente*. With God, however, it is otherwise, as His will and thought, etc., are one. Athanasius and Augustine too had similarly expressed themselves.

In the second chapter of their apology, they had spoken of three substances in Christ, and the Pope had found fault with this. Evidently he was wrong, they said. Every man consisted of two substances, body and soul; but in

Christ there was a third substance, the divine nature. Here, too, the Fathers and the Holy Scriptures also were on their side. Finally, they said, they had taken the third and fourth chapters almost literally from Ambrose and Fulgentius; and these Fathers no one would find fault with. If anyone should not be in accord with their doctrine, taken from the Fathers, they would have no dispute with him: their answer could displease only ignorant rivals.

The Synod then gave their judgment in regard to the two oaths, that in cases of collision the second should take precedence of the first. As, however, Egiza wished information respecting a third oath which Ervig had required from the whole people for the securing of his sons, the Synod examined also this subject, and found nothing in it which was doubtful or unrighteous. ^{fa193} Archbishop Julian now drew up a second apology, in order to remove all the doubts of the Romans with respect to the orthodoxy of Spain, and sent it to Rome, when Pope Sergius (687-701) declared himself in full agreement with it. Soon afterwards, A.D. 690, S. Julian died, and the former Abbot Sisebert became archbishop of Toledo. ^{fa194}

On November 1, 691, at the command of King Egiza, the bishops of the Spanish ecclesiastical province of Tarragona assembled in a provincial Synod at Saragossa (*Caesaraugustana* III), and decreed:

- (1) The old law, that churches, like clerics, may be consecrated only on Sundays, remains in force.
- (2) So also the law that bishops residing near at hand shall at Easter have recourse to their primate (metropolitan), and celebrate the festival in common with him.
- (3) Secular persons may not be received in monasteries as guests, except in houses specially destined for that purpose.
- (4) If a bishop has emancipated slaves belonging to the Church, they must, after his death, present their letters of emancipation to his successor.
- (5) The ordinance of the thirteenth Synod of Toledo in regard to widowed queens not only remains in force, but is extended to this: that every widowed queen shall, immediately after the death of her husband, put off her secular habit, and put on the religious, and enter a

monastery; for it is intolerable, what often happens, that former queens should be insulted, persecuted, and badly treated. ^{fa195}

SEC. 326. EXAMINATION OF THE ACTS OF THE SIXTH OECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

In the year 685 died the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, and was succeeded by his son, Justinian II, who, in the second year of his reign (687), convoked a great assembly of clerics and laymen, in order to protect the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council from falsification. We learn this from his letter to Pope John V. in reference to this subject, which certainly is extant only in a bad and in many parts scarcely intelligible Latin translation. Pope John V. had himself, as Roman deacon and legate, been present at the sixth Synod; ^{fa196} but now, when the Emperor wrote to him, he was already dead, but the news of this had not reached Constantinople. The Emperor's letter was received by his successor, Pope Conon. The Emperor says: "Cognitum est nobis quia synodalia gesta eorumque definitionem, quam et instituere noscitur sanctum sextum concilium...apud quosdam nostros iudices remiserunt. Neque enim omnino praevidimus, alterum aliquem apud se detinere ea, sine nostra piissima serenitate, eo quod nos copiosa misericordia noster Deus custodes constituit ejusdem immaculae Christianorum fidei." This means: "I have learnt that the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Synod have been sent back by some to the *Judices* who had lent them to them. I did not, indeed, foresee that anyone would venture to have these Acts without my permission; for God, in His abundant mercy, has appointed me to be the keeper of the unfalsified faith of Christ." ^{fa197} The Emperor proceeds to say that he has now convoked the patriarchs, the papal deputy, the archbishops and bishops, and many officials of State and officers of the army, in order to have the Acts of the sixth Synod read to them and have them sealed by them. He had then taken them out of their hands, in order to prevent all falsification, and he was desirous, by God's assist-ante, to carry the matter through. He communicated this to the, Pope for his information. ^{fa198} This matter is also mentioned in the *Vita Cononis Papae* (in Mansi, t. 11 p. 1098), with the words: "Hic (Conon) suscepit divalem jussionem (*l. c.* an imperial decree) domni Justiniani principis, per quem significat *reperisse* acta sanctae sextae synodi, et apud se habere." The Acts (certainly the originals) had thus been previously imparted to others, but now had come again into the hands of the Emperor.

SEC. 327. THE QUINISEXT OR TRULLAN SYNOD, A.D. 692.

A little later, the Emperor Justinian II summoned the Synod which is known under the name of the Quinisext.^{fa199} It was, like the last ecumenical Synod, held in the Trullan hall of the imperial palace in Constantinople, and therefore is also called the second Trullan, often merely the Trullan *kat jejochn*. The name *Quinisexta*, however, or *penqekth*, it received for the reason that it was intended to be a completion of the fifth and sixth OEcumenical Synods. Both of these had drawn up only dogmatic decrees, and had published no disciplinary canons; and therefore these must now be added to them, and the complementary Synod, summoned for that purpose, should also be called OEcumenical, and should be regarded and honored as a *continuation* of the sixth. Undoubtedly it was for this reason that it was held in the same locality as that was.^{fa200} So the Greeks intended, and so they regard it to this day, and designate the canons of the Quinisext as canons of the sixth Synod. The Latins, on the other hand, declared from the beginning, as we shall see, against the Quinisext, and called it, in derision, *erratica*.^{fa201}

Three views have prevailed as to the time of the holding of this Synod. The Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople asserted, at the seventh OEcumenical Synod at Nicaea: "Four or five years after the sixth OEcumenical Synod had the same bishops, in a new assembly under Justinian II., published the (Trullan) canons mentioned."^{fa202} Following him, the seventh OEcumenical Synod repeated the same assertion.^{fa203} Supporting themselves on this, several decided to ascribe the Quinisext to the year 686. This assumption is disproved, however, by the chronological date given by the Synod itself in its third canon, where it speaks of the 15th of January of the past 4th Indiction, or the year of the world 6109. The Indict. 4:in no way agrees with A.D. 686; it must therefore be read Indictio 14: Besides, it is quite incorrect to assert that the same bishops were present at the sixth OEcumenical Synod and at the Quinisext. A comparison of the subscriptions in the synodal Acts of the two assemblies shows this at the first glance.

That the number of the year, 6109, is incorrect, and the number 90 has dropped out, so that 6199 must have been read, the advocates of the second and third view are agreed. But the former reckon the 6199 years after the Constantinopolitan era, according to which they coincide with A.D. 691; whilst, according to the third hypothesis, we should refer to the

Alexandrian era, and therefore to A.D. 706. The latter is certainly incorrect, for after the close of the Trullan Synod, the Emperor sent its Acts, as we shall see (at the end of this section), for confirmation to Pope Sergius; but he had died in the year 701. So, too, the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople, who presided over the Trullan Council, died in 693. There remains, then, only the second theory. The year 6199 of the Constantinopolitan era coincides, as we have said, with the year 691 after Christ, and the 4th Indiction ran from September 1, 690, to August 31, 691. If, then, our Synod, in the 3rd canon, speaks of the 15th of January in the *past* Indiction iv., it means January, 691; but it belongs itself, accordingly, to the 5th Indiction, i.e. it was opened after September 1, 691, and before September 1, 692. ^{fa204}

What we possess of the Acts of this Synod consists in its address to the Emperor, and in 102 canons with the subscription of the members. ^{fa205} In the former it is said: The evil enemy always persecutes the Church, but God ever sends her protectors, and so the present Emperor, who wishes to free his people from sin and destruction. As the two last OEcumencal Synods, under Justinian I. and Constantine Pogonatus, gave no disciplinary ordinances, the moral life has in many ways fallen into decay. Therefore the Emperor has convoked “this holy and God-chosen OEcumencal Synod” in order to bring the Christian life again into order, and to root out the remains of Jewish and heathen perverseness. At the close, the bishops called out to the Emperor the words which formerly the second OEcumencal Synod addressed to Theodosius: “As thou by the letter of convocation (to this Synod) hast honored the Church, so mayest thou also seal up that which has been decreed.” ^{fa206}

(1) At the head of their canons — as they must begin with God — the Synod placed the declaration of their adhesion to the apostolic creed, and to the declarations of faith and anathematizms of the six OEcumencal Councils. Among other things, the anathema pronounced by the sixth Synod on Pope Honorius is renewed. Moreover, with genuine Greek flattery, it is said that the decree of the faith of the sixth OEcumencal Synod has so much more force as the Emperor has subscribed it. — After this follow the proper disciplinary ordinances.

(2) The 85 apostolic canons shall remain in force and be confirmed, as having been already received by the Fathers, ^{fa207} with the exception, however, of the apostolic constitutions, although these are named in

the apostolic canons. But they were early corrupted by the heretics. Further, there shall remain in force the canons of the Synods of Nicaea, Ancyra, Neo-Caesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, of the second, third, and fourth OEcumenical Synods, of the Synods of Sardica, Carthage, Constantinople under Nectarins (A.D. 394), Alexandria under Theophilus. So also the canons of Dionysius the Great of Alexandria, of Peter of Alexandria, of Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neo-Caesarea, of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, of Amphilochius of Iconium, Timothy of Alexandria, and the canon of Cyprian and his Synod, which had validity only in Africa. ^{fa208}

(3) In regard to the purity and continence of the clergy, the Romans have a more stringent, the Constantinopolitans a milder canon. These must be mingled. Thus:

(a) All clerics married a second time, who do not reform before the 15th of January of the expired 4th Indiction, or of the year 6109 (more correctly 6199, as we saw), shall be canonically deposed.

(b) Those, however, who, before the publication of our decree, have given up that unlawful union, done penance, and learnt continence, or their wives of the second marriage have died, shall, if priests or deacons, be removed from the divine service, but may, when for some time they have done penance, maintain the place belonging to their rank in the Church, and must be contented with this place of honor.

(c) Priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, who marry only once, but a widow, or marry after ordination, shall, after having done penance for a time, be restored to their office, but may obtain no higher degree.

(d) In future, however, in accordance with the ancient canons, no one may become a bishop., or a cleric in general, who has married twice after his baptism, or has had a concubine, or married a widow, or one divorced, or a prostitute, or a female slave, or an actress (see Can. Apost. 17 and 18).

(4) A cleric who has had intercourse with a woman dedicated to God is deposed. A layman who has done so is excommunicated.

(5) No cleric may have in his house any woman except those allowed in the ancient canons (*Nicaen*, c. 3). The eunuchs also are bound by this rule.

(6) The ordinance of the apostolic canons (No. 27), in consequence of its being often disobeyed, is renewed, namely, that only lectors and cantors, but not sub-deacons, may marry after receiving the dedication to their office.

(7) A deacon, whatever his office may be, must never have his seat before the priests, unless he is acting (e.g., at Synods) as representative of his patriarch or metropolitan; for then he takes his seat (cf. *Nicaen*, c. 18).

(8) At least once a year a Synod shall be held in each province, between Easter and the month of October.

(9) No cleric may be an innkeeper.

(10) No bishop, priest, or deacon may take interest, on penalty of deposition if he does not desist (cf. vol. 1:pp. 145, 190, 424, 476).

(11) No Christian, whether layman or cleric, may eat the unleavened bread of the Jews, have confidential intercourse with Jews, receive medicine from them, or bathe with them. The cleric who does so is deposed, the layman excommunicated.

(12) In Africa, Libya, and elsewhere, it comes to pass that bishops, even after their ordination, still live with their wives. This gives offense, and is henceforth forbidden under penalty of deposition.

(13) In the Roman Church, those who wish to receive the diaconate or presbyterate must promise to have no further intercourse with their wives. We, however, in accordance with the apostolic canons (No. 6), allow them to continue in matrimony. If anyone seeks to dissolve such marriages, he shall be deposed; and the cleric who, under pretense of religion, sends away his wife, shall be excommunicated. If he persists in this, he is to be deposed.

But sub-deacons, deacons, and priests, at the time when they have to celebrate divine service, must refrain from their wives, since it has already been ordained by the Synod of Carthage, that he who ministers in sacred things must be pure. ^{fa209}

- (14) In accordance with the ancient laws, no one shall be ordained priest before thirty years, or deacon before twenty-five. A deaconess must be forty years old. ^{fa210}
- (15) A sub-deacon must be twenty years old. If anyone is ordained too early to any degree, he shall be deposed. ^{fa211}
- (16) The Synod of Neo-Caesarea ordained (c. 15) that only seven deacons should be appointed to one city, however large it may be, because in the Acts of the Apostles mention is made only of so many. But the seven deacons of the *Acts* did not serve at the mysteries, but only in the administration of caring for the poor. ^{fa212}
- (17) No cleric may, without written consent of his bishop, go over to another church, under penalty of deposition for him and for the bishop who receives him.
- (18) If clerics have gone abroad on account of the incursions of the barbarians, they must, when peace is restored, come back again.
- (19) The higher functionaries of the Church must daily, but especially on Sunday, instruct the people, and explain the Scriptures according to the exposition of the Fathers (cf. Can. Apost. 58).
- (20) A bishop may not teach in a strange city.
- (21) Those who by offenses have been degraded to the *status laicalis*, if they voluntarily forsake their sin, may cut their hair after the manner of clerics. In the other case, they must wear their hair like laymen.
- (22) If anyone has obtained ordination for money, he must be deposed, together with him who ordained him.
- (23) No cleric may demand money for the administering of holy communion (*thv ajprantou koinwniav*), under penalty of deposition as a follower of Simon. ^{fa213}
- (24) No cleric or monk may take part in horse-races or theatres. If he is at a marriage, he must depart when the games take place.
- (25) Renewal of canon 7 of Chalcedon: see vol. in. p. 392.
- (26) A priest who, through ignorance, has contracted an irregular marriage, retains (c. 3) his place of honor, but may discharge no

spiritual functions. The unlawful marriage must, of course, be dissolved.

(27) Both at home and when travelling, the cleric must wear his clerical dress, under penalty of excommunication for a week.

(28) In some churches it is the custom for the faithful to bring grapes to the altar, and the priests unite them with the unbloody sacrifice and administer them at the same time with that. This is no longer allowed, but the grapes must be specially blessed and distributed. Cf. Can. Apost. 4; vol. 2 p. 399, c. 23.

(29) The African practice of receiving the eucharist, on Maundy Thursday, *after* a meal, is disapproved (see vol. 2 p. 399, c. 28). Thereby injustice is done to the whole of Lent.

(30) If priests, in the lands of barbarians, think that they should transgress the apostolic canon (No. 6), which forbids the sending away of a wife under the pretext of religion, and abstain from their wives with their consent, we will allow this to them, but only to them, in regard to their anxiety and their strange manners; ^{fa214} but in that case they may not live again with their wives.

(31) Divine service may be held in private oratories, or baptisms celebrated, but only with the consent of the bishop.

(32.) The use of the Armenians, to employ only wine without water at the holy sacrifice, is forbidden under penalty of deposition. ^{fa215}

(33) So also the other custom of the Armenians, to ordain only descendants of the families of priests as clerics, and to appoint untensured men as cantors and lectors. ^{fa216}

(34) Renewal of canon 18 of Chalcedon (see vol. 3 p. 404).

(35) No metropolitan, when a bishop of his province has died, may appropriate anything from his private property, or from the property of the church vacated, but a cleric belonging to the Church must administer everything until the election of a new bishop. Cf. c. 22 of Chalcedon.

(36) Renewing the decrees of the second and fourth OEcumical Synods, we decide that the see of Constantinople shall enjoy the same

rights (**twā i ʒwn apol auēin presbeiwñ**) as that of Old Rome, shall be highly regarded in ecclesiastical matters as that is, and shall be second after it. After Constantinople comes the see of Alexandria, then Antioch, and next that of Jerusalem. Cf. vol. 2 p. 357 ff.; vol. 3 p. 411 ff.; and Assemani, *l. c. t.* 1 p. 426 sqq.

(37) It has happened that bishops have been unable to enter upon the sees for which they were consecrated, because of the incursions of the barbarians (especially of the Saracens). This shall not be a disadvantage to them (cf. c. 37 Apost. vol. 1: and c. 18 of Antioch, vol. 2: p. 71); but their rank remains to them, and their right to confer orders. (Beginning of bishops *in partibus infidelium*.)

(38) If a city is renewed by imperial command, its ecclesiastical position is regulated, according to ancient law, by its new civil rights (c. 17 of Chalcedon; vol. in. p. 402 ff.).

(39) The archbishop of Cyprus, in consequence of the incursions of the barbarians, has gone abroad into the province of the Hellespont, into the city of New-Justinianopolis. He shall retain the rights there which the Synod of Ephesus conceded to the archbishop of Cyprus (vol. in. p. 71) (that he should not be subject to the patriarch of Antioch). He shall have the right of Constantinople (**to-dikaion thv Kwnstantinoupolēwv**), Shall take precedence of all bishops of the province of the Hellespont, and also of those of Cyzicus, and shall be consecrated by his own bishops. ^{fa217}

(40) If anyone will enter the monastic life, he must be at least ten years old.

(41) If anyone wishes to inhabit a cell of his own, he must have previously lived three years in a monastery. If he has then taken possession of the cell, he may not afterwards leave it.

(42) As there are hermits who frequent the streets in black clothes and with long hair, and have intercourse with men of the worth, it is ordained that they must go into a monastery with short hair and in the habit of their order. If they will not do so, they must be driven out of the cities. ^{fa218}

(43) Anyone may become a monk, however he may have hitherto lived.

(44) A monk who is guilty of unchastity, or takes a wife, is punished as unchaste.

(45) It comes to pass that women who wish to go into a convent are led to the altar covered with gold and precious stones, in order to strip off all their splendor and exchange it for the black robe. This must in future no longer happen, so that it may not appear that they only unwillingly forsake the vanities of the world.

(46) Nuns may not leave the convent without the permission and benediction of the superior, and then only in company with other women of the convent. Otherwise they may not sleep outside. So likewise monks may not; go out without the benediction of the superior.

(47) No woman may sleep in a men's monastery, and conversely, under penalty of excommunication.

(48) If anyone is consecrated bishop, his wife must go into a convent at a considerable distance. But the bishop must provide for her. If she is worthy, she may become a deaconess.

(49) Monasteries which have once been consecrated with the permission of the bishop, may not be turned into secular dwellings;. Moreover, what has once belonged to them, may never be given to seculars.

(50) To clerics and laymen, playing at dice is forbidden; under penalty of deposition to the former, of excommunication to the others.

(51) This holy and *OEcumenical* Synod forbids actors and their plays, the exhibitions of hunts, ^{fa219} and theatrical dances. Whoever gives himself to these things, if a cleric, shall be deposed, if a layman, excommunicated. ^{fa220}

(52) On all days in Lent, except Saturdays, Sundays, and the Annunciation of the Virgin, there is held only a *liturgia praesanctificationum*.

(53) Those who are sponsors to children may not marry their mother. The spiritual relationship is higher than the bodily. ^{fa221}

(54) Incestuous marriages are forbidden, under penalty of excommunication for seven years, and dissolution of the marriage. ^{fa222}

(55) In Rome they fast every Saturday in Lent. This is contrary to the 66th apostolical canon, and may no longer be done. If anyone does so, he will, if cleric, be deposed, if layman, excommunicated.

(56) In Armenia and elsewhere, on Sundays in Lent, they eat eggs and cheese. But these kinds of food come also from animals, and ought not to be partaken of in times of fasting, on penalty of deposition for clerics, of excommunication for laymen. In the whole Church one kind of fasting must prevail. ^{fa223}

(57) Honey and milk may not be offered on the altar. Cf. Can. 3 Apost. vol. 1 *ad fin.*

(58) If a bishop, priest, or deacon is present, no layman may administer holy mysteries (communion) to himself, under penalty of excommunication for a week.

(59) Baptism is not allowed in private oratories. Cf. above, canon 31.

(60) Those who represent themselves as demoniacs should be subjected to the same pains (maceration's and the like) which are imposed upon those who are really demoniacal, in order to deliver them.

(61) If anyone consults a soothsayer or so called hecatontarch, ^{fa224} in order to find out the future, he shall be subject to the penalty appointed for six years by the Fathers of Ancyra (canon 24 of Ancyra, vol. 1 p. 221). So also those who take about bears and similar animals to the injury of the simple, ^{fa225} who show men's destiny, cast their nativity, drive away the clouds, give out amulets, etc.

(62) The remains of heathen superstition of all kinds are forbidden, the festivals of the Kalendar, the *Nora* (in honor of Pan), the *Brumalia* (in honor of Bacchus), the assemblies on the 1st of March, public dances of women, clothing of men like women, and inversely, putting on comic, satyric, or tragic masks, the invocation of Bacchus at the winepress, etc. ^{fa226}

(63) False histories of martyrs, invented in order to insult; the martyrs and to mislead the people to unbelief, shall be burnt.

- (64)** No layman may publicly, in religious services, come forward as speaker or teacher, under penalty of excommunication for forty days.
- (65)** It is forbidden, on the new moons, to light fires before the dwellings or workshops, and leap upon them (as the impious Manasseh did, 2 Kings 21.).
- (66)** The whole week after Easter, until the next Sunday, must be kept as an ecclesiastical festival. All horse-races and public spectacles in this week are forbidden.
- (67)** The eating of the blood of animals is forbidden in Holy Scripture. A cleric who partakes of blood is to be punished by deposition, a layman with excommunication. ^{fa227}
- (68)** No one may annul or cut up a book of the Old or New Testament, or of the holy Fathers, or sell it to others (e.g. vendors of salves), who annul it and sell it, when it has become useless through moths, etc., on penalty of excommunication for a year. The like punishment is pronounced on anyone who buys such a book in order to annul it.
- (69)** No layman must enter the place where the altar stands, except, according to ancient tradition, the Emperor when he brings an offering. ^{fa228}
- (70)** Women are not allowed to speak during divine service (~~<448>~~ 1 Corinthians 14:34 f.).
- (71)** Those who receive instruction in the civil laws (the young jurists) may not allow themselves in heathen usages, nor appear at the theater, nor wear strange clothes, and the like, under penalty of excommunication. ^{fa229}
- (72)** Marriages between the orthodox and heretics are forbidden, under penalty of excommunication, and must be dissolved. It is otherwise when both sides were formerly unbelieving (heretical), and one became orthodox. Here applies ~~<472>~~ 1 Corinthians 7:12 ff. ^{fa230}
- (73)** Reverence for the holy cross requires that the form of the cross shall never be found on the floor, so that it may never be trodden under foot.
- (74)** Love feasts (**ajjapai**) within the churches are forbidden.
- (75)** Psalm singing shall not be disorderly or noisy.

(76) In the neighborhood of the church there shall be no wine-shops, cook-shops, or booths, etc., allowed.

(77) No man, whether layman or cleric, may bathe with a woman. Cf. c. 30 of Laodicea, vol. 2 p. 316.

(78) The catechumens of the first class must learn the Creed, and recite it on Thursday before the bishop or the priests. Cf. c. 46 of Laodicea, vol. 3 p. 319.

(79) It is in some places the custom for the people, on the day after the birth of Christ, to send presents of food to each other in honor of the childbed (**ta4oceia**) of the blessed Virgin (childbed presents). As, however, the childbearing of the blessed Virgin was without childbed (i.e. without bodily weakness and pains), because miraculous, we forbid this custom. ^{fa231}

(80) If a cleric or layman, without great hindrance, or without being of necessity on a journey, fails to go to church for three successive Sundays, the cleric shall be deposed, the layman excommunicated. Cf. canon 11 of Sardica, vol. 2 p. 143.

(81) It is not allowed to add to the Trisagion the words: "Who was crucified for us." Cf. vol. 3 pp. 454, 457; vol. 4 pp. 26, 29; and Assemani, *l. c.* t.5:8, p. 348 sqq.

(82) For the future, in pictures, instead of the Lamb, the human figure of Christ shall be represented (**ajasthl ousqai**). ^{fa232}

(83) The Eucharist may not be given to a dead man. Cf. vol. 2 p. 397, canon 4.

(84) If, in the case of a child, it is not certain that it has been baptized, baptism must be administered to it. Cf. vol. 2 p. 424, canon 7; vol. 3 p. 3.

(85) The emancipation of a slave should take place before three witnesses.

(86) If anyone keeps a brothel, he shall, if a cleric, be deposed and excommunicated, if a layman, excommunicated.

(87) If anyone forsakes his wife and marries another, he shall (according to the 57th canon of S. Basil) remain for a year in the

lowest, two years in the second, three years in the third, and one year in the fourth grade of penitence.

(88) No cattle may be driven into the church except in the greatest need, if a stranger has no shelter and his animals would otherwise perish.

(89) The fast in Passion Week [Holy Week] must last until midnight of the great Saturday.

(90) From Saturday evening to Sunday evening no one may bend the knee. Only at Compline on Sunday may the knees again be bent.

(91) Whoever gives or receives medicine for destroying the fruit of the womb, shall be punished as a murderer. Cf. canon 21 of Ancyra, vol. 1 p. 220.

(92) Whoever ravishes a woman, in order to marry her, or assists in such rape, shall, if a cleric, be deposed, if a layman, excommunicated. Cf. c. 27 of Chalcedon, vol. 3 p. 410.

(93) If a wife marries before she has sure intelligence of the death of her husband, who has disappeared, or gone off on travel, or is absent in war, she is guilty of adultery. Yet is her act excusable, because the death of her husband had great probability. If a man, deserted by his wife, has married another woman without her knowing of his first marriage, she must give way, if the first wife returns; and she has committed fornication, but in ignorance. She may marry again, but it is better if she does not. If a soldier returns after a long time, and his wife in the meantime has married another, he may, if he will, take his wife back to him, and forgive her, as well as him who married her.

(94) If anyone takes a heathen oath, he is to be excommunicated.

(95) In reference to the baptism of returning heretics, the 7th canon of the second OEcumenical Synod is repeated, and an addition made, of which a double text is presented. The ordinary one, as it stands in the collections of the Councils, gives this sense: "The Manichaeans, Valentinians, Marcionites, and all similar heretics, must (without being rebaptized) present a certificate, and therein anathematize the heresy, together with Nestorius and Eutyches and Dioscorus and Severus, etc.,

and then receive the holy communion.” This text is undoubtedly false, for

(a) the baptism of the Gnostics was, according to the recognized ecclesiastical principle, invalid, and a Gnostic coming into the Church was required to be baptized anew;

(b) besides, it would have us first to require of a Gnostic an anathema on Nestorius, Eutyches, etc. — More accurate, therefore, is the text, as it is given by Beveridge, and as Balsamon had it, to the effect that: “In the same way (as the preceding) are the Manichaeans, Valentinians, Marcionites, and similar heretics to be treated (i.e. to be baptized anew); but the Nestorians must (merely) present certificates, and anathematize the heresy, Nestorius, Eutyches,” etc. Here we have only this mistake, that the Nestorians must anathematize, among others, also Eutyches, which they would certainly have done very willingly. At the best, we must suppose that there is a gap in the text, and that, after **και < του < εκ των ομοιων αι < σεων**, *altimeter*, we must add, “the later heretics must present certificates, and anathematize Nestorius, Eutyches,” etc.

(96) If anyone plaits and adorns his hair in an exquisite manner, in order to mislead others, he is excommunicated.

(97) Those who visit their wives in sacred places or otherwise, dishonor those places, and shall, if clerics, be deposed, if laymen, excommunicated.

(98) If anyone marries the betrothed of another during his life, he must be punished as an adulterer.

(99) In Armenia it happens that some within the altar (in the sanctuary) boil meat and give pieces of it, in Jewish fashion, to the priests. The priests are no longer allowed to receive this. Outside the church, however, they may be contented with that which is willingly given to them. ^{fa233}

(100) Indecent pictures are forbidden. If anyone makes them he is to be deposed.

(101) Whoever wishes to receive the holy communion must come with his hands in the form of the cross. Some bring golden and other vessels,

in order to receive the Eucharist (the bread) in these, instead of immediately in the hand, as if a lifeless matter were better than the image of God (the human body). This must no longer take place.

(102) Those to whom the power of binding and loosing is committed must endeavor to heal individual sinners with prudence and with regard to their peculiarities.

These decrees were subscribed first by the Emperor, and this with vermilion. The second place was reserved for the Pope, and left empty. Then followed the subscriptions of Paul of Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria, Anastasius of Jerusalem, George of Antioch (he subscribed here, remarkably, *after* the patriarch of Jerusalem), in the whole by 211 bishops, or representatives of bishops; only Greeks and Orientals, also Armenians.^{fa234} According to an expression of Anastasius, no other Oriental patriarch besides the bishop of Constantinople appears to have been present (see below, p. 241); but in his biography of Pope Sergius (in Mansi, t. 12 p. 3), he himself mentions that the decrees of this Synod were subscribed by three patriarchs, those of Alexandria, Constantinople, and Antioch, as well as by the other bishops, *qui eo tempore illie convenerant*. Noticing only the expression of Anastasius mentioned above, Christian Lupus maintained that; the names of the patriarchs of Alexandria and the rest had been added by a deception. Assemani partly agrees with him, and tried to show (*l. c. t. 5 pp. 30, 69*) from Greek authorities that, at the time of our Synod, the patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Jerusalem were not occupied, on account of the incursions of the Saracens. On the other hand, like Pagi (*ad ann. 692, 8*), he rejects the statement of Baronius, that Callinicus had then taken possession of the see of Constantinople. Callinicus followed after Paul's death, A.D. 693.

As for the Pope, so also room was left for the subscriptions of the bishops of Thessalonica, Sardinia, Ravenna, and Corinth. Archbishop Basil of Gortyna, in Crete, added to his name the words: **τοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς πασῶν τῆς συνόδου τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας ὁ ὡμῶν**. He had signed in a similar manner, at the sixth OEcumenical Synod; and we have already there remarked that the island of Crete belonged to the Roman patriarchate, and that Archbishop Basil seems at an earlier period to have received a delegation on the part of the Roman Synod in the year 680. Whether this, which gave him authority as representative at the sixth Synod, still continued, or whether he only continued it arbitrarily, is uncertain. To the

gross blunders of Balsamon, however, belongs his assertion (Beveridge, *l. c. t. 1 p. 154*) that, besides Basil of Gortyna, other legates of the Pope, the bishops of Thessalonica, Corinth, Ravenna, and Sardinia, had been present at the Quinisext and had subscribed its Acts. He transferred them into the places left vacant, marked with **τοπον του qessal oni khv**, etc., with real subscriptions.

But we learn from the *Vita Sergii Papae* of Anastasius (Mansi, t. 12 p. 3), that the *legati* of Pope Sergius by the Emperor *decepti subscripserant*. — *Certainly*; but by *legati* are here to be understood the permanent papal representatives at Constantinople, and not those specially sent to the Synod, and the, instructed *legati a latere*.^{fa235} It was natural that these representatives, having no authority for that purpose, should not be personally present at the Synod. The fact, however, that they allowed themselves to be deceived by the Emperor, and induced to subscribe, suggests to me the following theory. Pope Nicolas I writes, in his eighth letter to the Emperor Michael III of Constantinople: “His (the Emperor’s) predecessors had for a long time been sick with the poison of different heresies, and had either made those who wanted to save them partakers of their error, as at the time of pope Conon, or had persecuted them.”^{fa236} Here it is indicated that the Emperor Justinian II had won over the papal representatives to his error. As no such occurrence is known of the brief pontificate of Conon (687), and Sergius was the successor of Conon, that which happened under Sergius might, by a slight *lapsus memoriae*, quite easily be transposed to the time of Conon, and certainly then with right, since it was Conon who had sent these representatives to Constantinople. If it is objected to this, that the representatives of Sergius, when they subscribed the Trullan canons, agreed to no heresy, it must be considered

(a) that the Emperor Justinian II. is designated as entirely orthodox by the ancients, as, *e.g.*, by Anastasius in his *Vitae Pontificum*, and thus the *error* to which, according to the statement of Pope Nicolas I., he misguided the representatives, can have been no heresy in the ordinary sense;

(b) but also, if Nicolas I. spoke of heresy, this would not be too strong, for the Trullan canons (13, 60, 36, 55) come very near to heresy, since they place Constantinople on an equality with Rome, thus certainly deny the primacy, and threaten several points of the Roman discipline with anathema.

SEC. 328. JUDGMENT OF ROME ON THE TRULLAN CANONS.

The Emperor Justinian II. immediately sent the Acts of this Synod to Rome, with the request that Pope Sergius would subscribe them at the place left vacant for him. But Sergius refused to do so, because *quaedam capitula extra ritum ecclesiasticum fuerant in eo* (the Council) *annexa*, did not accept the copy destined for him, rejected the synodal Acts as *invalidi*, and would rather die than *novitatum erroribus consentire*.^{FB1} In order to constrain him, the Emperor sent the Protospathar (officer of the imperial bodyguard) Zacharias to Rome, in order to bring the Pope to Constantinople. But the armies of the exarch of Ravenna and of the duchy of Pentapolis took the side of the Pope; troops of soldiers drew to Rome, in order to prevent his abduction, and surrounded the Lateran. Immediately on hearing of the arrival of the soldiers, the Protospathar had fled to the Pope and implored his help; now he even crept into his bed; and the Pope quieted the soldiers by going out to them and talking with them in a friendly manner. They withdrew again; the Protospathar, however, had to leave the city in shame. Thus relates Anastasius, and in agreement with him, more briefly, Bede and the deacon Paul.^{FB2} Justinian either could not or would not take revenge on account of what had happened. Soon afterwards he was deposed and banished, with his nose slit (hence his surname, **Риноѣмѣтов**). When he came again to the throne (705), Sergius was already dead (†701), and Justinian now sent two metropolitans to John VII. (the second successor of Sergius), with the request that he would arrange for a Council of the apostolic Church (*i.e.* a Roman Council), in order to efface those of the Trullan canons which were unacceptable, and confirm the others. The Pope, a timid man, would neither strike out nor confirm. He simply sent back again the copy which he had received.^{FB3}

Justinian opened new negotiations with Pope Constantine, and invited him to come to him at Nicomedia, without doubt on account of the Trullan canons. In the retinue of the Pope was also the Roman deacon Gregory, subsequently his successor, as Gregory II., and Anastasius relates of him, that he had then inquired of the Emperor *de quibusdam capitulis* (the objectionable canons of the Trullan) *optima responsione unamquamque solvit quaestionem*. That he and Pope Constantine succeeded in pacifying the Emperor, without his quite forgiving the matter, we see from the honors and favors with which he loaded the Pope.^{FB4} The process by which they came to an agreement is not recorded, but undoubtedly Constantine already struck that fair middle path which, as we know

certainly, John VIII. (872-882) subsequently adhered to, in the declaration that “he accepted all those canons which did not contradict the true faith, good morals, and the decrees of Rome.” That John VIII. had drawn up this decree, we learn from the *Praefatio* which Anastasius prefixed to his translation of Acts of the seventh Oecumenic Council. He there addresses Pope John VIII. thus: “Unde *apostolatu vestro decernente* non solum illos solos quinquaginta canones (the first fifty apostolic, which Rome had hitherto recognised, whilst they rejected the remaining thirty-five) ecclesia recipit, sed et omnes eorum utpote Spiritus Sancti tubarum (*i.e.* the Apostles), quin et omnium omnino probabilium patrum et sanctorum conciliorum regulas et institutiones admittit; *illas dumtaxat, quae nec rectae fidei nec probis moribus obviant, sed nec sedis Romanae decretis ad modicum quid resultant, quin potius adversarios, i.e. haereticos potenter impugnant. Ergo regulas, quas Graeci a sexta synodo perhibent editas* (*i.e.* the Trullan, which the Greeks liked to call *canones sextae synodi*), *ita in hac synodo principalis sedes admittit,* ^{FB5} *ut nullatenus ex his illae recipiantur, quae prioribus canonibus vel decretis sanctorum sedis hujus pontificum, aut certe bonis moribus inveniuntur adversae;* quamvis omnes hactenus ex toto maneant apud Latinos incognitae, quia nec interpretatae, sed nec in ceterarum patriarchalium sedium, licet Graeca utantur lingua, reperiantur archivis, nimirum quia nulla earum, cum ederentur, aut promulgans aut consentiens aut saltem praesens inventa est.”

FB6

Pope Hadrian I. seems to have been somewhat less prudent than John VIII. was ninety years before. When the latter refers to the Trullan rules with the words, “Quas Graeci a sexta synodo *perhibent editas*,” and thereby gives expression to the justifiable doubt, Hadrian accedes to the Greek tradition, without any such critical addition, in his letter to Tarasius of Constantinople (among the Acts of the second session of the seventh Oecumenical Council): “Omnes sanctas sex synodos suscipio cum omnibus regulis, *quae jure ac divinitus ab ipsis promulgatae sunt*, inter quas continetur, in quibusdam venerabilium imaginum picturis Agnus digito Praecursoris exaratus ostendi” (82nd Trullan canon). And in his letter to the Frankish bishops in defense of the seventh Oecumenical Synod he says, 100. 35: “Idcirco testimonium de *sexta synodo* Patres in septima protulerunt (namely, 100. 82 of the Trullan Synod), ut clarifice ostenderent, quod, jam quando *sexta synodus* acta est, a priscis temporibus sacras imagines et historias pictas venerabantur.” Probably Tarasius of

Constantinople had also written to the Pope what he persuaded the second of Nicaea to, that the same Fathers who held the sixth Synod had added the appendix four or five years later (see above, p. 22). This historical and chronological assertion, Hadrian, as well as the members of the seventh Oecumenical Council, seem to have believed. That, however, the Pope would not approve of all the Trullan canons, we read in his words quoted above: He approved those “*quae jure ac divinitus promulgatae sunt.*” Hadrian I. seems here to have done as subsequently Martin V. and Eugenius IV. did in the confirmation of the decrees of Constance and Basle. They selected such expressions as did not expressly embrace the confirmation of all the canons, but — properly explained — excluded a certain number of the decrees in question from the papal ratification (see vol. 1. pp. 51, 60).

That the seventh Oecumenical Synod at Nicaea ascribed the Trullan canons to the sixth Oecumenical Synod, and spoke of them entirely in the Greek spirit, cannot astonish us, as it was attended almost solely by Greeks. They specially pronounced the recognition of the canons in question in their own first canon; but their canons have never received the ratification of the holy see. ^{FB7}

SEC. 329. THE LAST SYNODS OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

Almost at the same time as the Quinisext falls a great English Synod under the excellent King Ina of Wessex, in A.D. 691 or 692. It is mentioned by Bede (*Hist.* 5. 9) and S. Aldhelm (*Epist. ad Geruntium regem*). Its decrees were transferred into Ina's Book of Laws, and we learn from this that, besides the King and the secular grandees (*aldermanni et seniores*), the Bishops Heddi of Winchester and Erconwald of London *multaque congregatio servorum Dei* were present.

Certainly the holy Abbot Aldhelm of Malmesbury, this friend and counsellor of the King, especially in ecclesiastical affairs, was not absent. They decreed: —

- (1) The clergy shall observe their rule of life.
- (2) A child must be baptized within thirty days after its birth, under penalty of thirty solidi. If it dies (after thirty days) unbaptized, expiation must be made with all the property of the parents.

(3) If a slave works on Sunday, by command of his master, then the slave goes free, and the master is fined thirty solidi. If the slave works on Sunday without the master's command, he must be scourged or pay quit money for his skin. If a freeman works on Sunday, he must lose his liberty or pay thirty solidi; a priest double.

(4) The dues to the Church must be paid on S. Martin's Day.

(5) If anyone takes refuge in a church, he may be neither killed nor beaten.

(6) Prohibition of duels and private feuds.

(7) Witnesses and sureties who lie are fined one hundred and twenty solidi.

(8) The first-fruits must be given from the property which is inhabited at Christmas.

(9) If anyone kills a child to whom he has been sponsor, or one who has been sponsor to him, — except in necessary defense, — he must atone for this as for the murder of a relative. The expiatory fine is determined by the position of him who is killed. For the son of a bishop must half as much be paid as for a King's son. ^{FB8}

In Spain, so rich in Synods, on May 2, 693, was opened the sixteenth Synod of Toledo, in the Church of SS. Peter and Paul. There were present fifty-nine bishops out of all the ecclesiastical provinces of Spain, ^{FB9} besides five abbots, three representatives of bishops, and sixteen secular counts. King Egiza appeared personally and presented to the bishop, in the usual manner, the tome, in which the points were enumerated on which he thought an ordinance of the Synod to be necessary. First of all, the orthodox faith was to be proclaimed; and then discipline was to be improved in many points. Specially, greater care was necessary for the bishops on behalf of the rural churches and the appointment of priests over them, that the Jews might not be able to say in scorn: "They had well done in shutting up and destroying their synagogues; but they did no better with their Christian churches." Further, there was pressing need to root out the remains of heathen superstition, and also Judaism; and to punish paederastians and conspirators against the King and State. Further, the bishops, when private cases were laid before them for judgment, must not be partial or corruptible.

King Egiza had in view, in the last two sentences, the case of Archbishop Sisbert of Toledo, who had hatched a conspiracy to murder the King and his whole family, and probably to raise to the throne one of his own relations (he sprang from a high Gothic family). The matter was betrayed; Sisbert was thrown into prison, and placed before the present Synod, to be tried. Ferreras, the historian of Spain, thinks that it was for this very matter that the Synod was called, ^{FB10} and we find, in fact, at the end of its Acts, a letter from the King, in which the Synod is requested to deliver its judgment as to the punishment of treason against the King. — Like other Synods at Toledo, this also placed at the head of its minutes a full confession of faith, in which especially the orthodox Dyothelite doctrine was suitably unfolded. Then followed 13 Capitula: —

(1) The old laws against the Jews, in order to force them to conversion, shall be exactly followed; and every Jew, who sincerely converts, shall be free from all taxes to the exchequer which the Jews are required to pay, and shall be regarded as quite equal to the other subjects of the King.

(2) Bishops, priests, and judges must be zealously concerned to root out the remains of heathenism — the venerating of stones, trees, fountains, the kindling of torches, soothsaying, magic, etc., under penalty of a year's deposition and excommunication. Those, however, who practice such superstition and do not amend, shall, if of high rank, be fined three pounds of gold, if of lower, shall receive one hundred lashes.

(3) The prevalence of sodomy makes severe punishments necessary. If a bishop, priest, or deacon commits this sin, he shall be deposed and banished for life. Moreover, the old law remains in force, according to which every such sinner is excluded from all communion with Christians, scourged with rods, deprived of his hair in disgrace, and banished. — If they have not sufficiently done penance, the communion is not to be administered to them even on their deathbed.

(4) If anyone has attempted to commit suicide, and has been prevented, he is to be excluded for two months from all fellowship with Catholics and from the holy communion.

(5) Some bishops burden too much the churches subject to them with taxes, and let many of them go to ruin. Therefore the bishops shall

spend the third part of the income of the church, which by old law belongs to them, when they have obtained it, on the restoration of decayed churches. If they prefer, however, to return that third, then those who are connected with the church must attend to the repairs. Besides, the bishops may demand nothing of the parishioners, and must give away nothing of the property of the Church to others. Moreover, several churches may not be given over to one priest. A church which possesses ten *mancipia*, ^{FB11} (farmhouses) must have a priest of its own; if fewer, it is to be united with another church.

(6) It sometimes happens that clerics at Mass do not employ specially prepared Breads, but cut a round piece from their house-bread (*de panibus suis usibus praeparatis*, and so probably leavened) and use it for the sacrifice. This may no longer be done. Only whole bread, not pieces cut off, and whole bread prepared with care, not too large, but a *modica oblata*, may be placed for consecration upon the altar.

(7) Six months after the holding of a provincial Synod, every bishop assembles the abbots, clergy, and laity of his diocese, in order to communicate to them the decrees.

(8) On account of the great merits of the King in respect to the Church and in respect to the people, shall all clerics and laymen be sworn to be faithful to his posterity, and to support no plan for removing them from the throne. Moreover, for the King and his family the holy sacrifice shall be offered daily at every episcopal and rural church, and prayers shall be offered, except on Good Friday, when no Mass may be said.

(9) Archbishop Sisbert of Toledo wished not merely to deprive the King of the kingdom, but also to murder him and his children, Flogellus, Theodemir, Liubilan, Biubigithon, and Thecla. We have therefore already deposed him, and this sentence must remain in force. Moreover, in accordance with the ancient canons, he must be banished, excommunicated, and deprived of all his property. Only at the end of his life can he again receive the communion. ^{FB12}

(10) As conspiracies and treasons are so frequent, they must be threatened with heavy penalties.

(11) Thanks be to God! God save the King!

(12) To the archiepiscopal see of Toledo we remove, with assent of the people and clergy, Felix, previously archbishop of Seville, to whom the King has assigned the temporary administration of the see of Toledo. For Seville we appoint Faustinus, archbishop of Braga; for Braga, Felix, bishop of Portucala (a port on the Douro).

(13) Because the bishops of the province of Narbonne were unable to come to the Synod, in consequence of a sickness that had broken out among them,^{FB13} they shall hold a provincial Synod in Narbonne, and there adopt and subscribe the decrees here recorded,^{FB14}

A conspiracy, in which the Spanish Jews with their co-religionists in Africa took part, gave occasion for King Egiza holding another Spanish general Council in the following year, 694. Many bishops and secular grandees (number and names are unknown to us, as the subscriptions have not been preserved) assembled on November 9, 694, in the Church of S. Leocadia, in the suburb of Toledo (seventeenth Synod of Toledo), and after having, in the customary manner, recited the confession of faith, drew up 8 canons or Capitula:

(1) At the beginning of a Synod all the *sacerdotes* (bishops) shall fast for three days in honor of the Holy Trinity, and in this time, without the presence of the laity, hold converse on the doctrines of the faith and on the improvement of the morals of the clergy. After that they shall proceed to other subjects.

(2) At the beginning of Lent, since from that time there are no more baptisms, except in case of extreme necessity, the font shall be sealed by the bishop with his ring, and so remain until the stripping of the altar at the feast of the *Coena Domini*.

(3) The washing of feet at the feast of the *Coena Domini*, which has fallen into disuse in some places, must be observed everywhere.

(4) The holy vessels and other ornaments of the Church may not be expended by the clergy for themselves, nor sold, etc.

(5) Some priests hold Masses for the dead, on behalf of the living, that these may soon die. The priest who does this, and the person who induced him to do it, shall both be deposed and forever anathematised and excommunicated. Only on their deathbed may the communion be again administered to them.

(6) All the year through, in all the twelve months, shall *Exomologeseis* (= *Litaniae*, see Du Cange, *s.v.*) with intercessions be said for the Church, the King, and the people, that God may forgive them all.

(7) The older laws for ensuring the safety of the royal family are renewed.

(8) As the Jews have added to their other crimes this that they endeavored to overthrow the country and the people, they must be severely punished. They have done this after they had (in appearance) received baptism, which, however, by faithlessness they have again stained. They shall be deprived of their property for the benefit of the exchequer, and shall be made slaves forever. Those to whom the King sends them as slaves must watch that they may no longer practice Jewish usages, and their children must be separated from them, when they are seven years of age, and subsequently married with Christians. The King ratified these decrees. ^{FB15}

In the same year, 694 [692 ?], King Withred [Wihtrud] of Kent held an assembly at Beccancelde [Bapchild], which is called a Synod, but in character was a parliament, at which resolutions were taken also with regard to the privileges of the Church. The King himself presided. There were also present the two bishops of the kingdom of Kent, namely, Archbishop Brithwald [Bertwald] of Canterbury, successor to Theodore, and Tobias of Roffa (Rochester), with five abbesses, ^{FB16} several priests, and many secular grandees. The King spoke thus: "In the name of God and all the saints, I deny to all my successors, to all prefects and laymen forever, authority over churches and their property. If a bishop dies, or an abbeſs, this shall be announced to the archbishop, and with his counsel and assent a worthy successor shall be elected. This in no way concerns the King's government. It belongs to him to nominate counts, dukes, princes, judges, etc.; but it is the business of the archbishop to govern the churches, to appoint, confirm, and admonish bishops, abbots, abbesses, etc., that no one may stray from the flock of Christ." Finally, he granted the churches freedom from taxes and other burdens, and they were required only to bring *voluntary* contributions to the State, if they held it necessary. ^{FB17}

The same King Withred arranged for (A.D. 697) the Synod at Berkhamstead [Barsted] under Archbishop Bertwald of Canterbury and Gybmund, bishop of Rochester. There were, besides, many clerical and lay

dignitaries present. The 28 canons, called also *Judicia Withredi regis*, decree: —

- (1) The churches are free from taxes, and shall offer prayers for the King.
- (2) If anyone violates the rights of the Church, he will be fined fifty solidi, just as if he had violated the rights of the King.
- (3) Adulterers must correct themselves by penance, or they will be excommunicated.
- (4) Foreigners who conduct themselves unchastely will be driven out of the country.
- (5) If the prefect of a *pagus* (cf. Du Cange, *s.v. Paganus*, is guilty of unchastity, he shall be fined one hundred solidi.
- (6) The *colonus* is fined fifty solidi.
- (7) If a priest has allowed this sin, or deferred the baptism of a sick person, or has been so intoxicated that he cannot fulfill his duty, he is deposed.
- (8) To a tonsured person, who travels about, lodging may be given only once.
- (9) If anyone has liberated his slave at the altar, he is free; but his inheritance belongs to his liberator, and the *aestimatio capiris*.
- (10) If a servant, by command of his master, works between the (first) vespers of Sunday and that of Monday (*i.e.* between Saturday evening and Sunday evening), the master must expiate this by a payment of fifty solidi.
- (11) If the slave does it voluntarily, he must pay his master six solidi, or be flogged. ^{FB18}
- (12) If a freeman works at the forbidden time, he is to be put in the pillory (*collistrigium*).
- (13) If anyone sacrifices to the devil, he is to be punished with confiscation of goods and the pillory.
- (14) A slave who does so is fined six solidi or beaten.

(15) If anyone gives his slave meat on a fast day, he must redeem himself from the pillory.

(16) If the slave eats meat on his own accord, he must be fined six solidi or beaten.

(17) The word of the bishop or King is as valid as an oath.

(18-24) Prescriptions on oaths of purification.

(25) If anyone kills a layman in the act of stealing, he has no fine to pay in expiation.

(26) A freeman who is caught with stolen property in his hand, may be either put to death by the King, or sold over the sea, or he must redeem his life from the King. Anyone who has informed upon him receives half of the money; but if anyone kills the thief, he must compensate by payment c f seventy solidi.

(27) A slave who steals must have his offense expiated by payment of seventy solidi (by his master), or must be sold over the sea.

(28) A stranger who roves about (a tramp) is to be regarded as a thief.

^{FB19}

To these canons there are, in the old MSS., ten more ordinances or compensations for offenses against the Church and clergy, without any intimation of the source from which they proceed.

A Synod at Auxerre (A.D. 695) arranged the order in which the clergy of particular churches and monasteries were to hold divine service in the cathedral church of S. Stephen. The Council of Utrecht of A.D. 697, however, is a falsification of pseudo-Marcellinus. ^{FB20} The Synod of Aquileia, about the year 700, we have already noticed, vol. 4. p. 355.

SEC. 330. THE WESTERN SYNODS IN THE FIRST QUARTER OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

At the beginning of the eighth century (about 701) falls the eighteenth and last Synod of Toledo, under King Witiza and Archbishop Guntheric of Toledo. Its Acts are lost. ^{FB21} Witiza, who had recently come to the throne, was at that time still zealous for good; but soon afterwards fell into the grossest excesses, so that he not only dishonored many wives and maidens,

but also, in a special law, allowed to husbands concubines in any number they pleased, and declared the law of celibacy for priests abolished. When Archbishop Gunderic made representations to him, he was deposed, and Sindereð, the King's friend, who greatly oppressed the better clergy, raised to the metropolitan see. Crime and incontinence spread more and more; but at the same time the discontent with the bad King grew to such a pitch that a party raised Prince Rodrigo, a son of Duke Theodofrid, to be King. An end was put to the civil war which sprang out of this by the death of Witiza, A.D. 710; but his sons, driven from the throne by Rodrigo, called the Saracens into the country, and thus brought it for many centuries under the power of the infidels.

A good many, if not very important Synods meet us now in England: We saw above (p. 207) that Archbishop Wilfrid of York, after having become reconciled with Theodore of Canterbury, had been restored to his bishopric. But his enemies did not cease to stir up the Northumbrian King Alfrid [Alchfrid] against him. So it came that the King, by his own authority, separated the monastery of Ripon from the bishopric of York, and made it a bishopric by itself; and Wilfrid, from fear of the King, thought it well to flee into Mercia, where the bishopric of Lichfield was conferred upon him. King Alfrid now got together the Synod, or more exactly the parliament, of the kingdom (Witenagemote) at Nesterfield [Easterfield] in Northumbria, under the presidency of Bertwald of Canterbury, who likewise belonged to the enemies of Wilfrid. He had been persuaded, by the promise of a fair trial, to appear at the Synod; but from the very beginning he was deluged with bitter words and reproaches, especially by the two bishops, Boso and John, who had as dioceses the pieces rent away from the bishopric of York, but which they had been forced to give up again to Wilfrid. When he was asked whether he would obey the ordinances of the departed Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, he answered suitably: "Yes, to those which agreed with the holy canons"; for he saw well that they wanted to bring the earlier unfair decrees of Theodore into exercise (vol. 4. p. 491), but not the later ones. As he further opposed them in a violent disputation, and remarked that for twenty-two years the ordinances of three Popes, Agatho, Benedict, and Sergius, had been disregarded by them, and forever only that brought forward which Theodore had done in the time of their disunion, King Alfrid became enraged, and declared that he would forcibly deprive Wilfrid of all his possessions. Archbishop Bertwald was in agreement with this; but

to the other enemies of Wilfrid this seemed too hard in regard to a man so famous, and they endeavored to persuade him that he should content himself with the monastery of Ripon, so as to live in peace there, and voluntarily, by a written document, resign his bishopric and all his other possessions. Wilfrid rejected this proposal with decision, saying: "How can you expect me to draw the sword against myself, and condemn myself?" Should I not by that means brand my episcopal honor which for forty years I have preserved unspotted?" He reminded them at the same time of his deserts, how he was the first to introduce in Northumbria the correct Easter festival, the singing of antiphons, and the rule of S. Benedict. Now, as a man of seventy years, he should condemn himself. He appealed to the Pope.

In fact, supported by King Ethelred of Mercia, he now hastened to Rome, where Pope John VI. immediately held a Synod (703 to 704) for the examination of his case. In the letter which he presented to the Pope, he relates briefly what had occurred, and prays the Pope to examine the matter, and give him a letter to take with him to King Alfrid of Northumbria, so that he might be restored to his possessions. If, however, his reinstatement in the bishopric of York were too disagreeable to the King, they might leave him the two monasteries of Ripon and Hagulstad [Hexham], which he had himself founded in that diocese. Finally, he declared that he would obey all the ordinances of Archbishop Bertwald which were not opposed to those of the earlier Popes in regard to him.

The deputies of Bertwald, who were likewise present at the Roman Synod, had represented that Wilfrid, at the English Synod at Nesterfield [Easterfield], had refused obedience to Archbishop Bertwald; but he was able to prove the falseness of this accusation. The Romans remarked that, by all right, accusers, whose first charge was shown to be groundless, should no longer be heard; but, out of respect for Bertwald, they would make an exception and examine specially all the particular points. This took place in seventy sessions, carried on for four months, and resulted entirely in favor of Wilfrid.^{FB22} We learn this from the letter of Pope John VI. (not VII., as it is given erroneously in the Collections of Councils) to the Kings Alfrid of Northumbria and Ethelbert of Mercia, in which, among other things, he says: "As the two bishops, Boso and John, whose claims were chiefly in question,—in opposition to Wilfrid, — had not appeared in Rome, they had arrived at no quite definite decision, but recommended Archbishop Bertwald, in communion with Alfrid, to hold a Synod, and to

summon Boso and John also to it, in order to bring about an adjustment of the opposed claims: if this did not succeed, they should all come to Rome for a further examination of the matter.” — Wilfrid wished to remain in Rome, in order there to close his days in peace, giving way to his opponents, but the Pope ordered his return. Wilfrid obeyed, and immediately after his arrival, Archbishop Bertwald was reconciled to him. He then went to Mercia, and found the friendliest reception with Ethelred, formerly King, who in the meantime had exchanged the crown for the monk’s habit, as well as with the new King Coenred. King Alfrid [Aldfrid] of Kent, however, agreed to the papal ordinances only in consequence of a serious illness, of which he died, A.D. 705.

Immediately afterwards, when the usurper Edulf was defeated, a Synod was held somewhere on the river Nidd in Northumbria, in the reign of King Osred (son of Alfrid) of Kent, a minor, by Archbishop Bertwald, A.D. 705 [or 706]. According to the papal letter, which was now made public, Bishops Boso and John were offered the alternative, either to give up their dioceses to Wilfrid or to go to Rome and there defend their cause. But if they did neither the one nor the other, they should fall under excommunication. When both resisted, the Abbess Elfleda of Streneshald [Strenaeshalch or Whitby], the sister of Alfrid, interposed and explained: “Here is the testament of my brother: in my presence he declared that, if he got well again, he would instantly fulfill the ordinances of the Pope, and if he died before doing so, he would commit that work to his successor.” Prince Bertrid, the guardian of the young King, entirely agreed with this. The opponents had to yield, a general reconciliation took place, and Wilfrid received back his two best monasteries, Ripon and Hexham (the latter also a bishopric). ^{FB24} Four years afterwards he died, A.D. 709. ^{FB25}

Of less importance are six other English Councils of this period, of which only very slight intelligence has reached us. The first of these, in Mercia, A.D. 705, gave to the learned and holy Abbot Aldhelm of Malmesbury the commission to prepare a memorial against the false Easter festival of the ancient Britons (see vol. 1.p. 330). ^{FB26} Reference is made to a Synod held on the river Noddre (now Adderburn) only in a document of Donation of S. Aldhelm. In a third, held in Wessex under King Ina, after the death of Bishop Hedda, who had the whole of Wessex under him (with the see at Vintonia=Winchester), his diocese was divided into the bishoprics of Vintonia, which was given to Daniel, and Scireburnia (Sherborne), which was given to Aldhelm.

With this Synod we must not confound one under King Ina which again undertook a division of the bishopric of Vintonia (Winchester). Bede tells us of this (lib. 5. 100. 18). In consequence of the occurrences in war, the East Saxons were deprived of their own bishopric (London), and were placed under the bishop of the West Saxons at Vintonia (Bede, 4. 15). This union was now again dissolved by a Synod which undoubtedly belonged to the year 711. ^{FB27} Another English Synod, under King Ina, about the year 708, was occasioned by the sudden breaking out of a riot, and was, of necessity, held in such haste that it was impossible to invite Archbishop Bertwald to it. In order to supply this defect, the King and the Synod sent the monk Winfrid (the future apostle of the Germans [Boniface]) to the archbishop to inform him of it? The Synod at Alne, finally, in the year 700, confirmed the gifts made to the monastery of Evesham. ^{FB28}

More recent writers mention also a Synod quite unknown to the ancients, at London, A.D. 712, by which the veneration of images was introduced into the English Church. Bishop Egwin of Wigornia (Worcester), from a divine vision, set up an effigy of the Virgin in his church. The matter had created a sensation, was carried to Rome, and thereupon a legate was sent by Pope Constantine to England in order to hold our Synod. They pronounced in favor of the veneration of images. But before this, the apostle of England, Augustine, according to the testimony of Bede, practically introduced the veneration of images, since he had carried before him and his companions a picture of the Savior painted upon a panel. ^{FB29}
 — Quite as uncertain is the English Synod which is said to have been celebrated on the occasion of the fancied marriage of Ina with Guala, and permitted marriages between Anglo-Saxons, Britons, and Scots. ^{FB30}

To the realm of fable belong four German Synods, two at Tungern and two at Liege, which Bishop S. Hubert is said to have held between the years 708 and 726. It is known that Hubert removed the seat of the bishopric of Tungern which was formerly at Maestricht, to Liege. ^{FB31} The short and little authenticated information respecting these pretended German Synods was collected by Harzheim (*Concil. Germ.* t. 1. p. 31 sqq.). Binterim also speaks of them (*Deutsche Concilien*, Bd. 2. S. 11 ff.); but the definite declaration of S. Boniface, the apostle of the Germans (Ep. 51, *ad Zachar.*), that for eighty years no Synod (provincial Synod) had been held in the country of the Franks, testifies against the existence of these pretended Councils at Liege and Tungern, as they made a claim to be more than mere diocesan Synods. At the second at Tungern e.g., no fewer than

thirty bishops are said to have been present; the second and last, at Liege, A.D. 726, is very suspicious, for this reason, that it was summoned on account of the stories about images, which Bishop Hubert (already ?) had found in his diocese. Also it is said to have repeated the decrees of a Roman Synod (under Gregory II.), which is itself highly dubious.

The only subject before the Synod at Vicovalari, in the Lombard kingdom, A.D. 715, was a dispute about boundaries between the bishops of Arezzo and Siena; ^{FB32} but that is very improbable which is related by pseudo-Marcellinus, that, after the death of the Frisian King Rathod (719), S. Boniface, with Willibrord, Suidbert, and other bishops and priests, held a Synod at Utrecht. ^{FB33}

A Roman Synod under Pope Gregory II., on April 5, 721, celebrated in S. Peter's Church, drew up 17 canons for the improving of Church discipline:

- (1) If any one marries the wife ,(widow) of a priest (*presbytera*, see vol. 2. p. 421, 100. 18);
- (2) or a deaconess;
- (3) or a nun;
- (4) or his spiritual *Commater* (see Schulte, *Eherecht*, S. 190);
- (5) or the wife of his brother;
- (6) or his niece;
- (7) his stepmother or daughter-in-law;
- (8) his first cousin;
- (9) or a relation or the wife of a relation, let him be anathema. So also
- (10) if a man marries a widow, or
- (11) ravishes a virgin who was not his betrothed, in order to take her as his wife even when she consents;
- (12) or if he is guilty of superstitious usages, or
- (13) violates the earlier commands of the Apostolic Church in regard to the olive-yards belonging to it;
- (14) Let Hadrian, who married the deaconess Epiphania, be anathema;
- (15) so also Epiphania, and
- (16) whoever helped her; finally,
- (17) every cleric who lets his hair grow. —

It is subscribed by the Pope, nineteen Italian bishops, and three strange ones; by Sindred of Toledo, of whom we have heard (p. 251), now a

fugitive because of the Moors; by Sedulius from Britain, and Fergustus from Scotland; also by many Roman priests and deacons. ^{FB34}

Under the same Pope, Gregory II., came Corbinian, the founder of the bishopric of Freisingen, to Rome, and prayed for permission to resign. A Roman Synod, however, which the Pope assembled in 724, and at which Corbinian himself was present, found it necessary that he should continue his office longer; and he consented to their decision. So relates his biographer Aribio. ^{FB35}

SEC. 331. IN THE EAST, MONOTHELITISM IS RENEWED AND AGAIN SUPPRESSED.

Important changes took place in the East in 716, described to us by the chief witness, the deacon and librarian Agatho of Constantinople, whom we already know, as follows: — “By the sixth Oecumenical Council rest and order were restored. But Satan did not long endure this. The Emperor Justinian II. was murdered at Damaticum in Bithynia by his rebellious army, and a certain Bardanes, who had been exiled to that place because of usurpation, was proclaimed Emperor by the rebels. He called himself Philip. As he himself said, he was by his parents, and still more by the infamous Abbot Stephen, the scholar of Macarius, educated in Monothelitism. When he went to Constantinople, before his entrance into the imperial palace, he caused the picture of the sixth Council, which hung in the vestibule of the palace, between the fourth and sixth schola, ^{FB36} to be taken away; the names of Sergius, Honorius, and the rest of those who were excommunicated with them by the Synod, had to be replaced :in the diptychs, and their pictures brought back again to their old places. The copy of the Acts of the sixth Council, written by deacon Agatho, and preserved in the palace, he caused to be burnt, and persecuted and exiled many orthodox men, especially those who would not subscribe the tome which he had drawn up for the rejection of the sixth Synod. ^{FB37} Deacon Agatho here refers to the Conciliabulum which the new Emperor held in the year 712. He had deposed the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, sent him away into a monastery, and given his see to John. In union with this man and some other bishops, particularly Germanus of Cyzicus, Andrew of Crete, and others, Philippicus procured that the spurious Synod mentioned should formally reject the sixth OEcumenical Council, and sanction the Monothelite doctrinal system in a special tome. Many Oriental

bishops, alas! were so weak that they acceded to the disgraceful decree.

FB38

The Emperor Philippicus, in a *Sacra*, requested from Pope Constantine his consent to the new decrees, but the Pope rejected them *cum apostolicae sedis consilio*, as Anastasius says (in Mansi, *l.c.p.* 179). Perhaps on this occasion he held a Synod at Rome. Anastasius adds: As the Roman people, full of zeal for orthodoxy, set up in S. Peter's Church a picture representing the six Oecumenical Councils, on the other hand, they held in abhorrence all the pictures of the Emperor, as of a heretic. His picture was also removed from the churches, and his name was no longer read from the diptychs.

The Monothelite intermezzo lasted only two years, for on Whitsunday, 713, Philip, entirely unprepared for it, was deposed by a military rising, and his eyes put out. Next day, however, Philartemius, who called himself Anastasius, a friend of orthodoxy, was proclaimed Emperor. The Patriarch John crowned him. At this solemnity the sixth Synod was again solemnly acclaimed by clergy and laity, its picture restored, and the likenesses of Philip and Sergiu again removed. Moreover, the Patriarch John again united with Rome, and sent to the Pope the synodal letter preserved in the *epi bogov* of Agathon, in which he represents his previous behavior as mere economy, *i.e.* a prudent yielding, affirms his orthodoxy, and adds that the Emperor had certainly burned the copy of the synodal Acts kept in the palace, but that he (John) had preserved the one belonging to the patriarchal archives.

The news of the deposition of Philippicus and of the elevation of Anastasius caused great joy in Rome, especially as the latter, by his exarchs (of Ravenna), sent the Pope a *Sacra*, in which he expressed his adhesion to the orthodox doctrine. ^{FB39} When, soon afterwards, the Patriarch John died, A.D. 715, ^{FB40} Germanus, previously bishop of Cyzicus, who had now come over to the side of orthodoxy, was elected, at a Synod at Constantinople, as his successor; and did not fail, at another Constantinopolitan Synod (of the year 715 or 716), to pronounce the doctrine of two wills and energies, and to anathematise Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, Paul, and John. ^{FB41}

BOOK 18.

The Controversy About Images And The Seventh Oecumenical Synod.

CHAPTER 1.

History Of The Controversy About Images Up To The Convocation Of The Seventh Oecumenical Synod.

SEC. 332. ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT IMAGES. ^{fb42}

THE Old Testament forbade images (^{<204>}Exodus 20:4), because through the weakness of the Jewish people, and their strong inclination to imitate the idolatrous worships of the neighboring peoples, they had brought the spiritual and Monotheistic worship of God into danger. This prohibition was, like all ritual ordinances, no longer binding, *in itself*, in the New Testament. On the contrary, it was the business of Christianity to lay hold of and ennoble the whole man in all his higher powers; and thus not only all the other noble arts *e.g.* music and poetry, but also to draw painting and sculpture into the service of the most holy. It was, however, natural that believers who came out of Judaism, who hitherto had cherished so well-founded a dislike for images, should bring over with them into the new dispensation the same, and that they should maintain this feeling so long — and properly — as they saw themselves surrounded and threatened by heathens who worshipped images. But the teacher's consideration for the newly converted heathen forbade also the early Church to set up religious pictures, in order to remove possible temptations to fall back into paganism. Moreover, the old Church, for the sake of its own honor, had to refrain from pictures, especially from representations of our Lord, so that it might not be regarded by those who were without as only a new kind of heathenism; and, besides, the old believers found, in their opinion of the bodily form of Christ, no inducement to the making of images of Christ. The *oppressed* Church represented to herself her Master only in the form of a servant, despised and having no comeliness, as Isaiah (^{<281>}53:2, 3) describes the Servant of God. ^{FB43} But the natural impulse to fix and support the memory of the Lord, and the thankful remembrance of the

salvation procured by Him by means of pictorial forms, called out substitutes and symbols instead of actual pictures, especially as those were partially allowed in the Old Testament. Thus arose the use of the symbolical pictures of the Dove, the Fish, the Lyre, the Anchor [the Lamb]; specially frequent and favorite was the Cross, on account of which Christians were often called cross-worshippers (*religiosi crucis*, Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 16). A decided step forwards to greater liberty is shown in the *human* symbolical figure of the Good Shepherd, which, according to Tertullian (*De Pudicit.* 100. 7), was often found in the second century upon the chalices. Such representations, however, were mostly found in private use, and their use in ecclesiastical places was greatly disapproved and forbidden. With the ortho

dox, pictures as objects of veneration ^{FB44} were not found so early as with heretics, particularly with the Carpocratians and with eclectic heathens, like the Emperor Alexander Severus. The celebrated Synod of Elvira, A.D. 306, spoke out strongly and severely against the use of pictures in the churches.

^{FB45} But held at the entrance of the time of Constantine, it stands at the boundary of two periods. In the new time we find, as in other things, so also an important change in regard to Christian art. Jewish Christianity had come: to an end, and its speciality and narrowness were extinguished. On the other side, even with heathens, any {great relapse was no longer seriously to be feared; and thus the two principal reasons, which previously spoke against pictures, no longer existed. Thus there could no longer arise an evil report against the Church if she made use of pictures for the embellishment of her worship, for her Monotheistic character and her spiritual worship were now placed beyond all doubt. Thus it happened that in the *victorious* Church there came naturally another representation of the bodily form of the Lord than that which was found in the oppressed Church. Christ was from this time regarded as the ideal of human beauty, e.g., by Chrysostom (*Opp.* t. 5. p. 162, ed. Montf.) and Jerome (*Opp.* t. 2. p. 684, ed. BB.), and this representation attached itself to Psalm 44. 3 [45. 2]. From this time very numerous representations of Christ, and also of the apostles and martyrs, in the form of pictures, mosaics, and statues, were fashioned, and, partly by Constantine himself, were put up in churches and in public places.

Where the ancient Fathers speak of the aim of these pictures, they find it in the *instruction* and *edification* of the faithful, and in the appropriate *decoration* of churches. Thus writes Pope Gregory the Great to Bishop

Serenus of Marseilles, who, in imprudent zeal, cast the pictures out of the Church: "You ought not to have broken what was put up in the churches, not for adoration, but merely for the promotion of reverence. It is one thing to worship an image, and another to learn from the history represented in the image what we ought to worship. For that which the Scripture is for those who can read, that a picture is for those who are incapable of reading; for in this also the uneducated see in what way they have to walk. In it they read who are not acquainted with the Scriptures" (lib. 9. Ep. 9). Still earlier, S. Basil, in his eulogy of the martyr Barlaam, called, in oratorical strains, upon the Christian painters to represent the glory of this great saint, as they could show this better in colors than be could in words. He would rejoice if he were surpassed by them, and if painting here triumphed over eloquence. ^{FB46}

The customary use of pictures, since Constantine the Great, in the whole Church, with the Greeks even more than with the Latins, Leo the Isaurian, in the eighth century, determined again to root out. His early history and his career are very differently related by the ancients. According to some, he was a poor workman from Isauria in Lesser Asia, who carried his few wares with him on an ass, and subsequently entered the imperial army as a common soldier, and rose in it, on account of his bodily strength and dexterity, from step to step. According to Theophanes, ^{FB47} on the other hand, he sprang from Germanicia, on the border of Isauria, was forced, in the reign of Justinian II., to remove to Mesembria in Thrace (why, is not known), once made this Emperor a present of 500 sheep, when he and his army were fit some need, and was for that reason made imperial *Spatharius*; ^{FB48} and afterwards, under Anastasius II., became general of the army in Asia Minor. When the latter Emperor, in consequence of a mutiny, A.D. 716, resigned and retired into a convent, in order to give place to the kindly but; weak Theodosius, whom the insurgents had proclaimed Emperor, Leo refused obedience to the latter, beat him, and compelled him also to retire into a convent, and now ascended the throne as the founder of a new dynasty. ^{FB49} Absolutely without education, rough in manner, a military upstart, he found in himself no understanding of art, and no aesthetic feeling that could have restrained him from Vandalism. Undoubtedly he was in all seriousness of the opinion that the veneration of images was a relapse into heathenism, and that the Old Testament prohibition of them was still in full force. How he came to this view, however, whether it arose in himself or was infused into him from without,

must remain undecided, on account of the partly incomplete, partly improbable statements of the authorities. It is quite certain, however, that the forcible carrying through of his plans, even in religious matters, without regard to the liberty of conscience, lay quite as much in the character of Leo as in the practice of the Byzantine Emperors. This he showed as early as the sixth-year of his reign, when he compelled the Jews and Montanists to receive baptism. The former submitted in appearance, but the Montanists themselves set fire to the house in which they were assembled, and rather died in the flames than comply with the command. Thus relates the chronographer Theophanes (†818), who from here forms one of our chief sources, and, in the later phase of iconoclasm, was a confessor and almost a martyr for images.^{FB50} All the others who have left us information respecting the controversy about images drew from Theophanes: Cedrenus (cent. 11.), Zonares (cent. 12.), Constantine Manasses (cent. 12.), and Michael Glyeas (cent. 15.);^{FB51} also the Latins. Anastasius (cent. 9.), in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and the unknown author of the *Historia Miscella* commonly ascribed to Paul the deacon, for the most part only translated faithfully the words of Theophanes.^{FB52} On the other hand, Paul the deacon, in his treatise, *De Gestis Lombardorum*, and Anastasius, in his biographies of the ropes,^{FB53} have given some important information of their own. To authorities of the first rank John Damascene would belong, who at the very beginning undertook the defense of the veneration of images against the assailants; but his writings unfortunately contain extremely little that is historical. Somewhat more of this we find in the biography of the Abbot, S. Stephen, of the ninth century, who was martyred under Leo's son, Constantine Copronymus, on account of the images,^{FB54} as well as the Patriarch Nicephorus, who, like his contemporary Theophanes, in the second half of the storm about images, was compelled to go into exile in consequence of his resisting the storm.^{FB55} Some other less important authorities we shall mention as occasion offers; but it is superfluous to mention that the letters of Popes and other authorities which belong to this period, and the Acts of the various Synods, are of highest importance for the history of the controversy about images. The later literature on the subject is uncommonly drawn out, and from the confessional point of view a good deal coloured. The relationship of the reformers to the old iconoclasts lay so near as to change the historical theme into a polemical one, and to lead to attacks against the Catholic Church. The subject has been handled, among Protestants, especially by Goldart, in his collection of *Imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum*, 1608;

Dallaeus [Daille], *De imaginibus*, 1612; Friedrich Spanheim junior, in his *Restituta Historia imaginum*, 1686; Bower, in *History of the Popes*, 1757, vol. 4.; Walch, in his *Ketzerhistorie*, 1782, Bd. 10.; and Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (of Heidelberg), in his history of iconoclastic Emperors, Frankfort 1812.^{FB56} On the Catholic side we name, besides Baronius, Pagi, Natalis Alexander, specially Maimbourg, S. J., *Histoire de l'heresie des iconoclastes*, Paris 1683, 2 vols. (not quite trustworthy); Assemani, *Historia Italic-orum Scriptorum*, t. 3.; and Marr, *Der Bilderstreit der byzantinischen Kaiser*, Trier 1839. Almost every one of the scholars named has formed a theory of his own on the chronology of the first lustrum of the controversies on images. This was occasioned by the uncertainty and indefiniteness in the information given by the authorities. A fresh examination of these led us to several new results, which we will communicate in the proper place.

As the attack of the Emperor Leo on the images was preceded by one quite similar, which the Caliph Jezid II., only three years before, attempted to make in the Christian provinces ruled by him, it was quite natural that the Emperor's contemporaries should charge him with having imitated the Mahometan, and accuse him of Saracen leanings. So particularly, Theophanes (*l.c.* pp. 618, 623), who mentions the renegade Beser and Bishop Constantine of Nacolia (in Phrygia) as the principal assistants of the Emperor in this affair.^{FB57} This Constantine, in particular, he calls an ignorant man, full of all uncleanness; of Beser, however, he relates that he, from birth a Christian, had denied Christ among the Arabs,^{FB58} and had come into great favor with the Emperor Leo. He had probably returned to Christianity.

Further information respecting Constantine of Nacolia we receive from two letters of Germanus, then patriarch of Constantinople.^{FB59} One of them is addressed to Bishop Constantine himself, the other to his metropolitan, John of Synnada. From the latter it appears that Constantine had personally come to Constantinople, and this gave occasion for his metropolitan himself to write to the patriarch, and to make him acquainted with his views in opposition to images. In consequence of this, Germanus had a conversation with Bishop Constantine on the subject. The latter appealed to the Old Testament, which forbade the images; but the patriarch explained the true state of the matter, and Constantine at last fell in with his view, with the assurance that henceforth he would confess the like, and give offense to no one. We learn this distinctly from the letter already

mentioned of the patriarch to the archbishop of Synnada, ^{FB60} which he put into the hands of Bishop Constantine to take care of, when he returned to his home. Constantine, however, disappointed this confidence, detained the letter, and kept at a distance from his metropolitan, pretending fear of being persecuted by him. The patriarch therefore issued a powerful letter to Constantine himself, and pronounced him excommunicated until he should deliver that letter. ^{FB61}

We do not doubt that the presence of Constantine in Constantinople belongs to the preliminary history of the image trouble. Bishop Constantine had, as we learn from these letters, first begun, in his own country, the battle against the images, and was thereupon driven into opposition on the part of the metropolitan and the comprovincial bishops. He went then to Constantinople, and sought the protection of his higher ecclesiastical superior, the patriarch, whilst in appearance he agreed with the explanation which he had given. That he was not serious in this we may infer from his subsequent behavior. The Patriarch Germanus, however, does not in the least indicate that the Emperor had then already taken steps against the pictures, whether it was that nothing had yet actually taken place on the part of the Emperor in this direction, or that the patriarch ignored it from prudence. I should prefer the previous supposition; for the ignoring of it could have been possible, only if at least so far nothing that was important or that excited notice had been undertaken by the Emperor.

Besides Beser and Constantine of Nacolia, Bishop Thomas of Claudiopolis ^{FB62} and Archbishop Theodosius of Ephesus, the son of the former Emperor Apsimar or Tiberius II, also belonged to those who shared the opinion of the Emperor. We hear of the first of these from the letter of the Patriarch Germanus, who explained to him at great length the Church view in regard to the veneration of images, and complained that he had been compelled to hear much that was so unfavorable, or even incredible, of Bishop Thomas. ^{FB63} The archbishop of Ephesus named, however, is pointed out by Pope Gregory II. as the secret counselor of Leo. ^{FB64}

Another ancient witness places Bishop Constantine of Nacolia in relation with the Caliph Jezid. This is the monk John, representative of the Oriental patriarchate, who read, in the fifth session of the seventh Oecumenical Council, a short essay, in which he states: "After Omar's death, Ezid, a frivolous and stupid man, became chief of the Arabs. There lived at Tiberias a leader of the Jews, a magician, a soothsayer, and a servant of

demons, named Tessaracontapechys (= 40 ells long; according to other MSS., his name was Sarantatechos), who gained the favor of Ezid, and told him: You will live long, and reign for thirty years more... if you immediately destroy all the images, pictures, and mosaics, all the pictures on walls, vessels, and cloths, which are found in the Christian churches of your kingdom; and so also all other pictures, even those which are not religious, which here and there in the towns are put up for ornament. The latter he mentioned in order to remove the suspicion that he was speaking only out of hatred against the Christians. The tyrant lent him a hearing, destroyed the pictures, and robbed the Church of all ornament, even before this evil came into our neighborhood. As the Christians fled, and would not themselves destroy the holy images, the emirs who were charged with the business made use of the Jews and common Arabs for the purpose. The venerable pictures were burnt, the walls of the churches smeared or scratched. When the pseudo-bishop of Nacolia and his friends heard this, they imitated the wickedness of the Jews and Arabs, and caused great disfigurement of the churches. Ezid, however, died after 2½ years, and the images were restored again in his kingdom. His successor, Ulid (Walid), even ordered the Jewish leader to be executed, because he had brought about the death of his father (as a judgment of God).” ^{FB65}

According to this, the bishop of Nacolia, who moreover did not stand alone, but must have had associates (perhaps also in the episcopate), appears as intermediary between Jezid and the Emperor Leo, as the man who induced the Emperor to become successor of the Caliph in the assault on the images. Another intermediary, however, has been introduced by the later Greek historians, and, according to their statement, the same Jews who misled Jezid won over the Emperor to their side. Fleeing, after the Caliph's death, they came to the borders of Isauria, and lighted upon a young man of distinguished form who lived by merchandise. They seated themselves by him, prophesied to him the imperial throne, and took an oath of him that, in case of his elevation, he would everywhere remove the pictures of Christ and Mary. ^{FB66} Leo promised it; some time afterwards entered the army, became under Justinian II. Spatharius, and finally even Emperor. Then came the Jews, reminded him of his promise, and in the tenth year of his reign Leo attacked the images.

Thus elated, with several variations in detail, but in fundamental agreement, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Michael Glycas, Constantine Manasses, and two anonymous writers, the authors of the *Oratio adv. Constantinum*

Cabalinum, and of the *Epistola ad Theophilum*. The time of the two latter cannot now be determined, probably they lived some centuries after Leo the Isaurian, ^{FB67} and the whole narrative bears so clearly the character of a later story, that it would be superfluous, with Bower (*Hist. of the Popes*, vol. 4.) and Walch (*l.c.* S. 205 ff.), to collect all kinds of grounds of suspicion against it. To mention only one, the Jews would have bargained with Leo for something more useful to themselves than the destruction of images; and how little the Emperor was grateful or well-disposed to the Jews, is shown by the circumstance that, as we have already seen (p. 264), he forcibly compelled them to receive baptism. Perhaps, however, the experience which he gained later on may have brought him to the reflection, that the converse. on of the Jews, which he so greatly desired, would be made much easier by the removal of the images. Many suppose that, in this way, he endeavored to make his Saracen neighbors more favorable, and to pave their way into the Church. ^{FB68}

If we add to these political grounds the narrow view of Leo already noticed, that all veneration of images was idolatrous, and also the insinuations of Beser, Constantine of Nacolia, and others, the reasons for the rising against images lie before our eyes. — That this was connected with the Monothelite controversies, and dated from the fact that the Emperor Philip Bardanes caused to be removed a picture of the sixth Oecumenical Synod (see p. 257), is a mere capricious assertion of some older Protestants, particularly Daille and Spanheim.

According to Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 621), whom Anastasius (*Hist. Eccles.*) and Paul the deacon (*Hist. Miscell.* lib. 21.) followed, Leo began in the ninth year of his reign (A.D. 725) **logou poieisqai** of the taking away of the sacred pictures, *i.e.* not merely in general to *speak*, to publish an *ordinance*, a *command*; for a few lines lower down Theophanes says: The Pope wrote on this subject to the Emperor, **mh<dein basil ea peri < pistewv logon poieisqai**. Pope Gregory II., on the contrary (*Epist. 1 ad Leonem*), as well as Cedrenus and Zonaras, remove the beginning of the controversy about images into the Emperor's tenth year; and this has also the greatest probability. So it comes that in this year, 726, that convulsion of nature took place which, according to the unanimous testimony of the ancients, brought the plan of the Emperor to maturity. Between the islands of the Cyclades group, Theta and Therasia (north-east from Crete), a volcano arose suddenly under the sea, which for several days vomited fire and stones with such violence, that the coasts of Asia Minor, and even

those of Lesbos, Abydos, and Macedonia, were covered with it. There immediately arose a new island which united with the island of Hiera. The Emperor and his associate Beser professed to see in this a judgment of God on account of the veneration of images, and now set to work. ^{FB69}

That the Emperor at his first steps against the images either did not consult Germanus, the patriarch of Constantinople, at all, or did not follow his counsel, is clear from the first letter of Gregory II. to Leo, in which he reproaches him that *Sapientes non percontatus es*. ^{FB70} In opposition to this, the biography of Abbot Stephen, martyred under Constantine Copronymus on account of the images, speaks of an *assembly* which the Emperor held, and in which he declared: "As the making of images is an idolatrous art, so may they not be venerated (*proskuneisqai*).” The old Latin translation departs from the Greek original in the rendering of this: "*Accita et coacta senatorum classe absurdum illud et impium evomuit* (Leo): *imagineum picturas formam quamdam idolorum retinere, neque iis cultus esse adhibendum.*" ^{FB71} In accordance with this, Schlosser (*l.c.* p. 166) has assumed that the Emperor Leo now held a consultative assembly on account of the images, but I fear mistakenly, for Pope Gregory II. knows nothing of any such assembly in the year 726, nor Theophanes or the Patriarch Nicephorus, nor the oldest authorities generally; and the biographer of Stephen had, in his expressions, nothing else in view but that *Silentium* (assembly of clergy and secular grandees) which first took place on the subject of the images in the year 730, as Theophanes and others testify.

Cedrenus, Zonaras, Constantine Manasses, and Glycas relate that the Emperor summoned the twelve professors who were appointed over the great library (of 36,000 volumes) in the neighborhood of the Church of S. Sophia, with their director, and endeavored to gain them over to his views. As this did not succeed, he caused the library to be burnt, together with the thirteen scholars named shut up within it. As this is not mentioned either by Gregory II. or by Theophanes or Nicephorus, or indeed any of the ancients, who yet fully describe Leo's cruelty, this story must be removed into the realm of fable. Schlosser thinks (*S.* 163 *f.*) so much is clear, that the Emperor spoke with those scholars, but did not gain them over; and then that the burning of the library, which took place six years later, was connected with this. But the fact of this burning is by no means sufficiently attested, and indeed rests on a confusion with the subsequent burning of that library which took place A.D. 780, under the Emperor Zeno. In

particular, the celebrated copy of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, written upon a dragon's skin, according to the testimony of Suidas, was burnt under Zeno, and not, as Constantine Manasses asserts, under Leo. Occasion for the fable of the burning, however, was perhaps given by the circumstance that Theophanes (*l.c.*) tells us that Leo specially persecuted the learned, so that the schools had been destroyed.

That the Emperor Leo published an ordinance, an edict against images (A.D. 726), is perfectly clear from the words of Theophanes quoted above (p. 271), and is by no one denied. But it is more difficult to arrive at the contents of this first edict. We shall discover hereafter that several of its principal passages are preserved in the letter of Gregory II. to Leo; but it was just here that they were not sought, because this letter was assigned to a later time. People founded rather upon the old Latin translation of the biography of Abbot Stephen, according to which the Emperor, in order to please the people, declared: "He would not destroy the pictures, but only hang them higher, so that people might no longer touch them with their mouths"; ^{FB72} and they inferred from this, that the first edict merely forbade the kissing and veneration of images, and that it was the second, in 730, which first ordered their destruction. ^{FB73} But, apart from the fact that this Latin translation has very little authority, this assembly, in accordance with what has already been said (p. 272), in which the Emperor made this declaration, belongs to the year 730. It appears, too, that a number, perhaps the most of the old pictures in the churches, were wall pictures or wall mosaics, which could not easily be disturbed, and, besides, were mostly fixed at a considerable height. Moreover, the incidents now to be narrated would be quite inexplicable if the Emperor had only required the pictures to be hung higher. Theophanes relates, at the year 718 of his reckoning, *i.e.* the tenth year of Leo, or A.D. 716: "The inhabitants of Constantinople were much disturbed by the new doctrines (the prohibition of images), and provoked to insurrection. When some servants of the Emperor destroyed the figure of the Lord over the great brass gate, they were killed by the populace, whereupon the Emperor punished many for their piety (adhesion to the images) with mutilation, blows, and exile." On the same occurrence Pope Gregory II., in his first letter to the Emperor Leo, says: "When you sent the Spatharocandidatus (*i.e.* Spatharius and Candidatus at once; see Du Cange) Jovinus to Chalcostrateia (a division of Constantinople where metal wares were sold), in order to destroy the figure of Christ which is called Antiphonetes, ^{FB74} some pious women who

stood there besought the workman not to do so. He, however, paying no attention to this, climbed a ladder and struck with an axe three times the face of the figure of Christ. (It was not, then, merely that he wanted the figure to be hung higher: it hung already so high that he required a ladder.) The women, profoundly indignant, overturned the ladder, and struck him dead; but you sent your servants and caused I know not how many of the women to be executed.” The like is related by Cedrenus and others, and small variations in the particular accounts are of no great moment.

The biographer of S. Stephen transfers this incident to the time after the deposition of the Patriarch Germanus, and adds: These women, after they had upset the ladder of the image-breaker, drew off in front of the residence of the new patriarch, Anastasius, in order to stone him, and shouted, “You shameful enemy of the truth, have you been made patriarch for this purpose, that you might destroy the sanctuaries?” Resting upon this, Pagi removed this incident to the year 730, and regards it as a consequence of the second edict ^{FB75} Almost all the later scholars agreed with him; but Theophanes and Cedrenus — not to mention Anastasius and Paul the deacon — place this occurrence expressly in the tenth year of Leo (= 726), and Pope Gregory II. clearly refers it to the beginning of the controversy about images. The first intelligence, he says, of the iconoclasm of the Emperor came to the West through those who had been witnesses of the incident at Chalcostrateia; and before an imperial edict against the images had stirred up a ferment in the West, the news of that occurrence had caused incursions of the Lombards into the imperial provinces of Italy. ^{FB76}

Thence it further appears that between the destruction of that figure of Christ and the composition of the papal letter a considerable interval must have elapsed. We could not, however, account for this if we removed that event to the year 730, for Pope Gregory died on February 11, 731, and we cannot assign the letter in question to his last days, as he received an answer to it from the Emperor, and even addressed a second letter to him.

The assumption that the brutal destruction of the celebrated figure of Christ gave occasion, so early as the year 726, to violent outbreaks in the West, need not be a matter of doubt, since, in the same year, elsewhere disturbances and even insurrections arose for the same reason. Theophanes (p. 623) and Nicephorus (p. 65) and others relate that the inhabitants of Greece and of the Cyclades did not receive the impious error, revolted against the Emperor, fitted out a fleet, and proclaimed a certain Cosmas as

rival Emperor. Under the guidance of two officers, Agallianus and Stephanus, they sailed to Constantinople, and arrived there on April 18 of the 10th Indiction (727). But their ships were destroyed by Greek-fire, Agallianus flung himself in complete armor into the sea, Cosmas and Stephanus were executed, and the Emperor proceeded so much the more decidedly in his iconoclasm. Soon afterwards, about the time of the summer solstice of the 10th Indiction (June 21, 727), the Arabs besieged the city of Nicaea, which was defended by an imperial army. A soldier of the latter, named Constantine, at this time threw a stone at a picture of the blessed Virgin ([qeotokov](#)), which had been set up in the city, and shattered its feet; but next day he himself was killed by a stone in an assault by the Arabs. Moreover, as Theophanes (p. 625) says, Nicaea was saved “by the intercession of Mary and other saints, whose images were venerated there, for the wholesome instruction of the Emperor. But instead of repenting, Leo now also cast off the intercession of the saints and the veneration of relics. From this time (*i.e.* since the controversy about images began), he hated the Patriarch Germanus, and declared (practically) that all previous emperors, bishops, and Christians were idolaters.”

We mentioned above the letter which the Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople addressed to Bishop Thomas of Claudiopoli, blaming him for his attacks on the images. As Germanus, among other things, says here: On account of this affair whole cities and peoples were in no slight tumult, ^{FB77} we may assume that the letter of Germanus falls in this time, and that some bishops, as Thomas, Constantine of Nacolia, and others, reformed in the sense of the Emperor. They naturally also cast the images out of their churches. In other cities, on the contrary, whose bishops held with Germanus, the attack on the images ordered by the Emperor seems hitherto to have touched the interior of the churches less than the images set up in public places. Of this kind was that over the brazen gate at Constantinople, and that destroyed by the soldier at Nicaea, whilst the latter city, according to the testimony adduced of Theophanes, was at that time rich in sacred pictures. If the crusade against the images was to make powerful progress, and the interior of the churches was also to be cleared, it was necessary finally to gain over the Patriarch Germanus, or to remove him. Theophanes (p. 625 sqq.) relates that, in the year 721 (according to his reckoning = the thirteenth regnal year of Leo, beginning March 25, 729), the Emperor summoned the patriarch to him, and gave him first very friendly words. Germanus replied: “An ancient prophecy says that certainly

an assault on images will be made, but not in your reign.” “Under what reign, then ?” asked the Emperor. “Under Conon.” “I myself,” said the Emperor, “in baptism received the name of Conon.” Thereupon the patriarch: “Far be it from you, my lord, that under your government this evil should come to pass. For he who does this is a forerunner of antichrist.” The tyrant, embittered by this, sought in the words of the patriarch material for a charge of *lese-majesty*, in order that he might depose him the more decently. A helper in this he found in Anastasius, the pupil and companion of the Patriarch, who wished to thrust him from his see. Germanus remarking this, exhorted the new Judas gently, in the spirit of Christ; but as he would not listen to him, and once, when the patriarch was visiting the Emperor, followed in the train” He prophesied to hint in those words the destiny which happened to him, after fifteen years, under the next Emperor (he was set upon an ass and carried round in the circus). Hereupon the Emperor, on Tuesday, January 7, of the 13th Indiction (730), held a Silentium or consultative assembly ^{FB78} in the hall of the nineteen accubiti or cushions, ^{FB79} and again endeavored at this to bring the patriarch, who had been sum-

moned to it, to fall in with his scheme. When he had boldly resisted, and had set forth [his views of] the truth in a powerful and lengthy speech, but saw no result, he laid down his episcopal dignity, and took off his pallium, with the words: “If I am Jonah, cast me into the sea; without the authority of an Oecumenical Council, O Emperor, nothing may be altered in the faith.” Thereupon he withdrew into his private residence, where he spent his remaining days (he was already over ninety years of age) in perfect peace. Anastasius was consecrated as his successor on January 7 (or, as other MSS. give it, January 2:2). — Thus relates Theophanes (*l.c.*), ^{FB80} and the Patriarch Nicephorus agrees with him. Only, he speaks with his accustomed brevity merely of the Silentium which the Emperor held (Nicephorus calls it an assembly of the *people*), without mentioning the preceding negotiations with Germanus; but adds very well that Leo wanted to induce him to put forth a document in favor of the destruction of the images. We see from this that the patriarch would have had to publish an edict against the images, corresponding with that of the Emperor, or else to join in subscribing a new imperial edict.

Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 629) says quite precisely that this Silentium was held on Tuesday, January 7 (Z). But in the year 730, January 7 fell on a Saturday, and therefore we must here assume a slip of the pen. Petavius, in

his notes to Nicephorus (*I.c.* p. 128), proposed either to put January 3 instead of 7, or instead of ~~hitherto~~ ~~lg~~ (Tuesday) to put **z** (= Saturday). But more probable is perhaps the suggestion, instead of January 7 (**z**) to read 17 (**iz**). The different statements will then agree, that the new patriarch, Anastasius, had been ordained on January 22, for this was a Sunday, and indeed the next Sunday after Tuesday, January 17, — and it is on Sundays that the consecrations of bishops did and do ordinarily take place.

As we saw above, there was a considerable interval between the interview spoken of between the Emperor and Germanus and the holding of the Silentium. To this interval belong the attempts to entangle the patriarch into a trial for *lese-majesty*, and also the warnings given by Germanus to the faithless Anastasius, and his visit to the Emperor connected with the prophesying. Moreover, so at least we suppose, Germanus now wrote also to Pope Gregory II., in order to make him acquainted with the demand of the Emperor and his own refusal. This letter is lost, but we still know it from the answer of the Pope, which is preserved among the Acts of the seventh Oecumenical Council. Gregory in this letter greets the patriarch as his brother and champion of the Church, whose deeds he is bound to praise. “Moreover,” he proceeds, “we might fitly declare that these deeds will be still more proclaimed by that precursor of impiety, who to thee, O fortunate man (*felicitati tuae*), has returned evil for good. He thought that he could revolt against Him who came from above (Christ), and triumph over godliness. But he is now hindered from above, and robbed of his hopes, and has heard from the Church what Pharaoh was forced to hear from Moses, that he was an enemy of God. But he heard also the word of the prophet: God will destroy thee. So is he hindered in his undertakings, deprived of power by the God-given strength of your opposition, and his pride has been wounded almost to annihilation. The strong, as Holy Scripture says, has been overcome by the weak. Have you not fought on the side of God, and as God has directed you, since HE ordained that in the camp of the kingdom of Christ the labarum of the cross should stand first, and then the sacred picture of His Mother! The honor shown to the picture goes over to the prototype (that which is represented in the picture), as the great Basil says; and the use of pictures is full of piety, as Chrysostom expresses himself... And the Church does not err when she asserts that God permits the veneration of images, and this is not an imitation of heathenism. When the woman with the issue of blood (S. Matthew 9.20) set up a statue of Christ at Paneas in remembrance of the

miracle wrought on her, she was not for that rejected (by God); on the contrary, a quite unknown medical plant grew up, ^{FB81} by the grace of God, at the foot of that statue. This is for us a proof that we may place before the eyes of all the human form of Him who took away our sins, so that we may thereby know the greatness of the self-humiliation of the divine Logos, and call to remembrance His life on earth and His sufferings. The words of the Old Testament are no hindrance to this; for if God had not become man, we should not represent Him in human form... Only the images of things which do not exist are called idols, as, *e.g.*, the images of non-existent deities feigned by the Hellenic mythology. The Church of Christ has no fellowship with idols, for we worship no calf, etc., never sacrificed our children to demons, etc. Did Ezekiel see (8. 14, 16) that we bewailed Adonis, and brought a burnt-offering to the sun? If, however, anyone, in Jewish fashion, misusing the words of the Old Testament which were formerly directed against idolatry, accuses our Church of idolatry, we can only hold him for a barking dog, and as a Jew of later times he shall hear that it so happened that Israel brought worship to God by means of visible things which were prescribed to him, and commemorated the Creator by means of types! He would have asked for more at the holy altar than at the calves of Samaria, more at the rod of Aaron than of Astarte! Yea, Israel would have seen more at the rod of Moses, at the golden pot, and the ark of the covenant, and the throne of grace (cover of the ark), and the ephod, and the table, and the tabernacle, and the cherubim, which are merely works of men's hands, and yet are called the most holy. If Israel had thought of these things, it would not have fallen into idolatry. For every image which is made in the name of God is worthy of veneration and sacred... The mistress of Christendom fought with you, the Mother of God, ^{FB82} and those who have long rebelled against her have experienced an opposition as strong (from her) as a contradiction (from you).” ^{FB83}

The contents of this letter, as we believe, by themselves point to the time immediately *after* the powerful opposition which Germanus maintained against the Emperor (A.D. 729), and *before* the Silentium, when, despairing of the result of his effort, he laid aside the episcopal mantle. The words of the Pope, so far the echo of those of the patriarch, show that the latter had written in the consciousness of a spiritual victory over the Emperor, and at that time had not the intention of resigning. On the contrary, he was hoping, by his opposition, to put an end to the controversy about images. After that Silentium, on the contrary, and after

the elevation of Anastasius, it was natural that the latter should draw up the ([suggraph](#)) against the images desired by the Emperor, as Nicephorus (p. 65) tells us, or as Theophanes will have it (p. 929), subscribed the edict published by the Emperor. Whether this was different from that of the year 726, as Walch (S. 225) and others assume, or whether that which was new in it consisted only in the subscription of the patriarch, may remain doubtful. The original authorities do not, require us to assume an entirely new edict. The assault on the images, however, had now, in any case, obtained an ecclesiastical sanction, and with the well-known servility of the Greek bishops, after the opposition of the *prima sedes* had been broken, the Emperor henceforth made sure of important advances.

It was otherwise in the West. It is indeed unfortunately most difficult to reconcile the accounts of what happened there with one another, and with facts otherwise known. Theophanes informs us that, in the ninth year of the Emperor, “after Pope Gregory of Rome had learnt this (the [logov](#) of the Emperor on the removal of the images), he wrote to Leo a doctrinal letter, to the effect that the Emperor should issue no ordinance in regard to the faith, and should alter nothing in the ancient dogmas; that, in consequence, he prevented Italy and Rome from paying taxes ([φορου](#)).”

Theophanes speaks of the same affair for the second time (p. 628 f., at the year 729-730) in the words: “The Patriarch Germanus withstood the Emperor Leo at Constantinople, like the apostolic man Gregory at Rome, who separated Rome and Italy and the whole of the West from political and ecclesiastical obedience to Leo and from his Empire...and censured him in his universally known letters.” The third passage (p 630) runs: “Gregory, however, the holy bishop of Rome, rejected (the new patriarch) Anastasius with his letters (the *litterae inthronisticae*, which he had sent to Rome), reprimanded the Emperor Leo, in a letter, for his impiety, and made Rome and the whole of Italy separate from his Empire.”

The Latins were naturally better informed on this subject than Theophanes. Anastasius relates, in his biography of Gregory II., in Mansi, t. 12. p. 229 sqq.:” The Longobardi made an incursion into the imperial domain of Italy (before the imperial decree against the images arrived in Italy), took Narnia (in the Duchy of Spoleto) and Ravenna, and secured large booty. After some days, the Dux Basil, the Chartular Jordanes, and the sub-deacon John Luxion, conspired to put the Pope to death, and the imperial Spatharius, Maximus, who then administered the Duchy of Rome, agreed with them;

but they found no occasion suitable for this. Subsequently, when the Patriarch Paul came to Italy as exarch, they again formed their scheme, but the affair was discovered, and the Romans killed Luxion and Jordanes, whilst Basil took refuge in a monastery. On the other hand, the exarch Paul, at the command of the Emperor, now endeavored to kill the Pope, “eo quod cenum in provincia ponere praepediebat, et cogitaret suis opibus ecclesias denudare, sicut in caeteris actum est locis, atque allure in ejus ordinare loco,” *i.e.* because the Pope prevented him from oppressing the province with an (unjust) tax, and because the Emperor had the intention to strip the churches of their property, as it had happened elsewhere, and to put another Pope in Gregory’s place. Thereupon the Emperor sent another Spatharius with the command to remove the Pope from his see, and Paul sent for the execution of this outrage as many people (soldiers) from Ravenna and the camps to Rome as he could get for the purpose. But the Romans and Lombards rose up to defend the Pope, took possession of the bridge Salario in Spoleto, surrounded the boundaries of Rome, and prevented the accomplishment of the attempt.

In a decree which was afterwards sent, the Emperor had ordered that no one should make the image of any saint or martyr or angel; these things were all accursed. If the Pope should agree with this, the favor of the Emperor would be granted to him; if, however, he opposed, he should lose his office. The pious man, however, rejected the heresy, armed himself against the Emperor as against an enemy, and wrote in all directions to warn Christians to be on their guard against the new impiety. Upon this all the inhabitants of Pentapolis and the Venetian army offered opposition to the imperial command, declaring that they would never agree to the murder of the Pope, but, on the contrary, would boldly fight in his defense. They now anathematised the exarch Paul, and him who had given him the commission, as well as all his associates; and discharging themselves from obedience to him, the Italians generally chose their own leaders, and on learning of the Emperor’s wickedness, the whole of Italy decided to choose a new Emperor, and conduct him to Constantinople. But the Pope quieted them, and induced them to give up this design, hoping that the Emperor would still amend. In the meantime, the Dux (imperial viceroy) Exhilaratus of Naples and his son Hadrian had led away the inhabitants of Campania to obey the Emperor and to make an attempt on the life of the Pope. The Romans, however, followed him up, and put him and his son to death. They also drove out the Dux Peter (from Rome), because he was

suspected of having written to the Court against the Pope. In Ravenna, however, because one party was on the Emperor's side and the other with the Pope and the faithful, controversies broke out, and the Patriarch Paul (the exarch) thus lost his life. The Lombards about this time took the cities of Castra Aemilia, Ferorianus, Montebelli, Verablum, with Buxum and Persicetum, also Pentapolis^{FB84} and Auximanum.^{FB85} After some time, the Emperor sent the patrician Eutychius, the eunuch, who had formerly been exarch, to Naples, to carry through the plan against the Pope which had previously miscarried; but it was soon evident that he would violate the churches, and ruin and plunder all. When he sent one of his subordinates to Rome with the command to kill the Pope and the nobles of the city, the Romans endeavored to kill the envoy, but the Pope prevented them. They now anathematised Eutychius, and pledged themselves by oath to the protection of the Pope. Eutychius now promised to the King and the dukes of the Lombards great presents if they would desist from protecting the Pope; but the Lombards united with the Romans, and declared themselves ready to lay down their lives for the Pope. The latter thanked the people for such attachment, but sought his chief protection in God by abundant prayers and fasting and rich almsgiving. At the same time he exhorted them all *ne desisterent ab amore vel fide Romani imperii*. About the same time, in the 11th Indiction (from September 1, 727-728), the Lombards got possession, by stratagem, of the castle of Sutri (in the neighborhood of Rome, to the north), and held it for 140 days, until the Pope, by entreaties and gifts, received it back as an offering for the Apostles Peter and Paul. Soon afterwards, in the January of the 12th Indiction (729), a comet appeared in heaven. Now also Eutychius and Luitprand, King of the Lombards, entered into the shameful league, to unite their armies and subject to Luitprand the Lombard vassal dukes of Spoleto and Benevento (who perhaps were endeavoring to make themselves independent), and to seize the city of Rome for the Emperor, and to deal with the Pope according to his instructions. Luitprand in fact compelled the two dukes to subjection, and then drew towards Rome. But the Pope met him and spoke so earnestly to him that the King cast himself at his feet. Only, he petitioned that the Pope would again receive Eutychius in peace. This was done, and the reconciliation took place.

Whilst the exarch was residing in Rome, a deceiver, Tiberius Petasius, set himself up in Italy as rival Emperor, and received homage from several cities.^{FB86} The exarch was greatly troubled about this, but the Pope

comforted him and supported him so powerfully, that the insurrection was speedily suppressed, and they were able to send the head of Tiberius to Constantinople. Notwithstanding this, the Emperor remained unfavorable to the Romans. Moreover, his evil disposition became ever clearer, so that he compelled all the inhabitants of Constantinople everywhere to take away the pictures of the Redeemer, of His holy Mother, and of all the saints, to burn them in the middle of the city, and to smear the painted walls with whitewash. As a good many of the inhabitants resisted, several were executed and others mutilated. The Patriarch Germanus was deposed by the Emperor, who made over the see to Anastasius. The latter sent a Synodica to Rome, but Gregory found that he assented to the heresy, and threatened him with excommunication if he did not return to the Catholic faith. And to the Emperor he gave wholesome counsels in letters. ^{FB87}

From all this we learn

(1) that even before the imperial edict against images was published in Italy, a violent division between Pope Gregory II. and the Emperor had taken place. How and why it arose, Anastasius does not relate, he only says: The Pope prevented the exarch from imposing a tax on the (Roman) province. By this tax we have to think of an unusual and unjust import, probably similar to the poll-tax which the Emperor Leo, somewhat later, imposed on Calabria and Sicily. ^{FB88} Anastasius indicates that it had been directed chiefly to the plundering of the churches, and perhaps it is here that we are to find the ground of the papal resistance. As to the manner in which this was exercised, its legal character can no longer be ascertained, on account of the quite defective account of Anastasius (and Theophanes). It is only clear from the subsequent behavior of the Pope (which we learn from Anastasius), that he endeavored to preserve carefully his loyalty to the Emperor and to discharge his duties as a subject. It was an opposition to unrighteous demands from authority, and within the bounds of right and duty. But that the Pope did not hinder the payment of legal dues and taxes, nor was guilty even of great disloyalty towards the Emperor, is quite sufficiently clear

(a) from the principles which he himself set forth on the relation of the priesthood and the imperial power in his letters to the Emperor Leo. We shall shortly ascertain their contents more exactly (pp. 293 and 297). ^{FB89} Witnesses for us are also

(b) the zealous efforts of Gregory to prevent any kind of rebellion against the Emperor, and all acts of violence against his officials. This is clear from the details which Anastasius gives, and from the letter of the Pope to Duke Ursus in Venice (p. 287). But moreover

(c), Paul the deacon is a powerful witness on the same side, since he writes (*De rebus gestis Longobard.* 6. 49): “Omnis quoque Ravennae exercitus et Venetiarum talibus jussis (for the destruction of the images) uno animo restiterunt, *et nisi cos prohibuisset Pontifex, imperatorem super se constituere fuissent aggressi.*”

When, therefore, the Greeks, who were often badly instructed in Western affairs, assert that the Pope had occasioned the revolt not merely of Italy, but the whole of the West (!) from the Emperor, such an assertion cannot weigh in the balance against the words of Gregory himself, and against the testimony of Anastasius and Paul the deacon. When, however, Zonaras says, “The Pope and his Synod had anathematised the Emperor,” seeing that no other of the ancients mentions it, this must be only a misunderstanding arising out of an expression in the second letter of Gregory to the Emperor Leo (see p. 296 f.), when the Pope, applying the words of S. Paul (1 Corinthians. 5. 5), wishes the Emperor a demon for the destruction of his flesh that his soul may be safe. ^{FB90} On another misunderstanding rests the assertion of the same Zonaras, that Pope Gregory II. had endeavored to form a union with the Franks against the Emperor. That the Pope did make efforts for such a union is quite correct, and Anastasius in his *Vita Stephani* II. (III.) speaks of it; ^{FB91} but it was directed against the Lombards, not against the Emperor.

(2) We remember that Theophanes represents the hindering of the imposition of that tax as a consequence of the controversy about images of the year 726. Anastasius, on the other hand, brings these two events into no connection with one another.

(3) He says expressly, the imperial officers had, with the previous knowledge of the Emperor, repeatedly made attempts on the life of the Pope. Some explain this to mean that the Emperor Leo had only given orders that the Pope should be taken and conveyed to Constantinople, of which Gregory himself speaks in his first letter to Leo (see p. 293 f.), and that report had exaggerated the matter, and made the order to imprison a command to murder. ^{FB92}

(4) Anastasius speaks of two principal incursions of the Lombards into the imperial domain. The one, in which they seized the city of Narnia, and even Ravenna, the capital of the exarchate, with the harbour of Classis, and carried off much booty, ^{FB93} he places before the arrival of the edict against the images; the other incursion, in which *Castra Aemilia*, etc., were plundered, later. To the same effect, Paul the deacon (*De gestis Longobard.* 6. 48, 49) tells of the pillaging of Narnia and Ravenna, before he mentions the prohibition of the images; but speaks of *Castra Aemilia*, etc., falling into the hands of the Lombards *after* the appearance of the imperial edict. For full light on this subject, however, we are indebted to the first letter of Gregory II. to the Emperor Leo, in which it is said that many Westerns had been present at the time of the destruction of the figure of Christ in Chalcostrate in Constantinople, and by telling of this outrage, and of the cruelties connected with it, they had filled the whole of the West with anger against the Emperor, so that the Lombards invaded Decapolis, ^{FB94} and even seized Ravenna. ^{FB95}

We see that the Lombards made use of the disagreement of the Italians with the Emperor which had been occasioned by those relations, and invaded his domain, which had long been desired by them. The capture of Ravenna etc., certainly was connected with the prohibition of images, and was a consequence of it; and yet Anastasius and Paul the deacon were right when they put this incident before the *publication* of the imperial edict in Italy. Undoubtedly those witnesses of the destruction of the figure of Christ in Chalcostrate brought the first certain intelligence of the attack on the images to Italy.

(5) Among the letters of Gregory II. there is one to Ursus, the Dux of Venice. ^{FB96} Gregory says in it: The city of Ravenna was taken *a non dicenda genere Longobardorum*, and, as he hears, the exarch fled to Venice. The Dux should remain faithful to him, and co-operate with him, so that Ravenna may again be restored to the Emperor. ^{FB97} That this was actually realized we learn from Paul the deacon (*De gestis Longobard.* 6. 54), who says: In his many wars against the imperialists, the King of the Lombards, Luitprand, was only twice unfortunate — once at Ariminum; the second time, when his nephew Hildebrand, whom he placed over Ravenna, was surprised by a sudden attack of the Venetians, and taken.

That Pope Gregory used the expression of horror, *A non dicenda gentre*, in reference to the Lombards, is clearly shown by the fact that this letter was written before the Lombards had come nearer to him, and made themselves serviceable to him. Indeed, the recovery of Ravenna must have taken place before, for the exarch Paul was able soon again to send out from Ravenna an army against Rome and the Pope, as Anastasius and Paul the deacon concur in relating. This was that army which was opposed by the united Romans and Lombards at the *Pons Salaris* (p. 281 f.).

(6) Pagi, Walch, and others assume that the imperial edict against the images, of the publication of which in Italy Anastasius speaks, was that of the year 730; ^{FB98} but Anastasius gives us quite another chronological turning-point. After describing the disturbances which this edict caused in Italy, and the indestructible fidelity of the much ill-used Pope to the Emperor, he thus proceeds: "About the same time (*i.e.* some time after the publication of the imperial edict), the Lombards, in the 11th Indiction (September 1, 727, 728), got possession of the castle of Sutri, and in January 729 a comet appeared." According to this, the publication of the imperial decree must have happened some time before the year 728, so that the first decree of the year 726 must here be meant.

(7) Theophanes, ^{FB99} immediately after the mention of the first edict against the images, adds that the Pope sent a letter against it to Leo, setting forth "that it was not the Emperor's business to issue an ordinance on the faith, or to alter anything in the old dogmas." In two other places also Theophanes speaks (see above, p. 281 f.) of letters of Gregory to the Emperor, and Anastasius also refers to them. But it was not until the sixteenth century that these letters were discovered by the learned Jesuit Fronton le Duc in the library of the Cardinal of Lorraine, and translated from the Greek into Latin. From him Baronius received them, and had them printed for the first time *ad ann.* 726. Pope Gregory bears in the superscription of these letters, by confusion with Gregory the Great, the surname of *Dialogus*, the latter on account of his famous work of that name being often so entitled. These letters soon found their way into the Collections of Councils, and were placed before the Acts of the seventh Oecumenical Council. That they were not, like other similar documents *e.g.* the letter of the same Pope to the Patriarch Germanus, presented and read at the seventh Oecumenical Council, is certainly remarkable, as Rosler observes; ^{FB100} but is

explained by the fact that the Emperor Leo had probably caused the copy which came to Constantinople to be destroyed, and thus the Synod had none in hand. Labbe was mistaken in thinking that these two letters should not be ascribed to Gregory II., but to his successor Gregory III., ^{FB101} and the doubts which Semler and Rosler have raised as to their genuineness are of no importance. As to the time of the composition of these letters, we can form a judgment only after we have communicated their contents.

The first runs: "Your letter, God-protected Emperor and brother, we received through the imperial Spatharocandidatus, when you were reigning in the 14th Indiction. We have preserved safe in the church your letter of this 14th Indiction, and those of the 15th, and of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th, at the foot of the grave of Peter, where those of your predecessors are also kept. In ten letters you have, as is becoming in a Christian emperor, promised faithfully to observe the doctrines of the Fathers. And above all, the most important is, that they are your own, furnished with the imperial seal, and none interpolated. You write in these: If anyone removes the ordinances of the Fathers, let him be anathema After receipt of these letters we offered hymns of thanksgiving to God that He had given you the empire. And as you did run well, who has rung the falsehood into your ears and perverted your heart? Ten years by God's grace you have walked aright, and not mentioned the sacred images; but now you assert that *they take the place of idols, and that those who reverence them are idolaters*, and want them to be entirely set aside and destroyed. You do not fear the judgment of God, and that offense will be given not merely to the faithful, but also to the unbelieving. Christ forbids our offending even the least, and you have offended the whole world, as if you had not also to die and to give an account. You wrote: '*We may not, according to the command of God (¹²¹⁰Exodus 20:4), worship anything made by the hand of man, nor any likeness of that which is in the heaven or in the earth.*' Only prove to me, who has taught us to worship (**sebesqai kai proskunein** anything made by man's hands, and I will then agree that it is the will of God. But why have not you, O Emperor and head of the Christians, questioned wise men on this subject before disturbing and perplexing poor people? You could have learnt from them concerning what kind of images made with hands (**ceiropoïeta**) God said that. But you have rejected our Fathers and doctors, although you gave the assurance by your own subscription that you would follow them. The holy

Fathers and doctors are our scripture, our light, and our salvation, and the six Synods have taught us (that); but you do not receive their testimony. I am forced to write to you without delicacy or learning, as you also are not delicate or learned; but my letter yet contains the divine truth...God gave that command because of the idolaters who had the land of promise in possession, and worshipped golden animals, etc., saying: These are our gods, and there is no other God. On account of these *diabolical* **ceiropoibta**, God has forbidden us to worship them. As, however, there are also **ceiropoibta** for the service and honor of God,...God chose and blessed two men from the people of Israel, that they might prepare **ceiropoibta**, but for the honor and service of God, namely, Bezaleel and Aholiab (⁽¹²⁵⁰⁾Exodus 35:30, 34). God Himself wrote the Ten Commandments on two tables of stone, and said: Make cherubim and seraphim, and a table, and overlay it with gold within and without; and make an ark of shittim wood, and in the ark place the testimonies for the remembrance of your tribes, namely, the tables of the Law, and the pot, and the rod, and the manna (⁽¹²⁵⁰⁾Exodus 25:10-24). Are those objects and figures made by man's hand or not? But for the honor and the service of God. Moses wished to see the Lord, but He showed Himself to him only from behind. To us, on the contrary, the Lord showed Himself perfectly, since the Son of God has been made man...From all parts men now came to Jerusalem to see Him, and then depicted and represented Him to others. In the same way they have depicted and represented James, Stephen, and the martyrs; and men, leaving the worship of the devil, have venerated these images, but not absolutely (with *latria*) but relatively (**tautav prosekunhsen oujl atreutikwv aj l a<scetikwv**). What think you now, O Emperor, that *these* images are venerable or those of the diabolical illusion? Christ Himself sent His portrait to Abgar, an **ajeiropoibton**.

^{FB102} Look on this: many peoples of the East assemble at this, in order to pray there. And also other images made by men's hands are venerated by pious pilgrims till today Why, then, do we make no representation of God the Father? The divine nature cannot be represented. If we had seen Him, as we have the Son, we could also make an image of Him. We adjure you, as a brother in Christ, turn back again to the truth, and raise up again by a new edict those whom you have made to stumble. Christ knows that so often as we go into the Church of S. Peter, and see the picture of this saint, we are moved and tears flow from us. Christ has made the blind to see: you have made the seeing blind...You say: *We worship stones and walls and boards*. But it is not so, O Emperor; but they serve us for remembrance

and encouragement, lifting our slow spirits upwards by those (persons) whose names the pictures bear, and whose representations they are. And we worship them not as God, as you maintain; God forbid! For we set not our hope on them; and if a picture of the Lord is there, we say: Lord Jesus Christ, help and save us. At a picture of His holy Mother we say: Holy God-bearer, pray for us with thy Son, and so with a martyr. And this is not correct which you say, *that we call the martyrs gods*. I adjure you, leave off the evil thoughts, and save your soul from the wrath and execration with which the whole world visits you. The children mock at you. Go now into the schools of the children, and say: I am the enemy of images, and they will immediately throw their tables at you. You wrote: *As the Jewish King Uzziah* (it should be Hezekiah) *after 800 years cast the brazen serpent out of the temple* (~~2 Kings~~ 2 Kings 18:4), *so I after 800 years cast the images out of the churches*. Yes, Uzziah was your brother; and, like you, did violence to the priests (~~2 Chronicles~~ 2 Chronicles 26:16 ff.). That brazen serpent David brought with the Ark of the Covenant into the temple, and it was an image of brass, sanctified by God for the use of those who had been bitten by the serpent (~~Numbers~~ Numbers 21:9 ff.). We might punish you in accordance with the power which has come down to us from Peter; but you have pronounced a curse upon yourself, ^{FB103} and may now have it with your counselors. What a great edification of the faithful you have destroyed! Christ knows that, as often as we went into the church, and saw the representation of the miracles of Christ, or the picture of His Mother, the divine Suckling in her arms, and the angels standing round in a circle and acclaiming the Trisagion, we did not go out again without emotion... It would have been better for you to have been a heretic than a destroyer of images. The dogmatists fall easily into error, when they are lacking in humility, partly from ignorance, partly because of the darkness of the subject; and their guilt is not so great as yours, for you have persecuted that which is open and clear as light, and stripped the Church of God. The holy Fathers clothed and adorned them; you have stripped them and laid them bare, although you have (~~et~~ ^{wn}) so excellent a high-priest, our brother Germanus. Him you ought to have taken into your counsels as father and teacher, for he has great experience, is now ninety-five years old, and has served many patriarchs and Emperors. But, leaving him aside, you have listened to the impious fool from Ephesus, the son of Apsimar (Archbishop Theodosius, see p. 266), and people like him. The Emperor Constantine (Pogonatus) behaved quite differently when he wrote to Rome about the holding of the sixth Oecumenical Synod. You see that the

dogmas of the Church are not a matter for the Emperor, but for the bishops. As these may not intrude into civil affairs, so should not the Emperors intrude into the ecclesiastical. You wrote that an *Oecumenical Synod should be called*. This seems to me superfluous; for if you are peaceful, all is peaceful. Think: if I had responded to your wish, and the bishops of the whole world had been assembled, where is the God-fearing Emperor who, in accordance with custom, should assist at these assemblies, since you destroy the peace of the Church and imitate the barbarians (Jezid)?... While the churches of God had deep peace, you have occasioned conflicts, controversies, and troubles. Cease and be peaceful, and there is need of no Synod. Write to all the countries which you have disquieted, that Germanus of Constantinople and Pope Gregory of Rome had erred in regard to the images, and we who have the power of binding and loosing will pardon your false step. ^{FB104} God is witness that I communicated all your letters to the Kings of the West, and made them your friends, commending and praising you. Therefore they accepted and honored your *laureata* (likenesses) before they heard of your evil undertaking against the images. When, however, they learnt that you sent the Spatharocandidatus Jovinus to Chalcoprateia, to destroy the miraculous figure of Christ, which is called Antiphonetes, pious women, followers of those who anointed the Lord, cried to the Spatharocandidatus: Do it not; and when he paid no regard to them, but mounted a ladder and struck with an axe three times on the face of the figure, the women enraged upset the ladder and killed him; but you sent soldiers and caused I know not how many women to be killed in the presence of many distinguished men from Rome, France, from the Vandals, Goths, and from Mauritania, almost from the whole of the West. When these returned back, and every one told in his home your childish acts, then they destroyed your *laureata*, and the Lombards, Sarmatians, and others who dwell in the North, made incursions into the unhappy Decapolis and took the metropolis Ravenna, ^{FB105} deposed your rulers, put their own in their palace, and wanted to do the same with the imperial cities in our neighborhood, and even with Rome itself, unless you can protect us. There you have the fruit of your folly. But you will alarm me and say: *I will send to Rome and destroy the picture of S. Peter, and carry off Pope Gregory a prisoner, as Constantine (Constans II.) did with Martin*. You must know that the bishops of Rome, for the sake of peace, sit as middle walls between the East and West, and are promoters of peace. If you wish to lay snares for me, as you say, I have no need to contend with you. The Roman bishop will merely remove twenty-four stadia to

Campania; and then come you and persecute the winds. ^{FB106} The Emperor Constantine (Constans II.) ill-treated and banished our predecessor, Martin I. But the Emperor was murdered in his sins, whilst Martin is honored as a saint. Willingly would I bear the same fate as Martin; but for the benefit of the people I am willing to remain in life; for the whole West turns its eyes on me, although unworthy, and hopes in me and in S. Peter, whose image you threaten to destroy. If you venture upon that, the Westerns are ready to take vengeance upon you for the Easterns whom you have wronged. But I adjure you by the Lord to leave off from such foolish things. You know that your throne cannot defend Rome, ^{FB107} the city alone, not to think of that which is outside; and if the Pope, as we said, removes himself twenty-four stadia, he has no more to fear from you... If the picture of S. Peter is really destroyed, I call God to witness that I am innocent of the blood that will then be shed. Let it fall on your head. A prince from the interior of the West, named Septetus, ^{FB108} has prayed me to come to him and administer baptism to him, and I shall do so. May the Lord again place in your heart the fear of God, and bring you back to the truth! Would that I might soon receive from you letters with the news of your conversion.”

^{FB109}

We saw that Pope Gregory, in this letter, repeated quite or almost verbally several passages from the edict which the Emperor had sent on the subject of the images to Italy. We have quoted those passages above in italics, and since, as we have shown, this edict was not published in Italy in the year 730, but before 728, our desire to be acquainted with the tenor of the first edict, at least in outline, is satisfied. At the same time, we see how Walch and others have gone astray, who regarded the first edict as mild, and would ascribe to it only the prohibition against the kissing of the pictures. The passages extracted from the edict itself prove its already fully *iconoclastic* character.

That the Emperor answered the Pope, we learn from the second letter of Gregory: “I have,” says the Pope here, “your letter, God-protected Emperor and brother in Christ, by your messenger Rufinus, and it has quite overshadowed my life, because you have not altered your disposition, but persevere in evil, and refuse to follow the holy Fathers. And yet I make my appeal not to strangers, but to Greek Fathers. You write: *I am Emperor and priest at the same time*. Yes; your predecessors were so in fact, Constantine the Great, Theodosius the Great, Valentinian the Great, and Constantine (Pogonatus). They reigned as Emperors religiously, and held

Synods in union with the bishops, and built and adorned churches. They showed by their works that they were Emperors and priests at the same time; but you have...not observed the decisions of the Fathers, but have plundered and stripped the churches of their ornament...Men and women instruct their children, and the new converts from heathenism, pointing with their fingers to the histories which are painted in the churches, they edify them therewith, and give thereby to their hearts the tendency to go upwards. But you have taken this from the people, and left them nothing but foolish discourses, fables, and musical farces, ^{FB110} Hear me, the lowly one, O Emperor; leave off and follow the holy Church, as you have known it as handed down to you. Doctrines are not matters for the Emperor, but for the bishops, because we have the mind (noun) of Christ...There is a difference between the palace and the Church, between Emperors and bishops. Recognise this, and save yourself ! If you were to be deprived of the imperial robes, the purple, the diadem, etc., you would seem before men to be treated with disrespect. In the like condition you have placed the churches, in robbing them of their adornment. As the bishop has no right to mix himself with the business of the palace, and to give away the offices, so it does not belong to the Emperor to mix in the inner affairs of the Church, to choose the clergy, to administer the sacraments, etc. Let each one remain in the place to which God has called him. Do you know, O Emperor, the difference between Emperor and bishop? When anyone fails in his duty towards you, O Emperor, you take from him his house and property, perhaps also his life, or you banish him. Not so the bishops. If anyone sins, and he confesses, instead of a rope, they lay upon his neck the gospel and the cross, and instead of casting him into prison, they bring him into the Diaconia or Catechumena of the Church, ^{FB111} and impose upon him fasting, etc. If he has repented, they administer to him the body and blood of the Lord...You persecute and tyrannise over us with military and physical force; but we, without weapons or earthly army, invoke the Leader of the armies of the whole creation, Jesus Christ, that He may send you a demon, according to the words of the apostle (~~ⲉⲕⲃⲉ~~ 1 Corinthians 5:5): ('I will) deliver him to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' Behold, O Emperor, into such misery you plunge yourself. How unhappy are we compared with our forefathers, who, on account of their good influence on the Emperors, will obtain praise in the day of judgment, while we shall be forced to blush because we cannot present our Emperor before God glorious and rich in renown. Behold, even now we exhort you: repent and return to the truth,

and honor the holy Fathers. You wrote: *How comes it that in the six Councils nothing is said of images?* But there is nothing said there, O Emperor, of bread and water, whether it shall be eaten and drunk, or not, because here the custom stood fast. So also the custom of the pictures; and the bishops themselves brought pictures with them to the Councils, as no pious man traveled without pictures. We exhort you to be at once bishop and Emperor, as you wrote. If you are ashamed, as Emperor, to ascribe the guilt of your mistake to yourself (*ai̅tiol oghsai e̅auton*), then write into all the places which you have troubled, that Pope Gregory of Rome and Germanus of Constantinople made a mistake in regard to the images, and we forgive you your false step, by virtue of our power to bind and loose... As we must give account to Christ, we have exhorted you; but you have not listened to our lowliness, nor to Germanus, nor to the holy Fathers, but have followed the perverters and falsifiers of the true doctrine. As we have written, we shall travel into the interior of the West, in order to administer holy baptism. I have already sent bishops and clergy thither, but the leaders of these countries are not yet baptized, and prefer to be baptized by me. God grant to you insight and a change of mind.” FB112

When we compare the expressions of Theophanes, adduced above (p. 281), in the letters of Gregory to the Emperor Leo, with the contents of the two now quoted, there can be no doubt that Theophanes had these very letters, and no others, in his eye. That which he presents as the chief contents of the papal letters, “It does not belong to the Emperor to issue ordinances in regard to the faith, or to alter anything in the old doctrines,” we find not only verbally in our two letters, but it is even a leading argument there. If, notwithstanding, it is attempted to distinguish the latter from those which Theophanes mentions, and to declare them considerably later, this rests upon a false assumption which proceeded from Pagi, which has perforce made its way through almost all later books, and with this we come to the examination into the time of the composition of the two papal letters.

Baronius had placed them at the beginning of the controversy, thus in the year 726, and had regarded them with Theophanes as an answer to the imperial edict. This was contested by Pagi (*ad ann.* 726, 3-6; 730, 7). Supporting himself upon the life of the Abbot S. Stephen (p. 273), Pagi removes the breaking of the figure of Christ over the *cal kh-puḥh*, or in Chalcostrateia, into the time *after* the deposition of Germanus, and after the consecration of Anastasius, thus into the year 730. Of this event, so Pagi

further argues, Pope Gregory speaks in his first letter, consequently this must be placed deeper into the year 730, and accordingly the second at the end of the year 730 or the beginning of 731, for Gregory II. died February 11, 731.

As already remarked, we contest the foundation of this whole argument, since, with Theophanes and others, we refer the incident at the [cal kh](#) to the year 726; and the first letter of Gregory himself confirms us in this, since he informs us that the first information of the Emperor's attack on the images (thus *before* the arrival of his edict) was given by witnesses of that act of violence who had come into the West. But that the first edict was published in Italy before the year 728 we learnt from Anastasius (p. 288).

Pagi appeals a second time to the fact that Pope Gregory, in his first letter to Leo, speaks of Germanus as former patriarch, in the words: "Tametsi talem habebas pontificem" (Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 3). But this Latin translation is well known to be only a work of Fronton le Duc, and the Greek text has [eῳwn](#) (p. 292), and in neither letter of Gregory is there any indication that Germanus had then been deposed. Pagi, in the third place, refers to the short chronological indications which are found at the beginning of the first papal letter to the Emperor Leo. Gregory says in it that he has received the letter of the Emperor of the 14th Indiction. As Leo became Emperor on March 25 of the 15th Indiction, as Theophanes says, the 14th Indiction would go from the 1st of September 730 to the 1st of September 731, and accordingly the answer of the Pope must be referred to the year 730 (Pagi, *ad ann.* 730, 7). But this argument, which Pagi brings forward with such confidence, we must turn against himself. If the Emperor, in the 14th Indiction, thus after September 1, 730, wrote to the Popes and that the Emperor did write in the 14th Indiction, not that the Pope answered in this Indiction, the words of Gregory declare expressly — if the Emperor wrote so late, *after* September 1, 730, then a good many weeks would elapse before this letter arrived in Rome, and weeks again before the Pope despatched his answer, which would not only be well considered, but undoubtedly discussed in council with his clergy. The year 730 must now have come to an end. But the papal answer is now sent to Constantinople, and again weeks were necessary for this. The Emperor answers it, sends the answer to Rome, and the Pope writes to him the second time, and all this must have taken place in the year 730 or in January 731 (Pagi, *ad ann.* 730, 10). Such despatch in official and diplomatic intercourse would be a rare thing even in the times of railways

and telegraphs. I think, then, we may venture to maintain: If Gregory II. died on February 11, 731, and Pagi throws no doubt upon this, then the facts so often mentioned above — the letter of the Emperor, its conveyance to Rome, the answer of the Pope, its conveyance to Constantinople, the reply of the Emperor, its conveyance to Rome, and the second letter of the Pope following upon this — could not be pressed into the brief time between September 1, 730, and the death of the Pope.

Pope Gregory places the letters which he received from the Emperor in the following order: — That of the 14th, that of the 15th, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th Indiction. Pagi thinks here that the letter placed *primo loco* of the 14th Indiction was the latest of the year 730, the one following the earliest of the year 717, and so the series would go on; only, there is a gap between the 9th Indiction and the 14th, *i.e.* from 725 to 730, as the Emperor, in these five years, apparently had not written to the Pope.

^{FB113} To me it seems more natural that Pope Gregory referred to all the letters which he received from the Emperor in chronological order, beginning with the earliest and ending with the latest. This latest would then be that of the 9th Indiction, or of the year 726, and this we regard as the one which contained the offensive remarks on the images. This agrees perfectly with the date of the beginnings of the controversy on the images, and with the expression of Gregory, that Leo had begun his follies in the tenth year of his government. This tenth regnal year bears the Indiction number 9. Gregory adds: Ten letters of the Emperor had been quite right, and this number of ten we obtain, even if we take away from the series given above the last letter of the 9th Indiction. Moreover, we shall be constrained, by what has been said, to the same inference as Baronius. Thus, if the first or earliest letter of the Emperor Leo to Pope Gregory belongs to the 14th Indiction, then the beginning of his reign must be placed in the year 716, and not, with Theophanes, in 717. ^{FB114} And we are not afraid to do this, in spite of the express statement of Theophanes, for the latter reckons the regnal years of Leo from the day of his solemn entrance into Constantinople, and therefore ascribes to the Emperor Leo a government of 24 years 2 months and 25 days. Nicephorus, on the contrary, gives in his *Chronicon*, 25 years 3 months and 14 days, reckoning from the moment at which Leo rose against the weak Theodosius, and was proclaimed Emperor in the camp. ^{FB115} It is not, therefore, improbable that the Emperor Leo, at the very beginning of his elevation, and so still in the 14th Indiction, *i.e.* in the year 716, sought also

to win for himself, in the West, so powerful a Pope, and assured him, by letter, of his orthodoxy, knowing well that the Italian provinces of the Empire would recognize him much more readily if the Pope spoke for him.

Thus do we believe that we have placed the occurrences of the first Lustrum of the controversy about images in their true light, and, at the same time, in the correct chronological order.

SEC. 333. THE FIRST SYNODS ON THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT IMAGES.

We assumed before, in the discussion of the chronological question, that Pope Gregory II., after the arrival of the imperial edict against the images, did not immediately return an answer, but only after mature reflection and *consultation*. This supposition finds itself confirmed, not only by the statements of Cedrenus and of the *Libellus Synodicus*, which speak of a Synod which Gregory now held at Rome, but also Pope Hadrian I. refers to such an assembly in his letter to Charles the Great.^{FB116} He says that Pope Gregory II. gave an address on the permissibility of the veneration of images, and he produces several of the arguments used, *e.g.*, in regard to the ark of the covenant, the cherubim, to Bezaleel and Aholiab, which have so great a similarity with some passages of the two letters of Gregory to the Emperor, that we may suppose that Gregory had also delivered in the Synod the principal part of that which he wrote to the Emperor. Naturally, this Roman Synod was contemporaneous with the first letter of Gregory to the Emperor Leo, and may therefore properly be, placed in the year 727.

FB117

In immediate connection with this Roman Synod, the *Libellus Synodicus* places a Council at Jerusalem under the Patriarch Theodore, which anathematised the new heresy of the “burners of the sanctuary.” As, however, Theodore demonstrably had possession of the see of Jerusalem *after* the middle of the eighth century, and despatched a Synodica to Pope Paul I. (757-767) in favor of the images,^{FB118} our Synod cannot be earlier than 760.

In Rome, after the death of Gregory II., the excellent priest Gregory III., by birth a Syrian, was raised to the papal throne, March 18, 731. The whole people, says Anastasius,^{FB119} at the funeral procession, as he was following the bier, called him with one consent to be Pope, and constrained him to receive this dignity. Soon he too endeavored to turn the Emperor

away from his iconoclasm; but the priest George, whom he had sent with a letter to Constantinople, had not the courage to deliver it, and returned back with the business undone. The Pope wanted to depose him, but the Synod which he had convoked at Rome on this account, A.D. 731, ^{FB120} interceded for him, so that he was merely subjected to penance, and then was sent anew with the same letter to Constantinople. When he came on his journey to Sicily, Sergius, the viceroy there, at the Emperor's command, had him seized, and kept him a whole year long in prison. The Pope, however, full of indignation at this, immediately celebrated a *new Synod at the grave of S. Peter*, at which ninety-three Western bishops were present, among them the Archbishops Anthony of Grado and John of Ravenna, ^{FB121} with the priests, deacons, and clerics of the Roman Church, and many distinguished laymen. It was decreed: "If anyone, for the future, shall take away, destroy, dishonor, or revile the pictures of the Lord or of His Mother, he shall be excluded from the body and blood of the Lord and the communion of the Church." They all solemnly subscribed this. That this Synod was summoned on November 1, 731 (Indict. 15.), we see from the letter of invitation which Pope Gregory III. addressed to Archbishop Anthony of Grado and his suffragans. ^{FB122}

The Pope then sent again a letter in favor of the pictures through the Defensor (sc. *pauperum*, an office among the Roman clergy) Constantine to the Emperor. But he was also imprisoned in Sicily, and the letter taken from him. The same happened to the deputies of the Italian cities, who had to bring similar letters to Constantinople. On the result of a fourth attempt which the Pope made to send letters, by the Defensor Peter, to the Patriarch Anastasius and the two Emperors, Leo and Constantine (Copronymus, the son of Leo), our authorities are, silent. ^{FB123}

In order to punish the Pope, Rome, and Italy for their opposition to iconoclasm, the Emperor Leo sent out a powerful fleet against them. It suffered shipwreck in the Adriatic Sea, and Leo now raised the taxes in Sicily and Calabria, and confiscated the patrimonies of the two apostle princes, *i.e.* the 3½ talents of gold coming annually to their churches (at Rome) for the exchequer ^{FB124} Besides, Leo now separated, besides Calabria and Sicily, also the Illyrian provinces which hitherto belonged to the patriarchate of Rome, namely, Old and New Epirus, Illyricum, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Dacia *Ripensis* and *Mediterranea*, Moesia, Dardania, and Praevalis (with its metropolis Scodra), and subjected them

to the patriarchate of Constantinople, an act of violence which in great measure became the cause of the later unhappy schism. ^{FB125}

SEC. 334. JOHN OF DAMASCUS.

Besides and along with Pope Gregory II. and Gregory II. and the Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus belonged to the first and most powerful defenders of images. Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 629) says of him: "Then (729) lived at Damascus, John Chrysorroas, the son of Mansur, priest and monk, distinguished for holiness and knowledge... In union with the bishops of the whole East, he pronounced anathema on the Emperor Leo." This account is very summary, for, at the outbreak of the controversy on images, John was not yet either priest or monk, but he occupied then one of the highest offices of State with the Caliph who ruled over Syria. At the news of the transactions in Constantinople, he prepared three discourses in defense of the images (*logoi apologetikoi*), the first at the very beginning of the controversy, when it might still be hoped that the Emperor would be brought by reason to a change in his conduct; the other two after the deposition of the Patriarch Germanus. ^{FB126} His ancient biography relates that the Emperor Leo, in order to revenge himself on John, got up and caused to be sent to the Caliph a false letter, in which John invited him to surprise the city of Damascus. Not suspecting the deception, the Caliph caused the right hand of the supposed traitor to be hewn off; but, at the intercession of Mary, the piece which had been cut off grew on again during the night, and the Caliph, astonished at this, asked forgiveness of the saint, and wished to appoint him again to his high office. But John preferred to become a monk, and withdrew to Palestine, into the Laura of S. Sabas. ^{FB127} That he did the latter is beyond doubt.

SEC. 335 THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS.

What the Emperor Leo the Isaurian did in the last years of his reign (June 18, 741) in regard to the images is unknown; but it is certain that the conflict was carried on by his son Constantine Copronymus. ^{FB128} The widespread disaffection towards the new Emperor, whom his contemporaries depict in the darkest colors, encouraged his brother-in-law Artabasdu, who had married the Princess Anna, and at that time commanded in Armenia against the Arabs, to make an attempt upon the crown for himself. ^{FB129} Constantine pretended to take no notice, and invited his brother-in-law and his sons to him, to consult about plans for

war, but in truth to seize him. But Artabasduſ saw through the trick, took to arms, ſtruck and killed the renegade Beſer, who firſt oppoſed him, and marched to Conſtantinople, where he had himſelf ſolemnly proclaimed Emperor. The governor Theophanes, to whom Conſtantine had entrusted the capital, did his beſt for Artabasduſ, eſpecially by circulating the falſe report that Conſtantine was dead, and that his brother-in-law was recognised as Emperor in the whole of the Eaſt. Partly from his own inclination, partly to gain the people over more to himſelf, Artabasduſ ſoon reſtored the veneration of images, and the Patriarch Anaſtaſius of Conſtantinople, the ſame who had been the tool of the departed Emperor in his attack on the images, and had ſo baſely ſupplanted Germanus, now took the ſide of the images and for Artabasduſ, and ſolemnly and publicly declared the Emperor Conſtantine to be a deteſtable heretic, who had even impudently denied the Godhead of Chriſt.

There were now two Emperors, ſince Artabasduſ ruled in Europe, Conſtantine in Aſia; but each intended, as far as poſſible, ſoon to ſupplant the other. Schloſſer, in his hiſtory of the iconoclaſtic Emperors (S. 205), writes: “The Pope (Zacharias), however, acknowledged the protector of the images (Artabasduſ), and entered into friendly intercourse with him.” This is incorrect, for in truth Zacharias, ſoon after coming to the ſee, ſent legates to Conſtantinople with a letter to the Emperor Conſtantine, and with the commiſſion to deliver the cuſtomary papal letter of enthroniſation, which was addreſſed to the Church at Conſtantinople, but not to the excommunicated patriarch. When the papal legates arrived in Conſtantinople, as we are told by the Roman *Vitae Pontificum*, they found the *invaſor* and *rebellis* Artabasduſ in poſſeſſion of the imperial power, then waited until Conſtantine had regained the Empire, and were now by him quite friendly received, and ſent back to Rome with preſents. In particular, the Emperor confirmed to the Roman Church the perpetual poſſeſſion of the two properties of Nymphae and Normice,^{FB130} all which would certainly not have been done if the Pope had taken part with the uſurper. The fact that in Rome, after Artabasduſ was practically maſter of Conſtantinople, the documents were dated according to the years of his reign, in no way proves that his ſide was taken. More correct than the judgment of Schloſſer was that of Walch (*l.c.* Bd. 10. S. 359, A. 3).

With the reſtoration of Conſtantine came the following events. After the great attack which Artabasduſ, in union with his ſon Nicetas, made upon Conſtantine, in order to aſſail him from two ſides, from the eaſt and from

the west, and to crush him, had entirely failed through the delay of Nicetas, Constantine marched across the Bosphorus, blockaded Constantinople, and, on the 2nd of November 743, captured the city, weakened by terrible famine, and took a horrible revenge on his opponents, particularly on his brother-in-law, his adherents and friends.^{FB131} The Patriarch Anastasius also was blinded, and led through the streets seated backwards upon an ass. Nevertheless Constantine replaced him, probably because he could find no more servile tool, and immediately with his assistance removed again the images which had been restored under Artabasdos. His contemporaries regarded the terrible plague which then raged, specially in Constantinople (A.D. 746), as a punishment of this outrage.^{FB132} Whether special acts of violence now took place against the friends of the images is unknown. In any case they were afterwards frightfully persecuted.

SEC. 336. THE MOCK-SYNOD AT CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 754.

The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus now formed the plan of having the veneration of images forbidden also ecclesiastically by means of a great Oecumenical Synod, and a preparation for this was made by several *Silentia* (assemblies for consultation), which he caused to be held (A.D. 752) in several cities, principally in order to mislead the people and gain them over to his impiety, as Theophanes says (p. 659). About this time the Lombards under King Astolph rent off and took possession of one piece after another of the still Byzantine provinces of Italy, and very seriously threatened Rome itself. In vain Pope Stephen III. entreated that the Emperor, in accordance with his oft-given promise, would send a distinguished commander to Italy, as the need had become very great; but Copronymus, without disturbing himself, gave an evasive answer, and preferred to fight the images rather than the Lombards. Thus shamefully abandoned by their own master and protector, Pope Stephen had recourse to Pipin, King of the Franks,^{FB133} and, whilst with this purpose he remained in France, and anointed Pipin with his sons as Kings, the Emperor, after the death of the Patriarch Anastasius (A.D. 753), summoned the bishops of his Empire to a great Synod in the palace Hieria, which lay opposite to Constantinople on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, between Chrysopolis and Chalcedon, a little to the north of the latter. The vacancy of the patriarchate facilitated his plans, since the hope of succeeding to this see kept down, in the most ambitious and aspiring of the bishops, any possible thought of opposition. The number of those present

amounted to 338 bishops, and the place of president was occupied by Arch-bishop Theodosius of Ephesus, already known to us as son of a former Emperor Apsimar, from the beginning an assistant in the iconoclastic movement (see above, sec. 332). Nicephorus (*l.c.* p. 74) names him alone as president of the Synod; Theophanes, on the contrary (*l.c.* p. 659), mentions Bishop Pastillas of Perge as second president, and adds, “The patriarchates of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were not represented (the last three were then in the hands of the Saracens), the transactions began on February 10, and lasted until August 8 (in Hieria); on the latter date, however, the Synod assembled in S. Mary’s Church in Blachernae, the northern suburb of Constantinople, and the Emperor now solemnly nominated Bishop Constantine of Sylaeum, a monk, as patriarch of Constantinople. On August 27, the heretical decree (of the Synod) was published.”

We see from this that the last session or sessions of this Conciliabulum were held no longer in Hieria, but in the Blachernae of Constantinople. We have no complete Acts of this assembly, but its very verbose **οἶον** (decree), together with a short introduction, is preserved among the Acts of the seventh Oecumenical Council. In its sixth section a document in six tomi was read, bearing the title, “Refutation of the patched-up, falsely so-called decree of the heap of accusers of the Christians,” ^{FB134} which contained both the words of the Conciliabulum itself and their complete refutation, by an anonymous writer. Bishop Gregory of Neo-Caesarea read the **οἶον** to the Synod, and the deacon John its refutation. ^{FB135}

In the superscription of these Acts, the Conciliabulum entitles itself “the seventh great and Oecumenical Synod,” and says: “By the grace and command of the Emperors Constantine and (his four-year-old son) Leo, ^{FB136} the Council assembled in the imperial residence city, in the temple of the holy and inviolate Mother of God and Virgin Mary, surnamed, in Blachernae, have decreed the following.” Then follows their **οἶον** which, in its leading points, runs thus: —

“Satan misguided men, so that they worshipped the creature instead of the Creator. The Mosiac law and the prophets co-operated to undo this ruin; but in order to save mankind thoroughly, God sent His own Son, who turned us away from error and the worshipping of idols, and taught us the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth. As messengers of His saving doctrine, He left us His apostles and disciples, and these adorned the

Church, His Bride, with His glorious doctrines. This ornament of the Church the holy Father and the six Oecumenical Councils have preserved inviolate. But Satan could not endure the sight of this adornment, and gradually brought back idolatry under the appearance of Christianity. As then Christ armed His apostles against the ancient idolatry with the power of the Holy Spirit, and sent them out into all the world, so has He awakened against the new idolatry His servants our faithful Emperors, and endowed them with the same wisdom of the Holy Spirit. Impelled by the Holy Spirit, they could no longer be witnesses of the Church being laid waste by the deception of demons, and summoned the sanctified assembly of the God-beloved bishops, that they might institute at a Synod a scriptural examination into the deceitful colouring of pictures, which draws down the spirit of man from the lofty worship of God to the low and material worship of the creature, and that they, under divine guidance, might express their view on the subject.

Our holy Synod therefore assembled, and we, its 338 members, follow the older synodal decrees, and accept and proclaim joyfully the dogmas handed down, principally those of the six holy Oecumenical Synods at Nicaea, etc. After we had carefully examined their decrees under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we found that the sinful art of painting blasphemed the fundamental doctrine of our salvation, namely, the Incarnation of Christ, and contradicted the six holy Synods. These condemned Nestorius because he divided Christ into two sons, and on the other side, Arius, Dioscurus, Eutyches, and Severus, because they maintained a mingling of the two natures of the one Christ. It is the unanimous doctrine of all the holy Fathers and of the six Oecumenical Synods, that no one may imagine any kind of separation or mingling in opposition to the unsearchable, unspeakable, and incomprehensible union of the two natures in the one hypostasis or person. What avails, then, the folly of the painter, who from sinful love of gain depicts that which should not be depicted, that is, with his polluted hands he tries to fashion that which should only be believed in the heart and confessed with the mouth? He makes an image and calls it Christ. The name *Christ* signifies *God and man*. Consequently it is an image of God and man, and consequently he has in his foolish mind, in his representation of the created flesh, depicted the Godhead which cannot be represented, and thus mingled what should not be mingled. Thus he is guilty of a double blasphemy, the one in making an image of the Godhead and the other by mingling the Godhead and manhood. Those fall into the

same blasphemy who venerate the image, and the same woe rests upon both, because they err as did Arius, Dioscurus, and Eutyches. When, however, they are blamed for undertaking to depict the divine nature of Christ, which should not be depicted, they take refuge in the excuse: We represent only the flesh of Christ which we saw and handled. But that is a Nestorian error. For it should be considered that that flesh was also flesh of God the Logos, without any separation, perfectly assumed by the divine nature and made wholly divine. How could it now be separated and represented apart? So is it with the human soul of Christ which mediates between the Godhead of the Son and the human flesh. As the human flesh is at the same time flesh of God the Logos, so is the human soul also soul of God the Logos, both together, since the soul is made divine, and the divinity of both, of body and soul, cannot be separated. Just as the soul of Christ separated from His body by His voluntary death, so the Godhead remained as well with the soul as with the body of Christ. How, then, do the fools venture to separate the flesh from the Godhead, and represent it by itself as the image of a mere man? They fall into the abyss of impiety, since they separate the flesh from the Godhead, ascribe to it a subsistence of its own, a personality of its own, which they depict, and thus introduce a fourth person into the Trinity. Moreover, they represent, as not being made divine, that which has been made divine by being assumed by the Godhead. Whoever, then, makes an image of Christ, either depicts the Godhead which cannot be depicted, and mingles it with the manhood (like the Monophysites), or he represents the body of Christ as not made divine and separate and as a person apart, like the Nestorians. The only admissible figure of the humanity of Christ, however, is bread and wine in the holy Supper. This and no other form, this and no other type, has He chosen to represent His humanity. Bread He ordered to be brought, but not a representation of the human form, so that idolatry might not arise. And as the body of Christ is made divine, so also this figure of the body of Christ, the bread, is made divine by the descent of the Holy Spirit; it becomes the divine body of Christ by the service of the priest.

The evil custom of assigning false names to the images (*e.g.*, to say: That is Christ) does not come down from Christ and the apostles and the holy Fathers; nor have these left behind them any prayer by which an image should be hallowed or made anything else than ordinary matter. If, however, some say, we might be right in regard to the images of Christ, on account of the mysterious union of the two natures, but it is not right for us

to forbid also the images of Mary, of the prophets, apostles, and martyrs, who were mere men and did not consist of two natures; we may reply, first of all: If those fall away, there is no longer need of these. But we will also consider what may be said against these in particular. Christianity has rejected the *whole* of heathenism, and so not merely heathen sacrifices, but also the heathen worship of images. The saints live on eternally with God, although they have died. If anyone thinks to call them back again to life by a dead art, discovered by the heathen, he makes himself guilty of blasphemy. Who dares attempt with heathenish art to paint the Mother of God, who is exalted above all heavens and the saints? It is not permitted to Christians, who have the hope of the resurrection, to imitate the customs of demon-worshippers, and to insult the saints, who shine in so great glory, by common dead matter.

Moreover, we can prove our view from Holy Scripture and the Fathers. In the former it is said: “God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth” (S. ~~(ROM)~~ John 4:24); and: “Thou shalt not make thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath” (~~(ROM)~~ Deuteronomy 5:8); on which account God spoke to the Israelites on the Mount, from the midst of the fire, but showed them no image (~~(ROM)~~ Deuteronomy 5:4). Further: “They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man,...and served the creature more than the Creator” (~~(ROM)~~ Romans 1:23, 25). (Several other passages are even less to the point.)

The same is taught also by the holy Fathers. (The Synod appeals to a spurious passage from Epiphanius, and to one inserted into the writings of Theodotus of Ancyra, a friend of S. Cyril, to utterances in no way striking — of Gregory of Nazianzus, of SS. Chrysostom, Basil, Athanasius, of Amphilochius and Eusebius Pamphili, from his letter to the Empress Constantia, who had asked him for a picture of Christ.) Supported by the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, we declare *unanimously*, in the name of the Holy Trinity, that there shall be rejected and removed and cursed out of the Christian Church every likeness which is made out of any material whatever by the evil art of painters. Whoever in future dares to make such a thing, or to venerate it, or set it up in a church or in a private house, or possesses it in secret, shall, if bishop, priest, or deacon, be deposed, if monk or layman, anathematised and become liable to be tried by the secular laws as an adversary of God and an enemy of the doctrines handed down by the Fathers. At the same time we ordain that no incumbent of a

church shall venture, under pretext of destroying the error in regard to images, to lay his hands on the holy vessels in order to have them altered, because they are adorned with figures. ^{FB137} The same is provided in regard to the vestments of churches, cloths, and all that is dedicated to divine service. If, however, the incumbent of a church wishes to have such church vessels and vestments altered, he must do this only with the assent of the holy Oecumenical patriarch (of Constantinople) and of our pious Emperors. So also no prince or secular official shall rob the churches, as some have done in former times, under the pretext of destroying images. All this we ordain, believing that we speak apostolically, and that we “have the Holy Spirit” (~~<4074>~~ 1 Corinthians 7:40).

To this **ofrov** they added immediately a series of anathematisms, in the first of which the orthodox doctrine of the six Oecumenical Councils is briefly and accurately set forth. Then, passing on to their own subject, they declare:

“(1) If anyone ventures to represent the divine image (**carakth̄s**, ~~<8008>~~ Hebrews 1:3) of the Logos after the Incarnation with material colors, let him be anathema!

(2) If anyone ventures to represent in human figures, by means of material colors, by reason of the Incarnation, the substance or person (ousia or hypostasis) of the Word, which cannot be depicted, and does not rather confess that even after the Incarnation He (the Logos) cannot be depicted, let him be anathema!

(3) If anyone ventures to represent the hypostatic union of the two natures in a picture, and calls it Christ, and thus falsely represents a union of the two natures, etc.!

(4) If anyone separates the flesh united with the person of the Logos from it, and endeavors to represent it separately in a picture, etc.!

(5) If anyone separates the one Christ into two persons, and endeavors to represent Him who was born of the Virgin separately, and thus accepts only a relative (**scetikh̄s**) union of the natures, etc.!

(6) If anyone represents the flesh made divine by its union with the Logos in a picture, and thus separates it from the Godhead, etc.!

(7) If anyone endeavors to represent, by material colors, God the Logos as a mere man, who, although bearing the form of God, yet has assumed the form of a servant in His own person, and thus endeavors to separate Him from His inseparable Godhead, so that he thereby introduces a quaternity into the Holy Trinity, etc.!

(8) If anyone shall endeavor to represent the forms of the saints in lifeless pictures with material colors which are of no value, — for this notion is erroneous and introduced by the devil, — and does not rather represent their virtues as living images in himself, etc.!”

After they had added some orthodox sentences on the veneration and invocation of the saints, etc., they conclude thus: “If anyone does not accept this our Holy and Oecumenical seventh Synod, let him be anathema from the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and all the seven Oecumenical Synods! Let no one set forth another faith!... Thus we all believe; this we voluntarily subscribe; this is the faith of the apostles. Many years to the Emperors! They are the lights of orthodoxy! Many years to the orthodox Empress! God preserve your Empire! You have now more firmly proclaimed the inseparability of the two natures of Christ! You have banished all idolatry! You have destroyed the heresies of Germanus (of Constantinople). George,^{FB138} and Mansur ([mansour](#), John Damascene). Anathema to Germanus, the double-minded,^{FB139} and worshipper of wood! Anathema to George, his associate, to the falsifier of the doctrine of the Fathers! Anathema to Mansur, who has an evil name and Saracen opinions! To the betrayer of Christ and the enemy of the Empire, to the teacher of impiety, the perverter of Scripture, Mansur, anathema! The Trinity has deposed these three!”

The *Libellus Synodicus* states that the Emperor Constantine at this Synod also denied the intercessions of the saints and burnt the relics.^{FB140} Similarly, it is said in the history of the life of the Abbot S. Stephen, that the Synod uttered blasphemies against the saints and the immaculate Mother of God, as if they could not help us after their death;^{FB141} but, as we saw above, everyone was expressly anathematised by the Synod, who rejected the invocation of Mary and denied her intercession. On the other hand, it seems true that the Emperor, in his own person, subsequently did that which those two documents ascribe to the Conciliabulum, and that their statement rests only upon an interchange of names.

SEC. 337. CARRYING OUT OF THE SYNODAL DECREES. ABBOT STEPHEN.

The immediate consequence of this Synod was that the images were everywhere removed from the churches, many were burnt, the wall-pictures and mosaics smeared over with chalk. In a special manner the *Vita S. Stephani* complains of the devastation of the splendid Church of S. Mary in Blachernae, on the walls of which were represented the Incarnation of Christ and His miracles and acts, until His ascension into heaven and the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. In order not to leave the walls bare, they were now decorated with landscapes, with pictures of trees and birds, or, as the *Vita Stephani* says, turned into a bird-cage and fruit magazine. The same took place in all the public buildings and palaces, *e.g.* that of the patriarch. ^{FB142} The sacred pictures were destroyed, but “satanic representations of ridings, hunts, plays, horse-races, and the like, were held in honor and beautified.” ^{FB143}

At the same time, the Emperor demanded of all the bishops and of the most distinguished monks a written assent to the decree of his Synod. We do not learn that one single man among the bishops and secular clergy of the whole [Byzantine] kingdom refused; but so much the more earnestly was opposition made by many monks. ^{FB144} That the bishops of the East, who were no longer under Byzantium, in no way assented, we shall see later on (sec. 340). Alarmed by the demand of the Emperor, the monks of the neighborhood of Constantinople and from Bithynia gradually betook themselves to the celebrated Abbot S. Stephen, on the mountain of S. Auxentius, in order to take counsel with him. Born in the year 715, Stephen was, while still quite young, brought by his parents to the anchorite John on the mountain of S. Aurelius over against Constantinople. After he had spent a long time in this monastery, and had already obtained a great fame for holiness, he obtained, as a recluse, a cave on the top of this mountain, above the monastery, and hither came now the monks from the neighborhood of Constantinople. Stephen counselled them to give way before the violence of the Emperor, and to go into neighborhoods which had not yet been infected by heresy, namely, into the mountains on the Pontus Euxinus, which were the boundary of Scythia, the neighborhoods of the Bosporus, Cherson, Nicopsis, those on the Parthenic sea (east end of the Mediterranean), to Reggio, Naples, Italy, etc. Abbot Stephen added: Of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch he will not make mention, as the bishops of these cities have declared themselves in writing as opposed to the

Emperor, and have called him an apostate and heresiarch (see below, sec. 340). So also S. John of Damascus has not ceased to oppose him as a second Mahomet, burner of images, and enemy of the saints. ^{FB145}

The monks followed the counsel of S. Stephen, and in great numbers forsook the residence and its neighborhood. Those left behind concealed themselves. Many came to Rome, and the new Pope, Paul I (since 758), for this reason ordered that in Rome the Psalms should also be sung in Greek, *i.e.* that the Greeks who had come there might say their office in their own manner. ^{FB146}

SEC. 338. THE STATES OF THE CHURCH THREATENED FROM THE BEGINNING BY THE GREEKS.

The greater acts of violence on the part of the Emperor, in destroying the images and persecuting those who venerated them, meet us generally for the first time from the years 761 and 763. Apparently the two unlucky wars against the Bulgarians in the years 756 and 760, ^{FB147} and the anxieties respecting Italy, had from prudential reasons made a temporary pause in the iconoclastic fury. In Italy, in the year 755, this great change had taken place, that the King of the Franks, Pipin the Short, took away from the Lombard Astolph the exarchate of Ravenna and Pentapolis, and had made of these provinces, formerly subject to the Byzantines, a present to S. Peter, *i.e.* to the Roman Church. The attempt of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, by means of two ambassadors whom he sent to Pipin, to get back those lands, miscarried; since Pipin, as is well known, declared: "The Franks had not shed their blood for the Greeks, but for S. Peter and the salvation of their souls, and he would not, for all the gold in the world, take back his promise made to the Roman Church." Whether the Pope at this time came into the secular possession of the city and the Duchy of Rome is a contested point, the decision of which we are not required to settle. It is certain, on the contrary, that the Byzantine Emperor, in the years 757 and 758, sent ambassadors both to Pipin and to Desiderius, the new King of the Lombards, and presented the former with an organ, the first that came into the West, in order, by the help of these two princes, to come again into possession of the exarchate and of Pentapolis. With the same object, his emissaries cultivated the people of Ravenna and the neighborhood, and a fleet, which he fitted out either at this time or somewhat later (A.D. 764), was intended to give effect by force to his demands. ^{FB148} Pope Paul I, who then occupied the holy see, took every

pains to work in opposition to the Byzantines, and to obtain as a perpetual adherent King Pipin, who, with the title of Patrician, had undertaken the duty of protection over the Roman Church. His position was in this respect so much the more difficult, as his own legate in France, the Cardinal Priest Marinus, had then concluded a serious friendship with the Byzantine ambassador. ^{FB149} In one of the letters which Pope Paul now addressed to Pipin, he assured him that it was the affair of the images that was the principal cause of the great anger of the Greeks against Rome. ^{FB150}

SEC. 339. THE CRUELITIES OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS.

From the year 761 the venerators of images were persecuted with a cruelty which recalls the times of Diocletian, and there goes through all our historical sources a cry of horror on account of it. Some new light was brought into the history of these persecutions, particularly a later chronological arrangement, by the new volume of the Bollandists, which appeared, A.D. 1853, in the treatise *de S. Andrea Cretensi, dicto in Crisi*, by which several errors, which from early times had passed into all the books, were corrected. ^{FB151} The Bollandists discovered two hitherto unprinted and mutually independent martyrologies of S. Andrew, whilst hitherto only a Latin translation of the second of them (in Surius) had been known. ^{FB152} From these two martyrologies and several ancient Greek Synaxaria (= festal kalendars), compared with the *Vita S. Stephani*, it results that Theophanes confounded two of the most distinguished martyrs of the time of Copronymus, Andrew and Peter; or, more exactly, not themselves, but only their names, for everything else which he tells respecting them is perfectly right, if only we exchange the names.

As earliest martyr he mentions, in the twenty-first year of the Emperor, 6253 of the world, “the venerable monk, Andrew Kalybites,” whom “Constantine caused to be put to death by scourging in the Blachernae, in the circus of S. Mamas, reproaching him with impiety. His corpse was cast into the water; but his sisters brought him up and buried him in the market of the Emporium. ^{FB153} Instead of Andrew Kalybites, we should here read Peter Kalybites (*i.e.* inhabitant of a **kal ubh** or hut), ^{FB154} of whom it is said in the *Vita S. Stephani* (*l.c.* p. 507): “I make mention of that holy monk Peter, who dwelt as a recluse at Blachernae, and was frightfully beaten with the tendons of oxen, and killed in the presence of the Emperor, because he had spoken of him as a Dacian (Julian) and a sacrilegious man.”

To the same effect say the Synaxaria: “Peter, who dwelt in the Blachernae, dies, beaten with the tendons of oxen.” ^{FB155} That this martyrdom is to be placed at the 16th of May 761, and not in the year 762, as might be inferred from Theophanes, is shown by the new Bollandists (*l.c.* p. 129), by reference to the eclipse of the sun mentioned by Theophanes himself (p. 665), which preceded final martyrdom about a year, and, according to the astronomical tables, took place, not in August 761, as Theophanes states, but in the year 760.

The Bollandists might have found another proof on their side on the same page of Theophanes, since Easter fell on the 6th of April, not in the year of the world 6252 (= 761), but in the year before, and the execution of the Kalybites belongs to the year immediately following. The day of the month of his martyrdom the Bollandists found in the old Synaxaria.

Soon after Peter Kalybites, probably on the 7th of June 761, John, the superior of the monastery of Monagria, was fastened into a sack and cast into the sea, because he would not tread under foot a picture of the Mother of God. This is also related by the Synaxaria and the biography of S. Stephen. ^{FB156}

The most famous martyr of the time of Copronymus was the Abbot S. Stephen (see sec. 337), generally designated as **o.jneov**, with reference to the protomartyr Stephen. His ancient biographer (in the *Analecta*, *l.c.* .p. 546 ff.) says: Soon after the end of the Conciliabulum held by Constantine (in fact, not until the year 763), the Emperor sent the patrician Callistus, a man of ability, but one who was zealously devoted to the new heresy (iconoclasm), to the mount of S. Auxentius, in order to induce Stephen to subscribe the synodal decree. Callistus accomplished his commission; but Stephen declared: The Synod having brought forward a heretical doctrine, it was impossible that he should assent to it, and he was ready to shed his blood in defense of the veneration of the images. He was then, at the command of the Emperor, dragged away from his cave by a party of soldiers, and carried to a monastery which lay lower down under the mountain (as, being quite enfeebled through fasting, he was unable to walk); and here he remained imprisoned along with the other monks for six days without food. As, however, the Emperor made an expedition against the Bulgarians, June 17, 763, ^{FB157} the action against Stephen was interrupted, and he was taken back again into his cell. During the absence of the Emperor, Callistus managed, by money and promises, that two

accusers should appear against Stephen. His own disciple Sergius declared that he had pronounced anathema on the Emperor as a heretic; and a female slave testified that her own mistress, the distinguished widow Anna, who was a spiritual daughter of Stephen, and dwelt as an ascetic in the monastery below on the mountain of S. Auxentius, had lived in sinful intercourse with the saint.

The news of this was conveyed to the Emperor by express messengers, and he immediately ordered the arrest of Anna. After the end of the Bulgarian war by the successful battle on June 30, 763, Anna was examined and even scourged, although no accusation against Stephen could be forced from her. Another means for his overthrow was, however, found. The Emperor, from hatred towards the monks, as being his principal opponents, had forbidden the reception of novices; but, with the Emperor's foreknowledge, says the *Vita Stephani* (p. 468 sq.), a young man holding a situation at the Court, George Syneletus, talked over S. Stephen by false representations, so that he received him into the number of his monks. ^{FB158} Scarcely had this been done when the Emperor openly complained, in an assembly of the people, that the accused ones, whose names must not be pronounced (so he ordinarily designated the monks), had again decoyed away from him one of his best and most beloved young men, and thereby so goaded the people that they uttered violent maledictions against the monks. A few days later, George escaped from the monastery and hastened to the Emperor. He was, at a second assembly of the people, solemnly girded again with a sword by the Emperor, and received anew into favor, whilst the people tore up the monastic habit which had been taken off him, and bellowed murder and death against the monks. Taking advantage of this state of mind, the Emperor sent a strong detachment of soldiers to the mountain of S. Auxentius. The disciples of Stephen were driven away, the monastery and church were burnt down, the saint dragged from his cave, beaten and tortured in every way,...and at last banished to the island of Proconnesus in the Propontis, because he refused utterly to subscribe the decrees of the false Synod, and even censured it by remarking: The Synod called itself holy, but the most holy Virgin and the apostles would withhold that predicate from it.

Here in Proconnesus the scattered monks assembled themselves around him; they lived together monastically, and commended to the people the veneration of images. Stephen was therefore, after a lapse of two years, bound hand and foot, and brought back to Constantinople. Here, in the

great prison of the Praetorium, he met with 342 monks from different lands. ^{FB159} Many had their ears or nose cut off, other their eyes put out or their hands chopped off; many still bore the scars of previous scourgings, others had their beard smeared with pitch and set on fire. ^{FB160} Stephen soon turned the prison into a kind of monastery, since day and night he sang psalms and hymns with his fellow-prisoners, and exhorted the people, who assembled from the neighborhood, to the veneration of images in order to their edification. He was consequently brought to trial and condemned to death. About the same time the Emperor commanded that everyone who had a relation among the monks, and concealed him, ^{FB161} or wore a black coat (*i.e.* was himself suspected of monasticism), should be banished, which caused great excitement in the city (*Vita Stephani*, p. 512).

Stephen was already led forth by the executioner; but the Emperor resolved to make one more attempt to gain him over to his view, for if Stephen came in, then would the victory of the opponents of images be fully assured. He was therefore brought back to prison, and two servants of the Emperor sent to him, instructed either to talk him over, or, if he were obstinate, to give him such a flogging that he should soon afterwards die. The two servants were, however, deeply moved by the appearance of S. Stephen, and were won by him for the orthodox faith. They left him covered with cushions, and told the Emperor that they had beaten him so that he could hardly live another day. In the following night the Emperor learnt through a demon how the matter had fallen out, and, at his bitter complaint that he was not obeyed, and that Stephen was really Emperor, a great number of his bodyguards dashed at the prison of the Praetorium, dragged the saint on to the street, and killed him with innumerable blows and stones on November 28, 767. So it is related in the biography composed forty-two years afterwards (*I.c.* p. 521), which, along with a good deal of evidently legendary ornament, contains undoubted historical truth. ^{FB162}

While Stephen still sat in the prison of the Praetorium, he conversed with the other monks respecting the men who, before him, had died as martyrs on behalf of the veneration of images. Two of these, Peter at Blachernae and John of Monagria, we have already mentioned (p. 320). Besides, we learn here that the monk Paul of Crete (not Cyprus) preferred to be tortured to death (March 17, 767) rather than tread under foot an image of Christ, as the prefect had required of him. ^{FB163} The priest and monk Theosterictus, however, of the monastery of Peleceta, on the Hellespont,

who had his nose cut off and his beard burnt by the iconoclasts, relates that the prefect of Asia, named Lachanodracon, ^{FB164} on the evening of the previous Thursday in the week of the Passion of Christ, while the mysteries were being celebrated, had, by command of the Emperor, penetrated with soldiers into the monastery, and had chained thirty-eight monks, carried them off to Ephesus, and then killed them, ill-treated all the rest, burnt some of them, cut off the noses of the rest, as of Theosterictus himself, and set fire to the whole monastery, together with the church. ^{FB165}

About a month before Stephen (October 20, 767), Andrew in Crisi also obtained the crown of martyrdom; but the monks in the prison of the Praetorium seem to have heard nothing of this, since they did not refer to him in their conversations. This is the man whom Theophanes (p. 683 sq.) erroneously designated as Peter (instead of Andrew) Stylites ^{FB166} (cf. p. 319), adding that the Emperor, on account of Andrew's resisting his doctrine, had him bound by the feet, dragged through the streets of Constantinople, and cast into a kind of skinning house called Pelagia. The same is related by the two Martyria of S. Andrew, recently published by the Bollandists, in which it is further told that some pious believers had afterwards buried his body in a holy place called Crisis. ^{FB167} That he came originally from Crete, and traveled to Constantinople expressly to make voluntary representations to the Emperor on account of his cruelty towards the friends of the images, we learn from the same source and the ancient Synaxaria; and if Baronius had followed them (*ad ann.* 762, 1), he would not have confounded this Andrew with the somewhat earlier Bishop Andrew of Crete, as Pagi (*ad ann.* 761, 2) erroneously did, and all followed him. In his annotations to the *Martyrology* (*ad* 17 Octobr.), Baronius expressly distinguishes the two, as the Bollandists have remarked, and gives proofs of his view. ^{FB168}

Another monk, who had formerly been an officer, Paulus Novus, was executed A.D. 771; ^{FB169} and also many laymen, even of the highest civil and military offices, suffered banishment or death, partly on account of their inclination for the images, partly because they had become politically suspected. ^{FB170} The Emperor and his deputies contended together in bloody zeal; and with peculiar prominence, Michael Lachanodracon, already well known to us, who, after having ill-treated many monks and nuns, blinding and killing them, sold all the monasteries in his province (Thrace), together with the sacred vessels, books, and all the church furniture, and sent the proceeds to the Emperor. If he found anyone using

relics as amulets, the relics were burnt, the person using them punished, and if a monk, put to death. ^{FB171}

As the Emperor was resolved entirely to root out monasticism, he turned many monasteries into taverns and the like, caused others to be entirely destroyed, required that the monks should wear secular attire and marry, gave places and offices to the obedient, and caused the steadfast to be led round the circus in great numbers with nuns (some say, harlots) on their arm, to the great sport of the populace. ^{FB172} That under such persecutions and oppressions some monks overstepped the bounds of righteous opposition, we will not deny; indeed, it would rather be wonderful if it were not so. It is, however, quite wrong, on the part of Walch (*l.c.* S. 405 f.), to try to make out that the fault of the monks was very great and that of the Emperor as small as possible. Of the latter, he goes so far as to say (S. 301): “He must have been a chaste prince, for no one attributes to him sensual excesses.” Walch, besides many other allusions in the original documents, must have known the decisive passage in Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 685), where the Paederastia of the Emperor is spoken of. But he thought good to omit this passage and (at S. 325) to translate only the remaining portion of this section.

In the course of the contest over the images, the Emperor came to the idea of requiring of all his subjects an oath on this matter. He therefore assembled first the inhabitants of Constantinople, “had the life-giving body and blood of Christ, and also the holy cross, publicly set forth, and all swore on the holy Gospels that henceforth they would reverence no image, and regard every such thing as an idol, have no fellowship with a monk, but rather would persecute every such worthless black-coat with insult and with stones.” This oath was first taken, as an example to all the people, by the Patriarch Constantine in the Ambo, the holy cross in his hand; and although he had once been a monk, from that time he began a quite secular kind of life. ^{FB173} The time at which this oath was required and taken is doubtful. Theophanes places it in the 4th Indiction, *i.e.* between September 1, 765-766; on the one hand, he himself, as well as Nicephorus, places this occurrence after the martyrdom of S. Stephen, and this gave occasion to Pagi (*ad ann.* 765, 1), holding by this latter statement, to ascribe the taking of the oath to the year 767, whilst the new Bollandists (*l.c.* pp. 127, 12 and 131, 26), taking no notice of this, hold firmly to the 4th Indiction, and thus to 766.

From the images the Emperor extended his persecution to the relics of the saints, which he caused everywhere to be removed. In particular, Theophanes mentions (*l.c.* p. 679) that the body of the highly venerated S. Euphemia was torn out of her splendid church at Chalcedon, in which the fourth Oecumenical Council had been held, and with the coffin cast into the sea. Moreover, of the church the Emperor made an arsenal. But the waves bore the venerable coffin to the coast of Lemnos, where pious believers concealed it, until, later on, the Empress had it brought back to the restored Church at Chalcedon. Even prayers to the saints were forbidden, and ejaculations, as, for example, “Mother of God, help us,” were followed by severe punishments.^{FB174} The Emperor is even said to have fallen into the Nestorian heresy, and to have asked the Patriarch Constantine whether it would not be well, instead of ‘God-bearer,’ in future to make use of the expression ‘Christ-bearer.’ But the patriarch had adjured him to keep away from this, and had promised the Emperor silence.^{FB175} Whether it was, as Cedrenus states, that he broke this promise, or that he fell under suspicion of other kinds of disloyalty, especially political, he was, in the year 766, deposed and banished, and subsequently shamefully ill-treated and beheaded; and Nicetas, a eunuch and a man of Slavonian or servile origin, raised to be his successor, who manifested his zeal immediately by effacing the pictures in the patriarchal residence, and elsewhere,^{FB176} and crowned Eudoxia, the third wife of the Emperor, as well as his two younger sons, Christopher and Nicephorus.^{FB177}

SEC. 340. THREE PATRIARCHS IN THE EAST ARE IN FAVOR OF THE IMAGES.

During these occurrences in the Byzantine kingdom, the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem declared themselves with all decision for the ecclesiastical veneration of images. As their cities were in the hands of the Saracens, and they were no longer politically dependent upon the Byzantine Emperor, they could express themselves more freely than the Greek bishops (*cf.* p. 316). One of them, Theodore of Antioch, had been exiled in the year 757 by the Caliph Selim, because he became suspected of having conducted a correspondence, dangerous to the State, with Constantine Copronymus;^{FB178} but his restoration must have speedily followed, for in the year 764 we meet him again in Antioch. Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 669) relates: Bishop Cosmas, named Comanites, from Epiphania in Apamea in Syria, had been accused by his diocesans, before the Patriarch

Theodore of Antioch, of having taken the sacred vessels from the church. In order that he might not be compelled to replace them, he had gone over to the doctrine of the Byzantine Emperor, but the Patriarchs Theodore of Antioch, Theodore of Jerusalem, and Cosmas of Alexandria had, in agreement with their suffragans, pronounced against him a sentence of deposition and anathema.

The *Libellus Synodicus* and the biography of the Gothic Bishop John, published by the Bollandists, speak of a Synod held about that time by the Patriarch Theodore of Jerusalem, at which he anathematised iconoclasm. This Synod is said to have sent to the above-named Bishop John, who had formerly taken part in the false Council of the year 754, but had amended, a biblical and patristic proof in behalf of the veneration of images. ^{FB179} That the *Libellus Synodicus* places this Synod of Jerusalem before the false Council of the year 754 is not of significance, for it is clear from the biography of the Gothic Bishop John that it *must* have taken place a good deal later, and we conclude from the words of Theophanes that every one of the three patriarchs, with the bishops under him, held such a Synod on the question of the images and on account of Cosmas of Epiphania. It is therefore very probable that the Synodica of the Patriarch Theodore of Antioch, which is found among the Acts of the seventh Oecumenical Council (Act 3.), had been drawn up on this occasion. ^{FB180} But this document bears quite evidently the character of an enthronisation letter (also called Synodica), and therefore contains

- (a) a copious confession of the orthodox faith generally, united with a very complete assent to the decrees of the six Oecumenical Synods, whilst, at the close, only a relatively quite small space is dedicated to the defense of the images.
- (b) With the idea of an enthronisation letter the last words also agree: “May the two colleges of Alexandria and Antioch receive this Synodica in a friendly manner, and if anything in it is to be corrected, kindly make him acquainted with it.”
- (c) On the other hand, there is no word in it relating to Cosmas of Epiphania, and the initiative in an investigation in regard to him did not belong to the patriarch of Jerusalem, but to him of Antioch. I cannot, therefore, agree with those who would bring this Synodica into connection with the matter of Cosmas, but, on the contrary, regard it as

older, and believe that we should recognize it as the letter of enthronisation which the Patriarch Theodore of Jerusalem sent out on taking possession of his see.

Thus the doubts of Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10. S. 379 f.) drop away of themselves, as to why the patriarch of Jerusalem had taken the chief part in the affair against Cosmas. This hesitation rests merely on a confusion of that *Inthronistica* [epistola] with the sentence of the three Oriental patriarchs against Cosmas. On the other hand, our *Inthronistica* is perhaps identical with that Synodica which Theodore of Jerusalem, after receiving the decision of his two colleagues of Alexandria and Antioch, sent to Pope Paul, in which he set forth his orthodoxy in general, and his agreement with the Roman Church in regard to the images. This Synodica arrived in Rome in August 767, when Paul was already dead, and the intruding Antipope Constantine sat on the throne. He sent this document immediately to King Pipin, “that they might see in Gaul what zeal for the images prevailed in the East”; ^{FB181} and even Pope Hadrian I. afterwards appealed repeatedly to this Synodica, and certainly describes it in a manner which does not quite harmonise ^{FB182} with the copy which has come down to us, and must therefore raise a doubt as to the identity of the two documents. In particular, the Synodica which Hadrian had before him appears to have contained patristic proof for the images, which is wanting in the other. But it may be that the Synodica sent to Rome is nothing else than an elaboration and expansion of this *Inthronistica* of Jerusalem drawn up in consequence of the counsel of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria.

SEC. 341. THE FRANKS AND THE SYNOD OF GENTILLY, A.D. 767.

In the meantime, Constantine Copronymus did not abandon the hope of attaining, with the Franks, by diplomatic arts, two important results which were for him of the highest importance, namely, their assent to the rejection of the images and the restoration of the former Byzantine provinces of Italy. Several embassies were interchanged between the two Courts in reference to this matter, and one such in particular is referred to in that letter of Pope Paul I. to Pipin which is given as No. 26 in the *Codex Carolinus*. We learn from this that ambassadors of the Byzantine Emperor had come to the Frankish Court, and had, by fine words (*suasionis fabulatio*) and all kinds of promises (*inanes promissiones*), obtained from King Pipin a favorable answer to their wishes. The latter explained to them,

however, his wish, first of all, to take counsel, on so important a matter, with the bishops and nobles of his kingdom in an assembly (*concilium mixtum*), and at the same time made the Pope acquainted with this, with the assurance of his unaltered adhesion to the Roman Church and the *orthodox faith*. Pope Paul replied, he was sure that Pipin's answer to the Greeks tended only to the exaltation of the Roman Church, which was the head of all the Churches and of the *orthodox faith*, that he would never draw back what he had offered to S. Peter for the salvation of his soul, and that the *suasionis fabulatio* of the Greeks would be of no avail with him, since the *Word of God and the doctrine of the apostles* was deeply fixed in his heart. ^{FB183}

The assembly of the Frankish bishops and nobles here referred to is, in our judgment, no other than the Synod of Gentilly (*in Gentiliaco*), a spot in the immediate neighborhood of Paris which King Pipin held in the year 767, when he celebrated Easter there. The Acts of this assembly have not been preserved, and the many ancient Frankish chroniclers who refer to them, *e.g.* Einhard, remark quite briefly that they discussed the questions of the disputes about the images and of the Trinity, whether the Holy Spirit proceeded also from the Son. ^{FB184} Pagi supposes (*l.c.*) that, as the Latins reproached the Greeks with heresy on account of the destruction of the images, these, in return, had accused the Latins of adding the *filioque*. Schlosser, on the contrary (S. 239), holds it for proved, but without the slightest support from the original authorities, that the papal legates who were present at the Synod brought up the discussion on the doctrine of the Trinity in order to excite dislike for the Greeks.

Further information respecting the Synod of Gentilly is found in the twentieth section of the *Codex Carolinus*, if we may assume that this letter of Pope Paul to Pipin was written a little later. ^{FB185} The Pope says, in this letter, that Pipin had never given audience to the Byzantine ambassadors except in the presence of the papal legates, that no suspicion might arise; moreover, that these legates had disputed concerning the faith with the Byzantine ambassadors in the presence of Pipin, and that the letter of the Byzantines to Pipin, as well as the answer of the latter, had been communicated to the Pope. The Pope here praises the zeal of Pipin for the exaltation of the Church and the defense of orthodoxy, and we see from this that the Synod of Gentilly had also made a declaration in regard to the veneration of images which was agreeable to the Pope.

SEC. 342. CONTESTS FOR THE HOLY SEC.

Soon after the holding of the Synod of Gentilly, Pope Paul I. died, June 25, 767. Even during his illness, Duke Toto of Nepi (a city somewhat to the north of Rome) wanted to kill him. But Christopher, the Primicerius of the notaries, prevented it by his watchfulness, and brought it about that the Duke, in union with the other men of influence, took an oath that the future Pope should be elected only by common agreement. As soon, however, as the Pope died, Toto violated his oath, penetrated into the city with armed peasants, took possession of the Lateran, and had his brother Constantine, who was still a layman, receive, in a few days, ordination and the papal consecration ^{FB186} at the hands of the three intimidated cardinal bishops of Palestrina, Albano, and Portus. That this Antipope Constantine wrote to King Pipin, and sent him a Synodica of the Oriental bishops, we have already seen. In a still earlier letter to Pipin, he attempted to gain him over and to excuse the irregularities of his election, as he had, against his will, been chosen by the enthusiasm of the Romans. ^{FB187} But after a year's respite he was overthrown. The discontented, who had gone abroad with the Primicerius and papal counselor Christopher and his son Sergius (treasurer of the Roman Church) at their head, ^{FB188} slipped into the neighborhood of the city by night, on July 28, 768, and, supported by a company of Lombard volunteers, got possession of the Salarian bridge, and on the following morning forced their way through the gate of S. Pancratius, which was opened to them by a relation inside the city. Duke Toto, who hastened up to force them back, fell, and his brother the Pope was taken prisoner. Whilst they were preparing for his deposition, the Lombard party, who had been assisting, under the guidance of the Lombard priest Waldipert, by their own authority caused a pious monk, Philip, to be proclaimed Pope; but Christopher and his friends did not give assent, and, hearing of this, Philip resigned immediately, in order not to give occasion for further contests. Thereupon, on August 5, 768, in a great assembly of the Roman clergy and laity, Constantine was declared an intruder and an antipope, and on the following day Stephen IV., hitherto priest in the Church of S. Cecilia, a learned and virtuous man, who besides had enjoyed in a high degree the confidence of Pope Paul, was unanimously elected. Constantine and his adherents, however, were treated by the embittered people with frightful acts of violence, having their eyes put out and the like. The new Pope seems to have been powerless in this confusion ^{FB189} and immediately wrote to King Pipin and asked for his

assistance, in order to the holding of a great Synod at Rome, so as to restore order. When his ambassadors arrived in Paris, Pipin was already dead (September 24, 768); but his two sons and heirs, Charles the Great and Carlmann, responded to the petition of the Pope, and sent twelve Frankish bishops to the proposed Synod. ^{FB190}

SEC. 343. THE LATERAN, SYNOD, A.D. 769.

The new Synod was held in April 769, in the Basilica of S. Salvator in the Lateran palace, under the presidency of the Pope, and besides the Frankish bishops, there were also present bishops :from Tuscany, Campania, and the other parts of Italy, — altogether fifty-two bishops or representatives of bishops, together with several priests, monks, secular grandees, officers, citizens, and many of the laity. A short history of what they did is given in the *Vita Stephani* III. (IV.): see Mansi, t. 12. p. 685 sq. Besides this, there were formerly only a few small fragments of the minutes of the Synod; but in A.D. 1735, Cajetan Cenni edited, from an ancient codex of the chapter library at Verona, a larger fragment containing the beginning of the minutes of the first session, so that we now possess at least one or another fragment of four sessions. At the same time, he elucidated the publication by a *Praefatio* and an extensive ecclesiastico-geographical dissertation. The whole bears the title: *Concilium Lateranense Stephani* III. (IV.) *ann. DCCLXIX. nunc primum in lucem editum ex antiquissimo codice Veronensi MS. Rom.* 1735, and is reprinted at length in Mansi's first supplementary volume to Coleti's edition of the Councils. In his own larger collection of the Councils, however, Mansi has omitted the dissertation on ecclesiastical geography, because he intended to publish it along with several other dissertations in a separate supplementary volume which never appeared. ^{FB191}

The fragment edited by Cenni shows that the first session took place on April 12, 769, that at that time, however, they no longer dated at Rome by the years of the Byzantine Emperors, and thus apparently no longer recognised their sovereignty. It was through this fragment that we first received a list of all the bishops and clergy present. The names of the twelve Frankish bishops had previously been discovered by J. Sirmond in *Schedis Onuphrii*, but neither completely nor correctly. We now learn that, first after the Pope, the representative of the archbishop of Ravenna (as the first metropolitan in the West) had his seat, and after him Wilichar, archbishop of Sens. He was followed by the Cardinal-bishop George of

Ostia; but immediately after him, and before all the other Italians, came the eleven remaining Frankish bishops: Wulfram of Meaux, Lullus of Mainz, Gabienus of Tours, Ado of Lyons, Herminard of Bourges, Daniel of Narbonne, Hermenbert of Joahione (according to Cenni = *Juvavia*, Salzburg), ^{FB192} Verabulp of Burte vulgi (= *Burdegala*, Bordeaux), Erlulf of Langres (the founder of the monastery of Ellwangen), Tilpin of Reims, Giselbert of Noyon. Bishop Joseph, whom Sirmond reckons among the Frankish bishops (whilst he omits the bishop of Meaux), was, according to Cenni, of Dertona in Italy.

It must naturally strike us that of these Frankish bishops, only Wilichar of Sens is designated archbishop, whilst the bishops of Mainz, Tours, Lyons, Bourges, Narbonne, Bordeaux, and Reims (genuine metropolitan sees) were present. But Cenni shows that in the eighth century the metropolitan constitution had almost entirely become extinct, and was not again restored until the time of Pope Hadrian and Charles the Great. Thus, *e.g.*, Lullus had occupied the see of Mainz for a long time before he received from Pope Hadrian the pallium, and therewith the archiepiscopal dignity. Thus, in the opinion of Cenni, at that time only Wilichar of Sens, among the Franks present, possessed the pallium and the title of archbishop.

The Italian bishops were: Joseph of Dertona, Lanfried of Castrum (subsequently united with Aquapendente), Aurinand of Tuscana (subsequently united with Viterbo), NN. of Balneum-regis (Bagnarea), Peter of Populonium (subsequently united with Massa), Felerad of Luna (removed to Sarzana), Theodore of Pavia, Peter of Crete (Cervetri, no longer a diocese), Maurinus of Polimartium (subsequently united with Bagnarea), Leo of Castellum (Citta di Castello), Sergius of Ferentino, Jordanes of Segni, Ado of Orti, Ansualdus of Narni, Nigrotius of Anagni, Agatho of Sutri, NN. of Centumcellae (now united with Viterbo), Theodosius of Tibur, Pinius of Tres Tabernae (united with Viterbo), Boniface of Piperno (decayed), NN. of Alatri, Valeran of Trevi (decayed), Bonus of Manturanum (decayed), Gregory of Silva Candida or S. Rufina (united by Calixtus II. with Portus), Eustratius of Albano, Pothus of Repi, Cidonatus of Portus, Antoninus of Caesena, John of Faenza, Stabilinus of Pesaro, Maurus of Fano, Juvian of Gallese (subsequently united with Castellum), George of Sinigaglia, Sergius of Ficoclae (Cervia), Tiberius of Rimini, Florence of Eugubium (Gubbio), Temaurinus of Urbino, Cidonatus of Velletri (subsequently united with Ostia). ^{FB193}

Pope Stephen opened the Synod with the declaration that its aim was to take counsel respecting the usurpation of the papal see by Constantine, and to determine the canonical punishment for this according to his deserts. Thereupon Christopher, the Primicerius of the notaries, informed them of what had happened at the appointment of that antipope, how he had himself gone in danger of his life, but had fled with his sons into the Church of S. Peter, and finally had obtained permission to go into a monastery.

So far goes the fragment of Cenni. From Anastasius, however, we learn further that at the same first session the deposed and blinded Antipope Constantine was brought forward, and asked how he had dared, as a layman, to aspire to the papal chair, a thing hitherto unheard of in the Church. He replied that he had been constrained by the people, and brought against his will into the Lateran, because they had hoped from him the abolition of the evils which had been complained of under Pope Paul. Thereupon he cast himself on the ground, with outstretched hands, and acknowledged himself as guilty. He said his sins were more in number than the sand of the sea, but he trusted that the Synod would have compassion upon him. They raised him up from the ground, and on this day came to no resolution concerning him. In the second session he was brought forward again, and once more asked how he had ventured to do anything so new and unheard of. He replied: "I did nothing new, for Archbishop Sergius of Ravenna (who was represented by a deacon at this Synod) and Bishop Stephen of Naples were also elected when laymen." The further course of his speech embittered those present so far that they caused him to be beaten and taken out of the church. ^{FB194} Then the Acts of a Conciliabulum which the antipope had held were burnt in the presbytery of the Church of the Lateran. ^{FB195} Pope Stephen, moreover, and all the Roman clergy and laity present, cast themselves on the ground, intoning the *Kyrie Eleison*, and confessed themselves sinners, because they had received the communion at the hands of the antipope. They all had penance imposed upon them (by whom?); and finally, after careful consideration of the ancient canons, the elevation of a layman to the papal see was forbidden, under pain of anathema. ^{FB196}

In the third session it was positively ordained that in future only a cardinal-deacon or cardinal-priest was to be elected Pope, ^{FB197} and all participation in the election was forbidden to laymen. *A certis sacerdotibus atque proceribus ecclesiae et cuncto clero ipsa pontiificalis electio proveniat.* Before, however, the elect, should be conducted into the patriarchal abode

(*Patriarcheion*), all the officers and the whole army, as well as the citizens of distinction and the assembled people, should greet him as Lord of all. In the same manner, the elections of bishops for other churches should take place. From the armies stationed in Tuscany and Campania, no one was to come to Rome at the time of an election, and neither the servants of the clergy nor military persons, who were present at the election, were to bring weapons or sticks with them. ^{FB198} In the same third session it was also decided what was to be done with those ordained by the antipope. If a priest or deacon has been consecrated bishop by him, he is to become priest or deacon again; but he may be elected bishop anew by the laity and clergy, and be consecrated by Pope Stephen. The like holds of those whom Constantine ordained as priests and deacons. They are to be put back to the degree which they had before, but Pope Stephen may ordain them again as priests or deacons. But they are not to be further advanced. If, however, a layman has been ordained priest or deacon by the antipope, he must do penance throughout his whole life. Finally, all sacraments which have been administered by the antipope must be repeated, except baptism and confirmation (*chrisma*).

The fourth session was occupied with the question of the veneration of images. Patristic testimonies for this were presented, the Council of Constantinople of the year 754 was anathematised, and that veneration recognised for the images which had been shown to them until this time by all Popes and reverend Fathers. In this session, too, that Synodica of the Patriarch Theodore of Jerusalem, with which we made acquaintance above (see p. 329), was read and approved. At the same time, Pope Stephen appealed to the picture of Agbarus (see above, p. 291), since by that Christ Himself had confirmed the veneration of images.

After the session was ended, all present betook themselves barefooted from the Lateran to the Church of S. Peter. The decrees adopted were solemnly read, and every departure from them threatened with anathema. ^{FB199}

SEC. 344. THE EMPEROR LEO IV.

The Emperor Constantine Copronymus, who, by unheard of cruelties towards those who venerated the images, had stained his government, which in political and military respects was not without glory, ^{FB200} died on September 14, 775, in a ship near Selymbria (in Thrace, lying on the Propontis), in consequence of a very violent and painful inflammation of

the feet, and is said to have understood his error before his death, and to have ordered hymns of praise to be sung to the holy Virgin and Mother of God.^{fc1} He was succeeded by his eldest son, Leo IV, surnamed the Khazar, because his mother, Irene, the first wife of his departed father, was a Khazar princess. But Leo's own wife also bore the name of Irene. She was born an Athenian, distinguished for beauty and intelligence, but also for cunning and ambition. At her marriage she had been compelled to swear to her father-in-law, Copronymus, henceforth to abandon the veneration of images, which she had hitherto practiced in Athens, and was afterwards crowned Empress on December 17, and on January 14, 771, bore her only son, Constantine. Four years afterwards, her husband Leo, by the death of his father, became actual governor, and soon gained great popularity by the liberality with which he distributed the large savings of his father and lightened the burdens of the people.

They therefore asked permission to proclaim his five-year-old son as co-emperor (and successor); but the Emperor Leo was afraid that, in case of his too early death, this title might lead to the murder of his only son, whilst, without this title, he might be permitted to live in a private condition, and only gave his assent to the wish of the people after they had sworn that they would preserve the crown to his family. Thereupon the young Constantine VI was crowned at the Easter festival in 776 by the Patriarch Nicetas.^{fc2}

The Emperor Leo IV. saw without doubt that his father had gone too far in the matter of the images, and therefore at first leaned decidedly to tolerance. The monks were allowed to return, many of them were even raised to episcopal sees, and the hard old laws against the veneration of images seemed, if not formally abolished, yet to be forgotten. We do not know whether this or something else was the reason why a discontented party, so early as May 776, particularly among the officers, attempted to overthrow the Emperor and to set his younger brother, Nicephorus, on the throne. The matter was, however, discovered, and the people loudly demanded the heads of the criminals. But the Emperor Leo only had the guilty shorn and banished. He does not seem even to have punished his brother Nicephorus.

When the Patriarch Nicetas died, February 6, 780, the Lector Paul was designated as his successor by the Emperor. He hesitated at first to accept the position, because the Emperor required of him a promise on oath that

he would not restore the veneration of images. But at last he took the oath, and was invested on the second Sunday in Lent 780. ^{fc3}

By the middle of the Lenten season, six of the most distinguished Court officials, the Protospathar ^{fc4} James, Papias, Strategius, and the chamberlains Theophanes, Leo, and Thomas, were denounced and imprisoned as actual venerators of images. ^{fc5} At the same time they found two sacred images in the bed of the young Empress, Irene. According to Cedrenus, the courtiers just mentioned had hidden them in the notion that no search would be made there; but undoubtedly this was betrayed, and was made use of by the iconoclasts in order to the overthrow of the Empress. Although Irene protested that she had not known the least of the hidden images, yet Leo made the bitterest reproaches against her, that she had broken the oath which she made to his father, and sent her into exile. Those Court officials, however, were publicly shorn and flogged, then led in disgrace through the city, and east into the prison of the Praetorium, where one of them died. All the others became monks, when, after Leo's death, they again obtained liberty. ^{fc6} And this happened soon, for the Emperor Leo IV died on September 8 of the same year, 780. Theophanes, and those who follow him, relate that the Emperor, from his great fondness for precious stones, had taken a crown belonging to the principal church which the Emperor Maurice had founded, and set it on his own head and retained it for himself. He says that this crown was set with beautiful carbuncles, and that now, as a punishment, he had got similar red ulcers on his head, and had died of them. ^{fc7} Some recent historians have, without any original authority, wanted to accuse the "friend of the images," Irene, of poisoning her own husband, but even Walch (S. 501) and Schlosser (S. 259) declare themselves against the accusation.

CHAPTER 2.

The Seventh OEcumenical Synod At Nicaea, A.D. 787.

SEC. 345. THE EMPRESS IRENE MAKES PREPARATIONS FOR THE CONVOCATION OF AN (ECUMENICAL SYNOD.

IRENE was recognized as guardian of her son, the new Emperor, Constantine VI Porphyrogenitus, who was only ten years old, and at the same time regent of the Empire. After only fourteen days, however, a party of senators and high officials resolved to proclaim Prince Nicephorus (brother of Leo IV) as Emperor. Irene discovered the conspiracy in good time, took the ringleaders, and, after having them shorn and scourged, banished them to several islands. Nicephorus, however, and his brothers were required to take holy orders, and on the following Christmas (780) to publicly administer the sacraments, that all the people might learn what had taken place. On the same festival, Irene restored to the great church the precious crown which her husband had taken away.^{fc8} So also the body of S. Euphemia was solemnly brought back to Chalcedon from its place of concealment at Lemnos (*see p. 326*); and from this time, says Theophanes (*p. 704*), the pious were allowed without hindrance to worship God and to renounce heresy, and also the monasteries revived, that is to say, each one was allowed, if his inclination and conscience urged him thereto, again to venerate the images, and in particular this was the case with restored monks, among whom Abbot Plato, uncle of Theodore Studites, was peculiarly distinguished. Abbot Plato distinguished himself also later on, at the preparatory Synod of the year 786, by defending the images, as his ancient biographer relates. But Baronius (*ad ann. 780, 7*), using the inaccurate translation of this *Vita Platonis* by Sirlet, has imagined a Conciliabulum of the enemies of images at Constantinople, A.D. 780, an error corrected already by Pagi (*ad ann. 780, 3, 4*).

There is no doubt that Irene already thought of the complete restoration of the veneration of images, and at the same time of the resumption of Church communion with the rest of Christendom. That Pope Hadrian I. exhorted her continually to this, he says himself (*see below, p. 351*); but that Irene expected from this favorable results in regard to the possible winning back of Italy, is the supposition of later scholars. But the carrying out of this

plan had to be put off so much the more on account of the wars with the Arabs and Slavonians, since with the military, among the officers who had been brought up under Copronymus, iconoclasm still counted its most numerous adherents. But after a peace, which was certainly inglorious, had been concluded with the Arabs, whilst, on the other hand, the Slavonians were gloriously overcome and made tributary, then it was possible to consider the ecclesiastical question more steadily. At the same time, Irene had brought about a betrothal between her son, the young Emperor, and Notrude, the daughter of Charles the Great, who was from seven to eight years of age, and therefore had to regard the restoration of ecclesiastical union with the West as requisite, or at least as desirable. The two men who specially assisted the Empress in this were Paul, until now patriarch, and his successor Tarasius; the former by the way and manner of his resignation, the other by the condition which he laid down on his assumption of the see. It is very probable that the Empress had come to an agreement with Tarasius as to the course to be taken; whilst it is less probable that any previous settlement had been made with the Patriarch Paul. When the latter fell ill in August 784, he experienced such violent pains of conscience on account of his behavior in the matter of the images, particularly on account of the oath at his entrance upon office, that he actually laid down his office, left the patriarchal palace, betook himself to the monastery of S. Florus, and put on the monastic habit, August 31, 784.

^{fc9} Theophanes says (*p.* 708) that he did this without any previous knowledge on the part of the Empress, and that as soon as she obtained intelligence of it she went immediately with her son into the monastery of S. Florus, in order to interrogate the patriarch, with complaints and reproaches, as to the reason of his withdrawal. He answered with tears: "Oh, that I had never occupied the see of Constantinople, since this church is tyrannized over, and is separated from the rest of Christendom." Thereupon Irene, returning, sent several senators and patricians to Paul, that they might hear the same from him, and through his confessions might become inclined to the restoration of the images. He declared to them: "Unless they call an (Ecumenical Synod and root out the prevailing error, you cannot be saved." To their reproach, "But why then did you promise, in writing, at your consecration never to consent to the veneration of images?" he replied, "That is the very cause of my tears, and this has driven me to do penance and to pray God for His forgiveness." Amid such conversations Paul died, deeply lamented by the Empress and the people,

for he had been pious and very beneficent. From that time many spoke openly in defense of the images.^{fc10}

Soon afterwards the Empress held a great assemblage of the people in the palace Magnaura, and said: "You know what the Patriarch Paul has done. Although he took the monastic habit, we should nevertheless have refused to accept his resignation if he had not died. Now it is necessary to give him a worthy successor." All exclaimed that there was none more worthy than the imperial secretary, Tarasius, who was still a layman. The Empress replied: "We have also selected him as patriarch, but he does not consent. He is now himself to enter and speak to the people." Tarasius then addressed the meeting in a detailed speech, speaking of the care of the Emperors (namely, Irene and her son) for religion, declared his own unworthiness and the like. But particularly, he proceeded, would he guard against this, that the Byzantine kingdom should be separated in religion from the West and also from the East, and should from all sides receive anathema. He therefore prayed the Emperors — and all the people should support his prayer — to summon an Ecumenical Synod for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity.

This speech is found in all completeness both in Theophanes (*l.c. pp. 710-713*) and in the preliminary Acts of the seventh OEcumenical Council,^{fc11} only with this difference, that Theophanes maintains: All present shouted approval to Tarasius, and with him demanded the summoning of an Ecumenical Synod; whilst it is added in the synodal Acts: "Some who lacked intelligence opposed." This statement, confirmed by the fact that, at the beginning, the military dispersed the Council which was subsequently called, is also in agreement with the biographer of Tarasius (Ignatius), who adds that, however, the right prevailed.^{fc12} Tarasius was consecrated patriarch at Christmas, 784. Almost everywhere we read the statement, referred to Theophanes, that he *immediately* sent a Synodica and declaration of faith to Rome and to the other patriarchs; but even Pagi remarked (*ad ann. 784, 2*) that the word *confestim* occurred indeed in the Latin translation of the chronography of Theophanes (*l.c.p. 713*), but was not justified by the original Greek text. It is, however, most probable that Tarasius, soon after ascending the throne, renewed intercourse with the other patriarchs. His letter, addressed "to the archpresbyters and presbyters of Antioch, Alexandria, and the holy city" (Jerusalem), an Inthronistica (without date), is preserved among the Acts of the third session of Nicaea, and relates at the beginning, how he, although still a layman, had been

constrained to accept the sacred office by the bishops and clergy. The other bishops were therefore requested to support him as fathers and brethren, for a spiritual conflict lay before him. But, in possession of unconquerable truth, and supported by his brethren, he would overcome the babblers. As, however, it was an ancient, even an essentially apostolic tradition, that a newly appointed bishop should set forth his confession of faith, he would also now confess what he had learnt from his youth. After a not very full confession of faith, in which anathema is pronounced upon Pope Honorius, he passes over to the question of the images with the words: “This sixth Synod I accept with all the dogmas pronounced by it, and all the canons promulgated by it, among them that which runs: *In some representations of the sacred images there is found the figure of the Lamb; but we decide that Christ shall be represented in human form.*” He cites here canon 82 of the Quinisext (*see p. 234*), and ascribes its canons to the sixth Ecumenical Synod, which, as is well known, promulgated no canons. He then proceeds: “What was afterwards superfluously chattered and babbled (*i.e.* the decrees of the false Synod of the year 754), I reject, as you also have done; and as the pious and faithful Emperors have granted the request for the holding of an Ecumenical Synod, you will not refuse your cooperation in order to restore again the unity of the Church. Each of you (patriarchs) will therefore please to send two representatives, with a letter, and communicate his view on this matter as it has been given him by God. I have also petitioned the bishop of Old Rome for the same,” etc. ^{fc13}

The letter addressed to the Pope, to which Tarasius here refers, and of which Theophanes also speaks (*I.e.p. 713*), we no longer possess, but we know it from the answer of Hadrian I and from the remark of the papal legates at the seventh Council, “that the Pope had also received such a letter, **toi auta grammata**” (thus in its principal contents corresponding with the letter of Tarasius to the Oriental patriarchs). ^{fc14} The conveyance of this letter to Rome was committed by Tarasius to his priest and representative (apocrisiar) Leo; ^{fc15} but the Court also sent a *Divalis Sacra* to the Pope. In the superscription, Irene placed, as in all the documents of this period (she altered it afterwards), the name of her son before her own. In this letter she starts with the statement that the secular and spiritual powers both proceeded from God, and therefore were bound in common to rule the peoples entrusted to them in accordance with the divine will; and then proceeds: “Your Holiness knows what has been undertaken here in Constantinople by previous governors against the venerable images. May

it not be reckoned to them by God! They have led astray all the people here in Constantinople, and also the East (as far as it was under Byzantium), until God called us to the government, — us who seek in truth the honor of God, and desire to hold that fast which has been handed down by the apostles and the holy doctors. We therefore, after consultation with our subjects and the most learned priests, resolved upon the summoning of an Ecumenical Synod, and we pray — yea, God Himself, who wills to lead all men to the truth, prays — that your fatherly Holiness will yourself appear at this Synod, and come hither to Constantinople, for the confirmation of the ancient tradition in regard to the venerable images. We will receive your Holiness with all honors, provide you with all that is necessary, and provide for your worthy return after the work is accomplished. In case, however, your Holiness should be unable personally to come hither, be pleased to send venerable and learned representatives, that, by a Synod, the tradition of the holy Fathers may be confirmed and the tares rooted out, and that henceforth there may be no more division in the Church. Moreover, we have called here to us Bishop Constantine of Leontium (in Sicily), who is also known to your fatherly Holiness, have conversed with him by word of mouth, and have sent him to you with this edict (*venerabilis jussio*). When he has come to you, be pleased to give him your answer soon, that he may return to us and inform us on what day you will depart from Rome. He will also bring hither with him the bishop of Naples.^{fc16} We have commanded our representative in Sicily to take care to provide for your peace and dignity.^{fc17}

This letter, which we now possess only in the Latin translation by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, is dated 4. Kal. Sept. Indict. 7, *i.e.* August 29, 784. As, however, we saw above that Tarasius was made patriarch on December 25, 784, according to this the imperial Sacra would have been dispatched four months before his elevation. This is contradicted alike by Theophanes (*I.e.* p 713) and by the answer of Pope Hadrian. Quite arbitrary and improbable, however, is the supposition of Christian Lupus, that the Court of Byzantium sent two letters, one after the other, to the Pope, the one just noticed and a later one, and that Pope Hadrian sent two answers, and that only his second answer is extant. Pagi (*ad ann.* 785, 3) opposed this hypothesis, and drew attention to the fact that the seventh Ecumenical Synod and the ancient collectors of its Acts knew of only one imperial letter to the Pope, and of only one answer from Hadrian. At the same time, that assumption was only a desperate way of escape, in order to

get out of the chronological difficulty which lies in the date given above. But this is easily got rid of, if with Pagi we read Indict. 8, according to which the imperial *Sacra* was written in August 785, a date which suits quite well. That such a correction has to be made, Walch (S. 532) had also seen from Pagi; but he went wrong about a full year, because he made the Indictio 7: to begin with September 1, 782, and the 8th with September 1, 783. Moreover, 4. Kal. Sept. is not August 27, as he supposes, but August 29.

Objections to the genuineness of this imperial letter to the Pope were raised by the Gallican Edmond Richer and the Protestants Spanheim junior, and Basnage, but even Walch (S. 532) found them untenable.

When the envoy of Tarasius, his priest and apocrisiar Leo, arrived in Sicily, the regent of that place, at the imperial command, gave him, as companions, Bishop Theodore of Catanea and the deacon Epiphanius (afterwards deputy of the archbishop of Sardinia at the Council of Nicaea), in order to convey to Rome, in common with him, the imperial *jussio* (two *jussiones*, indeed, the one regarding the Synod and the other on the recognition of Tarasius). We learn this from the minutes of the second session of Nicaea. ^{fc18} Bishop Constantine of Leontium, on the contrary, who had been sent by Irene, no longer appears, and even Hadrian makes no reference to him in the letter which he sent in reply to the Court. We may perhaps assume that Bishop Constantine fell sick on the journey from Constantinople to Sicily, and that after the regent had communicated information of this to the Court, Bishop Theodore and the deacon Epiphanius were named imperial envoys in the place of Constantine.

Pope Hadrian, on October 27, 785, answered the two rulers in a very extensive Latin letter. A Greek translation of this was read in the second session of the Nicene Council, and is still extant. But in this reading, as Anastasius testifies, ^{fc19} with the consent of the legate, they cut off nearly the last quarter, because in it, as we shall see, Tarasius was blamed by the Pope, and this might have been abused by his opponents and those of the Council so as to do an injury to the good cause itself. When Anastasius, on undertaking the translation of the Acts of Nicaea, remarked this, he inserted in his collection the Latin original of the letter of Hadrian, which he naturally found in Rome, and we see from this; that, in other places also, the Greek translation contains arbitrary alterations. In the collections of the Councils, it is found side by side with the original Latin text communicated

by Anastasius; ^{fc20} in the same way as elsewhere, there the translation of Anastasius is given along with the original Greek text.

Pope Hadrian, in this letter, first of all expresses his joy at the return of the two rulers to orthodoxy and at their resolution to restore the veneration of images. If they carried this through, they would be a new Constantine and a second Helena, especially if, like them, they honored the successor of Peter and the Roman Church. The Prince of the apostles, to whom God had committed the power of binding and loosing, would therefore protect them, and subject all the barbarous nations to them. The sacred authority (Holy Scripture) declared the height of his dignity, and what reverence should be given by all Christians to the *Summa sedes* of Peter. God had placed this *Claviger* of the kingdom of heaven as *princeps* over all; and Peter had left his primacy, by divine command, to his successors, and the tradition of these testified for the veneration of the images of Christ, His Mother, the apostles, and all saints. ^{fc21} Pope Silvester, in particular, testifies that from the time when the Christian Church began to enjoy rest and peace, the churches had been adorned with pictures. An old writing related: “When Constantine decided to adopt the faith, there appeared to him by night Peter and Paul, and said to him: Because thou hast put an end to thy misdeeds, we are sent by Christ the Lord to counsel thee how thou canst regain thy health. In order to escape from thy persecutions, Bishop Silvester of Rome has hidden himself with his clergy on Mount Soracte. Call him to thee, and he will show thee a pool, and when he has dipped thee in it for the third time, thy leprosy will immediately depart. In gratitude for this, thou must honor the true God, and order that in the whole Empire then the churches should be restored. Immediately after awaking, Constantine sent to Silvester, who, with his clergy, was employed in reading and prayer on a property on Soracte. When he saw the soldiers, he thought he was about to be led to martyrdom, but Constantine received him in a very friendly manner, and told him of the vision of the night, adding: Who, then, are these *gods* Peter and Paul? Silvester corrected this error, and, at the wish of the Emperor, had a *picture* of the two apostles brought up, on which Constantine cried aloud: Yes, these he had seen, and the vision therefore came from the Holy Spirit.” This proved the ancient use of images in the Church, and many heathens had already been converted by seeing them. The Emperor Leo the Isaurian had been the first who had been misled and had proclaimed war on the images in Greece, and had caused great vexation. In vain had Gregory II and III exhorted him,

and Pope Zacharias, Stephen II, Paul, and Stephen III, the Emperors succeeding him, to restore the images. He himself also, Hadrian, had continually put forward the same request to the present rulers, and renewed it with all his might, so that, as the rulers had already done it, their subjects might also return to orthodoxy, and become “one flock and one fold,” since then the images would be venerated again by all the faithful in the whole world.

The Pope further defends the veneration of images, which had been falsely given out as a deification of them. From the very beginning of human history, he said, God had not rejected what men themselves had contrived in order to testify their reverence for Him, thus the sacrifice of Abel, the altar of Noah, the memorial stone of Jacob (~~<120>~~Genesis 28). Thus Jacob, of his own impulse, kissed the top of the staff of his own son Joseph (~~<812>~~Hebrews 11:21, according to the Vulgate [adoravit fastigium virgae ejus]); but not in order to do honor to the staff, but to testify his love and reverence for the bearer of the staff. In the same manner, love and reverence were paid by Christians, not to images and colors, but to those in whose honor they were set up. Thus Moses had cherubim prepared for the honor of God, and set up a brazen serpent as a sign (type of Christ). The prophets, too, spoke of the adornment of the house of God and of the reverence and representation of the countenance of God (Psalm 25 [26] 8, 26 [27] 8, 44:[65] 13, 4:[5] 7); and Augustine said: *Quid est imago Dei, nisi vultus Dei?* Then follow beautiful passages from Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, Athanasius, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Stephen of Bostra, and Jerome. Supporting himself upon these patristic and biblical passages, he cast himself at the feet of the rulers, and prayed them that they would restore the images again in Constantinople and in the whole of Greece, and follow the tradition of the holy Roman Church, in order to be received into the arms of this holy, catholic, apostolic, and blameless Church.

So far the papal letter was read aloud at Nicaea; but Anastasius communicated, along with his translation of the Nicene Acts, a further portion of the letter, which is as follows: “If, however, the restoration of the images cannot take place without an Ecumenical Synod, the Pope will send envoys, and in their presence, before everything else, must that false assembly (of the year 754) be anathematised, because it was held without the apostolic see, and had drawn up wicked decrees against the images. In like manner must the Emperor, the Empress his mother, the patriarch, and

the senate, in accordance with ancient custom, transmit to the Pope a *pia sacra* (document), in which they promise by oath (at the Synod to be held) to be impartial, and to do no violence to the papal legate or any priest, but, on the contrary, in every way to honor and uphold them, and if no union could be attained, to provide in the most friendly manner for their return. Moreover, if the rulers would really return to the orthodox faith of the holy catholic Roman Church, then they must also again restore completely the *patrimonia Petri* (withdrawn by the previous Emperors) and the rights of consecration, which belonged to the Roman Church over the archbishops and bishops of its whole diocese (patriarchate) according to ancient right (cf. p. 304). The Roman see had the primacy over all the churches of the world, and to that belonged the confirmation of Synods. Hadrian, however, had greatly wondered that, in the imperial letter which had requested the confirmation of Tarasius, the latter was named *universalis patriarcha*.^{fc22} He did not know whether this had been written *per imperitiam, ant schisma vel haeresim iniquorum*; but the Emperors should no longer use this expression, for it was in opposition to the traditions of the Fathers, and if it should be meant by this, that this *universalis* stood even above the Roman Church, then would he be a rebel against the sacred Synods and an evident heretic. If he were *universalis*, then he must necessarily also possess the primacy which was left by Christ to Peter, and by him to the Roman Church. If any one should call Tarasius an *universalis patriarcha* in this sense, which, however, he did not believe, he would be a heretic and a rebel against the Roman Church. Tarsius had, in accordance with ancient custom, sent a Synodica to the Pope, and he rejoiced at the confession of the orthodox faith which was contained in it in regard also to the holy images, but it had grieved him that Tarasius had, from a layman and a booted soldier (*apocaligus*), been suddenly made patriarch. This was in contradiction to the sacred canons, and the Pope would not have been able to assent to his consecration had he not been a faithful helper in the restoration of the sacred images. The whole of Christendom would rejoice over the restoration of the images, and the Emperors, under the protection of S. Peter, would then triumph over all barbarous peoples, just as Charles, the King of the Franks and Lombards, and patrician of Rome (the Pope's *filius et spiritualis compater*),^{fc23} who, following in all things the admonitions of the Pope, subjected to himself the barbarous nations of the West, presented to the Church of S. Peter many estates, provinces, and cities, and had given back that which had been seized by the faithless Lombards. He had also offered to the Church much money and silver *pro*

luminariorum concinnatione, ^{fc24} and free alms to the poor, so that his royal remembrance was secured for all the future. Finally, the Emperors were requested to give a friendly reception to the bearers of this letter, the Roman Archpresbyter Peter, and the priest and abbot Peter of S. Sabas, and to let them return uninjured with the joyful intelligence that the Emperors were persevering in the orthodox faith, as they had begun.”

The Pope undoubtedly, at the same time, addressed his (undated) letter to the Patriarch Tarasius, which was read at the second session at Nicaea in a Greek translation. Anastasius says that the Greeks had also omitted much in this document, but that the original text was in the Roman archives. ^{fc25} Yet in this case the Latin agrees with the Greek in all the principal points, for the latter also contains the fault-finding, that Tarasius, being a layman, had immediately become patriarch, and a strong assertor of the Roman primacy. Indeed, the papal letter begins with fault-finding on that account. As, on the one hand, he was troubled by this uncanonical promotion, so, on the other side, was the Pope rejoiced by the assurance of the orthodoxy of Tarasius. Without this he could not have accepted his Synodica. He praises him, and exhorts him to persevere, and remarks that he had with pleasure resolved to send legates to the contemplated Synod. But Tarasius must take measures that the false assembly against the images, which had been held in an irregular manner without the apostolic see, should be anathematised in the presence of the papal representatives, so that all the tares should be rooted out, and the word of Christ should be fulfilled, who had left the primacy to the Roman Church. If Tarasius would adhere to this see, he must take care that the Emperors should have the images restored in the capital city and everywhere; for if this was not done, he could not recognize his consecration. Finally, he should give a friendly reception to the papal legates. ^{fc26}

It was probably a little later that an answer to the Synodica of Tarasius arrived from the three Oriental patriarchates. Evidently this did not come from those patriarchs themselves, ^{fc27} but from Oriental monks, because, as the latter openly assert, the messengers of Tarasius could not reach the patriarchs on account of the enmity of the Arabs. ^{fc28} The contents are as follows: “When the letter of Tarasius, inspired by God, arrived, we, the last among the inhabitants of the wilderness (i.e. the monks in the deserts), were seized with horror and joy at the same time: with horror, from fear of those impious ones whom we were forced to serve for our sins; but with joy, because in that letter the truth of the orthodox faith shines like the rays

of the sun. A light from on high, as Zacharias says (S. ⁴⁰⁷⁸ Luke 1:78), has visited us, to lighten us who sit in the shadow of death (that is, Arabian impiety), and to guide our feet into the way of peace. It has raised for us a horn of salvation, which you (Tarasius) are, and the God-loving rulers who occupy the second place in the Church. A wise and holy Emperor said: The greatest gift which God has bestowed upon men is the *Sacerdotium* and the *Imperium*. The former orders and guides the heavenly, the latter governs the earthly with righteous laws. Now, happily, the *Sacerdotium* and the *Imperiam* are united, and we, who were a reproach to our neighbors (on account of the ecclesiastical division between the East and Byzantium), may again joyfully look up to heaven.

“The messengers whom you sent to the Oriental patriarchs, under God’s guidance met with our brethren (other monks), ^{fc29} disclosed to them the aim of their mission, and were by them concealed, out of fear of the enemies of the Cross. But those monks did not trust in their own discernment, but rather sought counsel, and came to us without the knowledge of those whom they had concealed. After we had sworn to them to observe silence, they imparted the matter to us; and we prayed God for enlightenment, and then declared to them:

As we know the enmity of the rejected nation (the Saracens), those envoys should be kept back, and not allowed to travel to the patriarchs; on the contrary, they should be brought to us and earnestly exhorted to make no noise, as this would bring ruin on the now peaceable churches and the subject Christian peoples. Those envoys, however, after receiving our explanation, were indignant with us. They said they had been sent to give up their lives for the Church, and perfectly to fulfill the commission of the patriarch and the Emperors. We replied to them, that there was here no question merely as to their lives only, but as to the existence of the whole Church in the East; and when they hesitated to return with their commissions not executed, we besought our brothers John and Thomas, the syncelli of the two great patriarchs (of Alexandria and Antioch), ^{fc30} to travel with your envoys to Constantinople, to undertake their defense, and to deliver by word of mouth that which would require too much detail in writing. As the patriarch of the see of S. James (Jerusalem) had been exiled, on account of a trivial accusation, to a distance of 2000 stones (so that no special vicar could be appointed for him), John and Thomas were appointed to bear testimony to the apostolic tradition of Egypt and Syria in Constantinople, and to do what was required of them there. (The

messengers of Tarasius had already explained the aim of the Synod which was to be held, and therefore a commission might be given to the two monks referred to, which through its indefiniteness might be offensive.) They excused themselves from defect of learning, but followed our wish, and departed with your envoys. Receive them kindly, and present them to the Emperors. They know the tradition of the three apostolic sees, who receive six Ecumenical Synods, but utterly reject the so-called seventh, summoned for the destruction of images;. If, however, you celebrate a Synod, you must not be restrained from holding it by the absence of the three patriarchs and the bishops subject to them, for they are not voluntarily wanting, but in consequence of the threats and injuries of the Saracens. In the same way, they were absent from the sixth Synod for the same reason; and yet this in no way diminished the importance of that Council, particularly as the Pope of Rome gave his assent, and was present by his deputy. For the confirmation of our letter, and in order to convince you perfectly (of the orthodoxy of the East), we present the Synodica which the Patriarch Theodore of Jerusalem of blessed memory sent to Cosmas of Alexandria and Theodore of Antioch, and in return for which he received, during his lifetime, Synodiocae from them.” ^{fc31}

This Synodica of the departed patriarch of Jerusalem was probably intended to supply the lack of a special deputy from this diocese. It begins with a very lengthy orthodox confession of faith, then recognizes the six Ecumenical Synods, and regards any other as superfluous, as those six had completely exhausted the tradition of the Fathers, and nothing was to be added or could improve it. After several anathemas on the heretics, from their head, Simon Magus, down to the tail, the veneration of the saints (*timan kai proskuneia toux agiouv kai ajspazesqai*) is declared to be an apostolic tradition, a healing power is ascribed to their relics, and an inference is drawn from the Incarnation of Christ, justifying the representation of Him in images and the veneration of those images. There is added to this a defense of the images of Mary and the apostles, etc., by reference to the cherubim which Moses caused to be made. ^{fc32}

SEC. 346. THE FIRST ATTEMPT THE HOLDING OF ANECUMENICAL SYNOD MISCARRIES.

After the Roman and Oriental envoys had arrived in Constantinople, the rulers summoned also the bishops of their kingdom. As, however, the Synod could not be opened at once on account of the absence of the Court

in Thrace, this was made use of by the still considerable number of enemies of the images ^{fc33} among the bishops, in union with many laymen, to hinder the meeting of the Synod and to maintain the prohibition of the Synod. At the same time, they intrigued against the Patriarch Tarasius, and held several assemblies. But he forbade this on canonical grounds, under penalty of deposition, whereupon they withdrew. ^{fc34}

Soon afterwards the rulers returned from Thrace, and fixed the 17th of August for the opening of the Synod, in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople. ^{fc35} On the previous day many military men assembled in the **Iouthē** (either baptistry or porch, in which the font, **Iouthē**, stood) of the Church of the Apostles, ^{fc36} and protested with great noise and tumult against the holding of the new Synod. Nevertheless it was opened on the following day. ^{fc37} The Patriarch Tarasius assumed the presidency, ^{fc38} and the rulers looked on from the place of the catechumens. The passages of Holy Scripture referring to the images were considered, and the arguments for and against the veneration of images examined. The Abbot Plato particularly distinguished himself by delivering from the ambo a discourse in defense of the images, at the request of Tarasius. Naturally, the new Synod decided to declare the earlier one of the year 754 invalid, and to this end caused the older canons to be read, according to which an Ecumenical Synod could not be held without the participation of the other patriarchs. ^{fc39} But in agreement with the few bishops who were hostile to the images, and incited by their officers, the soldiers of the imperial bodyguard, posted before the church doors, who had served under Copronymus, pushed with a great noise into the interior of the church, marched with naked weapons up to the bishops, and threatened to kill them all, along with the patriarch and the monks. The Emperors immediately sent some high Court officials to rebuke them and bid them be at peace, but they answered with insults, and refused obedience. Upon this, Tarasius withdrew with the bishops from the nave of the church into the sanctuary (which with the Greeks, as is well known, is shut off by a wall), and the rulers declared the Synod dissolved. The enemies of the images among the bishops then cried out joyfully, “We have conquered,” and with their friends commended the so-called seventh Synod. Many bishops now departed, among them the papal legates.

SEC. 347. CONVOCAATION OF THE SYNOD OF NICAEEA.

When the legates arrived in Sicily, they were called back to Constantinople, for Irene had not given up the project of a Synod, and had got rid of her mutinous bodyguard by a stratagem. She pretended an expedition against the Arabs, and the whole Court removed, in September 786, with the bodyguard, to Malagina in Thrace. Other troops, under trustworthy leaders, had therefore to be brought into Constantinople; another bodyguard was formed, those insubordinate ones were disarmed and sent back to their native provinces.^{fc40} After this was done, Irene sent messengers through the whole Empire, in May 787, to summon the bishops to a new Synod at Nicaea in Bithynia. That the Pope gave his assent to this is clear from what has been said, from his letters to the Court and to Tarasius, and from the sending of his legates. Moreover, he afterwards said expressly in his letter to Charles the Great: *Et sic synodum istam secundum nostram ordinationem fecerunt.*^{fc41}

The reasons for choosing Nicaea are evident. Constantinople itself necessarily seemed unsuitable after what had happened the year before, and because, perhaps, many enemies of the images lived there. Nicaea, on the other hand, was not very far removed from the capital city, so that a connection between the Synod and the Court could be effected without much difficulty, and had, besides, the memory of the first most highly esteemed OEcumencal Council, under Constantine the Great, in its favor; and moreover, the fourth Ecumencal Synod (of Chalcedon) was first summoned to Nicaea, and was only removed to Chalcedon because of intervening circumstances (see vol. 3). Moreover, similar circumstances brought it about, in the case of the present Synod, that the eighth and last session was celebrated on October 23, 787, in the imperial palace at Constantinople. The Empress and her son were not personally present at the sessions of Nicaea, but were represented by two high officers of State, the patricius and ex-consul Petronus, and the imperial ostiarius (chamberlain) and logothetes (chancellor of the military chancery) John. Nicephorus, subsequently patriarch, was appointed secretary. Among the spiritual members, the two Roman legates, the Archpresbyter Peter and the Abbot Peter (p. 353) are regularly placed first in the Acts, and first *after* them the Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople, and then the two Oriental monks and priests John and Thomas, as representatives of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. From the transactions themselves,

we learn that Tarasius essentially conducted the business, as also the Sicilian bishops nominated him, at the first session, **toꝝ prokaꝑezomenon**.^{fc42}

The question has often been brought up, with what right did those two monks, John and Thomas, act at Nicaea as representatives of the Oriental patriarchs, since, as we saw, information of the summoning of the Synod had never been brought to those patriarchs? Here was undeniable deception and falsehood.^{fc43} But the letter of the Oriental monks, which gives the whole history of the matter in a thoroughly unadorned and circumstantial manner, was read at the second session of Nicaea, so that not one person could believe that John and Thomas had been sent directly by the Oriental patriarchs. The **ajrciereiv**, by whom they were deputed, and who are named in the superscription, as we remarked above, were not patriarchs, but monk-priests of higher rank, who acted *sedibus impeditis* instead of the inaccessible patriarchs. The necessity of the case would justify this. John and Thomas, however, subscribed at Nicaea not as vicars of the patriarchs (*qua* persons), but of the apostolic sees (**qronoi** = churches) of the East,^{fc44} and they might properly be so designated materially, for, in union with the two letters which they brought with them, they represented, in fact, the faith of the three Oriental patriarchates in regard to the images and the veneration of them. Apart from them and the Roman legates, all present were subjects of the Byzantine kingdom. The number of the members, partly bishops, partly representatives of bishops, is given by the ancients as between 330 and 367; and when the almost contemporaneous patriarch Nicephorus speaks only of 150,^{fc45} this is evidently incorrect, since the still extant minutes of the Synod give not fewer than 308 bishops and representatives of bishops as subscribers of the decrees of Nicaea. Besides, as the Acts here and there indicate, there were also present a good many monks and clerics not entitled to vote. The Patriarch Tarasius also, speaks of archimandrites and hegumeni and a **pl hquꝝ monacwꝝ**.^{fc46} Several imperial secretaries and clerics of Constantinople also acted as officials of the Synod.

SEC. 348. THE FIRST SESSION OF NICAEA.

After the bishops had arrived in Nicaea, during the summer of 787, the first session was held there, September 24, 787, in the Church of S. Sophia.^{fc47} As was usual, here also the books of the holy Gospels were solemnly placed upon a throne. In front of the ambo sat the two imperial commissaries and the archimandrites etc., who had no right to vote. At the

wish of the Sicilian bishops, the Patriarch Tarasius opened the transactions with a short speech, as follows: “At the beginning of August in the previous year, it had been wished to hold a Synod under his presidency, in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople; but through the fault of some bishops, who could easily be numbered, but whom he would not name, as every one knew them, they had been hindered by force. The gracious rulers had therefore summoned a new Synod to Nicaea, and Christ would reward them for this. This Helper the bishops should also invoke, and in all uprightness, without discursiveness, deliver a righteous judgment.”⁴⁸ This warning against discursiveness was very much in place because of the loquacity of the Greeks, but it does not seem to have profited much, for the Acts of our Synod are full of examples of unnecessary logomachy.

After Tarasius had ended his speech, three bishops, Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodosius of Amorium, — who had hitherto been enemies of the images, were introduced and placed before the Synod. Before they were permitted to answer for themselves, another imperial Sacra was read, the publication of which, as we know, had been required by Pope Hadrian. It contained, in accordance with ancient usage, the assurance that every member of the Synod was allowed to speak quite freely and without hindrance, according to his conviction;^{fc49} then gives information of the resignation of the Patriarch Paul and of the election of Tarasius, together with the desire of both for reunion with the rest of the Church, and after the holding of an Ecumenical Synod; and mentions, finally, the letters of the Pope and of the Oriental archpriests, which were soon to be read aloud in the Synod.^{fc50}

Upon this, the three bishops who had hitherto been hostile to the images begged forgiveness, and read a formula of faith and recantation,^{fc51} whereupon they were received into fellowship, and assigned their place in the Synod. Seven other bishops then entered, who, a year before, had contributed to frustrate the intended Synod, and had held separate assemblies — namely, Hypatius of Nicaea, Leo of Rhodes, Gregory of Pessinus, Leo of Iconium, George of Pisidia, Nicolas of Hierapolis, and Leo of the island of Carpathus. They had erred, they said, only from ignorance, and were ready to confess and confirm the faith handed down from the apostles and Fathers. The Synod was doubtful whether they should be admitted to communion, and therefore they had many older ecclesiastical maxims read, particularly canons of the apostles and of

different Councils, also judgments of the Fathers of the Church, respecting the receiving back of heretics. On this occasion, John, one of the vicars of the Oriental patriarchates, declared that the veneration of images was the worst of all heresies, “because it detracted from the Economy (Incarnation) of the Redeemer.” Tarasius, however, drew from the passages read the conclusion, that the seven bishops should be received, if no other fault attached to them. Many members of the Synod called out together: “We have all erred; we all pray for forgiveness.” The question was then proposed, whether those who held obtained ordination from heretics should be received again; but before the books necessary for this subject arrived, they proceeded with the presentation of proofs of the first kind on the reception of heretics generally. Finally the wished- for books arrived, and they read from the Church histories of Rufinus, Socrates, and Theodore the lector, from the Acts of Chalcedon, from the *Vita S. Sabae*, etc., proofs that, in earlier times, those who had been ordained by heretics had been received again. The actual admission of the seven bishops, however, was deferred until a later session. ^{fc52}

SEC. 349. THE SECOND SESSION.

When the second session began, September 26, at the command of the Court an imperial official presented to the Synod Bishop Gregory of Neo-Caesarea, who had also formerly been hostile to the images, but now wished to return to orthodoxy. Tarasius, however, treated him with some harshness, and seemed to doubt his sincerity. But when Gregory gave the best assurances and lamented his former errors, he was required to appear again at the next session and to present a written statement. After this the letter of Pope Hadrian, of October 27, 785, to the Emperors, already known to us, was read aloud (p. 349), although not in its entirety; and the Roman legates, at the request of Tarasius, testified that they had received this letter from the hand of the apostolic Father himself. This testimony was confirmed by Bishop Theodore of Catanea and deacon Epiphanius, who had conveyed the imperial *Jussio* to Rome, and had been present at the delivery of the papal answer.

In the same way, the letter of Hadrian to Tarasius was read, and at the request of the Roman legates the latter declared that he was in agreement with the doctrine contained in the letter, and accepted the veneration of the images. “We reverence them,” he says, “with relative regard ([ταύτα](#) [scetikw|poqw|proskunoumen](#)), since they are made in the name of

Christ and of His inviolate Mother, of the holy angels and all saints: Our **Iatreia** and **pistiv**, however, we evidently dedicate to God alone.” ^{fc53} When all exclaimed: “Thus believes the whole Synod,” the Roman legates demanded a special vote on the recognition of the two papal letters which had been read, and this followed in 263 votes, partly representative and partly personal, of the bishops and representatives of bishops (with exception of the legates themselves and Tarasius, who had declared himself already). Finally, Tarasius asked the monks present to give their assent individually, which was then done. Thus ended the second session. ^{fc54}

SEC. 350. THE THIRD SESSION.

In the third session, according to the Greek Acts on the 28th, according to Anastasius on the 29th, of September, Gregory of Neo-Caesarea handed in and read the declaration of faith in writing which had been required of him. It was nothing else but a repetition of that which Basil of Ancyra and his colleagues had presented at the first session. Before, however, Gregory was received into favor, Tarasius remarked that he had heard that some bishops in earlier times (under Copronymus) had persecuted and ill-treated some pious venerators of images. He would not believe this without proof (probably he had Bishop Gregory in such suspicion), but he must remark that the apostolic canons punished such an offense with deposition. Several members of the Synod agreed with him, and it was resolved that, if anyone should bring forward such complaints, he was to present himself immediately to Tarasius or the Synod. As, however, Gregory of Neo-Caesarea gave the assurance that in this respect he was quite blameless, the Synod declared itself ready to receive him, although several monks intimated that he had been one of the heads of the false Council of the year 754. Mildness prevailed, and along with Gregory, at the same time, the bishops of Rhodes, Iconium, Hierapolis, Pessinus, and Carpathus were received, and assigned to their seats. ^{fc55}

The Synodica addressed by Tarasius to the patriarchs of the East was then read, together with the answer of the Oriental **ajciereiv** and the Synodica of the departed patriarch, Theodore of Jerusalem (see p. 354); and the Roman legates declared, with the concurrence of the whole assembly, that these Oriental letters were completely in harmony with the doctrine of Pope Hadrian and of the Patriarch Tarsius. ^{fc56} The words employed at this voting by Bishop Constantine of Constantia, free from deception as they were, gave occasion, subsequently, at Cyprus, to the most violent

reproaches against the Nicene Synod. He said: "I assent to these declarations now read, I receive and greet with all reverence the sacred images; the *proskunhsiv kata* ~~atreian~~, *i.e.* the adoration, I offer to the Holy Trinity alone." By false translation and misunderstanding the Frankish bishops subsequently, at the Synod of Frankfort, A.D. 794, and also in the Carolingian books (3:17), understood this to mean that a demand had been made at Nicaea that the same devotion should be offered to the images as to the Most Holy Trinity.

SEC. 351. THE FOURTH SESSION.

The fourth session, on October 1, was intended to prove the legitimacy of the veneration of images from the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. On the proposal of Tarasius, there was read by the secretaries and officials of the Synod a great series of biblical and patristic passages bearing on this subject, which partly had been collected beforehand and partly were now presented by individual members of the Synod. The biblical passages were:

- (1) ~~<2517>~~ Exodus 25:17-22, and ~~<0478>~~ Numbers 7:88-89, in regard to the ark of the covenant, the mercy-seat, and the cherubims which were over it.
- (2) ~~<3401>~~ Ezekiel 41:1-18-19, on the cherubim with faces, and the palms, etc., which Ezekiel beheld in the new temple of God.
- (3) ~~<3901>~~ Hebrews 9:1-5, where Paul speaks of the tabernacle, and of the objects contained in it: the golden pot with the manna, Aaron's rod, the tables of the law, and the cherubim.

Tarasius then remarked: "Even the Old Testament had its divine symbols, the cherubim; and from this they went on to the New Testament. And if the Old Testament had cherubim which overshadowed the mercy-seat, we might also have images of Christ and of the saints to overshadow our mercy-seat." Further, he pointed out, as did Bishop Constantine of Constantia, in Cyprus, that even the cherubim of the Old Testament had a human countenance; and the angels, as often as they appeared to men, according to the testimony of Holy Scripture, appeared in human form. Moses, indeed, had so formed the cherubim (~~<0251>~~ Exodus 25), as they were shown to him in the mount. The prohibition of images had first been published by God when the Israelites showed themselves inclined to idolatry. John, one of the vicars from the East, remarked that God Himself

had appeared to Jacob in human form, and had wrestled with him (~~cf~~³² Genesis 32:24).

The series of patristic proofs is opened by a passage from the panegyric of Chrysostom on Meletius, in which it is said that the faithful had made representations of this saint upon their rings, cups, shells, on the walls and everywhere. A second passage from another discourse of Chrysostom alludes to the picture of an angel who drove out the barbarians. There was also read from Gregory of Nyssa, how, at the sight of a picture of the offering of Isaac, he had been forced to weep; and Bishop Basil of Ancyra at this justly remarked, that this father had often read this history in the Bible without weeping, whilst the representation of it in a picture had moved him to tears. "If this happened to a learned man," added the monk John, "how much more must it be useful to the unlearned, that they may be touched!" "Yes," exclaimed Bishop Theodore of Catanea; "and how much more must men be touched by a picture of the sufferings of Christ!" Representations of the offering of Isaac are treated in a passage of S. Cyril of Alexandria; a poem of Gregory of Nazianzus speaks of a picture of S. Polemon, by looking at which an immodest woman was converted; a discourse of Antipater of Bostra refers to the statue which the woman who was healed by Christ of the issue of blood caused to be erected.^{fc57} A great fragment of Bishop Asterius of Areasia gives a full description of a picture representing the martyrdom of S. Euphemia. Next came two passages from the martyrdom and the miracles of the Persian martyr Anastasius (627), which speak of the custom of setting up images in the churches, as well as testify to the veneration of relics, and moreover, of the divine punishment which smote a despiser of relics at Caesarea. A pretended discourse of Athanasius describes the miracle at Berytus, where the Jews pierced a picture of Christ with a lance, on which blood and water ran out. They collected this, and, as all the sick who were touched with this became well, the whole city received the Christian faith.^{fc58}

A passage was read from the letter of S. Nilus to Heliodore, relating that the holy martyr Plato had appeared to a young monk in a vision just as he had seen him in pictures; upon which Bishop Theodore of Myra remarked that the same had happened to his pious archdeacon in regard to S. Nicolas. As, however, the enemies of the images also appealed to Nilus, the passage used by them from his letter to Olympiodorus was also read. Nilus certainly in this letter blames some kinds of images in churches and monasteries, namely, representations of hares, goats, beasts of every kind,

from hunting and fishing, and recommends instead the simple figure of the cross; but he also commends the historical representations, from the Old and New Testaments, on the walls of the churches for the instruction of the unlearned; and this very clause was omitted by the enemies of the images when they brought forward the passage (A.D. 754), as several bishops now maintained. Another passage from the transactions between the Abbot Maximus and the Monothelite deputies sent to him, Theodorus of Caesarea, etc., showed that both the latter and also that learned abbot had revered the Gospels and the images of Christ, and the Oriental deputy John remarked that the images must be necessary, or they would not have been venerated by those men.

Naturally, an appeal was made to the eighty-two Trullan canons on the images. They were ascribed to the sixth Ecumenical Synod, whilst Tarasius maintained that the same Fathers who constituted this Synod had again assembled, four or five years later (*i.e.* 685 or 686), and had drawn up canons. That this was a mistake we have already shown (p. 221). As, however, they shared in this mistake at Rome (see p. 241), we can understand why the papal legates did not protest against the identification of the *Quinisexta* with the sixth Ecumenical Synod.

After the reading of a series of further patristic proofs in favor of the veneration of images, among them the letters, already mentioned, of Pope Gregory II and of the Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople to John of Synnada, etc., ^{fc59} and after anathemas had been pronounced upon the enemies of images, Euthymius of Sardes presented the synodal *Decree of the Faith*. The Synod there calls itself holy and oecumenical, again assembled at Nicaea by the will of God and at the command of the two rulers, the new Helena and the new Constantine, then declares its agreement with the six previous Ecumenical Synods, then adds a short Symbolum, and passes on to its special theme with the words: "Christ has delivered us from idolatry by His incarnation, His death, and His resurrection." It goes on: "It is not a Synod, it is not an Emperor, as the Jewish sanhedrim (the false Synod of A.D. 754) maintained, which has freed us from the error of idolatry; but it is Christ the Lord Himself who has done this. To Him, therefore, belongs the glory and honor, and not to men. We are taught by the Lord, the apostles, and the prophets, that we ought to honor and praise before all the holy God-bearer, who is exalted above all heavenly powers; further, the holy angels, the apostles, prophets, and martyrs, the holy doctors, and all saints, that we may avail ourselves of

their intercession, which can make us acceptable to God if we walk virtuously. Moreover, we venerate also the image of the sacred and life-giving cross and the relics of the saints, and accept the sacred and venerable images:, and greet and embrace them, according to the ancient tradition of the holy catholic Church of God, namely, of our holy fathers, who received these images, and ordered them to be set up in all churches everywhere. These are the representations of our Incarnate Savior Jesus Christ, then of our inviolate Lady and quite holy God-bearer, and of the unembodied angels, who have appeared to the righteous in human form; also the pictures of the holy apostles, prophets, martyrs, etc., that we may be reminded by the representation of the original, and. may be led to a certain participation in his holiness.” ^{fc60}

This decree was subscribed by all present, even the priors of monasteries and some monks. The two papal legates added to their subscription the remark, that they received all who had been converted from the impious heresy of the enemies of images. ^{fc61}

SEC. 352. THE FIFTH SESSION.

On the opening of the fifth session, October 4, Tarasius remarked that the accusers of the Christians (see p. 358) had, in their destruction of images, imitated the Jews, Saracens, Samaritans, Manichaeans, and Phantasiasti or Theopaschites. ^{fc62} Further patristic passages were then read, and even those which seemed to speak against the veneration of images. ^{fc63}

- (1) The series was opened by a passage from the second Catethesis of Cyril of Jerusalem, which blames the removal of the cherubim from the Jewish temple by Nebuchadnezzar.
- (2) A letter from Simeon Stylites the younger (592) to the Emperor Justin II, asks him to punish the Samaritans because they had dishonored the holy images.
- (3) Two dialogues, between a heathen and a Christian, and between a Jew and a Christian, defend the images.
- (4) Two passages from the pseudo-epigraphic book *periōdoi twn agiwn apostolwn* speak against the images, and were used by the iconoclasts at their Synod, A.D. 754, because therein John the Evangelist blames a disciple who, from attachment to him, had caused

his portrait to be painted. The Synod attributed no value to these passages, because they had been taken from an apocryphal and heretical book.

(5) As the enemies of images appealed to a letter from the Church historian Eusebius to Constantia, the consort of Licinius, in which her wish to possess a portrait of Christ is blamed, ^{fc64} the Synod now shows the heterodoxy of Eusebius from his own utterances, and from one of Antipater of Bostra. In the same way

(6) Xenaïas and Severus, who rejected the images, were represented as heretics (Monophysites, see vol. 3. pp. 456-459).

(7) Among the proofs in favor of the images, the writings of the deacon and chartophylax Constantine of Constantinople ^{fc65} were adduced; and it was remarked that the enemies of the images had burned many manuscripts, in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople and elsewhere, which spoke against them, and also had torn out some leaves from a writing of Constantine in which the images are discussed. On the other hand, they had left the silver boards with which the book was bound, and these boards were adorned with pictures of saints.

A passage was then read from the writing of that Constantine on the martyrs, in which he shows how the martyrs had, in opposition to the heathen, shown the difference between the Christian veneration of images and idolatry, and had based the former upon the incarnation of Christ. Probably this was the passage which had been torn out in the copy at Constantinople. In the same way, it was found, with several other manuscripts adduced, that leaves had been cut out of them. As the originators of these outrages, they designated the former patriarchs, Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas of Constantinople.

The presentation and reading of fifteen further passages from the Fathers, which were in readiness, the Synod held to be unnecessary, as the ancient tradition of the Church in regard to the images was clear from what had been read. On the other side, the monk John, representative of the East, asked leave to clear up the real origin of the attack on the images, and related that story of the Caliph Jezid and the Jews which we have given above (p. 268). It was then decreed by the Synod that the images should every where be restored, and at them prayers should be offered. In the same way, they approved the proposal of the papal legates, that

henceforth, and indeed on the next day, a sacred image should be set up in their own locality, and that the writings composed against the images should be burnt. The session closed with acclamations and anathemas against the enemies of images, and with praises of the Emperors. ^{fc66}

SEC. 353. THE SIXTH SESSION.

The sixth session was held, according to the Greek text of the Acts on the 6th, according to the translation of Anastasius on the 5th, of October, and immediately on its being opened, the Secretary Leontius informed them that there lay today before them the **oꝑov** (decree) of the false Council of A.D. 754, as well as an excellent refutation of it. The Synod ordered the reading of both, and Bishop Gregory of Neo-Caesarea was required to read the words of the **oꝑov** and the deacons John and Epiphanius of Constantinople to read the much more comprehensive document in opposition to it. The composer we do not know.

It is divided (with the **oꝑov** which is included in it) into six tomi, and in Mansi comprehends no less than 160 folio pages, and in Hardouin, 120. ^{fc67} The principal contents of the **oꝑov** have already been given in connection with the account of the iconoclastic false Synod of the year 754 (see p. 307). The other document opposes the **oꝑov** from sentence to sentence, and in this way contains much that is certainly superfluous, and is of unnecessary extent. But it contains also many excellent and acute observations, which thoroughly deserve the commendation which Leontius gave to the whole. The assumptions of that false Synod are therein powerfully met, and its sophistries exposed (*e.g.*, that no picture of Christ could be painted without falling into heresy). That the originators of the **oꝑov** were often harshly treated, is not to be wondered at, and, considering the dishonesty with which they went to work, perfectly justifiable. In proof that the use of images went back to apostolic times, the refutation appeals (tom. 4) to the statue of Christ which the woman healed by Him of the issue of blood had caused to be set up in gratitude (see p. 367), and to the universal tradition of the Fathers; and then shows fully that the iconoclasts were mistaken in appealing to certain passages of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers (tom. 5). It was then shown, particularly, that the patristic passages quoted by them were partly quite spurious, partly garbled by them, distorted, and falsely interpreted. If they brought forward the letter of Eusebius to Constantine (see p. 371), this was without importance, because the writer had been *maloe famae* in reference to his orthodoxy. In

conclusion, in tom. V5, the particular sentence of the false Synod, together with its anathematisms, is subjected to a criticism which is often pungent.

SEC. 354. THE SEVENTH SESSION.

Of special importance was the seventh session, on October 13, ^{fc68} when the **ořov**(decree) of our Synod was read by Bishop Theodore of Taurianum. ^{fc69} Who was the author of it is unknown; but we may naturally think of Tarasius, and at the same time assume that the solemn publication of this decree was preceded by a careful exhortation and discussion from the same hand, although the minutes are silent on the subject. The Synod declares in this **ořov** that they intended to take nothing away from the ecclesiastical tradition, and to add nothing to it, but to preserve all that was catholic unaltered, and follow the six OEcumenical Councils. The Synod then repeats the symbol of Nicaea and that of Constantinople without *filioque*; ^{fc70} pronounces anathema on Arius, Macedonius, and their adherents; then, with the Synod of Ephesus, confesses that Mary is truly the God-bearer; believes, with the Synod of Chalcedon, in two natures in Christ; anathematizes, with the fifth Council, the false doctrines of Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus (there is no word of the Three Chapters); with the sixth Synod, which had condemned Sergius, Honorius, etc., preaches two wills in Christ, and professes faithfully to preserve all written and unwritten traditions, among them also the tradition in respect to the images. It concludes, therefore, “that as the figure of the sacred cross, so also sacred figures — whether of color or of stone or of any other material — may be depicted on vessels, on clothes and walls, on tables, in houses and on roads, namely, the figures of Jesus Christ, of our immaculate Lady, of the venerable angels, and of all holy men. The oftener one looked on these representations, the more would the looker be stirred to the remembrance of the originals, and to the imitation of them, and to offer his greeting and his reverence to them (**ařpasmor̃ kai ðimhtikh̃ proskuřsin**), not the actual **latreia** (**th̃ ař hqinh̃ latreian**) which belonged to the Godhead alone, but that he should offer, as to the figure of the sacred cross, as to the holy Gospels (books), and to other sacred things, incense and lights in their honor, as this had been a sacred custom with the ancients; for the honor which is shown to the figure passes over to the original, and whoever does reverence (**proskunei**) to an image does reverence to the person represented by it.

“Whoever shall teach otherwise, and reject that which is dedicated to the Church, whether it be the book of the Gospels, or the figure of the cross or any other figure, or the relics of: a martyr, or whoever shall imagine anything for the destruction of the tradition of the Catholic Church, or shall turn the sacred vessels or the venerable monasteries to a profane use,^{fc71} if he is a bishop or cleric, shall be deposed; if a monk or layman, excommunicated.”^{fc72} This decree was subscribed by those present, and all exclaimed: “Thus we believe: this is the doctrine of the apostles. Anathema to all who do not adhere to it, who do not greet the images, who call them idols, and for this reason reproach the Christians with idolatry. Many years to the Emperor! eternal remembrance to the new Constantine and the new Helena: God preserve their government! Anathema to all heretics! Anathema in particular to Theodosius, the false bishop of Ephesus (p. 267), and in like manner to Sisinnius, surnamed Pastillas, and to Basil with the evil surname of

Tricaccabus!^{fc73} The Holy Trinity has rejected their doctrines. Anathema to Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas, who, one after the other, occupied the throne of Constantinople! They are: Arius II, Nestorius II, and Dioscurus II Anathema to John of Nicomedia and Constantine of Nacolia, those heresiarchs! If anyone defends a member of the heresy which slanders the Christians, let him be anathema! If anyone does not confess that Christ, in His manhood, has a circumscribed form, let him be anathema! If anyone does not allow the explanation of the Gospels by figures, let him be anathema! If anyone does not greet these things which are made in the name of the Lord and the saints, let him be anathema! If anyone rejects the tradition of the Church, written or unwritten, let him be anathema! Eternal remembrance to Germanus (of Constantinople), to John (of Damascus), and to George (of Cyprus, see p. 314), these heralds of the truth!^{fc74}

At the same time, a letter addressed by Tarasius and the Synod to the rulers, Constantine and Irene, reported what had taken place, explained the expression **proskuneia**, that the Bible and the Fathers employed this word to signify the reverence accorded to men, whilst **latreia** was reserved for God alone.^{fc75} A deputation of bishops, hegumeni, and clerics was also appointed, to present to the rulers a selection from the patristic passages in proof used by the Synod.^{fc76}

A second letter was addressed by the Synod to the priests and clerics of the principal and other churches of Constantinople, in order to make them acquainted with the decrees which had been drawn up. ^{fc77}

SEC. 355. THE EIGHTH SESSION.

The rulers then gave orders, in a decree addressed to Tarasius, that he, along with the rest of the bishops, etc., should now come to Constantinople. This took place. The Empress received them in the most friendly manner, and decided that, on the 23rd of October, a new session, the eighth and last, should be held in the presence of the two rulers, in the palace Magnaura. After Tarasius, by command of the Emperor, had opened this session with a suitable discourse, the two rulers themselves made a friendly address to the Synod, amid the liveliest acclamations from the members, ordered the **oꝑov** which had been drawn up at the previous session to be read again, and made the proposal, “that the holy and Ecumenical Synod should declare whether this **oꝑov** had been accepted with universal assent.” All the members exclaimed: “Thus we believe, thus think we all: we have all agreed and subscribed. This is the faith of the apostles, the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the orthodox.... Anathema to those who do not adhere to this faith!” etc. (almost the very same words as after the reading of the **oꝑov** at the seventh session; see p. 374 f.).

At the prayer of the Synod, the two rulers now also subscribed the **oꝑov**, Irene first, and for this they were again greeted with the most friendly acclamations. ^{fc78} At the close the rulers caused to be read again the patristic testimonies in favor of the veneration of images, from Chrysostom and others, which had been used at the fourth session; and, after this was done, all the bishops and the uncommonly numerous multitude of people and military present stood up, and expressed with acclamations the universal assent, and gave thanks to God for what had been done. ^{fc79} Finally, the bishops were allowed to return to their homes, with rich presents from the Emperor. ^{fc80}

SEC. 356. THE CANONS OF THE SEVENTH ECUMENICAL SYNOD.

Among the Acts of our Synod there are 22 canons, which Anastasius places in the preface to his translation of the seventh Council, but which the later collection of Councils assigned to the eighth. The latter followed

the tenor of the 10th canon, in which Constantinople (not Nicaea) is mentioned as the place at which it was held; but even the apparent contradiction of Anastasius is removed, when we consider that he considers the solemn closing transaction at Constantinople as one *actio* with the seventh and last session at Nicaea. In the same manner, most among the ancients, Greeks and Latins, generally reckoned only seven sessions. ^{fc81} The principal contents of these canons are as follows: ^{fc82} —

1. “The clergy must observe the holy canons, and we recognize as such those of the apostles and of the six OEcumical Councils; further, those which have been sent from particular Synods for publication (**ekdosiv**) at the other Synods, and also the canons of our holy Fathers. Whomsoever these canons anathematise, we also anathematise; whom they depose, we also depose; whom they expel, we also expel; whom they punish, we visit with the same punishment.”

Like the Greeks generally, so our Synod also recognized not merely, like the West, fifty, but eighty-five so-called apostolic canons (see vol. 1 *ad fin.*). Moreover, they speak of the canons of the first six OEcumical Councils, whilst it is well known that the fifth and sixth Ecumenical Synods published no canons. But also here our Synod acts in accordance with the custom of the Greeks, in regarding the 102 canons of the Quinisext as Ecumenical, and especially in ascribing them to the sixth Ecumenical Synod. With regard to this, Anastasius remarked, in the preface to his Latin translation of the synodal Acts, that the Council brought forward canons of the apostles and of the six Ecumenical Synods which Rome did not recognize, but the present; Pope (John VIII) had made an excellent distinction among them. We have already given this above.

2. “If anyone wishes to be ordained bishop, he must know the psalter perfectly (by heart), that he may therefrom suitably exhort the clergy who are subject to him; and the metropolitan must make inquiry as to whether he has striven to read also the sacred canons, the Holy Gospel, further, the Apostolos (the apostolic epistles), and the whole of the sacred Scriptures, not merely cursorily, but also thoroughly, and whether he walks according to the divine commands, and so teaches the people. For the essence (**oujsia**) of our hierarchy are the divinely-delivered maxims, namely, the true understanding of the sacred Scriptures, as the great Dionysius (the Areopagite) says.”

This canon is, in the translation of Anastasius, taken into the *Corpus jur. can.* c. 6, Dist. 38.

3. “Every election of a bishop, priest, or deacon, proceeding from a secular prince, is invalid, in accordance with the ancient rule (*Can..Apostol.* n. 31), and a bishop must only be elected by bishops, according to can. 4 of Nicaea.”

That by this the right of patronage belonging to secular rulers, and the many indults granted to Kings to designate bishops, are not taken away or forbidden, but that the opinion that the granting of ecclesiastical positions belongs to princes *jure DOMINATIONIS* is condemned, is shown by VanEspen, *l.c.* p. 460. In the *Corpus jur. can.* our canon occurs as c. 7, Dist. 63.

4. “No bishop may demand money or the like from other bishops or clerics, or from the monks subject to him. If, however, a bishop deprives one of the clergy subject to him of his office, or shuts up his church from covetousness or from any passion, so that divine service can no longer be held in it, he shall himself be liable to the same fate (deposition), and the evil which he wished to hold over another shall fall back upon his own head.” In the *Corpus jut. can.* c. 64, Causa 16:q. 1.

5. “Those who boast of having obtained a position in the Church by the expenditure of money, and who depreciate others who have been chosen because of their virtuous life and by the Holy Ghost without money, these shall, in the first place, be put back to the lowest grade of their order, and if then also they still persist (in their pride), they shall be punished by the bishop. But if anyone has given money in order to obtain ordination, the 30th apostolic canon and the 2nd canon of Chalcedon apply to him (vol. 1; vol. 3.). He and his ordainer are to be deposed and excommunicated.”

Zonaras and Balsamon in earlier times, and later, Christian Lupus and VanEspen, remarked that the second part of our canon treated of simony, but not the first. This has in view rather those who, on account of their large expenditure on churches and the poor, have been raised (without simony) to the clerical state as a reward and recognition of their beneficence; and, being proud of this, now depreciate other clergy who were unable or unwilling to make such foundations and the like.

6. “According to canon 8 of the sixth OEcumenical Council (*i.e.* the Quinisext), a provincial Synod should be held every year. A prince who

hinders this is excommunicated, a metropolitan who is negligent in it is subject to the canonical punishments. The bishops assembled should take care that the life-giving commands of God are followed. The metropolitan, however, must demand nothing from the bishops. If he does so, he is to be punished fourfold.”

Anastasius remarks on this, that this ordinance (whether the whole canon or only its last passage must remain undecided) was not accepted by the Latins. That this canon did not forbid the so-called Synodicum, which the metropolitans had lawfully to receive from the bishops, and the bishops from the priests, is remarked by VanEspen, *l.c.* p. 464. Gratian received our canon at c. 7, Dist. 18.

7. “As every sin has again other sins as its consequence, so the heresies of the slanderers of Christians (iconoclasts) drew other impieties after them. They not merely took away the sacred images, but also abandoned other ecclesiastical customs, which must now be renewed. We therefore ordain that, in all temples which were consecrated without having relics, these must be placed with the customary prayers. If, in future, a bishop consecrates a church without relics, he shall be deposed.”

“Jews who have become Christians only in appearance, and who continue secretly to observe the Sabbath and other Jewish usages, must be admitted neither to communion nor to prayer, nor may even be allowed to visit the churches. *Their children are not to be baptized*, and they may not purchase or possess any (Christian) slave. If, however, a Jew sincerely repents, he is to be received and baptized, and in like manner his children.

“The Greek commentators Balsamon and Zonaras understood the words **mh̄te toux paidav aujwn baptizein** to mean, “these seeming Christians may not baptize their own children,” because they only seem to be Christians. But parents were never allowed to baptize their own children, and the true sense of the words in question comes out clearly from the second half of the canon.

9. “All writings *against* the venerable images are to be delivered up into the episcopal residence at Constantinople, and then put aside (shut up) along with the other heretical books. If anyone conceals them, he must, if bishop, priest, or deacon, be deposed; if monk or layman, anathematised.”

10. “As some clerics, despising the canonical ordinance, leave their parish (=diocese) and pass over into other dioceses, particularly betake themselves to powerful lords in this metropolitan city preserved by God, and perform divine service in their oratories (*eukthriōiv*), henceforth no one shall receive them into his house or his church without the previous knowledge of their own bishop and the bishop of Constantinople. If anyone does so, and persists in it, he shall be deposed. But those who do so with the previous knowledge of those bishops (i.e. become domestic chaplains with persons of distinction), may not at the same time undertake secular business (of these lords), since the canons forbid this. If, however, one has undertaken the business of the so-called Majores (*meizoterōi* > *majores domus*, stewards of the estates of high personages), he must lay this down or be deposed. He ought rather to instruct the children and the servants, and read the Holy Scriptures to them, for to this end he has received the sacred ordination.”

On the office of the *meizoterōi* > the Greek commentators Zonaras and Balsamon (*l.c.* p. 301) give us more exact information. We have given the substance of it in the parenthesis.

11. “In accordance with the ancient ordinance (c. 26 of Chalcedon, see vol. 3. p. 409), an oekonomus should be appointed in every church. If a metropolitan does not attend to this, then the patriarch of Constantinople is to appoint an oekonomus for his church. Metropolitans have the same right in regard to their bishops. This prescription applies to monasteries.”

The Synod of Chalcedon required the appointment of special oekonomi only for all bishops' churches; but our Synod extended this prescription also to monasteries. Gratian received this canon as c 3, Causa 9:q. 3.

12. “If a bishop or abbot gives away anything from the property of the bishopric or the monastery to a prince or anyone else, this is invalid according to the 39th apostolic canon; even if it is done under the pretext that the property in question is of no value. In such a case the property is to be given away, not to secular lords, but to clerics or colonists. If, however, after this has been done, the secular lord buys the property in question of the cleric or colonist, and thus goes cunningly to work, then such a purchase is invalid; and if a bishop or abbot used such cunning (*i.e.* got rid of church property in such a roundabout way), he must be deposed.” In *Corpus jur. canon.* our canon is c. 19, Causa 12. q. 2.

13. “In the unhappy times which have just gone by (iconoclastic), many ecclesiastical buildings, bishops’ residences, and monasteries have been transformed into profane dwellings, and have been acquired by private persons. If now the present possessors restore them voluntarily, that is good and right. If they do not, if clerics, they are to be deposed; if monks or laymen, excommunicated.” In Gratian, c. 5, Causa 19 q. 3.

14. “We remark that some have received the clerical tonsure in early youth without any order, and then at the Synaxis (holy communion) they read in the ambros [the Epistle or Gospel]. This may no longer be done. The same is the case with the monks. On his own monks the hegumenus (superior of the monastery) may confer the order of lector, if he has himself been ordained to the office of hegumenus by the bishop and is undoubtedly a priest. So also may the country bishops, in accordance with ancient custom, ordain lectors by commission from the bishop.”

Van Espen (*l.c.* p. 469 sqq. and *jus canon.* t. i pt. 1 tit. 31, c. 6) professes to show

(a) that at that time there was no special benediction of abbots (different from their ordination as priests), and that therefore the words, “if he (the superior of the monastery) himself is consecrated by the bishop to the office of hegumenus,” and “evidently is a priest,” mean the same;

(b) that at the time of our Synod every superior of a monastery, a prior as well as an abbot, had the power of conferring upon the monks of his monastery the order of lector; but

(c) that the way in which Anastasius translated the canon (*si dumtaxat ABBATI manus impositio facta noscatur ab episcopo SECUNDUM MOREM PRAEFICIENDORUM ABBATUM*), and the reception of this translation into the *Corpus juris canonici* c. 1, Dist. 69., gave occasion to concede the right in question, of ordaining lectors, only to the solemnly consecrated (and insulated) abbots.

15. “Henceforth no cleric may be appointed to more than two churches at the same time, and each one must remain at the church to which he was called. In order, however, to provide for the necessities of life, there are several kinds of employment, and the cleric may (if his income does not suffice) provide by means of these the necessary sustenance, as also the

Apostle Paul did (~~408~~ Acts 20:34; ~~508~~ 1 Thessalonians 3:9). The provision mentioned has reference to this capital city. In village communities, however, on account of the small number of the inhabitants, allowance may be made” (i.e., as the communities are here too small, a cleric may serve several congregations).

Gratian received this canon as c. 1, Causa 21. q. 1, but in practice the so often lamented and forbidden plurality of benefices did not give way — a matter bewailed by the commentators Zonaras and Balsamon as a great injury to the Greek Church. What should be said in regard to the Latin Church? thinks VanEspan (*Commentar.*, etc. l.c. p. 471).

16. “The bishops and clergy may not adorn themselves with showy apparel. If they do so, they are to be punished. The like applies to those who anoint them. As, however, the accusers of the Christians (iconoclasts) not merely rejected the sacred images, but also persecuted with hatred those who passed ascetic lives, every one is to be punished who mocks men who are poorly and reverently clad, for in ancient times every cleric wore a poor and reverent garment, and no one made use of gay silken apparel or of a colored decoration at the border of his mantle.” In Gratian, c. 1, 21. q. 4.

17. “As some monks leave their monastery, and, in order to rule themselves, begin to build houses of prayer (small monasteries) without having the means necessary for completing them, the bishops should in future forbid this. But whoever has sufficient property must complete what he has begun. The same holds of laity and clergy.”

18. “No women are allowed to dwell in bishops’ houses or monasteries. Every bishop or hegumenus (superior of a monastery) who has in his dwelling a female slave or freed-woman for service, is to be blamed, and if he does not send her away, he is to be deposed. If, however, women find themselves on the estates of a bishopric or monastery, so long as the bishop or abbot remains on the estate, these women are to follow no business there, but must live elsewhere.”

19. “Some superiors of churches and monasteries, men and women, allow themselves to be so blinded by covetousness, that they demand money from those who are in the clerical state, or who wish to enter a monastery. If a bishop or hegumenus or cleric has done this, he is no longer to commit the same, or, in accordance with canon 2 of Chalcedon, he will be deposed. If an abbess (hegumena) does it, she shall be removed from her convent

and transferred into another as a subordinate. So with the hegumenus who is not a priest. In regard, however, to that which parents have given to the monastery with their children as dower, or that which these have brought of their own property with the declaration that it was consecrated to God — this must remain to the monastery, whether they continue there or go out again, if its superior is free from fault” (in regard to the departure of the person in question).

20. “Double monasteries are henceforth forbidden. If a whole family wishes to renounce the world together, the men must go into convents for men, the female members of the family into convents for women. The double monasteries already existing may continue, according to the rule of S. Basil, but must, in accordance with his prescription, observe the following ordinance: Monks and nuns (*monastriai*) may not reside in *one* building, for living together gives occasion for incontinence. No monk may enter the women’s quarter, and no nun converse apart with a monk. No monk may sleep in the women’s quarter (which frequently happened, in order to provide for the night or early morning service), or eat apart with a nun. And if food is brought from the men’s quarter to the canonesses (*proix tax kanonikax*), the hegumena, along with an aged nun, must receive it outside the gate. If, however, a monk wishes to see a female relative (in the monastery), he must converse with her in presence of the hegumena, and in few words, and speedily depart.” In Gratian, c. 21, Causa 18, q. 2.

21. “No monk and no nun may leave their own convent in order to go over to another.”

22. “In the case of the laity, it is allowed that both sexes may eat together, only they must give thanks to the Giver of all food, and refrain from all mimicry and satanic songs, etc. If they do not, they must amend, or the canons of the ancients will apply to them. Those, however, who live peacefully and alone, and have praised God that they bear the lonely yoke (of monasticism), and sit and are silent; those also who have chosen the spiritual life, may by no means eat apart with a woman, but only in the presence of several God-fearing men and women. This must hold also with relations. If, however, a monk or cleric, on a journey, does not carry food with him, and from necessity wishes to enter a public hostelry or a private house, he may do so, since need compels.”

SEC. 357. THE REST OF THE SYNODAL ACTS.

After these canons the synodal Acts contain another panegyric pronounced by the Sicilian deacon Epiphanius (representative of Archbishop Thomas of Sardinia), of which the Latin translation of Anastasius was given in the older collection of canons, whilst the Greek text was first given by Mansi from a manuscript in the library of S. Mark at Venice. ^{fc83} This wordy intercourse is without further significance for the history of the Synod, and its chief contents consist first in the disavowal of the reproach of idolatry, since Christ had appeared on earth in human form in order to free mankind from idolatry. The Church had ever preserved the doctrine of Christ unfalsified (and therefore had not recently fallen into idolatry), and, in fact, none of the follies of idolatry — of which several are adduced as examples, *e.g.* the mysteries of Ceres, the cultus of Venus, etc. — are to be found in the Church; even the splendid heathen temples had been destroyed by the Christian Emperors. To this was added the request, above all things to thank God for the destruction of idolatry, but also to congratulate the present holy Synod. After several encomia on this, the Patriarch Tarasius is specially commended as “the exarch of the present assembly,” in a manner as though he were the head of the Church. Further, they said, the city of Nicaea should rejoice, as it had now seen, for the second time, an Ecumenical Synod, with 350 bishops and innumerable venerable monks. The foundation of the faith, which had been shaken by Satan, had in this Synod again been confirmed. Yes, the whole Church should rejoice because it was again united. She had no longer to fear the derision of her enemies, the contempt of the Jews and Hagarenes (Saracens), and no longer the reproach of the heretics,, as if she no longer held fast the apostolic doctrine, and had forsaken the one God on account of the honor which she paid to the friends of God. She should rejoice, for she would no longer be mistaken for the temples of idols, and the holy images of the God-bearer, the apostles, prophets, confessors, patriarchs, and other holy Fathers and martyrs were suitable for her.

We possess, further, two other letters referring to our Synod, from the Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople to his “most holy brother and fellow-servant, the Lord Hadrian, Pope of Old Rome.” In the former he refers to the progress and the accomplishment of the Synod, and says in it: “Your high-priestly, fraternal Holiness has made haste, in union with the Emperors, to root out the tares by the sword of the Spirit, and, in accordance with our prayer, sent two envoys of the same name with Peter,

the Prince of the apostles. Our Emperors have received them in a friendly manner, and sent them to us. We discussed with them what was necessary, and took counsel also with the learned and venerable priests John and Thomas, who came from the East. After all the bishops of this diocese (patriarchate) had assembled, a session of the Synod began. But some mischievous persons drove us out, and we had to remain inactive for a whole year. Hereupon the rulers summoned all the bishops to Nicaea in Bithynia, and I also traveled thither in company with your representatives, and with those who had arrived from the East.

“After we had sat down, we took Christ for our head or president (*kefal hē epoihsameqa Criston*), for the Holy Gospel was laid upon the sacred throne. First, the letters of your Holiness were read, and we nourished ourselves in common with the spiritual food which Christ prepared for us through your writings. Then the letters of those who came from the East were also read, and the proof from the Fathers for the true doctrine brought forward. Thereupon we all gave our assent to the confession of the true faith, which you had sent to me, and through me to the rulers. The heresiarchs and their adherents were deposed; those of them who were present, however, acknowledged in writing the right faith. The Church did not remain divided. On the contrary, the new heretics, the slanderers of the Christians or enemies of the images, were, like the old, smitten with the sword of the Spirit The Emperors ordered the venerable images to be replaced everywhere, both in the churches and in their palaces.” ^{fc84}

In his second letter to the Pope, Tarasius explains how wrong it is to buy or to sell ordination for money, and gives the assurance that, in his diocese, he never ceases to remind them of this, and that he is himself entirely free from the sin of simony. He then collects several biblical and patristic passages against simony, and finally prays the Pope that he will be pleased to raise his voice in this direction and against all simony, “for we follow the words of thy mouth.” ^{fc85}

Further light on this point, and on the reason for this letter, we receive through another letter of Tarasius to the priest and hegumenus John, and through his famous contemporary, Theodore Studites. After the conclusion of the Synod of Nicaea, many monks complained that the majority of the (Greek) bishops had purchased the sacred office for money. This complaint was naturally brought to Tarasius, and his action against the simonists

became an object of violent controversy. A part of the monks, particularly Sabas and also Theodore Studites, accused the patriarch of having imposed upon the simonists penance for only one year, and, in opposition to the laws of the Church, had promised that, after the expiration of this penance, he would reinstate them in their offices. ^{fc86} Tarasius rebutted this accusation, and, in the letter referred to, to the priest and monk John, he declares that in this matter he has a perfectly good conscience, and is conscious of no simony, nor of tolerating any simonist in office. He certainly granted them penance, and then afterwards received them back into the Church, as he did with all penitent sinners, for he rejected the severity of Novatian; but they were no longer allowed to take charge of clerical offices. As, however, he had been slandered in this matter, he had submitted to the highly venerated priest and hegumenus John, whom he honored as a father, his principal reasons for his conduct, with the request that he would make the other monks and ascetics acquainted with them, and to pray for him that he might be delivered from the evils which assailed him from all sides. ^{fc87}

To the same time probably belongs his letter to the Pope, for it must have been of importance to him, in connection with the slanders, to explain his true view to the holy see. That he had sent a letter to Rome on this subject, his opponents also heard; they thought, however, and even Theodore Studites thought, that he had endeavored to gain the Pope for his alleged lax practice in regard to the simonists, and had been rebuffed. The assertion of Tarasius, that he had never granted to the simonists reinstatement, they declared to be an untrue statement devised in his difficulty, and the report went abroad that, in the course of a year, Tarasius had, at the command of the Emperors, offered the sacrifice in common with the simonists, *i.e.* had again recognized them as clergy. Upon this Sabas and others completely separated themselves from Church communion with Tarasius; but Theodore Studites did not go so far, and acknowledged subsequently that the alleged weakness of the patriarch was in noways proved, and that Tarasius, as he heard, had not in fact restored the simonists. ^{fc88}

The close of the collection of Acts of Nicaea is formed by an explanation, proceeding from an anonymous hand to the Emperor, as to how the passages of Scripture which seem to oppose the veneration of images must be understood. ^{fc89} One other document is given by Montfaucon from the Coeslinian Library with the title: "Letter of the holy, great, and Ecumenical

Synod at Nicaea to the Church at Alexandria.” ^{fc90} But even Montfaucon remarked that only the first half could be Nicene, and this is less a letter than a discourse on a Church festival, containing a commendatory exhortation for the restoration of the images. The second half, however, which contains laudations of the friends of the images and anathemas against their enemies, is evidently of the eleventh century, as is shown by the names brought forward in it of patriarchs (*e.g.* Ignatius, Photius) and Emperors (particularly the Empress Zoe). This second half begins with *epi ~ toutoiv* in Mansi, *l.c.* p. 816.

The copious letter of Pope Hadrian I to Charles the Great is usually appended to the Nicene synodal Acts; and in it the Pope defended our Council against the so-called *Libri Carolini*. ^{fc91} Of this, however, we can best speak when we have considered the part taken by the West in the controversy about the images.

The Greek text of the Nicene synodal Acts was taken from two MSS., first into the Roman collection of Councils, and then into all the others. One of these MSS. must be the original which the papal envoys brought back to Rome from Nicaea. ^{fc92} Pope Hadrian I had a Latin translation made immediately of these Acts, fragments of which were copied into the Caroline books. This translation, however, is so defective, in the way of omission and mistranslation, that the learned Roman librarian Anastasius, in the ninth century, says: Nobody could read it, and he had therefore prepared a new translation. ^{fc93} This is now placed alongside the Greek text in the collections of Councils. It lacks, however, the minutes of the eighth session, except the canons. A third translation was made by Gisbert Longolius from a Greek MS. which came into his hands. He published it at Cologne in the year 1540. This is also found in the collections, and has the same defect in regard to the eighth session as the version of Anastasius. Consequently, in the Greek text of the eighth session, a Latin translation by Binius is added from the beginning of the seventeenth century.

SEC. 358. SKETCH OF THE OCCURRENCES IN THE EAST UNTIL THE BEGINNING OF THE REIGN OF LEO THE ARMENIAN.

The energetic character of the Empress Irene, in connection with the pliability of the Byzantine clergy, leaves us no reason for doubting that, so long as she remained in possession of power, that is, until the year 802,

the decrees of the seventh OEcumenical Council of Nicaea were retained in full force, even although no particular information as to their enforcement has come to us. It appears as if Theophanes and all his contemporaries, amid the frightful occurrences within the imperial family itself, had forgotten to give any account of many other things.

A few months after the end of the Nicene Synod, Irene constrained her son, the Emperor Constantine, to break the engagement which, through her own influence (p. 343), he had entered into with (Notrude) the daughter of Charles the Great, and against his will to marry Mary, an Armenian, whom she had selected for him. Why she did so is not known; but this we know, that her quarrel both with her own son and with the great King of the Franks dated from that time. ^{fc94} Wicked people, says Theophanes (*l.c.* p. 719), failed not to widen the division between mother and son, so that she excluded him completely from all part in the government, whilst the eunuch Stauracius, patrician and logothetes, had all power in his hands. Enraged at this, Constantine, with some of his relations, formed the plan of imprisoning his mother and banishing her to Sicily; but Stauracius discovered the plot, and Irene, informed and urged on by him, imposed heavy punishments on the conspirators, so that she had her own son, the eighteen-year-old Emperor (born January 14, 771), flogged and imprisoned; and even made the army swear never to recognize another regent whilst she lived. From this time in all decrees she placed her own name before that of the Emperor. ^{fc95}

But shortly the troops of the different themas ^{fc96} rose in favor of the son, and in October, 790, proclaimed him sole regent,. Irene was now forced to set him free, and to see Stauracius and others of her confidants sent, with shorn heads, into banishment. At the same time she was herself deprived of all power, and the palace of Eleutheria assigned to her as a residence. ^{fc97} Yet on the 15th of January, 792, the Emperor declared his mother again co-regent, at her request and that of others, so that her name was placed upon all documents along with and after his own. Soon afterwards a very unsuccessful expedition against the Bulgarians gave occasion for an insurrection in a portion of the army, who proclaimed Nicephorus, one of the two uncles of Constantine, Emperor; but the rising was suppressed, and, at the advice of his mother and of Stauracius (again restored to favor), the Emperor took vengeance on his two uncles, Nicephorus and Christopher, and on all their friends. The first were blinded, the others had

their tongues cut out. A rising which, on this account, broke out in Armenia, A.D. 793, was suppressed. ^{fc98}

At the beginning of the year 795 the Emperor Constantine put away his Armenian wife, and compelled her to enter a convent as a nun. Theophanes says (p. 727) that he had been tired of her, and that Irene had advised him to put her away and to marry another, foreseeing that this would make him to be greatly hated, and would facilitate her recovery of power. He married, in August of the same year, Theodota, who had been previously a lady of the Court. Cedrenus adds: When the Patriarch Tarasius tried to oppose this uncanonical marriage, the Emperor threatened to set up again the idol-temple. What he meant by this is doubtful. Walch supposes, as the iconoclasts had nicknamed all the sacred images, idols, so the orthodox had in like manner, in return, called the temples empty of images idol-temple, and that the Emperor had thus threatened the destruction of the images. ^{fc99} It is certain that Tarasius shortly gave in, and that the celebrated Abbot Plato and other monks, for this reason, renounced Church communion with him, on which account they were punished with imprisonment by the Emperor. ^{fc100}

Not long afterwards, Irene got up a new conspiracy against her son. It was intended to seize him at a horse-race, but he escaped on a ship, and the people took his side. Irene thought herself already lost, when the Emperor was, by the false friends who were round him, given up to his mother, and she had his eyes put out, of which he soon afterwards died. ^{fc101} From this time onwards Irene was again in sole possession of power, and to this time belongs the plan of Charles the Great to marry her and thus to unite the two parts of the Empire. Irene, according to Theophanes (p. 737), would have consented, had not AEtius, who after the death of Stauracius (799) possessed the greatest influence, dissuaded her, with the view, after her childless death, of raising his own brother Leo to the throne.

In the following year, 802, by the rebellion of the patrician and logothetes Nicephorus, Irene was dethroned, deprived of her treasures, and imprisoned on the island of Lesbos, where she died, A.D. 803. ^{fc102} No change in ecclesiastical affairs took place in consequence, for the new Emperor, the usurper Nicephorus, was also friend of the images (although he did not persecute the enemies of images), and of the same opinions was the patriarch whom he raised to the throne in the year 806, after the death of Tarasius, who, like the Emperor himself, bore the name of Nicephorus.

The controversy respecting images was at rest, and also under the succeeding Emperor Michael Rangabe (811-813, son-in-law of his predecessor) the enemies of the images only once ventured to rise. The blinded sons of Constantine Copronymus furnished a lever for an insurrection, and at the same time they diffused the story that Constantine Copronymus had risen from his grave in order to assist the falling State. The attempt miscarried, and some enemies of images were severely punished. But the imperial general in the East, Leo the Armenian, availed himself of the bad luck of the Emperor in a battle against the Bulgarians, in order to make him hateful and contemptible to the army. A military outbreak now gave the crown to Leo the Armenian. Michael Rangabe voluntarily retired into a monastery in the year 813, and the times of iconoclasm were renewed.

POSTSCRIPT ON THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY.

IN one sense the second Council of Nicaea put an end to the controversy respecting the veneration of images. This Council was intended to be Ecumenical, and was generally received as such; but the controversy by no means came to an end with the promulgation of its decrees, and it seems proper that some information should here be given respecting the subsequent history of the controversy, and that something should also be said on the earlier history of the conflict beyond what Bishop Hefele has given in this volume.

As a rule, the editor has abstained from criticising or annotating the statements of this history further than by an occasional suggestion, especially as the author is almost always scrupulously accurate in his statement of facts. It can hardly be said to be otherwise in his account of the battle between the iconoclasts and the iconolators; and yet there are few, outside the boundaries of the Greek and Latin Churches, who will read this portion of the history with complete satisfaction, or who will not feel that it has received a certain coloring from the views of the writer which diminishes its value as mere history. On this point it may suffice to recommend to the reader the article on "Images," by the late Mr. Scudamore, in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, in which the whole

subject is handled with equal objective accuracy, but from a different point of view.

The controversy respecting images naturally points back to the Second Commandment, with its prohibition of the making of graven images or other likenesses for the purpose of worship. The question has been raised as to whether the commandment did not prohibit the making of likenesses for any purpose whatever. But the later Jewish beliefs on this subject — that all painting and sculpture of every kind were forbidden — are opposed to the simple facts of Hebrew history and institutions. It may be admitted, Kalisch remarks, that the prohibition has “exercised a retarding influence upon the progress and development of the plastic arts among the Hebrews; for plastic art, in its beginnings, generally stands in the service of religion, and advances by the stimulus it affords. But it is an incomprehensible mistake, if it is believed that the plastic arts in general, sculpture and painting, are forbidden in our text Such a barbarous and irrational law could not possibly emanate from a legislator who commanded and erected a holy tent furnished with all the adornments of art and beauty, who even ordered two cherubims to be placed in the Holy of Holy (^{<02518>}Exodus 25:18-20; cf. ^{<02534>}Exodus 25:34, ^{<02632>}Exodus 26:32; ^{<02108>}Numbers 21:8, 9). In the first temple, as well as in the second, was an abundance of plastic works, which nobody has found at variance with the spirit of Mosaism. We mention, further, the ‘serpent of brass’ which Moses erected (^{<02109>}Numbers 21:9); the golden figures which the Philistines offered for the holy tabernacle (^{<00617>}1 Samuel 6:17) A limited and shortsighted interpretation of the *letter* of the holy text has, in other passages also, led to the most perverse and almost ridiculous results. For the purpose of *religious worship*, no images were to be made; more than this does our text not forbid” (Kalisch, *Comm. on Exodus*, in *loc.* p. 347; cf. also Speaker’s *Commem. in loc.* p. 331).

In later times the Second Commandment was understood by the Jews as forbidding not merely the worshipping of images, but even the making of them; and this feeling was certainly deepened by the doings of Antiochus Epiphanes, who set up “groves and chapels of idols” in the cities of Judah (1 Macc. 1:47). Later on, in the days of Herod the Great, when the trophies of victory which he displayed were supposed to cover the effigy of a man, the Jews declared that they would never “endure images of men in the city, for it was not their country’s custom” (Josephus, *Antiq.* 15:8-1-2).

And Origen (A.D. 230) declares of the Jews, that “there was no maker of images among their citizens; neither painter nor sculptor was in their State” (*Contra Celsum*. 4:31).

It is quite intelligible, therefore, that there should be the strongest opposition to the veneration or making of images or likenesses in the early Church. First, there were the converts from Judaism, who brought with them the strongest repugnance to such objects. Next, there were the converts from heathenism, who had themselves to a large extent been idolaters, and who saw the danger, to themselves and others, of a relapse into their previous degrading customs. In later times, also, there were the Mahometans among them and around them, who cherished a fierce hatred against all making of images as being a violation of the law of the Prophet.

Bishop Hefele has given a fairly complete account of the origin of these controversies in the Church — of the introduction, in the first instance, of symbolical representations of sacred things, as the Lamb and the Dove, leading to such pictures as that of the Good Shepherd, and so advancing to representations standing for our Lord Himself and His saints. There are several ways of viewing these things. On the one hand, it; could hardly be denied that they might be, and actually were, vehicles for the instruction of the ignorant; as in later times, for example, Dr. Doddridge, when a child, was taught Scripture history by his mother from the Dutch tiles round the fireplace. This was the view of Gregory L, when a bishop of Marseilles of that period destroyed images which had been used for idolatrous purposes. “We praise you,” said Gregory, “for being zealous lest aught made by the hand should be worshipped; but we think that you ought not to have broken the said images. For painting is used in churches, that they who are ignorant of letters may at least read on the walls by seeing there what they cannot read in books” (Ep. 7:111).

The Pope acted on the well-known principle, “Abusus non tollit usum”; on the other hand, the iconoclasts might have quoted the example of Hezekiah, who broke in pieces the serpent of brass, although it had been fashioned by divine command, because it had been used to foster idolatry. Both positions are quite intelligible, and even reasonable. And if zeal for a spiritual religion should pass into fanaticism, such as condemns the application of every kind of art (painting, sculpture, music, poetry) in the service of religion, we cannot altogether wonder, although there comes a point when we must disapprove and condemn, in the interests of

civilization and religion alike. If, again, there should come a reaction against such fanaticism, and the defense of sacred art should lead to superstition, we might also be prepared for such results. These principles are abundantly illustrated in the iconoclastic controversy; and it is not necessary that they should be here further discussed. What remains for us is to give a brief sketch of the events connected with images which followed the second Council of Nicaea. — It may be here noted, in passing, that the “images” to which reference is so often made, were (almost certainly) not sculptures, but either mosaics or what is known in the Eastern Church as *icons*, which may be described as pictures with generally a kind of gold mount, sometimes adorned with jewels.

As we see in the history, it was not until after many controversies that the second Council of Nicaea decided (A.D. 787) in favor of the images; but this was far from ending the dispute. It is hardly too much to say that the Emperors of the East had always exercised a large influence on the decisions of the Councils and the subsequent reception of their decrees by the Church. Their intervention in the iconoclastic controversy did not come to an end with the Synod of Nicaea. Some subsequent Emperors were favorable to the Council, but a determined opponent was found in Leo V., the Armenian (A.D. 813-826), whose soldiers destroyed images in all directions. Michael II, who succeeded him, tolerated the worshipping of images (820-829). But his son Theophilus (820-842) not only did his utmost to root out image-worship during his lifetime, but, at his death, exacted an oath from his widow, Thedora, that she would not restore the icons or the worship of them. So far was Theodora from giving effect to her promise, that she did her utmost to bring back the cultus of the icons, and even procured the holding of a Council at Constantinople in the same year (842), at which the decrees of the second Council of Nicaea were reaffirmed. The day of the synodal decision (February 19) was appointed to be kept as a festival.

It has sometimes been said that from this time all opposition ceased; but this is not quite exact, since we find the Patriarch Photius (c. A.D. 860) proposing to Pope Nicholas that another Council should be held to complete the suppression of the “heresy of the Iconomachi.” The Council met (861) and pronounced the deposition of Ignatius, who had been supplanted by Photius, but there is no record of its decision in respect to the images. In 869 another Synod “denounced the iconoclasts, upheld pictures as useful in the instruction of the people, and declared that we

‘ought to worship them with the same honor as the book of the Holy Gospels.’ Here the history of the struggle closes in the East” (*Dict. Antiq. s.v. “Images”*).

Turning to the Western Church, we find that, on the occasion of an embassy of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus to Pipin the Short, a Synod was held (A.D. 767) at Gentiliacum (=Gentilly) on the subject of the images; but we have no record of the proceedings (cf. see. 341 in this volume of the History). In 790, Hadrian I. sent to Charles the Great the Acts of the second Synod of Nicaea. The Emperor, who did not appreciate the acceptance by the Western Church of the decrees of an Oriental Synod, and, moreover, disagreeing with the conclusions at which they had arrived, put forth a manifesto, written in his name, entitled *Libri Carolini*, directed against the practices sanctioned by the Council and the Pope. He censured the proceedings of the Synod in strong terms, refuted its Acts, denounced every form of image-worship as idolatry, without allowing the doings of the iconoclasts, — taking, in fact, the line adopted by Gregory the Great, that images were useful in quickening devotion, instructing the people, and providing suitable decoration for holy places. At the same time, veneration of saints, relics, and the cross is permitted.

This manifesto was sent to the Pope, and was answered by him without producing any effect on the Emperor.

Soon afterwards (792), by means of Alcuin, he took the opportunity of disseminating his views in Britain, and of procuring the presence of English bishops at the great Synod which he convoked, and which met at Frankfort, A.D. 794

a Synod which “rejected with contempt, and unanimously condemned, the adoration and service” which, the Greeks said, should be rendered to images. And so the question remained under the great Emperor.

At a Synod held in Paris, under Lewis the Pious (825), the bishops, referring to a letter from Pope Hadrian I to Irene, declared that the Pope “justly reproved those who rashly presumed to break the images of the saints, but acted indiscreetly in commanding to give them superstitious worship.” Down to the tenth century no recognition was given in the Frankish kingdom to the second Synod of Nicaea, and official opposition to image-worship was continued. Among those who wrote strongly against the practice may be mentioned Agobard of Lyons (c. 840) and Claudius of

Turin, soon after the Council of Paris. The latter was answered by Dungal, a monk of S. Denys of Paris, in a somewhat violent fashion, who charged Claudius to defend himself before the Emperor. The latter called upon Bishop Jonas of Orleans to reply, but his answer appeared after the death of Claudius. It would appear that Agobard's *Liber de Picturis et Imaginibus* was the last clear testimony against the images. Hincmar, archbishop of Reims (A.D. 845), wrote a treatise to explain "in what manner the images of our Lord and His saints are to be venerated," in which he speaks contemptuously of the Greek practice, and rejects the second Council of Nicaea. Perhaps it may be said that Jonas of Orleans most nearly expresses the result at which the Western Church arrived, in his *De Cultu Imaginum*, where he says that images are to be set up in churches *solummodo ad instruendas nescientium mentes*.

To this conclusion the Latin Church has held fast, teaching in the Tridentine decrees (*Sessio 25. De invocatione Sanctorum*, etc.), that images are to be used for the instruction of the people, and for inciting to the imitation of the saints, but holding that a certain veneration was to be paid to the images (*debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam*). But this is to be rendered, "not as though any divine power was supposed to be in them, on account of which they were honored, or as though anything should be asked of them or any confidence should be reposed in them,....but because the honor which is shown to them is referred to the originals which are represented by the images, — so that we, by means of the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and kneel, worship Christ and reverence the saints, who are represented to us in them." The Synod, in thus testifying, appeals to the decree of the second Nicene Council. —

How far these distinctions are valid for the people at large we need not here inquire.

FOOTNOTES

- ^{ft1} Only these sections belong to the present volume of the English translation. The earlier ones belong to vol. 4; the later are not translated.
- ^{ft2} The rest of the Author's Preface has no reference to the present volume.
- ^{ft3} We possess complete monographs on the Monothelite controversies — (1) from the learned French Dominican, Francois Combefis, *Historia haeresis Monotheletarum, sanctaeque in eam sextae synodi Actorum vindiciae*, in the second volume of his *Auctuarium Novum*, Paris 1648, fol., page 1-198; (2) from the learned Maronite, Joseph Simon Assemani, in the 4th volume of his *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis*, Rotate 1764; (3) from P. Jacob Ehmel (Benedictine of Brzeznov, and Pro-director of the theolog. faculty in the University of Prague), *Vindiciae Concilii Oecumenici vi., praemissa dissertatione historica de origine, etc., haeresis Monothelitarum*, Prag. 1777, 8vo, 484 pp.; (4) Tamagnini, *Historia Monothelet.*; (5) Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, Bd. 9 S. 1-666.
- ^{ft4} Theophanes, *Chronographia, ad ann. mundi 6113*, A.D. 613, ed. Bonn. vol. 1, page 466. Theophanes says that the Emperor celebrated Easter in Constantinople, April 4, and set out with the army on the following day. But Easter fell upon April 4 in A.D. 622. It is known, besides, that the era which Theophanes follows is short by eight years, and every year begins with the first of September; this year 613, therefore, begins with September 1, 621, and the Easter Monday of his year 613 is the Easter Monday of our year 622. Cf. Pagi, *Critica in Annales Baronii, ad ann. 621*, n. 5, and *Diss. de Periodo Graeco-Romana*, in vol. 1 of the *Critica*, sec. 28 and page 37. Ideler, *Compend. der Chronol.* S. 448.
- ^{ft5} Mansi, *Coll. Concil.* 9, page 530; Hardouin, 3 page 1311. Sergius only mentions generally that this took place when the Emperor stopped in Armenia on his expedition against the Persians. As, however, Heraclius, in his expeditions against the Persians, was in Armenia both in 622 and 623, it is possible that this incident took place A.D. 623. But his stopping in Armenia in 622 lasted longer, and in the following year only a few days. Cf. Theophanes, *l.c.* and A.D. 614, page 471f. We

cannot think of a later date than 622 or 623, for this incident necessarily occurred, as we shall soon see, before 626.

^{ft6} A party of the Monophysites. Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 99.

^{ft7} Mansi, t. 10, page 471 sq. Hardouin has not reprinted this *Disputatio S. Maximi cum Pyrrho*. It is found, however, in the Appendix to vol. 8 of the Annals of Baronius, in Mansi, *l.c.*, and in S. Maximi, *Opp.* ed. Combefis, t. 2, page 159 sqq.

^{ft8} In his Memorial to the Lateran Synod of the year 649; in Mansi, t. 10, page 894; Hardouin, t. 3, page 711.

^{ft9} In the thirteenth session, in Mansi, t. 11, page 555; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1331.

^{ft10} Mansi, t. 11, page 526 and 530; Hardouin, t. 3, pages 1310, 1314.

^{ft11} Several maintain that these words were interpolated by Timothy Aelurus. See Maximi *Opp.* ed. Combefis, t. 1, page 52.

^{ft12} Another inaccurate explanation of the words of the Areopagite was attempted by Fr. v. Kerz, in his continuation of Stolberg's *Geschichte d. Religion Jesu Christi* (Bd. 21 S. 389), when he says: "It is true that S. Dionysius speaks of a divine-human will, but this is no other than the human will, which, however, in all his actions, is ever ... connected with the divine will, in everything subjects itself to it, and wills always only that which God wills ... so completely loses itself in the divine will, that both wills may *figuratively* be called only one will."

^{ft13} Mansi, t. 10, page 754. See below, sec. 303.

^{ft14} Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 98.

^{ft15} Theophanes, *Chronogr., ad ann. mundi* 6221, ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 506. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 83, 84, 101.

^{ft16} Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*, Paris 1713, page 163 sq.

^{ft17} Mansi, t. 11, page 558 sq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1335. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 626, n. 13.

^{ft18} He refers to the famous *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo to Flavian, in which (c. 4) he says: "Agit (= [ejergeri](#)) enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est." Cf. vol. 3, sec. 176.

- ft19 Mansi, t. 11, page 559 sq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1338. Instead of **mi an h̄goumeni kh̄a**, the old Latin translator read **mi an h̄goun monadi kh̄a**, *una et singularis operario*.
- ft20 Mansi, t. 11, page 526; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1310.
- ft21 Assemani, in his *Biblioth. Juris Orient.* t. 4, page 12, takes a different view. He places the Synod of Garin in 632.
- ft22 Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* t. 1, page 1429. Walch, *l.c.* S. 106.
- ft23 We are assured of this by the *Libellus Synodicus*, in Mansi, t. 10, page 606; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1535.
- ft24 Mansi, t. 11, page 526; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1310.
- ft25 Mansi, 11, page 530; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1314.
- ft26 Theophanes, *ad ann. mundi* 6121, t. 1, page 506; Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium*, ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 736; Zonaras, *Annales*, lib. 14 c. 17, t. 2, page 67, ed. Venet. 1729; *Vita Maximi*, in the edition of the works of S. Maximus by Combefis, t. 1, page 7 c. 7. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 60 ff. The author of this *Vita* is, however, later than the sixth Oecumenical Synod, to which he refers in c. 38. He may perhaps be later than Theophanes (†818).
- ft27 *Instructiones historico-theologicae*, lib. 5 *De Monotheletis*, c. 1, page 222, ed. Amstelod. 1645.
- ft28 Pagi, *ad ann.* 627, n. 10 sqq., 627, 9, and 628, 2.
- ft29 In *Maximi Opp.* ed. Combefis, t. 1, c. 9, page 8. On the chronology, cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 630, n. 3.
- ft30 He says “the Emperors,” because, in the year 613, the Emperor Heraclius had caused his son, Heraclius Constantinus, then one year old, to be crowned Emperor.
- ft31 Mansi, t. 11, page 562; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1339.
- ft32 The Greek original has **mhni <Pauni>** As the Egyptian month Payni began with May 28, the old Latin version, which has *Mensi Maii die quarta*, is plainly wrong. Undoubtedly, for *Maii* we should read *Junii* † (see above, p. 12). The sixth Indictim indicates the year 633. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 633, n. 3; Walch, *l.c.* S. 113; and Ideler, *Compend. der Chronol.* S. 73.
- ft33 This is the infamous **kefabaion** which openly put forth Monothelitism, and will hereafter frequently be referred to.

^{ft34} Mansi, t. 11, page 563; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1339.

^{ft35} Theophan. *Chronogr.* ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 507.

^{ft36} Cedren. *Historiar. Compend.* ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 736. *Vita Maximi*, c. 9, page 8 of vol. 1 of the *Opp.* S. Maximi, ed. Combefis. In this *Vita* the expression *udrobafhs*, *watery*, is taken as identical with *colorless*. Walch, on the contrary, thinks (*l.c.* S. 113 f.) that it means that the union lasted only for short time, and on the seizure of Egypt by the Arabians became water again. In fact, the Monophysites again got the upper hand.

^{ft37} Mansi, t. 10, page 606; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1535.

^{ft38} This letter is found among the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649, in Mansi, t. 10, page 971; Hardouin, t. 3, page 778.

^{ft39} Epist. Maximi ad Petrum, in Anastasii *Collectaneas* in Galland. *Biblioth. Patrum*, t. 13, page 38; and Mansi, t. 10, page 691; Pagi, ad ann. 633, n. 3.

^{ft40} Pagi, *l.c.* n. 4.

^{ft41} In order to make out that the letters of Pope Honorius to Sergius were falsified, Bishop Bartholus of Feltre, in his *Apologia pro Honorio* I. (1750), has pronounced the letter of Sergius to Honorius to be totally corrupt. He has been recently opposed by Professor Pennacchi of Rome, although he is himself a zealous defender of Pope Honorius. Pennacchi declares most decidedly for the genuineness both of the letters of Honorius to Sergius and of that of Sergius to the Pope. Pennacchi's book, *De Honorii I Romani Pontificis causa in Concilio 6 ad Partes Concilii Vaticani*, published in Rome, A.D. 1870, and sent to all the members of the Council, is the most important which has lately appeared in defense of Honorius (see below, sec. 154). The hypothesis of an essential falsification of these documents is, besides, so utterly unfounded, that any further discussion of it is unnecessary. It suffices to remark that the letters of Honorius were read aloud at the twelfth session of the sixth Oecumenical Council, and at that time an official examination was made (by a deputy of Rome) as to whether the passages read were in exact agreement with the still extant originals; and this was shown. See below, sec. 319. (Added to the second edition.)

- ^{ft42} This is not true. Cyrus of Alexandria straightway adopted Monothelitism in his seventh Kephalaion. (Remark in the second edition.)
- ^{ft43} Sergius exaggerates, in order to make the Pope favorable. Not all the Monophysite parties, but only the Theodorians, had entered the union.
- ^{ft44} Sophronius, perhaps at a later period, collected in a work now lost 600 patristic passages in favor of Dyothelitism, as Stephen of Dor testifies. Another collection of patristic passages for Dyothelitism by Maximus is still extant. S. Maximi *Opp.* ed. Combefis, t. 2, page 154, and Combefis, *Hist. haeres. Monothelet. Auctuarium Novum*, t. 2, page 24. The sixth Oecumenical Council (sess. 10) also collected a great number of patristic proofs for the Dyothelitic doctrine.
- ^{ft45} Sergius shows clearly, by this comparison, that he considered the human nature in Christ as purely passive without a will of its own. Our body is related passively to the soul, is simply guided by it, has no will of its own, and in the same way, Sergius says, is the human nature in Christ related to the divine. (Added to the second edition.)
- ^{ft46} Mansi, t. 11, page 530 sqq; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1311 sqq.
- ^{ft47} Sergius says, indeed, that there was to be no more speech either of *one* energy or of *two* in Christ; but he does not at all accord an equal place to both expressions. The expression *duo ejesgeiai*, he maintains, has no patristic authorities whatever for it, whilst many Fathers had expressed themselves in favor of *mia ejesgeia*, and the patriarch had collected many passages of this kind in his letter to Pope Vigilius. By the expression *mia ejesgeia* great good fortune had happened to the Church (the union in Alexandria), and in the Kephalaia of union the *mia* must remain (in spite of the silence), if the union was not to be again destroyed. The Emperor, he said, was also in favor of *mia ejesgeia*. The expression *duo ejesgeiai*, however, would have very serious consequences (relapse into Nestorianism). Accordingly, Sergius, when he at last recommended the avoiding of both expressions, yet wanted to insinuate to the Pope, that *mia* had much more in its favor, and must not be removed from the Kephalaia of union, whereas the *duo ejesgeiai* was to be entirely rejected. One can see he was a Monothelite, and wanted to mislead the Pope. If the *mia ejesg.* was to remain in the Alexandrian Kephalaia, then

Monothelitism was practically approved, and the whole talk about *future* silence deceptive. (Added in the second edition.)

ft48 In his *Vita S. Bertulphi*, in Baron. *Annal. ad ann.* 626, 39.

ft49 Mansi, t. 20, page 538 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1319 sqq., and page 1593 sqq.

ft50 Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9, S. 14.

ft51 Mansi, *l.c.* page 538 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 1319 sqq. In the first edition the letter of Honorius was given somewhat less completely. But no passage of importance was omitted.

ft52 Compare the author's treatise, *Das Anathem uber Honorius*, in the *Tubingen Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1857, Heft 1.

ft53 The following, to the end of the paragraph, is added to the new edition.

ft54 *De Honorii I. Romani Pontificis causa in Concilio 6 Dissertatio*, Josephi Pennachii, in *Romana studiorum universitate historiae ecclesiasticae professoris substituti* (for the blind Professor Archbishop Tizzani). *Ad Patres Concilii Vaticani Romae*, 1870, 287 pp.

ft55 The *una voluntas* with Honorius is not, as is here maintained, the one incorrupt human will. Honorius understands by the *una voluntate* the moral unity of the incorrupt human will with the divine will in Christ. (Note in the second edition.)

ft56 Schneemann, S. J., *Studien uber die Honoriusfrage*, Herder, Freiburg 1864, S. 47 f.

ft57 When we said, in the first edition, that he had forbidden the term **due ejhergeiai**, this is too strongly expressed. An actual prohibition was not put forth by Honorius.

ft58 This paragraph remains unaltered in the second edition.

ft59 Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, in the Bonn edition of the so-called Byzantines, t. 1, page 507; *Vita Maximi*, in Combefis' edition of the *Opp. S. Maximi*, t. 1, page 9 c. 11. Both, however, make the mistake of calling the Pope, John. Honorius lived until 638.

ft60 Mansi, t. 11, pages 461-508; Hardouin, t. 3, pages 1257-1296.

ft61 *Libellus Synodicus*, in Mansi, t. 10, page 607; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1535.

ft62 *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 135.

- ^{ft63} Mansi, t. 11, page 461; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1257. We may add that Sophronius himself calls his letter once [sul labai sunodikai](#), and again, [gramma sunodikon](#). Mansi, *l.c.* page 472; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 1265.
- ^{ft64} Bingham, *Origines*, t. 1, page 171 sq.
- ^{ft65} Mansi has here, by a misprint, given a wrong text. The correct runs: [ta < eile sav fusikwv oujsiav eijgazeto, kata < thn ekatera | prosousan oujsiwdh poiothath h | kai < fusikhn idiothata](#). Hardouin, *l.c.* page 1272; Mansi, *l.c.* page 480. Rosler, in his *Bibliothek der Kirchenvater*, Bd. 10 S. 414, gives the inaccurate text of Mansi and a very incorrect translation.
- ^{ft66} The words of Leo I. in his famous *Epistola ad Flavianum*: “Agit enim utraque forma (natura) cum alterius communione, quod proprium est.”
- ^{ft67} Sophronius here takes [swma](#) as identical with [sarx](#) = human nature.
- ^{ft68} On the life of Sophronius, cf. the article in the *Kirchenlexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, s.v.
- ^{ft69} Sess. 10 in Mansi, t. 11, page 455; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1251.
- ^{ft70} Mansi, *l.c.* page 579; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 1351.
- ^{ft71} In the first edition we added: “Whether it (the [efi qe bhma](#)) found place at all in the latter (the second letter) cannot be decided. In any case, Honorius did not recall it (better, does not explain it in its right sense), and therefore the Monothelites had, formally at least, full right to appeal to him as their patron and defender. And herein lies his second fault. When, on the one side (negatively), he forbade the correct expression of the orthodox doctrine ([duo ejersgei ai](#)), so, on the other side (positively), he pronounced the *terminus technicus* of the heresy. And yet even on this point his thought was not heretical, but only obscure, as we showed above, and he only failed to draw the right inference from his own premiss. This remark in the first edition finds its connection, as far as that is necessary, in what is said above [†] (pages 36, 41, 44, n. 1).
- ^{ft72} In Anastasii *Collectanea*, in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. 13, page 32 sq., and Mansi, t. 10, page 682 sq. The *Apologia* of John IV. is here quoted somewhat more fully than in the first edition.
- ^{ft73} S. Maximi *Disput. cum Pyrrho*, in Mansi, t. 10, page 739 sq.

- ft74 This estimate of the apology agrees substantially with that in the first edition; but, as I believe, is more exact. That which follows up to page 57, “In this manner,” etc., is almost entirely new.
- ft75 Pennacchi (page 113 sq.) understood **ej̃ auj̃w̃a** = **uþ̃ jauj̃w̃a**, and assumed that the Roman priests had drawn up at a *Synod* the letter of Honorius to Sergius. But **ej̃ auj̃w̃a** can mean no more than, “the letter written from Rome to Sergius.”
- ft76 S. Maximi *Tomus ad Maximum Presbyt.*, in Migne, *Patres Graeci*, t. 91, page 243; in Mansi, t. 10, page 689 sq., there is only a Latin translation.
- ft77 Mansi, t. 11, page 547; Hardouin, t. 3, page 1326; cf. below, sec. 319 at the close.
- ft78 The *genuineness* of the letters of Honorius was fully defended by Pennacchi (*l.c.* pages 75-112). At the same time, he found them quite blameless. (See above, sec. 295.)
- ft79 In establishing this result also there is some deviation from the first edition. In that it is said: “Thus there remains for us the result: The two letters of Honorius, as we now have them, are unfalsified, and do not bear the *interpretatio suavis* which it is wished to give them. They show that, of the two heterodox terms **ef̃ qeþ̃hma** and **mia ej̃eþ̃geia**, Honorius actually used the former, and placed the latter on the same line with the watchword of orthodoxy, **duo ej̃eþ̃geiai**, and rejected both. They show also, however, that the fundamental conviction of Honorius, the foundation of his argument, and at the same time himself, was orthodox in heart, and his error consisted only in an incorrect representation of the dogma, and in a defect of logical consistency.
- ft80 Similar is the judgment of an anonymous writer in the *Katholik* (1863, S. 689 f.), thus: “The fault of Honorius consisted in this, that he did not discover the tricks of Sergius, which he ought to have suspected; that he did not sharply define and sanction the true meaning of the expression, “two energies”; that he placed this expression on the same line with that of “one energy”; that he treated the whole question in a superficial manner, as a mere strife of words; and finally, that, with the greatest want of prudence, he spoke of one will in a manner which, if it admitted of a good meaning, yet under the prevailing circumstances might easily be mistaken, and give occasion for great errors. He played with the fire which others had kindled; and thus made the fire stronger,

and shared the blame of the inventors and adherents of the heresy, although he did not himself share their error.” Added to second edition.

^{ft81} So most of the Gallicans, *e.g.* Richer, *Hist. Concil. generalium*, lib. i. c. 10, page 567 sqq. ed. Colon. 1683; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, etc., t. 6, page 69, ed. Mons. 1692. Bossuet, *Defensio Declarat. cleri Gallicani*, t. 2, page 190; and Protestants, *e.g.* Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 125; Bower, *History of the Popes*, “Honorius.” Forbes, *Instructiones Historico-theolog.*, page 240; Dorner, *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, Bd. 2 pt. 1 S. 218 [Eng. trans., T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh]. Even the cardinal of Lucerne formed so harsh a judgment on Honorius in his work, *Sur la declaration de l’assemblee du clerge de France en 1682*, Paris 1821, in Palma, *Praelectimes hist. eccles.*, Romae 1839, t. 2 pt. 1, page 106 sqq.

^{ft82} So especially Pighius (*Diatriba de Actis 6 et 7 Concil.*) and Baronius (*ad ann.* 633, 34 sq., and 681, 29 sqq.).

^{ft83} So, quite recently, Pennacchi; earlier, Cardinal Tunecremata (lib. 2 *De Ecclesia*, c. 93), Bellarmino (lib. 4 *De Rom. Pontif.* c. 2), and the learned Maronite, Joseph Simon Assemani (*Biblioth. Juris Orient.* t. 4, page 113 sqq.). The latter thinks the sixth Oecumenical Council certainly regarded Honorius as a heretic, and anathematized him as such, but that the points which spoke in his defense, particularly the apologies already mentioned of John IV. and of Abbot John, had not been known to the Synod. That the better instructed Pope Leo II, on the contrary, had not completely approved of the anathema of the Synod on Honorius, but had anathematized him, not on the ground of *heresy*, but of negligence. See below, sec. 324. The judgments of the different savants on Honorius, his guilt or innocence, are collected pretty completely by Schneemann in his *Studien uber die Honoriusfrage*, Herder, Freiburg 1864, S. 25 ff.

^{ft84} Cf. Chmel, O.S.B. Prof. Prag., *Vindiciae Concilii Oecumenici* 6, Prague 1777, page 441 sqq., 456 sqq.

^{ft85} Garnier, *De Honorii et Concilii 6 Causa* in the Appendix of the *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*.

^{ft86} From here to the end of the paragraph added to the second edition.

^{ft87} When the Longobardi conquered Upper Italy, the metropolitan chair of Aquileia was removed to Grado, as this city, strong by reason of its marshes could not be seized by the Longobardi; and the metropolitans

now took the title of “Aquileia at Grado.” Of the cities belonging to this ecclesiastical province, however, some remained in the power of the Emperor; others had been seized by the Longobardi. The bishops in the Longobardian territory would not enter the union in the year 607; and then appointed for themselves a special ecclesiastical head with the title of “Patriarch of Aquileia.”

ft88 Mansi, t. 10, page 577; Baron. *ad ann.* 630, 14.

ft89 Added to the second edition.

ft90 Mansi, t. 10, page 741.

ft91 This fragment of a letter is found in the *Collatio inter Maximum et socium ejus coram principibus*, Mansi, t. 11, page 9.

ft92 Mansi, t. 10, page 691.

ft93 In *Maximi Opp.* t. 1, page 9 c. 12.

ft94 Niceph. *Breviar. de rebus post Mauricium gestis*, ed. Bonn, pages 16, 17; Theophanes, *l.c.* page 463.

ft95 Mansi, t. 10, page 873; Hardouin, t. 3, page 695.

ft96 Mansi, t. 10, page 991; Hardouin, t. 3, page 791.

ft97 From here to the end of the paragraph altered in the second edition.

ft98 Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 636, n. 2 and 3; Baron. *ad ann.* 636, n. 4, and 643, n. 12.

ft99 Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 86 and 143; Baron. *ad ann.* 649, n. 64.

ft100 Fragments of this Synod are preserved in the *Secret.* 3 of the Lateran Synod of the year 649, Mansi, t. 10, page 999; Hardouin, t. 3, page 798. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 639, 8.

ft101 Fragments of this in Mansi, t. 10, page 1002; Hardouin, t. 3, page 799. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 639, 8.

ft102 Preserved in *Secret.* 3 of the Lateran Synod, Mansi, t. 10, page 1003; Hardouin, t. 3, 803. We learn from this that the imperial official (*magister militum*) Eustachius, who had been sent with the *Ecthesis* to Italy to the Exarch Isaac, so that the latter should obtain the subscription of Severinus, traveled by way of Alexandria, and communicated to Cyrus a transcript of that imperial copy for Isaac. Walch (*l.c.* S. 144) brought up the question, why the Emperor had not himself sent the *Ecthesis* to Cyrus, and supposes that Alexandria had been seized by the Saracens, so that Cyrus was no longer a subject of

Heraclius. On the other hand, the hierarchical union of Alexandria with the patriarch of Constantinople had continued, and therefore Sergius had written to Cyrus. — This hypothesis is unfounded. It is true that the Arabs had invaded Egypt by the year 634, but Alexandria was first seized by them in the year 641 (Pagi, *ad ann.* 639, n. 11, and 641, n. 13), and a glance at the end of the letter from Cyrus shows that Alexandria was then still in possession of the Emperor, and not long before had been delivered out of danger. Besides, Walch might have known from Nicephorus, (*Breviar. l.c.*, ed. Bonn, page 30), that, soon afterwards, Cyrus was summoned by the Emperor Heraclius to Constantinople, and deposed (thus treated as a subject), because he was suspected of an understanding with the Saracens. The succeeding Emperor reinstated him.

ft103 Baron. *ad ann.* 638, n. 6; Pagi, *ad ann.* 638, n. 5.

ft104 *Epist. Maximi ad Thalassium*, in Anastasii *Collectanea* in Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* t. 13, page 42; and Mansi, t. 10, page 677.

ft105 That Pope Severinus rejected the Ecthesis is declared by the *Professio* which several of his successors had to make at their consecration, as follows: “Profitemur etiam cuncta decreta pontificum Apostolicae sedis, i.e. sanctae recordationis Severini, Joannis, Theodori, atque Martini custodire, qui adversus novas quaestiones in urbe regia exortas ... cuncta zizaniorum scandala amputasse noscuntur, profitentes juxta duarum naturarum motum ita et duas naturales operationes, et quaecunque damnaverunt, sub anathemate damnamus.” From this Pagi (*ann.* 639, 3-5) would conclude that Pope Severinus rejected Monothelitism at a Synod.

ft106 Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 508; *Libellus Synodicus* in Mansi, t. 10, 607; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1538.

ft107 Nicephor. *Breviar. l.c.* page 31.

ft108 In Anastasii *Collectan.*, in Galland. t. 13, page 32 sqq., and Mansi, t. 10, page 682 sqq.

ft109 Zonarae *Annales*, lib. 15 c. 18, page 68, ed. Venet. 1729; Pagi, *ad ann.* 641, 3.

ft110 Cf., on the other side, Walch, Bd. 9 S. 187 f. and 193.

ft111 For this we have not merely the authority of the less trustworthy Eutychius (archbishop of Alexandria in the 10th century) in his *Annales*

Ecclesiae Alexandrinae, but it is mentioned also by Pope Theodore in his letter, hereafter to be noticed, to the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 641, 4.

ft112 The very inaccurate *Acta Audoeni* in Surius, *ad* 24 Augusti, profess to know that this foreigner had been banished from Asia.

ft113 Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 640, n. 13 and 14; Mansi, t. 10, page 759 sq.; Rivet, in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. 9, page 7. On S. Audoen, cf. Engling, *Der hl. Audoenus*, Luxemburg 1867.

ft114 Extant only in Latin in Anastasii *Collectanea*, in Galland. t. 13, page 39; Mansi, t. 10, page 702. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 643, n. 4.

ft115 Galland. *l.c.* page 41; Mansi, *l.c.* page 705.

ft116 Galland. and Mansi, *ll.cc.*

ft117 Preserved among the Acts of the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649. Mansi, t. 10, page 914; Hardouin, t. 3, page 730.

ft118 Anastasii *Collectanea*, in Galland. t. 13, page 38; Mansi, t. 10, page 691.

ft119 Prefixed to Combefis' edition of the works of S. Maximus.

ft120 Thus Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 195.

ft121 It is believed that Gregory was identical with that George with whom Maximus corresponded, and whom he greatly commended. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 190.

ft122 Printed in S. Maximi *Opera*, ed. Combefis, t. 2, page 159 sqq.; ed. Migne, Paris 1860, t. 1, page 287 sqq. Also in Mansi, t. 10, page 709-760 (misplaced by a misprint), and in the Appendix to vol. 8 of Baronius.

ft123 That the difference of wills rests in the difference of the natures was taught by Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril, etc. Cf. the collection of patristic passages for two energies in his *Opp.* t. 2, page 156 sqq.

ft124 Mansi, t. 10, page 715.

ft125 Mansi, t. 10, page 720.

ft126 Mansi, *l.c.* page 721.

ft127 Mansi, *l.c.* page 725.

ft128 Mansi, *l.c.* page 728.

ft129 Mansi, *l.c.* page 729.

ft130 Mansi, *l.c.* page 732.

ft131 Mansi, *l.c.* page 736.

ft132 Mansi, *l.c.* page 740.

ft133 Mansi, *l.c.* .page 744.

ft134 Mansi, *l.c.* page 745.

ft135 Thus, I believe, we must understand the meaning of this difficult passage. The old Latin translation of Turrianus departs here arbitrarily from the Greek, and is incorrect.

ft136 Mansi, *l.c.* page 748.

ft137 Mansi, *l.c.* page 749.

ft138 Mansi, *l.c.* page 751.

ft139 Cf. above, sec. 291.

ft140 Cf. above, sec. 291.

ft141 Mansi, t. 10, page 760.

ft142 “*Vita S. Maximi* in Combefis’ edition of the *Opp.* S. Martini, t. 1, page 12.

ft143 The Primicerius Theophylact says this at the Lateran Synod in his short remarks before the reading of the African synodal letters, in Mansi, t. 10, page 918; Hardouin, t. 3, page 92; it is also clear from the letter of Victor of Carthage, see below, in this section.

ft144 Cf. Baronius, *ad ann.* 646, 13.

ft145 Mansi, t. 10, page 919; Hardouin, t. 3, 734.

ft146 Mansi, t. 10, page 926; Hardouin, t. 3, 738.

ft147 Remi Ceillier (*Histoire des auteurs sacres*, t. 18, page 810) is doubly mistaken, I think, in supposing that the letter of the Byzacenes to Paul had been lost, and, on the other hand, that the letter of Probus to the primate of proconsular Africa was still extant. Probus was not primate or bishop of Carthage, but bishop of Tatia Montanensis, and subscribed the letter, not *primo*, but *secundo loco*. But even the first subscriber, Eubosus, was not bishop of Carthage, but of Puppita.

ft148 The same passages were also subsequently quoted by Pope Agatho and the sixth Oecumenical Synod.

ft149 Mansi, t. 10, page 943; Hardouin, t. 3, page 754.

- ^{ft150} Mansi, t. 10, page 607; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1535. In the superscription of the first of these four Synods, in the otherwise accurate Hardouin, *Constantinopolitana* stands, by mistake, for *Byzacena*.
- ^{ft151} Theophanes, ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 509. *Libellus Synod.* in Mansi, t. 10, page 610; Hardouin, t. 5, page 1537; and Anastasius, *Vitae Pontif.* sec. 127.
- ^{ft152} Theophanes (*Chronogr.*, ed. Bonn, t. 1, page 525) places his usurpation in the year 638, which is identical with 646 in the Dionysian era. Cf. above, page 3, n. 2. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 646, 1.
- ^{ft153} Mansi, t. 10, page 1019; Hardouin, t. 3, page 815.
- ^{ft154} Mansi, *l.c.* page 878; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 699.
- ^{ft155} We see this from a more recent letter of Stephen of Dor in Mansi, t. 10, page 891; Hardouin, t. 3, page 711.
- ^{ft156} Cf. the fragments of his letter to Peter, in Mansi, t. 10, page 690.
- ^{ft157} Mansi, t. 10, pages 879 and 1030; Hardouin, t. 3, pages 699 and 823. On the Chronology, cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 648, n. 2.
- ^{ft158} Here in a very improper manner Monothelitism is identified with the orthodox doctrine: one and the same (Christ) works the divine and the human.
- ^{ft159} Mansi, t. 10, page 1029; Hardouin, t. 3, page 823.
- ^{ft160} Baron. *ad ann.* 649, n. 4; Surius, t. 4; died Aug. 24. These *Acta* assert, quite incorrectly, that Andoenus was not then a bishop. He became one as early as 640; see above, sec. 302.
- ^{ft161} Baronius, *l.c.*
- ^{ft162} Bower, vol. 4.
- ^{ft163} Muratori, *History of Italy*, vol. 4.
- ^{ft164} Martini, Ep. 15, in Mansi, t. 10, page 852.
- ^{ft165} The Synods were often held in the *secretarii*, buildings adjoining the church, and it was perhaps for this reason that the sessions themselves were called *secretarii* or *secretaria*. Cf. vol. 2, secs. 109, 119; vol. 3, secs. 166, 172, 186.
- ^{ft166} This is, taken literally, not quite accurate. Certainly there stands fast in the Ecthesis the doctrine of *one* energy, but, as a matter of fact, it

forbids, for the sake of peace, the expression *mi a ejheʒgeia* and *duo ejheʒgeiai*, and defends only *efi qeḏhma*.

^{ft167} This is the principal content of the rather lengthy discourse of the Pope, in Mansi, t. 10, page 870; Hardouin, 3, page 694.

^{ft168} Mansi, t. 10, page 882 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 703 sqq.

^{ft169} Mansi, *l.c.* page 891; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 711. Stephen of Dor subscribes as *prwtov* of the *agīa sunodov* standing under the patriarchal see of Jerusalem.

^{ft170} Mansi, *l.c.* page 908; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 722.

^{ft171} Mansi, *l.c.* page 914 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 727 sqq.

^{ft172} Mansi, *l.c.* page 954-970; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 762-774.

^{ft173} Mansi, *l.c.* pages 970-980; Hardouin, *l.c.* pages 775-783.

^{ft174} On Themistius, cf. Photii *Biblioth.* cod. 108; and Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 8 S. 652 and 658.

^{ft175} Mansi, *l.c.* page 986; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 787.

^{ft176} Mansi, *l.c.* page 987; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 790.

^{ft177} Mansi, *l.c.* pages 990-1007; Hardouin, *l.c.* pages 791-804.

^{ft178} The two latter sought in the *moral* unity of the human and of the divine will in Christ, the connection of the two persons asserted by them. (See vol. 3, sec. 127).

^{ft179} Mansi, t. 10, page 1007 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 806 sqq.

^{ft180} Here are adduced the two passages of the Areopagite mentioned in sec. 291, but the Latin translation of one is incorrect, since *thv ajqrwpiāhv autou-qeourgiav* is translated by *humanae ejus operationi*.

^{ft181} The four passages which are here adduced are not by Justin. They are quoted as being taken from the 17th chapter of his first book on the Trinity. In the same manner are several of them quoted by Leontius *Contra Monophys.*, and the anonymous ancient writing, *Patrum doctrina*, etc. (both in Aug. Mai, *Veterum Script. Nova Collectio*, t. 7, pages 22, 24, 130). The three first of these four passages are found verbally in the book (of pseudo-Justin) *Expositio rectae fidei, seu de Trinitate* (Otto, Opp. S. Justin, t. 3, pt. 1, page 34 sqq.), but not c. 17, but c. 11 and 12 (the division of chapters must formerly have been different); and this writing is here called liber 3, not as though it were

divided into three books, but because the author (probably the Sicilian Bishop Justin in the 5th century) says, in chap. 1, that he has already written two books against the Jews and heathen, so that the present is the third. (Cf. Prud. Maran. Opp. S. Justini, *Admonitio in exposit, rectae confessionis*; and Otto, *De Justini Mart. scriptis*, etc., page 63.) The fourth passage here cited I do not find literally in pseudo-Justin, but the sense of it in c. 11.

ft182 One of the passages here adduced as of S. Athanasius is no longer found in his works.

ft183 Mansi, t. 10, pages 1066-1114; Hardouin, t. 3, pages 854-890.

ft184 From his treatise on the "Glorious Consecration" (*epi fanouv muhseww* = baptism). The Latin text of our Council is corrupt and gives no meaning — *Epiphanius Myeseos*.

ft185 Mansi, *l.c.* pages 1114-1123; Hardouin, *l.c.* pages 891-898.

ft186 Mansi, *l.c.* pages 1123-1150; Hardouin, *l.c.* pages 899-919.

ft187 The Lateran Synod read *ejh duo fusesi*, for the Latin text has, *in duabus naturis* (cf. above, sec. 291, and vol. 3, sec. 193, page 348, note 1). The Greek translation of the Lateran Acts, however, has here, *ek duofusewn kai ejh dusi fusesin*.

ft188 Mansi, t. 10, page 1150; Hardouin, t. 3, page 919.

ft189 So we should read instead of the meaningless *loci servaturas incongruas*. This is clear both from the Greek translation and from *Actio* 8 of the sixth Oecumenical Council, where this canon is repeated.

ft190 Mansi, t. 10, page 1151 sq.; Hardouin, t. 3, page 922 sqq.

ft191 Mansi, *l.c.* pages 1170-1183; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 933 sqq.

ft192 Mansi, t. 10, page 790; Hardouin, t. 3, page 626.

ft193 Mansi, *l.c.* page 1183; Hardouin, *l.c.* page 945. At the same time, the Pope in this letter requested Bishop Amandus not to resign, which, from grief at the bad conduct of his clergy, he had resolved to do, and actually carried out; cf. Pagi, *ad anna* 649, n. 6.

ft194 Baronius, *ad ann.* 649, n. 4 and 37; Pagi, *ad ann.* 649, n. 6. Cf. above, beginning of this section.

ft195 Mansi, t. 10, page 798; Hardouin, t. 3, page 634.

ft196 Cf. on this subject, below, the letter to Pantaleon.

- Fta1** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 806; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 639. Philadelphia lies near to Jerusalem on the east side, and near to this Esbus, — both cities belonging ecclesiastically to the province of Arabia.
- Fta2** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 815 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 647 sqq.
- Fta3** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 822; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 651.
- Fta4** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 827; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 655.
- Fta5** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 834 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 662.
- Fta6** Anastas. *Vitae Pontif.*, secs. 130, 133, t. 4: p. 48 sqq.; in Baronius, *ad ann.* 649, n. 49 sqq. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 649, n. 7 and 9; and Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9. S. 268 sqq.
- Fta7** “*Commemoratio eorum quae...acta sunt...in Sanctum Martinum*, etc., in Mansi, t. 10. p. 855; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 680. Cf. Muratori, *Hist. of Italy*, vol. 4.
- Fta8** Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 851, 853; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 676, 678.
- Fta9** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 853 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 678 sqq.
- Fta10** Martini Ep. 2, *ad Theod.*, in Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 851, 852; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 676, 677.
- Fta11** Martini Ep. 1, *ad Theod.*, in Mansi, *l. c.* p. 850; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 675.
- Fta12** Martini Ep. 2, *ad Theod. l. c.*
- Fta13** Either = *famulus*, or = a precious casket. Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss. ad 5 cauculus* 3, and *caucus* 2; also Muratori, *l. c.*
- Fta14** Martini Ep. 2, *ad Theod.* and *Commemoratio*, etc. The latter asserts that the Pope was not allowed to leave the ship. Martin himself, however, says (*l. c.*) that he lodged in a hospitium.
- Fta15** *Commemoratio, l. c.*
- Fta16** Martini Ep. 2, *ad Theol. l. c.*
- Fta17** *Duellum = rebellio*. See Du Cange, *s.v.*
- Fta18** On the insurrection of Valentinus, in consequence of which Constans II came to the throne (sec. 301 *ad fin.*), cf. Niceph. *Breviar. de rebus gestis post Mauricium*, p. 33 sqq., ed. Bonn. George was probably a participator in this rising.
- Fta19** An *Psachnion*, of. Du Cange, *s.v.*

- Fta20 In the rock grottoes of Inkerman, on the Black Sea, in the Crimea, there is still shown the cavern where Pope Martin lived.
- Fta21 The Greeks venerate him as a confessor on the 11th Of April. We [R. C.] as a martyr, November 12. What Bower objects (vol. 4) — that Martin did not suffer so much for the faith, but for disobedience — is ridiculous, as Bower himself *declares* the accusation of treason to be false, and by his disobedience understands only resistance to the Typus.
- Fta22 In the northern suburb of Constantinople, Blachernae, the Empress Pulcheria had built a church of S. Mary, which was the most celebrated of Constantinople; and after which churches were erected in or before other cities to the Holy Virgin [our Lady] of Blachernae. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 654, n. 3, and Niceph. Callisti *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 15 c. 24. *Commemoratio*, etc., in Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 855-861; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 680 sqq.
- Fta23 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 861 sq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 686 sq.
- Fta24 See *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s.v.
- Fta25 Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, *ad ann.* 621 (where later events of many kinds in relation to the Monothelite history are compressed), ed. Bonn, t. 1 p. 510.
- Fta26 Mansi, t. 11 p. 3 sqq. More completely in Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* t. 13. pp. 50-78; and S. Maximi *Opp.*, ed. Combefis, t. 1 pp. 29-70.
- Fta27 *Italicae historiae Scriptores*, t. 2 p. 149.
- Fta28 Pagi (*ad ann.* 657, 8) showed quite correctly that the examination on Maximus took place in 655, but he concluded too hastily that the arrival of Maximus at Constantinople must also be transferred to this year, 655. The Acts of the trial certainly say (in Mansi, t. 11 p. 3) *post dies aliquot* after the arrival in Constantinople, Maximus was placed upon trial; but elsewhere they bring together events separated in time, and in doing so make use of such vague expressions as *post dies aliquot*. A striking example will meet us soon.
- Fta29 Mansi, t. 11 p. 11; S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* p. 41.
- Fta30 Assemani, *l. c.* p. 143.
- Fta31 Mansi, t. 11 p. 12; S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* p. 43; Galland. *l. c.* p. 59.
- Fta32 In Mansi, t. 11 p. 1.

- Fta33** In a subsequent letter to Pope Vitalian the Patriarch Peter expressed himself more clearly. We know that in this he approved both expressions, — one will and two wills, one and two energies. Mansi, t. 11 p. 275; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1107.
- Fta34** Assemani (*l. c.* p. 153 sq.) and Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 308) thought that this Synod put forth that which is given at the close of the *Disputatio Maximi cure Theodosio*, in the edition of Combefis, *l. c.* p. 65 (printed also in Galland. *l. c.* p. 74, and Mansi, t. 11 p. 74), but not in the *Collectanea* of Anastasius, from *Exinde adductis*, etc., namely, that the Synod had decreed that Maximus and his two disciples should be flogged and their tongues cut out, and their right hands chopped off; and that this sentence, however, was not actually carried out until afterwards. Mansi and others, however, rightly saw that this shocking decree belongs to another and somewhat later Synod at Constantinople (see below, at the end of this section).
- Fta35** Mansi, t. 11 p. 10; S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* pp. 40 and 63; Galland. *l. c.* pp. 58, 73.
- Fta36** This date appears from S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* p. 44 Cf. with p. 59 and Galland. *l. c.* pp. 61, 70.
- Fta37** In S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* p. 44 sqq., and in Galland. *l. c.* p. 61 sqq.
- Fta38** Not 661, as Walch, *l. c.* S. 308, thought. Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* pp. 154, 155.
- Fta39** S. Maximi *Opp.* *l. c.* p. 66; Galland. *l. c.* p. 74; Mansi, t. 11 p. 74.
- Fta40** He was therefore only three months in his third exile, so that several ancient testimonies which speak of three *years* must be corrected from this. Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* p. 159.
- Fta41** Cf. the appendix to his letter mentioned, and Pagi, ad ann. 660, 4.
- Fta42** Mansi, t. 11 p. 14.
- Fta43** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 572; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1347.
- Fta44** Baron. *ad ann.* 655, 1-5.
- Fta45** Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 199, 346; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1047, 1163.
- Fta46** Anastasii *Vitae Pontif.* in Mansi, t. 11 p. 14 sq. Pagi, ad ann. 663, 2, 3; 668, 3.
- Fta47** Mansi, t. 11 pp. 199, 346; Hardouin, t. 3. pp. 1047, 1163.

- Fta48 That under him the separation between Rome and Constantinople continued is evident from this, that his name and that of his successor were not placed upon the Greek diptychs.
- Fta49 Mansi, t. 11 p. 575; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1350.
- Fta50 Cf. above, p. 102; and Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 392.
- Fta51 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 195; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1043. Partly different from this, the contents of the imperial convocation letter are quoted by Gregory 2, in Mansi, t. 12 p. 968. Perhaps he had in view a second later letter of the Emperor to the Pope, for at the time of its composition George had ascended he see of Constantinople.
- Fta52 Mansi, t. 11 p. 294; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1122.
- Fta53 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 346; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1163.
- Fta54 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 203; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1051.
- Fta55 *De Gestis Longob.* lib. 6 c. 4.
- Fta56 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 175; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1038; Pagi, *ad ann.* 679, 6. Cf. Schrodl, *Das erste Jahrhundert der engl. Kirche*, S. 201 ff.
- Fta57 Mansi, t. 11 p. 306; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1131.
- Fta58 “Schelstrate, Baronius, and others are of the opinion that Wilfrid really had a commission from the English episcopate to represent them *in rebus fidei*; but Wilfrid had gone to Rome, having had a dispute with his colleagues, and to make a complaint against the Primate, Theodore of Canterbury. Baronius, *ad ann.* 680, 2.
- Fta59 Pagi, *ad ann.* 679, 9, 10.
- Fta60 Schrodl, *l. c.* S. 182 ff. and 224.
- Fta61 “The *Vitae Pontif.* (Mansi, t. 11 p. 165) give, but only by a slip of the pen, the 10th of *November*. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 680, 5. That the papal deputies arrived as early as September is shown clearly by the *Sacra* of the Emperor to the Patriarch of Constantinople, of which hereafter.
- Fta62 The animadversions of Roncaglia, on the Church History of Natalis Alexander, maintain that the Pope in this letter prescribed to the sixth (Ecumenical Council what it had to do (Nat. Alex. *Hist. Ecclesiastes* sec. 7 diss. 1, ed. Venet. 1778, t. 5 p. 513). A certain support for this view is afforded by some expressions in the Decree of Faith of the Synod in the *logov prosfwnhtikov* to the Emperor, in the synodal

letter to Pope Agatho, in the letter of the Emperor to Leo II, and in the answer of the latter. Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 395, 406.

Fta63 We learn their sees from Anastasius, in Mansi, t. 11 p. 165.

Fta64 The Roman priests Theodore and George and the deacon John were the special legates of the Pope (*in specie*), on account of which they presided at the sixth (Ecumenical Council. The three bishops, on the other hand, were deputies of the Roman *Synod*, of the patriarchal diocese (*concilii*, as they say), and therefore subscribed after the Patriarchs.

Fta65 “Cum duas autem naturas duasque naturales voluntates, et duas naturales operationes confitemur in uno Domino nostro J. Chr., non contrarias eas, nec adversas ad alterutrum dicimus (sicut a via veritatis errantes apostolicam traditionem accusant, absit haec impietas a fidelium cordibus), nec tanquam separatas in duabus personis vel subsistentiis, sed duas dicimus eundemque Dominum nostrum J. Chr. sicut naturas ita et naturales in se voluntates et operationes habere, divinam scilicet et humanam: divinam quidem voluntatem et operationem habere ex aeterno cum coessentiali Patre communem; humanam temperaliter ex nobis cum nostra natura susceptam.” Mansi, t. 11 p. 239; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1079.

Fta66 Mansi, t. 11 pp. 234-286; Hardouin, t. 3. pp. 1074-1115. This extract from the letter of Agatho is much more complete than in the first edition.

Fta67 Added in the second edition [a paragraph which gives rise to many reflections].

Fta68 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 286-315; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1115-1142.

Fta69 Anastasii *Vitae Pontif.* in Mansi, *l. c.* p. 165. Cf. Pagi, ad ann. 680, 6.

Fta70 Baronius (*ad ann.* 681, 25) supposes that Theodore had been deposed on account of his adhesion to Monothelitism. On the contrary, Pagi remarks (*ad ann.* 681, 6) that the Emperor had not yet persecuted Monothelitism; this took place only after the eighth session of the sixth (Ecumenical Council. But it is still possible: that Theodore was forced to give way because he was an enemy of union, and this lay in the plan of the Emperor.

- Fta71** Of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem the Emperor says not a word, probably because those cities were then in the possession of the Mahometans.
- Fta72** Mansi, t. 11 p. 202; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1050.
- Fta73** According to this, Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 343, must be corrected, where he gives the year 679. At p. 387 he has it correctly.
- Fta74** “The sixth (Ecumenical Synod drew up no canons. But those of the Quinisext were often ascribed to it. See below, sec. 327.
- Fta75** The one Latin translation is placed by the side of the Greek text, and Walch (*Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 14) asserts that it was the work of the Roman librarian Anastasius in the ninth century, but without giving his reasons. The other more accurate Latin translation is placed after the Greek text.
- Fta76** Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss. mediae et inf. Lat.* s.v. *Trullus*. [Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Antiq.* s.v. p. 1998.]
- Fta77** In Mansi, t. 11 p. 166.
- Fta78** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 639 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1402 sqq.
- Fta79** Theophan. *Chronogr.*, ed. Bonn, t. 1 p. 551.
- Fta80** Cf. Wiltsch, *Kirchl. Statistik*, Bd. 1 S. 72, 126, 402, 431; Assemani, *Biblioth-juris oriental*, t. 5 p. 75.
- Fta81** Cf. Peter de Marca, *De Concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. 5 c. 19, 2, 3; and c. 29, 11.
- Fta82** The left side was formerly the place of honor. See Baronius, *ad ann.* 325, 58; and 213, 6.
- Fta83** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 656; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1413.
- Fta84** In Mansi, t. 4 p. 617 f., *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. 3. sec. 129.
- Fta85** The minutes of our Synod speak here of two **bibli a** which contained the Acts of the Ephesine Synod. In the first **bibli on** were contained the documents existing before the Synod, *e.g.*, the letter of Cyril to the Emperor; in the second, the Acts of the Ephesine Synod *in specie*. Our present collections of Councils divide these Acts into three books, — documents drawn up (a)before, (b) during, and (c) after the Synod of Ephesus.
- Fta86** Mansi, *l. c.* p. 217 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1062 sqq.

- Fta87 Mansi, t. 11 p. 221 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1066 sqq.
- Fta88 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 230, 315; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1071, 1142.
- Fta89 We shall get to know them more exactly in the eighth and ninth sessions.
- Fta90 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 322 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1142 sqq.
- Fta91 We learn to know this collection more exactly at the tenth session.
- Fta92 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 327; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1150.
- Fta93 Mansi, t. 11 p. 331 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1154 sqq.
- Fta94 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 339; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1159.
- Fta95 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 350; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1167.
- Fta96 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 350-358; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1167-1175.
- Fta97 Athanasii Opp. ed. Montf. t. 1 pt. 2 p. 941.
- Fta98 In the collection of Hardouin (but not in Mansi) the patristic passages are suitably made known by marks of quotation. But at p. 1178, Hardouin ought to have begun these marks four lines earlier, at the words, *Et dicitis*, etc.
- Fta99 Mansi, t. 11 pp. 359-378; Hardouin, t. 3 pp. 1175-1190. Cf. the author's *Chrysostomuspostille*, 3te Aufl. S. 217, where he has given the homily of Chrysostom here referred to.
- Fta100 Mansi, *l. c.* pt. 378-387; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1191-1198.
- Fta101 Mansi, t. 11 pp. 387-455; Hardouin, t. 3 pp. 1198-1252.
- Fta102 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 462-509; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1257-1295.
- Fta103 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 510-518; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1295-1303.
- Fta104 Isauria, until the beginning of the eighth century, belonged to the patriarchate of Antioch. The Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, was the first to unite it with Constantinople.
- Fta105 See above, sec. 292; Mansi, *l. c.* p. 526; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1310.
- Fta106 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 518-550; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1303-1327.
- Fta107 Added to the new edition.
- Fta108 Walch, *l. c.* S. 332, asserts that only the *Romae legates* regarded the reading as superfluous. This is untrue and invidious. The Acts say expressly, **hJagi a sunodov eiþen**, Mansi, *l. c.* p. 557; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1333.

- Fta109 It is the same letter which we fully considered at p. 93 f.
- Fta110 Mansi, t. 11 pp. 550-582; Hardouin, t. 3 pp. 1327-1354.
- Fta111 Cf. vol. 4 p. 291.
- Fta112 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 583-602; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1355-1370.
- Fta113 *Anastasii Vitae Pontificum*, in *Vita Agathonis*, in Mansi, t. 11 p. 168; Pagi, *ad ann.* 681, 14, 15.
- Fta114 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 602-611; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1370-1378.
- Fta115 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 611-622; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 1378-1386.
- Fta116 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 622 sq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1387 sq.
- Fta117 At the fifth it is mentioned that they had been assembled against Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius (see vol. 4 p. 295).
- Fta118 Mansi, t. 11 p. 631 Sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1395 sqq.
- Fta119 Mansi, t. 11 p. 658 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1415 sqq.
- Fta120 In the appendix to his *Historia Monothelitarum*, p. 199 sqq., Combefis gives us an [epi bogov](#) of deacon Agatho, which asserts that thirty-two years before, when he was still a lector, he had served the holy Synod as secretary, and in union with the secretary, afterwards Archbishop Paul of Constantinople, had written most of the Acts. The five copies of the decree of faith destined for the five patriarchs had also been prepared by his hand. — In the superscription of the copy destined for Jerusalem (Mansi, t. 11 p. 683; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1437), the last words are an addition by a later hand. See below, the last note in see. 326.
- Fta121 Mansi, t. 11 p. 683 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1438 sqq. This letter was also subscribed by the members of the Synod, with the exception of the papal legates. That a fragment of subscriptions formerly ascribed erroneously to the Nicene Synod (Mansi, t. 11 p. 694) belongs to the sixth OEcumenical Synod, we remarked before (vol. 1 see. 35).
- Fta122 [A court attached to early churches, usually placed in front of the church, and supported with porticoes. See *Dict. of Antiquities*, s.v.]
- Fta123 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 698 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1446 sqq.
- Fta124 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 711; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1459. This letter and the departure of the legates belong to the 10th Indiction (September 1,681=682), and not to December of the same date, as the *later* superscription of the imperial letter to Leo II states. The December of

the 10th Indiction would = December of the year 681. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 5 sqq.; Natal. Alexand. *Hist. Eccl.* See. 7 Diss. 2; and Chmel, *Vindiciae Concilii OEcum.* VI p. 83 sqq., who defend the genuineness of this letter and of the two following documents against Baronius.

- Fta125 Pope Leo had written to the Emperor immediately after his election, and notified him of it. See Pagi, *l. c.*
- Fta126 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 719; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1463. The chronological note at the end of this letter, found in one old Latin translation, is lacking in the Greek original, and is worthless. So also with that appended to the letter of Leo II to the Emperor, presently to be mentioned. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 5, 7.
- Fta127 With Macarius were, at the same time, sent to Rome, Stephen, Polychronius, Epiphanius, Anastasius, and Leontius. The two last were converted, and Leo II. received them back into the Church; the others were imprisoned in different monasteries. Anastasii *Vitae Pontif.* in Mansi, t. 11 pp. 167, 1047.
- Fta128 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 726 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1470 sqq.
- Fta129 It is doubtful whether this means Archbishop Quiricius of Toledo. He died in January, 680, whilst Pope Leo did not ascend the papal chair until 682. Perhaps the Pope had not heard of his death.
- Fta130 The letter to King Ervig is in many MSS. ascribed to the succeeding Pope, Benedict II.
- Fta131 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1050 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1730 sqq. As in all these letters of Leo to the Spaniards the anathema on Honorius is mentioned, Baronius wanted to declare them all spurious. But they were well defended by Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 5-14; and Combefis, *Hist. Haeres. Monothelet.* p. 154. The next paragraph in the text meets the objections of Baronius.
- Fta132 This section receives many alterations and additions in the second edition.
- Fta133 Pennacchi remarks (p. 275), in opposition to me: “Secundam doctissimi episcopi quaestionem praetermittere possem: siquidem et ego fateor (*et fateri id etiam omnes illi debent qui veritatem amant*) Honorium in 6 synodo ut Haereticum damnatum fuisse. Further remarks on Pennacchi’s attempt at a solution of the question of Honorius will be found below in this section, p. 188.

- Fta134 Mansi, t. 11 p. 554 sq.; Hardouin, t. 6 p. 1832 sq.
- Fta135 The Synod, too, remarked that several passages in the letters of Honorius stood in contradiction to his apparent Monothelitism.
- Fta136 Mansi, t. 11 p. 938; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1658.
- Fta137 Mansi, t. 13 p. 377; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 454.
- Fta138 Mansi, t. 12 pp. 1124, 1141; t. 13 pp. 404, 412; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 134, 147, 474, 482.
- Fta139 Mansi, t. 16 p. 181; Hardouin, t. 5 914.
- Fta140 in Mansi, t. 11 p. 1047.
- Fta141 *Libor Diurnus*, ed. Eugene de Roziere, Paris 1869, No. 84.
- Fta142 Mansi, t. 16 p. 126; Hardouin, t. 5 p. 866.
- Fta143 Cf. above, p. 34 ff., Schneemann's expression.
- Fta144 Mansi, t. 11 p. 726 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1470 sqq.
- Fta145 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1050 sq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1730 sq.
- Fta146 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1056 sq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1733.
- Fta147 Schneemann (*l. c.* S. 62) comes to the conclusion that "the Pope confirmed the judgment of the sixth Synod on the proviso that it anathematized Honorius *only on account of favoring the heresy*." Schneemann further remarks: "As the validity of the councilor decrees depended entirely on the confirmation by the Pope, it might be said that Honorius had been condemned by the (Ecumenical Council, not for heresy, but *for favoring* heresy." It is easily understood how far Schneemann departs from Ns and from Pennacchi. When the latter maintains that Pope II. "abrogated" the sentence of the Council against Honorius, Schneemann gives the milder and relatively more correct statement: "The Pope *confirmed* the sentence of the Council, but with a "*proviso*." But of "a proviso" there is no trace in the letters of *Leo. II*; but he defined with greater precision the fault of Honorius, and *explained* thereby the sense in which the sentence of the Council was to be understood. Note to the second edition.
- Fta148 Albert. Pighius, *Diatriba de Actis 6 et 7 Concilii*. Baron. ad ann. 680, 34; 681, 19-34; 682, 3-9; 683, 2-22. Barrual, *Du Pape et de ses droits*, pt. 1 c. 1. Roisselet de Sauclieres, *Histoire des Conciles*, Paris 1846, t. 3 p. 117. The hypothesis of Baronius was received with modifications

by Boucat, *Tract. de Incarnatione*, Diss. 4 p. 162, and recently by Damberger, *Synchronist. Gesch. des Mittelalters*, Bd. 2 S. 119 ff.

- Fta149 But the original was not in the patriarchal archives, but in the imperial palace, as we are assured by the deacon and notary Agatho, who wrote it, in his [επιλογov](#), in Combefis, *Hist. Monothel.*, in vol. 2 of his *Auctuarium Novum*, p. 199.
- Fta150 Combefis (French Dominican), *Dissert. apologetica pro Actis sextae Synodi*, p. 66 sqq. in the Appendix to his *Historia Monothelet.* in his *Auctuarium Novum*, t. 2 An extract from it is given by Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, t. 6 p. 67 sqq.
- Fta151 Pagi, *ad ann.* 681, 7 sqq.; 683, 4 sqq.
- Fta152 Garnier, *De causa Honorii*, in the Appendix to his edition of the *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontif.* p. 1680.
- Fta153 Nat. Alexander, *Historia Ecclesiastes* Sec. 7 Diss. 2 Propos. 1 p. 514 sqq., ed. Venet. 1778.
- Fta154 Mamachi, *Originum et Antiquitatum*, t. 6 p. 5.
- Fta155 Ballerini, *De Vi ac ratione Primatus*, p. 306.
- Fta156 *Biblioth. juris orient*, t. 4 p. 119 sqq.
- Fta157 Palma, *Praelectiones Hist. Eccl.* t. 2 pt. 1 p. 149, Romae 1839.
- Fta158 Chmel (Prof. Prag.), *Vindicise Concilii OEcum. Sexti*, Prague 1777.
- Fta159 Cf. on this, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. 1 p. 128.
- Fta160 Mansi, t. 12 p. 242 sq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1082 sq.
- Fta161 Pagi, *ad ann.* 681, 8, 9; Walch, *Ketzerhist* Bd. 9 S. 423.
- Fta162 Mansi, t. 11 p. 715; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1462. I know well that Baronius contests this letter also. But more of this hereafter.
- Fta163 See above, pp. 154, 156, 170 ff.; and vol. 4 p. 265.
- Fta164 This is proved by Pagi, *ad ann.* 682, 7.
- Fta165 This argument is not quite stringent, for it were possible that the copy destined for Rome might be given to the legates, and might have remained with them in Constantinople until the year 682, and so until the restoration of Theodore (according to the chronology of Baronius).
- Fta166 Combefis, *Novum Auctuarium*, t. 2 p. 204; Mansi, t. 12 p. 190.
- Fta167 Baronius, *ad ann.* 683, 6.

- Fta168 Mansi, t. 12 p. 968; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 10.
- Fta169 See above, p. 150.
- Fta170 Cf. Petr. de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. 5 c. 19, 2, 3; and c. 29, 11.
- Fta171 Combefis, *l. c.* p. 138; Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 14.
- Fta172 Combefis, *l. c.* pp. 154, 164; Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 13.
- Fta173 *Biblioth. juris orient*, t. 4 p. 549; t. 5 p. 39.
- Fta174 Baron. *ad ann.* 686, 4; Pagi, *red*, ann. 686, 7.
- Fta175 Mansi, 11 p. 737; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1478.
- Fta176 Anton Boucaut, *Tractat. De Incarnatione*, Diss. 4, 162. Cf. Chmel, *l. c.* p. 101
- Fta177 In the *Vita Aqathonis*, printed in Mansi, t. 11 p. 168.
- Fta178 Easter fell on April 14 in the year 681. The eleventh session was held on March 20; the fourteenth, April 5; the fifteenth, April 16, 681.
- Fta179 But even decided Curialists, like Pennacchi, *l. c.* p. 193 sqq., defend the genuineness of the Acts of the sixth OEcumenical Council.
- Fta180 Mansi, t. 13 p. 377; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 454.
- Fta181 Mansi, t. 16 p. 181; Hardouin, t. 5 p. 914.
- Fta182 The short original document on this Synod is given by Eddius, in his *Vita S. Wilfridi*, c. 33, in Mansi, t. 11 p. 187. Cf. Schrodll, *Das erste Jahrh. der engl. Kirche*, S. 182, 220, 226, 228, 231; and Montalembert, *Les Moines de l'Occident*, vol. 4.
- Fta183 Mansi, t. 11 p. 1023 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1715 sqq.; Aguirre, *Conc. Hisp*, t. 2 p. 681 sqq.; Bruns, *Biblioth. Eccl.* pt. 1 p. 317 sqq.; *Coleccion de Canones de la iglesia espanola*, por Gonzalez, Madrid 1849, t. 2 p. 453 sqq.; Gams *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, Bd. 2 Thl. 2 S. 168 ft.; Ferreras, *Gesch. von Spanien*, Bd. 2 S. 438 f.
- Fta184 With this ordinance begins the primacy of Toledo. Cf. Cams, *Kircheng. von Spanien*, Bd. 2 Thl. 2 S. 215ff.
- Fta185 Hardouin, Mansi, etc., *ll. cc.*
- Fta186 Of. Mansi, t. 11 p. 1043 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1727.
- Fta187 Mansi, *l. c.* 1046.

- ^{Fta188} Mansi, t. 11 p. 1059 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1735; Aguirre, *l. c.* p. 694 sqq.; Bruns, *l. c.* p. 333; Gonzalez, *Coleccion de Can. de la iglesia espanola*, Madrid 1849, t. 2 p. 494 sqq.; Gains, *l. c.* S. 172 f., 219 f.; Ferreras, *l. c.* S. 443 ff.
- ^{Fta189} Baronius, *ad ann.* 683, 22, supposes that under *gesta synodalia* we are to understand a complete copy of all the documents of the sixth Council, and so the Synod of Toledo would contradict the letter of Pope Leo II to the Spaniards, which speaks of only *some* documents sent. This letter, therefore, would be spurious. Cf. above, p. 201. But Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 14, rightly solves the supposed contradiction. Pope Leo sent the principal Acts (decrees) Of the sixth Council... and these might quite properly be called the *gesta synodalia*.
- ^{Fta190} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1086 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1754 sqq.; Aguirre, *l. c.* p. 717 sqq.; Bruns, *l. c.* p. 349 sqq.; Gonzalez, *Coleccion de Can. l. c.* p. 520 sqq.; Ferreras, *l. c.* S. 448.
- ^{Fta191} Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 1058, 1095; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1758; Schrod, *l. c.* S. 211; D. Pitra, *Histoire de St. Leger*. [See also Art. "Leodegarius" in *Dict. of Christian Biography*.]
- ^{Fta192} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1099. Pope Benedict XII speaks, in his *Libellus ad Armenos* of A.D. 1341, of an Armenian *Synodus Manesguerdensis*, in which, 612 years before, and therefore in the year 729, it had been laid down that in the holy Mass the wine should not be mixed with water. See Raynald, *ad ann.* 1341, n. 69, sec. 71.
- ^{Fta193} Mansi, t. 12 p. 7 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1749 sqq.; Aguirre, *l. c.* p. 721 sqq.; Bruns, *l. c.* p. 353 sqq.; *Coleccion de Canones*, *l. c.* p. 528 sqq.; Ferreras, *l. c.* S. 450ff.; Gams, *l. c.* S. 175f.
- ^{Fta194} Ferreras, *l. c.* 453 L; Dupin, *Nouvelle Biblioth.* t. 6 p. 37 sq. ed Mons.
- ^{Fta195} Mansi, t. 12 p. 42 sq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1779; Aguirre, *l. c.* p. 732; Bruns, *l. c.* pt. 2 p. 102; *Coleccion de Canones*, etc. t. 2 p. 182 sqq.; Ferreras, *l. c.* S. 455.
- ^{Fta196} Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9 S. 440, is mistaken when he identifies him with the legate, Bishop John of Portus. The facts are correctly stated by Anastasius in his *Vita Joannis* 5, in Mansi, t. 11 p. 1092.
- ^{Fta197} It is differently understood by Assemani in his *Biblioth. juris Orient.* t. 5 p. 37: "The Acts are no longer preserved anywhere, unless with

some imperial Judges and the Emperor himself, but not in the patriarchal archives.” But the word is *remiserunt*, not *remanserunt*.

Fta198 Mansi, t. 11 p. 737; Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1478; Assemani, *l. c.* t. 4 p. 599 sqq.; t. 5 p. 39 sq., supposes that the deception of the papal legates, of which we speak below (p. 238), had now happened. In what the error, to which they now assented, consisted, Assemani gives no hint; but thinks that it was on the same occasion as that on which the remark in the Acts of the eighteenth session was added: “George of Sebaste, then representative of the patriarchal administrator of Jerusalem, became subsequently patriarch of Antioch” — an addition which is found in *all* the still extant manuscripts of the synodal Acts, Latin and Greek. (Mansi, t. 11 p. 683, and Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1437.) Assemani wonders on this occasion, that Baronius did make use of the revision of the synodal Acts of Justinian II, and the deception which might have been practiced at that time, in favor of his hypothesis in regard to Honorius (see above, p. 202), — an hypothesis which Assemani does not accept. But a falsification of the Acts in the year 686 was for Baronius too late, since the genuine Acts had already gone to Rome.

Fta199 Quinisexta Synodus, or Quinisextum Concilium.

Fta200 This is contested by Assemani (*Biblioth. jur. Orient.* t. 5 p. 85), since he belongs to those who remove the sixth (Ecumenical Synod into the Church of S. Sophia. See above, p. 43.

Fta201 Baronius, *ad ann.* 692, 7. Only by mistake the Latins also sometimes ascribed the canons of this Synod to the sixth (Ecumenical Council. The *Latin* Canons which, in Hardouin, t. 3 p. 1711 sq., are ascribed in the margin to the sixth (Ecumenical Council, belong to Theodulph of Orleans. See Hardouin, t. 4 p. 916.

Fta202 At the fourth session, in Hardouin, t. 4 p. 191; Mansi, t. 13 p. 42.

Fta203 At the sixth session, in Hardouin, t. 4 p. 335; Mansi, t. 13 p. 219.

Fta204 Pagi, *ad ann.* 692, 2-7; Assemani, *l. c.* t. p. 60 sqq.

Fta205 Printed in Mansi, t. 11 pp. 930-1006; Hardouin, t. 3 pp. 1651-1712. To these synodal Acts is prefixed a Greek and Latin *Admonitio ad Lectorem*, composed by the editors of the Roman Collection of Councils (they say, in the index to the third volume, that it is *latine et graece nunc primum composita*), which differs from the Greek translation of the Quinisext. An extensive treatise on the Trullan Synod

and its canons was given by Joseph Simon Assemani in his *Bibliotheca juris orientalis*, Romae 1786, t. 5 pp. 55-348, and t. 1 pp. 120, 408 sqq.; and also the treatise, *De hymno Trisagio* (t. 5), partially touches on the 81st canon of our Synod. A hundred years earlier, Christian Lupus (professor at Louvain) explained the Trullan canons in his well-known work, *Synodorum generallium*, etc., *decreta et canones*. The older Greek commentaries by Theodore Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus, of the twelfth century, are found in Beveridge, *Pandectae canonum sine synodicon*, Oxon. 1672, t. 1 pp. 151-283, and Beveridge's own notes upon them, *ibid.* t. 2 pt. 2 p. 126 sqq. It is yet to be remarked that some MSS., e.g. that of Baronius, counted 103 canons, instead of 102, by dividing one of them into two.

Fta206 Mansi, *l. c.* p. 930 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1651 sqq. Cf. vol. 2 p. 369.

Fta207 This canon already contains a polemic against Rome, since that recognized only the first 50 apostolic canons. Cf. vol. 1 *ad fin.*

Fta208 This general statement does not enable us to know what special ordinance of an African Synod under Cyprian is meant. It is supposed that the Greeks had here, out of opposition to Rome, received that statement of Cyprian which he made at the beginning of the third Synod of Carthage, A.D. 257: "Let no one oppose the *episcopus episcoporum*. Baronius (*ad ann.* 692, 16), Assemani *Biblioth. jut. Orient.* t. 1 p. 414), and others, again, think that the Greeks, from hatred against Rome, had approved the African canon of the invalidity of every heretical baptism. But in that case they would have contradicted themselves. Cf. below, their canon 95.

Fta209 The Synods of Carthage of the year 390, can. 2, and 401, can. 4 (vol. 2 secs. 106, 113), require, however, not temporary, but permanent continence in priests; etc. The inconsistency of the Greeks is further to be noticed. Whoever becomes a priest as a married man must retain his wife; but if he becomes a bishop she must go into a monastery (c. 48). Cf. how Baronius (*ad ann.* 692, 18-27) opposes this canon. On this canon and the marriage of the Greek clergy, Assemani treats copiously, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 133 sqq., and t. 1 p. 418 sqq.

Fta210 Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 109 sqq.

Fta211 On the sub-diaconate among the Greeks, cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 122 sqq.

- Fta212 That this opinion is incorrect is shown by Baronius, *ad ann.* 692, 28. Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 147 sqq.
- Fta213 By the *koinwnia ajranov* the old Greek commentators, Balsamon and Zonaras, already understood the holy communion. See Beveridge, *Synodicon* t. 1 p. 182.
- Fta214 An attack on the Western practice. By “barbarians” the Westerns are meant.
- Fta215 Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 201 sqq.; and above, p. 217, n. 2.
- Fta216 Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 287.
- Fta217 Hitherto the bishop of Cyzicus was metropolitan of the province of the Hellespont. Now he too is to be subject to the bishop of New-Justinianopolis. What, however, is meant by *to-dikaion thv Kwnstantinoupolewv*? It was impossible that the Synod should place the bishop of Justinianopolis in equal dignity with the patriarch of Constantinople. But they probably meant to say: “The rights which the bishop of Constantinople has hitherto exercised over the province of the Hellespont, as chief metropolitan, fall now to the bishop of New-Justinimopolis.” Or perhaps we should read, instead of *Kwnstantinoupolewv, Kwnstantinewn polewv*, as the MS. Amerbarchii has it, and translate: “The same rights which Constantia (the metropolis of Cyprus) possessed, New-Justinianopolis shall henceforth have.” The latter is the more probable.
- Fta218 Cf. the commentary of Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 153 sqq.
- Fta219 The old Greek commentators, Balsamon and Zonaras, understand by this the fights of animals. Cf. Beveridge, *l. c.* p. 218.
- Fta220 Canon 24, which treats of a similar subject, is more mild. Naturally so, as there it is of spectators, here of actors, dancers, fighters of animals, that mention is made.
- Fta221 Cf. the commentary of Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 165 sqq.
- Fta222 Compare the copious commentary on the canon by Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 172.
- Fta223 Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 1 p. 431, and t. 5 p. 212 sqq.
- Fta224 According to Balsamon (in Beveridge, *l. c.* p. 228), old people who had the reputation of special knowledge [identified by Gothofred with

the “centenarii” of the Theodosian code. See *Dictionary of Christ. Antiq.* s.v.].

Fta225 They sold their hair as medicine or for an amulet. Cf. Balsamon and Zonaras in Beveridge, *l. c.* p. 228.

Fta226 These kinds of superstition are more fully discussed in Balsamon and Zonaras, *l. c.* p. 230 sqq.

Fta227 The Greeks want here, in their pedantry, to make a temporary prescription of the apostolic time, which was then necessary to unite Jewish and Gentile Christians, of perpetual validity. Cf. Baron. *l. c. ad ann.* 690, 30.

Fta228 Other laymen, besides the Emperor, ventured to pass the barriers which surrounded the altar, in order to make an offering, and so to reach the innermost part of the sanctuary. When, however, they had offered, they were required immediately to withdraw, and were not allowed to remain within during Mass. Only in Constantinople had Byzantine complacency conceded to the Emperor his usual place in the presbytery. When Theodosius the Great came to Milan, he wanted it to be so, and remained, after he had made his offering, within the rails. Ambrose, remarking this, asked him first, what he wanted, and pointed out to him the difference between clergy and laity. Theodoret, *Hist.* ~~2068~~ *Ecclesiastes* 5:18. Sozomen, *Hist.* ~~2075~~ *Ecclesiastes* 7:25. Cf. the notes of Lupus on this passage, and Baron. *ad ann.* 692, 317. Our canon does not express the truth exactly with its “ancient tradition.”

Fta229 What we are to understand by the forbidden **kul istrail**, Balsamon and Zonaras have not been able rightly to explain. Beveridge, *l. c.* p. 240 sq.

Fta230 The Synod erroneously here places marriage with a heretic on the same line with that with a heathen. Cf. Assemani, *l. c.* t. 1 p. 434 sqq.

Fta231 By **ta doceia** others understand the so-called after-birth, *secundinae*. Cf. the detailed commentary on this canon in Assemani, *l. c.* t. 5 p. 193 sqq.

Fta232 In the oldest times Christians set up only the figure of the cross without the *crucifixus*. From the fifth century the figure of a *Lamb*, or of the bust of Christ, was introduced on the cross, sometimes above, sometimes below, sometimes in the middle. Next to this, the third form was developed, when the whole figure of Christ was attached to the cross, and this form was made universally prevalent by the Trullan

Synod. But the older form still lasted on (the cross with the Lamb or with the bust of Christ) here and there. Cf. the author's treatise on "Antiquity and the oldest form of Crucifixes" in his *Beitrage zur Kirchengeschichte*, Tub. 1864, Bd. 2 S. 265 f.

Fta233 Cf. Asscmani, *l. c.* p. 294 sqq.

Fta234 The *Libellus Synodicus* speaks of 240 bishops; in Mansi, t. 11 p. 1018; Hardouin, t. 5 p. 1539. Assemani remarks (t. 5 p. 73) correctly, that, by a slip of the pen in the subscriptions to the Synod, two archbishops of Caesarea are mentioned, Cyriacus and Stephen; the latter must have been archbishop of Ephesus, as the addition **thv Asianwn eparciav** shows. When, however, Assemani finds two bishops of Ancyra in the subscriptions to the Synod, this rests upon a misprint in the edition used by him.

Fta235 Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 692, 9-12, and Assemani, *l. c.* 5 p. 72.

Fta236 Baron. *ad ann.* 686, 4; Pagi, *ad ann.* 686, 7.

FTB1 All that must have appeared offensive to the Latins in the Trullan Synod is put together by Assemani, *l. c.* t. i.p. 413 sqq.

FTB2 Anastas. *Vita Sergii*, in Mansi, t. 12. p. 3; Baron. *ad ann.* 692, 34 sqq.

FTB3 Thus relates Anastasius, *Vita Joannis VII.*, in Mansi, t. 12. p. 163; Baron. *ad ann.*, 692, 89, 40.

FTB4 We learn all this from Anastasius, *Vita Constantini*, in Mansi, *l.c.p.* 179; and *Vita Gregorii II. ibid.* 226.

FTB5 According to this, Pope John VIII. must have pronounced his judgment on the Trullan canons at a Synod. Lupus referred to the Synod of Troyes in the year 878, at which the Pope himself was present. Pagi, *ad ann.* 692, 16.

FTB6 In Mansi, t. 12. p. 982; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 19. Anastasius (or the Roman Synod under John VIII.) is mistaken in regard to the last statement; for, (a) as we saw, p. 237, the Greek patriarchs were present at the Trullan Council; (b) and the Greeks received unhesitatingly the Trullan canons, as canon I of the seventh Oecumenical Synod shows. Cf. Assemani, *l.c t. 5. p.* 86.

FTB7 Pagi, *ad ann.* 710, 2.

FTB8 Mansi, t. 12. p. 56; sqq.; Hardenin, t. in. p. 1783.

- FTB⁹ From the province of Narbonne we meet only two two bishops, Ervigius of Beziers and Suniagisidus of Lodeve. Why the rest did not come we are told in canon 13.
- FtB¹⁰ Ferreras, *Hist. of Spain*, vol. 2.
- FTB¹¹ On *mancipia*, cf. Du Cange, *Gloss. s.v.* By this are meant farmhouses which have been built by the slaves of the Church (*mancipia*) and their families.
- FTB¹² Cf. Concil. Tolet. 4. 100. 75; Tolet. 5. 100. 4; Tolet. 6. 100. 17; Tolet. 10. 100. 2.
- FTB¹³ Florez (*Espana Sagrada*, t. 6. p. 227) takes this quite literally, as though not a single bishop of the province of Narbonne had been present, and therefore supposes that Ervig, who is mentioned above (p. 243, note 2), who was present at this Synod, was not bishop of Beziers (in the province of Narbonne), but of Caladabria in the province of Mexida. On Suniagisid Ep. *Laniobiensis* (probably = *Lutrebensis*, Lodeve), he says nothing.
- FTB¹⁴ Mansi, t. 12. p. 59 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1786 sqq.; Aguirre, *Concilia Hisp.* t. 2. p. 735 sqq.; Gonzalez, *Coleccion*, etc., Madrid 1849, t. 2. p. 553 sqq.; Gains, *Kircheng. von Spanien*, Bd. 2. Thl. 2. S. 180ff.
- FTB¹⁵ Mansi, t. 12. p. 94 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1810 sq.; Aguirre, *I. c.* p. 752 sqq.; *Coleccion de Canones*, l.c. p. 588 sqq.; Gains, l.c. S. 183.
- FTB¹⁶ On the presence of abbesses at English Councils, cf. vol. 1. p. 24.
- FTB¹⁷ We still possess the brief Acts of this assembly in three draughts, in Mansi, t. 12. p. 87 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1806 sqq. Cf. Montalembert, *Moines de l'Occident*, vol. 5.
- FTB¹⁸ *Cute privari=fustibus caedi*. See Du Cange, s.v. *Cutis*.
- FTB¹⁹ Mansi, t. 12. p. 111; Hardouin, l. c. p. 1818; Bruns, *Biblioth. Eccles.* pt. 2. p. 311. (Hardouin has the older and inferior text.) Cf. Montalembert, l.c.
- FTB²⁰ Mansi, l.c.. p. 107 sqq.; Pagi, *ad ann.* 697, 2.
- FTB²¹ Mansi, t. 12. p. 163; Pagi, *ad ann.* 701, 4; Baron. *ad ann.* 701, 15.
- FTB²² Baronius, *ad ann.* 705, 6, identified this Synod with that at the holding of which Pope John VII. was requested to point out what was amiss in the Trullan canons. See above, p. 240. But, in the first place, it

is not certain that John VII. held such a Synod (Anastasius, who relates the affair, says not a single syllable of the actual holding of a Synod); moreover, the acquittal of Wilfrid belongs to the pontificate of John VI., not VII. Pagi, *ad ann.* 704, 8; 705, 4, 12.

FTB23 John received York. Bose, however, died about this time.

FTB24 The Acts of the three Synods of Easterfield, Rome, and on the Nidd, are found in Mansi, t. 12. pp. 158-174; Hardouin, t. 3. pp. 1822-1828, and are mostly drawn from the old biographies of S. Wilfrid by Eddius. Cf. Monta-lembert, *Moines de l'Occident* [English translation published by Blackwood], vol. 4.; Schrodll, *Das erste Jahrhundert der englischen Kirche*, S. 260-271; Pagi, *ad ann.* 702, 3-6; 704, 8, 9; 705, 4-12.

FTB25 Mansi, t. 12. p. 167; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1823.

FTB26 Cf. Bede, *Hist. Eccles.* 5. 18, ed. Migne, t. 6. p. 261. [Ed. Moberly, Oxon. 1881, p. 329]; Mansi, *l.c.* p. 175.

FTB27 Mansi, *l.c.p.* 178.

FTB28 Mansi, *l.c.p.* 187.

FTB29 Bede, *Hist.* 1. 35; Mansi, t. 12. p. 209.

FTB30 Mansi, *l.c.p.* 210; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 1847; Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 15; 740, 2. Ina's consort, who accompanied him after his abdication on his journey to Rome, was called Ethelburga.

FTB31 Cf. vol. 4. p. 367, note 4; and Rettberg, *Kirchenges. Deutschlands*, Bd. 1. S. 550f.

FTB32 Mansi, *l.c.p.* 251 sqq.

FTB33 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 260; Seiters, *Bonifacius, der Apostel der Deutschen*, 1845, S. 108.

FTB34 Mansi, t. 12. p. 262 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1863; Greith, bishop of S. Gallen, *Gesch. der altirischen Kirche*, 1867, S. 154.

FTB35 In Mansi, *l.c.p.* 267.

FTB36 *Scholae palatinae*= *cohortes variae ad Palatii et Principis custodiam destinae*. Du Cange, thus=Halls for the bodyguard.

FTB37 See Agatho's [epi bogov](#) in Combefis, *Novum Auctuarium*, t. 2., and Mansi, t. 12. p. 190; Hardouin, t. 3. p. 1834; Pagi, *ad ann.* 711, 4 sqq.; 713, 1.

- FTB38 *Libellus Synodices* in Mansi, t. 12. p. 190; Hardouin, t. 5. p. 1542; Pagi, ad ann. 712, 1-7; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 9. S. 449-468.
- FTB39 So Anastasius, in Mansi, t. 12. p. 180.
- FTB40 Cf. Pagi, ad ann. 714, 1, 2. He was not deposed, as Zonaras thought.
- FTB41 *Libellus Synodicus*, in Mansi, *l.c.p.* 255 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 5. p. 1542. The name of John is wrongly added by the inaccurate author of the *Libcellus Synodicus*. He also mentions erroneously the actual Emperor as Apsimar, instead of Artemius or Anastasius. Cf. Walch, *l.c.S.* 471.
- FTB42 Cf. the author's treatise, *Ueber das erste Lustrum des Bilderstreits*, in the Tübingen *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1857, Heft 4.
- FTB43 Justin M. *Dialog*, 100. *Tryph.* 200. 14, 49, 85, 100, 110, ed. Otto; Tertull *De carne Christi*, 100. 9; *Adv. Judaeos*, 100. 14; Clemens Alex. *Paedagog*, lib. 3. 1; *Stromat.* lib. 2. 5, p. 440; lib. 3. 17, p. 559; lib. 6. 17, p. 818, ed. Port; Origen, 100. *Celsum*, lib. 6. 75. Celsus, among other things, had made this representation of the form of the Lord a reproach to the Christians. Cf. Munter, *Sinnbilder u. Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen*, Altona 1825, Heft 2.; Gruneisen, *Ueber die Ursachen des Kunsthasses in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Kunstblatt, 1831, No. 29; and the author's article on 'Pictures of Christ' in the *Kirchenlexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, s.v. *Christusbilder*. A beautiful essay on the use of pictures in the ancient Church is given in Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.* See. 8. Diss. 6. t. 6. p. 91 sqq., ed. Venet. 1778.
- FTB44 Cf. *Kirchenlexicon*, s.v. *Christusbilder*.
- FTB45 See vol. 1. p. 151, 100. 36.
- FTB46 Basillii *Opp.* ed. Garnier, t. 2. p. 141. Cf. Marr, *Der Bilderstreit*, Trier 1839, S. 6, and his article on *Bilder* in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, s.v.
- FTB47 Theophanes, *Chronogr.* ed. Bonn, t. 1.p. 600.
- FTB48 *Spatharius*, from *spatha* = sword, an officer who bears the Emperor's sword, almost = adjutant. Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss.* s.v. *Spatharius*.
- FTB49 Baronius, *ad ann.* 716, 1-3, removes the year of the accession of Leo to 716; Theophanes, on the contrary, almost a contemporary, states (*l.c.* p. 635) that Leo ascended the throne on March 25 of the 15th Indiction. This ran from September 1, 716, to September 1, 717; and therefore the 25th of together and translated, the best edition by

Bekker in the Bonn Collection of Byzantines, t. 2. of the Chronography of Theophanes. On the *Historia Miscella*, which has been falsely ascribed to the deacon Paul, cf. Bahr, *Die christlichen Dichter u. Geschichtschreiber Roms*, 1. S. 152 ff. Of Paul the deacon we use the edition of the Abbe Migne, Paris 1850.

FTB50 Theophanes, *Chronogr.* Ed. Bonn 1839 (in the Collection of the Byzantines), t. i. p. 617. Of his peculiar chronolgy we spoke before, p. 3, note 2.

FTB51 Their works are included in the Bonn (and also in the Paris and Venice) edition of the Byzantines.

FTB52 The *Hist. Eccles.* Of Anastasius is one of the three Byzantines: Nicephorus (patriarch), George Syncellus, and Theophanes, *Chronographia Tripartita*, put together and translate, the best edition by Bekker in the Bonn Collection of Byzantines, t. 2. Of the Chronography of Theophanes. On the *Historia Miscella*, which has been falsely ascribed to the deacon Paul, cf. Bahr, *Die christlichen Dichter u. Geshichtschreiber Roms*, 1. S. 152 ff. Of Paul the deacon we use the edition of the Abbe Migne, Paris 1850.

FTB53 We mention, for brevity's sake, Anastasius Bibliothecarius as author of the *Vitae Pontificum*, although he probably wrote only the smallest part of it himself; and certainly the passages which we have to use in the history of the controversy about images are older than Anastasius.

FTB54 Published in Greek and Latin by Montfaucon in the *Analecta Graeca*, Paris 1688. An old Latin translation of this biography, by Simeon Meta-phrastes, which has a good deal peculiar to itself, was earlier known, and was used already by Baronius, but erroneously ascribed to John Damascene, *ad ann.* 726, 4.

FTB55 Nicephorus Constantinop. *De rebus post Mauritium gestis*, in the Bonn edition of the Byzantines, 1837.

FTB56 A work as offensive through insipid argument as by prejudiced perversion of history.

FTB57 Schlosser, in his *Geschichte der Bildersturmenden Kaiser*, S. 161, calls him wrongly Theophilus of Nacolia, copying a mistake of Baronius.

FTB58 The variations of the Greek text leave it undecided whether Beser was by birth a Syrian, or had come into Syria as a prisoner among the

Saracens. Cf. the notes of P. Goar to Theophanes, t. 2. p. 636 of the Bonn edition.

- FTB59 Germanus, formerly archbishop of Cyzicus, had, under the Emperor Philip Bardanes, held with the opponents of the sixth Oecumenical Synod, but speedily was converted. See above, p. 259.
- FTB60 Preserved in the Acts of the fourth session of Nicaea II., in Mansi, t. 13. p. 99 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 239 sqq.
- FTB61 Mansi, 50. p. 106; Hardouin, 1.100. p. 243.
- FTB62 There were several cities of this name in Asia Minor, thus, *e.g.*, a bishopric of Claudiopolis in Isauria and a metropolitan in Paphlagonia.
- FTB63 In Mansi, t. 13. p. 107 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 246 sqq.
- FTB64 In Mansi, t. 12i. p. 968; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 10.
- FTB65 Mansi, t. 13. p. 198; Hardouin, t. 4. 319. — Schlosser, *I.c.* S. 162 f. says: “The same Caliph Jezid also forbade wine to his Christian subjects, and lays importance on this. But it was not Jezid, but his predecessor Omar who did this, as Theophanes testifies” (*l.c.* p. 614).
- FTB66 Maimbourg adorns, here and elsewhere, the subject in his own way without justification from the authorities.
- FTB67 The two works in question were formerly, by mistake, attributed to S. John of Damascus, and are found among his works, ed. Le Quien, t. 1. p. 625sqq., and p. 633 sqq. Cf. Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10. S. 151-155.
- FTB68 Cf. John 5. Muller, *Allg. Gesch.* Bd. 13. K. 10.; Marr, *Der Bilderstreit*, S. 15 f.; Walch, *I. c.* S. 217.
- FTB69 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 622; Nicephorus, *De rebus post Mauritium gestis*, in the Bonn ed. of the Byzantines, 1837, p. 64, and all later editions.
- FTB70 In Mansi, t. 12. p. 960; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 5.
- FTB71 In Baron. *ad ann.* 726, 4.
- FTB72 Baron. *ad ann.* 726, 5.
- FTB73 So Walch, *I. c.* S. 225; and Neander, K.G. Bd. 3. S. 287.
- FTB74 A so-called miracle-working image, which once gave bail for a pious sailor Theodore, who was required to raise some money:
 ajti fwnhthv =Bail, security. Cf. Walch, *I. c.* S. 178 and 183; Pagi, *ad ann.* 730, 5.
- FTB75 Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 9; 730, 3, 5, 6; Walch, *I. c.* S. 199, 201.

FTB76 Mansi, t. 12. p. 969; Hardouin, t 4. p. 11.

FTB77 *Nun de-þoþeiv o[ai kai-þl hgh twa l awa ej o[igw|peri < toutou qorubw|tugcanousin.* Mansi, t. 13. p. 124; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 260.

FTB78 The *Synodicon*, and after that Spanheim and others, erroneously make a Synod of this meeting.

FTB79 On this building, famed for its beauty, in which at the Christmas festival the Emperor dined, not *sedendo*, but *recumbendo*, cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 730, 1.

FTB80 According to John Damascene, Orat. it. *de Imag.* c. 12, Germanus was beaten, and banished from the country. According to the biography of Abbot Stephen, he was even strangled.

FTB81 Cf. the author's article on *Christusbilder* in Wetzer and Welte, and in his *Beitrage*, Bd. 2. S. 256 f.

FTB82 [It is sufficient merely to note that this phrase now appears, an advance upon the Greek *geotokov* = God-bearer.]

FTB83 Mansi, t 13. p. 91 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 231 sqq.

FTB84 Pentapolis consists of the district of the five cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Umana, and Ancona. Cf. Muratori, *Hist. Italy*, vol. 4.

FTB85 The names of the cities are given somewhat differently by Paul the deacon, *Hist. Longob.* lib. 6. 100. 49. Muratori (*Hist. Italy*, vol 4.) says on this subject: "So much may be learnt from these words, that the city of Osimo (*Auxi-manum*) is distinguished from Pentapolis, *Feronianum* or Fregnano was a province of the Duchy of Modena, in the mountain range in which Sestola, Fanano, and other places lie. *Mons Bellius* is Monte Beglio or Monte Vio, in the chain of Bononia [Bologna], near the river Samoggia. Verablo and Busso, or Busseta, are perhaps falsified names, for it cannot be Busseto, which lies between Parma and Piacenza towards the Po, since it is incredible that the Lombards, as masters of the neighboring cities, should have put off the taking of this place until this time. Persicetum is a strip of country which, in ancient times, belonged to the county of Modena. The excellent estate of San Giovanni in Persiceto in the Bononian district has retained that name until now."

FTB86 What cities these were, Muratori examines, *l.c.*

FTB87 In Mansi, t. 12. pp. 229-232.

- FTB88 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 631; cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 10; Walch, *l. c.* S. 261.
- FTB89 Walch, *l. c.* S. 248, and Bd. 9. S. 459 f., shows, in reference to the refusal of the taxes, that the Pope had behaved similarly towards the Emperor Philippicus Bardanes, because he was a heretic. But it is to be observed that then it was the Roman *people*, and not the Pope, who refused obedience to the Emperor.
- FTB90 Natalis Alexander wrote a special treatise, *De Gregorii II erga Leonem Imp. moderatione*, *Hist. Eccl.* Sec. 8. Diss. 1. t. 6. p. 72 sqq., ed. Venet. 1778. This subject has been further handled, although sometimes with very different conclusions, by Baron. *ad ann.* 730, 5; Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 10-18; 730, 8-11; Bower, *Hist. of Popes*, vol. 4.; Walch, *l. c.* Bd. 10. S. 263-283.
- FTB91 In Mansi, t. 12. p. 524; Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 13; Walch, *l.c.* S. 255.
- FTB92 Walch, *l.c.* Bd. 10. S. 288 ff.
- FTB93 In the passage in Anastasius, we should certainly read *captos* instead of *captas*.
- FTB94 Decapolis consisted of ten cities of the exarchate of Ravenna, united for mutual protection, namely, Ravenna, Classis, Caesarea, Cervia, Cesena, Forlimpopuli, Forli, Bologna, Faenza.
- FTB95 Mansi, t. 12. p. 970 sq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 11. See below, p. 293 f.
- FTB96 Venice belonged then to the Byzantine emperors: see Muratori, *l.c.*; Walch, *l.c.* S. 245 f.
- FTB97 Mansi, t. 12. p. 244; Baron. *ad ann.* 726, 27. Muratori, *l.c.*, suggests some doubts as to the genuineness of this letter.
- FTB98 Walch, *l. c.* S. 248, Anm.
- FTB99 P. 621.
- FTB100 *Bibliothek der Kirchengvater*, Bd. 10. S. 475.
- FTB101 Cf. on the other side, Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 5, and Walch, *l.c.* S. 173f.
- FTB102 Cf. the author's articles on on *Abgar Uchomo* and *Christusbilder* in the *Kirchenlexicon* of Wetzer and Welte; and his *Beitrage zur Kircheng.* Bd. 2. S. 259 f.
- FTB103 Since the Emperor had previously written: "Cursed be he who removes the ordinances of the Fathers."

FTB104 Gregory thinks the Emperor, in order to facilitate the recall, should lay the blame upon the Pope and the patriarch, as if they had given him wrong counsel in regard to the images. So I believe we must understand this difficult passage, which is repeated more clearly in the second letter of the Pope.

FTB105 Gregory says nothing of the fact that Ravenna by his management was retaken by the help of the Venetians (see p. 287 f.). He is also silent on the fact of his having pacified the rebels in Italy, and restrained them from the appointment of a new Emperor. His letter seems, accordingly, to have been composed before those occurrences.

FTB106 Twenty-four stadia amount to about half a geographical mile. Several doubt whether the Lombards had come so near to Rome, and suppose some error of transcription in the number. Cf. Muratori, *l.c.*

FTB107 In Hardouin and Mansi, by a misprint, the word is *duasai*. Baronius has it correctly, *duatai*

FTB108 Perhaps a German prince converted by Boniface. Du Cange (s.v. *Septetus*) supposes that it should perhaps be called *Mepetus*, which would be identical with *Mepe*= *Iberorum regis dignitas ac appellatio*.

FTB109 Mansi, t. 12. p. 959 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 1 sqq.; Baron. *ad ann.* 726.

FTB110 Meaning: "You have left the people that which was hurtful to them, and with this they will henceforth occupy themselves. But that which was useful to them you have taken from them." Rosler thinks (*l.c.* S. 491): "According to this passage, Leo wanted to give the people, and in the church, instead of the pictures, something else for their instruction." He was thinking of the paintings of landscapes and the pictures of birds which the Emperor Constantine Copronymus had set up in place of the religious pictures, for the decoration of the walls. See below, sec. 337.

FTB111 Localities in the church, evidently for penitents. Cf. Binterim *Denkw.* Bd. 5. Thl. 3. S. 13 f.

FTB112 Mansi, t. 12. p. 975 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 13 sqq.; Baronius in the Appendix, *ad ann.* 726.

FTB113 Pagi, *ad ann.* 726, 6. The argument of Pagi is disfigured by two misprints. In the passage cited, 2. 6, Indiction 14. is printed twice for 15. The first time in the words: Leo, raised to be Emperor on March

25, 715, wrote to Pope Gregory a letter, *Indictione* 14., *quae eo anno in cursu erat*. It must be 15., for the 15th Indiction ran from September 1, 716, to September 1, 717; and Pagi puts it correctly, *ad ann.* 717, 2; 726, 3, 4, 5. A similar mistake is made towards the end of the quotation of No. 6.

FTB114 Baronius, *ad ann.* 716, 1.

FTB115 Cf. Schlosser, *l.c.* S. 143, and the notes of Petavius to Nicephori *Breviarium de rebus post Mauritium gestis*, ed. Bonn, p. 127; several other witnesses are brought forward for the year 716, or Indiction 14., as the beginning of the government of Leo.

FTB116 Mansi, t. 12. p. 267; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 805.

FTB117 Pagi assigned it naturally to the year 730. Pagi, *Breviar. Historico-crit.* t. 1. 529 sq.

FTB118 Cf. the letter of Hadrian I. to Charles the Great. Hardouin, t. 4. p. 778.

FTB119 In his *Vita Gregorii* III, in Mansi, t. 12. p. 271 sqq.

FTB120 To this Synod is related, as Mansi, t. 12i. p. 299, thinks, a still existing stone in the *Cryptis Vaticanis*, the inscription on which commemorates a Synod at the beginning of the pontificate of Gregory III.

FTB121 Grado and Ravenna were under the Byzantine Emperor, but held fast to the veneration of images.

FTB122 Mansi, t. 12. p. 299 sqq. According to a notice in the *Epitome Chronicorum Casinensium*, this Synod gave orders to the cities of Orleans and le Mans, under penalty of excommunication, to restore the relics of S. Benedict and S. Scholastica to the monastery of Casinum.

FTB123 *Vitae Pontif.* in Mansi, t. 12. p. 271 sqq,

FTB124 Theophanes. *l.c.* p. 631; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10 S, 260 f.

FTB125 Pagi, *ad ann.* 730, 11, 12; Walch, *l. c.* S. 262. The latter properly remarks that this happens, not as Pagi assumes, in the year 730, but in 732. The witnesses of this separation are the Popes Hadrian I. and Nicolas I., from whose letters Pagi adduces the passages relating to the subject verbally.

- FTB126 Extracts from these three discourses are given by Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* Bd. 20. S. 537 ff., and Neander, *Kirchengesch.* Bd. 3. S. 290 ff.
- FTB127 *Vita Joann. Damasc.* by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, in Le Quien, *Opp.* S. Joann. Damasc. t. 1.100. 14 sqq. Walch, *l.c.* S. 156 ff., 236 ff.
- FTB128 He received the surname of **Koprwahmov** (from **koprov**, dung) because, when a child, he dirtied the water at his baptism. Cf. Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, ed. Bonn, t. 1.p. 615. He was also called *Cabellinus*, from his fondness for horses.
- FTB129 The principal sources for the history of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus are his contemporaries, Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonn, t. 1. p. 637 sqq., and Nicephorus, *De rebus post Mauritium gestis*, ed. Bonn, p. 86 sqq. Partially also the later Greek historians Cedrenus, Zonaras, and others from the eleventh and twelfth centuries.
- FTB130 Mansi, t. xii. p. 308.
- FTB131 The day of the taking of Constantinople is given by Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 647, quite exactly; but the year is doubtful. Cf. Pagi, ad *ann.* 743, 18; Walch, *l. c.* S. 358.
- FTB132 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 653; Nicephorus, *De rebus post Mauritium gestis*, ed. Bonn, p. 71.
- FTB133 On the journey of Stephen into France, Oelsner treats at length in the Year-books of the Frankish kingdom under King Pipin, Leipzig 1871, S. 115 ff.
- FTB134 So the seventh Synod named the iconoclasts, because they calumniously accused the orthodox of idolatry.
- FTB135 Printed in Mansi, t. 13. pp. 205-363; Hardouin, t. 4. pp. 325-443. In both collections the very words of the Conciliabulum are given in italics. The old Latin translation of these Acts, by Anastasius, is found in Mansi, *l. c.* p. 652sqq., and Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 680sqq. Schlosser, who had a collection of the Councils before him, that of Coleti, but was not familiar with it, is acquainted only with this translation, and knows nothing of the original text, which, however, he says, is not necessary, "as here nothing depends upon a word" (!) *Geschichte der bildersturmenden Kaiser*, S. 214.
- FTB136 Constantine was married (A.D. 733) by his father, from policy, to a princess of the Khazars, who received in baptism the name of Irene.

She must not be confounded with her namesake and daughter-in-law, the celebrated Irene the friend of images. But she was also a hater of iconoclasm. Cf. Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 631.

FTB137 It seems that many seized the opportunity of making more than an *alteration!*

FTB138 In the confutation appended to these Acts of the Conciliabulum which was read at Nicaea, it is mentioned that George was born in Cyprus, renounced his property, lived in apostolic poverty, and bore patiently much ill-treatment (because he defended the images). He was probably a monk, but we know nothing more about him. Baronius (*ad ann.* 754, 32) confounded him with Bishop George of Antioch, who was certainly exiled on account of his defense of the images, but not until the following century, by the Emperor Leo the Armenian. Cf. Pagi, *ad ann.* 754, 20. All that has been discovered on this George is collected by Leo Allatius in his *Diatriba de Georgiis*, printed in the *Biblioth. Graeca* of Fabricius, ed. Harless, t. 12. p. 14 sqq. In the older edd. t. 10.

FTB139 Perhaps with reference to the fact that he held with the Monothelite under the Emperor Philippicus Bardanes. Cf. above, p. 257 f.

FTB140 Mansi, t. 12. p. 578; Hardouin, t. 5. p. 1542.

FTB141 Walch, *Ketzerhist* Bd. 10. S. 342 f.

FTB142 Niceph., ed. Bonn, p. 85.

FTB143 *Vita Stephani* in the *Analecta Graeca* of the Benedictines of S. Maur, 1686, t. i. p. 445 f. and 454. Cf. Walch, *l.c.* S. 340 ff., and Pagi, *ad ann.* 754, 13.

FTB144 Zonaras, *Annal.* lib. 15. in Walch, *l.c.* S. 337.

FTB145 *Vita Stephani*, *l.c.* t. i. pp. 401 and 447. Also in Pagi, *ad ann.* 754, 14.

FTB146 Baronius, *ad ann.* 761, 15.

FTB147 Cf. Theophanes, *l.c.* pp. 662 and 664 sq.

FTB148 The uncertainty in the chronology arises from this, that the letters from the Popes to Charles Martel, Pipin the Short, and Charles the Great, collected in the *Codex Carolinus*, have no chronological data. Pagi and Muratori differ widely in their attempts to fix the date of each letter. Cf. Muratori, *Hist. of Italy*, vol. 4. The best edited is the *Codex*

Carolinus (A.D. 791), in Cenni, *Monumenta Dominationis Pontificiae*, etc., Rom. 1760, reprinted in the ninety-eighth volume of the *Cursus Patrol.* of Migne, also in Mansi, *Collect. Concil.* t. 12. p. 282 sqq.; only that here the collection is broken up, and each single piece introduced under the letters of the Pope in question.

FTB149 Pagi, *ad ann.* 758, 3 sqq.

FTB150 Pagi, *ad ann.* 758, 1.

FTB151 *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris, t. 8. illustrata a Josepho van Hecke, Benamino Bossue, Victore de Buck, Antonio Tinnebrock, S. J., presbyteris theologis, Bruxellis 1853, p. 124 sqq.

FTB152 Pagi (*ad ann.* 761, 2) denied that the second Greek martyrology proceeded from Metaphrastes, appealing to Leo Allatius, *de Simeonionibus*. But Allatius, at p. 128 of this work, ascribes it expressly to Metaphrastes, as the Bollandists (*l.c.* p. 126) remark.

FTB153 Theophanes, *l.c.p.* 667.

FTB154 On the Kalybitae, cf. the remarks of Bollandus at January 15 of the *Acta Sanctorum*.

FTB155 *Acta Sanctor.* Oct. t. 8. p. 128.

FTB156 *Vita Stephani l.c.* p. 507, and *Acta SS. l.c.* p. 130.

FTB157 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 667.

FTB158 Abbot Stephen knew that George was of the Court, for all those holding situations at the Court were required to be shaved smooth, which seems to the biographer of S. Stephen (*l.c.* 470) very unseemly, or even sinful, as an offense against Leviticus 19, 27, and an attempt to conceal the age.

FTB159 Under the Emperor Phocas (†610) the Praetorium was turned into a great prison.

FTB160 *Vita Stephani, l. c.* p. 500.

FTB161 The monks of Constantinople and its neighborhood had in the mass gone abroad, but many remained behind in concealment (p. 317), and endeavored to make the people adhere to the images.

FTB162 The principal points of the history of S. Stephen are given to us also by Theophanes (*l. c.* p. 674) and Nicephorus (*l.c.* p. 81).

FTB163 *Vita Stephani, l.c.* p. 504. Cf. the new volume of the Bollandists, t. 8. Octobr. p. 127.

- FTB164 This Michael Lachanodracon is also mentioned by Theophanes, *l.c.* pp. 681, 688.
- FTB165 *Vita Stephani*, p. 505 sq.; *Acta SS. l.c.* p. 127 sq.
- FTB166 Many were named Stylites, not because they lived *on* pillars, but *in* cells which had the form of a pillar. Thus the cell of S. Stephen, which he erected for himself in Proconnesus, is called a ~~stul~~ *oeide* ~~mikron~~ *egkleistron*. Cf. *Vita Stephani, l.c.* p. 486; *Acta SS. l.c.* p. 132, and t. 1. Januar. p. 262.
- FTB167 *Acta SS. l.c.* pp. 128b, 141, and 148.
- FTB168 *Acta SS. l.c.* p. 132, and *Martyrolog.* ed. Baron. et Rosweid. Antwerp 1613, p. 440, n. d.
- FTB169 *Acta SS. l.c.* p. 130b. The Greek Kalendars also refer to a Princess Anthusa and her governess, also named Anthusa, who had both been rams, and had distinguished themselves by their zeal for the images. But doubts have been raised as to their existence. Cf. Baron. *ad ann.* 775, 5, 6; Walch, *l.c.* S. 412.
- FTB170 Theophan. *l.c.* pp. 676, 678; Nicephor. *De Rebus post Mauritium gestis*, ed. Bonn, pp. 81, 83.
- FTB171 Theophan. *l.c.* pp. ,584, 688, 689.
- FTB172 Theophan. *l.c.* p. 676; Nicephor. *l.c.* p. 83; Zonaras, lib. 15. 100. 5.
- FTB173 *Vita Stephani, l.c.* p. 443; Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 675, Nicephor. *l.c.* p. 82.
- FTB174 Theophan. *l.c.* pp 678, 684.
- FTB175 Theophan. *l.c.* p. 671.
- FTB176 Theophan. *l.c.* pp. 678, 680, 681, 686; Nicephor. *l.c.* p. 83 sq.
- FTB177 This took place in the hall of the nineteen *accubitorum* (see above, p. 277), which Damberger, *Synchronist. Gesch.* Bd. 2. S. 402, and *Kritikheft*, S. 162, mistook for a throne 19 ells high.
- FTB178 Theophan. *l.c.* p. 663.
- FTB179 Mansi, t. 12. p. 271; Hardouin, t. 5. p. 1542; *Acta SS.* t. 5. Junii, p. 184 sqq. The principal passage of the latter is printed in Mansi, t. 12. p. 680.
- FTB180 Mansi, t. 12. p. 1136 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 142 sqq.
- FTB181 Mansi, t. 12. pp. 760 and 680; Pagi, *ad ann.* 767, 5.

FTB182 In his memorial in defense of the seventh OEcumenical Synod, in Mansi, t. 13. p. 764; Hardouin, t. 4. p. 778.

FTB183 Mansi, t. 12. p. 613 sqq. The time of the composition of the particular parts in the *Codex Carolinus*, and so also that of No. 26, is doubtful, as is well known; but if; as we believe, the *concilium mixtum* then brought before us is identical with the Synod of Gentilly, then No. 26 must belong to the year 766 or the beginning of 767.

FTB184 Collected by Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 11. S. 9 ff.; partially in Mansi, t. 12. p. 677; Harouin, t. 2. p. 2012; Pagi, *ad ann.* 766, 3. The mistaken notice of Baronius, who placed the Synod in the year 766, was opposed even by Pagi (*l.c.*), but, in spite of this, it was renewed by Mansi (*l.c.*); but he was also opposed by Walch, *l.c.* S. 13 f.

FTB185 Mansi, t. 12. p. 604. Muratori and others remove this letter to the year 764, but Walch (Bd. 11. S. 18) saw correctly that it was certainly written *after* the holding of the Synod of Gentilly, and refers to this.

FTB186 We learn this from the *Vita Stephani* III. in Mansi, t. 12. p. 680, and more fully from the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 769 edited by Cenni. See below, sec. 343.

FTB187 Mansi, t. 12. pp. 757 and 712.

FTB188 Christopher, as is clear from the Lateran Synod of A.D. 769, was *Primicerius Notariorum* [Primus in ceram relatus — the first entered on the wax tablet; see *Dict. of Antiq. s.v.*], the first among the seven Court officials of the Pope (*Palatini*), at the same time *Judex palatinus*, a cleric, but in minor orders or a sub-deacon, which *ordo* was then reckoned among the *minores*. See Cenni, *Praefatio in Concil. Lateran.* in Mansi, t. 12. p. 707 sq.

FTB189 Cf. *Vita Stephani* III. in Mansi, t. 12. p. 683 sq. The eyes of the Lombard priest Waldipert were also put out, and his tongue cut out, because he had plotted a conspiracy for the murder of Christopher.

FTB190 *Vita Stephani* III in Mansi, t. 12. pp. 680-685, also in Baronius, *ad ann.* 768, 1-11. It is incorrect to maintain with Luden (*Gesch. des teutschen Volkes*, Bd. 4. S. 252), that only Charles, and not also Carlmann, sent bishops from his part of the Empire to the Synod. The *Vita Stephani* (*l.c.*) not only speaks of *both* Kings, but also the names of the twelve Frankish bishops (of whom later on) show clearly that several belonged to the kingdom of Carlmann. The latter had received the South: Burgundy, Provence, Languedoc, Alsace, and the Alemanni;

and therefore the bishoprics of Lyons and Narbonne certainly belonged to his part of the Empire.

FTB191 Mansi, t. 12. pp. 703-721.

FTB192 Hermenbert can certainly not have been the actual bishop of Salzburg, for the Salzburg catalogues do not contain this name; but as Bavaria was almost without bishops in those times, the church of Salzburg was governed for many years only by the abbots of S. Peter, without their being bishops. In this time without bishops, travelling bishops, or those who had been driven from their sees, were frequently requested to discharge episcopal functions in Salzburg, and Cenni believes (*l.c.* pp. 67, 71) that Hermenbert was one of these strangers who was temporarily living in Salzburg. But this supposition is very uncertain.

FTB193 As the work of Cenni here quoted is so rare, and as in the great collection of Mansi the geographical treatise of Cenni is lacking, I have thought it well to communicate the results in this place.

FTB194 Damberger, *Synchron. Gesch.* Bd. 2. S. 415, says, indeed: "Only *one* *deacon* forgot himself so far as to strike the blind speaker on the mouth." He gives no authority for this; and Anastasius says: "Universi sacerdotes (bishops) alapis ejus cervicem caedere facientes eum extra eandem ecclesiam ejecerunt."

FTB195 "Marianus Scotus, through a misunderstanding, states that the *members* of the Conciliabulum were burnt.

FTB196 The words of the Synod relating to this were taken into the *Corpus juris canonici*, c. 4, Dist. 79.

FTB197 In the *Corpus jur. can.* 100. 3, Dist. 79.

FTB198 Partly taken into the *Corpus jur. can.* 100. 5, Dist. 79.

FTB199 Mansi, t. 12. p. 713 sqq., and p. 685 sqq.

FTB200 He was an able soldier, and in particular the capital city, Constantinople, flourished under him. The great aqueduct which he caused to be built was an object of admiration long after it lay in ruins.

ftc1 Theophan. *l.c.* p. 693 sq.

ftc2 Theophan. *l.c.* p. 695 sq.

ftc3 Theophanes, *l.c.* pp. 701, 708.

ftc4 [Chief of the guards.]

- ^{ftc5} Schlosser (*l. c.* S. 257) quite erroneously makes these Court officials to be Court chaplains.
- ^{ftc6} Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 701.
- ^{ftc7} Theophanes, *l. c.* p. 702.
- ^{ftc8} Theophanes, *l.c.*p. 703.
- ^{ftc9} Walch, Bd. 10:S. 468, transposes this into the year 783, whilst, at S. 530, he himself gives the year correctly as 784. Theophanes says (*pp.* 707 and 713) quite clearly that the resignation of Paul took place August 31 of Indict. 7, and the elevation of Tarasius on December 25 of Indict. 8 The 7th Indiction ran from September 1, 783, to September 1, 784.
- ^{ftc10} Theophanes *l.c.*p. 708 sq.
- ^{ftc11} Mansi, t. 12 p. 985sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4:p. 23 sqq. In regard to the close of this document, there is found in Mansi (*l.c.p.* 989) the remark: The rest are the words of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who, as is known, translated the Acts of the seventh Council. But in truth the greater part of this addition is taken from Theophanes. Moreover, Mansi gives this remark as a note of Hardouin's; but in his own collection of Councils it does not occur.
- ^{ftc12} In Baron. *ad ann.* 784, 12. In all the editions of Baronius to which the writer had access, there is, at the beginning of this No. 12, a typographical error which misrepresents the meaning. Baronius here quotes a passage from the biography of Tarasius by Ignatius, and we should read: "*Cum vero idem, inquit Ignatius, per novae dignitatis gradum,*" etc. In Baronius, however, the comma stands *before* Ignatius, and this word itself is printed in italics, as if the reference were to Ignatius.
- ^{ftc13} In Mansi, t. 12:pp. 1119-1127; Hardouin, t. 4:p. 130sqq.
- ^{ftc14} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1128; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 135.
- ^{ftc15} Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 1076-1077; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 95-98.
- ^{ftc16} By this we must correct the generally diffused error (*e.g.*, Pagi, *ad ann.* 785, 4; Walch, *l.e.S.* 532), that the bishop of Naples was sent to Rome.
- ^{ftc17} Mansi, *l.c.p.* 984 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.p.* 21 sqq.
- ^{ftc18} Mansi, t. 12 p. 1076 sq.; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 95 sq.
- ^{ftc19} Mansi, *l.c.p.* 1073; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 94.

- ^{ftc20} Mansi, t. 12 p. 1055 sqq.; Hardouin, 4 p. 79 sqq.
- ^{ftc21} In this passage the Greek text departs from the Latin principally in this, that, along with Peter, it mentions also Paul, and designates the Roman Church as the Church of both, and weakens the expressions which testify for the primacy.
- ^{ftc22} Anastasius Bibliothecarius writes in the preface to his translation of the Nicene Acts: "During my stay in Constantinople I often blamed the Greeks on account of this title, and accused them of pride. But they replied that they called the patriarch of Constantinople Ecumenical, not in the sense *quod universi orbis teneat praesulatum*, but *quod cuidam parti praesit orbis*, for **oikoumenh** signified not merely the circle of the world, but also habitation and inhabited place." Mansi, t. 12 p. 983; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 20.
- ^{ftc23} Hadrian had baptized a son of Charles, A.D. 781, and had then changed his name of Carlmann into Pipin.
- ^{Ftc24} See vol. 4:p. 98, note.
- ^{ftc25} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1081; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 99.
- ^{ftc26} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1077; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 98.
- ^{ftc27} These were then Politian (Balatianus) of Alexandria, Theodoret of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem.
- ^{ftc28} The superscription runs: "The **ajcierei** of the East greet the most holy Lord and Archbishop Tarasius of Constantinople, Ecumenical patriarch." If anyone translates **ajcierei** by patriarchs, he must have found a contradiction between this superscription and the contents, for in this monks are designated as the authors of the letter. But the word **ajcierei** designates, not merely archbishops and patriarchs, but, even now among the Greeks, priests of higher rank generally, who usually lived in monasteries.
- ^{ftc29} Where is not indicated. Walch (S. 553) supposes in Palestine. I should think, rather in Egypt, as the monk Thomas, of whom we hear later on, belonged to an Egyptian monastery.
- ^{ftc30} Thomas, in his subscription at the Council at Nicaea, calls himself priest and hegumenus of the monastery of S. Arsenius in Egypt. John, who always subscribes before him, calls himself "priest and patriarchal Syncellus, representative of the three patriarchs," without intimation of the patriarchate to which *in specie* he belonged. Theophanes, who also

(p. 714) speaks of this affair, maintains that John had been Syncellus of the patriarch of Antioch, distinguished for virtue and knowledge; but Thomas he calls an Alexandrian, and remarks that he became bishop of Thessalonica

^{ftc31} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1128 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 135 sqq.

^{ftc32} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1136 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 142 sqq. Cf. above, p. 329.

^{ftc33} The principal authority on these events, the *suggraphē* among the Acts of the seventh Synod, calls them *Cristianokathgōrou* = accusers of the Christians, because they charged the Christians with idolatry, and says that there were many of them. The Patriarch Tarasius, on the contrary, at the first session of Nicaea, speaks of "bishops easily numbered, whose names he willingly passed over."

^{ftc34} Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10:S. 534, interprets this to mean that they had left the city; but that which follows shows that they remained in the place and continued to intrigue.

^{ftc35} Built by Constantine the Great, renovated and splendidly decorated by Justinian and his consort. It lies in the interior of the city. It contained also the graves of the Emperors. It was plundered by the Latins, A.D. 1204, and destroyed by the Turks, A.D. 1463.

^{ftc36} The *suggraphē* says: *ej tw̄ outhri thv agiav kaqol ikhv ejkkl hsiav* which does not, however, mean the cathedral.

^{ftc37} Theophanes (*l. c.* p. 714) gives August 17 expressly. Schlosser (S. 288) gives erroneously, the 7th; when Tarasius says, it took place *kata tax kal andav tou Augoustou* this is a vague statement.

^{ftc38} So he says himself, Mansi, t. 12 p. 1000; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 84.

^{ftc39} The meaning is plain: "The iconoclastic Synod of the year 754 is not Ecumenical, because at the beginning no patriarch was present, and afterwards only the patriarch of Constantinople." Schlosser (S. 285) (did not understand this, and built upon the misunderstanding the highly arbitrary hypothesis, that it was meant by those words to represent the two monks John and Thomas as deputies of the Oriental patriarchs, and this had rendered the soldiers (the sensitive janissaries) indignant.

^{ftc40} The lamentation of Schlosser over this is derided by Damberger, *Synchron. Gesch.* Bd. 2, *Kritikheft*, S. 184.

- ftc41 We owe this information (besides the already quoted [suggrafh](#) to Theophanes (*l.c.*), to the Patriarch Tarasius (Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1000; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 34), to the biography of Plato by Theodore Studites (*Acta SS.*, April, t. 1 p. 366 sqq.), to the *Vita Tarasii*, in Baron. *ad ann.* 786, 2, and to a letter of Hadrian, in Mansi, t. 13 p. 808; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 818.
- ftc42 On the convoking of the seventh Ecumenical Synod, and the *praesidium* at the same, there is a special treatise by Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.* Diss. 3 in Sec. 8:t. 6 p. 83 sqq., ed. Venet. 1778. Cf. *Hist. of Councils*, vol. 1 pp. 14 and 30.
- ftc43 Cf. Walch, Bd. 10 S. 551-558.
- ftc44 The sees founded by the apostles in the East are, like the Roman, called apostolic.
- ftc45 In his letter to Pope Leo III, in Mansi, t. 14 p. 50; Hardouin t. 4 p. 995.
- ftc46 Mansi, t. 13 p. 474, and t. 12 p. 1052; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 521 and 75.
- ftc47 Its Acts in Mansi, t. 12 pp. 992-1052, and Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 27-75. Theophanes, who was himself present at this Synod, gives the 11th October as the date of the first session (p. 717); but the synodal Acts must receive the preference as authorities, particularly as they give the date at each session, and yet must often have been wrong, since they place *six* sessions before October 11.
- ftc48 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1000; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 33.
- ftc49 Schlosser (S. 291) misunderstood the contents of this Sacra.
- ftc50 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 1001 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 35 sqq.
- ftc51 Schlosser (*l.c.* S. 292) is surprised that this formula contained not a word on the most important doctrines of the faith, and, on the other hand, so much the more in respect to the veneration of images. But the latter was the only matter in question.
- ftc52 Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 1008-1052; Hardouin, *l. c.* pp. 39-75.
- ftc53 In Mansi, t. 12 p. 1086, instead of the meaningless [ajatiqemenon](#) we read [ajatiqemenoi](#)
- ftc54 Mansi, t. 12 pp. 1052-1112; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 75-123.
- ftc55 It is certainly only by an oversight that Bishop George of Pisidia is not again named. See p. 363.

- ^{ftc56} Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 1113-1154; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 123-158.
- ^{ftc57} Cf. the author's treatise on Representations of Christ (*Christusbilder*) in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, s.v.; and his *Beitrage zur Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. 2, S. 256 f.
- ^{ftc58} Cf. the author's *Beitrage zur Kirchenges.* Bd. 2: S. 258 f.; *Kirchenlex. u.s.*; Pagi, *ad ann.* 787, 5.
- ^{ftc59} Mansi, t. 13 pp. 1-127; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 158-262.
- ^{ftc60} Mansi, t. 13 p. 130; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 263.
- ^{ftc61} Mansi, *l. c.* pp. 134-156; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 266-288.
- ^{ftc62} The Phantasiasti and Theopaschites are, however, not identical, but two different offshoots from Monophysitism. See vol. 3 pp. 458 and 459.
- ^{ftc63} This letter of Eusebius is in Mansi, *l. c.* p. 314; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 406.
- ^{ftc64} Cf. the author's article, *Christusbilder*, in Wetzer and Welte, and in his *Beitrage zur Kirchengesch.* Bd. 2 S. 257 f.
- ^{ftc65} Cf. the Dissert. 1of Cave, in the Appendix to his *Histor. litterar.* p 169.
- ^{ftc66} Mansi, t. 13 pp. 157-202; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 286-823.
- ^{ftc67} Mansi, t. 13 pp. 205-364; Hardouin, t. 4 pp. 325-444.
- ^{ftc68} Only by an oversight does Walch maintain (Bd. 10 S. 440) that the Greek text of the minutes of this session has been lost.
- ^{ftc69} The Acts say: "of Taurianum in Sicily." As Taurianum lay, not on the island of Sicily, but in Lower Italy, in the country of the Bruttii, the expression Sicily must have been then also taken in a wider sense.
- ^{ftc70} It is lacking in the Greek text; on the other hand, *filioque* is found in the Latin version of Anastasius. In the fifth session of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (October 16, 1438), the Latins showed an MS. of the sixth Ecumenical Synod, in which the kai ek tou uiou was read also in the Greek text. They wished to infer from this that our Synod had already made this addition. But the Greek scholar, Gemistius Pletho, remarked that, if this were so, then the theologians of the Latins, *e.g.* Thomas of Aquinum, would long ago have appealed to this Synod, and not have spent an ocean of words in order to find a foundation for the *filioque*. Cf. the author's treatise on "Union of the Greek Church," Art. 2 in the Tübingen *Quartalschrift*, 1847, S. 211, and *Conciliengeschichte*, Bd. 7 S. 685.

- ^{ftc71} It is well known that Copronymus turned monasteries into taverns.
- ^{ftc72} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 374 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 451 sqq.
- ^{ftc73} Basil of Ancyra also refers to him in the *Libellus* which he presented to the seventh Ecumenical Synod. According to this, Basil was from Pisidia (probably a bishop), and had great influence with the Emperor Constantine Copronymus. Mansi, t. 12 p. 1009; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 41. Basil Tricaccabus was also among those who sent Copronymus to the Abbot Stephen, to gain him over to a recognition of Conciliabulum; Baronius, *ad ann.* 754, 26; Pagi, *ad ann.* 754, 17.
- ^{ftc74} Mansi, t. 13 p. 398 sqq.; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 470 sq. These very three men were anathematised by the Conciliabulum of A.D. 754.
- ^{ftc75} If, nevertheless, later school men recognized a *cultus latræ* to the image of Christ and the cross, they yet referred the *latræ* to the Lord Himself. Baronius, *ad ann.* 787, 42.
- ^{ftc76} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 399 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 471 sqq.
- ^{ftc77} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 407 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 478.
- ^{ftc78} That they subscribed several copies of the οἶον we learn from the fact that, according to the testimony of Anastasius (in *Vita Adriani I*, Mansi, t. 12 p. 741), the papal legates took back such a copy with them to Rome.
- ^{ftc79} Mansi, t. 13 p. 414 sqq.; Hardouin, *l. c.* p. 482 sqq. In the translation of Anastasius, the minutes of this session, with the exception of the 22 canons, are wanting.
- ^{ftc80} Ignatius in *Vita Tarasii*, in Baronius, *ad ann.* 787, 55.
- ^{ftc81} Pagi, *ad ann.* 787, 6.
- ^{ftc82} Commentaries on these canons are given by the old Greek commentators, Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus (reprinted in Beveridge's *Synodicon*, t. i p. 284 sqq.), and by Van Espen, *Commentar. in canones et decreta juris*, etc., Colon. 1755, p. 457 sqq.
- ^{ftc83} Mansi, t. 13 pp. 442-458; Hardouin, t. 4 p. 501 sqq., only in Latin
- ^{ftc84} Mansi, *l. c.* p. 458 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 507 sqq.
- ^{ftc85} Mansi, *l.c.* p. 461 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 511 sqq. From this concluding sentence alone it is clear that Tarasius could not possibly have brought the accusation of simony against the Pope himself, as Baronius (*ad ann.* 787, 60, 61) inferred in consequence of an inaccurate translation.

In the Greek text Tarasius thus addressed the Pope: h̄joūn aj̄del fikh< ūthw̄n aj̄cieropreph̄ aj̄iosun̄h ej̄qesmw̄v kai <kata q̄eou~ boūhsin prutaneuousa th̄ ej̄arcikh̄ aj̄istei an, diabōton ej̄ei th̄ doxan. In the translation of Baronius we read: "Fraternitas ergo vestra et sacerdotalis sanctitas, quae *non jure nec ex Dei voluntate pontificale munus administrat, magna laborat infamia.*"

ftc86 Baronius, *ad ann.* 787, 58.

ftc87 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 472 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 519 sqq.

ftc88 Baronius, *ad ann.* 787, 58, 59.

ftc89 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 480 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 526 sqq.

ftc90 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 810 sqq.

ftc91 Mansi, *l.c.* p. 759 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 774 sqq.

ftc92 Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10 S. 421.

ftc93 Mansi, t. 12 p. 981; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 19.

ftc94 Theoph. *Chronogr.*, ed. Bonn, t. i.p. 718.

ftc95 Theoph. *l.c.* p. 720 sq.

ftc96 The Greek kingdom was divided into 29 themas (military lieutenancies), — 12 in Europe, 17 in Asia.

ftc97 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 723 sq.

ftc98 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 724 sq.

ftc99 Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. 10 S. 544.

ftc100 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 729.

ftc101 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 731 sq.

ftc102 Theophanes, *l.c.* p. 745.

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or

omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation.