Translated by Nosferatu

My substack: https://sedulitas.substack.com/
My X/twitter: https://x.com/nosfetigue
Book translated: De Imaginibus Libri IV

SUMMARY

INDEX OF THE BOOKS and chapters of the whole Work.....7
A NOTE TO THE READER.....10
THE FIRST BOOK ON IMAGES BY JEAN DAILLÉ..... 11
CHAPTER I. Preface to the work.....11
CHAPTER II. That the ancient Fathers of the first four centuries after the birth of Christ venerated neither the images of Christ nor of the Saints. The first reason, drawn from those things which they object to the Pagans when disputing about religion.....13
CHAPTER III. The second reason, drawn from those things which we have received that the Pagans of old responded to the Christians' objections concerning the cult of images..... 25
CHAPTER IV. The third reason, drawn from the disputations of the Holy Fathers against the Jews.....40
CHAPTER V. The fourth reason, drawn from the fact that the Fathers nowhere endeavor to solve and explain the difficulties that arise, or certainly seem to arise, from the cult of images..... 44
CHAPTER VII. The sixth Argument, drawn from the fact that the ancient Fathers reprehended the cult which some heretics rendered to the images of Jesus, the Apostles, Moses, and others.....*55*
CHAPTER VIII. Seventh Argument, that there are no images in the inventories of the ancient Churches. Eighth, that the true face of Paul and Mary was unknown to the ancients. Ninth, that the Armenians lack images. 60
BOOK TWO..... 65
CHAPTER I. First Testimony against images, from Origen.....*65*
CHAPTER II. Second Testimony: that of the Council of Elvira..... 68
CHAPTER III. The third testimony against images, of Eusebius of Caesarea..... 83
CHAPTER IV. The fourth testimony against images, which is that of Epiphanius..... 86
CHAPTER V. Testimonies against images: The fifth of Chrysostom; the sixth of Amphilochius; the seventh of Theodotus..... 106
CHAPTER VI. Two other testimonies against images: The eighth of Optatus; the ninth of Augustine.....110
BOOK THREE.....118
CHAPTER I. The first objection of the adversaries, drawn from those chalices which Tertullian mentions were painted..... 118
CHAPTER II. The second objection, sought from two passages of Eusebius of Caesarea.....122
CHAPTER III. Six other objections are solved, sought from Adrian, Sozomen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine.....130
CHAPTER IV. The first introduction of images into the churches of certain Christians at the end of the fourth century; two passages of Basil and Gregory are explained, brought forth in vain for images, for adornment, not for

veneration....136
CHAPTER V. The arguments which are brought from Paulinus, Ambrose, and Augustine to prove that the ancients showed veneration to images, are resolved....143
CHAPTER VI. The first abuse of images, noted a little before the end of the fourth century by Augustine, and disapproved; the responsibility being cast by the Catholic Church, to which it was falsely imputed, upon certain private and ignorant men....149
CHAPTER VII. The use of images grows in the fifth and sixth centuries. Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, and Gregory, Bishop of Rome, think the error should be countered in two different ways; the former, indeed, by removing images from sacred places; the latter, by admonishing the Christian people to beware of their adoration....156
BOOK FOUR....167
CHAPTER I. The contests of the Christians concerning images in the eighth century; the Council held in Constantinople in the year 754 orders them to be abolished; the Synod assembled in Nicaea in the year 787, to be adored.... 167
CHAPTER II. Charlemagne in the West abrogates the worship of images and the Nicene Synod, and on that subject writes those four books which are still extant today.... 173
CHAPTER III. The authority of the books on images is asserted, and it is shown against the cavils of the adversaries that they were written either by Charles himself, or certainly at his command.... 178
CHAPTER IV. The definition of the Second Council of Nicaea concerning images is abrogated in the year 794 by the Synod of Frankfurt; the decree of that Synod is explained and vindicated from the cavils of the adversaries... 198
CHAPTER V. That the decree of the Synod of Frankfurt was valid and was observed in the churches of Gaul and Germany is proved first indeed by the testimonies of Agobard, Jonas, Dungal, and Walafrid.... 217
CHAPTER VI. The same is proved secondly from the book which is inscribed the Synod of Paris, whose truth and authority is asserted against the adversaries....224
CHAPTER VII. The decree of the Council of Frankfurt was long preserved in Gaul....241
CHAPTER VIII. The final touch added to the error by the Church of Rome, which, beyond the definition of the Nicene Synod and the entire use of the Greeks, admits both sculpted things and images of God.... 244

FOUR BOOKS ON IMAGES by **JEAN DAILLÉ.**

Council of Elvira, Canon 36. It has been decided that there ought not to be pictures in the Church, lest what is worshipped and adored be depicted on the walls.

NOT ALONE

Leiden. F**rom the Elzevirian Press**. 1642.

To the most distinguished man, D. Pierre Marbald, Counselor and Secretary to the Most Christian King, and of the House and Crown of France, Greetings.

While I was reflecting, most renowned Marbald, on those gross stains of errors and superstitions by which the Christian Religion, contaminated by the disgrace of former times, has, however, by the singular benefit of the Lord, been purified in our age, it seems to me that no blemish in that number was fouler, none more hostile either to the right reason of men or to the sacred Scriptures of God, than the veneration of images, which is practiced even today in the communion of the Roman Pontiff.

For human reason itself teaches that the nature of God, the best and greatest, is such that it can neither be grasped by the eyes or other senses, nor perceived by the thought of the mind, much less can it be simulated or represented by the art of a painter or sculptor. The same reason teaches most clearly that it is unjust and wicked for man, a most noble animal, endowed with the admirable faculty of sensing and understanding, and born for eternity, to prostrate himself in honor before mute images, devoid of all life. Hence it happened that not a few nations of old, admonished by the voice of nature alone, repudiated all use of statues and images in religion. For we have learned that the ancient Persians, the Germans, and the Africans were of this opinion; and it is established that the Romans themselves maintained this practice until the 170th year of the city. In that state, even after the use of idols was accepted, those who were held to be the most learned and wisest men did not hesitate to confess and to commit openly to writing, that the Gods were more purely observed without images, and that those who first set up images of the gods for the people, as Varro states according to Augustine in book 4, chapter 31 of *The City of God*, both took away fear from their cities and added error.

But the voice and authority of the Sacred Scriptures is much more explicit and clear against this kind of superstition. For those most holy monuments testify that God, from the very beginning, proclaimed to his Israel with a thundering voice from the peaks of Sinai that they should not fashion, adore, or worship the likeness of any thing, whether earthly or heavenly, and he sanctioned this law with a most grave threat, in which he declares himself to be a strong and jealous God, who visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the grandchildren, and upon the great-grandchildren of those who hate him. This precept is urged and inculcated everywhere in the Scriptures, and it is explained and illustrated by the various disputations and orations of the Prophets, and it is repeatedly confirmed by the most severe punishments of those who, having spurned the law, had made images. And this authority of God had such weight among the Jews, as was proper, that in the last times following the Babylonian captivity, they always most steadfastly turned away from the cult of images, to which they were initially drawn by the greatest propensity of nature.

All the greater and more detestable, therefore, must be judged the blindness of those who, in such a great light of facts and examples, have polluted the true and spiritual worship of God, established by the celestial teaching of the Lord Jesus, with this gross and shameful superstition. God, indeed, according to His mercy, has often admonished them of their duty, both in former times and especially in our own. But their minds, hardened in wickedness, spurning the most salutary words of the Lord, have voluntarily increased and confirmed the error that should have been corrected. And as the passions of the human mind are generally ingenious, they have also applied various contrived pretenses and colorings with the utmost cleverness in this case, in order to give some semblance of respectability to this foul and dishonorable superstition; I believe, lest they should seem to be mad without reason. But because they understood that they had no support in the Scriptures for the error they had undertaken, they fled, as is their custom, to tradition, the sole fount, if we believe them, of Roman rites and dogmas. For they say that this rite of fashioning and venerating images, which prevails among them, was commended to the disciples by the Apostles from the very beginning, not in silent letters, but by the living voice; and that it was thenceforth transmitted to posterity, as if by hand from the first authors of Christian piety, and has been propagated in the Church down to our times.

I have taken this as the subject for this work, in which (unless my mind deceives me) I have snatched away from our adversaries this whole defense of their very bad cause, and have demonstrated with arguments that seem clear and necessary to me, that among the ancient Christians there were no images in the churches until the fourth century from the birth of the Lord; but that in the ensuing times they gradually crept in, but only for the purpose of either adorning sacred places or delighting or instructing the more uncultured of the common people, and that they did not attain the honors of worship and veneration with which they are treated today until very late, when the darkness of the preceding centuries was already weighing upon the world, and after great contentions on both sides, in which the exceptional virtue of our Gauls shone forth. For there is no nation of Christians that either defended the truth longer or yielded later to the importunity and tyranny of error. I confess that this subject has long since been cultivated and illustrated by the more eloquent writings of our countrymen, so that the Church could easily have done without our little effort. Nevertheless, either the judgment or (what I rather believe) the favor and indulgence of certain brethren has wrung from me that I should now at last dare to publish this little book, which I have kept at home for eight years, praying to God, the best and greatest, that He would deign to bless it, and that in this public light it may have the course and usefulness that my friends promise and vow for it, to the glory of the divine name and the illustration of celestial truth.

But to you, most distinguished Marbald, we have thought that this little work, whatever it may be, should be inscribed above all, so that if, hindered by the weakness of our talent, we are less able to be of public service, we may at least achieve something of value with you in private, while by this monument, as it were, we openly testify to both our reverence and our gratitude of mind toward you. For this duty has long been demanded of us by both that exceptional piety which shines forth in you, seasoned with the greatest pleasantness of character and adorned with the most absolute elegance of mind, and your most constant and truly singular love for us. To which are added the most pleasant fruits of the honorable intimacy which has long existed between us, and your almost innumerable merits toward us, which flow most abundantly every day from the same source. Therefore, receive with a favorable eye this pledge of our esteem, owed to you on so many accounts, with which you are accustomed to look upon us and ours. As for me, if I should be unequal to other duties, I will certainly worship God with assiduous prayers, that He may guard and preserve you and all yours for as long as possible, safe and sound in the Lord Jesus. Farewell.

From Paris, on the 26th day of February, in the year of Christ 1641.

Your most devoted,

J. Daillé

INDEX OF THE BOOKS and chapters of the whole Work.

BOOK I.

Page

CHAP. I. Preface to the work. 1

CHAP. II. That the ancient Fathers of the first four centuries after the birth of Christ venerated neither the images of Christ nor of the Saints. The first reason, drawn from those things which they object to the Pagans when disputing about religion. 6

CHAP. III. The second reason against images, drawn from those things which we have received that the Pagans of old responded to the Christians' objections concerning the cult of images. 33

CHAP. IV. The third reason, drawn from the disputations of the holy Fathers against the Jews. 66

CHAP. V. The fourth reason, drawn from the fact that the Fathers nowhere take pains to resolve and explain the difficulties that either arise, or certainly seem to arise, from the cult of images. 75

CHAP. VI. The fifth reason, drawn from the fact that the Fathers taught or wrote not a few things alien to the veneration of images and conflicting with it; such as that some condemned the art of painting as absolutely illicit, others as vain and useless, etc. 103 81

CHAP. VII. The sixth reason, drawn from the fact that the ancient Fathers reprehend the worship which some heretics offered to the images of Jesus, the Apostles, Moses, and others. 106

CHAP. VIII. The last three reasons are drawn: the Seventh, from the fact that in the furnishings of the ancient Churches no mention is made of images; the Eighth, from the fact that the ancients confess that the true and genuine form of Christ, Paul, and the Blessed Virgin was unknown to them; the Ninth, finally, from the fact that among the Armenians, most ancient schismatics, there are no images. 115

BOOK II.

CHAP. I. The first testimony against images, from Origen. 124

CHAP. II. The second testimony, of the Council of Elvira. 128

CHAP. III. The third testimony, which is that of Eusebius of Caesarea. 163

CHAP. IV. The fourth testimony against images, which is that of Epiphanius. 170

CHAP. V. Testimonies against images, the fifth of Chrysostom: the sixth of Amphilochius of Iconium: the seventh of Theodotus of Ancyra. 219

CHAP. VI. Two other testimonies against images, the eighth of Optatus of Milevis: the ninth of Augustine of Hippo. 227

BOOK III.

CHAP. I. The first objection of the adversaries, drawn from those chalices which Tertullian mentions were painted. 245

CHAP. II. The second objection, taken from two passages of Eusebius of Caesarea. 254

CHAP. III. Six other objections are resolved, taken from Adrian, Sozomen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. 272

CHAP. IV. The first introduction of images into the Churches of certain Christians at the end of the fourth century; for adornment, not for worship. An exposition of two passages of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, which the adversaries misuse in favor of images. 287

CHAP. V. The arguments drawn from Paulinus, Ambrose, and Augustine to prove that the ancients showed some veneration to images are resolved. 302

CHAP. VI. The first abuse of images, noted and disapproved by Augustine a little before the end of the fourth century, and attributed not to the opinion of the Catholic Church, to which it was falsely imputed, but to private, ignorant men. 315

CHAP. VII. In the fifth and sixth centuries, the use and worship of images increases. The bishops Serenus of Marseilles and Gregory of Rome think the error should be countered in two different ways; the former by removing the images from sacred places; the latter by admonishing the Christian people to beware of adoring them. 330

BOOK IV.

CHAP. I. The conflicts of the Christians concerning images in the eighth century. Two councils held in the East: one at Constantinople in the year 754, which decrees that images should be abolished; the other at Nicaea in the year 787, which decrees that they should be adored. 355

CHAP. II. Charlemagne in the West abrogates the worship of images and the Nicene Synod, and writes on that subject those four books which are still extant today. 368

CHAP. III. The authority of the books on images is asserted; and it is shown against the cavils of the adversaries that they were written either by Charlemagne himself, or certainly at his command. 380

CHAP. IV. The definition of the Second Council of Nicaea concerning images is abrogated in the year 794 by the Synod of Frankfurt. The decree of that Synod is explained and vindicated from the cavils of the adversaries. 429

CHAP. V. It is proved that the decree of the Synod of Frankfurt was valid and observed in the Churches of Gaul and Germany, and this is proved first by the testimonies of Agobard, Jonas, Dungal, and Walafrid. 475

CHAP. VI. The same is proved secondly from the book which is entitled, The Synod of Paris, the truth and authority of which is asserted against the adversaries. 491

CHAP. VII. That the decree of the Council of Frankfurt was long preserved in Gaul even after those times. 528

CHAP. VIII. The culmination of the error added by the Roman Church, which, beyond the definition of the Nicene Synod and the entire practice of the Greeks, admits both sculpted images and images of God. Epilogue of the Work. 534

A NOTE TO THE READER.

When, in the previous year, the most illustrious theologian, and to me for many reasons uniquely venerable, Lord Andreas Rivetus, had read these little books of mine on Images, written in French and published, according to his kindness, he, in a letter sent a little after, was the author of the suggestion that I should, having rendered them in Latin, share them with foreign nations, signifying, according to his benevolence toward me, that this labor of mine could bring some utility to the pious. I, who would think it a crime not to obey the will of a most excellent man who has deserved so well of me, although I undertook the truly troublesome province of translating, I have committed the whole work, rendered from French into Latin, to the care and diligence of the printer. I did not want you, Reader, to be unaware of this, so that, if you should derive any fruit from this lucubration of mine, you may have gratitude for it to the most illustrious Rivetus, who by his authority brought it forth into the light of the Latin language. But if it should happen otherwise, which I would not wish, you will certainly condone the rashness, if any there is, of this edition, out of my devotion and deference to the same man. Farewell.

THE FIRST BOOK ON IMAGES BY JEAN DAILLÉ.

CHAPTER I. Preface to the work.

Since among those controversies which today, to the great sorrow of all pious men, divide the Christian world, the disputation concerning the use of images in religion is neither of low rank nor of light moment, I thought I would be doing a worthwhile service if I were to explain clearly (at least as far as my humble ability allows) what the opinion of the ancients was concerning this whole matter: not because I think that our faith in this part needs the support of any human testimony, being abundantly founded, by the grace of the Lord, on the divine Scriptures, in which since we read that the cult of images was neither instituted, nor praised, nor finally practiced by any Apostle or Prophet, there is, as it seems to me, no human authority so great as to be able to persuade us that we ourselves should admit or practice it. But it will nevertheless be helpful to have it known and ascertained whether Christian men, from the very first ages of the Church, felt the same thing about images that we see taught today by those who live in the communion of the Bishop of Rome. For everyone knows how highly they value the images of the Trinity, of Christ, of the Angels, of Mary, and of the Saints, and with what religious ceremony they dedicate them publicly in sacred places, with what care they adorn them, with what affection they venerate them, with what great demission of mind and body they revere them, with uncovered head and prostrating on their knees, with what pomp they carry them around elevated on high and show them to the people, and finally with what zeal they visit them, even by undertaking long pilgrimages. I confess that in their School there have been theologians of no mean reputation, like Alexander, Durandus, and Alphonsus de Castro, and several others, who seem to have held that an image is in no way to be worshiped in itself, but that the exemplar is only to be worshiped before the image. But that opinion was neither very common, and today is almost extinct among them. For all of them commonly hold that the image itself is properly to be worshiped in itself, although they disagree not a little, nor lightly, about the very kind and degree of worship.

For there are those who contend that the same honor is to be shown to the image as is due to the exemplar, so that the image of God and of Christ is to be adored with the cult of *latria*, that of Mary with *hyperdulia*, and that of the other Saints with *dulia*. This opinion is followed by Thomas, Cajetan, Bonaventure, Marsilius, Almain, Dionysius the Carthusian, Capreolus, and others. The rest, who wish to seem a little more moderate, think that the honor of the image is indeed less than that which is due to the exemplar, but that it is nevertheless of such a kind that it pertains to it analogically and reductively; so that the worship due to the images of the Saints is *dulia*, not simply and absolutely so called, but in a certain respect, analogically, and reductively; similarly, the *hyperdulia* and

latria which are exhibited to the images of both the Blessed Virgin and of Christ are so called not simply, not in a proper and perfect manner, but in a certain respect, analogically, and reductively. For we are forced to use the very words of the Schools, however much they may abhor from the common usage of Latin speakers, because their mysteries are so abstruse and recondite that common and customary human speech has no words by which they can be explicated and explained. Into this latter opinion most of the theologians of the Roman Church seem to have conceded, as is manifest from the published disputations on this subject by Pererius, Catharinus, Sanderus, Bellarmine, Perron, and others. And this, indeed, is generally the opinion, or rather imagination, of the learned among them. The common people, however, to whom the subtleties of the Schools are unknown, worship images more simply and (so to speak) in good faith, and pour out upon them whatever fervor and religion they have conceived in their minds; so that if you should scrutinize either their secret thoughts, or the movements of their hands and eyes, and the gesture of their whole body, and other external signs, you will perceive nothing by which it can be understood that they worship the image differently from the exemplar, or that they hold different images of the same exemplar with any distinction when adoring. In this matter, superstition is so widely and deeply rooted that even men of that communion, and indeed not contemptible ones, have complained publicly about the foulness of the error. Certainly Polydore Vergil, where he speaks of the veneration of images, says that it has come to such a point of madness that this part of piety differs little from impiety.

In this work, therefore, with God's help, I shall inquire whether the opinion of the ancients concerning the use and worship of images was formerly the same as that of these men is now, taking my start from the earliest and most remote times of the Church, because their history both contributes more weight to our matter and is indeed far more encumbered and involved by the disputations of our adversaries than the knowledge of the last eight or nine centuries, which has much less utility and controversy. I shall follow that order which has seemed to me most convenient. For whatever arguments I have been able to derive by reasoning from the disputations, sermons, opinions, and rites of the ancients, by which it can be either certainly ascertained or probably conjectured what they thought about the use of images, I shall recount them in the first place, and, as far as is necessary, I shall explain and defend them. Then I shall recite their explicit testimonies; arguments of this kind the rhetoricians call inartificial, just as they are accustomed to call those of the former kind artificial. Finally, in the third place, I shall weigh what is asserted by our adversaries in opposition.

CHAPTER II. That the ancient Fathers of the first four centuries after the birth of Christ venerated neither the images of Christ nor of the Saints. The first reason, drawn from those things which they object to the Pagans when disputing about religion.

And so, to enter into the disputation itself, setting aside digressions, I say first of all that the Church which flourished within the four hundredth year from the birth of Christ offered no religious worship to the images of Christ or the Saints, of the kind that the men of the Roman communion think should be offered to them today. That this can be demonstrated by various arguments is apparent even from the fact that the Christian doctors of those times, with whom they dispute about religion, everywhere reproach the heathens for the worship of statues and images, and they attack that whole rite as being full of the gravest error and of a certain monstrous folly and madness. By what right, if they themselves offered to the images of holy men the same veneration that the Pagans showed to the statues of their deities?

Tertullian, in his *Apology*, after having demonstrated that those who were then worshiped by the Pagans as gods were mere men, adds these words about the images themselves: "Regarding the images themselves," he says, "I censure nothing other than the materials, which are sisters to common vessels and instruments, or which are transformed from these same vessels and instruments as if changing their fate by consecration through the license of art, and indeed most contemptuously and sacrilegiously in the very work." Then at the end of the chapter: "Therefore," he says, "if we do not adore cold statues and images, most similar to their dead originals, which kites, and mice, and spiders understand, did not the rejection of a recognized error deserve praise, rather than punishment?" And Tertullian indeed says these things: which I do not see with what face, with what mouth, and with what mind he could have written, if indeed he thought about images the same as the theologians of the Roman Church today. For what then? Did he not understand that all the same things applied to his own effigies of Christ and the Saints? That they were not made of better clay, or of a more honorable appearance, or finally endowed with more senses than the statues of the Gentiles? That both were equally sisters of common vessels and instruments, and that mice, and spiders, and kites understood these no more than those? Whence that great stupor in a most keen-witted man, that he suddenly forgot that the cause of the heathens was established by his own opinion about images? These and other things forced Franciscus Zephyrus, a man of the Roman party, to confess that the Christians of his time had nothing in their temples except the sign of the cross above the altar facing the East.

Indeed, not only Tertullian, but also the other Fathers dispute with the Pagans in this way. Octavius in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, which is said to have been written at the end of the second century of Christianity, receives them no differently, falsely deriding them because they prayed to and publicly worshiped consecrated images of the Gods, while, he says, "the opinion and mind of the ignorant is deceived by the elegance of the art, is dazzled by the glitter of gold, is dulled by the gleam of silver and the whiteness of ivory." Then he explains at length in what ways a statue was fashioned, polished, and prepared, for the purpose of receiving divine honors; how a wooden one was hung, cut, hewn, and planed; how a bronze or silver one was cast, beaten with hammers, and shaped on anvils; how a stone one, finally, was cut, sculpted, and smoothed; and after these works of art, it was constructed, and erected, and finally adorned and consecrated. If the same religion was then among Christians as is today in the Roman Church, where was the mind of that man who objected to the deities of the Pagans things that could with no trouble be retorted upon the Saints worshiped by his own Christians? For their effigies are prepared and constructed in precisely the same way before solemn veneration is exhibited to them publicly in the churches.

For to them also apply perfectly what he adds about the statues of the Gentiles: "Indeed, what judgment," he says, "do dumb animals naturally pass on your gods—mice, swallows, kites? They know they do not feel, they gnaw them, they climb on them, they sit on them, and unless you drive them away, they build their nests in the very mouth of your god. Moreover, spiders weave their web over his face, and hang their threads from his very head. You wipe, clean, and scrape them, and you protect and fear those whom you make." Thus far Octavius.

Nor does Lactantius speak differently, who everywhere reprehends the Pagans on the grounds that they worshiped the images of those whom they falsely held to be Gods. "What is the meaning," he says, "of temples? what of altars? what, finally, of the images themselves, which are monuments of either the dead or the absent?" Then a little after: "Nor do these most foolish men understand," he says, "that if the images could feel and move, they would have voluntarily adored the men by whom they were polished." Presently: "Therefore," he says, "those who feel adore insensible things, those who are wise adore irrational things, those who are living adore lifeless things, those who are born from heaven adore earthly things." Then, with a few words inserted: "For those baubles of mortal fingers," he says, "and fragile figures, formed from any kind of material, what else are they but the earth from which they are born?" At the beginning of the same chapter, he had already said these things before: "You are afraid, no doubt, because you think they are in heaven. For if they are gods, it cannot be otherwise. Why then do you not lift your eyes to heaven? And, having invoked the names of the gods, do you sacrifice in the open? Why do you look at walls, and wood, and stones rather than to that place where you believe them to be?"

Elsewhere, he observes that men at the beginning, admiring the elements of the world—the sky, the sun, the earth, the sea—worshiped them without any images or temples; that it was demons who taught men to fashion images and statues; then, that it is perverse and incongruous that an image of a man should be worshiped by an image of God. "For he worships," he says, "what is inferior and weaker." Then, that it is an inexpiable crime to desert the living to serve the monuments of the dead, who can give neither life nor light to anyone, which they themselves lack. Finally, a little after, that the sacred images themselves, which the most foolish men serve, are devoid of all sense, because they are earth. "But who does not understand that it is wicked for an upright animal to be bent over to adore the earth?" Let the prudent reader consider in his own mind whether Lactantius would have written these and similar things if he had honored the images of departed saints with the worship that is now offered to them in Rome.

Athanasius, who it is established lived in the time of the Emperor Constantius, toward the end of the fourth century after the birth of Christ, criticizes the folly of the heathens in the same way. "They are not ashamed," he says, "to prostrate themselves as suppliants before pieces of wood, nor do they see in the meantime that they trample under their feet things that are similar and of the very same kind, and use them for kindling fires, while yet they call parts of these things deities; and what a little while before they held in common use, these things, out of madness, when they have been carved, they think should be worshiped, using neither their eyes nor their minds at all, since they adore not gods, but the art of the carver." Presently, he also adds these words: "Who, I ask," he says, "would not pity them, and for this very reason, that they, being endowed with sight, think that things which do not see should be adored, and being able to hear, they solicit with prayers those things which do not hear? and being by nature instructed, as men, with soul and reason, they greet as gods those things which are not even moved once, but are inanimate, and, what is a matter of the greatest admiration, they serve as masters those whom they themselves have under their own power?"

So also Chrysostom, in his commentary on Isaiah: "For what is," he says, "viler and more humble than for a man to bow himself before inanimate things, and to venerate stones?" The same, on Genesis: "See," he says, "how great was the excess of error, that those who are honored with reason should worship wood and stones." Let Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, who flourished in the now-adult fifth century after the birth of Christ, follow Chrysostom: "But the images," he says, "worshiped by the gentiles do not make, but are made, and they have their honor from their material, etc. The images indeed are endowed with the dwellings of the senses, but they are deprived of their operation. Therefore, they are viler not only than those who made them, but even than the smallest living creatures; since flies, and gnats, and creatures more delicate than these, have power in the seats of the senses; for they see and hear and fly and walk."

To these things, I do not doubt that our adversaries, along with Perron, will answer that the opinion of Christians concerning sacred images differs very much from what the Pagans of old judged about their statues. For the Pagans thought of their idols or statues that they were truly deities, either by a simple change of substance, which opinion was especially prevalent among the more uncultured, or by a certain infusion of divinity into the statues themselves, and, so to speak, an incorporation, which was generally followed by the learned, etc. But Christians hold the images of the saints which they venerate neither as deities nor as images of deities; but on the contrary, the Council of Trent expressly forbids anyone to believe that there is in them any divinity or power on account of which they are to be worshiped, or that anything is to be asked from them, or that trust is to be placed in images. Therefore, the ancient Fathers had no need to fear that those things which, as we have commemorated above, they most hatefully objected to the idols of the Gentiles, would be retorted upon the images of Christ and the Saints. But this answer is vain, because neither are the things which it posits about the judgment of both the Pagans and the Christians concerning images entirely true, nor, even if they were true to the highest degree, would they have any force in resolving this objection.

For to begin with the first point, I confess indeed that it could have happened that in such a great multitude of peoples blinded by heathen superstition, a few men of brutish intellect could be found who thought that the wooden, golden, marble, and silver effigies which they perceived with the senses of their eyes and hands had truly passed into the nature of deities through some prodigious conversion of their original substance. But that such a gross and monstrous delirium was public, or was acknowledged by the theologians of the heathens as a true and genuine dogma of their religion, this I certainly deny. If there were any learned men among them, they openly protested against it, and contended that this error, being far removed from their own faith and opinion, was proper to the ignorant and the baser sort of the common people. Thus Celsus, the gentile, according to Origen, says that the wisdom of the Christians is ridiculous if they wish to teach nothing else than that God is not a stone, wood, bronze, or gold, polished and worked by this or that craftsman. "For who else," he says, "unless he be completely foolish, would think that these are gods, and not rather offerings to the gods, and statues?" So also Lucian most clearly distinguishes the deity itself from the statue, when to a matron complaining that he had compared her to goddesses in an invidious praise, he responds thus: "I, most excellent lady, in no way compared you with goddesses, but with the works of outstanding artists made of stone, bronze, or ivory. But to compare things made by men with men I do not think impious, unless you believed that what Phidias fashioned was Minerva herself, or that what Praxiteles made not many years ago in Cnidus was the celestial Venus. But see that it may not be improper to think such things of the Gods, whose true images no human industry can attain, as I feel." Athenagoras, a Christian writer (who is said to have flourished around the one hundred and seventieth year of the Lord), also testifies to this, that the

Pagans distinguished among themselves, when he writes that there were not lacking (among the heathens) those who said that these things (he speaks of idols) were nothing but images (εἰκόνας), but that the gods in whose honor they were dedicated, and whatever revenues and sacrifices are conferred upon them, are referred to the gods themselves and are done for their sake, and that men can in no other way approach the gods.

A clear testimony of Arnobius on this matter is also extant, where he introduces a Pagan man speaking thus: "But you err," he says, "and you are mistaken: for we do not decree that the bronze, nor the materials of gold and silver, nor others of which the images are made, are in themselves gods and religious deities; but in these we worship them, and we venerate those whom the sacred dedication introduces and causes to inhabit the fabricated images." A little later, however, he reveals that the heathens used an even more cunning excuse: "In this same part," he says, "the defenders of the images are also accustomed to say that the ancients were not ignorant that the images have no divinity, and that there is absolutely no sense in them; but that for the sake of the untamed and ignorant multitude, which is the largest part in the peoples and in the cities, they wisely and with counsel formed them, so that, with a certain appearance presented to them, they might cast off their harshness through fear of the gods, and, believing themselves to act in the presence of the gods, they might lay aside their impious deeds and pass over to human duties by a change of morals." Finally, to pass over the others, Lactantius also makes the heathens speak thus: "We do not fear the images themselves," they say, "but those to whose likeness they are fashioned and in whose names they are consecrated." And from these things it is clear that that gross and brutish imagination is unjustly attributed to the Pagans, since it is unjust to attribute the particular errors of individual men who live in any given sect to that whole sect.

But neither do I deny that there were even learned men in Paganism who taught that either the deity itself or at least its power and virtue resided in those statues and images once they had been consecrated; which the words of Trismegistus, according to Augustine, clearly signify, which, as Augustine himself interprets them, teach that the wise men of the Pagans, by a certain art, joined invisible spirits to visible things of corporeal matter, so that the statues dedicated and subject to those spirits might be, as it were, animated bodies. And to this pertain all those passages of Scripture and of the holy Fathers which Perron, with more ambition than necessity, has collected and described in six whole pages, as he is often wont to pour out a great deal of words and arguments where the reason of the case itself least demanded it. But what he pretends, that the Pagans established a personal or hypostatic (as they say in the Schools) union between their deities and their effigies, so that the statue, together with the deity that resided in it, was one and the same person, this, I say, is empty and rests on no reason. For whatever testimonies of the ancients, both Christian and Pagan, Perron has brought forward, they establish nothing else than that either the

power or the substance of the deity resided in the statue according to the opinion of the Gentiles: from which it by no means follows that one of these things was personally united with the other. For from the fact that a helmsman is present in the ship which he steers, or an angel in the sphere which he moves according to Aristotle, it is not concluded that either the former is one and the same person with the ship, or the latter with the celestial sphere, properly and synonymously.

But neither is it true that all Pagans were persuaded that in the statues they worshiped, there lurked either the power or some form of the deity to which they were consecrated, by which they were inhabited and, in a way, animated. For as error is wont to divide the minds of men into multiple thoughts and various and conflicting opinions, the Pagans, when pressed by the Christians who reproached them for the worship of vile and transient things, in order to dissolve so specious a charge, some fled to one refuge, some to another. There were those who answered that the statues were the seats and, as it were, the domiciles of the Gods. Others, more acute, pleaded that their images were not indeed seats, but signs and symbols of the deities, and certain monuments of them. Augustine, having cited their response, who used to say that they did not worship this visible thing, but the deity which inhabits it invisibly, a little later adds: "But those seem to themselves to be of a purer religion who say, 'I worship neither the statue nor a demon, but through a corporeal effigy I behold the sign of that thing which I ought to worship.'" And hence it is that Augustine, in the place praised by Perron, divides the heathen idolaters into two kinds, when he says that they venerate idols either as gods, or as signs and images of gods.

So also Origen, speaking of the philosophers of the Gentiles, says, "They are not ashamed to address inanimate things as Gods, or as images of the Gods." Celsus, indeed, certainly in that same place which we have quoted above from Origen, teaches that idols are to be considered not as the Gods themselves, but as offerings of the Gods, that is, as donations and statues. Similar pretexts of the Pagans are also reported at length and refuted by Athanasius, as can be seen in his Oration against the Gentiles. Certainly, it cannot be denied that they sometimes call their idols, which they metonymically call gods (just as today the images of the Saints are commonly called Saints), also often properly signs, effigies, and images of the gods. Livy says, "The statues at Juno Sospita's temple dripped with blood." Ammianus Marcellinus: "Serapis adorned with breathing likenesses of statues." Suetonius in his *Caligula*, speaking of Artabanus, king of the Parthians, says, "He adored the images of the Caesars." And Capitolinus in his *Maximinus*: "They adored before the images of Maximus, and Balbinus, and Gordian." In the same sense, Agrippina, according to Tacitus, speaking of the images of Augustus, denies that the divine Spirit was transfused into mute effigies. And Tacitus himself, speaking of the Jews, says, "With the mind alone they comprehend the one and only deity. They deem profane those who fashion images of the gods from mortal materials into the forms of men." Finally,

Clement introduces the Pagans speaking thus: "We adore visible images in honor of the invisible God."

From which it is clear that the worship which the Pagans offered to idols or statues was, according to their own mind, not absolute but relative, and of such a kind that it was properly and primarily exhibited not to the statue, but to the deity whose statue it was, and this because of the union which they dreamed existed between them, either because the deity itself, or at least its power and authority, resided in the statue, or because the statue was a kind of image of the deity, and a sacred symbol and monument, by which its person, or its power and efficacy, was in some way represented and presented to the human senses. Now, do not our adversaries feel the same things, both concerning the worship of what they call sacred images, and also concerning their union with the Saints and Angels, to whom they are sacred, and in whose name they think religious veneration is due to them? For just as in the multitude of Pagans there were some, but few, who by a most gross and beastly error of mind, with the learned resisting and protesting, held those mute and deaf statues, before which they prostrated themselves in temples and shrines, to be true deities; so in the common people of those Christians who venerate images, perhaps some are also found of such dull wit that they think there is either no difference, or a very slight one, between the image and the Saint to whom it is consecrated. And as among the more learned Pagans there were those who thought that a deity was present in the statues either by its very substance or at least by its power; so neither have there been lacking among our adversaries those who felt almost the same thing about the union of the Saints with their images.

No one, as far as I know, has hitherto openly defended the personal presence of the Saints in the statues dedicated to them, since all, as far as I have been able to observe, confess with one consent that the spirits of those men whose images are consecrated and venerated here on earth enjoy the glory and repose of God in heaven; although many things are both done and said among them which are not far from this fiction, such as the stories they tell about the tears, sweat, and blood of certain images. But the presence of power, although I confess it was denied by the Council of Trent, I contend is explicitly posited by many men of the Roman party, in which number are also the Fathers of the seventh Synod, who attribute to images the power of sanctifying, and (what is defended by Adrian, bishop of Rome) they wish Christians to be saved by the sight of images, just as the Jews of old were by the bronze serpent. We also read in the Roman Ceremonial that those little images, which they commonly call Agnus Dei, are sanctified by mystical ceremonies; so that the Pontiff prays that, just as that lamb once sacrificed delivered the people from the persecution of the Egyptians, and just as that innocent lamb Jesus Christ, when sacrificed, snatched our first parent from the power of the devil: so these immaculate lambs may receive that virtue; so that, being sanctified by the abundant blessing of God, they may receive the same virtue against all diabolical wiles. In the consecration of an image which

they dedicate to the Blessed Virgin, these words are explicitly found: "Sanctify, O God, this form of the Blessed Virgin, that it may bring the salutary aid of help to your faithful, that thunders and lightnings, if they should become destructively strong, may be more swiftly expelled." Thus, in consecrating an image of the Baptist, they ask of God that "this image may be a holy expulsion of demons, an invocation of angels, a protection of the faithful." But in that prayer with which they address the image of Christ, impressed, as they narrate, on the holy sudarium, they first greet it thus: "Hail, holy face of our Redeemer, in which shines the appearance of divine splendor, impressed on a cloth of snowy whiteness, and given to Veronica as a sign for love's sake, hail, glory of the age, mirror of the saints, which the spirits of the heavens desire to see"; then they ask these things: "Cleanse us from every stain of vice... hail, blessed image of the Lord's face, wondrously adorned by an eternal gift, pour light into our hearts by the power given to you"; and finally: "Lead us to our own, O happy figure, to see the face which is Christ's pure."

Perron himself somewhere affirms that the ancient Christians were of the opinion that they obtained a certain protection and tutelage from the images of the Saints. Bellarmine indeed wants the image to be considered as conjoined with the exemplar, and the exemplar to be worshiped as if clothed with the image. But I do not see how all these things can stand, if it is established that there is no power, no force in the images. Thomas, certainly the prince of the Roman school, defines in general that inanimate things by consecration acquire a certain spiritual virtue through which they are rendered fit for divine worship, so that men may perceive a certain devotion therefrom. But if they think there is no force or virtue at all in the images of the Virgin of Loreto, or of Aspricollis, or of Ardilliers, as they call them, no one will easily divine why so many people daily travel to those places with such labor and expense from different regions of the earth. Finally, just as among the Pagans those of more subtle intellect, and who seemed to themselves to be of a purer religion (as Augustine said), held the consecrated statues in the temples as signs and symbols of the gods; so also among the Christian worshipers of images, those of Trent, being in their own judgment more cunning and refined than the rest, proclaim that they receive these things which they venerate in no other way than as effigies of the saints, and that all the worship which is exhibited to them is to be referred to nothing other than the persons expressed and represented by them as signs. Therefore, if what these men now feel about the veneration of images, the ancient Fathers of the Christian Church also once felt, it is clear that they could not, without ridicule, have objected to the statues of the Pagans those things which have been commemorated by us above.

As for what Perron denies, that sacred images are held by his party as images of God or of gods, this is neither entirely true nor pertinent to the matter. For it is established that our adversaries, besides the statues of the Saints, also fashion and worship images of Christ, of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, to which

apply directly and without any exception the things that were cast by the ancient Christians against the effigies of the deity; so that they would have had to abstain from that whole accusation concerning statues in the matter of religion, if their opinion on this subject was the same as that of our adversaries today. But neither is that exception of Perron to the point. For the question here is not about the objects of the images, whether they are Gods or not whom they represent, but about the use of the images themselves and about the worship which the Pagans offered to them. Let us grant that the ancient Christians felt the same as our adversaries do about this article of faith. I confess, nevertheless, that it was lawful for them to deride the Gods of the Pagans, and to subvert with impunity that whole most inept theology of the Gentiles, and to demonstrate that those whom they worshiped as true deities were not Gods, but men, or the dreams and fictions of men. I only mean this, that the ancients, if they followed the modern faith of the Romans, foolishly and undeservedly complained about the Pagans because they prostrated themselves before the images of those things which were held by them as deities, since this accusation would most openly have recoiled upon the Christians themselves, who, by hypothesis, exhibited the same honors to the images of their own celestial beings. So today, it is indeed permissible for our adversaries to refute the gods of the Pagans safely and without any fear of retaliation. But if the same men should set about accusing the Pagans, and severely and bitterly charging them with using images in religion, would they not thereby offer themselves up to be laughed at by all, and deservedly hear that saying of the Satirist, "Let the straight-legged man deride the club-footed, the white man deride the Ethiopian"?

From these things, unless I am mistaken, we have sufficiently proved that the whole distinction which our adversaries place between their opinion on images and that of the Pagans is in many ways false. But let us grant that it is true. I say that not even so would the force of our objection be resolved. The Pagans, you say, thought that the statues which they worshiped were images of the Gods. So be it, I say; although it is established that they held divine beings with a great distinction, and accurately distinguished the supreme God, to whom that name absolutely belongs, from the inferior ones, whom they wished to be received and worshiped as ministers and servants of that supreme one. The same men, you say, thought that the Gods truly dwelt in the statues. We have sufficiently demonstrated above that this was not the opinion of all. Yet let us grant that all felt this way. What then? If these things are so established, I will confess that the Christians did not for that reason absurdly attack the stupor and madness of the Pagans, who attributed the holy and supreme name and worship of God to miserable creatures and most vain fictions, and held as immortal Gods those whom it was not worthy to count even among men. Nor likewise will I deny that the brutishness of the same people was deservedly censured by the Christians, who enclosed God—a most pure, most holy mind, far removed from all contagion of matter—in gold and silver, wood and stone, as if in some filthy and vile prison.

But a Christian who himself venerates images, who prostrates himself before them, who offers them candles and incense, whatever the exemplar of those images may be, will deserve ridicule if he wishes to chastise and deride the Pagans because they offer the same things to the statues of their deities. And yet the holy Fathers reprehend these three things separately and distinctly in the religion of the Pagans. For they also extensively demonstrate from the monuments of the Gentiles themselves that the first and principal objects of heathen piety, or, to speak more truly, impiety—namely, the fictitious Gods, whom they placed partly in heaven, partly in the air and on earth, and in all the elements of the world—were men, and indeed mostly most wicked men, for the most part tyrants and robbers; and with reasons drawn from the very nature of things, they teach that there is one true God, as can be seen from the extant writings of the ancient Fathers against the Pagans. Nor indeed do they leave untouched or unchastised that gross and most alien to all reason delirium of the Pagans, by which they established that the power, or even the substance itself, of the divine deity could be bound and enclosed in gold, silver, marble, or other similar matter devoid of sense and soul. "It is not an unreasonable," says Arnobius, "nor a contemptible argument, by which any slow-witted, and indeed any very prudent person, could be brought to believe that the Gods, having left their proper abodes, that is, heaven, do not refuse, nor do they flee from entering earthly dwellings, but rather, impelled by the right of dedication, they coalesce in union with the statues. Do your Gods, then, dwell in plaster and in potsherds? Or rather, are the minds, spirits, and souls of potsherds and plaster the Gods? And so that the vilest things may become more august, do they suffer themselves to be enclosed and to lie hidden in the confinement of a dark abode? Therefore, we first desire and demand to hear from you in this matter, whether they do this unwillingly, that is, being drawn by the right of dedication they enter the mansions of the statues, or willingly and readily?" and what follows, which is rather prolix. Then: "And yet, O you people, if it is clear and plain to you that the celestial gods live and dwell in the bowels of the images, why do you guard, preserve, and keep them enclosed under the strongest locks, and under huge bolts, under bars, latches, and other things of this kind?" These are the words of Arnobius.

But besides these two things which the Fathers reprehend in Paganism, they also most explicitly condemn that third thing, that the Gentiles venerated the statues and effigies of those whom they held as deities, as we have more fully observed above. They laugh because they honored the works of their own hands, because they venerated stones, and because they, endowed with mind and reason, prostrated themselves before materials lacking sense and soul. Augustine distinctly notes these two things in the worship of the Pagans; one, that they attributed to creatures those things which belong to the one creator; the other, that they offered to the deity statues, a foolish thing and displeasing to God. "If," he says, "any element of the world, or any created spirit, even if it is not unclean and evil, is worshiped with a temple, with a priest, with a sacrifice, which is due

to the true God, it is not therefore evil because the things with which it is worshiped are evil, but because they are such that only He should be worshiped with them, to whom such worship and service is due. If, however, anyone should contend that he worships the one true God, that is, the creator of every soul and body, with the stupidity or monstrosity of statues, with sacrifices of homicides, with the crowning of male private parts, with payment for debaucheries, with the cutting of limbs, with the castration of genitals, with the consecration of effeminates, with festivals of impure and obscene games, he does not therefore sin because he whom he worships is not to be worshiped, but because he worships Him who is to be worshiped, not as He ought to be worshiped." These are the words of Augustine.

I grant, therefore, that those passages of the holy Fathers in which one of the first two errors of the heathens is reprehended do not pertain at all to this cause, and that anyone who concluded from them that the Fathers neither had nor worshiped images of Christ and the Saints would be collecting wrongly. I only think that from those things which were said against the second error, it is legitimately concluded that transubstantiation was neither acknowledged nor believed by the Fathers; since it most openly supposes that the inclusion of the deity in earthly matter, derided by the Fathers, is neither impossible nor absurd. But those testimonies of the Fathers which pertain to the third head of accusation necessarily prove that the ancient Christians worshiped no images of Christ the Lord, or of the Saints, of the kind that either the fathers of the seventh Synod formerly, or the Roman Church now, institutes and defends, since the difference of the things themselves which the Pagans and Christians venerate (which we confess to be very great) by no means prevents the images of both from being of the same material, and the worships which are offered to them by each side from being plainly similar to each other.

If it is not wicked to erect and consecrate golden, silver, wooden, and marble effigies to that deity whom we religiously worship, if it is permissible to carry them around publicly with veneration and to display them, to offer incense and candles to them, and to prostrate oneself before them; to this extent, certainly, the Pagans would not have sinned in consecrating images to those whom they held as deities and in honoring them with such honors, however grave and foul their error was otherwise, who worshiped as a true deity what was anything but a deity. For this being once posited and established, that they believed those to whom they consecrated the images to be truly Gods, it is no more difficult to defend and assert the worship which they exhibited to such images, than that which is offered by the Nicene and Roman doctors to the sacred, as they call them, images of the Saints. Indeed, to one who looks at the matter more accurately, the cause and entire reasoning of the former seems not a little easier and more straightforward than that of the latter. For a Pagan man will say, "If it is lawful for you Christians to erect and consecrate images to your celestial beings, whom you deny to be Gods, how much more just is it for me to grant statues to

those whom I hold to be true gods? You greet images and statues, in which you think there is neither any divine substance nor power, yet you do so most humbly, with uncovered head and with joined and outstretched hands, and prostrate with your whole body, bowed and suppliant, you venerate them, magnificently adorned and clothed in silks you carry them on your shoulders, and with great pomp you parade them around, and by long journeys you visit their places and shrines, and you wear down the thresholds and railings with religious kisses; how much more holily and earnestly, therefore, is it right for me to worship the statues of our gods, which I believe to be not empty or void, but full of a present deity and celestial power?"

Today, indeed, the men of the Roman communion are not accustomed to inveigh against the images of the Chinese and other idolaters in the East, or to reprehend their use in religion. On the contrary, as they are cunning and clever, they misuse this whole institution of the barbarians for their own advantage, and the effigies and sacred objects which those people formerly dedicated to fictitious deities, these men, having only changed the names, transfer to the Saints and holy women of heaven. Since, therefore, the doctors of the ancient Church dealt plainly otherwise with the ancient Pagans; since they not only attacked their errors concerning the nature of the deity and the inclusion of divinity in matter, but also explicitly condemned the statues themselves, and the worship of statues, and this whole institution, it remains for us to conclude that they, in the practice of their religion, neither had nor worshiped any effigies of things or persons which they considered to be holy and divine.

And, to add this also by way of a supplement, the same thing appears most clearly from the fact that the Fathers sometimes praise the earliest and most ancient ancestors of the Pagans, who had worshiped the deity without any statue. Varro had committed to writing that the most ancient Romans had worshiped the Gods for a full one hundred and seventy years without any effigy or image, "which if it had still remained," he says, "the Gods would be more purely observed"; and he did not hesitate to conclude this whole passage by saying that "those who first set up images of the gods for the peoples both took away fear from their cities and added error." Augustine quotes and praises this passage of Varro: "He prudently judged," he says, "that the gods could easily be despised in the foolishness of images"; and a little after, "If," he says, "anything against antiquity could have availed against so great an error, he would certainly have thought that the one God, by whom he believed the world to be governed, should be worshiped even without a statue."

CHAPTER III. The second reason, drawn from those things which we have received that the Pagans of old responded to the Christians' objections concerning the cult of images.

But let us grant that the ancient doctors of the Christian Church (which, however, is incredible) either lapsed through some lack of thought, or, being hindered by excessive zeal for their cause, objected to the heathens things which would recoil upon themselves and subvert their own faith and worship; the heathens, certainly, with whom they had to deal, if there had been any images among the Christians, would not have failed to bring up in this cause the veneration customarily shown to them by the faithful; they would have dissolved the above-mentioned accusations of the Christian men on this subject by their own usage, practice, and opinion, and would have brought forward their worship of the images of the Saints to remove, or at least to mitigate, the odium of their own superstition toward idols. For they managed this cause, although a very bad one, with marvelous cunning and subtlety, and anxiously scrutinized the entire faith of the Christians, all their rites and forms of worship, omitting nothing that seemed to favor them, even if only speciously and slightly; so that Celsus, according to Origen, in this very question, asserts that which we believe from the sacred letters, that man was created in the image of God; and from that he may conclude, even from the opinion of the Christians themselves, that the human form is the image of the divine; a quibble which, as is known, not even those among the Christians who later instituted the veneration of images scorned in this cause. Although certainly no mental ingenuity or special attention was needed by the Pagans to discover or to object what freely offered itself to those engaged in this dispute.

For imagine, I ask you, some Pagan of today living in the city of Rome, looking at the painted and sculpted images with which all the churches there are plentifully adorned, gleaming with much gold, silver, and gems, and an innumerable crowd of both sexes prostrated most religiously before them, burning incense, carrying candles, and praying with their eyes fixed on their faces; seeing also the honors with which they are sometimes treated on set days, when with great pomp and the incredible joy and exultation of the whole city, they are carried about in triumph on men's shoulders through the most noble streets, with a very dense crowd of mortals pressing on and applauding; and finally, also observing what takes place in their chapels, when pilgrims flock thither from all parts of the Christian world, salute with great humility the places where they are displayed consecrated, and, adoring, kiss the very thresholds.

Imagine now, if you please, one of the leaders of these cults, holding an image of the crucifix in his hands, lest anything be wanting, conversing about religion with that Pagan who has been a witness and spectator of all these things, and

rather sharply rebuking the man, with Athanasius, because he prostrates himself in supplication before wood and stones, or repeating with Lactantius that it is perverse and incongruous for an image of a man to be worshipped by an image of God, or finally, admonishing with Chrysostom that there is nothing more vile than a man bowing himself before inanimate objects. Tell me, I pray, would not that Pagan be deafer and more senseless than his own idols, and more stone-like than the very stones he adores, if he did not immediately make this reply to such an admonition: "What is it then, my good man, that you people do, prostrating yourselves before images every day? What is this, that even now I see an image in the hand of the one admonishing me? Are not those effigies of the saints that you have, images? Indeed, are not the men who worship them holy and animate images of God? If it is right for a man to prostrate himself before a stone, why do you condemn us? If it is wrong, why do you absolve your own people who do this?"

But grant that the ancient doctors of the Christian Church (which however is incredible) either lapsed through some lack of thought, or, being hindered by excessive zeal for their cause, objected to the pagans things which would fall back upon themselves, and would subvert their own faith and worship; the pagans certainly with whom they had to do, if there had been any images among the Christians, would not have missed the fact that the veneration customarily shown to them by the faithful in this cause was in their favor; they would have dissolved the above-mentioned accusations of the Christian men in this argument by their own use, practice, and opinion, and would have brought into the open their worship of the images of the Saints to remove, or at least mitigate, the odium of their own superstition towards idols. For they managed this cause, although a very bad one, with wonderful cunning and craftiness, and anxiously scrutinized the entire faith of the Christians, all their rites and forms of worship, omitting nothing that seemed to them to favor their case, even if only superficially; so much so that Celsus, according to Origen, in this very question asserts what we believe from the sacred letters, that man was created in the image of God; and from that he may conclude, even from the opinion of the Christians themselves, that the human form is the image of the divine; a quibble which, as is known, not even those among the Christians who later instituted the veneration of images scorned in this cause. Although certainly no mental ingenuity or special attention was needed by the Pagans to discover or to object what freely offered itself to those engaged in this dispute.

For imagine, I ask you, some Pagan of today living in the city of Rome, looking at the painted and sculpted images with which all the churches there are plentifully adorned, gleaming with much gold, silver, and gems, and an innumerable crowd of both sexes prostrated most religiously before them, burning incense, carrying candles, and praying with their eyes fixed on their faces; seeing also the honors with which they are sometimes treated on set days, when with great pomp and the incredible joy and exultation of the whole city,

they are carried about in triumph on men's shoulders through the most noble streets, with a very dense crowd of mortals pressing on and applauding; and finally, also observing what takes place in their chapels, when pilgrims flock thither from all parts of the Christian world, salute with great humility the places where they are displayed consecrated, and, adoring, kiss the very thresholds. Imagine now, if you please, one of the leaders of these cults, holding an image of the crucifix in his hands, lest anything be wanting, conversing about religion with that Pagan who has been a witness and spectator of all these things, and rather sharply rebuking the man, with Athanasius, because he prostrates himself in supplication before wood and stones, or repeating with Lactantius that it is perverse and incongruous for an image of a man to be worshipped by an image of God, or finally, admonishing with Chrysostom that there is nothing more vile than a man bowing himself before inanimate objects. Tell me, I pray, would not that Pagan be deafer and more senseless than his own idols, and more stone-like than the very stones he adores, if he did not immediately make this reply to such an admonition: “What is it then, my good man, that you people do, prostrating yourselves before images every day? What is this, that even now I see an image in the hand of the one admonishing me? Are not those effigies of the saints that you have, images? Indeed, are not the men who worship them holy and animate images of God? If it is right for a man to prostrate himself before a stone, why do you condemn us? If it is wrong, why do you absolve your own people who do this?”

Who doubts that a pagan man would now make such a reply to a Roman master, and, if there were no fear of the dire tribunal of the Inquisitors, would even with free indignation reproach him for his unbearable impudence, who so severely attacks in others what he praises and commends in his own? And yet, the pagans of the centuries closer to the birth of Christ, who lacked neither subtlety for observing an opportunity, nor either eloquence for speaking or freedom and authority for daring, since in those times and places they themselves held power, and no tribunals then stood out which did not most intensely favor their cause, make no exception of this kind to these accusations of the ancient Christians. Read the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix; the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian; the eight books of Origen against Celsus; examine whatever exists of Athenagoras, Lactantius, Arnobius, Justin, Eusebius on this subject. There you will find what our writers objected to the pagans, what in turn the pagans either reproached our writers for, or responded to their arguments and reasons. Only this retaliation upon the images of our people, which we have just now set forth, nowhere occurs. Let us gather, therefore, that our people gave them no occasion for this exception; that they had no images of Christ or of holy men in their churches, and none (as our adversaries do today) that they worshipped with religious veneration.

Nor does Perron's quibble help here at all, that there was no place for this exception because of the immense difference between the pagan idols and, of

course, our images. For in those times when we all agree that images were in Christian use, the pagans were certainly by no means deterred by that difference, whatever it may be, from employing in this cause that veneration which they saw was paid to images by Christians. There exists in the Acts of the seventh Council a remarkable passage of a certain John, bishop of Thessalonica, on this matter, in which a pagan is introduced conversing with a Christian man about this chapter of religion in roughly these words: “Do you not, therefore, paint images in the churches to your Saints, and adore them? And not only to the Saints, but also to your God himself? So, therefore, consider that we too, while cherishing our images, do not adore them, but the incorporeal powers that are placated, or rather, are worshipped through them (δι' αὐτῶν θεραπευομένας).” Then, when the Christian interlocutor had interjected certain things to dilute this exception, he says: “But what do you say about the Angels? For you depict them also as men, and adore them, although they are not men, but are both said to be and are intelligible and incorporeal. So consider also that those who are honored among us as Gods are placated (worshipped, θεραπεύεσθαι) through statues, with us doing nothing improper, just as it is not for you concerning the depicted Angels.” And thus far that pagan disputant.

What of it? That not even the barbarians from India were blind to this manner of disputing with Christian men? For Petrus Martyr of Milan, in those commentaries on Indian affairs which he wrote in Italian, narrates that the barbarians of the Mexican tract in New Spain, when their idols had been suddenly removed and overthrown, sent four men from their chief men to Alphonsus Zuasus, the Licentiate, by whose order and authority this had been done; who, complaining of the injury, declared that this plan of his had come upon them against their expectation all the more because they saw that the Christians also had idols and images in use and esteem, and adored and worshipped them. Then, at the same time, pointing with an outstretched finger to an image of Sebastian, which happened to hang fixed on the wall near Alphonsus's bed, they added that with whatever honor and worship he venerated this image of Sebastian, they likewise showed to their own idols. The unexpected sharpness of the barbarians struck Alphonsus; who, when he had collected himself, replied that Christians venerate these signs, not as they are images, but inasmuch as they represent blessed men dwelling in the heavens. And, to give credence to his word, he tore the image of Sebastian from the wall and ripped it apart in the presence and sight of the barbarians. To this they replied, that they were not so rude and obtuse as he imagined them; for they too adored their images, not simply as they are images, but for the same reason as the Christians, in that they represent the Sun, the Moon, and the other lights of heaven. Alphonsus, more disturbed by this response, with a small, so to speak, declination of his body, transferred the disputation from the images to the things signified by them, declaring that the worship which the Indians pay to their idols pertains to evil demons; but contending that the worship which Christians show to their images is referred to the supreme creator of the

universe. If, therefore, the opinion of the Christians concerning images and their worship in the times of John of Thessalonica and of Alphonsus Zuasus was the same as it had also been in the earlier centuries closest to the birth of Christ, it is not to be doubted that the ancient pagans would have responded to those who reproached them for the adoration of idols with the same things as these more recent ones. For what prevented them from doing so? The slowness of their intellect, or their inexperience in debating and disputing? But it is established that they were as much superior to these more recent ones in erudition and eloquence as their age was earlier than this of ours. Read what remains of their disputations in Origen, in Minucius, and Cyril, and Symmachus, and others. You will confess that they were not of such an intellect as either not to have noticed, or having noticed, to have omitted any support for their cause, if any existed. Since, therefore, they by no means employed this very obvious and very specious coloring in this dispute, who does not see that it did not yet exist in those times? And that there were then no images in the religious use or worship of the Christians of that age?

But what need is there to linger longer in weighing the silence of the Pagans, when their most express and most open testimonies on this matter are extant? For they not only do not object to the Christians any images of God or of the Saints, which however, if any had then been among them, they could not have passed over in this disputation without stupidity and disgrace, but on the contrary they repeatedly complain that our people used no images or idols in their religion. They hold this as a crime against them, and seize upon it as a great argument of impiety, because men accustomed to images, and born and educated in their adoration, did not think that religion and the worship of a deity could exist without them. Caecilius, a pagan man, disputing about the Christians in Minucius, says: “Why do they have no altars, no temples, no known images?” Origen testifies that the same complaint was made by Celsus about the Christians: “After this,” says Origen, “Celsus says that we flee from the dedication of altars, statues (ἀγαλμάτων), and temples.” Thus also Arnobius, addressing the Pagans: “In this part you are accustomed to attach to us the greatest crime of impiety, that we neither construct sacred edifices for the offices of veneration; nor do we set up a statue or form of any of the gods; nor do we build altars, nor shrines.” And these things indeed they said. But I beseech you, to imagine that Pagan, whom we recently pictured in the midst of the cults and religions of Rome as it is today, to be present again in this place, and to converse with them about divine matters. I appeal to your good faith; do you think he would at all reproach the men of the modern Roman communion with any of these things which Caecilius and Celsus once objected? Would he also cry out: “Why do you have no altars, no temples, no sacred effigies, no images? Why do you flee their dedication?” And if he had complained of anything of this kind, would there be anyone who would not think the man either mad, or certainly joking and being ironic? I am not indeed unaware that men are sometimes so disturbed by the affections of the mind that they sometimes level false accusations, and ones

abhorrent from all appearance of truth, against those whom they hate. But it is not credible that anyone could be found so depraved in mind and front as to dare to impute these things to the Church of the Roman Pontiff; which would be entirely the same as if someone today were to accuse the Jews and Muslims (whom everyone knows to abominate all images with the greatest horror) of nevertheless having their synagogues and mosques full of images.

Grant, however, what is by no means true, that in those early centuries there were images everywhere in the churches of the Christians, consecrated by religion and worshipped with that rite which now prevails in Rome. It certainly cannot be denied (if the matter so stood) that the Christians of that age ought to have responded to the Pagans who disputed so foolishly and so impudently that they had their own images in religious use, although consecrated to other things and persons than those to which the pagans dedicated their idols. For if today in China an idolater should be so foolish as to ask a Jesuit, disputing about religion, "Why do you Christians have no altars? no temples? no idols? no sacred images?" the Jesuit would doubtless receive him who asks thus with no other than these or similar words: "You are indeed greatly mistaken, my good man. We have altars, on which we daily offer a truly expiatory sacrifice for all sins. We have temples; we have images, sacred to the true God and to his true ministers. You will desire no ornament of this kind in our religion; nor will you find anything else lacking in it, except the profane cults of your impieties." Therefore, if the Christianity of ancient Rome was in this part the same as that of the new is now, it is impossible that either Octavius or Origen (unless we make them out to be stupid and devoid of the common sense of men) would have let that expostulation of Caecilius and Celsus pass without refutation, who were outrageously complaining that the Christians had no idols, ἀγάλματα. That so heinous and so importune a calumny ought by all means to have been refuted; and the adversary ought to have been advised that the churches of Christ, although they worshipped the signs of neither Jupiter, nor Mercury, nor Venus, were nevertheless not lacking in their own ornaments of this kind; and that as the Pagans dedicated images of the deities to whom they prayed according to their rite, so also the Christians consecrated and worshipped, with a certain rationale, and that most consistent with their faith, effigies and images of the best and greatest God, the creator of all things, of the Lord Jesus, the author of their religion, and of the divine men whom they understood to have been most dear to God.

But it is certain that they not only respond with nothing of this kind, but moreover they reply to the Pagans who dispute thus with things that most openly establish that either it is not possible, or not lawful, or certainly not expedient, for any image of God to be made. "For what image," says Octavius, "shall I fashion for God, when, if you rightly consider, man himself is the image of God? What temple shall I build for him, when this whole world, fashioned by his work, cannot contain him? and while I, a man, dwell more broadly, shall I enclose the power of so great a majesty within one small shrine? Is he not better

to be dedicated in our mind? To be consecrated in our inmost heart? Shall I offer to God hosts and victims, which he has brought forth for my use, that I should cast back his own gift to him? It is ungrateful, when the acceptable sacrifice is a good spirit, and a pure mind, and a sincere conviction. Therefore, he who practices innocence supplicates God; he who practices justice, makes a libation to God; he who abstains from fraud, propitiates God; he who snatches a man from peril, fells the best (or richest?) victim. These are our sacrifices, these are the sacred rites of God. Thus among us, he who is more just is more religious." And this indeed is the response of Octavius to the interrogation of Caecilius concerning images; which, to which of the two it more aptly suits, the Christians of the Genevan or the Roman discipline, I leave to the judicious reader to judge.

Nor does Origen receive his Celsus any differently, when he complains about the Christians that they lack altars, idols, and images: "In place of altars," he says, "for us each has his own mind, from which are sent up truly and intelligibly fragrant incenses, prayers from a pure conscience." Then after a very few interjections: "Moreover, the images to be dedicated to God are not the works of craftsmen, but are carved and formed in us by the word of God, namely the virtues, in imitation of the first-born of all creation." And finally: "Let him who wishes hear our doctrine, that our bodies are the temple of God"; and what follows. It must certainly be confessed, either that the Church of the Lord Christ then worshipped no images, or that both the Pagans who objected these things, and the Christians who responded thus to the objections, were equally senseless; which no one unless a fool or a madman would say, since the power of mind and intellect which shines forth everywhere in the disputations of both, joined with the highest eloquence and erudition, proclaims loudly enough how judicious and how excellent those men were.

But here Perron appears, and forbids us to conclude from the above-cited passages that there was no use of images in religion among the ancient Christians. For he contends that Caecilius, when he asks in Minucius, "Why do they have no *known* images?", means that the images of the Christians were not non-existent, but of such a kind that they were either kept secret from the Pagans, or were of things unknown to the Pagans and abhorrent from their usage, that is, they were something other than effigies of the Gentile gods. For this is the customary trick of our Perron, that what nowhere occurs in the writings of the Fathers, he alleges was hidden and concealed by them on purpose. There are six hundred places in the ancients concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, in which no trace or vestige of the recent transubstantiation appears. "To be sure," says Perron, "they held this mystery in secret, nor did they ever openly enunciate it before the common people." Thus also in this dispute, when he saw that no images exist in the religion of the ancient Fathers, the cunning man, mindful of his old trick, boasts that they were hidden by the Christians. Here, then, I first ask what reason there was why the Fathers wanted their use of images to be unknown to the Pagans, than which nothing was indeed

more pleasant or more acceptable to them in religion. A wonderful and clearly singular prudence is attributed to these Fathers, who would keep far from the eyes and sight of the Pagans that which alone could most greatly mitigate their hatred towards them, and diminish the odium of our novelty and religion; in which it is established that nothing so gravely and so bitterly offended them as that they saw no images in it. Nor indeed should it be alleged here that the images of the Christians, because they were not of things familiar to the Pagans, would have exacerbated rather than placated their offense. For the Pagans required nothing more than to see some appearance of the worship which they practiced, although otherwise the faces and countenances, and even the very forms of the images, differed not a little from those which they themselves worshipped separately. A Roman would tolerate an Egyptian depicting a God in the form of a cow, or a ram, or even a dog: it was enough for him to see something painted or sculpted. But neither do the images of the modern Roman religion have anything that would clash with the usage, morals, and civility of the ancient pagans. The forms of men and women are; and these are no less varied, or beautiful, than the icons of the Ethnic deities. If any Pagan had seen them consecrated, placed, painted, arranged, and crowned with that rite and adornment which now prevails in Rome; if he had seen the incense that is burned to them, if the wax candles that are lit, if the veneration that is offered, if the chapels that are dedicated, frequented by a great crowd of adorers, if he had seen the tables laden with rich gifts, I do not doubt that, content with so blessed a pomp, he would at once have embraced the Christians as brothers, and would have approved their religion as sister to his own; how truly I affirm this is sufficiently proved by the example of that Ethnic whom we recently heard comparing the cult of his own idols with that which the Christians of later centuries offered to the images of the Lord Jesus, of the Angels, and of the holy men. If, therefore, the primitive Church of Christ had possessed any of this kind, if it had religiously worshipped them (as is now done), the Holy Fathers would doubtless not only not have hidden them from the Pagans, but in their prudence would have disclosed them, placed them before their eyes, and shown them, since the sight of them seems to have been of the greatest moment for placating, or at least diminishing, that envy with which the Christian religion then burned among their princes and citizens.

Therefore, the very fact that the Pagans did not know that any images existed in the churches of the Christians most openly proves that in truth none were then used by them in religion. Let us imagine, however, since Perronius so pleases, that the Christians of that age, with a certain preposterous and plainly incredible wisdom, hid their images; certainly it cannot be denied that the principles of both Christian charity and prudence demanded of them that, when their adversaries were pressing and with a great voice reproaching them for lacking idols, and testifying that this was vehemently displeasing to them, they should reveal whatever there was of this mystery, and should teach at last in good faith that their Church did not lack images, although different from those of the

Ethnics, and that they rendered them the due mode of cult and veneration, and that they were deterred by no other fear from bringing them to light than the imminent persecution from their savagery. Who does not understand that Octavius (if indeed he felt the same about religion as the Seventh Synod) owed this confession and instruction to his Caecilius? And yet he did nothing of the kind, as we have heard above. He only brings forth some reasons by which he proves that it is a sin for God to be painted, and by this he sufficiently testifies that he had no idol of God, and acknowledged no image.

For there are altogether two ways of repelling an accusation; one, by which we deny that what is objected has been done: the other, by which we defend that what we confess to have been done, was rightly done. Caecilius accuses the Christians of having no known idols. Octavius responds on behalf of the Christians that there is no need for idols. Therefore, he admits what was objected, namely that he and his have no idols in the use of religion. Otherwise, all the defense he uses, denying that idols are necessary in religion, is absurd and ridiculous. But (you will say) if the Christians had no images at all in religious use, why does Caecilius not simply demand why they have no idols? To what purpose does he add that, "no known idols" unless to signify that they had some, but unknown ones? Furthermore, if the Christians had no images hidden from the Pagans, what is the meaning of those things which Caecilius had asked before the words we recited above, "Why do they strive so hard to hide and conceal whatever it is they worship, since honorable things always rejoice in the public, while crimes are secret?" To these things I respond that the Pagans, who knew of no religion that did not worship some visible effigy of a deity, or at least employ some external rites and ceremonies, when nothing of this kind occurred among the Christians—no image, no sacrifice, no mystical symbol—were left in doubt as to what to decide about their God, and were led by this to suspect one thing or another about him; as can be seen both in this same writer, and more fully in Tertullian in his *Apology*, ch. 16, where several most diverse, most absurd, and plainly prodigious opinions of the Gentiles on this matter are recounted. To Caecilius, wrestling with the same difficulty of judgment, it occurred that it might be possible that the Christians secretly worshipped a deity of a shameful and dishonorable form, whose effigy they were so deterred by some shame that they dared neither to make it public nor to bring it forth openly. Suspecting this, he asks, "why do they strive to hide whatever it is they worship? why do they have no known images?" tempering his speech so that he does not seem to object to them as certain something that is doubtful and not well ascertained, as if to say, "Either they have no idols at all, or if they have any, they certainly have them hidden, and of such a kind that they cannot bear to expose them openly to our eyes and senses."

Minutius in the same place. And that this is Caecilius's meaning is proved in the first place by the comparison he institutes between our people and the Jews; "The solitary and wretched nation of the Jews also worshipped one God, but

openly, with temples, altars, victims, and ceremonies." Then the response of Octavius to these things does not allow us to doubt that this was Caecilius's intention: "Do you think," he says, "that we hide what we worship, if we do not have shrines and altars? For what image shall I fashion for God, when, if you think rightly, man himself is the image of God." Now indeed (as we have shown above) the very fact that the Pagans did not know that there were any images in religious use among the Christians argues this quite openly, that there were some; and then also that other fact more openly, that when the Pagans made this accusation, the Christian men responded thus, for whom it was of the greatest interest, if there were any images among them then, that they should be brought forth and shown to the Pagans rather than be hidden and concealed. But before I proceed to other matters, it will perhaps not be out of place to explain briefly in passing what Caecilius means when he says that the Christians of that time had no temples. For his speech is not to be taken as if there were then no buildings in which the men of the Christian communion held their sacred assemblies, where they could both be instructed in divine matters and supplicate the common God together; such as are those which today are called the temples of the Protestants. For it is sufficiently established not only from the history of Eusebius, but also from several other monuments of the ancient Church, that the Christians already had sacred edifices of this kind; and if they ever lacked them anywhere, this was done by the violence and injury of the Pagans, who unlawfully envied pious men that resource and liberty, and not by any religion of the Christians themselves. But both Minucius in this place, and perhaps others elsewhere, by the name of temple understand a place proper to God and divine worship, and sacred not so much by use as by dedication, in which the deity is thought to reside in a certain special manner, and to exercise its force and power far otherwise than elsewhere; in which, finally, for this greatest reason, an external and properly so-called sacrifice is offered to the deity, as being more present there; such as was the temple of the Jews in Jerusalem; such as were also either the temples of the Pagans in the past, or are now the temples of the Roman people. Of this kind of temple, certainly, neither did those ancient Christians ever have one, nor do we now have one; to which Octavius not obscurely refers, when he denies that the power of divine majesty can be enclosed within one small shrine. For what Perronius contends, that the word "temple" was then used by Minucius in this place, and commonly by the Pagans, in the sense that it signified only that edifice in which there was some idol consecrated in the ethnic rite, and (as he says in Greek) ἀποθεωθέν, this, I say, is a futile invention of a man serving his cause, which can be overturned with no trouble. And indeed, that a temple for the Pagans was not only that in which the idols of the gods were placed, but also that in which there was no consecrated image, is most clearly proved by this one passage of Plutarch in Numa, in which he says that the Romans for the first one hundred and seventy years built temples (ναοὺς) and cellas for the gods, but had no image during that time, thinking it a sin to express higher things by lower ones, and that God could not be approached

otherwise than by the mind. The same is also confirmed by a passage of Lampridius in his *Alexander Severus*, which I have chosen to transcribe here in its entirety, because it is remarkable and pertains most especially to our matter, and teaches that in those ancient times there were no images in religious use among the Christians; from the edition of Salmasius, p. 120. "He wished to build a temple to Christ (he is speaking of Alexander) and to receive him among the gods. It is said that Hadrian had also considered this, who had ordered temples without images to be made in all cities, which for that reason today, because they have no deities, are called Hadrian's, which he was said to have prepared for this purpose. But he was prevented by those who, consulting the sacred rites, had found that all would become Christians if his wish were fulfilled, and the other temples would be abandoned." And thus indeed both Plutarch and Lampridius bestow the name of temple even on those edifices in which there were no images. As for Minucius himself, it is certain that he does not understand the name of temple in such a way that he uses it otherwise than for that edifice in which there is an idol dedicated in the ethnic rite, since in him occur those words already recited by us above concerning the Jews, in which Caecilius says that they worshipped one God with temples, altars, and victims. In which passage, while Caecilius opposes the Christians to the Jews in this respect, he demonstrates most clearly that, when he denied that the Christians had any temples, he said this in the sense which we have just received, and not in that which his adversaries attribute to it. But let us now return to the cause of images. We have heard Celsus above, in Origen, simply denying that any idols are dedicated by Christians. Now to this Perronius responds thus, as to say, that it was not his meaning that he understood that there were no images of Christians at all, but that there were none consecrated in the name of the gods in the ethnic rite. Refutation of the discourse p. 178.

What can you do with these men, who, in order to defend their cause, do not fear to twist the speech of God and men at their whim? He denies that Christians dedicate idols. "Not at all," says Perronius. "He does not deny this: what he means is something far different." Was there ever any greater or more unjust force than that you should assume for yourself the right and authority to change at will the very thoughts of men, and indeed of men dead for many centuries? But the reason which Perronius adduces for this invention of his is truly marvelous. For, he says, the name ἀγάλμα, that is, of an idol, whenever it is used by Pagans κατ' ἐξοχὴν and concerning matters pertaining to religion, always signifies a statue consecrated with the title of some god, and, as he likes to say, deified. But I here appeal to the faith of all the Grammarians of Greece, who testify with one voice that ἄγαλμα, in Homer indeed and other most ancient authors of this language, from the etymology of the word itself, was in general that with which anyone rejoices, ἀγάλλεται, such as are the donaria which, for the sake of elegance or price, are either placed in the temples of the gods, or are preserved as κειμήλια in the treasuries of men; from Eustathius on the Iliad, Roman edition, p. 456. but among more recent writers, in whose number Celsus is, ἄγαλμα ἰδίως ξόανον is

properly and peculiarly a carved image; whence ἀγαλματοποιὸς is said of him who in Latin is a statuarius or sculptor, not who consecrates or dedicates an idol, but who fashions it, and who gives it the form not of a god, but of an idol, from which is derived the verb ἀγαλματοποιεῖν, not to consecrate idols, but to make and fashion them; which is the perpetual signification of these words among Greek writers. For so Origen used both, and indeed, lest examples be sought from afar, in a few verses above that passage which we are now discussing, where you have these words, from Origen, book 8 against Celsus, p. 401. "Among the makers of images, the works of some are wonderfully successful, while others make images less well": which Gelenius translated thus, "Among the craftsmen of idols, the works of some excel even to a miracle, those of others are less good"; properly, they make statues less well or less suitably. Therefore, since the word ἀγάλματος is general and indefinite, it signifies without any distinction any made image, whether profane, civil, religious, public, private, whether of a Pagan or of a Christian; and it posits nothing else in the thing to which it is attributed, besides the form of an image; no differently than the name of man simply and promiscuously comprehends any animal endowed with reason, of whatever census, genius, and dignity; so that it is no less accidental to an image, τῷ ἀγάλματι, and adventitious beyond the nature of the thing itself, to be sacred, or as I may speak with the adversary, deified, than for a man to be a musician or a priest.

Of the Christians, certainly, as many as thought images should be worshipped, had no religious scruple about calling those ἀγάλματα which they themselves consecrated for this use; which can be seen in that much-recited saying of Isidore among the Fathers of the Seventh Synod, from Council 7, Act 1: "There is no account of a temple that does not crown an image." For I do not think they understand this of an idol consecrated and deified in the ethnic rite. I could bring forward six hundred examples of the same kind. But there is no need, since the adversary seems to concede the very thing we affirm; for he wishes the sense of ἀγάλμα to be restricted only when that word has been used by Pagans, and indeed concerning religion; tacitly confessing that it is to be understood more broadly if it ever occurs either in the speech of Christian men or is said of things outside of religion. For thus they define the name ἀγάλμα, that whenever it is used by Pagans κατ' ἐξοχὴν and concerning matters pertaining to religion, it always signifies a statue consecrated with the title of some god, and deified. A truly marvelous definition, which it is hardly possible to establish in a sense in which it is not either false, or certainly inept. It is false, if, as the words profess, it signifies that a Pagan man, speaking of religion, never uses the word ἀγάλματος unless of his idol consecrated by rite. For what prevents him from calling that bronze statue, which was famously dedicated to Christ at Paneas, an ἄγαλμα, if the conversation happens to turn to it? Surely what was permitted to Sozomen, a Christian writer, from Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History, book 5, ch. 21, "a notable statue (ἐπίσημον ἄγαλμα)," I do not see why it should not be thought to have been equally permitted to a Pagan man. But if you take the Perronian distinction of

ἀγάλμα in this way, that he means by that name to be understood an idol consecrated to some god in the ethnic rite, whenever it is said of those images which are used by Pagans in the business of religion; what can be imagined more inept, or more diluted? For thus the matter finally comes to this, that the name is to be thought to signify a deified idol, whenever it is said of a deified idol; as if I should pronounce that the name of man, whenever it is said of a musician, designates him who is skilled in music. A truly horrible secret, and plainly worthy of being revealed to us by so great a Master. I, however, confess that the sense of this and of other words is to be taken according to the nature of the subject matters, and to be established and defined from it. From the Iliad, edition of Rome, 387. Therefore, in the places in which we are engaged, since the conversation is about religion, I grant that those idols are signified, not which are used in common life, but which are used in religion, and that Celsus's meaning is, not that he denies that Christians have any images at home either for the adornment of their houses or for the memory of their friends, but that he signifies that they employed none in the use of religion, none in sacred and divine matters. Which the matter itself about which he speaks sufficiently teaches, and the word which he used, when he says that Christians "flee the dedication of statues (ἀγάλαζα ιδρύθζ φεύγειν)," that is, as Gelenius translates, "they flee the dedication of statues." For as has been observed somewhere by Eustathius, to dedicate (ιδρύειν) is properly said of a temple or an idol. But if the effigies and images which afterwards in later centuries crept into the churches of the Christians, if it was the custom then also to consecrate and dedicate them; I ask, what could be more foolish or more inept than that philosopher, who rebukes those for fleeing the images of statues? "But the images of Christians," says Perronius, "are different from those of the Pagans." Who denies it, when even the idols of the Pagans themselves differ immensely from each other in cult, form, and habit? It is enough that although they are diverse in other respects, in this they certainly agree, that both are ἀγάλματα, that is, idols, which both these and those wished to be used in religion and sacred matters according to their own mind and sense. The Eucharist which is in use among the men of the Roman communion differs not a little from ours; and the baptism of the Ethiopians and the Latins is not at all the same. Nevertheless, it would not be tolerable if someone were to say that either we lack the Eucharist, or the Ethiopians baptism. So neither, if there is any difference between the images of the Christians and the Pagans, does it follow that a Pagan man is permitted to complain of the Romans of these times, that they "flee the dedication of statues." But this is furthermore to be observed in the Perronian distinction, that even if it were granted that the word ἀγάλμα used in the business of religion always signifies an idol of the same kind as those which were worshipped by the ethnics, it will not therefore have been concluded that an idol in that sense is either an image of God or a deified sign. For besides the gods, the Pagans also worshipped heroes, demigods, and demons, and dedicated idols to them, and the greater part of what they adored, they called gods only improperly and καζαχρησικῶς; for

they held that they were ministers and intermediaries of that first and highest deity, to whom alone the name of God properly belongs. As for the ἀποθέωσις of idols, those same adversaries who so often boast of it in this cause, confess that the most acute and subtle of the Pagans held idols to be mere signs and images of the gods, which has also been demonstrated by us above. From these things it is established that even if the signification of an idol is to be measured most greatly by the sense and opinion of the Pagans, that name will nevertheless also comprehend those images which are neither of any god, nor are indeed considered ἀποθεωθεῖσαι, but are instituted and dedicated only to signify the nature of divine things, of which kind the idols of the Saints which the Roman Church now venerates undoubtedly are, it certainly follows that they had no place of use in religion among the ancient Christians.

Now it is to be noted that Celsus was one of the number of the more subtle, who held the sacred images of the Pagans not as gods, but as signs and gifts of the gods, which he himself (as we have mentioned above) professes, and Origen elsewhere explicitly testifies, from Origen against Celsus, Book 7, p. 387 of the Greek codex, "Celsus," he says, "states that he considers those idols not to be gods, but offerings to the gods (αναθήματα)." From which it follows, since he is the very one whose words are in controversy, that the name of ἀγαλμάτων must here necessarily be taken in his sense for images dedicated to a deity, and not, as the adversaries imagine, for idols changed into some divinity by consecration, in which number not even Celsus himself counted his own idols. The same thing is also most evidently confirmed by what the same author elsewhere reports from Herodotus, that the Persians "dedicate neither statues (τὰ ἀγάλματα), nor altars, nor temples, and consider others who do this to be foolish." from the same, Book 7 against Celsus, p. 384 of the Greek codex. What? Does Celsus mean this, that the Persians indeed had in religious use no deified idols, or dedicated with the title of gods, but that there were others instituted and consecrated for this purpose only, that they might either represent or signify gods or heroes? By no means. It is clear that he means that among the Persians there were in religious use no idols whatsoever of any kind or institution, which is necessarily concluded from the reason adduced by Herodotus. For he adds that the Persians seem to have instituted this for themselves, because they did not believe that the gods had a human form, which is the opinion of the Greeks. Therefore, there is no doubt that when Celsus says in the same place that Christians cannot bear to look at temples, altars, or statues (τὰ ἀγάλματα), he likewise understands that there were no idols at all among the Christians, and not (as the adversaries wish) that there were no deified ones (ἀποθεωθέντα), even though there were some of a different kind among them, instituted for this purpose only, to express and represent the nature of God and the Saints.

But whatever Celsus's intention may have been in these matters, it is certainly clear from Origen's response that the Christians of those times had no sacred (as they call them) images, which, if there had been any among them at that time,

Origen would not have omitted in this place, but would have detected Celsus's error and demonstrated the difference of his own from the pagan ones. There was formerly no less difference between the feasts of the Christians and the Gentiles than that which exists today between the idols of the Romans and the Pagans. When, however, that same Celsus objected to the Christians that they celebrated no feast days, as the Pagans did, Origen immediately refuted the man, and having executed many truly excellent things on that subject, from the same, ibid., book 8, p. 404 of the Greek codex, he explicitly names our Lord's Day, Easter, and Pentecost as the feasts of the Christians. Here, therefore, in a plainly similar case, if there had been any images among the Christians at that time, there is no doubt that Origen would have likewise commemorated them, with Celsus reproaching that Christians flee and hate this whole genus. And yet, he says nothing in this place about those images. He does indeed bring forward some images and effigies, which he confesses were then held in the greatest price and honor among the Christians, but they are utterly different from those about which we are now disputing. from the same, book 8, p. 400 of the Latin-Greek codex, 396. "The idols," he says, "to be dedicated to God are not the works of artisans, but are carved and formed in us by the word of God, namely the virtues in imitation of the first-born of all creation, in quo are the examples of justice, temperance, fortitude, wisdom, piety, and the other virtues. These are the statues dedicated to God in the souls of those who practice justice according to the precept of God, and fortitude and piety, and the other virtues, by which we believe the archetype of all such statues, the first image of the invisible God, the only-begotten God, is decently honored"; and what follows in the excellent writer. From which, first, it is to be seen how vain was all the suspicion of the adversaries concerning the word ἀγάλμαλ, or idol, as if it did not suit other signs than those which are infested by demons. For that very name, which Perronius imagined to be so dire and horrendous, Origen does not fear to attribute both to the most holy virtues of Christian piety and also to the faithful themselves, when he calls Christ Jesus "the archetype of all images (τὸ πρωτότυπον πάντων ἀγαλμάτων)." Then also here we see a most excellent writer opposing to the idols of the Pagans not other images which were among the Christians, but the true effigies of the virtues, and the sacred form of the new man created in that justice which is according to God; which abundantly confirms that there was not yet in the use of the Christian religion any of those idols which are wont to be fashioned either from wood, or from marble and metals, and the rest of this kind of material.

CHAPTER IV. The third reason, drawn from the disputations of the Holy Fathers against the Jews.

BUT what these contentions of the ancient Fathers with the Pagans prove, the same is taught, and certainly no less obscurely, by their extant disputations with the Jews, namely that the primitive Church had no images instituted and consecrated for that religious use which obtains today. No one is ignorant of how greatly the entire nation of the Jews abhors images, both universally and especially in the business of religion. The cult which is paid to them, they hold as a certain supreme and inexpiable crime, than which none more noxious or dire can be committed by mortals against God the best and greatest. Nor has this opinion settled in their minds recently, or the day before yesterday. Ever since the times of the release from the Babylonian captivity, the hatred of idols among them has been so great and so constant that they have never been willing to receive into the temple an image of any creature whatsoever, considering it a sin most severely forbidden by divine law; whence it happened, as Bellarmine wrote in *On Images*, ch. 7, that those who had formerly been most prone to idolatry, after the advent of Christ were most superstitious against images. If, therefore, the Christian Churches had had images from the very first times, if they had paid them the same cult and the same veneration that now obtains in the Roman rite, there is no doubt that the most bitter and implacable enemies of our discipline, the Jews, would have seized upon this, and would have accused it as some unspeakable impiety. Indeed, in the times when the cult of images is confessed to have flourished among Christians, it is also established that the Jews did not sluggishly attack that rite, and counted it among the chief crimes of the Christian faith. A dialogue written a little before those times is praised by the Fathers of the Seventh Synod, in which a certain Jew is introduced addressing his Christian interlocutor with these words, from Synod 7, Act 5: "I have believed in all things, and I believe in the crucified Jesus Christ, that he is the Son of the living God. But I am scandalized by you Christians, because you adore images; for Scripture everywhere commands that no one should make for himself a graven thing, or any likeness." Nor did Leontius of Neapolis, bishop in Cyprus, omit this accusation of theirs in the apology he published for the Christians against the Jews, striving earnestly to remedy their scandal in some way; as can be seen in the passage from the fifth book of that work, which we have described at length in the Acts of the Seventh Synod. The same is the diligence of all the men of the Roman communion, who for some centuries past have commented on anything against the Jews. There is none of them who does not strain every nerve of his genius to remove the stumbling block which they understand is placed in the minds of the Jews by their images. If anyone desires examples, let him read the Epistle of Ludovicus Carretus; let him read the Sepher Amana, and the Catechetical Dialogues of Fabianus Fioghi, and other disputations of this kind against the Jews. from the same, Act 4.

And yet we do not find that anything of this kind was objected to our religion by the Jews who lived in the first times of Christianity, nor do we see the Fathers of that memory, when disputing with the Jews, laboring anywhere on this subject, or striving to remove this scruple from the minds of their adversaries. There is extant Justin's quite lengthy dialogue with Trypho the Jew. There is extant Tertullian's golden book against the Jews. There are extant in their works many disputations scattered throughout against the same. In these volumes it is explained at length what the Jews objected to the Christians, and what the Christians responded to the Jews in opposition. How is it that in neither part of the disputation is there any mention of images? Why was such a specious accusation omitted by the Jews, or such a necessary defense by the Christians? Was the keenness of intellect of Trypho and the other Jews of that age more blunt, or their zeal for their cause colder, than that of their posterity? Was there in Leontius, and the other doctors of the seventh century, either greater erudition, or more ardent charity, than in Justin and Tertullian? And yet it is not right to say or imagine any of these things. What else therefore remains, but that we should say that this whole difference proceeded not from the persons, but from the very diversity of the things, and from that change which was made in the religion of the Christians in the following times? and so we should conclude that Trypho for this reason nowhere objected the cult of images to Justin, because it was not yet known to the Christians? and for that reason Tertullian did not labor in mitigating the odium and offense of our images among the Jews, because that rite had not yet been received into either the faith or the discipline of Christians? but that the change which happened in the third or fourth century after, when images were openly both dedicated and worshipped in the Churches, rightly brought it about that both the Jews accused this rite, and the Christians purged and defended it, whenever they disputed about religion among themselves? Nor indeed does what has been brought against this by Bellarmine invalidate our argumentation, from Bellarmine, On Images, c. 6. §. Nicholas Sanderus, that the churches of the Christians are called houses of idolatry by the Jews in the Talmud. For to answer this first, even if it were established that the sacred assemblies of the most ancient Christians were defamed by that name by the Jews, it would not thereby be effected that images were then in use and honor among the Christians, since it is certain that every cult of religion that differs from the faith of the Jews is called by them עבודה זרה, that is, external and alien cult, whence it happens that they do not hesitate to call any sacred edifice, in which men whether ethnic or Christian exercise such a cult, a בית עבודה זרה, that is, a house of idolatry. But there is also another certain proper and peculiar reason, on account of which they think that this name should be attributed to the cult and churches of the Christians, namely the adoration of the Lord Jesus, whom the Jews (as is known) think to be anything but the true God. Therefore, they also consider us ourselves, who by the grace of God have no images in the use of religion, to be idolaters nevertheless, and do not fear to mark our sacred rites with that same title of עבודה זרה, that is, idolatry,

and to call our churches בית עבודה זרה, a house of idolatry; because, forsooth, we exhibit the highest cult and divine honors to the Lord Jesus, as the true Messiah and true God. But besides this, I also respond this in the second place, that it is false that those words of the Talmud were said of the churches of the first Christians. For Bellarmine wishes that the Talmud was published in the year of the Lord 476, from which it is manifest that those words which have been brought forward by the adversary, if they truly exist there, pertain to the Christians, not of the first, or second, or even the third century, but of the fifth, at which time the use of images had already begun to creep into some churches, as will be demonstrated below, God willing, in its proper place and order. But there is also another thing I shall say: in that whole passage of the Talmud which Bellarmine praised, in the second order as he says, the first tractate, the second distinction (and that is the second chapter of the tractate on the Sabbath), none of the things which are cited appear. Many other things are contained there about oil and the wick with which the lamps were furnished on the Sabbath day, which are plainly alien to this disputation. Finally, by an accurate consideration of the Talmud, our argumentation is not only not solved or weakened, but is moreover strengthened and proved. So that this may be understood, it must be observed that that immense mass of the Babylonian Talmud (for the Jerusalem Talmud no longer has any authority among the Jews) is composed of three parts, neither of equal dignity, nor of the same age, but most diverse from each other. The first of them is the Mishna, the principal and by far the noblest, the cause and subject of the whole work, which we have received was composed by Rabbi Judah Ha-Kadosh, around the year of Christ two hundred. The second is the Gemara, as it were a gloss on the Mishna, which comprises the disputations, traditions, and decisions of the most ancient and, in this genre, principal Masters, compiled by Rabina and Rabbi Ashi, and completed and received into use in the year of Christ five hundred, or thereabouts. The third part contains the commentaries of the Rabbis, published indeed in the same volumes, but in a different form and appearance of characters, written and published in the tenth and eleventh centuries after the birth of Christ, at which time the studies of letters among the Jews began to emerge from the shadows of the deepest ignorance, in which they had lain as if buried for a long time, and gradually to revive. If the authors of this last part sometimes attack the images of the Christians, it is no wonder, since they lived in times when it is established that they were in great use and price among the Christians. Indeed, I would not think it at all absurd that something similar is found in the Gemara itself, since at the end of the fourth century from the birth of Christ, images had already crept into some churches. But in the Mishna, published at the end of the second century, nothing at all occurs about the images of Christians. Which diversity confirms not obscurely the very thing we wish. For if in those times in which we have said the author of the Mishna lived, the cult of images had already been received among the Christians, it does not seem that he would have omitted such a fine occasion of attacking our people. He would have noted and signified it

somewhere, especially in the chapter of that book which is inscribed *De avodah kokhavim*, or *de avodah zarah*, that is, *on the worship of stars*, or *on idolatry*, Tractate 9, order 4, which was the proper place for this matter. And yet in this whole place there is nothing about the Christians. For that they were Pagans whom he there censures, and not Christians, is established from this, that among their feasts he commemorates the Kalends and the Saturnalia, which were of the Pagans, not of the Christians. Therefore, I see nothing now standing in the way of our deducing from this silence of the ancient Jews what we had set out to do, that there was no use of images in religion among the Christians of that age.

CHAPTER V. The fourth reason, drawn from the fact that the Fathers nowhere endeavor to solve and explain the difficulties that arise, or certainly seem to arise, from the cult of images.

BUT even if we were to grant to our adversaries that they may imagine the Jews of those times to have been either so blind as not to have seen so specious an occasion for incriminating Christianity, or so lazy and torpid as to have been unable to use it for the advantage of their cause; certainly the very building up of the Church demanded that the Holy Fathers should propose and explain to their listeners the difficulties emerging from the veneration of images (if indeed it was then in use), whenever they came upon a place opportune for this discussion. It is of no relevance to the present undertaking to contend more sharply that the veneration which the Romans now accord to their images conflicts with the law of God, which so often and so explicitly forbids us to fashion and worship any likeness of celestial or terrestrial things. This at least certainly cannot be denied, that there is a great appearance of conflict between these things. For who is there, even from the flock of their own infants, who, seeing the images consecrated in the most holy places with great pomp, and a very great force of men prostrate before them, adoring on their knees with the greatest signification of humility, and on the other hand hearing those tremendous voices of God the best and greatest, thundered of old from the heights of Sinai, "You shall not make for yourself a graven image, or any likeness of those things which are in the heavens above, or which are on the earth beneath, or which are in the waters under the earth; you shall not adore them, nor worship them"; who, I say, is so much an infant, that perceiving these things, and comparing them even most lightly with each other, does not immediately ask how that cult of theirs does not conflict with this law of the Deity? For if there is no conflict between these, how then has it happened that from the time the veneration of images was openly received, this chapter of divine law has always been most constantly objected to it, by all who for these eight or nine centuries past have been adversaries of this religion, or superstition, both those who were once called Iconoclasts in the East for having overthrown images, and those who in the West followed the decrees of the Synod of Frankfurt, to say nothing of those who in the most recent centuries have departed from the communion of the Roman Church? If there is no conflict between these things, how is it that the men of the Roman party have for so long now been in such a turmoil in resolving this difficulty? See Bellarmine, On Images, c. 7. Some of whom, like Catharinus, will have it that this divine precept is not moral, real, and eternal, but positive and temporary only, and of such a kind that not the faithful of the new, but only of the old covenant are to be thought to have been bound by it; Others, among whom is Cajetan, solve this knot thus, that they say by that mandate this one thing is forbidden, that an image made by man be held for God; Still others employ a distinction, stating that an idol is one thing, and an image another; which disagreement and turmoil of individuals among

themselves on this subject sufficiently cries out, as it seems to me, that the difficulty of this cause is supreme and almost desperate. For unless they themselves had judged that this article of the law appeared to conflict vehemently with their veneration of images, they would surely never have so solicitously withdrawn it from the eyes and sight of the common people. For their unlaudable prudence has proceeded to the point that, while they take care that the common people of the Christians should not find out what that command of God is, they have taken care that the words in which it is contained be omitted entirely in the editions of breviaries and catechisms. For example, in the decalogue, "worship one God," and in the Catechism of Lyons, 1600, and in Bellarmine's Catechism. Therefore, however much they may deny that their cult of images truly and in reality conflicts with the divine law, they certainly neither ought nor can deny that it seems to conflict vehemently. Therefore, if the opinion of the ancients concerning this matter of images had been the same as theirs, it is not to be doubted that they would have employed the same diligence as they in defending and explaining it, and would have taken the same pains to remove from the minds of the faithful all that appearance of repugnance between the divine law and their cult which has been mentioned. They would never have expounded the decalogue without some mention and solution of this difficulty; and what the Roman theologians now do, they likewise would have diligently warned that by the first words of God not images, but idols are forbidden, not the likenesses of the holy servants of the Lord, but of the fictitious deities of Paganism; and that by the latter words it is indeed decreed that we should not adore images, or hold them as gods, but not in such a way that it is a sin either to venerate them or to deem them worthy of any cult in religion. And yet you will find these observations in none of those writers who flourished in the first centuries of Christianity. When Origen expounds this command of the divine law at length in his eighth homily on Exodus, he neither excepts the images of the saints, nor does he signify by a single little word that they should be excepted. Tertullian, Clement, and, from Tertullian against Marcion, and Clement's Stromata, Book 5, the even more ancient Justin, commemorate the words or the sense of the same precept in various places, and they do not hint at any trace of this Roman doctrine. Nor did the much more recent Augustine, commenting on the decalogue expressly, touch on any of those things which are now everywhere common among the adversaries. from Augustine's Questions on Deuteronomy, q. 4. What shall I say of those questions which the Roman schools have for so long been agitating with such contention of minds on both sides, as to what and of what kind is that cult which is due to sacred, as they call them, images? Are they themselves to be adored, or only the exemplars to which they refer? Then, if they themselves are to be venerated, does latria, or dulia, and hyperdulia befit them? Finally, is that honor, whatever it may be, exhibited to them properly, or improperly, univocally or equivocally, for their own sake, or for the sake of another, analogically and reductively, or simply and absolutely? These mysteries of such recondite words, these

ambiguities of such subtle questions, you will no more find in the monuments of those who wrote within four hundred years of the birth of Christ, than the very names of Bellarmine, or Peresius, or Vasquez, who now agitate them. And yet those ancient Fathers, no less than the theologians of this age, ought to have discussed and explained those things, if their opinion concerning the cult of images was the same as that of these latter. For this whole disquisition and distinction of these matters is at once brought forth by the modern hypothesis of the adversaries, and it pours it forth no differently than a body placed in the light casts a shadow; so that the consecration and veneration of images cannot be established without immediately exciting the attention of even a moderately intelligent mind to inquire what species of honor or cult is suitable for them, and by what reason it is to be discerned, since the Scriptures most openly teach that that which belongs to God cannot be transferred to them without sacrilege, and the common sense of men itself cries out more than enough that no other is due to their material or form. Since, therefore, we find that none of the most holy, most acute, and in every kind of literature most versed Fathers, in the so many monuments of their genius which they have left, has either taught, or warned, or finally even touched with his fingertips, any of those things which cohere so closely and indivisibly with this question; it must necessarily be confessed, that neither to them, nor to that primitive Church in which they lived, in the first four centuries from the birth of Christ, was the veneration of images, which Rome today teaches, either approved or known.

CHAPTER VI.

The fifth reason, derived from the fact that the Fathers taught or wrote not a few things alien to, and conflicting with, the veneration of images; such is that they condemn the art of painting, some as absolutely illicit, others as vain and useless.

But why do I observe that these distinctions and exceptions of the Roman school are nowhere to be found in the writings of the Fathers? I have another, far greater and more certain argument for the cause which I am pleading. For not only do those things which the worshippers of images could not have been silent about or omitted nowhere occur in their monuments, but many things furthermore occur in them which are vehemently abhorrent to the sense and judgment of him who thinks images are to be venerated. For example, Clement of Alexandria, comparing that edict of Moses, by which images are forbidden, with a certain saying of Pythagoras, says in Clement's Stromata, book 5: "Moses, many centuries before, openly established the law that no graven, or molten, or fashioned, or painted image, or likeness should be made, so that we should pay minimal attention to sensible things, but pass on to those which are perceived by the intellect. For the majesty of God is rendered cheap and contemptible by the ready habit of seeing, and to worship the essence which is perceived by the intellect through matter, is to cheapen it through the senses." Following Clement is Tertullian in his book *On the Spectacles*, ch. 23: "Now indeed, as for the very

work of masks, I ask whether it is pleasing to God, who forbids every likeness to be made, how much more so an image of himself?" And this indeed they said. Is it thus, I ask, that these writers would have spoken, if they had felt the same about images as the modern Roman doctors? It is clear that Tertullian thought that the second commandment of the decalogue (which the adversaries wish to be part of the first) simply and absolutely forbade every likeness whatsoever, from whatever material, fashioned by whatever artifice, whether drawn or shaded with a pen, carved with a chisel, or cast by fire, for whatever use, whether of religion or of common life itself. This is most openly taught by his passage just recited, in which he refutes the use of masks from this precept; absurdly, unless we understand him to have established that all images whatsoever were forbidden by this divine law, and not (as the adversaries wish) only those which represent empty and fictitious things, and which are adored with the cult of latria. He, indeed, in his book *On Idolatry*, ch. 3, says that the devil brought into the world the craftsmen of statues and images, and of every kind of likeness. And in the following chapter, speaking of the Lord, he says, ibid. ch. 4: "Throughout the whole world He has forbidden such arts to the servants of God." Then in the following chapter he resolves what he understood could be objected to him, that the likeness of the bronze serpent was erected in the desert by God's command, responding that the same God who by law forbade a likeness to be made, commanded the likeness of a serpent, from ibid. c. 5. "If you observe the same God," he says, "you have his law, 'You shall not make a likeness.' If you also consider the precept for making a likeness that came later, you too should imitate Moses. Do not make any image against the law, unless God himself commands you." Therefore, when in the fourth book against Marcion he set out to prove, from book 4, ch. 22, that Moses and Elijah were recognized by Peter on Tabor by the light of an extraordinary ecstasy, and not by any natural knowledge, he argues from the fact that he had never seen their images, because the law forbids any to be made. For this proof necessarily requires that Tertullian thought it was wrong for the Jews to make images not only of false deities, but also of holy men. For it is clear that all this argumentation of his is futile and vain, if the Jews were permitted to make and have images of this kind, such as the Romans defend today. And from these things it is clear in what sense are to be taken those words which were written by the same author in the second book of that work, from ibid. book 2, ch. 22: "Forbidding a likeness to be made of all things which are in heaven, and on earth, and in the water, he also shows the reasons, namely, restraining the substance of idolatry." For he adds, "You shall not adore them, nor serve them." He does not mean by this what someone might perhaps suspect, that those images are forbidden by the law of God which are adored and worshipped, but that those which are not worshipped are by no means forbidden (if he said this, he would contradict himself, and would most manifestly overturn the passages we just recently brought forth from him). The sense of those words is far different. For they simply signify this, that the reason why God so strictly forbids every likeness is this, that he might exterminate all

idolatry whatsoever from his people, by restraining and removing the very substance of idolatry, that is, the art of painting and sculpting, from which idolaters borrow the object and matter of their impiety. And lest anyone think, as some men of the Roman communion feel today, that Tertullian also thought the same, namely that only the Jews, and not Christians, are held bound by that command of the divine law, it seems it should be briefly demonstrated that the matter is far otherwise. I pass over the fact that the Fathers everywhere hand down that the Decalogue (if you except the one command of the Sabbath) is otherwise the natural law, and that therefore all men whatsoever are bound by it, under whatever dispensation they may have lived, as can be seen in Irenaeus in the fourth book, ch. 31 and 32, in Cyprian's *Testimonies*, book 3, ch. 59, in Origen's eighth homily on Exodus, and others who are praised by Bellarmine himself for this opinion. from Bellarmine, On Images, c. 7, §. But this. But omitting these witnesses, it is plain (as has also been noticed by the adversaries themselves) that Tertullian, throughout his entire book *On Idolatry*, contends that this precept must now (that is, under the New Testament) be observed with greater care and zeal than ever before. For first he argues sharply, as is his wont, and eloquently, that idols ought not to be made by Christians, and he harshly censures some who would admit into the clerical order those who were not ashamed to make idols for the pagans, or (as he says) to confer bodies on demons. from Tertullian, On Idolatry, ch. 7. To those craftsmen of painting and sculpting who object that they will have to die of hunger unless they practice this art, which is the one they know, he persuades them to transfer their industry to some work similar to their own; "let him who used to design a sign," from ibid. c. 8, "plaster a cupboard; let him who used to carve Mars from a linden tree, assemble a cabinet," and finally let them practice arts that provide a living without departing from the discipline. Who does not understand that this man, if he had thought that only idols were forbidden to Christians, and not all likenesses whatsoever, would in this place have advised craftsmen of this kind to devote their efforts to sculpting images of the Heavens and of other living things, from which no less nor more uncertain profit would be returned than from the signs of the gods? For if the Church of that time had been so adorned and variegated with every kind of image as the Roman Church is today, who doubts that he would have ordered them to change not the art, but the type of work, and to fashion Christ and the saints and martyrs instead of gods and demons? To adorn the Churches of the Lord, not the temples of the ethnics? And finally, to supply a most useful spectacle for the piety of the faithful, not fodder and matter for the impiety of the Gentiles? Since, therefore, Tertullian suggests nothing of this kind, since he plainly abrogates those arts, and transforms painters and sculptors into plasterers and carpenters, it is clear that he thought it was equally forbidden by divine law to paint the Saints of the Church and the deities of the pagans, or to simulate them in any art at all, and that that whole genus of craft is simply illicit, and of such a kind that no Christian can practice it with sound piety. Thus, he elsewhere objects to Hermogenes that painting is a

grave crime, from the same, against Hermogenes, ch. 1. "Furthermore," he says, "he paints illicitly, he marries frequently; he defends the law of God for his lust, he despises it for his art; twice a forger, both with branding-iron and with stylus, wholly an adulterer both of preaching and of the flesh." To be sure, Hermogenes thought it was lawful for a Christian man both to paint and to remarry; Tertullian, however, admitted neither. But because Scripture seems to forbid one of these, namely painting, and to permit the other, namely second marriages, he therefore says that that man defends the law of God for his lust and despises it for his art. But there is no need to demonstrate with more words that this writer thought it simply and absolutely wrong to fashion any likeness whatsoever. For the adversaries themselves, from Du Perron, Acts of the Conference of Fontainebleau, f. 93, confess this most explicitly and in so many words, but they allege that he was a Montanist at the time he wrote those books in which this dogma is found interspersed. To this exception I reply, first, that this cannot be affirmed with certainty of all of them. The work against Marcion was indeed composed by Tertullian when he was already following Montanus, which is argued by the fact that in chapter XXII of the fourth book he mentions a certain question that he had with the Psychics, that is, the Catholics; for so he calls them mockingly from the time he departed from the communion of the Church. Likewise, the disputation against Hermogenes seems to have been written when he was already favoring Montanus. But the book *On Idolatry* is counted among the works published by him as a Catholic by Pamelius, Archdeacon of Saint-Omer, a man whose numerous and lengthy studies on this author exist. Nor do the reasons that led Perronius to another opinion seem sufficiently firm. He says that the book *On the Spectacles* is mentioned in the one *On Idolatry*. Now, he concludes that Tertullian was a Montanist when he published the one *On the Spectacles* from the fact that, among the pleasures and delights of a Christian man, he lists, from the book on spectacles, c. 29, seeking revelations: from which the adversary further collects; "therefore he was a Montanist, and much more so when he composed the book *On Idolatry*." To this I reply thus: first, what is assumed is uncertain. For if a certain mark of Montanism is to seek revelations, then Brigid and not a few others of her kind, whom the Roman Church holds in the highest honor, will have to be numbered among the heretics. Nor, likewise, is Gregory, the Roman bishop I, to be considered a Catholic, who made so much of revelations that he did not hesitate to fill his writings with them, and especially the work of the *Dialogues*. Furthermore, neither from the fact that the book *On the Spectacles* is mentioned in the one which is *On Idolatry* does it seem necessarily to follow that the former was published before the latter. For it often happens that authors revise works already long published, and in second editions add things that were lacking in the prior ones. Who will teach for certain that Tertullian did not do something of this kind here, and in a repeated edition of the book *On Idolatry* mentioned that he had treated some things pertaining more fully to that argument in the book which is *On the Spectacles*, although it was published after the first edition of the one which is *On Idolatry*?

But the adversaries also assert this in the second place, that Tertullian, if he had been a Catholic at the time he wrote that work *On Idolatry*, would not have simply and absolutely condemned every fashioning of any image or likeness whatsoever; since he would not have been ignorant that this dogma was repugnant to the custom received in the Church, in which he himself elsewhere relates that Catholics used glass chalices which had a depicted image of the Shepherd carrying on his shoulders the sheep that had gone astray. But their cause is not helped at all by this argument. For neither Tertullian, nor any other writer of his age, testifies that it was a universal law or custom of the Catholic Church at that time that all Christians should use such depicted chalices. And if the matter had been so, it would (I confess) scarcely have been permissible for Tertullian to contend that all painting is illicit. In the place cited, he relates nothing other (which will be demonstrated more fully hereafter in its proper order) than that this was done in that one Church which he there rebukes, which I believe to have been the Roman one. Now, everyone sees how absurd it is to establish that no one was permitted to depart from the dogma or rite of any particular Church without thereby losing the name of Catholic. from Epiphanius's letter to John of Jerusalem. For, not to stray further from the present matter, if that were to hold, Epiphanius would have to be counted among the heretics, who, although he had seen an image suspended in the church at Anablatha, did not hesitate nevertheless to affirm in a letter written to John of Jerusalem that it is contrary to the authority of Scripture for an image of a man to hang in the Church of Christ. In the same number would also have to be held the nineteen Fathers of the Council of Elvira, canon 36, who, although they knew that there were already some Churches that kept images among their ornaments, nevertheless decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the Church. Why then, because it had pleased one bishop, or someone from his clergy, that the parable of the Shepherd be painted on the glass of a chalice, should we think, I say, that it was not lawful for any of the Catholics of that age, nor for Tertullian himself, a most learned man, of sublime genius, and of great authority in those times in the Carthaginian Church, of which he was a presbyter, to either mutter or write anything against it? Besides, who can also affirm for certain that, when he wrote the books *On Idolatry* and *On the Spectacles*, in which he contends that all painting is plainly illicit, that image of the Shepherd already existed on the chalices of those Catholics against whom he later sharpened his pen in the book *On Modesty*? Or if it already existed, that Tertullian also knew it, so that the authority of that picture would undermine, or certainly restrain, his opinion on images? For it could certainly have happened, either that at the time the book *On Idolatry* was written, that emblem was not yet depicted on the Roman chalices, or certainly that Tertullian, living far away in Africa, did not know that it was depicted. And so it appears that all the foundations of the Perronian response are mere postulations, mere bold and equally uncertain conjectures of that man, such as are for the most part the observations and speculations which he is accustomed to bring forth in these

disputations concerning the religious opinion of the ancients. But, let us grant freely and out of good will what he could not prove by right and reason; let it be so; suppose Tertullian was already a Montanist when he wrote those books in which he either defends, or urges, or posits this opinion against pictures; does it follow from this that he drew and received this dogma, whatever it is, from the school of Montanus? Who does not know that this sect had innumerable things in common with the Catholics? And that Tertullian, after he gave his name to it, nevertheless most constantly testified that his dispute with the Catholics was not about faith, or about doctrine itself, but about discipline and polity? Which anyone can learn, both from the second chapter of *On Monogamy*, and from the former disputation *On Fasting* against the Psychics. And this was observed by the most distinguished man Rigaltius in that preface which he prefixed to the nine books of Tertullian. Therefore, since he so openly and so vehemently fights that all painting is illicit, it seems that there was certainly nothing then in the faith of the Church that fought against this dogma; from which it also follows that the veneration of images was then unknown to Christians, which no one fails to see cannot have a place in the Church, unless it is established that the art of painting and sculpting is not only licit, but also highly useful and necessary for the pious.

But if the adversaries deny assent to such clear arguments, come then, let them prove by the testimony of some ancient and suitable writer what they contend, that this was one of the ravings of Montanus. For what they assert, that "all Christian discipline was reduced by that sect to a certain morose and superstitious austerity, so that it is not surprising that it also rejected the cult of images"; while they argue thus, they most openly mock us. For I ask, whom do they think they will persuade that it is superstitious to abstain from the cult of images? Let them call this an error, if they please, let them even call it heresy, as they are wont to over-dramatize and to defame with that word whatever departs from the decrees of their Rome; but superstition, certainly, they cannot name it, unless they wish to be ridiculous. They ought rather to fear that the epithet of superstition applies much more truly to the cult which they themselves show to images, compelled by no authority of God, by no law, but voluntarily and from the mere whim of their mind, and from that "will-worship (ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ)" which was not noted by Paul in vain from Colossians 2. And the severity and austerity which they here mention, who ever heard tell that it abhorred the use and cult of (as they call them) sacred images, or so opposed it that the two could not stand together? And yet, none are now more addicted to images, none more religious, shall I say, or superstitious towards them, than those who most studiously practice fasts, stations, and xerophagies, and (to put it in a word) the entire discipline of Montanus. I ask, did the Carthusians, or the Capuchins, and other orders of the most severe (as it seems to them) piety, sad and austere beyond all the moroseness of Montanus, reject painting? In ancient times, moreover, when the most fatal contentions of Christians among themselves concerning images raged for so long throughout the entire East, did those ages produce any who either defended them more keenly, or worshipped them more

studiously, than those who at the same time professed the greatest austerity and severity of all, namely the monks and hermits? Since, therefore, morose and superstitious austerity is the last thing to scorn these matters, it is so far from being the case that the severity of Montanus proves that the veneration of images was in use in the Church in the age of Tertullian, that I think plainly the contrary: from the very fact that Tertullian so expressly rejects pictures, it is most clearly concluded that their cult was unknown to the Christians of his age. But let us dismiss these uncertain and frivolous things, such as the adversaries pursue all too often. Let us see if what they posit and assume in their response is true. They want this opinion—that divine law forbade all painting—to have been either drawn by Tertullian from the ravings of the Montanist Paraclete, or certainly to have been dreamed up by himself and produced from his own brain. Let us imagine it to be so. Surely, when first, either in the sect of Montanus or in the books of Tertullian, there appeared so new (as is supposed) and so contrary a dogma to the common opinions of Christians, which forbids images not only to be worshipped (as was later decreed by the Synod of Frankfurt), but even to be made, and tears them from the sacred buildings, and plainly exterminates them from all use in human life; it is clear that the Church of that age (if it thought the same as Rome does today) ought to have gone to meet such a fury, to censure its authors, and in their errors to condemn this one as capital, expressly and by name, and to strike it with a sacred thunderbolt. For so it is done even now with those whose opinion on this whole matter is much more modest, and who deny to images not their value or civil use, but only their veneration in religion, who prohibit them not from being made, but from being worshipped; not from being used in life, but from being adored in the Church. It is not probable that the zeal of the primitive Church for preserving so useful and, as they will have it, necessary a rite was less than that of the Roman Church now. And yet it is most certain that this opinion was never noted by the ancients either among the heresies of Montanus or among the private and singular opinions of Tertullian. The works of Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine, Theodoret, and others are extant, in which we have both a detailed description of the history of heretics and accurate lists of what each one taught erroneously and contrary to the faith of the Church. They do not mention the Montanists among others in passing, and Jerome, in his fifty-fourth letter, has detailed their entire controversy with the Catholics more than the rest. And yet none of them attributes to them a singular opinion on images, differing from the faith of the Church. Who would think that such and so great men would have omitted this, if there had really existed so notable a disagreement of theirs from the Catholics on this article? But Tertullian would have by no means escaped the censure of the ancients, if this opinion of his had been contrary to any (as they imagine) head of ecclesiastical doctrine. For so great was the learning of that man, so admirable, so keen his judgment, so strong his eloquence, so elegant his sentiments, and so vigorous his manner of disputing, that by the abundance and felicity of his genius he long overcame the odium of the schism he had made

from the Church, the monuments of so great a writer retaining even their own grace and esteem among the Catholics. For it is established that Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, no mean star of the Western Church, called him "Master," and was accustomed to let no day pass without reading something from him. Therefore, since the Catholics handled him no less than any other writer, it could not happen that they did not notice this opinion of his concerning images, interspersed throughout his works (as we have demonstrated above), and treated and disputed at length in the book On Idolatry. And who doubts that, having noticed it, they would have condemned it with a black mark, if it had fought with the decrees of that Church as much as with the cult of the Roman Church which exists today? And yet, of so many ancients who have recorded the schism and errors of Tertullian, there is none who, I will not say has condemned this opinion of his or overturned it with a strict anathema, but who has even reprehended it, or even mentioned it in passing.

All attack the man's departure from the Church; they attribute to him the error of the Chiliasts, the ravings of Montanus concerning Ecstasy and the new revelation of the Paraclete, and an excessive rigor of discipline. They do not omit that he, as Augustine indicates in *On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis*, book 10, chapters 25 and 26, and in his work on heresies addressed to Quodvultdeus, heresy 47, contends that the soul, and God himself, is a body. But not with a single word do they assail the fact that in so many places he so stubbornly and so vehemently abolishes all images, leaving none for Christians for either public or private use. Let this dogma of his, then, have flowed (if you please) from the dregs of Montanus (which our adversaries now, after fourteen centuries of it being unheard of, are pleased to dream up); certainly, the fact that it was so neglected by the Fathers demonstrates by that very fact either that it was of no concern to the ancient Church what was done with images, and therefore that the ancients thought far differently about this whole matter than the Romans now feel, who do not suffer images to be touched with the tip of a finger without immediately crying out and aiming dire thunderbolts and anathemas at the heads of any who have dared to disturb so excellent (as they indeed judge it) and so necessary a part of their piety.

But the ancient Church did not tolerate this opinion in Tertullian alone. It is well known that Clement of Alexandria and his disciple Origen, most ancient and by far the most celebrated authors, were both of the same opinion, and that they committed it to writing, and were on that account neither censured nor noted by the Catholics of their own time or by posterity. Clement, indeed, in his *Protrepticus*, speaking of the idols of the Pagans, and proclaiming us blessed who are without that spectacle, says, in the last edition of Paris, page 41: "For it is openly forbidden to us to practice the deceptive art. For the Prophet says, 'You shall not make a likeness of anything that is in heaven, and of whatever is in the earth beneath.'" Likewise, in the sixth book of his *Stromata*, page 687, he says: "Just as he who steals another's property, since he does a great injury, justly falls

into the evils he deserves; so he who appropriates divine works through the art of modeling or painting, and says that he is the maker of plants, and animals, and similarly, those who imitate true philosophy are thieves." And Origen, in his fourth book against Celsus, page 187 of the Greek codex, 185 of the Latin, says: "Into their city" (he speaks of the Jews) "no painter was admitted, no sculptor, the laws banishing this entire class of art, lest an occasion be given to crass men, and lest their minds be called away from the worship of God to earthly things, through enticements of this kind." To prove this, he recites the following from Deuteronomy: "For they had," he says, "among others, this law: 'Do not act impiously, nor shall you make for yourselves a graven thing in the likeness or image of a male or a female, in the likeness of all the beasts that are upon the earth, or of winged birds flying under the sky, or of any fish whatsoever, that live in the waters under the earth.'" Therefore, since Origen testifies elsewhere (as we have indicated above) that this law also pertains to the people of the New Testament, there is no doubt that he thought it was a sin for a Christian to practice any of those arts. I do not now ask whether their opinion is true or not; for that is not the issue at present. I only insist on this: that whatever it may be, the ancient Church would certainly not have allowed it to be taught among its own with impunity and without a mark of censure, if it had felt the same way about images as Rome does now. For if there were any of the modern theologians to whom something similar to what we have just transcribed from Tertullian, Clement, and Origen were to slip out, all the men of those parties would immediately raise an outcry, struck by the novelty of the thing, and the Vatican itself would soon be stirred, and would undoubtedly thunder a bolt upon the head of the wretched man, unless he, by a humble and prompt satisfaction, were to timely divert from his own neck the tempest gathering from that formidable mountain. And yet, from the death of these three men whom we have cited, at least thirteen centuries have now passed, and in so long a time not one among the ancient Catholics has been found who noted them on account of this opinion, let alone excommunicated them; so great is the difference between the customs and tenets of ancient and present-day Rome.

To this I think should also be referred what Chrysostom writes in his 49th homily on Matthew, edition of Savile, page 447, discussing various arts, and removing this name from the industry of confectioners and caterers. "Not only these," he says, "but I would not even call the art of painters, or of embroiderers and feather-workers, an art"; for which statement of his he adds this reason, that the works which are made by them are "useless to human life." Is that so, O most holy mouth? Do you dare to expunge from the number of arts that which, above all, supplies ornaments for your churches, and for all Christian people, and indeed for yourself, the sweetest and most useful exercises of piety? What else could that most excellent and eloquent man reply to this complaint, if he were now living on earth, except that he was not in the least accustomed to conform his speech to those opinions which were received for the use of the Romans only many ages after him, nor could he have foreseen so far in advance that Christian

men would one day place some part of their piety in that cult which he himself judged to be either illicit, or certainly vain and empty? For he, as is noted in the Seventh Synod, Act 6, page 776 D, always felt that "we enjoy the presence of the Saints through the Scriptures, having images of their souls, not of their bodies." For to condemn the art of painting, and not even to count it among the arts, is not at all inconsistent with a man feeling as Chrysostom did, as we shall hear later; but it is as alien as can be from the dogma and rite of the modern Roman Church. And yet we do not read that a charge was ever brought against Chrysostom by any mortal for having felt and spoken thus, any more than against Tertullian, Clement, and Origen, for not having hesitated to commit to writing what we have recited above; although, to be sure, Chrysostom, neither living nor dead, lacked the most bitter adversaries of the highest authority in the Church, who, if these words of his had clashed with the public use and sentiment of the Christians of that age, would not have omitted them, but would have broadcast them everywhere to create ill will against a most hostile man.

CHAPTER VII. The sixth Argument, drawn from the fact that the ancient Fathers reprehended the cult which some heretics rendered to the images of Jesus, the Apostles, Moses, and others.

Indeed, that ancient Church of the first four centuries after the birth of Christ not only did not reprehend or chastise these things said in contempt of images (which it absolutely should have done, if its opinion on this head of religion was the same as that of Rome today), but also, what must not be omitted, it explicitly noted the veneration which some heretics showed to the images of Christ and the Saints, and it specifically enumerated and condemned that cult among the errors of those heretics. Irenaeus, in the first book of *Against Heresies*, chapter 24, speaking of the Gnostics, says: "Moreover, they also have some images, some painted, and others made from other material, saying that the form of Christ was made by Pilate at that time when Jesus was with men, and these they crown and set forth with the images of the philosophers of the world, namely with the image of Pythagoras, and Plato, and Aristotle, and the rest; and they practice the rest of their observance concerning them in a similar manner to the Gentiles." Epiphanius, two hundred years after Irenaeus, reports the same in his heresy of the Carpocratians: "They have images," he says, "depicted in colors, some also of gold and silver, and other material, which images they indeed say are of Jesus, and were made by Pilate. They have them, however, secretly; and besides, with those of certain philosophers, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and others, they also place other images of Jesus, and having placed them, they adore them and perform the mysteries of the Gentiles." Who, indeed, are the Gentiles, whose customs are other than sacrifice and other such things? Augustine, a little younger than Epiphanius, writes similarly in his book *On Heresies*, that Simon Magus had offered to his disciples for adoration images of himself and of a

certain prostitute whom he had made his associate in crimes, and that he had established them in Rome with public authority as idols of the gods. Then in the seventh chapter of the same work, concerning Carpocrates, he has this, in heresy 7: "His sect is said to have had a certain associate, Marcellina, who worshipped images of Jesus, and Paul, and Homer, and Pythagoras, by adoring and offering incense."

Now, besides the matter itself, it seems that in this history it should be observed that the Gnostics claimed "the form of Christ was made by Pilate at that time when Jesus was with men." For this (as it seems to me) openly signifies that there were then no images of Christ among the Catholics, for if there had been any among them, this whole fabrication of the Gnostics would be inept and empty. For if images of the Lord Jesus were then commonly available among Christians, what need was there to trace their origin so far back, and to invent so odious and preposterous a narrative, so that they might seem to be truly of Jesus? Moreover, the fact that they referred the first origin of this image of the Lord to Pilate, surely teaches us that the Christians of that age not only did not believe (what the entire Roman Church believes today) that the face of Christ was painted in colors by Luke, but thought it absurd and incredible that any of the first disciples of Christ should have either fashioned his image himself, or have had it fashioned by others. For if the matter were otherwise, these Gnostics must surely have been foolish, and devoid of all reason and of common sense itself, to have thought that their images should be referred to a Pagan man rather than to a Christian, to an executioner of Christ rather than to a disciple. What then is it? Doubtless they foresaw that the Church, which had no images of Christ, would marvel at these of theirs, would decry them as false and fictitious, would ask whence they came, and by whom they were handed down to them. To pre-empt that question, they invent that an image of Christ was painted by a painter while he was on earth. But since they also perceived that it would be far from any semblance of truth if they were to attribute this icon of Christ of theirs to his first disciples, because it was known that they, educated under the law of the Jews, abhorred such things, and had left no image of Christ to the Catholics (to whom, most of all, if they had had any such thing, it was fitting for them to hand it down), the heretics, lest they involve themselves in these difficulties, fled to Pilate, and were compelled to attribute the deed, which they understood could not be ascribed to Christians without the utmost absurdity, to a Pagan man. I do not see what other reason for that fable of the Gnostics can be offered besides this, which evidently establishes that images of the Lord Jesus were as yet unknown to true Christians.

Now, as to the main point of the history, which confirms this same thing much more lucidly, those who defend the cult of images are accustomed to reply that those heretics were reprehended by the most holy Fathers not because they had and worshipped images of Christ and Paul, but because they offered to them the same cult that the Pagans offered to their idols, namely sacrifices and other

things of that kind; and also because they mixed them with the images of Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and of the poets and philosophers of the Gentiles, and consecrated them in the same place. To this I first of all warn that Irenaeus, whose testimony ought to be held in far higher regard than the testimonies of the other two (since they received all their information from him), nowhere records that sacrifices were offered by the Gnostics to the image of the Lord. He only says that it was "crowned by them, and set forth," that is, erected and placed in a high place to be seen and venerated. Epiphanius, however, takes the words of Irenaeus that follow, "and they practice the rest of their observance concerning them in a similar manner to the Gentiles," to mean sacrifices, which it is known were offered by the Gentiles to idols; for he says, "For what other customs of the Gentiles are there, than sacrifice and other things?" by which words he manifestly shows that what he says about sacrifices being offered to the image of Christ, he does not testify on his own faith and authority, but reports it as drawn from the passage of Irenaeus described above, and collected by reasoning. But those words of Irenaeus, who is thus the sole witness and authority in this case, do not necessarily signify the cult of sacrifices; and they can be taken no less conveniently to refer to the other honors which the Gentiles were accustomed to bestow upon the images of illustrious men. For they would dedicate them magnificently erected, clothe them, veil them, adorn them with both woven and loose flowers. Indeed, the observation mentioned by Irenaeus seems rather to be referred to this than to sacrifices. For here the subject is not the statues of gods, but the images of Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the other sages of the age. Now, the Pagans were indeed accustomed to fashion images of such men, whose names were illustrious and venerable, and to hold them in great honor, but not so as to perform sacred rites for them (which was the proper cult of gods and demigods); and if anyone dared any such thing, it was the madness of one, and perhaps another, singular man, not the publicly received custom of all.

But let it be so; let not only Epiphanius, but even Irenaeus himself explicitly have accused those heretics of sacrificing to the image of the Lord Jesus. How does this help our adversaries to weaken the force of the argument we draw from this passage? "He reprehends them," they say, "both because they sacrificed to their images in the rite of the Gentiles, and because they mixed them with the images of Pagan men." Quite right. For both are wicked. For even if it were permissible to show some veneration to the images of Christ and the Saints, it would not thereby become right either to offer them ethnic sacrifices or to join to them in that cult the images of Gentile philosophers. But from the fact that Irenaeus censured both of those acts of the Gnostics, it does not follow, as our adversaries wish, that he either praised, or admitted, or certainly did not reprehend, the fact that they had and venerated these images. His words are clear and explicit: "Moreover," he says, "they also have images, some painted, and others made from other material, saying that the form of Christ was made by Pilate at that time when Jesus was with men, and these they crown." Who does

not see that the whole thread, so to speak, of his discourse is the same? So that if what he says about the fashioned and crowned images of Jesus, he does not say with the intention of reprehending it; then neither should what he adds about them being mixed with the images of gentile philosophers, or about the cult of sacrifices, be taken in the sense that he wished to reprehend or condemn it. For there is nothing in the whole text that establishes any distinction at all between these two parts of Irenaeus's discourse. But our adversaries admit that Irenaeus attributes these last two things to the Gnostics as crimes and parts of their heresy. Therefore, they must necessarily confess that he also recounts that first point about them with the same intention and sense, namely that they fashioned and crowned images of Jesus, not as something praiseworthy and common to them with the Catholic Church, but as a private and singular rite of that sect, and to be repudiated by other Christians. Nor, indeed, do I see how these things can be explained otherwise. In this whole chapter, Irenaeus recounts the ravings of Carpocrates and his disciples, and those monstrous opinions and rites, from which, as it were, that most foul sect was composed. Having detailed many things of this kind, and lastly that "others of them mark their disciples by cauterizing them on the back parts of the right ear," and that they call themselves Gnostics, he then and indeed continuously adds, "moreover, images" and the rest, which have been described by us above. Does not this continuous and nowhere interrupted series of discourse cry out that this very thing is also reckoned by Irenaeus among the impious fancies of the Carpocratians? Surely, either it must be confessed that Irenaeus was not at all sane when he wove these things together so continuously, or it must certainly be conceded that these things which he recounts last were also peculiar to the Gnostics, and not common to them with the Catholics.

To make this clearer, it must be observed that Irenaeus did not simply say, "They also have images of Jesus, which they mix with the images of Gentile philosophers." For if he had said only this, there might perhaps be some room for suspecting that the images of the Gnostics are mentioned here with no other intention than that their contumelious superstition towards them might be understood. But now it is far otherwise. For first he notes the material and form of those images, that they were partly painted with colors, partly sculpted and, as he says, fabricated from other material. Then he teaches from whence they derived their origin, claiming that an image of Christ was fashioned by Pilate. Finally, he says that they were also crowned by the Gnostics. To what end does he recount all these things so accurately, if they were not the private inventions of this sect, but the public tenets and institutions of the Catholics? If the Church of that age had had images of Christ and the Saints, if it had dedicated them in the sacred buildings, if it had venerated them with a religious cult, with bared head and prostrate body, if it had adorned them with wreaths of flowers, with gold, with silver, and with gems (as the entire communion of the bishop of Rome does today), there is no doubt that Irenaeus would have tempered his discourse in this place in a completely different way than he did. What in this

institution of the Gnostics agreed with the rites of the Church, he would have distinguished from the adventitious stain and impiety of those heretics, and what they had in common with the Catholics he would have carefully separated from what was peculiar to this sect, and would have constructed the whole passage in this or a similar manner: "They do indeed have an image of the Lord Jesus, and they venerate and crown it with garlands just as we do, boasting that it was made by Pilate while Christ lived on earth. But they contaminate its just and legitimate cult most foully, by mixing it with the images of Gentile sages and worshipping it with sacrifices in the pagan rite." Here I appeal to the good faith of our adversaries, if their zeal for their cause has not blinded them; should not Irenaeus have spoken thus, and instituted his discourse in this or a similar form, if indeed the man's sentiment about these things was what that of the Romans is today? Is there truly anyone among them who, if he were to undertake to write this history of the Gnostics, would not take care that these things be accurately distinguished from one another? Yet Irenaeus speaks far otherwise (as has been demonstrated above); and plainly in the manner in which someone from among the ministers of the Church of Geneva would seem to have written the whole matter. Let us conclude, therefore, that the Catholics, among whom Irenaeus lived, had nothing in common (at least as far as the matter of images is concerned) with the present sentiment and rite of the Roman Church.

This can be gathered with all the more force from what we have observed above, because Epiphanius and Augustine treat the same matter in no other way than Irenaeus does. Let us imagine (what is vehemently abhorrent to any semblance of truth) that Irenaeus was so incautious, or so negligent of his reader, that, although feeling the same as the Romans on this article of faith, he nevertheless used such an inconvenient and dangerous discourse; surely Epiphanius and Augustine, writing on the same matter many years after Irenaeus, ought toto have removed that stone of stumbling from the way, and (as the Romans do so anxiously today) to have warned the reader not to think that the just and legitimate cults of sacred images should be confused with the impious rites of the Gnostics. Who does not see that the edification of the faithful demanded this admonition from their pens in such a place, all the more earnestly as they understood that this duty was neglected, shall I say, or rather flagitiously omitted by Irenaeus? Who indeed in this part behaved himself so, that the scandal which he ought to have cleared from this path, he seems to have thrown it there himself, if indeed the present opinion of the Roman Church concerning images is true (as our adversaries wish)? Yet nothing of the sort was done, either by Epiphanius, or by Augustine, who not only do not remove that stumbling block, whatever it is, but even replace it anew. For each of them, with the discourse of Irenaeus unchanged or mitigated, weaves this whole narrative with the same simplicity, in the catalogue which they compile of the Carpocratian heresies, noting that they had, erected, and worshipped images of Christ and Paul. Which I do not see with what good faith, what judgment, what shame they could have written so, if it is true that they venerated the images of Christ, Paul, and the

Saints with the same rite that now obtains in Rome. Similar is the account of what Epiphanius relates elsewhere, in *Heresies 55*, page 469 of the edition of Petavius, that the inhabitants of Arabia Petraea in Edom and Rocom, on account of the stupendous miracles he performed, hold Moses as a god and adore his image, "which," he says, "having expressed or fashioned, they went astray"; in which place he most openly reprehends them for having fashioned the image of Moses, and establishes that this was either an error, or certainly the occasion of the error into which they fell, when according to the modern tenets of Rome, both their zeal should have been praised, for rejoicing in the effigy of so great a man, and at the same time that enormous opinion about the divinity of Moses should have been chastised.

CHAPTER VIII. Seventh Argument, that there are no images in the inventories of the ancient Churches. Eighth, that the true face of Paul and Mary was unknown to the ancients. Ninth, that the Armenians lack images.

Here, by way of a concluding flourish, I am pleased to add to the foregoing three arguments on the same matter, which although they may seem lighter to others, are not, in my judgment at least, to be scorned. The first of these I draw from the fact that if the use of sacred (as they call them) images among Christians had once been the same as it is now, some mention of them would undoubtedly occur in the so many monuments of the first antiquity that survive today, especially in those places where what was then the sacred furniture (so to speak) of the Churches is described. Yet, in fact, no such images are found in Christian books until very late; so much so that Germanus himself, bishop of Constantinople, a most avid praiser and most keen defender of them, a man otherwise most learned and most versed in ecclesiastical antiquities, cited no witnesses for his cause older than Basil and his brother Gregory, who are known to have lived in the time of the Emperor Valens, when the fourth century after the birth of Christ was already advanced and drawing to a close. What testimonies are brought from them we shall examine in their own place afterwards, and as I hope, we shall demonstrate that they by no means establish that any cult was then paid to images by Christians.

But to deal with the matter at hand now, Eusebius, as has already been observed by the most illustrious hero Philippus Mornaeus in his work *On the Eucharist*, chapter 2, has left us a most diligent description of that temple which was magnificently constructed in Tyre by Paulinus, the then bishop of that city, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, book 10, chapter 4, pages 110-111 of the edition of Robert Estienne. Having detailed all the parts of the work, all the ornaments, one by one, the porticoes, the ceilings, the chair, the candelabra, he says nothing of images; which yet he could not have omitted without disgrace in so accurate a description, if it is true that they were then held, as they are now, not only for

the most noble ornaments of the Churches, but also for the most useful instruments of faith and piety itself. The same argument can be drawn from the description of that edifice which the same author, in book 3 of his *Life of Constantine*, page 141, committed to writing, which the Emperor Constantine founded in Jerusalem among those who led a solitary life. Athanasius, while narrating the plunder of the Church of Alexandria, most cruelly carried out by Pagans and heretics, places that bitter slaughter most accurately before our eyes, mentioning the broken table, the torn veils, the overturned bishop's chair, the scattered seats of the clergy and people, the violated fonts of holy baptism. Do you think that the audacity and petulance of those impious men would have spared the sacred images, if any had then been in that temple, as they are now in all the churches of the Roman rite? Or if they had also raged against them, that Athanasius would have omitted it, in a place where he most diligently pursued every single part of that disaster? Yet he says nothing of images; from which it appears that there were none then in the Alexandrian Church, which certainly would not have been lacking in such and so great an edifice, if they had then been held by the ancient Christians in the same place and number as they are held today among the Romans. The same narrative occurs in the epistle to the Orthodox, which is circulated under the name of Athanasius, although the diversity of style and speech, and of some matters, compels me to doubt whether it is really the genuine work of that author. Optatus Afer, a bishop, in the place where he describes at length in his work *Against the Donatists*, book 6, what had been petulantly and contumeliously done in the Churches formerly possessed by the Catholics, does indeed mention the altars, chalices, divine codices, veils and altar linens, and other things of this kind either broken or scraped away by those raging men, nor is he silent about the walls, which they had washed with a kind of lustral water as if contaminated by the Catholics; but he does not mention golden or silver statuettes of the crucified Christ, or any images at all. Who would believe that the Donatists, who had not spared the altars or the chalices, would have left images, if any had been in those sacred buildings, whole and untouched; or that Optatus, who so anxiously pursues the other details, would have concealed this part of their madness, if they had designed anything of this kind? Palladius, in his *Life of Chrysostom*, most diligently described the image of that horrendous night, in which that most holy man, surrounded by the wickedness and power of his enemies in Constantinople, was shamefully seized and abducted by force by the praetorian soldiers in a most foul tumult; when the impious robbers, basely rushing into the Church from which he was being torn away, left nothing untouched or inviolate. He relates that in that slaughter the Sacraments were thrown down and trampled, the holy waters of baptism were stained with blood, virgins were wounded, women were put to flight, and all the furniture of the Church was plundered. He makes no mention of images. Jerome, in his epitaph for Nepotian, in epistle 3, enumerates all the sacred things which Nepotian, when he undertook the office of deacon, cared for with the greatest diligence, which were entrusted to him: the altar, the

veils, the vessels, the walls of the church, the doors, the floors. He commemorates images no more than those whom we have praised above. Therefore, since no mention was made of images by them in such opportune places, it is sufficiently clear that none were yet in use among Christians in those first centuries of the Church.

A second argument for the same thing we draw from the fact that Augustine testifies that it is uncertain what was truly the face of the Lord Jesus, what that of the Blessed Virgin, what that of Paul, or what the form of their countenance and their whole effigy. In his book 8 *On the Trinity*, chapter 4, he says, "The very fleshly face of the Lord is varied and pictured by the diversity of innumerable thoughts, though it was but one, whatever it was." Then in the following chapter, he says, "Whether that face of Mary was the one which occurs to the mind when we speak or remember these things, we neither know at all nor believe"; and a little later he says that "we are utterly ignorant of what Paul's face was like." But indeed, if, as our adversaries pretend, it had been the custom from the very times of the Apostles that images of holy men should be painted to be dedicated and worshipped in the assemblies of the faithful, and that same custom had constantly remained among posterity in the following centuries, doubtless the effigies of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and Paul would have been most accurately expressed and fashioned from life by those first Christians, and preserved with the greatest care by all, both in the temples and at home; and it is plain, if the hypothesis of the Romans stands, that those ancient faithful could not have failed in this duty without the greatest impiety, and one plainly abhorrent to the morals of that Church. Yet that nothing of this kind was done is apparent from those words of Augustine which we have just recited. For if icons of Christ, and of Mary, and of Paul had been expressed from life in their very times, and had been faithfully transmitted by them to posterity, as it were, by hand, Augustine, who lived at the beginning of the fifth century after them, could have known with no difficulty what their faces were, what their countenances, what their features; yet he confesses that this is utterly unknown to him and to the other Christians of the same age, so that it is necessary that images of Christ and the Saints were not in that price and honor in that ancient Church in which they are now among the Romans.

Lastly, it is also manifest from this, that the Armenians not only do not venerate images, but also excommunicate their worshippers, as has been handed down by Nicon in his little work on their religion, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, part 1, chapter 3: "They do not adore venerable images," he says, "but what is more, their universal bishop with the others strikes with anathema those who do adore them." The same is also affirmed by a certain Isaac, whose manuscript disputation against them is preserved in the Royal Library. His words, since they have not yet been published, as far as I know, I will write down in Greek: “ὡς εἰκόνα Χρισοῦ, καὶ τῆς θεοτόκου μὴ προσκυνῶντες, καὶ τούς τοῦτο μὴ ποιοῦντας, ἀλλ' εἴδωλα ἀποκαλῶντες ἀναθεματίζουσιν οἱ Αρμένιοι.” which means, "That the Armenians are

anathematized, who do not adore the images of Christ and the God-bearer and the Saints, but call them idols." The same in the following little book: “τὰς σεπτὰς καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς θεοτόκου καὶ τῶν ἁγίων οὐ προσκυνέουσι.” which means, "They do not adore the venerable and holy images of Christ, and of the God-bearer, and of the Saints." Wherefore Nicetas, in his book 2 on the emperor Isaac Angelos, says that they agree in this part with the ancient Germans, reporting that among both the adoration of images is equally forbidden. Now, that the Armenians did not depart from the communion of the rest of the East until after the time of the third universal Synod, held at Ephesus in the year of Christ 431, under the emperor Theodosius II, can be sufficiently established from the fact that they accept that very Synod along with the two previous ones, Nicaea and Constantinople, but repudiate Chalcedon and the following ones, as is clear from the disputations of the Catholics against them, and, to omit other things, from the colloquy of Theorianus with their chief Bishop, from Theorian's colloquy, vol 1 of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, page 440, which exists in Greek and Latin in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. From these, moreover, it can be seen that the veneration of images was not received among the Catholics until after the times of the Council of Ephesus; for if it had been either a tradition of the Apostles, or a universal rite of the Christians who lived before the Council of Chalcedon, it would have remained equally in the religion of the Armenians, as did the other catholic and public dogmas of the same Church. Nor can it be answered that they indeed had this custom at the beginning, but in the times following the schism they cast it off. For if this had truly happened so, it would doubtless have been noticed by the Church, and all the odium of this dispute would have been cast upon the Armenians, as if they were the first to abrogate the use of images in religion, with a great loss, of course, of piety; yet we have learned that this was never objected to them; neither by those who lived before the fatal dissensions of the East on this matter, nor afterwards by the patrons of images themselves; who indeed are accustomed to attribute this whole crime to the Iconoclasts, as they call them, who arose some centuries after the schism of the Armenians, that they were the first of the Christian name to overturn the cult and use of images, and that they contracted this stain on the faith (as they fable) not from contact with the Armenians, but with the Jews and Saracens.

These are the things which I have been able to observe in the disputations, rites, and dogmas of the Holy Fathers, and in the whole history of the ancient Church, pertaining to this argument; and I do not doubt that whoever is willing to handle those surviving monuments of antiquity with a mind free from partisan zeal, attentively and seriously, will find much more on this matter. But these very things which we have touched upon demonstrate sufficiently and more than sufficiently that the opinion concerning images which the Roman Church now defends is new among Christians, and not handed down from the Apostles, or from those who flourished in the Church in the four centuries immediately following the Apostles.

BOOK TWO

CHAPTER I. First Testimony against images, from Origen.

I come now to the other kind of arguments, which is situated in those sayings of the Fathers by which they themselves clearly testify what they thought about the use of images in religion. Origen, indeed, most explicitly denies that there were any such among the Christians of his century. For when Celsus ridiculed them because they adored Jesus, a man condemned by Pilate and put to death, and on that account compared them with certain Gentiles who worshipped dead men, such as Zamolxis by the Getae, Mopsus by the Cilicians, Amphilochus by the Acarnanians, Amphiaraus by the Thebans, Trophonius by the Lebadeans, Origen responds thus in his third book against Celsus, page 135 of the Greek codex, 132 of the Latin: "We shall declare that all these are unjustly compared with us. For temples and idols have been set up for those whom he enumerated by their own peoples. But we (who do not show God such honors, as being more fitting for demons consecrated in this or that place, as each either has occupied them themselves, or is compelled to inhabit them, enchanted by certain mysteries) admire Jesus, who has led our minds away from everything sensible, and not only corruptible but also subject to corruption, to the worship of the supreme God, consistent with a correction of life, and with prayers; which we offer to him as a Mediator between all created and uncreated nature, who brings to us all benefits from his Father, and in turn, in the manner of a Pontiff, bears our vows to the supreme God."

Thus far he, whom it was a crime to use in this whole defense, if Christians then thought that the veneration of images was a part of divine worship. He testifies the same thing most lucidly elsewhere, in book 7 of the same work, page 373 of the Greek codex, 367 of the Latin, where he contrasts the piety of the simplest of Christian men with the cult which the greatest of the Gentile philosophers offered to the divinity: "God," he says, "chose the foolishness of the world, those among the Christians who were simplest, living more modestly and purely than the philosophers, to put to shame those wise men, who are not ashamed to address inanimate objects as gods, or as images of gods. For who of sound mind does not see that he who, after those excellent and very philosophical disputations about God or the gods, looks upon statues, and either offers prayers to them, or through contemplation of them, as of some conspicuous sign, tries to raise his mind to the imagination of the intelligible deity? But the Christian, even the unlearned, is most persuaded that any place in the world is part of the universe, and the whole universe is the temple of God, and in any place he prays, with the sensible eyes closed, but with the lights of the soul raised; and thus he ascends above the whole world; nor does he stop at the vaults of the world, but having transcended the supercelestial places in his mind, by the guidance of the divine Spirit, as if already rapt outside the world, he offers prayers to God about no common things; for he has learned from Jesus to ask

for nothing small, that is, sensible; but only great and truly divine things, which, when granted by God through his Son, the Word of God, lead to that blessedness which is with Him."

I beseech you, which of these two images fits more exactly the cults and rites of the modern Roman Church: that of him who, looking at statues, "either offers prayers to them, or through their contemplation, as of some conspicuous sign, tries to raise his mind to the imagination of the intelligible deity," or that of him who, "with sensible eyes closed, ascends above the world in his mind, and there prays to God in spirit?"

But I think I should not omit another passage of the same writer, in which, when Celsus boasted that Christians were doing the same as the Scythians, Numidians, Seres, and other impious and barbarous nations, equally spurning the use of temples, altars, and idols in religion, he most learnedly responds that it does not follow from that conformity that the cult of the Christians and of those peoples should be held in the same place and number, since it not rarely happens that even similar things, or even the same things, are the effects of very different causes, and men abstain from the same things, but not for the same reasons; which he pursues at length, and demonstrates that the causes which impel the Christians and those which impel those barbarians to repudiate the use of idols, or images, in religion differ very much from each other. In book 7 of the same work, page 386 of the Greek codex, 382 of the Latin, he says: "But Christian men and Jews refrain from these things (namely, statues and their cults) because of that passage of the Law, 'You shall fear the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve'; likewise, because of that, 'You shall not have other gods besides me'; and 'You shall not make for yourself an idol, nor any likeness of those things that are in heaven, etc.' Likewise, because of that, 'You shall adore the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve'; and many other similar things, which so prohibit us from altars and idols, that they even command us to die sooner than contaminate our faith in God with such impieties." What could be said more explicitly or more lucidly in this cause? But if anyone should take refuge in saying that this witness means that Christians should be without not all images whatsoever, but only those which were in use among the Pagans, every way of escape has been cut off by Origen himself. For, first, that command of the divine law, which he lays down as the true foundation of Christian faith and piety in this matter, forbids not only the idols of the nations, but the likeness of all things whatsoever, celestial and terrestrial. Second, Origen most explicitly compares and joins Jews with Christians in this respect; from which it necessarily follows that this was a cause common to both, not proper to one. But it was by no means common if the Christian religion dedicated and worshipped images of Christ and the Saints, since it is well known that the Jews admit nothing of this kind, for everyone knows that they have always most constantly repudiated the use of all images, whatever they may be, especially in sacred places.

CHAPTER II. Second Testimony: that of the Council of Elvira.

So much for Origen. Now follows the second testimony on the same cause, from the Council of Elvira. There was once a city in Spain, which Roman writers indeed call Iliberis, but those who lived afterwards in the times of the Goths, with a slight change, call it Eliberis; from which soon the name Elberia, and finally Elvira, was derived; which name remains to this day on a certain hill near Granada, and in one of the gates of the city of Granada, one of which the common people call Mount Elvira, the other the Elvira Gate. In that ancient city (of which, besides these, no traces now exist in the nature of things) there was once held, in the year (as has been recorded by Baronius) of the Christian era 305, a not insignificant Council, which from its name is called the Council of Elvira. There had gathered from various parts of Spain nineteen bishops in all, who defined many things concerning Christian religion and discipline, worthy (as it seems to me) of great observation. But to omit the rest for now, the thirty-sixth Canon of that Synod has it thus: "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted on the walls." This canon was praised in this very cause eight hundred years ago by Agobard, bishop of Lyon, in his learned treatise on images, which Papirius Masson published in our parents' memory. He says: "Rightly, indeed, in order to abolish superstition of this kind, it was defined by the orthodox Fathers that pictures ought not to be made in the church, nor" (for so he seems to have read it) "should that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls." From which it is clear how rotten is the cavil of those who wish this canon to have been forged by the adversaries of images, and to have been foisted upon those ancient Fathers.

But since the evidence of the truth pressed from this side, while the love of preconceived opinions on the other side prohibited admitting anything to the contrary, they were forced to take refuge in a response as impudent as it was foolish, which if it is admitted, the authority of the ancient Fathers will have to be entirely removed from these disputes about religion. For if that canon, which is found in all the codices of the Synod of Elvira, both manuscript and printed, and which is known to have been praised by a most noble prelate of our Gaul eight hundred years ago, is nevertheless called into doubt; what else, I ask, will there be in the monuments of the Fathers about which we can henceforth be certain and secure? Nor are they to be listened to any more, who, in order to undermine the reverence and faith due to the antiquity of this Synod, are accustomed to object that its canons abound with dangerous opinions, and come very close to the rigid severity of Novatian. For it is sufficiently established both from ancient history, and from the disputations of Tertullian, and from the paraeneses of Pacian of Barcelona, and from some other monuments of antiquity, that the discipline of the catholic Church in the first centuries was indeed rigid, and afterwards, at various times and places, being gradually

softened, it relaxed, as has already been observed by the very leaders of our adversaries, Baronius, Petavius, and others, as Petavius notes in his *Animadversions on Epiphanius*, page 23. Therefore, that rigor of discipline is so far from needing to make the Fathers of Elvira suspect to us, that on the contrary it is a most certain argument of their genuine antiquity.

And so those among the adversaries who are more learned, having dismissed such frigid exceptions, enter upon other ways of escaping from these straits. Bellarmine did not hesitate to condemn and confute some of them himself, as being manifestly of too great absurdity; as for example that response of the learned and eloquent man, Andradius Payva, that the Council of Elvira only prohibits an image of God, which is painted to represent the effigy of God himself. But Bellarmine says this does not seem to satisfy, in his work *On Images*, chapter 9. For certainly, if the matter is so, the stupor of those Fathers must have been marvelous, who both forbid what never came into the mind of any Christian man, and deny that they are pleased that there should be pictures in the Churches, so as, forsooth, to signify that the form of God cannot be fashioned or adumbrated with a brush. For the same reason, Bellarmine rejects the opinion of Alanus Copus, an English man, who responds that images are prohibited here because they had begun to be adored by those Christians as if they were gods. But this response, besides the absurdity noted by Bellarmine, seems to me to have this inconvenience as well, that it in no way solves the difficulty objected. The Fathers of Elvira deny that pictures should be had in Christian Churches. The Tridentine Fathers judge not only that they should be retained, but also venerated, that is (as the chief men of that communion indeed interpret that word) adored, and worshipped with a certain analogical kind of honor, reducing it to that cult which is due to their exemplars themselves; and they do not hesitate to strike with anathema those who think otherwise. I say that from these things it is clear that the opinion of the ancient Church concerning images was far different from what that of the Roman Church now is. Alanus guesses that this pleased the Fathers of Elvira because they saw that images were being adored by the Christians of that age as gods. But this is to adduce some cause for that difference which exists between the decrees of the ancient and the new Synods (which we are not now seeking). It is not to demonstrate what we are seeking, namely that there is no difference between them. Whatever reasons impelled the Elviran Fathers to establish this canon, let them indeed be what are imagined. It is at least certain that they took care that there should be no pictures in the Churches, let alone that they, with the modern prelates of Rome, should have judged them to be venerated and worshipped. Therefore, what the Tridentine Fathers command, the Elviran Fathers forbid, and they acknowledge as genuine followers of their discipline only those in whose churches there are no pictures, whom the others, on the contrary, think should be kept from all sacred rites and devoted to dire curses as enemies of God and the Church.

The same reasoning also refutes the cavil of Sanderus, as noted in Nicholas Sanders' work on images, chapter 9, who suspects that the Elviran Fathers ejected images from Christian temples for this reason, lest the Gentiles should think they were adoring wood and stone. For first, if they had this in mind, why did they not express it explicitly? Why did they leave their mind, forsooth, to be explained by this man born thirteen centuries after their deaths? But whether their plan was this or another (about which I do not think one should labor too vehemently), their decree is certainly clear and explicit: "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches." This, indeed, is precisely what is sought in this disputation. But if those Fathers rightly and wisely forbade the use of pictures in churches, lest (as Alanus guesses) Christians should hold them as deities; or lest (as Sanderus suspects) they themselves should be thought by others to adore them; why does the bishop of Rome not only not decree the same thing, but furthermore excommunicates those whom the same fear has compelled to likewise remove pictures from their churches? If the bishops of Spain were to hold a Council now, and were to publish a canon of this kind in their provinces, "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches"; I beseech you, do you think that because they would say that there were not lacking some reasons for this council, they would therefore escape and get away with such temerity with impunity? And not rather, as enemies of the faith and of ecclesiastical concord, would they experience the wrath and threats of the Capitoline Pontiff, and those avenging flames? And yet, the Fathers of Elvira made this very decree in the past; and no one from among those who were then Catholics either went against it or complained. Therefore, it must necessarily be confessed that the opinion of the Roman Church today is not what that of the ancient Church once was concerning images.

Cardinals Bellarmine and Perron, the Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez, and not a few others use another stratagem here. They wish the meaning of the Council of Elvira to be that images should not be painted on the walls of the church, but not that they should not be had in the church when painted on tablets or on veils, as discussed in the acts of the conference of Fontainebleau; and they contrive that this was decreed out of a certain reverence for the images, lest (as Bellarmine and Vasquez indeed wish) the dampness of the walls and mold, or some other reason, should corrupt them, or (as our Perron preferred) lest during a time of persecution they should be forced to leave them exposed to the ridicule and injuries of the Pagans, if they had been painted on the walls of the churches; for they could not have been torn from there and carried away into private houses when that storm was breaking, and, as it were, withdrawn into safety along with the sacred volumes and vessels, and the rest of the furniture of the ecclesiastical ministry, which they were accustomed in such a crisis to take from public places and hide in the secret recesses, as it were, of private houses. And he contends that this was the mind of the Synod of Elvira with three arguments; the first of which he draws from the fact that Tertullian, in his book *On Purity*, testifies that the Catholics of his time had an image of Christ on the sacred chalices. The

second he takes from the reason for this decree, which the Elviran Fathers themselves adduce, "lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted on the walls." For this reason (says Perron) is of such a kind that it could have no place except in those images which are painted on the walls. For it would have been a childish absurdity to adduce a particular cause for a universal prohibition, and to forbid that there should be any pictures at all in the churches, whether on the walls themselves or outside the walls, for the reason that what is worshipped and adored should not be painted on the walls. Lastly, he refers to this, which he says is still observed today in the diocese of Granada, in memory of the Council of Elvira, that in the churches only statues and images expressed on tablets are had, but no pictures are fashioned on the surface of the walls themselves.

And so even in the clearest and most explicit words human subtlety plays, bending by ingenious circumlocutions to the defense of its own cause those very things which seemed to utterly overturn it! For who is there who, hearing this canon, "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches, lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls"; who, I say, hearing this canon, would not think that it ejects pictures from Christian temples? Contrary to what Rome does today, which establishes images in the same temples, and defines that they are to be worshipped and venerated. Yet those men hope they will persuade us that the Elviran Fathers do not eject or defame images, but retain and honor them; and I think their confidence in their cunning will gradually become such that they will one day bring forward that very canon, by which it is provided that there be no pictures in the churches, to demonstrate what they now maintain, namely that images are to be had and venerated with an analogical cult of latria and dulia.

But this passage is nevertheless surrounded on all sides by so great and so clear a light, that if only we are willing to arouse and attend to our own senses a little, we shall easily discover that all their arts are nothing but deceptions and illusions. First, they all agree on this one point, that images painted on the plaster, or the outer surface of the walls, are forbidden by the Council; but those of another kind are not forbidden, for instance, those which are so fashioned in color on canvas, or on wood, or on some other hanging and movable material, or by some other means, that they can be transferred from one place to another. But if the Synod of Elvira wanted this, why, I ask, did it not express it in clear and perspicuous words? Why did it not at least hint at it? Who would think that those bishops of Spain were so crude and obtuse that they were quite unable to express so easy and obvious a matter? The Emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus, an example of whom is brought forward by Bellarmine in this very dispute, for the sake of honor and reverence forbade that the sign of the cross should be sculpted or painted on the floor of churches. Did they then express this law in the words of the Synod of Elvira, in this manner, "It is decreed that crosses ought not to be in the churches?" Far be it that they should have expressed their mind so ineptly and so preposterously. If they had done so,

everyone would think that they meant something completely different from what they meant. Hear, indeed, what their discourse is in the law which they passed on that matter, and which exists even today in the Code, in title 8, law 1: "Since it is our diligent care," they say, "to protect in all things the religion of the supernal deity, we command that no one be permitted to sculpt or paint the sign of Christ the Savior either on the ground, or on stone, or on marbles placed on the floor, etc." Thus far those Emperors. And the authors of the Trullan canons preface no differently, when they decreed the same thing, in canon 73. Therefore, what they established concerning the sign of the cross, if the Elviran Fathers had also wished to decree the same thing concerning images, there is no doubt that they would have explained that mind of theirs in similar words, in this or another not dissimilar manner: "Since great honor is due to the Sacred images of the Lord Jesus and the Saints: it is decreed that they ought not to be painted on the walls of churches." But as the Trullan Fathers immediately added this reason to that law of theirs, by which they forbid the sign of the cross to be painted on the ground, "lest the trophy of our victory be afflicted with injury by the trampling of those who walk on it"; so too would the Elviran Fathers have done, if their mind had been the same, and to that prohibition of theirs against painting images on walls they would have added this, or another similar reason: "lest the precious instruments of our piety, and the venerable monuments of those whom we most love and worship, be corrupted by the dampness of the walls, and gradually either rot or fade away"; or, as Perron prefers, "lest they remain exposed as prey to the fury of persecutors." Here I appeal to faith, and to the very common sense of men; if the mind of those Fathers was truly what is feigned for them, should not this also have been their discourse? Would not the discourse of our adversaries also be the same, if after so many centuries have elapsed, a marvelous and hitherto unheard-of fear of corruption or rot should suddenly persuade them to decree some such thing? Therefore, since nothing of this kind occurs in the words of the Elviran Fathers, what remains but that we confess that they had no such thing in mind?

But why do I deny that the discourse which they used agrees with this sense which our adversaries wish? It is plain that it not only does not agree, but even so opposes it that it cannot bear it, whether you look at their decree itself, or at the reason for the decree which they add. The words of the decree are indeed most explicit: "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches." Are only those things said to be in the churches which, being applied to their walls, adhere to them? Are not also those things considered to be, and are in fact, in the churches, which are contained enclosed by their roof and walls: the altar, the veils, the candles, the chair, the multitude which assembles there for the worship of God? It has never hitherto been heard that these words have been accepted otherwise in any speech of men. Since, therefore, the Elviran canon expressly decrees that "there ought not to be pictures in the churches," who does not see that its sense is this, that it denies that there ought to be any images at all under the roof and within the walls and enclosure of the churches? But it is clear that

images which are dedicated in churches, painted on tablets and veils, or fashioned in any other way, are under the roof and within the walls of the churches. It is a consequence, therefore, that they are no less forbidden and interdicted by this decree than those which are painted on the plaster of the walls. What? For those people of Granada, who have their churches full of statues and painted tablets, because (as has indeed been reported by Perron) they paint no images on the surface of the walls themselves, would it therefore be permissible to affirm truly and seriously that there are no pictures in their churches? And if they were to affirm some such thing, would not even an infant ask them, "But if there are no pictures in your churches, where then, and in what place are so many tablets, which I see painted there everywhere, either standing or hanging?" Surely, either it must be confessed that the Elviran Fathers spoke most absurdly and against the custom of all mortals; or it must be conceded that their decree is violated by those recent men of Granada (such as are indeed feigned by Perron). The Tridentine Fathers used a plainly similar locution, and indeed with the same sense, except that they command what the Elviran Fathers had forbidden. For they wish the people to be taught by the Pastors that "the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints are to be had and retained especially IN TEMPLES," from the decrees of the Council of Trent, Session 25. I ask you, would he seem tolerable, if there were anyone who would contend that the mind of the Tridentine Fathers in these words is that images of Christ and the saints should indeed be had painted on the plaster and surface of the walls, but not any others on hanging tablets and fashioned separately from the walls of the temple? Would not a gloss of this kind be hissed off by all? Would it not, as it is, be held most inept and like a monster? And yet, the interpretation of the Elviran Canon which they bring forward is plainly the same. For the locution of both Synods is entirely the same. The one denies that there ought to be pictures IN THE CHURCHES. The other affirms that images are to be had and retained IN THE TEMPLES. If, therefore, he complies with the Tridentine Fathers who has painted images in the temple, whether on the surface of the walls, or on wooden tablets, or on veils or linens; who does not understand that he, by the same reasoning, violates the opposite decree of the Elviran Fathers? I am ashamed to relate the subtlety of Bellarmine; it seems so futile, and unworthy of the fame of so great a man. For he wishes that in the Elviran Canon the words "in the churches" should signify not the mass and structure of the churches themselves, as I might say, and all the space contained therein, but the fabric and walls of the churches, as he states where cited above; as if in that Tridentine decree which we recently brought forward, these words IN THE TEMPLES were taken not for the whole buildings, but for the fabric itself and the walls of the buildings. If this cavil of Bellarmine is valid, then neither should the altar be said to be in the church, nor the ecclesiastic's chair, nor the priests, nor the people gathered there, nor anything at all except what is in the walls of the church themselves. The excess of our adversaries (which may be said with their leave) is surely too much confidence either in our stupor or in

their own authority, who hope that they will prove to us glosses so inept and so abhorrent to all use of divine and human speech.

But the reason added by the Elviran decree fights no less against this interpretation of theirs than the words of the decree itself: "It is decreed that there ought not to be pictures in the churches, lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls." If the prior part of the Canon has the sense which our adversaries wish, that there ought to be no pictures on the walls of the churches, the whole canon will be thus constructed: "there ought to be no pictures on the walls, lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls." Thus, for the reason of what is decreed, the very thing that is decreed is brought forward, and they deny that there should be pictures on the walls, for this reason, forsooth, lest pictures be made on the walls; than which, I see nothing that can be said or imagined more foolish or absurd. Those Fathers (if faith is to be had in our adversaries) forbid us to paint any images of Christ or the Saints on the walls. Why so? "For this reason," they say, "lest Christ or the Saints be painted on the walls." Who, unless he were either mad or an infant, would speak thus? Therefore, in order to free the Elviran Fathers from the by no means honorable charge of such inept tautology, it must be confessed that they meant something completely different from what our adversaries feign. For they mean this, which their words most clearly declare, that there ought to be no pictures at all in the churches of the faithful, lest by that use and custom the majesty of God, whom we adore, should gradually be so cheapened that He is at last painted on the very walls, in the manner of the Gentiles, whose folly and stupor is tacitly censured here.

But that the sense of the whole canon may become clearer, come, let us examine and weigh one by one those two reasons for this decree which are brought forward by our adversaries, both what each one is like, and how it agrees with the words of the Canon. In the first place, who does not see that those two reasons are empty and fictitious, and fashioned in the single brain of the adversaries who bring them forward, and finally of such a kind that it is by no means probable that they ever came into the minds of the Elviran Fathers? Bellarmine says that they feared lest the dampness or mold of the walls should corrupt the images. But this, Bellarmine, if it ought to be justly feared, why have you Romans never hitherto feared it, who for eight hundred years now have worshipped images with such affection and zeal of mind? For that you have never feared this, the walls not only, but also the ceilings, and as in the sacred shrine of Mark in Venice, even the very pavements of your churches, pictured with mosaic work, sufficiently teach. If this care and solicitude is part of that reverence which you think you owe to images, then you admit that the Fathers of the Seventh Synod, and of the others which have been held since those times, and your thrice-great Pontiffs of Rome, have all been little religious, who either have themselves exposed those sacred and tutelary images of yours so unworthily for so many centuries to the dampness and mold of walls with the

greatest sloth and carelessness, or have suffered them to be exposed by others. Confess that their zeal for pictures was less than that of the Elviran Fathers, and finally defend this paradox, that those who ejected images from the churches of the Christians loved and worshipped them more intensely than those who restored them. But if you truly believe this, what remains but that you imitate their zeal, and correct the sin of the others; and so, that you restore this most holy canon of the Synod of Elvira to the Church, recalled as if by right of postliminy after so many centuries, and observe it accurately; and that you diligently delete the pictures which are seen everywhere on the walls of your temples, because (as you indeed wish) the Elviran Fathers judged that they could not be retained in such a place without some injury. But however much you may boast of these things now, I know for certain that you will never come to that, as long as you retain the opinion concerning images which you defend, since it is plain that to obey the Elviran decree is in reality nothing other than to follow the party of the Iconomachs. For if the utility and necessity of images is what you contend for, as Bellarmine argues in his book on images, chapter 10, not only for the adornment of churches, but also for instruction and erudition, because "a picture sometimes teaches better than Scripture," for fostering and increasing charity towards God and the Saints, for preserving their memory in us and exciting imitation, for the confession of faith, because "while we love and honor the images of the Saints, we testify that their faith and doctrine please us," and finally for the honor of God and the Saints; if, I say, the uses of images are so multiple and so excellent, is it not of the highest impiety to defraud the Christian people of even the smallest part of so great a treasure, especially for so light and so futile a cause, as that either the dampness or the mold of the walls will corrupt them? As if, indeed, it were not easy to remedy this inconvenience, and to patch up and renew the fading pictures on the walls? Or as if their great utilities could not abundantly refund all the expenses which it will be proper to incur in this work, even in a single day, and repay them with huge profit? Or finally, as if there were any material for images not subject to the same accidents and inconveniences? For what, I beseech you, is that preposterous and ridiculous caution, which fears for itself from the single dampness of the walls, but does not fear decay, moths, fire, time, and six hundred other accidents, by which we daily see their statues and images consumed? If you consider the matter well, the pictures on tablets are subject to no fewer dangers than those on walls. Indeed, they certainly do not fear the hands of thieves. Therefore, if on account of the danger of dampness and corruption, pictures ought not to have a place on the walls, it is manifest that they cannot be retained even on wood or on canvas, with religion being safe, and least of all on glass, than which material none is more futile or more fragile.

But neither does Perron's invention succeed more fortunately. He thinks that the Elviran Fathers feared lest the pictures, if they were fashioned on the walls themselves, would remain exposed to the ridicule and plunder of the Pagans when persecution was raging. But if this fear is just and legitimate, whence is it

that no one occurs in the history of the Church who is said to have feared anything of this kind?

For neither is there any writer of those times, or of the succeeding ones, who has recorded anything of this sort. This secret was unheard of in past ages, until in most recent times, with Sanderus and Perronius revealing it, it at last emerged from its hiding places. We have it for a fact, indeed, that those ancient faithful took the greatest care lest the sacred furnishings of the Churches, lest the codices of the divine Scriptures, lest the veils, or chalices, or other instruments of piety of this kind should come into the power of the Pagans during a raging persecution, with a familiar and almost innate zeal in all nations to guard most diligently and keep inviolate those things which pertain to religion. But it is in no way credible that the fear of such chances could have impelled the ancients to decree what is established in the Elviran canon, if their opinion concerning images was the same as that of our adversaries is now. For, as we have said before, it would have been an impious and unjust deed, and one such as we know has hitherto been attempted by none of those who venerate images, to snatch away from the faithful so necessary a part of piety for fear of an uncertain chance, and not only uncertain, but also of such a kind that, if it happened, it would indeed afflict the Church with grief, but not involve it in any fault or crime; since it would suffer all this injury solely by the violence of enemies, with no negligence of its own.

But neither did the remedy which they have devised cure this evil. For whence do our adversaries know that those things which were kept in the Churches separate from the walls were not exposed to the fury of the persecutors? How often have those sacred vessels and ornaments been seized by the Pagans in the very places of Christian assembly? How often have they been extorted from the houses and hands of private individuals, when the fear of death swayed some, and open force overwhelmed others? It is well known that this not rarely happened to the codices of the Scriptures, which the persecutors particularly sought, in order to abolish all copies of the divine oracles; so that it is plain that even those panels and images which were not at all attached to the walls would have been liable to this same danger. And so all that prudence which our adversaries assign to the Elviran Fathers is vain; who, forsooth, in order to protect the sacred images from the injuries of the Pagans, command them to be effaced and obliterated from the walls, as if the same chances and the same dangers did not threaten the others (of which, if we are to believe them, there was then a great number in the Churches).

And thus it is clear how vain and futile are the reasons brought forward by our adversaries, since they in no way absolve the Elviran Fathers of the crime of either imprudence or even impiety, with which this decree of theirs is most manifestly fraught, if the current hypothesis of the Roman Church concerning the veneration of images stands. But what need is there to investigate the

intention of the Elviran Fathers in this canon with conjectures sought from so far afield, when they themselves have enunciated it in the plainest of words? How long, then, shall we pursue these dreams of recent interpreters, when we have the express and formulated words of the authors themselves? "It has been decided," they say, "that there ought not to be pictures in the Church, lest that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls." What greater or more unjust force was there ever? The most holy Fathers cry out that they feared lest that which is worshiped and adored be painted. On the contrary, our adversaries contend that they had other things entirely in view. "They did not fear this, which they say," says Bellarmine, "but something far different, namely lest the dampness of the walls corrupt the pictures, and not, as the words sound, lest art should dare to fashion that which we adore." "Nay," cries Perronius on the other hand, "they do not seem to have been concerned even about that; but they feared something else, namely lest a Pagan should violate the sacred images if they remained on the walls."

Let us grant, therefore, that these reasons are, what they are not, just and consistent with right reason; this at least is certain, that they are not the ones by which the Synod of Elvira was led to decree this, whatever it is. For where in the world was it ever heard that these words, *lest that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls*, that these words, I say, signify, *lest that which is painted on the walls be corrupted by damp and decay*, or, *be violated by the Pagans*? And indeed, regarding this second exposition (which he says is good), Bellarmine nevertheless confesses that the reason given in the canon, *lest that which is adored and worshiped be depicted on walls*, does not square well with it. As for the other, which is his own, if zeal for his cause had not impeded his mind, he could easily have perceived that it agrees no better with that reason of the canon, since no lexicographer has hitherto existed who takes the verb *depingi* (to be depicted) to mean *to be corrupted* or *to rot*.

Setting aside, therefore, those reasons which have been fabricated by our adversaries, it remains for us to consider that reason for this decree which we see proposed by the Elviran Fathers themselves, and which is clearly alien to the fictions of these men. The Synod forbids pictures to be in the churches, "lest," it says, "that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls." No one is unaware that it was the ancient and almost universal custom of the Pagans, whose religion was still very strong in the times of this Council, to fashion images of the gods and demigods whom they worshiped, both with the brush and with the chisel, and by other means, and that this error, by which they thought that the deity could be painted and fashioned with colors or other artifice, was almost the sole source of heathen idolatry and impiety. When, therefore, the Elviran Fathers saw that some bearing the Christian name dared to paint histories and biblical parables, and, contrary to the most ancient custom, to introduce those images into the Churches (for it is established that this was already being done somewhere in those times), fearing that from this

practice men might gradually slip into errors similar to the superstition of the Pagans, they judged that that entire custom should be abrogated and removed from their midst. In the beginning (which we will demonstrate more clearly below in its proper place) either mystical and symbolic figures were painted, such as that of the Shepherd carrying the lost sheep back to the fold on his shoulders, or histories taken from the Scriptures, or the contests of the Martyrs. And these things, perhaps, could have been tolerated. But those Fathers rightly fear lest the evil creep further, and lest Christians, progressing further, should at last come to the point of thinking that even that which they adored and worshiped, that is, the Father himself, and his eternal Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, should be painted.

But they did not add those words *on the walls* with the intention of signifying that what is adored could be painted on panels, and on veils, and anywhere else, in short, than on walls, without crime. For the thing itself cries out that there is no true difference between these things, and that God neither ought to be, nor can be, fashioned in this way rather than in that; and this restriction is most manifestly overturned, both by the general formula of prohibition which the Fathers used, decreeing universally and without any exception that there should be no pictures in the Church, and by that notable deed of Epiphanius, which will be commemorated below, and which alone proves sufficiently and more, that pictures on veils were no more approved by him, nor by other men of the same faith and zeal, than those on walls. What then is it? Why did the Elviran Fathers, when they thought that all pictures whatsoever should be rejected from the Churches, make mention of walls? No doubt they did this only by way of example, so that from this most noble and most common type, it might be understood what should be judged of that whole genus. For the Pagans were accustomed to paint the forms of their deities on walls. To this is also added the fact that there seems to be no greater indignity, nor one more contemptuous toward the majesty of the deity, than that by which its supposed form is brought down to the very walls of either profane or sacred buildings. And so, to put it briefly, walls are mentioned here only for the sake of example, as a certain most vile and most unworthy part of those things on which such pictures were wont to be commonly and everywhere made by the Pagans; but not so that by that word some restriction of illicit images might be made, as if it were permitted to receive without crime and danger those which are painted elsewhere than on walls. Perhaps also the Fathers name walls for the reason that those Christians who are noted here painted their things only on them, but did not dedicate signs or panels separately, as the Pagans did, which is established to have been received into the Church only later.

Now, how just this fear of the Elviran Fathers was, is by no means obscure. For God, the best and greatest, most gravely and most severely forbids in the law that we should dare to paint or fashion him in any way, and with dreadful anathemas he has cursed this whole rashness and insanity of the Gentiles. The

very outcome of events has proved that these beginnings were rightly suspected by those Fathers; from which it is established that Christians, progressing step by step, at last came to the point where they not only paint that which is worshiped and adored—as the images of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which are in use among them, teach—but also worship what they paint, which part of this superstition, although by no means expressed by the Fathers, it is plain is nevertheless comprehended and implied in this canon. For it is clear that those who forbid that what is worshiped be painted, would much less grant that what is painted be worshiped. This, therefore, was truly their fear, and to no other end can these last words of the canon be drawn without the greatest absurdity, *lest that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls*.

Thus Agobard, bishop of Lyons, understood them eight hundred years ago in that little book which we have already praised before: "Now the error," he says, "by growing stronger has become so conspicuous, that it is akin to, or similar to, the idolatry or the heresy of the Anthropomorphites to adore images and to have hope in them; and for the cause of this error, since faith is taken away from the heart, all trust is placed in visible things. Just as, when we see armed men painted, or men intent on agriculture, either reaping or harvesting grapes, or fishermen standing in ships and casting nets, and also hunters with outstretched spears, pursuing roe deer and stags with dogs, we do not hope to receive from them an increase of our army, nor help for the year's labor, nor heaps of wheat, nor skins or streams of must, nor fish, goats, and swine; so also if we see winged Angels painted, preaching Apostles, martyrs suffering torments, we ought to hope for no help from the images which we behold, because they can do neither harm nor good. Rightly, indeed, in order to abolish such superstition, was it defined by the orthodox Fathers that pictures ought not to be made in the Church, lest that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls." And thus far Agobard.

Nor does that reply of Alan, which we brought forward above, recede much from his sense, with whom also Bullinger, who wrote against our Mornaeus, agrees, who says that this canon was established by the Synod of Elvira for this reason, lest the Christian populace should worship pictures in the manner of the Pagans, and, taking occasion from the pictures, should gradually relapse into their former idolatry. It has been recorded by Cassander that this was also the opinion of Joannes Antonius Delfinus, otherwise a supreme defender of the pontifical power, since he indeed elevates it above the universal Councils of the Church itself. He, however, compares this decree of the Synod of Elvira with the act of king Hezekiah, who did not hesitate to break the bronze serpent, which he saw the people were abusing for superstition; whence Delfinus also collects these things: "But if at any time," he says, "as is human foolishness and rashness, it should happen among the peoples that superstition and idolatry fix their roots more deeply, so that it is then most difficult to uproot them, then the Catholic Pastors of the Church can and ought to take diligent care that, in those places

where there is so much danger and such great abomination, all images and statues should be removed from their midst for a time, and in the meantime the simple and every most unlearned person should be well instructed and admonished concerning the worship of God and the Saints." And whether this doctrine of Delfinus is true or not, let our adversaries see. For our present disputation, it is enough for us that both these men and those others whom I named a little before confess with us that the Elviran Fathers were led to forbid the use of pictures in the Church for no other reason than that they either lamented that that error had already crept in among some, or certainly, lest it should creep in in the future, they rightly feared. Whence it is necessarily concluded that those most holy men cast out all images whatsoever from the Churches of the Christians, and not only those which are expressed and adhere to the surface of the walls; since it is clear that pictures on veils and panels are no less liable to the danger they feared than those on walls.

Nor do those three arguments which we said were brought forward in this case by Perron oppose this exposition. In the time of Tertullian, the good Shepherd from the Gospel parable was already painted somewhere on the chalices of the Catholics. I confess it. But it is certain that this was done neither by any law of the Church, nor by the common usage of all Christians. Nothing else can be legitimately concluded from Tertullian, except that in that particular Church against which he disputes, that is (as I indeed feel) in the Roman Church, there were such chalices, as will be demonstrated below in its proper place. But this not only does not overturn our exposition of the Elviran Canon, but even confirms and illustrates it. For it contains a signal testimony of that fact which we posited in the first place as true; namely, that there were already then Christians who had pictures in the Churches, and that the Elviran Fathers were led by this very fact to meet the creeping evil in time, and to decree that this whole custom, as noxious and dangerous, should be repudiated.

As for Perronius's denial that the reason attached to this decree in the canon itself is consistent with our exposition, we have already explained this abundantly above, and have demonstrated that those words *on the walls* were added with this intention, not that only those pictures which are on the walls should be understood to be forbidden, but that by that example, as it were, it might be understood how dangerous the use of images in the Church is; since it gradually leads miserable mortals to such a point of madness that what they adore with the mind, they also paint on the walls, in the manner of the heathens. Nor is there just cause why this sense should seem absurd or childish to anyone. Finally, the modern inhabitants of Granada, who are also brought into the theater of this disputation, are too recent for us to do violence to the most explicit words of a most ancient Council for their sake. But to demand that the customs and practices of our ancestors, who died thirteen centuries ago, be judged according to the present custom which those people have, as if by a rule, after so many changes have been made in their province and faith, this is, to put

it most mildly, to trifle. But I also confess that we do not have such faith in our adversaries that we think what they narrate about the custom of the people of Granada should be accepted as true and indubitable, unless it is confirmed by some more certain testimony; which, since however it may be, it pertains nothing to the present disputation, I think should be left in the middle.

And so it is plain that all the stratagems and cavils of our adversaries are empty, so that it may now at last be permitted to conclude that the Elviran Fathers felt the very same thing that their words express, namely, that *pictures ought not to be in the Churches, lest that which is worshipped and adored be depicted on walls*. Whence it first follows that the Christians of those times by no means thought that it had been either handed down to them by the Apostles, or commanded by any universal law of the Church, that they should have and worship images of Christ, Mary, and the Saints in their sacred buildings. For if that had then been both the practice and the faith of the whole Church, neither would those nineteen Fathers have sanctioned or promulgated a decree of this kind, nor, if they had done so, would they have gotten away with such great temerity with impunity, since the other bishops who then flourished would have undoubtedly protested, and would have immediately proscribed from their sacred fellowship those who had dared so insolently to abrogate the custom of the universal Church. But it is certain that nothing of the sort happened to the authors of this canon. On the contrary, it is established that one of them, Hosius, bishop of Corduba, was for a very long time afterwards engaged in the greatest affairs of the Church with the highest honor, and presided over the Council of Nicaea itself—than which none was ever held more holy or more celebrated among Christians—either in his own name or, as our adversaries will have it, in the name of the Pope of Rome.

Hence also it appears, in the second place, that it was then accepted among Christians that it was a wicked thing to paint that which is worshiped and adored; and, what necessarily coheres with this, that it was equally a wicked thing to adore or worship that which is painted. For if this had not been established among all, it would not have been brought forward by the Elviran Fathers to confirm the force of that decree. Now, I permit any prudent and honest man to weigh how their decree and its reason can agree with the modern faith, discipline, and practice of the Roman Church. Indeed, Melchior Canus, bishop of the Canary Islands, a writer by no means to be despised among those of that party, whether you consider his judgment or his eloquence, could not digest this canon (so harsh is it, and irreconcilable with the practice of the Roman Church), nor restrain himself from openly cursing it, saying that it was imprudently and impiously established. "It is not to be denied," he says, "that laws either too harsh or little consonant with reason were sometimes issued by provincial Councils. Such was that law concerning the removal of images, passed not only imprudently, but even impiously by the Council of Elvira." But whether this law was passed piously and prudently, or otherwise, by the Elviran Fathers, I do not now dispute; nor indeed do I ask this, whether a new Master, the bishop

of a diocese created just yesterday, conducts himself modestly or otherwise, who does not hesitate to condemn so intemperately nineteen prelates who lived in the ancient Church without any crime, and died happily in the Lord with the highest honor thirteen centuries ago; nor, finally, do I bring this to examination, whether it is consistent with that reverence which Rome thinks should be shown to antiquity, to say that a most ancient law was passed imprudently and impiously. Let others, if they please, judge and decide these things according to their own faith and integrity. For us, who have undertaken to dispute simply what the Fathers thought on this question, not whether they thought rightly or otherwise, it is sufficient for the present that a man of the first rank in acuteness, and, if anyone, of sharp discernment, confesses that a law was passed by the Elviran Fathers concerning the removal of images.

CHAPTER III. The third testimony against images, of Eusebius of Caesarea.

But lest anyone should think that the use of images in religion displeased only the Fathers of the Synod of Elvira, it seems fitting to recite next the testimony of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, a man who was present at that most celebrated Council which was held at Nicaea, not more than twenty years after the one at Elvira. When, therefore, Constantia, the sister of Constantius and wife of Licinius, thought, from the solemn error of the Pagans which she had recently renounced, that images were useful in religion, and asked Eusebius to send her an image of the Lord Jesus, he responds to the woman in this manner: "Since, indeed, you have written concerning a certain image, as it were of Christ, wishing this to be sent to you by us, which image do you mean, and of what kind is this which you say is the image of Christ? Is it the true and immutable one, bearing its natural characteristics? Or is it that one which he took up for our sake, clothed in the schema of the form of a servant? But concerning the form of God, I myself do not think you are asking, having once been taught by him himself that 'no one knows the Father except the Son, and no one ever knows the Son worthily except the Father alone who begot him.'" After some things, there follows: "But you are surely asking for the image of the form of a servant, and of the little body with which he was clothed for our sake. But we have learned that this too has been mingled with the glory of divinity, and that what is mortal has been absorbed by life." And after a few words: "Who, therefore, could have delineated with dead and inanimate colors and shadowy writings such splendors of dignity and glory, vibrating and flashing forth? since even his excellent disciples on the mountain could not bear to look upon him, who even fell on their faces, confessing that what had appeared to them was unbearable. If, therefore, his incarnate form, having been changed by the divinity dwelling in it, obtained such virtue then, what must be said, when, having been divested of mortality and washed clean of corruption, he exchanged the appearance of the form of a servant for the glory of the Lord and God, after his victory, that is, against death, after his return to the heavens, after his placement on the royal throne at the right hand of the Father, after his repose in the inenarrable and ineffable bosom of the Father, into which the celestial Virtues praised him as he was ascending and being restored, saying, 'Lift up your gates, O Princes, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in'?"

And Eusebius indeed wrote these things in response to Constantia's request, demonstrating most lucidly that it is a wicked thing to fashion an image of Christ the Lord, by which either his divine or even his human form might be expressed. Now, if the churches and the private homes of the faithful in the Christian world were then as full of images of Christ and the Apostles as they are now in the Roman communion, what need, I ask, was there for that Augusta to request an icon of Christ from so far away in Palestine from Eusebius? But grant

that Constantia, led either by blind curiosity or by some unknown affection, wished to receive the image of Christ she sought from the hand of this particular bishop; would Eusebius have repulsed the desire of a most illustrious woman in such a way, if it had been permissible for him to satisfy her according to the laws, rites, and faith of the Church?

But this testimony of Eusebius was already, 880 years ago, brought forward in this very case against images at Constantinople in a most numerous Council of 338 bishops, as has been recorded by their own adversaries in the Synod held at Nicaea a little later in favor of images, from whose Acts we have transcribed it. And the adversaries indeed do not trouble the testimony itself at all, it being too explicit to be eluded by any art. But they prolixly incriminate the witness, and boast that he was an Arian, and that he subscribed to the Nicene Council feignedly and contrary to the sentiment of his own mind; and they adduce various passages from his writings which smack of Arian impiety. It is not my purpose here to enter into a contest for the reputation and faith of Eusebius. I know that there have not been wanting, either in our memory or in that of the ancients, those who have attempted to clear the man: and no one has pursued that cause more eagerly than a certain Gelasius of Cyzicus, who described the acts of the Nicene Synod; although (to say what I feel) the things which are brought forward for his defense seem little suited to the purpose. But setting aside that dispute about the faith of Eusebius, I answer that this odium of Arianism pertains nothing to the present disputation.

Let Eusebius have been an Arian, which he seems to many to have been, and perhaps not undeservedly: let him have been, if you please, the standard-bearer of the Arians. The force of that testimony which he gave against images is not thereby weakened. For what controversy was there ever between the Church and the Arians about images? Which of so many Fathers who wrote against the Arians reprehends their faith or discipline in this part? There were almost no minds of any distinction in either the Greek or the Latin Church that did not descend into this arena. There are still extant the monuments of Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, the Gregories, Epiphanius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Fulgentius, the greatest portion of antiquity, in which we see no impiety of the Arian perfidy passed over; no error, however slight, not shaken out and attacked. Who would believe that these men would have passed over in silence and untouched so signal a diversity in worship, if the Church of the Catholics had everywhere had in its temples and had worshiped the images of the Savior, which the Arian so mercilessly explodes (as the Fathers of the seventh Synod pretend)? The suspicion of Arianism, therefore, seems rather to add weight to the testimony of Eusebius against images, than to detract from it. For the Church sometimes dissimulates the sins of its own members: but it is not accustomed to be silent about the errors and wicked deeds of its enemies, and to cover them, as it were, with silence. Therefore, if the common faith and custom of the Christians at that time in this matter of images had been violated, either by all the Arians or by

Eusebius privately, it is not to be doubted that someone from so many Catholics who took up their pen against them would have noticed and reprehended it. But no ancient, whose literary lucubrations have come down to us, ever wrote anything of this kind. The patrons of images at Nicaea were the first to note it, whose authority in this case ought therefore to be null. It must be concluded, therefore, that there was no singular dogma of the Arians concerning images, differing from that of the Catholics.

Since, therefore, the Arians so thought that the image of Christ neither could nor indeed should be fashioned (for this is the explicitly expressed opinion of Eusebius, whom they will have to have been an Arian), it is clear that the Catholics also felt the same thing about this matter; or certainly they did not think, as the writers of the Roman Church today teach, that the images of the Lord Jesus were either necessary or greatly useful for Christians. I pass over the other crime, on account of which the Nicenes strive to create ill-will for Eusebius; namely, that he said that the incarnate form of Christ was changed into the nature of his divinity, as if he had mixed and confused the two natures of Christ. For even if Eusebius had spoken thus, it would not thereby be concluded that he was of the opinion which they reprehend, since it is sufficiently established that Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, and several others who lived before the controversies of Eutyches arose, often spoke thus, and sometimes even more harshly; and yet they cannot be accused of the Eutychian heresy without the greatest injustice. But there is also something else much more to be observed. For in this epistle of Eusebius, as they themselves recite it, those words which they reprehend nowhere appear, but certain others plainly different, whose sense is true and orthodox, namely these: ἡ ἔνσαρκ αύτε μορφὴ πρὸς τ ἐνοικέσης αὐτῇ θεότης μεταβληθείσα, that is (as the Latin interpreter of this Synod also translates it), *his incarnate form having been changed by the divinity dwelling in it*. Therefore, this whole accusation of theirs is a mere slander; and all those passages of the ancient Fathers, with which they have filled several pages with great clamor, strike not the sense or the words of Eusebius, but a monster fabricated by them. Learn from this what faith is to be had in them, while they hawk to us marvelous and unheard-of opinions about images in the name of the most holy Fathers. As for the adversaries we now have in the Roman communion, they (as far as I have seen) say nothing to this passage of Eusebius; content, as I suppose, with this, although most inept, response.

CHAPTER IV. The fourth testimony against images, which is that of Epiphanius.

But to a certain passage of Epiphanius, which the Nicene Fathers had left untouched, the writers of the Roman party, in turn, offer many replies, what value they have, and what force each one has, now comes to be considered by us according to our established order. Epiphanius, in the year of the Christian era 374, ruled the Church of Salamis, which is called Constantia, the metropolis of Cyprus, with a great reputation for sanctity and learning. He, therefore, in that epistle which he wrote to John, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning the controversy that had arisen between them, and which Jerome did not hesitate to render into the Latin tongue, in that epistle, I say, he institutes a narration of this kind: "When we were traveling together," he says, "to the holy place which is called Bethel, that I might there hold a gathering with you according to ecclesiastical custom, and I had come to the village which is called Anablatha, and had seen there as I passed by a burning lamp, and had asked what place it was, and had learned that it was a Church, and had entered to pray, I found there a veil hanging in the doors of the same Church, dyed and painted, and having an image, as it were, of Christ, or of some Saint (for I do not well remember whose image it was). When, therefore, I had seen this, that in the Church of Christ, against the authority of the Scriptures, an image of a man was hanging, I tore it, and rather gave counsel to the custodians of the same place that they should wrap a poor dead man in it and carry him out. And they, murmuring in response, said: 'If he wanted to tear it, it was just that he should give another veil and replace it.' When I had heard this, I promised that I would give one, and would send it immediately. But there was a little delay on my part, while I was seeking the best veil to send for it; for I thought I should send one from Cyprus. Now, however, I have sent what I could find, and I pray that you will order the presbyters of the same place to receive the veil from the bearer, which has been sent by us; and henceforth to command that in the Church of Christ such veils, which come against our religion, should not be hung." Thus far Epiphanius.

Tell me, I pray you, reader: Is this man not a true and genuine Iconoclast, who dares to affirm that *it is against the authority of the Scriptures for an image of a man to hang in the Church of Christ*? Who confirms this dogma not only with words and writings, but also with deeds, openly tearing a veil hanging in a Christian Church because he saw on it the depicted image of Christ or a Saint? Who condemns that image by his own sentence, as it were, and commits it to the darkness of the tomb for the use of a dead man, so that it might rot there far from the light of heaven under the earth? Who, finally, gravely admonishes the Bishop, in whose parish that Church was situated, that he should *henceforth command that in the Church of Christ such veils, which he says come against our religion, should not be hung*?

What do our Romanists say to this? Do they finally yield? Far from it. These are not the Roman spirits; these are not their customs. Nay, nowhere do they rise up more fiercely: nowhere more spiritedly, and, such is the confidence of their art, they hope that they will easily and with almost no trouble repel this dire thunderbolt from their images. To achieve this, they turn themselves into every countenance; they change into every form. And if men, willingly and deliberately closing their eyes against the light of truth, were not more worthy of compassion than of laughter, the spectacle of so varied and so manifold a game would perhaps be pleasant. At one moment they say that the image which was depicted on that veil was of a profane, or at least a common man, not a holy one; and that for this reason Epiphanius was justly incensed and tore the veil, because he saw a profane thing placed in a sacred building. Presently, since they are confident they will scarcely persuade anyone of a fiction so abhorrent from all appearance of truth, they flee to another stratagem, and plead that this epistle is spurious and falsely attributed to Epiphanius.

But when they see that this accusation is dishonest and impudent, and therefore not very safe, they sometimes act a little more modestly, and, while conceding that the rest of the epistle is entirely Epiphanius's, they incriminate only its last little piece, in which the passage recited by us is read; and they contend that it was sewn onto the epistle with the worst deceit by some crafty enemy of images. Finally, when they think it can scarcely be done that they should elude this weapon by any art, then, at last taking courage and with a hardened brow, openly, and as is worthy of Roman generosity, with the freest indignation they complain that Epiphanius was an Iconoclast, and they sing the old tune, *one swallow does not make a spring*. How doubtful, how slippery, how almost desperate this cause is, is sufficiently argued by so varied and so manifold a defense. But there is nothing in this whole disputation of theirs more pleasant than that they peevishly and with disdain confute one another's opinions, and while one of the four defenses just enumerated is overturned by each of them, it comes about that in the end none is left for them all. *The brothers perish by mutual wounds.* While they conquer individually, they are conquered collectively. Our one labor, therefore, is this, to set them against one another, and to watch them as they duel.

The first defense for us, which is that of Vásquez, the abridger of Bellarmine the Monk will dispatch. The third, which is Bellarmine's, Vásquez, as if by the law of retaliation, will in turn attack; and the second, which was Alan's, he will stab through in the same operation. But before they proceed one against the other, let us first watch as they all rush with one impulse, as it were, against the miserable Alphonsus, and attack his response, which was fourth in place and number. Although what it posits must be confessed to be most true, namely, that the very opinion of Epiphanius concerning images was that which was afterwards defended with the greatest force in the East by the Iconoclasts (as they call them). For the passage brought forward by us cries this out so clearly

that it cannot be more explicit. Thus far, indeed, we accept the ingenuous confession of Alphonsus. But as for his condemning that opinion, and confidently, as those Masters are wont, pronouncing it to be an error and a heresy, and his laboring to excuse Epiphanius, because in a matter not yet established by the judgment and authority of the Church, it was permitted for him to err without crime, which is not permitted for us now—this whole speech, I say, is of a man who, feeling himself defeated, cannot bring himself, due to the pride of his mind, to confess himself defeated.

Nor do I deny that Bellarmine is justly angry with Alphonsus, restraining the man's immodesty with a grave and wise oration, and admonishing that *it is not without rashness and prejudice to the Catholic faith that such gross errors are attributed to such great men*. (He calls the faith which is that of the Roman Pontiff the Catholic faith.) Besides which, he holds that this whole cause in the time of Epiphanius was already sufficiently defined and determined by the usage of the whole Church. And concerning these things, indeed, let them settle it among themselves as it shall seem good to them. That controversy does not pertain to us, who in this whole disputation have undertaken to inquire simply this one thing, what the Fathers thought about images, not whether they thought rightly or otherwise. As for the terms of error and heresy which they are wont to impose on those opinions which they do not approve, they do not frighten us at all, being taught to discern the true from the false, and faith from heresy, not from the precepts of men's partisan studies and preconceived opinions, but from the very nature of things, and the established and immutable oracles of the divine Scriptures; from which if the veneration of images cannot be proved and established, let Alphonsus indeed rage, and let him cry himself hoarse that the Epiphanian opinion of rejecting images is heretical, his zeal or his intemperance will never bring it about that we should either hate or contemn the truth.

Although, indeed, I cannot restrain myself at this point from complaining about the harshness and injustice of these men. For when we profess that we spurn the worship which they decree for images for the reason that it seems consistent neither with right reason nor with the sacred letters, they, in order to remove this whole kind of disputation, which they understand to be most difficult for them in this cause, appeal to the Fathers, and contend that images were worshiped by them, and they clamor that the Fathers, such was their wisdom and sanctity, would never have done so, unless it had been lawful and right to do so. The cited Fathers give their testimony; and beyond the expectation of these men, they confess such a hatred for images that some decree that *pictures ought not to be in the Church*, others that, if any are found there, they should be torn. Then those very men who had cited them, and who had ordered them to give testimony in this case, suddenly changing their minds, affirm that those whose words they ought to have received reverently, acted imprudently and impiously, and spoke heresies; but that they are worthy of pardon, who lived so many centuries before us. Do they not thus openly mock both us and the Fathers?

Them, indeed, whom when they have called as witnesses and judges, they afterwards upbraid as if they were defendants, reprehend, and finally grant grace and pardon? Us, truly, whom they bid to approach and hear antiquity, that we may be taught the truth of the Roman doctrine and religion, but with this broad law, that we should receive nothing at all from those things which the Fathers testify and commend, except what has pleased them.

But let us dismiss Alphonsus indeed, routed by his own side; and now let us see what the others will accomplish. Here a certain Alan Cope comes forth, who, to extricate himself from these tricks, says, but most timidly, that this epistle is spurious and falsely attributed to Epiphanius. But Vásquez explodes this fiction of Alan, no less than that of Alphonsus. Rightly so. For among the genuine works of Epiphanius, there is nothing truer and more certain than this epistle; which is found in almost all the codices of Jerome, both manuscript and printed; which Petavius himself, a man of the Jesuit family, exhibited in his edition of Epiphanius; which the Blessed Jerome most explicitly testifies was rendered into Latin by him, and he recalls several chapters from it; which it is established was praised 842 years ago by Charlemagne (or if another is the author) in his book on images, and likewise somewhat later by the Parisian Fathers, who by a slight lapse of memory make that John to whom it was written the bishop of Constantinople, who was of Jerusalem. The epistle itself is indeed of such a kind that it agrees perfectly both with the general history of those times and with the private history of Epiphanius; nor does it differ from his genius or style of speaking, which is familiar and almost plebeian, and alien to the ornaments of those arts by which language is wont to be educated and polished. If a writing of this kind may be rejected as suppositious, what, I ask, of those things which are circulated under the name of antiquity will be able to be held as certain and indubitable? For as to their objection that the epistle exists only in Latin, this has no force. For what of it? Are there not six hundred works written in Greek by authors which have hitherto been published only in Latin, because the Greek copies have either perished through the injury of time, or certainly lie hidden, enclosed in the darkness of a few libraries? If that calamity is a legitimate argument for supposition, almost the whole disputation of Irenaeus against the heresies will have to be expunged from the list of genuine monuments of antiquity; the volume of Didymus on the Holy Spirit will have to be expunged; most of the works of Origen, and of Theophilus of Alexandria, and six hundred others which it would be tedious to commemorate here individually, will have to be expunged.

But that the Greek exemplar of this Epiphanian epistle, about which we are disputing, has perished, is not to be wondered at, since it is established that for these past eight centuries the patrons of images, especially in the East, have raged with the greatest license and no shame against the literary works of Christian writers, so that if anything occurred anywhere which was adverse to the cause they were pleading, it was all abolished either by force or by deceit, as

appears for example from Canon IX of the 7th Synod, by which all writings against images are ordered to be given to the bishopric of Constantinople, to be stored with the other books of the heretics; with a grave penalty imposed on those who should be found to have concealed them. Since this was their diligence and severity in seeking out and abolishing monuments of this kind, no one ought to be surprised that the Greek copy of this epistle has perished. I think it much more to be wondered at that the Latin version of that writing could have survived to our memory, and this I think is to be attributed solely to the moderation of our men in the West, who, as we will show later in its proper place, long and sharply opposed the veneration of images in these parts.

Therefore Bellarmine and others, since they understood that this response of Alan was too impudent, use a slightly more modest defense, and they do not, like him, call the whole epistle into question, but only its last part, as if it had been neither written by Epiphanius, nor translated into Latin by Jerome, but fabricated by some enemy of images and sewn onto the epistle of Epiphanius to win favor for his error from so great a name. But they could not prove this fiction of theirs either to Gabriel Vásquez, who refutes it expressly, or to Marianus Victorius, or to Dionysius Petavius, who in their editions of Jerome and Epiphanius have published this entire epistle, with no mark of censure branded on the last part. Jacobus Sirmondus also, a most noble French Jesuit, cites it somewhere as a genuine work of Epiphanius. Nor had anything about this supposition, which Bellarmine invents, been suspected before, either by Thomas Waldensis or by Alphonsus de Castro, who acknowledge this whole epistle as the true offspring of the author to whom it is inscribed. But if we inspect the matter itself more deeply, we will confess that this new cavil is so flimsy, and so abhorrent from all appearance of truth and honesty, that it is a wonder that Bellarmine and Baronius, men of the highest genius among their own and of the highest fame in letters, fled to it; nor indeed can I take it otherwise than as a most certain argument of the desperate cause which they plead here.

I pass over the inseparable connection of this part, which is accused, with the rest of the body, and the genius of Epiphanius breathing in it no less than in the rest of the epistle. I now only ask, who are these enemies of images who sewed on this piece to the Epiphanian epistle? In the first place, it is sufficiently established that the suspicion of this fraud does not fall upon those who, in the last hundred years after the struggles of Luther, have openly seceded from the Roman Church. For, to say nothing of the fact that the whole is found in very many manuscript codices which those men never touched, it is certain that the very passage which is now called into controversy was praised and transcribed, entirely as it is now read, 725 years before Luther had troubled the Papal authority in Germany; as can be seen, both in Charlemagne's fourth book on Images, and in the Synod of Paris. Therefore, it is necessary that this clause of the epistle was fabricated and stitched together either in those very times, or

even before, by the enemies of images. But that it was not fabricated by the men of those times, whoever examines the matter more attentively and with a mind free from partisan zeal will discover with no trouble. For in those centuries, none at all occur upon whom the odium of such a crime could be conferred. I confess it may seem that the Iconoclasts of Greece (as they are called) had some reason for fabricating this particle, which most openly favors their dogma. But it is most certain that it was not, however, fabricated by the Iconoclasts. For to what end would they have attributed this to Epiphanius, unless to use this, as it were, as a support in the cause they had undertaken against images, and to object it to their adversaries? But that this passage was not even praised or indicated anywhere by them is so clear from their extant disputations against images, that our adversaries confess this with us, and they abuse that very silence of the Iconoclasts in this part for the support of their cause (as we shall soon hear). Therefore, because the Iconoclasts never employed this particle in this cause, it most clearly demonstrates that they were not the authors of this supposed substitution.

It remains, therefore, for our adversaries to say that this spurious and supposititious offspring was produced by the Western enemies of images, in whose books alone mention of it occurs. But neither can this be said. For why, if it were their offspring, would it overturn one part of the opinion which they were defending? Those men indeed denied, as will be demonstrated in its proper place, that images should be worshiped. But they did not think they should be torn or destroyed; for they tolerated them in the churches, not indeed for worship, but nevertheless for ornament. But that particle of the Epiphanian epistle, about which we are now inquiring, goes much further. For it tears the images, and casts them out of the Church, and buries them in the tombs of the dead. Who, therefore, would think that those Western adversaries of the second Nicene Synod were so mad that they would want to bind themselves with a crime that would profit them nothing, and, as the saying goes, forge fetters to their own harm, by attaching to the words of Epiphanius a patch that would not only not help their opinion, but would even overturn it? Nor is there reason for anyone to boast that Claudius of Turin was the architect of this substitution, because he was of the same opinion as the Eastern (as they are called) Iconoclasts. For neither is there any mention of this Epiphanian passage in his writings, any more than among the Iconoclasts. Nor, indeed, would Jonas of Orléans, a man most learned for that age, have forgiven such a fraud in Claudius, if he had been its author.

Besides, it is certain that Charlemagne, the father of Louis, was older than that Claudius, who lived in the time of Louis Augustus. But this passage which we are now investigating is praised by Charlemagne from Epiphanius as true and genuine, who nevertheless inveighs not sluggishly against the Iconoclasts everywhere, and where he transcribes the words of Epiphanius, he explicitly adds these words: "For we have found this opinion of Epiphanius on this matter,

whether it is to be praised or blamed is left to the judgment of the reader." O admirable providence of God, the best and greatest! which so moderates and governs all things that even the smallest events have no small momentum for revealing the truth! So it happened divinely in this place, that those whose cause the latter part of the Epiphanian epistle hindered were the ones to mention it; while those whose opinion it confirmed, said not a word about it. But why so? No doubt, so that the mouth of calumny might be stopped on both sides; and it appears that neither side fabricated this testimony against images, which we are investigating; not these, indeed, who would not have omitted so suitable a support for their cause if they had known of it; and they could not have been ignorant of it if they themselves had fabricated it; but those much less, who had no reason for fabricating it, but had reason for abolishing and suppressing it. Since, therefore, it is now sufficiently manifest that this particle about which we are disputing was not affixed to Epiphanius by the enemies of images, either ancient or recent, it remains, surely, that it be held as a true and genuine writing of Epiphanius, not (as our adversaries fruitlessly contend) as spurious and supposititious. For I do not think that the patrons of images would have attributed this to Epiphanius, to the ruin of that cause which they undertook to plead with such great zeal and such great contention of minds.

But even if this argument were lacking to us, yet it would be sufficient to assert the truth of the controversial particle, that it is found in all copies of the Epiphanian epistle; that it was cited by that name 800 years ago; that in the succeeding times, when those contests about images were raging most fiercely, no one was found to bring a suit against it concerning its parentage, until in our memory at last, zeal for a desperate cause compelled these newest masters to dare to call the truth of this writing into controversy, in the one thousand two hundredth year, finally, after it had gone forth from the hands of its author. Who gave to Bellarmine and Baronius this authority over the writings of the holy Fathers, that it should be right and lawful for them to expunge entire clauses at their own whim against the constant faith of all the copies? If this license obtains, what will become of it? What in all of antiquity will hereafter remain certain or fixed? For if the zeal of each man should assume for itself that it may, according to its own will, fix and unfix the reading of ancient books, that it may introduce what does not please it, and hold as true only what pleases it, who does not see that there will be no place left for ancient monuments in these disputations? For just as Bellarmine and others of the same party delete this whole part of the Epiphanian epistle, because they see that it is adverse to their cause; so the Protestant disputants, by that example, will think it is also permitted to them to hiss off as spurious and supposititious whatever is objected from the Holy Fathers, whenever no other probable solution occurs.

But let us now hear those arguments, or, to speak more truly, dreams, with which they strive against a most clear and most confirmed truth. "Jerome," says Bellarmine, "in his epistle to Pammachius, recites almost this entire epistle of

Epiphanius as translated into Latin by himself, and yet he makes no mention of this veil." As if, indeed, Jerome in that place had promised that he would review all the chapters of the Epiphanian epistle one by one; as if he had not passed over certain other things which are still read in it today, such as that lengthy narration which occurs at the very beginning about that presbyter whom Epiphanius had ordained in the parish of John of Jerusalem; as if, finally, it were obscure that Jerome's purpose was to touch only on those things from Epiphanius's epistle which pertain to the Origenism of John, with whom he was carrying on a feud, which whole cause (as is plain) had nothing in common with the veil and image of Anablatha. "But," says the same man, "they are added thus after the end of the epistle." Certainly, if (as they wish) the epistle is to be concluded before these words, I do not deny that for that reason these words are to be considered as added after the end of the epistle. But if we follow what all the codices, both manuscript and printed, have, they all, after this narration about the image of Anablatha is concluded, exhibit another period on top of that, in which Epiphanius warns John to beware of Palladius the Galatian, who was preaching and teaching the heresy of Origen; at which point, finally, the whole epistle is concluded in these words, "I wish that you may fare well in the Lord." But that prayer of Epiphanius for the concord and peace of the Churches, which the controversial particle immediately follows, is, I confess, the conclusion of the preceding matters, but not of the whole epistle; and those who conclude thus are openly mocking us, as if it were not lawful for holy men to wish, and to pray, and to make vows anywhere else than at the end of their epistles; which how ridiculous it is, everyone sees. For if the matter were so, the last 47 verses would have to be expunged from Paul's epistle to the Romans, so that it might end with that vow of the Apostle which is found in chapter xv, verse 13: "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope, and in the power of the Holy Spirit." From the second to the Thessalonians, the last two chapters would have to be cut off, because the Apostle had concluded the third, which precedes them, with a sufficiently long prayer for those to whom he was writing. Finally, most of the epistles of that divine man would have to be mutilated, since there is scarcely one extant in which some vow is not interspersed, even long before the conclusion.

Bellarmine adds, "This passage was never objected to the Catholics by the Iconomachs; which they would not have omitted if it had existed in the works of Epiphanius." We, on the contrary, demonstrate from this very fact that it is true, because if it were false, it would without doubt have been fabricated and substituted by the Iconomachs; which, however, was by no means done by them, is abundantly argued by the fact that they never used it in this disputation. What will you do, miserable Iconomachs? How will you conduct yourselves in defending this cause? If you bring forward some passage of an ancient writer, your adversaries cry out that by the very fact that it is brought forward by you, it is argued to be false and fictitious, as we shall soon hear in this very author. If you pass over something in silence, they conclude that it was equally fictitious

and supposititious from the fact that it was passed over by you. But now let us see how sharp and effective this argument of our adversaries is. "This passage of Epiphanius was not praised by the Iconomachs in this controversy; therefore it is false and supposititious." Therefore, many things will have to be expunged from the works of Clement of Alexandria, of Origen, of Athanasius, and of Chrysostom, which we bring forward in this cause, because the Iconomachs of old by no means employed them in the same disputation. How do they know that the Iconomachs read everything that pertains to this cause? That nothing was withdrawn from them by the fraud of their adversaries? That nothing was neglected through carelessness, and the very infirmity of the human mind? To this is added that this epistle of Epiphanius exists only in Latin, and has never been praised except by Latin men; which leads me to believe that its Greek copy either perished immediately as soon as it was rendered into Latin by Jerome, or certainly was afterwards abolished by the patrons of images in the East through malicious deceit. But if this is so (as it seems to be), it is not to be wondered at that the Iconomachs did not see this passage. But neither, if they had seen it, would it therefore necessarily follow that it would have been employed by them in this disputation, since they themselves explicitly deny that they brought forward everything they had for this cause; but that they collected a few things from many, lest their definition should be extended to great length, voluntarily omitting many other things on account of their infinite multitude. But concerning Epiphanius, after having recited a certain testimony of his, they explicitly say that "he set forth other discourses for the subversion of the making of images, which those who have a love of learning," they say, "will find by seeking."

Next, Bellarmine tells us that a certain Epiphanius, a Deacon from the 7th Synod, convicted them, saying that two other similar passages of Epiphanius had been inserted into his writings by heretics. But this argument is plainly miserable; for it neither posits what is true, nor does it conclude well. That Deacon indeed says that a certain testimony of Epiphanius, objected by the adversaries, is false and supposititious; but he neither proves this, nor does he adduce any solid foundation for that accusation. Therefore, since this whole charge rests on the bare affirmation of that Deacon, it is plain that Bellarmine is not disputing, but trifling, while he foists upon us as certain and confessed proof the statement of a man giving testimony in his own cause, in whom he himself knows we have much less faith than in those whom he calls Iconomachs. But even if this proof of Bellarmine were true and certain (which it is not), it would not therefore bring about what he desires it to effect. For let us grant that the Iconomachs were so carried away by excessive zeal for their cause that they did not hesitate to fabricate some testimony in the name of Epiphanius for its defense (which since it is not proved, is certainly not to be admitted). Let us grant it to be so. Does it therefore follow that we should believe that this particle of the epistle, about which we are now disputing, was also substituted by

Charlemagne, or by the Parisian Fathers, whose opinion it much more opposes than it favors?

But perhaps what follows of Bellarmine's argument is more pressing: "The disciples of Epiphanius placed his image in his temple, which they certainly would not have done if their preceptor had said that this was against the authority of Scripture." First, concerning this whole affair, we know nothing other than what has been recorded by that good Deacon of the Nicene Synod, to whom, indeed, why greater faith should be had than to Bellarmine, I certainly do not see. For his animus in this cause, and his proven audacity in other matters, and his age, who was four hundred years (as he himself confesses) after Epiphanius, rightly render the man suspect to us. Furthermore, he affirms nothing else than that "the disciples of Epiphanius dedicated a temple on the island of the Cypriots, naming it by the same name of their Father, and with many other titular pictures they placed his image in the temple itself"; nor does he define who they are whom he mentions as disciples of Epiphanius, whether the first, who had seen him alive and had conversed with him, or others born long after, so called because they professed to follow his discipline, though he was long since dead; just as we call those men disciples of Francis, Dominic, or Augustine, who today glory in observing the rules of those men, though they died many centuries ago. For if he understood the disciples of Epiphanius in this sense, I do not see why the faith of Epiphanius should be measured by their words or deeds, since it is well known that it not rarely happens that, contrary to the institutes of their masters, many things are both believed, and said, and done by disciples, changes of which kind are sometimes so sudden and precipitous that a course of even fifty years is sufficient to completely invert disciplines.

"But," say our adversaries, "we know that in those very times of Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa and other Fathers of no obscure name praised pictures in temples." As if, indeed, the faith of all the others should be prejudged from the saying or deed of one or another Father. If this reasoning pleases, we will in turn argue for the falsity of those passages of Nyssenus which commend pictures; namely, that it is not probable that they were praised or approved by him, which we know were torn up by Epiphanius at almost the same time. The deed of Epiphanius no more elevates the faith of the saying of Gregory, than the saying of Gregory does that of the deed of Epiphanius. It is unjust for one to be slain by the authority of the other. Nor is there reason for us to be terrified by the conflict that is found between them; since it is most certain, and has been demonstrated at length by us in another work, that the Fathers of neither different nor the same age always think the same thing about matters pertaining to religion. But this diversity shines forth especially in those rites and dogmas concerning which nothing had been explicitly commanded by the Apostles in the very beginnings of the faith. For in those matters, their opinions were free, and for the most part discrepant, according to the capacity of each, and various occasions and events. Therefore, that very diversity between Epiphanius, the

Metropolitan of Cyprus, and Gregory, the bishop of Nyssa, in the matter of images, most lucidly proves that their cult was not formerly handed down and instituted either by the command of the Apostles or by a universal law of the Apostolic Church. For the rest, we shall afterwards examine in its proper place the testimonies of Gregory and of others (if there are any), and, God willing, we shall demonstrate that those Fathers, although their opinion in this part is different from that of Epiphanius, by no means followed that dogma which was afterwards established by the Nicene Synod and which Rome received, and has handed down to be observed with great consent by the men of her communion to this day.

The adversaries also adduce in this cause that in the testimony brought forward by us it is read that it is *against the authority of Scripture to hang the image of a man in a temple*; which words they deny to be worthy of the erudition of Epiphanius; and they contend that he would never have introduced such a most inept opinion (for so they call this) into his mind. And yet, while they act thus, they prove a controversial matter by another equally, or even more, doubtful and controversial. For those who, with Epiphanius, think that pictures should be cast out of temples, by no means concede what these men, as if by imperial authority, most confidently pronounce, that it is inept to think it repugnant to the authority of Scripture that an image of any man be placed in a sacred building. But they think that this is said not only not ineptly, but even truly, and they establish their opinion chiefly by the authority of the Scriptures, which not only nowhere command that an image of any man be either placed or painted in temples by the faithful, but also posit and affirm many things everywhere which seem to manifestly conflict with that use. And there are many of that opinion whom no wise man would say were foolish or inept. Whether they thought so rightly or otherwise, is not the place to dispute here. For now, it is enough that they did think so. For by this it is most clearly effected that the reasoning of our adversary is inept and vain, which, because the passage praised by us contains that opinion, thence collects that it is not Epiphanius's. But even if we should grant to Bellarmine that they think ineptly who suppose that it is *against the authority of Scripture to hang the image of a man in a temple*, he would not therefore have effected that Epiphanius did not say it, who, both from his certain and indubitable works which are extant, and from the confession of our adversaries themselves, is established to have sometimes, and in not a few things, been mistaken.

Finally, they bring forward Gregory the Great, who, writing to Serenus at the end of the sixth century of the Christian era, denies that any bishop before Serenus had broken images; which he does not seem likely to have denied if that veil of the Church of Anablatha had been truly torn by Epiphanius. But neither does this argument have any force to prove that which has been undertaken by our adversary. For what then? Did Gregory know everything? Could he not have been ignorant of the deed and epistle of Epiphanius, he who did not know that

there had been any Eudoxius among the heretics, and had to be taught this by Eulogius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, so much a stranger was he in the histories and books of the Church? And who did not know what *stibium* was, and took *cornustibium*, the name which is imposed on one of Job's daughters, by a laughable and plainly childish error, for a horn-pipe? But even if he had read this epistle of Epiphanius at other times, could it not have happened that, when writing to Serenus, he either did not remember having read it, or even dissembled it for the use and convenience of his cause? For that Gregory could also have been led astray by his excessive zeal, no one will deny who has diligently read the writings of that man; where, in a great abundance of the best things, there also occur from time to time not obscure blemishes of human infirmity; such as that which he inculcates several times, that the title of Universal Bishop had been offered to his predecessors by the Council of Chalcedon, contrary to the faith of the Acts of that Council, in which nothing of this kind is read. For I do not think anyone would stretch to this purpose the fact that Theodorus, and Ischyrion, and a certain Athanasius, deacons or presbyters of the Church of Alexandria, while they each separately narrate or write about their own affairs, name Leo the universal bishop. For to take those three little men for the Council of Chalcedon, this is truly nothing other than either to be delirious, or certainly to trifle.

Since, therefore, our adversaries adduce no suitable reason for doubting the praised particle of the Epiphanian epistle, it remains for us to conclude that it was truly written by Epiphanius, just as it is read today in all the copies of his epistle to John of Jerusalem. And so Bellarmine and those who agree with him are thrown down from their rank, and are driven and routed from this line of battle, as it were, of the disputation, with Vásquez and Victorius and not a few others of the same party applauding, who confess that this testimony of Epiphanius is truly as it is. Now it must be seen what remains, what art they employ to ward off this weapon. In the first place, therefore, they say that it was the image not of Christ, or of any saint, but of a private and plebeian, or even a profane man, that was depicted on that veil and placed in the church at Anablatha, as if it were the effigy of Christ or some saint; and that the most holy man, seeing so unworthy a deed, was rightly moved, and tore the veil, and by that act defined indeed that sacred buildings are not to be contaminated with common or profane pictures (which they testify is also very pleasing to them), but that it does not therefore follow that images of Christ and the Saints should also be cast out from such places. This indeed is the whole of their defense. I pass over that Bellarmine judged it unworthy of the labor to defend it. For he says that the other explanation, namely the very one which we have just now refuted, is more true; by which he signifies that this one is either false, or certainly doubtful and obscure. But Bellarmine's abbreviator, a Monk, perhaps to avenge the defeat of his Master, rushes upon Vasquez, and refutes this solution of his expressly. Rightly so, indeed. For they jest too impudently, who hope to persuade us of so absurd and so inept a fable, which coheres neither

with the deed nor with the words of Epiphanius. Not indeed with the deed. For, as he himself narrates, as soon as he caught sight of that image of a man depicted on the veil, he immediately, with no delay interposed, tore the veil which was hanging in the doorway of the Church. He does not ask, he does not interrogate, who that man is whose image he had seen in the Church, whether a saint or a profane person. He had so scorned and neglected this whole kind of care that, writing about these things some time after, he does not even remember whose image it was; which he would not have forgotten so quickly if he had inquired about it from the inhabitants. But having taken no time for deliberation, as he sees the image, he immediately seizes the veil and tears it; which is the greatest argument that it was the image itself, and not merely the type or quality of the image, that displeased him in the Church. And when he afterwards sent a veil to the custodians of that building, in place of the one he had torn, he does not say that he had taken care to have painted on it the image, not of a profane man (which had been wrongly done in the former), but of Christ or some Saint; nor does he mention anything of this sort; he only says that he is sending what he could find. If now Vasques, or any other of their number, who think that images of Christ and the Saints should be placed and dedicated in sacred buildings, traveling abroad and entering a church along the way, were to see an image painted there on a veil and hanging in the doorway, and did not have it ascertained whose it was, whether of a saint or a profane man, would he, I ask, immediately tear it? because, forsooth, images of profane men are not to be tolerated in churches? Would he not first inquire of the inhabitants whose image it was, whether of a Christian man or an infidel? Of a saint or a profane person? Why, when, and by whom, against right and decorum, and even common usage, it was placed in a sacred place? Indeed, even having inquired into these things one by one, I do not know if he would dare to lay a hand on it. This indeed I know, that if, omitting these things, he immediately flew at the image and tore it without delay, he would be considered insane. If, therefore, the opinion of Epiphanius had been the same as that of Vasques, the sanctity and wisdom of the man do not permit us to doubt that he would have employed the same moderation and the same temperance in this matter. He is traveling outside his own diocese, in the parish of John of Jerusalem. He comes to a village to which he had perhaps never come before. He enters an unknown Church. He sees an image on a veil hanging above the door. He does not hesitate at all; he inquents nothing; he seizes the veil and tears it. Was there ever, I beseech you, any deed more insolent or less tolerable than that, if indeed the universal Church at that time had images in the place and number that the Roman Church now has them? Did not Christian charity demand of Epiphanius that he should not rashly think anything amiss of the ministers of that church, the priest, the sacristan, and others? And that he should not think that image to be of a profane rather than of some holy man? Did not the sanctity of the place and of the persons demand the same? And if he suspected anything otherwise, did not equity itself, and humanity, demand that he should restrain and contain

that thought in his mind for a little while, until he knew the whole matter more certainly and more exploratively? Especially since he was in another's diocese, and in an unknown Church, whose usage and rationale he could easily have been ignorant of. But he did none of all these things. It is enough for him to have perceived that it is an image. As soon as he perceived this, he is immediately moved; immediately he is inflamed with all his heart, and, incited by the indignity of the thing, he tears the veil without delay. With the leave of Vasques, let me say what I think: he who concedes that Epiphanius did these things thus, unless he also confesses that neither he himself nor the other Christians of Cyprus and Palestine then dedicated or had any images in their churches, makes that man, from a most holy and most wise man, a stupid and rash person, imbued with no sense of either Christian modesty or charity. This deed of his cannot be defended otherwise; which indeed will be a remarkable specimen of zeal, if you establish that this, which we have said, was the religious use and sense of most Christians of his time; but if the matter was otherwise, it would have been the mere madness and insolence of a man not quite sane. But the glosses of the adversaries refute not only the deed of Epiphanius, but also his words.

For if he was struck not because it was simply an image, but because he had seen the image of a profane man in the Church, why does he nowhere say this? Did not the use and edification of those whom he had first addressed, did not the consideration of him to whom he now writes this very thing, John of Jerusalem, a rival and an enemy, demand that he should state this first and foremost clearly and expressly? Did not common human sense itself teach that this deed could be justified in no other way, nor the murmur of the Anablathenes be more easily quieted, than if he were to point out that the man who was painted on the veil was profane? and therefore that this defense ought to have been employed as the sole bulwark of this cause, both at the beginning, and in the middle and end of this narration? And yet (O incredible stupor of mind and senses!) Epiphanius not only said none of these things in the whole narration; but he also said things which are in complete opposition (as they say) to them. For he summed up the narration of that deed in these words: "I found there a veil hanging in the doorway of the same Church, dyed and painted, and having an image, as it were of Christ, or of some saint." Now this sentence either has no sense, or it signifies that this was the image of a man, not (as the adversary wishes) profane, but holy, although Epiphanius does not sufficiently remember which saint it was that the image represented. For this is entirely the sense of those words: that Epiphanius noticed an image on the veil; that he also understood well enough that it was the image of some Saint; but that he was so unconcerned about the matter itself, that the true form of that image soon escaped his mind, and only this remained confusedly and generally in his memory, that either Christ or some other of the number of the blessed had been depicted on the veil; but which of the two is truer, he cannot now affirm with certainty. For this, which he adds enclosed in parenthesis, "for I do not sufficiently remember whose image it was," this, I say,

contains the reason for what he had said before, "having an image, as it were of Christ, or of some saint," and as it were excuses him for having left the reader's mind doubtful and uncertain, by no means defining whether it was the image of Christ, or of a saint different from Christ. Let us imagine Vasques to have found in some church an image of Caesar or Pompey depicted on a veil; and that he does not sufficiently remember whose it was; let us imagine him, wishing to explain the matter as it happened, to begin his narration with these words: "I saw a veil hanging in the doorway, dyed and painted, and having an image, as it were of Christ, or of some saint, for I do not sufficiently remember whose image it was." Tell me, I beseech you, is there anyone who would not think that one speaking so alien to the sense of his own mind, is either delirious, or is certainly mocking his hearers? And yet Epiphanius speaks in this very way. Therefore it is necessary that he means something plainly other than what Vasques quibbles.

To this is added the fact that the reason which he subjoins, and by which alone he, as it were, supports and fortifies this deed of his, also demonstrates the same thing most splendidly: "When therefore I had seen this in the church of Christ, an image of a man hanging against the authority of the Scriptures, I tore it." I appeal to you here, most holy man Epiphanius. Why did you suddenly become enraged? Why did you so contemptuously tear the sacred image placed either to adorn the building or to kindle the piety of the faithful? Did the subject of the picture perhaps offend you? That it represented a profane man, not one from the choir of the saints? On the contrary, none of these things occurs in Epiphanius. What then was it at last? "Doubtless," he says, "the veil displeased me, because, against the authority of scripture, it exhibited the image of a man in the church of Christ." What can be said more clearly or more expressly? Surely it is plain that those who are holy are also men. When, therefore, Epiphanius exclaims that it is against the authority of Scripture for an image of a man to hang in the church of Christ, who does not see how great and how unbearable is the audacity of those who try to persuade us that Epiphanius cast out of the church images not of the Saints, but only of the profane? But this cause is clearer than to need more argument; and that we have lingered on it a little longer was not because of the obscurity of the matter, but was compelled by the iniquity and pervicacity of our adversaries. Therefore, having begged the reader's pardon for our prolixity, let us at last conclude that Epiphanius truly believed that it was not lawful for Christians either to place images in sacred buildings, or to tolerate them when placed by others.

Nor is there any reason why anyone, to diminish the weight of this testimony, should sing to us that hackneyed phrase with Damascene, "one swallow does not make a summer," nor that "what is rare is the law of the Church." Firstly, this is not one swallow. We have already seen nineteen flying together at once before; and we shall see others hereafter; to say nothing of those arguments which we observed in the first part of this work. Furthermore, it seems most unjust for this saying of Epiphanius to be counted as only one testimony, whether you look at

the witness himself, or the circumstances of the testimony. The witness indeed is the great Epiphanius, whose fame and admiration among the men of his age, not only ecclesiastical but also external, was so great that the Arians themselves venerated him. He is the one whom Jerome calls "the father of almost all bishops," and "a relic of ancient sanctity"; a most religious observer of the traditions of the ancients, and a sworn enemy of new and private rites (as is clear from his *Panarion*, a huge work against heresies); moreover, bishop of Constantia and head of all the churches that were in Cyprus. Who would have thought it possible that such a man, and so great, should have fostered an opinion that conflicts with the universal custom of the whole Church? and not only fostered it, but even openly displayed it in the common light of men, and trampled upon the public usage of Christians, and held it up to ridicule, by boldly tearing down and rending an image from a sacred building, which had been consecrated in that place by the solemn religion of all the faithful? It is manifest that Epiphanius would never have done these things thus, if the veneration of images had then obtained by public law of the Church and by the common usage of Christians.

Let it be so, however: that the man's insolence and moroseness were so great that he could have fallen into this, I will not now say ineptitude, but madness and insolence. Yet who would have believed, if that opinion concerning images which now obtains in the Roman communion had then been received among Christians, who, I say, if these things had been so, would have thought that the ministers of the church of Anablatha, the priests, the sacristans, the custodians, would not have been indignant, would not have cried out at this so flagrant and so incredible audacity of Epiphanius? And yet they do not even mutter. They only complain that he gave no other veil in place of the one he had torn, testifying by this that they desired the use and price of the veil, not the picture. Can anything be said or imagined more inept than that complaint, if those who complain held the same opinion as our adversaries? They see the law of the universal Church being scorned and violated; they see a sacred instrument of public piety being torn up by a prelate of another province, and they are mute and silent; they are not indignant, they do not resist, they do not protest. This one thing they reprehend in so bold and so contemptuous a deed, that by the tearing of the veil, a loss was made of that covering, or piece of cloth. If an equal amount were returned, they will be placated and quiet; nor will they bear it ill or impatiently that their image is rotting under the earth with a corpse. By which argument it is clear that that image was used on the veil for ornament alone, and that this was the use sought from it by those people, not that it should feed their faith, not that it should be worshipped with any veneration, not that it should teach the rude and ignorant (for which reasons images are sought today), but that it should render the veil, on which it was depicted, more beautiful and more elegant. The veil itself, however, was spread over the doors of the church and hung on the inside, according to the custom received in those times, as is clear

from Jerome's epitaph for Nepotian, and not a few other monuments of the ancients.

But neither should it be passed over that Epiphanius, not content with the consciousness of so egregious a deed, narrates the whole affair most fully to John of Jerusalem, a most hostile man, in whose parish Anablata was, almost boasting, who (if what is posited by the adversaries is true) ought to have either concealed, or certainly purged and excused the deed. For if he had transgressed the boundaries of the Fathers, if he had violated the law and custom of the universal Church, how did it happen that he feared neither the reprehension of the bishop nor the slander of his enemy? With what front, after having desecrated the sacred things of the Church which was in John's parish, does he dare to teach him that it is against the authority of the Scriptures to have images painted on veils in churches? With what front does he admonish him to henceforth "command that such veils, which go against our religion, not be hung up"? But grant (what is in no way credible) that Epiphanius behaved himself not only so wickedly and stubbornly, but also so foolishly and improvidently; how is it that John takes up none of these things? criminates nothing? reproaches nothing? Why does he pass over so splendid an occasion? Why does he not spread the odium of this deed throughout the Christian world? that the great and most severe censor of the Origenists most insolently violates the laws of the Church and most unworthily tramples upon its most sacred rites? How much more specious would this crimination have been than that other accusation of the same man, by which he, with little probability, objected the error of the Anthropomorphites to Epiphanius? But if John's hatred was so clement and patient that it could let so great a crime of his enemy pass in silence and unavenged; is it to be thought that Jerome's love was so cowardly and so faithless that he would by no means have undertaken to admonish Epiphanius, whom he greatly loved, of so great an error? or his prudence so blind that he did not see that that epistle, in which that marvelous narration is contained, ought by every means to have been destroyed, and, as it were, buried in deep oblivion? Was there ever any stage drama more entangled, or more involved and perplexed? Therefore, that the whole matter may at last be explained, and that the glory of sanctity and wisdom may be preserved for Epiphanius, and the name of men and Christians for the Anablathenes, and that what was most true, as it was, so it may appear to have been, the supreme hatred of John and the love of Jerome for Epiphanius, that, I say, all these things which are certain and established may be made plain and shine forth, and emerge from those shadows, as it were, of contradictions, it must necessarily be confessed that neither Epiphanius, nor the Anablathenes, nor John, nor Jerome felt the same about images as our adversaries do today; because if this had been their opinion, neither would Epiphanius have torn the veil of Anablatha, nor would the Anablathenes have suffered it, nor would John have dissembled the crime of his enemy, nor finally would Jerome have left the sin of his friend uncorrected; much less would he have published his grievous reproach, and translated into Latin and made public

that epistle, which rather ought to have been abolished by every art, if it is truly to be considered the outrage which the narration of it contains. Let the adversaries now see whether this passage of Epiphanius is of such a kind that the old saying, "one swallow does not make a summer," can be rightly and appositely drawn to it.

This testimony being thus explained, and vindicated from the tricks and calumnies of the disputants, it should henceforth seem surprising to no one that Epiphanius testified to the same opinion in another place as well; which we have learned was cited in this cause almost nine hundred years ago by the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople from the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea. That passage therefore runs thus: "Pay heed to yourselves," says that most holy man, "and hold to the traditions, which you have received: do not decline to the right, nor to the left." To which he subjoins: "And in this keep it in memory, beloved sons, not to introduce images into the churches, nor into the cemeteries of the saints. But by memory have God in your hearts. But neither into a common house. For it is not fitting for a Christian to be carried away by the eyes, and the wanderings of the mind." Thus Epiphanius. What, however, would even Geneva itself have said that is more alien from the definition of the Council of Trent? But the bishops who had convened at Nicaea at the behest of Irene boldly cry out that the passage is supposititious. A fine and expeditious way, indeed, of easily and with no trouble eluding all the objections of an adversary: which if it is to have force in these disputations, then indeed both we and our adversaries are both wasting our efforts most wretchedly, while with unceasing labor we turn over the monuments of the ancient Fathers day and night, that we may be able to learn what their opinion was concerning our controversies. For as often as any passage from them is objected, it will be enough to reply that it seems supposititious, and that it is far from all appearance of truth that most holy men should have written anything against the truth of the faith. But by the grace of God, law and right have not so perished from human affairs that it is sufficient to accuse any document of being false to overthrow its credibility. The arguments which are brought to prove the charge are weighed; which if they are found to be vain and inefficacious, the credibility of the document stands, and those who had rashly and for no reason accused it of falsehood are also commonly wont to be punished; lest it be permitted to anyone with impunity to traduce the reputation and credibility of men with empty calumnies. The Nicene Fathers are the accused in this case. Therefore, setting aside all their authority, let us see what their arguments are worth, and what force they have to prove that this passage which is objected is not a true and genuine one. Do they adduce any suitable witness who denies it to be Epiphanius's? or who, reviewing his works, expressly expunges the booklet from which this passage is taken? Do they observe anything in it which is abhorrent from the genius or style of Epiphanius? Do they adduce any certain and confessed opinion of this writer which conflicts with that one? They do none of these things. They only narrate (what no one is ignorant of) that all the heresies

were reviewed and confuted by Epiphanius in that book which he inscribed *Panarion*; and that there up to eighty sects of heretics are mentioned; so that if he had held the veneration and consecration of images for a heresy, it seems he would by no means have omitted it in such a work. Since, therefore, Epiphanius made no mention of this opinion in the catalogue of heresies, the most acute disputants conclude that he made and worshipped images; and therefore that he is not truly the author of that testimony which was objected in his name by the adversaries, since in it images are so expressly condemned. This is their argument, egregious indeed and invincible: Epiphanius by no means listed the fashioners of images among the heretics; therefore he never said or wrote anything against them; therefore he himself both fashioned and worshipped images. If that argumentation is valid, why will not this also be valid? Epiphanius in this catalogue of heresies mentions neither the Nestorians, nor the Eutychians, nor the Severians, nor the Monothelites; therefore he never wrote anything that is adverse to the heresy of these men; therefore he also felt the same about religion as they did. But the most subtle Dialecticians should at least have noticed that their adversaries could also misuse that proof for their own purpose, and reason from that example thus: Epiphanius lists no Iconoclasts in the *Panarion*; therefore he wrote nothing against them; from which it further follows that it ought not to seem alien from the truth, if he is said to have written anything consonant with their faith.

But far be it from the minds of pious and upright men that fallacious and sophistical kind of reasoning. For who does not see that Epiphanius, having died at least three hundred years before these contests about images, could not have referred the names of parties that arose so long after his death to a catalogue of heresies? And so his silence in this part neither helps nor harms either side? But the Nicenes, moreover, observe that a little after, images were praised by Gregory, the brother of Basil, and by some others in the time of Epiphanius. But the vanity of this argument has already been demonstrated above, which we said Bellarmine used to detract from the credibility of the immediately preceding testimony. Finally, they say that while the *Anchoratus* and other books of Epiphanius are spread throughout the Christian world and are extant everywhere, of those little books against images only two or three copies are found. But this reason is ridiculous. For who does not know how various are often the fates even of the books of one and the same author? That some are read, published, held in esteem? That others are neglected, and left in dust and decay, according as their merit is different, and the opinion of men about them is various? Indeed, it is not to be wondered at that the *Anchoratus* and *Panarion* of Epiphanius were more often and more diligently copied than his letters. By the same reasoning, his epistle to John of Jerusalem will have to be condemned, of which no Greek copy is found. Yet Jerome, an eyewitness and a witness above all exception, teaches that it is true and genuine. In the last hundred years, innumerable books have been copied and printed from two or three codices; some from one, about whose credibility, on account of the scarcity of copies at

that time, no one doubts. Therefore, nothing can be objected to the above-described testimony of Epiphanius except the bare voice of those Nicenes, who deny it to be Epiphanius's. But their mere negation is of no weight in their own cause; and to it should rightly and deservedly be opposed the contrary affirmation of the three hundred and thirty-eight Fathers, who some years before, in the Synod held at Constantinople, had used this as a true and genuine testimony of Epiphanius in this cause.

But besides the fact that this is the Nicenes' own cause, in which they themselves should by no means be heard as witnesses, there are other things besides, and indeed neither few nor light, which render their credibility vehemently suspect. For these are the men who, that they may slander Eusebius more safely and freely, falsely and impudently attribute to him a false and impious opinion, as if he had written that the incarnate form of Christ, that is, his flesh, was changed into the nature of the divinity, when he had nevertheless said what was true, that this form of Christ was changed by the indwelling divinity, as was observed by us above. These are the men who peddle a most insipid and inept narration of I know not what miracle, which was reported to have happened not more than thirty or forty years before in Berytus in Syria, under the name of Athanasius, and shamelessly obtrude it as a true and legitimate offspring of purer antiquity. These are the men whose Synod is entirely rife with the most putrid fables; and likewise with apocryphal testimonies, unknown and unheard of in the first antiquity; such as that remarkable and especially admirable decree of I know not what Council of the Apostles, held (as these men chatter) in Antioch: “Lest those who are being saved should any longer err concerning idols, let them instead imagine the manly statue of our Lord Jesus Christ”; such also is that saying of Basil, to wit, “I honor, and adore, and venerate especially the figures of the images of the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs; for this has been handed down from the Holy Apostles, and is not to be prohibited; and therefore in all our Churches we depict their history”: of which kind there are six hundred in their Synod; of which neither trace nor vestige appears, either in the manuscript codices of the authors to whom they are ascribed, or in the histories of the Church, or in any other slightly more ancient monuments of Christian antiquity. I ask, are not these men worthy to be believed even without an oath in their own cause? Moved by whose bare and simple authority, should we reject as false and supposititious that testimony about which we are disputing, although thirty-three years before in the Constantinopolitan Synod it was praised and described by three hundred and thirty-eight bishops; although, as they themselves confess, it was found in one or two old copies; although, finally, it is plainly consonant with other sayings and opinions of Epiphanius, as is taught partly by those things which we have recently recited from his epistle to John of Jerusalem, partly also by those two passages from the *Panarion* which we brought forward in the preceding book, in one of which he accuses the Carpocratians of having and adoring images of Christ; in the other he severely reprehends some Arabs for offering a similar worship to an image of Moses.

CHAPTER V. Testimonies against images: The fifth of Chrysostom; the sixth of Amphilochius; the seventh of Theodotus.

But now the remaining witnesses must be aroused. Let Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, who lived in the same times as Epiphanius, rise first here. He, in a certain place praised by the Constantinopolitan Fathers five hundred and eighty years ago, has these words: “We,” he says, “enjoy the presence of the Saints through the Scriptures; having images not of their bodies, but of their souls. For what was said by them are the images of their souls.” Thus Chrysostom; which if anyone from the ecclesiastics of the Roman communion should say now, denying that there exist among his people corporeal images of the saints who have departed this life, would he not rightly be considered either to be joking or to be delirious? The same had been said before by Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, that most famous friend of Basil the Great, in a place cited by the same Constantinopolitan Fathers: “It is not our concern,” he says, “to depict the fleshly persons of the saints on tablets with colors, since we have no need of these things; but to imitate their way of life with virtues.” What could be said more expressly to this cause? The Nicenes complain that the passage is not described in its entirety. Why did they not describe it themselves, so that from what either precedes or follows, its true sense might become clear? But they add nothing, except the very things which had been cited by the Constantinopolitans with the best of faith (as is clear even from this). For that they by no means supply the passage is a great and clear argument that in the whole series of it there was nothing that would support their cause. They only respond that those words of Amphilochius, “it is not our concern to depict the fleshly persons of the Saints on tablets with colors,” that those words, I say, are to be taken not absolutely, but comparatively; so that the sense is, not that all care for fashioning the carnal faces of the Saints with colors is to be simply rejected (which they confess conflicts with their opinion), but that our first care ought to be to imitate most studiously those virtues which shone forth in their life and morals; for without this care, all that effort which is put into painting the faces of the Saints is vain and useless; since indeed images ought not for any other reason either to be made or to be worshipped, than that the eminent piety of the Saints may be proposed as something to be loved and imitated; this indeed they profess to admit willingly, as being consonant with their faith. “But to constantly dedicate temples to them,” they say, “or to erect them in an image, for those who condemn their virtue, is not laudable. For no one plainly would praise it, if he saw a man who holds the virtues of the Saints of little account, day after day dedicating images of them, or erecting many temples, or preparing sacred vessels, and not adorning his own temple with deifying virtues.”

To confirm this subtlety of their interpretation with some example, they adduce the words of Isaiah, by which the Lord testifies that he rejects and execrates the

sacrifices of the Israelites, because they, forsooth, offered them with minds empty of all sense of piety. As therefore from those words of Isaiah no sane person would conclude that no sacrifices were offered at that time either by the Prophet himself or by the rest of the Church (since indeed the divine prophet only means that those things which are offered without an inner affection of the mind and faith are displeasing to God); so from the words of Amphilochius it is truly and legitimately collected that to paint the faces of the saints and not to imitate their virtues, this indeed is a vain and a more praiseworthy than blameworthy pursuit; but it does not therefore follow that either Amphilochius himself, or the Church that then was, had no images of the Saints depicted on tablets. This is entirely (if I judge well) the solution of the Amphilochian saying brought forth by the Nicenes, which otherwise (as is their custom, who oppose manifest truth) they involve in many and perplexing circumlocutions of words. But the passage is clearer than to be able to be obscured by these deceptions. For first, Amphilochius, speaking of himself and of other true Christians of his age, says these things most expressly: “It is not our concern to depict the fleshly persons (or faces, and countenances) of the Saints on tablets with colors.” If the Church was then full of such tablets, and they were magnificently worshipped and adorned, if images were a part of Christian piety, of the public and private worship of the pious, with what mind, with what front does he so pointedly pronounce that it is by no means his concern, or that of his people, to depict and express on tablets the carnal countenances of the saints? But neither was it enough for him to deny that these things were his concern; why they are not, and indeed why they ought not to be, he adds this further reason: “since we have no need of these things.” If what the Nicenes later decreed, if what the Romans teach today, Amphilochius had already then felt, that images are necessary, forsooth, for the honor of God and the Saints, for the profession, faith, and sanctification of the pious, how could he deny that we have need of these things? I know it sometimes happens that, speaking comparatively, we either praise or blame those things which otherwise, if they were considered simply in themselves and separately, would perhaps be neither praiseworthy nor blameworthy; and I confess that what has been adduced from the first chapter of Isaiah is to be interpreted in that way; and not a few other similar things. But I deny that the words of Amphilochius pertain to this genus. For their form is plainly different, as is their very matter.

For first, the Prophet addresses hypocrites, and expressly and by name chastises their impious cults: “Your new moons,” he says, “and your appointed feasts my soul hates, they have become a trouble to me.” Then he also clearly teaches what it was that caused the offered cults to be unpleasing to God; namely, that this proceeded not from the nature of the things offered, but from the stain and wickedness of the offerers; “Your hands,” he says, “are full of blood. Wash yourselves, be clean.” Come then; let us imagine there are (and there are indeed very many) let us imagine, I say, there are some, such as are described by the Nicene Fathers, who, having moreover held the imitation of the heavenly beings

in contempt, place all their piety, industry, and effort in dedicating, worshipping, and venerating their images; let us imagine some ecclesiastic introducing the Lord himself, rebuking the wickedness and madness of these men with this speech: “The honors you show to my images and those of the Saints, I hate and abominate. When you especially set them up and adorn them in sacred buildings, when you raise your hands before them prostrate, I will then most turn away my mind and my eyes; so that however much you may have increased those cults and honors to infinity, I will not for that reason, being more placated, hear your prayers. Wash yourselves; be cleansed; remove from my eyes the wicked stains of your life. Let the depravity and impurity of your morals be far away. Imitate the virtues and piety of my saints. What need have I of those images, which you consecrate in their name?” If a doctor or bishop were to say these and other things of this kind similar to what is read in Isaiah against the Israelites, to Christians, I confess there would be no reason why anyone should think it should be concluded from them that neither in that man, nor in his co-religionists, is there any use of images in religion; just as it cannot be rightly concluded from those things which are found said in the same way in Isaiah, that neither the Prophet himself nor the pious Israelites had sacrifices, or new moons, or sacred assemblies, or other ceremonial rites of that kind. Although, indeed, to mention this in passing, the latter collection would be far more inept and more alien from right reason than the former, since after the law of Moses and the writings of the Prophets, no room for doubt is left concerning the sacrifices of the earlier Israelites; but concerning the images of Christians, there is a great and open reason for doubting, because neither the writers of the New Testament, nor other authors of the times immediately after the Apostles, ever made any mention of them.

But however these things may be, it is clear that the speech of Amphilochius is very different from this form of expression. For he is not dealing with degenerate and corrupt Christians, whose error and hypocrisy he chastises separately and particularly with some emotion of the mind. He speaks in general of the true and genuine servants of Christ, and he counts himself among them: “It is not our concern,” he says, “to depict the fleshly persons of the Saints on tablets with colors.” Then, as to why they neglect such things, he gives a reason drawn from the very nature of the neglected things, that they, forsooth, are useless, not one sought from the vice or wickedness of men: “since,” he says, “we have no need of these things.” If that aforementioned speech of Isaiah had been fashioned and constructed in the same manner, “It is no concern of ours to offer sacrifices to God in the temple, because we have no need of things of this kind; but we worship in spirit and in truth”; if, I say, Isaiah had spoken thus, there is no one who would not think it should be concluded from this that neither he himself, nor the pious men of that time, offered sacrifices to God on an external altar. Since, therefore, the discourse of Amphilochius on images is of this kind, it must necessarily be confessed that neither he himself, nor the Christians of the

Church which he ruled, either consecrated or worshipped any images of the Saints.

But there had also been brought forward by the Fathers of Constantinople another certain, very noteworthy passage of Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, who is known to have lived in the times of Cyril of Alexandria, and to have been present with him at the first Council of Ephesus in the year of the Lord 431. That passage, however, runs thus: “We have received that the faces of the saints are not to be formed in images made of material colors; but we have learned to imitate their virtues through those things which are indicated about them in the Scriptures, as certain images, and from this we are raised to a similar zeal for them.” Thus far Theodotus; but what follows is much more express: “For let those who erect such forms say, what utility, think you, they enjoy from them, or into what spiritual contemplation are they led by the commemoration of them? But it is manifest that such an excogitation is vain, and an invention of diabolical argumentation (circumvention, deception, craftiness, μεθοδείας).” But these last words are perhaps those of the Constantinopolitan Fathers, and not of Theodotus himself; which, however, the Nicenes themselves read continuously, and hold as the perpetual oration of one and the same author; singing their usual refrain here in place of a response: namely, that this testimony was fabricated by the enemies of images and, by the highest wickedness, was attributed to Theodotus. But we have demonstrated sufficiently above how unjust this manner of responding is, and how suspect and ambiguous is their credibility in this whole dispute.

CHAPTER VI. Two other testimonies against images: The eighth of Optatus; the ninth of Augustine.

But to the preceding, I here add two Latins. The first is Optatus, an African bishop: “It was said at that time,” he says, “that Paul and Macarius would come (namely, for the sake of the Catholics), who would be present at the sacrifice, and when the altars were being solemnly prepared, they would bring forth an image, which they would first place on the altar; thus the sacrifice would be offered. When their ears received this, their minds also were struck; and the tongue of each one was moved to these words, so that everyone who had heard this said, ‘Whoever tastes from it, tastes of the sacrilegious.’ And it was rightly said, if such a truth had followed such a rumor. But when the aforementioned came, nothing of the sort was seen from what the rumor had a little before falsely reported. The Christian eyes saw nothing that they would abhor. The sight proved none of those things by which the hearing had been disturbed. Purity was seen, and the solemn custom according to the usual rite was observed.” Thus Optatus; by which he shows that in that time images in churches were unknown to both Catholics and Donatists, especially on the altar (which almost never lacks this ornament in the temples of our adversaries), and that it was then the common opinion of all Christians that divine worship was polluted and, as it were, defiled by the mixing in of images, and that whoever was a participant in such rites was, as it were, contaminated with a certain sacrilege. Unless the Donatists felt thus, why are they so greatly struck by that rumor spread about Paul and Macarius, as if they were going to place an image on the altar? Unless this was also the sense of Optatus and the Catholics, why then does he concede that the struck Donatists would have rightly said, “Whoever tastes from it, tastes of the sacrilegious,” if such a truth had followed such a rumor?

Augustine remains, who in various places, partly already adduced in the preceding book, partly to be adduced in the following when the occasion presents itself, testifies more than enough that among the Christians of his time it was not received either by law or by universal custom that images should be either worshipped or had in churches. He teaches this same thing most splendidly in his second tractate on Psalm 113. For having inveighed against the images and idols of the pagans with many words, and having at length chastised the vanity and crassness of that worship, he finally also notes with the Prophet that those idols are the works of the hands of the men who venerate what they themselves have made of gold and silver. Then, however, speaking of Christians, he adds this: “But indeed we also have many instruments and vessels of such material or metal for the use of celebrating the sacraments, which, being consecrated by that very ministry, are called holy, in honor of him to whom service is rendered thereby for our salvation. And indeed, are not these instruments or vessels also anything other than the works of men's hands? But yet do they have a mouth, and not speak? do they have eyes, and not see? Do we pray to them, because through them we pray to God? That is the greatest cause

of insane impiety, that a form similar to a living being, which makes one pray to it, has more power in the affections of the wretched than the fact that it is manifest that it is not living, so that it ought to be contemned by the living. For images have more power to bend the unhappy soul, because they have a mouth, they have eyes, they have ears, they have nostrils, they have hands, they have feet, than to correct it, because they will not speak, they will not see, they will not hear, they will not smell, they will not handle, they will not walk." Thus far Augustine; conceding indeed that the instruments and vessels which the Church of the Christians used in celebrating the sacraments were themselves also for the most part of gold and silver; but denying that they had a mouth or eyes, with which they could neither speak nor see, after the manner of the pagan images. Therefore, one of these two things must be established: either that no images were then used in divine worship by Christians, or if there were any, they were living and animate, and endowed with sense and the faculty of speech, and entirely of a different nature and character than those which are now in use; and that therefore no other images existed in the churches and assemblies of the African faithful (among whom Augustine lived) except those of which Clement of Alexandria had made mention many years before, when he said that every truly pious and Christian man is an ἄγαλμα ἐνάρετον, ἀνακείμενον θεῷ, an image endowed with virtue, dedicated to God.

When Bellarmine noticed the force of this testimony of Augustine, he tried to dilute it. He says therefore that the author wished to show that the images of the Gentiles hold men in error, not by reason of their material, because they are precious, but by reason of their figure; because they have a figure similar to ours; and that Augustine shows this in a twofold way; first, because many turn their back to the Sun, and in the meantime pray to an image of the Sun; not because the Sun is not far nobler, but because that globular figure of the Sun does not so easily persuade that the Sun lives and feels, as does the figure of the image, which is similar to ours. Secondly, because Catholics also have in sacred places vessels even of precious material, and yet because the human figure is lacking, not even the Gentiles would think that those vessels live and breathe. But this response of his is nothing other than the inane evasion of a man who is obstinately determined in his mind to reject and remove the truth which he sees. Augustine in this tractate attacks the folly and brutish stupor of the pagans, who were not ashamed to name as Gods, and to hold as Gods and to worship, golden and silver images, devoid of life and soul, which no sane person would hold even for true men, much less that they should be considered Gods. Having pursued this at length, when he had shown that idols are to be considered not only below men, but also, since they lack sense, below the beasts themselves, he brings forth the exception of the pagans to this, who alleged that those material effigies, although they by no means exercised external functions of the senses, nevertheless contained within them a hidden power of the deities, which, having been infused from heaven when they were consecrated, thereafter resided in them. "I do not worship this visible thing," said the pagan, "but the deity that

inhabits it invisibly." Augustine responds that the Scripture, which often warns us that those which were vaunted by the ethnics as deities were demons, not true Gods, also snatches this excuse from them. Then he proposes the other evasion of the pagans, which the more subtle were accustomed to use: "I worship neither the image," said these men, "nor a demon; but through the corporeal effigy, I behold a sign of that which I ought to worship." These men, therefore, held idols neither as Gods, nor indeed (like the gross and ignorant masses) as places, seats, or receptacles of the Gods, but as mere signs, symbols, and monuments of the divinities; so that one image signified the earth, namely that to which the name Tellus was given; another the sea, for instance that which was called Neptune; Vulcan fire, Venus the morning star, another the Sun, another the Moon. These men, however, if anyone objected that not even thus were they freed from the worship and adoration of bodies, since it cannot be denied that those things which they said were signified by their idols are bodies—fire, earth, sea, sun, moon, and the rest—thus, I say, to one pressing them they dared to respond (says Augustine) that they did not worship the bodies themselves, but the divinities which preside over their governance. To this response of theirs, Augustine opposes those words of the Apostle to the Romans: "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature, rather than the creator, who is God blessed for ever." And in the former part of this sentence, he says, the idols or images of the pagans are condemned by the Apostle; but in the latter, the interpretation which they imposed on the images; "For by calling the effigies," he says, "made by a craftsman by the names of those things which God has fabricated, they change the truth of God into a lie; but by holding the things themselves as Gods, and venerating them, they serve the creature rather than the creator, who is blessed for ever."

To this he demonstrates that that subtlety of the pagans is false, by which they professed to worship not the image, but the thing signified by the image, since experience itself sufficiently testified that their piety and religion were directed to the present images, which were objects to the senses, and not to the things signified by the images. "For who adores," he says, "or prays looking at an image, who is not so affected that he thinks he is heard by it, and hopes that what he desires is granted to him by it?" To prove this, he adduces what was commonly done by the pagans at that time, that they would pray to the statue they called the Sun, while turning their backs to the Sun itself, and likewise strike the statue of Neptune with their groans, while being struck from behind by the roar of the sea. Which indeed sufficiently argued that they by no means held the images as bare and simple signs of the things to which they were consecrated (for if they had thought so, they would not have lingered on the signs, whenever the things themselves were present), but imagined that in those images there lurked some power, more divine and more potent than the very bodies of the Sun, and the Sea, and similar things, which would hear their prayers and vows. And here indeed Augustine subjoins that that error of the pagans was born from the form of the images, since "the figure of the limbs," he says, "in a way extorts, so that

the living soul in the senses of the body is more inclined to think that a body feels, which it sees to be most similar to its own body, than the round Sun, and the diffuse waves, and whatever it perceives is not formed with the same lineaments with which those things are formed which it is accustomed to see living." Then, "against this affection," he says, "by which human and carnal infirmity can easily be captured, the Scripture of God sings of things very well known, and as if to arouse the minds of men sleeping in the habit of their bodies, 'Idols,' it says, 'are silver and gold.' But God made gold and silver. 'The works,' it says, 'of men's hands.'" But when he saw that the pagans would respond here that idols ought not to be condemned on this account, that they are of gold and silver, fashioned by the art and hands of men, since the Christians themselves also had many instruments and vessels of such material, and used them in divine worship, he meets this objection thus, that he concedes indeed that Christians use such instruments in certain offices of religion, but he contends nevertheless that there is a great difference between those vessels and the idols of the pagans. And that they are the works of men he admits. "But yet," he says, "do they have a mouth, and not speak? Do they have eyes, and not see?" and the rest, which have been described by us above.

This is entirely the series of the whole Augustinian disputation. Now then, if the churches of the Christians were then also full of images, where was Augustine's mind, where his front and shame, when he told the pagans that a "form similar to a living being" was the greatest cause of their "insane impiety," and that it was what "made them pray to it"? Did not the most acute man understand that the pagans had at the ready what they might respond, and by which they might turn this weapon back upon the Christians themselves in this way: "If this likeness to a living thing is the cause of our insanity, why then have you thought it should be retained among your people? Why do you not fear that this likeness to the human form, which is in your images of the Saints, will lead the minds of the common people astray, when with eyes fixed on them it prays on bended knee in veneration, or adores? Why do you not fear that that appearance will produce among your people an error similar to that which you point out and reprehend in us? and will imbue their minds with a false, and as you boast, insane opinion of divinity?" Then, what kind of sharpness, I ask, is this of Augustine, to accurately purge and defend the chalices of the Church, which this crimination minimally pertained to; but to plainly omit the sacred images, which this weapon properly sought, which it threatened, and upon which it pressed? For who among the pagans is so dull, so leaden, that if he sees his own images of the deities being reprehended and derided by a man of the Roman communion, would object to the adversary not the images of the saints, but the chalices and candelabra, to blunt the crimination? Who indeed is the doctor of the Roman party who, in conducting this case, would think that the exception of the chalices and candelabra should be refuted? and not rather that the objection which can be drawn from the sacred images of his own people should be diluted? But Augustine does plainly the contrary; he repels only that exception concerning

the chalices and candelabra of the Church, and other instruments of this kind; he is concerned about this one alone. Therefore, one of these two things must be confessed: either that Augustine was delirious when he so disputed, or that certainly the pagans who existed in those times had nothing to object to the Christians concerning this business of images, and consequently that no images were yet worshipped in the Church at that time.

Bellarmine, to solve this knot, responds that Augustine does not say that images of human form are thought to live; but that if they are thought to, they are thought so on account of the form, not on account of the material. A marvelous subtlety, indeed, by which the whole reasoning of Augustine is resolved into nothing. For thus he would have said nothing else than that the likeness of the human form persuades that images live only those who already believe they live; but that for those who do not believe, it persuades them of nothing of the kind. But the mind of Augustine is clear, that although it is manifest that the material of the images lacks life and sense, nevertheless that likeness of a living and human form which is seen in them imposes upon the minds of the crasser sort, as if some vital force and virtue lies hidden within. He means therefore that they are induced into this opinion, not those who have already preconceived it in their minds (for that cannot be said without the highest absurdity), but those who, while previously by no means engaged in such an error, gradually, being deceived by a false appearance, slip into it: which he signifies most evidently when he says that that "figure of the limbs," which forsooth they see in the images, "extorts" that opinion from the "wretched pagans." Augustine had already warned of this same thing elsewhere: “That idols indeed,” he says, “lack all sense, who can doubt? Nevertheless, when they are placed in these seats with honorable sublimity, so that they may be attended to by those who pray and sacrifice, by the very likeness of animate members and senses, although they are insensate and inanimate, they affect weak minds, so that they seem to live and breathe; especially with the addition of the veneration of the multitude, by which so great a worship of God is paid to them.” Certainly those against whom Augustine disputes thought that the images were not Gods, or the seats and receptacles of gods (as our adversaries falsely think), but signs and monuments of the things which they themselves worshipped (to which opinion the opinion of the Romans today about their images of the saints is plainly similar). Therefore if, what these men now feel, Augustine had once felt the same, it is plain that he would never have used the method of disputing which he follows against the images of the pagans. But whatever may be imagined about Augustine's plan, it is certainly established by his words that various images and effigies, which are now in use among the men of the Roman communion, are excluded from the Church which then flourished. For these are his most express words, that the golden and silver instruments and vessels which the Christians then used in celebrating the sacraments were indeed the works of men's hands, but they had neither a mouth without the faculty of speech, nor eyes without sight.

And yet many are the instruments of the Roman cult today of which this cannot be said, since in most of this kind the forms of the crucified Christ or of the saints are seen sculpted, which, although they have a mouth, ears, and eyes, yet neither speak, nor hear, nor see. To this is added that since golden, silver, and wooden effigies of Christ, and many others, are used by them in most parts of religious worship, and scarcely any sacred rite is performed among them without some image, I do not see how such images can be expunged from the census of those instruments which Augustine says are had for the use of celebrating the sacraments. Therefore, since he most expressly denies that all instruments of this kind had a mouth and eyes without speech and sight, from this it necessarily follows that of the modern images, which without any faculty of speaking and seeing yet have a mouth and eyes, there was then no use at all in religion among Christians.

To these testimonies of the ancients on this cause I could, if I chose, add not a few others. But I will be content to touch upon them in passing in the remaining parts of this work, as the occasion presents itself. For now it does not seem that I should linger longer in proving a matter which is so clear that we have some of the adversaries themselves agreeing with us here. For besides Franciscus Zephyrus, whom we heard above ingenuously confessing on Tertullian's *Apology* that the Christians of the primitive time had no images of the Saints in their churches, Lilius Giraldus also confesses the same thing at the beginning of his *Syntagma de Diis Gentium*, in which place, having complained not obscurely of the intemperance of the Roman Church in the matter of images, and having prefaced that it is better to consign these things to Harpocrates and Angerona, he says: “This certainly I will not pass over, that we, I say Christians, like the Romans at one time, were without images in the primitive, so-called, Church.” Erasmus does not dissent: “up to the age of Jerome,” he says, “there were men of approved religion who tolerated no image in temples, neither painted, nor sculpted, nor woven, not even of Christ.” In the same place he also has these words: “That images should be in temples, no human constitution has commanded; and as it is easier, so it is also safer to remove all images from temples.” But Cassander treats this whole cause at length in his *Consultation*, and mentions most of the things which have been brought forward by us, and concludes no differently than we do: “It is certain,” he says, “that at the beginning of the preached Gospel for some time among the Christians, especially in the Churches, there was no use of images, as is clear from Clement and Arnobius; finally pictures were admitted into the Church, either expressing the history of past events, or referring to the true effigies of holy men. For those alone are to be called images, which represent the appearance of the archetype as closely as can be done.” Soon he distinguishes, and rightly so, symbolic pictures from images; and says that the former were in use before the latter (which also, to say it in passing, was done by the most learned Masius in his Commentary on Joshua). Then he observes from the writings of Gregory that, although even then superstition in the cult of the Saints had grown not a little, nevertheless only

pictures had been admitted into the Churches, not statues or images. He adduces the testimonies of Augustine and Optatus, mentioned by us above, and from the narration of the latter he concludes how abominable Christians considered it if an image or statue were placed on the altar; and he proves the same from those things which were written by Epiphanius, both against the Collyridians and to John of Jerusalem; and also from various places in Origen, Arnobius, Lactantius, and Clement of Alexandria. “Finally, however,” he says, “when Paganism was almost obsolete, and Christianity had grown, and that danger of adoration and worship of images was less feared, the minds of Christians being sufficiently instructed and confirmed in the sincere worship of God, pictures were received in the temples; and that this was already received in the age of Ambrose, Paulinus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Prudentius is clear from their writings.” Then, having cited from Gregory the Great passages which we will recite below in their proper place, he teaches that those pictures were had for this reason, not that they should be worshipped and adored, but that the unlearned, by inspecting the pictures, just as by reading letters, might be reminded of past events and incited to piety.

Soon he recounts the long struggles of the Greek Church, and how the Bishops of our Gaul generously resisted the growing error: to which matter he adduces the Synod of Frankfurt, the books of Charlemagne and of Jonas of Orléans, and some passages from Walafrid Strabo, Durandus of Mende, and Nicetas. He deplores that in the following centuries the worship of images and idols grew too strong, and that "too much indulgence was given to the affection or rather superstition of the people, so that to the highest adoration, which was accustomed to be shown even by the Pagans to their images, and to the extreme vanity, which the ethnics admitted in fashioning and adorning their idols and images, nothing," he says, "seems to have been left undone by our people." And so he adds that "prudent men in the Catholic Church had long ago thought that some measure should be put to this matter and that superstition should be opposed," in which place it is memorable what he reports from Gabriel Biel, a most celebrated theologian of the Roman school, that "some say that an image is to be adored neither as it is considered in itself, according to which it is wood, stone, or metal, nor as it is considered according to the reason of a sign and image." "From them," says Gabriel, "is clear the stupid error of certain men, who are so attached to images that they believe there is in them some divinity, grace, or sanctity, by which they are powerful to work miracles, to grant healings, rising from this to their veneration, so that they may obtain some of the aforesaid things." Having described these things from Gabriel, Cassander continues, and wishes that "these things be diligently attended to by the Bishops and rectors of the Churches; and that by their sermons and admonitions the people be called away from those errors"; and that "the Princes themselves also lend their common effort to this business." But the images which are called images of the Trinity, he expressly attacks, and finally concludes that "it seems advisable if the matter could be brought to this point, that a return be made to that moderation

which our ancestors, according to the opinion of Gregory, long held in Germany and Gaul, that is, that images be held as monuments of past events, not as instruments of worship."

BOOK THREE

CHAPTER I. The first objection of the adversaries, drawn from those chalices which Tertullian mentions were painted.

And so it has been sufficiently demonstrated, unless I am mistaken, that in the four centuries immediately following the birth of Christ, the veneration of what they call sacred images was not established in the Catholic Church either by Apostolic tradition or by any universal law. For those whom we heard as witnesses in this cause in the preceding book all lived after the three hundredth year of the Christian era, if you except only Origen. The Eliberitan Fathers indeed were in the farthest West; Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Amphilochius in the East; Chrysostom and Theodotus in the northern region of the Church; finally, Optatus and Augustine in the South. Now let us see what the ancient as well as the more recent patrons of images object to a matter so manifest and so established. In the beginning, they bring forward a passage of Tertullian, already touched upon by us in passing above, from his work *On Modesty*. In that book, the writer, most excellent by far, but now addicted to the delirium of Montanus, directs his pen against the leniency and indulgence of certain Catholics of his time, because they admitted fornicators to penitence, and thence to communion, having somewhat mitigated the rigor of the pristine discipline which excluded these sinners, equally with murderers and idolaters, from the hope of communion. Therefore, while he is engaged in that disputation, he objects to himself in the name of his adversaries the evangelical parable in which the sheep that had wandered from the flock, having been sought with the highest zeal by the Shepherd and brought back to the sheepfold, seems to favor the opinion of those who thought that a sinner, after completing his penance, should be received again into the communion of the faithful. To this Tertullian responds that the wandering sheep is a symbol, not of a Christian man repenting from some crime or disgrace, but of an ethnic first converted from infidelity to the Gospel. Then, he says: "Let the pictures of your chalices themselves come forth, to see if the interpretation of that sheep will shine even in them, whether it will align with a Christian or a pagan sinner." And again, on the same opinion, in the third chapter from here: "If by chance," he says, "the Shepherd whom you depict on the chalice, a prostitute even of the Christian sacrament, will plead your case." From these two passages, our adversaries conclude that in the very time of Tertullian, that is, in the two hundredth year of the Christian era, Christians were already accustomed to painting the Lord Jesus in the form of a Shepherd, and indeed on the sacred chalices, which were used in administering the Eucharist. I do not wish here to call into doubt what these men posit as certain and indubitable, that those which Tertullian speaks of were the sacred chalices of the Church, with which the sacrament of the Lord's blood was distributed to the faithful, nor to contend that they were common ones, which were used in domestic meals among Christians; although there are not lacking most learned men on all sides who think so, nor indeed should it seem strange

that the common Christian people adorned domestic vessels with such emblems, since Jerome, two hundred years after Tertullian, writes that in the gourds of vessels (which they commonly called *saucomariae*) the images of the Apostles were accustomed to be adumbrated. Let it be that Tertullian understood sacred chalices. What is this against the cause we are pleading? Does it follow from the fact that those Catholics with whom he disputes depicted the evangelical parable of the good Shepherd on glass chalices, that they also, either in that very place or elsewhere in the church, consecrated or worshipped images of Christ, of the Father, of the Holy Spirit, of the Virgin Mary, and of the Saints in their churches? Or (which is properly the hinge of the present controversy) that they were adored and honored with some religious cult? If you consider the subject of the picture itself, it was an emblem drawn from the parables of Scripture, mystically adumbrating the office of Christ's ministers, which it exhibited to the eyes first and immediately, not the face of Christ or of any Saint, but the form and habit of a shepherd carrying a sheep on his shoulders; so that the faithful, moved by that spectacle, might philosophize on something higher in their mind, and in the deed (which is common in ordinary life) might contemplate with the eye not of the body, but of the mind, first indeed the goodness of that mystical Shepherd, whom we know to have descended from heaven to earth, that he might gather us, freed from spiritual error, into the celestial fold; then also the office of his ministers, who by the master's example ought to receive erring Christians and lead them back into the allegorical sheepfold, that is, into the Church. What does an emblem of this sort have in common with those images which are publicly dedicated in churches to be worshipped with a religious rite? These latter are believed to refer immediately to those who are thought to be worshipped in this manner; the former, however, present to the senses first and in themselves common and earthly things, which are in no way to be adored, so that they may usefully exercise the mind with some spiritual lesson that can be drawn from them.

Therefore, they are fashioned for no other reason than either to teach men with some delight, or to adorn the places in which they are located; whereas those images of the other kind are both painted and dedicated chiefly for this purpose, that they may be worshipped. Emblems demand only the keenness of the eyes and the attention of the mind; images also demand religious worship. For this reason, even the Protestants who abominate these, being, as the adversaries please to call them, iconoclasts, yet do not at all spurn the former, as is evident from the mystical and symbolic pictures which are commonly in use among them; such as, for example, that emblem of religion which, leaning on the cross, tramples on death, and this very Tertullianic one of the shepherd carrying the sheep on his shoulders, and that other one of the two gates, one of which is narrower, the other wider; and many other icons of this kind, which they are accustomed to engrave on the tokens of holy communion, and with which they also adorn the frontispieces of Bibles, Psalters, and other books of this kind. If anyone should conclude from this that images of the Saints are also publicly

dedicated, consecrated, and adored with an analogical cult in the churches of these people, would he, I ask, have argued well? But neither does the form and position of that emblem which was mentioned by Tertullian oppose the purpose of the adversaries any less than its subject matter. For it was not painted on a panel, nor fixed and consecrated in a specific place in the church, but fashioned on the glass of an ecclesiastical chalice, for the adornment of the vessel, as it appears, not for the religion and worship of the people. Indeed, the Church would not have attached that image to the vessel (which already had its own use, and one far different from the veneration of an image), but would have fashioned and exhibited it separately, if indeed its plan had been that this picture should be worshipped by the faithful. In windows and glass cups, craftsmen of this kind paint many things everywhere—true, false, sacred, profane; and there is no one who suspects that these are worshipped by those who use them, or are kept with the intention that they be worshipped, since it is clear and obvious to anyone that these were added for no other purpose than for ornament. And, if in the churches of the adversaries there were no images except on the glass of windows and cups, I do not think anyone would venerate them, since everyone understands that pictures of this kind are instituted for the elegance of windows and cups, not for the religion and worship of men. Nor indeed do even the Protestants themselves spurn those which are of this kind, that is, which are not made separately and for themselves, but only as appendages and ornaments of other things; who, although they repudiate the use of images in religion, yet do not think it a sin to adorn the doors of temples, the pulpits of ecclesiastics, and the sacred benches with such elegances and works of art; who also are accustomed for the most part to paint icons of this kind on the first pages of the codices of the Bible, which they hold most sacred; from which no sane person will gather that the images of the Saints are in the same use, price, and honor among them as they are among the men of the Roman communion. The Jesuit Lorinus, where he disputes in what sense images were forbidden in the law, also applies this distinction of them, judging the more probable opinion to be that of those who deny that the use of all images that were made by themselves, and not merely as appendages or ornaments of other things, was lawful for the Jews in the old law, in his notes on Acts 17:29. Thus, according to the hypothesis of this theologian, he would reason incorrectly who contends that images of the Saints were in use and veneration, trying to prove it from the fact that they read in Tertullian of a parable depicted on the glass of a chalice. This passage of his certainly did not in the least prevent Franciscus Zephyrus from believing that in those times there were no images of the Saints in the churches of the Christians. Nor can anything else be truly and legitimately gathered from this, except that there were then some Christians who thought that it was not a sin to paint parables and mystical emblems; which conclusion everyone sees how far it is from those things which the adversaries undertook to prove. For it does not follow from this that the Christians of those times attributed any analogical cult to images, or even had images fashioned and dedicated separately in their

churches; indeed, not even this appears from it, that the opinion of those who thought it was lawful to paint parables was common to all Christians, but on the contrary, as we have demonstrated above, that Tertullian himself, as well as Clement and Origen, condemned the art of painting as entirely illicit. Lastly, neither is it established from this that that use of painting parables or mystical emblems was in the Church from the beginning. Indeed, it seems more likely that that image of the shepherd carrying the sheep on his shoulders was introduced into the church which Tertullian criticizes for the first time on that occasion. For when it had made a decree about admitting fornicators to penance and communion, it is probable that that sacred emblem was then for the first time presented to the eyes of the faithful, because it was exceedingly congruent with the present matter, and not only represented the indulgence which it had pleased them to use towards sinners, but also confirmed and established it by the authority of the Lord himself. This, however, is the only passage which our adversaries oppose to us in this cause from the three centuries closest to Christ, that is, the purest and most holy of the Church; and they have found nothing else in the so many surviving monuments of Justin, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and the rest, which they thought could be bent, or even dragged and twisted, to the defense of their images.

CHAPTER II. The second objection, sought from two passages of Eusebius of Caesarea.

The first whom they adduce from the succeeding times is Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, as we have said above, who it is established was present at the universal Council of Nicaea, in the year of the Christian era 325. I, however, cannot wonder enough that they bid him to give testimony for them, whom they know to have been so ill-received by their own Fathers of the Seventh Synod, as they number it, and so invidiously hissed out, as if openly favoring the Iconoclasts, and in that letter to Constantia which we mentioned above, expressly denying that it is lawful for any mortal to fashion the human form of Christ. Nevertheless, the adversaries adduce a passage of Eusebius, in which, while he describes certain images placed by Constantine, he says in *On the Life of Constantine*: "You may still see the symbols of the good Shepherd placed at the fountains in the middle of the forum, well known to those who are learned in the sacred letters. Also Daniel with the lions carved in brass, shining with plates of gold." from the Christopherson edition. But it is plain that by these words it is by no means established either that those images were then in the churches of the Christians, or that it is lawful to fashion the form of the Lord Christ; which conflicts with the opinion of Eusebius himself, as they say, by a whole diameter. For this passage does not mention an image of Christ, but "symbols of the good Shepherd," that is, either the sign of the cross, as Christopherson interprets it, or the evangelical emblem of the shepherd carrying the sheep, as our Chamier more verisimilarly thinks in his *Panstratia*, vol. 2, book 22, ch. 7, §. 15. The only thing that can be concluded from Eusebius's narration is that the Augustus Constantine was of the opinion that he did not think it a sin either to fashion the cross and the parables of the Gospel and the histories of the Old Testament from bronze and other metals, or to place signs and effigies of this kind in the forum; in which matter he will have, as far as I know, no one of our own men, although they are the most severe iconoclasts (as is believed), disagreeing or dissenting. I confess that Bellarmine attempts something far greater from Eusebius. For he says that in the 3rd and 4th books of the *Life of Constantine*, Bellarmine, *On Images*, c. 9, §. Sozomenus, he says that in the temples constructed by Constantine in Palestine there was a very great abundance of golden and silver images. Bellarmine indeed says these things, of which nothing is extant anywhere in Eusebius; nor, when I think about it, does anything else occur to me that could have led him into so foul an error, than the crime of a certain Joannes Portesius in the Latin version of these books. For in his description of the temple which was built in Jerusalem by Constantine, he makes Eusebius speak thus: "But to this was added an infinite force of golden and silver images"; from Eusebius, as translated into Latin by Joannes Portesius, Book 3 of the Life of Constantine, p. 681, Basel edition of 1559. whereas the Greek codices of Eusebius have it thus: "he adorned it for its own sake with indescribable beauties of a great many offerings of gold, silver, and precious stones in various materials," that is, as

Christopherson translates it in his Eusebius, Book 3 of the Life of Constantine, ch. 39, on the multitude of donatives: "he adorned that (temple) with ornaments which cannot be described in speech, and with monuments of gold, silver, and precious stones distinguished in material and as if painted, which were almost infinite in number." And thus by the crime and singular audacity of Portesius, the donatives of Constantine were changed into images; just as if some interpreter were to render in Latin what we read in Luke 21:5 about the temple of Jerusalem, "adorned with beautiful stones and offerings (λίθοις καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθήμασι κεκοσμημένον)," as "it was adorned with beautiful stones and images." Whether the sin of Portesius was a deception for Bellarmine, I do not know. This I know, that though the former be condemned for infidelity, the latter is not therefore absolved of error and culpable ignorance. If one of our own had committed something similar, there is none of them who would not make a great tragedy of it; who would not demand the man for punishment, as guilty of immense perfidy and of an intolerable impiety. But to return to the disputation I have undertaken, from Eusebius they also adduce what has been handed down by him in the books of his histories concerning a certain statue consecrated, as they reported, to Christ. For having made mention of Paneas, which city the divine books call Caesarea Philippi, from Eusebius, book 7, history, ch. 18 in the Greek edition, which is 14 in the Latin edition of Christopherson, he says: "since I have happened upon the mention of this city, I think it worthwhile to cite a history in this place, which seems plainly worthy that we commend it by memory to posterity. They relate that the woman afflicted with a flow of blood, whom we know from the testimony of the holy Gospels to have found a remedy for her disease from our Savior, originated from that city, and that her house is shown there, and that certain admirable monuments and, as it were, trophies of the Savior's benefit to her endure to this time. For before the doors of her house is placed a bronze effigy of a woman on her knees, with her hands extended forward in the manner of a supplicant, upon a raised stone; opposite this, an erect image of a man, fashioned from the same material, decently adorned with a garment hanging down to his ankles, and extending his hand to the woman. at whose feet, on the very base, a certain foreign and unusual species of herb grows; which indeed, when it has grown up to the fringe of the bronze garment, has the power and faculty of curing diseases of every kind. This statue, they say, expresses the effigy of Jesus; which, remaining even to our own age, we ourselves, having gone to that city, saw with our own eyes. Nor is it at all surprising that those who, being born of the gentiles, had been affected with benefits by the Savior while he lived among men, should have done these things, since we also have seen images of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Christ himself, expressed in the variety of colors in pictures, and preserved; and this, as is probable, because our ancestors, approaching as closely as possible to the likeness of gentile custom, without deviation, were accustomed to honor in this manner among themselves those who had been, as it were, saviors to them, that is, those who had brought them some salvation and aid, without consideration."

And this indeed is the most celebrated passage of Eusebius, brought up often and studiously in this disputation by all patrons of images, both ancient and recent. Charlemagne, however, already 840 years ago, explained at length how little this narrative helps their cause; whose response, described from the fourth book of his work on images, I thought it worthwhile to subjoin here in its entirety. For having recited the history of this statue, from Charlemagne, book 4 on images, ch. 15, he says: "In which deed, indeed, if however it is to be believed that it was done, no adoration of images is commended. If therefore that woman, with the facility of the female sex and a certain levity of mind, having received the benefit of health, as if always seeking the Lord's presence and being ignorant that he can be everywhere, erected an image, who so foolish, having received the sacred charisms of the faith and not being ignorant that he is everywhere, will therefore erect an image, that he may have his presence, and adore it? And if she, the world not yet being liberated from the cults of idols, having seen statues of certain dead men in cities erected for the memory or cult of certain things, similarly strove to act as she was able, who of sound mind will give assent to her acts, and believing that the Lord is not in things made by hand, but in heaven, or rather everywhere, will take care to do such things? Or if perhaps she, in a superstitious rite, had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, what Catholic, strengthened in the faith, will take examples from her acts in this respect and do things similar to these? Or if perhaps she, in the infancy of her conversion, who was not yet able to eat solid food, therefore used tender food, so that she might grow by taking strength little by little to receive food, that is, so that through a visible and tangible thing she might approach the cult of the invisible and ineffable God; who, being made an imitator of her in this deed, having spurned the strength of solid food, would desire to be brought back again to the foods of infancy? In the miracle, therefore, which is in the herb, if however it is to be believed that it was done, which, as he confessed, heals all sicknesses, their assertion can by no means be supported in any way; since it is not reported that this was done so that herbs or images might be adored, but so that the minds of the infidels, having spurned the vanities of idols, might be converted to the rudiments of the true faith, since according to the Apostle, signs are believed to have been given not for the faithful, but for the infidels. For the Catholic Church, in order to grow in faith, had to be nourished by miracles, and so that its new planting might grow strong, it had to be fostered by assiduous irrigations." Thus far Charlemagne, in which place he defends this cause with the churches of Gaul and Germany, as will be demonstrated later. But of this response, not only is the authority venerable, but the reason and equity are also perspicuous. For first, that Charlemagne hints that the credibility of this deed is very doubtful, when he says twice, "if, however, it is to be believed that it was done," this will become manifest if you accurately weigh all the circumstances of the whole affair. I pass over the silence of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, who, when narrating the woman's cure in the Gospels, seem that they ought by no means to have omitted so illustrious a monument of her gratitude

to the Lord, yet they mention nothing of the kind. I pass over likewise the silence of the other writers of the Church more ancient than Eusebius: Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others, who, while in their Apologies and other books they are accustomed to pursue and collect most studiously all the documents of the miracles which are narrated by the Evangelists as done by the Lord, have made no mention of this, which however is of such a kind that it alone would suffice to refute the pervicacity of the infidels, and ought to be most known to all Christians, but especially to Justin, born and educated in Palestine, and also to Origen, who spent so many years in Tyre in the very near vicinity of Paneas. There are, however, two things which I cannot pass over, and which, as it seems to me, either utterly demolish the credibility of this deed, or at least render it vehemently suspect. One is that Luke and Mark explicitly testify that the woman, before she was healed by Christ, had spent and consumed all her resources on physicians, whom however the aforementioned narrative makes to have placed two bronze images before her house. And yet this could not have been done without great expense, to which the resources of even wealthy men could hardly be equal. The other is that those bronze images are imagined to have remained at Paneas intact and inviolate in public for three hundred years; and that in so long a time it did not occur either to the Christians or to their enemies and persecutors, for the former to remove them and place them in safety, for the latter to overturn and destroy such illustrious monuments of that truth, which with the greatest effort and a certain incredible force some defended, while others attacked. It is established from various ancient books that the pagans were accustomed to seek out most studiously the sacred codices of the Scriptures, the ecclesiastical chalices, and other such monuments or instruments of the Christian religion, even in the houses of private men, during those three centuries, and whatever they could get their hands on, to burn and abolish, lest any, even the slightest, trace of ecclesiastical truth should remain. Who would believe that those men, in such hatred and such madness, would have left that most beautiful bronze at Paneas, if it had existed, unharmed, and would have suffered it to testify and preach openly and in public, with a clear voice as it were, the miracles of that Jesus whom they could not bear to exist or be named even in the corners and hiding places of hidden crypts? Who likewise would believe that Christian men, the most fierce defenders then of the Gospel and of all that pertained to it, would have recklessly neglected two such splendid and precious monuments, exposed for so long to the fury and mockery of their enemies? Nor should the authority of Eusebius be objected to us in this place. For he confesses that he received whatever there is of this narrative from no other source than from the sole rumor of the populace, whose credibility, how weak, how doubtful and uncertain it is, everyone understands. Eusebius cites no certain author from the ancients, as he is accustomed to do in other cases, no praised witness. He only says that it was so rumored; "they said," he says, "they reported, they recounted"; upon which word he suspends this whole history, whatever it may be, and he

repeats this again at the end of the narrative, "this statue, they say, expresses the effigy of Jesus." He does indeed say, I confess, that he saw the statue he describes at Paneas; and I do not think it is right or just for anyone to doubt what Eusebius so explicitly testifies. But that the one which he narrates he saw, and we believe him narrating it, was the true effigy of the Lord Jesus, truly placed and consecrated to him by that woman of whom the Gospel speaks, this indeed Eusebius hands down not on his own authority, nor on that of another suitable author, but solely from the rumor of the populace; confirming the matter no otherwise than by the common rumor of the citizens, "they said," he says, "they reported." Therefore, that two bronze images existed at Paneas, such as are described by Eusebius, I would by no means deny. But that they were placed by that woman whom they reported, or with that intention and purpose which they divined, the arguments which I have set forth above do not permit me to believe. I would rather think that they were placed of old by ethnic men (for this was a city of the Greeks) according to custom (for what reason, or with what subject, is uncertain), and that the Christians afterwards, when they had increased and gained power in that city, twisted it to the history of the woman with the issue of blood, on account of some similarity of the things themselves, since one of the images was prostrate in the manner of a supplicant, the other stood in the manner of one ordering and commanding something, which did not seem absurdly able to be referred to those things which are read in the Evangelical narrative, that the woman trembling fell at the feet of Jesus, and openly professed what had happened to her; but that Jesus addressed her with praise in the sweetest words, and so consoled her: "Take heart, daughter. Your faith has saved you. Go in peace." As we see today, if any coins are found which bear some likeness of Christ (such as he is commonly fashioned by painters), they are almost always referred to Christ, and are shown as true and genuine icons of him. For that even those ancient Christians, through a certain human affection, sometimes incautiously fell into an error of this kind, is sufficiently shown by the example of Justin Martyr, who, when he saw the inscription "Semoni Deo Sanco" on the island in the Tiber in Rome, did not hesitate, deceived by the similarity of the words, to refer it to Simon Magus, as if he had read "Simoni Deo Sancto"; from Desiderius Heraldus's notes on Tertullian, p. 77. when it is sufficiently established that it was the effigy not of Simon, but of some false deity, which we know was worshipped and consecrated of old by the ancient ethnics under the name of Semo Sancus, among other superstitions. Since so great a man, versed in the studies of philosophy and letters, could so err and be mistaken, it is not to be wondered at that the rude populace of Paneas, deceived by a false appearance and similarity of things, wrongly attributed to Christ an image which was in truth of another thing. The marvelous herb, which seems to make it so that they rightly suspected this to be the effigy of Christ, that, I confess, does not move me much. For Eusebius does not affirm that its power had been explored by him in any experiment; he only says that it was rumored by the populace that it grew at the feet of the statue on the very base,

and that, when it had grown up to the fringe of the bronze garment, it had the power and faculty of curing diseases of every kind. When once a noble and magnificent opinion about some matter has occupied the minds of men, especially of the populace, they allow themselves to be persuaded with no trouble of something marvelous and surpassing nature concerning it; of which facility, examples are everywhere daily met with in common life, far too many. It is therefore not at all surprising that those who had already conceived in their minds that this was the image of Christ, also esteemed the herb that happened to grow in that place to be admirable; and when they saw that it had grown to that salutary fringe of Christ, usefully touched by the woman, as they imagined for themselves, they were led to believe that it was endowed with a singular power and genius. If some sick person was relieved by its use and contact, whether the innate faculty of the herb effected this (for we know that many have stupendous powers from nature itself), or whether this also happened only by chance, one case of this kind could have been enough to commend this rumor, and to persuade the entire populace of that city. And thus it is clear how not without reason Charles left the credibility of this history in uncertainty, since there are so many things which render it suspect, and so few which render it probable. But neither did he deny without just reason the collection which the patrons of images were weaving from it. For even if we were to grant that the whole rumor of this deed, received from Eusebius, was true, it would not thereby be established either that the images of Christ and the Saints ought to be consecrated and worshipped in the churches of the Christians according to the current rite of the Romans, or that this was the use of the ancient faithful. For what, in the end, would they carve or hammer out from this whole history, even if it were certain and confessed, other than that there was one image of Christ, fashioned not by the order and institution of any bishop or doctor, but by the will of a little woman emerging from the mire of Paganism? placed not in a church, but in a public street before her doors? with the intention not that it should be adored or worshipped, but that it should be a monument of a benefit divinely received from the Lord Christ? not from a Christian, but from an ethnic use, to which she had long been accustomed? Eusebius indeed writes that it was held as an image of Christ by the inhabitants of that city; he does not write that it was worshipped by Christians. He narrates that it was seen by him as he was traveling in those places; he does not narrate that it was adored, honored with a salutation, a kiss, a candle, or any other gift. But why do I say that Eusebius testifies or writes none of these things? He, in fact, not obscurely testifies that the matter was otherwise. For having followed out the whole narrative, he subjoins these words: "Nor is it at all surprising that those who, being of Gentile origin, had been affected with benefits by the Savior while he lived among men, should have done these things." To what purpose does Eusebius warn of this, if it was then received among all Christians that images of Christ should be both had and worshipped in sacred places? For if this was the common use of the Church that then was, there was nothing in that history that could seem marvelous to

anyone. And yet Eusebius addresses the wonder, when he says that it is not to be wondered at that that woman placed an image to Christ. Therefore, it is necessary, contrary to what the adversaries wish, that it was an unusual and unaccustomed thing in that Church for any true Christian to have an image of Christ. For otherwise it would not have come into anyone's mind to wonder at this deed of the woman. But the reason for that admiration or doubt which is subjoined by Eusebius most clearly confirms this very thing. For while from the modern dogma of the Romans the solution would be easy and ready, namely that that woman did what had been instituted by the Apostles, what had been handed down to all the disciples, that the images of Christ and the Saints should be both preserved and indeed also worshipped, on the contrary Eusebius attributes this use and custom to a few certain people, and those pagans by birth and education; "Nor is it at all surprising," he says, "that those who, being of Gentile origin, etc. did these things; since we also have seen images of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Christ himself, expressed in the variety of colors in pictures, and preserved." Can anything be said more obtuse and more inept than that speech, if the churches of the Christians were then in that cult and adornment in which those of Rome now are? Would not a Roman doctor today who commented on that statue of Paneas, and admonished his listeners that it is not to be wondered at that that woman, who was a pagan, placed an image to Christ, be deserving of ridicule? And if finally he added those words of Eusebius, "Since we also have seen images of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Christ himself, expressed in the variety of colors in pictures, and preserved"? Is there anyone so infantile that he would not think the man was delirious? who would not either object to one saying such things with a clear voice, or at least certainly mutter to himself in silence: "But, O good man, why do you look for a knot in a bulrush? why do you weary yourself in vain in solving a doubt which cannot come into the mind of any of your people? Why do you excuse the paganism of the woman, as if the laws of Christianity do not permit, do not even command and prescribe, what she used? Why do you tell us, as if it were something great, rare, and unusual, that you have seen some images of the Apostles and of Christ himself? as if all the houses of Christians, public, private, sacred, profane, are not full of them?" Surely, either it must be affirmed that Eusebius was delirious when he wrote these things thus, or it must be confessed, what the thing itself speaks, that there were then indeed no images in the churches of the Christians; but that there were, contrary to public custom and use, some in the private libraries and rooms of some, who preserved them not for the sake of cult or religion, but only for the sake of memory. and this with the distinction that those of Christ were found more rarely and more sparingly than those of Paul and Peter. Now indeed, even among the most hostile Protestants against images, how many are there who both hold in price and studiously preserve the icons of their own men, who have lived with some fame either of piety or of erudition? Finally, that very deed, both of the woman of Paneas and of others who preserved effigies of Christ and of Paul and Peter, Eusebius refers to no other source than to the use

and custom of the pagans, because they were born and educated among them, for whom it was customary to gift their saviors and liberators with statues and images, so that the memory of the virtue and beneficence which they had experienced might exist and be preserved for as long as possible among posterity.

And that this indeed was the received and common custom among the ethnics, we learn sufficiently and more from the books of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Indeed, it also seems close to the truth that the cult of idols flowed chiefly from this source. To wit, the matter gradually proceeded to the point where they judged that those whose images they had received from their ancestors with great honor should be consecrated and held as deities, and worshipped. This, therefore, is the opinion of Eusebius, a most true and certain one indeed, that the use of images among Christians flowed from the imitation of the pagans, not that it was instituted, as the adversaries dream, either by the precept or by the example of the Apostles. Whence it is sufficiently apparent that by this passage of Eusebius, what that writer teaches elsewhere, that it is a sin to paint an image of the Lord Christ, is not only not overturned, but is established and confirmed.

CHAPTER III. Six other objections are solved, sought from Adrian, Sozomen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine.

And so we have passed the times of the Augustus Constantine, whom we have received to have departed from this world in the year of the Christian era 337; and we have not yet found any images in the sacred edifices of the faithful. For what Adrian narrates, that even then the churches in Rome were adorned with pictures by Sylvester the bishop, and likewise what the writer on the lives of the Pontiffs (who is commonly held to have been Damasus) relates, that Constantine, in the place where he had been baptized, placed a lamb of the purest gold, on the right a silver statue of the Savior, but on the left a silver statue of John the Baptist, and in the Lateran church itself he placed silver images of the Savior, the twelve Apostles, and four angels; these testimonies, I say, we pass over with the leave of our adversaries, because they are of men rightly suspect, and more intensely addicted to this cause which we oppose, than that their zeal can be disguised. For the Adrian who is now adduced, flourished in the year of our Lord 790, more than four hundred years after Constantine, the leader of that Seventh Synod which established the cult of images, and who for their defense wrote this very book from which the passage cited by the adversaries is sought. The book on the lives of the Pontiffs, however, although written before those times, it is established by the common judgment of the learned that it was augmented and interpolated by Anastasius, a man of the ninth century, and indeed of the late ninth century, the Librarian of the Pope of Rome, and a most noble sycophant of that see, who defended the cult of images with such zeal and such contention that (as we will demonstrate more fully later) he did not hesitate somewhere to note our Gauls because they would not receive it. If Bellarmine, a learned man and most versed in the monuments of the ancients, when he was writing in this very century, in the clearest light of letters, in the greatest abundance of adversaries, nevertheless dared to attribute falsely and through the highest calumny to Constantine that he had filled the temples of Palestine with golden and silver images; why will it seem incredible that Adrian and Anastasius, in dark times, obscured by a foul barbarity and the gloom of ignorance, out of the highest zeal for this cause, attached these images to Sylvester and Constantine? Why here shall we think that they could not have been mistaken, or would not have been willing to deceive, whom it is manifest have sinned in so many other things? For one of them, who wrote the lives of the Pontiffs, says that Constantine was baptized by Sylvester, against the faith of all the ancients; the other, however (namely Adrian), attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria the questions to Antiochus, which it is established were written 300 years after his time; and to Chrysostom the homily on the legislator of the old and new Testament, which even the adversaries themselves confess is not Chrysostom's, and he attributes these words to him: from his adversary to Charles for images, ch. 34 and ch. 42. "For it was necessary that he should not forbid the veneration of sacred images": which are found neither in the homily on the beheading of

John the Baptist, which he praises, nor anywhere else in Chrysostom, from the Paris edition of 1636, p. 143. What if there were no doubt about the faith of these men in this cause, yet the times of Constantine were so far removed from their age by such an interval that they cannot be suitable witnesses of the things that then happened. For to whom will it be probable that Eusebius, who lived when Constantine was emperor, and who most studiously and accurately pursued whatever was then done to amplify and adorn the Church, either did not know these so illustrious things, or wished to dissimulate them? that the other writers of ecclesiastical history passed over these same things, buried in deep silence? that finally after four or five centuries two men were found, who alone were able to either learn and bring out of darkness, or to commit to writing, what all others before them had not known? Who does not see how much more probable it is that the same zeal for images, which compelled them to hand down so many other things either false or doubtful as certain and ascertained, likewise impelled them to invent and disseminate those fine fables? Lastly, it will not be tedious to admonish this also, that even if what is uncertain and closer to false were true and explored—that images were formerly placed in the churches by Constantine and Sylvester—it would not thereby be concluded that they were placed for this purpose, that they should be adored by Christians with some cult, whether analogical or other.

Now from those times which followed the death of Constantine, they first adduce what was handed down by Sozomen, that the statue of Christ at Paneas, which we mentioned above, was overthrown and broken by the Augustus Julian, and afterwards collected by the Christians around the year of our Lord 362, from Sozomen's History, book 5, ch. 21, and placed in a certain church, and preserved there for his memory. I respond first that it seems false that that statue was placed in a church at Paneas. How could it be, when Sozomen affirms that it was broken by the pagans? Therefore, it is not to be thought that the statue itself was either erected or placed in the temple; but that its fragments, which were scattered here and there, were collected by the Christians and replaced in the church to preserve the memory of the event. Then I also add this besides, that the entire credibility of this history is shaky, since in Photius, Asterius, bishop of Amasia, a most praised writer, and both older and far more excellent than Sozomen, from Photius's *Bibliotheca*, codex 1 relates the matter plainly otherwise. For he says that the Augustus Maximinus, Constantine's predecessor, not a few years older than Julian the apostate, removed that statue of Paneas; so that at the time when he himself was writing, it was nowhere to be found in the nature of things. In such a great diversity of narration, to which shall we give faith? Finally, if we were even to imagine that the matter was conducted plainly as the adversaries narrate, they would nevertheless legitimately conclude nothing else from it, except this one thing, that in the year 62 of the fourth century there were some Christians who had images in their churches, but not that they venerated and worshipped them, in which properly turns the whole hinge of this question.

After, however, pomp, luxury, and opulence invaded the Church along with the majesty of the Roman empire, it is not at all to be wondered at that among not a few other institutions of bad custom and dangerous example, the use of images also, hitherto either entirely unknown among Christians or certainly obscure, was brought into religion; at first with no other intention than that either adornment might be sought for sacred places from painting, or that a support for the memory of the faithful might be sought from the representation of pious men and things pertaining to piety. The adversaries diligently seek out whatever passages of the ancients bear any mark of this kind, and they diligently collect them to fortify the cause they are pleading. To this pertains the testimony they adduce from Chrysostom, from his oration on Meletius, to the people, which we have received that this man was born in the seventh year of the fifth century; from the 7th Synod, Act 4. "What therefore," he says, "you have done in the names, this you have also managed in his image. For indeed many have everywhere engraved that holy image on the circlets of rings, and on chalices, and on phials, and on the walls of bedrooms." He speaks, however, in that place of Meletius, bishop of Antioch. But he does not say that an image of him or of anyone else was publicly proposed in the church. The Reformed themselves, who have no images in their temples, do not for that reason think it a sin to have the faces of pastors, whom they more intensely revere or love, painted from life, and to preserve the icons in their houses. From the same author also the Fathers of the Seventh Council adduce the following passage, from the same, act. 6, p. 770. "I," he says, "have loved even a picture coated with wax for piety's sake. For I have seen an angel in an image driving back the hordes of barbarians. I have seen the tribes of barbarians trampled underfoot, and David speaking the truth, 'Lord, in your city you will reduce their images to nothing.'" To these things, we first deny that the homily from which these things are taken is Chrysostom's, which is circulated under this title, "That there is one Mediator of the old and new testament." This, indeed, is most lucidly shown first by the very diversity of the oration, which is very far from the purity, sweetness, and facility of Chrysostom; secondly, because it praises a testimony of Ignatius, which is alien to the custom of Chrysostom, who cites no sayings except those of the Scriptures; and finally, by the judgment of the Jesuit Fronton du Duc, who cast that oration into the sixth volume among the spurious works, falsely attributed to Chrysostom. From Ducaeus's notes on Chrysostom. In which place it is to be noted in passing, how much faith we ought to place in the Nicene Fathers in citing the ancients, when not even the Jesuits themselves hold as a true and genuine work of Chrysostom what had been praised by them in his name. But even if the homily were truly Chrysostom's, the passage adduced from it by them would still do nothing for the present cause. For the author does not say that the picture itself was either worshipped or proposed in the church by the Christians. He only narrates that he had watched with pleasure the slaughter of the barbarians expressed in wax. Who even of the Protestants themselves is so averse in mind from images that he would not rejoice in a similar spectacle, not

only because of the artifice of the work, but also much more because of the piety of the subject? For it is more worthy and more just that the art of painters be occupied in expressing the works of God, than in simulating the trifles of men. But before I proceed further, I would wish to beg the reader here to note how great is the confusion and blindness of those who defend images in this cause. Chrysostom, in his third homily on David, instructs his listeners to deeply engrave on their minds the leniency and justice of the most holy Prophet, praised at length in that place. At these words, those who published the works of Chrysostom in Paris annotate thus, in vol. 2 of Chrysostom's works, p. 1039: "The image of David is to be painted." What? Does not the desire of these men seem ingenious? Does it not seem that such a one, for the cause he studies, could easily find testimonies and supports in the very sound of bells, if he wished? But let us now proceed to the rest. From Jerome, who it is established died on the day before the Kalends of October in the twentieth year of the fifth century, they praise these words: from his commentary on Jonah 4. "Indeed," he says in the fourth chapter of Jonah, "on the gourds of vessels themselves, (which are commonly called *saucomariae*), the images of the Apostles are wont to be shaded." But do they not mock us, who conclude from this that in the times of Jerome the images of the Apostles were painted and adored in the churches? For he speaks only of private individuals, and of images on gourds and small vessels, which everyone sees were shaded not for worship, but for ornament. For who has ever heard it said that things which are adored in religion are proposed for veneration on common cups? Now indeed, how greatly Jerome was averse to and execrated the very veneration of pictures, we learn abundantly, not only from the fact that he translated into Latin and published the above-mentioned letter of Epiphanius, in which the most holy man most severely ejects and proscribes all images whatsoever from the churches of the Christians, but also from those things which he himself comments on the third chapter of Daniel. "Whether," he says, "we wish to read 'statue,' as Symmachus, or 'golden image,' as the others have translated, the worshippers of God ought not to adore it," from Jerome, vol. 5, commentary on Daniel, ch. 3. "Therefore, let the judges and princes of the age, who adore the statues and images of Emperors, understand that they are doing what the three youths, by refusing to do, pleased God. And the propriety is to be noted: they say gods are *worshipped*, an image is *adored*, neither of which is fitting for the servants of God." Bellarmine responds, from his *On Images*, c. 16, §. Therefore: "Jerome is speaking of the statues of kings, who were held as gods, and whose statues were treated with divine honors"; and he proves this from the fact that Jerome says he is reprehending those who do what the three youths refused to do in Babylon. But the adversary deludes us. In the words of the Hebrew youths, Jerome notes two things distinctly; one, that they deny they worship the gods of Nebuchadnezzar; the other, that they are not willing to adore his image either. Then he says that neither is fitting for the servants of God. Therefore, he condemns not only those who hold creatures as gods, but he also reprehends those who adore an image, whatever they may in

the meantime think of its exemplar. Nor indeed is it obscure that the opinion of those whom Jerome here notes was not that they held the Emperors, whose images they adored, as gods. For who does not see that those judges and princes of the age of whom he speaks were Christians in religion? who at that time also treated the statues of the Roman Emperors with the same honors with which they were accustomed to be treated of old when Paganism was flourishing, undoubtedly alleging that all that veneration was civil, and far removed from the considerations of religion. This appears first from the fact that he speaks of them in the present tense, "let them understand," he says; so that it is necessary that those of whom he treats were judging and presiding at the very time when he himself was composing these commentaries on Daniel. And yet, when Theodosius and Valentinianus were emperors, at which time these things were being written by Jerome, it is plain that the judges and princes of the age were Christians, not ethnics. The same thing also shines forth more clearly from this, that in order to remedy their error, he proposes the example and authority of the three youths, "Let them understand," he says, "that they are doing this, which the three youths, by refusing to do, pleased God." To what purpose does he bring this example? to what purpose does he object the will of God, if those with whom he is dealing neither admitted the Scriptures, nor professed that they wished to obey or please God? It is therefore necessary that they were Christians, and did not hold the emperors whose statues they adored as gods, since it is abhorrent to every appearance of truth that such a gross and immense madness could fall upon any Christian. The reason which is brought against this by Bellarmine, derived from the fact that those men were doing what the three youths refused to do in Babylon, this, I say, in no way establishes what the adversary wishes to be established. For those three youths, with no distinction, condition, or restriction applied, expressly and absolutely deny that they will adore the statue of Nebuchadnezzar, so that those who adore the statue of any prince evidently do what these refused to do, whether they hold the prince himself as a creature, or as a god; although this error indeed is so alien not only from all reason, but also from all sense, that I think there is hardly anyone so dull and stupid an idolater that he has seriously taken it into his mind. The other part of the Bellarminian response, which thinks that to adore an image is the same thing as to treat it with divine honors, is neither truer than the former, nor more apt to the proposed matter. For who does not understand that to adore an image is for Jerome the very same thing that Nebuchadnezzar demanded from the three youths, which the youths constantly denied to his request, which finally the princes and judges of the age wrongly deferred to the statues of the Emperors? And yet sacred history does not relate that Nebuchadnezzar demanded anything else from the youths, except that they should fall down at the harmony of the musicians and adore his statue; nor do the writers of Roman affairs anywhere report that the Emperors (especially indeed those who reigned after the establishment of Christianity in the empire) demanded any other kind of honor or veneration from their ministers, besides the inclination and

lowering of the body, that is, (to say it in one word,) genuflection. From which it follows that this very thing is also condemned by Jerome, by whatever word one may please to call it, whether divine honors or otherwise. By which judgment of Jerome it is plain that even that veneration which the adversaries attribute to the images of the Saints is exploded. For they prostrate and incline to them no differently than the Chaldeans to the effigy of Nebuchadnezzar, and the judges and princes of the age to the statues of the Emperors. But if that use which now obtains among the Romans had also formerly been received in the Church, Jerome would surely never have so expressly and invidiously condemned this whole business; he would have excepted the images of the Saints; he would have distinguished relative from absolute cult; and as is now customary for Roman doctors in such a case, he would have softened that crude and obstinate opinion with some moderation.

But to pursue the remaining testimonies of the adversaries, they are also accustomed in this disputation to object some things from Augustine, who fell asleep in the Lord on the 28th of August in the 30th year of the fifth century. And first indeed they take what is reported by him in the 22nd book against Faustus, that the sacrifice of Abraham was painted in many places; from Augustine, book 22 against Faustus. to which place can be added what is read written in these words in the work against Julian, from the same, book 5 against Julian, ch. 2: "You deride me for having learned from painters that Adam and his wife covered their private parts." Then they also bring forth those things which occur in the first book on the consensus of the Evangelists, observed also by Agobard, bishop of Lyons, 800 years ago, where, when Augustine had said that some of the pagans had fabricated some books written by Christ to Peter and Paul about the secrets of performing miracles; "I believe," he says from the same, on the consensus of the Evangelists, book 1, ch. 1, "that they saw them painted together with him in many places." I respond that by these testimonies of Augustine it is by no means established that images of Christ and the Saints were then publicly proposed or adored in the churches. From them it only appears that there were already some who painted the Lord Jesus and the Apostles, namely on the walls of private houses; which even today not a few of the Protestants themselves do, who are otherwise the most fierce and hostile enemies of that veneration which is deferred to images. For what Bellarmine denies to be credible, that Augustine spoke of private houses because access to them is not open to all, this, I say, is futile and laughable, from Bellarmine, *On Images*, ch. 9, §. B. Augustine. As if indeed it were a sin for pagans to enter the houses of Christian men, with whom they lived under the same prince and within the same walls, and to see and observe those images painted either on the walls or on panels. But it is not to be passed over that whatever those pictures were, whether public or private, Augustine sufficiently teaches how little value he thought they had, and how dangerous he judged their use in religion to be, when in the place mentioned before, immediately after the words we have described, he continuously subjoins these words: "Thus they fully deserved to err, who

sought Christ and his Apostles not in the holy codices, but on painted walls; nor is it any wonder if those who make things up have been deceived by those who paint things." And thus indeed Augustine thinks that those are not only not to be praised, who learn divine things from pictures, not from the sacred codices; but he also deems it a crime, and indeed one worthy of that punishment than which none is more grave, namely the error and deception of the mind. I ask, how could it happen that these things escaped from that most grave and most wise man, if any images were then in the parish of Hippo, and the rest of the churches of Africa, I will not say worshipped or adored, but painted or proposed to the people?

CHAPTER IV. The first introduction of images into the churches of certain Christians at the end of the fourth century; two passages of Basil and Gregory are explained, brought forth in vain for images, for adornment, not for veneration.

Therefore, no passage occurs in the writings of the ancients by which it is demonstrated that the use of images was received into all, or most, of the Christian churches before the beginning of the fifth century. We confess, however, that in some provinces it was already then frequented; as, for example, in Cappadocia and Pontus. For that it was already received there not only that the sacred histories of the Scriptures should be painted in private places, but also that in the churches icons and panels of the martyrs and of the contests which they had sustained for the faith should be proposed, this is sufficiently apparent from Gregory of Nyssa, who it is established flourished in the year of Christ 375, as the fourth century was already drawing to a close. For he, in his oration on the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, from Gregory of Nyssa's oration on the Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, vol. 2, when he had happened upon the mention of Isaac, offered as a sacrifice by Abraham, says: "I have very often seen the image of this miserable event in a picture, and I have not passed by the spectacle without tears, so perspicuously and evidently did the art of painting subject the deed to my eyes." Thus elsewhere, describing a shrine named after the martyr Theodore, from the same, vol. 2, oration on Theodore the Martyr, he says: "But if anyone comes to some place similar to this, where our assembly is held today, where the memory of the just and the holy relics are; first indeed he is delighted by the magnificence of the things which he sees, while he beholds the shrine, as a temple of God, splendidly elaborated both by the magnitude of its structure and by the beauty of its added ornament; where also the carpenter has formed wood into the figure of animals, and the stonemason has polished slabs of stone to the lightness of silver; and the painter has also introduced the flowers of his art in a painted image, the brave deeds of the martyr, the conflicts, the tortures, the savage and inhuman forms of the tyrants, the violent attacks,

that fiery furnace, the most blessed consummation of the athlete, the human form of Christ, the president of the contests, depicting everything for us with colors artificially, as in some book which contains the interpretations of languages, he has expressed for us the contests and labors of the martyr; and he has adorned the temple like a pleasant and flourishing meadow." Thus far Gregory, sufficiently teaching that the Cappadocians and the neighboring Pontians were the first of the Christians to admit images into their churches; whom on this occasion it is very probable followed the method of Gregory, bishop of Neocaesarea in the same diocese of old, and transferred this use and rite of the ethnics into the Christian religion, so that men might more easily be led from gentile superstition to the faith of Christ. For that same Nyssen, whose passage we recently recited, relates elsewhere that Gregory of Neocaesarea permitted the pagans newly converted to the Lord to exhilarate and delight themselves in the memorials of the holy martyrs, and to pour themselves out in gladness, so that he might thereby achieve what is principal, namely that, having left behind vain superstitions, they might be converted to God, as he had noticed that the simple and unskilled multitude clung to idolatry chiefly on account of bodily pleasures: from his oration on the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus; a counsel in appearance useful and prudent; but (as the event has sufficiently and more than sufficiently taught) most dangerous and fatal. Therefore, I would easily believe that the Cappadocians and Pontians (among whom it is established that the memory of Gregory was most dear and most holy), led by his example, thought that they would be doing a worthwhile thing if they also imitated this use of the pagans, and just as these decorated their temples with images of the gods, if they too adorned their churches with images of the Saints and Martyrs. However it may be, whether this reason or some other unknown to us impelled them, they seem to have been the first among the Christians of ancient memory who received images into their churches with praise and commendation. It is therefore less to be wondered at that other bishops of the same province or diocese also wrote in the same manner about images, as for example, Heraclides of Nyssa, and Asterius, bishops of Amasia. And of Heraclides indeed the very words are wanting; we only learn from Photius that there were two letters of his, in the other of which, he says, "there was a sentence concerning the antiquity of venerable images"; from Photius's Bibliotheca, codex 52. for that is what γνῶσις signifies in this place, and not use, as Perronius ridiculously thought, with a shamefulness, indeed, even in a beginner, let alone in so great a master of ignorance, from the Acts of the Conference of Fontainebleau, fol. 97. But the passage of Asterius is extant in its entirety in the Acts of the Seventh Synod, in which he says that the history of Saint Euphemia was expressed by a painter on a veil, and placed around the tomb as a sacred spectacle, from Synod VII, Act 6, p. 781; and he himself follows out the subject of the work with so soft, so elegant, and (so to speak) so picturesque an oration, that I do not doubt that the industry of his style far surpassed the art of that painter (whoever he was). Although these things do not allow us to doubt that even then in those provinces the memorials

of the martyrs had begun to be adorned with images, yet that same Asterius in another place (which is had in the same Synod) sufficiently teaches that this use was not very pleasing to him, and that he vehemently abhorred the sense and opinion of those who think that a part of piety is situated in the cult and veneration of images. "Do not," he says from the same, p. 780, "paint Christ on your garments, but rather give the expense of these to the poor." Soon after: "For the one humility of his incarnation is sufficient for him." I know that by Bellarmine and others the testimonies of two other Cappadocians are brought here, namely of Gregory and of Basil, whose younger brother Nyssen was. But what is adduced from them does not seem to pertain to this cause. The passage of Basil, indeed, described from the homily on Saint Barlaam, has it thus: from Basil, vol. 1, homily on St. Barlaam, at the end. "Arise now, O illustrious painters of athletic deeds; illustrate with your art the mutilated image of the leader, and make conspicuous with the colors of your industry the crowned athlete more obscurely depicted by me. I shall depart, defeated by the image of the contests and victories of the martyr placed by you; I shall rejoice to be defeated today by such a victory through your dexterity. Let me see the struggle of this hand with the fire more exactly depicted by you; let me see the more alert fighter depicted by your image; let the demons weep, and now struck by the victories of the martyr in us: let that burning and victorious hand be shown again to them. Let Christ, the judge of the contests, also be painted in one panel." Thus far Basil. But who does not see that this whole oration is figurative, by which the most holy man invites the other orators of the church to speak and to celebrate in turn the contest of the martyr; and he exhorts them to pour out all the force of their art on the benign subject? declaring that nothing more pleasant could happen to him than if their eloquence and contention should surpass all his own efforts. For by a common allegory for the best writers, he understands orators by the name of painters; he compares the rhetorical ornaments of diction and other flowers of oration to colors; and finally, he calls a lucid and copious laudation of his constancy and fortitude, with which Barlaam had sustained the contest undertaken for the faith, and one complete in all the numbers of eloquence, the icon of the martyr. Basil himself explains this translation quite openly elsewhere, when, about to praise the forty martyrs, he promises to demonstrate their brave deeds openly to all, "as if in a picture," from his work on the 40 martyrs, at the beginning. "For," he says, "magnificent deeds in wars, both orators very often and painters most beautifully demonstrate; the latter by oration; the former by describing and adorning with panels." From which similarity of both arts with each other, it came about that the words for pictures and painters were transferred to orators and their works. But if Basil had had painters properly so called in mind here, he would by no means have adorned them with such magnificent names, "Arise, O illustrious, splendid painters of athletic deeds"; nor would he have said the colors of wisdom (σοφίας χρώμασι), if he had wished those to be understood which are mixed in the workshops of painters. Then what can be imagined more inept or more inopportune than that a bishop in a most

frequent assembly of the church, having broken off the course of the homily he had undertaken, should suddenly address those craftsmen, and bid them immediately, and indeed on the same day, to depict the contest of the martyr on a panel? These things are surely so absurd that one must be blinded by zeal for his cause not to see that Basil's business here was not with painters, but with eloquent men, whom he, since they were also about to ascend the pulpit and to speak on the same subject, exhorts and incites to the work they have undertaken; from the same, on St. Barlaam. sacredly testifying that he by no means envies them the prize of so noble a contest. The same is furthermore most lucidly confirmed by these words, which are read in Basil before the passage we have described: "But why," he says, "do I diminish the victor with my childish babbling? Why do we not cede his praise to more magnificent tongues? Let us summon the more sonorous trumpets of the doctors to his proclamation." Finally, lest any place for doubt remain, we adduce Fronton du Duc, a Jesuit noble among the adversaries, confessing in these words the same as we do concerning this passage: from his notes on Basil. "Since," he says, "many were formerly accustomed to have a sermon to the people in the same synaxis and assembly, as we have noted in our notes on the Panegyrics of Chrysostom, Basil, using elegantly the allegory of trumpeters and painters, invites the others who are to speak after him to celebrate the praises of this martyr." Now follows the passage of Gregory, no more effective for this cause. It is extant in the letter to Olympius, in which Gregory deplores the grave misfortune of the people of Diocæsarea, for whose statues, temple, and finally the city itself he heard that ultimate destruction was being prepared. From Gregory Nazianzen, vol. 1, ep. 49 to Olympius. "Let our gray hairs move you," he says, "for whom it will be a grave and bitter thing, if having once had a great city we now have not even a city, but after your rule that temple which we have built, and all our zeal in adorning it, should be turned into a den of wild beasts. For if the statues are thrown down, this is not a grave and bitter thing, although bitter in other respects, (and do not think that our speech is about these, for we are intent on more excellent things), but if an ancient city, and one which has produced something distinguished and noble, should fall along with them, while we are living and seeing, we who are in honor with you." From these things it is established that there was a temple at Diocæsarea, sacred to God, built by Gregory, and studiously adorned; that in the same city there were also statues; and that the most holy man bore the prepared destruction and ruin for all these things with great sorrow, as was fitting. But that the statues of which he speaks were in the temple, is not established. For why might they not have been elsewhere in the city? in the forum, in the palace, in a public square, in which places statues are most often set up for pomp and decoration? Indeed, it also seems to have been so, since Gregory distinguished these statues from the temple, as things of a plainly different order. For having said before that it would be a grave and bitter thing if the temple were overthrown and laid waste, he subjoins: "For if the statues are thrown down, this is not a grave and bitter thing, although bitter in other respects, and do not think

that our speech is about these, for we are intent on more excellent things"; which he surely would never have said, if these statues he means had been sacred, a part and ornament of the temple itself. Therefore, it seems most probable that these were statues of some nobles of Diocæsarea, who, having offended the Emperor, Olympius the Prefect was ordered to overthrow the ornaments placed for them by their citizens, and to destroy and demolish the city itself, involved in their crime. For those are the words of Gregory which not obscurely suggest that that storm fell first and properly upon those statues; that they, having been afflicted and overthrown, then dragged the city itself into the same ruin; "But," he says, "if an ancient city should fall along with them." However, what the sense of these passages is, is of no concern to us, who, having been taught by Nyssen, confess that images were already then received in some churches of that diocese. Although, however, in other places the prime simplicity almost obtained; (just as we have learned above from the example of Epiphanius, who, living in the same times as Nyssen, thought that pictures, which Nyssen either approves or certainly seems to approve, were by no means to be tolerated in the church,) it appears nevertheless that the use of images was at the same time also received in certain parts of Italy. For Prudentius, a not ignoble Christian poet, writes in his hymn on Cassian that the passion of the martyr was depicted in the church of the same name, from Prudentius, Hymn 8:

"I raised my face to heaven; there stood opposite me an image of the Martyr, painted with the hues of colors."

The same author elsewhere mentions that the martyrdom of Hippolytus was expressed in colors on the walls of a shrine in Rome, from Hymn 19. Whence it can be established that both in Rome and in the neighboring provinces of Italy, images were admitted into the churches even before the end of the fourth century. These ornaments were doubtless first desired by those among whom wealth and luxury, and the other resources of the flesh and the world, abounded most. Paulinus, bishop of Nola in Campania, following these examples, adorned the basilicas and edifices of Felix with various pictures, which he himself describes in that work which he dedicated to the name of Felix; from Paulinus's Nativity of Felix; where, speaking of the three basilicas, he sings these things:

"Pious names mark the middle with painted martyrs, whom equal glory has crowned in varied sex. But faithful painting adorns the twin spaces that are open on the right and left with two histories. The sacred deeds of holy men fill one: Job, who was tempted by wounds, and Tobit by the loss of his sight. But the lesser sex occupies the other, the renowned Judith, with whom the powerful queen Esther is also depicted."

But the reasons by which Paulinus professes he was led to this plan must not be passed over, in a passage especially noble, and cited already eight hundred years ago, under the emperor Louis, by a certain Dungal in a work on images against

Claudius of Turin, as found in the fourth tome of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, part two. Paulinus says:

"Perhaps it may be asked for what reason this sentiment took hold of us, to paint holy houses in a RARE manner with figures resembling living beings. Listen, and I will attempt to explain the causes in a few words. To what throngs the glory of Saint Felix draws people hither is obscure to no one; but the crowd here is more numerous, of a rustic sort not void of faith, yet not learned in reading. This crowd, long accustomed to serve profane rites, with their belly as their God, at last is converted as a newcomer to Christ, while it marvels at the works of the Saints made manifest in Christ. See how many flock together from all the fields, and how piously they wander, with minds deceived in their simplicity. They have left their distant homes, they have spurned the frosts, not being cold, but with fervent faith; and now behold, in throngs throughout the entire space, they stretch out the joyful night in vigil, and with torches they ward off the darkness from their sleep. Then: For that reason, it seemed a useful work to us, to play with holy painting throughout all the houses of Felix. If perhaps by these spectacles the painted shadow with its colors might captivate the astonished minds of the country folk. Soon: While the painting beguiles their hunger, and as they read the holy histories, the honesty of chaste works steals upon them, induced by pious examples; sobriety is drunk by the gaping crowd, and forgetfulness of excessive wine ensues. And while they prolong the day by looking for a greater space, their cups become infrequent; because with the time drawn out by the miracles, few hours now remain for the feasters."

And here I ask the Reader to be willing to consider this passage of Paulinus a little more attentively. For it is of such a kind that it alone can disclose and illustrate this whole disputation. And First, indeed, it appears that in the times of Paulinus (that is, at the very beginning of the fifth century from the birth of Christ) the custom of painting "holy houses," as he says, that is, Churches and other sacred edifices dedicated to the use of religion, was still rare in Italy. He says this in explicit words, and he abundantly teaches it by the very fact that he strives to justify and defend his plan, bringing forward his reasons for it; for which admonition and defense there would have been no need, if that use had been either handed down from the Apostles or received everywhere by the Church. But since Paulinus understood that images, because they were neither commanded nor instituted by the divine word, nor much frequented by Christians, would easily furnish an occasion for wonder and reprehension to some, he thought he should counter these by adducing the reasons by which he had been moved to adopt that plan, contrary to the common use and custom of others. Secondly, it is to be observed that Paulinus, in explaining the causes of this institution of his, says nothing about the veneration of images; he mentions only the delight and instruction of the faithful, and those of the ruder sort, namely, country folk and rustics. Lastly, by these things is also confirmed what we said in the preceding parts, that it seems probable that the Cappadocians and

the people of Pontus, following the opinion of Gregory of Neo-Caesarea, received images into the Churches for the reason that they hoped by that means that Pagans would be more easily brought over to the faith of Christ. For this was also the plan of Paulinus in painting the church of Felix. And such were the reasons by which men in Pontus and Cappadocia, in Latium, Campania, and a few other provinces were moved to receive the use of images in Churches around the end of the fourth century; with no other plan, as it appears, than to adorn the sacred places, and to delight or even instruct and enlighten the ruder and weaker among the humble folk. Therefore, our adversaries are in vain, who today adduce the example of those men, wishing that images placed in Churches, contrary to their intention and plan, should furthermore be adored and worshipped in religion; which is properly the hinge of this disputation. For there are not lacking among the Protestants themselves those who have no religious objection to having pictures for ornament and delight, even in sacred buildings; contending only this, that no cult and no veneration should be shown to them.

CHAPTER V. The arguments which are brought from Paulinus, Ambrose, and Augustine to prove that the ancients showed veneration to images, are resolved.

When the adversaries themselves noticed this, being conscious that nothing had been achieved unless they prove that veneration was paid to images by the ancient Church, they undertake to prove this, compelled by the necessity of their cause; however much it may appear that the opinion of Paulinus and the other Fathers was different, from what has been disputed by us both recently in this very book, and a little before in the two preceding ones. And so, to establish that sacred pictures, as they call them, were held in the same place and number in the very times of Gregory of Nyssa as they are now held in Rome, they scrape together some passages from the writers of that age, but so weak, and so doubtful, and so alien to what they wish to conclude, that they ought to have been no less ashamed to object such things, than we are weary to report and examine them. First, therefore, they adduce that very Paulinus whom we have just heard, and they bid him, unwilling and reluctant, to give testimony for them. For in the place where he described the pictures of the church of Felix, which we mentioned a little before, he immediately adds:

"...And let us be borne into the holy halls, and let us admire the sacred figures, monuments of the ancients;"

Where, to say this in passing, Perron for some reason takes "admire" to mean "contemplate," contrary to the common and customary usage of the Latin language. From this, therefore, the adversaries conclude that Paulinus adored images. But in which lexicographers does "to admire" mean "to adore"? When the Poet, speaking of Aeneas looking at the Carthaginian tablets and pictures with avid eyes, says in the first book of the Aeneid:

"He admires the hands of the artists among themselves, and the labor of their works;"

does he mean that the picture was adored by the hero? Do not we also, whom our adversaries call iconoclasts, admire the workmanship, the art, the elegance of those very images whose veneration and cult we execrate? "But since he calls the figures sacred," says Bellarmine in his work *On Images*, chapter 12, "he also teaches that they are to be honored, for all sacred things are to be honored." In which passage, either when he says they are to be honored, he means with religious cult and adoration, or he is mocking us. Now indeed, if whatever things are sacred are to be honored in that sense, then in ancient times the tiara of Aaron and of the other Pontiffs was to be adored; the vestments of the priests were to be adored, which are everywhere called sacred and holy. Now the doors, keys, locks, windows, both wooden and glass, of the churches will have to be adored; whatever is referred to the same category will have to be adored, for

these are commonly called sacred by all. Who does not see that Paulinus calls those figures sacred for the reason that they were placed in a sacred place, namely in a church; and also because they were of saints, whose images they were? But neither is it here questioned whether Paulinus held those figures, which he names sacred, in any esteem and consideration; whether he valued them more than profane or common ones; whether, finally, he thought it more useful for them to be made and looked at than others of a dissimilar subject. (For if he had indeed thought otherwise, he would never have filled the whole church of Felix with them, as he did.) None of these things comes into controversy. It is something far different that is in question, namely whether Paulinus worshipped or adored those sacred figures, as he calls them, as is now done in Rome; whether he supplicated on his knees before them with his head bared; whether he poured out prayers with his eyes intent upon them; whether he offered them smoking incense or lit candles; whether he adorned them with magnificent clothing and attire, with gold and gems. To conclude from the fact that he called them sacred that these honors were paid to images by Paulinus, this is truly to jest, and to treat us as if we were fungi or tree stumps. We ourselves commonly call any codices of the Scriptures sacred; we also name the pulpit from which the gospel of Christ is preached sacred, nor do we speak otherwise of anything whatsoever that has some use in religion. Would our adversaries therefore have judged that the same cult and honor which they show to the images of Christ and the Saints should also be shown to these things?

To this they also bring the Liturgy which is circulated under the name of Chrysostom, in which the priest is said to incline his head to the image of Christ. But this appears nowhere either in the edition of Claudius de Sainctes, or in that of Morel. And there is hardly any little work of the ancients among whose copies there is such great diversity as is found in the codices of that Liturgy. Pelargus confesses that his copy agrees neither with that of Leo Thuscus nor with the copies of Erasmus; and he testifies that he saw a certain other one in Rome, differing from all these. And Claudius Espencaeus says in his work *On the Private Mass*, page 220, that this Liturgy, though begun and composed by the most holy Chrysostom, was expanded by many insertions according to the variety of the times. How truly this was affirmed by Espencaeus is sufficiently apparent from those whose names are recited there in the commemoration of the dead. For among them are some who lived after the death of Chrysostom himself; such as Cyril, Euthymius, Sabas, John the Almoner; of whom the first died thirty-seven years after Chrysostom, the second sixty-six, the third one hundred and twenty-six, the fourth two hundred and thirteen. For it is established that little works of this kind, which are in the public use of the Church, have been changed and interpolated in many and various ways, since different authors at different times have added to them diverse and sometimes contradictory things, according to their varied pious affectation, and according to the taste, sense, and custom of each one's own age, as has been observed by Andreas Masius, a most learned man among our adversaries, in his preface to the Anaphora of Basil. In

vain, therefore, is the name of Chrysostom brandished here, since it is plain that the words which are brought forward, if they exist in any copies, were inserted into it in the times following the death of Chrysostom, when the cult of images had already been brought into the Church. And if this Liturgy of Chrysostom is accurately compared with the Commentaries of Germanus, it will be clear that it should begin some pages after those words which have been adduced, so that even from this it may appear that they are false and fictitious.

No more true or certain is that passage which they adduce from some letter to Julian bearing the name of Basil, in which that most holy man is feigned to speak thus: "I receive also the holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, who make supplication to God; etc." and in its place, "and I honor, and adore, and venerate especially the figures of their images" (the Greek codex has φανερῶς, openly). "For this has been handed down from the holy Apostles, and is not to be forbidden." That these words are not Basil's, besides the very insolence and absurdity of the diction, being very far from the brilliance and purity of that most serious writer, there are many other things which teach it. And first indeed, that this epistle is found in no ancient copy of the works of Basil, either manuscript or printed. Then, that these words are nowhere (as far as I at least remember) brought forward in this cause either by John of Damascus or by Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, the most learned of the Greeks, and easily the leaders of those who defended the veneration of images; which is an argument that those words existed in the true and genuine works of Basil no more in their times than in the times of our Fathers. Pope Adrian alone mentions them, in his letter to the Emperors in the seventh Synod, a man whose zeal for this cause is most well-known. For this is that Adrian who, alone of all, by his authority both promoted and especially confirmed the Synod of Nicaea, in which the veneration of images was decreed and sanctioned; who, when he saw that decree censured and repudiated by the Synod of Frankfurt, at the nod and under the auspices of Charlemagne, most keenly defended the error with an obstinate mind, even in a volume written to Charlemagne on that subject; in which he adduces not a few things partly evidently false, partly uncertain and doubtful, with no religious scruple, but only with the lust for victory, as has already been observed by us in the preceding parts. This is, forsooth, the one whose single testimony we should prefer to all the ancient witnesses of Basil; on whose authority we should unhesitatingly believe witnesses commended by him. But even if there existed no arguments of his so great and so unrestrained zeal for this cause, who would still believe that a Latin man, and (as is apparent from his writings) not very skilled in ecclesiastical antiquity, saw and discovered in the works of Basil those things which had escaped Germanus and Damascenus, men by far the most learned of all who are said to have flourished in that century, and most versed in every kind of literature, but especially in the monuments of the Greek Fathers? Since these things are so, it seems there should be no doubt that the testimony which has been brought forward is false, and was audaciously attached to Basil by that very Adrian who was the first to use it; of which kind

many things occur in the seventh Synod, praised by those good and modest Fathers with the same shame and the same faith for this cause, as can be seen from the examples which we have already collected before. Our Perron, indeed, as it seems, deterred by some shame, omitted this passage of Basil among the many which he objects to us from the Fathers in this disputation in his *Refutation of the Reply* to the *Conference of Fontainebleau*; which, however, if he had judged it true and undoubted, he would surely not have omitted, since it alone is much more powerful and explicit for the cause of the adversaries than all the rest. For which reason I am the more compelled to miss the good faith and equity of those who recently procured the last edition of the works of Basil in Paris. For they, since they could hardly have been ignorant of these things, and certainly ought not to have been, nevertheless did not hesitate to list and print that spurious offspring, born of doubtful parents, among the true and genuine works of Basil, and indeed with no note added, no admonition; from which it might be obscurely understood that its authority is not the same as that of the others.

Into this disputation is also drawn by Bellarmine what Ambrose writes somewhere in sermon 90 on Psalm 118, commending the care of the poor to us for the reason that they are, as it were, so many images of God: "He who crowns the image of the Emperor, certainly honors him whose image he has crowned; and he who has contempt for the statue of the Emperor, is seen to have certainly done an injury to the Emperor." But where was Bellarmine's mind, when he concluded from this that some religious cult was paid to the images of the Saints by Ambrose? And yet he says nothing of the sort; nothing that we also, those enemies of images, do not use daily; namely, since man is both the image and the work of God, that the majesty of God is either honored or violated in man. This image which Ambrose understands has nothing in common with those about which our adversaries conclude. That one lives, endowed with sense and reason; these lie cold, and devoid of all life and soul. It is established that that one was instituted, created, and fashioned by the Lord; these the Lord neither made, nor indeed commanded to be made. The duty towards that one which Ambrose requires of us, namely that we should help and console it when in need of our aid, that, I say, has been decreed and sanctioned by the Lord himself in most explicit and lucid words, with a most heavy penalty pronounced against those who should do otherwise. But the cult of these which is urged by our adversaries, we know is nowhere at all in the Scriptures either commanded or commended, either by the Lord himself or by the most holy Apostles. From this it happens that the similitude of Caesar's image brought forward by Ambrose most aptly adumbrates that to which it is brought forward; since that image is of such a kind that it is established to have been instituted and approved by the Prince, and indeed with this plan, that in it, as in some sign and monument, his own person and majesty should be proposed to be seen. But to the images of the Saints this comparison procures no veneration or authority at all; since it is found that neither God in the Scriptures, nor the Saints themselves, have anywhere instituted or approved them. And if this argumentation of our

adversaries is valid, since they feel that a cult of such a kind should be shown to an image, which by a certain analogy pertains to that species of cult which is due to its exemplar itself; surely it must be confessed that from the fact that the poor are so many images of God, it also follows from Ambrose that we should adore them with a certain analogical latria, to be reduced to that cult with which we pursue the best and greatest God, and of entirely the same kind as that adoration which they decree for the images of Christ and the Trinity; how absurd this is, everyone sees. Therefore, it is clear that it does not follow from what has been written by Ambrose in this place that even the images of the Saints are to be adored. And if it did follow in the highest degree, it would not thereby happen that Ambrose himself should be judged to have thought so, since those who posit and defend some thesis not rarely either do not see what legitimately follows from it, or certainly do not admit it. Therefore, in whatever way that Ambrosian passage is understood and treated, it is plain that the cause of our adversaries can in no way be helped or relieved by it.

Nor indeed do they do a lesser injury to Augustine, when they drag these words of his about signs into this disputation, by the scruff of the neck, so to speak. In his book *On the Trinity*, chapter 10, he says: "But because these things are known to men, because they are made by men, they can have honor as religious things; they cannot have wonder, as miraculous things." Is anything more resourceful than necessity and desperation, which has given them so much genius, so much acumen, that they have been able to hammer out the adoration of images from such a passage? By this reasoning, indeed, they could easily express water from a pumice stone, and food from a flame. Augustine is speaking of those signs which were instituted by the Lord for the use of religion, of which kind was the bronze serpent, by which we know Christ was once figured; of which kind also are those sacraments of water, bread, and wine, by which the Lord represents both the grace of the Holy Spirit and the power of his body and blood under the new covenant. From this Bellarmine establishes that some religious veneration was paid to the images of the Saints by Augustine. Here I first ask, where has Augustine numbered those images of the Saints, which they make so much of, among those signs divinely instituted in religion, about which he is speaking here, and has he attributed to them any sacred and mystical power of either signifying or imparting? And if they posit that the images of the Saints were held by Augustine in that place and number, they not only posit what is in question and controversy; but they also attribute to that writer things which openly fight with his mind and opinion. For this is that very man who elsewhere testifies that there were no instruments of this kind in the Christian religion which had a mouth, and did not speak; and nostrils, and did not smell; since both of these apply to the images of the Saints, who does not see that they, according to the opinion of Augustine at least, had no place among the means and instruments of the Christian religion? And I would also like to know where Augustine has taught that to those signs, which have some use in religion, a cult is to be offered analogous to that which is due to their exemplars and primary objects? That to

the bronze serpent, for example, some kind of analogical latria was to be shown, because Christ, to whom the serpent referred, is to be adored with legitimate and absolute latria? What then is this new and insolent dialectic of our adversaries, which boldly assumes and supposes the very thing it undertook to prove? Which, after it has attached its own dreams to Augustine, then finally collects from them whatever it pleases? There is no writer, not even Calvin excepted, from whom you could not easily conclude the adoration of images by this warlike artifice.

CHAPTER VI. The first abuse of images, noted a little before the end of the fourth century by Augustine, and disapproved; the responsibility being cast by the Catholic Church, to which it was falsely imputed, upon certain private and ignorant men.

These are the arguments that are brought forward from the writers of the fourth century; than which nothing can be feigned more trifling and more alien to the present cause. From which it is to be seen that those who, a little before the beginning of the fifth century, had introduced pictures into some of the edifices of the Christians, had no other aim than that the sacred places should be adorned, and that provision should be made in this way for the delight and instruction of the ruder sort, as we have heard Paulinus expressly professing above. But alas! how great is the vanity of human thoughts! Although their intention was no other, yet the matter by no means stayed within those limits. The plan, at first useful in appearance, soon resulted in a most dangerous abuse; and the images which had been received into sacred places for the reason that Pagans might be more easily allured to the Christian faith, as if by this bait being offered, they themselves led the Christians away into the superstitions of the Pagans. Which pestilence so quickly corrupted this institution, that Augustine, who was able to behold this practice at its birth in Italy, himself saw it already degenerating and slipping into a foul error, through the flagitious ignorance of certain people, who polluted with superstitious veneration images that had been instituted for a completely different end.

The most holy man confesses and condemns the crime of these people in his book *On the Morals of the Catholic Church* in these words, from the first tome of his works, book 1, chapter 34: "Do not," he says, "bring up to me the professors of the Christian name who neither know nor exhibit the force of their profession. Do not follow the crowds of the ignorant, who are either superstitious in the true religion itself, or are so given over to their lusts that they have forgotten whatever they have promised to God. I know that there are many who are worshippers of tombs and of pictures; I know that there are many who drink most luxuriously over the dead, and exhibiting feasts to the corpses, bury themselves over the buried, and count their voracity and drunkenness as religion." Here Augustine distinctly notes two outrages which, in his time, had already invaded the morals of some: one, of those who at the tombs of the Christian Martyrs imitated the foul gluttony and carousing of the Pagans; the other, of those who adored pictures. He vigorously condemns both, calling them "crowds of the ignorant," and numbering them with those who, while professing the name of Christ, either do not know the force of their profession, or certainly do not exhibit it; and he testifies that the stain of these people has nothing to do with Christian doctrine, and that they would act most unjustly if they were to impute them to the Christian name. He could not have taught more clearly or

more explicitly that if there were any then who adored images, their action was repugnant to ecclesiastical doctrine, and was only a private and singular aberration of certain people from the common and public faith of Christians.

Bellarmine, pressed on all sides by the force of the truth, has no place to stand; and uncertain of his plan, he flees now here, now there, and in vain attempts to elude with ambiguous and uncertain responses the knot which he cannot solve. "I say," he says in his work *On Images*, chapter 16, concerning the passage from Augustine, "first, that perhaps he is speaking of the idols of the gentiles." Is that so, indeed? But Augustine holds and lists those worshippers of pictures among the professors of the Christian name, and indeed of the true religion. But all those who adore the idols of the Gentiles, the whole Church has always held as deserters of Christianity and open enemies of the faith. Then, with what color, with what appearance could the Manichees have imputed the adoration of gentile pictures to the Catholics, who in all their books everywhere most openly and most explicitly not only condemned but even abominated it? It is therefore in no way possible that Augustine here understood the idols of the gentiles, since it is plain that he is speaking of a superstition of such a kind that, while it was repugnant to the Christian faith and truth, had not yet been proscribed or interdicted singularly and by name by any universal edict of the Church; so that there was some cause, at least in appearance, for the adversaries of the Catholics to expostulate and to accuse the Church. And Augustine robs them of that cause in this place by testifying that it is the private crime of a few men, not the public institution of the universal Church; which cannot be understood except of those who adored the pictures of the Saints. Bellarmine himself seems to have acknowledged this. For, distrusting that first response, he adds that "Augustine is perhaps speaking of certain people who worshipped the images of the Saints superstitiously, so that it approached idolatry." There was no need to suspend his discourse on that uncertain adverb "perhaps." Augustine is speaking of these very people, not perhaps, but certainly and indubitably. But who and what sort these were, it is worth the effort to understand. For to Bellarmine, those who solemnly place images in churches in a high and conspicuous place, dedicate them, salute them, and treat them with religious cult, who pray before them as suppliants and venerators, with bended knees and bared head, do not worship the images of the Saints superstitiously; who honor them with the light of candles and the odors of incense; who on fixed days carry them around publicly in great procession; who go on long pilgrimages to the places where they are consecrated; he who does all these things, Bellarmine judges to be guilty of no superstition towards images. Indeed, he thinks that there was then no one truly Catholic who did not either do these things himself, or rejoice that they were done by others; so that these had nothing in common with those worshippers of pictures whom Augustine explodes so gravely and so sharply. In truth, this whole response of Bellarmine is vain and empty; feigned by him at will, not supported by any true and solid reason. For it has not yet, as far as I know, been demonstrated by our adversaries that the cult which they themselves pay to images is not

superstitious, or that it was already publicly received in the Church in the times of Augustine. Secondly. If those who adore pictures in the manner I have described, that is, the Roman manner, are not worshippers of pictures, I ask who, then, are those worshippers of pictures whom that most holy writer excludes from the number of true and genuine Christians? Bellarmine responds in the same place that they are those who adore images "as if they were Gods." But this definition of the Cardinal makes us no wiser. For the same ambiguity that the previous words involved recurs here also.

I ask again, therefore, what do these words mean, that those Christians, whoever they were, adored images "as if they were Gods"? Is this their sense, that they believed that those mute and inanimate effigies, which they perceived with their eyes and other senses, were truly divinities, and eternal natures, endowed with some infinite wisdom and power, which had created the heavens, the earth, and the other parts of the universe in the beginning, and even now ruled and governed them; and that, according to this faith, they showed to them from the heart that supreme cult (which our adversaries commonly call latria) which is due to divinity alone? But to whom will it be plausible that for Christian men, professing the true religion, such a crass and brutish imagination could not only come into their mind, but even take root in their soul? Which even the Pagans themselves banished far from them, cleverly distinguishing (as we have demonstrated above) the image from the deity, the material of the idol from its object and exemplar. But if by adoring images "as if they were Gods" they understand those who show a religious cult to images similar to that with which we have received that the Pagans once pursued their gods; who does not see that they themselves are also guilty of that crime, whatever it may be, whose cult, acts, and honors towards the images of the Saints are (for the most part indeed) twins of what superstition once showed to its gods?

Finally, if this was the meaning of Augustine, as they wish; why did he not express it clearly and explicitly? Why did he use so inept a word, which by the excessive scope of its signification involved the innocent with the guilty, the true Catholics with the superstitious alike? For if the Church of those times observed what the Nicene Synod afterwards decreed, namely, to adore the images of Christ and the Saints; if it truly proclaimed what the Fathers of that Synod did, as seen in the first and seventh acts of the Seventh Synod, pages 531 and 834 of the last Paris edition: "Anathema to those who do not adore the venerable images"; "To those who do not diligently teach the entire Christ-loving people to adore the venerable, holy, and to-be-adored images of all the Saints who have pleased God from the beginning of time, anathema." "It is established that the imaginal formations of the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Virgin Mary Mother of God, and of the Angels, and of all the Saints are to be adored and kissed; and whoever does not hold himself thus, but has doubted or even grown languid towards the adoration of the venerable images, our Synod anathematizes him." If these, I say, were the sentiments of the Church in the age

of Augustine, if these were the voices of the Catholics, who does not see that all the truly Christian men of that age were worshippers of pictures, while those for whom it was a religious scruple to adore them were outside the communion of the Church, and Christians in name only? But if the matter was so, where was Augustine's mind, when he called the worshippers of pictures "crowds of the ignorant," and counted them, as stains and blemishes on the Christian name, with those who "either do not know or do not exhibit the force of the Christian profession"? Basil, the firmest and most illustrious pillar of the Church which then flourished, cried out with a most clear voice (if we believe our adversaries), from the second act of the Seventh Synod, "I honor, and adore, and venerate openly the figures of the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the Prophets, and the Martyrs; for this has been handed down from the holy Apostles, and is not to be forbidden." The bishop of Rome, the other prelates of both the Eastern and the Western Church, did the same (if indeed we are to believe our adversaries), and felt and did so at that very time. And yet Augustine was so foolish that in Rome, in that very city in which these things were, forsooth, publicly both taught and done, he dared to write that the worshippers of pictures were ignorant men, who beyond a bare name and a simple profession, had nothing Christian, nothing Catholic? What uproars would the Manichees, with whom he is here disputing, have caused, if they had noticed the cause so flagitiously betrayed by him? "Why do you forbid us," they would say, "to object to the adoration of pictures by Catholics, which you openly both teach and practice? Are not those images which Basil, the pillar of your churches, which Damasus, the head of your bishops, which all the others, adore, pictures? With what face, then, do you either expel the worshippers of pictures from the number of your Catholics? Or condemn as the private act of certain individuals what they defend as handed down to the whole Church from the Apostles? If Basil, if Damasus, if the others are ignorant, if they are Christians only by profession, who then, finally, are these whom you tell us are truly Catholics, worthy of the glory of so great a name?"

Surely, if the faith, practice, and discipline of the Church then were what our adversaries wish, Augustine, lest he give place to this most just expostulation and accusation of the Manichees, ought to have either completely omitted those worshippers of pictures whom he so sharply attacks, or rather defended than condemned them; and he ought to have accurately noted and described those chimerical idolaters (whom Bellarmine feigns out of excessive zeal for his cause), if any such then existed anywhere among Christians, and depicted them in those colors which would clearly and certainly distinguish them from true Catholics. But he is found to have done nothing of this kind, either here or anywhere else. For he simply calls them "worshippers of pictures"; which name, according to the tenets and hypotheses of our adversaries, it is plain, suited all the true and genuine Catholics who then existed. What then is left, if we wish the prudence, the sanctity, and the charity of Augustine to remain intact, but to confess that there were then no Basils, no Damasuses, no true and approved masters of the

Catholic Church who either adored images themselves, or taught that it was handed down from the Apostles that they should be adored? And that the whole thing was the private offense of only certain ignorant people from the populace, who, out of the whim of their own superstition, were already then under the Christian name meditating and practicing those cults which, in the centuries that finally followed, were received and sanctified by public law?

Bellarmine, who knew well enough that no others than these were aimed at by Augustine, finally concedes this very thing to us himself, although unwillingly; but, as he was acute, he uses a certain stratagem in this place, than which hardly any can be imagined more urbane or more elegant. For he clemently condones the sin of Augustine, whom he supposes to have been mistaken in this judgment of his concerning the worshippers of pictures, excusing the newness and rudiments of a man not yet sufficiently instructed in the Christian religion, because, as Bellarmine states where cited above, he wrote this book "in the beginnings of his conversion to the Catholic faith"; and, as if pronouncing from a tripod, he declares that having been better instructed afterwards, he changed his opinion, and that he himself afterwards excused from idolatry those rites which in the beginning he had thought smacked of idolatry. I confess that a great debt of gratitude is owed by Bellarmine and the other adversaries to Augustine and the other Fathers, for whom they so benignly condone those very things which they judge ought to be so rigidly and so sharply punished in us. For what they now bear so clemently and excuse in Augustine, for that very thing our adversaries daily rage against us with the dire thunderbolt of anathema; namely, because we accuse the worshippers of pictures of superstition and ignorance.

But since here the question is not of right, but of fact, and our whole disputation has been instituted for this purpose, that we might simply investigate whether the ancient Church adored images, not indeed whether it adored or did not adore with merit or otherwise; Bellarmine will pardon us if we judge that faith is rather to be had in Augustine, living in those very times, than in himself, born 1160 years later. For if the Church which then was openly adored the images of the Saints, as our adversaries wish; if it observed this use as handed down from the Apostles; Augustine surely could not have been ignorant of that. Yet if he had known this, it is by no means probable that he would either have professed the communion of the Catholic Church, since he then (even by the admission of our adversary) thought this cult to be superstitious and illicit, and to smack of idolatry; or that he would have deceitfully and cunningly dissimulated the whole matter, and falsely cast the blame upon some unknown, ignorant, and superstitious little men. And to conclude in a few words, Augustine either knew that pictures were adored by the Church, or he did not know. If he did not know, then it was not being done by the Church at that time; for if it had been done publicly and openly (as our adversaries wish), he could not have been ignorant. But who will affirm that he knew, when he himself denies it, explicitly attributing that adoration of pictures to only certain ignorant people, and

Christians by profession alone? "But," says Bellarmine, "he was a neophyte when he wrote these things." As if, indeed, it were lawful for Christian neophytes to lie; and to confer with cunning upon a few ignorant men what they well know is done by all Christians from the common sense of the universal Church.

But neither was Augustine then so ignorant of sacred and ecclesiastical matters as they feign. He was a man of full and now mature age; for he had passed his thirty-third year. He had deliberated for not a few years on this whole cause of the Church: he had diligently heard the catechisms of Ambrose; he had searched the hidden things of the Christian faith, he had investigated the obscure and difficult things; he had diligently consulted the chief men of both parties, I mean the Catholics and the Manichees, on every single point; and finally, after these so lengthy struggles, he had given glory to God, and having abjured the perfidy of heresy, had aggregated himself to the Catholic Church; so worn and subdued in all Christian doctrine, that immediately after his conversion he wrote books to defend this cause, among which are those which are now in question, so polished, so strong, and so acute, that there is hardly anything in the so many works of that most holy man that can rightly be preferred to them. And what the Church of those times thought of him, it demonstrated sufficiently itself, when it immediately bestowed upon him the honor of the presbyterate, and a little later, by a new and unusual example, ordained him bishop before the death of Valerius, whom he was to succeed. Who would believe that such and so great a man would have accused, with the highest contempt, the public and universal doctrine of the Church into which he was then entering, of superstition, ignorance, and error? Who, indeed, would think that the Church itself, if Augustine had dared this, would have borne it? Who would not have compelled the man to retract his error with admonitions and censures? Who, finally, would have repaid one who had deserved so ill of it with the highest offices of the most holy ministries, as a reward for his temerity? And yet it is established that Augustine was neither then, nor ever afterwards, reprehended by the Church for having written so, nor was this passage of his noted with any censure or animadversion. On the contrary, it is certain that very few exist whose works were read and celebrated among Christians with greater favor, applause, and admiration.

But what Bellarmine seems to signify, that Augustine, having been better instructed afterwards (as he says), changed his opinion, this is affirmed rashly and without any proof, and is vehemently abhorrent to any semblance of truth. For if Augustine afterwards changed his opinion, what then is the reason that he warns us nothing about it in the first book of his *Retractations*, chapter 7, where he explicitly names that little work *On the Morals of the Church*, and retracts and castigates certain passages from it quite at length? But neither in that place, nor anywhere else in his so many extant works, is he found to have retracted this opinion of his concerning the worshippers of pictures, or to have favored the veneration of images. On the contrary, indeed, he has scattered not a few things,

although in passing and by occasion, in various places, which plainly agree with this judgment of his, as can be seen from those which have been commemorated by us in the preceding parts. The cavils of our adversaries, therefore, do not prevent us from now concluding what we undertook to prove at the beginning, that in the times of Augustine the adoration of pictures was held by true Catholics to be an error and a sin, and if any men of the Christian name then adored images, they did not do so from any public and received law or custom of the universal Church, but rashly usurped it from a singular superstition and private ignorance.

CHAPTER VII. The use of images grows in the fifth and sixth centuries. Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, and Gregory, Bishop of Rome, think the error should be countered in two different ways; the former, indeed, by removing images from sacred places; the latter, by admonishing the Christian people to beware of their adoration.

But neither these inauspicious beginnings of pictures, nor the judgment of Augustine, nor the authority of Epiphanius, nor many other things of this kind obvious to each person by himself, could deter men from the use of images gradually creeping into almost all the Churches of the Christians, and, being gradually confirmed, from growing strong, while all the best men thought it sufficient to admonish the people that they were to be had not for veneration or religious cult, but for the adornment of places, for the delight of the eyes, and for the memory of past things. For in those writings which survive from the time when the fifth century was already mature, and throughout the passing of the whole sixth, frequent mention of images occurs, and indeed sometimes (although more rarely and later) of the veneration then already shown to them. We shall taste a few things from many. Theodoretus, around the year 450, narrates concerning Symeon Stylites, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, book 4, page 649, also cited in the Seventh Synod: "They say," he says, "that this man was so famous in great Rome, that at the doors of all the workshops, they would erect short images of him, acquiring for themselves from this a certain protection and defense." But in the sixth century, as the error grew daily, superstition at last proceeded to the point that images, believed to have fallen from heaven, were carried into the camps and into the midst of the battle lines. For thus Theophylactus Simocatta narrates in his work on Maurice, book 2, as found in Photius, codex 65, that Philippicus, the son-in-law and legate of Maurice, emperor in the East, went about the army carrying some image not made by hands, and purified and sanctified it; by which deed the Romans were victorious; and the image itself was sent with veneration to Symeon, bishop of Amida. Priscus also writes a little after that, having brought forth an *eliphrepha* (for so he calls it), an image not made by hand, he attempted to mitigate and calm the rioting army. The same author in his fifth book mentions a certain image of the Blessed Virgin.

Then for the first time, the veneration of images began to be objected to us by the Jews and Pagans, a crime unheard of in former centuries. For the Fathers of the seventh Synod relate that, under the emperor Maurice, that is, around the year of the Christian era 590, there lived that Leontius, the Neapolitan bishop in Cyprus, who in the fifth book of his *Apology* introduces a Jew reproaching the Christians with these things. But that John of Thessalonica, who (as is in the Acts of the seventh Synod) made a Pagan object the same things to a Christian man, flourished many years after Maurice; for he subscribed to the Acts of the sixth

Synod, held in the year of Christ 681. It is probable that that Dialogist, whom the Fathers of the seventh Synod likewise testify also labored in this, to repel the same weapon hurled by a Jew, lived around the same times. Nor do I doubt that of the same vintage also is what Adrian, in the same second act of the seventh Synod, obtrudes on us under the name of a certain Jerome, presbyter of Jerusalem, a testimony conceived in these words: "As God permitted every nation to adore handmade things, but wished the Jews to have the tablets which Moses carved, and the two golden Cherubim; so also to us Christians he has given the cross, and to paint, and to adore, to venerate, and to demonstrate our work, the images of good works." For this is, a new and marvelous (who would deny it?) theology of those men.

As the evil thus grew daily and crept further, the pious undoubtedly groaned; nor did they see or suffer this stain on the Christian name, so bitter at home, so odious abroad, without the greatest sorrow of mind. But while each one hopes for better things; while they persuade themselves that time itself can cure the disease by itself; while they fear that if images should be wrested from most against their will, the evil will not be so much healed as exacerbated, and while they think they have abundantly performed their duty by admonishing the people about not adoring pictures; the error, widely and broadly disseminated, took deep root in the minds of very many Christians everywhere. But among so many, either vanquished by superstition or torpid with carnal prudence, one man was found, who, inflamed with divine zeal, did not hesitate to go against the public error and to oppose the slaughter spreading through the peoples. This was Serenus, of most blessed memory in the Church, bishop of Marseilles in our Gaul, who, when he considered in his mind that images had brought much more detriment than utility, ordered them to be broken and cast out of all the churches of his parish; imitating the prudence of Hezekiah, who had once overturned and broken the bronze serpent, because he noticed that it was a scandal to the Israelites. But this most salutary deed, when all ought to have praised it and followed it as a distinguished example, not only did the populace of Marseilles take it very ill, but almost all, even the bishops, disapproved. Gregory of Rome, from the solemn custom of the Pontiffs, often not useless for amplifying the dignity of their see, seizes this cause, and rebukes Serenus for having broken the images; pretending that they are useful for the ruder sort, and that they take the place of the divine codices for those who do not know letters. In his letters, book 9, epistle 109, he says: "And indeed we praised you for having had the zeal that nothing handmade could be adored; but we judge that you ought not to have broken those same images. For painting is used in churches for this reason, that those who do not know letters may at least read by seeing on the walls what they cannot read in books. Your fraternity, therefore, ought to have both preserved them and prohibited the people from their adoration, so that both those ignorant of letters might have a means from which to gather a knowledge of history, and the people might not sin at all in the adoration of a picture."

But since Gregory was not able to move Serenus from the opinion he had undertaken, eighteen months later he wrote letters to him again, of the same argument, which are extant in the same book of his letters. From the very threshold he betrays an offended and somewhat angry mind; and indeed deservedly, if the matter is viewed from the opinion of those who think there is no graver crime than to scorn the majesty of so great a see, or to despise its commands, or even to undertake them more slowly and hesitantly. He says in the same book, epistle 9 of indiction 4: "Tell me, brother, from what priest was it ever heard that you did what you did? If nothing else, at least this should have restrained you, lest despising other brothers you should believe yourself alone to be holy and wise. For it is one thing to adore a picture; it is another to learn through the story of the picture what is to be adored." Then he warns what uproars that deed of his is said to have excited in the whole Church of the people of Marseilles; that he was said to have so scandalized his own people that the greatest part of them suspended themselves from his communion. He advises that he should hasten to recall the dispersed sons of the Church with every effort and every zeal; and should teach them that he was moved to order the images to be broken because he saw that they had passed into adoration: for pictures were made for the edification of the ignorant people, so that those not knowing letters, by attending to the history itself, might learn what was done.

This was the opinion of Gregory concerning this whole matter. That the counsels of Serenus were sounder and safer, the event has abundantly proved. But Gregory adduces no reasons which are indeed firm. He asks Serenus, by what priest was a similar thing ever done? But this proof both supposes what is false, and collects badly. For what Serenus then did in Gaul, Epiphanius had done the same thing two hundred years before the episcopate of Gregory in Palestine, on a plainly similar occasion, as we have demonstrated above. But even if neither Epiphanius, nor anyone else, had ever done it, it does not therefore follow that it is a sin for something of this kind to be done. For if this is valid, Hezekiah will have to be condemned for rashness, before whom no one had broken the bronze serpent. The condition of bishops, and of others who are in charge of any society of men, is not such that it is never lawful for them to do anything, to dare anything, of which there is no external example. It is their part at times to give examples to posterity, not always to require them as given from their ancestors. Foolish and flagitious is the fear of him who, when others are sinning, thinks that he too must therefore desert his duty, lest he seem to have despised others, or to have wished to be wise alone. What Gregory adds is no firmer, that "antiquity has admitted that the histories of the Saints should be painted in venerable places," unless perhaps he calls ancient what had been instituted 200 years before that age. Since, therefore, neither the reason of the thing itself, nor of antiquity, prescribed anything, nothing else came to be considered in this question but the utilities and inconveniences of each side. And if this is done, who does not understand that the counsel of Serenus is to be preferred to the Gregorian? For the danger of ignorance which Gregory feared if

images were removed was far lighter than the evil of idolatry, into which Serenus saw the people of Marseilles had fallen from the use of pictures; and it was much easier to provide for the instruction of the ruder sort with the pictures removed, than to remedy the superstition with them retained. But the disturbance of the populace which arose from the broken images is in no way to be compared with the scandals which the cult of the same images presented, both within and without the Church. The authority of the bishops, joined with doctrine and piety, could have met the former evil far more easily than the latter. But it is all too clear that Gregory, who ought to have favored, assisted, and aided Serenus as he labored in a most just cause, fomented the schism and the most unjust commotion of the ignorant in the parish of Marseilles; doubtless so that the necessity of gathering the flock would compel Serenus to yield, even unwillingly, to his opinion; by which art we know that the prelates of the same see have not rarely been used at other times.

Be that as it may, it is certain that Gregory then favored not the error itself, properly speaking, but only the occasion of the error; and that he undertook to defend the seeds of evil, not the evil itself. For although he fights that images should be retained, from which the superstition itself was born, yet he most constantly rejects the cult and adoration of images; and he wishes them to be preserved not that they may be worshipped in any way by the faithful, but that they may offer some use for instructing and teaching the rude. In his former epistle he praises the zeal of Serenus, who could not bear that anything handmade should be adored. In the other likewise, he says from book 9, epistle 109, "And indeed, that you had forbidden them (the images) to be adored, we altogether praised." A little later he says they were placed in churches not for adoring, but ONLY for instructing the minds of the ignorant. Then, persuading him to gather the scattered and dissipated flock of his church, he says: "The sons of the Church are to be called together, and it is to be shown to them by the testimonies of Holy Scripture that it is not lawful to adore anything handmade, for it is written, 'You shall adore the Lord your God, and Him only shall you serve.'" And he wishes Serenus to use this excuse to justify his action among his people: that "because he had seen that they had passed into adoration, he was therefore moved to order them to be broken." From these, and not a few others of this kind, which are read scattered in various places in both epistles, especially in the latter, it is plain that Gregory agreed with Serenus in this, that images were not to be adored; and that in this he followed that opinion which fights directly against the decree of that seventh Synod (which was afterwards held at Nicaea, and confirmed by Adrian, bishop of Rome). For while the Nicene Fathers in the first act of the Seventh Synod decree an anathema on those who "do not diligently teach the entire Christ-loving people to adore the venerable, holy, and to-be-adored images of all the Saints," Gregory plainly decrees the contrary, that "it is to be shown to the Church that it is not lawful to adore anything handmade."

Bellarmine here, according to his custom, raises the vain specter of superstitious adoration, as he calls it, and objects it to the style of Gregory, to receive those wounds which would otherwise have pierced the Roman cult of images: not otherwise than Homer's Apollo, who, to withdraw his Aeneas from the battle line and from danger in the first book of the Iliad, offered an empty image of him to the weapons of the Greeks. So plainly does the Cardinal in this place, as he writes in his work *On Images*, chapter 16: "I say that Gregory reprehends only the superstitious cult of images, that is, by which images are worshipped as Gods." Then he says, "some veneration is due to an image according to the opinion of Gregory": that is (as I indeed interpret) that very veneration which Nicaea once, and which Rome now, has decreed is to be paid to images. But indeed, why did Gregory nowhere express this opinion, if he was truly of it? Serenus removed images from the churches of his parish because he saw that they were being adored. Gregory reprehends him for having removed them; he praises him for not having wished them to be adored; and he carefully distinguishes from each other what in the deed and plan of Serenus he judged to be either approvable or reprehensible. If therefore he had thought that some species, some degree of adoration was due to images; who does not see that he would have mentioned it in this place, and indeed necessarily, since Serenus by this deed of his most openly punished them, not only with superstitious adoration (which Bellarmine deserts and rejects) but also with religious cult (which he defends and admits)? That same love of Serenus, which compelled Gregory to distinguish so diligently the piety of his counsel from the rashness of his deed; did it not also demand that he should likewise define, and indeed accurately, what in the cult of images was to be condemned and repudiated, and what was to be commended and retained? And as he admonishes him that "it is one thing to adore a picture, another to learn through the story of the picture what is to be adored"; should he not similarly have admonished that it is one thing to adore an image as God, another to venerate it analogically? And that if someone supplicates before it with prostrate body, with a lit candle, and with offered incense, and other rites of this kind, he is not therefore immediately guilty of superstitious adoration? And the more atrocious the words with which he thought he should thunder against the deed of Serenus, the more diligently he ought to have laid open here all the mysteries of that doctrine. To demonstrate that Serenus had sinned, who had removed images from the churches, he brings forward nothing else but the injury done to the ruder sort, whom he, forsooth, had defrauded of the most useful documents of divine things, necessary especially in the parish of Marseilles, constituted almost among the gentiles. These are entirely the foundations of the Gregorian cause against Serenus; which he urges solely; in which he thought he should dwell and stick. But you, Gregory, while you do these things, what are you thinking? Why in such a cause does the contempt neither of the celestial saints, nor of the faithful living, come into your mind? Both of whom (according to the opinion of your successors, at least) this deed of Serenus most gravely wounded? By which, doubtless, both the glory of the

former and the piety of the latter was diminished. You urge the one loss of the ruder sort. Is the dignity of the saints, either triumphant in heaven, or the religion of those militant on earth, so vile to you that you judge neither to be even most lightly commemorated in that cause, which most manifestly pertains to the injury of both?

But it is especially worth the effort to hear how fine the oration is, according to the hypothesis of Bellarmine, which Gregory wishes Serenus to use to calm the populace. "It must be shown," he says, "by the testimonies of holy Scripture that it is not lawful to adore anything handmade; and then it must be added that the pictures of images were made for the edification of the ignorant people, so that those not knowing letters, by attending to the history itself, might learn what was done; and it must be said to them: 'If you wish to have in the Church this instruction, for which images were made in antiquity, I permit them to be made and had in every way, etc.' And if anyone wishes to make images, by no means prohibit him; but avoid adoring images in every way." This place certainly required that he should commemorate that adoration, if any there be, which is licit and legitimate, and should studiously remove and distinguish it from that which he forbids as illicit and nefarious. If a bishop of this time were to dare in the Roman Church what Serenus once did in the parish of Marseilles, I ask, would Pope Urban write to him in the same manner? Would he reprehend nothing else in his deed than that it harmed the instruction of the ruder sort? Would he not first of all object that the glory of the Saints was violated in their images? Would he not reproach him that the religion of the Church was afflicted and diminished, with its instruments cast down? Would he not first of all adduce this most common reason of the Council of Trent, Session 25, that "the honor which is shown to images is referred to the prototypes which they represent"? Would he not urge what is added in the same place, that "through the images which we kiss, and before which we bare our heads and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and venerate the Saints, whose likeness they bear"? Would he not finally conclude from these things that to condemn and break images is truly nothing else than to wage an impious war with Christ and the Saints, and to assault their name and glory insolently, and as it were to drag and cast them down from heaven?

Yet Gregory says none of these things; who, since he was too acute and too cunning to be said to have omitted a matter of such moment through error and imprudence in this cause; what is left but that we conclude that he did not in the least feel that any religious cult should be shown to images? But what need is there of arguments? Let him himself come forward: let him himself speak the opinion of his mind. Tell me, Gregory, what do you think about the use of images? Or for what reason do you think they were admitted by Christians? "The painting of images," he says, "was made for the edification of the ignorant people, so that those not knowing letters, by attending to the history itself, might learn what was done. For this instruction images were made in antiquity." But do

you then judge that they were instituted for no other use? "They were placed," he says, "not for adoring, but ONLY for instructing the minds of the ignorant." What? Is it therefore not lawful to show them even a relative and analogical adoration? (For we by no means urge a direct and absolute one.) "If anyone," he says, "wishes to make images, by no means prohibit him; but avoid adoring images BY ALL MEANS." Could Gregory have struck down the Nicene and Roman opinion on this subject more clearly or more explicitly? Or more openly scoffed at the censorious decrees of those men who, like Bellarmine in chapters 11 and 21 of his work *On Images*, pronounce that "images are useful even apart from history," and "are to be worshipped in themselves and properly," and who say that "those who say that imaginal formations suffice to be had only for commemoration, and not also for salutation, receiving one and reproving the other, are shown to be semi-depraved, and partly liars and partly truthful"? In which place it is to be observed how reverently they held Gregory, whose followers in opinion they have adorned with such honorable eulogies.

But against such explicit and open testimonies of Gregory, they object that the same man elsewhere, in book 7, epistle 5, of indiction 2, bids that an image of the Blessed Virgin and a cross be removed from a certain synagogue of the Jews "with the veneration that is due." But the whole matter is thus. A certain Christian from a Jew in Cagliari, on the very festival of Easter, on the day following his baptism, had forcibly invaded the synagogue of his own people, which was in Cagliari; and there he placed an image of the mother of God our Lord, and the venerable cross, or the white garment in which he had been clothed when he rose from the font. Gregory reprehends the man's intemperance, and admonishes Januarius, the bishop of the city, that the synagogue should be returned to the Jews, with the image and the cross being removed from there "with the veneration that is due." From these words our adversaries by no means collect that a religious cult is to be paid to images. For first, Gregory nowhere says that that image of the Blessed Mary, which he mentions, is to be worshipped or venerated. He only says that it is to be removed from that profane and impious place, into which it had been brought, "with the veneration that is due." He defines in what manner it was to be rescued from the synagogue of the Jews; he establishes no cult that is due to it. He means this, surely: that it is not to be adored with the body prostrate on the ground on one's knees, as the Romans now do; but that it is to be taken decently from the place where it was, by the hands of the clergy, and to be carried back into the Church from which it had been stolen; with that gesture and gait which would show it to be a sacred and ecclesiastical, not a profane or domestic, instrument. As if, to the Jew who was the author of this injury, it had pleased him to bring a codex of the New Testament or a sacred chalice into that synagogue instead of the image, and Gregory had ordered them to be removed from there in the same words, "with the veneration that is due," no one, I think, would conclude that an analogical adoration is due either to the codices of the New Testament or to the sacred chalices. The Church of Geneva explicitly bids the ministers of the gospel to

distribute the sacred bread of the Lord's Supper "with reverence." And yet there is no one who does not know that the sacred bread is neither adored by them, nor was it the plan of that Church to signify by these words that it should be adored.

But even if that veneration, of which there is mention in Gregory, were of the things themselves which are ordered to be removed; it would still remain to be asked whether that veneration pertained to the cross or to the image; but that it pertains to the former rather than to the latter would be clear even from this, that Gregory calls only the cross, but not the image, venerable. Now, it is clear that the ancients established no small difference between the cross and an image, and that Charlemagne conceded to the cross that veneration which he denies to images. Finally, grant that Gregory, what he by no means said, had said most explicitly and in so many words that some veneration is due to images; it would not yet thereby be defined what that veneration is, whether it is a religious cult, as the Romans of today wish, as Bellarmine argues, or indeed a reverence of such a kind as befits the things and persons of the Church, and all the instruments of religion, for instance, priests, chalices, codices of Scripture. For since all call these and other things of the same kind venerable and to be venerated, yet no one thinks they are to be pursued with a religious cult. Walafrid Strabo, indeed, not only Baronius, but also those who edited the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, count among the adversaries of the seventh Synod, and think that he felt, along with the rest of the prelates of Gaul, Britain, and Germany, that images ought not to be in the churches of Christians, except for the memory of past things and for the instruction of the ruder sort. And yet he himself sufficiently implies that they are to be venerated in some way, as he notes in his work *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, chapter 8, when he says that "some venerate them more than is enough." Nor indeed by the name of that veneration which he leaves to them does Walafrid understand anything other (as the matter itself teaches, and Baronius freely confesses) than that they are not to be cast out of sacred places, as Serenus had once done in the Province, and as the Iconomachs in those very times were most active in the East; nor should the use that they seem to be able to offer for the instruction of the unlearned be spurned; which is plainly the opinion of Gregory himself. And so this passage of his would not help the cause of our adversaries at all, even if (which it does not do) it were to affirm in clear and set terms that that image of the Blessed Virgin was to be venerated, since from what we have said, it is quite apparent that by these words, had Gregory used them, he would have meant that it was not fitting for that image to be left in the synagogue of the Jews, but that it should be brought from there into a sacred place to provide use for the instruction and advancement of the unlearned; which he acknowledges as the one reason for having images in Churches. But they copy out another passage from the same writer, from book 7, epistle 109, where he addresses a certain Secundinus as follows: indict. 2 ep. 54. I know indeed that you do not ask for the image of our Savior in order to worship it as if it were God, but so that you may be rekindled

in the love of Him by the recollection of the Son of God, whose image you contemplate seeing. And we indeed do not prostrate ourselves before it as before the divinity, but we adore Him whom by means of the image we remember as either born, or having suffered, but also as sitting on His throne; and while the picture itself, like a Scripture, brings the Son of God to our memory, it either assures our soul of the resurrection, or soothes it concerning the passion.

But these things not only do not overturn our opinion concerning the sentiment of Gregory, but they moreover confirm it. For what then? Does not this whole passage most clearly teach that there is no other use for images in religion than that the mind may be educated and instructed by them, and be rekindled, moved by the memory of the things they represent? And that a picture is like a scripture, and therefore is set forth to teach, but not to be adored? Now, as to what he says, that Secundinus does not ask for the image of the Savior in order to worship it as if it were God, he thereby indeed denies that the worship which is owed to God almighty was rendered to this image by Secundinus; but that some degree of religious worship was rendered, this he in no way affirms. Augustine writes somewhere that whatever signs of religious deference were employed in the places of the martyrs were ornaments of the memorials, not sacred rites or sacrifices for the dead as if for Gods. If someone were to infer from this that the Church once offered sacrifices to the martyrs, not indeed as to Gods, but in some other manner, say as friends and ministers of God, would he not be inferring badly and sophistically? And plainly against the mind of Augustine, who in the same place expressly denies that he offers sacrifices to the martyrs? The paralogism of our adversaries is entirely the same, when from the fact that Gregory denies the image was worshipped as God by Secundinus, they conclude that it was therefore worshipped by him in some other manner. And yet we recently heard him instructing Serenus to avoid adoring images by all means, and reminding him that they were placed solely for instructing the minds of the ignorant.

But the antithesis which he immediately institutes shows well enough that no worship at all was rendered to this image by Secundinus. For if Secundinus had adored it with an analogical worship (as our adversaries wish), Gregory, after those words, "you do not ask for the image of our Savior in order to worship it as if it were God," would doubtless have subjoined these or other counsels in the other part of the antithesis, such as: "but that you might adore it analogically, that you might bestow *dulia* upon it, that you might religiously venerate it as the image of God." Yet Gregory says none of these things; but he opposes this affirmation to the preceding negation; this thesis to the "arsis," (as the Greek Grammarians say): "but so that you may be rekindled in the love of Him by the recollection of the Son of God, whose image you contemplate seeing." From which it is established that Secundinus used this image with this intention only, that upon looking at it, the memory of Christ might come to him, but by no means that he might adore, worship, or venerate the image itself. The sense of

what follows is the same, with this difference, that what he had said in the preceding parts about Secundinus, he here says the same things about himself. Only the ambiguity of these words must be observed, "And we indeed do not prostrate ourselves before it as before the divinity;" which grammatically seem to be able to be construed in two ways; in the first, indeed, so that the verb "prosternimur" (we prostrate) is taken affirmatively, while the negative particle "non" (not) is joined with the adverb "quasi" (as if), in this way: "we indeed prostrate ourselves before it, not as before the divinity." If this clause is taken in this sense, it will signify (I confess) that Gregory was accustomed to prostrate himself before that image, and it will define the nature of the worship he showed it, denying that it was divine; whence it would further follow from Gregory's opinion that it is licit to prostrate oneself before an image of Christ, provided it is not as before the divinity. And our adversaries indeed interpret these words thus. But this sentence of Gregory can also be resolved and constructed otherwise; namely, by placing the negative particle "non" before the verb "prosternimur," in this way, "and we indeed do not prostrate ourselves before it, as before the divinity." If we follow this reasoning, Gregory will be simply denying that he prostrates himself before that image of Christ, since he considers that this honor is fitting for no one in religion except God alone. And so, since in this point of the debate, one is permitted to choose one of the two senses of the Gregorian passage while defending one's position, not while questioning; if I should say that I retain this latter one after repudiating the former, I shall have satisfied the objection of the adversary abundantly. However, "out of abundance," and to add to the completeness of the solution, I add that it is not only permissible to interpret this passage thus, but it is also necessary.

For first, when some passages of the same author that seem to be in conflict come to be reconciled, it is fair that those which are obscure and ambiguous be interpreted from those that are clear and certain, not the other way around. Since, therefore, what was written by Gregory to Serenus, which we have mentioned above, is both clear and express, and what we have now recited from his epistle to Secundinus is ambiguous, it is consistent that the latter be explained from the former, and not that the former be inverted and twisted to be able to agree with the latter. But in those passages, Gregory most openly states that pictures were placed in churches, "not for adoring, but solely for instructing the minds of the ignorant," and that "adoring images must be avoided by all means." Therefore, that other passage of the same writer to Secundinus must be constructed and interpreted not in the former, but in the latter way that we have explained; because if it is taken in the former sense, it will result that images are placed not solely to instruct the minds of the ignorant (as Gregory wishes), but also that they may be adored, and at least in some way be worshipped by the faithful. Furthermore, the very logic of correct speech demands that the passage be understood in this way. For what follows in the same period teaches that a certain opposition was instituted here by Gregory between these two verbs, "we prostrate before it" (namely, the image) and "we

adore him" (Christ); which is no antithesis unless you prefix the negative particle to the verb "prosternimur," in this way: "we do not prostrate ourselves before the image as before the divinity, but we adore Christ." Thus indeed, no one fails to see that the sense is clear and consistent. But if, changing this construction, you refer the negative particle to this complex, "not as before the divinity," the legitimate form of the period will be overthrown, and it will be rendered disordered and full of barbarism. For if that had been Gregory's meaning, to complete this clause it was absolutely necessary to add something that would be opposed to that accusative, "ante divinitatem." For what ear is so unlearned that it does not perceive that this sense should have been expressed thus, so that after this clause, "we prostrate ourselves before it, not as before the divinity," these or other such words would immediately be added, "but as before a symbol and monument of the divinity"? Yet Gregory added nothing of the sort. For he immediately subjoins what we have just recited, "but we adore Him whom by means of the image we remember as either born, or having suffered, but also as sitting on His throne." Therefore, it is necessary to take this entire passage in the sense in which we have explained it, and not in the one our adversaries wish.

This very point is finally confirmed by the authority of the Synod of Paris. For the Fathers of that Synod interpret this saying of Gregory in plainly the same way as we do, as can be seen in the last part of their book. And thus it appears that none of the things which have been objected by our adversaries prevent us from thinking that Gregory truly felt about this subject what he himself left testified in both his epistles to Serenus, namely that images are neither to be broken, nor to be adored, but are to be retained in the Churches solely for the memory of past things and the instruction of the unlearned.

BOOK FOUR

CHAPTER I. The contests of the Christians concerning images in the eighth century; the Council held in Constantinople in the year 754 orders them to be abolished; the Synod assembled in Nicaea in the year 787, to be adored.

And such were the beginnings of the adoration of images among Christians, which, in order to counter the creeping evil, Serenus indeed thought should be removed, but Gregory judged should be retained in such a way that the people should be diligently admonished that they are useful only for instruction and memory, and are in no way to be adored. Of these opinions, this one of Gregory, although (as the most disastrous outcome has more than sufficiently taught) it was by no means less dangerous, nevertheless prevailed, and remained for a very long time in our lands of Gaul, as we shall explain more fully later. For besides the illustrious name of Gregory and the already excessive authority of the Roman see, especially in the West, it was also commended by the false color of prudence with which it was painted; because it seemed both to preserve the use of pictures with the purity of divine worship intact, and to avoid the contrary evils of the abrogation and the adoration of images, and, as it were, to hold a straight course between opposite rocks. By which it came to pass that men agreed to it with no difficulty, because it satisfied in a certain way the wishes and desires of both parties, since to the one it grants the pictures they longed for; while for the other, who abhorred them, it either removes or certainly lessens the fear of superstition by forbidding the adoration of images. And so it prevailed here that (as is very often wont to happen in human affairs, and sometimes to produce great calamities and disasters) extreme counsels were held in less esteem than moderate ones. For since the former are generally arduous and exposed to many dangers, while the latter are alluring with a certain appearance of ease, few are found with such a character and spirit as to prefer to cast aside the latter and embrace the former. It is credible that this opinion of Gregory also flourished in Italy, and in Rome, where it had arisen. But with the strong counsels of Serenus spurned, and as it seems, with future plans not in vain, men, left as it were on a middle slope, first gradually slipped, and soon, as is wont, went to ruin. However, as all things are prone to evil, something happened in the following times which snatched the minds of the Romans from that moderation which Gregory had defined, and drove them into error.

For about a hundred years after the death of Gregory, Philippicus, who had seized the empire of the East in the year of the Christian era 711, since he was addicted to the heresy of the Monothelites, which had been condemned in a Council a little before, he removed the images of the six universal Synods from Constantinople. Paul the Deacon, *History*, book 6, ch. 34. Constantine, who was

seated in Rome at that time, took this action indignantly; and he took care to have images of the Fathers who had attended the Synods painted in the Roman portico of St. Peter, so that he might either avenge or obliterate the injury inflicted on their memory by Philippicus. This event, although it arose from an unrelated cause, so commended images to the bishop and clergy of Rome that, bound by this pledge as it were, they never afterwards deserted their patronage, and with the heat of their spirits increasing daily, they finally established their veneration and worship in the West. But the truth, before it was dislodged and oppressed by their force and arts, sustained great and illustrious struggles with great effort, the memory of which, with the adversaries vainly resisting with all their might and obscuring or inverting and turning upside-down the fame of the deeds with wondrous fraud, has nevertheless, by the highest benefit of God, come down to us almost intact.

First of all, then, it is sufficiently established that when the worship of images had become prevalent everywhere in the East, and was openly defended by many men distinguished for their learning and authority, such as Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, and John of Damascus, and the Church was being rent into different factions by these disputes, Leo, who attained the empire in the year of the Christian era 717, attached himself to the party of those who repudiated the veneration of pictures; and, inflamed with divine zeal, he ordered by an edict published on the seventh day of January in the year of Christ 730, that they be cast out of the sacred buildings and places and burned, and he punished the bishops who favored the error with various penalties, at which time, Germanus having been deposed, Anastasius was substituted in the bishopric of Constantinople.

His son, Constantine, surnamed Copronymus, who succeeded him on the 18th of June in the year of Christ 741, followed his father's example. For in the year of the Christian era 754, he summoned 338 bishops from all the provinces of his domain to the royal city to pronounce freely on this whole controversy from the divine oracles. The Synod sat from the tenth of February to the eighth of the following August; in which time, after mature deliberation on the matter, they finally made a decree. It still exists today, entire, in the Acts of the 7th Synod, Act 6. Therefore, all those 338 bishops in this Synod, which they inscribed as the seventh universal, with one voice and harmonious sentiment, define that to worship images is truly nothing other than to renew the superstition of the Pagans; and that those who paint an image of the Lord Christ either divide him with Nestorius or mix and confound him with Dioscorus and Eutyches; Ibid. Tom. 3. that the true image of Christ, to be celebrated and honored by all the faithful, is that which the Lord himself instituted and commended to his disciples, namely the most holy eucharist, a most evident type and commemoration; that the other kind of image of Christ which is fashioned has no basis in the tradition of Christ, or the Apostles, or the Fathers; nor is there a sacred prayer by which it may be sanctified so as to become holy from being

common, but it remains common and unhonored, just as the painter made it; that the images of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints are both useless in Christian worship and injurious to those Saints themselves, to whom they are consecrated in a custom that arose from the Gentiles. Then they adduce various passages of the Scriptures with which they support this opinion of theirs; these indeed from John, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship God must worship him in spirit and in truth." "No man hath seen God at any time." From other books, these: "Neither have ye heard the voice of God, nor seen his shape;" "Thou shalt not make unto thyself an idol, nor any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath," "because in the mount and in the midst of the fire you heard the voice of the words, and you saw no likeness, but a voice." "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the creator." To these they add many testimonies of the more ancient Fathers, of Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Athanasius, Amphilochius, Theodotus of Ancyra, Eusebius of Caesarea. Then they decree that every image made of various material and colors is to be cast out, alien, and abominable from the Church of the Christians; but if anyone should dare to construct an image, or adore it, or set it up in a Church, or in a private home, or conceal it, they order that if he is a bishop, or a presbyter, or a deacon, he be deposed; but if he is a monk or a layman, he be anathematized. They pronounce a general anathema on those who undertake to circumscribe the Lord Christ in a human form by means of material colors in images. Likewise, they pronounce anathema on Germanus of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, bishops, and Mansur or Damascenus, most noble and most eager patrons of images. This was the definition of the Eastern Church concerning images in the Synod of Constantinople, under the rule of Copronymus and his son Leo Porphyrogenitus, observed most accurately in those parts until the year 784.

But the Bishops of Rome in the West, favoring the opposite side, attacked that whole cause and opinion of the Greeks most fiercely, and established the cult of images with all their might and effort. For Pope Gregory, the second of that name, already in the year 726 of that century, had openly undertaken to defend images, which he saw being attacked with the greatest force by Leo III, Emperor of the East; he attempted everything to restore those that had been cast down and overthrown. And so great was the zeal of the best and most holy Pontiff that, in order to make that Monarch more teachable, after having in vain threatened him with the sword of Apostolic censure and anathema, he finally even stripped him of the just and legitimate rule of Italy, having cut off and intercepted the annual revenues of the Italians, which up to that time were paid to the Princes of Constantinople. *Preface of the 7th Synod. History miscellanea.* The two epistles which he wrote to Leo testify more than enough that the man's wisdom was no less prodigious than his zeal was admirable. For he seriously narrates that religious men, lovers of Christ, at the beginning painted the Lord Jesus as they had seen him, and proposed him to be looked at, and likewise James, and Stephen, and

the martyrs, and upon seeing these images, men thereafter throughout the whole world forsook the adorations of the devil, and adored these not with *latria*, but relationally; not with *latria*, but with *habitude*. He affirms that Christ, while living on earth, wrote with his own hand to Abgar, king of the Edessenes, and sent his sacred and glorious face to him. He bids Leo to send to that image not made by hands; to which he says the multitudes of the peoples of the East gather there and pray. He warns that he himself is mocked even by small boys; whom, if he should visit their schools, and profess himself to be an overthrower and persecutor of images, they will forthwith hurl their tablets at his head. He boasts that Uzziah, king of the Jews, was truly a brother of Leo; who broke the bronze serpent, a great, to be sure, and inexpiable crime. Thus the supreme Theologian ignorantly confuses Uzziah with Hezekiah, and he does not hesitate to condemn with a black mark that deed which the Scriptures celebrate among the principal praises of a most excellent Prince. The reason which he adduces for this stupendous opinion is wondrous and like a portent; For that serpent, he says, the sanctified David brought into the temple along with the Holy Ark. For what was it, but a piece of bronze consecrated by God, for the sake of those who were then sick and wounded by serpents? Lastly, he teaches that the kings of the Western and Northern provinces trampled on Leo's laurels and tore his face to pieces upon hearing what he dared against images, and infested the Decapolis with incursions, and occupied the metropolis of Ravenna itself.

In a subsequent epistle to the same, he wishes the use of images in religion to be of natural law; handed down to the human race from antiquity and from the beginning no differently than the use of bread and wine, and of other things pertaining to the preservation of human life. He adds that Pontiffs were formerly accustomed to carry images to Councils; and that there was no one among the lovers of Christ and religious men who, when undertaking a journey, would go on pilgrimages without images, inasmuch as they were endowed with virtue and approved before God. These are the truly brilliant enthymemes of Gregory, with which he labors to persuade Leo of the adoration of images. When Gregory III succeeded him, he attacked that prince with not dissimilar deceptions; but when he saw that his mind was not only not moved in the least from the opinion he had undertaken, but was more and more confirmed in it by these reasons, offended by such obstinate contumacy, having gathered a not contemptible number of bishops, he excommunicated all who repudiated images. *Anastasius in Gregory III.* Zacharias, Stephen, and Paul, who succeeded the Gregories, following in their footsteps, pursued the same dogma and the same counsels; and they omitted neither letters, nor prayers, nor councils, nor anathemas, nor any reason at all by which they might restore the adoration of images in Greece; having tried everything in vain, until the death of Leo IV. At which point it should not be passed over that all those bishops of Rome, who harassed the Iconoclasts with dire anathemas as the most hostile enemies of God and the Church, at the same time called those same men "most pious;" as can be seen in the subscriptions of some epistles given by Gregory, Zacharias, Stephen,

and Paul; in which they call the Augusti, Leo and Constantine, "most pious," "crowned by God," "great Emperors." *Greg. 2. epist. 14. to Bonif. Greg. 3. ep. 7. to Bonif. Zach. ep. 1. & 2. to Bon. &c. Thus also in the Rom. Counc. under Zacharia. init. in the Privil. of Stephen 2. grant. to the Dyon. monast. & in the Priv. of Paul granted to the monastery of Hilar. Galiat.*

But what the opinion was of the Gallican, German, British, and other Churches that were then in the West concerning these dissensions of Greece and Italy, is difficult to demonstrate clearly and plainly. For the Historians of those times indeed report that legates were sent by the Emperors of the East to Pepin, then reigning in Gaul, at whose command and in whose presence a Council was held at Gentilly near Paris in the year of the Christian era 767, no more than thirteen years after the decrees of the Constantinopolitan Synod against images; and they testify that in that Gentilly Synod a question was ventilated between the Greeks and the Romans concerning the Trinity, and whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as he proceeds from the Father: and concerning the images of the Saints, whether they should be sculpted or painted in the Churches. *Ado in Chron. p. 367.* But it is not expressly handed down by any ancient writer, that I at least know of, what the definition of that Synod was concerning images; so that it would seem rash to affirm anything about that matter for certain and explored on either side. I only warn that what was done not long after at Frankfurt, and in other places on the occasion of the second Nicene Synod, shows more than sufficiently that from the zeal of the Romans in this cause of images, the opinion of the Gallican and German Bishops should by no means be prejudged, as will be manifest from what we shall say later.

For Irene, wife of the Emperor Leo IV, having taken power in the East after her husband's death and with her son being a minor, finally changed the state of religion in Greece. For the unrestrained woman undertook to restore to the Churches the images, in which she delighted rather excessively, from whence they had been cast out, and to establish their worship. And as she was cunning, she elevated a certain Tarasius, although a layman (a class which the canons of the Church remove from such a dignity), to the see of Constantinople because he felt the same way about images, and by so great a benefit she won him over to her side. Then she joined to herself Adrian, the bishop of Rome, having informed him of her will by written letters; and she provided for other things that would be useful; and finally she announced a Council at Constantinople for carrying out what she had in mind. Adrian sent legates there, Peter, Archpriest of St. Peter's, and another Peter, Abbot of St. Sabba's. But when the people of Constantinople had smelled out that the plan of that Synod was nothing other than to restore the worship of images, they rioted so that the assembly could not be held, neither being calmed by Irene, nor by the bishops who were present. And so, the plan having been changed, the Synod was transferred to Nicaea, the chief city of Bithynia, whose people it was easier to contain and restrain than those of Constantinople. There everything was transacted according to Irene's

whim. For the 350 bishops who had convened completed this whole cause in one, and not even a whole, month, the Synod which had begun on the twenty-fourth of September being dissolved on the twenty-third of the following October, in the year of Christ 787. They refuted and abrogated the Synod held at Constantinople thirty-three years before, under the emperor Copronymus; and they defined that images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary, and of the Angels, and of holy men, made both of colors and of mosaic tiles, as well as of other suitable material, are to be set up in the Churches, and on sacred vessels, and on vestments, and on walls and panels, in houses, and on roads, for the purpose of giving them honorary adoration, but not, however, for giving them the true *latria*, which according to the faith is due to the divine nature alone; so that to these, just as to the figure of the precious and life-giving cross, and to the holy Gospels, and to the other sacred monuments, an offering of incense and lights may be exhibited for their honor. Lastly, they decree an anathema against anyone who should dare to think or teach otherwise. And thus images in the East were abrogated and restored within a small span of thirty-three years.

CHAPTER II. Charlemagne in the West abrogates the worship of images and the Nicene Synod, and on that subject writes those four books which are still extant today.

But in our West, when the fame of what had been done in Greece had spread, and the definition of the Nicene Council in favor of images had been received, Charles, who was then King of France and soon after obtained the imperial dignity, and earned the cognomen "Magnus" (the Great) from the greatness of his deeds, took the matter so indignantly that, with the pen of the priests restraining him, he completed a most brilliant volume against the Nicenes in the third year after that Synod; in which he refutes most of their dogmas and sayings; and accuses them of error and of an intolerable impiety. On the other hand, he chastises the immodesty of the Iconoclasts, because they had not been content to prohibit the veneration of images, but had also removed the images themselves, broken and shattered, from the Churches; which Charles wishes to be retained for ornament, and thinks can be used safely, provided they are had without veneration. The work is still extant in its entirety today; in the preface of which Charles first testifies that, content with the Prophetic, Evangelical, and Apostolic scriptures, and imbued with the institutions of the holy orthodox Fathers, he accepts the six holy universal Synods; but he repudiates those two most recent ones held in Greece, the one for images, the other against images. But he pursues the former much more keenly and bitterly than the latter. For he says that in the latter there was levity, but in the former, atrocity; in the latter, ignorance, in the former, wickedness; the latter made the wine of sacred eloquence, which they should have used, insipid by mixing it with water; the former sharpened it with poison. To this also pertains what he pronounces elsewhere, that images, when removed, bring a certain incautious levity; but when adored, they promote guilt.

He therefore attacks this Synod of the Nicenes, and examines and confutes all its supports and arguments one by one. And first indeed he warns that images are newly and dangerously called holy, to which holiness belongs neither by nature, nor by art, nor does it accrue from any canonical consecration. *Book 1. chap. 2 & 22.* He explains in what sense Abraham is said in the Scriptures to have adored the sons of Heth, Moses to have adored Jethro, and Nathan to have adored David; namely, for the sake of salutation; and that these instances can only be wrongly and ignorantly drawn to the adoration of images; which we nowhere read were even slightly adored by the saints. He resolves the other passages by which they tried to establish or at least inlay the worship of images; such as that which they adduced from Genesis, "Jacob erected a pillar to God," and likewise that "Jacob adored the top of Joseph's staff;" that Moses made the propitiatory, and two golden Cherubim, and the ark of the testament at the command of the Lord; that the Israelites put a hyacinthine purple on the fringes at the ends of their garments for the memory and keeping of the precepts; at which point he

wisely shows that the true virtues of the saints cannot be fashioned or taught by material images and pictures; that the bronze serpent was erected by Moses in the desert; where he praises king Hezekiah because he did not hesitate to break that serpent when he saw it being adored by the people; that Joshua set up twelve stones in memory of God; what the same people brought forth from the Psalms, "The light of thy countenance is signed upon us;" and "All the rich among the people shall entreat thy countenance;" and, "O Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house," etc.; "and the place of the habitation of thy glory" and, "As we have heard, so have we seen;" and, "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and adore his footstool, for it is holy;" likewise, "adore at his holy mountain." He demonstrates that it is not relevant to their cause that Solomon is said to have made oxen and lions in the temple, or that it is read in the Canticle, "Shew me thy face, and let thy voice sound in my ears, for thy voice is sweet, and thy face comely," or in Isaiah, "There shall be an altar to the Lord in the land of Egypt;" or finally in Matthew, "No man lighteth a candle, and putteth it under a bushel." Charles examines these and other passages of Scripture, and demonstrates at length that they are twisted to this cause by the Nicene Fathers partly incautiously and absurdly, partly even impudently; repeatedly testifying that the adoration of images which they establish was instituted nowhere by the Patriarchs, nor by the Prophets, nor by the Apostles, nor by apostolic men; and in the entire twenty-fifth chapter of the second book he proves that it was never instituted by the Apostles by examples or words to adore images.

He also responds to what was brought forth from the Fathers, from Sylvester, Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius, and the disciples of the Sixth Council and of Epiphanius. He likewise refutes those reasons by which this error is vainly disguised by the Nicenes; such as are these: first, the alleged utility of images for recalling the memory of divine things; second, the honor which is paid to the statues of Princes in the state; then, the union of pictures with their exemplars of such a kind that the honor of them passes to the primary form; next, that power which the sight of the effigy of the philosopher Polemon is said to have once had in restraining some youth from the perpetration of adultery; fifth, the reverence which is shown to the relics of the holy martyrs and confessors; sixth, the signs, or miracles, which are said to be performed through images; seventh, the silence of Epiphanius, who, in the catalogue of heresies which he composed, by no means mentioned the adoration of images; and finally, that it is handed down that Christ sent his image to Abgar, king of Edessa. He defends with all his might the arguments which support the contrary opinion; such as these are, that the Scriptures nowhere instituted the worship of images; that on the contrary they most expressly forbade that anything besides the one God be worshipped or adored; that of this adoration of images no mention was made either by the six universal Councils or by the Fathers in their expositions of their faith; that it is expressly rejected by Gregory the Great; at which point the testimonies from him recited in the book above are found.

And lest any caviller should here obtrude the customary distinction of *latria* and *dulia*, or of absolute and relative worship, Charles denies to images all worship whatsoever in religion, not only the adoration due to the divinity, but also worship, observance, veneration, honor, and that which is shown with a bowed neck or a lowered head, or which consists in the offering of incense and lights: which words embrace any religious worship, even inferior to *latria*, and therefore that which today Rome thinks should be rendered to images. *Council of Trent. Sess. 25. decree on sacred images.* For the Synod of Trent wishes the faithful to venerate images, to kiss them, and before them to bare their head, and to prostrate themselves. Furthermore, Charles denies that that veneration should be shown to images which is shown to the saints departed from life, or that adoration which is shown to the living out of the duty of charity and salutation; that is, civil salutation, which sinks immeasurably far below religious worship. "If therefore Angels," he says, "or men, etc., are by no means to be adored, saving the adoration which is shown out of the duty of charity and salutation; much less are images, which are devoid of reason, worthy of either salutation or adoration, because they are insensate, to be adored."

To this it is added that Charles does not permit images to be equated even with the sacred vessels of the Church or with the codices of the divine Scriptures; and he is angry with the Nicenes because they had compared these things with each other. But the honor that is paid to images today surpasses by a long interval that which is had for the sacred vessels and volumes in the Church. Then he praises and follows the opinion of Gregory on this subject; and from the preceding it is established that Gregory by no means paid that veneration to images which the Nicene and later the Roman doctors judged should be given. To this, he himself everywhere testifies in the most express words that he neither breaks nor adores images; "But according to the ancient tradition," he says, "of the Fathers, and of the Church, let us have them in the Church for ornament and for the memory of past deeds, if we wish." Elsewhere; "In the basilicas of the Saints, we permit images to be had, not for adoring, but for the memory of past deeds, and for the beauty of the walls." Again elsewhere, even more expressly; "Permitting them," he says, "to be had in the ornaments of the Church, we spurn adoration in every way;" which is an argument that no use of images in the Church was approved by Charles, except for ornament and memory. The same man is indignant that images are made equal in honor by the Nicenes to the relics and vestments of the holy martyrs and confessors. Therefore, he showed no religious veneration at all to images; since it is confessed by all that the veneration which is paid to relics is far below *latria*. He fights that the veneration which is shown to the places of God is by no means due to images; whether by that name we understand the basilicas in which God is worshipped, or the souls of just men in whom God dwells through the Spirit. Now, no one is ignorant that the honor which is shown either to sacred buildings or to faithful men is infinitely distant from the worship of *latria*. It is therefore necessary that we confess this writer

denied to images not only the worship of *latria*, but also that degree of veneration which is today paid to them by the men of the Roman communion.

But why is there need for arguments? Does he not openly and with indeed most bitter words attack the lights that are prepared and the incense that is burned before the images of the saints by the Nicenes and Romans of old? Does he not on this account reproach them for a "madness to be reasonably derided?" Does he not describe the rite of this veneration, which he condemns, in such a way that it appears to be the same as that which is practiced by our adversaries? For speaking of the images of two beautiful women, one of which is of Mary, the other of Venus, "That one," he says, "because it has the inscription of the mother of God, is erected, honored, kissed;" which no one fails to see are the same things that are done today. To the same point pertains what he writes in the fourth book, chapter twenty-one. For in that place he relates that the Blessed Virgin was accustomed to be painted, carried on the back of a donkey, holding the boy in her arms, descending into Egypt with Joseph preceding. From that picture, however, he argues that if the image of the Virgin is to be adored, then the image of the animal must also be adored, because in no way can a separation be made between them in adoring; "or the adoration of both," he says, "is to be spurned, or both are to be adored." Therefore, since the latter is most absurd, he concludes that the former must be posited and confessed. Now who does not understand that by that reasoning any adoration of images whatsoever, whether absolute or relative, whether *latria* or *dulia*, is utterly and completely subverted, since none of those cults, however small, is fitting for the image of an animal? "Since therefore," he says, "the one cannot be separated from the other without schism, and both ought not to be adored, lest perhaps the image of the animal be adored, it remains that both should lack the honor of adoration (of any adoration, indeed, and however it may be called and understood, since no part, no species, or degree of it is due to the image of an animal) and they should only hold the place of ornaments in basilicas, or in any places whatsoever, and provide to onlookers a memory of past deeds."

He most gravely castigates the Nicenes because they employed many apocryphal and derision-worthy tales everywhere in this cause. But he chastises with a special chapter that fable about a certain recluse who, when he was being assailed by the demon of fornication, and had sworn to the same demon, who was asking him not to adore the image of the B. Virgin, that he would not betray this to anyone, and afterwards related the whole matter to the Abbot Theodore, consulting what should be done, received this response from him: "It is better for you to enter all the brothels in the city than to deny the adoration of the image of the Lord or of his holy mother." This narrative, indeed, is still read in the Acts of the Nicene Synod, at which, and deservedly so, our Charles exclaims thus: "O incomparable absurdity! O ruinous evil! O madness to be preferred before many madnesses!" But besides the error of superstition itself, he also accuses the Nicenes of inhumanity, because they had not hesitated to compare

those who had broken images with the Jews, the enemies and killers of Christ, and to attach and accommodate to them what had been predicted against these by the Prophets. Then he inveighs against the rash and insolent audacity of those men, who dared to anathematize the Churches of the whole world presumptively or incautiously, before they had addressed them in the ecclesiastical manner by consulting or inquiring through epistolary discourse. "For they ought," he says, "to have made an inquisitive legation to the Churches of the surrounding provinces, whether images should be adored or not adored." But he testifies that their anathema is "most demented and most vain," and full of fury and temerity, "which," he says, "imparts a loss to them rather than to us;" finally, that it is more tolerable to be execrated by them, than to adore insensate things with them against the institutions of the divine Scriptures.

For these and other reasons, therefore, he says that this Nicene Synod is far, and beyond what can be said, far distant from that which was once held in the same city against the perfidy of Arius. "Since that one," he says, "leads the Catholic Church back from error; this one on the contrary leads it into error; that one pushes it away from the most dangerous shipwreck of Arius; this one, forced, impels it into the shipwreck of adoring images; that one thoroughly teaches that the Son is consubstantial and coeternal with the Father; this one deems that insensate things should be adored, etc.; in that one the blasphemies of those who neither believe nor confess that the Son is coessential with the Father are execrated; in this one the purity of those is abominated, who, spurning the adoration of pictures, profess with a steadfast mind and a devoted heart that they will serve God alone." Finally, he concludes that this Nicene Synod, since it neither has the unshaken purity of the universal faith, nor does its authority consist in the acts of the universal Churches, falsely and unjustly arrogates to itself the title of universal.

That the opinion of the British Church concerning the Nicene Synod was also the same is taught by what Roger of Hoveden reports from the life of King Offa in these words: "In the year 792, Charles, King of the Franks, sent a synodal book to Britain, directed to him from Constantinople; in which book many unfitting things, and things contrary to the true faith, were found; especially that it was confirmed by the unanimous assertion of almost all the Eastern Doctors, no fewer than 300 or even more bishops, that images ought to be adored, a thing which the Church of God utterly execrates. Against which Albinus wrote an epistle, marvelously affirmed by the authority of the divine Scriptures, and he brought it, along with the same book, in the person of our bishops and princes, to the King of the Franks." Matthew of Westminster narrates the same for the year of the Lord 793, which he also attests is to be found in Simeon of Durham, and in the history of Rochester, and in the Saxon language, in the last part. Henry Spelman, in Volume I of the Councils of Britain. And thus was that second Nicene Synod and its new dogma concerning the adoring of images received in the West.

CHAPTER III. The authority of the books on images is asserted, and it is shown against the cavils of the adversaries that they were written either by Charles himself, or certainly at his command.

But Albinus's work has indeed perished. As for the extant books of Charles, how true it is what he who first made them public property said, that "they would have caused nausea to Eck," if they had burst forth into public while he was alive, that, I say, how truly it was said, the example of the other theologians of the Roman school shows more than sufficiently. For this volume so moved them when it first appeared that they vomit forth every insult against those whom they falsely suspect to be its authors. Surius, a monk from the flock of those they call Carthusians, rages more than the others; and since no one else occurred on whom he could pour out his collected bile, the man of unrestrained spirit and most slanderous mouth attacks our people, whom, according to his usual modesty, he calls heretics; affirming that these books on images are today printed under the name of Charlemagne by their putrid fraud, not without signal insult to so Holy and Catholic a Prince. *Surius, Annotations on the Council of Frankfurt.* Another, I know not who, says from Suarez that that volume was written in some conventicle of heretical and ignorant men, and likewise by some one or several heretics, and he affirms that it is full of lies and impostures. *Ibid. other annotations on the Council of Frankfurt.* But let us dismiss these men, angry and rabid as they are, and let them indulge their anger and vent the heat of their spirit in insults. Let us look more attentively into the whole matter itself.

In the first place, therefore, that these books on images which are circulated under the name of Charles were not written by any author of this age, and least of all by any of our party, is so clear and perspicuous that no one, unless his zeal for his cause has plainly blinded him, can call it into doubt. For what is there in the individual parts of this work, whether you consider the matters themselves or the character of the language, that either smacks of our century or does not perfectly agree with the times of Charles? I would shrink from no judge in this cause, provided he be even moderately versed in this kind of literature. And in the first edition of the work, I confess, neither the name of the city in which it was printed, nor of the man who took care to have it printed, was inscribed. But no one who is even a little curious is now unaware that it was Jean du Tillet, Bishop of Meaux, who published this volume in Paris in the forty-ninth year of the last century, transcribed from a most ancient manuscript, which he himself, in the Preface, narrates was found in a certain very great and most august church, the most ancient in all of Gaul. The Council of Trent had not yet forbidden any book to go out into public without the name of the author and of the place in which it was printed. Why Tillet then made use of what was permitted since this law had not yet been passed, so as to publish this work without his own name and that of the printer, anyone can easily conjecture. To

wit, he was living in the communion of that Church in which it is dangerous to bring anything to light that even slightly opposes publicly received opinions, as they experience daily, if there are any of that party who think they should use their own liberty. Now indeed, what reason is there why we should hold in suspicion the trustworthiness of Tillet in transcribing and publishing this work, a pontifical bishop, and indeed most devoted to the Roman see, and most hostile to us, as is established from that preface which he prefixed to the works of Lucifer of Cagliari, also published by his care? To this are added so many and such manifest arguments of truth, that I think hardly any ancient book exists whose authority is more certain and more explored.

For that four books on images were written by Charlemagne, John Eck, a noble adversary of Luther, testified as early as the year 1529 of the last century; although what he says obscurely argues that they were either not read by him, or certainly that the Caroline side of the argument was maliciously concealed. Bernard of Luxembourg, also, a brother of the Order of Preachers and a Professor of sacred letters at Cologne, reports that Charlemagne wrote a work against certain heretics, divided into four books; and that it is held in Rome in the Vatican Library. And Agostino Steuco of Gubbio, the Papal Librarian, teaches that this was a most ancient codex written in Lombardic letters in the Palatine Library (that is, the Vatican) and he stated beforehand that for a non-believer, the opportunity to see it would be made available: he recites the entire sixth chapter of the first book, exactly as it is read in the Tillian edition of this work.

But why do I linger on these things, when we have two most certain and most ancient arguments for this matter, dating back to the times of Charles himself? The first of these is that Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, speaking of the Greek "Pseudosynod" of Nicaea (as he calls it), which was destroyed and abrogated by the Council of Frankfurt, adds the following in his usual way: "Concerning whose destruction a not insignificant volume, which I read as a young man in the Palace, was sent to Rome by the same Emperor (namely Charles) through certain bishops; In the fourth book of which volume these things are written concerning the name Universal." And at this point Hincmar describes the twenty-eighth chapter of the fourth book (except for a few words at the beginning of the chapter), plainly the same as that which is presented by Tillet under the same number. What could be desired clearer or more express to confirm the credibility of this book? But besides Hincmar, Pope Adrian also confirms the same thing, the very one to whom this book was sent by Charles; a witness beyond all exception; who responded to Charles by writing a lengthy epistle on this subject. And that epistle was both cited more than once by Ivo in the fourth part of his Decretum, and it exists today in all editions of the Councils, and is usually appended to the Acts of the Nicene Synod. Adrian, therefore, at the beginning, having testified with how much love he had received Engilbert, who was sent by Charles, and had listened with a placable ear and a benign mind, continues thus: "Among which things," he says, "he presented to us

a capitulary (for so a book divided into chapters was called in that century) against the Synod which was held in Nicaea for the erection of sacred images." Then he proceeds to give a response through each and every chapter. He runs through all the chapters, and reports their titles expressed in the very same words in which they are read today in the Tillian edition; and he responds to each one as best he can; only having changed the order in which they are digested today, with the parts of the work distributed and arranged more according to his will and whim than according to the natural reason of the matter itself. For example, what Charles had placed in the fifth chapter of the third book, Adrian responds to in the third chapter of his epistle; and what Charles had discussed in the first chapter of the second book, Adrian discusses in the fifteenth chapter of his epistle; and he similarly inverts and mixes the rest with the utmost disturbance of legitimate order. To this, Adrian, either for the sake of brevity or for some other reason, having omitted almost all the main points of the Caroline disputation, touches only on the titles and mere summaries of the chapters. However it may be, from this epistle it is most certainly established; first, that a volume on images was sent to Rome by Charles (as Hincmar says); then, that that volume, or capitulary, was "against the Synod held at Nicaea for the erection of images" (for Adrian expressly states this); and finally, that that work is the very one which, ninety years ago, was published under the name of Charlemagne by Jean du Tillet, bishop of Meaux. Let Surius go now, and with the men of his ilk, cry out that these books are falsely attributed to Charles, and not without signal insult to so Holy and Catholic a Prince.

Bellarmine, led by these or other reasons of the same kind, confesses that these books were "without doubt written in the time of Charles, and indeed in the Council of Frankfurt," and contain its acts. But although he concedes these things, he nevertheless does not hesitate to deny (which indeed I marvel at) that these books are truly Charles's; he contends that they were composed by some heretic, and sent by Charles to the Pontiff, so that he might respond to them. First, because whatever copies of this volume have been seen to date bear the name of Charles himself; and especially those two manuscripts, from one of which the others have been propagated, I mean the Vatican and the Tillian; Tilius himself has recorded that its title was this: "In the name of the Lord and our Savior Jesus Christ begins the work of the most illustrious, and most excellent, or admirable man, Charles, by the will of God, King of the Franks, ruling Gaul, Germany, and Italy or their neighboring provinces with the Lord's help, against the Synod which was foolishly or arrogantly held in the parts of Greece for the adoring of images." By what right does Bellarmine assume this for himself, to change the titles of things, and to command that a work of a most excellent and most Christian Prince be that of a heretical author? But (the adversary will say) Adrian, who refutes these books, acts in such a way that he seems to have thought they were composed by someone other than Charles; he nowhere mentions that Charles is their author. I confess; but who does not see

that it was in Adrian's interest to act in such a way as to offend Charles less? Bellarmine adds from the Greek and Latin histories that it is established that Charles was not an Iconomach. But what kind of Iconoclast is the writer of these books, who repudiates, rejects, and condemns the opinion of the Iconomachs in six hundred places?

No firmer is what Bellarmine subjoins in the third place, that Jonas of Orléans called the Augustus Charles a "most pious man and of holy memory;" with which praise he does not seem likely to have adorned the author of this work. Why not? For I pray, what reason was there why Jonas should fear to praise a man who thought the same as he did? For neither does the author of the Caroline books break images with the Iconomachs, nor does Jonas of Orléans adore them with the Nicenes, which Bellarmine seems to dream in vain. His delirium is sufficiently refuted by the disputation of Jonas himself; which equally castigates both the adoration and the overthrowing of images, and contends (plainly like the Caroline book) that they are to be preserved indeed, but not venerated, which is so clear that it is conceded by all the more learned adversaries, by Baronius, by those who preface Jonas in the fourth Tome of the Library of the Fathers, by Giovanni Maria Brasichella, Master of the Sacred Palace in the Index Expurgatorius, by the Jesuit Possevino in the Appendix to his Apparatus, and finally by Bellarmine himself in another work on the Writers of the Church. From which it is also clear how inane is what Bellarmine objects in the fourth place, that Pepin, the father of Charles, confuted the error of the Greek Iconoclasts in the presence of the legates of the Greek Emperor in a certain Council held at Gentilly. As if indeed the author of the Caroline work defends or confirms that error; and does not most expressly, and indeed in several places, condemn it. Although not even that is certain, which the adversary assumes, that the Iconoclasts were condemned or confuted by Pepin in the Council of Gentilly. That the matter of images was dealt with in that Synod is established; but what was defined on that subject there is doubtful and uncertain; and neither Regino nor Aemilius, whom Bellarmine cites as witnesses, anywhere report (what he rather shamelessly attributes to them) that King Pepin confuted the error of the Greeks against sacred images.

And that friendship and union of Charles and Adrian, which he brings up here in the fifth place, I do not see why it should have deterred Charles more from writing than from sending this volume; so that since Bellarmine concedes it was sent by him, there is no reason why he should contend that it could not have been composed by the same. Those two writers, I confess, attack each other's opinion not perfunctorily; but yet in such a way that they show mutual reverence for each other; so that Charles speaks magnificently and with much praise everywhere of Adrian and of his see; so Adrian always mentions Charles and his majesty and piety illustriously and honorably; and this argues that they disagreed on this subject with their friendship intact, and although defending different dogmas, they remained united in other things; which no one is

ignorant often happens among the wisest princes. Today, certainly, it is plain that some cultivate friendship with the Roman Pontiff, whom he has not yet been able to persuade to accept the Council of Trent.

Bellarmine lastly argues from the style and manner of speaking: "It is certain," he says, "that Charles was a man skilled in Greek and Latin, prudent, and ingenious; but these books seem to be those of a barbarous, unskilled, frivolous, and almost foolish man." But Bellarmine does not notice that, while he so impotently reviles this writer, he involves Charles himself and that whole century in the same insult. He denies that these books were composed by Charles: certainly he does not deny that they were sent to Adrian, a most friendly and most united man; (for Adrian himself expressly affirms this) certainly he does not deny that they were preserved, celebrated, and read in the court of Charles and his successor Louis; (for we have learned this above from Hincmar, an eyewitness.) Bellarmine concedes these things; and besides adds (although this indeed falsely and ignorantly) that these books "seem to have been written in the Council of Frankfurt, and contain the acts of the Synod of Frankfurt." Since these things are so, does he not think honorably of the capacity and judgment of those men, who he wishes to believe that the Frankfurt Fathers chose above all a barbarous, unskilled, and almost foolish man for collecting the acts of their Synod? And that Charles sent the writing of the same man all the way to Rome by a most faithful minister to the Pontiff? And that such was the stupor of Louis, who succeeded Charles, and of the whole Court, that they preserved and cherished so inept a volume? And finally, of Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, such a dull wit, that he would waste good hours badly in reading trifles of this kind, and would wish to insert whole chapters from them into his own disputations?

Nor would Adrian himself, that thrice-greatest Pontiff, (if Bellarmine's judgment about this writer stands) be immune from the crime of this either imprudence or foolishness; who devoted his labor to confuting so miserable a piece of writing; and did not deign to warn Charles, a prince who had deserved so well of him and of the whole Church, even with a single word about the intolerable foolishness and barbarity of these books? Truly, it must necessarily be confessed here, either that Charles, and Adrian, and Hincmar, and the Frankfurt Fathers all lacked common sense, or (what I rather think) that Bellarmine's judgment was corrupted and blinded by his zeal for his cause. Besides the reverence due to such great names, the matter itself, if it is considered more deeply, will seem to altogether persuade this. For whoever reads those four books on images with a mind pure from affections and biases, will find that they are by no means as bad as Bellarmine thinks; and that the faults which he thinks he has seen in them are to be imputed rather to his own bile than to their merit; and if he accurately compares them with other writings of the same times, he will easily understand that they are by no means unworthy of the most outstanding minds of that century, and even of Charles himself. I would not hesitate to affirm this indeed, that however rough and unpolished they may be imagined, they are pure

elegance and pure erudition compared to Adrian's epistle; of which the disorder in the arrangement of the individual parts is so great, the indolence in the thoughts so great, the weakness in proving so great, the ignorance in refuting, the carelessness in arguing, the rusticity in speaking, and finally the faithlessness in reciting testimonies, that if judgment is to be made about the authors of these works from their style and manner of speaking, this epistle is much less to be attributed to the Pontiff than that volume to the King. I am certainly not unaware how great the difference is between the darkness of that century and the light of our times; yet if (as Bellarmine most confidently pronounces) this Caroline book ought to be held as the writing of a barbarous, unskilled, and almost foolish man, I do not see in what place and number the works of Bellarmine himself are to be considered, which no one is so devoted to him as to be able to deny that they labor under very many paralogisms and not a few other faults and blemishes of this kind.

But now let us weigh those things on which so atrocious and so arrogant a censure by Bellarmine is based. "That writer," he says, "says that Constantinople, a most well-known city, is in Bithynia, when no one is unaware that it is in Thrace, unless perhaps (for Bellarmine also wished to be witty in that place) because frequent earthquakes occur there, it has changed its ground; and in that city, he asserts that a Council for the worship of images was celebrated, when however there is no one who does not know that it was celebrated at Nicaea, except one who has read nothing." Then he attributes certain statements about the Eucharist to the Nicene Fathers, which were not theirs, but those of their adversaries. These are entirely the things which he objects to the writer of the Caroline books; and on account of which he thought he should be called "barbarous, unskilled, frivolous, and almost foolish." As if a man, born and educated in the furthest West, cannot without barbarism and foolishness be ignorant whether Constantinople is situated in Thrace or in Bithynia; whether the Synod convened by Irene for images was celebrated at Byzantium or at Nicaea. If this is so great a crime, what will become of most of the Fathers, even the most praised, who often err no less, sometimes even more gravely? Is Basil to be considered barbarous and unskilled, who makes the Rhine rise in the Pyrenees? Or Epiphanius, who places the mouths of the Ganges in the strait of Gades, and narrates the Meletian schism entirely differently than the truth of the matter required? Away with such rigid censors. Not even Bellarmine himself will defend the fame of doctrine and acumen acquired by the labors of writing, if he is dealt with by this severity.

To Pope Adrian, indeed, the liver was much milder, who so despised these things, which his own purple-clad descendants now tragically agitate, that he did not think them even worth touching or noting. Deservedly, as it seems to me; because sins of this kind are nothing other than hallucinations of a not sufficiently attentive mind, or lapses of a weaker memory, which often escape even the best and most erudite minds. But that this writer attributes the

discourse of the Iconoclasts on the Eucharist to the Nicenes, in this, I confess, he erred more gravely, yet not so that he should therefore be accused of calumny and be received so inhumanely. For his own book cries out that he had read not the entire codex of the Nicene Synod, but only certain excerpts which contained the principal heads of the synodical acts; among which it could have happened that whoever was the author of them imprudently threw in this article on the eucharist; and through thoughtlessness he thought that those words were of the Nicenes, which in reality are of the iconomachs. For even in the Acts of that Council which are now extant in Greek and Latin, the confutation of the Nicenes is so intermingled with the definition of the Iconomachs, and the discourse of both is so dense and continuous (with no other distinction than that the words of the Iconoclasts are recited by a certain Gregory, but those of the Nicenes by the deacon Epiphanius) that although the distinctions in printed books are far clearer today than those of manuscripts once were, yet in discerning them it is easy even now to make a mistake, unless one reads that whole part of the work with great attention. Who therefore does not see that Bellarmine is abusing his talent and indulging his zeal for his cause, while he so invidiously exaggerates a sin which it is most likely was committed not by the writer of the Caroline books himself, but by him from whom he had the excerpts of the Nicene Synod, and that one himself being imprudent? For that deceit was absent, the thing itself sufficiently indicates; since from those words which he attributes to the Nicene Synod, nothing is added to his own cause, and nothing is taken from that of his adversaries.

As for what Bellarmine objects in the last place, that this Caroline book first came out without the name of the editor, or the printer, or the place where it was printed; this, I say, has already been discussed by us above. As if indeed this offspring should therefore be considered spurious or illegitimate because it lay hidden for so long through the ignorance or fraud of men, and was not brought to light with the pomp that befitted the child of so great a parent. Therefore, since all these little cavils of Bellarmine are futile and vain, let us at last conclude what the Vatican and Tillian exemplars declare, that this work on images is truly Charles's, that is, written either by Charles's hand, or certainly by his command and authority; in the same way, perhaps, that the codices of ecclesiastical institutions, compiled under his and his son Louis's auspices and command, are still today, as no one is unaware, called the Capitularies of Charles and Louis, from the name of the princes themselves. For I would not wish to contend too vehemently that Charles either wrote these books himself, or dictated them; because it is difficult to explore an obscure and ancient matter for certain and without doubt. But why do we delay on a litigious Bellarmine, when Charles himself expressly and openly not only confesses but even proclaims that this work is his own, against whom it is a crime for anyone to be heard or admitted in opposition? For the author of these books everywhere bears the person of Charles, and speaks no differently than Charles himself; in the very first preface of the whole work, he says, "Since We, in the Church, by the Lord's granting,

undertook the helms of the government in the bosom of the Church, it is necessary that we strive with all our effort in its defense and for its exaltation, with Christ's help." Soon after, he says: "which work we have undertaken with the assembly of the priests in the kingdom granted to us by God who are prelates over the Catholic flocks, not with the haughtiness of arrogance, but with zeal for God and the pursuit of truth." Then, in the sixth chapter of the first book, he calls King Pepin of venerable memory his father, a most illustrious and excellent man; by whose and his own care, he says, it was effected that the Gallican and other churches of the West were joined to the Roman in the order of psalmody and public chant. He also mentions somewhere legates destined for the East in either his own or his father's time. Who would believe that anyone else, besides Charlemagne himself, or one of his ministers by his own will and command, would have spoken these things? Who would think that any impostor so depraved has existed, who would not hesitate to mock so impudently the venerable name and majesty of so great and so glorious a Prince? and would dare to offer him so insolent a drama? who would not revere his sacred countenance? nor fear his anger and indignation? Let us imagine, however (which is by no means credible), that the majesty of this King among his own people was so cheap that there could then be found one who would make such sport of him: What then? Shall we think that Charlemagne himself, a Prince of most celebrated wisdom, was such a blockhead that, upon receiving the book, he not only did not perceive or punish the gross fraud of a most impudent impostor, but even kissed it, and that, having received the deed of the barbaric knave into his bosom and royal purple, he sent it all the way to Rome to Pope Adrian, and indeed by a man of his intimate familiarity, Engilbert, formerly his son-in-law through his daughter Bertha? And if it was so easy to impose upon Charlemagne, how did it happen that not even to Adrian himself did anything of that fraud, which is imagined, become apparent? Was he of so dull a nostril that he could not detect what Bellarmine noticed eight centuries later? or of so hard and inhumane a heart that he was loath to admonish Charlemagne that he had been deceived by a barbaric, ignorant, almost foolish man? Who does not see that one of two things is necessarily incumbent upon Bellarmine: either to confess with us that these books are truly Charlemagne's, or certainly to defend that nothing more obtuse and crass has ever existed, either among Princes than Charlemagne, or among Pontiffs than Adrian? But far be it that we should either speak or think anything of this kind about men of so great a name. Let all Bellarmine's subtleties and cavils perish, rather than that so foul a stain should be branded upon the name of so great a King. Nor do I doubt that Bellarmine himself would far prefer that all praise for his subtlety should perish, than that it should be saved, redeemed by the disgrace of a most beloved Pontiff.

Since, therefore, Charlemagne acknowledged these books on images as his own; since he allowed them to bear that name; since he sent them to Pope Adrian; and neither Adrian nor anyone else raised a dispute with them concerning the author; since, finally, the whole court of Louis, Charlemagne's son and successor,

cherished them, distinguished with this title, and the most learned Prelates of the same times read them frequently, as we have learned from the example of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims; let it be at last concluded that they are, in fact, Charlemagne's, both as they are said to be, in the sense we have mentioned, and also in reality. Bellarmine, whatever he may argue against it, being conscious to himself that the matter is so, objects two things here, so that their authority may become useless to us in this cause; one of which is that, even if it were established that Charlemagne wrote this book, we would have nothing else than the testimony of one layman, a soldier. But he seems here to have forgotten what he posited above as very probable, that this volume contains the acts of the Synod of Frankfurt. Was Charlemagne alone present at that Synod? Does Bellarmine count for nothing the three hundred bishops who convened there? But grant that those books were no part of the Synod of Frankfurt; it by no means follows from this that they do not contain a distinguished testimony, and one above all exception, concerning the opinion of the Gallican and German Church. For who would have thought that Charlemagne, a most learned and most religious Prince, would either have written, or certainly would have confirmed with his authority, a work which opposed the sense and faith of the Catholic Church, in whose communion he lived with so much glory? Who would have believed that, if he had done so, so many and so great Prelates, with whom he daily conversed reverently and most amicably, would have dissembled so great a sin of his, and not have rebuked him? especially when they had convened at Frankfurt a few years later in great number, and were fortified by the presence of the Apostolic Nuncios, as they are called? Who, finally, would persuade himself that Adrian, if he had noticed Charlemagne holding some separate opinion, would not have admonished him to embrace the opinion of his own prelates together with the other members of the Church? For it is plain that these books already existed before the Council of Frankfurt was held; since it is established that they were written three years after the Synod of Nicaea (which has already been observed by us above), and thus three or even four years before the Council of Frankfurt; and it seems entirely very probable that they were offered to the Fathers of Frankfurt, approved, and inserted into the synodical acts; and finally sent to Adrian at Rome, so that he might learn from them by what reasons especially they had been led to judge that that second Nicene Synod should be repudiated. Therefore, these books contain not (as Bellarmine says with notable contempt for Charlemagne) the testimony of one layman and soldier, but the common voice of all the churches of Gaul and Germany; which churches were pleased to use the pen of so great a Prince as a most effective and most powerful instrument for pronouncing what they felt about this article of faith with greater dignity and authority.

But Bellarmine's other objection is that, whatever the authority of those books on images may be, we will nevertheless gain nothing from them because their author expressly opposes almost all our dogmas; openly teaching that the final judgment concerning controversies of faith pertains to the Roman Pontiff, that

one should pray for the dead, that the Saints are to be invoked, that relics are to be venerated, etc. "If therefore," he says, "they want us to believe this author, when he teaches that the Nicene Synod erred, let them believe the same man when he asserts so many things which we have now enumerated." But you, Bellarmine, who accept these dogmas of this writer which you have enumerated, why do you not equally accept what he judged concerning the Nicene Synod, and what he handed down somewhere about giving the Eucharist to infants? If the testimonies of that man have any force with you, why do you judge that faith should be denied to the others? You will say that you hold those tenets of this author with this distinction, that the Roman Church (whose voice is the supreme and sole norm of your faith) has approved the former, but has rejected the latter. But I likewise respond that I accept those things which are affirmed by this writer about the Nicene Synod; but I repudiate those other things which he inserts in various places; because the former are consonant with reason and the truth of the Scriptures (which alone is the rule of my religion), but the latter are not. If we love the truth, it must be confessed, adversary, that neither we, nor you indeed (although you sometimes boast otherwise to deceive the unlearned), hold either this book of Charlemagne or other monuments of antiquity as the rule of faith. We indeed simply and in good faith seek in them what the opinion of the preceding centuries was concerning those articles of religion which today are, against our will and resistance, thrust upon us with the greatest force by the men of the Roman Church; so that it may thus become clear whether it is truer, what these men wish the inexperienced to be persuaded, that Christianity was the same from the beginning as it is now among them, or what we teach, that the doctrine handed down by the Apostles was gradually, by the fault of men, encrusted and corrupted, with various opinions, partly vain and empty, partly even false and pernicious, being admitted into it from elsewhere. And now indeed I am inquiring about the cult of images, which is urged by the Romans. Let the book of Charlemagne therefore be useless to us in other matters, let it even be adverse in many; it does not for that reason fail to establish most validly what I have undertaken to prove now, namely that the opinion which you now hold concerning the adoration of images was at that time new among Christians, and that those very men whom not even you dare to deny the name of Catholics then opposed it, just as we do today; I mean Charlemagne, and the entire clergy of Germany and the Gallican Church together. This is enough for me at present. Concerning the other articles, in which you contend that that writer is adverse to us, I will perhaps see to them at another time, if God grants; and concerning the Eucharist, enough has already been done by our men, both often at other times, and recently by the reverend sirs Falcarius and Albertinus; who have, unless I am mistaken, sufficiently demonstrated that this Charlemagne favors your transubstantiation no more than the adoration of images. For now, we shall stand firm in the cause we have undertaken concerning images, because it seems necessary to us, for uncovering the matters in dispute and placing them in clear light, that individual articles of the controversies be treated separately, and each

in its own order and place, and that all confusion and disorder of matters be, as far as possible, sedulously avoided.

But, to return our discourse to whence it digressed, there is nothing in this whole disputation of Bellarmine against the Caroline books more serious in appearance than what he objects, that their author imposed upon the Synod of Frankfurt, and, to create ill will against them, attributed to the Nicene Fathers two notable falsehoods through the highest calumny; one, that they had made a synodical decree without the consent of the Pope of Rome; the other, that they had defined that images should be adored with the cult of latria. And as to the first crimination, I confess that Adrian sent legates to the Nicene Synod, and not only admitted whatever was decreed in it concerning images, but also, in letters written to Constantine, strove with the greatest force and contention that it should be decreed; and therefore the authors of the Synod of Paris, as they call it, have somewhere affirmed that from the text of this Adrian's epistle "the Emperor and the clergy, and likewise the people of the East, taking authority, held the Synod." But as to what the adversary adds, that the writer of the Caroline work denied this and affirmed the contrary, I, for my part, as far as I remember, have nowhere read this in his work. I do remember indeed that Hincmar, about forty years after this work was published by Charlemagne, wrote that the Nicene Synod had defined concerning images "without the authority of the Apostolic See." But if Hincmar was delirious, is it just therefore that Charlemagne should be punished, and pay for another's sin against all right? Nor indeed do I dissemble that the author of the Caroline work always speaks of the Roman See with great honor, and even in the sixth chapter of the first book undertakes to demonstrate that that Church was preferred to the others, and that in matters of faith, when a question arises, it should by all means be consulted. But that he wrote these things thus does not lead to the conclusion that he affirmed that the adoration of images was decreed by the Nicenes without the Pope's consent. The Fathers of the Synod of Paris (which will be more fully explained below in its place), although they praise the Roman See most effusively, nevertheless pronounce that Adrian favored the cult of images and confirmed it with his authority; which they also freely profess was done by him indiscreetly. But why do I speak of the Synod of Paris? Does not that very writer of the Caroline books who is accused of having cunningly and calumniously persuaded the Frankfurt Fathers that the Roman Pontiff had no part in the Nicene Synod, does not, I say, he himself expressly name the letters written by Constantine and Irene to Pope Adrian on this subject? Does he not mention the conjunction of the same Adrian with Tarasius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the primary patron of images, whose words he sometimes confutes in this very work? Does he not most gravely rebuke a certain presbyter by the name of John, because he had rashly and adulatorily, in the participation of Adrian and Tarasius, brought forth this verse from the Psalmist with a bent and distorted sense of the Holy Spirit, "Mercy and truth have met each other; justice and peace have embraced each other"? Was he going to commemorate these things if (as is

imagined by the adversaries) he had wished to persuade men that Adrian had disapproved of the adoration of images, and that it had been established by Tarasius and the other Fathers of the Nicene Synod, either against Adrian's will or without his knowledge? This writer, therefore, knew that Adrian had consented with the Nicenes and had approved their error; this same thing, however (I confess), he consistently kept silent about, and nowhere expressly reproached Adrian for it, but rather always mentioned him and his see with great honor, and adorned them with not a few praises. But the reason for this is by no means obscure. For since he wished to send this work of his on images to Pope Adrian, and to gently recall and lead him back from error to the truth; who does not understand that the principles of prudence absolutely demanded this of him, that he should deal with the Pope in this way? and that it was enough for correcting him to chastise in the Greeks the error with which he labored, and to tell a story about him, as a certain person says, under another's name? To the same end it tends that he praises the man, namely, that thus softened he might more willingly give himself to Charlemagne; that he dissimulates that he has erred, so that he might abandon the error, as if it pertained in no way to himself, all the more easily. For it often happens that a certain false and unjust shame confirms men in error; while they hesitate to renounce it for this very reason, lest they should seem to have erred.

The Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, 341 years before, had used the same art with Leo, one of Adrian's predecessors; when they wrote to him with great reverence concerning those privileges which they had decreed for the see of Constantinople, with his legates interceding in vain, and accepted this contradiction of theirs with a cunning and admirable interpretation, as if it had been done by Leo's Legates with this intention, not that the order established in the Synod of Chalcedon should be disturbed or overturned, but that Leo himself, as the first in the Church, should establish it, and that no one else should snatch from him the praise of this most beautiful deed. In the times that soon followed, the Parisian Fathers were the authors of the advice to Louis, the son of Charlemagne, that he too should employ that temperament of prudence in this same cause concerning images; namely, that he should, as far as possible, conciliate Pope Eugene, adorned with many praises, to himself; and should reprehend and rebuke only the Greeks. "We believe therefore," they said, "that by reprehending them and compassionating them, but by soothing, praising, and preferring these, and by extolling their authority with great proclamations of praise, and by deferring due praise to the Holy Roman Church, yet by bringing forth the truth from the testimonies of the Holy Scriptures and the sentences of the Holy Fathers, and by expounding it truthfully and soberly, your most holy devotion will be able, as it desires, to consult for both." Will you conclude from this that those Fathers wished to persuade Louis that Rome was immune from the error of the Greeks? By no means. For in the same place a little before they had signified with sufficient clarity that Adrian had contributed so much to establishing that dogma concerning the cult of images in the Nicene Synod that

he could be considered its author: and at the time when they were writing these very things, they say that partly "through ignorance of the truth, partly through the use of a most evil custom," the plague of this superstition had grown strong in those parts (and they mean Rome and Italy). Therefore, neither from the fact that Charlemagne seems to have used the same art and economy in this same cause, does it follow that he should be thought to have wished to persuade men that the Nicene decree concerning the adoring of images was made without Adrian's consent.

I come now to the other crime of this writer, by which he is said to have concealed the true opinion of the Nicenes on this subject, and to have attributed the contrary to them, to create ill will. Bellarmine, to prove this, recites some passages from the Acts of the Nicene Synod, in which those Fathers deny that they worship images with latria, because that is due to God alone; but he says that the Caroline book, on the contrary, attributes to them that they bestow on images the worship of the Saints with which the most holy Trinity is adored; and from this he concludes that whoever the writer was, he is manifest of a most atrocious calumny; and he adds that it should not seem at all strange, since now the Magdeburg Centuriators and Calvin dare to write that the men of the Roman communion worship images with divine honors, plainly as Gods, although they both in published books and in the Council of Trent itself, expressly cry out the contrary. And these things indeed Bellarmine says. But I respond that Charlemagne in good faith brought forth those things which were contained in the excerpts from the Nicene Synod sent to him, sincere and complete; and that the audacity of those is not tolerable, who do not fear to now at last impute so great and so monstrous a crime to a most excellent Prince, who has been resting in the Lord for so many centuries. The book itself which is extant demonstrates his innocence more than enough. The Nicenes had more than once denied that they adore images as God. Indeed; but neither did the writer himself dissimulate this; and openly and without dissimulation he commemorated that they are accustomed to use this distinction: "They seem," he says, "to inflict a palliated error upon the common people. For they say, 'We do not adore images as God, nor do we pay them the cult of divine service; but while we look upon them and adore them, we fix the keenness of our mind there, where we are not ignorant that those are, of whom they are the likenesses.'" The same writer elsewhere, speaking of the same men, says: "For they say, 'Jacob blessed Pharaoh, but he did not bless him as God. We adore images, but we do not adore them as God.'" The same Nicenes call the cult which they attribute to images a "fitting honor and an embraceable adoration"; by which they distinguish it from the cult due to God alone. Nor did the author of the Caroline volume keep silent about this either, who recites these words of Euthymius, bishop of Sardis, in that Synod: "With all my heart I receive the venerable images with fitting honor and embraceable adoration." The same Fathers, to defend their dogma, accurately interpret the word "adoring," which from the reason of its etymology they wish to be nothing other than to kiss or to

embrace. Nor did the writer of the Caroline work pass this over; but having expressly commemorated it, he refutes it in the twenty-third chapter of the fourth book. The same men had distinguished the image from the exemplar which it represents, so that from the dignity of the latter they might establish the honor and cult of the former. This also the same writer thought should be reported and refuted. "For although it can be avoided," he says, "by all the learned, what they practice in adoring images, who, that is, venerate not what they are, but what they signify; yet for all the unlearned they generate a scandal, who venerate and adore in them nothing other than what they see." Finally, the same Fathers, to show that it was by no means their intention that the cult due to God should be exhibited to images, commemorated the honor which the Church everywhere attributed to sacred things and vessels, temples, relics, the cross, etc. These very things also that writer, as has been demonstrated above, accurately confutes, and disputes at length that not even the honor which they were accustomed to attribute to such things is fitting for images. He who so candidly and so ingenuously brings forth all these mysteries of the Nicenes, who has dissimulated or passed over none of those things with which they think their error can be colored or encrusted; by what right do the adversaries accuse him of bad faith, as if with wicked craftiness he attributed to them something other than what they truly felt?

But Bellarmine urges: by this writer is introduced Constantine, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, thinking in the Nicene Synod things plainly alien from his opinion. For Constantine is reported by Charlemagne to have used these words: "I receive and embrace the honorable, holy, and venerable images according to the service of adoration which I offer to the consubstantial and vivifying Trinity." Forsooth, if it happened to error, as is wont, that he spoke conflicting things; if among so many bishops one was found who, having progressed further than the rest, confessed simply and in good faith that very thing which shame compelled others to dissimulate and deny; why should Charlemagne keep silent about it? why should he so foolishly favor his adversaries, as to pass over as if unsaid what he found in their speech to be most harsh and most absurd? For that we should believe this to be a fiction of this writer, who, when those words were by no means extant in those excerpts of the Nicene Council which he had, himself fabricated them at his pleasure and attributed them to Constantine through mere calumny; that we should think thus, I say, neither the name of Charlemagne (of whom we have demonstrated above this to be a true and genuine offspring) nor the context and series of the work itself permit. But neither is it credible that this fraud was committed by the author of the excerpts himself. For first, both from the circumstances of the matter itself, and from the testimony of Hincmar, which we will bring forward below, it seems entirely very probable that what Charlemagne had of the Nicene Synod, whether acts or excerpts, were brought from Rome, in which city there is no reason to suspect that anything was fabricated in fraud of the images. Furthermore, from those things which have been disputed by us just now, it is manifest that the author of

those excerpts, whoever he may have been, reported with the best of faith those things by which the Nicene Fathers had distinguished the cult of images from the adoration and service of God. Surely he who does not keep these things silent, it is not likely that he fabricated those either; for if he had fabricated them, he would never have commemorated these or brought them to light, since they are openly in conflict with what he had fabricated. Then if these things had been falsely attributed to Constantine by the Caroline books, Pope Adrian in his response would undoubtedly have warned Charlemagne of so horrendous a calumny, and would have shown by this argument how insane and how wicked was the audacity and improbity of those who opposed the Nicene Synod. And yet he replies nothing of this kind to this passage; but having described the title, which is prefixed to the seventeenth chapter of the second book in the Caroline work even today, where those words of Constantine are found which we have recently recited, he subjoins only this in place of a response: "Returning from a perverse heresy, with all their efforts they attempted to satisfy the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in their confession, and therefore they confessed to believe such an adoration for the sacred images, as is established in the definition of the Synod among other things"; in which place he brings forth that very definition of the Nicene Synod which we have exhibited above. And this indeed is Adrian's response, which (if I grasp his meaning well) seems to signify this, that those bishops who renounced the error of the Iconoclasts, in order to wipe away all suspicion from the minds of their hearers, expressed the cult which they thought should be attributed to images with effective and emphatic words; but in such a way, however, that their opinion is to be interpreted from the definition of the Synod itself, in which they participated; and therefore that that speech of Constantine the bishop, however harsh and horrid, ought not to be a source of fraud for the Council, whose clear and indubitable opinion is that the honor which is paid to images is below latria. But whether this or another be the sense of Adrian's response (for there is no reason why we should labor over it or contend more vehemently), it certainly confesses that the speech which is attributed to Constantine by Charlemagne was truly attributed to him, since it accuses him of neither falsehood nor calumny.

Finally, the very nature of the things in question is repugnant, that we should believe so gross and so monstrous a fraud was admitted either by Charlemagne or by those from whom he had the excerpts of the Nicene Synod, which, since the deed was recent, could with no trouble have been detected and refuted. Nor does it help Bellarmine at all, that we should assent to him, what he obtrudes here, the example of the Magdeburg Centuriators and of Calvin. For those whom he here compares, if the matter is estimated from his own opinion, differ very much among themselves, since he holds Calvin and the Magdeburg writers for heretics, but counts Charlemagne, the true parent of this book, in the number of the Saints, and invokes him, or at least tolerates those who invoke him. To this is added a greater difference of the matters than of the persons. For it is true indeed that Calvin and the Protestants write that divine honors are

exhibited to images by the men of the Roman Communion; but it is most false that any of them has attributed to any of their adversaries a speech on this subject which was never held by him. If indeed they were to do this, they could not (I confess) be excused from falsehood. But that which they say, that the adversaries worship the images of the Saints with divine honors, is free from calumny. For while they so speak, they signify that the honors which are exhibited to images by those men are divine, not by the confession of those who exhibit them, but in themselves and in the thing itself, whatever those men may either feel or say about their nature and true description. Therefore, if the honors which the adversaries exhibit to images are in reality not divine, our men indeed, who say they are divine, will have erred, been false, and deceived, in that they thought that to be which is not; but they will by no means have lied and calumniated, who have spoken sincerely and in good faith what they felt. But in the business of Charlemagne, the matter is plainly the contrary. For he, not speaking from his own opinion, says that the Nicenes exhibit the cult of latria to images; but he introduces Constantine, one of them, himself affirming with most express words that the adoration which he pays to images is the same as that which he offered to the most holy Trinity; which (if indeed that Constantine said nothing of this kind) is a calumny so monstrous and so prodigious that it is scarcely credible that it ever came into the mind of any man endowed with common sense, much less of Charlemagne. Therefore, we may be permitted, with his leave, to believe Charlemagne affirming that Constantine said these things in the Nicene Synod, rather than Bellarmine denying it. There are only two things which I see can be objected against this; and the first indeed is this, that in those which are extant today of the Acts of the Seventh Synod, those words of Constantine cited by Charlemagne nowhere appear; but these, conflicting with them from the opposite side: "I receive and embrace the holy and venerable images, καὶ τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκύνησιν μόνῃ τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ τριάδι ἀναπέμπω, and the adoration which is according to latria I offer only to the supersubstantial and vivifying Trinity"; for which words it might seem that the copy which the author of the Caroline excerpts used had these: κατὰ λατρείαν προσκυνήσεως ἣν τῇ ὁμουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ τριάδι ἀναπέμπω, "according to the service of adoration, which I offer to the consubstantial and vivifying Trinity." But this diversity of reading by no means proves that the speech which Charlemagne attributes to him was not held by Constantine; since those acts of the Nicene Synod have been in many ways altered and corrupted, as appears from that variety which is seen even today in its copies. For in the second Action, in the epistle of Adrian to Constantine, the version of Anastasius has many magnificent things about the authority of the Roman see and about the title of Universal, which are read neither in the Greek context nor in the old Latin version. Thus the epistle of the same Adrian to Tarasius is plainly different in Anastasius from that which is read in both those editions. But in the fifth Action, the eulogy of Universal Bishop, with which Tarasius is distinguished in the Greek and old Latin copy, is lacking in Anastasius. If these and other things of the same kind

have been either added to or taken away from the Acts of this Council; why not also those words of Constantine recited by Charlemagne, because they did not seem to cohere with the more subtle and more cunning opinions of the other Fathers of the same Synod, have been altered and softened? The zeal of Anastasius for the Roman See and images is more than well known. However it may be, since the credibility of this saying hangs doubtful and ambiguous between Charlemagne, who affirms it, and the modern codices of the Council, which deny it, there seems to be no reason why we should prefer the authority of their copies, which exhibit so many marks of corruption, to the testimony of so great a Prince.

But there is also another thing which is objected; namely, that the other Fathers of the Nicene Synod so accurately and so perspicuously distinguish the adoration which they decree for images from the cult due to the Trinity, that it does not seem probable that either Constantine or anyone else in the same Council should have pronounced those words, which so manifestly and so frontally conflict with them. But the response is ready at hand. For first, it rarely happens that those who have undertaken to defend some error agree among themselves. How great is the diversity of opinions among the adversaries themselves concerning this same subject? Some deny that the image should be adored at all; they wish only the exemplar to be adored before the image. But those who also venerate the image itself, again some think it should be treated with a certain inferior cult, others, and indeed the most noble, attribute the very same honor to the image and the exemplar. And to these indeed it is no matter of religion to affirm and defend that the image of the Lord Christ is to be adored with latria. Jacobus Naclantus, certainly, bishop of Chioggia in Italy, says it must be confessed that the faithful in the Church adore an image without any scruple, and indeed venerate it with the same cult as its prototype; "for which reason, if that," he says, "is to be adored with latria, so also is the image to be adored with latria"; which speech, certainly, if you look at the sense, is entirely the same as that opinion of Constantine of Cyprus, which Bellarmine cannot stomach. If among the men of the Roman communion this diversity of opinions and of speech has a place, why could not the same have had a place among the Nicene Fathers? and if it by no means prevents them from being considered of the same religion and faith; why will this singular and from the others discrepant speech of this Constantine prohibit him from being held as a true and genuine brother of the Nicenes, whose opinion he does not so much subvert as extend and amplify, and what follows from it, he explains simply and roundly? For indeed, in those which are extant today of the acts of the Nicene Council, John, the legate of the See of Antioch, expressly posits that the adoration of the image and of the exemplar is one and the same; from which it seems to follow further that at least the images of the Trinity itself and of Christ the Lord are to be adored with the same cult of latria with which the most holy Trinity is adored. "This Father," he says (speaking of Basil), "shows that there are not two adorations, but one, both of the image and of the principal archetype of which it is the image."

Furthermore, however harsh that above-recited opinion of Constantine may be, it does not however recede so far from the sense of the others that it cannot easily accommodate the recent distinctions and limitations of the Roman School, and be softened by them, and be bent to the common mind of the Nicenes. Nor are other things to be sought than those which Bellarmine himself has supplied to us, and indeed in this very disputation. For he, although he denies that it can be said according to the truth of the matter that images are adored with latria, yet he concedes that it can be said *per accidens* or *improprie*. Why then should not Constantine purge and mitigate that harsher expression of his, so as to allege that what he said he understood not *per se* and *proprie*, but *per accidens* and *improprie*? I confess that Bellarmine, that very thing which he does not deny can be said, yet forbids it to be said, especially in a sermon to the people. But he ought not to take it ill that Constantine paid less obedience to a law passed so many centuries after him; especially since he held this speech not before the people, for whose scandal he is chiefly concerned, but before bishops in the midst of a Synod.

And from these things, unless I am mistaken, it is sufficiently apparent that there is no cause at all why we should think that the opinion of the Nicene Synod concerning the cult of images was dissimulated by Charlemagne, or, for the sake of ill will, was accepted and explained otherwise than it was said. But Bellarmine argues against this, having brought forward a certain other testimony which he says is had in the preface of the Caroline books and is affirmed, that the Synod of the Greeks had established that "those who did not bestow service or adoration on the images of the Saints in the same manner as on the deifying Trinity should be judged anathema." To this I first respond that that passage by no means pertains to the present cause of the Caroline book. For these are the words not of Charlemagne in the preface of the book on images (which Bellarmine seems to have thought) but of the Synod of Frankfurt, which we will demonstrate more fully later. Therefore, if they calumniously attribute anything to the Nicenes, the whole odium of this crime is to be conferred not on Charlemagne, who nowhere writes these things, but on the Fathers of Frankfurt, in whom, in the second chapter of the Synod, those things recited by Bellarmine are read. Furthermore, in the second place I respond that in those words it is explained simply and in good faith what the opinion of the Frankfurt fathers was concerning the dogma of the Nicene Synod, not, however, what the speech of the Nicenes themselves was concerning their own definition. The Nicenes had decreed that a religious cult should be exhibited to images; that the honor of salutation and adoration should be paid, that incense and lights should be offered, and other things of the same kind. This indeed is equally confessed by both, I mean the Nicenes and the Frankfurt fathers. But a new controversy arises between them from this; namely, whether that cult which we have just described, and which it is established was decreed for images by the Nicenes, is the same or not as that cult which is exhibited to God. The Nicenes deny that it is the same; the Frankfurt fathers say it is; which is clear both from their

above-described words, and from the testimony of Charlemagne (who was undoubtedly of the same opinion with them). For he expressly testifies that he acknowledges no other cult of religion besides that which is paid to the supreme God. "It is no mediocre error," he says, "when something other is adored with the cult of religion than he who said, 'You shall adore the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'" Therefore, since the Fathers of Frankfurt here speak from the opinion of their own mind, in their own place and name, there is no reason why this speech of theirs should be accused of calumny, in which they say it was established by the Nicenes that "service or adoration should be bestowed on the images of the Saints in the same manner as on the deifying Trinity." For they themselves so felt, that the cult decreed for images by the Nicenes was of the very same kind as that which is paid to the Trinity; although the Nicenes pretended otherwise. That this was their mind is sufficiently argued even by these very words which they use, "to bestow service or adoration on the images of the Saints in the same manner as on the deifying Trinity." For these words, as is manifest to anyone, by no means signify to believe or profess that images are Gods, or the persons of the most holy Trinity, but to pay to images the cult which is wont to be exhibited to the Trinity. Now to prostrate oneself, to uncover the head, to hold out the hands in the manner of a suppliant, to offer incense and lights, to pour out prayers before them, and other things of this kind, do they not pertain to that cult which is wont to be exhibited to God? Therefore, since the Nicene Synod thought that those who are unwilling to pay these things to images should be struck with anathema, it is clear that it (according to the opinion of the Fathers of Frankfurt, indeed) in reality excommunicated those who did not bestow service on images in the same manner as on the Trinity.

And this speech of the Fathers of Frankfurt is plainly in agreement with the discourse of certain Protestants concerning the modern Church of Rome, who do not hesitate to write and affirm that it attributes divine honors to images. For those who speak thus do not mean that Rome itself professes or concedes that the honors which it bestows on images are divine; so far are they from this, that they themselves freely testify that the Doctors of that party strenuously deny this; and on the contrary they fight against it, and bring forth, examine, and confute those reasons and exceptions with which they are accustomed to defend this cause, and strive to prove that the cult which they exhibit to images is by no means divine. What then at last is the sense of the speech which they use? This, forsooth, that the honors which Rome exhibits to images, however much it may protest and resist, are nevertheless in reality divine, and of such a kind as should be paid to God alone. For in this cause there are two things which are questioned; first, whether the thing itself exists; namely, whether the men of the Roman communion religiously visit those places in which consecrated images are had, whether they prostrate themselves before them and supplicate, and offer gifts, light lamps, burn incense. Then what and of what kind this thing itself is; whether a religious cult, or of another kind, whether an adoration of latria or otherwise. And concerning the former indeed there is no controversy between

the parties; for the Romans do not deny that they are accustomed to do and think should be done those things which we have just now commemorated. But concerning the latter is the whole dispute and dissension which is between them; the Protestants on the one hand affirming that that cult which it is established is attributed to images is divine, and of such a kind as is due to God alone in religion, the adversaries on the other hand denying it. It is to be granted to both, therefore, in this disputation, that they should speak from the opinion of their own mind; and that they should designate that cult, concerning whose kind and definition they dissent among themselves, each from his own, not, however, from the opinion and judgment of the opposite party. From which it follows that the charge of sycophancy which Bellarmine writes against Calvin and the Magdeburg writers is vain and unjust, because they said that images are worshipped by the adversaries with divine honors, plainly as Gods; nor is it any more just or more true, what he likewise imputes to the Frankfurt fathers, the crime of calumny against the Nicenes; especially if, as he ought to wish, the Fathers of the Nicene Synod were engaged with the same liberty in this argument which we see obtains today in the Roman schools; in which it is established that there have existed Masters neither ignoble nor of the common sort, who have not hesitated to contend openly (as has been observed by us in the preceding parts) that the adoration of latria is to be attributed to the images of God and of the cross.

CHAPTER IV. The definition of the Second Council of Nicaea concerning images is abrogated in the year 794 by the Synod of Frankfurt; the decree of that Synod is explained and vindicated from the cavils of the adversaries.

But since we have hitherto abundantly asserted the authority of the Caroline work, let us now come to the decree of the Fathers of Frankfurt themselves. For Charlemagne, in the fourth year after that volume was completed, held a most numerous Synod at Frankfurt on the Main; having convened from Gaul, Britain, Germany, and Italy at least three hundred Bishops, who, having first condemned the heresy of Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgel, bishops, and of some other Spaniards, afterwards dealt with the matter of images, and what the Greek prelates, recently compelled by Irene, had decreed in Nicaea in their favor, this they, having noted it with most grave words, abrogated in this manner. "The question was brought forward concerning the new Synod of the Greeks, which they held at Constantinople concerning the adoration of images, in which it was written that those who did not bestow service or adoration on the images of the Saints in the same manner as on the deifying Trinity should be judged anathema. Our most holy Fathers above, refusing in every way adoration and servitude, disdained and, agreeing, condemned it." And this indeed was the judgment of the Synod of Frankfurt concerning the new definition of the Nicenes; which agrees precisely with the above-recited sentences of the Caroline work. Here indeed is great trepidation and agitation on the part of the adversaries, because they see that that Synod, which among them is counted by the number and name of the seventh universal, and whose decrees are held in the highest honor, as so many canons of the faith, is so expressly rejected and damned by the voice of a most noble and ample assembly. But for men determined to defend and hold their own through right and wrong to the end, the usual audacity and hardness of front is by no means lacking in this article of the disputation. But (which is always their fate, who oppose the truth) being discordant among themselves, they go off into the most diverse opinions. For that Alanus Copus (of whom mention has been made by us above) denies that that Synod held at Nicaea by Irene and Tarasius to restore the cult of images, that one, I say, he denies to have been condemned by the Fathers of Frankfurt. On the contrary, a man of immense confidence, he contends that it was confirmed by them; and that no other Synod was rejected in that Council than that which had been celebrated by the Iconoclasts at Constantinople in the year of Christ 754, thirty-three years before the Nicene, to overthrow images. Gregorius de Valentia follows Alanus. But Bellarmine and Baronius, when they noticed that this manner of responding was a little too impudent, and rightly feared lest such projected audacity should be seized upon by their adversaries as an argument of a desperate cause, thought they should have recourse to another artifice. For these men concede, what is more open than can be denied, that the second Nicene Synod was truly reprobated in the Synod of Frankfurt, but they

contend that it was done through error, and as they say, *materialiter*; since the good Fathers, deceived by malevolent men, and especially by the author of the Caroline books, as Bellarmine wishes, believed that it had been defined in the Synod of Nicaea that images should be adored with the cult of latria, and that this decree had been made by the Greeks without the consent of the Pope of Rome; it is not to be wondered at that, holding these two falsehoods for the truth, they reprobated the Nicene Synod as profane and illegitimate; and that they would have done far otherwise if they had understood what the true opinion of the Nicenes was; namely, that only a relative and honorary cult is to be attributed to images, since they themselves also in reality felt the same. Perron also employs the same artifice in this cause, and, changing the fiction, or certainly the conjecture, of his own people into a history, seriously narrates to us that excerpts of the Nicene Synod were fabricated and disseminated in the West by the execrable artifice and calumny of the Iconoclasts; and he affirms the matter no otherwise than if he had either inspected it himself present, or had received it from some grave and suitable witness of that memory. But Gabriel Vasquez and Franciscus Suarez, Jesuits, and Binius, a Canon of Cologne, who most recently edited the Councils, having repudiated this fiction because it seemed absurd and incredible, prefer the response of Alanus, and labor to resuscitate and bring back to life posthumously the monster that had been confuted and routed by two Cardinals. For these men are not content to follow different and from each other discrepant opinions, but, in order, I believe, to find greater favor with us, some not sluggishly overturn the tenets of others; in which conflict they so conduct themselves that the labor of each in opposing and destroying what is another's is just and successful; but the effort of all in establishing and defending their own is vain.

We shall watch their contests, but not, however, will we be so idle as not to also join hands ourselves, if at any time either the refutation of a falsehood or the confirmation of the truth shall demand this effort from us. Bellarmine comes forth first into the line of battle, who undertakes to refute the response of Alanus, having prefaced these things civilly indeed and urbanely: "I would wish this opinion," he says, "to be true, but yet I suspect it to be false." Then with three arguments he proves that the Synod concerning images condemned in the Council of Frankfurt is truly the Nicene one. First indeed, because the Caroline books, without doubt written in the time of Charlemagne, and indeed (as he says it seems) in the Synod of Frankfurt, truly refute the Nicene Synod. Secondly, because all ancient authors agree in this, that in the Council of Frankfurt was reprobated the Seventh Synod, which had decreed that images should be adored. And concerning the Caroline books indeed, from which Bellarmine draws the first argument, I think enough has been said above. But the confirmation of the other argument requires that we should at this point arouse some ancient writers to give testimony concerning the Synod of Frankfurt. Of whom let the first be the author of the life of Charlemagne published by the illustrious P. Pithoeus. He, in the place where he makes mention of the Council

of Frankfurt, most expressly affirms that in it the Synod of the Greeks for images was rejected. For having prefaced that Charlemagne celebrated Easter at Frankfurt, he says: "And there a great Synod of the bishops of the Gauls, Germans, and Italians was gathered in his presence. There were present the legates of the Lord Apostolic Adrian, Theophylactus and Stephanus, bishops, and there for the third time they condemned the Felician heresy, which condemnation they wrote down in a book by the authority of the holy Fathers, which book all the Priests confirmed by subscribing with their own hands. There Queen Fastrada died, and was buried at St. Alban's. The Pseudo-synod of the Greeks, which they falsely called the seventh, for images, was rejected by the Pontiffs." The Annals of the Franks, continued from the year of Christ 704 to 883, testify to the same thing for the year 794 in almost the same words: "A Synod was held in Frankfurt, in which the Felician heresy was for the third time condemned before the bishops of the Germanies, and of the Gauls, and of the Italians, in the presence of the great Prince Charlemagne, and of the legates of the Apostolic Adrian, Theophylactus and Stephanus, bishops, and the condemnation was confirmed by a ratified stipulation. Queen Fastrada dies, and is honorably buried at Mainz at Saint Alban's. The Pseudo-synod of the Greeks held for the adoring of images, and falsely called the seventh, is condemned by the bishops." Adhelmus the Benedictine, having spoken of the Synod of Frankfurt in his Annals, says: "Also the synod which a few years before had been gathered at Constantinople under Helena and her son Constantine, and was called by them not only the seventh but also universal, was, so that it should be called neither seventh nor universal and be held as superfluous, in whole abdicated by all." Strabus, the Monk of Fulda, Regino of Prüm, the Abbot of Ursperg, and Hermannus Contractus report the same in their Annals and Chronicles for the year 794. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who is known to have flourished in the fiftieth, or thereabouts, year after the Synod of Frankfurt, in his epistle to his nephew Hincmar, says: "The seventh, called universal among the Greeks, pseudo-synod concerning images, which some said should be broken, but others that they should be adored, neither part however defining with a sound understanding, was held at Constantinople not long before our times by very many bishops without the authority of the Apostolic See, and was sent to Rome, which the Roman Pope also directed to Francia. Whence in the time of Charlemagne the Emperor, by order of the apostolic see, a general Synod was celebrated in Francia, the aforesaid Emperor convoking it, and according to the path of the Scriptures and the tradition of the elders, the pseudo-synod of the Greeks itself was destroyed and entirely abdicated: concerning the destruction of which a not small volume, which I read in the palace as a youth, was sent to Rome by the same Emperor through certain bishops, in the fourth book of which volume these things are written concerning the name of Universal." In which place Hincmar describes from the Caroline work the twenty-eighth chapter of the fourth book, entirely as it exists today in the published codices. Whence it is manifest that the Synod which was

condemned at Frankfurt is the very same which Charlemagne attacks and refutes in these books, that is (which all confess) that second Nicene, which established the cult of images. Ado of Vienne, who is said to have lived not more than fifty years after the times of the Synod of Frankfurt, after he has said a few things about it in his Chronicle, and concerning the condemnation of Felix of Urgel, adds this: "But the pseudo-synod, which the Greeks call the seventh, for the adoring of images, was utterly abdicated." The same is also reported by the Chronicle of Fleury, ending in the year of the Lord 807; the Annals of the Abbey of Saint-Bertin, which end in the year of the Lord 882; and those of Metz, of the abbey of Saint-Arnulf, which go to the year 903. To which are to be added the manuscript annals of the Franks of du Tillet from the year of the Lord 708 to 808; also the Annals of the Franks from the manuscript of Pithou from the year 769 to 806; the Annals of the Franks from the manuscript of Loisel from the year of the Lord 741 to the year 814; the Annals of the Saxon Poet in the fourth book for the year of the Lord 794; the Annals of Eginhard; the life of Charlemagne written by Ademar, a monk of Saint-Eparchius, and finally Aimoinus, in the fourth book, chapter eighty-five, and Aventinus. And these witnesses, who are all twenty, and who for the most part lived in times close to the age of Charlemagne, with one voice so affirm concerning the Synod of Frankfurt.

Now see, I ask you, what is the front of those men who do not fear to protest against so clear, so suitable, so confirmed from every part a testimony, and against the faith of all the ancients contend that the Nicene Council was confirmed by the one at Frankfurt; see whether the Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius did not rightly shrink in horror from so impudent an audacity. But they fight nevertheless, and with light arguments they try to undermine so great an authority. In the first place, however, they object that some of those writers, like Adhelmus, like the Abbot of Ursperg, like Aimoinus, like even Hincmar himself, say that the Council which was rejected by the Frankfurt fathers was held at Constantinople. But this objection is of no account. For first, it is possible that those authors used Constantinople for the provinces of the Eastern empire, of which Constantinople was the capital, as if they had said that that Synod was celebrated in the East, as the names of Rome, Babylon, and other principal cities are often wont to be taken for the whole empires which are subject to them. And this is the opinion concerning these passages of those writers of the most illustrious man and venerable brother in Christ, David Blondel, whom I name for the sake of honor. But Bellarmine responds differently, and concedes that Constantinople was named by them for Nicaea through error; but in such a way, however, that they had in mind that very Synod which was held at Nicaea; and he wishes the source of that error to have been the Writer of the Caroline work, who, when either by a lapse of memory or from lack of skill he had written that this Synod was held at Constantinople, the error thence spread to the others. To which can be added that the lapse here was the more prone, because that Synod had first been indicted for Constantinople, whence it was soon transferred to

Nicaea on the occasion of a tumult of the soldiers and the populace. And concerning Charlemagne indeed, it cannot be doubted that he understood the Nicene Synod, since he attributes the cult of images to the Synod of which he speaks; since he refers to and confutes the names and opinions of the Nicene Fathers everywhere throughout the work; since elsewhere he expressly and not once testifies that the Synod which he opposes was held at Nicaea in Bithynia, and on that occasion he institutes that rather lengthy comparison, of which we have made mention above, of this later Council of Nicaea with the former, in which Arius was once condemned. Just as therefore the fact that that writer, through inadvertence, said that the Synod which he refutes was celebrated at Constantinople, by no means prevents everyone from confessing that he signified that Synod which is commonly called the Seventh universal, and which established the cult of images; so indeed neither should the error of the others who likewise sinned move us from thinking that they understood concerning that same Synod, namely the Nicene one. For that this was truly their mind, they themselves cry out more than enough. For the Abbot of Ursperg, Adhelmus, and Aimoinus, and likewise Eginhard, the Saxon Poet, and the Synod of Paris say that the Council of which they speak was celebrated under Constantine and Irene; which agrees with the Nicene alone, and by no means with the iconoclast Synod of Constantinople. Hincmar similarly signifies that the Synod of which he speaks was celebrated in the time of Charlemagne, and was directed to Francia by the Roman Pope, which agrees very well with the Nicene Synod, which is known to have been held in the twenty-sixth year of Charlemagne's reign; but not at all with the Constantinopolitan one, which had been celebrated in the reign of Pepin, thirteen years before Charlemagne began to reign. Furthermore, what Hincmar reports, that that Synod which was abdicated by the Frankfurt fathers was also confuted by Charlemagne in that very volume which is still extant today; this, I say, does not permit us to doubt that by those words he understood the Nicene. Finally, those writers almost all affirm that the Synod which was reprobated at Frankfurt had decreed the cult of images; this indeed can be said of no other than the Nicene; and least of all of the Constantinopolitan, which, under the emperor Copronymus, not only did not judge that images should be adored, but decreed that they should be broken and abolished.

What do the adversaries say to these things? Indeed, their zeal is nowhere more impotent than in this place, nor their pervicacity greater or more unjust. For with a hardened front they dare to turn their horns against all those writers; and some indeed contend that they by no means either felt or wrote what we have just now heard them speaking and testifying with the highest consent; others, however, that they did write, but falsely, either having been mistaken or deceived and circumvented by another's fraud. Those former ones, therefore, contend that whatever testimonies of the ancients we have praised are either wrongly understood, or corrupt and vitiated, or finally fabricated and fictitious. Meanwhile, among those which they say are badly and against the authors'

meaning accepted by us, they review this passage of Ado of Vienne: "The Pseudo-synod, which the Greeks call the seventh, for the adoring of images, was utterly abdicated." For they say that those words "for the adoring of images" are not to be joined with the preceding; but with the following, with a comma interposed in this way: "The Pseudo-synod, which the Greeks call the seventh, for the adoring of images was utterly abdicated"; so that the sense is that it was utterly abdicated in defense of the adoration of images. But what these men preach as the sharpness of this response, that indeed is crass and obtuse, and of such a kind that it can consist neither with the usage of the Latin language, nor with the truth of history. For where have they ever read such a phrase, either in Ado himself or in any other Latin writer, "was utterly abdicated for the adoring of images," with this sense, that it was abdicated with this mind and plan, that images should be adored? Who indeed is so blinded by zeal for this cause as not to understand that those recently recited words of Ado are either entirely null and void, or signify what we have said, namely that that Synod which was held by the Greeks for the adoration of images was utterly abdicated? And Regino indeed, almost a contemporary of Ado, the adversaries themselves confess took his words in this sense, and for that reason they wish that, having been led into error, he wrote these things which are read in his work: "The Pseudo-synod of the Greeks, which they had made for the adoring of images, was rejected by the Pontiffs." As if indeed it is credible that new men, seven hundred years after that age, and in addition of most noted zeal for this cause, perceived the mind of Ado better than Regino, living in the same times with him? or as if Regino, what he wrote about the Synod made indeed by the Greeks for the adoring of images, but abdicated by the Frankfurt fathers, could not have had it from anywhere else than from Ado alone? as if, finally, it is not much more probable that Regino received these things from that writer of the Annals of the Franks, whom he himself professes he will follow, and whom he says was one of the counselors of Charlemagne. Who these Annals are, however, is difficult to affirm certainly and indubitably. This at least is certainly established, that whatever has been reported by Regino concerning this matter is had in the same number of words in that life of Charlemagne which the most illustrious Pithoeus made public; from which the passage which was cited by us above is entirely the same as this testimony of Regino, if you except one or two little words.

But the force which is brought to bear on the words of Ado shakes not only the laws of Grammar, but much more so the credibility of historians, and subverts it. For (which we will demonstrate at length later) most of the writers of those times testify that our Gauls did not agree well with the Romans on the cause of images; so much so that Anastasius, the Pope's Librarian, in the year of the Christian era 880 (that is, almost ninety years after the Synod of Frankfurt) complained of their dissent from the others in this article. But if (as the interpretation of the adversaries posits) the adoration of images was decreed and confirmed in the Council of Frankfurt; surely there was no reason why Anastasius should be angry with the Gauls. And if there had been any who were hostile to images, he

would undoubtedly have objected to them the authority of the Synod of Frankfurt, which is established to have been in the highest place among them. Lastly, grant that neither the reasons of Grammar nor of history conflict with this marvelous gloss of the adversaries; and so that the words of Ado labor under mere ambiguity, who does not see that their sense should be sought not from our prejudices, but from the testimonies of ancient writers who lived in the age of Ado, and who are established to have known much better and more certainly than we what was then done by the Fathers at Frankfurt? And yet not only Regino, but also the author of those annals which we praised above, most expressly testifies that the pseudo-synod of the Greeks which was condemned at Frankfurt was held "for the adoring of images." And so it remains that from the customary usage of the Latin language, from the credibility and authority of history and of the writers of that age, we should conclude that the passage of Ado is to be accepted as we interpret it, with this meaning, namely, that "that pseudo-synod, which the Greeks call the seventh, held for the adoring of images, was utterly abdicated"; not, however, as these men, against all reason, contend, that it was abdicated in order to defend and establish the adoration of images.

But the other passages, which are more explicit than to be able to be twisted elsewhere, they respond are either vitiated, or plainly fabricated and supposed. In this number they count that passage of Adhelmus, which pronounces that the Synod which was damned at Frankfurt was celebrated "under Irene and her son Constantine." For Copus says that these words were inserted by some Iconomach into the testimony of this author; and the same man contends that in Regino, in place of what is found in all the copies, "The Pseudo-synod of the Greeks which they had made for adoring images," one should read, "the Synod which they had made for *not* adoring images"; feigning that the particle *not* was removed either by the carelessness or the malice of the scribes. But while the adversaries act thus, do they not openly mock God and men? They bid us to go to the monuments of the ancients, that we may learn from them what their opinion on religion was. They themselves bring forth the codices from their libraries; in which they had lain preserved for eight or nine hundred years back. We obey; we consult the books. Soon, if anyone should wish to hold and cite what we read there as true and suitable testimonies concerning those things which were then either done or believed, then they themselves, who handed over the books, who advised that the faith of the ancients should be sought from them, with suddenly changed minds cry out, "Beware of doing so. Those codices are vitiated, they teem with innumerable errors." And soon, having seized the censor's rod, they emend the books of the ancients at their pleasure, they delete whole sentences in them, they change an affirming speech into a denying one; finally, they do not make an end of inverting, feigning, and re-feigning, until they see that nothing remains which even lightly conflicts with the tenets of the Roman Church. Your good faith, adversaries. By what documents, at last, will you arm yourselves to defend that opinion on religion which you have undertaken? The scriptures of God are obscure, the writings of the Fathers are vitiated. To you, all is darkness.

If this is the fate of books, that what they affirm, what they deny, cannot be established even then, when all the copies of twenty authors, described both by hand and by type, testify to one and the same thing equally; what shall we henceforth hold as fixed and certain in this whole genre? But if you assume this right, that in those places by which you understand your opinion on religion to be pressed and opposed, you may with impunity introduce a few words, and with particles of negation inserted, invert the whole speech into a plainly contrary sense, and dare other things of this kind against the faith of all the codices, for no other reason than that it is expedient for you; why should not the same license also be granted to your adversaries, if at any time the use and reason of the cause which they are pleading should demand it? But if this right is lawful for both (which that example of yours necessarily establishes), what are we doing? why do we waste time in vain in scrutinizing the monuments of the ancients, when in them, with this way and method established, everyone will easily find his own private and singular opinion? even an Arian his heresy in Athanasius himself? And this cavil indeed Bellarmine, I confess, explodes in this place: "To say," he says, "that all these are lying, or their books are corrupt, as Copus says, seems to me a little too harsh"; although he himself elsewhere, as we have noted above, acts with us just as illiberally and as shamelessly as Copus, where he contends that the objected passage of a certain epistle of Epiphanius to John should be entirely cut away, as having been stitched to that epistle by another's hand. The same also is the judgment of those who edited the Councils at Cologne, concerning this response of Copus: "It is difficult," they say, "since it cannot be proved."

But what those men respond to the testimony of Hincmar easily surpasses the impudence and absurdity of all the others that we have heard thus far. For they stubbornly deny that it is Hincmar's, "because neither is that book of Hincmar, from which it is said to have been taken, extant, nor has it come to us," they say, "except from the relation of the heretic Illyricus, to whom we give no faith, nor do we know from where he excerpted that fragment." O immense impudence, or certainly, incompetence! And yet it has now been almost thirty years since that book of Hincmar has been in the public light of men, printed in Paris by Sebastian Cramoisy with the privilege of the Most Christian King, from a manuscript codex of the most distinguished man Jacques Auguste de Thou, and edited by the best and most upright Corderius, a Canon of Limoges; whose erudition, faith, and humanity are abundantly well-known to almost all students of literature. But also, there is no one who does not know that Baronius himself adduced this very passage of Hincmar in question in his *Annales*, in its entirety, and indeed augmented with a certain clause most pertinent to this cause, which is not read in the Corderian edition. Since these things are so, what impudence is this, to trouble the credibility of this testimony, and to carp at it as if it were fabricated and substituted by Illyricus?

But the new rhetors from the school of Pericles also bring forth reasons with which to assail the credibility of our senses, lest we believe that the passage we read in Hincmar is Hincmar's. For, they say, "in those words there are many things that are false and mutually contradictory, or not very probable. First, that he asserts that in a certain Seventh Synod of the Greeks, some said that images were to be broken, but others that they were to be adored; for this happened not in one synod, but in different ones. Then, that he says the Nicene Synod was held without the authority of the Pope, and was sent to Rome. Again, that he says the Roman Pope directed that Nicene Synod, sent to him, to Francia, so that it might be examined or corrected there. Finally, what is said there about a volume published against the Nicene Synod, and sent by the Emperor to Rome by certain bishops." But this one thing is now in question, whether this passage which has been cited is Hincmar's or not. Baronius attributes it to Hincmar. De Thou's codex exhibits it in the very work of Hincmar, as do the copies of the Corderian edition described from the same codex. What need is there of other arguments in a clear matter? But whether the things which are narrated there as having been done are false, pertains to another matter. This indeed I know, that concerning these things, Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who was close to those times, is to be believed far more certainly and justly than six hundred Biniuses and Suarezes, and than all the fellows of the Jesuit order; new men, who emerged in the eighth century after the memory of those things in question.

But let us see, nevertheless, what sort of things these are which are objected to this passage of Hincmar. He, they say, confounds two synods. Is that so? And yet I read nothing else here in him, except that "some of the Greeks said that images were to be broken, while others said they were to be adored." That these things are most true is plain from the acts of those two synods; one of which, which was held at Constantinople, decrees that images are to be broken; the other, which was at Nicaea, that they are to be adored. What Hincmar adds, that "neither party defined with sound understanding," pertains not to the truth of the event, but to his own judgment about the matter. However, that these diverse and mutually conflicting opinions about images were either agitated, or decreed and established in one and the same synod (which would indeed be vehemently absurd), this Hincmar asserts neither here nor anywhere else. He says that the Nicene Synod was sent into Francia by the Roman Pope. I confess; nor do I see what is absurd in that. That it was sent "to be examined or corrected" (which indeed would not sit well with Roman pride), Hincmar neither says nor signifies; and that whole thing, whatever it is, is from their workshop. For there is no reason why Hincmar should be believed to have wished to suggest that the Acts of the Nicene Synod were sent into Francia to be corrected rather than to be received and published. Finally, I do not grasp this either, why what Hincmar says, that "a not insignificant volume was sent by the Emperor to Rome by certain bishops," why, I say, this should be considered to conflict with what Adrian relates, that "Charles sent a book to him by Abbot Engilbert." Rather, these things seem mutually to shed force and light upon each other. For neither

does Hincmar deny that those bishops whom he mentions were companions of Engilbert, a minister from the intimate friendship of the Prince; nor does Adrian affirm that Engilbert came to him alone without those bishops. Then indeed, if we were to concede that the name of "bishops" for the word "Abbot" had slipped from the man by inadvertence while narrating the matter in passing and while occupied with something else; this certainly does not seem so grave a crime that it could not have befallen Hincmar. And I would wish the same to be said of what he writes, that that Synod in Greece was held "without the authority of the Apostolic See" (as he says), in which part I do not deny that this writer sinned greatly, whether by a lapse of memory or by lack of thought.

And thus far we have defended the twenty testimonies which have been adduced by us in this cause, and we have demonstrated them to be neither fabricated, nor corrupted, nor twisted into a foreign sense; whence it is so established, that the Synod of the Greeks condemned at Frankfurt by the Caroline Council is the very same one which had been celebrated a little before at Nicaea for the adoration of images. Nor does it help the adversaries at all that Platina, Blondus, Sabellicus, and Paulus Aemilius say that the synod "concerning the removal of images" was rejected. Bellarmine, *On Images*, ch. 14, §. Nor does the last thing stand. For first, all of these (as has been very well observed by Bellarmine) are more recent, and are in no way, as far as the weight and authority of their testimony is concerned, to be compared with the twenty writers cited by us above in this cause; the greater part of whom lived within a hundred years of the Synod of Frankfurt. Then (as the same Bellarmine also truly and prudently responds) "what these men say does not conflict with the sayings of the ancient historians. For in the Synod of Frankfurt two synods were reprobated, namely the Constantinopolitan against images, and the Nicene for images," as is plain from the Caroline books and from Hincmar. For the Frankfurt Fathers thought that images were to be kept, contrary to what the Constantinopolitans had judged; but not, however, to be adored, contrary to what the Nicenes had decreed. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at that those recent writers, born and educated in the Roman Church, when they found in the ancients that these were the two judgments of the Synod of Frankfurt, thought that one of them, which was congruent with the customs and institutions of their own age and church, should be commemorated; but the other, which conflicted with the same, they kept silent. But neither, finally, ought the silence of either Jonas of Orléans or Walafrid Strabo be opposed to the most explicit affirmation of twenty witnesses, and indeed suitable ones; neither of whom mentions the condemnation of the Nicene Synod by the Frankfurt Fathers. For, to say this in the first place, not all men hand down or commemorate all things; and it has now become a common proverb among all that one should not argue from authority, except affirmatively. Then, to what purpose would Jonas have commemorated the condemnation of the Nicene Synod at Frankfurt, which does nothing for the cause which he was pleading against Claudius of Turin? For that Claudius was an Iconoclast. By the same reasoning, and much more

probably and effectively, it could be concluded that the Constantinopolitan Synod was by no means reprobated at Frankfurt; because Jonas made no mention of this matter (which pertained very much to that cause). Yet there is no one who thinks that, contrary to the faith of the ancient writers, it should therefore be denied that the Synod of the Iconoclasts was repudiated by the Frankfurt Fathers. Walafrid Strabo, however, thought it sufficient to illustrate and explain the matter itself, omitting the testimonies of authors and synods which could be adduced, and he touched upon what had been done in Gaul under Louis the Pious only in passing and with the greatest brevity. However, it is established that neither of the Greek synods pleased either Jonas or Strabo. For both (as will be explained more diligently later) judged that images should be so retained that they think they are by no means to be adored; which is a great argument either that it was so decreed by the Synod of Frankfurt, or certainly that nothing was defined by it to the contrary. For it is not probable that such men would have thought anything concerning the faith which conflicted with what had been established a little before in the Western Church, in which they flourished, in a most ample and most frequent assembly.

The Jesuit Vasquez, who denies that the Nicene Synod was condemned by the Frankfurt one, overcome by so many arguments, concedes indeed that Hincmar and all those ancient writers whom we have mentioned above did affirm this; but he contends that what they affirm is false; from Vasquez, *On Adoration*, book 2, disp. 7, ch. 4. and he wishes that all, deceived by the false relation of Pseudo-Carolus, committed this lie to writing and propagated it to posterity. But this response of Vasquez is so absurd and so abhorrent from every appearance of truth, that the Jesuit Suarez likewise, from Suarez, vol. 1 on the third part of Thomas, disp. 54, sect. 3, and with him Binius, in his notes on the Council of Frankfurt, have exploded it, hissingly rejected and confuted with many arguments. For who would think that so much should be attributed to the testimony of a single Jesuit, a man born just the other day, that, content with his sole faith and affirmation, he should believe that so many and such grave men, almost all dead for seven centuries, have handed down and disseminated so gross and so illiberal a lie with one consent, especially concerning a matter which was transacted either in their own memory or a little before in a most celebrated and by far most illustrious assembly, and in the presence of that Prince, greater than whom our West has seen none since Constantine? If, as Vasquez wishes with the others, the second Nicene Synod was first approved at Frankfurt, and from there received by all churches everywhere, how did it happen that those authors did not examine and scrutinize more diligently the Caroline work, in which, if these men are to be believed, they found a narrative so dissonant and so alien from their own faith and from the use of all the churches? that they did not think it should be inquired into further? that they did not interrogate their elders, from whom they could have been taught the whole matter with no trouble, because the memory of the Synod of Frankfurt, recent and almost still alive, would have remained in the minds and

conversations of men even to their age? What need of many words? Those authors either drew what they report—that the Nicene Synod was condemned by the Frankfurt Fathers—from the one book of Charles, or they received it from others. If from others, Vasquez labors in vain to concentrate the odium which he strives to establish for this narrative on the one Caroline work. But if they received it from that one alone (which itself, however, is far from every appearance of truth), in vain do Vasquez and the fellows of Vasquez try to undermine the credibility and authority of this work. For we cannot be persuaded by their bare affirmation to repudiate as false and full of lies a book which they themselves confess was read and received by very many and very grave men, and those living in that century which was both closest to the sources of truth and was far removed from the partisan studies of today. If those ancients thought that faith was to be given to the Caroline work, I do not see why the authority of the Jesuits ought to deter us from following the ancient example and giving faith ourselves also to this work. And so those brilliant arts of Vasquez finally come to this, that what he himself strives to overturn, he himself confirms, and on the contrary, he vigorously overturns what he especially desires to be confirmed. Indeed, even setting aside the consensus of the witnesses whom we have recently heard, that one book of Charles, which Vasquez and the others of the same flock hold in such contempt and contumely, would abundantly suffice to prove what we contend; namely that the second Nicene Synod was truly condemned in the Council of Frankfurt, since nothing at all is brought forth, as has been demonstrated at length by us in the preceding sections, which might weaken the authority of that work. And although Bellarmine by no means esteems that book in the place and number which it deserved, yet he did not think it unworthy of having this very cause confirmed by its testimony, as we have mentioned a little before.

But what need is there for arguments and testimonies against the frigid cavils of Copus and Vasquez, to teach what the judgment of the Synod of Frankfurt was on this cause? That very decree is still extant, published by Jean du Tillet, bishop of Meaux, also by those who edited the works of Alcuin, and finally by Sirmond himself, from which it was described by us above. In it, it is explicitly stated that "the question concerning the new Synod of the Greeks, which they had held concerning the adoring of images, was brought forward." Then the final Canon says: "Which above, our most holy Fathers, in every way despising adoration and servitude, rejected and unanimously condemned." By what name, then, is their audacity to be granted, who in such a great light of things desire to persuade us that the synod which was held at Nicaea by the Greeks to establish the adoration of images was confirmed and approved by the Frankfurt Fathers? Who not only defend and champion so immense a lie, but also display it in public and most authentic editions of the Councils, and do not hesitate to adorn and dignify the title of the Synod of Frankfurt with it? For they have prefixed this inscription to that Council: "The Provincial Council of Frankfurt, Approved, in which about 300 bishops condemned Elipandus and Felix, and their heresy which is called

Felician, AND CONFIRMED THE ACTS OF THE SECOND COUNCIL OF NICAEA IN THE CAUSE OF IMAGES"; from vol. 6 of the Councils, Paris edition. plainly as if someone were to publish the acts of the first Council of Nicaea with this title: "The First Universal Council of Nicaea, in which 318 bishops confirmed the dogma of Arius against the homoousion of the Son." O times! O morals! For the faith of God and man! But Jacobus Sirmond, a Jesuit, by far the most learned and most modest man of that order, has so bravely and so ingenuously confessed the truth openly of late, that all contention between us on this cause seems to be superfluous hereafter. For in the second volume of the Gallican Synods which he edited, he has exhibited the fifty-six canons of the Council of Frankfurt, the second of which is the very one we described above. from Sirmond, vol. 2, Councils of the Gallican Church, p. 191, admonition to the reader. He has prefixed to the work an admonition to the reader, in which he both acknowledges the four Caroline books on images and these very Frankfurt canons to be true and legitimate, and confesses that the second Nicene Synod was attacked by them. It seems worthwhile to transcribe the words of the most learned man: "But now," he says, "almost all acknowledge both the canons of the Synod (he means Frankfurt) and the books of Charles as legitimate, and they similarly agree that there was a question about the Nicene Synod, as is plain from the books themselves. And concerning the books of Charles, indeed, to omit Hincmar, who testifies that these were read by him, no one can deny, unless he wishes the credibility to be detracted from the response or confutation of Pope Adrian to the same books, which is in the hands of all. Concerning the Canons which follow, however, that they too are true and sincere, it is certainly not permitted for us to doubt on account of the authority of a most ancient codex, to say nothing of many writers of that century, who while they relate that the seventh Synod was rejected by the Frankfurt one, tacitly signify this according to the canon of which we are treating." And thus it has been sufficiently demonstrated, unless I am mistaken, that the Synod which was condemned by the Frankfurt Fathers was truly the Nicene one, which a few years before had established the cult of images in the East; which is also the opinion of Cardinals Bellarmine, Baronius, and Perronius. Now let us see what these men object, by which to diminish the authority of so great and so venerable a Council; in which both 300 bishops chosen from all the provinces of the West had convened, and Charles himself was present, the eternal glory of the Gauls, the restorer of the empire, and (what is greater than all titles) the pillar of Christianity, the scourge of infidelity and heresy; over which Pope Adrian presided through the bishops Theophylact and Stephen, sent from Rome to convene this assembly; in which, finally, the heresy of Elipandus and Felix, an offshoot of Nestorianism, was crushed and overthrown, so successfully that even Rome itself has always held its decree on this head as a true and legitimate definition of the Church.

What can the adversaries bring against so illustrious and so eminent an authority, which seems to have lacked nothing at all of those things by which it

happens (according to their opinion, at least) that the judgment of such assemblies is infallible and unerring? They respond, as we have already touched upon above, that all those best and most holy Fathers decreed truly and unerringly concerning the affair of Felix; but concerning the Nicene matters, falsely and wrongly through error, materially, since being deceived they were ignorant of the deed of the Nicenes, though they held the law itself. "For," says Bellarmine, "the author of the Caroline books imposed upon the Synod, and foisted two lies upon it," from Bellarmine, *On Images*, ch. 14, §. Nor does it stand in the way. "One lie was, that it had been defined in the Nicene Synod that images should be adored with the cult of latria: the other, that that decree was made by the Greeks without the consent of the Roman Pope. The Synod of Frankfurt, having taken these two lies as truth, reprobated, and deservedly, the Nicene Synod as profane and illegitimate." This is the defense of those men, all of whose subsequent labor is consumed in this, that they may prove both that those two things which they have mentioned were false, and also that they were served up to, and persuaded upon, the Frankfurt Fathers. We, indeed, have already abundantly vindicated the credibility of Charles from so immense a crime above; and this one thing is sufficient to refute and overturn this whole response, which rests on no other foundation than this rotten and empty one. But now I also add this to the preceding, that if (what is by no means true or credible) the author of the Caroline work had written those two things, it would not thereby be established that it is probable that the Frankfurt Fathers were ignorant of what had truly been the decree of the Nicene Council on this cause. This invention, indeed, is so gross and absurd, and so badly stitched together, and alien from every appearance of truth and from all the individual circumstances of the matter, that neither the purple, nor the erudition, nor the subtlety, nor the fame of those who defend it could deter even men of the same party from openly speaking against it. They certainly who edited the Councils at Cologne were so far from approving this whole fiction that they were not afraid to write that "it is in no way credible," and the opinion which follows it, having prefaced that they were, as it were, "unwillingly led away from it by the reasons," they attack it manfully, and they lash the purpled fathers with a most free disputation; from the annotations on the Council of Frankfurt; indignant, I believe, because they saw that the response which they themselves defend was in turn assailed by them. And in this part, indeed, they rightly dissent from their Cardinals.

For who is so ineptly credulous as to allow himself to be persuaded of what those men imagine? that in three hundred prelates, who had been chosen and sent from the whole West for the greatest affairs of the Church, there was no one who knew what had been decreed and defined in the recent Nicene Synod? Not a whole seven years had yet elapsed since that Synod in question had been held in the midst of Greece with so great a concourse of men and with such applause that nothing was lacking for the highest celebrity. For both they were present whose authority was by far the greatest in the Christian world, the Augustus

Constantine, Irene the mother of the Augustus, the legates of the Pontiff Adrian; in addition to these, 350 bishops, and the outcome of the affair had been such that nothing greater or more illustrious could have been done in the Christian republic. For indeed, if we believe the adversaries, the entire Church of the East had been liberated from a most grave and most bitter yoke; the most foul heresy of the Iconoclasts, which for thirty-three years had been raging most cruelly, had been most happily overthrown, and truth had been, as it were, recalled to light after an exile. With what speed ought the news of so joyful and so magnificent a thing to have been carried and to have penetrated into all the shores and corners of the Christian world? With what ardor of minds is it fitting that the fame of so desired an event was both spread by the Greeks and imbibed and received by the other Christians? And yet in this so great and so universal concourse of men, some narrating, others listening, all exulting and rejoicing for joy of mind, not only our Gauls, but also all the Western Christians are imagined to have been so dull, so stupid, and so foolish, that out of all their bishops not even one was found who had learned certainly and truly what had been done in Greece. But let it be so; that the long distance of places, and the commerce of peoples divided from each other by the greatest spaces, brought it about that this news remained hidden from our men for some months. Who would believe that for six whole years nothing true, nothing certain was brought to them? With the leave of these men, let me say it: he holds our ancestors for mushrooms and logs, who attributes so much stupor to them, and us for children and fools, to whom he does not hesitate to narrate so inept and so insipid a fable.

Let us imagine, however, what those men affirm, that none of the bishops of the West received anything certain from the Catholic Greeks, and that this happened either through their stupor or through the sloth and negligence of these latter; who, however, would grant that Adrian, that father, as they boast, of all Christians, especially of the Westerners, was of so harsh and unmerciful a mind towards his own children that he envied them the sweetest message of so great a thing? and did not even make Charles, a man (as Bellarmine recently proclaimed) most closely joined to him, a participant in so great a joy? This indeed, unless one is wanting in mind and deprived of common sense, who would believe? In which cause I am the more incensed at Bellarmine, because he wishes our ancestors, lest any contumely be lacking, to have been deceived not by some cunning or crafty artisan, but by "a barbarous, unskilled, frivolous, and almost stupid man," from Bellarmine, *On Images*, c. 15, §. Finally, it is certain. For with these epithets he elsewhere adorns that very writer of the Caroline work, whom he now contends imposed upon the Synod of Frankfurt. He wishes that both Charles and the 300 bishops who were present, impelled by the voice and authority of so grave and so excellent a witness, persuaded themselves of this concerning the entire Church of the East, which Binius thinks should not be esteemed even of heretics themselves, or of anyone who professes the faith of Christ; from the annotations on the Council of Frankfurt; namely that that Church, publicly and openly in a most frequent Synod, had defined that error

which is so gross and so immense that it hardly befalls the Gentiles themselves. For what does Bellarmine think the Frankfurt Fathers thought of the Nicenes? That they perhaps had decreed for the images of Christ and the Saints an analogical cult of latria and dulia? That they had simply defined that some images should be worshipped with latria? If he thought the former, he would accuse no one of slander; for he thinks that this was truly the opinion not only of the Nicenes, but also of the Frankfurt Fathers themselves. If he thought the latter, not even so would he write that the Frankfurt Fathers would have deservedly reprobated the Nicene Synod for so thinking, as profane, since Thomas, or Bonaventure, or Marsilius, or Cajetan, and not a few others, whom Bellarmine himself reports to have thought that the image of Christ and the cross was to be adored with the cult of latria, had not yet been excommunicated from the Roman Church, from Bellarmine, *On Images*, c. 20, §. The third opinion. What then, in the end, is it that Bellarmine wishes the Frankfurt Fathers to have thought concerning the Nicene definition? He, indeed, contends that they so esteemed of the Nicenes, that they thought that they had decreed that images were to be adored as so many gods, and on that account to be pursued with that very cult which is owed to the Trinity, directly and properly. If this is to be believed, was not the charity of both Charles and those prelates then marvelous, who attributed so immense and so prodigious a madness to the entire Oriental Church? Was not their acumen extraordinary, who allowed themselves to be persuaded of so horrendous and so iniquitous a calumny by the authority and testimony of one man, and indeed a barbarous, unskilled, frivolous, and almost stupid one? who, what one Jesuit could discover eight hundred years after the event, they all, when the matter was almost still present and before their eyes, were unable to notice? namely that the witness who was imposing on them was vain and inept? Does not the adversary, finally, make the wisdom and gravity of those Fathers admirable, does he not make them most worthy to sit in the tribunal of the world and of the Church, whom he imagines to have been so led astray by the voice of one scoundrel, that with no more accurate disputation, with no inquiry made concerning a matter of such great moment, they immediately, without any hesitation, condemned a most ample Council, that is 350 bishops, and all the Christians of the East in whose name they had convened, of a most shameful and almost portentous crime?

But if this cavil of Bellarmine and Baronius were contumelious only against the bishops of Gaul and Germany, I would indeed wonder less at it. This, however, seems plainly stupendous, that men most zealous for the Pontifical dignity did not think that even the legates of Adrian should be spared, whom by this fiction of theirs they transform, as it were, into so many trunks, and mute and deaf effigies. For these men (if faith is to be had in them) watched, stunned and astonished, a nefarious and pestilent calumny being served up to a most holy and most reverend assembly, and being imbibed by the prone ears of all; they suffered an impostor to run rampant with impunity; they did not demand him for punishment; they did not accuse, or at least insinuate, slander or falsehood;

they did not, what the common charity of all Christians and especially the affair of the Pontiff himself demanded, admonish the Synod over which they presided concerning the true opinion of the Nicene Council. For that they did this indeed, but in vain, and that both Charles and the Fathers spurned the voices of those admonishing, who would believe? since on the one hand there was a most close union both of the King with the Pontiff and of the Gallican Church with the Roman, and on the other hand the supreme stupor, and the supreme frivolity and incompetence of the slanderer? If the Frankfurt Fathers had been in any error, it is not to be doubted that Theophylact and Stephen would have driven it away with all their might, and would have taught them all truer things; and if they had done this, it is not credible that the Fathers would have remained in error, or certainly that they would have promulgated the decree which they had prepared against the Nicene Synod. And yet they neither changed the opinion which they had conceived in their minds; nor did they either omit or soften with any moderation their decree concerning the abrogation of the Nicene Synod; but (as Bellarmine, Baronius, and Perronius willingly concede) they most expressly condemned the definition of that Synod concerning the cult of images. Therefore, it must likewise be confessed that neither did the present legates of the Pope go against their preconceived opinion of the Nicene definition; whence it further follows that they esteemed truly, not falsely, of the whole matter, having been taught either by the letters of the Greeks, or of Adrian, or even (which is more probable) of both.

But why do I scrutinize with arguments whether the Frankfurt Fathers were well or ill taught concerning the Acts of the Synod of Nicaea, and from where they had received their knowledge of the things transacted there? Do not the ancients hand this down to us expressly and without ambiguity? Did not Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, write seven hundred years ago that the Synod of the Greeks "was directed into Francia by the Roman Pontiff"? and that this was the cause why "in the time of Charles, by the order of the Apostolic see, a general Synod was celebrated at Frankfurt"? With what faith is the insipid comment about the deceived Frankfurt Fathers now foisted upon us? With what shame is it imagined that either the Caroline books or those excerpts of the Iconoclasts, which no one either of the ancients or of the recent has mentioned, and which the entire human race had hitherto been ignorant of, until in our memory it pleased the Perronian brain, most fertile of such monsters, to dream them up at last, induced them into error? Hincmar says that Charles and the prelates of the Gallican Church received the Synod of the Greeks from Adrian, the Roman Pontiff, that is, either all the acts of the Synod, or (what I rather think) excerpts of the acts, and only the main points. The new Cardinals contend that they were deceived. If this is true, then it must necessarily be confessed that Adrian was the author of the fraud; that Adrian imposed upon our men and persuaded them that a divine cult for images had been decreed by the Nicene Fathers, and indeed without his consent. But if, as it is, this seems most absurd and incredible, and alien both from the very appearance of truth and much more from the

opinion of the adversaries, what remains but that they confess with us, and indeed with not a few of their own, that the Frankfurt Fathers were by no means deceived, but, having been well taught both by the letters of the Greeks and (as has been handed down by Hincmar) of Adrian himself, knew the true definition of the Nicene Council concerning images?

Indeed, I am reluctant to linger any longer in refuting so absurd and so incredible a comment. But I must nevertheless proceed, since it has pleased even the Bellarmines and the Perroniuses, that is, the most illustrious and flourishing intellects of those parties, to seize upon it. Let us imagine, therefore, what those men wish, that it did not befall our ancestors to obtain the true and sincere acts of the Nicene Synod, nor was there so much genius in them that they could detect and repudiate the gross lie of a barbarous and unskilled slanderer. Let us imagine that the legates of Adrian were so blind that, being present, they by no means noticed so great an imposture, so dull that they did not understand what would follow from it; finally, so mute that they were unable to convict and refute the fraud (when this could easily have been done with a single word); this certainly I do not think the adversaries will deny, that Charles and the prelates of Gaul and Germany who thought with him were finally freed from that error of mind which they attribute to them, after they received Adrian's letter written to the king on this subject, in which he teaches at length and explicitly that the Nicene Synod was celebrated neither against his will nor without his knowledge, nor had it decreed a divine cult for images. For if they themselves also held in their minds the opinion which was that of the Nicenes on this matter, having imbibed and received it in the Church from its very cradles; if, no differently than the Nicenes, they themselves also judged that images were to be worshipped and adored, and for no other reason did they flare up against the synod and definition of those men, than because through the highest error of mind they had thought it to be plainly different from what it really was; if, I say, these things were so, it is clear that when, the nebula of error having been dispelled, and that fascination, so to speak, having been loosed, they beheld the light with healed eyes, they ought to have awakened and come to their senses, to have revoked and rescinded the anathema which they had imprudently hurled at the heads of their undeserving brethren; to have execrated the barbarous slanderer by whose crime and impiety they had been driven to so great an outrage, and to have burned his books, and to have testified openly and publicly of the man's fraud, and to have warned all the bishops of the West, both present and future, to beware of the impure calumniator.

Now indeed it is established that none of all these things was done by them. No conversion or change of minds in Charles, in the others who had held the Synod at Frankfurt, or finally in the cisalpine churches followed the received letter of Pope Adrian. After that time, the Frankfurt decree was not rescinded, not tempered, not in any way changed; the four books against the Nicene Synod, which had been written in the name of Charles, were not burned, not

suppressed, not condemned. Nay rather, the same grace and the same honor remained for them among men. For it is established that in the succeeding times they were also preserved in the royal court, read, and held in the same price as before. "That volume," says Hincmar, a most noble writer of that century, Archbishop of Rheims among us, "I read in the palace as a youth"; and he himself makes so much of that work that he was not loath to transcribe the whole chapter from it which we have noted above. What mischief is this, so insolent and so unheard of a confusion of all things, that neither the lights, nor the thunderbolts, nor the warnings, nor the threats of the Pontiff Adrian (whose authority is proclaimed to have been supreme then among all the bishops of the West, and especially among King Charles) were able to either shake or wrest from their hands the book of an unlearned man? Then (what plainly overturns the comment of Bellarmine and the others), it is sufficiently established that neither by the admonition, nor by the objurgation, nor finally by the authority of Adrian or of others who thought with him, could the prelates of Gaul and Germany be deterred from persevering in the opinion they had undertaken, and most constantly repudiating the Nicene Synod and the cult of images defined by it. If, as the adversaries wish, no other effort was required among them than that they should be taught the true opinion of the Nicene Synod; were the Pontiffs who then sat at Rome so inhuman, or so rude and unskilled, that they either were unwilling or unable to perform this? And yet they contend that this service was timely rendered to them by Adrian, and that King Charles was warned that the Nicenes had decreed for images not latria, but only a religious veneration, and indeed with his own knowledge and consent. Since, therefore, it is established that our men, even after that admonition of the Roman Pontiff, nevertheless contemned and repudiated the Nicene decree, it necessarily follows that they, not through error and materially, as Bellarmine says, but knowingly and prudently, from a certain and true counsel of the mind, reprobated and condemned that Nicene Synod at Frankfurt.

CHAPTER V. That the decree of the Synod of Frankfurt was valid and was observed in the churches of Gaul and Germany is proved first indeed by the testimonies of Agobard, Jonas, Dungal, and Walafrid.

Indeed, that the prelates of the Western Church, even after those times, held the opinion defended in the Caroline books, and constantly repudiated all veneration of images whatsoever, is so manifest that Baronius and those who edited the Library of the Fathers confess, although unwillingly and indignantly, that the most noble writers of that memory were of that opinion. For which matter I do not wish here to employ a certain clause of that passage which we have described above from Hincmar, which has it thus: "By the authority of this (Frankfurt) Synod the veneration of images was somewhat repressed. But nevertheless Adrian and other Pontiffs persevered in their opinion, and after Charles died they promoted the cult of their puppets more vehemently." For these words, although cited and censured by Baronius himself in the name of Hincmar, as said inconsiderately and rashly, from Baronius, on the year of Christ 794, §. 63, I nevertheless do not think are truly Hincmar's. For when I diligently inspected the most ancient manuscript codex of that work from which they are asserted, I plainly noticed that they were wanting there, and that nothing else was to be found besides those things which have been represented with the best faith by the most distinguished man Corderius in his edition of Hincmar. And indeed, if we love the truth, it must be confessed that these things are by no means coherent with either the plan or the parts of that passage to which they have been wrongly stitched. Therefore, the matter having been more accurately weighed, I have finally come to this, that I do not think it is to be doubted that these are the words of the Magdeburg Centuriators, who after describing the passage of Hincmar which we have mentioned above, add these things themselves as a warning, from their own store, not from that of the author whom they praise; which both Baronius and not a few of our own men, deceived by the continuous and nowhere interrupted series of the oration, have imprudently held for the true and genuine words of Hincmar.

But other true and indubitable testimonies are not lacking, by which we may most clearly prove what we have now set out to prove. For this appears first of all from Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, a man not the last among the learned and illustrious men of his age, who it is established was born while Charles was reigning, but died while Louis, the son of Charles, was emperor, and not under the sons of Louis, as he thought who first published his works in the year of Christ 1605, Papias Massonus, which have been printed more often thereafter. Agobard, therefore, not only repudiated the opinion of the Nicene Synod, but moreover wrote a book, which is still extant, in which he disputed on this whole subject, and in it he sometimes proceeds so far that he seems to approach very closely to those whom they call Iconoclasts. For having begun from the

decalogue, and having recited the words by which it is forbidden that we should make any likeness, he says, from Agobard, *On Pictures and Images*: "It is understood to have been said not only of the likenesses of foreign gods, but also of celestial creatures, or of those which human sense has been able to devise in honor of the creator." Soon after, having described from Deuteronomy 4:12, 15 that famous passage in which Moses admonishes the Israelites that they had seen no form when they heard God speaking on Horeb, he subjoins these words, from Agobard, ibid.: "In which words," he says, "it is to be noted with the greatest care, that if the works of God's hands are not to be adored and worshipped, not even in honor of God; how much more are the works of men's hands not to be adored and worshipped, not even in honor of those whose likenesses they are said to be?" Which opinion he confirms with various reasons and with testimonies of Scripture and of the Fathers, especially of Augustine; ibid., much later. and having executed with many words how much visible things hinder the grasping of invisible things, and how much the love of corporeal things, even good ones, hinders the contemplation of spiritual things, he finally concludes that a faithful man, in order to progress, must be drawn from exterior things inward, not cast forth from interior things outward, so that he may fail. "For he ought," he says, "to pass from the flesh to the soul, from the body to the spirit, from visible things to invisible, from the world to God. And this is said to be progress if one passes to better things, not to worse. But that the soul is better, the body worse, the spirit more eminent, the flesh lowest, is known from Augustine," he says. ibid., a little later. "But that those things which human and carnal presumption fashions are much worse than these," he says, "even fools agree." ibid., soon after. "In which genus are also found those which they call holy images; sacrilegious not only from this, that they exhibit divine cult to the works of their own hands, but also foolish in attributing holiness to those images which are without a soul. And not only this, but also in dementedly conceding that sanctification which the Apostle testifies is made by the word of God, to those idols which have never spoken." Then after he has proved from the Scriptures and the Fathers that religious cult is owed to no one except God, he disputes thus, ibid., a little after: "Since," he says, "it is the one opinion of all that the cult of religion is owed to God alone, what remains for the faithful, but that with our souls purged from all profane servitude of figments, we should strive with all our might, so that we may be able to say truly that which is written: 'For the evil device of men's art did not lead us into error, nor the shadow of a picture, a labor without fruit, an effigy sculpted by various colors, the sight of which gives desire to the senseless, and he loves the effigy of a dead image without a soul'; those are lovers of evils who have hope in such things, and those who make them, and those who love them, and those who worship them." And so that he may snatch away from the patrons of images every color and excuse for error, he says, ibid., continuing, p. 237: "Perhaps someone will say that he does not think that there is anything divine in the image which he adores, but that he gives it such veneration only for the honor of him whose effigy it is; to

whom it is easily answered, that if the image which he adores is not God, it is by no means to be venerated, as if for the honor of the Saints, who by no means arrogate divine honors to themselves, as has been shown by many testimonies above." In which place, from ecclesiastical history, he recalls that when the shrines and idols of the idols had been destroyed at Alexandria, ibid. a little later, "the standard of the cross was painted everywhere, not any likeness of a human face. For," he says, "if those who had abandoned the cult of demons were ordered to venerate images of the Saints, I think that it would have seemed to them not so much to have abandoned idols, as to have changed their images." ibid., continuing. As for what pertains to the images of the Apostles and of the Lord himself, he responds that they "were expressed by the ancients more for the sake of love and remembrance than for the honor of religion or any veneration in the manner of the gentiles"; and he confirms this from the passage of Eusebius cited by us above, in which the narrative of the statue of Christ at Paneas is had. Then from the acts of Pope Sylvester he relates, ibid. a little later, that the Emperor Constantine, not yet reborn from the font of life, recognized the faces of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul from tablets shown to him by the aforesaid Pope, in which the effigy of each Apostle was preserved, expressed of old for memory, just as they had been shown to him in a vision by night, and immediately adored them; "But," he says, "are we on this authority of Constantine to adore the image of any Saint? since the same emperor did this more from the pestiferous custom of idolatry than from the consideration of the truest reason, which he himself had not yet known?" Soon after, with a few things interspersed, he not obscurely approves the opinion of those who are called Iconoclasts by their adversaries, pag. 243. "If the bronze serpent," he says, "which God commanded to be made, because the erring people began to worship it as an idol, the religious King Hezekiah broke with great praise of his piety; much more religiously are the images of the Saints (the Saints themselves also favoring this, who most indignantly bear that they be adored in the manner of idols for their own honor with contempt for divine religion) to be broken in every way and to be scraped even to dust, especially since God did not command them to be made, but human sense devised them." Then from Augustine he demonstrates that even the Pagans themselves acknowledged that God is more chastely venerated without images; ibid., after many things, p. 252. and with many other things observed against the cult of images, "Let no one deceive himself," he says, "let no one seduce himself, let no one circumvent himself: Whoever adores any picture or molten or ductile statue, does not exhibit cult to God, does not honor the Angels or holy men, but venerates idols. The crafty and cunning enemy of the human race does this, forsooth, that under the pretext of honoring the Saints he may reintroduce idols, that he may again be adored through diverse effigies, that he may turn us away from spiritual things, and submerge us in carnal ones; ibid. and that in all things we may be worthy to hear from the Apostle: 'O foolish ones, who has bewitched you, and are you so foolish, that having begun in the spirit, you are now being made perfect in the flesh?' For Satan himself, as the

same Apostle says, transforms himself into an angel of light." Then a little after, ibid. p. 253: "Let us look at the picture," he says, "as a picture, lacking life, sense, and reason. Let the eye be fed by this vision; but let the soul venerate God." Soon after, ibid.: "For the ancients also had images of the saints, either painted or sculpted (as has also been shown above), but for the cause of history, for remembering, not for worshipping; as for example, the acts of synods, where the catholics were painted supported by the catholic truth, and victorious; but the heretics, convicted by the lies of their perverse dogma, were detected and expelled for the remembrance of the firmness of the catholic faith, according to the custom of wars, both external and civil, for the memory of the event, as we also see in many places. But no one of the ancient Catholics ever thought that they should be worshipped or adored." To these he praises the above-cited decree of the Synod of Elvira, ibid. a little after: "It was decided that there ought not to be pictures in the churches," the clause of which he reads thus, "nor (and not, as we now have it, lest) what is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls." Then he complains of the men of his own age, who, having transgressed the boundaries of the ancients, celebrated masses over figments of this kind. ibid. a little after, p. 254. "For the error," he says, "had not yet emerged, by which now a figured effigy of coals and minium or sinople would be called a holy image, and would be preached as adorable. Nor let crafty cunning again have recourse to its fraudulent hiding places, to say that it does not adore the images of the Saints, but the Saints. For God cries out: 'My glory I will not give to another, nor my praise to graven things.'" But these things from Agobard are sufficient. For his whole booklet would have to be described by us from head to toe, if we wished to adduce whatever he has pertaining to this.

In the same times, indeed, a certain Claudius, a Spaniard by birth, but educated in the court of the Emperor Louis, lived, whom Louis, so that he might provide for the sacred doctrine of the Italian people (who for the most part were far from the senses of the holy Evangelists), had substituted as prelate for the Church of Turin, as Jonas says in the preface to the work which he wrote against him, from Jonas of Orléans, preface to his books, vol. 4 of the Library of the Holy Fathers, p. 536. This Claudius, therefore, felt plainly the same about this subject as Agobard. For when he had noticed that the people of Turin were most superstitiously addicted to the cult of pictures, in order to remedy so great an evil, he followed that reason which Serenus of Marseilles two hundred years before, and in more recent memory the Synod of Constantinople in the East, had approved, and having removed the images from all the churches of his parish, he replied most freely to Abbot Theodemir, who reprehended this institution of his, having also written a booklet on this subject; from which Louis, when it had been brought to him, sent certain excerpts to Jonas, bishop of Orléans. Jonas examined the excerpts and wrote three books against Claudius, which are still extant; and following the decree of the Synod of Frankfurt, and the opinion of Gregory and Charles, he indeed condemns the deed of Claudius, as full of intemperance and audacity; but everywhere he agrees with him that

images are in no way to be adored, which he wishes to be kept and used in the churches for no other purpose than for the ornament of the sacred edifices, for the delight and instruction of the unlearned, and for the memory of past things. For he confesses that the adoration of images is superstitious and pernicious; from the same, book 1, p. 537. he notes that some of the Orientals are enslaved to that most wicked error; ibid. p. 538. also that some of the Italian parts (for he speaks of them) labor greatly with it. But he denies that our Gauls and Germans are infected with that plague. "Who, I ask," he says, "are these who wish to adore painted lambs?" ibid. book 1, p. 572. "Is it the Gauls and the Germans, who not only decline to defer adoration to any picture, but also freely retort against those who adore, and rebuke them with as much invective as they can?" He had already said above that "all the most sincere worshippers of the holy catholic and apostolic Church inhabiting Gaul and Germany are immune from this superstition." And speaking of Gaul, he says, ibid., p. 547: "Which, for the reasons mentioned before, both has and permits images, but it holds their being adored and venerated in the cult of demons in great detestation and abomination." From which it is most clearly established that those ancient prelates of the Gallican Church neither were ignorant of the consensus of Italy with Greece in this error (as Bellarmine contends); nor did they think Italy so infallible and unerring that they considered it a sin to depart from its opinion and institution. For they testify that Italy labors with this disease equally as Greece, and they themselves carefully separate and remove the churches of Gaul and Germany from the Italian ones in this respect. Now indeed, that Jonas thought with Charles about images, the whole book cries out. For first, he always expressly, absolutely, and simply condemns their adoration, and nowhere does he either distinguish or except a cult which could legitimately be deferred to them. "Those who adore images," he says, "with that adoration which is owed to God alone, make themselves an anathema." from the same, book 1, p. 540. Then a little after, p. 541: "it is true, I say, and most congruent with the faith, that no likeness at all of all the things which are in heaven, or which are on earth, or which are under the earth, is to be made, to which the cult or adoration which is owed to God alone may in any way be exhibited." p. 542. Soon after: "But that a creature should be adored, and that anything of divine servitude should be paid to it, we hold to be a sin." The speech of this writer is everywhere the same; with no mention anywhere, or exception of any religious cult which is to be exhibited to images. Furthermore, he does not deny that the Italians (that is, those who had received the Nicene Synod with the Roman Pontiff) had erred; ibid. p. 539. he only contends that their error was not so grave as Claudius thought. "But it is credible," he says, "that although they spent some time in the cult and adoration of images, with ignorance deceiving them, they are in no way to be believed to have defected from the unity of the Catholic faith and to have been converted to idols." To this, he thinks that images are to be retained, no differently than Gregory and Charles, for the sole memory of past things. "Let images of the Saints," he says, "and every history of the Saints be permitted by you, not that

they may be adored, but rather that they may render a certain beauty, and may introduce a memory of certain past things to the senses of the unskilled, to be painted in the churches." ibid. p. 542. Elsewhere, when Claudius was detecting the deceit of the adversaries and reprehending those who, to fortify their error, responded: "We do not think that there is anything divine in the image which we adore, but we adore it with such veneration only for the honor of him whose effigy it is"; ibid. p. 547. Jonas testifies that this speech of theirs is not approved by him either; "But we," he says, "reprehend and detest one thing; because when it does not escape their knowledge that there is nothing divine in the images, they are worthy of greater invective, because they have paid the due honor to divinity to an infirm and needy image." Thus a little after, when Claudius had posited this sentence: "If the works of God's hands are not to be adored and worshipped; how much more are the works of men's hands to be adored and worshipped? certainly not in honor of those whose likenesses they are said to be"; ibid. p. 550. Jonas responds, "In the sense of this sentence, you think soberly with us." Furthermore, when Claudius added: "If the image which you adore is not God, it is by no means to be venerated with the honor of the Saints, who by no means arrogate divine honors to themselves," Jonas likewise says, "We entirely approve, and we judge it congruent with the Catholic faith." Finally, he defines his opinion in plainly the same way as Charles: "We," he says, "do not worship figures and images. We have images, however, and we do not censure those who have them." Dungalus, who at the same time also sharpened his pen against Claudius, from Dungalus's response to Claudius of Turin, vol. 4 of the Library of the Fathers, part 2, p. 155, sufficiently testifies that this was the opinion of the Gallican Church on that subject. For in that work which he wrote against him, and which is still extant today, he nowhere reprehends him for thinking that no adoration or veneration should be deferred to the images of the Saints; he only blames him for having broken them; and to prove that it is lawful for images of the Saints to be had and kept by Christians, he praises what Gregory had written to Serenus of Marseilles, and what Paulinus, bishop of Nola, had written about the pictures of Saint Felix. However, he nowhere contends that images are to be adored; and if he had done so, he would have openly departed from the opinion of Gregory, who (as we have demonstrated in its proper place above) thought that they should be had only for the instruction of the unskilled and for the memory of past things; And Dungalus himself explicitly professes this, ibid. p. 157: "Therefore, from this," he says, "those are not to be reprehended who have holy pictures, recalling divine histories through them to the praise and honor of God."

It is also plain that Walafrid Strabo thought the same, a learned writer and skilled in antiquity, in his book on ecclesiastical matters, in which there is one chapter on this subject. from Walafrid Strabo, *On Ecclesiastical Matters*, ch. 8, in the Library of the Fathers, vol. 15, p. 668. For in the first place he lays this down, that the variety of images is not "to be worshipped with a certain immoderate cult, as it seems to some foolish people; nor again is their beauty to be so

trampled with a certain contempt, as some assertors of vanity think"; by the former part of which sentence the Nicenes, by the latter the Iconoclasts, are not obscurely censured. Then against these he disputes that it is lawful for sacred places to be adorned with pictures and sculptures; but also against those he denies that any honor or divine cult is to be exhibited to things made by man, whether they were instituted to signify something mystical, in which genus he considers the entire structure of the ancient tabernacle and temple, or for the memory of past things, such as the painting of histories, or finally to excite and more deeply infix in the minds of beholders the recollection of outstanding men, to which the icons of Christ and the Saints pertain. And to this he refers those words of the divine law, "You shall not adore them, nor worship them. Whence," he says, "we may understand that in making these things, the devotion and utility by which we desire to be moved or instructed is not to be blamed, but in worshipping them, the superstition and dullness by which the erroneous strive to transfer spiritual cult to corporeal things is to be condemned." Soon after, he touches on the dissensions and contests of the Eastern Church on this subject; and he sharply attacks Claudius of Turin, because he attempted to renew the opinion of the Iconoclasts; and having testified that God alone is to be adored and worshipped, ibid. p. 669, he concludes: "honest and moderate honors of images are not to be rejected in every way," that is, as he himself opens his mind in the words immediately following, "pictures are not therefore to be trampled upon and destroyed, as if unnecessary or harmful, because we know that icons are not to be adored nor worshipped." ibid. He teaches what their use is, namely to instruct the more unlearned, so that they may learn from them what they cannot read in the Scriptures on account of their lack of skill. But he says nothing of that relative, as they call it, adoration or veneration, which the Nicenes and Romans think should be attributed to images; which he was not about to omit in this place, if he had thought the same as they. Finally, he concludes the whole chapter with these words: "Thus, therefore, images and pictures are to be had and loved, so that neither is their utility annulled by contempt, and this irreverence redound to the injury of those whose likenesses they are; nor is the sanity of faith wounded by immoderate cult, and honor too much paid to corporeal things argue that we contemplate spiritual things less." This, however, which we have signified to have been the opinion of Walafrid, Baronius willingly confesses and teaches with the same arguments, from Baronius, on the year of Christ 794, §. 41: "Walafrid Strabo," he says, "an author of the same century, is found to have been of plainly the same opinion, etc. For of what flour he himself was, is clearly to be seen, while he both teaches that only so much honor is to be attributed to sacred images, that they not be thrown down and trampled upon; and a little after he concludes that he teaches that images are to be preserved only for ornament, and for the instruction of the people in historical truth." These things Baronius says.

CHAPTER VI. The same is proved secondly from the book which is inscribed the Synod of Paris, whose truth and authority is asserted against the adversaries.

Indeed, the things which were done at Paris concerning this business of images while Louis, the son of Charles, was emperor, and of which that very Jonas whom we mentioned a little before was a part, so clearly illustrate and lay open this whole cause that no place for doubting is left. So that these things may be thoroughly understood, it must first of all be observed that the veneration of images was not so established in the East by the decree of the Nicene Council that the truth was plainly afflicted and oppressed, and gave no more trouble to error. For that very Constantine, in whose boyhood we have shown the Council of Nicaea was held, as an adult abrogated the decree concerning the adoring of images. Leo V, an Armenian by nation, having obtained the empire of the East in the year of Christ 813, restored the Constantinopolitan Synod, and from its definition he removed images from the temples, and he removed from their dignity the bishops who defended and retained them. Zonaras relates this occasion for his institution, from Zonaras, vol. 3, p. 105-107: when at one time those divine words of Isaiah were being recited in the Church, "To whom have you likened the Lord? Does the craftsman make his image? or did the goldsmith prepare his likeness?" and the rest, Patriarch Theodore approached and said in the emperor's ear: "Hear the Prophet, Lord, and obey him. from that time," says Zonaras, "without shame Leo followed that sect" (he means the Iconoclasts). When Leo was removed from the living, Michael, surnamed Balbus, succeeded him in the empire in the year of our Lord 820. He, when he saw the peoples torn into various studies and various parties, some execrating images with the Synod of Constantinople, others adoring them with the Nicene one, in the fourth year of his reign sent legates to Louis and his son Lothair, who were reigning in the West; and he wrote a letter, from the letter of Michael Balbus to Louis, in the Synod of Paris, p. 613, in which he first teaches how he obtained the empire, how he was exercised in various wars, how he crushed a certain Thomas, a leader of the Saracens and a deserter of the Christian faith, having broken him in several battles. Then he signifies what the disturbance of the Eastern Church is; from the same, p. 618, "many of the ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, having become aliens from the apostolic traditions, and not keeping the paternal boundaries, have become inventors of evil things. First indeed," he says, "they expelled the honorable and life-giving crosses from the sacred temples, and in the same places they set up images, and they placed lamps before them, and at the same time burned incense, and they held them in such honor as the honorable and life-giving wood on which Christ our true God deigned to be crucified for our salvation. They sang psalms and adored, and sought help from the same images. Many, however, wrapped the same images in linen cloths, and made them godmothers for their sons from the font of baptism. Others, wishing to take up the religious monastic habit, postponed more religious persons, who were

formerly accustomed to receive the hair of their head, and having brought in images, they allowed their hair to fall as if into their bosoms. Some of the priests and clerics, scraping the colors from the images, mixed them into the oblations and the wine, and from this oblation after the celebration of the masses they gave to those wishing to communicate. Others, however, placed the body of the Lord in the hands of the images, from which they had those wishing to communicate receive it. Some, indeed, spurning the Church, in common houses, used tablets of images for altars, and celebrated the sacred ministry upon them, and many other things similar to these and contrary to our religion were done in the churches, which seemed to be quite unworthy to the more learned and wiser men." For which causes he states that the orthodox Emperors and the most learned priests had decided "to assemble a local Council to hold an inquiry concerning these things; and that those who had convened had forbidden by common counsel that such things be done anywhere; from the same, p. 619, that they had had the images removed from the lower places, and had permitted those which were placed in the more sublime places to remain in their places, so that the picture itself might be had for scripture, lest they be adored by the more unlearned and weaker, but they had forbidden that lamps be lit for them, or that incense be burned; and that he himself so thinks and holds, and casts out of the Church of Christ those who study such malign inventions." Whence, to mention this in passing, it seems to be concluded that the Greeks, having obeyed the opinion of Charlemagne and the Synod of Frankfurt, had remitted something of the rigor of the Constantinopolitan Synod. For while this latter broke the images and entirely ejected them from the sacred edifices, Michael, as it appears, with his followers repudiates indeed their veneration and cult, but retains the images themselves; and he only removes from the churches those which, because they were placed in lower and more obscure places, being so useless for the instruction of men, seemed to have been instituted for this purpose only, that they might be adored.

But to return to the matter, Michael proceeds and adds that "some of those who were unwilling to accept the local Councils and to be refuted by the truth, fled from Greece and came to Rome, inflicting injury and calumnies on the Church, and detracting from the true religion." Omitting the blasphemies of these men, he professes that he both preaches and inviolably holds in his heart the creed of the six universal Synods; and he expounds the main points of that creed. He advises that he has commanded his legates to go to Rome and to deliver his letters to the Pope along with some small gifts. He asks Louis to be willing to help them on that journey and to support them with his favor; and to command the Pope that "if hereafter some manifest seducers, Pseudo-Christian slanderers of the Church, should be found, to expel them from there," from the same, p. 620. Louis, having received these letters, having seized so excellent an opportunity for uniting the Church, sent Bishop Freculfus and Adegarius to Rome, to procure and promote the business of the Oriental legates. But when they perceived that the minds of the Romans were affected far otherwise than

was fitting, they petitioned the Pope that it might be permitted through him for Louis, together with his bishops, to inquire familiarly into the truth of so great a matter, from the same, p. 629-630. This license having been obtained, p. 627, he selected some of the most learned men from the clergy who then presided over the Church, and convened them at Paris, having ordered them to scrutinize and define this whole cause as accurately as could be done. They, indeed, when they had convened on the Kalends of November in the year of Christ 824, the matter having been deliberated, wrote a long letter to the Emperors Louis and Lothair, in which they teach that they, in order to know the whole matter better and more certainly, first read the letters of Pope Adrian formerly directed to the Emperor Constantine and his mother Irene for the erecting of images, at their request; and that he indeed justly reprehends those who with rash daring had presumed in those parts to break and utterly abolish the images of the Saints; but that he had acted indiscreetly in this, that he had superstitiously ordered them to be adored, and for their cause had also commanded a synod to be gathered, and by his authority had decreed under oath that they should be erected and adored and be called holy, when it is lawful to erect them, but truly a sin to adore them. To this they note, and rightly indeed, that "Adrian had inserted in that epistle certain testimonies of the holy Fathers, very dissonant and by no means pertinent to the matter which was being treated." They add from the text of this epistle that "the Emperor and the clergy, and at the same time also the people, taking authority, had made a synod; in which, just as those had much deviated, who in that other synod, which was made under Constantine the grandfather of the aforementioned Constantine, had decreed that the images of the Saints should be utterly abdicated, from the same, p. 628; so these had not moderately erred, who sanctioned not only that they should be worshipped and adored and be called holy, but even professed that they obtained sanctification from them." Then they say that the Fathers of that Synod, that is, the Nicene, "seem to have taken certain testimonies of the sacred Scriptures and sayings of the holy Fathers to confirm their superstitious error"; which indeed, how truly it was noted by them, the Acts of the Nicene Council, which are still extant today, sufficiently and more than sufficiently teach. And here they explain how Charles, the parent of this Louis to whom they are writing, when he had had the same synod read before himself and his followers, and had reprehended it in many places as was worthy, had noted certain chapters which were open to reprehension, and had directed them by Abbot Engilbert to the same Pope Adrian, so that they might be corrected by his judgment and authority. "But that Adrian, again favoring those who by his instigation had inserted such superstitious and such incongruous testimonies into the mentioned work, had endeavored to respond for their excuse through individual chapters, what he wished, but not, however, what was fitting. For such indeed are some of the things which he opposed to their objection, that being removed, they resist both the truth and the authority moved by pontifical authority. They excuse the man, however, and conclude from this that he

deviated from the right path in that deed not so much knowingly as ignorantly, because although in the objections themselves he strove to bring forward for the sake of defense testimonies that were sometimes dissonant, sometimes unsuitable, and sometimes even worthy of reprehension, yet at the end of the same Apology he professed that he felt, and held, and preached, and commanded concerning these matters as it was established to have been instituted by the Blessed Pope Gregory.

Here they record that Bishop Freculfus explained to them by word of mouth how he and Adegarius, his associate, had dealt with the Pope and his ministers on this matter; and that from his account they had learned everything about how, partly from ignorance of the truth, partly from the use of the worst custom, the plague of this superstition had become ingrained in those parts (that is, in Rome and in the rest of Italy). They praise the just sorrow of the Emperor, which arose from the fact that he saw those deviating in some way from the right path who, endowed with the highest authority, ought to have corrected all who were deviating. They extol the zeal of the same Prince, who, when he saw two constituted in peril and declining from the royal way—one, that is, on the left, having fallen into the abyss of breaking images; the other, however, on the right, inclined to the superstitious adoration of the same images—wished to oppose himself as a mediator with an affect of piety, and to confer a salutary medicine on the disease of both parties.

But above all they praise his prudence and skill, that when he saw that the party which ought to have corrected errors was lending support to superstition, he obtained from that same party the license to seek the truth of so great a matter familiarly with his own people, so that (they say) "by your holy desire and vigilant study, the truth, being laid bare, when it showed itself in the midst, that very authority also, willing or unwilling, would yield and succumb to the truth." Then they reveal their counsel on how the Emperor should handle so difficult and thorny a business; namely, that this work should be so tempered by him that whatever is known to be worthy of reprehension in both parties should rather be referred to the person of the Greeks, who could be admonished freely, and whose scandal, if it arose for the sake of truth, could be more easily tolerated. But the Pope was to be soothed, praised, and preferred, and his authority to be extolled with great proclamations of praise, and due praise to be deferred to the Roman Church; yet in such a way that the truth from the testimonies of the holy Scriptures and the sentences of the holy Fathers be brought forth into the midst, and be explained truthfully and soberly. In such a way it seemed to them that the Emperor could be of service to the salvation of both parties; nor was it believable that the Pope, although favoring a superstitious custom, would presume to command anything otherwise than as authority and truth have it, for he would fear the power of Louis, the authority of the See, and the testimonies of the truth. Finally, "although either these or those may have wished to deviate in some point, and may have contemned to

hear his most salutary admonition, which is brought forth entirely from the authority of truth, no less a recompense will be made to him for it by the Lord, because, according to the words of the Blessed Prophet Elijah, he will have striven to do what was his part."

Then they say that they, coming together in one place, and familiarly conferring according to the capacity of their understanding, have collected testimonies from divine authority and sentences of the holy Fathers, as the shortness of time permitted; and whatever they judged necessary and apt for the matter that was being treated, they have striven to gather into one, and to direct it to the imperial power through the venerable men Halitgarius and Amalarius, as stated on page 633 of the same book. They make excuse for the shortness of time, that being excluded by it, they collected neither as much as they wished, nor as much as they could, though they strove with all their might to obey his sacred commands. To this was added the fact that certain from their number, coming from afar, did not have the space to make inquiries; while some could not truly know the cause for which they were ordered to come to that assembly until they arrived; and Moduinus, detained by illness, was unable to come. Nevertheless, in what has been collected, the substance of this business is discretely comprehended, so that "any faithful person reading them can perceive that the images of the Saints are not to be broken by foolish presumption, nor abolished to the injury of the Saints, nor utterly despised, nor are they to be worshipped or adored with superstitious assertion; but rather, with superstition of this kind removed, according to true religion, they are to be had for the cause of memory and love, for the recollection of them whose images they are, as is declared to have been said quite catholically and perspicuously by the most blessed Gregory."

Furthermore, since some of them know by sight, and all by the report of others, the superstitious veneration of the Popes towards images, as they state on page 634 of the same work, they wished first to set down sentences against those who presumed to break images with presumptuous temerity, so that the latter, animated thereby, might more valiantly correct the errors of the others with the Emperor, and might more easily bend their minds to acknowledging their own superstition and to receiving the testimonies of truth. And for the same reason that they have already stated, they now also judge that the discourse of Louis should be directed everywhere against those to whom the above-mentioned epistle was directed; "because its text demonstrated that both parties were worthy of reprehension: both that which venerated images with an undue and superstitious cult, and that which ordered the same images to be overturned and destroyed from lower places." And they think that "although that same Emperor (that is, Michael) did other things according to the authority of truth as is contained in his writings, yet on account of this deed he scandalized certain weak persons of those parts, and also disturbed certain people of the city of Rome."

Having stated these things, they present to Louis a rather lengthy collection of various passages from different books of the Fathers, distributed into certain chapters; of which the first to occur, according to the plan and order mentioned above on page 635, is that "which is against those who presume to abolish images indiscriminately not only from houses, but also from sacred vessels." And here they adduce some of those things which are accustomed to be brought forward today by our adversaries in this cause, and which have been examined by us in their place in the preceding parts; such as that which is sought from Eusebius about the statue of Christ placed at Paneas by the woman; likewise others from the life of Sylvester, from Paulinus, from Gregory of Nyssa, and from Augustine.

In the chapter that follows, from various places of Pope Gregory, which have also been recited by us above, they show on page 641 "what discretion is to be held regarding having images of the Saints and pictures of histories." In the third chapter, on page 646, they turn the point of their style against those "who worship and adore images with an undue cult, and call them holy, and confess that they attain sanctity through them"; for they say they found it so inserted in that Synod of the Greeks, by which they mean the Nicene. They are occupied with the same argument in the chapters that follow, all the way to the fifteenth; and they praise almost the same testimonies which we have used in this cause, and among others the narrative of Epiphanius about the image at Anablatha; and just as Charlemagne did, they refute the objections and exceptions of the Nicene party; for example, about the top of Joseph's staff being adored by the patriarch Jacob, likewise about Nathan being adored by David, about the cult and veneration of the Cherubim and the ark, and other things of the same stamp. In the fifteenth chapter they return again to the Iconoclasts, whom they undertake to confute with various testimonies of the ancients, some also apocryphal, and most of them drawn from the Nicene disputation, from which in the sixteenth chapter they describe a long and rotten fable about a certain Jew named Sarantapechy, whom they wish to have been the first author of breaking and exterminating images.

To this they subjoin a copy of his epistle, which they thought should be written by Louis to the Roman Pontiff; in which, for those reasons which have been explained above, he first extols the Pope with great praises, and magnificently praises and proclaims his see and authority; then he persuades him, with a signification of the greatest humility, to write to the Easterners about images; and he shamefacedly excuses this audacity of his, that he undertook it, "not that he presumed to set a limit for his holy and God-given wisdom to progress higher and more sublimely, but lest he should cover in silence what the mercy of almighty God had deigned to confer upon him therefrom." For he says that he has striven to consider, not by congregating a Synod, but, as he had requested from the Pope and had perceived license to act, together with his familiars, what he could signify to his highness concerning so great a necessity, by which the same people of the Greeks could be recalled to true concord. To this epistle they

add a copy of a certain other, which they wished to be written by the Pope of Rome to Michael and Theophilus, Emperors of the East; in which is explained that plan of which we have spoken above, concerning removing the schism and reconciling the peoples of the East into one Church; the sum of which is this, as stated on page 734 of the same work: "that those who wish, for pious memory or sound doctrine, may have painted or fashioned images in competent places without any illicit cult; but those who do not wish, without any illicit contempt for those who have images in such a way, or for the images had, should in no way spurn them."

Louis, having received these letters of the bishops, writes to Eugenius, who in those times presided over the Roman Church. At the beginning, he recounts what he did upon hearing the legates of the East; he teaches that his bishops, according to the license granted by Eugenius himself, had sought and collected sentences from the books of the holy Fathers, which could be suitable for defining the cause of images truthfully. He says that what he has received from them he is sending to Eugenius to be read and examined, through the legates Jeremiah and Jonas, venerable bishops, very learned in the sacred letters, and not a little exercised in disputatious reasons; so that if he should think it worthy, he himself could have with them a not useless, but rather profitable, conference about sending a legation into Greece. He testifies that they have been directed by him not for the sake of teaching him, but of helping, if they can offer any aid in the present business. He asks that he deign to apply care and diligence, and to send that legation to the East which would be both worthy of that most sacred See, and suitable for extinguishing that fatal dissension which was raging over the business of images. If he desires any legates to be sent from himself also to Constantinople, he offers his services at length.

Louis sent these letters to Eugenius to be carried to Rome by the above-mentioned bishops, namely Jonas and Jeremiah; admonishing and commanding them, as stated on page 750 of the same book, that "they should handle the uncertain and slippery business with exquisite prudence and skill, and have a disputation with the Pope about this cause patiently and modestly; that they should take the utmost care lest by resisting him too much they compel him to fall into some irrevocable obstinacy; but that by gradually, as it were, obeying his words rather than openly resisting, they might be able to lead him to the measure which is to be held in having images." He bids that he be asked whether it pleases him that legates from Francia be sent with his own into Greece; if he should assent, he wishes to be made more certain of that matter as soon as possible, so that Halitgarius and Amalarius might be able to prepare themselves for that journey in a timely manner.

And these are entirely the things which are contained in the codex of the Synod of Paris; which book I am not at all surprised is exploded and hissed off the stage by Bellarmine and the others of the same party. For it vehemently attacks them,

and plainly disjoins and overturns all those exceptions and defenses which they were preparing against the Council of Frankfurt and the Caroline books. For it most clearly testifies that the Princes and prelates of our West truly repudiated the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning images, and thought that the images themselves were to be worshipped neither with latria nor with any relative adoration, and judged that they were to be had or retained in no other way than for the memory of things and the instruction of the ruder sort. It also teaches most openly that our people were not ignorant of what part Adrian and the other Roman Pontiffs had in this business, and that they spared them with no other plan, and dissimulated their zeal for this cause, except that by this clever and skillful economy they might more easily lead them from error to truth, from superstition to religion; whom otherwise, in suitable places and times, they do not fear to accuse with a most free voice. For here they pronounce roundly and without ambiguity that "Adrian acted indiscriminately," and "judged what was wrong"; and they say that the same man, in both epistles which he wrote about images, then to Constantine, then to Charlemagne, "inserted certain testimonies of the holy Fathers that were very dissonant, superstitious, and incongruous," and "attempted to respond what he wished, but not what he ought."

From that book also it is manifest that the efforts of Adrian were in vain, and that the Emperors themselves and the bishops of the West remained constantly in the opinion of the Synod of Frankfurt, and demanded of the Pope that he too should concede to the same, repudiating the error of the Nicene party. From which things it is necessarily concluded that nothing can be feigned more foolish or more mendacious than what our adversaries narrated above as certain and ascertained; namely, that the Frankfurt fathers condemned the Nicene Synod for the reason that they, through the highest error of mind and without the consent of the Roman Pontiff, falsely persuaded themselves that it had been celebrated and had decreed the cult of latria for images. It is therefore not surprising, or alien to his genius and custom, that Bellarmine rejects this book with the same audacity with which he is accustomed to reject others that are adverse to the tenets of his sect. But this would seem to me, indeed, deservedly surprising and unworthy, if the blindness of those men, contracted from excessive zeal for their cause, should make doubtful and uncertain to anyone the faith of that book, whose truth is so clear and so explored. For first, it was printed from a copy which had been described with the highest fidelity from the manuscript codex of Pithou, a most famous man, born, educated, and deceased in the communion of the Roman Church; in which he lived in such a way that he was esteemed to have excelled not only in erudition and letters, but also in probity, candor, and wisdom, and all other good arts. I myself have inspected the manuscript copy on parchment; which bears all the marks of great and venerable antiquity; so that it is permissible to employ here what Sirmondus wrote above in a similar argument, "Concerning this book, that it is true and sincere, it is certainly not permissible for us to doubt, on account of the

authority of the most ancient codex." Now, that the copies published by Bongars, then orator of the most Christian King in Germany, were truly and faithfully described from that codex, cannot be doubted. For if anything had been changed either by deceit or imprudently, men would doubtless have warned of that fault, who had, or now have, the manuscript codex in their power, namely, formerly indeed Pithou, but now the most ample Thuanus, both devoted to the sacred rites and communion of the Roman Church. And yet nothing of the sort has been done to this day, although more than forty-five years have passed since it was published at Frankfurt.

The things themselves, and the facts, which are contained in that book, are of such a kind that there exist explicit testimonies of ancient writers concerning most of them. For Eginhard, the Annals of St. Bertin, and the Annals of Metz mention this legation of the Greeks to Louis. But the continuator of Aimoin follows the whole matter almost in detail in his *Deeds of the Franks*, book 4, chapter 112: that Louis was met at Rouen by the legates of Michael; that the letters of Michael with small gifts were delivered to him; and that among the other heads of the legation they asked what should be done about images. And he said that the Pope should be consulted by him on that cause at Rome. Having heard them, and a response having been given, Louis took care that they should be led to Rome. Platina, in his life of Eugenius II, seems to have drawn what he relates on this matter, somewhat interpolated, from that place. If anyone desires the words of that writer (which are also found in Athelmus in the Annals for the year of our Lord 824), let him have these: "The Emperor returned to the city of Rouen, where he had ordered his wife to wait for him, on the 15th of December. For he had also ordered the legates of the Emperor Michael to meet him there, with whom also Fortunatus, Patriarch of Grado, having returned, came into his presence. But the legates of the Emperor, bearing letters and gifts, saying that they had been sent for the cause of confirming peace, spoke nothing on behalf of Fortunatus. Among the other things, however, pertaining to their legation, they brought forward certain things concerning the veneration of images, on account of which they said they ought to go to Rome and consult the prelate of the Apostolic See. When he had dismissed them, their legation having been heard and a response given, he ordered them to be led to Rome, as they said they wished."

But Dungalus seems to have had entirely in mind the inquiry about images made by order of Louis and his son Lothair, in the place where, writing against Claudius of Turin, he discloses that an inquiry "concerning the reason of painted images was held more diligently two years before in the palace among the most glorious and most religious Princes," as found in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tome 4, part 2, page 155, "where," he says, "by the examples and authority of divine Scripture, of the holy books, and of the most approved men who wrote them, it was found, confirmed, and defined quite evidently with how great and what kind of moderation and discretion they are to be had." Walafrid Strabo also testifies

the same, writing after Louis was already dead, in his work *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, chapter 8: "Finally, that same complaint of the Greeks," he says, "was brought to Francia in the times of the Emperor Louis of good memory, and was confuted by the providence of the same Prince in synodal writings." A most ancient manuscript codex of those synodal writings on parchment was found in our memory, not in the library of some Protestant, but of a man devoted to the Roman communion, whose skill, judgment, and faith in unearthing the monuments of antiquity all praise. The book itself is so written, and bears such marks of antiquity both in style and in the manner of disputation, and so alien to this our age, that it testifies as if with a clear voice that it was born not in our time, but in that very time to which it is attributed. What, finally, can our adversaries bring forward, by which to shake the truth of this writing, so fortified on all sides, so coherent in every part?

Here, indeed, Bellarmine comes forth into the battle line; and with a great voice he threatens that he will soon bring it about that "those who have published the little book will grieve that they have lost their oil and labor," as he writes in his appendix to the book on images, chapter 1. And to those who recently published the Councils, this labor of Bellarmine was so pleasing that they thought his whole disputation on this argument should be inserted into their work, in the place where the Synod of Paris itself ought to have been read. Let us try, therefore, what this promiser will accomplish.

"What worthy of so great a gaping maw will this promiser bring forth?"

At the beginning, as stated in the same work, he is indignant that what is contained in this little book is called a Synod, in which no decrees are to be seen, no Canons, no subscription of bishops, no mention, finally, of a Synod; that the little book itself openly refutes the vanity of this title, in the place where Louis, writing to Eugenius, denies that he has "congregated a Synod." But let it be so, since this pleases Bellarmine. For what does it matter by what title this book is called, as long as it is established that it contains the opinion of many bishops, formerly convoked at Paris by Louis by the grant and license of Pope Eugenius, so that they might together diligently inquire into this whole cause of images? If they envy the name of Synod for the common definition and opinion of those prelates, it is fine by us. For we are not so ineptly morose as to think we must fight over a single word. It is enough for us that this was the opinion concerning images of Freculfus, Adegarius, Jonas, Jeremiah, Amalarius, and the other principal prelates of the Gallican Church, and indeed approved by Louis, the best and most gentle of Kings, and ordered to be executed.

Then Bellarmine relates that this Michael Balbus, whose epistle is contained in this book, full of religious zeal and breathing the piety of a most Christian Prince, was a most wicked robber, who had obtained the empire by the worst arts and the nefarious murder of Leo. I for one am not unaware how little faith is

deserved in this cause by the authors whom Bellarmine follows here, namely Zonaras and Cedrenus, men of most well-known zeal for images, which this Michael persecuted in the East. Let us imagine, however, that he was entirely such as Bellarmine describes him to us; what force will this have to prove what he wishes, namely that this book is suspect and supposititious? The ancients testify that Michael wrote to Louis, and indeed concerning images. Bellarmine denies that this is his epistle. Why so? "Because," he says, "Michael was impious and wicked; but he who is introduced in this epistle uses a most honorable speech, full of religious zeal." O sharp argumentation! What? Did you hope, Bellarmine, that this man would reveal his own disgraces and the crimes of his mind, and would openly profess them? Are you so ignorant of the nature of fraud and crime that you think the impious never feign faith and piety?

But neither can our adversary bear that, as he states in chapter 2 of the same work, Michael narrates that there were men in Greece who practiced the superstitions or ineptitudes which he recounts in the cult of images; and he not only says that these are mere calumnies and impostures, but even proves it from the fact that the Nicene Council, celebrated thirty-five years before that time, is found to have commanded nothing of the kind. What would you do with those who profess that they know better and more certainly what was being done in Greece eight hundred years ago than those who were living in those very times? What, indeed, has the Nicene Council to do with these things, of which Michael makes no mention, commemorating only the sins and superstitions of his own time?

These things having been managed excellently, Bellarmine presses us with this invincible dilemma: "Either the Franks, who were counselors to Louis, had faith in the letters of Michael, or they did not. If they had faith, they were circumvented and deceived. If they did not have faith, they abused those letters to persuade the supreme Pontiff to rescind the acts of his predecessors." But this consequence of the Bellarminian argumentation rests on no foundation. For let it be that those men had faith in the letters of Michael; whence do you conclude that they were deceived, you who have not yet proved that anything was false in the letters of Michael? Let it be that the same men did not have faith; it does not follow from this that they wished to circumvent the Pope; for the plan which they themselves propose, they confirm with many of the best and most certain reasons, and indeed ones plainly alien to what is narrated in the epistle of Michael. But however the matter may be, whether those men were deceived, or wished to deceive, Bellarmine concludes this chapter by saying that "it was of no use to publish a little book of this kind, which could bring no utility, but very much detriment." Doubtless, to those men, whatever does not help the Roman cause is useless; whatever is adverse to its reasons, is harmful.

Bellarmine then comes to the epistle of the Gallican Prelates in chapter 3 of the same work, whom he gravely accuses because they dared not only to criticize

and censure the epistles of Adrian, but also the second Nicene Synod itself, and for that reason he says that those men "audaciously assumed for themselves a judgment over apostolic writings, and judged their own judge and that of the whole world, and taught the teacher of the universe"; than which temerity, he writes, none greater can be imagined. I confess, indeed, that those prelates, if their opinion of the Pope of Rome was the same as Bellarmine's, dealt with him so unjustly and beyond their right; and that they acted rashly, who dared to teach the supreme and unaccountable Doctor, and the master and infallible monarch of the universal Church, forsooth. But that those men thought far otherwise of him, this very fact that they deal with him so is the greatest argument. Now indeed, whether they thought rightly and truly, who thought that the Pope could err and be corrected by the admonition of his brethren, it is not for the present undertaking to inquire. For us now it is enough that they did not judge that images were to be adored, and freely reprehended both the Synods and the Pontiffs by whom it had been decreed. For there is nothing else that we are doing in the present disputation.

Bellarmine soon notes, in chapter 4 of the same work, that many testimonies were brought forward by those men that were little apposite to the cause they were pleading; such as the sayings of Basil and Gregory the Great, examined by us above in their place; and not a few other things ineptly and ignorantly inserted into this collection, as he judges. I, indeed, do not defend those things; and I freely confess that those men sin in many things; nor do I wonder, since they lived in that century in which letters lay almost oppressed in darkness; to say nothing of that shortness of time which they themselves also excuse. But if sins of this kind are to be judged to take away all authority from books, I do not see in what place and number are to be held the epistles of those whom Bellarmine just now called the judges of the world, and that very letter of Adrian, which he here does not hesitate to call most learned; most of which are so filled with many ineptitudes, so teeming with so many and so great paralogisms, written in so rustic and barbarous a style, that they need a certain heroic patience who would wish to read them all from head to heel.

But Bellarmine bears nothing more indignantly than that those, as he calls them, collectors dared to write a copy of an epistle to be sent by Pope Eugenius to the Emperors Michael and Theophilus, as he states in chapter 5 of the same work. That their deed deserved to be condemned for imprudence, I do not deny, if they held the Pope, just as Bellarmine does, for an unerring oracle. But since they plainly thought otherwise, and thought that the Pope was both a man, and could slip and err, and could be taught and could learn; I for one do not grasp why this plan of theirs should be esteemed inept and indecorous rather than that of Cyprian of Carthage or Cyril of Alexandria, of whom the former so often admonishes Cornelius, the latter Celestine, concerning those things which seemed ought to be either done, or said, or written. For Cyprian, indeed, however outstanding, was nevertheless one bishop; and Cyril similarly; but these

Gauls of ours were many; nor did they undertake to admonish or write about these things until after they were ordered to convene by the great and most Christian Prince Louis, having obtained the faculty for this from Eugenius, and to inquire seriously and accurately into the whole matter. To this is added that they temper that liberty of theirs with such prolix and such submissive circumlocutions of excuses, that they have rendered their whole oration, so many are they, not a little convoluted and impeded.

But Bellarmine notes certain things in this epistle which do not seem to befit the Pope. And if we grant that this is so, I do not see what this does for the present cause. Let us nevertheless inspect one by one what our adversary objects. First, therefore, he complains that "this epistle makes the supreme Pontiff a most impudent flatterer of the Emperor," when it speaks thus, "O venerable Princes of the world, with the entire holy Church of God, which by the disposition and commission of the Lord you govern." And below, "on account of uniting the Church, which by the ordering of the Lord God you rule." Bellarmine reprehends that a secular Prince governs and rules the Church; that a wicked Prince, who had tyrannically invaded the empire after his master and lord was killed, is said to reign "by the disposition and governance of God." Our adversary exaggerates this most invidiously, and makes a tragedy of it no differently than if the Christian cause were at stake. To the first, I respond that there is no cause why Bellarmine should begrudge the name of Church to the Greeks and other peoples of the East subject to the empire of Michael; whom he cannot deny were Christians, and indeed baptized. Does he think that the name of Synagogue should rather have been attributed to such, than that of Church? Nor do I see what this detracts from the authority and office of the Bishops. For if anyone were to say that David ruled and governed the people of God, he would not, I think, by that speech have either extinguished or diminished the offices and dignities of the high Priest and the other priests among the Hebrews. One and the same people, one and the same Church of the Lord, is ruled both by Princes and by bishops, but differently and in a different way; the latter, so to speak, spiritually, by spiritual reasons and means; the former, civilly, by civil means and reasons. However it may be, this is not a harsher speech than that which Amalarius used elsewhere, addressing the Emperor Louis thus in his preface to *On the Offices of the Church*, found in tome 10 of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: "Since we know," he says, "that you are the ruler of the entire Christian religion, as far as pertains to men." So also the sixth Synod of Paris, held in the year of our Lord 829, says in its preface, found in tome 6 of the Councils, page 321 of the Paris edition of 1636, that "Christ wished the Church, which he redeemed with his own blood, to be committed by his hidden dispensation to be ruled and protected by his orthodox servants Louis and Lothair, glorious Augusti."

To that which Bellarmine objects in the second place, I respond that God indeed forbids and detests parricides and murders; but he nevertheless cares for and dispenses kingdoms and republics, and decides concerning them. And so,

although that Michael had conducted himself against the will of God, he had nevertheless not obtained the empire without the will of God, that is, not without his decree and permission; so that it seems it can be said in a not disapproving sense that he reigned "by the disposition, commission, and ordering of God"; especially since Scripture is by no means abhorrent to such a phrase, which says that God gave ten tribes to Jeroboam, whose empire he had seized by the worst arts and with the highest injury to Rehoboam, as stated in 1 Kings 11:31. I am surprised that Bellarmine did not here come to mind of the letters of Gregory to Phocas, who had likewise obtained the empire by a dire and nefarious parricide, when he had most cruelly killed his master and Lord Maurice, together with his brother and five children. The best and most holy Pontiff congratulates the world and the Church on the dignity and reign of the impious robber; he bids the heavens to rejoice, the earth to exult, and the people of the entire republic to be joyful over the benign acts of Phocas, as recorded in his letters, book 11, epistle 36; and to this he refers what Scripture teaches, that "God changes the times and transfers kingdoms, and rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomever he wishes." Writing to Leontia, the wife of that parricide, on the same argument, in epistle 44, he says, "What tongue can speak, what mind can think, how great thanks we owe to almighty God for the serenity of your empire, that the hard burdens of a long time have been removed from our necks, and the light yoke of the imperial summit has been submitted to, which it is a pleasure for subjects to bear? Let glory therefore be rendered to the creator of all by the hymn-singing choirs of Angels in heaven," and what follows. After these examples, was it to be feared by those Collectors of ours that, while they make Eugenius speak as we have heard above, they would seem to have attributed to him a speech unworthy of Papal sanctity?

Bellarmine also makes it a fault in them that in the same epistle this argument is repeated more than once, "If no image had ever been painted or fashioned, nothing would be lost from the faith, hope, and charity by which the eternal kingdom is reached." But why should they not have written that which they esteemed to be true? And which in this cause, and others of the same kind, it is most fitting to consider? For the veneration of images, even if it were, what it is not, licit and free by its own nature, yet since all confess that it is not necessary, it ought to be omitted, on account of the disturbances which it has excited in the Church, and the scandals which it presents to most of the faithful and the unfaithful. As for what our adversary says, that by that argument it follows that images ought to be removed entirely from our midst, which they nevertheless did not wish, I do not see what the necessity of that consequence is. For not everything that is not necessary is useless, and there are many things which we could otherwise do without, which are to be retained on account of the times, the places, the persons with whom we are dealing. Just as consideration for the faithful who were hostile to images demanded of other Christians that they not adore them, so our Collectors thought that the use and edification of those who favored images in turn demanded of others that they tolerate them in the

churches. As for what Bellarmine adds, that "although nothing would be lost from faith, hope, and charity if no image were painted or fashioned, yet when it is painted or fashioned, he who denies that it is to be venerated sins against faith," that, indeed, would be a consequence if what he posits were true, namely that a religious cult is due to an image. But it is clear that those ancient Gauls would never have conceded this to him, since that is properly the hinge of the cause which was being attacked by them.

Nor does this hypothesis of Bellarmine prove that the honor of the image is referred to the prototype. For first, that sentence has a place only in those images which have been either instituted or certainly not prohibited by him whom you wish to honor. Then, neither if this were fitting for the images of the Saints, would it therefore follow that they are to be worshipped with religious veneration. For neither do we religiously venerate men because they are the living and breathing images of the best and greatest God; nor do we rise for all the likenesses of those whom we either love or worship, or salute them with bended knee and bared head. And finally, even if these things, which everyone sees are most inept and absurd, were most true and most certain, yet it is manifest that they would not be true absolutely or always; because times could occur in which it would be safer and more useful for those honors to be omitted. For example, to the bronze serpent, according to this opinion of Bellarmine, cult and veneration was due; and yet it, on account of the abuse of the people, was not only not worshipped and honored by King Hezekiah with the highest praise, but was even cast down and broken. So daily in the republic adulterated coins are destroyed with impunity, and are even melted down, on which nevertheless the effigy of the Prince is inscribed.

But he also openly mocks us when our adversary argues thus. For this is now the question, whether the Gallican Fathers repudiated the Nicene Council, not indeed whether they repudiated it rightly or unjustly. Omitting the former, Bellarmine digresses into the latter. Let him therefore fight about the right, if he pleases, with those venerable Fathers. For us now it is enough that what is established about their deed. Lastly, Bellarmine also makes this a crime, that in the same epistle Constantine and his mother Irene are reprehended because by their edict they had ordered that sacred images should be had with veneration, according to the decree of a general Council; for he says that that reprehension could not have been written by a supreme Pontiff, unless he were plainly mad. But he, according to his custom, supposes as true and certain what is in question. For if, as Bellarmine thinks, Adrian and the Nicene Fathers decreed with just merit that images were to be pursued with a religious cult, and if, as he also likewise believes, the mouth of the Roman Pontiff is an infallible oracle; if these things, I say, are so, I confess that Eugenius ought not to have written what has been noted by Bellarmine, nor did Louis and the bishops demand with sufficient prudence and reverence that he write them. But if on the contrary, both Adrian and the Nicene fathers sinned most gravely when they judged that veneration

was to be attributed to images, surely it cannot be denied that both Constantine and Irene deserve to be reprehended for having ordered an unjust decree to be executed, and that Eugenius could have censured that deed of theirs; unless perhaps it be imagined that those Pontiffs ought never to reprehend the deeds and decrees of their predecessors, however foolish, unjust, and dangerous. Now, which of these the Bishops of the Gallican Church thought concerning Adrian and the second Council of Nicaea is sufficiently clear from what has been disputed by us above. It was therefore right for them to wish that Eugenius should write thus on this matter; whom they could not induce to speak otherwise unless they themselves betrayed their own cause.

These are, forsooth, the horrendous weapons with which Bellarmine was threatening that he would soon bring it about that the editors of this little book would "grieve that they had lost their oil and labor." But since he was sufficiently conscious to himself how true and uncorrupted this book is, and not, as he says, "concocted, or depraved and augmented," he finally concludes in chapter 6, "whether it be true, or concocted, or partly sincere, partly adulterated, this at least is certainly established, that this book is not worthy of having time wasted in reading it." "He himself has said it." Master Bellarmine has spoken. This is enough. For thus do they despise and spit upon that venerable antiquity, which they pretend to worship and praise so much, whenever it is adverse to their cause. We, however, with Bellarmine's leave, believe that this little book truly contains, as its title presents, the common opinion concerning images of many bishops formerly gathered at Paris; nor indeed do either the style and manner of writing, or the faith and probity of the library from which it came, allow us to doubt the truth of this work; especially since our adversaries bring forward nothing against it that is of any moment. "The diction," says Bellarmine here, "is barbarous, the thought insipid, the order perverse, the repetition of the same testimonies frequent." Let it be so, indeed; and let this book labor under even more other faults, if it so pleases them. For this reason, certainly, I receive and embrace it willingly, and judge it most worthy of being read, because from it, however inept and insipid in other respects, we learn most clearly that which both pertains most to illustrating the true faith of antiquity and is most pertinaciously attacked by our adversaries, namely, that the Emperor Louis, and the most illustrious bishops who then presided over the Gallican Church—Amalarius, Jonas, Alitgarius, Trevolsus, Adegarius, Freculfus, and others—with all minds consenting, rejected and exploded the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning images, approved by Pope Adrian, which even today is obtruded by them as the true and authentic law of the universal Church. And this is so evident that Baronius, in his Annals for the year 794, section 55, confesses that "the greatest men of our Gaul flourishing in the times of Louis and Charles opposed the opinion of the Nicene council concerning images," in which number he lists all those whose names we have most recently recited, and that man of unrestrained mind, since nothing else occurred to him which he could oppose to this weapon, dismisses them, overwhelmed with many curses

and condemned for insanity, most contumeliously. "It is plainly to be marveled at, and to be lamented," he says, "that the more distinguished men of this age from that province, specifically recited above, under the two Emperors, Charles and Louis, so contentiously, and with a mind utterly refractory, with pertinacious zeal, with indefatigable effort, with an inflexible purpose of will, have clamored, cried out, and, may I say it with their leave, gone mad against the adoration of the holy images against the seventh Synod, and have revered nothing of the majesty of the ecumenical Synod, nor the power of so many Roman Pontiffs fighting for it." For with these little flowers he adorns whoever dares to go against his thrice-great Pontiffs, in whatever century they may have lived, in whatever rank.

CHAPTER VII. The decree of the Council of Frankfurt was long preserved in Gaul.

But what the outcome of the legation sent by King Louis to Pope Eugenius was, and with what mind it was received at Rome, and whether the letters which the prelates of Gaul desired were sent from there to Constantinople, is difficult to determine, since there is a deep silence concerning these things among all the ancient writers. Only this I find in Athelmus for the year of our Lord 828: "Halitgarius, bishop of Cambrai, and Aufridus, abbot of the monastery of Nonantula, sent to Constantinople, were honorably received by the Emperor Michael (as they themselves reported upon their return from there)." By which I am almost induced to believe that Michael, who (as appears from his letters to Louis) had already remitted much of the pristine rigor of the Iconoclasts, finally came completely to the temperament of the Gauls, and retained images in the Churches in such a way as to prohibit them from being adored. Indeed, in Theodorus Studites, a monk most addicted to images, in book 2, epistle 172, a certain person of the diverse party testifies that his side had permitted pictures to be had for the simpler sort, as being more imperfect. This at least is certainly established from Zonaras's Annals, tome 3, and Cedrenus's historical compendium, that both Michael Balbus and his son Theophilus always attacked the Nicene Synod with the greatest force, and were hostile to all who worshipped images. But when Theophilus died in the year of Christ 842, his wife Theodora, having seized power with her young son Michael Barda, as narrated by Theophanes Continuatus, Curopalates, and Cedrenus, held nothing more important than to restore the cult of images. Thus, as if by a certain fate, women especially favored this error, first indeed Irene, and lastly Theodora.

In our West, the temperament of the Synod of Frankfurt prevailed for a long time. Hence the testimony of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who lived beyond the seventieth year of the ninth century, which we recited above. But Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in his preface to Pope Nicholas II, which he prefixed to the Latin version of the Nicene Synod around the year of Christ 880, signifies clearly enough that the definition of that Council had not yet been received by the Gauls at that time. "For what," he says, "the present Synod teaches concerning the adoration of venerable images, this your Apostolic See, as some writings indicate, has held from antiquity, and the universal Church has always venerated and venerates to this day, with the exception of certain of the GAULS, to whom the utility of these things has not yet been revealed." And from these words of Anastasius it is clear (that we may also add this argument to the others explained by us above) how unjust is the obstinacy of those who contend that the Nicene Synod was condemned by the Frankfurt fathers for no other reason than that they were ignorant of its true opinion concerning images. For eighty-six years (for so many there were between the time of the Synod of Frankfurt and these words of Anastasius) could have more than sufficiently snatched this error, which

is imputed to them (if it was nothing else), from them, and taught them the true definition of the Nicene party.

But that it also remained longer, both in our Gaul and in Germany itself, Nicetas Choniates is the authority, when in the year 1160 Frederick Barbarossa entered Philippopolis, only the Armenians remained in the city, and judged the passage of the Germans not an incursion of enemies, but the arrival of friends. "For," he says in his work on the Emperor Isaac Angelus, book 2, page 199, "they conduct commerce among themselves, and agree in most dogmas of religion. For among the Germans and the Armenians the adoration of sacred images is equally interdicted, and both use unleavened bread in the sacred rites." But what the opinion of our Gauls was on this argument is sufficiently testified by the continuator of Aimoin, a Monk, in the place where he speaks of the Eighth Synod (as our adversaries number it), celebrated at Constantinople in the year of Christ 869. "In which Synod," he says in his *Deeds of the Franks*, book 6, chapter 28, "they decreed concerning the adoring of images otherwise than the orthodox Doctors had previously defined, and they established certain things in favor of the Roman Pontiff, who assented to their vows concerning the adoring of images, and they established things against their own Synod, as he who will have read the same Synod will patently find." Now, since this writer lived in the year of Christ 1150, it is established from this that in those times our Gauls still counted the adoration of images, established in the third canon of that eighth synod, among those things which fight with the preceding definitions of the orthodox Doctors.

And here the impotence of our adversaries in their zeal for this cause must be chastised in passing; which has proceeded to the point that in the edition of this writer, procured in Paris in the fifth year of this century at Druart's by a certain monk Jacob de Brueil, they have corrupted this distinguished passage of his entirely with the worst deceit, substituting words which produce a sense plainly contrary to the author's mind. For thus it is read there in the Paris edition of 1605: "They decreed concerning the adoring of images according as the orthodox Doctors had previously defined." And yet all other codices, both manuscript and printed, exhibit the passage plainly as we have described it; and Baronius himself also, in the tenth Tome of his Annals, where he cites it, for the year 869, section 79. Can a more wicked and impudent perfidy, or a more capital fraud, be imagined? From this one crime it is to be learned what is the faith and religious scruple of those men in handling the monuments of the ancients.

But to return to the matter, the power of the Pope of Rome, when it had gradually grown to an immense size, finally propagated this error into the West, and derived the adoration of images, long since received in Rome and in Italy, from there into the other nations; not so, however, that no traces at all remained in Gaul of the doctrine which had been received and approved by their ancestors, which the most famous Pithou observed in these words in his preface

to Paul the Deacon's history: "Indeed, if we wish to speak the truth," he says, "it is only very recently that our people have begun to be fond of images." Certainly Durandus, bishop of Mende, who is known to have lived at the end of the thirteenth century, has these things in his *Rationale of the Divine Offices*, book 4, part 2, rubric 4: "Nor is the servitude of adoration to be paid to them" (he is speaking of the Saints and Angels), "but to God alone; lest if it be done otherwise, the cult not of theosebeia be exhibited, but the crime of idolatry be incurred, by serving the creature as the creator, and by changing the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of corruptible man. If therefore neither men nor Angels are to be adored, let them attend to what they are doing, who under the pretext of some religion or piety adore diverse images. For it is not lawful to adore anything handmade." Thus far Durandus. But since superstition, confirmed by the favor of Roman authority and by the natural propensity of men, was growing, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, Jean Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, proposed these things to the prelates of those times, in his first tome, *Declaration on the Defects of Ecclesiastics*, article 67: "Judge," he says, "if so great a variety of images and pictures in the Churches is expedient, since it sometimes perverts many simple people to idolatry."

CHAPTER VIII. The final touch added to the error by the Church of Rome, which, beyond the definition of the Nicene Synod and the entire use of the Greeks, admits both sculpted things and images of God.

And these, indeed, like the last voices of a gradually dying liberty, fruitlessly scattered, beat the empty air; but the cult of images was at last established in that manner which we expressed at the beginning of this work; and even somewhat augmented and accumulated beyond that which had been defined in that Nicene Synod, and repudiated with such detestation by Charlemagne and our ancestors. For first, while the Nicene party and their disciples had only painted images, our Romans have admitted also sculpted ones, and cast ones, and those fashioned by any other art and reason. And while the former thought it a sin to fashion or represent the nature or persons of the most holy Trinity with any image; the latter today have no such religious scruple. These two additions to the superstitious cult we shall pursue in a few words before we conclude this disputation, begging pardon for our prolixity.

And so, to begin with the first, those who first judged that images should be adored seem, indeed, to have had no others than those expressed with colors and a brush. For even today, this use has remained among the Greeks, who, having repudiated sculpted and cast things, employ in religion only those which are painted. But Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, an ancient and easily the chief patron of images, and on that account expressly excommunicated by the Synod of the Iconoclasts, as they call them, testifies sufficiently that he felt the same about sculpted things as the Greeks follow today. For in that epistle which he wrote to Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, where he treats this cause of images professionally, when he had recounted the history of the bronze statue of Christ placed at Paneas by the woman with an issue of blood, he immediately adds, as if by a certain epanorthosis, "But we do not say this, that we should be eager to make bronze statues"; which words there was no need to add if he himself had also followed the opinion which the Romans defend today, as recorded in his epistle to Thomas in the fourth act of the Seventh Synod. The Nicene Synod, indeed, in its definition established the use of no other images than those "from colors and from tesserae," that is, expressed either with colors or with mosaic work, as stated in the seventh act of the same synod. From which it is understood how vain and how impudent is the annotation of some unknown, but corrupt, Greekling in the margin of the Roman codex, writing on page 527 of the fourth act, that "from the very definition of this Synod it is most clear that it is pious, and not alien to the custom of the Catholic Church, to erect sacred statues."

As for what pertains to the superstitious custom of painting the persons of the most holy Trinity, which now commonly obtains in the communion of the

Roman Church, and is indeed defended by Bellarmine, Cajetan, Catharinus, Payva, Sanderus, Walden, and others (you have the places of the authors commemorated here in Bellarmine's *On Images*, chapter 8), it is clear that it was not approved by those who, before these last times, venerated images in Greece and elsewhere. For Germanus, in that very epistle which we have just praised, having commemorated and weighed various testimonies of Scripture by which the use of images seems to be entirely interdicted, confesses that by them it is forbidden that we should paint God. "All these things," he says in his epistle to Thomas of Claudiopolis in the fourth act of the Seventh Synod, "have a manifest sense, that the divine nature is eternal and incomprehensible, and is to be esteemed similar to none of those things which are seen; so that no one may be led by conjectures and suspicions to corporeal conceptions." The same man, in another epistle on the same argument to John, bishop of Synada, expressed this opinion of his in most explicit words: "For neither," he says in his epistle to John of Synada in the fourth act of the Seventh Synod, "do we form an image, and likeness, or schema, or any figure of the invisible Deity, which not even the sublime orders of the Holy Angels themselves are able to consider and investigate fully." But Damascenus, the other leader of those parties, pronounces the same even more explicitly, in his *Orthodox Faith*, book 4, chapter 16: "Of the invisible," he says, "incorporeal, uncircumscribed, of that which has no figure, who can make a representation? It would therefore be of the highest madness and impiety to figure the Godhead."

Pope Gregory himself, the second of this name, although (as we have demonstrated above) he defended this cause of images with the highest zeal of mind, yet repudiated this custom of painting God in his first epistle to the Emperor Leo, as found in the tome of the Councils before the Seventh Synod: "Why, then," he says, "do we not subject to the eyes and paint the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Because we do not know who he is, and the nature of God cannot be proposed to be seen and painted." It is plain that the opinion of the Nicene fathers was also the same. For in the fifth action they bring forward a rather lengthy passage from a certain John, bishop of Thessalonica; where he, to a Pagan man objecting that cult which he says is shown by Christians to the images of the Saints and of God himself, responds that he makes images of those who were men, namely of the holy servants of God, and bearing bodies. "For neither," he says in the fifth act of the Seventh Synod, "do we act according to you; nor do we show corporeal characters of any incorporeal beings." But he concedes that Christians make images of the Lord Jesus, but of him "as he was seen upon the earth, and conversed with men, not, however, as he is understood by nature to be God." "For what," he says, "is the likeness, or what is the habit of the incorporeal and figureless Word of the Father?" and a few lines later, "We paint his humanity," he says, "not his incorporeal divinity." When the Pagan presses and objects that angels, although "intelligible and incorporeal," are nevertheless painted by Christians; the good bishop responds that "the Catholic Church acknowledges that they are indeed intelligible, but not, as the Pagans

thought, altogether incorporeal and invisible; but of a subtle body, and airy and fiery; for only the divinity is incorporeal and uncircumscribed." From these sayings of John it is clear that in his opinion only those things are to be painted which are corporeal, and consist of a certain and circumscribed mass, form, and figure; and that God, therefore, being devoid of all these, and plainly incorporeal and invisible, it is a sin to paint. But this testimony, publicly read in that Synod, Tarasius and all the other Fathers of that Council approved. And elsewhere, in the part where they refute the Synod of the Iconoclasts (as they call them), after they have complained that it is imputed to them by the highest calumny that they circumscribe the incomprehensible nature, they immediately add these words, in the seventh act of the Seventh Synod, tome 4: "Christians have never made an image of the invisible and incomprehensible nature; but according as the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, those things which are of his human dispensation, they paint and express in images."

Those who followed the decree of this Synod concerning images were also of the same opinion, as among others the author of the little book on images, in the first Tome of the Greco-Latin *Bibliotheca Patrum*. For he confesses to the Emperor whom he addresses, an Iconoclast, that it is a sin to paint the immortal God, and to this he refers the chapters of the divine law by which images are forbidden to be made. "The Legislator," he says in his work *On the Use of Sacred Images*, tome 1 of the Greco-Latin *Bibliotheca Patrum*, pages 734-739, "forbade to make and institute images of God alone"; and he repeats the same thing. "Nor is that to be painted in an image," he says, "which cannot be seen. For the Godhead lacks species and figure, nor can it be seen, nor is it anything of those things which are seen and are known by human eyes; but it is to be contemplated by the mind alone; if, however, anyone can do even this." Then, after a few intervening lines, he says on page 737, "Images of God are not to be made; indeed, if anyone should attempt anything similar, he is to be subjected to the extreme punishments, as one communicating with ethnic dogmas." Then, responding to the objection of the image of Christ, he says, "But we do not paint Christ as he is God, nor do we establish images for him in that respect. But as the same is man, and has been seen on earth, we use his images. Nor do we adapt what is visible and circumscribed to the measures of invisibility and uncircumscription, lest we fall from salvation. Nor do we, adapting what cannot be touched, or seen, or circumscribed to the reason of touch, circumscription, and sight, furiously undertake to express it by some form."

And thus far indeed he. But Bellarmine is confident that he can scatter all these testimonies of the ancients with one puff, as it were, and disperse them to the winds. He therefore tells us, in his work *On Images*, book 1, that something can be painted in three ways: "One way, to express the perfect likeness of the form and nature of the thing itself. Another way, to exhibit some history to the eyes; in which way if anyone," he says, "should wish to paint the expulsion of Adam from paradise, he would have to paint God in the form of a man walking, and Adam

and Eve naked hiding themselves among the trees, and finally an Angel in human form bearing a sword, and expelling Adam with his wife. Thirdly," he says, "something can be painted apart from history to explain the nature of a thing, not by an immediate and proper likeness, but by analogy or metaphorical and mystical significations. In which way we paint Angels as young, winged, beautiful, with bare feet, etc., to signify that they are always full of strength, move most swiftly, are endowed with the splendor of grace and virtues," and in that way, he says, Christ is painted in the form of a sheep.

From these he responds that by the mentioned authors and others, those pictures of God are reprobated which are of the first kind, but not those which are of the second or third. I, however, see no other foundation or support for this response, either in the things themselves, or in the sayings and opinions of the Fathers about whom we are here treating, besides the single authority of Bellarmine, if any it be. Not in the things themselves. For here the question is about the picture itself, not, however, about the plan of those who paint. I confess that pictures are made, either for the memory of those things which the picture represents, or for the history of those actions which someone has performed, or finally for exhibiting something mystical to the minds of the beholders, to which what is expressed in the picture is referred analogically. But every picture, nevertheless, with whatever mind and plan it is made, ought to represent the form and figure of its subject, whose image it is. And so, if there is any image of God, it must necessarily represent the form of God himself. Otherwise it will not be an image of God, however much the painter may have wished to represent either an action or some property of God. For example, even if a lion is a symbol of fortitude, and a rooster of vigilance, yet no one will be so inept as to think that the effigy of a lion or a rooster is an image of Alexander or Caesar, because those men were most brave and most vigilant. Let it be, therefore, as Bellarmine bids; let some painter, whether by the orders of another or by his own plan, paint a lamb, to signify mystically the passion of Christ; yet that effigy of a lamb will not therefore either be or rightly and truly be called an image and likeness of the Lord Christ. But the second mode of picture which is proposed is much more alien to the present matter. For who will concede to Bellarmine what he himself supposes, namely that it is permissible, for the sake of representing some history, to attribute to the subjects who are introduced in it those forms with which they have in reality nothing in common? "If I wish," he says, "to paint the expulsion of Adam from paradise, God will have to be painted in the form of a man walking in paradise." Is that so? And yet there is no necessity. For thus the very thing that is in question is posited, namely that it is permissible to paint God, which is impossible even by the confession of Bellarmine himself. A painter, indeed, according to the license of his art, will assume for himself the power of daring anything he pleases. But that the Fathers used that liberty which Bellarmine concedes, he himself does not prove, and the passages which have been recited most openly deny.

Briefly, it is not here questioned whether natural things can be painted which have some analogy to supernatural ones, so that the minds of the beholders may be excited by the species of those symbols offered to the senses to think of those things to which they are referred mystically. The entire controversy turns on this, whether it is lawful to fashion an image or likeness of God. Since, therefore, that is said to be painted or fashioned of which a likeness is made either with a brush or a chisel, when the species, form, and lineaments which are in the thing itself are drawn and exhibited in the image, and since it is established that there is no species of God, no form or figure, no lineaments, finally, surely from these things also it is most evidently concluded that God can neither be painted, nor therefore ought to be, whatever Bellarmine may tell us about those histories and analogies of his.

Now let us see whether his response agrees better with the sayings of the authors than with the nature of the things themselves. And first, indeed, that deservedly occurs to be wondered at, if the sense and mind of the ancients on this argument was the same as his, why none of them ever said or wrote anything of this kind. They, whenever discourse on this matter arises, explicitly deny that they form any image, or schema, or figure of God; they say it is of a singular madness and the highest impiety to fashion or figure the Godhead; that they represent Christ, insofar as he was man, but not, however, insofar as he is God; and that they do not subject his Father to the eyes and paint him. Why does no one among our adversaries speak thus today? Because, doubtless, the cunning men understand well enough that a speech of this kind fights most manifestly with the public use of their Church. If the opinion of the ancients was the same, why did they not restrict those general propositions, full of danger and offense, and, with some distinction added, coerce them within their own limits, as it were? Why do they not at least somewhere admonish that they are to be accepted in the way that Bellarmine has taught? Namely, so as to signify that God is not indeed to be painted absolutely and simply, but only in that way, if one wishes to do it to express the perfect likeness of his form and nature; but that if anyone should set out to paint God to exhibit some history to the eyes, or to explain his nature analogically, not immediately, that they hold this to be neither impossible nor a sin. Why is none of all these things read in the Fathers? Then what, I ask, is that admirable interpretation? "We form no image, or likeness, or schema, or figure of the invisible deity" (says Germanus); that is (says Bellarmine), "we do indeed form many and almost innumerable images, and likenesses, and figures of God, but none with that plan and mind, that by it we may express the perfect likeness of the form and nature of God." O prodigious acumen! Now indeed Bellarmine will be able to swear safely, if he pleases, that no image, likeness, or form of the Virgin Mary or of any Saint is either made or had by the men of the Roman communion; for I do not think that the images of those are made to express the perfect likeness of their form and nature. And it was permitted for the Pagans, with this caution at least, to swear truly that they make no likeness of the

immortal Gods; for they too, indeed, freely profess that they by no means made those things to express the perfect likeness of their form and nature.

This was the explicit oration of the Nicene fathers above: "Christians have never made an image of the invisible and incomprehensible nature." If those Fathers meant what Bellarmine contends, that Christians have made no image of God to express the perfect likeness of the divine nature; why, having denied this, did they not immediately posit that other thing: "although they are sometimes accustomed to paint it to exhibit histories to the eyes, or to signify something about it analogically"? And yet we find that neither these, nor anyone of their times, has said anything of this kind. But the Nicene fathers subjoin this to that prior part of the oration: "But according as the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, those things which are of his human dispensation, they paint and express in images." By which words they most clearly signify that there were among them images of the human nature of Christ; but of the Word, as it is the Word, or of the Holy Spirit, there were none. Otherwise that antithesis which is instituted here between the pictures themselves, not between the modes of the pictures, would be diluted and empty.

The same thing, indeed, appears even more clearly from that little book on images which we praised in the last place. For its writer says that the "Legislator forbade to make images of God alone." I ask, did he think that God under the Old Testament had indeed conceded that his image might be painted, but had only forbidden that it be painted to express the perfect likeness of his form and nature? If the matter was so, the Jews indeed do not seem to have been to be condemned for rebellion or sin, who cast the golden calf in the desert; for it is not to be thought that they were so foolish or insane as to have wished to express the perfect likeness of the divine form and nature with the effigy of that animal. That same writer says that if anyone should attempt to make an image of God, he is to be punished by the Iconoclast emperor whom he addresses, and to be afflicted with the extreme punishments, and he freely concedes this. Does he not make a fool of the man if he understands that he is to be punished only who has made an image of God to express the perfect likeness of the divine form and nature? For it is not credible that so foolish and so prodigious a plan ever came into the mind of any man.

Furthermore, Nicephorus in the 18th book of his Histories most clearly teaches that the mind of those ancients was far different, in the place where he reprehends the Armenians because they painted images of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, and says that this is utterly absurd. "For images," says Nicephorus Callistus in chapter 53, "are of bodies, which can be seen and circumscribed; not of those things which are invisible, and cannot be comprehended by the intelligence." Now since it is established that the Armenians were by no means Anthropomorphites, or attributed a corporeal nature to God, it is clear that they wished to represent the Father and the Spirit simply, not, however, to express

the perfect likeness of their nature and form; which plan does not fall into the mind of anyone except him who imagines those most holy persons to be corporeal and divisible. Therefore, since Nicephorus nonetheless reprehends the Armenians, it is surely necessary that both he and the other Fathers of the same memory and Church thought it simply and absolutely absurd to fashion an image or likeness of God, with whatever mind it may be done, whether to express the perfect likeness of the divine form and nature, or otherwise. And that this is so, Baronius himself also acknowledged, or at least, whoever it was that appended the marginal annotations to the Baronial Annals. For in the place where those words of Gregory II, commemorated by us above, are described, as noted in Baronius's Annals for the year 726, "Why, then, do we not subject the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to the eyes and paint him?" he, I say, annotates these things there in the margin: "Afterwards it came into use that God the Father and the Holy Spirit are painted in the Church." By which words he confesses that the images of God and the Holy Spirit which are now had and approved in the Roman Church are those very ones which were formerly in no use in it, and which were then repudiated and reprobated by the Pontiffs themselves.

But neither in the school of the Roman Church itself were there lacking those who could not digest that superstition, in which number was Tostatus, the most celebrated bishop of Avila. As he notes in his commentary on Deuteronomy 4, question 50, he says: "God forbade not only that any image be adored, but even that he himself be adored in an image." And in the same place: "In images purely signifying God, that is, the Trinity, two unsuitable things can follow. The first is idolatry, lest the image also be worshipped. The second is error and heresy, namely to attribute to God corporeality and essential difference, such as we see those three figures to signify." Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, a man of the greatest and most illustrious genius, even by the testimony of Bellarmine himself, was also of the same opinion. In his commentary on the third book of the Sentences, he says: "An image either represents Christ according as he is man, or it is made to represent the Father, or the Son as to his deity, or the Holy Spirit, just as certain images are painted, of which one represents God the Father, and another the crucified Son, and a third the Holy Spirit as a dove, proceeding from the Father to Christ." Then, having conceded the use of those images which are of the first kind, he says, "But in the second way it is foolish to make images, or to venerate them"; for which he also praises the passage of Damascenus described by us above, "It would therefore be of the highest madness and impiety to figure the Godhead." Indeed, we even read in Aventinus's *Annals of Bavaria*, book 7, that those who had painted the Trinity were burned by order of John XXII as heretics. But Lucas of Tuy, in those books which he formerly wrote against the Albigensians, and which our adversaries were pleased to have recently published by the Jesuits and inserted in the last edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, he, I say, Lucas testifies that in his times pictures of this kind were held to be figments of the heretics. In his work *Against the Errors of the Albigensians*, book 2, chapter 9, he

says: "Heretics for the most part strive to deceive many by the novelty of false pictures. For they depict an image of the deific Trinity, the Father as an old man, the Son as younger, the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, or smaller than the son, so that by this the simple may be compelled to believe in three Gods of one will; being seduced by a depraved understanding, so that for this reason it is said there is one God, when there are three, because they are of one concord of will." And a little after, he says, "To enclose him who uncircumscribably fills all things within corporeal lineaments is to fall into the heresy of the Anthropomorphites." Elsewhere, in chapter 20 of the same book, he denies that an image of the Trinity either ought to be or can be depicted.

But lest anything be lacking for the height of superstition in this genre, these pictures also were at last received into the Roman Church by public use, and were openly approved and defended by its chief and most noble Doctors, whose leaders we commemorated at the beginning of this disputation.

And so, unless I am mistaken, we have sufficiently demonstrated that the veneration of the sacred, as they call them, images of Christ and the saints is a new thing among Christians, not handed down from the Apostles, not instituted by a public or universal law of the ancient Church, but that it crept in gradually, and, stealthily progressing, gradually spreading and growing, as one century admitted one part of the error and the following decreed another, it at last grew to that mass which is seen today. For in the first three centuries of Christianity, no forms or likenesses of this kind are to be found at all in the sacred edifices of the Church, which can rightly and properly be called images of Christ or the Saints. But in the three following centuries, they were introduced by Christians, but only for this use: that they might be an ornament for the sacred places, an instruction for the rude and ignorant, and might preserve the memory of past things. In the four centuries which soon succeeded, after many and great struggles both in the East and in the West, religious veneration was at last attributed to images, with this temperament, however, that no pictures of God should be made; until the Roman Pontiff, having gained power over things in the times which flourished down to the memory of our fathers, when he administered all things according to his whim, finally established the error in the place where it is now held.

But as many as there were who rose up against that monstrous and immense power which the Pope had invaded, and dared to flee and oppose his communion, they all also repudiated this doctrine and use of his concerning images; such as were in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Waldensians, in the thirteenth Wycliffe with his disciples, at the beginning of the fifteenth Jerome of Prague and the Hussites, and after a hundred years Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Calvin, and all the Protestant Churches, whom our adversaries are accustomed to call by names fabricated to create odium, "Lutherans" and "Calvinists"; although they solemnly profess that they

acknowledge no other author and prince of their faith and discipline than the Lord Jesus speaking in the divine letters; to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the one true God, be praise and glory for ever and ever, AMEN.

THE END.

CANDID READER,

We think it is as much in your interest as in ours that, before you undertake to read through these books *On Images*, you should not be reluctant, in accordance with your fairness and candor, to first correct with a pen the typographical errors which crept in during the printing due to the Author's absence, and which were noticed and noted by the Author himself after the work was already finished, as we have appended them.

On page 248, lines 1 and 2, the words "they depicted the parable of the good shepherd on glass chalices, it is established by them also, or in..." should be deleted, as they are repeated in vain and ineptly.

On page 252, line 1, after "Saints'," add these words which were wrongly omitted: "likenesses of men, one would conclude that the Jews had and worshipped them from the fact that some figures were perhaps sculpted on the sacred vessels and instruments of the Jewish temple for ornament; so also it is plain that our adversaries collect most badly, when they conclude that among the ancient Catholics, just as now in Rome, the Saints'..."

THE END.