

THE HISTORY OF IMAGES RESTORED

by FREDERICK SPANHEIM, F.F.

Principally Against the Recent French Writers

LOUIS MAIMBOURG,

And

NATALIS ALEXANDER.

LEIDEN,

At the house of JOHANNES VERBESSEL,

1686.

To the Magnificent, Most Noble, Most Esteemed Quattuorviri Consuls of the Republic of Amsterdam:

D. JOHANNI CORVER, J.C.

D. JOHANNI HUYDEKOPER, J.C., Knight, Lord of Maarssenveen, Neerdijck, etc., Prefect of the East India Company.

D. JOHANNI DE VRIES, Prefect of the East India Company.

D. WILHELMO VAN LOON, J.C.

AND ALSO

To the Man of Highest Dignity,

D. NICOLAO WITSEN, J.C.,

Former Consul of the same Republic and recent Delegate in the Assembly of their High Mightinesses the States-General, etc.

FREDERICK SPANHEIM F.

WISHES HAPPINESS.

ILLUSTRIOUS MEN, there will be someone who is unaware of the reason for this Dedication of mine, of what I owe you privately and what I owe you publicly. On that private account, I profess myself bound to you as if by a certain bond, because a few months ago, with no common benevolence, you granted me a viewing of the Blondellian Baronius, which I had long been seized by a desire to see. And yet, the smallness of the characters with which those Annals are from time to time corrected, and the use of a winter lamp, meant that my eyes could not sustain the focused reading. I therefore put it off for a more opportune time, having cursorily and with a furtive glance here and there observed those things which would clearly strengthen and add light to this History of ours, on which I was then engaged.

And I believe it would be to the benefit of the literary world if that terse type of annotation, of which the late master transcribed many from Jacobus Capellus, a most excellent man in these letters, were converted for public use, but by someone more skilled in antiquarian and chronological matters, who could compare it with the text of Baronius, explain the mind of the Censors, and further perfect a certain revision. I have no doubt, POWERFUL MEN, that this will one day be effected by your munificence and authority, because of that plainly distinguished zeal for the Reformed Cause which, in these most difficult times, has elicited love from your citizens, admiration from foreigners, solace for the exiled, fear for our enemies, and joy and prayers for this entire Republic.

This now is a public matter, which I also make my own, and we will never be able to erase or remove it. You were recently among the first, while implacable Rome rages, plotting more grievous things in its mind, not setting a limit to its audacity, you decreed security for the Republic, protection for the oppressed, refuge for the cast out, hospitality for the scattered, subsidies for the stripped, aid for the destitute, food for the poor, stipends for the soldiers, and finally supplements and honoraria for the Pastors, with united minds and efforts. This, at last, will be the Palladium of your Emporium; this will be its wall and rampart. And it will be safer for you, MAGNIFICENT LEADERS, to appear before the supreme Judge accompanied by a great host of the afflicted who owe their salvation to you today, than it will be for the kings of today, deceived by the wicked hope of a recent Jesuit, to stand before that fearsome Tribunal surrounded by a long line of either Confessors showing their numerous scars, or the Lapsed showing their consciences violated by force. It is for men to give "small things in return for great ones," but for God alone to repay "great things for small ones." This, surely, will be the greatest fruit of your labors and works, not in the sense that Alexander the Great prayed for it for himself, but that whenever you depart from this life, you may be consecrated to Immortality. Leiden, February 11, Gregorian calendar, in the Year of the Dionysian Era, 1686.

TO THE BENEVOLENT READER, GREETINGS.

A French author of the *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1681, writes thus about Natalis Alexander, after the publication of the 8th Century of his *Ecclesiastical History*: "P. Alexander thoroughly treats the heresy of the Iconoclasts, and the Seventh General Council, in which it was condemned. He added a copious Dissertation on the Use and Veneration of Images, in which he refutes the arguments of the old and new Iconoclasts; and he responds step-by-step to the four books of the minister Daillé against Images, to which no Catholic author had yet responded. Thus the glory was left to this Father, that he was the first to refute this minister, considered among the most learned whom they celebrated at Charenton."

The other, Louis Maimbourg, having published in French a *History of the Heresy of the Iconoclasts*, boastfully declared, as is his custom, in the Preface to the Reader, that this history had not yet been sufficiently clarified in certain more difficult points, and that, notwithstanding its antiquity of so many centuries past, he would nonetheless present in it many things that would recommend themselves by their welcome novelty. And throughout that work of Maimbourg, in which he more truly played the part of an actor on the stage than a historian in the republic of letters, he expresses indignation against Surius, Alanus, Suarez, Sanderus, Baronius, Binius, Bellarmine, Vasquez, Valentianus, Gretser, etc. He complains, and indeed rightly, that not all the documents of antiquity concerning images were sufficiently weighed by them, and that this part of history had turned out to be most confused, because of the diversity of

circumlocutions and evasions by which those men sought to extricate themselves. He accuses them of having resorted to conjectures fabricated at will, and without any reasonable foundation; that they did not seek historical truth, but merely presupposed things not to be true which they very much did not want to be true. Yet this Antoninus professes more than once, while he surpassed them all in the art of deception, that he himself would act in good faith, without prejudice, and that he would dissipate all those shadows and bring forth into the light the truth that had hitherto been hidden in obscurity.

Finally, he challenges the Protestant theologians in this Iconomachic cause to the arena, if any of them should be so imprudent as to henceforth dare to oppose him with the Council of Frankfurt, or the Caroline Books, or the Synod held under Constantine Copronymus, or the Assembly of Paris under Louis the Pious, or other monuments of antiquity. And in closing what he called his History, he says that from now on today's Protestants will be ashamed, and will recognize the infamy of their origin and their shameful birth among those Iconoclasts, and that they will gnash their teeth that their Fathers so abused their credulous simplicity, by representing the Catholic faith to them under a false schema and imposing upon the wretched.

This self-praising Jesuit, everywhere cooking up lies, with his remarkable arrogance, in making the very same judgment about our Fathers as the Jansenists of Port-Royal did in a certain Dialogue about the Maimbourgian Histories and their most deceitful appearance, and also the rash judgment made about that other Dominican monk of *Gallia Pontificia*, has prompted me, among other concerns, to re-examine this entire History of Images, in that part which seemed not yet sufficiently restored and vindicated, and to scrutinize these men, so full of themselves while drawing from another's coffer, in every detail, and certainly in the more serious ones. All the more excellently and truly did our own Ussher once say, in his book *On the Succession of the Churches*: "Then indeed the Christian cause began to fall and slip backwards and be carried away, when that thing hateful to God, whether idolatry or image-service, began to reign in the churches of Christians." This was truly the calamity of our foundation, and the beginning and, as it were, the seed-bed of all the evils by which the state of the Church has been undermined and convulsed.

To this was added the savage and unheard-of barbarity of the present times, to be exercised against those who would abhor every superstition and idolatry of this kind; from which Epiphanius, Augustine, Severus of Marseille long ago, then those defamed by the name of Iconoclasts, and finally Charlemagne, and with him the Gauls, Germans, Britons, Italians, and Spaniards, all recoiled. It was also grievous to see the most deceitful schema, as will be made plain, presented everywhere by Maimbourg, namely that of the persecutions against the Iconolaters, under Leo the Isaurian, his son Constantine, Leo the Armenian, Michael the Stammerer, and Theophilus, successor of the Stammerer. This was

done with no other end, as our sources teach, when a comparison is made with recent events (especially on pages 235, 243, 570, etc.), than that the truculent Jesuit might fashion a certain model of Tartarean savagery, to be imitated by Louis the Great, just as “insolence begets a tyrant.”

Whence, what was once not done, except perhaps against rebels and raging monks, this man has now shown by his history ought to be done, for the extermination (as he urges) of those who are guilty of nothing but a name and a sect, in common with the first Christians. Certainly, this is their only crime in the sight of all Europe and France: that they have approved their religion of adoration towards the one supreme God, but of honor to whom honor is due; in addition to this, their trust placed in Christ alone, and the expiation sought by them in the sacrifice of the Cross alone, and the safe obedience of their piety to His commands alone; finally, that the entire faith of their Church and the discipline of their morals is tested against the Scriptures alone; while at the same time all their prayers, as well as their duties of fidelity, love, and subjection, are turned towards the one Most Christian King.

And now the Jesuit knew that the wretched people throughout all of France were either nearly destroyed or about to be destroyed, henceforth wandering and exiled, like a turtle-dove bereft of its mate, and also of its home. He knew that, by a new example, there had been sent forth, and would further be sent forth, against every rank, sex, and age, as far as the borders of that most ample empire extend (indeed, would that it were within the borders!), armies of executioners, or were they werewolves or dragons. He was aware of the armed force to be applied, not indeed to their minds—for noble courage nourishes a vigorous liberty and does not desert it—but to their mouths and pens, so that they might become *libellatici* by an unwilling subscription, as in the time of the Decian persecutions. He himself saw consciences daily excruciated, bodies consumed by sword, fire, hunger, and sleeplessness, the ancient tortures of the martyrs compounded with new ones, the prisons filled, the monasteries resounding with the laments and wails of virgins and matrons. He had heard even from the very architects of these evils, and by no uncertain rumor, of infants snatched away, mothers pierced with wounds, spouses torn apart, old men subjected to torturers, the scene of the Diocletian age revived, in which idolatrous sacrifices were forced into the mouths of resisting Christians and incense into their hands, so that they might thereby be proclaimed as among the ranks of the Converted and the Idolaters. And despite all this, the Jesuit sings a victory hymn in this manner, and in his most recent writing, he breaks out into the most abject words to Louis the Great, testimonies of a depraved conscience: “To you alone,” says he, “will be eternal and immortal glory and felicity, for having exterminated from the Most Christian Kingdom that enemy heresy of God, by bringing back into the bosom of the Catholic Church, through infinite conversions, those who had gone out from it not without the crime of schism or heresy: and this was done by you without violence, according to the Spirit of the Gospel, not with other

arms, nor by force, other than that of your Charity, and the Zeal and Justice expressed in all your Edicts.” And in a recent Gregorian History, Book I, to the year 590, preceded by a sarcasm, and a public and signal lie (which for him, surely, unlike for the great legislator of the Tatars, is not a capital crime), concerning the liberty still left to his erring subjects (by the clemency of Louis the Great), “such a liberty as the Protestant Princes, both Lutheran and Calvinist, deny to Catholics in their own dominions,” he soon thus foists upon his King a feigned and impious acclamation, more a raven than a flatterer: “How great will be the prerogative of Louis the Great above us all on the last day, when he shall stand before the Judge of all, attended by that huge multitude of Calvinists, or Converts, whom he calls back daily, by a most sweet and efficacious way, to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ!”

And with similar petulance, it is said that monks of the most depraved audacity insulted the downtrodden Catholics with victory hymns after the images were restored and the Iconomachs suppressed, in praise of the impious Irene, as Maimbourg admits. The beginning of the first ode was from the Greek *Triodion*, with the author (as they say) being that Studite, the standard-bearer of the turbulent Iconolaters under the emperors Nicephorus, Leo the Armenian, and Michael. “A song of thanksgiving to God the benefactor... Because he has raised up a horn of salvation, a mighty kingdom, a champion of Orthodoxy.”

You, reader, shudder, groan, pray, hope, and let it be decreed for us all to suffer, and never to lose heart. And if you have so much leisure from your own affairs, “You may trace my footsteps in a swift course,” and if not the success of this little work, at least approve of its intention.

INDEX OF TOPICS or SECTIONS of the Entire History.

SECTION I.

Occasion of this writing. Recent writers. Summary of the history of the Use or Worship of Images, up to Leo the Isaurian. Passages recently produced from Tertullian, Eusebius, the Council of Elvira, Augustine, Epiphanius, Bede, etc., are briefly vindicated and turned against their objectors. The very poor faith of Natalis Alexander and Maimbourg in many matters. The state of affairs in the 4th Century. How Constantine the Great paved the way for images. The nature of superstition in the time of Augustine. In the time of Gregory I, Serenus the Iconoclast. Before him, Epiphanius. His action illustrated. In the 7th Century. The rationale for images in churches. Among these, pictures of Emperors, Bishops, and Synods. The action of Emperor Philippicus and Pope Constantine, 8th Century. The confession of Baronius. What followed from that. The controversy over the worship of images was stirred up before Leo the Isaurian. The practice concerning them in Britain, in the time of Bede. How Pope Constantine preceded Gregory II. Pag. 1

SECTION II.

Continuation of the history, under Leo the Isaurian. The fable about the Origin of the Iconoclastic Heresy. The prediction made to the boy Conon. Refuted on many counts. The conflict and bad faith of the ancient and more recent Iconolaters. Specifically, of Maimbourg. The true origin of the Iconomachy under Leo. Its milder beginnings, and the course of action taken by Leo. The true time of the overthrow of images. Whether Leo acted without consulting the Bishops. What a Σιλέντιον (Silentium) was to the Byzantines. The deceit of Baronius, and especially of both recent writers. The deeds of Gregory II against Leo, asserted historically. The doctrine from this of Baronius and the Romanists. The empty evasions of Natalis Alexander. Leo's actions in the East, truthfully recorded. The more notable fables about Leo, with the deceit of recent writers wiped away. About the overthrow of the Image of Christ in Constantinople. About the destruction by fire of the College, the Library, and the Professors in Constantinople. About the threats made by Leo against Pope Gregory and Patriarch Germanus. About his perfidy toward John of Damascus. Pseudo-miracles. The falsity of all these things is proluxly demonstrated. Other fictitious matters exaggerated by Maimbourg. The end of Leo. The criterion of biases in Historians. 43

SECTION III.

The unjust judgment of Baronius on Leo the Isaurian, Charles Martel, and Gregory III, all having died in the same year. Constantine, a hated name. The fable about the defiled Baptismal font. The true portrait of this prince, from the Historians. The monstrous Image in the writings of the Byzantines, and of Baronius and Maimbourg. The causes of the most bitter hatred. The authors of the calumnies were monks, and sworn enemies of Constantine. Why he was called Copronymus and Caballinus. The fallacious conjecture of the Historian Glycas. More than one origin of the insult is revealed and illustrated. The prudence of Constantine in the cause of images. The false narratives of the Historians. Celestial portents, and scourges, and disasters, falsely imputed to the Iconomachy. The cause of images referred by the Emperor to an Ecumenical Synod. The history of the Seventh Synod under Constantine. How it was depraved by the Byzantines and the Nicaeans. Proluxly restored. Everything in it was legitimate. The process in the cause of images. The arguments of the Fathers against images of Christ. Others against those of the Virgin and the Saints. Passages of Scripture. Of the Fathers. The summary of the decrees of this Synod, under five heads. The falsehoods of the Iconolaters are countered. The most vain exceptions concerning the absence of the Pope. Concerning the absence of the Patriarchs of the East. The reasons for this. Examples of other Synods. The remaining criticisms leveled against this Synod. The bad faith of Maimbourg in all things. Things wickedly fabricated against the Emperor Constantine. The lies, insults, and fables of the Acts to which they appeal. The imposture of Baronius and Maimbourg. The confession of Natalis Alexander. 131

SECTION IV.

Continuation of the calumnies against Constantine. Whence the accusation of Magic? The other of Nestorianism and Arianism. Their falsity demonstrated. And also their origin. Maimbourg confessing. Was Copronymus a Blasphemer against the Virgin, or contemptuous of the Saints? An examination of the matter. A vindication of the Emperor. What the Prince decided concerning them. What he condemned. His emblematic action explained. The opinion of Epiphanius compared with that of Constantine. The accusation of cruelty. How they describe the persecution of the monks. Baronius and Maimbourg called to account. The truth of the whole matter to be revealed. Images abolished in the East after the Seventh Synod. Hence the indignation and fury of the monks. And hence their punishment. The first cause of the Monastic Persecution according to Maimbourg: the Impiety of the Prince. The dire words of the Jesuit. The fury of the writer. A fair judgment. Excesses on the part of Constantine's ministers. The barbarity of the Prefect Draco and the Asiatic legion described by Maimbourg. Never a more explicit image of the Dragons of today's Conversions. An observation by the Author. The second cause of the persecutions, from the mind of the Jesuit. Hatred of God Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, Chastity. The accusation retorted upon the accuser. A comparison made between the cause of the Monks, against whom Constantine was incensed, and that of the Reformed, against whom Maimbourg incites Kings. An immense difference. Certain examples of Monastic rebellions and seditions. Andrew Calybites. Stephen the Younger. Peter the Stylite. By what right are these Martyrs? Pope Stephen IV more cruel than Copronymus. Barbarity exercised at Rome in the year 768. A new cause for Constantine's fury. The loss of the Exarchate. The history of this, and its limits. The successive efforts of the Pontiffs against the Greeks. And the Lombards. The Donation of Pepin. The truth and circumstances of this. And also its iniquity. The Greeks protesting. The legation of Constantine to Pepin. The end of the legation, as confessed by the Jesuit. The Gallican Synod, principally in the cause of Images, A.D. 767. Its more accurate history. Did it increase the worship of images? The falsity of this is proven by many arguments. Maimbourg's various frauds concerning this Synod. Brought into the clear light. The Roman Synod of A.D. 769. How the cause of Images was long neglected at Rome. What the Pontiffs alone were pursuing. Soon, Hadrian I. Concerning the donation of King Charles. The true separated from the false. What the Franks retained for themselves. The supposititious Constitution of Louis the Pious. More precisely on the Roman Synod. The certain distinguished from the uncertain. Maimbourg's bad faith again. Various proofs of this. That the Bishops of the Gauls did not assent to the adoration of Images. Gregory I and Ambrose vindicated against the assertion of the Jesuit. The fictitious Epistle of the Patriarchs of the East. What was done in the meantime at Rome until the death of Constantine. His final moments. How Maimbourg and Baronius describe them. The memory of the Prince restored. Was the illness of Constantine a divine plague? The vanity of the thing demonstrated. A retort concerning the

deaths of Persecutors in the previous century. Immense calumnies. Did Copronymus confess his blasphemies? Did he condemn himself to eternal fires? The fate of Charles Martel is parallel to that of Constantine. Did he, repenting, enjoin the worship of the Blessed Virgin? Did he revoke his own deeds? The falsity of all these things exposed to public light. An evident argument against the Iconodules. Constantine's fate was that of the Orthodox, and of Christians from the beginning of time. Calumny against the Reformed in the previous century. 207

SECTION V.

The Succession of Leo IV. What kind of wife was Irene. The prudent moderation of the Prince towards the Iconodules and Monks. His Orthodoxy, and zeal for the Christian cause in that matter. Whence his unexpected death. Irene takes power. This woman, by the consensus of all Historians, an execrable image. Notable circumstances of the crime committed against her Son. Other inhuman acts. The foul praises of Irene among the old and new Iconolaters. The parricide praised by Baronius. The cause of Images is the sum of the Christian religion for these people. Opposing confessions, about the foreignness of Images. The wondrous conflict of these men. The means employed by Irene. The abdication of Patriarch Paul. The bad faith of the Historians. The substitution of the layman Tarasius. Maimbourg's candor in translating. The levity of Baronius and his followers. How at other times they declaim against lay ordinations. What kind of man Tarasius was, even to Maimbourg himself. The abject and contradictory statements of Baronius. And of the Greeklings. Conspiracy with Hadrian I. The cunning of the latter, and his letter to the Easterners. In turn, the caution of Irene and Tarasius. Other means employed in the East. Frauds of the Iconolaters. Examples. About a certain ancient and prophetic inscription. As narrated by Maimbourg. Its vanity demonstrated. And its origin. Frauds of this kind in the Histories. 305

SECTION VI.

History of the Council of Nicaea. The Synod first convened at Constantinople. Reasons for transferring it to Nicaea. An ominous time. Irene's actions preceding the Synod. Other circumstances of this truly "robber" Synod. The president Tarasius. Whether it should be considered Ecumenical. Arguments to the contrary, even from the East. The pseudo-credentials of the Iconodules. A comparison of this Synod with the Seventh under Constantine Copronymus. Did the three Patriarchs of the East attend the Pseudo-Nicene synod through Legates? The rash assertion of this matter. Prolixly refuted as false. The confession of Baronius. A similar fraud, concerning the legation to the Roman Synod of A.D. 769. The Acts of Nicaea also contradict this. Maimbourg's fiction, distinguishing two periods. Its vanity. Conflict with the Acts, and with Theophanes. A medley of contradictions. Concerning the Patriarchs of the East, what their status was at that time, and what kind of men they were. Specifically

concerning the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. Concerning the Synodal Letter of Theodore of Jerusalem. And the anti-Synodal letter of the others. A more accurate examination of the matter. Several fallacies detected. A similar letter most falsely attributed to Theodore by Hadrian I. Concerning the ancient tradition of the Eastern Churches. The vanity of the assertion. The sessions of the Nicaeans, within what period. A summary of each. Arguments for the use and worship of Images. The judgment of Charlemagne. A specimen of passages from Moses. From the Prophets and Psalms. From the New Testament. The foolishness of the objections. Exceptions to the passages of Holy Scripture objected by the Iconomachs. How the Fathers were produced by the Nicaeans. A fable attributed to Athanasius, defended by Maimbourg. The impudence of the fiction. Maimbourgian evasions. Other traditions about the images of Peter, Paul, the Blessed Virgin, Anastasius, Cosmas, Damian, Euphemia, Theodosius the Abbot, etc. A name, dreams, old wives' tales. A condition prescribed by a Demon, and the response of a certain Abbot. About the bronze Statue at Paneas. About the Image of Abgar. A summary of things to be observed. Passages objected from Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Basil, Nyssenus, Cyril of Alexandria, Asterius, etc. The fable about the relics of Euphemia. The most bitter words of Maimbourg. An objection from the Synod in Trullo. Retorted. What kind of testimonies of the Nicaeans. Various criteria of the council. Profane disorder. A summary of the decrees. They are demonstrated to be idolatrous. Maimbourg's vain and contradictory statements. 350

SECTION VII.

The success of the Nicene Synod, according to Maimbourg. The Jesuit's sport. Irene's intention. A summary of the history to follow. On the opposition made by Charlemagne. The character and learning of this Prince. Why was he incensed against the Synod? What did he himself write? A summary of the Books. The Synod of Frankfurt, concurring with Charles. Its dignity. The Second Canon, opposed to the Nicaeans. The evasions of recent writers, all others having been repudiated. Maimbourg's caution, his scolding of his own party, his splendid promises about himself. A survey of the individual exceptions, against the Caroline Books, and the Synod of Frankfurt. First, that the Nicene Synod had not yet been confirmed by Hadrian. The vanity and falsity of Petavius's evasion. Maimbourg self-condemned. Hincmar objected in vain. His errors here as well. Charles imitated Constantine the Great. The exception about the dissent of the Gauls exploded. Another, about Charles's hatred of the Greeks. Refuted. Do the Caroline Books not reflect the Spirit of Charlemagne? The conflict of the men among themselves. The principal exception, about an error of fact, which is also that of Petavius and P. de Marca. This is insisted upon. Did the Franks condemn only Latria, which is explained? The falsity of the matter is shown at length from the Franks. That they condemned every kind of adoration. That they also foresaw cavils of this kind. The leading men among the Adversaries were more ingenuous. But also the opposite concession of more recent Gauls.

Maimbourg's imposture, that Charlemagne made the worship of Images free. Refuted from Charles, and from Gregory I. That he permitted only a historical use to be free. And in some places condemned it. Other evasions of Natalis Alexander. The falsity of all demonstrated. Was there an equivocation in the word Adoration? Or Servitude? Did no one ever place their hope in Images? Other impostures of Natalis Alexander. That Charlemagne never said that some could make good use of the Worship of Images. The confession of those men about abuse and superstition. The exception concerning the error of Charlemagne and the Frankfurians, from the Words of Constantine the Cypriot. Expounded at length. Very many falsities and absurdities. Even assuming an error in the Latin Version. Maimbourg's injury against the Synod of Frankfurt. Was the error later detected by the Franks? The deceit of Petavius about the Christian-accusers of Damascus. Who these were. What kind of worship the Pagans had. The true opinion of Damascus concerning Images. Maimbourg's sport about the complete consensus of Charlemagne and Hadrian, as well as of the Nicene and Frankfurt Synods. Maimbourg's candor in this cause examined. His own statements. Plainly adverse to the cause he argues. How he subverts each point in turn. His consensus with the Jesuit School. Why the Monuments of this Century lay hidden. The assertion of Baronius. Conclusion.

529

SECTION VIII.

Return to the East. All things turn out disastrously for Irene. The deeds of Constantine against her will. The Schism of Theodore the Studite and Plato. Maimbourg's confession about these Saints. The mind of Constantine towards the Iconolaters. The end of Irene. The Succession of Nicephorus Logothetes. He favors the Iconoclasts. Who were called Exocionitae. The tolerance of the Iconolaters under him. The second Schism of Theodore and Plato. The audacity of these Monks. Theodore's invective against the Roman Pontiff himself. What does Baronius say? The last days of Nicephorus. Michael Rhangabe succeeds through tyranny. Why he was more favorable to the Iconodules. The efforts of Theodore the Studite under him. The death of Plato. Maimbourg's judgment on Miracles. Retorted against the Jesuit. The times of Leo the Armenian. Maimbourg's iniquity. A prosopography of Leo. The rare virtues and merits of the Prince, by the consensus of all. The Empire twice refused. His misfortune from the hatred of the Iconolaters. Horrendous curses against him. The putrid contradictions of the Greeklings and Maimbourg. Fables about Leo, more than old wives' tales. Refuted from the matter itself, and from the earlier Byzantine Historians. A lucid confession by Maimbourg. And by the Iconolaters. A most vain exception. A summary of events under Leo in the cause of Images. His prudence, his moderation. The pertinacity of Nicephorus and the Monks. The saner mind of others. The lies of the Byzantines. The petulance of Theodore the Studite. Leo's leniency toward him. His audacity even in prison. Horrendous examples of Iconolatory. The death of Theophanes the Confessor. A comparison

of the Leonine and the modern persecution, from Maimbourg. The last days of Leo. The state of Images under Michael the Stammerer. The equity and moderation of Michael. The legation and letter to Louis the Pious. The adverse efforts of Theodore the Studite. His faction, his death. Lying pages about him. The virtues of Michael. Why was Crete lost under him? The reproaches against Michael, and their origin. Who were called Attingani. Theophilus the successor. Praises of so great a Prince. His actions against Images. Hence calumnies, and among others, those of Maimbourg. Retorted. The last days of Theophilus. Theodora the Widow and Regent. Why she restored the images. By whom she was induced. The history of the restoration of Iconolatory in the East. Maimbourg's very bad faith in all things. The manifold difference of the Greeks from the Latins. Shown in six principal matters, concerning Images. 603

SECTION IX. AND LAST.

Oppositions in the West after the time of Charlemagne and the Synod of Frankfurt. By whom this work was undertaken. What remains against Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander. The Iconomachs of Britain. Spain. Italy. Germany. The Gauls under Louis the Pious, and thereafter. The Assembly of Paris. The assenting Prelates and Theologians in the 9th Century. Recent exceptions against the Parisian Synod. Maimbourg's arguments individually examined. Was it an Assembly, not a Synod? Other retorts. The difference shown between the Cross and Images. The evasions of Natalis Alexander concerning the opinion of the Gauls in the 9th Century. Broken and enervated. Proofs from the Gauls themselves against Images. The assent of more recent writers regarding the fact. The statements of Sirmond, Petavius, Baluze, Mézeray. And also of Maimbourg. The most unjust Jesuit against his own Gauls. His acrimony, his savageness. What kind of Gospel Spirit Maimbourg has. The continuation of Iconomachy observed in the Gauls, still in the 12th Century and following. The moderate Judgments of the Gauls of a former age. Jesuitical Gaul has lapsed into the other extreme. The most recent persecution for having repudiated Superstition. The controversy over the Symbols of the Eucharist, born on the occasion of the Images, pointing elsewhere.

THE HISTORY OF IMAGES

by FREDERICK SPANHEIM, F.F.

Principally concerning the 8th Century

Against

LOUIS MAIMBOURG, & NATALIS ALEXANDER.

SECTION I.

Occasion of this writing. A summary of the history of the Use or Worship of Images, up to the time of Leo the Isaurian. Passages from Tertullian, Eusebius,

the Council of Elvira, Augustine, Epiphanius, Gregory, Bede, etc., are briefly vindicated and turned against recent pretexts. On the events of the 4th century. The bad faith of Alexander and Maimbourg is shown in many instances. The controversy over images was stirred up before Leo the Isaurian. The history of Philippicus and Pope Constantine.

I. That the holier ages were ignorant of or condemned the religious use of images or the erection of pictures in sacred places, and that they abhorred their worship and adoration all the more, at least as far as true Christians are concerned, has been understood by some of the Latins from the indubitable monuments of the ancient Church, and has been demonstrated professionally by our writers. *Maimbourg, History of the Iconoclasts*. Now let some ingenuous person, not born to be a slave, compare the recent *History of the Iconoclasts* by Louis Maimbourg, and also the very new Dissertation by Natalis Alexander, a monk still in France today, against Jean Daillé and others of our countrymen who had proven this with many arguments, with the writings of those men, or with those of Bellarmine and his party! *History, Saec. VIII. Dissert. VI. Art. I, II, III*. And how quickly he will understand that a miserable cabbage is being recooked, that darkness is being cast upon the clearest light, that dust is being thrown in our eyes, that the many things our writers have set forth are being concealed, and that everywhere, in place of proofs (as they call them), there are the most empty fictions, and disputed suppositions!

II. For example, it had been most prolixly proven by Chamier, Molinaeus, Daillé, Ussher, Forbes, M. Bochart, Martel, and other countrymen of ours that no documents of the public and sacred use of images can be produced before the times of Gregory, first bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, then of Paulinus, prelate of Nola in Campania, that is, before the end of the 4th century. For those men did not dwell on the pseudepigraphal and apocryphal works, produced at last in the 8th century in the Acts of the Nicene Council, about which more later, and which at that very time were rejected by Charlemagne and the Fathers of the Synod of Frankfurt. *Tom. VII. Concil.* But also that all that use, first born in parts of Asia and Italy, was none other than historical for instruction, or for the memory of things, ethical for imitation, political for ornament, and mimetic, by which Gentiles, accustomed to images and statues, might be more easily led to the Christian faith, with no adoration of images at that time, no *proskynesis* (veneration), as was copiously demonstrated by the same men, and not against the will of the more sensible writers in Catholic France. And in these things Charlemagne, Agobardus of Lyons, Jonas of Orléans, Dungal the Deacon, Walafrid Strabo, Durandus of Mende, and then Polydore, Erasmus, Vives, Cassander, Barnesius, and not a few others preceded them.

III. What now does that recent Natalis do, in Article II of his dissertation? *To Saec. VIII. T. XIV*. To prove the religious use and worship of images from the Fathers of the earlier centuries, he begins with the story of the woman with the issue of

blood, which is found in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VII. Soon, he himself is about to enervate the entire force of this testimony, following Agobardus in his book *On Images* and, before him, Charlemagne in his *Capitulary*; he admits that the Caroline books doubted the truth of the event. He also admits that the discussion there is about a statue, and one indeed erected by gentile custom or manner, as Eusebius explicitly says, just as many other rites are wont to be used by the Gentiles. Finally, he grants that it was not erected in a sacred place or in a Church, nor was it erected with the intention that it be venerated, which, however, is the hinge of the whole controversy. For the Iconomachic war, as we will show more fully below, began from the worship of images hung in sacred places. From here Natalis passes to an emblematic picture, or to the parable of the Good Shepherd, expressed on certain glass chalices, about which Tertullian speaks in his book *On Modesty. Chap. VI*. Again he supposes what is the point at issue, and what Daillé and our writers had long ago refuted, that it was the very image or effigy or statue of Christ, painted on sacred or Eucharistic chalices, to be preserved therefore in the Church, and indeed for religious salutation, kissing, or adoration. But Tertullian says none of these things. Nor was the question ever raised about sacred emblems, histories, or parables, whether expressed in colors or bronze, or carved in wood or marble, such as are also found among the Reformed. Nor indeed do these things proceed from a wicked disposition, when they are represented on tablets, vases, or cups, but entirely from a sense of piety, which that author uselessly urges. This does not, however, lead to worship, to adoration, to veneration, and indeed in churches, temples, chapels, on altars, etc., as if it were some religious duty, which again is the state of the controversy. Thus, among the ornaments of New Rome, the City of Constantine, Eusebius reports the symbols of the good Shepherd, expressed on the fountains which were in the middle of the forum, as well as other symbols and innumerable statues, yet these were not in the temples, nor for the sake of worship. *Hist. L. III. C. XLIX*.

IV. From Tertullian, with a huge leap, he appeals to Nyssenus, Asterius, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Paulinus, etc., famous at the end of the 4th century or the beginning of the 5th, to prove that Christians at that time had historical pictures, and indeed of the Saints and Martyrs, of Paul, of Stephen, and of the contests of others, expressed in colors, on panels, linens, vases, chalices, etc. Thus, with many citations from Nyssenus and Paulinus, he proves that in their time such pictures adorned even the basilicas or temples themselves, in the regions of Cappadocia, Pontus, and Campania. But this is beside the point; we have already conceded the reliability of the cited authors to Alexander, and Daillé did not turn it into a controversy, and it has just been preemptively addressed by us by way of *anthypophora* (a figure of speech in which one asks and then answers one's own questions), and in the Historical Introduction, to Saec. IV. p. 388. The question was, how rightly was this done, and was it consistent with the practice of earlier ages? Whence Charlemagne, concerning the objected Gregory of Nyssa, said: "In this part we must observe the admonition of Paul, test the spirits,

whether they are of God.” *Lib. II. C. XVII.* The question also is, whether images at that time placed in temples were there for the sake of worship and adoration, of which there is no trace in genuine writings of the fourth Age?

V. Nor are those deeds from the age of Nyssen reconciled with the well-known Canon 36 of the Council of Elvira, which Agobardus the Archbishop of Lyons praised under Louis the Pious, in his book *On Images*, c. XXXIII. “It was resolved that there ought not to be pictures in the church,” whatever they may be, or in whatever manner they are to be placed in churches. The reason is added: “lest (other codices have ‘neither’) that which is worshipped or adored,” namely God or Christ, the one object of religious worship at that time, “be depicted on the walls.” How much more did it please them that what ought not to be worshipped or adored, such as the images of the Apostles or Saints, should not be depicted in churches, for the sake of worship or adoration, or certainly with this danger, as experience has taught? Natalis, on page 662, makes an exception: “From this Canon nothing else can be gathered than that the use and actual worship of images was removed from the churches in the Province of Baetica.” Correctly, it was not removed, for there had been none yet among Christians under the rule of the Gentiles, as Maimbourg elsewhere admits, but the use of images and pictures was forbidden, lest it be introduced into the churches of Christians, lest pictures be made in churches in the manner of the Gentiles, to guard against all superstition or idolatry, as Agobardus argues at greater length in the cited book. Nor was that a Provincial synod of Baetica alone, but a National Synod from all of Spain, as the subscriptions show, with Hosius of Cordova, Valerius of Saragossa, and other most holy men present, at the very beginning of the 4th century at least, to assert or certainly to restore the ancient discipline. Hence that synod later had the greatest authority in the West. Far more absurd is Maimbourg, from his own party, who argues that the Council of Elvira only forbade images to be painted on walls henceforth, namely for fear of corruption or disfigurement; while they would permit them to be hung on the walls, in painted and framed panels, and indeed for worship, or *proskynesis* (veneration), in a sense most evidently opposed to the Canon. That this view, drawn from Bellarmine, Vasquez, Hurtado, Sanderus, Garcia, Perronius, Mendoza, Coriolanus, Gonzalez, and others, was long ago exploded and confuted by Daillé and by our writers everywhere, the Ex-Jesuit was not unaware. Baronius, at A.D. 57, n. CXXI, CXXII, cut the knot, and with ill-advised temerity declared that this canon was supposititious, and had been concocted with remarkable imposture by some disciple of Claudius of Turin, a great Iconoclast, supposedly in the 9th century. Whence he later made a more moderate judgment on that canon, at A.D. 305, n. XLV. Alispinaeus argues in vain, in his notes on this canon, but following Alan Cope, Ayala, and Sixtus of Siena, that what was prohibited were not pictures of Saints and Martyrs, but those by which God and the Trinity itself were represented. Indeed, and also those by which Christ, certainly an object of worship and adoration, was represented. And Christians knew nothing else that was worshipped or ought to be worshipped. The discussion is also about pictures

indiscriminately, or images, none of which were to be represented on the walls of churches, for fear of worship or adoration. But if any Christians at that time worshipped Saints or Martyrs, according to the Maimbourgian hypothesis, then the Canon certainly regarded their images as well. But there were never any pictures of the invisible God or of the Holy Trinity among Christians, even for many centuries after the Council of Elvira, whence a prohibition of these alone would have been dissonant and foreign. This was also seen by the Spaniard Gonzalez, in his annotations on this canon, and by all those who have attempted other, plainly evasive, interpretations. Therefore, at that time, images of Christ, Peter, Paul, and any others, were kept among private treasures, painted on panels, as Eusebius attests: “preserved in paintings by colors.” *Hist. L. VII. C. XVIII*. The Spanish Fathers did not permit such images to be placed in churches, nor to be painted on their walls, much less to be worshipped or adored. Whence the reading of the Canon: “There ought not to be pictures in the church, nor (with the canon now being two-part) should that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls.” But more on that canon elsewhere, which induced Carranza, Canus, Baronius, Bellarmine, Bozius, Spondanus, and others to at times declaim against this Council of Elvira and its impiety in this matter, a council which was to be vindicated on many points by the Spaniard Mendoza, in his *Apology to Clement VIII*.

VI. Furthermore, for the 4th century, Maimbourg and Alexander are silent about what preceded the deeds of Nyssenus and Paulinus, things which prove that at that time there was no use, much less worship, of Sacred Images in the churches. *Hist. Lib. VIII. C. I, II*. Eusebius reports, on the occasion of the Diocletianic persecution, which began in the 19th year of Diocletian, of the Dionysian Era 303, that Christians in the larger cities had many basilicas, built from their foundations, and splendid edifices. The same author reports how these were leveled to the ground by imperial edicts, and the sacred codices in them were consumed by flames. Of images that might have adorned those sacred edifices, or of any insult done to them, any breaking or burning, he makes absolutely no mention. Thus, when Constantine was raised to the Empire, the Historian is solicitous above all else in describing the basilicas or temples or martyria, and oratories, which were ordered to be built everywhere under the Pious Emperor: in Jerusalem at the site of the Lord's sepulchre, at Mamre, in Bethlehem, Antioch, Nicomedia, Constantinople, and elsewhere. *On the Life of Constantine, M. Lib. III, IV*. Above all, he subjects to the eyes of his readers the Martyrium of Jerusalem, and another of the Holy Apostles in the city named after himself, in a graphic description. He omits nothing of what adorned the atria, porticoes, walls, vaults, apse, coffered ceilings, and the entire basilica. Here one can see the interiors with marble revetments, gleaming with polished stones, a great amount of gold, or, if you prefer, even with tessellated work. It is also said that the same Constantine erected a Sign of the Cross, radiant with gold and gems, but within his own Palace.

However, concerning the images hung in these Basilicas, whether of Christ the Savior, or of the Virgin, the Apostles, or the Martyrs, there is a deep silence in Eusebius. But this is also the case with Socrates and Sozomen, who were to describe the Basilicas of Constantine and his mother Helena. From this, one understands the very poor reliability of the author of the third Oration on Images, attributed to Damascene, who attempts to prove the erection and veneration of Sacred Images even in the time of Constantine the Great from this passage in Book I, Chapter XVIII of Socrates: "He placed his own images in the temples." For it is plain that Socrates is speaking of the temples of the Gentiles and the shrines of their gods, in which, after the idols were removed, the Emperor substituted his own images. There is nothing about the sacred images of Christ, the Virgin, or the Saints. Nor is there anything about images erected for veneration or adoration.

Nor is there anything in Theophanes, Cedrenus, or Codinus himself in his work on the Origins of Constantinople. Hence, Baronius and his followers had to seek support from Nicephorus Callistus, from the Pseudo-Acts of Sylvester, from Pseudo-Damasus, and that sort of Apocrypha, a matter which we have discussed in the Introduction to the History of the Fourth Century, where we deal with things falsely attributed to Constantine. Nevertheless, it is certain that this most splendid Emperor, fresh from paganism, decorated public places and forums all too much with statues and *ἄγάλμασι* (images), for instance, of Jove, Delphic Apollo, Minerva, Diana, Hercules, Castor and Pollux, etc., and similar figures, according to Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and the more recent Byzantine writers. Indeed, we read that in the middle of Constantine's forum was placed an effigy of Daniel with the lions, made of bronze, and symbols of the Good Shepherd for the adornment and splendor of the fountains.

The result of this was that afterward, by a preposterous imitation, as this fourth century was declining and the fifth beginning, Christian images were erected everywhere in place of the pagan ones, such as those of the Savior, the Virgin, Peter, Paul, and others; eventually also to be an ornament for the churches themselves, though not everywhere, as that superstition gradually spread. It is well known that in Asia, Nyssenus, a man whom no one would dispute had more zeal than judgment, and in Italy, Paulinus, a bishop of Nola who had been a monk, devoted themselves to this work more than others, with the applause of the throng of monks and the ignorant multitude, which is captivated by external things. Indeed, not even in the Church of Saint Sophia of Theodosius or Justinian are such images read to have been placed for the sake of veneration and adoration, no matter how diligently historians have observed every portico, atrium, courtyard, hall, spiral staircase, wall, pavement, veil; whatever adorned the Narthex, the Apse, the Holy Table, the Bema, the Solea, the Nave, the Diaconicum, and the rest. Nor, however, were statues of the Emperors, the sign of the Constantinian Cross, and mosaic and tessellated works omitted, but these do not pertain to the present case.

VII. Now, what Augustine thought in the fifth century against the worshippers of tombs and pictures is taught primarily by the indignation of the Bishop of Hippo against the superstition of his time, which had invaded certain Christians. A well-known passage, among others, is in his book *On the Morals of the Catholic Church*, Volume I of the newest edition, Chapter XXXIV, page 75: "Do not follow the crowds of the ignorant, who are superstitious even in the true Religion itself, etc. I know that there are many worshippers of tombs and Pictures," and more on that subject. In his aforementioned Dissertation VI, on the eighth century, page 680-681, Natalis raises two exceptions to this passage: 1. That Augustine is not speaking of any kind of adoration, but of a superstitious one, in the manner of the Gentiles. 2. That he speaks of that which was done at the tombs of any dead, not at those of the Martyrs, as (he says) Daillé falsely claims.

But the first exception had already been Bellarmine's, though he took a hesitant step, adding a "perhaps," that Augustine was speaking of superstitious worship. The same was extensively refuted by Daillé himself, and most fittingly retorted upon the superstitious adoration of the Latins. For there is no kind of adoration or religion by which the Gentiles venerated their *ἰδωλματα*, their idols, that Pontifical Rome does not also use for the images of the Virgin and the Saints, as it calls them, with consecration, prostration, prayers, vows, gifts, candles, incense, ascribed virtues, etc., as Polydore Vergil, Ludovicus Vives, Georgius Cassander, Erasmus, and other ingenuous men have long since confessed, and more recently, other honest men. Therefore, these things were not to be so securely put forward by Alexander, as he does. And his unsubstantiated assertion that the Christian men, of whom Augustine speaks, offered a Gentile worship, even in an ethnic rite, to those tombs and pictures as if to gods, is more to the point, that they indiscriminately offered that worship of religion to the images of any of the dead. This is utterly abhorrent to the words of Augustine, to the morals then in the Catholic Church, and to the Christian name. The latter exception is no more true, namely, that Augustine in that place is not speaking of the sepulchers and pictures of the Martyrs and Saints, nor of the superstitious festivities that were frequented there from all sides. For, in the first place, if such Christians were guilty of this, they should have been charged not with superstition or ignorance, as Augustine does, but with a more-than-pagan idolatry, for having adored the images and relics of any of the dead as so many deities. One need only consult the books *On the City of God*, *On the True Religion*, *On Christian Doctrine*, and the *Expositions on the Psalms*, especially on the second part, as it is called, of Psalm 113. 2. The most luxurious feasts over the dead, of which the Bishop of Hippo speaks in the same context, and indeed for the sake of religion, were then entirely born in Africa at the tombs of the martyrs, at the martyria, at the memorials of the saints, in their honor, as Augustine himself testifies in more than one place. In Book VI, Chapter II of his *Confessions*: "When she had brought porridge and bread and wine to the memorials of the Saints, as was the custom in Africa," etc., speaking of his mother Monica, but with the disapproval of her Son. In the eighth book of *The City of God*, the last chapter, he

similarly criticizes that custom of some who would bring feasts to the places of the martyrs, at the memorials of the martyrs, whence arose the occasion for gorging oneself, which Ambrose of Milan abolished. Yet Augustine warns in the same place that this was not done by the better Christians. Elsewhere, in the second volume of his works, Epistle 69 to Bishop Aurelius, he complains at length that revelries and drunkenness in honor of the most blessed Martyrs were celebrated everywhere and daily in the African Church. We omit documents of this kind, as the superstition arose "from pagan custom," as has long been observed by the Learned.

VIII. But behold the integrity of Natalis Alexander in producing or vindicating Augustine! First, the ingenuous man is silent about other and most explicit passages of Augustine, and very well-known ones at that, in which he calls back those superstitious worshippers of tombs and pictures to the religious worship that is to be rendered to God alone. Nor is any distinction between absolute or relative adoration approved by the Bishop of Hippo. That august name in the Church speaks eloquently: The memorials of the Saints and Martyrs are indeed to be honored, but temples, sacred rites, and sacrifices are not to be established for them: The worship of deceased men ought not to be a matter of religion, for they do not seek such honors: They are to be honored for imitation, not to be adored for religion, etc. And you may read more on this either in the work *On the City of God*, at the end of Book VIII, or in the book *On the True Religion*, Chapter 55 of the first volume, which certainly stand out among the writings of Augustine. But especially pertinent to the present matter is the lucid Sermon of Augustine, in the newest Edition, Volume V, on Psalm 113, according to the Hebrew codices, Psalm 115, where he speaks of the idols of the Gentiles which have mouths and do not speak. The holy man argues at length how vain is the excuse either of the Gentiles or of those among the Christians who imitate them with a preposterous and inconsiderate zeal, that it is not this visible thing that is worshipped by them, not the idol, not the sign, not the effigy, but the thing whose effigy they gaze upon. The Pontifical iconolaters should believe this is said to them. Hence Augustine's indignation at the superstitious practice, with the minds of Christians being raised to God. But with these things concealed, what does Natalis draw from Augustine in Dissertation VI for the use and worship of images, as he entitles it? He brings forth a passage from Book I of *On the Consensus of the Evangelists*, Chapter X. There the Bishop of Hippo laughs at those who deliriously imagined that Christ had written about magic to Peter and Paul. But why, he asks, to Peter and Paul? "I believe," he adds, "because in many places they saw them painted together with him," whose merits, also joined together on account of the same day of Passion, Rome would solemnly commend. But does the Bishop of Hippo approve of the viewing, or even the worship, of those pictures in those deranged men? Does he profess there that they were adored together with the image of Christ, or that they were erected or ought to be erected in Basilicas for the sake of religion, and indeed by Christians of the true name? Certainly none of this.

Indeed, hear what he immediately adds, and right after, which Natalis has cut out with malicious deceit and by design! “Thus they wholly deserved to err, who sought Christ and His Apostles NB. not in the Holy Codices, but on painted walls: Nor is it a wonder if they were deceived by the painters.” You have a specimen of Alexander's citations, and also of his integrity. And in what regard Augustine held such painted images of Christ, Paul, Peter, the Virgin, he taught elsewhere explicitly. Namely, he held those forms and representations to be fictitious and uncertain, but also useless. Thus, in his dissertation *On the Trinity*, and on the faith and love of Him whose face no one has seen with carnal eyes, on this occasion, from the third volume of his work *On the Trinity*, book VIII, chapters IV and V, he speaks of the face of Christ, of Paul, of the Virgin, of Lazarus, which were varied and imagined with the diversity of innumerable thoughts. And at the same time, he teaches in several places that what those faces were like, with what features, is utterly unknown, not known, completely uncertain, but also that it does nothing for faith or for the worship of the Lord Jesus: It is enough, indeed, if our faith is occupied with these things, that by the grace of God they lived thus, and performed those deeds which Scripture testifies, and to believe this is useful.

From this it can also be gathered that Augustine, and the Christians of his age, were ignorant of the fables of Evagrius, Bede, the Nicæans, Pope Adrian, Theophanes, Cedrenus, Simeon Metaphrastes, Nicephorus, and the like, concerning the face of Christ, the Virgin, Paul, Peter, which they fabricated as either impressed by Christ himself on a cloth, or on a burial shroud, or expressed in colors by Luke the painter, about which we will speak elsewhere. And yet our writers of the Iconoclastic History, Natalis and Maimburgius, securely present these things to their readers, that is, to those ignorant of early antiquity, and also ignorant of Augustine.

IX. Similarly, we understand the mind of Gregory I, the Roman Bishop, toward the 6th century, at the end of which occurred the action of Serenus of Marseilles, about whom Gregory writes in two letters, Epistle 107 and 11, and we in the Historical Introduction to that Age, Chapter III. To Serenus he says, “Forbid or in every way avoid the adoration of images: they are not placed in the church for adoration, but only for instructing the minds of the faithful (who are ignorant).” Elsewhere, in Book 11, Indiction 2, Epistle 10: “The picture itself, like Scripture, brings the Son of God to memory,” whom he professes to adore alone. See both letters to Serenus. Gregory was therefore most alien, as Natalis Alexander does not deny on page 683, from the decree of the Seventh Synod, with which he is in direct opposition. Hence also Charles the Great concluded his Capitulary with the words of Gregory, and everywhere fortified himself with his authority, as seen in Book V, the final chapter. Nevertheless, Gregory did not approve of the breaking of the images in the act of Serenus, inasmuch as he thought they had their use, both for ornament and for instruction. From this it is established, whatever recent writers may invent from their own minds; 1. That the use of

images in not a few churches of the West was familiar at the end of the 6th century, certainly with the approval of Gregory I, for the instruction of the ignorant populace: 2. That no worship or adoration was approved, in whatever way it was offered to the images: Hence the statement, “forbid in every way”; and that they were placed “only for instructing the minds,” and indeed of the “ignorant”; that “it is not lawful to adore anything made by hand,” and that Christians should be admonished, “that in the adoration of the omnipotent Trinity alone they should prostrate themselves humbly.” Therefore Gregory also condemned προσκύησιν, humble prostration, before an image. And P. Gussanville, a priest of Chartres, rightly says of Gregory: “Thus the most holy Roman Pontiff opined at the end of the 6th century.” And this same most recent editor of Gregory observes that the addendum to Epistle 54 of Book VII, written to Secundinus, which Baronius strains at in the year 599, in which it is read, “And we indeed, not as before the Divinity, but before it (the Image of the Savior) we prostrate ourselves,” is ingenuously not found in many manuscript codices.

3. Finally, from Gregory himself it is clear that Serenus of Marseilles, a most holy man, was already an Iconoclast, breaking the images with a most salutary purpose, and removing the stumbling blocks against which the ignorant populace, warned about them in vain, would openly trip. But Baronius, for the aforementioned year 599, No. XVI, absurdly twists all that Gregory wrote to Serenus, so that the Pontiff seems to have inveighed only against the worshippers of the colors applied to a panel to form an image, since Christians who are not out of their minds agree that they should venerate and adore the image by reason of the Prototype. By which reasoning, no one among the pagans can be considered an idolater. For which of the pagans, to return Baronius's own words to him, “was found so dull of wit and out of his mind, that when he prostrated himself before an image, he would say that he was adoring those colors applied to a panel to form an image?” Indeed, who would not say what Augustine also observes in his sermon on Psalm 113, no. 4, that he is looking only at an effigy and a sign of that thing which he ought to worship?

From the action of Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, at the end of the 6th century, of which Gregory the Great himself is a witness, it is understood that the assertion of Baronius and his followers, as well as of Maimburgius and Natalis Alexander, that Leo the Isaurian, of whom we shall speak later, was the first of the Iconoclasts, is a fabrication. Indeed, Serenus, in casting out the images, had been preceded by Epiphanius, Bishop in Cyprus, toward the end of the 4th century, who tore a veil that he had found hanging at the doors of a certain church he had entered to pray; namely, at the Holy Doors of that screen which separated the βῆμα or sanctuary of the priests from the ναός or the rest of the temple. These doors, because they were permeable with lattices, grilles, or intercolumniations, whether of wood, stone, or bronze, were thus covered with a veil or curtain to conceal the mysteries while they were being performed, in

imitation of the Jewish Veil that covered the Sanctuary. For that Christian temples expressed the Solomonic temple, with atriums, porticoes, a pronaos, a temple, and a sanctuary, and hence with veils or *απετάσμασι*, has been observed elsewhere; and these they called by the mixed-barbarous word *βηλόθυρα*, veils hung on the doors. The reason for tearing that veil in a certain village of Palestine, Anablatha, is added by Epiphanius: that it was not only painted, but also had an image as if of a certain Christ or of a Saint, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, and, as he adds, “contrary to our Religion.” Not only does Epiphanius himself report this in his Epistle to John of Jerusalem, but Jerome also, the translator of his epistle, out of hatred for that John, who was of course an Origenist, reports it in the second volume of the works of Epiphanius, and in the second volume of Jerome's works, page 161. Serenus had also been preceded by that Xenaias mentioned by Theophanes in his Chronograph, during the reign of Zeno, the same man being the Bishop of Hierapolis in Syria (Maimburgius calls it Heliopolis, being little concerned with names), at a time when the superstition of images was growing strong, teaching that “images should not be accepted,” and therefore if any existed, they should be abolished. For this reason, Maimburgius calls him an Iconoclast, but also a Manichean, and unbaptized, as the later Greek writers say after Theophanes, on the pretext that he had sided with Peter Gnapheus; but images had nothing to do with the cause of Chalcedon. It is also established that the Armenians, tenacious of their ancient custom, never received them, as the superstition arose after their schism.

The result of this was that Constantine, the one of ill repute, around the year 752, the 20th of his reign, after capturing Melytene, formerly the metropolis of Armenia Secunda and then of Tertia, and retaking Theodosiopolis of Armenia Prima, both on the Euphrates, and thus after subjugating the Armenians, he led them into Thrace, as being most alien to images and their worship. Theophanes is the witness to this for the aforementioned year, and after him the rest. Where Maimburgius, in book II, page 245, most absurdly and falsely, but in his usual manner, states that most Armenians at that time became Iconoclasts from long commerce with the Saracens. Why did they not, from the same commerce, become Antitrinitarians, or enemies of the Cross, retaining this as their sole sign? Nor did the Armenians have the Saracens as neighbors before the 7th century was well advanced, and the Saracens permitted the Christians the freest practice of their religion, as Maimburgius himself admits in book 1, chapter 12.

Now we must return to the action of Epiphanius, whose imitator was Serenus. Indeed, Natalis Alexander makes an exception to that, from his Dissertation VI on the eighth century: “it seems that the use of images in the churches of Cyprus and Palestine had not yet been taken up at that time.” Correct! But the same Epiphanius explicitly judged that they could not be taken up, saving the authority of the Scriptures and the Christian Religion. And ingenuous men in their Adversaria have conceded that the excellent Man also had respect for the Illiberitan Canon, with its most explicit prohibition of hanging such images or

pictures in churches, on their veils or walls. Maimburgius, in his "History of the Iconoclasts," page 140, with a most inept evasion, as is his habit, though not of his own invention, suggested that the image was a profane one, under the figure of Christ or a Saint, perhaps of Cupid, or of Jove about to embrace Venus, placed, of all places, in a Christian church! But Epiphanius, his memory not serving him sufficiently, was merely uncertain whether that image was representative of Christ or of some Saint, and tolerated neither, because it was "contrary to our Religion," or the institution of our ancestors. Whence Baluzius, in his note on that passage of Lactantius, concerning the ministers of Diocletian, "an image of God is sought in the church," ingenuously states, as is proper in his notes to Lactantius' chapter XI: "Therefore the churches of the Christians lacked images," which Heraldus, Rigaltius, and other more recent scholars have also professed.

Plainly contrary to the mind of Epiphanius and the interdict of the Eliberitan Synod, Gregory the Great, writing to Serenus, stated that pictures could or should be used in churches, so that they might read by seeing on the walls what they cannot read in codices. And yet, the matter ought to have been of greater moment to Gregory, to use instruction from the Holy Scriptures to remove such stumbling blocks and instruments of the creeping idolatry.

XI. Thenceforth, in the 7th century, which preceded ours, and at the beginning of the 8th, not only were the images of Saints placed in temples or oratories or sacred porticoes for the sake of ornament, remembrance, or imitation, far from the religion of adoration. But also those of Emperors, Princes, Bishops, Fathers or Confessors, who had condemned heresies in general Synods. And concerning the images of Emperors, the matter is certain, and has already been observed elsewhere regarding the images of Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian and Theodora, from Byzantine sources. But let Baronius, for the year 603, speak from Gregory I concerning the images of Phocas and Leontia, the Augusti, which Saint Gregory ordered to be placed in the Oratory of Saint Caesarius within the Palace, that is, the church situated on the Appian way at the turn-off from the Latin way. Indeed, the images of the Augusti were received with many acclamations, and not without incense and candles, in the manner of the Gentiles, which they called *λαυράτα*, *laurata* or *laureata* (which a learned man says of the laurel-wreathed eagles). The Nicæans also protected themselves with this example, when Charles reproached them in his Capitulary for their pagan imitation, as seen in Book III, chapter XV. And in this way they also erected votive images, according to Anastasius in his life of Constantine I, or "pancrean" images, as others substitute, that is, representing every countenance. And hence it happened that Philippicus Bardanes, who favored the Monothelites and was the successor of Justinian II, sent his image to Pope Constantine, about which Anastasius writes, and from him Baronius for the year 710, number XII, whence his effigy was not introduced into the church. Thus, thereafter, they did not see fit for the image of Leo the Isaurian, after the contention with Gregory arose, nor of his Iconoclast successors, to be retained or introduced.

But pictures of patriarchs and bishops were also erected in temples or porticoes, for the sake of honor and memory, to be removed if they had lapsed into heresy, their names at the same time being erased from the diptychs. Thus in the Synod of the 7th century, drawing to a close, as Anastasius reports in the Life of Pope Agatho, the likeness of those patriarchs through whom the Monothelite error had sprouted—Cyrus, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, Peter—was removed from the pictures of the church. Hence in the Life of John VII, for the year 705, the zeal of that Pontiff is commended for adorning the churches with images, to be recognized even by the countenance of the Fathers. And in that manner, and for the same reasons, as a μνημόσυνον (memorial) of the Orthodox faith, the images of those bishops who had presided over the Universal Synods were hung in sacred places, as a kind of history of the synodal acts. Thus also Agobardus, in his book on Images, who was renowned at the beginning of the 9th century. Thus he says in chapter XXI from the edition of Stephanus Baluzius: “For the ancients also had images of the Saints, either painted or sculpted, but for the sake of history, for remembering, not for worshipping: as for example, the acts of the Synods, where the Catholics were depicted, supported by truth and victorious, while the heretics of perverse dogma, convicted with their lies detected, were expelled, for the sake of remembering 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 none of the ancient Catholics ever thought that they should be venerated or adored. Now, however, the error in its growth has become so conspicuous that to adore created things is close or similar to the idolatry or heresy of the Anthropomorphites.” See the rest there.

XII. And with that intention, the images of the Fathers of the 6th Synod, as of the previous synods, convened against the heresy of the Monothelites, were depicted in the sacred Portico of Constantinople, about which is the history of the 7th century. What did Bardanes, a supporter of the Monothelites, acclaimed Emperor after a sedition was raised against Justinian, in the year of the Dionysian Era 712, or 711 according to Baronius? After holding a Monothelite Synod, he ordered the picture of the 6th Council to be scraped from the Basilica, along with the rest of the Universal Synods, at the instigation of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, adding a sacred letter to Pope Constantine, in the year commonly 712, but more truly once the empire was somewhat stabilized in the year 713. Whether he also ordered all images of whatever kind to be abolished from the temples, as Sigonius and others say, may be more doubtful. For ancient Acts, in the 6th volume of the Councils, report that in place of those images, Bardanes put back those of Honorius and Sergius the Monothelites, and of those who had been ejected with them. Whatever the case may be (for the reliability of such Acts is shaky), there is certainly complete agreement about the removal, by order of Philippicus, of the image of the Sixth Synod from the Sacred Portico, ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων αὐλῶν (from the sacred courts), and in principle, not so much out of hatred for such images as for the cause asserted in that Synod. Agatho the

Deacon, a scribe of the 6th Synod, reports this in Concil. 1405, and John of Constantinople in Concil. 1409, in that epistle which is attributed to him to Constantine, and what Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, Zonaras, Ado of Vienne, Marianus Scotus, Sigonius, Nauclerus, and if there are any more, have, does not disagree, with Baronius also not concealing it for the year 711, nos. 10-12.

Hence arose the indignation of Pope Constantine, not only restoring in the Basilica of Peter, after a Synod was held in Rome, the votive tablet containing the six universal Synods, as Anastasius has it, but also devoting the Emperor Philippicus to curses on the pretext of heresy, and decreeing that his image, as was customary, should not be brought into the temple, so says Sigonius, and indeed that the Romans should receive it neither painted nor struck on coins. Baronius, as is his habit, extols this deed for the year 712, no. 5, "counting it to the glory of the Roman Pontiffs, that they so execrated the heretical Emperor, that they not only would not receive him, but would not even look upon his image." Not content, the Pontiff erected in the Basilica the image which represented the Universal Synods; whether on that occasion, just as indignation is wont to strive in the opposite direction, or from the superstition that was daily gaining strength, he added another decree, by which "all who denied the veneration, established by the Church, to the Holy Images, were condemned," according to the same Sigonius in the place cited. Thus, it is understood from Ado, P. Diaconus, and others, that the tablet removed by Philippicus was soon restored in the East by Theodosius, the predecessor of Leo the Isaurian.

XIII. Furthermore, from the action of Pope Constantine flowed the things we have just mentioned. First, once the controversy over Monothelism, which implicated Pope Honorius, condemned in the Sixth Synod, was set aside, and about which there was almost silence thereafter in both East and West, another was shortly agitated with great passion, concerning images and their veneration, or religious worship, which was to progress under Leo III, the Isaurian, brought to the Empire in the year 718 and called Iconomach or Iconoclast. Hence, soon under Pope Constantine, visions or apparitions were proclaimed in favor of the veneration of images, and especially of the Mother of God. Such was that of Egwin, bishop of the Hwicce, or of Worcester, in Britain, who, brought to Rome to Constantine, affirmed under oath that he had been divinely admonished to exhibit the image of Mary, the Mother of God, in his church to be venerated by the people.

The Abbot of Ursperg in his Chronicle, Nauclerus likewise in his Chronographia, and Bale in his "Writers of Britain," Century 1, on Egwin, report this in greater detail; the Westminster chronicler also mentions the journey to Rome for the year 714. The English Annals consistently add that a Synod of London was celebrated at that time, and in it, under Primate Britwald, a decree concerning the worship of Sacred Images was promulgated. It is no wonder that Bede was silent about this in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, since these things happened

after it had already been completed, at the end of the year 714. Nor are the Acts of the Councils silent, although the editors, after Baronius at the end of Volume VIII for the year 714, render this Synod suspect; and, says the writer of the Annals, we are easily led to think that it is a fiction. Why so? Because, they say, it is established from Bede that the use of images had already obtained in England at the time when Augustine the Younger was brought to that island, bringing with him an image of the Lord Savior depicted on a panel.

But 1. No one denies that Augustine commended the use of images, following the example of Gregory I, intending to bring Roman customs into Britain, Romanism with its attendant superstitions, being himself ignorant of both the Scriptures and the native tongue, as Bale observes from his sources. 2. The image of the Mother of God was not yet mentioned, only the effigy of Christ the Lord is said to have been brought forth by Augustine, according to Bede, and it is about the former that Egwin finally claims a vision or revelation, as he was about to found a monastery, which in that age arose from such apparitions and new cults. 3. The controversy began to be moved not so much about the *use* as about the subsequent *religious worship* of images within churches, along with the growth of the superstition of relics, of Mary, of saints, of the Mass, and of monasticism, Egwin having been born, as it were, for superstitions, as the English chroniclers say of him. Hence, not a few pious men in the West, and in Britain, offered resistance: John of Beverley, the preceptor of Bede, and others, and also long after in the time of Charles the Great, Alcuin and his associates and disciples. Whence many chronicles refer the origin of the controversy concerning images to these times of Pope Constantine, and of the Emperors Philippicus, Anastasius, and Theodosius. The *Fasciculus Temporum* calls the heresy then creeping in, the Heresy of Images. And besides the propensity of Rome at that time for all superstitions, it is easy to gather that the actions of Philippicus and Pope Constantine gave it the occasion. For when the votive tablet of the synods was removed by the former, and restored by the Roman Pontiff with strict anathemas against the Prince, there was no lack of defenders for him in the East. Hence others began to urge that no images at all should be placed in temples, and much less should προσκύνησις (veneration), so hateful to the Saracens, be offered to them. On the contrary, Constantine with his followers, as the times of the Latins permitted, applied himself with all zeal to multiplying and venerating images. There also followed from Constantine's anathema on Philippicus another very grave matter, which should be noted here: First, the occasion arose for those plotting revolution in the East to rebel against the Prince, as one bound by the crime of heresy and the chain of execration. Then, the action of Gregory II, Constantine's successor, against Leo the Isaurian; for he, moved by the example of his predecessor, just as the latter had hurled his thunderbolt against Philippicus for Monothelism, did not hesitate to vibrate it not long after against Leo for his Iconomachy, a preamble to rebellion, and a support for the aggrandizement of Pontifical power.

SECTION II.

Continuation of the History, under Leo the Isaurian. The Fable of the Origin of the Iconoclastic Heresy. The struggle of the ancient and recent Iconolaters, refuted in many ways, and their bad faith. In particular, that of Maimburgius. The true origin of the Iconomachy under Leo. Its milder beginnings; the reason initiated by Leo; the true time of the overturning of the images. The deception of Baronius, and especially of both recent writers. The actions of Gregory II against Leo asserted historically. The doctrine from this of Baronius and the Romanists. The empty evasions of Natalis Alexander. The actions of Leo then in the East recounted from the truth. Things falsely attributed to this Prince through calumny. Each point demonstrated. More notable fables about Leo, with the veneer of recent writers wiped away. About the overturned image of Christ in Constantinople. About the College, Library, and Professors of Constantinople destroyed by fire. About the attempts made by Leo against Pope Gregory and against Germanus the Patriarch. About his perfidy toward John of Damascus. Pseudo-miracles. Other fictitious things for Maimburgius to exaggerate. The end of Leo.

I. This is the most true origin, or the first spark of that war which was soon excited on the cause of images. From which was to be born for the Roman Pontiffs the opportunity of shaking off the yoke of the Eastern Empire. Nor would we have revisited the matter a little more deeply in the preceding Lemma, if the pair of most recent writers, Maimburgius in his said History and Natalis Alexander in that of the eighth century, with a diffuse disputation which he calls a Panoply against the old and new Iconomachs, had not imposed upon this whole cause, after Baronius and his followers, a work excessively praised by the Gallic writer of the Journal of the Learned. What do they say? First, keeping silent about the facts we have mentioned, silent about the origin of the introduction of images into churches, oratories, or sacred porticoes, even those of the Princes, Bishops, and Doctors of the Catholic Church themselves, they rehash their old cabbage, as we have just seen from Natalis. And they assume all too securely that the religious use and worship of images obtained from the very first age of the Apostles, all the way to the times of the Second Nicene Synod. Second, those men conceal more cautiously than is proper, in the life of Philippicus or of Pope Constantine, either the act of the former in removing the pictures from the sacred portico of Constantinople, or the opposite deed of the latter, in restoring them and decreeing by law the veneration of the Holy Images in Rome and elsewhere through his agents. Those cunning men say nothing of these things, though they are about to open up the very origins of either Iconodulia or Iconomachy. These same men are not unaware, as even afterward not only the Greek Iconomachs, but not even Charles the Great, nor for a long enough time a large part of the West, permitted images to be called holy or to be worshipped religiously, of which the esteemed Agobardus, quoted by Baluzius, said the former was a mark of foolishness, the latter of sacrilege, in his work on

Images, chapter XVI and XXXIV. Third, after Baronius for the year 716, they invent, from Cedrenus indeed and from the Greek Iconolaters, with circumstances augmented among the later Byzantines, such as John Zonaras, Michael Glycas, and especially Constantine Manasses, a completely different origin for Iconomachy, one that reflects the character of the lesser Greeks quite well, and is clearly set up for ridicule. They pretend that first Iezid, the Caliph of the Arabs at this time, and soon after Leo the Isaurian, were incited against the Holy Images, at the instigation of certain Jewish tricksters, who had predicted to the one a long duration of his attained empire, namely forty-one years of placid rule for the Caliph, and to the other, Leo, the imperial dignity itself, and also a longevity to be measured by a century. And what is to be marveled at, they had predicted this to Leo when he was still a boy, and a poor little donkey-driver, of a sordid art, “poor, and of a mean trade,” with the cognomen of Conon, when by chance on a journey in Asia he had met them, with his beast of burden and his wares. Furthermore, they fable that those Jews stipulated nothing else in reward for their prophecy than that each should abolish the idolatry of the Christians, and cast the idols or images, both painted and sculpted, out of the churches, as being contrary to the first precept of the Decalogue. Thus Maimburgius in his *History of the Iconoclasts*, Book I, page 22, adds that the Jews interpret the first Precept most wickedly, which forbids only idols, not images, as if his business were only with his catechumens, and he were unconcerned about the things that have long since been brought forth by our side against Bellarmine, Gretser, Perronius, Richelius, and others. Therefore Leo, after gaining the empire, mindful (so they continue) of the oath by which he had bound himself to the Hebrews, and being reminded by them about destroying the images, at their impulse, after communicating the matter to Germanus, finally promulgated the Edict for the abolishing of images. And thus, says Natalis in volume XIV, in his section on the Heresy of the Iconoclasts, part II, impiety was passed from the Hebrews to the Christians, which the Pseudo-Nicæans also say. You have, reader, Leo as the first of the Christians who dared to turn into a controversy that which, of course, had been handed down from the Apostles themselves, received by the usage of all centuries, and confirmed by so many miracles in perpetual succession; namely, whether the images of Christ, the Virgin, Peter, Paul, Stephen, and all the male and female Saints should be venerated with religious προσκύνησις.

II. But this Byzantine fable, and hence the deception of Baronius, Maimburgius, and Alexander, is betrayed by too many things at the very threshold. 1. The silence, as far as Leo the Isaurian is concerned, of Paul the Deacon, of Anastasius the Librarian, and of Nicephorus of Constantinople, whose work was edited by Petavius, of whom the last, though a most fierce Iconolater, recounts a completely different occasion for Leo's Edict, for the year 726. Namely, certain terrifying prodigies, which Leo had interpreted as θείας ὀργῆς μηνύματα, “divine signs of wrath,” γινόμενα, “which happened” ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν εἰκονισμάτων ἰδρῦσει τε καὶ προσκυνήσει, “on account of the placement and adoration of the images.”

Theophanes also, whom Baronius cites, has nothing of the fable about the boy Conon, about that meeting of the Jews with Leo, about the prediction, about the oath of Conon, as is established from his Chronographia. Nor do the Nicene Acts, in which it is they themselves that testify that no fables or supports for the Iconolatric cause were omitted. To be sure, in Action V, John, a monk of Palestine, reports, with what reliability he does not say, concerning Iezid or Ezid, the successor of Omar, that he, deceived by a *Φαρμακομάντης*, a Hebrew, was incensed against all images by a false prophecy, as recorded in Concil. col. 389. But about Leo the Isaurian, about the boy Conon, about the prediction of the empire made by the Hebrews, and about the final Jewish stipulation for the removal of the images, that little Greek monk says nothing, nor do the Acts of the Synod.

II. Much more recent than all these is Cedrenus, from the declining 11th century, otherwise a copyist of Theophanes, and a purveyor of endless fables, a man in whom everyone finds a lack of judgment to the point of Iconolatric madness, and who has not been transmitted to us intact. If no little Greek has interpolated Cedrenus here, not only have Zonaras, Glycas, and Constantine Manasses copied him in this part, all driven by an equal zeal for images and hatred for Leo and Constantine, which was characteristic of their times, but they have also augmented the fable with other circumstances. Certainly Constantine Manasses, a chronicler who is among the most mendacious of all in these matters, and whom Maimburgius copies in this little narrative, varies from Cedrenus: 1. Concerning the condition of the Jews, whom he says made a journey for the sake of commerce, not as fugitives from Jezid, or from his son, as impostors. 2. Concerning the time of the prediction, after they had journeyed together with Leo, who was driving a small donkey laden with merchandise; Cedrenus has it differently. 3. Concerning the time of approaching Leo, to whom they flew as soon as he was declared Emperor, immediately stipulating the *καθαίρεσιν τῶν εἰκονογραφημάτων* (destruction of the images). Cedrenus places this event in the 7th year of Leo. 4. Concerning the execution of Leo's promise; Manasses is the authority that the Emperor immediately gave his assent and discussed with Germanus the removal of the images. 5. Furthermore, Manasses does not call him Conon, nor does he say anything about Jezid having been previously deceived by a similar fraud. We omit other points.

III. Now behold, we challenge Maimburgius and Natalis Alexander on the authority of those whom they often hold in low esteem elsewhere. Thus, while Theophanes, Cedrenus, and Zonaras report the action of Gregory II, namely, his withdrawing Rome, Italy, and whatever he could in the West from the empire of the Emperor Leo, and forbidding the tribute, Natalis Alexander says that they wrote these things falsely, namely, so that he would not seem to recognize such power in the Roman Pontiff under Louis the Great. Thus, the silence of Anastasius concerning the transfer of the kingdom from Childeric to Pepin by Zacharias is of the greatest weight to this recent writer, in his Dissertation 1 on

the 8th century, who denies that event, and in many other places. But now, in this little narrative about Leo, the silence of the same Anastasius, and of the others I mentioned who are earlier than Cedrenus and Constantine Manasses, had to be concealed by these men. Nor is Baronius any different, at one moment objecting to a silent Anastasius if something is less favorable to his cause, at another, for the year 739, no. VI, finding that “many things were omitted by Anastasius,” etc., and so throughout his work of the Annals.

IV. It is plain to anyone that the little narrative about Jezid II, the eleventh of the Caliphs, who was going to rage against the Sacred Images at the impulse of a certain Jew, gave rise to the other one, about Leo the Isaurian; so that the lesser Greek Iconolaters might conflate Iconomachy with Jewish and Saracen impiety. But not even what they report about Jezid, that he was going to remove the images from the temples at the tricks of a Jewish impostor, is narrated by the Arabs. Certainly Elmacin is silent in Book I of his Saracen History, the Chronicle of the Caliphs is silent: nor does Marmol report it in his History of the Successors of Muhammed from Arab sources, but from the lesser Greeks, as is clear from his Africa, part I, book III, chapter III. V. Add the everywhere conflicting circumstances, the witnesses of the fable. 1. In the Nicene Acts, and in the recently published *Διήγησις* (Narrative) of John of Jerusalem after Theophanes, the plan to exterminate the images is attributed to a certain *πηγέτης* (leader) of the Hebrews from Tiberias, a *Φαρμακομάντης* (sorcerer), whose name was Tessaracontapechus: Theophanes introduces a Jew from Laodicea on the Syrian coast: Cedrenus, not one, but several *ἑβραίους* (Hebrews): Constantine Manasses, *ἐμπόρους ιουδαίους*, Jewish merchants, who happened upon Leo. 2. The Nicene Acts, and that recently published John, by reason of the times, refer the matter to Iezid II, the successor of Omar, as seen in Conc. col. 387. Thus Theophanes, that the event happened in the seventh year of Leo the Isaurian, that is, 723 of Christ, and therefore under the second Jezid, who succeeded his paternal uncle Omar, in the fourth year of Leo, 719 of the common Christian era, and of the Hegira, from the Eastern Chronicle, Theophanes, and others. The rest of the Byzantines say the event happened when Conon or Leo was still a boy, and therefore under Iezid I, and thus Baronius, Maimburgius, and (so the last one) with an exact calculation, in the year of the Christian Era 686: so accustomed is he to be accurate in computing years and uncovering primary sources. 3. John the Monk in the Nicene Acts says that the Saracen Caliph in fact destroyed whatever images and *ὁμοιωμάτων* (likenesses) there were everywhere, and compelled the Christians themselves to destroy them. Indeed, following the example of the Saracen, the first Iconoclast to show himself was the Pseudo-Bishop of Nacolia, *καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν* (and those around him), and not, of course, Leo the Isaurian. The Bishop of Messina adds that when he was a boy, while in Syria, these things were done thus, and that the images were subverted by that token from the Saracens.

Now if you listen to Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and the rest, and from them Marmol, and among the most recent, Maimburgius, all those things are false to a one. For the Saracen was prevented by death before the decree against the images was either published or put into execution. Hence Maimburgius draws a moral conclusion, for the humbling of kings, of course. And this infamy of having removed and condemned the images is to be heaped upon Leo alone, as the very first. 4. Add that in the Nicene Acts a reign of 30 years is promised to Iezid. All the rest, 40 years. Furthermore, that Nicene writer says that Jezid survived for two and a half years; on the contrary, the rest say that he was killed in the same year. Again, in Action V of the Synod, you have Vluid or Alvalid, his son, ordering the Hebrew poisoner to be killed by a most shameful death: but if you listen to the Byzantine historians, and from them Maimburgius, those very same Hebrews escaped by flight when they ran into Conon, as Moawid, intending to avenge his father, was threatening death: indeed, these same impostors, after a long series of years, when Leo was brought to the empire, extorted Iconomachy from him, and exacted the fulfillment of the boyish promise. The workshop of painters, but liars ought to have good memories. When this was at last noticed by Maimburgius, he thought he would reconcile the conflicting circumstances with a new fiction, if he were to pretend that mendacious Jews were the instigators for both Jezids, concerning the removal of images, and that different circumstances should be fitted to the different Caliphs. Thus, as if from a tripod, for the year 724, he simply doubles the fable, yet with the historians no less at odds with each other, who wrote of one or the other, but no one before Maimburgius wrote of both.

III. Come now, let us further demolish this very fable about Leo being incited against the images by the Hebrews, which has been peddled with the utmost impudence by all the Iconolaters. First, if we believe Constantine Manasses, whom Maimburgius follows in this narrative, Leo, having barely taken the reins of the empire, graciously listens to the Jews, obeys their counsel, and plots in his mind a most perilous affair, such as was the subversion of images, which had stood from the very origin of Christian affairs throughout the East, for the sake of the Hebrews. And yet, it is established by the consensus of all historians that Leo, at the very beginning of his reign, was invaded by land and sea by the Saracens, whose fleets he also scattered and burned, according to the history of Nicephorus the Patriarch, edited by Petavius, for the year 717, and from Theophanes, Paul the Deacon, and others. But the Jews were intermingled with and favoring the Saracens, animated by an equal hatred for the Christians. This being established, the lie becomes clear, that Leo would have begun his reign by obeying the counsels of the Jews, and indeed for the sake of strengthening and prolonging his own rule.

Then, so far is it from the truth that Leo was mindful of the remarkable prophecy of the Jews, by which the rule over the entire East was predicted to him as a boy, that on the contrary, no Emperor raged more severely against the

Jews. For certainly if Leo had experienced the prophetic spirit of that nation, with the event wonderfully corresponding to the prediction, against all appearance of truth, after an interval of 30 years, that nation would have had a favorable Emperor. But, with Theophanes as witness, for the 6th year of Leo, the author of the *Miscellanea*, Cedrenus, other historians, and from them also Baronius, in volume IX for the year 722, no. 1, this was the Leo who promulgated feral edicts against the Jews throughout the entire empire, by which he forced the Jews to be baptized, using violence, just as he did the Montanists, or Manicheans under that name. Whence came a grave persecution of the Jews, as of the Montanists, who, not bearing the violence done to their consciences, burned themselves inside their own houses, as Theophanes reports, and from him Cedrenus.

Furthermore, this little fable betrays itself by its own absurdity. The Hebrews, whether with Jezid, or with Leo, or even with both, uniquely urge that the images, both painted and sculpted, be removed from the Christians' temples, as being contrary, by their very erection and use, to the First Precept of the Decalogue. Let the latter be granted! Did it matter so much to the Jews and infidels if Christians used images in their sacred rites, and contaminated themselves with a certain stain of idolatry? The circumcised, it seems, want the faith of the Christians to be purified, whether it be the Hebrew soothsayers, or even the Saracen, lest they seem to transgress the First Precept of the Decalogue? And what advantage thence to the infidels from the removal of images, while the Christian nation venerated Christ as God, who is a *πέσκομμα* (stumbling block) to the Jews, and condemned Mohammed as an impostor, who to the Saracens is the legate and prophet of God? Why do not the Apellae more truly stipulate that, whatever the Christians may decide about Christ, he should not be held as the highest God? That they should also not pursue with the worship of adoration or invocation any other than God the Father? Not certainly the Virgin Mother of God, or the Saints, if indeed from the Maimburgian hypothesis that cult had already become established? Indeed, these things seemed to fight more evidently with the First Precept of the Decalogue, from the mind of the Jews, than if images were tolerated in temples for the sake of instruction or ornament. For the East had not yet seen statues or sculpted images for worship in its temples, which not even the Nicæans themselves, nor the Greeks to this day, have admitted for religious purposes. But neither did the Christian world as yet adore painted images, sanctioned by any law. Then, if those Hebrews wished to extort something either from a Saracen or from a Christian prince, which would be to the benefit of the Jews, why not other things more profitable to themselves? Why not the restoration of the worship of the seventh day, from the Fourth Precept, than which nothing is more sacred to the Jews? Why not the restoration of Jerusalem, the rebuilding of the Temple, the remission of tributes, the vindication of their nation into liberty, then vehemently afflicted? Indeed, if not things beneficial to the whole nation of the Jews, why not certainly things useful

to themselves, such as wealth, honors, privileges, for men devoted to making profit, ἐμπόριοι Ἰουδαῖοι (Jewish merchants) according to Manasses?

But the end of the trifles is not yet. What lies will Greece not tell? And who, having weighed the matter a little more attentively, can suppress their gut reaction to these things? For, from the narrative that Maimburgius follows, those who had already openly deceived Jezid by soothsaying, and whose tricks against the Caliph were no longer obscure to anyone, and had incited Jezid's successor to vengeance, then predict with truth the empire to Conon, who was still a boy, a miserable pauper, who happened to meet them! They are impostors who deceive Jezid, so the Jesuit calls them, but to Leo they are seers, and very sincere at that, so says Maimburgius, and filled with a prophetic spirit, having predicted the empire to him in 686, which would finally come to him in the year 716, current indiction V, or VI, or begun in indiction XV. For the epoch of Leo's reign is later, according to Theophanes and others. And by what augury of the future empire? Forsooth, on account of the handsome form of his body, ἄξιον τυραννίδος (worthy of rule). Perhaps they had learned from the Roman writer of the Annals of Tacitus, book IV, that the empire had been predicted to Tiberius, Nero, and Galba; yet that was not the Nero, but the other son of Germanicus, to whom as a youth his modesty and form were worthy of a prince. But the former were from the family of the Caesars, whereas Conon was a pauper, and of the most abject fortune. Or perhaps they had learned from Aristotle's *Politics*, books IV and VI, that the Ethiopians once bestowed the empire based on size and form, κατὰ μέγεθος διένεμον τὰς ἀρχάς, ἢ κατὰ κάλλος (they distributed the offices according to size or according to beauty). More similar, indeed, was the prediction of Leontius the Mathematician, among the Byzantines, who augured a most splendid fortune for his daughter Athenais, of remarkable beauty, who was then to be brought to the marriage of Theodosius, and to a share in the empire, under the name Eudocia. But if greater faith is to be placed in the other narrative, from the Nicene Acts and Theophanes, Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, and then finally they presented themselves as impostors to the second Jezid, in the seventh year of the now reigning Leo, to delude the Caliph with a false prophecy and an empty promise of a forty-year reign; who would believe that the Christian Emperor, the most sagacious Leo, not unaware of these things, with a similar hope of a long reign and a life to be extended to the hundredth year, allowed himself to be seduced by impostors? Who would think that Leo, at the voices of the circumcised, thence augured for himself the security and happiness of a long reign, if he were to rage against the sacred things, against the religion of his ancestors, against the holy images, which the Nicæans, the Byzantines, and recent historians suppose to have been hitherto throughout the whole Christian world the object of religious worship and public veneration? Whence also, if Maimburgius speaks true, Leo, warned by the circumcised immediately at the outset of his reign about liberating the faith, as written in Book I, Anno 717, page 35, and warned hence about removing idolatry as quickly as possible, by a grave and pathetic speech of the Jews, if he wished to complete the final year, Leo

would have delayed this plan for a full decade, not erupting against the Images until the year 726? That is, a full forty years, according to the exact calculation of Maimbourg, after Leo had bound himself by an oath to those Hebrews, concerning his grateful disposition toward the prophets and his intention to fulfill what they would one day stipulate. For the delays that the Jesuit contrives, he has from his own invention, as will be clear to the reader. And how sincere, how good, how burning with the zeal of God, were those Jews—whom the Jesuit previously required as impostors in the case of Jezid—who, when Leo took up the government of the Empire, as a reward and prize (such as these seers deserved, who had thirty years earlier promised the principality to Leo while he was driving a donkey), extorted nothing other than that Christians should not be worshipers of Images? And learned men peddle these trifles in a most enlightened Century, and to the erudite and clear-sighted France, which, however, was soon to be sent under the yoke of Jesuitical domination.

IV. And these things had to be set forth with a little more diligence and noted concerning the very origin of the Iconoclastic History among those writers. I could add the most fabulous predictions of that kind, which the Jesuit, from Cedrenus especially, Zonaras, Glycas, and Constantine Manasses, pours out abundantly, or rather, proposes for others to drink, in this mythology of his. For he makes it sufficiently clear everywhere that he himself is not so foolish as to believe it, at the very threshold of such narrations. And just as some Jews once portended the majesty of the Empire to Leo the Isaurian, who was still a boy, so afterwards, a certain Anachorete—the same one who, according to Maimbourg, was notoriously wicked because he was an Iconomach; *History of the Iconoclasts*, Book V, p. 151, 152—and a certain girl of servile condition, who was also subject to manic and frenetic fits, prophesied this dignity to Leo the Armenian and Michael the Stammerer, as Maimbourg also relates in many places. The later Byzantines, with Theophanes leading the way, are teeming with trifles of this sort of prophecies and apparitions, which the silence of Theophanes and that of contemporary writers, and the very ineptitude of the circumstances and their conflict with History, allow Readers to laugh at.

Our Jesuit would admit that in the predictions and horoscopes of such seers, which exceed all the art of Astrologers, something hidden lies concealed, impervious to any philosophy or reasoning. *Ibid.* p. 157. Yet, he adds, there are many other things whose causes God wished to remain hidden, to check our pride: but that those predictions were true, however much they proceeded from idle or foolish people, and surpassed all the sagacity of human intellect.

How bland the gravity of his expression there, a falsehood more concealed on his face! Now let the judgment of the Readers be on all the rest of the credibility, both of the Byzantines, to the fury of the Iconolaters, and of the Monks in the Acts of the Iconolatric Nicene Synod, and in the published Acts of the Martyrs whom they invent under Leo and Constantine (who were in reality rebels against

the Princes, and guilty of treason), and so also of the credibility of Cardinal Baronius, Gretser, and their associates, and recently of Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander in the History of Leo the Isaurian and the Iconoclasts. And this should be stated at the outset: in that great crop of Iconomachs, who were numerous throughout the East under the Emperors Leo, Constantine, Nicephorus, Michael the Stammerer, and Theophilus, and who asserted the Iconoclast cause with such spirit from Scripture, the Fathers, and ecclesiastical monuments, the fury of the Iconodules willed that none of their work should survive to be transmitted to posterity. For they, especially under Irene and Theodora, most tyrannical women of unrestrained superstition (about whom more later), persecuted the Iconoclasts. Hence, just as the Iconoclastic heresy was to be exterminated, so too was whatever remained of its monuments. Hence also, the Acts of so many Synods that had decreed against Images were abolished and destroyed, the *Synodicon* of which both Theophanes and the Byzantines mention everywhere, but also the Tomes of the Councils, under the name of *Conciliabula*: and especially the Acts of the Seventh Synod under Constantine, the son of Leo the Isaurian, of which nothing remains except what it was pleased to insert into the Nicene Acts, in the Sixth Action. Hence, finally, it should seem no surprise that whatever writings and Acts are produced, whether in the Collection of the Councils or in the Byzantine Works, mostly if not all from the times of Irene, favor the cause of Images.

V. Therefore, this was the truest origin of the Iconoclast war that arose under Leo the Isaurian. As the public use of Images was then degenerating more and more into superstitious veneration, to be sanctioned in the West by a recent decree of Pope Constantine, Leo was incited against the Images, after communicating the matter with pious Bishops, after he had reigned for more than a decade, in the year 726. He had more than one reason for this action. 1. The daily increase of superstition, by which the public use of Images, condemned by Epiphanius himself, as seen above, was subsequently devolving into a cult and adoration unknown to earlier ages, disapproved of even by the likes of Augustine and Gregory, and sanctioned by no law of the Church. Paul the Deacon says, "he accused all his predecessors of having been idolaters, on account of the adoration of the Holy and venerable Icons." To the cult of Images was added that of Relics, of the Virgin, and of the Saints, which Theophanes adds Leo equally opposed, in his *Chronographia* for the 11th year of Leo, as does Paul the Deacon for his 10th year, and more recent writers. 2. The offense to the Infidels, especially the Saracens, as Mezeray confesses, *Vol. 1, p. 629*, who for this reason would stir up persecutions against the Christians, as they report of Jezid and his predecessor Omar. Although in reality, these were not so much concerned with abolishing Images as with driving Christians from their domains. But from that idolatrous cult of Images, the fury of the Mohammedans, who tolerate no images at all, not even private or civil ones, grew greater. 3. The controversies already stirred up on this matter, after Pope Constantine had decreed in the West that a cult should be shown to Holy images,

as was recently seen, by the recent action of the Latins. Nor is there any doubt that the fame of this matter had spread throughout the East, with some, the Latins, approving, and others condemning, especially since the action of the Emperor Philippicus, about which above. 4. Others of the Easterners favoring the veneration of Images, among whom were preeminently Germanus of Constantinople and John, surnamed of Damascus, about whom, however, the Iconolaters tell innumerable fabulous things, as does John of Jerusalem in his *Life*; while others strenuously opposed it, among whom were various Bishops, consulted by Leo, and later to be gathered by him into a Synod, about which matter shortly. Just as the Caroline Books, the Synod of Frankfurt, the Synod of Paris, and the precious Golden Book of the Blessed Agobardus testify that many of the Westerners also resisted, in which, at the end of Chapter XXIII, following the example of King Hezekiah, he decrees that the Images of the Saints, on account of the adoration, servitude, cult, and religious veneration given to them, are to be shattered in every way and ground to dust. 5. Add also the portents and signs of divine wrath, about which above from the *History* of Nicephorus of Constantinople, *ed. Paris, p. 177-178*, which pious men with Leo ascribed to the foul idolatry concerning Images. Theophanes confirms this, for the 10th year of Leo: "who, considering the divine wrath upon him (from a certain portentous eruption of the Sea near Hiera) on his own account," *ed. Reg. p. 339*, that is, believing the divine wrath to be kindled against him for his own cause (I would prefer "in his presence"), he decided, with Christian counsel, to restrain superstition and remove the Images, or rather, to remove the stumbling blocks.

VI. And for these reasons chiefly, it seemed advisable to Leo, after communicating the matter with the Senate, and having held a meeting of Bishops, to discuss this most grave cause within his Palace. The *Synodical Booklet* states: "having held a nefarious Synod in the palace." Theophanes the Chronographer, but for the 14th year of Leo, says: "he celebrated a *Silentium*," a term familiar to the Byzantines for a meeting, or consultation, or conference within the *Silentiarium* or *Secretarium*, otherwise within the *Tribunalium*, arranged with nineteen couches or seats, about which in the Byzantine History. In this, however, the senate was accustomed to recline. Whence I do not know why a certain Learned Man rendered it, "Leo promulgated an Edict," as if *Silentium* there meant an Edict, which indeed followed that *Silentium*. Rather, a *Silentium* is a council, an assembly, and the *Silentiarii* are counselors to whom silence or secrecy was entrusted. Hence *Secretarium* for a synodal council or session: the Prince presiding in the *Secretarium*, in Anastasius on Agatho, and everywhere. Hence Leo is remembered to have summoned Patriarch Germanus to this same meeting, to persuade him to lend his vote. The Acts of Stephen and his companions, cited by Baronius, for the year 726, No. IV, state: "the class of Senators having been summoned and compelled." And in the Nicene Acts, the Bishop of Nacolia and others are said to have approved what was decreed against the Images: Nacolia was on the border of both Phrygias, under the Constantinopolitan. The *Historia Miscella*, Book XI, says: "Leo celebrated a

Silentium against the Holy and venerable Icons." From which it is clear that it was decided to remove the Images from cult and adoration not by the will of Leo alone, but by the counsel of the most serious Fathers both in the Republic and Prelates in the Churches. Indeed, Gregory himself testifies in his Epistle to Leo, inserted in the work of Baronius, that Leo had it in his vows, in the very beginnings of the disputed cause, that an Oecumenical Synod should be called. To the year 726, ed. Col. p. 91. He wrote: "you wrote that a universal Council should be convened, but that matter seemed useless to us." Whence the Pontiff Gregory himself resisted this most salutary counsel, intending in the meantime to advance his own cause in the West under the pretext of the Iconoclast controversy, and to stir up hatred against Leo.

But what Leo first intended concerning the Images, it is worth the effort to observe. Baronius reports, from the very acts of his Martyrs: "My opinion does not aim at their complete destruction, but I say this, that they should be placed in a higher location, that is, they should be raised up higher, far from the eyes of onlookers," with the like intention that neither should insult be done to them, nor should adoration be offered. *Ibid.* No. V. Thus, Platina himself, in his life of Gregory II, holds that the Edict against Images was promulgated by Leo for the cause of abolishing idolatry. Therefore, Leo was not at first concerned with completely tearing down whatever Images there were, or having them treated ignominiously, to be trampled, broken, or handed over to the avenging flames. But when matters were exacerbated a little later, as happens, and spirits were inflamed, and there were rebellions everywhere against Leo, and superstition went to the opposite extreme, with Patriarch Germanus, John of Damascus, George of Cyprus, and others conspiring for the adoration and cult of Images, and not without insult to the Prince, the matter ended in the complete removal from holy Places, and hence the breaking of Images, from which the name of the Iconoclasts arose. And since the common people were already fascinated by these things, accustomed to be captivated by external matters of this kind, it is no wonder that the insane mob, moved by the authority of those men, and especially by the resistance and clamors of the Monks, under a feigned appearance of piety, erupted into seditions, which in the end permitted nothing moderate for Leo.

VII. Since these things are so, one is further amazed at the credibility and audacity of Cardinal Baronius, Gretser, Spondanus, etc., and recently of Louis Maimbourg. He, for the year 726, No. IV, states that Leo, "without consulting the Bishops of the Orthodox Faith, decided so arduous a matter by his own will." Again, "The sentence concerning the abolition of Images was declared and confirmed without consulting the Senate." Soon, in No. VI, he introduces Patriarch Germanus, who represented to Leo that "for seven hundred and twenty-six years from now, the cult of venerable Images was clearly handed down, nay, sanctioned by the sacrosanct Councils, at various times, was their adoration." The former of these is refuted by the Acts cited by Baronius himself,

and by those copiously produced just now; the latter, if those words were ever Germanus's, argues either a remarkable ignorance of Antiquity, the Fathers, and the Councils, or the worst of faith on the part of Patriarch Germanus. Of this sort are the things which are said there to have been objected to Leo, as from Germanus of Constantinople, about the face of Christ impressed on the divine linen, about the Image sent to Abgar, about the Image of the Virgin painted by Luke, none of which any of the Ancients, before Evagrius Scholasticus at the end of the 6th Century, ever mentioned, which Valesius also observes, and the Collectanea attributed to Theodore Lector by later writers.

Now you will be astonished, whoever you are, Reader, at Maimbourg's bold spirit in composing his History. Immediately, at the very threshold of the History of the Iconoclasts, *Book I, from the year 726, from p. 62 ff.*, after the fiction about the Hebrews being the authors of Iconoclasm, he not only repeats the same things as Baronius, but clothes them in a new and rhetorical form. First, he says that Leo, having communicated the matter with only two wicked men, immediately, with no deliberation, with no votes accepted, with his will alone as the supreme law, began at once with the execution. Then, that he began not with some Edict about placing Images in a higher place in the churches, or even about removing them, but with the breaking and tearing down of Images, and first of all that of the Savior, erected by Constantine, of course, opposite the Augustan Forum, and which had been the cause of so many miraculous healings. To this the Jesuit adds that a great slaughter was carried out by Leo at the very birth of the Iconoclastic plan, and the annihilation of the most eminent men in the City for their learning and life was decreed, unless they conspired with him for the extermination of Images. Thus also he introduces Germanus, and other grave Bishops and Doctors, who would call to Leo's memory, *Book I, p. 78, 79, 92*, "the consensus of Christ, the Apostles, the Fathers, the six universal Councils, and of the whole Church, for the veneration of Images, with a practice undefiled from the earliest antiquity." Which things, if not attributed to those men by Iconolater writers, and those ignorant of antiquity, certainly argue either the ignorance or the impudence of that age.

VIII. It is therefore most true that Leo did not engage in any such slaughters, nor did he earn the name of iconoclast, before first Gregory II in Italy, with the ministers of rebellion, then rebels in the East, plotting defection, rose up against the Emperor himself and his Majesty. Whence not until the 10th year of Leo, that is, in the course of the common era 730, did the matter come to a head, and as Baronius says, "he thought he had to act with violence." To the year 730, No. 1. Meanwhile, however, after Gregory had been solicited by Leo concerning an Oecumenical Synod, what was done in the West? Gregory, instead of the obedience which (as Maimbourg and Alexander confess) the Pontiffs rendered to the Emperors, and instead of an approved Synod, binds Leo with an anathema; in a Roman Council he condemns the Heresy of the Iconoclasts, and decrees the cult of Images; he adduces the practice of Christ and the Apostles in that decree,

not without ridicule of the matter; he promotes the defection of the Romans and of Italy from obedience to the Greek Emperor; nay, a sentence having been passed, at the beginning of the year 727, or at the end of 726, after Leo's Edicts had been brought to Italy, he attacks Leo in letters everywhere among Christians as an impious postulant, *See Tom. VII Concil. col. 1460. Anastasius, Platina*, declares him unworthy of the Empire as an enemy of the Church, decrees that tribute should not be paid to him, prohibits the removal of Images from the Temples, and permits the Emperor's images to be trampled with every kind of insult. Soon Gregory III, made successor in the year 731, Indiction XIV, confirms the sentence of Gregory II. The writer of the Annals would indeed wish that Leo had not been deposed, nor the dire thunderbolt of Excommunication hurled against him before the year 730. Maimbourg and Natalis follow Baronius, as they are wont. But that Gregory did not wait that long is sufficiently understood from Anastasius and the rest, and from the things done in the meantime in Italy against Leo. For hence it happened that the Patrician and Exarch Paul was sent to apprehend Gregory, to be brought to Constantinople, according to Anastasius the Librarian in the Life of Gregory, and from the Pontiff's own letter to Leo, mentioned before. Hence also the Lombards were emboldened, with King Luitprand, under the pretext of favor towards Gregory, and towards the cause of Images, and for the protection of both the Pontiff and the Orthodox, to take up arms against Leo, to occupy the most fortified places of the Exarchate, and to make incursions into the Roman Duchy as well. And from there, the Italians also formed plans, as Anastasius says, for all of Italy, to elect a new Emperor, though Gregory resisted, who is said to have prohibited and suppressed such a plan, according to Paul the Deacon and in the Pontifical book; but for no other reason than that he himself should not admit a superior in Italy, but rather that he himself should convert the spoils of Leo in the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Roman Duchy into the Patrimony of Peter, and a new face of the Republic should arise, as eventually happened. By which it was brought about that the Patrician Eunuch Eutychius, substituted in the Exarchate after Paul was killed, was sent by Leo to pacify matters and to recover the fortresses and cities occupied by the Lombards, in the year 727, others think 728, to attempt in vain a path of friendly transaction. In vain indeed does Natalis Alexander, from those words of Anastasius, "the Pontiff suppressed such a plan," gather that the story of the tribute forbidden to the Italians by Gregory, or of the excommunication pronounced against him, is a fable. For the election of a new Emperor, and in Italy indeed, who would loom over the Pontiff as a Lord—for the Pontiffs venerated the Emperors by this name—and who would fill everything with soldiers, and assert for himself what the Pontiff wished to be acquired and preserved for Peter, the Prince of the Apostles (this was the style then), was plainly most foreign to Gregory's mind. But what was done by Gregory against the Emperor, let the writer of the Annals, Baronius, himself say, although not in its proper place: To the year 730, No. V. "Gregory, when he could not recall the Emperor from his undertakings either by words or writings, nor restrain him by

favors, but rather saw him slipping for the worse, thinking that the time had now come for the axe to be applied to the root of the unhappy tree, NB, with Apostolic authority, cries out, 'Cut it down!' Aroused by this thunder, the faithful of the West soon defected completely from Leo's empire, adhering to the Apostolic Pontiff." Thus the same Gregory left a worthy example to posterity, NB, that Heretical Princes should not be allowed to reign in the Church of Christ, if, after being often warned, they were found to persist in error with an obstinate mind. For then it happened, what all the Greek Historians affirm, and the same Theophanes says in the fourteenth year of the Emperor Leo, that Leo himself was deprived by the same Gregory of the collection of taxes from Italy. Cedrenus and others testify to this. Zonaras reports that these things were done synodically in Rome (as is right to believe), and that in the same Council the Emperor himself was afflicted with the penalty of anathema. If this was not a worthy example for posterity, it was certainly the first of a king being deposed for dissent from the faith or practice of the Church. For Christians had suffered to reign princes infected even with pagan, then with the Arian stain, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Gepids, Lombards, Heruli, Suevi, Vandals, Burgundians, etc. Not long after, Zacharias, with Stephen III confirming, deposed Childeric from the kingdom, even for a reason other than heresy, because he was useless for so great a power. *Gratian, Causa 15, q. 6, can. Alius*. Thus it subsequently came to be held and confirmed in Rome that Emperors could be deposed and deprived by the Supreme Pontiff not only by reason of those things which pertain to the Faith (a heretical Prince), but also those which pertain to Morals and Civil Law: as witnesses after Gratian, in the cited Cause, Celso Mancino, on the Rights of Principalities, Bzovius on the Roman Pontiff, Philip Maynard on Ecclesiastical Privileges to Paul V, Caspar Schoppe against King James, and six hundred others. And Bzovius indeed in the aforesaid Book, printed in Cologne, in the year 1618, reports more than thirty Kings and supreme Princes deposed and struck with anathema by the Popes. But to whom are the facts hidden! Now Caesar Baronius adds concerning the act of Gregory, No. IV, that Gregory "not only cursed Leo with an anathema, but also caused both the Romans and the Italians to withdraw entirely from his obedience," candidly and truthfully. The same opinion was held by Onuphrius on Gregory III, by Bellarmine, Perronius, the editors of the Councils, and the entire Roman Pontificate. Recently also by Leo Allatius, in his work *On the Perpetual Consensus of the Easterners*, and in the midst of France by Mezeray, in Volume 1 of his *History of France, Book VIII, p. 326*, by Charles du Fresne in his *Family of Leo the Isaurian, Part 1 of the Byzantine History, p. 124*, and also by Louis Maimbourg, in the first book of his *History of the Iconoclasts, p. 147, 168*. The words of Mezeray are: "Gregory II, after receiving letters from Leo, in which the Emperor urged him to remove the very Images from the Temples in order to avert the reproach of the Infidels, called Leo ignorant, stupid, and frivolous; soon, to Leo's threats, the Pope, who had his support in the favor of the People and in his Troops, opposed other threats and the most atrocious insults. Finally, the contention flared up to such an extent that in the year 726,

Gregory, no longer considering Leo as his Supreme Lord, wrote letters full of pride and novelties, then halted the Italian Tributes, and turned the Peoples away from the Obedience they owed the Emperor." Mezeray adds that Gregory III proceeded further and even excommunicated Leo. But Gregory II did both, nor could he have withdrawn the people from Leo's rule or forbidden the tributes, except under the pretext of Heresy and Excommunication. The French Jesuit, after almost all his own, connects both, *History of the Church of Rome*, p. 282, 287, but intending to retract it in a later *Work*: "Nor was God's vengeance slow, so that Leo, with his successors, lost the remaining part of the Western Empire." Soon: "Finally Gregory, after hearing the Sentence of the Fathers, having held a Council, excommunicates Leo as a Heretic, or rather as a Heresiarch, etc., hence he forbids both the Romans and all of Italy to pay any tribute to Leo." He adds that patronage was sought by Gregory from the Gauls, which he could not expect from the Lombards, who were often treacherous to the Roman see, nor from the more unwarlike Venetians, nor from Spain, oppressed by the yoke of the Saracens: hence a splendid Legation was sent, with royal gifts, to Charles Martel, to solicit his aid against Leo. This act was of Gregory III, not II, after he began to fear not so much Leo as the Lombards, that is, Luitprand, who, having joined forces with Transamund of Spoleto and Godescalc of Benevento (after these Dukes had been reconciled to Luitprand), finally besieged Rome and gave the Vatican Basilica over to his soldiers to be plundered. The authorities for this deed of Gregory are for them Theophanes the Chronographer cited by Baronius, Anastasius in his History, Cedrenus, Zonaras, the compiler of the *Historia Miscella*, Sigebert, Platina, Sigonius, Fredegar the Continuator of the History of the Franks of Gregory of Tours. *History, Book XX*. Baronius states that all the Greek Historians confirm the matter. And Theophanes, to whom they perpetually appeal, states most emphatically: "Gregory caused Rome and Italy, and the whole of the West, to withdraw and defect from the obedience of Leo, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, and from his Empire." *Ed. Reg. p. 342, 343*. He soon repeats the same. Thus far, therefore, we impute nothing to Gregory, and yet Natalis Alexander recently prolixly complains of being imposed upon, after Peter de Marca, *On Concordance, Book III, Ch. XI*, and P. le Cointe in the *Annals of the Franks*. To the year 730, Sat. VIII, Dissert. I, Tom. XIV. He contends with petty reasonings and cold conjectures, from the sanctity and doctrine of the Pontiff, that whatever the historians above have said about Gregory II shaking off the yoke of Leo is a fable. And he thinks that this was most foreign to the most holy Pontiff, an example, forsooth, of reverence towards the Emperor, of ultimate patience, and of supreme humility. And he produces certain gentler and more submissive passages from the Epistles of Gregory; with which indeed he later tried to soothe Leo, after he saw himself besieged by the Lombards, from whom he had hoped for defense. Concerning which matter, I see that David Blondel has annotated some things in the margin of Baronius's work, but they are difficult to read and will see the light in their own time. Hence the Monk is accused of falsehood and imposture, whatever is from his own or from writers

in either world. But indeed, that Natalis himself, or those whom he describes, are deceived by their own conjectures, being intent on this for the sake of Louis the Great, lest the Pontiffs be thought to have arrogated any authority over Kings, and hence denying facts which were nonetheless facts, in the sight of both worlds, our *Historical Introduction* to the 8th Century teaches more specifically. There we, against Natalis, discuss the act of Gregory II against the Isaurian, and a little later the acts of Zacharias and Stephen III against King Childeric, to be denied by the same, in the history of the Papal domination in this Century. Nor should this seem strange, since something similar had been attempted by Constantine against Philippicus, as was seen from Sigonius, *History, Book III, p. 63*, and the authority of the Greek Emperor in Italy was already diminished in a major way. But also the veneration of Images, in which the Italians were superstitious above others, seemed very opportune for Gregory's plans, whence Iconoclasm was to be traduced as the sum of all heresies.

IX. These things having been thus managed in Italy, with so many commotions and dissensions, on the occasion of Gregory's action and under the pretext of Leo's impiety, agitated and distracted, until in the year 729 a concord was established between Luitprand and Gregory, as Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, Sigonius, and others relate at greater length, let us return to Leo in the East. Namely, in the fourteenth year of Leo, 730 by the Dionysian era, there followed the abdication of Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, according to Theophanes, the Synodical Booklet, and the other Byzantines. This was after, in a Synod convened by Leo—such as the times allowed, though he would have preferred an Oecumenical one—Germanus had most pertinaciously resisted both the Synod, which was decreeing the abolition of Images from sacred places, and the Prince Leo, under the most vain pretext that the very core of the faith was at stake, and the authority of previous Councils, which had said nothing about Images.

Thus, Anastasius was appointed in place of Germanus, who was next to him in dignity and right of succession. For he was made Patriarch from being the Syncellus or Coadjutor (more accurately referring to the Latin *Coadjutor* than, as a learned man thought, a suffragan); Theophanes calls him "a disciple of a false name," which the interpreter poorly renders as "a man of a false name." Caesar Baronius, however, and from him our French writers of Iconoclastic History, invent that this was done by Leo with no council of priests, neither Germanus's detention nor Anastasius's promotion. They add from Cedrenus and similar sources that this Anastasius was a true Iscariot, a traitor, an impious heretic. Fables are added, about an ancient prophecy under a certain Conon that images would be overthrown, which was fulfilled in Leo; another, about a prediction of Patriarch Germanus to Anastasius, "Diippus awaits you," that is, a severe punishment in the Diippus, a public place in the Milion of Constantinople, in which was the Miliarium, or a column to which criminals were wont to be exposed for the sake of ignominy; just as there are Pillories or *Piloria* today, from

pilae or columns, *piliers*, pillars. They add that the event corresponded to this prediction, fifteen years later, under Constantine Copronymus. Our Byzantine or Latin writers are now forgetful that no one other than Anastasius should have been appointed to succeed Germanus, according to the ancient right of the Syncelli, and that here Leo observed the Canons more truly than Irene did later in intruding the layman Tarasius, who would promote Iconolatry, just as Nicephorus also was made Patriarch from a layman, under Irene's successor. And from this time, matters in Constantinople and elsewhere were exacerbated, with George of Cyprus, John of Damascus, and a crowd of clergy, but especially of monks, being everywhere the torch of war and promoters of sedition, under the pretext of devotion to images. From here also Theophanes begins, at the end of the 13th year of Leo: "From which time the Tyrant, because he was impatient of seditions and of idolatry asserted to the point of madness, being daily stirred up with fury, moved a persecution against the holy Images." So also Paul the Deacon, Chapter XXVI of the twenty-first book, placing before this persecution the action of Gregory and the defection of all Italy.

Hence those tears, and Leo, who before had reigned most laudably for a whole decade, as Baronius relates from Gregory himself, *in Epistle IX, Annals p. 87*, and whom, even after the first Edict against Images, the same Gregory in another Epistle to Boniface, found in Baronius for the year 727, No. II, calls "the most pious Augustus Leo," was from this time to be torn to pieces; or rather, long afterwards, by all those writers who, after the restoration of images under Irene, wrote about Leo, being addicted to this cause to the point of insanity. From these, Baronius fills his Annals with insults against this Emperor, in Volume IX, to be augmented even recently by Louis Maimbourg, in Part I of his History, that is, Fable, of the Iconoclasts. Indeed, from the indubitable faith of historians, it is certain that Leo excelled not only in the praise of continence and temperance, but also in military virtue, and in deeds bravely performed against the Saracens, manfully asserting Christianity, constantly defending Orthodoxy, and upholding it against the heresies condemned by the first six Oecumenical Councils. He was certainly rather spirited against the worshipers of Images, kindled with the pious zeal of Hezekiah; but the spirits of the Iconolaters were more ferocious against him, with Rome and all of Italy as witness, and those with whom Rome conspired. Hence, afterwards, when the Prince was removed, nothing was not fabricated by the Nicenes and the Greek Iconolaters to render his memory execrable to posterity. And with these fabricated images of crimes, as I said just now, the writer of the Annals, Maimbourg, and the recent Alexander, fill the history of Leo, immediately from the year 726 and from the decree enacted against Images.

X. Of which matter it is now worth the effort to submit to the faith of the Readers some more illustrious specimens. And we shall follow the order which the aforesaid Maimbourg observes. The first is that Leo, even before the responses and actions of Pope Gregory, being carried away by a sudden fury,

raged in Constantinople, *Maimbourg, Part 1, p. 68*, against the Image of JESUS CHRIST, which had supposedly been ordered to be erected in a public place by Constantine the Great, and was worshiped by the entire city with the highest devotion of spirit, namely as the Palladium of the Eternal City, and which performed virtues by its mere touch, such as proceeded from Christ himself on earth, as in the touch of the woman with the issue of blood. He states these things, after Baronius and his followers, citing Theophanes, Cedrenus, the *Miscella*, along with the Acts of St. Stephen in Damascenus. Then he adds that a sedition soon arose against Leo's guards, which caused the Emperor to rage like a beast against an innocent crowd of Monks, Women, and Citizens, with slaughters, torments, punishments, mutilations, exiles, and if barbarity suggested anything more inhuman than these. Now we remind the Reader of these few points. First, that Image of the Savior was placed not in any Basilica or Temple for the sake of adoration, but above the Chalke, or the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace, which is also the Chalke of the Hippodrome, and its Brazen Gate, for the ornament and splendor of the place. Second, none of the historians whom Maimbourg cites wrote that this very Image had been erected there by Constantine the Great, whatever the uncertain Author after Theophanes and Codinus in the *Origins* may have reported. Nor did Eusebius, who is otherwise very detailed in recounting these things, report in the *Life of Constantine the Great* what things decorated the Palace, Porticoes, Fora, Fountains, and other places of the City by Constantine's order. But neither did Socrates, Sozomenus, or the rest mention this in the deeds of this Emperor concerning Constantinople. Third, the Jesuit had even less from these authors for what he reports of the miracle, namely that the woman with the issue of blood was healed by the touch of his image, just as the other was in the Gospel, of which Theophanes, Cedrenus, and the rest would not have been silent. And let Maimbourg have his own words to himself: "Nothing is easier, in supposing such Miracles, than to abuse the credulous simplicity of the common people. It is so inclined to have faith in extraordinary things that, if only a little imposture is covered with some appearance of it, it immediately takes it for a Miracle." *History of the Iconoclasts, Book I, p. 69*. Fourth, that Chalke itself, or vaulted Triclinium, opposite the Forum, was adorned with many other statues and images, even of pagan superstition, according to the *Christian History of Constantinople* from the *Origins* of G. Codinus. So that it is hardly probable that the mind of Leo, a most prudent prince and, if Maimbourg is to be believed, of a naturally timid disposition, and who feared for his own safety in all things, was enraged against a single Image of the Savior, and one so conspicuous in the midst of the City for its many miracles. Which seems to be abhorrent not only to the prudence but also to that timidity of Leo, who, constrained by fear alone, is said to have suppressed in his mind what he had been planning for a decade, and also to the testimony given to him for his hitherto most praiseworthy rule. Pope Gregory said in his first letter to Leo the Isaurian, produced by Baronius for the year 726, *Annals, p. 87*, and in Volume VII of the Councils, *p. 7*: "For ten years you have walked rightly by

the grace of God, while you were running rightly, etc." If that statue of the Savior was also erected there by Constantine the Great with others, whence is it that in that most grievous fire, in which the public Library burned under the Emperor Basiliscus, being located in the same place or Triclinium of the Chalke, this statue remained unharmed? When, with Suidas as a witness in his entry on Malchus, along with the Library, the statues and the Augustal statues perished in the flames. Finally, the faith of Maimbourg and the Iconolaters appears most wicked. For if anything of this sort was done in the tenth year of Leo, it is plain even from Theophanes himself and from Paul the Deacon that it did not happen immediately by Leo's command, but by the inconsiderate zeal of some royal men, that is, from the Prince's Court, who thought they would do a thing pleasing to him on the occasion of the decree against the Iconolaters. And if any punishments were then inflicted on the Constantinopolitans by Leo, the historians add the cause: "because the populace strove to attack the Emperor himself, and put to death many of the Emperor's household." *Theophanes, ed. Reg., p. 341; Paul the Deacon; Cedrenus*. Which of the Emperors or Kings, then, would not have taken action against those guilty of treason, against the authors of rebellion and sedition, raised in the Royal City?

XI. But behold another crime of Leo, in the exaggeration of which Maimbourg displays all his sarcasm! *Book I, p. 70*. Namely, in the same tenth year of Leo, the year of Christ 726, immediately after the slaughter of the citizens of Constantinople, Leo's fury made an attack on the College which was most splendid in Constantinople, and on all its Professors, and even on the Oecumenical Master, its Prefect, and indeed sentenced them to be burned alive, their ashes to be mixed with those of the most splendid Palace, after they had denied Leo their assent in the cause of the Images. They add that in that edifice or college the Royal Library was kept, consisting of thirty-three thousand volumes, so says Manasses; among which was that admirable poem of Homer, the Iliad and Odyssey, written in golden letters on the intestine of a Dragon. Glycas, however, says that this treasure comprised thirty-six thousand five hundred books. And the same writers report that this very thing was to be sacrificed to the vengeance of Leo the Isaurian. In his account of Leo, Cedrenus was the first to report it; *p. 454, ed. Reg.* Zonaras followed; Michael Glycas and especially Constantine Manasses added to the atrocity of the deed with new circumstances; *Annals, p. 281*. Manasses is the one on whom Louis Maimbourg chiefly insists, after Baronius, *in Compend. Chron. ed. R. p. 87*, in the *History of the Iconoclasts*, as he calls it, *Book I*, and Alexander Natalis, on the Heresy of the Iconoclasts, *Article I, On the Impiety of Leo*. But also the most learned writer of Byzantine History recently gave his assent to this narration, inveighing against the impiety of Leo on this account in *Book II* of his *Christian Constantinople. On the Impiety of Leo*. Since this crime is scarcely more nefarious than any other, and Maimbourg is diligent in fashioning it in dark colors, *Book I, from p. 70 to 82*, so may it fall back on the head of the slanderers, what was imputed to the Emperor Leo with an unscrupulous desire to lie, if not with a certain madness. And this

very thing is now to be exposed to the public light. 1. It should be noted that of this fire, excited by Leo, memorable above others, and of his fury against so many most precious treasures, against a most splendid abode of the Muses, against a truly Royal Palace (a venerable palace near the imperial one), specifically against these Professors and Masters, certain pillars of the Empire, whom the Prince removed by the dire punishment of being set on fire, no writers before Cedrenus made any mention, not the Nicene Fathers, nor Theophanes the Confessor, nor Nicephorus the Patriarch, nor Paul the Deacon, or Anastasius. Although they omitted none of those things that would render Leo hateful to the whole East and execrable to posterity. To the year of Leo. Theophanes indeed reports that under Leo, the Schools along with sacred doctrine declined, and that Leo took action against men outstanding in piety and learning, namely against various Bishops, Doctors, and Monks, who were defenders of idolatry, which for him is sacred doctrine, even to the point of sedition. But of the burning of the palace, the royal library, the college, that Oecumenical Master who was the sun of the East, and the twelve professors with devastating flames, who were like the twelve signs and luminaries of the Zodiac, with the added circumstances, namely, the prior warning, the responses to Leo, and the rest, neither did Theophanes add a word, nor does any trace appear in the other writers of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. 2. Great now is the authority of Cedrenus, Glycas, and Manasses for Natalis Alexander, because they tear Leo apart; little or none at other times when it serves his purposes, as when he negates what was said before about Gregory II denying tribute to Leo. Nor would Baronius, Allatius, and their sycophants want their Readers to always stand by these same witnesses. 3. As a lie is seldom consistent with itself, so it is in this whole little narrative. Glycas says 36,500 books were consumed. Manasses says 33,000, "books which would amount to thirty and three thousand." Maimbourg, intending to be an interpreter of Manasses, *History of the Iconoclasts, Book I, p. 79*, to prove his skill in both languages, but also his fidelity, says with a childish error that this library, in Leo's time, consisted of "three hundred and three thousand volumes," that is, rendering the word for thirty thousand. But Cedrenus had expressed no such number. This detail also about the poem of Homer, admirable indeed for its art of writing, on an intestine 120 feet long, which was to be reduced to ashes by this crime of Leo, was reported by only one, Constantine Manasses, in the time of Manuel Comnenus, that is, in the mature 12th century, and by later writers from him. 4. But that very account of the historian Constantine argues a supine carelessness of one who is lying. For how can you reconcile with history the burning long ago of the Constantinopolitan Library, which was kept in the Chalke, with all its treasures and statues, and 120,000 books, and that very Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, consumed under the Tyrant Basiliscus, that is, about two and a half centuries before? The witnesses to this are Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Suidas in his entry on Malchus, a Byzantine Sophist. From which it is clear that Constantine Manasses, either from ignorance or fraud, imputed to Leo III the Isaurian what had happened in the times of

Zeno, who began to reign after Leo II, his son and grandson of Leo I, in the common year 474. From which specimen, and from many others of its kind in this history of the Images, it is sufficiently clear that what the distinguished lights of our Belgium, Johannes Meursius and Janus Dousa, attributed to that historian was not enough. 5. But also the very location and site of the Palace, which the fury of Leo the Isaurian supposedly attacked, betrays the imposture. Zonaras says that library was in the Basilica itself, "next to the bronze market"; Glycas, "near the Temple of St. Sophia"; Codinus, "near the Chalke," or the Royal Portico, in which the Royal Library, chiefly augmented by the Emperor Valens, was indeed kept, destroyed by flames under Basiliscus, and to be restored under Zeno, as the Byzantines report. Therefore, it is at least confessed that the Basilica of the library, the Chalke, the Royal Palace, the Capitol, the Patriarchate, the Triclinium called Thomaites, in which was the Patriarchal Library, and the Church of Sophia, that miracle of the East, were contiguous places and very close to each other. And so fire could not have been applied to that Basilica in which the library was, with so many papers that would immediately catch and spread the flame far and wide, without the most evident danger, while a nearby neighbor burns, that the fire would not pervade all the other buildings, and reduce them to ashes, or at least convert them into a miserable spectacle. And with what zeal the Emperors of Constantinople were in extinguishing those fires which widely devastated the royal City, such as under Marcian, Zeno, and Constantine, the great-grandson of the Isaurian, under whom the Library of the Church burned, and with it (as Zonaras reports) the autographs of Chrysostom on the Holy Scripture, the historians may tell. 6. Let the reader therefore pay attention, and interpose his own judgment, whether these dire things imputed to Leo by his sworn enemies, more worthy of some Phalaris or Lycaon, are even similar to the truth; and which would cast the Prince, his Wife, Children, House, life, fortunes, treasures, subjects, the Royal City, and the Empire itself into the most immediate danger. Do they suit a Prince who was by nature fearful, so says Maimbourg, and of whom historians report so many other excellent things above? What is more, at that very time when, terrified by portents of the sky and seas, he thought he had to appease the wrath of God, just before the war was stirred up against the Iconolaters, as was recently seen from Theophanes, and more expressly from the Historical Breviary of Nicephorus of Constantinople, which in the brevity of its history deserved the palm above others. 7. Let another argument of the fable be added. The Byzantine Iconolaters, out of hatred for Leo and Constantine, and in favor of the Iconolatric cause, expressed with the greatest diligence and solicitude the otherwise obscure names of the Bishops and Monks who suffered harder things under both Emperors: mutilations, reproaches, scourgings, exile, and death itself. All these were to be diligently recorded in the order of Confessors and in the catalogue of Martyrs, with their name, place, time, and the circumstances of their passion designated, in the Menologium of the Greeks, and in the Pseudo-Acts and Lives of the same, with Metaphrastes, Monks, and Rhapsodists as authors. Whence came St. Emilianus,

St. Germanus of Cyzicus, St. Hypatius of Ephesus, St. Gregory Limniota, St. Eudamon, St. Basil, St. Nicholas, St. Michael of Synnada, St. Theophylactus of Nicomedia, St. Andrew Calybites, St. Stephen the Younger, St. Plato the Abbot, and very many others. Now we want your belief, whoever you are. If what Baronius, Maimbourg, and Natalis say from the Greeks about this Oecumenical Master, about that light of the East, and about the twelve Professors who excelled in the praise of doctrine and wisdom, is true, how did it happen that both his name and theirs have remained hidden in obscurity? Why do we not read any of them called by their own name? Why were they defrauded of the honor and place of Martyrs, either in the Menologium of the Greeks or in the monuments of history? 8. Even supposing such a conflagration under Leo the Isaurian, was it immediately necessary to attribute to the Emperor any fire that broke out in Constantinople, a city exposed to devastating flames of this kind? Could it not have been excited by any other chance, either unexpected and fortuitous, or by the madness or imprudence of anyone whosoever? And what profit, in the end, was there for Leo in the burning of that Library, for whose cause there was a defense in the monuments of the earlier centuries? Why rage against a Palace, against Books, against so many treasures, because of the obstinacy of a few men, whom he could have moved from their position, or sent to a workhouse, or led to the gallows, in the name of sedition? How foolish this kind of vengeance against stones, rocks, books, vessels, with one's own risk, and such a signal public expense? And how far were they from the madness of this deed, who raged insanely against the river Gnydus, against the statue of Homer, against the trident of Neptune, against the statues of the enemy, against Mount Athos, against the Hellespont, against Jupiter himself as he hurled lightning, against houses, walls, bows, arrows? ... "and he attacks the received weapon in his anger! and what is proper to madness, he rages and storms against himself." 9. Finally, why does the Jesuit heap new fictions upon those of the Greeks, and bring forth from that fertile storehouse of his, things which you would seek in vain in the Byzantines? Of such a kind indeed is the prolix "Oration" to Leo, delivered, forsooth, by those Doctors of the College of Constantinople, for asserting the cult of Images, with the very same arguments that the Papists are wont to use, and delivered with much emotion and profuse tears, plainly in imitation of erotic writers. And lest you doubt, he himself thus addresses the Reader in the Preface to this *History of the Iconoclasts*: "I have endeavored to write History in such a way that it might give the pleasure of a Novel;" that is, "I have taken pains that my manner of writing History should affect with a pleasure equal to that which Erotic Books, which they call Novels, are wont to give." As if he were saying, "our labor is placed in the art of deceiving, all hope is in that." Hence also he wrote entirely new things about Leo the Isaurian, "of new discoveries," or ingeniously fabricated, as under this name often nothing but inventions are sold.

XII. Let them proceed to falsely attribute to Leo things that must be proven false. If there is any credibility to Anastasius, in his *Life of Gregory II*, and hence to the more recent Iconolaters, and prolixly to Maimbourg, Leo first suborned

assassins, through Marinus the Spatharius, who by order of the Prince, with the help of a certain Deacon John, a traitor, were to kill the Pope. When this was less successful, the same command was given in the strictest terms to the Exarch Paul by the emperor, who also used every effort to bring about the death of Gregory, Maimbourg adds. This indeed is on the faith of Anastasius, which I confess is of the worst kind. Let us grant that Leo had it in his wishes that the Pontiff be removed. He would have done so by a certain right of defense. He had recently been devoted by anathema by Gregory, under the pretext of Heresy, and as far as was in the Pontiff's power, Leo was to be driven from the Italian Empire. By this very act, plots were to be laid against Leo's life from all sides, as in Italy his laureate images were thrown down and his icons trampled. Nor was the Emperor safe from the ministers of Gregory. For the law in Canon Law is, as confirmed by Urban II, in Gratian, *Causa 23, q. 5, cap. 47, Excommunicatorum*, that "they are not homicides who take up arms against the excommunicated and kill them." Whence so many parricides against Emperors, Kings, and Queens, either committed or attempted, after a sentence was passed by the Pontiffs. Therefore, Leo would have wished to consult for his own and the Empire's security, if indeed by the Emperor's command they had attempted to kill the Pontiff, which are the words of Anastasius. But the author of the Pontifical book says this most falsely. Theophanes says no such thing, nor Paul the Deacon, nor Nicephorus in his Historical Breviary, nor Hadrian I, nor the Nicenes. But neither did Gregory reproach Leo for this in the two letters he sent to him, which are to be inserted by Baronius for the year 726. Only this, that the Emperor had threatened that he would have "Gregory the Pontiff brought to Rome in chains," just as Constantine had ordered Martin to be brought. *In Baronius, Tom. VIII, p. 94*. Rightly so, if the Pontiff were to persist in his aggression against Leo, his Lord and Emperor, he was to be brought to Constantinople, and not without precedent. In the death of the Pontiff, while all of Italy was raging against Leo, there was little security for the Emperor; in his capture, who would thus be in Leo's power, there was a great deal.

A similar fabrication is another, to be exaggerated at length by Maimbourg, concerning St. Germanus, who, after his abdication as Patriarch, was not only treated most unworthily by the Emperor, and then handed over to a Monastery, but a little later, by Leo's order and with assassins sent, was to be strangled, when he was nearly a hundred years old. *Maimbourg, Lib. 1, p. 139, 140*. Hence you may see the historian acting the tragedian at such an inhuman crime. All things are fictions, as far as they concern Germanus being taken away by such a violent death. I confess that in the *Libellus Syndicus*, though of a later age, one reads, "he put him to death by hanging," *laqueo eum suffocavit*. But Theophanes reports nothing of this, only stating that Germanus retired to his paternal home, εἰς γονικὸν αὐτοῦ οἶκον, *in paternam domum*, and there, being at peace, or ἡσυχάσαντα, he passed the rest of his life in the utmost silence. The same is held by Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius, and Cedrenus, who would not have omitted this crime of Leo's, a matter to be remembered among the first. Therefore, Germanus lived as

a private citizen after abdicating the Patriarchate, and remained quiet until his final old age, in that house where he had first received the gift of light. No kind of life is more to be wished for by the old; may this be my seat, I pray, in my old age! Maimburgius, however, everywhere records as certain and indubitable things which he knew were destroyed even by the Byzantines themselves, provided they might strike horror into his readers.

XIII. It is scarcely worthwhile now, Hist. Icon. Lib. II., to insist on the remaining fictions about this Leo, with Maimburgius above all others devoting himself to the single purpose of giving the appearance of history to the most putrid fables and applying a false color to them. Another example, which may stand for all, is the perfidy of Leo against John of Damascus, the prefect of the city, then a prince of Syria, whose favor with the Caliph was most ardent, and who was, moreover, a most fierce defender of images. The summary, according to Maimburgius, is that Leo, to avenge these efforts of John for the assertion of images, resorted to the most abject crime of forgery. For this, he ordered someone skilled in the nefarious art to imitate as accurately as possible the handwriting of John, and then to forge letters as if sent to Leo, in which the Damascene would betray the city committed to him to the Greek Emperor. And by these letters, soon transmitted to the Caliph by Leo, with the added envy of the Saracens against John, the Emperor intended that this man should expiate his contumacy under the torments of punishments, in the cause of images, against the Edicts of Leo.

They add that this perfidy did indeed succeed according to Leo's wish, for by the sentence of the Caliph, John's right hand was cut off, with which it was believed he had betrayed his prince. But not a long time having passed, after John had adored an image of the Virgin and poured out prayers to it, that by her intercession his right hand might be restored to him, a placid sleep crept over John, and the voice of the smiling Image was heard by him, by which she benignly granted the use of his right hand, on the condition that Chrysorrhoeas should stand by his promises and henceforth combat the impiety of the Iconoclasts with his writings. And Maimburgius reports this whole affair in such a way that not only one author of the Life of Damascus can be thought to have committed these things to paper, but also those whom he notes in the margin: Elmacinus, the *Chronicon Orientale*, and Rodericus Toletanus. Baronius reports it, from a single John of Jerusalem in his *Vita Damasceni*, under the year 728. Natalis Alexander urges the same from the same source.

But it was granted to Maimburgius alone to adorn masks of this kind with a specious habit, and to delight the reader with an added scheme of a certain truth, *donner le plaisir de Roman*. The particulars argue it to be a fable. 1. Historians, however much they were Iconolaters and most hostile to Leo the Isaurian, made no mention of this portent or miracle in John, and a recent one at that, proceeding from an image of the Mother of God; certainly not

Theophanes, Paulus Diaconus, Nicephorus the Patriarch, Anastasius, Cedrenus, Glycas, Constantine Manasses, and the rest. Nor did the Acts of Nicaea, which are almost entirely devoted to compiling fables and miracles of this kind, especially in Action IV and V. Nor did Damascus himself in his own works, for whom it would have been of the greatest support for arguing against the Iconoclasts. Besides the silence of the Arabs in the history of the Caliphs, and of Marmolius himself, who professes to have thoroughly examined whatever the Greeks, Latins, Arabs, and Africans had handed down in their writings pertaining to that history. 2. All faith, therefore, rests with one John of Jerusalem, the author of the *Vita Damasceni*, or rather its interpreter from the Arabic language, as he himself professes.

It is well known, however, that the Syrians and Arabs have a talent for falsehood, wherever they have superstitions to establish; and that this one reason for writing this Life was the author's desire to venerate "venerable images" (τὰς σεβασμίες εἰκόνας), the beginning, middle, and end abundantly prove. But we will insist on this one little narrative against the Emperor Leo, who from the very beginning of this history is a "raping and roaring lion" (λέων αρπάζων ὄρνόμν). The Life was also written at a time when the images had already been restored by Irene; for this John is not to be referred to the last years of Constantine Copronymus, with Vossius, but to those of the Emperor Theophilus, from the seventh year of the Caliphate of Al-Mu'tasim, who began in the year of Christ 833, according to the Chronology and Annals of Eutychius the Patriarch. Whence it happened that neither Theophanes, nor any others before him, could have made mention of this fable, which proceeded from the Syrians.

3. Let the faith of history itself speak. First, the author of the *Vita Damasceni* did not express the name of that Saracen leader, which ought to have been done. Maimburgius conjectures that it was Hisham, the brother of Yazid II, which he finally understood from a diligent investigation of the Arab historians. And yet, none of the Arab historians he cites connects anything of John of Damascus with the caliphate of this Hisham. The Jesuit merely sought which caliph the chronicles assigned to the times of Leo, and he found Sulayman, Umar, Yazid, and Hashim, and this last was first placed under guardianship, according to Marmolius. This one, however, was particularly pleasing, because from it an occasion arose for Maimburgius to fill several pages with his description and with a portrayal of his immense wealth, among which were a thousand pairs of trousers, ten thousand undergarments, seven hundred wardrobes, etc. Meanwhile, when he died, a shroud for his corpse was denied him.

But that Damascus, the chief seat of the Caliphs, was destitute of a garrison under the caliphate of Yazid II or Hashim; that the same was entrusted to Manzur, a Christian and a monk, by a Saracen Prince, who was most skilled in policy and government, and vigilant above others in his affairs; and finally, that

matters in Syria were so disposed that it would be easy for Leo to arrive unexpectedly, as the letters suggested, and to crush the sleeping Caliph, or at least that it would be easy to persuade Leo of this; these are things of such a kind that all faith in history and the laws of prudence contradict them, and those very witnesses cited by Maimburgius themselves refute them. 4. To this is added the very absurdity of the fabrication, which entangles itself. John is introduced rising up against Leo the Isaurian, as one who was of the same faith as himself, who excelled in singular prudence and honesty; and this indeed some years after the Isaurian's Edicts against images, and the vengeance taken on Germanus of Constantinople and the other Iconolaters. For Maimburgius refers this perfidy of Leo to the year 731. And yet the author of the *Vita Damasceni* records that as soon as Leo's decree against images was established, in the year 726, John animated the Churches everywhere with pamphlets and letters against Leo, to show that "the adoration of the divine effigies was necessary" (*ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὸ τῶν θεῶν ἐκτυπωμάτων προσκίησιν*). Theophanes describes the same zeal of the Damascene in the 13th year of Leo, that is, of Christ 728, according to the calculation of Baronius himself; so also Paulus Diaconus, when John, with the Bishops of the East, subjected Leo to anathemas. Reconcile these councils now, reader, if you can, with the letters forged for Leo, or for the Damascene, praising Leo for his consonant faith.

Not to mention that the amputation of that right hand, by order of the Caliph, to be exposed in the public forum to the eyes of all, and soon restored before the same witnesses, by the miraculous virtue of the Image, being entreated by prayers; the Saracen himself being an eyewitness; and Leo being made more certain of it all, yet for this very reason the Iconoclasts were to rage more impotently against John and against the images; these are circumstances which would provoke the most unrestrained laughter in anyone moderately sane. Let not even the Jew Apella believe it. And with such trifles of the most trifling sort, stitched together from the workshop of monks and the weavers of legends, the Jesuit patches together his history. You, reader, from one learn all, and indeed everything. It began to be common in these times, if you do not know, to recover by the virtue of images, the touch of relics, the clemency of the Virgin, the intercession of the Saints, severed heads, tongues, hands, eyes, and any other members, with no trouble. Such as, for example, another fable, also mentioned by Maimburgius, after Baronius, about Basil, the son of Leo the Armenian, being castrated, but before an image or statue of Gregory Nazianzen, and with a devout mind in the cult of the image, recovering the use of his tongue which he had lost. The chronicles of the monks and the Byzantines, and the Acts of the Saints and Martyrs of this age, are teeming with examples.

However, if what they record about John of Damascus is true—to whom many things have been attached, both said and done and written, and among these the Pseudo-Acts of the Martyrs and the Orations on Images—he certainly merited

the indignation of Leo, whom it was not for John to strike with anathema for his condemnation of Iconomania.

XIV. There is hardly an end to what they have fabricated about this Leo the Isaurian, whether they be Byzantine Greeks or Latin worshippers of images. This is certain, that the Roman Pontiffs persisted in fostering rebellion against Leo, and scarcely had Gregory III entered the Pontificate when he deprived Leo, the Emperor of Constantinople, of both his empire and the communion of the faithful; these are the words of Platina, based on historians before him, and Onuphrius and Baronius do not disagree. Anastasius, in his *Life of Gregory III*, states that this was done by a synodal decree, although not against Leo by name, but against "whosoever hereafter, despising the use and veneration of sacred images, should be a deposer, destroyer, and profaner, or blasphemer of them." Maimburgius, under the year 732, says that Gregory enjoined Leo and Anastasius by letters to restore the Holy Images as quickly as possible, if they themselves wished to be restored.

Whence the just indignation of the Emperor; and besides Baronius, Allatius, Maimburgius, Natalis, and the men of his school, no one should blame Leo if, to avenge the Pontiff's attempts, he instructed a fleet against the Italians, and claimed for himself and the imperial treasury the patrimonies and estates of Calabria and Sicily, and imposed taxes, as reported by Theophanes, Paulus Diaconus, and other chroniclers. For no other way remained to suppress the rebellion and to vindicate the rights of the Empire. Thus, Maimburgius most ineptly accuses the "fury and impiety of Leo." Meanwhile, the invasions of the Saracens occupied the Emperor, as they saw Leo engaged in war against the Pope, and by movements throughout Thrace, Candia, Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily. Nor do the writers of the Iconoclastic history of Leo's affairs henceforth mention anything besides fictions, their sole support. A recent Jesuit has surpassed all in his lust for lying. From the legends and Menologia of the Greeks, and with the sole faith of apocryphal sources, without any approved historian, he rails against the savagery of Leo, exercised, forsooth, against the bishops who were defenders of images: especially against a certain Theophylactus of Nicomedia, whom he confesses, in a certain excess of zeal, to have openly traduced the Emperor before everyone as a precursor of the Antichrist, a betrayer of Christ, and another Judas. Whence, he says, Leo's indignation was kindled against this Theophylactus.

I do believe it, and if anyone in the midst of France, where Maimburgius wrote, were to rise up with equal fury against Louis the Great and against his Edicts for the destruction of the temples of the Reformed, would not Maimburgius agree that he would suffer the most deserved penalties for his most insane fury? Again, the Jesuit, wondering at Leo's moderation towards a certain John, a bishop in Phrygia, who resisted the imperial edicts, gives a reason that is not without charm. He says that Leo did violence to himself, restraining the motions of his

anger, because that John was a distinguished wonder-worker, and he feared the man, "as one who had the scourges of God in his power," *qui dispoit des fleaux de Dieu*, and for whom miracles were a game, & *à qui les miracles ne coutoyent rien*. In such a manner are the most trifling pages written about Francis of Assisi, Anthony of Padua, and similar wonder-workers.

XV. With equal ingenuity, Maimburgius trifles with other things at the end of the Iconomachic history under Leo. If the Emperor took action against any bishops or monks, summoning them to the Royal City, for example, Hypatius of Ephesus or Gregory of Limnae, known from the Menologion of the Greeks, the Jesuit conceals the movements of these rebels, who were mixing the lowest with the highest and impelling the populace to defection under the pretext of venerating images. If any punishments were inflicted on seditious persons or those guilty of treason, or if in any cases the guards or officials exceeded the limits of their orders, as long as Iconodules suffered, they are forthwith to be inserted into the order of Martyrs. If Irene, a woman of Scythian origin, devoted to images, is recorded by the Byzantines to have been joined to Constantine, the son of Leo, in the 16th year of Leo's reign, the Jesuit glories that "Catholic truth triumphed in the very palace of Leo," who did not dare to avenge the matter. Baronius, under the year 732, writes: "It was done by the truly wonderful providence of God that a barbarian woman, both a foreigner and a neophyte, with the Emperor being hateful and contradicting, and moreover persecuting and condemning to punishments the worshippers of the Sacred Images, she herself should worship them and freely testify that they ought to be worshipped." Fine words indeed!

And these things are rather a hindrance to the cause of images. For when they confess that this woman was a Barbarian, hitherto imbued with ethnic superstition, fresh from it, and a neophyte, let no one wonder that the Christian religion pleased her more under that form of images which approached more closely to Idolatry. Thus, if the Imperial fleet was to suffer shipwreck in the Adriatic gulf, the Jesuit, unmindful of so many unfortunate expeditions in the Holy War, or of the Spanish fleet sent against Elizabeth, forthwith ascribes it to an angry God, the avenger of the injured images. If also Constantinople was shaken by a great earthquake, towards the end of Leo's reign, which was to last for a year according to Theophanes, Nicephorus, and other chroniclers, if any plague devastated it, or if anywhere the grain supply failed, there was no other cause than the vengeance of the Deity on the Iconoclasts, just as the Christians were once the cause of evils under the ethnic dominion. But Leo, with innumerable pious men, attributed those movements of the Iconodules and their foul superstition, according to Nicephorus the Patriarch. Finally, if Leo, after a long reign, exercised by so many labors and wearied by wars, and moreover advanced in age, was to die from dropsy, a familiar disease, in the year of the Dionysian Era 741, a disease in which the acrimony of the humor ended in

dysentery, these things again were to be attributed by Maimburgius to Nemesis, demanding penalties from Leo for his opposition to the images.

To be sure, "Rarely does punishment with a limping foot desert the preceding wicked man." And for him who lay ill from the disease for a few days, for this man, you see, "it was days of punishment for years of guilt," according to that saying, "a day for a year I have given you!"

XVI. However, you may nowhere learn the character, servitude, and disposition of historians by a surer indication than when they either obscure all the virtues of rulers or call their crimes virtues. Of this matter, no clearer mirror can be beheld than in the commentaries of those historians who have handed down matters pertaining to religion. Those are ingenuous who, in the Iconoclastic History, neither praised all the actions of Leo the Isaurian, wherever the medicine exceeded its measure, nor subsequently all the deeds of Constantine, commonly called Copronymus, or of Nicephorus, or of Leo the Armenian, or of Michael the Stammerer, or of Theophilus, the successor of this man, about whom we will speak in their proper place. Thus, those who, in describing the history of the Reformation, for example, did not remain silent about the faults and vices of the German Princes or of Elizabeth of England, nor about the virtues of Philip II or Mary, if any were conspicuous in them. On the other hand, all those historians are treacherous, scarcely to be considered by that name, who, in uncovering the origins of the entire Iconomachic Controversy, believed this one task was given to them: to suppress all the virtues that shone in the destroyers of adored images—Leo the Isaurian, Constantine his Son, the Armenian, the Stammerer, Theophilus the husband of Theodora—and to convert them into portents and monsters of Princes; while they almost adored the divine name of Irene, the restorer of images, and then that of Theodora. Thus, those who in the history of the preceding age, while they insert Philip II or Mary, red with the blood of so many martyrs, into heaven with a certain deification, transform into demons the Princes, whether men or women, whom Rome struck with its anathemas. Now concerning the progress of Iconomachy under Constantine.

SECTION III

On Leo the Isaurian, Charles Martel, and Gregory III, taken away in the same year; the unjust judgment of Baronius. Constantine, a hated name. The fable of the defiled baptismal font. The true effigy of this prince, from historians. The monstrous image in the works of the Byzantines, Baronius, and Maimburgius. The cause of the most terrible hatred. The authors of the calumnies were monks and sworn enemies of Constantine. Why he was called Copronymus and Caballinus. The fallacious conjecture of Glycas the historian. The origin of more than one insult is opened up and illustrated. The prudence of Constantine in the cause of images. The false narratives of the historians. Celestial portents, scourges, and disasters falsely imputed to Iconomachy. The

cause of images to be referred by the Emperor to an Ecumenical Synod. The history of the Seventh Synod under Constantine. How it was corrupted by the Byzantines and the Nicenes. It is prolifically restored. Legitimacy in all its aspects. The process in the cause of images. The arguments of the Fathers against images of Christ. Others against those of the Virgin and the Saints. Passages from Scripture. From the Fathers. The summary of the decrees of this Synod, in five chapters. The falsehoods of the Iconoclasts are met. On the absence of the Pope. On the absence of the Patriarchs of the East. The remaining points which they press against this Synod. Maimburgius's bad faith in all things. And that of the Acts to which they appeal. But also that of Baronius.

I. The year 741 was fatal to three of the highest leaders in the world: Leo the Isaurian, whom dropsy extinguished at the end of June; soon after, Charles Martel, the father of Pepin, whose aid Gregory III had implored not so much against Leo as against the Lombards; and finally this very Gregory, who in the month of November was to make way for Zacharias, soon assumed to the Pontificate. Gregory had embroiled everything in seditions and wars against Leo, and also against Luitprand, the most praised King of the Lombards, by asserting for himself temporal dominion, and also by supporting rebels against Luitprand. Charles Martel had plundered monasteries everywhere, removed bishops from their sees, converted the wealth of the churches to the uses of war and of his own dukes, and had violated ecclesiastical immunities, according to Baronius. Emperor Leo, after a praised decade, had done many things bravely against the Saracens, but had disturbed nothing in the faith that had been defined by the six Ecumenical Councils. What happened then? Gregory was to be inscribed in the catalogue of the Blessed for having defended images and for having opposed and harassed Leo. Charles Martel, whom the avarice of the clergy had otherwise cursed, and whose soul St. Eucherius saw consigned to the pains of Hell, according to Surius, Gratian, and Baronius himself, because he had nevertheless shown respect to the Pontiff and had finally donated certain things to Peter and the Church, being himself also a worshipper of images and of the Saints, was for this reason to be extolled with praises by Baronius: Eucherius, however, was to be accused of falsehood, or at least he who wrote those things about Eucherius, and for the writer of the Annals, the best things were to be hoped for concerning the salvation of Martel. The miserable Leo, for this one reason, that he had first undertaken to place images beyond the risk of adoration, and then also to remove them from the Sacred Places, and to coerce rebels and insurgents everywhere, and to provide for his own security, was to be devoted to the demon and the infernal regions, to breathe out nothing but a blasphemous soul, and also to be defamed for all posterity as one who had surpassed Caligula and Nero and Domitian in savagery and impiety.

And this too was the integrity of Louis Maimburgius, above Baronius, in his Iconoclastic History. And the same man, about to begin the affairs of

Constantine, commonly called Copronymus, closes the history of Leo with this man's greatest crime of all, that he had left Constantine as his successor, "the most wicked of all bipeds that ever lived, and adorned with none of the laudable qualities that had been in Leo." For the dissension in the cause of images grew greater under Constantine VI, the son of Leo the Isaurian, and his successor not only in the Empire (counting the years from the Kalends of September, A.D. 741, Indiction IX), but also in his zeal for overthrowing Iconomania. Because his reign was long, and his authority very great, and his mind little inclined towards idle monks, and his prudence in convening an Ecumenical Synod (as he was able) for the purpose of cognizing and defining the cause of images, hence those tears, hence those cartloads of lies and insults with which all the Byzantines to a man, the same who were worshippers of images to the point of insanity, and also the Latins, Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius, and others, dared to censure that Prince. Whence also he was to be called by the single name of Copronymus and Caballinus, on account of the baptismal font, forsooth, which was contaminated by this royal infant when he was being baptized by Patriarch Germanus, a distinguished assertor of images.

For this fable was circulated by the petty Greeks after hatred towards Constantine had arisen and the images had been restored, as is clear from the writers. Whence not even Nicephorus the Patriarch mentions it in his lucid Historical Breviary, under the years 718 and 720, where he speaks of the name of Constantine being imposed, and of his coronation in the following year by Patriarch Germanus. But because all rage boiled over against this Constantine, an omen of his future Iconomachy was to be sought from his very infancy and baptism, forsooth, and indeed with St. Germanus as the prophet who, after the excrement was emitted by the royal infant into the Laver, is said to have burst forth into this cry: "Let it be established for Christians and the Church that this will be the sign of the greatest evil to be effected by him!" And this at a time when Leo was the love of all, in the beginnings of his Empire, Constantine the desire of all, a full eight years before the controversy about images was moved.

Who would also believe that Germanus would have lapsed into such imprudence that, amidst so many acclamations and vows, amidst public joys, on a most festive day, in the presence of the Augusti, from a harmless and common accident, even if it had happened in the extreme, and something not at all to be wondered at in a naked infant being immersed in the sacred font according to the Eastern custom, he would have dared to burst forth into such a dire and inauspicious presage? And upon this most putrid and foul fiction were built those foul and execrable things which the Iconolaters soon invented about this Constantine, fodder for Maimburgian slander and the subject of puerile declamations. Concerning which matter, we shall soon speak a little more diligently.

III. In truth, to summarize and to delineate the effigy of Constantine in a brief tablet, with historians leading the way, this Prince walked in his paternal footsteps, and was even to surpass his father in some things. The details are understood even from the very History of Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, first edited by Petavius, though he was most hostile to Copronymus, yet in that Breviary he was to exhibit more the faith of a historian concerning the things laudably accomplished by Constantine. Let the vestiges of history be added, amidst so many lies with which the trifles and dire imprecations teem, in the very writer of the *Historia Miscella*, Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, etc. Although it is known to the learned that these are often interpolated, mutilated, often violated by the adulterous hand of the Iconolaters; but also everywhere betraying a maniacal affection against Constantine, as well as an immoderate zeal for images, contrary to the laws of history. So much so that from the sole faith of the Iconolaters, under Irene, and the succeeding patrons of images, then under the Roman Pontiffs, after the genuine records were subverted, all the truth of those things depends, which equate this Constantine not just with the Diocletians or the Maximians, but with all the demons combined.

And that fragment taken from Theophanes and attributed to Patriarch Nicephorus, at the end of the Petavian edition, does not present the appearance of a history, but of some declamation and invective against the Iconoclasts and their standard-bearer Copronymus, as the Loyolite himself acknowledged. Among all these things, however, in the history of Constantine, and in his long reign of almost thirty-five years, amidst so many incursions of barbarians, and movements of tyrants and rebels, the most brilliant virtues are conspicuously apparent: vigilance worthy of a Prince, proven continence, remarkable humanity, fortitude rivaling that of the greatest emperors, but also the most upright zeal for the Christian religion, and a piety true and not defiled by superstitions.

And these are not now the fabrications of Calvin or the Magdeburgenses, as Maimburgius trifles, but the very faith of history, with even the enemies I have mentioned as witnesses. Therefore, it was that Constantine who, immediately after the death of Leo, successfully suppressed Artabasdu his kinsman, who was about to invade the tyranny by a conspiracy of the Iconodules, as the Jesuit Maimburgius admits, against the rights of succession and empire, and therefore guilty of treason, along with his sons Nicetas and Nicephorus. And Artabasdu had no stronger defense than in pretending a zeal for images, and by restoring them, thereby binding their supporters to himself, as usurpers are accustomed to be carried to opposite sacred rites, and to clothe themselves in the mantle of religion. And rightly, the recent author of the Byzantine History wrote: "Artabasdu, to win over the minds of the Catholics to himself, restored the cult of images." And while the Jesuit extols this Artabasdu and rises to his tyranny, supposedly to assert the Catholic faith, he betrays the character of the Society,

and adds a white stone to the schemes of the Guisians against the Henrys, and to the traitors or parricides of kings, under the pretext of the Catholic faith.

Afterwards, the same Constantine punished Sisinnium the Patrician, convicted of conspiracy and of aspiring to tyranny, with the loss of his eyes, as Nicephorus the Iconodule and witness testifies, just as he did to Artabasdus and his sons, a familiar punishment among the Orientals. Maimburgius, inverting everything in his hatred of Constantine, extols Sisinnium to the heavens, praises his zeal, equates Constantine with Phalaris, and ascribes this vengeance to the most ungrateful mind of the Prince, who could not bear the one to whom he owed his Empire: "Is this the price for care and watchful labors?" Again, during the siege of the city of Constantinople, as many native citizens as fled to Constantine, to withdraw themselves from the calamities in which they were entangled, being so besieged in the city, the citadel of the rebels, he received them humanely and honorably, as the words of the same Nicephorus state. The supply of grain was his utmost care, lest the Royal city, lest his subjects be deprived of its abundance, as Maimburgius himself confesses.

Then this same Emperor is the one who waged wars against the Saracens in Armenia, Syria, and the parts of the East, even into Assyria itself, having crossed the Euphrates, and in Europe against the Bulgars, Slavs, and Huns, who were devastating the Thracian provinces, by land and sea, successfully and bravely, intrepid in spirit, tireless in labors and vigils, until he at last succumbed to them, and to his continual application to the preparations of war, a fact the Jesuit did not dare to deny. In describing these things, however, this same man betrays his own venom, and a mind not sufficiently that of a historian, nor of a Christian. For, if ever Constantine was inferior in arms, amidst so many laurels and triumphs—as Mars is ever-changing—with his army facing adverse conditions, externally from the incursions of the Slavs and Bulgars, internally from civil discords and the movements of the rebellious Iconolaters, which was also the fate of David and of all the best princes, the Jesuit does not fail to immediately cast those things upon the impiety of Constantine, and upon the vengeance of the Deity, and he almost praises the barbarians themselves for the slaughters they committed and the victories they sometimes gained. Our author always seeks the outcome of the war, not its cause, as the Tragedian argues.

Thus, he either involves in a veil of silence or deforms with foul colors the many pious and Christian deeds done by Constantine. Such as that, among others, related by Nicephorus the Patriarch, in the year 773, when this Emperor redeemed several thousand Christians from the Slavs for a great sum of money, and also endowed them with gifts out of his royal munificence and clemency, and permitted them to go wherever they wished. And what ought to have redounded to the praise of this Prince, and what earlier and holier ages would have proclaimed, these things that Natalis Alexander and Maimburgius—not the first, I confess—turn into material for hatred, imprecations, anathemas, and

incensed fury. Of this kind are the superstitions of the Iconolaters and the Relic-worshippers, which had grown daily, but were curbed under Leo and Constantine; for the idleness and impure celibacy of the monks, those remedies were prescribed which Christ and Paul enjoined: manual labor and an undefiled bed; the convocation of a universal synod, primarily to investigate the cause of images and to confirm the prior Ecumenical Synods, in the manner of our ancestors, as soon as it was permitted and as the times allowed, in the year of the Dionysian Era 754. Then, a legation to King Pepin, to compose the dissensions concerning religion in the Republic and in the Church, in the year 766. And what other things of this kind he was compelled to either decree or attempt for suppressing rebels and sedating movements, are to be vindicated below from atrocious injuries.

Finally, just as he showed himself a Prince in administering the Republic, an Emperor in waging wars, and in protecting the Church an assertor of the divine Law against the Iconolaters, and a Defender of the Faith against heresies, so he showed himself a husband and father in ruling his family. This man is certainly not to be accused of any wandering lust, or adulteries, or incests, or if anything more enormous than these, in the midst of the Purple and on that pinnacle of power. He was joined in lawful and honorable nuptials first to Irene, from whom came Leo, his son and successor, then to another, Maria, in a second marriage, and finally to Eudoxia, from whom he begot Christophorus, Nicephorus, Nicetas, and Eudoxus—a union which is called a disgraceful pollution in the Acts of the Iconolaters. He was a man, indeed, and thinking nothing human alien to him, his patience was often injured by the tumultuous, and sometimes turned into the highest indignation. Whence his rather severe punishment of the authors of rebellions was mostly congruent with their offenses and a consequence of their injustice. Or if it at times exceeded the measure, it was not always with the Prince being conscious of it, unless he was at the same time conscious of, and a witness to, desperate and rebellious fury, of which there is more than one example of the matter below. And concerning the persecution instigated against the monks, whence some appearance is given to the maledictions of his accusers, we too will speak hereafter.

IV. And these things have been said in advance about Constantine, commonly called Copronymus, so that henceforth the integrity—or lack thereof—may be established, not only of the Byzantines we have mentioned, but also that of Baronius, Gretser, Spondanus, Petavius, and others, and recently of Louis Maimburgius and Natalis Alexander, whom we observe especially in this cause as the most recent historians. First, those men, one and all, forgot the laws which they believed were dictated for them when writing history, and Maimburgius above all, in the Preface to his Iconoclastic History, declaiming at length against preconceived opinions and the blind faith of historians, and promising nothing but what is certain and sincere, and alien to party zeal. Meanwhile, in the affairs of both Leos, and of Constantine, and of this one above all others, they begin

immediately with insults and maledictions beyond all belief, with which they lacerate and defame the princes, especially Constantine. And immediately at the beginning of the historical narrative about this Emperor, when he succeeded his father, so that they may preoccupy the readers with prejudices, they describe this effigy of him.

To them, Constantine is, with the Greek Iconolaters leading the way in many things (I confess), from Theophanes onwards: "From the seed of Leo, a most cunning leopard; from the seed of a serpent, an asp and a flying snake; a suitable instrument of the Antichrist; a horrid monster in mind and body, having nothing human; in whom there was never anything laudable; from his tender years devoted to vices, luxuries, every kind of abomination; an execrable magician; an invoker of demons, and an evoker of shades; delighted by sorcery, bloody sacrifices, horse dung and urine, not only smearing his whole body with these, but also compelling his friends to do the same; the same a Photinian, an Arian, a Socinian; an impious Nestorian; blasphemous against God, Christ, the Virgin, and all the Saints; cruel, inhuman, deceitful, a suborner of perjured witnesses; another Herod, another Nero, a Diocletian," and more things that are found even on the threshold of Maimburgius's history. And from these men, expect, my reader, a faithful narration of the deeds and facts of Constantine!

And there were two principal causes—that I may preface this to the examination of the main chapters in this History—for the most terrible hatred against him, and for all the infamy with which he was branded among the superstitious and the cowed. The first was his Iconomachy, following the example of his parent, and hence the synod held under his auspices against the Iconolaters, and indeed against the will of the Roman Pontiff, who was then Stephen III, at a time when this one was solely endeavoring to snatch the Exarchate of Ravenna and whatever other parts of Italy from Constantine, with the favor of Pepin. The other was the proscription, throughout the East, of superstitious monasticism and impure celibacy, veiled with the mask of chastity, and the mockery with which he is said to have daily exposed the idle monks, who were above all others the assertors of iconolatry: namely, either to be punished by the name of rebellion, or to be compelled to the chaste laws of matrimony and to a manner of life profitable to the Republic.

In which cause, however, many things were afterwards spitefully fabricated against Constantine by the petty Greeks, the monks themselves, and the Iconolaters. Such as, chief among others, Theophanes the Confessor—of images, that is, under Leo the Armenian—from whom Anastasius the Librarian, the continuator of Paulus Diaconus, and the later Byzantines almost had their contemptuous remarks against both Emperors, with the envy of the accusations being increased by these as well. Among these also was John of Jerusalem, to whom is attributed the *Life of Damascenus*, and the recent narrative made at the Nicene Synod, a most superstitious monk, who also bears the title of his

profession. Of the same habit and character was that Theodore the Studite, whose life was written by Michael the Monk, from whom Baronius draws many things, though he is sometimes more equitable, as will become clear below. If not mostly monks, certainly petty Greeks, filled with a superstitious devotion to images and a lust for lying, are those who compiled the Lives of Tarasius the Patriarch, Plato the Abbot, Theophanes the Confessor, and Nicephorus and Methodius the Patriarchs. Nicetas the Monk, etc., or those who under the name of John of Damascus fabricated the history of the two martyrs, who compiled the Acts of Andrew Calybites, Stephen the Younger, and their companions, and similar fables and rhapsodies, even under the guise of uncertain authors. Indeed, that many of these are pseudepigraphical, and not the work of those whose names they bear as authors, is testified by anachronisms, absurdities, and contradictions. And since it is established that those very lauded Confessors, or their laudators, asserted the cause of images and their worship to the point of insanity and rebellion under the Emperors Leo the Isaurian, the Constantines, Nicephorus, the Armenian, and the Stammerer; and moreover, that they took an oath to the monastic way of life, against which Constantine had declared war; being on both counts sworn enemies of the Emperors, who would be of such credulous simplicity as to believe them when they narrate? But what, I ask, do they narrate?

From there come the ludicrous or monstrous tales about Leo and his son Constantine, now to be refuted as of notorious falsehood; from here, about the martyrs, forsooth, for punishments generally given for rebellion or contumacy, all sorts of old-womanish and childish tales, turning each one into a wonder-worker and a miracle-monger, with Maimburgius set to fill his every page with these trifles. Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, was certainly not from the family of the Ascetics at first; but both in the name of his father Theodore, who was driven out by Constantine for Iconolatry, and then in his own, who was an exile under Leo the Armenian and Michael the Stammerer for his tenacious assertion of the veneration of images, he was a most bitter enemy of the Iconomach Emperors. If, however, that impotent railing against Copronymus, published by Petavius at the end of the *Ιστορίας Συγκωτόμα*, is to be believed as Nicephorus's. Georgius Cedrenus, merely a copyist and interpolator of his predecessors, and later than him, John Zonaras of the 11th and 12th centuries, also professed the monastic life. These writers were more remote from the events under Leo and Constantine, and were slaves to Iconolatry. Thus, what faith is to be given to Symeon, commonly called Metaphrastes, in his *Lives of the Pseudo-Martyrs*, among which is that of Andrew of Crete, an Iconolater under Constantine Copronymus, let them not say who are born to serve the cause—Bollandus, Gretser, Leo Allatius, himself a petty Greek, in his *Diatriba de Symeonibus*—but let Canus, Baronius, Bellarmine, the aforementioned Allatius himself, say sometimes: and all the ingenuous have professed the same, and men of no stuffy nose, Casaubon, Vossius, Blondellus, Capellus, Godwinus, and others. Now, whatever the Latin chroniclers have recorded as monstrous and

impious about Constantine Copronymus depends on the sole faith of the Greeks. The author of the *Miscella* and Anastasius copied Theophanes. Thus Sigonius, in his *History of Italy*, Book III, the *Annals of the Franks* for the times of Pepin, and as many writers of any note as are to speak of Constantine, forewarn that they report these things from Greek writers, or even copy the Greeks word for word, as in *Pipino*. *Paulus Æmilius. De Reb. Franc. P. 20.*

V. But that the aforesaid writers—and Louis Maimburgius, who was to surpass them all in the license of inventing, detracting, and maligning—have dishonestly defiled the entire history of Constantine and of the superstition opposed by him, should be exposed to the public light with a few more illustrious examples, so that the integrity of history may be restored. Let the first be the dung-like and horse-like impurity: "To this excess of brutality at last," says that Louis, "that horrendous one indeed, Constantine progressed, that his greatest delight was most frequently to cover his whole body with horse dung, and even to compel whomever wished to earn his favor to do the same deed: for which reason, besides that shameful cognomen of Copronymus, another of Caballinus was imposed on him, which has stuck to him and still sticks to him in History." He cites in the margin Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and the *Miscella* on Constantine.

In the first place, let the reader observe Maimburgius's fidelity, whether in citing or in translating. Theophanes and the *Miscella* state simply that Constantine "delighted in horse dung and urine," which could be said of some distinguished horse-lover, or of one who loves to manure gardens and trees, like a "dung-man," as Aristophanes says. Cedrenus says he was "devoted to the eviscerations of victims," which is certainly something the sons of anatomists are devoted to. Zonaras, indeed, says "to the dissections of sacrificial animals," as perhaps soothsayers in their inspection of the entrails of victims; but this would make Constantine a pagan, placating the gods of the Gentiles with sacrifices, in the midst of Leo's palace! Now compare these with the Maimburgian paraphrase, and marvel at the historian's fidelity. Then, everyone sees that the dung-fable was first born from the other one about the excrement ejected into the baptismal font, whence (says the Jesuit) came the infamous cognomen Copronymus, but this has just been refuted as false and a lie.

But you have a far different origin for the cognomen Caballinus, as well as Copronymus, in Michael Glycas. "There is a certain region called Caballa, and those who originate from there were all called Caballini. From there, then, he himself traces his origin, and since by a certain custom horse dung is called 'Caballina,' the most wicked man was rightly nicknamed Copronymus, as if carrying a name of dung within himself." "A certain region is called Caballa. As many as are sprung from it, are all called Caballini. Wherefore, since this Constantine traced his origin from thence, and as it became customary to call horse-dung Caballinum, the most wicked man was not unreasonably named

Copronymus from the stercoraceous name, as if he carried a stercoraceous name in himself." Glycas adds in the same place that, after a diligent inquiry, when he was frequently asked about the origin of this cognomen, he had found "nothing else, but only this."

But one fable pushes another, and Glycas is false in his conjecture. There is no region of Cabala, unless it be Cabalis of Lycia, according to Pliny, which is Καβαλις to Strabo and Stephanus, towards Taurus and Lycia, hence Καβαλᾶς, Καβαλεῖς. But from whence did Constantine derive his origin? More truly, by reason of his paternal lineage, he was an Isaurian, or a Syrian, originating from Germanicia, according to Theophanes and his copyists, a city and bishopric on the border of Syria and Cilicia. To which, indeed, the city of Castabala is closest to the west, whence Mary of Castabala, to whom a letter to Ignatius is ascribed, is read, not of Caesobela, as Isaac Vossius rightly has it. But Castabala had nothing in common with Caballa, whence the cognomen Caballinus, and the omen of the name Caballinus, as if stercoraceous, according to the interpreter Glycas. The matter stands thus. The emperor did not bear this perpetual epithet of either Copronymus or Caballinus until long after the images had been established in the East.

Whence you will not read it in Theophanes, nor in Nicephorus of Constantinople, Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius the Librarian, Sigebertus, or others. Perhaps this prince was said to be delighted with horses (καβάλλαις) beyond measure, like that hippomaniac Theophylactus of Constantinople, son of Romanus, just as this emperor was skilled in horsemanship. It could also be that, frequently being among his horses in the stable, he was at times soiled by their dung or urine. From which afterwards the joke and the ambiguous cognomen Caballinus, and then Copronymus, was born. To which succeeded the most putrid fiction, about the urine and dung of a horse, in which he not only delighted, but with which both he and his parasites befouled their entire bodies, nay, enveloped them completely.

We add another origin of the insult, and not an obscure one, from the Fragment attributed to Nicephorus, though it is most dissimilar to the *Ἱστορία Σύντομος*, which is the genuine offspring of the historian Nicephorus. That Invective reports that Emperor Constantine, just as his mind, so "his body he defiled" (τὸ σῶμα ἐμολυνόμεθρον) with every kind of lust. It adds that the food which he had ingested at lunch, he subsequently excreted in vomit (ἐμετοῖς); which, being converted into a stercoraceous excretion, into τὸ καββαλεῖν, or καταβαλεῖν or καταρρίψαι, whence καββαλις, and καβαλλις, concerning that which is excreted, declining καβαλλίνα, καβαλλίνη. And from these were born the scoffs about cabbaline dung, foul excrements, with which he would sprinkle his whole body. Hence he was to be called καβαλλίνος, and κόπριος ἀνὴρ or κοπρώνυμος, by way of insult. But this was long after the family of Leo the Isaurian was extinct, and the Iconoclasts were completely suppressed under the long reign of Theodora, the widow of

Theophilus, from the year 841 to 855 and thereafter, a whole century after Constantine was removed from the Empire. At which time also the other cavil was disseminated, about the befouled baptismal font of the monastery, or its being polluted by the royal infant's *τῆ καββαλίῳ*, lest an omen now be thought to have been lacking.

Which, however, might happen to any little infant, sprinkled with cold water, or even immersed with its whole body in a font or swimming pool. And that former point in the aforesaid Fragment, concerning the most corrupt morals of the prince's youth, which is established by the single testimony of his enemies, is no reason why they should turn it to the odium of the Constantinian cause. Nor would the Jesuit wish that from the most dissolute morals of courts, especially in the slippery age of princes, for whom whatever they please is lawful, and from those of which France itself is a witness, historians are witnesses, from Henry II and III, when hatred against the Reformed was most inflamed, a prejudice should arise against the Pontifical cause. But the other point which Nicephorus reports about this Constantine, namely frequent ejection of ingested food through vomiting, is often familiar to voracious youth, or even to those suffering from stomach ailments, who would voluntarily provoke vomiting. Wherefore he adds that this prince was subject to various bodily discomforts and pains, which was not to be immediately turned into a vice of the mind.

VI. Now it comes to be considered in a few words what decrees were undertaken by this ill-named Constantine against images, or the Saints. We will insist on the Jesuit's narration, in the principal chapters of the history. "As soon as he held the reins of the empire," he says, "he renewed the Edicts against images, and not only this, but he also forbade the Saints to be invoked; he ordered their Relics to be prostituted and treated contemptuously in the most unworthy manner; finally, he attacked the Virgin Mary with execrable impiety, with many blasphemies and jests against her, and even by torturing those who invoked her Holy Name." And these things the Jesuit everywhere dramatizes, and represents them described in the most terrible colors, and with the venom of his malicious pen poured out everywhere. Now the venom must be wiped away, history must be restored, and the true must be separated from the false.

That Constantine walked in his paternal footsteps, and in his own time promulgated edicts against the Iconolaters, proscribing images from sacred places, is the constant testimony of history. It is false, however, what Maimburgius would have us believe, that this was done immediately after the death of Leo. Indeed, he dissembled for some time, and only after the rebels were subdued, the tyranny suppressed, Constantinople brought back, and a successful expedition against the Saracens, having crossed the Euphrates itself, and the noblest cities of Syria restored to the Empire, in the year 745, did he undertake to abolish the cult of images throughout the whole empire, as the Jesuit later recounts. And indeed, he refers it to the fifth or rather the sixth year

of Constantine, in which, according to Theophanes, a cruel plague spread through all of Greece, and the islands of the Aegean Sea, and other places of the East. So that this scourge of God might be opportunely ascribed to the impiety of Constantine, against which God had terribly animadverted, by sending exterminating angels to avenge the profanations and sacrileges of heresy. So too the petty Greeks.

It is most true, however, that Constantine, after defeating Artabasdu, until the 12th year of his reign, in the Vulgar Era 753, when the controversy concerning images revived, as Maimburgius notes from Theophanes, left this cause in the state it had been at the time of Leo's death. That is, images were exiled from Constantinople, and elsewhere throughout the Eastern Empire, from the sacred places, to prevent their worship, and only those which the tyrant with his followers had restored after the death of Leo were removed. And whatever the Iconolaters might plot secretly, matters stood in that state, and were peaceful, until Constantine judged it opportune to compose such great disputes, and to restrain henceforth the disturbers of public peace, by a Decree of an Ecumenical Synod. For which reason it happened that in that year which preceded the Council, to be announced in the year 754, he ordered that silences, or gatherings and consultations, be held in every city, thus preparing matters and minds for the universal assembly.

Let Maimburgius say again from Theophanes: "After the bishops in most cities, with a foul desire of pleasing, had conformed themselves to the will of the Prince, he willed that particular assemblies be held in the principal cities, in order to gently prepare the minds (pour disposer doucement les esprits) to embrace the definition of the General Synod." Nothing could have been instituted more prudently or more consistently with ancient customs by that prince, who, elated by so many victories and successful in his undertakings, could have proscribed images forever by the severity of his Imperial Edicts, by his most absolute power. Meanwhile, concerning the insults offered to the Virgin, or the Saints, or their Relics, as Maimburgius stated above, there is none of those things which the accuser mentioned there, in Nicephorus the Patriarch, Theophanes, Paulus Diaconus, or Anastasius. And the Jesuit notes only Cedrenus in the margin stuffing his synopsis of events for three centuries since Constantine with fictions, fables, and inaccuracies, and lying about many things concerning Copronymus. For this reason, it also happened that Pope Zacharias decreed nothing in Rome against the Iconoclast Constantine, contrary to the example of his predecessors, whatever favor he had at first shown to the tyrant Artabasdu when his fortune was more successful. But the proscription of images in the East was of little concern to Zacharias; far more important was the augmentation of the Patrimony of Peter, on the one hand by the liberality of Constantine, as Baronius reports from Anastasius, and on the other by the cession of the Exarchate of Ravenna by Ratchis, King of the Lombards, about which Exarchate more later. To Anastasius, On the Year 742, N.I. And his

successors, Stephen III and Paul I, followed in the same footsteps. Indeed, in the Pontifical Epistles you may read Constantine adorned everywhere with the encomium of a most pious Augustus and great Emperor.

VII. Nor is there a more lucid indication of a wicked disposition, whether in the Byzantine Chronographers or in our Maimbourg, than when they ascribe the dire plague, which ignited in the year 746 and raged for three years, to the wrath of the Deity against the Iconoclasts, and to the vengeance of Heaven for the denial of religious worship to images, or relics, or saints. For first, that plague began to rage, according to Nicephorus of Constantinople, Theophanes, Paul the Deacon, and the rest, at a time when the Emperor Constantine was enjoying a propitious Heaven in all things, was routing the Arabs and Saracens in Syria—those enemies of images, as the Jesuit says in the same place—and was freeing Christians from the harshest servitude, victorious and triumphant everywhere. *Maimbourg, book 1, p. 80*. Nor had the deadly edicts against images yet been issued, nor the persecution against the monks yet been moved. Secondly, that plague devastated with greatest effect those places in which the Iconolaters were active. For it began in parts of Italy, Calabria, and Sicily, which venerated images above all others. Thence it was to penetrate into Syria, where there were also very many Iconodules, and Monophysite Heretics, whom Constantine, intending to recall them from heresy, led away from their homes as bound captives. Furthermore, that plague raged primarily, and the consternation born from it, among the superstitious common folk, who adhered to images as much as possible, not against Constantine himself, who at that very time was enjoying his wishes and his supremely successful arms in Syrian Commagene and in Assyria itself. Finally, whence do the Iconodules, whence does Maimbourg, have it that scourges are destined and sent from heaven against those who restore the worship of the one God, of the one Savior, by proscribing that of images, idols, and creatures? Where does Moses, where do the Prophets, where does Christ, or the Apostles, thunder against princes of this sort, as if they were sacrilegious, who urge that the one God, the one Christ, be adored, in spirit and in truth? Indeed, do not the men of God threaten every extremity to those who would prostrate themselves before images, who would worship God in the likeness of an image, who would transfer his glory to created things, rendering *dulia* or service to things that are not by nature gods? And is it not more like the truth that God the Best and Greatest, as Iconolatry grew strong, along with the immoderate and religious worship of the Virgin, the Saints, and Relics, blazed forth from heaven against the truly sacrilegious, against the violators of divine Law, against the robbers of the honor to be rendered to him alone?

Let the judgment be the same concerning the other prodigy which Theophanes mentions, for the 23rd year of Constantine, and after him Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, and others, namely of the most bitter frost from October to February, such that lights and the seas froze to the very bottom. Soon, from a lack of rain

the springs were to dry up, and all things were nearly exhausted by filth and thirst, while "the grass prays for a rainy Jove." As much as Maimbourg is in his description of these prodigies, he likewise ascribes the cause, along with the Greeklings, to hatred of the monks, and specifically to the martyrdom of Stephen the Younger, who had trampled the Prince's image under his feet while he was watching. *Book 1, p. 84, 86.* And yet that very year, according to the Patriarch Nicephorus in his *Breviarium* and other witnesses, was the one in which Constantine forced the Bulgars to the peace conditions that he wanted. It is read that the Imperial Fleet was indeed scattered and afflicted by winds and storms, but this was after the barbarians had been subdued. And if we are to judge of the wrath of the Deity from portents of this kind, or from the scattering of Constantine's Fleet, why should God not be considered to have restrained the frenzies of the seething Iconolaters with an unusual frost? Whence also do we read of peoples terrified and afflicted by similar portents under the best of princes? Or even under Iconolaters, and those given over to superstition, for an example, in the formidable Fleet and forces of Irene, which were utterly destroyed in the year that followed the Pseudo-Nicene council, according to Theophanes? But also in the innumerable obvious examples in the writings of the Byzantines, Paul the Deacon, Sigebert, Sabellicus, Krantz, and the like, and whatever chroniclers there are. And what sort of judgment, therefore, shall we have of so many disasters in the expeditions of the Holy War, which were plainly to be sent from heaven, even as Maimbourg himself is often a witness, and other Austrian or Spanish writers? *History of the Crusades.* Above all, of that portentous disaster, caused by nothing less than winds and sky conspiring for its ruin, as Philip himself pronounced, of that invincible and thundering Fleet of the year 1588, which filled all of Catholic Belgium and all the Spains with grief and lamentation, but vindicated Reformed England and the United Provinces from imminent and certain destruction?

VIII. But we must return to the images trampled upon by Constantine. This one thing remained, which had been sought by so many prayers from his father Leo the Isaurian: that this entire cause which pertained to the worship and veneration of images, saints, or even relics, might be weighed and debated in a Universal Synod, and at last be defined from Scripture, the Councils, the Fathers, and the practice of the purer Church, before the superstition of the most recent times. We have seen above that the most prudent of princes had prepared everything for holding this Synod, having forewarned the churches and bishops everywhere, as was indeed fitting. That Synod was therefore convoked in the year 754, the 13th of Constantine, the 7th indiction, the same year in which Stephen III, after undertaking a journey to the Gauls, little concerned about images, would either transfer the kingdoms of the world to others, or claim them for himself and Peter, as Baronius himself says at the beginning of this year. It is to be lamented, however, that the Iconolaters have left nothing remaining of this Synod, except for those things which, having conspired under Irene and Tarasius, they produced, and interpolated at their discretion, in the

Pseudo-Nicene council, Action VI. Or what is contained in the pages of the Acts of Stephen and his Companions (which Binius most ignorantly calls the *Acts of Pope Stephen*), pages which are at once most mendacious and most insulting, from which, that is, from the furies unleashed against Constantine, Baronius offers his own account, and after him the recent writers. *To the Year 754, N. LIX and following*. Theophanes, in a few words, on the 13th year of Constantine, but with mordant salt, calls it an "unlawful council" assembled; adding the place of the assembly, in the Hieria Palace (Cedrenus wrongly says "in the palace of Syria") or Hereum or Herianum, opposite the City, on the Asiatic shore beyond the Bosphorus; and adding also the presidents, the bishops of Ephesus and Perga, since Anastasius of Constantinople had died. Finally, he gives the number of bishops as three hundred and thirty-eight. The *Synodal Book* calls it an "impious Synod," convoked after a conspiracy had been entered into with Constantine, the successor of Anastasius, and other "most vain" bishops. From these witnesses, indeed, who profess themselves to be Martyrs or Confessors for the cause of images, and who send their own sufferings or those of their party under Copronymus to Heaven with complaints and laments, you would expect, like Baronius, a faithful and most sincere narrative! And perhaps Maimbourg would have us believe that the recently suffering Reformed in Occitania, Aquitaine, Saintonge, and the whole Kingdom, after the Dragons were sent forth from hell, would testify perfidiously and with little Christian charity about the recent Assembly of the Gallican Clergy, or about the Jesuitical Society, by whose hands they perished?

Although, to be sure, this difference exists: that the former things about the Synod of Copronymus were written only by its enemies long afterwards, while the latter things are testified to by the Sun itself, and by a groaning France, even a Catholic and eyewitness France, and by all of Europe today. But it is well that the writer of the Annals, as well as all who think with him—Binius, Bellarmine, Pighius, and the rest—profess this elsewhere about the Greeks, concerning the Acts of the Sixth Synod against Honorius: that "the Greeks are generally corrupters of synods;" and that in the Acts of the Sixth Synod many things are wanting; that many things have been added to them, truncated by Theodore of Constantinople, etc. *Baronius, to A.D. 682, N. III, XXXV*. Why, by equal right, should we not affirm the same of the Seventh Synod, when Tarasius of Constantinople presents it with his followers, and only the Greeklings, who conspired to reject that synod, present it? Namely, that they truncated and corrupted whatever they wished, according to their own disposition.

IX. The truest history of the Constantinopolitan Synod, however, even from the records of our adversaries, is referred in summary to these points. 1. The manner of its convocation was legitimate, by imperial authority, by which all the previous Ecumenical councils were also called. The matter was also communicated with the bishops in advance, and sacred commands, "most pious decrees," were sent wherever they could be sent, and wherever the world obeyed

Constantine. 2. More bishops assembled for this Synod than for the previous Ecumenical ones, or for the Sixth Synod under Constantine Pogonatus. Namely, 338 bishops, as Theophanes himself reports, and the Pseudo-Nicaeans in the *Acts*, Tome II, from all parts of the Eastern Empire. The Council of Nicaea had comprised 318 bishops; the first of Constantinople, 150 bishops; that of Ephesus, while the Africans and John of Antioch with his party were absent, not many more than 200 bishops. The second of Constantinople under Justinian, about 160 bishops. Finally, the third under Pogonatus, in the Monothelite cause, not even 300 bishops. Concerning the absence of the Roman or the Patriarchs of the East, more shortly. Whence it rightly and deservedly inscribed itself, "the holy, great, and universal seventh Synod." 3. The presidents of the Synod, according to Theophanes, were two distinguished bishops, the Exarch of all Asia from Ephesus, and the Metropolitan of Pamphylia from Perga, Anastasius of Constantinople having died a few days before. And although the Emperor could have, as Irene later did in the elevation of Tarasius, first designated a Patriarch who would moderate the council and direct everything according to his nod, the most prudent Prince was unwilling to do so. And only after the cause had been debated in the Synod, from the 10th of February to the 7th of August, for a whole six months, was Constantine elected in the presence of the Synod, to bring the matter to a close. He was not a layman, as they lie, like Tarasius and Nicephorus later were, but the bishop of Syllaion, or Syllai, a city of Pamphylia, a monk in habit and way of life, yet not having laid that aside even in the episcopate itself. 4. What the Pseudo-Acts of Stephen and the *Synodal Book* lie about concerning this Constantine, and from them Maimbourg securely, that he was a nefarious and ignominious man, ejected for his crimes and removed from his episcopate, "chased out for his dissolute and utterly scandalous life," is reported neither by Theophanes, nor Patriarch Nicephorus, nor Cedrenus, nor other Byzantines, though they were most hostile to this Patriarch. And indeed, the Emperor would have added little authority to such an election or synod, or strength to the cause of iconoclasm; rather, he would have enervated all the force of the decrees. Also false is what the Jesuit says by way of belittlement, that this Constantine was formerly bishop of a tiny town in Pamphylia, without even expressing its name. For the city of Sylaum, wrongly written in some tables or records as Siluum, on the sea-coast of Pamphylia, was one of the principal cities of this province, to which the metropolitan right was also transferred, according to the records of Leo, Doxopatrius, and other Byzantines: "Perga, that is, Sylaum." 5. The time spent on examining the cause of the images was not a few days, as in the truly "Robber" Council of Nicaea, but six whole months, by the consensus of Theophanes and all the chroniclers. But also the method of this examination, the manner of knowing and defining, was plainly arranged according to the example of earliest antiquity. The Acts themselves teach this, even such as they are, which are put forward on the authority of the Nicaeans who assembled against this Synod. The arguments against images, as is clear from Tomes III, IV, and V, are sought from the testimonies of Scripture and the

Fathers, and from the former first, as "divinely inspired and blessed," as the rock upon which they were firmly built, and according to whose doctrine they profess, at the end of the decrees, to have defined all their matters. *Council, from col. 598, 530. Col. 504. §30. &c.* On which matter, more soon. 6. Add that this entire Synod confirmed, and often, and most emphatically, all the doctrine and all the decrees of the six Universal Synods, as the Catholic faith, anathematizing Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, etc., and their heresies. But also, they expressly declare, strengthen, and sanction the entire Orthodox faith, as received from the Apostles, concerning the Nature of God, concerning Sin and Misery, concerning Redemption through Christ, concerning the Prophetic predictions, concerning the Incarnation of the Word, and the Union of the Natures, and concerning the remaining heads of the Faith, in Tomes I and II. 7. Add that, in so numerous an assembly, no one dissented, and with the greatest harmony of voices and minds, the bishops having been transferred on the 8th of August to the Royal City, and into the Basilica of Blachernae, whose walls had long been whitewashed, the images having been removed, it was acclaimed by all: "We all believe thus, we all think the same, we all have subscribed consonantly and voluntarily." Again: "This is the faith of the Apostles, this is the faith of the Fathers!" And although that Basilica in Blachernae, situated in a corner of the city, toward the walls and the head of the Golden Horn, which constitutes the port of Byzantium, took its name from the Theotokos, the Emperor, and the Council with him, wished by this very act to prove to the entire world, as is clear from the definition itself of the Synod, that this proscription of images from sacred places contained nothing insulting to the Blessed Virgin, nothing to the Saints, any more than to Christ the Savior himself. And so this Seventh Synod terminated, truly as Ecumenical as any other of the Eastern councils, soon to be publicly and solemnly promulgated. *Maimbourg p. 249.* Also, before its end, a new Patriarch was established, whom Constantine, by the Emperor's right, presented to the Synod, adding, after the example of Constantine the Great, Theodosius, Marcian, and his predecessors, a brief oration on those things which pertained to Religion.

X. But specifically, how this Synod conducted itself in the cause of images, what the opinion of the Fathers was concerning the images of Christ, the Virgin, the Apostles, and the Martyrs, what arguments they brought forward from the Scriptures, from the Fathers, from the use of earliest Christianity, and what they finally defined concerning them, is worth knowing in summary from the Acts themselves, inserted into the Sixth Action of the Nicene Synod. All is understood, chiefly from what they call the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Tomes. They begin with the image of Christ, accusing of impiety those who would fashion it for the sake of worship. *Tome VI, Conc. col. 498.* I observe these to be the chief arguments of the Fathers. 1. Some regard Christ as also God, and with respect to his Divinity, which is inseparably united to the flesh. This divinity, however, is spiritual, incomprehensible, and uncircumscribable, in no way confused with the flesh, and therefore not to be painted, unless the impiety of

the Anthropomorphites is to be revived. 2. But the Fathers of the seventh Synod also judge that painted images represent Christ as a "mere man," and fashion his flesh "without God" and "divided" from the Deity. And thus the idea formed of Christ is an injury to his Divinity. Otherwise, it would be an image of God and man at the same time. 3. They plainly think that by such images of Christ, Nestorianism is tacitly favored. For thus it is necessary that the humanity be divided or separated from the divinity, while the former is fashioned with colors without the latter, which can neither be fashioned, nor ought it to be. And where the body of Christ is, there is his divinity, which "remained inseparable even in the passion." 4. They add that Christ the Savior left us one vivifying image of his body, that true and unfalsified one, namely in the Eucharist, when he said, "This is my body, This is my blood." *Col. 446-447*. And this same image is not in the shape of a man's form, but in the substance of bread, in the Eucharistic bread, which he commanded to be offered "as a type and most evident commemoration." At the same time, the opinion of the Greeks is explained, how the bread becomes the body of Christ, sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of the priest—an opinion for theologians to consider.

To these reasonings the Fathers add other arguments, and indeed most urgent ones, in Tome IV. They bring forth the most important ones from the Scriptures, whether from Moses, Deuteronomy V, about not making an idol or likeness; or from Christ, John I, IV, V, etc., teaching that God is Spirit, never seen by anyone, nor in any form, to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, etc.; or from Paul, Romans I, 2 Corinthians V, who does not want God to be represented under the image of a corruptible man; nor Christ to be known henceforth by his followers according to the flesh, but for them to walk by faith.

In the following Tome, they add the tradition of the ancient Church, and the clearest testimonies of the Fathers. By these, indeed, they commend images, but those expressed in the Holy Scriptures, and these are to be impressed on the heart, or imprinted on the memory of Christians. But as for the others, fashioned and painted with colors, they teach that they are either useless for spiritual contemplation, or are joined with the most present danger of idolatry, and are by no means to be introduced into the churches or cemeteries. Passages are cited from Epiphanius of Cyprus, Gregory the Theologian, John Chrysostom, Athanasius, Amphilochius, Theodosius of Ancyra, and Eusebius of Pamphilia, the last of whom, for this reason, is said by the Nicaeans, as also by Baronius, Gretser, and their flock, to have been "given over to a reprobate sense, a man of two minds, inconstant, an Arian, in whose writings are various blasphemies," and more of the same from them. *Col. 495*. And not only do those Fathers reject images of Christ, whether for the sake of worship or for the purpose of remembrance, but also those of the Virgin, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Martyrs. *Col. 456. seqq.* Although these were indeed "mere men," and hence could be delineated in colors without danger of error, which

the Iconolaters urged. The reasons of the Seventh Synod for not approving these images either, to be painted for the sake of religion, were both solid and pious. That Christ or the Apostles did not hand them down, and that contrary to their doctrine or practice that kind of idolatry was gradually introduced, "under the guise of Christianity." That the making of those images is a pagan imitation, and flows from Hellenism, from the customs of "demon-worshipping nations," who had no hope of the resurrection, nor did they worship God in spirit and in truth, but worshipped what was man-made. That the Christian Church, midway between Judaism and Paganism, admits neither the ceremonies of the Jews—sacrifices, holocausts—nor the idols or images or statues of Paganism, erected for the sake of worship, nothing at all that is "foreign." That this "image-service" also fights against the very glory of the Blessed Virgin, the "all-praised" and higher than the heavens and the Cherubim, and indeed against the very condition of the Saints, who, destined to reign with Christ, do not seek such honor. Indeed, more truly, the Saints are thus afflicted with ignominy, for it is to "dishonor them in inglorious and dead matter." Finally, that the Saints are to be painted in ourselves, through certain "living images," by expressing their virtues recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

XI. And so this Constantinopolitan Synod, after a long and serious examination of the matter, according to the norm of the Scriptures and the analogy of the Christian faith, and the practice of purer antiquity, finally, in the last Tome, as if having the Spirit of God, after the example of its predecessors, piously and Christianly defined: I. That it would be nefarious for anyone "to construct an image," or to adore any with impious intent, or "to place it in a Church, or in a private house," or even "to hide" any, namely for fear of adoration, which is the sole focus of the entire debate of the cause. *Col. 507*. And so that Synod wishes that religious images be henceforth removed from the sight of men and peoples, to prevent every appearance of idolatry. They summarize the reasons: if any should contravene, they would be acting against the precepts of God, the Imperial edicts, and the dogmas of the Fathers. II. Yet, not for that reason, namely the removal of images, should any form of sacrilege be committed by anyone. And so it would be lawful for no one, not even "princes" or prefects, to lay hands on the divine temples, on the vessels, vestments, cloths, or consecrated veils, and remove them from the churches—a most prudent and most pious caution, to be sure. III. Having added an Orthodox confession concerning the Holy Trinity, the Divinity of the Word, the individual and unconfused Union of Natures, the Session of Christ at the right hand of the Father, his coming thence for Judgment, etc., the Venerable Synod forbids anyone whatsoever from fashioning that divine Word of God, Christ the Savior, "with material colors." For he is to be sought where he sits at the right hand of God, but with "intelligible eyes," that is, of the mind and of faith, and thus to be adored with the whole heart. Nor, on the pretext of the Incarnation, should the Word be circumscribed with a human form or painted in an image, "as if a mere man," by naming him Christ, which name signifies God and Man, with an inseparable union of

Natures, an error prolixly rejected by the Fathers and devoted to anathema, the error of Nestorius. IV. Thus they prohibit the images of the Virgin and of all the saints, as a "vain thing" and a "diabolical seduction," while they confess both her glory and her intercessions for the faithful, and the honor of these saints, who are "honorable before God," and who also have the confidence "to intercede for the world," "according to Ecclesiastical tradition," which the Fathers of the Synod acknowledge in this part. V. Finally, having rejected the errors that fought against the Orthodox faith concerning the final state, they pronounce anathema on all who do not receive this Holy and Universal Seventh Synod, or who would innovate in any part, even by "an empty contrivance of words or distinctions;" such as are, of course, those of the worship of *latria*, *dulia*, *hyperdulia*, of absolute and relative adoration, and similar distinctions born thereafter, which were prudently guarded against by the Fathers. And all things having been confirmed, with an equal consensus of minds, tongues, and subscriptions, with the customary acclamations to the Augusti Constantine and Leo, they finally pronounce anathema on the "wood-worshippers," "image-worshippers," the "heterodox," the "double-minded," and the "insulters of Christ." They specifically name Germanus of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, and Mansur or John of Damascus, the triumvirate having been publicly convicted of these things, with equal evidence from both their writings and their deeds.

XII. These things concerning the Seventh Synod of the Greeks, or the Constantinopolitan, or the Iconomachic, have been set forth the more carefully from the very evidence of the opposing Iconolaters, so that from it may be understood both the imposture of that Pseudo-Monk who cobbled together the Acts of Stephen, and the bad faith of those who draw from those muddy fonts, and the violated laws of History, after Baronius, Binius, Bzovius, Spondanus, Petavius, and the rest, by the recent pair of writers, Alexander and Maimbourg. All of them, with an equal tide of fury, rant against this seventh synod as a "Robber" synod, a "Pseudo-Synod," "Heretical," "Illegitimate," "Antichristian," a "Conciliabulum," a "Synagogue of Satan," an "Assembly of the most wicked men," and if there are any mockeries or curses of words more grievous than these. In contrast, the Pseudo-Nicene and Iconolatric Synod, in which all the laws of synods were trampled upon to a one, as will be shown in the following History, is to be extolled by them to the heavens as a "Most Holy, Ecumenical, Great, Seventh Synod." But let us hear Maimbourg and Natalis, or the former in place of all, since he is everywhere boasting of his good faith, sincerity, most diligent examination, the laws of History preserved, sources consulted, party zeal forsworn, and what other praises of his own writings, this eloquent boaster of himself, and lover of himself, perhaps without a rival, everywhere trumpets. First is that neither the Pope was present through his legates, nor any of the four Patriarchs of the East, except perhaps the Byzantine, who was to be created at the end of the Conciliabulum. *Pag. 247.*

I. The Jesuit conceals that the Roman Pontiffs had previously been solicited for an Ecumenical Synod in the cause of images, certainly Gregory by Leo, but in vain, as they were reluctant. Because a synod of this kind was to be held in the East, far from the nod and discretion of the Pontiffs, with Iconolatry still recent and wavering, and because the Gregories, Zacharies, and Stephens were plotting other things as well, namely, the shaking off of the Imperial yoke. Gregory already said above, when Leo the Isaurian was being discussed: "You wrote that a universal Council should be convoked, and the matter seemed useless to us." Useless, I do believe, to the schemes and plans of Gregory, who was about to advance his own cause, and that of St. Peter, from what he called the Iconomachic heresy. 2. The Roman, and a great part of Italy, had withdrawn himself from Eastern dominion and empire. Stephen had already fled to Pepin, before the Synod was convoked, and was to arrive in the Gauls in the month of November, 753, and to confirm a treaty with the Gaul, against Constantine and the Lombards at the same time, having already devoured in hope the Exarchate of Ravenna, as the spoil of the Greek Emperor, who had, of course, been struck with anathema. The Pontiff, the Gaul, the Italians, and the Lombards were equally incensed against the Greeks at the time when Aistulf was retaining the Exarchate for himself, Constantine having been deluded, and with no other recourse for him than in arms. Whence, indeed, all these men would have been called to the Synod in vain, even though they were thereafter devoted to the superstition of images. 3. But neither was it right to call the Pontiff to a placid discussion of the cause, from Holy Scripture and earliest antiquity, when he had already usurped the part of Judge, had pronounced in this cause of images, and had struck the Easterners with anathema, and had even, as far as he could, stripped them of the Empire. 4. They presuppose what is in dispute: that no synod can be held as Ecumenical unless with the intervention of the Roman Pontiff, moderating the synod by himself or his legates. And yet, the First Council of Constantinople under Theodosius the Great, and the Second under Justinian, were held as Ecumenical, from which, however, Damasus and Vigilius were absent, not even being present through their legates, as Baronius and his followers concede. But Maimbourg also says this explicitly; in his recent *Treatise on the Roman Church*, he introduces a Pope who is not only absent from, but also opposed to a Council, yet it was held at the time as Ecumenical, and truly so, whether the Pope confirmed it or not. *Chap. II, XVIII, XXIII*. Whence a judgment can be made on the Pseudo-Acts of Stephen, from which Baronius, Binius, and the rest pronounce on this Synod, denying that ecclesiastical matters can be reduced to the norm without the authority of the Roman Pontiff. *Baronius to 754, N. XXX*. This Maimbourg expressly impugns in the said treatise with many examples: "It is most false," he says, "that a General Council cannot decree on Faith without the Pope." *Chap. XXIII, p. 225*. And he adduces the example of the First Council of Constantinople, decreeing against Macedonius; of the Fifth Council, decreeing against the Three Chapters; of the Council of Constance, from which John XXIII had withdrawn, decreeing even against the Pope; of the

Council of Basel likewise, vindicating all authority for itself by decree, even without Eugenius IV.

XIII. What they add to invalidate this Synod, that all the Patriarchs of the East were absent, is plainly contrived for fraud. For 1. There was no Patriarch of Constantinople at that time, as Anastasius had recently died shortly before the synod was assembled, in the 13th year of Constantine, as Theophanes himself reports. And the fact that the Emperor did not elevate one of his own subjects to that See, as Irene did Tarasius, who would moderate the synod at the nod of the dominant power, is an argument for the candor and prudence of Constantine. 2. The remaining Patriarchs, of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were at that time oppressed by the yoke of the Saracens, part of whom occupied Egypt, the other part Palestine and Syria, as far as Amanus. The Byzantines, the Saracenic History, Marmolius, and the rest teach this. Whence Constantine had most bitter wars with the Saracens, as thereafter with the Bulgars. Therefore those Patriarchs could neither be called to the Synod, nor be present. When Theophanes, Cedrenus, and all those who serve their hypothesis conceal this in this place, accusing the absence of these Patriarchs, they betray their candor in these things as in the rest. And that Pseudo-Stephen, whom Theophanes says had spent sixty years in confinement, or in a small cell, in a certain desert of Bithynia, with what faith, with what documents, could he testify, as Baronius claims from his Pseudo-Acts, that "neither the Roman had approved the Council, nor the Alexandrian, nor the Antiochene, nor finally the Jerusalemite"? *Ibid.* Although we would not hesitate to grant that in the parts of Syria, over which Theodore of Antioch presided, and in the island of Cyprus, over which that George the Cypriot presided, who was to be struck with anathema, there were perhaps some supporters of images, for this very reason schismatics and refractory. But that their absence does not prejudice an Ecumenical Council, the defenders of the Synod of Trent contend, and Maimbourg, in the cited pamphlet. *Chap. xx, p. 221.* 3. But indeed, did not the same Patriarchs of the three sees, pressed by the same cause, the harshest yoke, absent themselves from other Ecumenical councils? They were certainly not at the Quinisext Synod, neither by themselves nor by their Vicars, which for the Greeks is sometimes the seventh Synod, and for Eutychius the Patricide in his Annals, under Justinian II. And yet it was held as universal by the Iconolaters themselves, as by all the Greeks, even by those very Palestinian monks, in the letters written to Tarasius. For they speak of this Synod, as Anastasius himself renders it: "But this is to be considered more subtly by the holy and venerable sixth Synod itself, in which none of those who were bishops in these parts at the same time is found to have assembled, etc." *VII, Conc, col. 1750.* But, NB, "no prejudice attached to the Holy Synod from this, nor did any prohibition of making decrees follow," and you may read more there. Although this very Synod is called a "Conciliabulum" by modern Latins, about which we have written most fully in the Introduction to the Seventh Century. *Chap. VIII, pag. 625.* But we will demonstrate below that no Patriarchs of the East were present at the Pseudo-Nicene Iconolatric council either, whatever they may

claim. Indeed, from the Council of Ephesus decreeing against Nestorius, the Roman, the Antiochene, and the Constantinopolitan were at first absent, as is established from the Acts of Ephesus, yet it was Ecumenical. 4. Finally, for a Synod to be held as legitimate, as Holy, as Ecumenical, one ought not to look at the presence or absence of this or that Bishop or Patriarch. Rather, it is the number of churches coming together, as far as the Empire of the East then extended, and the district of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. But above all, it is the legitimate convocation, the legitimate mode of proceeding and defining, and the Catholic doctrine, that is, what is understood to be asserted and confirmed from the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the previous Ecumenical Councils.

XIV. The remaining things which they vomit against this Seventh Synod collapse of their own accord. For example, that rant against the new Patriarch Constantine, brought forth by the Emperor into the ambo before the definition and promulgation of the Synod, about which matter we have spoken above. So too, what the recent Jesuit urges, that the decrees of the Synod had been prepared in the Palace before they received their due form in the Assembly. *Pag. 248.* As if, indeed, this does not apply with greater right to the decrees of the Nicene Conciliabulum, which was to be terminated in a few days and sessions, from the end of September to the 12th of October, and in which all things were transacted tumultuously, confusedly, and according to the whim of Tarasius. Of a similar sport is Maimbourg's claim that this Synod attacked images with "false and frivolous reasons, most solidly confuted by the Nicaeans," and with almost the same ones with which the Protestants have assailed the Church. *Pag 250.* It is well that the reasons of the Constantinopolitan Synod, and the supports of its cause, were almost the same as those of Charlemagne and the Gauls later, as have been narrated by us above in summary. Let whoever is not driven by a Jesuitical spirit compare them with the responses of the Nicaeans which the Deacon Epiphanius read, whether they consist of a wagonload of curses and womanish invectives in place of confutation, along with old wives' fables and putrid fictions with which they sought support for the images, and let him pronounce. And of these things later in the history of the Nicene Synod. Of the same stock is what the Jesuit trifles about, that the Constantinopolitans rely everywhere on the false hypothesis "that an idol is the same thing as an image, and that the same honor is rendered to the latter as to God," namely, *latria*. *Pag 251.* Elsewhere, on page 450, he says there is a threefold genus of errors against the truth defined in the Council of Nicaea II. Two, however, are extreme errors, and the first indeed is that of the Iconoclasts, who would tolerate no image, subverting them under the appearance of an idol. The other is that of the "Christ-accusers," who would attribute the *latria* owed to God alone to the images of Christ. The Jesuit smiled while writing these things.

The Constantinopolitans altogether distinguish between idols or "Hellenistic idolatry" and the images introduced into Christianity. But they feel that the

latter have flowed from the former, and the adoration of them, with the name changed. Nor do they condemn images as being held for the idols of the Pagans, or as being held for God, of a divine nature, and honored with an equal worship of *latria*. The Fathers do not fight with these reasons. They attend to the images of Christ, the Virgin, and the Saints, about which the dispute was, insofar as *proskynesis* or prostration, humiliation, religious adoration, a species of divine worship or honor, was rendered to them, both in practice and in doctrine. And as they teach that these things are injuries to Christ and the Saints, and are contrary to the doctrine of Moses, Christ, the Apostles, the age immediately following the Apostles, and even the Fathers of the fourth Century, so finally they are found to be useless for faith, for the worship of God or Christ, for the contemplation of spiritual things, and indeed in many parts noxious and adverse to them. But more on the Maimbourgian distinctions later, when we discuss the decree of the Nicene Synod.

Again, behold for yourself the historian's wondrous security and confidence in affirming! About to condemn the impiety of Constantine and of the whole Synod, he mentions as a certain, indubitable matter, ratified by the equal voice of historians, the nefarious sacrilege of the Prince, before the Fathers were admitted into the temple or Basilica of the Virgin Mother of God, which was in Blachernae. *Pag. 284*. Namely, that he first ordered to be broken whatever images adorned the most splendid Basilica, which set before the eyes the history of the Nativity, the Miracles, the Mysteries, the Cross, and the Resurrection of Christ, and which had been untouched under Leo. Then, that he substituted in their place images of trees and of all kinds of birds. And finally, that he commanded the Holy Relics, which Christians venerated in that temple, to be committed partly to fire, partly to the sea, and partly to be thrown off cliffs. But were those things from Theophanes, or the Acts after Theophanes, or from Patriarch Nicephorus, from the Nicene Acts, from Cedrenus, Glycas, Zonaras, the *Miscellanea*, and the like? Beware of believing it, my reader! The one and only author for both Baronius and Maimbourg is that wicked rhapsodist, who wrote the *Acts of the Martyrs*, as they are called, *Stephen and his companions*, as the writer of the Annals says, "most sincerely." *To the Year 754, N. XLV*. And most falsely does the same Baronius say that he is a writer of this time, who reported things seen or done by himself into the Acts very recently. Indeed, this very work of ours everywhere produces a most abundant harvest of the lies with which that most recent Impostor swarms, in whom a single lust dominates: to invent things that no one besides himself has, and also to rant against Constantine.

But hear the falsehood and calumny in the history of this very council, even where he is most sincere to Baronius! Constantine calls them idolaters, when he himself worshipped gold rather than Christ. He calls them idols, when he himself was rather an idol of impiety. He convokes a stupid multitude, devoid of wisdom. He compels them to swear by the venerable wood of the Cross, by the divine Mysteries, and by the Gospels pure from all stain, in which the SON OF

GOD forbids Christians to swear at all. He constitutes a certain Constantine as bishop by tyrannical power. Just as if they were playing on a stage, both ascend to the pulpit, and the one, girt with a sword, creates the bishop, Attagas joined with Numenius, an obscene pair. He who had devoted himself to wars and slaughter for the whole time of his life, who had most flagitiously contaminated himself with three women (his lawfully joined wives), now performs the office of a sacred initiator, a Pontiff. And all these things Planus reports, as if they had preceded the letters to all cities and provinces, by which the bishops were hastily summoned to the Imperial city. When from Theophanes, Cedrenus, and all the Byzantines it is established, and not denied by Maimbourg, that that Constantine was brought forth by the Emperor from being a bishop and monk to be elected Patriarch only at the end of the Council. *Pag. 247.* Then the most mendacious writer adds those things which Maimbourg just did, about the sacred images being scraped from the Basilica of Blachernae, other profane ones being substituted, and the venerable relics being burned or thrown away. Which most odious crime no one of the Byzantines would have omitted, nor the Nicene Acts, if there were any truth to these things. Although it is beyond doubt that Leo, with the approval of Constantine, had long ago removed from this very Basilica whatever had been adored images up to that point, by having the walls covered with plaster, or by leaving only those which were out of eye-shot or the danger of adoration. And long after Constantine, from the time of the restoration of images by Theodora, mother of Michael III, there was brought into that most splendid edifice that image of the Mother of God, from which a veil would hang, to be lifted up to heaven on the return of every Friday; when by a miraculous and salvific power, every week, that image would commend itself, hence "savior of the world," among the later writers of Byzantine history.

That author from whom Baronius draws his material continues to lie in his history of this Synod, and Maimbourg continues to deceive following his example. He says, in the series of the Baronian narrative, that the Emperor commanded the Fathers and the Patriarch to enter into a disputation on images with the divinely inspired Stephen, who placed Emperors, Patriarchs, and Bishops in the number of Heretics (a most superstitious monk, about whom more later). This author operosely recounts the most inept circumstances of this debate, and its glorious outcome for Stephen, with a Senator exclaiming, "we are conquered, we are conquered, O Emperor," etc. This Stephen is read to have been accused before Constantine of impiety and rebellion against the Imperial edicts in his 25th or 26th year, Christ 766, according to Theophanes, the *Breviarium* of Nicephorus, the author of the *Miscellanea*, and the rest, and thus about 12 years after the Synod was held in Constantinople. Nor is there any trace of such a disputation as they invent in the chroniclers, who are intensely pro-Iconodule. Again, having inserted some most insulting and at the same time most inept things about Theodosius of Ephesus and Constantine of Nicomedia, this ranter rants against the Constantinopolitan Synod. "A holy council! which profaned, shattered, and tore apart what is holy." And having added another

most putrid lie to the insult, which Baronius eagerly drinks in, this was added: "You have rejected the name SAINT from all the just, from all the Apostles, from the Prophets, from the Martyrs, and from pious men." *Numb. xxv. A.D. 754.* Where, when, by what decree, you filth? Indeed, is it not clear from the preceding Acts, as the Nicaeans themselves produced them, that those men of God are perpetually called "the saints" by the Fathers, as being honored by God with the "axiom of Sanctity"? *T. VII. Conc. col. 459.* And do they not also introduce the Blessed Virgin as "the holy," "the all-holy," or "the all-blameless," "the ever-virgin," adorned with other encomia? And what face did that impostor have, or what shame now has Baronius, or Maimbourg? "Constantine forbids them to be adorned with the glorious title of Saints." *Book II, p.179.* But also as to the rest of the things described by Baronius, who would not stand there astonished? That this Council "abrogated the sanctions of the six prior Councils;" that "in all the Temples where those were congregated, there had been painted images," namely, of Christ, the Mother of God, the Apostles, and the Martyrs. But also that the Fathers of this seventh council "asserted that the mother of God is a useless thing, devoid of all advantage, that there is no protection in her." Indeed, as Baronius himself says, that they issued a nefarious canon, in which they denied "not only that all the Saints, but that the Mother of God herself has any right after death to intercede for us." To which Natalis Alexander says: "The most learned Cardinal Baronius was deceived, when he wrote that the prelates of the Pseudo-Seventh Synod had issued that nefarious canon." *To Saec. VIII, T. XIV. p. 76.* Indeed, we shall now show that they established the opposite of that canon, in the historical discussion of those things which have been attributed to Copronymus most impudently and at the same time most insultingly.

SECTION IV.

Continuation of the calumnies against Constantine. Whence the accusation of Magic? The other of Nestorianism and Arianism. Their falsity demonstrated. But also their origin. Maimbourg confessing. Was Copronymus a Blasphemer against the Virgin, or contemptuous of the Saints? An examination of the matter. A vindication of the Emperor. What the Prince decided concerning them. What he condemned. His emblematic action explained. The opinion of Epiphanius compared with that of Constantine. The accusation of cruelty. How they describe the persecution of the monks. Baronius and Maimbourg called to account. The truth of the whole matter to be revealed. Images abolished in the East after the seventh Synod. Hence the indignation and fury of the monks. And hence their punishment. The first cause of the Monastic Persecution according to Maimbourg: the Impiety of the Prince. The dire words of the Jesuit. The fury of the writer. A fair judgment. Excesses on the part of Constantine's ministers. The barbarity of the Prefect Draco and the Asiatic legion described by Maimbourg. Never a more explicit image of the Dragons of today's Conversions. An observation by the Author. The second cause of the persecutions, from the mind of the Jesuit. Hatred of God, Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, Chastity. The

accusation retorted upon the accuser. A comparison made between the cause of the Monks, against whom Constantine was incensed, and that of the Reformed, against whom Maimbourg incites Kings. An immense difference. Certain examples of Monastic rebellions and seditions. Andrew Calybites. Stephen the Younger. Peter the Stylite. By what right are these Martyrs? Pope Stephen IV more cruel than Copronymus. Barbarity exercised at Rome in the year 768. A new cause for Constantine's fury. The loss of the Exarchate. The history of this, and its limits. The successive efforts of the Pontiffs against the Greeks. And the Lombards. The Donation of Pepin. The truth and circumstances of this. But also its iniquity. The Greeks protesting. The legation of Constantine to Pepin. The end of the legation, as confessed by the Jesuit. The Gallican Synod, principally in the cause of Images, A.D. 767. Its more accurate history. Did it sanction the worship of images? The falsity of this is proven by many arguments. Maimbourg's various frauds concerning this Synod. Brought into the clear light. The Roman Synod of A.D. 769. How the cause of Images was long neglected at Rome. What the Pontiffs alone were pursuing. Soon, Hadrian I. Concerning the donation of King Charles. The true separated from the false. What the Franks retained for themselves. The supposititious Constitution of Louis the Pious. More precisely on the Roman Synod. The certain distinguished from the uncertain. Maimbourg's bad faith again. Various proofs of this. That the Bishops of the Gauls did not assent to the adoration of Images. Gregory I and Ambrose vindicated against the assertion of the Jesuit. The fictitious Epistle of the Patriarchs of the East. What was done in the meantime at Rome until the death of Constantine. His final moments. How Maimbourg and Baronius describe them. An imposition on the entire world by the Iconolaters. The memory of the Prince restored. Was the illness of Constantine a divine plague? The vanity of the thing demonstrated. A retort concerning the deaths of Persecutors in the previous century. Immense calumnies. Did Copronymus confess his blasphemies? Did he condemn himself to eternal fires? The fate of Charles Martel is parallel to that of Constantine. Did he, repenting, enjoin the worship of the Blessed Virgin? Did he revoke his own deeds? The falsity of all these things exposed to public light. An evident argument against the Iconodules. Constantine's fate was that of the Orthodox, and of Christians from the beginning of time. Calumny against the Reformed in the previous century.

I. Furthermore, from the Acts of the Synod just described, even as they were interpolated at their own discretion by the Iconodules, the remaining curses and lies of the adversaries of Constantine Copronymus must be beaten back. We have seen above that this unfortunate Prince, because he was to be inflamed by so much hatred and stabbed by so many calumnious pens after his death, was accused of magic, incantations, prestiges, invocation of demons, and evocation of the dead. Furthermore, he was charged with the impiety of the Nestorian, Arian, and modern Socinian, and of blasphemies against Christ, against Mary, and against the Saints of God. For all of them, let Louis Maimbourg now stand for us, with his Natalis Alexander, with an equal lust for invective in both. *History*

of the Iconoclasts, 3rd ed., p. 196, 206, 296, 339, 355, etc. Saec. VIII. Chap. II. Art. IV. n. 2. So Constantine was a magician, or an invoker of demons! I confess, Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and the *Miscellanea* have, in a way, gone before them. But Nicephorus the Patriarch says nothing of this kind in his *Historical Breviary*, nor indeed does that fragment from Theophanes, about which more above, which is a declamation against Constantine. There is nothing about the magic of Constantine, either while his father was alive or after he was gone, in the Life or Works of Damascenus, nothing in Michael the Monk in the Life of the Studite, Michael Glycas in his Annals, Sigebert in his Chronicle, and many others who are most bitter against both princes. But neither is there any trace of the matter in the entire history of Leo the Isaurian, either before or after the marriage of Constantine with Irene. Nor do we read that Artabasdu, the invader of the tyranny, or the Nicaeans, or the Roman Pontiffs reproached him with so great a crime. But he was, of course, a magician, under whose auspices every species of idolatry was put to flight, the adoration of the one Triune God was sanctioned, and the faith of the Six Universal Synods, and all the Orthodoxy of the former age, was confirmed and strengthened by a solemn oath! The canons and definitions at the end of the seventh Synod teach this. You will ask, whence the atrocity of the accusation? From the aforementioned fiction, of course, about the blood of beasts, the cutting out of entrails, or the horse dung, in which the Prince delighted exceedingly in his youth. The mendacious Greeklings have now interpreted these things as haruspicy and extispicy, hence the art of divination, and every species of magic and soothsaying. And surely Maimbourg and Natalis would not want all those Roman Pontiffs, whom the chroniclers or those who have written the lives of the Pontiffs have marked with this stigma, from Sylvester II or Benedict IX onwards, to have been magicians and invokers of demons.

II. Is the accusation, perhaps, closer to the truth, that Constantine denied either the Divinity of the Son, or the Catholic sentence against Nestorius? Nothing, however, is more certain, if Maimbourg or Natalis is to be believed. Indeed, nothing more mendacious could be asserted about this Prince. Let one but read the most express Canons of the Constantinopolitan Synod, VI, IX, X, and the following, for the Holy Trinity, the Divinity of the Son, the indivisible union of the Natures, and for Mary as "properly and truly the mother of God." *Tome VII, Concil. col. 514, 519, etc.* Let the Acts of the Synod be read, and the very closing of the Synod itself, and the exclamations of the Fathers. And marvel, whoever you are, at the forehead and the mind of the monks! Moreover, in the very beginning of the synodal definitions, the assembled Fathers are said to have gathered by the most pious sanction of Constantine and Leo, in the Temple of the "holy, immaculate mistress, mother of God and ever-virgin Mary." And indeed, Byzantine history says nothing else of Constantine than that he was the heir of his father's impiety, in that he proscribed the Sacred Images and persecuted Catholics. Yet what appearance, what pretext was there for the accusation of the

Arian or Nestorian Heresy? Here it is in a word. First, the perfidious Anastasius is read to have been the accuser, after he had defected to the Tyrant Artabasdu.

This is the witness of a rebellious, perfidious, traitorous man, another Iscariot, a hypocrite, an apostate, for Maimburgius himself everywhere adorns that Patriarch Anastasius with these little flowers. Hear other witnesses. According to Theophanes for the twenty-fifth year of Constantine, and from him Baronius for the year of Christ 766, in the ninth volume, page 169, number III, behold, certain clerics and monks, and also laymen, “suborned” by Constantine himself, accuse the Patriarch Constantine of betraying the Emperor to the people. Namely, that the Patriarch Constantine had revealed that the Prince had once asked him what harm there would be if Mary were called not θεοτόκος (God-bearer), but χριστόκος (Christ-bearer). Cedrenus, in the second volume of the Royal Edition, page 463, tells it differently, that the Patriarch said this entirely for the sake of revenge, and wanted to persuade others of what the Emperor had denied: both that Mary was the Θεοτόκος and that Christ was to be held as God.

Behold again the sole witness of Constantine's impiety: that Patriarch, the Emperor's namesake, according to Cedrenus; or rather, according to Maimburgius in his book II, pages 300-301, an impudent slanderer, driven by a brutish lust for revenge, whence that horrendous imposture! Or if Theophanes is to be believed, behold witnesses found and brought forth by the Prince himself, who would impute this συκοφαντείαν (slander) to the Patriarch, so that an occasion might arise for the Prince to punish him. And on these witnesses, on these fictions about Constantine, and on these curses against the Prince, Maimburgius's so-often-repeated imprecation against the son of Leo uniquely rests, casting him as a Nestorian, an Arian, a Socinian, a blasphemer, to be execrated. Whoever you are, do not laugh; rather groan, and understand the confidence of a historian whose far more slanderous pen would later infect his feral pages concerning Luther, and Calvin, and their disciples.

III. Such is the faith of the Jesuit, where from impostor Greeks, and the Pseudo-Acts of the Martyrs, and the most mendacious pamphlets of monks, he recounts the insults offered to the Blessed Virgin, the blasphemies vomited forth against her, the Saints held in contempt, the most holy relics spat upon and trampled, all intercession of the Saints denied, and things of that sort which fill pages on both sides in the affairs of Constantine. But this recent pillar of the Loyolite family is not even consistent with himself. For regarding the year 754 of Constantine, in his book II, he inveighs against the Protestants, whom that Emperor supposedly condemned, to whom he supposedly said anathema, namely, to all who would reject the intercession of the Virgin and the Saints. And indeed, in the final canons of the Constantinian Synod, which the Jesuit notes in the margin of the seventh volume of the Councils, columns 523-527, Mary is defined as being ὑπετέρα πάσης ὀρατῆς καὶ ἀόρατου κτίσεως, “more sublime than any visible and invisible creature”; while the Saints are τίμιοι ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ, “honorable

before God.” But also throughout the Acts, they extol with wondrous praises and pursue with every honor both the Blessed Θεοτόκον, “the all-praised,” and the truly Saints, τιμηθέντας τῷ ἀξιώματι τῆς ἀγιότητος, “honored with the axiom of sanctity,” ever living. Indeed, if the Nicene Acts are to be believed, that same synod not only attributed to them τὸ πρεσβύειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου, “to intercede for the world,” which had long been the opinion of Christians, but they also command that their ἐξαιτεῖσθαι πρεσβείας, προσάχας, “intercessions and prayers be sought, asked for, and desired.” The hypothesis, however, was very different from that of the Latins, not by way of adoration or religious invocation, with added Litanies, Offices, Sacrifices, innumerable Feasts, etc. But rather in the manner that the suffrages of living confessors were sought; a matter for discussion elsewhere.

Maimburgius also grants, as he notes on pages 254-255, that those Iconoclasts, whatever images they could not bear, nevertheless revered the Cross. Correctly, that sign of the Christians, shown to Constantine the Great, was, as seen above, erected everywhere from then on, to be adorned with gold, silver, and gems, and to be held reverently, just as they held the codices of the Gospels, the Holy Table, and other things, but by no means to be worshipped. For they ought to have ridiculed those who attributed to Lactantius the well-known poem, *On the Passion of the Lord*, in which is the verse, “Bend the knee, and the venerable wood of the Cross adore.” But Maimburgius may say that the figure of the Cross was very dissimilar to the image of Christ, which it represents directly, which, of course, the Cross certainly does not do. Whence also on the coins of Leo the Isaurian and Constantine V, Augusti, from Octavius Strada, there appear a cross-bearing crest, a cross-bearing globe, and a small cross. And it is confessed that both the Armenians to this day, who know nothing of images, and the ancient Iconoclasts admitted figures of the Cross, as a sign known from the Gospel history, while the face of Christ was unknown, and as a symbol of Christianity, a μνημόσυνον (memorial) of the paganism driven out by Constantine, and a sign made in the primitive church, lest anyone should think Christians were ashamed of the Cross of Christ.

Thus Constantine was indignant against relics in no other way than insofar as they were an object of adoration and instruments of superstition, which the Jesuit calls devotion, on page 342, and for the most part were to be considered under false names. How he was also contemptuous toward Mary, Maimburgius himself explains on page 339: “If it should happen to anyone, even unexpectedly, to take refuge in the Mother of God in times of danger, NB. invoking her Most Holy Name, the Emperor's favor would instantly turn into terrible hatred.” If these things are true, Constantine was not so much the blasphemer as were those who would invoke the Most Holy name of Mary, who is not God herself, nor lays claim to the honor of God, nor is the Savior, nor was ever commanded to be invoked, nor was invoked by earlier Christians, though she was certainly saluted by the angel and held in honor by them under the name of Mother of God. For the rest, she was more blessed because she bore

Christ in her heart than in her womb; she was a happy mother not because the Word was made flesh in her, but because she kept that very Word of God through which she was made, and which was made flesh in her, according to the well-known saying of the Bishop of Hippo in his Tractate 10 on John, Chapter 2, in the second volume of the Newest Edition, pages 9-11.

IV. But that statement of Cedrenus will also testify to the mind of Constantine, which the Jesuit, in his history of Constantine, book II, pages 198-199, turns into material for renewed attack right at the beginning, drawing from Cedrenus and from him Suidas, on Constantine. Meanwhile, Theophanes, Nicephorus the Patriarch, and the more ancient opponents of Constantine are silent, and for this reason alone it should rightly be considered of ambiguous reliability. Cedrenus reports, on page 460 of his work on Constantine Copronymus, that Constantine once took some little pouches, βαλαντίω, full of gold, and asked the bystanders at what price they estimated those pouches, to which it was answered that they were εἶναι, “of no value.” Then the Emperor, turning to them, said: “So also Mary, while she carried Christ in her womb, τιμημένη ἦν, was in honor; but after she gave birth to him, οὐδὲν τῶν λοιπῶν γυναικῶν διενήνοχε, she was in no way superior to the rest of women.” If there is any truth in this little narrative, which rests on the sole authority of G. Cedrenus, who assigns no time to it and reports it among other contemptuous and most mendacious things, no one fails to see the point of that emblematic act of Constantine. To wit, that the pouch should not be equated with the gold it contained, the God-bearer with God, Mary with Christ, who was once present in his Mother's womb—whence the ἀγαλλίασις (leaping) of Elizabeth's fetus, not at the arrival of Mary herself, but of Christ, as Maldonatus notes. Hence, the Θεοτόκος by her nature does not differ from other women, nor is the Mother to be pursued with the same honor as the Son whom she bore in her womb. Otherwise, there was no controversy about offering honor to Mary, and Constantine himself wished it to be decreed in the Seventh Synod that she be τιμᾶσθαι, honored above every other creature.

And Epiphanius says it plainly (to whom a Mariolatrous sermon, ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Θεοτόκον, is falsely inscribed, as will be shown from what is about to be cited) against the Collyridians, Heresy LXXIX, in the second volume, page 1064: Ἐν τιμῇ ἔστω Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατήρ, καὶ Υἱός, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα προσκυνεῖσθω, τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνεῖτω. “Let Mary indeed be in honor, but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit be worshipped: let no one worship Mary.” A little before, on pages 1061-1062, the same Epiphanius says: Ναὶ μὴν ἅγιον ἦν τὸ σῶμα τῆς Μαρίας, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ θεός. “Yes, the body of Mary was holy, I confess, yet she was not God.” Soon after: Ἀπὸ τοῦ, Γύναι τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; ἵνα μὴ τινες νομίσωσι περισσότερον εἶναι τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον, γυναῖκα ταύτην κέκληκεν· ὡς προφητεύων, τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σχισμάτων, &c. “From the saying, ‘Woman, what have I to do with you?’ lest any should think the holy virgin to be of a more excellent nature (the very thing Copronymus said above), he called her by that name; as if prophesying, he used it to refute those schisms and heresies which he knew would one day be stirred

up in the world.” Again: Εἰ γὰρ Ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖσθαι οὐ θέλει, πόσω μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἄννης γεγεννημένην; “For if he does not permit angels to be worshipped, how much less would he grant this to the daughter of Anna?” We omit the rest, all of which Petavius had to ignore in his *Animadversions*. Let the reader now compare these words of Epiphanius with the foregoing ones of Emperor Constantine, and with the Pontifical doctrine and practice, and the foul Μαριοδουλεία (servitude to Mary), and judge who comes closer to sacrilege and heresy, Copronymus or Maimburgius? For Epiphanius had said nothing of λατρεία (worship due to God), but only of προσκύνησις (veneration), which he pronounces cannot be offered without the crime of sacrilege either to angels or to Mary the θεοτόκος, as she is of the same nature as other women, which to our Jesuit is, of course, an execrable impiety. Indeed, all this is an execrable and unbridled license of slander in those who falsely claim the name of historians, in those things which pertain to Constantine. But it will exceed all measure in describing the end of this Emperor, where there is more about the blasphemies against Mary, at the end of this section.

V. Let the atrocious fates of this prince now follow: the cruelty and barbarity exercised against the faithful, Catholics or worshippers of images dragged about everywhere, mutilated of their limbs, deprived of their sight, flayed, roasted, beaten with clubs, thrown into the deep, afflicted with every kind of insult and torture, and especially monks and nuns, whose persecution the Jesuit recounts for the year of the common era 769, on page 336. Baronius says the persecution against the orthodox Christians revived in the year 761, in his ninth volume, number XV and following. But we will observe first that Maimburgius is later than Baronius and the others. In order to entice his reader, and to fill him with a certain pleasure, *pour donner le plaisir du Roman* (to give the pleasure of a novel), as he himself said above, besides the things the Byzantines lied about, he invents not a few things of his own, ἐτύμοισιν ὅμοια (similar to the truth). Hence, on the one hand, he depicts in the Prince savage motions of the mind, impious words, and a certain canine rage against, of course, most holy men; on the other hand, in the monks, nocturnal and assiduous prayers, pathetic orations, and a constancy like that seen under the Decii or Diocletians, made illustrious by frequent portents and miracles. And the credibility of all these things rests with them alone, the greater part of it drawn from apocryphal acts and the tables of impostors, concerning the passions of the martyrs under both princes. Not even Petavius himself, and all the most learned men, have dared to deny that many things which are read under the names of Nicephorus the Patriarch, Theophanes, Paul the Deacon, Cedrenus, etc., were often added by later writers, or otherwise interpolated. And the Fragment which the Jesuit added to the *Ἱστορίαν Σύντομον* (Brief History), as if it were by Nicephorus, betrays (as noted above) not so much in Constantine himself as against Constantine a certain fury in the writer, and from the style, a declaimer with an ulcerated mind, rather than a historian.

What is now to be said of the writer of the Annals, Baronius? He certainly drank all the more greedily from these springs because both emperors, Leo and Constantine, had severe conflicts with the Roman Pontiffs, at whose hands the princes suffered all manner of indignities and hardships, as has already been partly seen. This was reason enough for Baronius to lacerate the memory of both. Hence the declamations, exaggerations, dire imprecations, and the wish that the earth lie heavy on the wicked heads. Hence if there were any earthquakes, familiar in those parts of the East, if any devastating plagues and contagions of diseases, if any disasters inflicted on the Empire, if any less successful expeditions against the barbarians, if any prodigies reported by the ignorant populace or by little old women, if the princes themselves were struck by any disease, such as dropsy, dysentery, or a malignant fever, etc., all were immediately to be ascribed to a divine power taking vengeance on the wicked heads of the emperors. And why wicked? On account of the removal of pictures and panels from adoration, and the taking away of the objects of superstitious worship. Or on account of the coercion of the mob of monks, who everywhere incited seditions among the populace, and rushed with insane fury before all others into the assertion of images, or idols, from which the foulest superstition and the objects of religious προσκυνήσεως had arisen. Furthermore, under the guise of sanctity and the mask of the sacred habit, which they report Constantine called the "garment of darkness," when the Emperor saw it being imposed on the people, and that under that cloak the seeds of wickedness and crime were for the most part hiding, thence arose what they call the persecution, about which a few things must be reported.

VI. After the decree of the Constantinian Synod, icon-mania seemed suppressed in the East. Rome, however, under Stephen III and Paul I, was little concerned about the definitions of that synod. For no opposing council is read of against that seventh synod, however much it was held to be ecumenical, before the Roman Council under Stephen IV in the year of the Dionysian Era 769. Indeed, much honor was still paid to Constantine, as to a most august emperor, from the letters written to him from Rome and the legates sent, according to Anastasius, in which Stephen supplicatingly begged for Imperial Clemency to come to his aid and that of Italy. For at that time, the one concern for the pontiffs was to drive the Lombards from the Exarchate, finally claiming it for the Roman see by the donation of Pepin, and converting it into the patrimony of Peter and Paul. Whence Aistulf, King of the Lombards, although a worshipper of images, yet because he had invaded the dominion of the Exarchate for himself after the death of Rachis, was to be held in the same place as any Gentile; hence in the letters of Pope Paul, found in Baronius for the year 757, number II, after the Pipinian donation, the Exarchate is said to have been redeemed from the hands of the Gentiles. This was done under Stephen III, who went to Pepin in Gaul, about which more below, and in our Introduction to the affairs of the 8th century.

Therefore, to remain in the East, those were narrow and more remote spaces of land that remained pure and untouched by the heresy of Copronymus, by his venom, as the lesser Greeks put it, that is, which adored images. Let the Pseudo-Acts of Stephen the Younger say, as Baronius cites in volume IX, for the year 755, number L, that the monks at that time knew no refuge except in the barbarian regions almost across the Euxine Sea and to the Sea of Azov; or in places in Italy torn away from the Eastern Empire; or in the mountainous climes of the province of Lycia, and in the island of Cyprus, and in the maritime places of Phoenicia, towards Tyre and Joppa. The sees subject to Antioch, Alexandria, or Jerusalem are not referred to among the iconodules, nor would the Saracens have permitted it then. The result was that the mob of monks, most addicted to superstitions and pullulating throughout the East, everywhere went into a rage, and their standard-bearers and more ardent members rose up, seditious and rebellious, against the Prince himself, against his edicts, and against his ministers. And hence the punishments, exiles, tortures, disgraces, and penalties exacted from the contumacious, and finally the proscription of monasticism, since the monasteries were certain receptacles of religious images, of the foul and forbidden προσκυνήσεως, and of conspiracies against the public tranquility. They report the heat of this monastic persecution for the 25th and 26th years of Constantine, so says Theophanes, that is, of the Vulgar Era 766 and 767, to be continued in the following years. In the history of this persecution, which is to be remembered with tragic words and with many curses hurled at Copronymus, Nicephorus the Patriarch, Theophanes, Cedrenus, the Pseudo-Acts of the Martyrs, etc., are prolix. But the recent compiler of the *Iconoclastic History*, Maimburgius, is more prolix and more unjust than the others. And so that this man might show himself to be an ingenuous and sincere historian, he judged that two things had to be done. First, that he should invent from his own mind the causes of what he pretends was a madness in Constantine against the monks, but was in reality indignation—causes most odious, indeed, but also, from what is about to be said, most false. Then, that in recounting certain more atrocious deeds, while he augmented everything and played the tragedian in his usual manner, he should cast all the blame upon the Prince himself, and his barbarity and impiety, rather than upon those whom he calls the executioners, or the infernal furies, today they say Dragoons.

VII. Therefore, among the causes of the kindled bile in Copronymus, which the Jesuit reports, the first place is held by—and the mind shudders to recall—the impiety of the Prince, his heap of sins, his hardness of heart, his rancor of mind, his fury, perfidy, cruelty, the daily lusts in which he wallowed, the vehemence of his passions, his infamous life, his execrable actions, his detestable crimes, in which he also implicated others against their will: hence his fear that they, being either conscious or accomplices of these things, would divulge them, and also that there were pious men, truly converted, and confessors, who with their groans to God daily lamented so many horrendous crimes. These things he says, and many more, and graver ones, on pages 274, 336, 338, etc. of his second book,

for the purpose of horrendously lacerating the person of the Prince, and so that the fables he himself was making might please his own iconolaters and Mariolaters. Whence he concludes on pages 356-357: "He was a prince, without contradiction, than whom the truth of history has transmitted none more wicked and more brutal to posterity. There is no kind of wickedness and abomination of which he did not make himself guilty, with never the least trace of virtue observed in him that could be opposed to so many crimes. And so, after he emulated Antiochus in oppressing the faithful with every kind of calamity, he met with an end to his life equal to his." Be astonished, reader, whoever you may be, and consider whether those words do not rather betray the fury of the writer than that of the Prince. Certainly, no one constituted outside the parties will not grant this: that it is a mark not only of extreme imprudence, but also of unrestrained slander in a historian, to put it most mildly, to pierce and tear apart the supreme head of the world with that kind of accusation and reproach whose foundation rests solely on the whim of those who affirm it and the conspiracy of sworn enemies, against the faith of more certain history. On the deeds and deserved praises of Constantine, the matter has been dealt with above from Nicephorus the Patriarch himself, and from the testimony of his adversaries, to which the reader may return. Now, if you listen to Maimburgius, the prince's heart swells with savage rage, the sorrow of this wicked Hydra is something more, and at no other time did a fiercer lioness, forgetful of her own cubs, roam the fields, than Copronymus rages both in the royal city and in the provinces themselves, solely from the consciousness of his crimes, and the fury of a lost, ulcerated, and despairing mind.

VIII. First, indeed, we are of such fairness that if any things were established too harshly by the Prince against the obstinate, whether iconolaters or monks, we would wish it not to have been done, sometimes condemning them for the crime of others. I confess that the seeds of idolatry and superstition had to be eradicated, hence strong hands and bold counsels were needed. And they were only prohibiting things that had nothing to do with the essence of religion, as Petavius and Maimburgius themselves confess below, but much to do with giving offense. Whence, the more contumacious the mob was, and the more spirited against the Prince, the more ferocious were the spirits in the Prince. Yet one should not always break, by testing your strength, what you cannot bend. The sick, the ill-affected, are to be cured, not slaughtered, whence that prophetic woe in Ezekiel 34:4, because you rule the diseased sheep with force and with cruelty! Second, it should be beyond doubt, after what has been observed before, that the innumerable things which are recounted about Leo, and likewise about his son Constantine, especially the horrendous slaughters and massacres carried out in the name of iconolatry alone, are the inventions of monks. Not even the most savage Michael thereafter is read to have punished them with massacres, but rather with exiles and floggings, according to Curopalates or Cedrenus. Third, those things which were perpetrated too harshly and violently by ministers or legionaries should not have been immediately imputed to

Constantine. At least there were those in the provinces, far from the court of Copronymus, who exceeded his commands, as barbarous soldiers are wont to do, a point the Jesuit himself does not deny in some places.

A brilliant example is in that Draco, such in deed and in name, the Prefect of the Thracian theme, or τῷ τάγματι, that is, of the military force stationed throughout Lydia, Ionia, Caria, Maeonia, formerly colonies of the Mysian Thracians, whence the name of the Thracensians. Cedrenus writes at length about this commander, for the 25th year of Copronymus, in his second volume, pages 466-467, but Maimburgius, with his usual right, writes more prolixly and with more additions. And here we appeal to the faith of our readers, whether the Jesuit did not wish to graphically describe his French Dragoons, recently unleashed upon a miserable and innocent people, more truly than that Asiatic Draco. Maimburgius says on pages 341 to 346: “with his furies unleashed, that Draco became like one, who was also called Λαχανοδράκων (the Cabbage-Dragon), and having summoned the monks and nuns together in an open place, he immediately ordered them either to choose a wife's robe or a wife, by royal mandate, that is, to renounce their profession, or to choose mutilation and exile. If any were so unwarlike and soft, out of love for the world, as to yield to the tyrant's violence, the reward for their perfidy was blandishments, to ensnare the rest. But if any truly preferred the obedience of God to that of the Prince, and Faith was more important than Life (so he says, when the matter was only about the habit and type of monastic life), executioners were sent in against them, who with barbarous cruelty would plunder and sell off all their furniture, vessels, ornaments, flocks, books, faculties, and whatever was sacred and precious to them. But if any showed signs of their constancy, they were to be afflicted with every kind of torture as rebels against the Prince. They were burned alive with flames, their skin and hair smeared and brought to the fire and half-roasted, and even those fleeing were dragged back from the deserts, caves, and hidden places, to be punished with whips or death in a savage manner. Whatever could be devised of tortures and torments, NB. was applied to the wretched ones, but in such a way that they could not die. Until the name of monk was plainly exterminated in those parts, with all having been converted to the world. And afterwards, when it was learned that these conversions pleased the Prince (who would even give thanks to Draco the Prefect, as the one who had most of all effected what he intended), a like barbarity was exercised in the remaining provinces. All the commanders vied with each other, under the false appearance of zeal, but in reality to please the Prince, to promote the conversions of the monks. And finally, the Patriarch Nicetas himself, truly under the habit and name of an Arch-Prelate, the first of the royal slaves, wished not a trace to remain of the religion condemned by the Prince. And this is the character of soft bishops, who betray their own character, *trahissent leur caractère*, so that they may foully serve the passions of princes, whose fathers they ought to have been, and allow themselves to be driven headlong to every cruel and abject thing, lest they displease their master. But in the end, they receive contempt and hatred as the

reward for their servitude.” These are the words of Maimburgius, not as a historian of what truly happened under Constantine—for he everywhere adds to Theophanes, the Miscellanea, and Cedrenus himself—but as a prophet of those things which he knew were soon to be done by his ministering Dragoons in his own France, things which the European world had recently said could not happen.

If there is any discrepancy, it is observed to be multiple, and in a very different cause today, for the matter is not about omitting adiaphora; and in a new and utterly unheard-of kind of torture; and in the persons oppressed by the barbarity itself. These are not now rebellious or seditious monks of immoderate superstition, with an insane zeal for their cowls and images. But innocent and most faithful subjects throughout the entire kingdom; myriads of little women, virgins, matrons, old men, and infants; children torn from their fathers, fathers from their children, husbands from their wives, wives from their husbands; of all of whom either the most tender bodies were flayed, or the bonds eternally disrupted, or their consciences forced by violence to adore a creature and Rome. And yet these wretched ones do not dare to impute to the greatest of kings each of the things they suffer, nor do they, God forbid!, tear apart the person of the prince with curses. They have learned that saying, “You shall not speak evil of the ruler of your people.” But this Jesuit casts all barbarity upon Emperor Constantine, and also loosens the reins of the ultimate slander, as if any of these things that have been said about a “monster unredeemed by any virtue from his vices” could apply to him.

IX. But we must still dwell for a moment on the causes of the monastic persecution stirred up by Constantine. Maimburgius says it was done out of hatred for God, Christ, the Virgin, and the Saints, with Constantine being unable to bear the honor paid to them. This calumny has already been refuted above, from the Nicene Acts and the testimony of his very adversaries. It is a far different thing that Constantine, and also the fathers of the Seventh Synod, were indignant against those invoking the “Most Holy Name” of the Virgin, rendering divine honor to creatures, offering adoration to images or relics, with prayers directed to Mary or the saints, with that Most Holy Name of hers religiously invoked, with her aid implored, with divine virtue ascribed to her, with vows offered, and with pseudo-miracles fabricated. Theophanes may say, in his account of this persecution for the 26th year of Constantine, page 370, that he “everywhere forbade as useless” prayers to the Holy Virgin Mother of God and all the Saints, whether written or conceived in the mind, from which *πᾶσα βοήθεια πηγάζει*, “all help flows.” Again, that the Emperor could not bear that customary phrase, *Θεοτόκε βοήθει*, “O Mother of God, help!” But where had Christ commanded, or the Apostles enjoined, or the first Christians taught by their own example, to conceive such prayers, with faith in the Virgin, the Saints, or creatures? But, according to the Maimburgian hypothesis, while those prayers are useful, just as the use of images is useful, these things are by no means

necessary, nor essential to religion, nor commanded by any law, but are in fact very noxious on account of their indiscriminate worship, about which there were complaints even in the midst of the Papacy. Now, I ask you! which is the greater impiety: in the Prince, who commands that refuge be sought in God and Christ with prayers, adoration, and trust; or the pertinacity in the monks, who mix heaven and earth, and fill everything with seditions, tumults, and clamors, for the sole cause of painted images and a worship that is not necessary, nor divinely commanded?

Thus, what all of them report as a most atrocious thing, he commanded monks to be joined to wives, and nuns to husbands, in legitimate nuptials and in the individual society of life, according to the institution of God and Christ. Hence, with Theophanes reporting in chapter 68, he ἔπεισε, “persuaded,” the Patriarch Constantine, formerly a monk, to become a στεφανίτην, or a husband, crowned with a nuptial wreath, having abandoned the monastic habit and the ascetic type of life. Thus, he sometimes ordered monks to be brought forth in public into the Hippodrome, each one leading a nun by the hand, so that they might become accustomed to the honest society of the sexes, according to Nicephorus the Patriarch in his history, page 129 of the Petavius edition. “O the crime!” they say, “O the deed, than which none more grave is anywhere conceived.” For to them these nuptials are incestuous, which, although they conform to divine and natural law, are adverse to canon law. And it is better for them to burn, or to be wickedly polluted, than to marry. Finally, the solitaries were compelled to leave their monasteries, dragged back from their deserts, and to inhabit houses. Behold, the impiety of Constantine is again to be expiated with the flames of Hell, at which astonished minds rightly stand stupefied! And yet, the monasteries were at that time workshops of idolatry, hiding-places of adored images, and seminaries of those rebelling against the Prince. But also, under the pretext of devotion, they were refuges for idle men, useless to the public good, if not sometimes for those bound by previously committed heinous crimes.

X. Now compare, reader, all these things with the reason for the most recent persecution throughout all of France, which Maimburgius champions, indeed, to excite which he inscribed his *Calvinism* to King Louis. Constantine, I confess, was hostile to those who would invoke the Most Holy name of the Virgin, to the worshippers of wood and stone, to those who would make flesh their arm, to those who in this would depart from the doctrine and practice of Christ and the Apostles, and also to those who would prohibit marriage as a polluted thing, which to Paul was a doctrine of demons. The same Emperor was averse to that kind of men, who would profess themselves ἀσπόνδους, implacable enemies of the Prince, of the held Council, of the synodal decrees, of the imperial laws, and of public tranquility. What is to be added shortly from the historians, and from Maimburgius, will prove this with more examples. Now, what crimes have the modern Reformed citizens of France, upon whose bodies and souls you approve of your Dragoons and Prefects raging, at last committed in the face of all

Europe? Namely, they wish their faith and salvation to be required according to the one standard of the Scriptures, according to the doctrine and practice of early antiquity. They invoke the Most Holy name of the one God and of Christ the Savior. They can by no means be induced to prostrate themselves before an image, or wood, or bread, or some unknown relics, with a religious worship of adoration and veneration. Their trust is in the one expiatory sacrifice of Christ; whose memory they studiously recall in the Eucharist, under both species instituted by Christ. They confess their sins to God daily with a humbly contrite heart, with the solace of their pastors being admitted. They prefer the marriage of these pastors to wandering lust, or to concubinage, or to foul pollutions. The positive heads of faith and morals, insofar as their Confessions command them either to believe or to do, a shamefaced Rome does not dare to condemn: from harsher things, if any were expressed long ago by theologians in the heat of disputation, and mostly outside the borders of France, they willingly and readily abstain, and indeed they have abstained in that kingdom for a long course of years. They teach, contrary to the Jesuits, and confirm by their practice, that it is not lawful to rise up against their Most Sacred Kings on any pretext, not of heresy, not of tyranny, nor any other whatsoever. If in this respect any, under the name of Protestants, have ever bound themselves with any guilt, they execrate it with their whole heart. Louis the Great, since he was given by God, they have held dearer than the apple of their eye, worshipped with every kind of fidelity, love, veneration, and obedience, by an inviolable law; even as exiles and wanderers they look back to him, who is perhaps unaware of all the calamities, the like of which the sun has not looked upon elsewhere. And this, to put it briefly, has hitherto been the state of the Reformed throughout all of France, to whom royal edicts, and so many sworn oaths, have guaranteed public security.

And with these things being no obstacle, will you, Maimburgius, maintain that the cause of the monks under Constantine, to whom nothing had been sworn, was more holy, that the edicts against them were more brutal, and that the glory of their martyrdom was more true? And that the Reformed are a pernicious and rebellious pest? To be destroyed even by name, their temples to be leveled to the ground, their sacred rites to be proscribed forever, their consciences to be justly constrained by royal law to the adoration of images, saints, relics, and the Eucharistic bread? And that finally, by whatever right, a persecution should be moved against every sex and age, against so many hundreds of thousands of subjects supplicating in vain to the Most Christian King, a persecution whose history will obscure all that of the monastic or imaginary persecution, and will soften it by its own atrocity, a persecution unheard of until now, since the name of Christians was first heard?

XI. But it would be worth the effort to learn from the Byzantines, and from Maimburgius himself, what sort of men were the standard-bearers of these monks and iconolaters, against whom more severe measures were taken. Among the πρωτομάρτυρας (first martyrs) of Constantine, Theophanes, for the 21st year of

this emperor, around the vulgar era 761, and hence Cedrenus, the Miscellanea, and the Pseudo-Acts, report Andrew Calybites, ἐκ καλύβης or from a little hut on the island of Crete, who, incited by a certain madness, was to hurry to Constantinople to resist the imperial edicts by starting a sedition. Maimburgius, in part 1, pages 276-277, says with emphatic words: "Having passed the night in his hut, he crept through the royal city by day to the Blachernae, to excite the Orthodox to openly oppose the impiety of the Heretics, that is, of Constantine." Soon after: "On the day that Constantine was torturing the martyrs, that is, when punishment was being meted out to the seditious, Andrew, having made a way for himself through the midst of the guards, to the throne of the Emperor, reproached the savage impiety to his very face, calling him another Valens, a Julian, a persecutor of Christ in his members and images." Thus the Jesuit, soon after mentioning that the cause of the kindled fury was not so much in Constantine as in the Praetorian soldiers.

Another monk, not dissimilar to this Andrew, was formerly enclosed in a little hut, as they say, at the foot of Mount Auxentius in Bithynia, and he is commonly called the Proto-Martyr, because his name was Stephen, but ὁ νέος, the younger, to be included in the Menologium, with his companions, and in the Acts of the Martyrs. Theophanes mentions him for the 25th year of Constantine, and the Breviarium of Nicephorus for the year of the Vulgar Era 766. And those Acts which Billius inserted into the works of Damascenus are full of trifles about his sanctity, miracles, passion, and contests, and Baronius, Binius, Allatius, Labbe, and others everywhere extol them, and we preserve them in Greek MSS. along with other lives. Now, hear from Maimburgius, who is about to state the immediate cause of his passion from the aforementioned writings. Plainly contrary to the edicts of the prince, this Stephen was urging everyone he could to embrace the monastic way of life, and also Iconodulia, so say Theophanes and Nicephorus, and the supposititious Acts themselves. Hence he was denounced to Constantine as guilty of sedition, and finally brought to Constantinople, where, in the presence of the Emperor, as Maimburgius reports in book 2, page 284, he is said to have thrown a coin bearing his image onto the ground and trampled it with his feet, ῥήξας τὸ νόμισμα κατεπάτησεν αὐτό. The Jesuit adds that this was done undoubtedly from a special inspiration, and that this is not an example that you ought to imitate. And he confesses that Constantine immediately restrained his anger, but afterwards allowed the man, who was contumacious even in prison, to the fury of the iconoclasts.

Nor was the reason any different for the harsh punishment of that Peter the Stylite, whom Theophanes mentions for the 27th year of Constantine, and after him Cedrenus and others, because he was refractory and seditious, μὴ ὑπειξας, refusing to yield to the commands of the prince. But what Maimburgius reports is false, as if either Theophanes or Cedrenus had recorded that this man was thrown down from the top of his column, which is not extant in the Greek of Theophanes. Thus these other chroniclers, and above all Maimburgius,

exaggerate the savagery of the Emperor, exercised against his own Patriarch Constantine. And yet they report from Cedrenus that this was the Prelate who, even in exile, furiously raged against the Emperor, spouting the most unworthy things about him, and accusing him of wanting to restore the heresy of Nestorius in Constantinople. From this it can be understood for what reasons the Emperor, at times, decreed rather harsh measures against the contumacious and rebellious monks or bishops, who were the authors of almost all movements and seditions. This is what made it necessary for him to coerce their petulance with edicts, and also with exile, floggings, mutilations, prison, and death itself. And so after Constantine, in the following century, Nicephorus, Leo the Armenian, and Michael the Stammerer were wonderfully vexed by this restless, bold, proud, and most superstitious kind of men, as will be shown in its proper place. Now let the Jesuit imagine for himself some such person, from the order of either the ministers or the elders of the common people, or otherwise burning with zeal for the Reformed faith, who in the royal city, or within the palace of Louis the Great, would dare to emulate the seditious words of Andrew, or the insolent deed of Stephen! Let him suppose that someone bursts out in the face of the most August King, as against another Antiochus, a Julian, a persecutor of Christ, or who would unworthily throw down the image of Louis the Great and crush it with his feet! Would he judge that the punishment of such madmen should be counted as martyrdom, or that the savagery of the indignant King should be accused? But indeed, why does the Jesuit not look at what is behind him in the pack?

And let us not even mention the harsh persecutions which the iconolaters thereafter stirred up against the Orthodox, and in this very century, the Empress Irene, with her Tarasius. Did not Rome itself, at the very time when this ferocity and unheard-of barbarity is imputed to Copronymus, namely in the year of our Lord 768, see Pope Stephen, with his followers, more savage than any Nero or Diocletian against the Antipope Constantine? For on the pretext of the unjust exaltation of Constantine, who, of course, a layman, had been elevated to the Pontificate by the faction of Duke Toto, whatever violence Stephen's faction used to remove Constantine, was it any less? What did he decree or procure or certainly permit against Constantine? The Annals and Anastasius show this miserable Pope, after sentence was passed, bound in iron shackles, thrust into a monastery, afterwards most truculently beaten, prostrated, deprived of his eyes, and after a Synod was held in the Lateran, in the presence of the new Pontiff, he was struck with slaps, cast out, and left to the worst of fates. As Maimburgius says on pages 311 and 326, "He had indeed invaded the See tyrannically, but he was to be dislodged from it by horrendous violence": namely, by a greater tyranny, as Sigonius notes concerning the affairs of Italy for the year 768, so that he might make a place for Stephen, with no doubtful elections about creating one Stephen as Pontiff. Nor let them say that all these things were perpetrated without the knowledge or against the will of Stephen. For the opposite is established from Anastasius, in the Life of Stephen III, otherwise IV, and from the fact that his

faction at that time was prevailing by force against Constantine, and from the proud nature of Stephen. You may know this nature from his letter to the kings Charles and Carloman, in the sixth volume of the Councils, column 1707, in which, by the authority of the Blessed Peter, he threatens the bond of anathema and the punishment of eternal fire with the Devil. And why? If, forsooth, Charles should take the daughter of Desiderius the Lombard as his wife, or the son of Desiderius should take Charles's sister, contrary to the interest of the Pontiff, though the Lombard was otherwise most devoted to Roman traditions.

XII. The recent historian, Maimburgius, as noted in book 2, page 374, proceeds to invent other causes for Constantine's hatred of the monks and iconolaters. Among which, for the year 757, the 16th of Constantine, he reports the indignation of the Prince over the loss of his Exarchate, and because the Pope had fled to the protection of the Gauls against him. The Emperor was most justly indignant about the Exarchate of Ravenna being snatched from him by force, through the arts of the Roman Pontiff, a fact Maimburgius himself does not deny elsewhere. For here he vindicates no temporal dominion for the Popes, nor any power either to usurp royal dignities for themselves or to confer them on others, as Gregory II himself confessed in his letter to Leo the Isaurian. But concerning that loss for the Greeks, the matter must be revisited from a little further back.

The Exarchate had been a most extensive Prefecture, to be administered in the name of the Emperor by the Exarchs, since the time of the general Narses, after the Goths were ejected, during the reign of Justin II. It encompassed the provinces of Flaminia and Aemilia, from the river Trebbia in the west and the city of Piacenza, to the very borders of Senigallia in Picenum Annonarium, with the Apennines terminating it to the south, and the Po and the Adriatic gulf to the north. A part of Flaminia was also called the Pentapolis, from its five principal cities, besides Ravenna its capital, which was at times the seat of emperors, then also of the Ostrogothic kings, and finally of the Exarchs. Hence often Ravenna and Pentapolis, the people of Ravenna and the people of the Pentapolis, and their chief cities were Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Senigallia, Osimo, Ancona, Urbino, etc.

And first, when Leo the Isaurian was emperor, these people, along with the Romans and Campanians, having received Gregory's decree against Leo, had defected from the Caesar, enticed by immunity from taxes. Their Exarch Paul was soon killed, as were Peter in Rome and Exhilaratus in Campania, leaders who were removed by Gregory's faction. This gave the Lombard Luitprand the opportunity to invade Aemilia and the Pentapolis, penetrating as far as Osimo and the Esino river, and afterwards he would even bear arms against the Pontiff himself and the Roman Duchy. Nevertheless, the Patrician Eutychius, sent with an army in Leo's name, held Ravenna itself, with the people of Ravenna being brought back to loyalty to the Empire, late in the year 727. Afterwards, he also

recovered the Pentapolis, after defeating the army of the Lombards at Rimini, in the year 730. Thus the Exarchate, for the most part, was under Imperial jurisdiction during the reign of King Luitprand. For although Luitprand, while Constantine and Artabasdu were contending for the Empire in the East, had again invaded the Exarchate, recovering Cesena, between Ravenna and Rimini, and various places in the province of Aemilia, and was already threatening Ravenna itself, he soon restored what he had occupied. This happened in the year 743, at the intercession of Pope Zacharias, who had traveled to the king at Pavia for this purpose, with the still-Exarch Euty chius pleading with the Pontiff, though at that time he was on the side of the tyrant Artabasdu, at the inducement of Zacharias.

Again, the Exarchate was to be invaded by Rachis, who was elected King of the Lombards from being Duke of Friuli, and he subjected the Pentapolis to himself with victorious arms in the year 749, extending these conquests even into the Roman Duchy, as far as Perugia. Rachis did not hold it for long, yielding to Pope Zacharias who came to meet him in his camp and expostulated with a grave oration that the goods of St. Peter were being violated. Moved by this, the Lombard restored the Pentapolis with the occupied towns, and not long after he would adore, with his wife and daughter, the thresholds of the Holy Apostles, which was the highest form of religion at that time. But after Zacharias was removed from the living, having bound Pepin to himself, whom he had declared king, the entire Exarchate returned to the Lombards. For Aistulph, Rachis's successor, of a keen mind, with power adding to his ferocity, stormed Ravenna with a strong army, as Euty chius, unequal in strength and destitute of all aid, yielded in the year 752, at which time the Saracens and Bulgars were harassing Constantine with incursions and wars. With Ravenna surrendered, the other places of the Exarchate and the Pentapolis passed into the power of the victor with no trouble. And from that time the Greeks were utterly driven from the Exarchate, with this specious pretext from Aistulph, that he was doing something pleasing to the Church and the Pontiff, since Constantine was bound by a nefarious heresy. But for this very reason, the Pontiffs contended, at first tacitly, then openly, that the Exarchate was owed to them and to Peter, as the spoil of a heretical prince, after they entered into a pact with Pepin and Stephen III journeyed to Gaul.

Before that, they envied the Lombards the Exarchate, however addicted the Lombards were to iconodulia, but on the pretext that it was of the imperial domain. Stephen himself, when he arrived at Pavia toward the end of the year 753, urged King Aistulph, along with the imperial envoy and even with tears, that those dominions be restored to the empire, as Baronius notes for that year. They were not yet hearing of the Patrimony of Peter, which was restricted to certain places in the Roman and Campanian countryside, the donation of which Constantine had confirmed to Zacharias at the end of the year 743. But what the pontiffs were pressing in their hearts, that same Stephen soon betrayed after his

arrival to Pepin, from which journey no one could move him, neither Aistulph nor the legates of Constantine. Namely, when he saw himself adored even by Pepin, to whom he in turn confirmed the royal title, he extorted from him, as a reward for so great a benefit and so that he might consult for the salvation of his soul, tablets of promise, secured by an oath, concerning the taking of the Exarchate with the Pentapolis from Aistulph and the donating of it to St. Peter, or the Roman Church.

Hence, first a legation from Pepin to Aistulph, but to be eluded by the Lombard; who also trifled with the legates of Constantine in a like manner. Soon, having made a levy and crossed the Alps, Pepin forced Aistulph to terms of peace, and to this harsh law of restoring the Exarchate and the Pentapolis. This was done in the year 754, so that at the time when Constantine, having assembled a universal synod, was watching over the affairs of the Church, the Pontiff, having stirred up a war in Italy, was gaping after temporal dominion. In the following year, however, Aistulph, returning to his nature and intending to take vengeance on Stephen, besieged Rome itself with his arms. What did Stephen do? In the name of St. Peter the Apostle, indeed inspired by God and by His Prince of the Apostles, the Blessed Peter, he gives letters to Pepin, by a new example, in which, if he does not promptly come to their aid, the Pontiff pronounces that by the power given to him, he would be alienated from the Kingdom of God and eternal life. Maimburgius, who elsewhere rebukes this papal pride, and who indeed laughs at that writing of Stephen, saying that another like it had never been before nor would ever be again, now, on page 265 of part 1, calls it an "excellent epistle," though in reality it is in part execrable for its blasphemies and in part laughable for its ineptitudes, which you may see in Baronius, for the year 755, number 1 and following. Nevertheless, it effected that Pepin, in a second expedition, besieged Pavia, reduced Aistulph to extremities, and finally extorted the Exarchate and the Pentapolis from him. Which he then immediately donated to be possessed in perpetuity by the pontiffs, with Ravenna and most of the cities soon being handed over to Abbot Fulrad in a procuratorial capacity, with the exception, however, of Ferrara, Faenza, and a few others. Hostages from each city were also given as a pledge of faith; and the keys of the cities were sent to Rome, to be deposited at the Confession of St. Peter, that is, upon his tomb, at the main altar, as a sign of true and perpetual dominion, as the inscription of a Pipinian coin has it, but by the "gratuitous piety of the king." These things are in Anastasius's *Life of Stephen*, the Frankish Annals, Sigonius, and who not?

From which time the pontiffs joined the principate to the priesthood, and the scepter to the keys, plainly, as Maimburgius says elsewhere in his *Traité de l'Eglise de Rome*, chapter XXVII, contrary to the interdict of Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world"; and "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, but you shall not be so," etc. And so, most correctly, the same Maimburgius above said there was more than enough reason for Constantine to be indignant at the recent perfidy of the Roman Pontiff, who after so many efforts had finally seized, with the help

of Pepin, what was not even Pepin's to grant, being, as Mézeray rightly says in his book IX, page 367, "foreign provinces truly belonging to Constantine," nor was it for a pontiff and a priest to invade. If any donation were just, it ought to have been Constantinian, not Pipinian; whence some have wished that it was made under Constantine's name, and hence the fable of the Donation of Constantine. It is certain that the Emperor's legates protested, brought into Pepin's camp, as Paulus Aemilius notes on Pepin, urging that the Prefecture of Ravenna was as much the right of the Augusti as Lutetia was of the Frankish kings: that it was also most unjust to invade the Italian domains of the Caesar while he himself in the East, as a bulwark of the Christian state, was sustaining the force of so many barbarians and the weight of such great affairs: with the Turks having recently crossed the Caucasus into Armenia, and the Slavs also having crossed the Euxine and poured into the Empire with an innumerable multitude. Thus the Emperor did not neglect his own affair, never ceasing to press amicably either the Pontiff, or Aistulph, or Pepin. But that this perfidy of Stephen, and the munificence of Pepin with what belonged to another, was the cause why Constantine from that time raged against the monks and the religious in the far East, from which point the Jesuit begins his account of the persecution, all will judge with us to be both precarious and absurd. And we have seen far different causes above. So much for the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis being torn away from the Greek Empire, though the Lombard Desiderius would invade those dominions again, until he fell by the arms of Charles. But concerning the donation of Pepin being amplified, as they say, by Charles the Great and hence by Louis the Pious, perhaps more below. That the Pipinian donation is also excessively extended by Leo of Ostia, and hence by Baronius for the year 755, no. XXVI, and his sycophants, is the consensus of the most learned. From this time, however, the pontiffs ceased, in their epistles and diplomas, to note the years of the most pious Augusti, as had been done before, being safe under the patronage of the Gauls.

XIII. Now a few things must be reported concerning another legation of Constantine to King Pepin. To the unhappy success of which, as noted on page 336, the Jesuit attributes the increased fury against the Orthodox, that is, the monks and solitaries. And this circumstance of the iconoclastic history is all the more worthy of mention because it involves the Synod of Gentilly near Paris, held on the cause of images in the year 767, not long before Pepin departed from human affairs exempt from this, while Paul I was still presiding.

The supporters of Images, and above all the faithless Jesuit, adulterate and obscure almost this entire history. The matter was thus. The Emperor Constantine, who had hitherto left nothing untried to negotiate for peace with the Gauls or Italians, once again decreed a splendid legation to Pepin. Six Patricians were sent from here, but also some more distinguished Bishops and Priests, to treat of the Faith. The purpose of the legation was twofold: one, that a firm peace might be established between Constantine and the Westerners, by

contracting a marriage between the Augustus Leo and Gisela, the daughter of Pepin, to whom the Exarchate would be granted as a dowry. The other, however, was that the controversies concerning Religion, chiefly about Images and the Procession of the Holy Spirit, might be removed. The Epistles of Pope Paul, the summary of which Baronius presents for the year 767, as well as Volume VI of the Councils, Aimoinus, Ado of Vienne, Regino, and other chroniclers testify to both.

Maimbourg himself reports the Oration delivered by the Legates to Pepin: *Book III, p. 307 ff.* In which, after the preliminaries concerning the nuptials of Leo and Gisela, they begin thus concerning the Images: "We know, Lord, that the Westerners have taken pains to have us regarded as heretics and impious, because we have exterminated in the East the idolatry that had been gradually introduced into the Church by that cult of images or statues, which God expressly prohibited in the first commandment. Although this horrid abuse is sufficiently clear from itself, and it is enough to be a Christian to take up arms with the best right against this impiety: the Emperor nevertheless, following the example of his Predecessors, Constantine the Great, the Theodosiuses, Marcian, Justinian, and Constantine Pogonatus, who convened the Six Ecumenical Councils against heresies, also willed that a Seventh be assembled, of 338 Bishops, who excelled in doctrine and merits throughout the whole Empire, by whom this latest heresy was condemned with a unanimous voice." Then they add complaints about the Constantinopolitan Creed being corrupted by the Westerners, with this addition, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father AND THE SON, etc.

Finally, the convocation of a Synod was requested from King Pepin, in which, according to the sole standard of Scripture, the Gallican Bishops, together with those of the Greeks, would weigh the controversial Articles. This matter having been communicated to Paul I, the Pontiff assented and ordered his Legates to be present at the Synod. Paul would easily allow the matters pertaining to Religion to be discussed, provided that nothing was detracted from the Pipinian donation, as he wrote in an epistle to Pepin, which is the 26th among the Caroline letters, in which he trusts that the King will see to it that nothing is lost to the exaltation of his Holy Mother, the Roman Church. *Volume VI of the Councils, col. 1703.* And nearly all of Paul's epistles aim at this, even from their summaries in Baronius. *To the year 767, No. II.* From which it is certainly gathered with what moderation and equity Constantine, after having received so many injuries from the Westerners, desired the whole matter to be settled, both in the Republic and in the Church. The outcome of this must be told shortly.

XIV. Hitherto neither the Italians, nor the Gauls, nor the Germans, if you except the Roman Synods under the sway of the Pontiffs, had defined anything concerning Images in councils held. The use of them was indeed retained by these peoples, where it had already become strong; they were not overturned or

broken as in the East, or as in the Diocese of Serenus of Marseilles, at the beginning of the previous age. But what they decided about the cult of them, both this Synod under Pepin, to be held at the persuasion of the Greeks, and then the one at Frankfurt under Charlemagne, testify not obscurely. Therefore, the Bishops from all of Gaul having been summoned by royal authority, they gathered in large numbers at Gentilly near Paris, a suburban villa where Pepin had a Palace, captivated by the pleasantness of the place; whence it is called a great Synod in the Annals of the Franks. The time was shortly after the feast of Easter, in the year 772, the 5th Indiction, while Paul I was still alive, but soon to die on the fourth day before the Kalends of the following July. His Nuncios were present along with the Legates of the Greeks, and those whom Constantine had joined to the Bishops and Doctors. However, although no Acts of this Synod exist anywhere, it is nevertheless not ambiguous what it decided concerning Images. We prefer to report it in Sirmond's words rather than our own, who is rightly praised above all of his Order by Maimbourg in those things that pertain to these Antiquities. Namely, in his Admonition to the reader concerning the second Canon of the Council of Frankfurt, *Volume II of the Gallican Councils; Vol. VII, General Councils, p. 1055*, he advises that in the Synod of Gentilly the Gauls argued against the Greek Iconoclasts that "images should be retained, but should be had only for the sake of memory and instruction, not to be adored, which they utterly rejected, as they did later in the Synod of Frankfurt." All the deeds and writings of Charlemagne, the Synod of Frankfurt, that of Paris under Louis the Pious, and the constant opinion of the Gauls under both Emperors confirm this definition of the Fathers of Gentilly. Moreover, unless the cult or adoration of Images had been condemned by that Synod, with only their use for instruction and also for adornment being permitted, so many assertors of Iconodulia in Latin and Greek would not have been silent about this decision of the Synod of Gentilly, which was conspicuous for many reasons. Adrian would have reported it in his letters to Irene and Constantine; Adrian's legates would have extolled it in the Pseudo-Nicene Synod; the earlier chronicles would have mentioned it, at least those written in Iconolatric times, certainly Aimoinus, Sigebertus, Ado, Regino, Urspergensis, Paulus Aemilius, and many others. But none of them dared to affirm this of the Pipinian Synod, whatever this or that person may have said in more recent times. The same prudence was shown by Dionysius Petavius, when mentioning this Synod in Book XV of *On the Incarnation. Volume V, p. 571*. Nor do those words of Paulus Aemilius, "the Greek Orators were ordered to admonish their Caesar to think with the other pious men," in *Pepin*, imply anything other than that the Caesar was to be admonished not to utterly exterminate the Images, as was done, since their retention was useful at least for instruction and remembrance. Natalis Alexander, concerning this Synod, speaks cautiously, but ambiguously: "What the outcome of that Council was, can be gathered from what was afterwards done by the Gallican Prelates in other Councils, at Frankfurt and Paris, and from the faith of our Church, proved by the monuments of those times," that is, from the writings of

the Gauls under Charles and Louis, that "the Heresy of the Iconomachs was condemned in that Synod." *Saec. VIII, Vol. XIV, p. 60*. Insofar as this heresy, namely, rejected all use of Images, even historical, but the annals do not mention a condemnation or anathema, but only an admonition made to the Greeks. Whence it happened that Baronius thought little of this Synod: "the Franks," he says, "had association with those heretical Greeks through their Legates." *To the year 767, No. XXII*. A little before: "A strong conjecture persuades that the merchandise of the Greeks (against the cult of Images) was unfortunately brought by the Legates of the perfidious Emperor, along with many gifts brought by the same to Pepin, in the manner of the Easterners." What could be more express in strengthening our previous statements about this Synod?

XV. From which all may again observe the candor of the Jesuit Maimbourg—which is, of course, to be forsworn by him everywhere—in his history of the Synod of Gentilly. *Book III, from p. 318*. 1. He who in his Admonition to the Reader criticizes historians who "act on conjectures and reasonings alone, and turn to the left, with no guidance from the Ancients," *Preface, ed. ult.*, himself shamelessly infringes upon these laws in his description of this Synod, with no guide in the Ancients. He invents out of his own head, and graphically represents, without any witness indeed, the entire order of this assembly, and the definition of the Synod, and its manner, and the very arguments of the Fathers, on the one side the Greeks, on the other the Latins, and finally the ignominious condemnation of the Constantinian Heresy. 2. Under this name of condemned Heresy, he wants to persuade his reader that the cult of Images or Statues was asserted in the Gallican Synod. For the Legates complained uniquely of this in their Oration to Pepin, as of a certain idolatry introduced into the Church, as Maimbourg himself reported above. *No. XII*. Nor were Images removed from the churches in the East for any reason other than to prohibit their adoration. Hence he also supposes that the same thing was defined in the Synod of Gentilly as was defined two years later in the Roman Council under Stephen IV, about which we must speak shortly. 3. He inserts parenthetically that Pepin sought permission from the Roman Pontiff to congregate a Synod in his Kingdom, which Natalis Alexander also says. *To Saec. VIII, Vol. XIII*. Pepin had indeed signified to Paul the arrival of the legates, and their request, and the detention of the Pontiff's envoys, for a meeting of priests and nobles. And for this reason Paul gave thanks, and committed the matter to Pepin's prudence, in Epistle XXVI among the Caroline letters. But that the right of convoking Synods within the borders of his Kingdom was plainly royal, after so many Gallic assertors, Maimbourg and Natalis themselves at other times grant. 4. With no guide from those times, the Jesuit also adds that the Roman Pontiff moderated this Synod, and indeed through Six Legates, whom he invents, citing the Epistles of Pope Paul I in Volume VI of the Councils. In which certainly neither these Presidents, nor that number of six Pontifical Envoys, appear, but rather only two Legates are mentioned. He adds the reason, "since the Greeks and Franks then held the Pope as the first Patriarch and Head of the

Church." As if indeed for the Greeks these were equivalent: to be the first Patriarch in order, and to be the Head of the universal Church, in the Maimbourgian sense. Or as if wherever the legates of the Roman Bishop were present, they for this reason had the indubitable right of presidency. Let him now invent, against the faith of the Acts, a presidency in some Ecumenical Synods, or even in the many Gallican ones, from the first of Arles under Constantine, and the African, Spanish, Thracian ones, such as Sardica was, or the Constantinopolitan, Asian ones, when Roman Legates are said to have been present, and yet did not preside. Indeed, if there is any force in reasoning, where they did not enjoy the right of Presidency, there the Pope was not held as Head of the Church, or as the first Patriarch. 5. Maimbourg now holds as the same things which he elsewhere confesses are most different, namely "the confirmed use of Images," and "the sanctioned cult of them." "There is no doubt," he says, "that the Council confirmed the use of Images." *Part I, p. 321*. Which he soon interprets as the anathema struck against the Constantinopolitan Conciliabulum. Again: "The Bishops of the Gauls, in the Roman Synod, strongly asserted the holy use of Images." *Ibid. p. 333, 334*. Then, as if it were the same thing, "that cult of the Holy Images, with relation to their Prototypes, was so strongly established by valid testimonies, etc." Behold the candor and fidelity of this Historian, confounding things he knew to be most different, and which he himself elsewhere so distinguishes that among the errors contrary to the truth he places this one, of those who approve the use of Images, but not any religious veneration. *Part I, p. 449, 459*. But that this game is familiar to our Maimbourg, the Port-Royalists of Gaul observed long ago, as did the scourgers of the *History of Calvinism*.

XVI. Now for a few words on the Roman Synod, insofar as the cause of Images was discussed in it, in the year 769, under Pope Stephen IV, with twelve selected Bishops from Gaul present. *Volume VII of the Councils, col. 1721*. The Jesuit, again with the same faith with which he treats all his subjects, says that this Synod was convened chiefly for this purpose, "that what had recently been decided at Gentilly in the cause of Images might be confirmed in it." *Part I, p. 328*. And would that they had done so, and that neither Rome nor Pontifical Gaul had ever departed from the doctrine of the Gauls of that time, and of Charlemagne. But Stephen had a more important reason for convening the Synod. Namely, that the elevation of Stephen might be confirmed, the Pseudo-Pope Constantine condemned, all his acts rescinded, and that laymen and armed men be henceforth barred from the election of the Pontiff, and that only one of the Priests or Deacons of the Roman Church, such as this Stephen, a Priest from a Monk, should be elevated to the height of the Papacy. The surviving Acts of that Synod, and Baronius himself, at the beginning of the year 769, teach this. The controversy over Images had hitherto been postponed in Rome. No Synod is read to have been opposed in Rome to the Constantinian one against Images for fifteen whole years. Stephen III and Paul I in the meantime had done one thing only: that having shaken off the yoke of the Greek Emperor, but also of the

Lombards, and having won over Pepin, and then his son Charles, they might increase their own dominion, and that Peter, with Christ unwilling, might become the Lord of the Earths. To this pertains the preceding history of the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis, to be devolved by the right of principality to the Pontiffs by the eventual action of Pepin. Nor is there almost any other subject of the Epistles of both Pontiffs to the Gallic King, and of Paul I especially. To this all their vows, all their efforts, to this their adulatory letters to Pepin, and their threatening ones against Aistulf and Desiderius, tended, as they wove delays in the restitution of some cities. Nor would Adrian I be quiet a little later, as is clear from his letters to Charles, *Volume VI of the Councils, col. 1757, etc.*, until, with Desiderius crushed by Charles, and the Dukes restrained, he obtained from King Charles the cities of the Exarchate and the Pentapolis, donated, of course, to the Roman Church, whence the name Romaniola and Romandiola. Caesar Baronius reports this deed at length from Anastasius, a domestic witness, under the year 774, while Constantine was still reigning; *Baronius ibid. No. VI*; but the Greek chroniclers are silent. Whatever the case may be concerning the handing over of the Exarchate and the whole Pentapolitan region by the munificence of Charles, we observe: 1. That the Vatican Archive has never produced the deeds or Instrument of either the Pipinian or the Caroline donation, from which archive the writer of the Annals, and after him Allatius, Holstenius, and others, have produced so many other documents, far inferior in the dignity of the matter. 2. The old Annals of the Franks speak more sparingly of this donation of Charlemagne. 3. That Anastasius in amplifying that donation, and from him Leo Ostiensis in the History of Cassino, Sigonius, and others, and afterwards Baronius with his followers, and the recent commentator on Metropolitans in the Gauls, *Vol. I, p. II, dissert. I, ch. IV*, give themselves up shamefully. It was certainly enough for the Pontiffs if they were at last put into full possession of those things which had indeed been promised by Pepin, or only partially handed over, because they had been either invaded again by the Lombards or retained. In which sense Charles is said not only to have confirmed the gifts of his father Pepin, but to have increased them, according to Paulus Aemilius. *In Charlemagne, p. 38*. When indeed by that very act the Exarchate of the Ravennates was ordered to be under the dominion of the Pontiff, and perhaps certain other things were to be restored in the parts of Campania, they called them the rights of the Church. But it must be counted among the fables that Charlemagne added to the Pipinian munificence the Sabinensian Territory, between Umbria and Latium, a part of Tuscany and Campania, and even the Duchies of Spoleto in Umbria and Benevento in Samnium, or if you please, also the Provinces of Venice and Istria, and what is more, not even his own Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Saxony, which was conquered by Charles. Charles was not so insane as to attribute the victories he owed to God to the Prince of the Apostles, and thus to concede to him, and hence to St. Peter, so many territories, to be possessed, of course, by the supreme right of dominion. Indeed, it is clear from History that King Charles retained for himself, in the name of the

Kingdom of Italy, Liguria, Aemilia, Corsica, the Province of Venice, and the Cottian Alps, which comprised all of this Piedmont and the Genoese territory, which soon passed from the dominion of the Lombards to the power of the Franks. This part of Italy was certainly never possessed by the Roman, whatever they may report about the donation of Aripert. It is also indubitable that the Duchies of Friuli, Spoleto, and Benevento were assigned by Charles to their own Dukes and Prefects, to be received into his allegiance and clientage, as Mezeray also correctly states from the Annals of the Franks, for the year 774. And if anything is said to have been promised or donated concerning the Duchy of Spoleto or Benevento to St. Peter in the Epistles of Adrian, the summaries of which Baronius produced from the Vatican Codex, it must be understood only of certain places or towns, and of useful dominion. The confidence in lying subsequently grew among those who fabricated the Constitution of Louis the Pious, about which Baronius speaks from Gratian for the year 817, long after this Emperor, in the times of Hildebrand. If this were to be believed, Louis would have left almost nothing for himself but the empty name of Emperor, having donated to St. Peter and his successors almost all of Italy, from the farthest borders of the Alps to the last of Calabria, with Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, etc. But Maimbourg himself at other times professes that a certain semblance of Dominion remained to the Greek Emperors over the city of Rome and the Roman Duchy, and even over the Roman Pontiff himself, until under Leo, the successor of Adrian, the Roman People handed themselves over to the allegiance and subjection of Charlemagne. *History of the Iconoclasts, Part II, p. 58*. Nor yet did the Emperors of the East remit their right, not even Irene herself, with various attempts to reintegrate the Exarchate. But now we must return to the Roman Synod.

XVII. Concerning which, certain things must be distinguished from uncertain ones, for the Acts of the Synod do not exist. It is certain that some Bishops of Gaul convened, sent by Charles and Carloman, with the Bishops of Tuscany and Campania. Nor is there any doubt that, after those things which were of primary concern to the new Pontiff, the question of Images was also discussed in this Council. We also readily grant that those who decreed the cult of Images prevailed in the Synod, as Adrian affirmed to Charlemagne in his defense of the Nicene Synod: "They decreed that the Sacred Images should be adored and venerated." *Volume VII of the Councils, col. 1721*. For the Italians had long since gone into that superstition, from the time of Pope Constantine I. Anastasius says ambiguously: "It was decreed that Images are to be venerated with a great feeling of honor." But Maimbourg, after Baronius, Binius, and the rest, relates many false or doubtful things about this Synod. 1. The names and sees of the twelve French Bishops are recounted from Binius with not enough certain faith, being wanting in Anastasius himself: whence the security of Maimbourg's assertion is to be judged. Indeed, it is quite clear that most are fabricated. 2. They precariously divine that these very Bishops conceded to the opinion of the Italians, which was also later that of the Nicene Synod, concerning the adoring

of Images with religious proskynesis. No Anastasius says so, no Acts testify to it. Indeed, they would thus have departed from the discipline of their own people, and would have exceeded the limits of the Synod of Gentilly, as has been seen. It is hardly to be suspected that twelve primary Bishops were so abject as to change their opinion for the sake of the Italians, perhaps so as not to exasperate them. Nay, for this very reason, on account of the sanctioned adoration of Images, the Franks were induced not long after to reject the Nicene Synod, as will be shown below in Section VII. Nor should the question of the permitted use of Images for the sole purpose of instruction and remembrance be confused with the necessary cult, adoration, and proskynesis, sanctioned by law, as has been warned elsewhere. 3. It is most false that those Prelates of the Franks, "with many testimonies of the Fathers, asserted the cult of Images, with relation to their prototypes." *Maimbourg, Part I, p. 334*. Anastasius and Adrian I, in his Epistle to Charles, do indeed report those testimonies, either supposititious or foreign to the question, as produced not by the Franks, but by Pope Stephen, and in a certain epistle attributed to Theodore, Bishop of Jerusalem. *Tom. VI Conc. col. 1722; Tom. VII Concil. col. 23 ff.* One of the Gallic Prelates, namely Herulphus, is reported on the faith of Adrian's Epistle to have recited the words of Pope Gregory alone to Secundinus, for the relative adoration of Images. *Ibid. col. 30; cf. Baron. to A. 769, No. X*. But indeed, that Gregory was most alien to the adoration of Images, of whatever kind, has been seen above at length, and elsewhere; hence Charlemagne more than once attacks Adrian and the Nicenes in his Capitulary. But the fraud is also transparent. Those last parts of Gregory's Epistle to Secundinus, which is LIV of Book VII, *Tom. II, latest ed., col. 821*, were never Gregory's: "The images which you asked to be sent to you by Dulcidus the Deacon, etc.," and what follows there, about the images of God the Savior, of the Holy Mother of God Mary, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter or Paul, before which Gregory would prostrate himself, etc. And so, concerning one Cross, a Key for a blessing, from the most holy body of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, "that through Peter himself you may remain defended from the evil one, etc." The epistle plainly ended with what precedes this patch: "I ask that you should pray for me more earnestly, etc." The most recent editor of Gregory notes: "But these things are not found all the way to the end in many MSS." And indeed, since Gregory of Rome had permitted only the use of images, with adoration rejected, it had to be invented in Rome according to the genius of the place and the license of the Iconolaters, at the time when this Controversy was raging, to have appended such a patch to one of the Epistles. 5. Of the same strength is that passage from Ambrose produced by Sergius of Ravenna, whom the Jesuit says was most influential in that Roman Synod, to be objected also by Adrian to Charlemagne, in the said Epistle to King Charles. *Maimbourg, Part I, p. 333*. For it is cited, as from Epistle LIII of Book VII, a certain Ambrosian vision, "a person similar to the blessed Apostle Paul, whose face a picture had taught me, etc." But where is there not only any faith, but the decency that is at least desired in public? The Ambrosian Epistle LIII contains no such thing, nor does any similar

one, even where it speaks of Gervasius and Protasius, such as Epistle LXXXV. The cited words also mean nothing other than that in Ambrose's time there existed some picture that represented the face of Paul. But that this picture of Paul (whose face Augustine, after Ambrose, said was completely unknown and unrecognized, *On the Trinity, Book VIII, Ch. IV, V, Tom. III*) was erected in any church, much less worshiped or adored, no words attributed to Ambrose report. Behold for you the Maimbourgian testimonies of the Fathers! 5. Finally, no fraud is more evident than in the supposition in Rome of the "Letters of the three Patriarchs of the East, after a great Synod was held in Jerusalem," from the three patriarchates, in which the Heresy of the Iconoclasts was condemned. *Ibid. Part I, p. 324, 332*. And that these letters were first directed to Rome to Paul, which, upon his death, the Pseudo-Pope Constantine sent to Pepin in the year 767, shortly after the Synod of Gentilly, in a copy written in Greek and Latin, to later be a defense for this Roman Synod, and also for the Nicene Synod. Whence Adrian, in his Response to Charles, insists greatly on these Synodal Letters. *Tom. VII Concil. col. 49 ff*. Yet that nothing is more inept, nothing more flimsy than these, being most evidently pseudepigraphal, so that Rome, a worshiper of Images, might impose on the more remote Franks from the East, there will be a place to advise below, when we speak of the legation and Letters of the three patriarchs to the Nicene Synod.

XVIII. From here, however, to the last days of Copronymus, there is nothing that those writers of Iconoclastic History report which pertains to the cause of Images. Other things also delay Baronius. He is almost entirely occupied for the year of Constantine's death, 775, in denouncing Desiderius, King of the Lombards, as perfidious to the Roman See, perjured against God, etc. Thus in exalting King Charles, especially when, having defeated Desiderius, he showed himself munificent towards the Roman Pontiff with the Donation of the Exarchate, about which above. Thus when, having been brought to Rome in 774, he attributed the victory he had received to the Prince of the Apostles. Thus, when Charles earnestly "begged the beneficent Pontiff to grant him license to enter Rome," as the Pontifical book of Anastasius most impudently states. *Baronius, to A. 774, No. IV*. This Charles who was the triumpher over the Italians, was at least to enjoy the right of the Patricians, and to whom, as he approached Rome, all the Judges and the entire school of the militia would have gone out to meet, with Adrian awaiting at the Basilica of Peter. But these and other things are for another place. Especially what Baronius prolixly states for that year concerning the right of electing Pontiffs and Bishops; which Gratian, from Sigebert, said had been granted by Adrian to Charles, with the Cardinal being vehemently indignant at both. It should not have been kept silent by these men that the Emperor Constantine was not so execrable to Pope Adrian, that the latter even sent supplicatory Letters to Constantine and Leo, as to most pious Augusti, in the year 772, in which he "supplicated the Imperial Clemency, that the Exarch Paul might be received for the emendation of his guilt." *To A. 772, No. XIII*. Which the Pontiffs are not accustomed to do towards those Princes whom

they consider bound by the guilt of nefarious Heresy and by the chain of anathema. Maimbourg also insults Constantine with little Christianity on account of the plots laid for him by the King of the Bulgars, and the defeat he received, and the vengeance he meditated in vain against the Barbarians, while a lethal illness crept up on him, broken by so many labors and vigils, when he was nearly sixty, in the 35th year of his reign, according to the Byzantines. *p.* 353, 354.

XIX. Nowhere, however, does the character of the Iconolatric faction, which was afterwards to pour out all its fury, as it were, upon the ghost of Constantine, and especially that of the recent Gallic Historian, reveal itself more clearly than in describing the last moments of this Emperor. On which matter, may I be permitted to delay the reader for a little while. And first, let us hear Maimbourg, the equal of all, declaiming, and (as he says) "drawing with the utmost fidelity from the very sources," which we are soon to approach. He begins by stating that Constantine was "divinely struck, in the very expedition against the Bulgars, by a sudden and so violent an illness, that the lower part of his body was soon covered with anthraces, with so burning a fever, that the physicians confessed they had not observed another like it, and were entirely ignorant of the nature of the disease." *Book VII, p.* 357. From there the Historian adds that the sick man was carried to a suburban castle, called Strongylum, and in the very ship—Theophanes calls it a *chalandion*—he cried out with a horrendous wail, "that while still alive he was condemned and given over to the eternal fires, for the very reason that he had attacked the Blessed Mary with his blasphemies." Soon, with the sick man somewhat composed, he asked, nay, commanded all who were present, "that they should promulgate everywhere that this was his last will: namely, that not considering what he himself had committed against the Virgin, the same should hereafter be honored throughout the whole extent of the Empire as the Mother of God." With these words, amidst vows and prayers for the safety of the People, the Senate, his son Leo, and the churches of Hagia Sophia and of the Theotokos in Blachernae, which he had profaned in a horrendous manner, he expired in the ship, or "breathed out his most wicked soul," as the recent writer of Byzantine History says. Baronius, for this year 775, adds: "Thus, therefore, with that confession of the truth divinely extorted from him, both concerning his own perpetual damnation, and concerning the cult of the Mother of God which he had execrated, he closed his final day, in this respect similar to Antiochus." *No. XVIII.* Nor is there any Historian thereafter who has not reported that this Constantine died in despair, and was delivered to Hell even while alive and breathing. So much so that this constant rumor and the consensus of those reporting it has imposed upon not a few, even those most alien to the Iconolatric cause, and the Erudite, to this day.

XX. But the memory of so great a Prince must be vindicated, insofar as the faith of History permits; and that of the Byzantines, and hence of Baronius and Maimbourg, must be placed in its own light. We shall discharge our duty with a

few observations. And first, it is indubitable that Theophanes describes a pestilential anthrax, with which Constantine was seized "in the legs, and from there a most vehement fever." The *Miscella* likewise calls it an anthrax, and hence a most violent fever. A fragment attributed to the Patriarch Nicephorus, the successor of Tarasius, although of doubtful faith, describes the whole illness with febrile heat: "burning with the sharpness of acute fevers and inflammations." *From the Paris ed., p. 217.* We pass over later writers, who would augment everything according to their own genius, yet no ancient writer says that nearly the middle part of his entire body was covered with carbuncles. By what right now did the Iconolaters call such an anthrax or carbuncle, or if you will, carbuncles, and hence the flame conceived in his veins, a divinely sent plague, such as were divinely sent upon the Alastors, Antiochi, and Diocletians; with what appearance of truth do they say it was a disease unexplored and completely unknown to any physicians hitherto, let equitable judges decide! And does not the former accuse the bias of the historians, and the latter the ignorance of the physicians of that age, if the matter was so? Then, Maimbourg himself describes the natural causes of the disease: "the burning desire for vengeance, with which he was incensed against the King of the Bulgars; the continuous application to the apparatus of war, hence the inflamed blood; and indeed in the middle of summer, when all things were burning with heat and sultriness, etc." If a more vehement fever was then excited from this, tell me, you sons of physicians, that this was a new and impervious kind of disease! Furthermore, if judgment is to be made of Constantine's impiety or reprobation from that illness, what should be thought of David, Hezekiah, Job, what of the most pious heads, even at that royal summit, who were struck by not dissimilar anthraces or ulcers, or were to be consumed alive by a flame that could not be extinguished? Are the prodigies and certain victims of divine fury—of the angered Gods—all those whom a great heat of the internal organs consumed, or leprosy ate away, or apoplexy seized, or phrenesis invaded, or the plague carried off, or a graver Plague turned into a miserable spectacle? Is Maimbourg truly unmindful of the fates by which those Princes perished who, with a blind zeal for both Images and all superstitions, vehemently afflicted the Church! Let us suppose that Henry II, Charles IX, Henry III, Kings of France, Philip II of Spain, and Mary, Monarch of the English, were Iconoclasts, not to mention the ministers of Persecutions! How the Maimbourgian page would luxuriate in exaggerating the Nemesis against these Royal Heads? While Henry is struck, amidst orgies and jousts, in that right eye which he had recently feasted on the sight of martyrs to be burned for the cause of the faith, as Thuanus and Meteren report. While for Charles, who had recently decreed the Parisian slaughter, whole blood erupts from his pores everywhere, and from the passages of his whole body, by an unusual and truly divinely sent disease, at the end of his life in 1574. While the other Henry perishes by the iron of a monk assassin, in the same place and on the same day that he had advised the Bartholomew's Day massacre. *Mezeray, Abridg. 1579, 1589.* While Guise likewise, the chief instrument

for accelerating that night, "whose funerals who could express in speaking," falls in the same City, the Castle of Blois, and in the same Chamber in which at his principal instigation it had first been decreed. *Mezeray ibid. 1588*. While Mary of England, the instigator of so many flames and pyres, is extinguished by grief of mind, and hence by dropsy, in the very flower of her life and Empire, by a death so opportune for Elizabeth. While at that very time, more than fifty Peers of the Realm, thirty Bishops or Abbots, and nearly a threefold number of Canons were carried off by a malignant fever in Pontifical England, as the English Annals testify. While Philip II, than whom no King was more cruel to the Reformed, is corroded by a disease of lice, like a second Herod, and is consumed alive, not now by horse dung, but by the stench of his own intestines, grievous and unbearable to himself. We do not now comb through the Annals, or collect examples of horrid and unheard-of death, even among the Pontiffs themselves and the Persecutors of Evangelical simplicity. Now to the cause of the Constantinian plague, which he himself, like one in despair, professed in the very jaws of Hell, as it were!

XXI. Let the reader, I ask, pay attention to the following observations. 1. Theophanes the Confessor does not give this cause for the burning innards, namely, blasphemies against the Blessed Virgin; hence neither does Paul the Deacon, nor Anastasius, nor even that Peravian Fragment under the name of the Patriarch Nicephorus. Cedrenus, according to his custom, added it, I confess, namely that Constantine exclaimed that he was burning on account of the Mother of God, which the Jesuit interprets as blasphemies against the Virgin. 2. Those words of the languishing and feverish Prince, "while still alive I am delivered to the unquenchable fire," the historians have rendered most odiously. No one fails to see that these could have been expressed by a sick man in a febrile heat, and in a fire, as it were, that could not be extinguished by any help of remedies: "I burn all over, I am burned alive, nothing tempers, nothing extinguishes the fire that consumes me, it is a vehement flame in my marrow, miserable me, etc!" Or as the Psalmist says: "My heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels; my strength is dried up like a potsherd; my boils have putrefied, I am wholly consumed, I am contorted, I am worn out, I roar for the disquietness of my heart," and things similar to these. Nor is it indeed new for sick people to erupt into such cries, to groan, to whimper, to wail, amidst torments, or during febrile heats, especially Princes unaccustomed to diseases and pains. Let anyone now compare this with the Maimbourgian or Baronian paraphrase, of "the horrendous wail, on account of the sentence of eternal damnation, of the eternal fire, to which he knew he was consigned with the Demons, to be cast into the lake overflowing with sulfur and fire." 3. Let us also grant that the Prince uttered what seemed to be words of despair in those fevers; it is well known to physicians that in the paroxysm of a more acute fever, and in a fire, as it were, the brain is seized, the mind is disturbed, delirium, terror, restlessness, and other symptoms of that kind arise. Nor, if Constantine's mind was then sound, should he have been solicitous about offending Mary, but about

offending the Godhead, about piety towards God often neglected, about faith in Christ, about clemency, equity, beneficence towards his subjects, and other duties of Princes. That Judge of all was to be placated, not by hymns in honor of the Virgin, but by the commemoration of the Cross of Christ, by prayers, tears, penitence, by depositions of piety, and by the interdiction of all those things which would harm and provoke the uniquely to be adored Majesty of God. 4. We have seen before that those blasphemies of Copronymus against the Virgin, as of an "implacable enemy" of hers, are supported only by the testimony of wicked witnesses and by the worst faith of his adversaries, and are in reality non-existent. Indeed, what the Constantinian Synod had decreed concerning the Theotokos, with the Emperor approving and subscribing wholeheartedly, and the very confirmation in it of the prior Synods and of the Orthodox faith, both ensured that the dying Prince would be secure in this respect, and rendered that signification of his last will superfluous. 5. It should also be noted for the Mariolaters that the agonizing Prince is not reported to have enjoined the adoration or invocation of the Virgin; not that trust should be placed in her; that prayers should be directed to Mary; Marian litanies; festivals, sacrifices, vows, for her cult; epithets which otherwise belong to the Supreme God; the Marian Office, Psalter, Symbol, Sabbath, or the other pledges of Monastic and Jesuitical superstition. They only say he commanded that the Theotokos be "hymned (or blessed, sung, spoken of, praised, called blessed)," that she be celebrated or praised as the Mother of God, "that she be recognized and revered in the capacity of Mother of God." *Maimbourg, Part 1, p. 361.* Truly, according to the sentence of the Ephesine Synod, and of pious Antiquity, with no Christian denying the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, "blessed among women." Nor does the silence of his successor Leo IV, or of the attending Greeks, concerning a Marian cult under Leo, teach that this was interpreted otherwise than as retaining the dogma of the Theotokos, and not concerning the cult of Mariolatry. 6. But this also, above all else, is most worthy of observation, and is especially relevant to the cause we are arguing. Namely, among those words which he is said to have uttered last, witnesses of his penitence forsooth, Constantine said nothing at all of his sorrow for having proscribed Images. Among his vows for the safety of his Son, the City, the Senate, the Churches, having at the same time issued an Orthodox confession concerning the Theotokos, against the unjust accusation of the Patriarch Constantine about which we spoke above, not even Theophanes, Nicephorus, the *Miscella*, Cedrenus himself, or Zonaras, say anything about restoring the Images. No edict was ordered to be promulgated about the iconography so badly attacked by him, about recalling the Exiles on this account, about restoring Monasticism, about rescinding the prior *Silentia*, or about abolishing the Seventh Synod. This should have been done, however, if through these things Religion, the Church, and Catholicism had perished.

XXII. Let the reader henceforth judge, and let the incautious cease to detract from the virtues, or envy the salvation, or impotently rage against the name and

fame of Copronymus, not without curses and imprecations, of this unfortunate Prince, who was to be brought into odium by the victorious cause of the Images, first by the Monks and the Pseudo-Nicenes, and then by the succeeding Iconolaters. Nor will the prudent reader be surprised, I know, that all Byzantine History on this part has been deceived, or that the implacable enemies of the Iconoclasts have imposed on the entire world. Let these recent writers, Maimbourg and Natalis, remember that Charles, the father of Pepin, experienced a nearly parallel fate in this very 8th century, out of hatred from the Bishops and the entire Ecclesiastical Order. By whom, not without fabricated miracles of angelic apparitions and Revelations, he was to be transmitted to posterity by a constant rumor as eternally damned, his soul thrust into the lower Hell, to distinguish it from Purgatory. A parallel envy of a surname was added, but plainly on the example of Constantine, as the most learned Valesius observed long ago, to be added to Charles very long after his death, with monks as similarly the authors. Such was that of Charles the Hammer, as the Hammer or Scourge of the Church and of the clerics. Add the constant faith of the Annals, about his monument being opened by Boniface of Mainz and Abbot Fulrad; and in place of the body of Charles, a Dragon came out, and that whole Sepulchre was found blackened inside, as if it had been burned. If these and other things were to be reported in all the Annals by the envy of the monks and clergy, in the midst of Gaul, about Charles Martel, and even in the Decretum of Gratian, with Baronius himself being indignant, *To the Year 741, No. XV*, and in the Lives of the Saints in Surius; why would it seem strange to anyone that in most mendacious Greece, with the time of the Iconodules and Monks returning, long after the death of Constantine, both this Prince was judged to be in Hell, and the words of a despairing man were attributed to him, and also the surname of Copronymus or Caballinus was later imposed upon him?

And let equitable readers remember, furthermore, with what persistent slander all that was pagan of old, even the more clear-sighted, traduced the faith and morals of the Christians, not to be wiped away or washed clean by any Apologies. Let them likewise recall to mind the impostures of the Inquisitors, Monks, and Chroniclers concerning the Berengarians, Waldensians, Albigensians, Leonists, Wycliffites, Hussites, Bohemians, etc., as Manichaeans, Cathars, Arians, Atheists, and Monsters. Let them consider the shameful inventions of this and the previous age about the first Reformers, concerning either their doctrine or their way of life. Let the French attend to the lies spread about the Huguenots, to be disseminated even in the Courts of Kings and in the supreme Courts, and even to be persuaded, that they were guilty of Infanticide, of Thyestean feasts, of promiscuous lusts; not to mention our own Belgians oppressed by the calumnies of the Spanish, and the Protestants everywhere by those of the monks. And finally, let them peruse Louis Maimbourg's recent *Lutheranism* and *Calvinism*, with the Society especially acting as midwife, for the ruin of innocence and the extermination of the Protestant name, to be occupied even by the greatest of Kings! And let them gather from all these things, with

what prudence one must proceed in the monuments of History, whenever they report on Religion and sacred matters; "a wise unbelief," a Tragedian once said. But let them also infer that blessed are those Servants of Christ, who, conformed to their Lord in reproaches, curses, and the cross itself, hasten by that royal road to the like goal and crown of immortality.

V.

The Succession of Leo IV. What his wife Irene was like. The prudent moderation of the Prince towards the Iconodules and Monks. His Orthodoxy and zeal for the Christian cause. Whence his unexpected death. Irene takes power. The execrable image of this Woman, by the consensus of all Historians. Notable circumstances of the crime committed against her Son. Other inhuman acts. The foul praises of Irene, among ancient and new Iconolaters. The parricide praised by Baronius. The cause of Images is for them the summit of the Christian religion. Opposite confessions, about the foreignness of Images. The wondrous conflict of these. The means employed by Irene. The abdication of Patriarch Paul. The bad faith of the Historians. The substitution of the layman Tarasius. The candor of Maimbourg in his translations. The levity of Baronius and his followers. How they otherwise declaim against lay ordinations. What Tarasius was like, even to Maimbourg himself. The abject and contradictory statements of Baronius. And of the little Greeks. The conspiracy with Adrian I. The cunning of the latter, and his letter to the Easterners. In turn, the caution of Irene and Tarasius. Other means employed in the East. The frauds of the Iconolaters. Examples. Concerning a certain ancient and prophetic inscription. As narrated by Maimbourg. Its vanity demonstrated. And its origin. Frauds of this kind in the Histories.

I.

Leo IV emulated his father Constantine as his son and successor from the year 775, born at the beginning of the Dionysian Era 750, according to the Byzantines. He was sometimes given the cognomen Porphyrogenitus, from the Purple chamber where he was born; and Chazarus, because his mother was a Khazar, of Scythian origin; also Leo Copronymus, out of hatred for his father's name. To him was given in marriage Irene of Athens by his father, at the end of the year of the Vulgar Era 769. She was outstanding in beauty and intellect, but

with a soul corrupted by pride

destined for the ruin of her husband and son, and for the triumph of Iconolatry, the Fates permitting her to be joined with Leo. Not, however, before she had bound herself by a solemn oath to both Princes not to ever restore or worship Images; as the Historians agree, nor do the recent writers, Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander, deny the religious force of this dire oath. But she was afterwards a supporter of Images and a perfidious one, in asserting the Empire

for herself; so much more ardent than all other passions is the lust for power, once it has possessed a woman's mind, to which laws, faith, and a hand pledged in union must yield.

She dissembled, however, while her husband Leo was alive, being most skilled in this art, in whom she observed a great zeal for Orthodoxy and an equally great alienation from the superstition of Images. For under this Prince, Images were exiled from the sacred places, although, as moderate counsels pleased him, he showed himself more clement towards the Iconodules and Monks, intending to accomplish through tranquil authority what he could not by violence. But indeed, when two Images were discovered in Irene's bedchamber, he discovered his wife to be a perjurer on this very account, and suspected of clandestine machinations with courtiers, and he refused to cohabit with her any longer, "he himself stood apart from her, having not known her anymore," so says Cedrenus. *Cedrenus, Tom. II, p. 469*. This one thing brought a great deal of envy upon this Leo—a Prince otherwise praised even by his adversaries—among the worshipers and defenders of Images, and from Irene, hatred, which from then on knew no bounds. But he is accused in vain of having concealed his opinion through deceit at the beginning of his reign, or as they say, of "concealed Catholicism." *Maimbourg, Book III, p. 360, 377*. Namely on account of Leo's gentleness, in that he inhibited persecution at a time when the Iconolaters were plotting nothing new. For in reality, "he was involved in the same error as his Father," confesses the Jesuit; *Ibid.* and the recent writer of Byzantine History says precariously, in his work on this Flavius Leo, that "in the beginning he feigned the Catholic cult." *Byzantine Families, p. 126*. Besides the fact that Catholic faith is now to be estimated most absurdly from the assertion or removal of Images, which, as they will grant below, have nothing to do with the essence of Religion. And if Leo was less Catholic for having rejected the cult of Images, then the Eliberitan fathers, Epiphanius, Augustine, Serenus, and the rest, about whom we spoke in the first Section, must equally be defrauded of the eulogy of Catholicism. Indeed, that this Leo was a most tenacious adherent of the six universal Synods and of ancient Orthodoxy, and that he detracted nothing from the primordial faith, is clear even from the silence of the Iconolaters. Add to this Cedrenus, who explicitly reports that a great multitude of Jacobite or Syrian heretics was to be led captive by this Emperor into Thrace. In the same way, he was a most bitter enemy of the Arabs and Saracens, against whom he sent huge armies, to be defeated in more than one battle. And this is worthy of note in the Iconoclastic Princes: they preferred to turn their arms against the Barbarians rather than against Christians, or Westerners, even while the Lombards, the Franks, and the Pontiffs were dividing the spoils of the Eastern Empire among themselves.

II. After Leo, however, had recognized his wife Irene to be perfidious and perjured, and also certain ministers of Irene, it is no wonder that indignation arose in this Prince, who would take precautions against the hidden movements of the Iconolaters. Whence it happened that the end of Leo, who was carried off

not long after by an unexpected death, having barely completed the fifth year of his reign, was interpreted according to custom as the immediate vengeance of the Godhead. For the Byzantines report, and Maimbourg laboriously, that this Leo, soon after placing on his Royal Head a certain crown glittering with gems, which either the Emperor Maurice or Heraclius had consecrated in the Hagia Sophia, was struck by a divinely inflicted and visible plague, with carbuncles suddenly appearing on his Head, by which he was soon extinguished as punishment for his Sacrilege, since "he was mad," they say, "about stones." The authors are Theophanes, the *Miscella*, Cedrenus, and others, with Maimbourg assenting to the appearance of the fabulous circumstances after his master Baronius. *Part I, p. 382, 383*. But he does so in such a way that he quite openly laughs at the credulous simplicity of the Byzantines, who ascend to supernatural causes, while he confesses that natural ones could be given, namely either blood already inflamed from other causes, whence a most ardent fever would erupt into carbuncles; or the suspicion of poison administered by Irene or her Ministers, after the most ambitious Woman had fallen from Leo's favor. *Ibid. p. 384*. And why would she not have administered such poison to her Husband, a Woman who was removing herself from all society of the royal bed and Empire, who in this way would be administering the Empire in the name of a Guardian, with her son Constantine being barely ten years old, and who later endured to have this very Son blinded, and to violate all things divine and human, for the sake of ruling? And what in Leo's act was so worthy of the avenging hand of God, when he placed on his Royal head a crown glittering with the gems of the Empire, to be put back in its place soon after? Or what about the carbuncles, arising from a strong and ardent fever, was so preternaturally portentous in a young Prince, whose blood could easily boil in his veins, that it should be ascribed to the justice that avenges crimes? When Scripture itself recalls that even the most pious Kings were afflicted from heaven with such a plague, and with a pestilential ulcer or carbuncle. And how much more illustrious was the vengeance of God upon the Kings and Queens of a former age, by whom bloody persecutions were stirred up against those who wished all idolatry to be proscribed? Each of them was taken by an unexpected and miserable fate, and by plagues truly sent from God and very similar to Herod's, their tyranny not enduring. But now we forbear from naming the Princes.

III. Therefore, that time had arrived when it was in the fates for a certain peak of Iconolatric superstition, and a wondrous Catastrophe of affairs, to appear, first in the East, under the Empress Irene. And the Time of this conversion indeed began immediately after the death of Leo IV, in the year of Christ 780. His son Constantine was still a boy, and hence the reins of the Empire were permitted to the widow of Leo, a Woman who, while her husband was alive, had courted the favor of the Iconolaters with secret arts, against the sanctity of her oath, as Theophanes, Cedrenus, and the rest report at length. And concerning Irene, the Greek Annals, after Theophanes the Chronographer, agree, and also the Latins, although they are supporters of Images, that scarcely another woman has

reigned since women were born who surpassed this one in ambition, cruelty, evil arts, perjuries, slaughters, crimes committed against the entire family of her father-in-law Constantine, and even against her own Son, and finally in the very crime of parricide. "Let all perish, so long as I may rule," may deservedly be believed to have been the motto of this Woman. Nor have Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander themselves recently dared to deny it in their cited books.

Of those cited, he everywhere accuses Irene of horrendous crimes, of furious ambition, of fierce cruelty, of immense tyranny, of impious dissimulation, of unheard-of pride, etc., and that she was far more wicked than Agrippina, the mother of Nero. Whence also Charles and the men of Frankfurt did not hesitate to compare her with Athalia. Indeed, it was not enough for that woman to remove Nicephorus, the appointed tutor and paternal uncle of the minor prince, from the administration of the Empire. It was not enough for her to prohibit her son, as much as she could, from the same governance; to expose him to the hatred of all, by those very deeds which she wickedly advised; to be the sole cause of the repudiation of his wife Maria (Cedrenus wrongly says Marina) and of the admission of her chambermaid Theodota into the conjugal bed; and finally, to convert the sum of affairs to herself alone, by perpetual plots laid for her son Constantine. When the unhappy mother had attempted these things in vain, at last she ordered this very son, in the seventh year of his reign, to be the lamentable victim of maternal ambition. For she deprived her son, through the nefarious ministers of her conspiracy, of both his life and his sight, in the same *porphyra* (the so-called House, or Triclinium of the Palace, which first received the nascent successors of the Empire) in which he had obtained the use of life from his mother, "in the porphyra in which he was born."

That phrase of Theophanes, however, "they blind him so that he might die," the interpreter softens to "they almost inflicted death." Theophanes adds that at such a great crime, "the sun was darkened for 17 days." Added to this is the time observed by the most wicked of mothers for perpetrating the crime. For she awaited the birth of a son to her son Constantine, in the month of October in the year of the vulgar era 796, according to Theophanes, so that she might again rule the Empire at her whim in the name of her infant grandson. Hence in the following year, 797, Indiction V, Constantine was deprived of his eyes and his life at the same time, with the Empire devolving back to his mother, so Baronius writes at the beginning of that year. Hence what was plainly new in the Eastern Empire, behold a woman ruling, and alone, not so much in the name of a Regent as in her own name of *Basilissa*, Empress, with the supreme power of the Empire. Moreover, she who was guilty of so many crimes and of a detestable parricide was then to be praised, such is the most corrupt race of the adulatory Greeks; on the other hand, the unhappy Constantine was to be lacerated with accusations, after he began to walk in the footsteps of his ancestors in the cause of images. We pass over in silence the other inhuman acts of Irene, after she alone gained power, with Theophanes himself relating them. And by whose

counsel the four brothers of Leo IV had formerly been punished with the loss of their eyes or tongue, behold, by her later command, in exile, these same men were killed by a bloody death, in the second year of Irene's reign. And thus the entire posterity of Leo the Isaurian was to be sacrificed to the ambition of this nefarious woman, who could not be sated with royal blood, just as it was to the hatred of the Iconolaters. Let Maimburgius go now, and on this account insult the memory of Leo the Isaurian, as he does most abjectly!

IV. And this is that very Irene, who, though she subordinated religion, oaths, and all things divine and human to her lust for ruling, as the recent ex-Jesuit confesses several times, was the first in the East to institute the cult of images. Henceforth she was to be commended for her religion, faith, piety, Catholicism, and for following in the footsteps of the Saints, indeed, worthy of immortal praise, according to the recent writers of Iconoclastic history. The Byzantines, I confess, preceded them, being Iconolaters to the point of madness, for whom Irene, on this one account, namely for having sanctioned Iconolatry, "the adoration of the holy icons," is called "prudent, most pious, one who administered affairs most wisely, possessed of a divine zeal," and even to be equated with the martyrs themselves in faith, piety, and constancy, a "new Helen," and such are the encomiums of this kind in the very letters of Hadrian to Constantine and Irene.

Whence Maimburgius did not dissemble that these immoderate praises for a woman of execrable actions were to be ascribed to the vice of the Greeks, whose nature is abjectly adulatory. Meanwhile, he himself extols the Catholicism and faith of Irene everywhere with every praise. And Natalis Alexander, on the Eighth Century, writes: "Irene is worthy of immortal praise on account of her religion, faith, and piety, for the restoration and defense of which she exerted herself with outstanding effort." But Baronius exceeded all measure, even instituting a defense of the parricide committed by Irene, and dissimulating most of this woman's execrable deeds. For, beginning in the year 780 with a proclamation of the marvels of God, who had raised up this woman, he is thereafter entirely intent on images, and on the praises of those who had restored them, namely Irene, Tarasius, Hadrian, Theodore the Studite, etc. Finally, when he is to act on the twin parricide committed against her own son and emperor, he foully palliates it in this manner. He calls it "a zeal for justice, by which name she deserved to be commended thereafter: That it is licit to take a sword from the hand of a madman: That Christ had taught that the highest form of piety in this matter is to be cruel against one's son: That long ago by God's precept the hands of parents were justly armed against their sons who went after other gods: That it matters very much with what mind one does something: That because these things are believed to have been perpetrated against her son for the cause of religion and the love of justice, Irene is for this reason celebrated with praise by some of the Orientals, most holy men, who were present at the deed."

We omit more from Baronius, with which he extols Irene to the heavens and almost inscribes her in the catalogue of goddesses. The mind shudders, and my hair stood on end while reading. We now implore the faith of our readers. Indeed, after so many immense and bloody crimes of Irene, yet on account of the restored images, and perhaps some civil tributes that were donated, the writer of the Annals again introduces Theodore the Studite himself, that is, that man of God, illustrious for so many miracles, resplendent with so many virtues, and indeed a champion among the Iconolaters, thus flattering the most impious woman! "Irene, a divine name! Every mouth and tongue is opened in your praises: Assertor of the Orthodox Faith, Vindicator of God, champion of Truth, etc." See the entire letter of this Theodore in Baronius. But this is the same Theodore who, under the remarkable guise of sanctity and doctrine, and also of eloquence, was entirely disposed to the arts of foul adulation, as his letters to emperors and pontiffs teach: especially that one to Michael the Stammerer, although he was an Iconomach prince, whom he addressed as another David, Josiah, Jovian, etc., but who was to be torn apart in a cruel manner by the Iconodules. And more on the Studite below.

SECTION V.

This must certainly be inserted parenthetically: that this cause of images, to be promoted with such great efforts by Irene, by the Greek Iconolaters, and by the Roman Pontiffs in this age, is perpetually represented, I will not say by Baronius and the more rigid, but recently also by Louis Maimburgius in this entire history, and by Alexander Natalis, as if the highest point of the Catholic faith were at stake. Hence, for them, the Iconoclasts are everywhere guilty of heresy, execrable impiety, sacrilege, an attack on the Faith, religion, Catholicism, salvation itself, a revival of the impiety of the Jews, Marcionites, Manichaeans, and Theopaschites, and that no commerce should be had with those heretics, and things more grievous than these. Hence also, battles were undertaken, councils were held, and anathemas were pronounced for the assertion of images just as for the name of Christ, and the faith received from the Apostles, and the Kingdom of God; martyrdoms were undergone for icons; rebellions against majesty were stirred up for this reason alone; miracles were, forsooth, divinely produced; canonizations of Iconomartyrs followed; and eternal rewards for the Iconolaters in Heaven: while the Iconomachs would send their miserable, blasphemous, sacrilegious souls into the eternal fire, as enemies of God, Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, of all Orthodoxy, of the Catholic faith, etc., and six hundred other things of that kind. And from this proceeded the praises for Irene, who was detestable for so many crimes.

But if you hear the same Maimburgius elsewhere, in this very history of the Iconoclasts, the whole dispute in reality was about a matter that is indifferent, or free in itself and not necessary, which began to be introduced several centuries after the Apostles. For he confesses more than once that the sacred use of images

in the churches of the Christians was most rare in the first centuries, that is, non-existent, but after paganism was triumphed over under Constantine the Great and temples were built by Christians, they began to display sacred images publicly in churches, and to have them in private homes, etc. Elsewhere, concerning the cult of images, he says, "as this matter is not of the essence of religion, nor absolutely necessary for salvation, the Fathers left it free, declaring that they did not wish to compel anyone to worship, adore them, etc." Again, "there is no obligation to honor images, neither all of them in general, nor individual ones in particular; just as no one is absolutely obliged to invoke the Saints." The same man says elsewhere that images are "indifferent in themselves, as things neither commanded in the Gospel, nor forbidden, etc." Nor was the hypothesis of Dionysius Petavius different, who said that images are of the kind of things that are called non-essential, that is, which are not at all necessary for salvation, nor do they pertain to the substance of religion itself: "But they are in the power of the Church to either employ them or to remove them, according to what it has judged to be better."

There is no other opinion in the new methods by which the Reformed are invited to return, in the judgment of Cardinal Richelieu, of the modern French, of the Walenburgs, especially of the recent Bishop of Condom, now of Meaux, in the controversy concerning images, referring this article, even according to the mind of the Tridentines (so they say), outside the census of necessary things. These are now more equitable than the Jesuit Gretser, in his book *On Images Not Made by Hands*. "It is a necessary article of faith," he says, "to believe that the images of Christ and the Saints are to be reverently worshipped and venerated." "Nor is there any doubt that Christ wished his own images and those of the Saints to be held religiously," and many more things there, worthy of Gretser. Alexander Natalis himself, about to begin this controversy, says cautiously: "It is proven that the use of images in no way conflicts with the law of God"; just as other indifferent things, neutral in themselves, whose use in no way conflicts with the Word of God. Thus, many rites in the ancient Church did not conflict with the law of God, concerning the Eucharist, baptism, prayers, fasts, discipline, being indifferent in themselves and not necessary for salvation. Whence long ago Charlemagne and the men of Frankfurt had wished the use of images to be free, useful only for adornment, for memory, and for instruction, with all religious cult being forbidden, about which more later. Indeed, those very men said that images have little utility, except for remembrance; that they have no office at all for carrying out the mysteries of our salvation; and other things of this kind very frequently.

And the Fathers of the Council of Paris, under Louis the Pious, in A.D. 824, persuaded Pope Eugene to return to grace with the Greeks with this argument: if no painted or sculpted image had ever existed, "nothing would be lost of faith, hope, and charity, by which one arrives at the eternal Kingdom." Louis urged the same on Eugene, on the advice of the Fathers, in a letter given to the Pontiff by

Jeremiah of Sens and Jonas of Orléans, the sum of which was, as Maimburgius said, an exhortation "to concord, which was broken over a matter of such small moment as are images." And from this comes the railing of Baronius in the year 725, and hence of Binius, Bellarmine, and the rest, against those men of Paris, as if they were Iconoclast heretics. Now let the reader judge. By their own confession, this whole dispute was about a free matter, by no means necessary, nor of the essence of religion, such as the public use of images was then, or even a merely external cult, a relative honor, as they afterwards argue. Therefore, did the Greeks deserve on that account, for having removed them for the sake of taking away scandal, the accusation of an execrable heresy; and on this account, did Irene, more detestable than Agrippina, deserve the praise of an asserted religion, faith, and of the Catholic Church, for having restored the images? And the Caroline books state excellently: "If not to worship images is against the Christian religion, as they deliriously claim, then to adore or worship God alone will be against the Christian religion." A sharp argument. But now to the history of the restoration under Irene.

SECTION VI.

History of the Nicene Conciliabulum. The reason for transferring to Nicaea. Ominous timing. Irene's actions preceding the Synod. Other circumstances of a truly predatory Synod. The president Tarasius. Whether it should be considered Ecumenical. Arguments to the contrary, even from the East. The pseudo-characters of the Iconodules. A comparison of this Synod with the Seventh under Constantine Copronymus. Did the three Patriarchs of the East attend the Pseudo-Nicene Synod through Legates? The rash assertion of this matter. It is proluxly refuted as false. Baronius's confession. A similar fraud, concerning the legation to the Roman Synod of A.D. 769. The Nicene Acts also contradict. Maimburgius's fiction, distinguishing two periods. The vanity of it. The conflict with the Acts, and with Theophanes. A medley of contradictions. Concerning the Patriarchs of the East, what their position was then, and of what sort they were. Specifically concerning the Patriarch of Antioch. Theodorus of Antioch. On the Synodical Epistle of Theodore of Jerusalem. And the anti-Synodical letter of the rest. A more accurate examination of the matter. Several fallacies detected. A similar epistle most falsely attributed to Theodore by Hadrian I. On the ancient tradition of the Eastern Churches. The vanity of the assertion. The sessions of the Nicenes, within what time frame. A summary of each. Arguments for the use and cult of images. The judgment of Charlemagne. A sample of passages from Moses. From the Prophets and Psalms. From the New Testament. The foolishness of each. Exceptions to the passages of Holy Scripture objected by the Iconoclasts. The Fathers, how they were produced by the Nicenes. The fable attributed to Athanasius, defended by Maimburgius. The impudence of the fiction. Maimburgian evasions. Other traditions about the images of Peter, Paul, the Blessed Virgin, Anastasius, Cosmas, Damian, Euphemia, Theodosius the Abbot, etc. Dreams, old wives'

tales. A condition prescribed by a demon, and the response of a certain Abbot. On the bronze statue at Paneas. On the Image of Abgar. A summary of things to be observed. Passages objected from Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Basil, the Nyssen, Cyril of Alexandria, Asterius, etc. The fable about the relics of Euphemia. Maimburgius's most bitter words. The objection from the Synod in Trullo. The retort. What sort of other testimonies of the Nicenes. Various criteria of a conciliabulum. Profane disorder. The sum of the decrees. They are demonstrated to be idolatrous. Maimburgius's inanities and contradictions.

I. Truly, no means seemed more effective for sanctioning Iconolatry and for strengthening the affairs of Irene, and also of Tarasius, than the indictment of a Synod that was in appearance universal, to be opposed to the seventh Synod of Constantine. And this was first to be convened at Constantinople, in the year 786, on the Kalends of July, after one or two sessions had been held in the Church of the Holy Apostles, after the legates of Hadrian had been brought there, and those who falsely bore the name of the three Patriarchs of the East. The Synodal Book, Theophanes, Anastasius in his preface before the Nicene Acts, and Maimburgius in many places testify to this, applying his familiar false coloring.

But the beginnings of the Synod did not correspond to the wishes of Irene and the new Patriarch. For the Scholarii, or veteran soldiers, who were not devoted to images, as many as had served under Constantine and Leo, and also a frequent crowd of Byzantine citizens, whom the Acts call a "disorderly multitude of the people," saw in the very beginnings of the council that the Empress and Tarasius were conspiring, "hastening to strike the Iconomachs with anathema," according to the Synodicon in Justel or Labbe. They observed that there would be no place for freedom of suffrage, and that those bishops who were averse to Iconolatry would be inferior not in number but in authority, "which they did not permit to happen." Wherefore, a tumult having been made, and as the Byzantines note, at the instigation of the bishops "who thought evil," at the first and second gathering of the Fathers, the Empress dissolved the Synod by the voice of her Chamberlain. But the true reason for its dissolution, and hence for its transfer to Nicaea, was not singular. First, because Irene had observed that there were many bishops in that Synod who venerated the decrees of the seventh synod and the memory of Constantine and Leo; whence the shouts of those leaving the Temple, "praising the seventh synod." Then, because she feared for herself from the military schools, as Constantine had long since not tolerated any Iconolaters in his Praetorians, as the Jesuit confesses after Baronius. Finally, because by transferring the ministers of Irene and the conspirators to Nicaea, far from the assaults of the Iconoclasts, the name of a Nicene Synod would be more august, and under that name the decree against the Iconoclasts would now be ratified. Therefore, the entire crowd of bishops was dismissed, retaining those in Constantinople, with the Palestinian monks and the legates of Hadrian, with whom Irene might agitate new plans for accomplishing the matter.

II. Therefore, in the very next year, 787, Indiction V, with matters arranged according to the will of the rulers and the desire of Hadrian's legates, the Synod of Nicaea in Bithynia was convened, in the month of September. In that very month, on a Sunday, after the divine liturgy was performed (they render it as the solemnities of the Mass), a great eclipse of the sun appeared, according to Theophanes, Cedrenus, and the rest. And at about that time, Sigebertus notes for that year 87, that blood flowed from the sky and the earth. If these phenomena and celestial portents had occurred in the year and month of the Constantinian Synod, how delightful it would be to hear Maimburgius declaiming, who would prolixly turn them into just as many presages of the truth being obscured, and sinister auguries! Such as the later solar eclipse was, around the time of Constantine's blinding by Irene, as the chroniclers observed above when discussing Irene's crimes. And Irene judged that three things especially had to be done beforehand. First, that those veteran soldiers, imbued with Constantine's discipline, with themes from nearby Thrace being summoned in the meantime by Stauracius the Patrician, she should, by employing fraud, discharge from service and order them, as exiles from the city, to go to their own provinces. Then, that she should bind the militia, summoned to the city from their stations, to her own allegiance, and create new Praetorians, new dukes, obligated to her alone. Finally, that having sent envoys from the court to all the regions subject to the East, she should canvass the votes of the bishops and monks, whom it would be easy to bend to the will of their mistress. And the Acts, Theophanes, Anastasius, and the consent of their adversaries themselves do not allow for doubt. While the Jesuit grants each of these points, he is forced by this very fact to confess that everything in that Synod was to be conducted and defined according to the whim of this woman. Whence she is falsely criticized in the Caroline Books as the "founder, teacher, and President of the Council," a new example. For the name of her son Constantine was to be prefixed everywhere, for the sake of form and honor only.

But the council was not convened by the authority and command of Hadrian, as those in Rome would wish, but by the single decree of the Augusti, who also summoned Hadrian there by a divine sacred letter, as the Acts also teach. Thus, Tarasius moderated this entire synod, under the auspices of Irene, according to his own judgment, and Natalis Alexander confesses that the Apostolic Legates relinquished the direction of the synod to him. But the synodal book, and Photius in his book on the Synods, make Patriarch Tarasius the *protos*, *exarch*, and *prokathexomenos* of this synod, to be placed before the legates of Hadrian; who, if they were also presidents, as Natalis urges, were certainly secondary, with only a semblance of honor left to them, but after Tarasius nonetheless. And it was fitting for that Patriarch to moderate the assembly, who, by the cleverness of his intellect and his experience in managing affairs, but also by his authority and by his prior arrangement with Irene, would direct everything, with the certain sentence of the synod having long since anticipated its beginning, and his industry reached its goal. Furthermore, the members of this synod, from the

Acts themselves, are understood to have been for a great part abbots, monks, most bitter enemies of the memory of Constantine, and among them were the Palestinian monks, Plato, Theophanes, and other venerable monks, according to Baronius, who suffered much under Copronymus. Ignatius in the *Life of Tarasius*; "And whoever were venerable and distinguished monks, who were moved by a zeal for discipline, set out for Nicaea." Nor is there any doubt that most of the bishops were of that discipline, newly created for that purpose, besides very many apostates, lured into the party of the Iconolaters by the blandishments of Irene and the arts of Tarasius. Among these were that Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, Theodosius of Amorium, bishops who, with a foul recantation and horrendous insults against Constantine and the seventh synod, betrayed their venal and abject minds. From which it is no wonder that, besides the manner of proceeding being plainly tumultuous and violent, about which later, this synod merited the name of "latrocinial" (a robber synod), along with the Ephesian synod of Dioscorus; and was held to be a pseudo-synod, an impious, erroneous, heretical synod, and by other names of this kind, by Charlemagne, by the men of Frankfurt, the Gauls, the Britons, in this and the following century.

IV. Therefore, it is altogether precariously that recently Natalis Alexander, Louis Maimburgius, Cabassutius in his *Notitia Conciliorum*, but following Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, Spondanus, Petavius, and whatever Iconodules there were, pronounce this synod to be truly Ecumenical and the seventh; at which the three Patriarchs of the East were present, at least through legates and vicars, who would testify to the faith and ancient tradition of the Churches of Egypt, the East, and Palestine. Thus, the Jesuit extols the majesty of the synod with many and magnificent words; "present," he says, "besides Tarasius and the legates of Hadrian, were also the holy monks, as deputies of the three Patriarchs, and St. Plato the Abbot, St. Theophanes, ever a virgin even in matrimony, etc." "The assembly was most distinguished, most numerous, most holy, of more than 350 bishops," and many more things there, you would believe the matter was being narrated seriously. Wherefore, the fraud must be laid bare at the threshold, the false color wiped away, and it must be proven that neither is the name Ecumenical rightly applied to this synod, nor did those three Patriarchs of the East attend. The following will demonstrate that the synod was not Ecumenical, and in no part did it approach the sanctity and gravity of the Constantinian Synod.

1. As many as held it for a pseudo-synod, or certainly, like Sirmondus on the second canon of Frankfurt, for a peculiar synod of the Greeks, and moreover reprobated its doctrine, in this and the following age, denied it was universal. Among these were several emperors of the East, and under them patriarchs and bishops, Charlemagne, the Germans, Gauls, and Britons, as will be established below from the history of the opposition. And the Caroline Books falsely assail and explode this appellation of Universal Synod or Ecumenical Council, in more than one place, about

which will be spoken in its own place. 2. But neither did those who were otherwise patrons of images long hold the Nicene synod among the Ecumenical ones, in the eighth and ninth century, any more than they did the Synod of Constantine VII. Theodore the Studite himself, a distinguished Iconolater, but one who would disapprove of the wicked arts of Patriarch Tarasius, from whom he was also openly divided, called this synod "local" in one of his letters, which is the 38th, to the indignation of Binius, in his notes on the inscription of the Nicene Synod. Thus, that all the patriarchal churches of the East, with the sole see of Constantinople excepted, were accustomed in their synodical and public confessions of faith to enumerate only six Ecumenical Synods, and not to acknowledge a seventh besides them, is taught by Photius's Encyclical to those same sees, and the writer of the Annals who published it also confessed as much. Thus Nicholas I in the middle of the 9th century, in a letter written to the Constantinopolitans against Photius, according to Baronius, mentions only the authority "of the six venerable Universal Councils." And also after Nicholas, Hadrian II, his successor, from the year 867. This was also reproached to the Pontiffs by Photius, who was by then a great defender of Patriarch Tarasius, that is, his nephew, and hence an assertor of the Pseudo-Nicene synod, under the Iconolatric empire, after the Iconomachs had been extirpated by Theodora, the mother of Michael III, a woman who would yield to wicked arts. 3. Nor could the synod be considered Ecumenical, to which from the East certainly none of the three Patriarchs (whatever they may fabricate) attended, neither in person nor through delegates, instructed with the proper letters and the required synodical, about which matter immediately. From the West, besides the two presbyters sent by Hadrian, with whom Tarasius was conspiring, there were no bishops from Africa, nor from Italy, nor from Gaul, nor from Germany, nor from Britain, nor from Spain, by their own confession, which the Nicene Acts themselves and the subscriptions in the seventh action also teach. Whereas in the sixth Ecumenical Synod under Pope Agatho, besides the vicars of Agatho, these legates themselves, and Theodore of Ravenna, John of Porto, and John of Thessalonica, represented the Western churches. That story of theirs about the vicars or placeholders of the three patriarchs is an audacious fiction, and one than which there is scarcely another more impudent, as will now be established. 4. An universal synod is certainly not constituted by the number of 350 bishops: which number was either equal or very closely approached in other synods, in the fifth at Constantinople, in that of Frankfurt under Charlemagne, in the eighth under Photius, and in others. And a sometimes greater number appeared in Western synods, which were nevertheless not Ecumenical. But let Pope Nicholas say, concerning a synod in the number of those who deposed Ignatius in the Eighth Synod. "And what good do we consider it, for a college of the same number to

preside, when they prevaricate from the very judgment whose number they imitate? We say this is worthy not so much of praise as of reprehension; because the accumulation of sins is altogether greater where the host of prevaricators has been multiplied. We indeed follow not only the numerous college of holy bishops of the Nicene and Chalcedonian Councils, and the synodal constitutions of the other Fathers, that is, we do not regard the number, but we venerate their balanced judgments, etc." This is barbarously put, since it has almost no vigor of Latin integrity, and is uncouth in its words, as Charlemagne would have said. *From the Greek in Capitularies, L. II. C. XVIII. 5.* Surely the place, Nicaea in Bithynia, does not command that this be held a universal Synod, any more than other Synods at Constantinople or Ephesus. Nor does the presence of envoys from the Roman pontiff; such were present at topical, national, and various provincial synods. As in the resident Synod under Menas, and even in this century in the Synods of Gentilly and Frankfurt, where this very cause of images was treated. Thus the same were present and presiding in the Photian Synod, which is nevertheless held by the Latins to be a robber council. But neither does the name of Ecumenical Synod, claimed for itself by the Nicaeans, prove that it was truly Ecumenical. Unless the Latins now also venerate as Ecumenical the Trullan Synod, the Seventh of Constantinople, and also the eighth under Photius, all of which are vehemently odious to them, though adorned with the same inscription. The Romanists themselves sometimes deny this prerogative to the First Council of Constantinople under Theodosius the Great, though it has constantly deserved the name of Ecumenical. We say nothing of the Lateran, Constance, Florence, and other Pontifical councils, which they precariously call Ecumenical. Finally, neither the presidency of Tarasius, a recent patriarch from being a layman, nor the sanctity of the monks, which Maimbourg extols, nor the splendor of the assembly, command that this Nicene synod be Ecumenical, as anyone will easily grant. *Capitulary L. IV. C. XXVIII.*

6. Nor can that be held as an Ecumenical Synod whose judgment was manifestly repugnant both to the doctrine and to the Ecumenical or Catholic practice of all previous ages. And this indeed was the indignation of Charlemagne, urging with almost the entire West this argument that the Catholic unity had been dissolved by the temerity of Nicaea, with innumerable pious men in the East groaning for the same reason. Of this kind was the decree on adoring the images of the saints, as the writers of Pontifical history report in summary. Or concerning rendering to the images of Christ, the Mother of God, the Angels, and all the saints a religious worship; they say not indeed of "true latria," as if they were of a divine nature, but nevertheless of "adoration," "salutation," of the kiss, and of the "offering of incense and lights;" thus of religious veneration, as will be discussed more fully below. *Scoglio, Hist. Eccl. L. X. p. 486, Ed. Rom. T.*

VII. Concil. Act. VII. Col. 555 & passim. Since this worship, surely with relation to the prototypes, is accused by Charlemagne and most of the churches throughout the West of novelty, impiety, temerity, insanity, foolishness, most grave and execrable error, and of ancient paganism contrary to the judgments of Scripture and the Fathers, etc., how could that definition and sanction have proceeded from an Ecumenical, from a Catholic Synod?

V. Furthermore, this Nicene Synod can be considered Ecumenical by no greater right than the prior Constantinopolitan Synod under Constantine Copronymus is considered. For the latter, assembled from 338 bishops from the whole East, as far as it obeyed Constantine, and defining with the highest consensus of all the bishops, as was seen at length in Section III, and rejecting all worship and adoration of images, is called by the judgment of the "holy, great, and Universal seventh Synod." Why, pray tell, is this one to you a "robber" council, a Pseudo-Synod, and whatever other verbal curses of that kind are found among the profligate Iconodules, among Baronius, Binius, and the others of his family, and these recent writers in Gaul? Is it because the adoration of images was rejected by this seventh Synod? But the Synod of Frankfurt also rejected it, and almost all the Westerners at that time rejected it. And there is an equal right of retort against a Synod decreeing that adoration. Or is it perhaps on account of the illegitimate manner of the synodal process? On the contrary, to claim what has already been demonstrated, the Fathers are convoked by equal authority, namely imperial, by which the previous Ecumenical councils were called; for the space of a whole six months, from February 10 to August 8, they expend the most diligent effort on this entire cause; they define according to the norm of Scripture alone, as it says; they most faithfully present the judgments of the prior Fathers; they receive and strengthen the six prior Councils, and the entire Catholic faith, as even the Pseudo-Nicene Acts themselves testify. *Theophanes and the rest. Vide defin. Syn. T. VII. Conc. Col. 530. Acts V, from col. 395.*

Now let cause be composed with cause, reasons with reasons, bishops with bishops; let the arguments of the Constantinopolitan Synod, contracted into a summary above, be compared with the Responses which the Deacon Epiphanius read in Action VI. Let anyone who stands outside party zeal attend to that conspiratorial and most hasty process of the Nicene Synod, begun on the 24th of September, and to be dissolved soon after on the 12th of the following October. Let him observe the brief time of the sessions, their number, their entire method, the tumultuous bishops, the fables peddled, the given arguments for venerating images—"a conglomeration of trifles," said Charlemagne. Besides that unbridled lust for cursing, and the infamy of words sought from taverns and from Orcus, against the previous Augusti and the Seventh Synod, which was prolixly vindicated in the preceding parts, let him pronounce, in accordance with the office of a fair judge, to which of these Synods the name of "Conciliabulum" is more truly adapted!

And let them not henceforth urge that the Synod under Constantine was held without consulting the Roman and in his absence, but not the one which was assembled at Nicaea under Irene. This prejudice has already been met in the preceding parts, and the dust intended to be thrown in these lights has been plainly blown away. Now it is time to speak more precisely of the legation of the three Patriarchs to the Nicene Synod, and of their synodal letters.

VI. Therefore, Natalis and Maimbourg, drawing from their own sources, repeatedly complain that none were called to the Constantinopolitan Synod from the Patriarchal Sees of the East! On the contrary, they add, in the Nicene Synod there appeared Legates or Vicars of the three Patriarchs, and through them the faith and ancient tradition of the churches of Egypt, the East, and Palestine was testified! Air and words, and a fraud poorly confuted, by which the Christian world has been imposed upon to this day. 1. These sensible men conceal that those Patriarchal Sees of the East—Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—were as little in the power of Constantine as they were thereafter in that of Irene, as will now become clear from the Acts. And so, neither could Constantine's sacred edicts be sent there, nor could their absence stand in the way of an Ecumenical Council under an Ecumenical Emperor and Patriarch, as was seen in the history of that seventh Synod. 2. The very same thing had happened in the Quini-sextan Synod, which for the Greeks is sometimes the seventh Synod, and for Eutychius the Patricide in his Annals, under Justinian II. In this council, there were no patriarchs from the three sees, nor even any Vicars, and who such men were under that harshest of yokes is not even sufficiently established. And yet it was held as Universal by the Iconolaters themselves, as by all the Greeks, even by those very Palestinian monks in their Letters to Tarasius. For they speak of this Synod, as Anastasius himself renders it: "But this is to be considered more subtly, even by the sacred and venerable sixth Synod itself, in which none of those who were bishops in these parts at the same time is found to have assembled, etc. But no prejudice attached to the Holy Synod from this, nor did any prohibition of making decrees follow," and you may read more there. Although this very Synod is called a "Conciliabulum" by modern Latins, a matter about which we have written most fully in the Historical Introduction to the seventh century. *Introduction to Saec. VII. p. 626.*

3. It is so far from being the case that the same Patriarchs attended the Pseudo-Nicene Synod, that there is scarcely a more putrid fiction in history. For it is established that the letters which they say were from Tarasius, and the Legates of Irene, did not reach those three Patriarchs of the East, and so these neither wrote back to Tarasius, nor sent to the Synod. Let Baronius speak, to the year 785, adding the reason: "since Aaron, prince of the Saracens, a most bitter tyrant, was reigning, most hostile to the Christians." *Num. XL.* He adds that as soon as the Legates of Constantine arrived in Palestine, they heard that the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theodore, already an exile, was dead. Hence they diverted to

some monks of most holy life, from whom they understood the most bitter servitude which the Eastern Christians were suffering, and how very dangerous it would be to approach either the Patriarch of Antioch or Alexandria: for if they were detected, not only the Legates themselves would undergo extreme danger, but they would cast all the faithful of the East into that same danger. For which reason, they recalled them from their proposal of proceeding thither. Behold, with the Cardinal confessing, and with history and the Nicene Acts themselves commanding, the Patriarch of Jerusalem was dead before the arrival of the legators, while the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and their Sees, were plainly inaccessible to those same Legates of Irene, and indeed were not even sought.

4. It is no wonder that a legation of the three Patriarchs to this Synod was fabricated, which was to be peddled as Universal, with two monks taking on this role, after the Westerners had been imposed upon by a similar fraud in the Roman Synod under Stephen IV. Hadrian was the first to produce this legation, after the Synod of Frankfurt, in his epistle to King Charles on behalf of the Nicene Synod, and from it Baronius, to the year 769, and recently Maimbourg. *p. 1. p. 332*. But nothing is further from the appearance of truth than that legation to Pope Paul on behalf of the veneration of the holy images, with letters added as if written by Theodore of Jerusalem. For besides the fact that in the Actions of the Nicene Synod itself, there was no mention of this legation, neither injected by the Palestinian monks nor by the nuncios of Hadrian, behold Hadrian the confessing culprit, in his epistle to Constantine and Irene: "The entire people who are in the Eastern parts, in the whole East, have erred (concerning the venerable images) until God exercised you to reign." *T. VII. Conc, Col. 99*. How then could the three Patriarchal sees long ago, by a solemn legation, almost thirty years before these letters of Hadrian, have testified to their constant doctrine and practice, and that of their people in the most noble and ample parts of the East, in favor of the worship of images? Add to this the silence of Theophanes, Nicephorus, and the Byzantines, and the harshest servitude of those Sees at that time, under Abdallah, the Chaliph of the Abbasids, an invader of the Empire.
5. Therefore, all that is boasted of concerning the delegation to the Synod from the three Sees of the East, with their letters, confession of Faith, and the full instruction such as is wont to be given to deputies, amounts entirely to this. Namely, that those few Palestinian monks, upon whom the Legates from Constantinople had stumbled by some miracle, as the letters relate (which however lack a subscription, and have a false inscription, as will be shown immediately), were finally persuaded by the Legates themselves, though without consulting and without the knowledge of the Patriarchs, to add two of their own monks, John and Thomas, to the Legates, with letters to Tarasius, which would testify to the

Apostolic tradition in the churches throughout Egypt and Syria, forsooth! And what sort of monks were these? "Being private and unknown men, weakly and ignorantly disposed towards the matter, lowly," "idiots and inexperienced, and for so great a cause infirm, most vile little men," as they themselves profess, few in number, hiding in the deserts of Palestine, and "the last of those who hasten to inhabit the desert." As for their saying that John and Thomas were *Syncelli* (secretaries) of the two great Patriarchs, beware of believing they were such at that time, or were sent from their side. Whatever dignity they may be imagined to have once excelled in, at that time they were certainly living the eremitical life, a "holy quietude," and the Patriarchs whose co-secretaries they are said to have been are not even expressly named. Moreover, they call themselves unknown, inexperienced, idiot monks, such as *Syncelli* were not wont to be, which was the first dignity after the Patriarchal, as has already been observed above, concerning the election of Anastasius under Leo the Isaurian. The entire delegation is also said to have been made upon much persuasion from the Legates, with the reason added, lest they return to Irene and Tarasius completely destitute, "bearing absolutely none of those things which they were hoping for according to their wish." Finally, the letters themselves to Tarasius, carried by these monks, confess that the Synod which the Greeks were contriving would be "destitute of the presence of the three Apostolic Sees, of the nourishing Patriarchs, but also of the very bishops who serve under them." Whence also Charlemagne everywhere castigates the ignorance of these wretched men, and concerning John, the first among those Legates forsooth, that he was "of lesser honor than the bishops residing in the same Synod;" that "those preceded him with a sublimity of rank which was not less than their error." *Book. II, Cap. IV.*

Behold, Reader, the three Patriarchs of the East, present in that Synod through their Legates or deputies, as they are most mendaciously called by the conspiratorial Nicaeans! Behold, forsooth, the genuine witnesses, in that inexperience and ignorance of theirs, which they themselves indeed ingenuously profess, of the Apostolic tradition, and of the faith of the churches of Egypt, the East, and Palestine, which they knew so clearly! Behold also by what right, or with what faith, these few idiots and monks in the deserts of Palestine inscribe themselves in their letters to the Synod, "the chief Priests of the East"! Observe also the faith of the recent writer, the Dominican Monk Alexander, in his history of this Synod: "The letters of the same Patriarchs (of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) to Tarasius were read, in which they excused their absence from the Synod." *Art. IV. p. 87.* Read the Acts, whoever you may be, and suspect the audacity or the supinity of men, to put it mildly!

VII. Nor does Maimbourg escape, with a newly excogitated fiction (as he himself boasts). "I believed," he says, "that I ought to elucidate in a few words this

difficulty, which could be a sticking point, and which, I think, had not yet been sufficiently cleared up: so that it may be evidently established, how those Letters of the Palestinian monks can be reconciled with the testimony of the historians of that age, who assert that those two Priests were Deputies of the Patriarchs of the East, whose churches were then groaning under the yoke of the Saracen Princes." *Hist. Icon. L. III. p. 422, 423.* What is Maimbourg's expedient? "Those writers did not observe that the council was not held until after an interval of a year and more, in which intermediate time, both time and means were granted to those three Patriarchs for furnishing those Deputies with due authority, and for sending them with full power to act in their name, which it is certain that they did." He proves this by the authority of his contemporary Theophanes, asserting that John, most celebrated for the praise of his doctrine, was deputed by the Patriarch of Antioch, and Thomas, who had been Archbishop of Thessalonica, with the greatest esteem, by the Patriarch of Alexandria. The Jesuit adds the testimony of Ignatius, a contemporary author, who wrote the Life of Tarasius, found in Surius on February 25, and who added this: that Politian, Patriarch of Alexandria, deputed Thomas, and John was blessed with the same honor by Theodore of Antioch and by Elias of Jerusalem. *Baronius ad Ann. DCCLXXXV, N. XLII.*

Thus far Maimbourg. The Muse gave genius to the Gauls; to the Jesuit, she gave confidence, and the habit of invention. To this man it was first given to solve that knot, which had not been sufficiently extricated either by Baronius or by the rest! And this, among others, which we designate in their places, he wished to highlight in the preface of this History: "Difficulties concerning History will be discovered in this Work, which had not yet been plainly extricated, and which will appear altogether with a certain grace of novelty." See the rest there. But the Jesuit is giving us words, "he cooks the wind, whence he may offer smoke to sell." And in reconciling the Nicene Acts with his Theophanes and Ignatius, and in clearing up the knot, he increases the dissension, and ties the knot tighter. 1. For the letters of the monks, which are presented besides in the Nicene Acts, also by Anastasius the Librarian, and indeed written most sincerely (that is, fuller, as it happens), either their authority stands, or there is none. If it stands at all, then whatever Theophanes, whatever others may have invented afterwards, that must be held as ratified, which at the time these letters were presented and read in the Synod, Action III, established that all authority of the monks John and Thomas proceeded from these vile and idiot and inexperienced monks of the desert of Palestine, with the Patriarchs at that time neither daring to write, nor to mutter in any way about such things. 2. It is also certain that nothing further was established by the Fathers, namely concerning the submission by the three Patriarchs, in the intermediate time, of full power, or due authority for acting in their name. For this would have been done either by letters, and these would have been presented again in the Synod; or by other delegates, and these would have appeared in the same, nor would Anastasius have been silent in his fuller edition of the Acts, which was praised above all others by Baronius. 3. An

interval certainly elapsed between the departure of these two monks from Palestine with the Legates of Constantinople, and the holding of the Synod at Nicaea, at the end of a September in the year of our Lord 787, even by the calculation of the Latins! So then, in the meantime, were time and means granted to the three Patriarchs for supplying what was lacking in the monks? Was their condition therefore milder than before, and their servitude lifted? Did the monks now dare to approach the individual Sees, or the Patriarchs to write back? Who brought these confirmatory letters from the Patriarchs? Why were they not read in the Synod? Or by what document will the Jesuit prove that after the Synod, those very men whom he calls Patriarchs ratified whatever the monks had done or said in their name? For he confesses that from that time on, those supposed Legates lingered in the court of Irene and Constantine, grown weary of the solitary life, and no one has ever dreamed that they returned to their own.

4. But if in the meantime, until they convened at Nicaea, they had been instructed with the due power of Legates, why then were they to be held as Legates of the Patriarchs by Irene and Tarasius, indeed as the Patriarchs themselves, as if representing their persons, for the whole thirteen months or so before the Synod was assembled at Nicaea? For they come with this title, both in Theophanes and in the Nicene acts, in the "Record of what was done before the Synod," in the 6th year of Constantine, when the council was to be held in Constantinople, in the Temple of the Holy Apostles, and was to be disturbed by the Scholarii and the populace. And afterwards they are said, in the following year, to have been retained with Irene, together with the legates of the Roman see, until matters could be prepared for the Nicene assembly. *Maimbourg L. II. ad Ann. DCCXCI.*
5. Therefore, there is no support for Maimbourg either in Theophanes or in his interpreter Anastasius the Librarian, who reports the same things in his history. For he mentions no other mission, no other deputation, made by the Patriarchs, than when the aforesaid nuncios of the Empress and the Patriarch led away with them those two monks John and Thomas, at the end of the 5th year of Constantine. *Theophanes, Chron. Ed. Reg. p. 389, 390.* And these immediately in the following year, as the same Theophanes says, appeared in the Royal City for the Synod indicted there, while in the East the Arab leader Aaron was raging cruelly against the Christians. But indeed Theophanes the Confessor, that is, the most bitter of the Iconolaters, or if someone has interpolated Theophanes in this part, certainly invented it out of his own head, that one was abducted from Antioch, the other from Alexandria; for the Acts teach that they gave themselves to the road from the deserts of Palestine together with the Legates, without either approaching in person or by letter the Patriarchs whom they are said to have represented. And by the same token, the chronicler soon after, in the 6th year of Constantine, calls these same monks, as they were approaching the assembly of bishops to be held in

Constantinople, one the Patriarch of Antioch, the other of Alexandria; for he says that the legates of Pope Hadrian arrived, and "of Antioch and of Alexandria."

6. But let the reader marvel at this medley of fictions and syllogisms! In the Nicene Acts, and in Anastasius, as produced by Baronius, those monks and silentaries of Palestine profess themselves to be "idiot men, vile, inexperienced, for so great a cause infirm, unlearned." But if Theophanes is to be believed, John was a "great and most celebrated man," even for the praise of his doctrine; while Thomas had been, with the highest esteem, as Maimbourg says, "Archbishop of the great city of Thessalonica," that is, Primate of all Illyricum, who was also at one time called patriarch, or so in Theophanes, and the same was formerly Vicar of the Apostolic See, by the indulgence, at last, of Theodosius in favor of the Augustus Honorius, from the year 421, with Rufus then being of Thessalonica. *Baronius ad Ann. DCCLXXXV, N. VI.* For before that, whatever Henry Valois and Peter de Marca may object, it had been made subject to the See of Constantinople, even by the law of Theodosius, about which matter elsewhere. *Cod. de SS. Eccl. L. XVI.*

Then, if we believe the prior letters, these men had long been living the solitary life, "inhabiting the desert," whatever they may be said to have once been as *Syncelli*; but Theophanes represents them as having been abducted immediately from Antioch and Alexandria. In the Acts, John always precedes Thomas, both in casting his vote and in the series of subscriptions; indeed, John for the most part gives the opinion alone. But if we listen to the Maimbourgian witnesses, Thomas, as Vicar of the see of Alexandria, according to the received order among the patriarchal sees and the constant law of subscriptions, ought to have been listed first, and to have voted first, and to have subscribed first. Also, both appear in the Acts as deputies of the three apostolic sees, with an equal title and vicariate for each; in those historians, one is specifically delegated by the Antiochene, the other by the Alexandrian, with no mention even of the Jerusalemite. It is also strange that Thomas, formerly Archbishop of Thessalonica, above the entire diocese of Macedonia, should thereafter be described as *Syncellus* of the Alexandrian, hence his deputy. The condition of this Alexandrian at that time was most miserable, not only under the Saracenic yoke, but also under the dominion of the Jacobites in Egypt. For these administered almost all the churches of both Lower and Upper Egypt with patriarchal right, extending even into Ethiopia and Nubia, with scarcely any Melkite or Orthodox Patriarch left, unless perhaps in name only, as Ibn-Patrik or Patricides, himself the Melkite Patriarch of the Alexandrians, says at greater length for those times, edited by Selden. *Tome II. p. 387, etc.*

But hear how well the patrons of this seventh Synod agree among themselves! Neither the Nicene Acts, nor Theophanes up to that time, nor Anastasius, nor the Synodal Book mention who the Patriarch of Antioch and Alexandria were at

that time, or even of Jerusalem; they were obscure at that time if they existed at all, hence the sees are vacant in the chronological tables of Theophanes. That Ignatius in Surius, the most impure writer of the Life of St. Tarasius forsooth, says that the Alexandrian was Politian, the Antiochene Theodore, and the Jerusalemite Elias. *Tome II*. But Photius, in his work on the Seventh Synod, says that the Patriarch of Alexandria at that time, by whom Thomas is said to have been sent, was called Apollinarius, while the Antiochene, by whom John was sent, was Theodoritus. And from this you may understand the lust for invention among the Iconolaters. For first, that Politian is entirely absent from the series of Alexandrian Prelates, neither in the Byzantines, nor in Patricides of Alexandria, nor do the writers of Coptic history mention him, from whom, after the publication of the *Chronicon Orientale*, Van Lobrega, a Dominican in the city of Cairo, described the catalogue of the Coptite Patriarchs. *Hist. Eccl. Alex. Part. VI*. But neither is Apollinarius, if there was any Alexandrian of this name, referred to the times of Irene, but to those of the Emperor Justinian, long before, to be sure, even in Theophanes who mentions him, as also in Patricides in his *Annals of Alexandria. Tome II*.

Moreover, Theodore of Antioch, who is said to have sent John away, is placed on that throne from the first year of Constantine Copronymus, 751 of the Incarnation, although the tables of Theophanes refer to the year 743, being deficient, as has been observed by the learned, by a whole eight years. *Theoph. Chron. Ed. R. p. 358*. And Theodore sat for only six years, according to Theophanes, until the 16th year of Constantine, when he was deported into exile and driven from his See, because he was believed to be betraying the affairs of the Arabs to the Iconoclast Constantine. And who the bishop of Antioch was after this Theodore is uncertain; and that Theodoritus of Antioch in Photius is entirely different, not to be confused with Theodore, and is listed after him in Euty chius in the Annals. *Oriental Chronology, in Leunclavius. T. II. p. 411*. Furthermore, contemporary with Theodore of Antioch, among the Melkite Alexandrians, was not some Apollinarius, or Politian, but Cosmas in Theophanes, an idiot man, after the See had been vacant for ninety-seven whole years, as Euty chius says in more than one place. *T. II. Annal. p. 267*. After Cosmas, Balatianus of Alexandria is said to have followed, mentioned several times by the aforesaid Euty chius; but contemporary with Theodoritus of Antioch was Christophorus, also of Alexandria; Patricides Euty chius, himself the Patriarch of Alexandria in the 10th century, was well aware of this succession. Behold now with what faith those Patriarchs are related to the times of the Nicene Synod, or to those close to it, a whole thirty years after Theodore of Antioch ceased to sit, whom Cosmas, long before, preceded in the See of Alexandria, praised by Theophanes in the second year of Copronymus. You have also a new specimen of the most exact Maimbourgian faith, which he promised in the threshold of his *History of the Iconoclasts. Admonition*. He had said that having weighed everything most exactly, he would narrate each detail from the very sources and originals, having accused his preceding historians of negligence or infidelity.

VIII. But, they add, these monks also present to the Nicene Fathers a Synodal Epistle of Theodore of Jerusalem, to Theodore of Antioch and Cosmas of Alexandria, to be inserted into Action III of the same Synod! And in it, the Jerusalemite professes that he "adores the saints;" that in adoring he also "embraces the salutary Relics," handed down by Christ, the bones of the Martyrs, to which he attributes every kind of miracle and virtue, and indeed from Athanasius, through Christ dwelling in them; and finally that he "adores the Holy and venerable Images," the Icon of Christ, of the Holy Mother of God, of the Holy Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, Confessors, etc. And among the epithets of the Blessed Virgin is that of "our immaculate Lady." Theodore adds the damnation of those who would impiously contend that the images of the saints ought not to be adored, since they are man-made. But Maimbourg also adds that this profession of Faith, written by Theodore, was "received by two other letters written in return by the Patriarchs, Cosmas of Alexandria and Theodore of Antioch, which were in all respects conformable to that of Theodore." *Hist. Icon. L. III. p. 420.* Baronius adds further that those monks "had with them the pamphlets of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch themselves, namely letters written on that topic to Theodore, Bishop of Jerusalem, when they had received from him, newly created, as is the custom, a Synodal Epistle on the profession of the Catholic faith." *Ad Ann. DCCLXXXV, N. XLI.*

You would believe them again as they narrate, but do not hasten to believe, and have faith only in your own eyes. We will dispatch the matter in a few words, to prevent tediousness. 1. Note that in the Nicene Acts, with even Baronius and Maimbourg confessing it, this Theodore is represented as having died very recently, to whom the Legates of Irene had even been sent, but hearing there that "Theodore the Patriarch of Jerusalem was already deceased," so the Cardinal says. *Ad Ann. DCCLXXXV, N. XL. Ibid. p. 420.* And yet that Theodore of Jerusalem, with Theophanes as witness, occupied that See at the time when Cosmas presided over Alexandria, and Theodore over Antioch. *Chron. Ed. R. p. 365.* Of whom, Cosmas was already Patriarch in the year of Christ 742, as Baronius also notes for that year; the other was driven from his see in the year of Christ 757, having sat for six years, as Theophanes is the authority. *Baronius ad A. 751, N. ult.* Euty chius also refers that Theodore of Jerusalem, to whom Elias was successor, to earlier times, when Justinian II was reigning, and the Chaliph Walid I. *Annal. T. II. p. 376.* The Synodal book mentions a Synod held under this Theodore of Jerusalem against Leo, soon after the sign was raised against the images, which was done in 726. You see how well the Greeklings agree with each other, and with those Nicene Acts!

2. It is also strange that the chronicler Theophanes makes no mention either of this Synodal letter of Theodore, or of the responsive letters of the Alexandrian and Antiochene, or of their presentation by the monks. He who omitted none of those things that would add authority to the Nicene Synod and weight to Iconolatry, being the standard-bearer of the

Confessors, that is, of the Iconolaters. Yet he is not the one whose prayers to St. Nicephorus the Patriarch, another Confessor, which are plainly superstitious, are reported by the writer of the Annals in Tome X. *Ad Ann. DCCCXLV, N. IV*. For which reason Baronius mentioned these letters more sparingly, and in his example Maimbourg, who in his history of Action or Session III, reports only that the letters of Tarasius to the Patriarchs were read, and their response to Tarasius. *Hist. Icon. p. 434*. The same is done also by the History of the Council prefixed to the beginning of Tome VII of the Councils, with the letters of Theodore being silent.

3. But also the tenor of the letters betrays a "Gree-king" Iconolater author, effusively superstitious. Most mendaciously it reports that the bones of the Martyrs, the Relics, were handed down by Christ as salutary fountains, and that he even dwells in them. He also abuses the name of Athanasius, just as that Peter of Nicomedia did in the Fourth Action of the Nicene Synod, mentioning as from a pamphlet of Athanasius the fable about the image of Christ in the city of Berytus being transfixed by the Jews and emitting water and blood. A similar abuse is made of Moses, as if the Cherubim, and the Mercy-seat, and the Ark, and the Table were constructed for adoration, which argument the Nicaeans also used, with Charlemagne in Book I accusing the argument of the utmost absurdity and dementia. The same, contrary to the use of antiquity, certainly genuine antiquity, calls the Blessed Virgin "our immaculate Lady," an epithet that for Paul and the Fathers had been Christ's. And the more recent Iconolaters, in order to pursue the image of the Virgin and of Christ with an equal worship of adoration, and to excite minds to that worship, perpetually called her "immaculate," "all-spotless," "all-blameless," etc. To refute each of these points in the epistle of the Jerusalemite, if it is permissible to believe it is his, is not the place here for many words. *T. VII. Conc. Col. 919*.
4. Again, the reason for this supposition is the same as that of the prior one in the Roman Synod, if what Hadrian says in his epistle to Charles, indicated before, is true. For in this one too, the letters of this Theodore of Jerusalem are said to have been read, plainly fictitious, and by the very character of the oration and the matters arguing a forgery. But also the same were to be promulgated as the Synodal letter of the three Patriarchs of the East. The letters are also of a different tenor from those which are said to have been presented to the Nicaeans, and they flatter the Roman, as being the Rock and Peter, as Baronius describes it, to the year 769, Num. IX. Besides those things which Charlemagne castigated in this Theodore's profession, in Book III of his Capitulary on Images.
5. Wondrous also is the presumption of Baronius in affirming, and hence of Louis Maimbourg, when they imagine that there existed at that time letters of this kind from the Alexandrian and Antiochene to Theodore, of a like tenor with the letters of the Jerusalemite, and with a like

approbation of image-worship. There is nothing of the kind in the letters of the Palestinians, but only that Theodore had received "anti-synodical" letters while he was alive. Indeed, the writer of the Annals says that the Palestinian monks had those pamphlets with them in the Synod, though they are certainly not mentioned in the Acts, nor read anywhere. This would have been done above all, as those pamphlets would have been far more efficacious than letters written by the hermits of Palestine, if there was anything of this kind in them for the cause of images. Not to mention that Cosmas of Alexandria is described in the *Alexandrian Annals* as an idiot, who could neither read nor write, his one art being to make needles, according to Patricides.

6. What they add concerning the delegation made by Elias of Jerusalem obtains similar belief, this Elias being silent to Theophanes himself and to the Palestinian monks; whom they also confess was a contemporary of Theodore of Antioch, long before these times, as was just seen. And indeed Elias in the chronological series of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem is referred to the times of Constantine Copronymus, at least from the 17th year of his reign, in which, according to Theophanes, Theodore was moved from his see; but in the Chaliphate of Hesham, according to Patricides. This Hesham or Hisham, Maimbourg himself placed above as a contemporary of Leo the Isaurian. *Vide Sect. II. Num. IV. p. 119.*
7. Finally, that constant faith and ancient tradition of the churches throughout Egypt, the East, and Palestine concerning the adoring of images, relics, etc., which is claimed among them, is most false. By what definition, therefore, of the prior Synods of the East? By what consensus of the Greek Fathers, if you except the sentences of certain Fathers depraved by the Nicaeans, and most stupidly indeed, as the Caroline Capitulary shows in many places in the second book, and we below? Whence, therefore, in the Constantinopolitan Synod in which the Iconolaters were condemned, thirty-three years before, was the opposite tradition shown, as has been seen at length from the Acts in my third Section? Whence did all the bishops with consonant voices say, "we all believe so, we all think the same, etc. This is the faith of the Apostles, this is the faith of the Fathers"? *Tome VII. Conc. Col. 531.* Whence also did the same Latins themselves judge, Charlemagne, the Frankfurians, the Gauls, appealing to the tradition of the Fathers against the Nicaeans? But also we have seen Hadrian himself recently profess, in his Response to the divine sacred letter of Irene and Constantine, that all the peoples in the East had hitherto erred in this cause of images. And does perhaps the single voice of the monks of that age, who, as they were born to all superstition but also ignorance, were thus inflamed with a certain fury against Copronymus, the scourge of the inert crowd, lend faith to that Iconolatric tradition? Or the bare assertion of Tarasius, or of this or that Gree-king among the Nicaeans, that an "ancient custom" had been subverted by Leo

and by Constantine, as Tarasius alleged before his entry into the Patriarchate, in an Oration delivered to the People? *Supra Sect. V, p. 333*. We grant, indeed, that that custom had gradually prevailed, especially from the sixth and seventh centuries, as the supports of the Nicaeans sufficiently teach, who certainly produced no witness from the prior centuries. *Infra Num. XI, XII, XIII*. And when images then began to be in sacred use, erected in public temples, no worship of prostration, of candles, of fumigations was exhibited to them, but these things were gradually introduced, as recent French writers, and they Catholic, expressly state in the Dialogue in which they scourge the Maimbourgian Histories. *Entret. d'Eud. p. 138, 139*. Nor was the superstition of images ever objected to Christians, either by the ethnics before the Emperor Constantine, or by the Jews before the 5th or 6th century; but that the Jewish writers did so especially around the 11th century, the same men agree and grant. Concerning the practice of the fourth century, and of the mature fifth, certainly in the East, Spain, Cyprus, and Africa, we have spoken copiously in the preceding parts, in Section I. Concerning the image of Edessa, or the statue of the Savior at Paneas, more still later in response to the Nicene objection. *Hac Sect. Num. XIV*. Behold for yourself the Iconolatric prescription! *Num. IV, V, VI, VII, VIII*.

IX. That we may pursue the individual and indeed tumultuous Actions of this Synod, the importunity of the recent Alexander and Maimbourg commands it. Who would believe that this entire cause, which had exercised the Constantinopolitan Fathers with most diligent examination for the space of a semester under Constantine V, was dispatched by these Nicaeans in the interval of a few days, and in a few sessions which they call Actions, with a wondrous rapidity, as happens with factionalists, and with an incredible impetus for brandishing anathemas? The first Session, to be sure, began on the 24th of September, by their own admission, and the Sixth on the 5th of October, in which an end was put to the examination of the whole cause, with the sentence soon to be delivered in the Seventh Session. In the very first session, dire imprecations were immediately made against the heresy of the Iconoclasts, forsooth, which had not yet begun to be examined, by those very bishops who shortly before had devoted the cult of images to destruction. This having been done, a place for sitting and voting was at last granted to them, with no one being admitted into the assembly unless he was a conspirator. But it is most false what, after Baronius, Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander assert, that in the first Action, the letters of Hadrian were read, as if convoking the Synod, or directing it, which for them is the Synodal Law of all Ecumenical Synods. *Book III, p. 432. On the Heresy of the Icon. Art. IV, p. 87*. They give words, while they give their own. On the contrary, in Action I, only the letters of the Emperors were read, by whose command they had convened in the Synod. But in Action II, the letters of Hadrian were at last read, as of the Pope, or Prelate, or Archbishop of Old Rome, everywhere with that restriction. And these letters indeed were both those that

were testimonies of his obedience to the Sacred letter of Constantine and Irene, and in the manner of a supplicatory pamphlet for the restoring of images; and others in response to the Synodal letter of Tarasius, "Most Holy and Universal Patriarch," as he is called by the Synod. And concerning these letters, Tarasius is asked by the Legates whether he consents, to which he will answer that he consents and confirms. *Tome VII. Concil. col. 127.* But concerning the letters of the Easterners read in Action III, as of the three Patriarchs, which their vicars had presented, this has been discussed at length now in this Section, with the faith of Baronius, Natalis, and Maimbourg exposed in the light of men. *Num. VI, VII.* And again in this third Action, the Greeks partly erupted into anathemas, before the examination of the cause itself, and partly into adulatory voices, by which they rose for the Patriarch Tarasius, according to the custom of the Greeks.

And finally in Actions IV, V, and VI, there is some appearance of arguments for the cult of images, and of a disputation instituted against the Iconomachs. But what supports for the cause? what arguments? what gravity either of matters or of words? Let the Capitulary of Charlemagne, approved by the Synod of Frankfurt, that is, by the Italians, Gauls, Germans, Spaniards, and also the Britons whose opinion Alcuin expressed, speak. They call them either twisted from the Scriptures, or unlearnedly produced from the Fathers, or dug up from the Apocrypha, or resting on frivolous examples, little histories, fables, and petty reasonings, throughout the whole work: "most inept, most false, most absurd, most demented, most insane, worthy of laughter, covered with sloth, lacking reason and sense, not a mediocre sluggishness, insanity, foolishness, malignity, dull conjectures, most stupid sayings, an execrable error, obsolete from ancient paganism, the Scriptures usurped for foreign senses, almost no testimony of the divine tips of the pen aptly placed, the sentences of the Fathers mutilated, depraved, disturbed in order, sense, and words, apocryphal trifles, worthy of derision," etc. *Apud Goldastum, Germ. I. C. XXV. n Lib. II. C. IX, XIX. o Lib. III. X. XXX.* The matter will be made more evident by more illustrious examples, because there is no shame in Maimbourg, none in Natalis Alexander, in either replacing the same arguments, everywhere urging them, or certainly commending them, in the history of the individual Actions. *Nat. T. XIV. p. 87. Maimb. L. II. p. 434. &c.*

X. Do you want arguments from Moses for the religious cult of images, or *proskynesis*, produced either in the letters of Hadrian to the Emperors, in Action II, or by the Palestinian monks, by Tarasius, or by the most ignorant Gree-klings, in the third, fourth, and fifth Actions? "Abraham adored the People of the Land. Moses adored Jethro. Jacob erected a title to God. In the form of a man he wrestled with Israel. Jacob kissed the worn-out garment of Joseph. The same adored the top of his staff. The same blessed Pharaoh. Moses made the Ark of the Testament, the Mercy-seat, the Cherubim, the Brazen Serpent to be looked upon. He gave the Tables of Testimony. He commanded a work to be perfected of gold and silver. There was to be purple of hyacinth on the fringes of the

garment." And if there are more of that kind from Moses, to which the Caroline Books occur distinctly one by one. And since no argument was more familiar to the Iconolaters than that from the Cherubim, and from the Ark of the testimony, and from the Brazen Serpent, which is also the perpetual shield of our writers, Charlemagne insists on them at length, but he is to be dissimulated in this part by those who would re-cook death, Natalis Alexander and Louis Maimbourg. *Lib. I. C. XVIII, XIX, XX. Lib. II. C. XXVIII. Differt. VI. Art. I. T. XIV. Lib. III. p. 746.* Charlemagne urges that that was a time of shadows, of figures; that those symbols were indeed instituted by God, but not images; that they had arcane and mystical senses, not images; that we have in truth spiritually what the Jews had carnally in figure; that the true Ark, the true Mercy-seat is to be sought by us, not on painted panels, or walls, but in the inner chambers of our heart, to be beheld by the eye of the mind; that there is a great difference between the Ark of the Covenant and images; that the two Testaments were signified by the two Cherubim; that the Brazen Serpent was indeed placed on high, but certainly not to be adored, and that when this was done, King Hezekiah broke it with most laudable example, and took away the vain superstitions; that thus neither the Ark itself was adored, nor the Tables, nor the Cherubim, although they were placed in the Sanctuary, and were worthy, like the Sanctuary itself, of veneration. See the rest there, for this is not the place to dispute. And a huge difference was long ago observed by the Pontificals themselves: "They are painted not only to be shown, as the Cherubim formerly in the Temple, but to be adored." *Cajetan in 3. p. q. 25. A. 3.* And the recent Frenchmen of Port Royal: "The use of images under the new Law is one thing, the Cherubim and the Brazen Serpent under the Old Testament is another." *Entret. p. 136.*

Now receive what things from the remaining books of the Old Testament these Nicaeans claimed for the cult and adoration of images. Joshua son of Nave set up twelve stones in memory of God. Nathan adored David. Solomon made oxen and lions in the Temple. The bride says, "Show me thy face." "There shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of Egypt." And David everywhere: "Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house." "The light of thy countenance is signed upon us, O Lord." "As we have heard, so have we seen." "Adore his footstool, for it is holy." "Adore at his holy mountain," and more from the Psalms, and the Roman Pontiff Hadrian himself in his own writings. Let prophecies also come against the Iconoclasts. "How great evils hath the enemy done in thy sanctuary," about those who would overthrow Jerusalem and the Temple, says the Capitulary. "For there is no longer any prophet, and he will know us no more." "O Lord, in thy city thou shalt bring their image to nothing." "That the just may not stretch forth their hands to iniquity." "They have forsaken me, the fountain of living water, and have digged to themselves broken cisterns," etc. Nay, hear a prophecy, about the association of Hadrian with the Patriarch Tarasius against the Iconomachs! John, the legate of the Easterners forsooth, proffers in Action II: "Mercy and truth have met each other, justice and peace have kissed." *T. VII. Conc. col. 348.*

But in the books of the New Testament, what do you suppose were the supports for venerating images for these most grave Fathers? "No man lighteth a candle, and putteth it under a bushel." "That seeing the good works of the Saints, they may glorify the Father who is in heaven." "The woman touching the hem of the Lord's garment, received her desired health." "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow." "The first tabernacle was made, in which were the candlesticks, and the table, and the setting forth of loaves," etc. It is tiresome to describe the rest, nor is it necessary; Jerome used to say of the Montanists, that a brief speech should subvert every single delirium they proffer. *Epist. ad Marcell. T. I.* But where, the Westerners used to ask, was it instituted by the Apostles, by examples or words, to adore images, as they prattle? Did Peter perhaps institute it? or John? or Paul? or Barnabas? or an Evangelist? And how great an absurdity would it be to equate images either with the Body and Blood of the Lord, or with the mystery of the Lord's Cross, or with the sacred vessels, or with the books of Divine Scripture, when these are not adored, nor painted but written, and proceeding from God himself, "so that in them we might learn the erudition of spiritual doctrine"? Surely we have never been admonished to be taught that in images, pictures, and statues. All these things are in the same Caroline books in several chapters, especially from the 25th chapter of the Second Book, which you may see in Tillius or Goldastus if you please. And in Book I, near the beginning of Chapter I: "Almost no testimony of the divine tips of the pen was aptly placed in the aforementioned Synod."

XI. The futility of this Pseudo-Syllogus—if I may use a word familiar to those Nicaeans—is equal in eluding the passages of Holy Scripture by which the Iconomachs defended themselves. To the passage from Moses, repeated by the Savior, "Thou shalt worship thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," they except more than once, the Patriarch Tarasius himself: it is indeed said, "thou shalt serve God only," but not "thou shalt adore only;" that to adore is an act of honor, whence if images are to be honored, they are also to be adored, as if these things were convertible. To the Mosaic interdiction, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness," the men respond that Moses meant that the idols of the Egyptians were not to be made, that demons, the sun, the moon, quadrupeds, and alien gods were not to be served, and that this has nothing to do with the images of Christians. To the precept of Christ about adoring God in spirit and in truth, the men have a ready answer: surely the invisible and incomprehensible essence of God is not to be fashioned with colors; but neither is that *latria* which befits God alone to be rendered to images. *Act. VI. col. 467.* To those words of Paul, about the glory of the incorruptible God being changed into the likeness of a corruptible image, the Fathers have an immediate escape: Paul speaks only of the sacred rites of the Egyptians, Persians, and Gentiles, who served living creatures, reptiles, birds, the sun, fire, creatures, and idols. The apostle does not forbid Christians their own images and likenesses, the honor of which they transfer to the one God, having been redeemed from the error of idols. *Ibid. col. 467.*

And no exception is more specious to the Nicaeans than that which belongs to all Iconolaters, to be re-presented time and again by Maimbourg: that the worship of *latria* is not exhibited to the image, as if it were of a divine nature, as if to God; nor do they adore the colors, the wax, the panel, with an absolute and supreme worship of the image; but they adore the image with the worship of *proskynesis*, with relation to the prototype, to him whose image it is, "because the honor of the image passes on to the principal." As to what Charlemagne, what the Frankfurians, what the Gauls soon thought of this evasion, and how little the Nicaeans and all who have supported Iconodulia were consistent with themselves, with their very practice convicting them, there will be a place to speak below according to the measure of this History, where it will not be ungrateful to have observed Maimbourg reconciling the Nicaeans with the Frankfurians, and with the Caroline Books. *Act. IV. T. VII. p. 261.*

XII. Why should I now mention the Fathers of the Church, produced unlearnedly and fraudulently in that Pseudo-Syllogus! One or two examples will again make it plain with what integrity the recent men, Natalis and Maimbourg, may harp on the Synod having been safe in the tradition of the Fathers and the Church, everywhere asserted and demonstrated. Excellently did King Charles say in his Capitulary, on the occasion of a passage of Ambrose twisted by the Nicaeans to the adoration of images: "They will most easily dare to misuse the sentences of the Holy Preachers, who do not fear to misuse the oracles of the Divine Law and the Prophets, nor will they dread to inflict a certain violence on the documents of the juniors, who do not dread to inflict injury on the doctrines of the seniors, nay on the seniors themselves."

Let the first be, for the sake of example, Athanasius, produced by Peter, Bishop of Nicomedia, in the Fourth Action of the Synod, and to be read by Stephen the Deacon, from a "Pamphlet on the Passion of the Image of Christ in Berytus." The sum is that a certain image of Christ in that city of Syrian Phoenicia, after the Jews had raged against it in mockery of the Cross, finally emitted, upon being struck with a lance, a multitude of blood and water; whence thereafter infinite other miracles, and the conviction of those very Jews, and finally their conversion. The French nephew of Loyola calls it a "celebrated miracle, in the sight of infinite witnesses who were irrefragable, which cannot be denied without the highest impudence." *Book III, p. 435.* O Jesuit mouth! It now accuses of impudence the King of the Franks, Charles, and all the Gauls, Germans, and Italians who sided with Charles at that time. For they, in their books IV, chapter XXX, and V, chapters X and XI, call this and other little narratives of its kind, with which the Nicene Acts luxuriate, "Apocryphal and laughable nonsense," and they "turned their foot to the waters, when they saw that the testimonies of the Divine Law were incompetently applied, frivolous, sought from Apocryphal books, to be spurned, dreams, delirious ravings, etc." Indeed, the Jesuit himself accuses the Greeklet of falsehood for reporting the matter as if from a writing of Athanasius; for he says, following Baronius for the year 787, that this Berytan

miracle had happened recently at that time, in the time of the Nicenes, which Sigebert also in his Chronicle, for the year 765, says happened in the time of Emperor Constantine and his wife Irene. Whence then was it mentioned by Athanasius, four hundred years before, and even more? And whence, moreover, does Maimburgius say that this whole affair happened at that time, with those witnesses? For the authority of one Sigebert, perhaps, or of more recent writers, is not sufficient, when Theophanes, the Miscellanea, Cedrenus, and other Byzantines are silent. Also, if that deed was very recent, with the memory of the event most fresh, how could it be reported in the Synod as if from the testimony and book of St. Athanasius? Whence also does Tarasius, immediately after the reading of that miracle, deny that one should judge of the past from the reason of his own time, in which images were marked by no miracles? As noted in the Council proceedings, column 287: Μη τις εἴπη, τίνου ἕνεκεν αἱ παρ' ἡμῖν εἰκόνες οὐ θαυματουργοῦσι. "Let no one say, why do the icons that are among us not perform miracles?" He adds the reason, that signs are given to unbelievers. What wonder is it that no one in the Synod contradicted this little fable from Pseudo-Athanasius? But neither was there any contradiction to the very rich crop of apocryphal narrations of that sort, in the same and the following session, which a little later were rejected by Charles the Great and the Latins. And Maimburgius supposes that the most ardent Iconoclasts sat in that Synod, which was entirely assembled from conspirators, after the shameful defection to Tarasius of Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, Theodosius, Bishop of Amorium, Gregory of Neo-Caesarea, and others who had previously condemned idolatry.

Nor did this one portent please Maimburgius. He proves, with a like credulity, of course, the rest of the conglomerated delirious tales. For example, as if from a genuine monument of antiquity, there are brought forth from the first Nicene Act the images of Peter and Paul brought by Sylvester of Rome from the church where they had been erected, to Constantine the Great, who was suffering from leprosy. This fiction, rejected by all learned men, certainly in learned France, urged by Hadrian in his letter to the Augusti from the Pseudo-Acts of Sylvester, but of a sort to be unearthed from the archives in Rome in a later age, Charles rightly laughs at, and undoubtedly Maimburgius himself does too. And the Emperor of the Franks was right: if there were any truth to it, the images were brought to be seen, not to be adored. Thus, the reason of this learned century does not bear the fables about sacred images being donated by Constantine, or even about the image of Christ the God-Man, what Damascenus called the θεανδρικὸν χαρακτῆρα (theandric character), being impressed by the same Emperor on a coin.

Furthermore, those grave Fathers, as if from authentic writings and the prior records of the Church, but with the order everywhere inverted, confused, and preposterous, urge the following documents of images adored with profit. A history is recounted of an image of the Mother of God, for which a certain lamp

that was lit, upon suppliant prayer, remained unextinguished even into the sixth month. Another, about an image of Anastasius the Martyr, which was to miraculously heal a certain woman from Caesarea in Palestine, after preliminary apparitions and a prayer directed to the image. Others, about the images of the Blessed Virgin, of Cosmas, of Damian, of Euphemia the Virgin and Martyr, of Theodosius the Abbot, of Polemon, six hundred of this kind, through which voices were uttered, demons were put to flight, diseases were removed, chains were loosened, blood was emitted, the dead were raised, the sterile were made fecund, failing waters poured forth, insults offered to the images were most severely vindicated, and more of this sort which are the feverish dreams and old wives' delirious tales, which Maimburgius would have studiously rejected everywhere else, except in this cause.

Thus it is repeated once and again, in Action IV and V, as if from Sophronius of Jerusalem and from the *Limonarium*, the little story of a demon vexing a certain recluse, and stipulating that if he wanted peace from this struggle, he should cease adoring the image of the Mother of God. The recluse asks for time to deliberate, and reports the matter to his abbot, whose response was that it would συμφέρειν, be more expedient for him, to enter all the brothels in the city than to deny the adoration of the image of Christ or of his Mother. At these things, the Caroline Capitulary, in book IV, chapter XXXI, rightly recoils in horror at the “incomparable absurdity! O destructive evil! O madness etc.!”

XII. Nor do these Fathers omit among so many miraculous virtues of images, the bronze statue of Paneas, from Eusebius, and the image of Christ Θεότευκτος (God-made), from Evagrius, in which our Maimburgius and Natalis, after their Baronius, or Gretser, seem to place their chief defense. But we are not pleased to belabor a point already made. Long ago, Charles the Great was indignant at the Nicenes for having to fortify their cause with these fig-wood props. Thus, concerning the image or statue of Paneas erected by the woman, he first says the fact is doubtful, yet if it is to be believed that it was done. Then, it is not precisely the effigy of Christ that Eusebius affirmed it was, although some said so, much less that it was adored, or fashioned for the sake of adoration, but only for the cause of love and remembrance. Furthermore, either the woman was a Gentile, not yet freed from the cults of idols, and hence was imitating her own people in erecting statues of the dead—whence Sozomen called it a Χριστοῦ ἄγαλμα, a statue of Christ—or at least that woman was placed in the rudiments of her conversion, not yet capable of solid food, and therefore the deed was done incautiously, and not for anyone's imitation. Finally, what is added about the virtue of the herb growing up at its feet was not done so that the herb or the images might be adored. We omit what was observed long ago and put forth by Agobard of Lyons, that this was not a sign of religion or veneration, but rather of love and remembrance; by Henri de Valois, in his notes to Eusebius, that the thing was done ἀπαραφυλάκτως, inconsiderately, imprudently, contrary to Christian discipline; and, worth all the rest, by our own Jean Daillé, in his *De Imaginibus*,

book III, chapter III, on this little objection from Eusebius, and then from the author John of Antioch, Damascenus, and the Nicenes.

And the objection was all the less suitable for the Nicenes because they themselves—neither Germanus of Constantinople, nor Damascenus, nor any of the more ancient writers—had approved of τὰ ἀγάλματα, statues.

Likewise, the greatest of the Frankish kings sharply criticized those who brought up that θεότευκτος image of Christ, miraculously impressed on a linen cloth, or a sudarium, or a cloth, and sent, of course, by the Lord himself to Abgarus of Edessa with letters, about which the Nicenes and Hadrian I spoke after Evagrius. And Maimburgius, in book I, page 78, does not cease his frequent commendation of this image, adding also, that the matter rests on testimonies “against which nothing can be reasonably opposed,” undoubtedly bursting into laughter as he wrote. But Charles denied, even if the matter had happened in this way, that Abgarus had requested the image in order to adore it, or that the Lord had destined the image for Abgarus to be adored, as he argues in book IV, chapters X and XI. But Charles, moreover, rightly urges the silence of the Gospel history, in a matter more memorable than others. Add to that the silence of Eusebius, as far as the Edessan image is concerned, whatever he may say about the letters of Christ and Abgarus, which were rejected by Pope Gelasius. Added to this is the silence of Procopius in his history of the siege of Edessa by Chosroes, and of all the historians whatsoever who preceded Evagrius. The fable, therefore, was born in what was already an imaginary century, when superstition was gaining strength daily. And this they handed down from Evagrius Scholasticus, a writer of more than one fiction, at the end of the 6th century, and afterwards in the 8th century, Gregory II in his first letter to the Isaurian, and Damascenus, in book IV of *On the Orthodox Faith*, chapter XVII, but hesitantly: Φέρεται τις ἱστορία, ὡς ὁ Κύριος, “But a certain history is reported, as if the Lord, etc.” Hence the Nicenes, Hadrian I, Theophanes, Leo Grammaticus, Porphyrogenitus, Cedrenus, the Menologium, Xanthopulus, and who not, but most with very different circumstances. And that, of course, was the very image that was afterwards to be transferred to Constantinople under Constantine Porphyrogenitus, at which time iconolatry was firmly established in the East, in the 10th century. Baronius also urges, for the year 769, that mention was made of the same Edessan image in the Roman Synod, from the pseudo-letters, of course, of the Patriarchs of the East, about which we have discoursed a little before.

But we do not belabor matters already frequently dealt with, and our countrymen have prolixly exposed the origin, frigidity, and absurdities of this most vain fiction, against Baronius, Bellarmine, Pamelius, Gretser, and others, with that last one being especially insulting to Casaubon and Hospinian. And not a few of the more sensible men in Pontifical France itself have understood this, as can be seen after the Valois dialogues. And worth all of them, John Reyskius, a

Saxon Headmaster, a most learned man, has recently opposed another Syntagma, *On the Images of Christ*, to the Syntagma of Gretser, in which he pursues this argument diffusely, with the writings on both sides collated.

XIII. We would scarcely find a goal for this race, or an end to our labor, if we were to bring out into the open the absurd, jejune, preposterous, and also untrustworthy citations of the Nicenes, when they appeal to the Fathers. Do you want Gregory the Theologian as a patron of εικονοδουλείας (image-servitude)? Accept from his poem *περὶ ἀρετῆς* (On Virtue), in Action IV, column 206, in which he recounts the wonderful icon of Polemon, at the sight of which a certain woman who was called to lewdness, as this image was σεβασμία, venerable, was immediately suffused with shame, drew back her foot, and abstained from the lewd act. For Nazianzen there is speaking of the virtues of the Gentiles, and also of Polemon, an ethnic philosopher, the master of Zeno, about whom Laërtius writes. His image was certainly not sacred to Nazianzen, nor to be worshipped except by idolaters, nor to be compared with the image of God and the mediator of men, so says Charles the Great in book I, chapter XXI, nor was it certainly mentioned by that theologian to commend the use or Christian worship of images.

Do you want Chrysostom favoring the cult of images? A passage had to be produced, from an encomiastic sermon on Meletius of Antioch, in column 200, where he says that the memory of this bishop was so dear to the entire city that they even wore his icon on their rings, chalices, bowls, etc. How fitting, and to the point! Elsewhere, in column 259, from Chrysostom's sermon *εἰς τὸν νιπτήρα* (on the foot-washing), they urge the words in which he says that creatures, when they minister to man, minister more to the image of God, or to God whose image is in man: he adds a simile, that when the imperial image is honored, the character of the emperor is honored, not the panel or the picture. How do these things infer that God, or Christ, is rightly adored, according to his institution, with John, forsooth, teaching, wherever the image of Christ is adored!

Do you expect the agreement of the great Basil of Caesarea with the iconodules! Have it, from his sermon against the Sabellians and Arians, in column 261. Namely, intending to prove one principle, the substantial unity in the Holy Trinity, he teaches that the Son is indeed the image of the Father, begotten of the Father, but is nevertheless one and the same substance with the Father. He adds a simile, from an imperial image, about which if it is said, "this is the Emperor," the Emperor is not thereby deprived of his principal appellation of Emperor, nor from this do you gather that there are two Emperors. Who besides the Nicenes would have concluded from this metonymical way of speaking, by which the image takes the name of its prototype, the erection and religious worship of images in temples? For as to what others urge as from Basil, a passage from a letter to Julian, in which the adoration of images is ascribed to apostolic

tradition, the more learned among the Pontificals have professed that it is inscribed with his name through fraud.

Do you want arguments that they might wrest for the iconolatric cause from Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Asterius, etc.? You will have the cited places, in which images or pictures are mentioned by pious men, expressing in living colors the history of Abraham, the sacrifice of Isaac, the passion of Christ, the martyrdom of Barlaam, or of Euphemia the Virgin; etc. Nowhere will you have them worshipped or honored. And since Euphemia is mentioned, the Jesuit, in book II, page 291 of his *History of the Iconoclasts*, displays at length that the λείψανον (relic) of this latter, distilling a sacred balsam, was thrown into the sea by Constantine Copronymus, but that divine Providence led it to Lemnos, to be preserved for the sake of religion by so great a miracle, and to be revealed through a nocturnal vision. He adds an apostrophe to the Protestants, who are to be suffused with shame by the reading of this history, and are to observe that their ancestors were but copies (*des copies*) of that most wicked of mortals, Constantine, whom they expressed most exactly in doctrine and example. How prudently, moderately, and opportunely, concerning an insipid fable from Theophanes, which, we know for certain, he laughed at in his sleeve while he rehashed it after Baronius for the year 766, number IV. For whenever miracles, or visions, or apparitions of this sort occur, Maimburgius is almost always accustomed to so occupy the reader as to make the faith of it ambiguous, whether the thing truly happened so, or whether it proceeded from those who were too credulous; or from the power of imagination; or from historians who did not weigh the matter enough; or who consigned it to writing with no proof of the matter, with no suitable witness. So in his *History of the Holy War*, both elsewhere throughout, and where he speaks of the miracles attributed to St. Bernard, as on page 319: "Far be it," he says, "that in those times they were of such exact diligence as we are today in the examination of such matters. Often they think excessive credulity is a merit; I believe everyone is free to opine in such matters as he pleases." And recent Frenchmen, and Pontifical ones at that, in a dialogue on the writings of Maimburgius, having noted this levity in the man, say: "The argument from miracles is fallacious: because without revelation it does not certainly stand whether what is narrated as a miracle is true or false," with the authority of Augustine against the Donatists, and of Tertullian against the Gentiles, being alleged.

But we are called back to the Nicenes. And lest the authority of a Universal Synod be lacking, they produce a canon of the Sixth Synod, which is the 82nd. The sum of the canon is that Christ is badly represented, in certain images, under the form of a Lamb pointed out by the finger of John; by which very thing the practice of the Roman Church is condemned, as Caesar Baronius confesses, for the year 692, number XLIV, and hence that canon was utterly disapproved. The Trullans therefore define: that Christ ought to be entitled, ἀναστηλοῦσθαι, or figured κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον χαρακτῆρα, in human form. For the sake of worship, or

προσκυνήσεως perhaps? Hear the Fathers! No, πρὸς κατανόησιν τῆς ταπεινώσεως τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ εἰς μνήμην τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ, &c. “for revolving in the mind the humility of the Word, from that height of divine loftiness, and for the memory of his conversation made in the flesh, and of his passion, death, and redemption.” If images had remained within these limits, whether in the East or in the West, although Christ and Paul enjoined on us another way of remembering, and if there had never been any danger of religious worship being offered to images, they would certainly not have been cast down by Leo, nor prohibited in his Seventh Synod, nor would the troubles that the fury of the iconolaters stirred up have afterwards arisen. We omit what these Nicenes bring forth from later writers, of the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries, such as from Leontius of Cyprus, Sophronius of Jerusalem, Symeon the Stylite, Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus, Gregory II of Rome, at which time all things everywhere began to be filled with fables and superstitions, in both parts of the world. Besides the fact that not a few things were fabricated by the iconodules under these names, or that apocrypha were taken by them for true things, as is clear from Damascus alone, who was exceedingly prone to superstitions.

Caesar Baronius may say, for the year of Christ 31, number LXXV, on the occasion of the hemorrhaging woman of Paneas: “Furthermore, John Damascus recounts, from the chronicle of John, Bishop of Antioch, that a suppliant petition was offered to Philip the Tetrarch of the region of Trachonitis, that for the benefit she had received, she might be permitted to erect statues as a perpetual monument of that event.” But since the reliability of his writing wavers in many things, and NB. is known to abound with numerous lies, we have thought it unworthy to weave it into these our pages. You have the Nicene consensus of all Christian antiquity, which recent historians are not at all ashamed to extol with praises; but Charles the Great hissed it off as illusory and fraudulent, because the sentences of the Fathers, if any were genuine, were everywhere perverted in order, sense, and words, especially in Book II of his Capitulary. But what would have been most worthy of Maimburgian and Alexandrine observation, these same Nicenes, from the innumerable witnesses they produce in the fourth or fifth Action, produced no Father from the first three centuries, to whom the first place in this cause was certainly due. Whence all that Apostolic Tradition which they boast of, finally comes down to this, that it must be sought from two or three centuries at most; and the same, when they rise to that point, must be taken as concerning only the use of images, gradually introduced into the churches.

XIV. But so that you may finally know the gravity, piety, sanctity, exactitude, order, orthodoxy, and whatever other encomia are in Maimburgius, of this assembly of Tarasius and the Nicene pseudo-synod, both concerning the method of the whole process and concerning the definition and sentence itself, a word remains for us to add. First, so that it may be established that no bishop

had a free vote unless he was a conspirator, immediately in Action I, before even the letters of Hadrian and what they call the synodical letters were read, those who had previously condemned idolatry under Copronymus solemnly recant and profess it. This having been done, and deliberation having been had, the Synod finally decrees that those who have returned from heresy be admitted. Second, in the published Confessions of Faith, such as that on the occasion of Basil of Ancyra, the principal articles of the Christian faith being passed over in silence—for instance, the Mystery of Redemption, the Remission of Sins, the Resurrection, eternal life—there scarcely appears anything but a confession of the Lady Mary, of angels, of saints, of images, of relics, and of rendering religious worship to them, under the names of seeking intercession, veneration, adoration, and salutation. The confession of Theodosius, Bishop of Amorium, professing nothing but iconodulia, begins: “I confess, and promise, and receive, embrace, and adore principally the undefiled icon of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the icon of the Mother of God etc.”

Thus the remaining confessions, in Action III, of John of Ephesus, Constantine of Cyprus, Euthymius of Sardis, Peter of Nicomedia, Hypatius of Nicaea, Stauracius of Chalcedon, and the other bishops in succession: all of them, before any debate of the cause, before the Scriptures were weighed, the places of the Fathers consulted, the iconoclasts heard, their arguments weighed—which finally happens in the session that immediately preceded the definition, namely the Sixth—all to a man confess, embrace, salute, and adore the venerable images, some even “receiving them with their whole heart,” and with an “embraceable adoration.” Charles the Great, in book III, chapter III, charged this latter with impiety, and rightly, teaching that the Catholic Church receives with its whole heart the mercy of God, God, Christ, who is our peace, etc. Third, those pious and Christian Fathers immediately erupt, at the very threshold of the assembly, into dire anathemas and horrendous execrations, to be hurled in every single action and almost in every vote, against Constantine, against Leo, against all the Fathers of the Seventh Synod; and thus against all the Fathers of the Church, or Synods, such as the Council of Elvira certainly was, by which that ἐπιτήδευμα, “the business concerning images,” in introducing them into churches and the cemeteries of the saints, was disapproved and condemned. This levity of anathemas and devotions, compared with the definition of the Seventh Synod under Copronymus, ought to have been all the less approved by Maimburgius, because in these matters he professed himself to be one of those who consider the use, or even the veneration, of images to be a free and indifferent matter, and not of the essence of religion. Whence Charles, and with Charles the members of the Frankfurt synod, detested with the bitterest words this impotent lust for imprecation of the Greek Fathers, which was almost a madness.

Fourth, whoever has just read the Acts and paid attention to the preposterous order of the interlocutors, the alien testimonies, the insipid judgments, the inept acclamations, the everywhere present monastic ignorance, and the vehemence

of the affections, which are poured out now into absurd and immoderate praises, now into contumelious and slanderous words, will judge that it was a gathering of men acting like Greeks rather than a synodal assembly. Fifth, of the six sessions just mentioned, in which the entire process of the cause is seen, the first three concluded in the reading of the imperial, patriarchal, and Roman letters, and those which they supposed were from the thrones of the East; the two following were spent in producing the witnesses I have mentioned, either alien, or suspect, or domestic, and truly *συκίναις ἐπικουρίαις* (fig-leaf aids). The sixth was entirely taken up with reading the *ἀνασκευή*, the (so-called) refutation, of the Seventh Synod, written and adorned long before the synod, which was more truly, as is clear from the given specimens, a certain concatenation of injuries from the taverns and carts, and of captious arguments, of distortions into a most iniquitous sense, and of nearly puerile evasions. And finally, the Nicene definition followed, in Session VII, which it will be worthwhile to set down from the Acts themselves, lest the Jesuit hereafter gloss it over with deceit.

XV. Namely, 1. it begins with an invective against the *ἀνιέρους*, the “impious” ones, who had violated the *ἐνθεον παράδοσιν*, the “God-given tradition” of the Catholic Church, and who had called the holy images *ξόανα σατανικῶν εἰδώλων*, “statues of satanic idols,” with an addition. When it is in the open that the Iconoclasts detested not the images in themselves, but with respect to their cult and adoration, and that they had called this superstition of the 7th Synod itself concerning images a seduction of the Devil. And indeed after Epiphanius, in his *Panarion*, who called it a *ἐγχείρημα διαβολικόν*, a “diabolical enterprise,” by which mortal nature, with images set before it, is as it were *θεοποιεῖσθαι*, or deified. 2. After prefixing the Creed, and then an anathematization of heresies and heresiarchs, among whom is Honorius the Roman Pontiff, they soon proceed to the traditions about images: and first they profess that they receive all of these in general, whether sanctioned in writing or without writing; that is, whether genuine or supposititious, whether old or fresh, whether read in writings or recited orally, and received by hearsay from these and those little women, monks, solitaries, and witnesses of that sort.

3. They sanction in particular that, just as the figure of the life-giving Cross, *σο τὰς σεπτὰς καὶ ἀγίας εἰκόνας*, the “holy and venerable images,” both painted and expressed in tessellated work, are to be set forth in the holy churches, on vessels, in houses, on roads, etc., under anathema; and thus that they ought to be exposed, sanctioning the necessity of images. And indeed they want images not only of Christ, or of the undefiled Virgin, or of the saints, but also of the *τιμίων Ἀγγέλων*, the “honorable angels.” 4. Furthermore, they define that worship is to be exhibited to them, and indeed in itself and properly, as Bellarmine confesses in his *De Imaginibus*, book II, chapter XXI, through *ἀσπασμὸν*, salutation, a religious kiss; through *τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν*, honorary adoration, as Maimburgius says on page 447, *adoration d'honneur & de respect*; through a *προσκύνησις* of such a kind as the

ζωοποιὸς σταυρός, the “life-giving cross,” is adored, as they add ἐξηγητικῶς (explanatorily); through θυμιασμάτων καὶ φώτων προσαγωγὴν, the “offering of incense and lights”; through τὸ σέβος, a term Zonaras uses for the Nicene decree, which is προσκυνεῖν, and also λατρεύειν, whence σέβας, σέβασμα, σεβάσμιος, in which sense they were called σεπτὰ εἰκόνες. Meanwhile, they except in appearance the ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, the “true latria,” such as is rendered to the divine nature.

4. Again, they teach that by adoring the image, they adore in this very act τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ ἐγγραφομένου, the “person or subsistence” of the one depicted in it, to wit, Christ. Whence it necessarily follows, with that Angelic Thomas affirming it in his *Summa*, part III, question 25, article 3, one of the four Doctors of the Church, and with him most and the more distinguished in the Roman Church, that the same reverence, cult, honor, and adoration is to be attributed to the image of Christ as to Christ himself. Since, therefore, Christ is adored with the adoration of latria, it is a consequence that his image is to be adored with the adoration of latria. And when the Greeklets decree the same adoration for the images as for the life-giving Cross, they have certainly decreed an adoration which is by latria, at least for the image of the crucifix, at least according to the doctrine and practice of Thomas and the Romanists before the Reformation arose. From which time they have learned to speak more cautiously, with various glosses of distinctions, the practice always remaining the same. Furthermore, since these Nicenes added their authority of approval to so many examples of images being invoked, throughout Action IV and V, and of salvation being sought from them, again, whatever the verbal evasions may be, it is in the open that they have also approved the cult of servitude. Whence Charles the Great, with this in view, said in book III, chapter XV: “They demonstrate that they profess one thing with their mouth, but believe another in their heart; they seem to be imposing a cloaked error upon the common people.” When they deny λατρεία to images, they add exegetically that λατρεία is denied as to the θεία φύσει, the “divine nature,” which is adored in spirit, which they do not want the images themselves to be considered, in case idols were at some time held for gods, and as if of a divine nature, in the mind of the Nicenes, by a crasser paganism. Which for Bellarmine, in his *De Imaginibus*, book II, chapter XXIII, section *Quod*, is that λατρεία is denied to images separately from their exemplar, but not as they are conceived conjoined with their exemplar. John, that vicar of the patriarchs of the East, had said to a certain passage of Basil, in Action IV, column 263, μίαν εἶναι προσκύνησιν, τῆς εἰκότος καὶ τοῦ Ἀρχετύπου, “that the adoration of the image and of the principal is one.”
5. Finally, they confirm with their own authority whatever things the members of that assembly, conspicuous among the bishops and monks, had repeated concerning the cult of images, their embraceable adoration,

their reception with the whole heart, their deific virtue, and prayers directed to them out of faith. Thus what the same had said about the necessity of this adoration, so that Theodore the Aeliot, to be praised by the Fathers in two places, in columns 251 and 383, considered it a far graver offense not to adore the image of the Mother of God than not to leave the brothels of the city, but to enter all of them for the sake of lust. Whence they conclude that all ecclesiastical traditions which they had received are to be held, and they decree that the same are to be held for true and legitimate, hurling bolts of anathema against those who decree otherwise, and against the Caiaphan Council of Copronymus. And so that all might understand by what spirit these Fathers were driven, they rise with foul and shameless adulation, at the end of the Acts, to the nefarious Irene as well, who to Maimburgius is total wickedness, and for whom he professes religion was a mask, calling her a new Helena, a prefulgent luminary for the faithful, and *Δαβιδικῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς πρυτανεύουσα*, “governing in all things in a Davidic and pious manner,” and guarding the Church.

XVI. Thus far, the history of the Nicene conciliabulum has been restored, everywhere from authentic documents. Nor will anyone easily restrain himself, the one from a sense of indignation, the other from more effusive laughter, who has observed the recent Jesuit, after having expounded a part of the Nicene decree in Part II, pages 447 to 457, twisting himself about, like a chameleon, as is commonly said, or trying to break through and slip away here and there, dissimulating many things, eluding others with little distinctions, now putting on this form, now that, and entangling himself in wondrous contradictions. For on the one hand, being well aware that he would have to deal with the Caroline Books and the Synod of Frankfurt, which were rightly to be opposed to this pseudo-Nicene one, as well as with the opinion of all the ancient Gauls, he explains the matter in such a way that he seems to cross over into their camp. Soon, lest he be believed to be receding either from the Nicenes or from his own Tridentines, and from the Society itself, having promised his readers they were blind and cross-eyed, he overturns to a man what he had conceded. And these things will have to be subjected to the readers below, where the writings and decrees of Charles and the Westerners against the Nicene doctrine have preceded, to be vindicated hereafter from recent cavils.

SECTION VII.

The success of the Nicene Synod, according to Maimburgius. The Jesuit's game. Irene's intention. Summary of the following history. On the opposition made by Charles the Great. The character and doctrine of this Prince. Why was he animated against the Synod? Who wrote it himself? Summary of the Books. The Synod of Frankfurt concurring with Charles. Its dignity. The Second Canon opposed to the Nicenes. The evasions of recent writers, all others having been repudiated. Maimburgius's caution, his chiding of his own, his splendid

promises about himself. A conspectus of the individual exceptions against the Caroline Books and the Synod of Frankfurt. First, that the Nicene Synod was not confirmed by Hadrian. The vanity and falsity of the Petavian evasion. Maimburgius *αὐτοκατάκριτος* (self-condemned). Hincmar objected in vain. His errors here also. Charles imitated Constantine the Great. The exception concerning the dissent of the Gauls rejected. Another, concerning Charles's hatred of the Greeks. Refuted. Do the Caroline Books not reflect the spirit of Charles the Great? The fight of the men among themselves. The principal exception, concerning an error of fact, which is also that of Petavius and P. de Marca. This is insisted upon. Did the Franks condemn only Latria, which is explained? The falsity of the matter shown at length from the Franks themselves. That they condemned every kind of adoration. That they also met cavils of this sort. The more ingenuous princes in the *Adversaria*. But also the opposite concession of recent Gauls. Maimburgius's imposture, that Charles the Great made the cult of images free. Refuted from Charles and Gregory I. That he permitted only the historical use freely. That it is also disapproved in some places. Other evasions of Natalis Alexander. The falsity of all demonstrated. Was there an equivocation in the word Adoration? Or Servitude? Did they never place their hope in images? Another imposture of Natalis. That Charles the Great never said that some can make good use of the cult of images. The confession of those men about abuse and superstition. The exception concerning the error of Charles the Great and the Frankfurt synod, from the words of Constantine of Cyprus. Expounded at length. Many falsities and absurdities. Even assuming an error in the Latin version. Maimburgius's injury against the Synod of Frankfurt. Was the error afterwards detected by the Franks? The Petavian gloss on the Christianocategori of Damascenus. Who these were. What the cult of the pagans was like. The true opinion of Damascenus on images. Maimburgius's game concerning the supposed consensus of Charles the Great, Hadrian, the Nicene Synod, and Frankfurt. The candor of Maimburgius in this cause weighed. His given facts. Plainly adverse to the cause he argues. How he overturns each point in turn. His consensus with the Jesuitical school. Whence the monuments of this century lay hidden. Baronius's assertion. Conclusion.

I. The iconolatric assembly having been brought to the desired end for Irene and Tarasius, and also for Hadrian, at the close of October of the year 787, its decrees, if indeed you listen to the recent historian in his *History of the Iconoclasts*, at the end of Part II, were received with general applause by every order and every people, peace was restored to the church and the empire, a sweet tranquility appeared everywhere, and finally the ornament was restored to the churches, of which a nefarious heresy had despoiled them with sacrilegious daring. But while the Jesuit makes this preface, about to play with the reader, he immediately, with his mask removed, reports that right after the Synod, and after the fathers were dismissed, in that very same year, through the ambition, malice, and imperious nature of Irene, the empire was again precipitated into

new troubles, which would be equally destructive to religion and the empire. And this latter part is indeed true. For the iconoclasts were not suppressed by Irene for any other reason than that, safe in the applause and desires of a seemingly ecumenical council, of Patriarch Tarasius, and of the iconolaters and monks throughout the East, having also conciliated Pope Hadrian by that means, she might execute the hostile plans she was plotting in her mind against King Charles, and soon against her own son—the whole affair being in fact nothing but τέχνη καὶ δόλος (*par mille lâches artifices* - by a thousand cowardly tricks). And Maimburgius himself, in Book IV, pursues these things at length from Theophanes, Cedrenus, the Frankish Annals, or more truly from his own Baronius for the year 788, and the more recent writers whom he describes. Everywhere, however, he takes care for the security of both the iconolatric cause and that of Charles the Great, in whom as an ancestor and founder of Frankish power, the Jesuit knows that Louis the Great prides himself; hence he is also copious in describing the disaster that soon followed for Irene, as a reward, of course, for the sanctioned iconolatriy, and in describing the victory of the Franks. But we, setting aside those things which are outside the circuit of the history of images, being already more prolix than is proper, and ordered to hasten to the goal, will finish what remained for our undertaking.

Namely, we will briefly expound in the public light of history those things which followed the Nicene Synod in the cause of images, in this very 8th century and the beginning of the 9th. And thus, with what contention of minds, writings, and deeds, kings, emperors, synods, and all the most pious prelates, and the theologians and doctors imbued with the old discipline, opposed themselves in both parts of the world to the foul iconolatriy and to a Christianity that was rushing headlong into Hellenism.

II. We will gather the whole matter into a few points, beginning with the oppositions made in the West, so that our page may, in our own way, come to the aid of a history that is laboring and has been violated by recent writers, a history which, in Maimburgius's judgment, has not yet been sufficiently untangled or elucidated by anyone, because the offering is not made to truth but to affection.

Charles the Great, surrounded from his tender years by the wisest bishops, abbots, and doctors, among whom was Flaccus Albinus, who was also Alcuin, an Englishman by nation (whom the Annals report he used as a preceptor, a man most learned in the Scriptures and in all secular disciplines), had himself exhausted whatever was recondite in the science of sacred things, being more a master than a disciple, if anything seemed obscure or arduous, he would fill the place. That this prince was assiduous above all in turning over the Holy Scriptures of both Testaments, and was also most skilled in ecclesiastical antiquity, all historians with one voice, and the writers of the life of Charles, have recorded. But also that he devoted himself entirely to this care, by the

example of the pious kings David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, to conform faith and morals to the prescript of the Scriptures and the discipline of the ancient church. Whence those Capitularies of Charles the Great were expressed, by which he sanctioned that the study of the Holy Letters should be promoted in the bishoprics and monasteries, plainly around the time of the Nicene Synod, as found in Jacques Sirmond and Stephanus Baluzius: “We exhort you not only not to neglect the study of letters, but also with a most humble intention pleasing to God to learn for this purpose with emulation, so that you may be able to penetrate the mysteries of the Divine Scriptures more easily and more rightly.” In the Capitulary of Aachen, of the year 789, at which time he was occupied in refuting the Nicene Synod, he says in the preface: “For we read in the books of the Kingdoms, how the holy Josiah, by going around, correcting, and admonishing the kingdom given to him by God, strove to recall it to the worship of the true God.” And in chapter XX, he added a sanction, that no other books should be read in the church besides the canonical ones alone, according to Canon LIX of Laodicea. And soon, in the Capitulary of the following year, 790, prefixed to the books on images: “If anyone should evangelize to you beyond that which has been evangelized”—contained, that is (as he soon explains) in the prophetic, evangelic, and apostolic scriptures—“let him be anathema!”

Furthermore, the memory of the Synod held in Gentilly was recent for Charles, about which we spoke at length above, around the end of Pepin's life, which we have shown with invincible proofs of the matter, the Maimburgian glosses having been dispelled, was most alien at least from the cult and προσκύνησις of images. Let it therefore not seem new or strange to anyone that when the fame of the Nicene Synod reached Charles, and hence its Acts, he, indignant at the undertakings of Irene and Tarasius, by which, as stated in the preface to his Capitulary, they “were compelling the adoration of images,” with the zeal and study of the truth that was his, and also from his daily familiarity with learned and pious men, opposed to it a lengthy Capitulary. In which, indeed, while permitting images, contrary to the opinion of the prior Synod, for the ornament of churches and the memory of things done, he taught and commanded that God alone is to be adored, and he inveighed most sharply in five books against all adoration and cult of images, under whatever cloak of words, distinctions, and foolish inventions. In which Maimburgius confesses that one hundred and twenty chapters of accusation are proposed against the Nicene Council; and all historians and chronographers with one voice say that it was abdicated by Charles as a pseudo-synod.

And that Charles the Great undertook this work immediately, with Alcuin undoubtedly lending his labor, after he learned of Irene's decrees and deeds in the East, with the connivance of the priests in the kingdom granted to him by God, as prelates over the Catholic flocks, and that he completed it within almost three years elapsed since the synod was held, that is, toward the end of the year

790. The preface itself testifies to this. And that Charles passed that year at Worms, without any military expedition, with no other occupation than in the study of letters and what pertained to justice or piety, Mézeray has observed from the Annals and the Life of Charles. The work was to be published thereafter, a "not small volume," Hincmar called it, and to be confirmed in the Synod of Frankfurt in the year 794, about which later, and finally to be sent to Rome to Pope Hadrian I, through Abbot Angilbert and some bishops, in the same year 794. This is most certainly gathered from the inscription itself, from the second canon of Frankfurt, from the response of Hadrian, to be attached to the Latin collection of the Nicene Acts, from the synodical letter of the Synod of Paris, and from Hincmar of Rheims in his book to the other Hincmar of Laon.

III. King Charles was indeed stimulated all the more strongly to the examination of the whole cause, and also to apply his hand to the refutation of the Greeks, because he had it explored that the emperors themselves in the East, the kings of the oriental parts—on the one side Constantine Copronymus, on the other Irene the mother of the younger Constantine, that woman, the teacher and leader of the council—had been the principal architects of all the decrees and deeds in the cause of images. He was now about to draw his pen against both, both by himself and through his assistant bishops and priests, intending to reprehend sharply the levity of those who had broken the images, and far more sharply the dementia of those who had sanctioned that they be adored or venerated, which was his principal aim throughout the whole work. Whence also the Caroline Books, and hence the Fathers of Frankfurt, are not said to be opposed to the Constantinopolitan Synod against images, but to the Nicene Synod, held in Bithynia, the "Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks" ἐξόχως, to be destroyed and utterly abdicated. Mézeray, after all the chronographers who have mentioned the writing, says: *Charlemagne mesme écrivit, ou ordonna qu'on écrivit un Livre pour la combattre*; namely, that Charles the Great had attacked the Nicene Synod, and the adoration of images decreed in it, in a book written for this purpose. Although this last, because it was finally terminated in Constantinople, by the Constantinopolitan emperors, is called in the canon of Frankfurt, and in Eginhard, the Synod held or congregated at Constantinople.

Nor will we now gather in this place the great King's invectives, sarcasms, and obeli, in a perpetual series, against that Synod, against Irene, against Tarasius, against the Fathers, against their decree, against the most insane and most absurd arguments of the Greeks, against the depraved scriptures, Fathers, and history, and against the "apocryphal and laughable nonsense." This has been abundantly occupied, with frequent excerpts from the Caroline books, by our Daillé, in Book IV, chapter II of his *De Imaginibus*, by Forbes in his *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, Book VII, and by others, with the recent Natalis Alexander himself rehashing most of it, in the third century, in the dissertation which he inscribes against the Iconoclasts. And those four books are in the hands of all, not such as, Maimburgius craftily suggests, were published by a Lutheran

infector in the year 1549, but such as were edited by Jean du Tillet, Bishop of Meaux, and a most fierce champion of images, then by Melchior Goldast, in one volume of his collection of Imperial Constitutions, besides what is inserted in the refutatory letter of Hadrian and elsewhere. But why Binius, Sirmond, and Labbe did not exhibit them in their volumes of the councils, whether general or Gallican, the thing itself teaches, and Sirmond confesses in his note to the Frankfurt canon, because “our ancestors in the end condemned the Caroline Books by the fact itself.”

But that that Capitulary was approved by the Fathers of the Synod of Frankfurt, to which it is also wont to be ascribed, and in which Bellarmine would doubtless have it written, and whose authority the inscription also prefers, Hincmar, in his opusculum 55, called it a “general synod in Francia, convoked by the Emperor Charlemagne.” Baronius, Bellarmine, Sirmond, all ingenuous men have confessed it. Which synod was held, at the beginning of the age, in the year 794, with the emperor present and opening the synod, who had celebrated Easter at Frankfurt, with two legates of Hadrian present, Theophylact and Stephen, and about three hundred bishops from France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Britain, as the Jesuit confesses: whence the aforementioned prelate of Rheims wished it to be held as a universal or general synod. To be sure, the cause of Felix of Urgell and Elipandus of Toledo was to be dealt with again in that synod, a sentence having already been passed against them, even before the condemnation made by Hadrian in Rome, in the councils of Friuli and Ratisbon, as we have shown with more detail in our most recent Introduction, against the prejudices injected by Baronius and Natalis Alexander. But besides this, that the cause of images was dealt with in that synod, and the Nicene Synod condemned, which recent historians, after Petavius and others, would have us believe was only thought to be condemned, everything teaches: the constant faith of the annals and chronographers, asserted by others; the aforementioned Hincmar; the confutatory letter attributed to Hadrian I at the end of the Nicene collection; and finally, the Second Canon itself: “The question was brought forward concerning the new synod of the Greeks, which they held at Constantinople concerning the adoring of images”—or rather, they terminated and confirmed it there, in a kind of eighth session, according to Theophanes—“in which it was written that those who would not render service or adoration to the images of the saints, just as to the deific Trinity, should be judged anathema. Our most holy Fathers above, NB. refusing adoration and servitude in every way, contemned it, and consenting, condemned it.” And that condemnation was sent to Rome to Pope Hadrian, with the Caroline Capitulary, as was noted in the preceding paragraph. Which very thing, concerning the Nicene Synod (to which Hadrian had subscribed) being condemned by the Fathers of the Synod of Frankfurt, has been evinced and proved by a lengthy disputation against Alan Cope, Vasquez, Suarez, Binius, de Valentia etc., and worth all of them, by Jean Daillé, with the passage from Hincmar also being diffusely vindicated.

And because not even Natalis Alexander and Louis Maimburgius have dared to deny this, nor to maintain with Binius, Surius, Bellarmine, and others, that the Caroline Books did not have Charles as their author or promoter—such gross evasions of that kind having been rejected by them, and diffusely by the aforementioned Alexander in his Dissertation VII on the 8th Century—we therefore suppose both, as henceforth ratified and ὁμολογούμενον (agreed upon). And this one thing comes to be subjected in very few words to the eyes, and also to the judgment, of our readers: what different exception each historian has recently made from these, whether to those books of Charles the Great or to the second canon of Frankfurt, and what new κρησφύγετα (refuges) of the men seem to have pleased them above the others.

IV. Natalis indeed, more openly, lays out the way in which the champions of iconolatry should escape in these straits. The sum is this: the Caroline Books denied to images only the cult of latria, or absolute adoration, which is owed to God alone, being deceived by the equivocal word "adoration" approved by the Nicenes, and by the words of Constantius, Bishop of Cyprus, as they were read in Latin in the Acts of the same synod, about which later. And that Charles the Great did this all the more sharply, and was all the more inclined to believe these things about the Greeks, because he was offended by Emperor Constantine on account of the repudiation of his sister, whom he had betrothed to him. Whence political interests drew Charles the Great and the Gallican prelates into a party against the synod celebrated by the Greeks at Nicaea. And likewise, the Fathers of the Council of Frankfurt condemned the seventh synod by an error of fact, thinking that the adoration of latria, which is owed to God alone, had been decreed for images by the Second Nicene Synod: and that they paid more attention to that confession of Constantine of Cyprus than to the definition of the synod itself.

Maimburgius, of a more refined wit, well aware that all the little chinks of evasion had long since been blocked up, and that almost whatever recent writers there were were only setting themselves against each other and against history itself, proceeds cautiously and masked: "The Nicene Council," he says, for the year 794, part II, page 26 and following, "was validly attacked in the West by the Council of Frankfurt. But because this is one of the most momentous and delicate chapters of my history, it is necessary that, in order to extricate it and happily dispatch it, I should repeat the matter from further back, to be examined a little more diligently than ought to be expected from a historian." After he has thus prepared the reader, he postulates various things, with his usual confidence in affirming and supposing. And concerning the Caroline Books, he is indeed more sparing, and prudently so, by design, which he confesses are most hostile to the Nicene Synod, having proposed against it 120 chapters of accusation, hence they are to be almost dissimulated with a puerile and inept silence, as is clear to one reading his *Iconoclastic History*. But concerning the Synod of Frankfurt, he dissertates in a long series of pages,

because he seemed to himself to be better instructed for this, for infirming the defenses of the Protestant ministers from it, by another reason and way than had been done hitherto.

Whence he is indignant in a major way at his own theologians, who so entangle themselves that this part of history has finally become most confused, by the diversity of circuits and evasions by which they have wished to extricate themselves. Hence he notes and flagellates the sacred anchors of Surius, Alanus, Sanderus, Suarez, Binius, Vasquesius, but also those of Baronius and Bellarmine, who have fled to conjectures fabricated at will, *faites à plaisir* (made for pleasure), and without any reasonable foundation, not seeking historical truth, but presupposing that what they greatly wished not to be, in fact was not. Namely, either that the Synod of Frankfurt did not in fact reject or condemn that of Nicaea, as most of the earlier ones held; or that it was certainly deceived by the Caroline Books, which imposed upon it, and that it pronounced on the opinion of the Nicenes from their false information, as a pair of Cardinals thought. These having been rejected, the Jesuit wants to persuade his reader that he, as it were, will be the first to act in good faith, without prejudice, and with no trouble will dissipate all these shadows, and will bring the truth, hitherto lurking in obscurity, into the light, adhering precisely to the Acts of the Synod. And after long ambages and obtestations, and having achieved a great nothing with a prolix declamation, he girds himself to reconcile the canon of Frankfurt with the Nicenes, and Charles with Hadrian, as if they were in fact of the same opinion. And that whole method of reconciling, in the end, is nothing but that very one which Bellarmine had in part pioneered, and which Petrus de Marca and Dionysius Petavius had perfected, concerning an error, forsooth, in fact on the part of the Fathers of the German Synod, from a false version of the Nicene Acts, which is also cited in the Caroline Books. And although at that very same time, another Gaul, Natalis Alexander, was insisting on this one evasion far more strongly, meanwhile the Jesuit applauds himself in this manner: "Behold," he says, "the true history of that famous Council of Frankfurt. Which (as it seems to me) I have happily enough rescued from those shadows and difficulties in which it has hitherto lain entangled, because all those documents of antiquity which could elucidate this matter have not been sufficiently examined by others, as has been done by me." Then, turning to the Protestant theologians, if there were any among them with some erudition and good faith, he boasts that there would be none among them so imprudent as to dare hereafter to oppose the Council of Frankfurt, which, he says, is in reality no less contrary to them than is the second Nicene. Plaudits, and the palm is given with great favor!

V. It is the art of art to conceal art, and the more the Jesuit forswears all the faith of a historian, the more he involves himself in contradictions, the more circuitous and ambages and plagiarism there are in him, so that even he himself does not know what he wants to establish, just as he says of the Gauls with prelates, the more he extols in words his own faith, candor, industry, diligence in

dealing only with authentic documents, and the correct path on which he himself proceeds. And we certainly do not envy that man this fine opinion of himself and his works, nor the praises he proclaims of himself both everywhere in this work and in others, lest in this respect he fall short of the Scaligers, Lipsiuses, Balzacs, Arnaulds, Voitures, and other men renowned in our age, but sometimes too fond of themselves.

The sum of it all finally comes down to this: 1. Pope Adrian did indeed approve the Nicene Council for himself, or in his own person, but had not yet authentically, juridically, and solemnly confirmed it as Ecumenical at the time it was confuted by the Caroline Books and the Synod of Frankfurt was subsequently convened. But neither did he confirm it afterwards, whatever Apology he may have written for that Council to King Charles. *Maimbourg, Part II, p. 32-33, 39, 57, etc.* 2. In the time of Charlemagne, the opinions of the Gallic Prelates in the cause of Images were greatly divided, since there were many who, following the example of the twelve French Bishops who had subscribed to the Roman Synod under Stephen, attributed a religious cult and honor to Images, while others denied them any. *Ibid. p. 39.* The indignation of Charlemagne was added, being greatly animated against the Greeks, especially on account of his sister being repudiated by Constantine, who then took Mary as his wife, whence the Frank also rejected both councils, both the one under Copronymus and the other under Irene. 3. The books commonly called the Caroline Books were also conceived in such atrocious and injurious words that from this it is sufficiently apparent that their authors were in no way led by the Spirit of that Prince, wherefore they also lay in obscurity until their publication was made by a Lutheran man, under the name of Eli Phili, around the year 1549. *p. 61-62.* 4. Indeed, the Nicene Synod was not only reprobated by Charles, in writings of 120 objections or chapters of accusation—Adrian called them "Reprehensions"—but was also plainly rejected and condemned, according to the testimony of all the most ancient writers, by the Fathers of the Synod of Frankfurt, after a copy of the Nicene acts had been sent by Pope Adrian through his Legates who were to be present at that Synod. *p. 34.* But it is no wonder that King Charles and the German Synod were exasperated against the Nicenes. It happened through an error of fact, and they were all persuaded that an abominable doctrine had been handed down by the Greek Fathers, which they rightly condemned. *p. 39-40.* What was that doctrine? Namely, that the cult of latria, of servitude, which is owed to God alone, or to the Holy Trinity, should be given to Images; against which doctrine they then opposed the second Canon of Frankfurt, as is clear from the words above. But what was the cause of so great an error? Take it: not any fraud or imposture of the author of the Caroline Books, which was the imprudent conjecture of Baronius and Bellarmine, based on no foundation; but a Latin version, and a very bad and false one, of the Nicene Acts, which Charles and the Frankfurt fathers had at hand, the authentic Greek being then wanting. *p. 41.* Again, what had those Westerners read written in that version? Namely, they came across those words of Constantine, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, in

the third Action of the Synod: "I receive and embrace honorably the holy and venerable images, according to the servitude of adoration which I emit to the Consubstantial and Vivifying Trinity." These words, and hence the opinion concerning the adoring of Images with the cult of *latria*—which among Damascene was the mark of the *Christianocategori*—being imputed to the Nicenes by the Westerners through error, was for those men the one cause for the condemned and confuted Synod. *Maimbourg, Part II, p. 41-42*. But they say the fault was not in the Nicene Fathers, but in the interpreter, who had rendered the Seventh Synod into Latin by order of Pope Adrian, about whose incompetence Anastasius complained. *Natalis Alexander, Saec. VIII, p. 733*. Namely, that a punctuation mark should have been placed after those words, "To these I consent, receiving and honorably embracing the Holy and venerable Images." Then, in the Greek, the other part of the sentence follows: "And the adoration which is according to *Latria*, I emit only to the supersubstantial and vivifying Trinity." Behold, they say, the knot of the cause! Behold what those Fathers condemned! And this is the very thing which not some Maimbourg first suspected from the authentic Acts, but which he described from earlier French writers. Bellarmine had indeed urged it, as far as the substance of the matter, against the objection concerning the Synod of Frankfurt, *On Images, Book II, Ch. XIV, in two places*, as had Baronius on the same Synod. *To the year 794, No. XXXVI, XXXVII*. Afterwards, however, but more cautiously, Peter de Marca, where he speaks of the repudiated Nicene Synod, *On Concordance, etc. Book VII, Ch. XIX, n. 4*, and Dionysius Petavius, in his section on Sacred Images, in the last volume of his *Dogmata Theologica. Book XV of the Incarnation, Ch. XIII, n. 4*. And finally, the aforesaid Maimbourg and Natalis conclude that the Synod of Frankfurt "subjected its judgments to that of the Roman Pontiff," *Natalis Alexander, p. 740*, those Fathers being well aware that no council could have any force unless confirmed by the Pope. *Maimbourg, Part II, p. 44*. They add that "that Synod was indeed praised by Adrian as venerable and sacred, although he did not authentically confirm it." *Ibid. p. 48-49, 66*. And that in reality, the opinion of the Synod of Frankfurt, and also of Charlemagne, was no other than that of the Nicenes, or that of Pope Adrian, but, as they got from Petavius, they "agree exactly, and do not dissent in the least." *Dogmata Theologica, Tom. V, p. 581*. Which the last Article, added by the Frankfurt Fathers to their Capitulary, sufficiently teaches, in these words: "The last Article which we add here is this: Let our Apostolic Lord and Father, and the entire church of the Romans, know that according to what is contained in the Epistle of the most blessed Gregory, which he directed to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles. We permit the Images of the Saints, whoever may wish to form them, both in the church and outside the church, for the love of God and his Saints. But we in no way compel those who are unwilling to adore them. We do not permit anyone who wishes to break or destroy them. And because we freely profess that in this Epistle, following the sense of the most holy Gregory, the universal Catholic Church is pleasing to God, without a doubt." Add, in Maimbourg's judgment, that Charlemagne did not think

differently from the Pontiff concerning Images can be gathered from that epitaph which Charles wrote for Adrian, as a Pontiff who "imbued the peoples also with holy dogma." *Maimbourg, Part II, p. 67.*

VI. How many, good God, are the circuits and winding paths, but also the classes of dissenting writers, in this same cause, lest it be believed that either Charlemagne or a plenary Synod from the entire West had condemned the cult of Images. *See Maimbourg, Part II, p. 34-35, 36-37.* For our part, since our page has now grown long, we have decided to present in a brief table and with distinct observations the drowsiness or bad faith of both recent writers, with the truth of History restored once again.

And first, nothing could be asserted either more precarious or more self-contradictory than what these men, and especially the Jesuit, claim: that the Gauls could judge the Nicene Synod the more freely because, although approved by the singular judgment of Adrian, it had not yet been juridically confirmed by him. But 1. He here supposes, forgetful of himself, what he elsewhere stubbornly denies: that a council is not held as authentic or juridical as long as it has not been authentically and juridically confirmed by the Pope. *Treatise on the Prerogatives of the Church of Rome, Chap. XVI.* Indeed, Maimbourg teaches expressly that even prior councils, certainly the first of Constantinople and the second of Constantinople under Justinian, but also more recent ones, were held as ecumenical, or at least were held as authentic, whose decrees were binding with supreme authority, whether already approved or confirmed by the Pontiff, or less so, where he speaks of the superiority of a Council over the Pope. *Ibidem, Chap. XVI, XVII ff.* Nor do any of the Jansenists think otherwise, but also the assertors of Gallican Liberty, following the example of their ancestors. 2. The Jesuit got this, whatever escape route it is, from another of the same Society, Dionysius Petavius: "They knew that the Seventh Synod was not yet Ecumenical and approved by Adrian, inasmuch as the Pontiff had sent its Acts to them, certainly to be considered and recognized, as Hincmar testifies." *On the Incarnation, Book XV, Ch. XIII, p. 581.* Fine words! Yet they knew from the Acts themselves transmitted by Adrian, and also from the Roman Legates, that the synod was inscribed as Universal or Ecumenical, in the beginning, middle, and end, and in the letters written after the Synod, whether to the Emperors or to the clergy of Constantinople. They knew it was held with Adrian consenting, nay, if you listen to Adrian himself, "it was made according to his ordinance," and what is more, as Natalis Alexander contends, with the Pope presiding through his Legates, a point we do not wish to contest now. *Adrian, Epistle, Tom. VII, col. 962. Natalis Alexander, dissert. III, quaest. I, art. II.* They knew that these legates had made up a great part of the Council, and had subscribed to it in everything, with the Greeks exulting over that consensus of Tarasius and Adrian, and over the mutual embrace of justice and peace, as those men usurped the Scriptures. *Action VI, col. 513.* The Frankfurt fathers knew that that subscription had been approved by Adrian, that the Synod had been accepted by him, as he himself

had professed several times, and that he had transmitted the Acts for no other purpose than to draw the Franks and the rest of the Westerners into consensus. When he understood this was denied, he immediately undertook to defend that Synod by writing a learned and indeed lengthy Apology, contrary to Maimbourg, against the eighty articles objected by the authors of the Caroline Books. The later Pontiffs would not rest until it was also received in the Gauls, which happened later and after a long time, as superstition concerning Images gradually increased, as the same Jesuit reports again, after Sirmond, Petavius, and others. *Ibid.* p. 67. 3. The cause for that act of confirmation being delayed by Adrian is plainly stated otherwise by Maimbourg himself. Namely, he was waiting for an opportunity to write back to the Greek Emperor, in which he would at the same time demand back the Sicilian Patrimony of the Church, which if Constantine did not return, he would be declared a heretic. *Ibid.* p. 29. For this was what was vexing Adrian, that the Greeks in that Synod had been little concerned about the temporal rights of Peter, or about the "just claims of the Roman Church," as they said in those times, which to deny was the greatest of heresies. But with your leave, Maimbourg, neither the Greeks, nor the prior Ecumenical Councils, and most recently the Quinisext, which for the Greeks is simply the Sixth, expected any confirmation from the Pontiff. Nor did Tarasius, writing back to Adrian as to a "Brother, Fellow-minister, and Pope of old Rome," *Tom. VII, Concil. col. 623*, ask for any approval; he merely narrates historically that all things had now been happily consummated and terminated. 4. Nor does the Roman appeal to Hincmar in vain. The prelate of Rheims states this one thing, that "the Roman Pope directed the Pseudo-Synod concerning Images into Francia." *Opusc. LV, Cap. XX. Ep. 28, 93*. From which it is clear in what regard the Nicene Synod was held in the time of Hincmar the Elder, who died almost a whole century after it was held. But he says Adrian directed it into Francia; was it so that the Gauls might recognize it, or perhaps retract it, or expunge it? Nonsense! He directed it, however, out of duty, even though it was approved and confirmed by himself, because it was his duty and obligation to communicate the Acts. And no approval of the Roman, or even confirmation or sanction, brought prejudice to the other Bishops throughout the West, preventing them from freely reprobating it. That the decrees and judgments of Popes are subject to Councils, and not vice versa, the decrees of Councils to Popes, is the very thing that Maimbourg teaches expressly in his later work on the Prerogatives of the Bishops of the Roman Church. *Chap. XVIII ff.* And there he does this one thing, and certainly principally intends it, to destroy his own prior assertion, and that of his associate Natalis, that "a Council is subject to the judgment of the Pope; no Council can have force, unless it has been confirmed by the Pope." Or, that an Instrument of Papal and juridical confirmation was required for any Synod to be held as Ecumenical or Authentic. This error is today, for Maimbourg, most pernicious and most dangerous to the whole Church. And he understood well that all of antiquity was ignorant of this right of the Roman to juridically confirm Synods. But also that Charlemagne did nothing other, in

convoking the Synod of Frankfurt, than what Constantine the Great had long ago done in convoking the plenary and general Synod of Arles. For he, for a like reason, as was long ago observed by Eusebius, Optatus of Milevis, and Augustine, took care to have the judgment of Pope Melchiades and the Roman Synod examined more diligently. *Augustine, Ep. 162, al. XLIII. Ep. 166, al. CLXV, c. 7, n. 20.* But with a different outcome, since the fathers of Arles confirmed that judgment of the Roman, while the Frankfurt fathers, together with Charlemagne, reprobated it. 5. Add that Hincmar, cited by Petavius and also by Maimbourg, is wrong in more than one way. He confuses both synods, the former for breaking images and the latter for adoring them, as if they were different parts of one synod held in Constantinople, and the latter also without the intervention of the Apostolic See. Again, that a general synod was celebrated in Francia by order of the Apostolic See. Which was more truly in Germania, where the Emperor was then active, but also by the order of Charles, just as the prior one of Ratisbon or Regensburg in the year 792, with Adrian certainly being called and invited to it.

VII. Do the recent Gauls, but after their Petavius from whom alone they get their wisdom, argue more successfully that at the time of the Synod of Frankfurt, very many of the Gauls, following the example of the twelve bishops at the Roman Synod, were in favor of the cult of Images? Or that Charlemagne took the opposite side out of hatred for the Greeks, certainly of the Emperor Constantine, on account of the repudiation of Charles's sister? Hence the entire Caroline Work breathes its author's offense and envy towards the Greeks, as does Natalis? *Loco cit.* Or as Maimbourg says, it does not reflect the spirit of that prince. These things they say, but they do not profit much by these verbal and factual deceptions. 1. That invention about the twelve Gallic Bishops asserting the cult of Images in the Roman Synod under Stephen IV was prolixly exploded by us before. *Sect. IV, No. XVII.* They affirm indeed that the opinions of the Gauls were divided on that point, but with their usual temerity, they prove it with no documentation. The consensus of the Synod of Gentilly, of Frankfurt, and subsequently of Paris under Louis the Pious was total. The Caroline Books conspire to the same end, as do the subsequent deeds and writings of the Gauls, to destroy all cult of Images, whatever it may be, with only historical use being permitted, against Copronymus, and subsequently Claudius of Turin, who would not even tolerate this. Now if you listen to these men, not only was the Gaul of Charlemagne's time divided on this account, but even the Synod of Frankfurt, that General one, did not dissent in the least from the Nicene one. 2. With equal confidence those men say that Charles reprobated the Nicene Synod out of hatred for the Greeks, being animated, forsooth, against the Greeks on account of the repudiation of his sister, who had previously been betrothed to Constantine. The times of Charles were certainly such that he did not so much seek an alliance with Constantine as Constantine sought one with Charles. Hence Legates were sent repeatedly to the West, to ask for Charles's daughter Rotrude (Erythro to the Greeks), whom Constantine was desperately in love with, as a

wife for him, according to prior pacts, but with Charles refusing, having changed his plan, as Maimbourg himself reports from the Annals of the Franks, to the great sorrow of the Greek Emperor. Nor was the Frank as hostile to Irene as she herself was to Charles, at least pretending to be very incensed against him on account of the repulse she had suffered, and from there wishing to "avenge herself on Charles," as Theophanes says for the year after the synod. *Book XV, On the Incarnation*. 3. But let us grant Charles's indignation! What could be established more unworthy of that King, what more unjust, concerning so many grave Prelates of Germany, Gaul, Italy, Spain, and England, who were to be assembled at Frankfurt? Namely, that on account of Charles's private feeling against Irene, they betrayed the faith, attacked the ancient tradition of the Church—so Pope Adrian says—that is, the received cult of Images, and the Nicene Synod itself, which had been approved by the Pontiff. If this was so, why is it that neither the Greeks nor Adrian I are remembered to have reproached so great a Prince for it? At least the reverence for Adrian, by whom the Synod was promoted and approved, but also that friendship which Maimbourg elsewhere urges was always most tender between that King and that Pontiff, should have restrained Charles. 4. Therefore, the momentum of the cause did not allow either Charles or the Gallic Prelates to be silent. The definition of the Synod, being plainly new and adverse to the Scriptures, to Antiquity, to the Synod of Gentilly, and to the constant doctrine and practice of the Gauls, and supported by flimsy pretexts and stitched-together fables and lies, did not permit it. And if the Franks are indignant at the Patriarch Tarasius for being assumed to the see of Constantinople from a layman, arguing a flaw in his ordination, which Natalis Alexander adds there, they do so according to the Canons of the Church, they do what the Latins later did against Photius, indeed what Adrian himself did against Tarasius, as stated at length above. *Sect. V*. 5. Then they deny that the Caroline Books reflect the spirit of Charlemagne, as they breathe everywhere envy and offense; then they prolixly establish, certainly Natalis Alexander does, that their author is in reality Charlemagne. *Dissert. VI, Art. I*. Which, he says, is sufficiently attested by the Inscription of the Work, the Capitulary prefixed to the Work, the mention of Pepin as his father, Adrian's Response to Charles, the Synod of Paris under Louis the Pious, Hincmar's express words to the Bishop of Laon, the Vatican and Tilian manuscripts, and other things I omit. Maimbourg himself, noting the evasion of Bellarmine, Baronius, and others, plainly ascribes the refutation of the Nicene Council, made three years later, to the authority of Charlemagne. *p. 31*. Hence he also grants that that Capitulary was inscribed with Charles's name with the Prince's knowledge, and was sent by the same Emperor to Rome to Adrian, according to Hincmar, with Adrian also writing back to Charles and to the eighty-one chapters objected in those books. *No. II*. Not to add now what was occupied by us a little before on this matter. And yet the Jesuit would have us believe that the aforesaid Capitulary does not sufficiently express the spirit, nor the genius, nor the doctrine of Charles. 6. Add that on this point they are again set against each other, those who are indignant at those books: for

they are praised by Natalis Alexander for their "intellectual acumen and erudition," far superior to the Greeks. *On Images*. But if you listen to Bellarmine and his supporters, those Caroline Books seem to be the work of a "barbarous, unskilled, frivolous, and plainly stupid man." Maimbourg says they are "conceived in injurious and atrocious words;" Petavius, that they are "exceedingly virulent and bitter." *Maimbourg, Part II, p. 40, 41*. They are unmindful that the bitterness of the words, as will be clear to one who inspects them, was born from the atrocity of the things it notes: the abominable and impious doctrine, and the injuries, curses, and anathemas with which the whole virulent page of the Nicenes swells and flashes. Again, Maimbourg says that those books were first published "by a Lutheran man, and one who was raging against the cult of Images;" then, that it was a "true work attributed to Charlemagne," and such as Bishop Tillius published from the Vatican and his own manuscripts. *Ibid. p. 62*.

VIII. Now we hasten to the hinge of the cause, and to that in which these more recent writers think they have a safe citadel. The compendium of what was just described is this: The Caroline Books and the Fathers of the Synod of Frankfurt erred in fact, and confuted that opinion which was never that of the Nicenes. *This Section, No. V, §. 4*. They were deceived, that is, by the words of Constantine the Cypriot, and these indeed not as they were in the authentic text, but as they found them in the Latin version transmitted to them. They add that there was the highest agreement between the doctrine of both Synods, the Nicene and the Frankfurt one, just as there was between the opinion of Charles and Adrian. To which recent invention, ingenious in appearance, but in reality crude and proceeding from impudence itself, we thus briefly counter. And first, the certain doctrine concerning Images of the Caroline Books, and of the consenting Synod in Germany in those eighty Chapters which are said to have been transmitted to Adrian, must be supposed. Second, that contrived invention about the error of fact, and of the doctrine imputed to the Nicenes which was not at all theirs, and indeed from those sole words of Constantine the Cypriot falsely translated, is to be turned back on its authors. Finally, how well the historian Maimbourg, forgetful of himself everywhere, is consistent with himself, and is guilty everywhere of those things which he criticizes in others, must be opened in a few words.

IX. As many as have now used their own lights on the Caroline Capitulary, and hence the consonant doctrine of the Gauls of the eighth and ninth centuries, even with today's Gauls as judges, far from Monachal or Jesuitical bias, will agree, I think, with our following points. In the first place, Charles, with all his supporters, condemned not this or that kind of religious adoration, this or that degree, such as supreme, absolute adoration, of latria, of servitude, in itself and for itself, or by reason of the material of the images, which ascribes divinity, divine power, or internal sanctity to the images themselves, and converts them into the idols of the Gentiles, as Natalis and Maimbourg absurdly restrict it. Rather, he condemned whatever religious cult, whatever kind or image of

adoration, was to be offered to painted or sculpted tablets, or to figures of Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, or Angels, under whatever name, or pretext, or manner of speaking, with Charles looking everywhere to the thing itself. And so, contrary to what the Jesuit contends, he did not permit that cult which the Nicenes had sanctioned as free, as good, as useful, with only the necessity of that cult being disapproved, but he most sharply forbade and vehemently reprobated all of it. This is so true that we may now appeal to the very opening of the Caroline writing. It nowhere insists on the word or cult of *latria*, whatever it may have criticized in Constantine the Cypriot somewhere. It nowhere designates its adversaries as being only those whom Natalis and Maimbourg interpret as the *Christianocategori* of Damascene. It nowhere says it permits the matter, the veneration of religion, and is offended only by the name of adoration, or *proskynesis*. It nowhere complains of the Nicenes that they had attributed the divine nature, divine perfections, or those intrinsic virtues, to Images; since in the Nicene Synod nothing is more express than that by the name of adoration or *proskynesis* which is attributed to Images, true Latria which is owed to the divine Nature is not understood. *Sirmond to Canon II of the Synod of Frankfurt, Vol. I, p. 232*. These miserable refuges of a prostrate cause will be considered a most certain indication by equitable judges of things. Charles denies to Images all adoration, all servitude, all supplications, and also all manner of cult, all veneration, all salutation, all observation, all bending of the neck, head, or knees before an Image, all offering of incense, of lights, and whatever could be considered a religious honor, or an "honorific proskynesis," such as the Nicenes had decreed. *See Book II, Ch. XXI, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVIII, XXX, etc.* He admits no evasion of words or distinctions here, by which the thing itself, the cult and veneration decreed for Images, might be palliated, "rejecting all newness of words and foolish inventions, and not only not accepting them, but even despising them as refuse." *Preface to the Capitulary*. He was unwilling for Images to be considered, without the highest temerity, in the same place as the Cherubim, the Mercy Seat, the Ark of the Testament, or consecrated treasures of that kind, full of mysteries, were once held; which were certainly not objects of adoration, but of veneration. *See e.g. I. 19*. He does not even permit the same honor to be had for Images as for the sacred vessels consecrated to divine worship, or for the books of the Divine Scriptures in which, not in Images, we learn the erudition of spiritual doctrine. *Book I, Ch. XXIX, XXX*. But who would consider these to be religiously adored or adorable? Similarly, he denies to Images that veneration with which we pursue the Saints who, having triumphed over the Devil, reign with Christ, or with which we pursue Angels, who are by no means to be adored; and what is more, also that with which we pursue living men, which is only a civil adoration, for the sake of salutation and the office of charity. *Book I, Ch. 21, XXIV, XXV*. Everywhere Charles argues, if not even these are to be adored for any reason, much less are Images to be adored, which are devoid of reason, which are also far inferior to any man in dignity and honor, and in which there is not even a like reason for salutation or for exhibiting charity or humility.

Elsewhere he says even less veneration is owed to Images than to a Temple, or a place of God, whether you interpret "place of God" as a Temple, or as the soul of a just man, in which God dwells. *Book III, Ch. XXVIII*. We omit other things, already excerpted by Daille, Forbes, and our own people. Why say more? He everywhere rejects and reprobates all-encompassing adoration, of whatever mode, kind, or degree it may be considered, as superfluous, superstitious, vain, incautious, sacrilegious, demented, most absurd, "the height of absurdity," and what is even graver than these in the common dislike of the words. Gregory instructs how "we must avoid adoring images in every way." *Book II, Chap. XXIII*. "We abdicate the adoration of images entirely." *Ibid.* "The cult of images will cease in every way, if cult is owed to God alone." "We must take care in every way that all adoration is excluded." Again, "we reject adoration in every way." *Book IV, Chap. XV*. Hence everywhere, he says that images can only be retained for memory, instruction, comeliness, adornment, and recollection, having for others little utility, except for the recollection of the thing of which they are an image. *Book I, Ch. XVI*. What utility do any historical, chronological, mnemonic, or emblematic pictures or tablets provide? There are six hundred things of this kind in the Caroline writing. The Frankfurt fathers confirmed this with these words: "rejecting adoration and servitude in every way." Then also the Synod of Paris, under Louis the Pious, in the year 824, was to condemn all-encompassing adoration, even the honorary cult, the Nicene "honorific proskynesis," as is the consensus of almost everyone, nor does Maimbourg himself deny it, *Part II, p. 187*, nor would the Port-Royalist censors of Maimbourg deny it. *Entretiens d'Eudoxe & Philandre*. Not to mention now Agobard of Lyon, Jonas, Hincmar, and the principal Gauls under Louis the Pious, Lothair, Charles the Bald, etc. Indeed, Anastasius the Librarian himself, almost a whole century after the Nicenes, in his Preface to this Synod, addressed to John VIII, excepts from the consensus concerning the adoration of venerable images "certain of the Gauls, to whom at any rate this utility had not yet been revealed." *Tom. VII, Concil. col. 31*. And if the word "adoration" had offended the Franks as equivocal, to be easily drawn to that adoration which is owed to God alone, whence did it happen that, having rejected that supreme and absolute adoration, they nowhere replaced it with that other, inferior one? Why did neither Charles nor the Frankfurt fathers, nor subsequently the Parisians, or Agobard, Jonas of Orleans, and the rest, ever say that they permitted at least the inferior, relative, indirect, external adoration, or cult, or veneration, or honor of religion, of *dulia*, on account of the Prototype? Indeed, why does the Capitulary expressly refute these verbal and distinction-based evasions, against those who would "palliate the error;" who would "impose on the unlearned;" who would say that "the honor of the Image passes to the Exemplar itself;" who would distinguish between adoring as Images and as God; or between adoring the Image itself and the Lord through the Image, etc.? *Book I, Ch. XIV; Book III, Ch. XVI, XVII, XVIII*. Why also does the Capitulary, in more than one place, sharply criticize even those saluting, honoring, and kissing Images, and especially those kneeling? And why would it

speak of any other adoration than that which had been approved and sanctioned by the perpetual suffrages, arguments, examples, and finally the very definition of the Nicenes? Namely, of *proskynesis*, of kissing, and of whatever honor of religion. Or was Charles going to act foolishly, and wrestle with shadows, and offer up both himself and the Gauls and the Fathers of a General Synod to be ridiculed by the Roman Pontiff and the whole East? How then did it happen that all of Rome, after Adrian, was indignant at those Caroline Books, from the time they became known, as being truly adverse to its opinion, and even more so at the Parisians, and at Agobard, whose writings under this title concerning Images the Spanish decree should all be expunged in the published Expurgatory Index? *Class. I, sec. II, Papirius Massonius*. And far more candid now were either Petavius, or de Marca, or Natalis, Surius, Baronius, Bellarmine, Gretser, and almost all the rest, who understood well that all adoration was denied to images in those books, and hence they were to be marked for heresy. The Frenchman Mezeray said of the Synod of Frankfurt, as a historian taught: "The Fathers of this Western Council, refusing to hold the Nicene as Ecumenical, rejected this adoration, NB, in every way, and condemned it by common consent. Charlemagne himself wrote, or certainly ordered to be written, a Book for opposing it." Hence also P. Pithou, Jac. Sirmondus, Steph. Baluzius, the anonymous Port-Royalists, and Maimbourg himself, generally unmindful of himself, have confessed that the opinion of the Gauls was eventually changed, that their plan was changed, who had at first more pertinaciously resisted the Nicene Synod and the adoration of Images, but would afterwards do neither, but would embrace both, at least in fact and practice. That this happened later, learned men grant, and the aforesaid Port-Royalists demonstrate it from Aimoinus, Gerson, Pithou himself, the jurist, and an eminent historian in Gaul in the previous century, that his countrymen had "begun to be imaginous only very recently." These passages had already been produced by our Daille, in his book *On Images*, and concerning Pithou, Thuanus says, "no one held private and domestic affairs more exactly than Pithou did French history, its origins, laws, morals, and customs." *To the Year 1596, Part V*. Indeed, Papirius Massonius, a renowned man, at the beginning of this century, reported that in these writings "the errors of the Greeks concerning the adoring of Images and Pictures are most manifestly detected." Nor did any of the French annals or historians think otherwise, after Eginhard, Hincmar, Anastasius, Strabo, Aimoinus, Ado, Regino, Conrad of Ursperg, etc.

X. With what face now does Maimbourg attribute to Charles, or certainly to the Frankfurt fathers, that they left the cult of these Images free, that they permitted it, which the Nicenes established as necessary? *Part II, p. 66*. If to permit is this, which you accuse in every way of ultimate madness and vain superstition, indeed of execrable error, then I confess Charlemagne and the Caroline theologians permitted the cult of Images. But the Jesuit urges the last Article of the Capitulary sent to Adrian, conceived and decreed in this manner, in which are these words, "we do not in any way compel those who are unwilling to adore

images." But whence do you, Maimbourg, make those words, which are inscribed as the last chapter of Book IV of the Caroline work, the decree of the Synod of Frankfurt concerning Images? And did this clause perhaps depart from the entire disputation of Charles, and now at the end of the Work permit or establish as a free matter what he had destroyed in four whole books as a vain, sacrilegious, and superstitious matter, not to say something more grave? Or was the mind of the Synod of Frankfurt also different from that of those Books, or of its Capitulary, which that Synod would confirm with its consent and by its mission to Adrian? And what, I pray, does that Article of yours establish? Namely, the very thing that the Epistle of Gregory to Serenus of Marseilles contained; about which he had already spoken in Book II, Chapter XXIII, and elsewhere. But that this epistle permitted and approved only the use, and forbade adoration in every way, has already been shown at the threshold of this History. Nor up to this point has any of the more sensible Gauls doubted Gregory's mind. And lest some Maimbourg or Natalis maintain that Gregory condemned only absolute adoration, or that of *latria*, those words "forbade in every way" stand in the way, which the Gallic Port-Royalists rightly translate as, "Forbids that one adore Images, in whatever manner it may be." And why would Gregory have forbidden with such contention only the adoration of *latria*, about which there was no fear, nor any complaint from Serenus, as if the Gauls held images as gods, as the Divine Nature? Indeed, Serenus did not want the faithful even to prostrate before them, or for them to be adored in any way. Gregory concedes this to him, only urging that images be retained to instruct the minds. The word "adore" also, as it refers to pictures, why for Gregory is it everywhere the cult of *latria*? Why did he not express that other, legitimate kind of adoration or veneration? With what words did he permit the relative adoration of an Image, of a Picture? He who more often, even in the epistle to Secundinus about which we spoke before, said that he does not adore the picture, not the image, but adores Him and Him alone, whom he remembered was born or suffered through the Image; likewise, that the more unlearned learn what is to be adored through the history of the picture. Nowhere does he say that he adores Christ *in* the Image, or *before* the Image, or *through* the Image, which is relative cult, as the Jesuit again supposes. Indeed, this difference exists between Charlemagne and Gregory, that Charles would permit Images to be formed, had, and retained, but yet he would not prescribe it, not greatly urge it, nor contend that the utility of Images was very great. *Book I, Ch. XVII*. Whence these words: "Especially since Images have little utility, except for the recollection of the thing of which they are an Image." *Book II, Ch. XXX*. Again: "But Images, NB, with all culture and adoration of them excluded, whether they are in Basilicas for the memory of past events and for adornment, or whether they are not, can bring no prejudice to the Catholic faith; since indeed they are known to have, NB, no office at all to perform for the mysteries of our salvation." Later: "It is one thing to have Images by will, another by need, etc." *Book II, Ch. XXII*. Since, that is, a man can be saved without the sight of Images. Indeed, in the same Chapter, he teaches that it is a sign of the

greatest infirmity and blindness to flee to that aid of Images, or for that reason to erect Images, lest one be able to forget God, or Christ, or his saints. Elsewhere also, which Agobard also says from Augustine, that those visible things are harmful for comprehending invisible things. And that man is to be drawn inward from the exterior, not projected outward from the interior, in order to profit. Again, Charles says: "If pictures sometimes advance the mind to recollect the truth, in turn, they can advance the senses to think of falsehoods instead of the truth, by fashioning in colors things that neither are nor were." *Book III, Ch. XXIII*. From which it is plain that that final clause of the Caroline Books, "we do not in any way compel... to adore images," condemns the decree of the Nicenes, as impious and rash, in which they had commanded to adore images. Although that clause does not cohere well enough with the preceding ones: "We permit Images of the Saints to be formed;" "but we do not in any way compel them to be adored," nor is there a just opposition between these. It would be well if it were read, "we permit them to be formed, but we do not in any way permit them to be adored," which is the summary of the entire Caroline Work.

XI. Natalis Alexander is no more successful in his exception. The one sells empty smoke, the other charcoal. The Dominican denies that Charles rejects all religious cult for images, that is, cult commanded by religion. But he everywhere prohibits them from being worshipped in any way, even in the way we venerate the codex of the Gospels or the Sacred Vessels. Add that those offices which we perform for the poor, for children, for servants, for our neighbor, are commanded by religion, yet the cult, honor, and veneration are not for that reason called religious. But concerning Images, nothing was commanded by Christ or the Apostles. The Monk continues: "Charles thought that this was the mind of the Nicenes, that there was an internal sanctity in Images;" in the colors, forsooth, in the art, in the material of the Picture? How much of a ram you now make Charlemagne, born under a thick sky! Indeed, he was indignant that they were even called "Holy," certainly with relation to the Prototype, just as not long after Agobard said: "they are sacrilegious who call Images holy." The Dominican, moreover, everywhere errs on the same chord, everywhere cuckoos and begs the principle, and sings that one refrain: that Charles and the Frankfurt fathers were only offended at the word "adoration," which caused ill will; which they interpreted as the adoration of servitude, the cult owed to God alone; that they did not want hope to be placed in Images; what kind of cult the Gentiles had transferred to their Idols and simulacra; and that this was the Heresy of the *Christianocategori*. Furthermore, that they did not condemn the cult of Images as illicit by divine Law, but as dangerous on account of abuse, from which they feared superstition, hence they prohibited the use of honorary adoration lest abuse arise, while confessing at other times that some can use the cult of Images well, and many other things he says to that effect. But, 1. No equivocation could lie hidden in the word "adore." Charles uses six hundred times the words, "worshipping, honoring, saluting, kissing, observing, venerating, bending the neck, head, knees, offering incense, lights, etc.," and orders all of them to be far

from Images. Natalis himself, self-condemned, says "they seem to prohibit the use of honorary adoration," of "honorific proskynesis," which was most expressly sanctioned by the Nicenes. To adore, therefore, for Charles and all the Gauls, signified that which it signified for all of Antiquity, for Cyprian, Minutius, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Vigilius, Gregory I, and subsequently Adrian I, and then also for Thomas Aquinas and the entire School: namely, to exhibit religious cult, of whatever kind, even relative, by genuflection, prostration, bowing, offering of gifts, of incense, and the like. To adore, for Charles and the Franks, was also the very thing that it was for the Nicenes, *proskynein*, to do *proskynesis*, and things related to these, as all the suffrages of those Fathers, and the synodal definition, carried. Nor was only that kind of adoration condemned by Charles which implied direct Idolatry, but also, as has been seen, that which argued a superstition, that vain, inane, superfluous, insane one, concerning inanimate things. Agobard said, not only "to offer divine honor," but also "to honor ambitiously." 2. The cult of servitude, I confess, more recent Latins have restricted to *latría*, which they most sharply defend should be offered even to the images of the Cross and of Christ, after the Angelic Doctor and the principal Scholastics, and even the Jesuits, certainly Gregorius de Valentia in his works on Idolatry. But indeed, the cult of servitude for Charlemagne, and then also for Agobard and the more ancient writers, was the same as it was for Augustine. Augustine, however, distinguished this from the cult of charity, of society, of imitation. And by this name he called every kind of divine cult, all that servitude which pertains to worshipping God, even to burn incense, to offer a Sacrifice, to vow gifts, to consecrate and recollect memory with solemnities, feasts, and set days, as was long ago observed by theologians, after Agobard of Lyon, from the books *On the City of God*. 3. Natalis supposes the matter in question, with his Maimbourg, when they want the Frankish Emperor with his supporters to have had in view the heresy which is called that of the *Christianocategori* in John of Damascene. These, namely, held images as gods or as God, or thought they were of a Divine Nature, just as the Gentiles did their Idols. On which matter we must speak a little below. Thus Natalis supposes that only that cult was disapproved by the Franks, in which they placed hope of aid in an image, to be won by prayers and supplications. Indeed, Charles had discovered many examples of this insane superstition in the very Acts of Nicaea, of aid experienced from an image or through an image, and received, in Actions IV and V. But also places of Scripture were distorted for this purpose, such as those about the face of the image: "Your face, Lord, I will seek;" "All the rich will entreat your face, etc." He had also read that Confession of Euthymius of Sardis, "With all my heart I receive the venerable Images." Charles so scourged these things in one place as in another, that he also had in view all the other things which attributed some religious cult to Images. We are silent now about the invocations, deprecations, and vows of Pontifical superstition to the image of the Crucifix, of Veronica, of the Virgin, etc., about which there are authentic witnesses. 4. No less impudent is the assertion that neither Charles nor the

Gallican and German Prelates attacked the veneration of Images as illicit in itself and prohibited by divine Law. Indeed, everywhere they did, as fighting against the precepts, "you shall adore and worship your God alone;" "adore the Lord;" "to me every knee shall bow;" "you shall not adore a man-made thing;" etc. This other assertion, from the doctrine of Charles and the Germans, that "some can use the cult of images well." Give place, I beg you, for they did not say this in the cited Chapter XVIII of Book IV. Only this did Charles say, by way of a certain pre-emption, that he for his part does not wish to call images placed in basilicas "Idols," insofar as they are erected in basilicas "for the adornment of the basilicas and for Memory." But lest they degenerate into Idols, "for that reason," he says, "we refuse to adore, or worship, or pay religious servitude to them." The thing itself, images in themselves, or in that civil and mnemonic use, is not considered a crime or an impiety; but the cause of the thing, or images placed for the purpose that you should worship, adore, or pay servitude to them, is well considered so. The former they call the use of images, in which there is no cause of impiety; the latter, the evil use, which is converted into a disgrace. Where now, Natalis, does it say that "some can use the cult of images well," when the Capitulary notes abuse and disgrace and danger in that very cult? You also have the Caroline distinction between an Image and an Idol. An image is outside the use of adoration or cult; it is an idol if you have worshipped or adored it. An image, as the same says elsewhere, is that which is for adornment or for showing things; an idol, when a sacrilegious rite and vain superstition is added. Whence the recent Censors in Pontifical Gaul of the Maimbourgian Histories admitted that in the first centuries images did not obtain, much less their cult; because otherwise the Pagans would have retorted the charge of the cult of idols, which was objected to them, against the adorers of images, nor would any difference be seen in the external cult. Let Maimbourg and Natalis now go and argue that Nicene images are as far from Idols as heaven from earth! 5. Finally, they opportunely grant that the fear of dangerous abuse and superstition from the cult of images deterred Charles and the Gallican Prelates. Excellent! But who will deny that this abuse, this superstition, and that a nefarious one, has obtained by perpetual and universal practice, from the time that that cult was established? Not now Charles, the Frankfurt fathers, the Parisians, Agobard, Jonas, Strabo, and the men of their times would say it. But those who groaned as that superstition grew more and more strong, within the Papacy itself: Durandus of Mende, Johannes Gerson, Pius II, the author of the Commentaries, Polydore Vergil, Ludovicus Vives, Erasmus, Cassander, and many others, produced elsewhere by our own Raynold, Molinaeus, Daille, Drelincourt, and Forbes. Nor can you ever root out this superstition from the minds of the common people or the Monks. Whence, from the Maimbourgian hypothesis, which is also that of Petavius, if the cult of images is a free and indifferent matter, and it has been the perpetual cause of impiety and danger, it follows that neither the Nicenes, nor any others, could or should have commanded or sanctioned such a cult. Whence it happened, on account of the execrable and perpetual abuses from the very

origin of iconodulia, that almost all Reformation has proceeded from the overthrow of images and simulacra.

XII. Hitherto the doctrine of Charlemagne and the Gallican and German Prelates is established. What the doctrine of the Nicenes was like, the prior Section has taught at length in a compendious anatomy of that whole Synod, even with Maimbourg having been heard. Now to that sacred anchor, which Dionysius Petavius and the Parisian Prelate have supplied to our writers! What it is like has been described above, namely, that Charles and the Frankfurt fathers were intent upon the words of Constantine the Cypriot, in the Latin version, which certainly contained the detestable error of offering *latria* to images, such as is offered to the Holy Trinity. *This Section, No. V, §. 4.* Now our page has grown too much, hence we note these things summarily. 1. Those men suppose, but prove with no witness, no author, that the entire Capitulary of Charles, and hence of the Germanic Synod, looked to those few words of the Cypriot Bishop, which are in Action III. I confess the Emperor criticized them, but perhaps once, and as the private and self-contradictory confession of Constantine, "like the opinion of a private individual." *Book III, Ch. XVII. Maimbourg, Part II, p. 41.* Having weighed, before and after, the confessions of Basil of Ancyra, Theodosius of Ammorium, Euthymius of Sardis, and all the rest. Charles nowhere imputed those words to the whole Synod, or held them as the synodal definition. Our writers agree that he recited them in the best of faith, as they were in the copy transmitted from Rome by Adrian. 2. We readily grant that there could have been a fault in the version, which presented that Constantine as venerating images "according to the servitude of adoration which he would emit to the Trinity." Although it is very strange that that version deceived Adrian himself, and deceived the Legates of Adrian who were present at the Synod, and that they did not suspect an error at those harsh words. For Adrian thinks they should indeed be explained from the definition of the Synod, but he does not deny that they were expressed by Constantine. *Tom. VII, Concil. col. 946.* Nor does Anastasius the Librarian, who prepared another version almost a whole century later, note this error; indeed, he says plainly that the prior interpreter followed word for word, but for this very reason was obscure and tedious. Whence there is equal reason to suspect that the Greek text was later softened, which is a reason for accusing the old interpreter. 3. So be it! Let us say Constantine ascribed no other cult to images than that which the synodical letters of Theodore of Jerusalem ascribed, to which the Cypriot added his consent in these words of his, from the Acts: namely, "honor, proskynesis, kissing," distinctly from the *latria* which befits the Holy Trinity. *Action III, col. 160.* But it has just been demonstrated that Charles attacked in his whole Work that very *proskynesis* or "honorific proskynesis," and all-encompassing, even relative adoration, as it "passes into the first form," or the Prototype. *No. IX of this Section.* Just as concerning those words of the Cypriot Bishop, the most prudent King anticipates this very exception: "They say," he says, "we do not adore Images as God. But while we look upon them and adore them, we fix the keenness of our

mind there where those are whose images they are." What does Charles say to this? That this is "to inject a palliated error into the common people," which he reveals as "unfortunate;" that here "thought is obscured," while there "it is revealed without any obscuration;" that "unstable men profess one thing with their mouth, and believe another in their heart." 4. What is more absurd than that Charles and the Frankfurt fathers judged the opinion of the Nicenes from the words of one Bishop, who is reported as one out of 350 Fathers, besides the Patriarchs and Archimandrites? And what is more express in that entire Work than the destruction of both the individual suffrages, and all their supports and arguments, whether from Holy Scripture or from Tradition, and then finally the very "Terminus" (definition) of the Synod, with the added anathematisms? And what was that Terminus like? Was it not that by which they order to be given to images not only salutation, veneration, kissing, embracing, offerings of incense and lights, but also *proskynesis*, adoration, by which, while the Image is adored, the Person himself, the Exemplar itself, the Prototype depicted in it, is adored at the same time, with a single adoration? And return, if you please, my reader, to the history of the Nicene definition, restored above. *Sect. V, No. XV*. And with what face, or by what right, does Maimbourg say that the Frankfurt Fathers (and thus Charlemagne himself, whose Books he almost dissimulates) "did not want to look either at the definition of the Council, nor at the opinions of the other bishops, nor at the vote which Constantine would add to the letters of Tarasius and the Easterners, but wanted to judge the opinion of the Nicenes with all rigor, and indeed precisely from the words which they had found in only one place"? *Part II, p. 46-47*. By which the Jesuit tacitly laughs at the vanity of the invention. Unless he now holds Charles and all the Fathers, and the attending Legates of Adrian, who did not intervene, as either most iniquitous judges, or certainly as most ignorant ones. Exceedingly iniquitous judges, if they imputed the words of one man, and indeed words taken in the most rigid sense, to the whole Synod. All the more so since that Synod, as Maimbourg declares, in more than a hundred places that they did not offer the true cult of Latria to images, but an adoration of honor and veneration, on account of the Prototype. But they were most ignorant, and almost blockheads, if every last one of them did not know what had been truly decreed in Greece and in the Eastern Synod a few years before, or what those Acts contained which were at hand. Maimburgius now rightly says, "it is difficult, I confess, to conceive this very thing"; thus he praises and turns up his nose, he builds up and he tears down. 5. Let us also grant that an error in fact was made by Charlemagne and by the Synod of Frankfurt, with the legates of Hadrian remaining silent, or having been turned into gourds; why did not Hadrian reproach this error, conceived from the words of Constantine, and adhere to this one response? Why did not the Greeks publish an apology, after the public violence done to their Synod, and its subsequent defamation as having been impious, sacrilegious, idolatrous, etc.? Why, after the Greek text appeared, or even after the defense written by Hadrian, did the Gauls not think

more equitably of the Nicenes and the Iconodules, whether under Charlemagne, or under Louis the Pious, or his sons Lothair and Charles the Bald?

For that the Gauls were tenacious in the opinion expressed in the Caroline Books, being enemies of all iconodulia, and also scorers of the Nicene Synod, which was long afterwards called a "Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks" even by Hincmar of Rheims, this indeed is something that no sophistry of Maimburgius, no shamelessness of Natalis Alexander will obscure. It has already been noted before in this Section, and will be again briefly below in the course of the history, concerning the deceptions of both of these recent writers.

XIII. A fiction on par with the rest is that the Nicenes decreed against the "Christianocategori," about whom Damascenus writes, and that Charlemagne and the men of Frankfurt condemned these alone, whom they supposedly thought were defended by the Greeks. What the Nicenes decreed, what the Franks or Germans condemned, has been seen at length, not with the eyes of Petavius, Natalis, or Maimburgius, but with those eyes with which the authentic documents allow themselves to be used. Now observe the deception concerning the Christianocategori. If you listen to those men, these were, for Damascenus, those who offered true latria to images, as if to the Divine Nature, and of the sort that the Gentiles offered to their idols. But first, the things attributed to Damascenus, at the end of his book *On Heresies*, do not imply that. His words are: "The Christianocategori worshipped the venerable images of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of our Lady St. Mary, of the Holy Angels, and of his Saints, as gods, in the manner of the Greeks." That is, with a cult similar to that which the Greeks or Romans, in accordance with Hellenism, offered to their statues, venerable objects, simulacra, and idols. Which certainly they themselves did not hold to be the divine nature, nor the gods themselves, nor did they worship them as such, not even among the most idolatrous.

That the Gentiles long ago argued that they worshipped the images as signs of the gods, and sometimes of the True God, has been understood from Athenagoras, Origen, Arnobius, the most ancient Fathers, not to mention from Plato and the Platonists, from Diodorus, Varro, Seneca, Plutarch, etc., even by the more learned from the flock of the Pontificals. Nor does Augustine alone leave any room for doubt, that the Gentiles were accustomed to respond, when they were accused of idolatry, that they "do not worship the idols themselves, but the divinity which is signified by the idol." A hundred times these men professed that they did not worship that which is visible, not the sign, not the effigy, but that through the corporeal effigy they beheld a sign of that which they ought to worship. On which matter, long ago among our writers were Hospinianus, Raynoldus, Chamierus, and many more. But also most recently the men of Port-Royal in France, in the cited Dialogue, with which they scourge Maimburgius and the Jesuits! The more learned pagans certainly did not adore images as gods. Secondly, neither is that true of those Christians, however much

they were Iconolaters. Certainly not Carpocrates, or Simon Magus, or the Gnostics, offered to images that adoration which belongs to God alone.

That they did indeed adore, offer incense, crown with flowers and garlands, and observe the rites of the Gentiles around them, just as around the images of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, is reported by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Augustine. Therefore, John was more truly referring to the unhealthy practice of more recent Christians, by which they in truth accused Christianity and prostituted it among the Saracens. And from this arose the plans of Leo the Isaurian, and then of his son Constantine, to remove the images. And Damascenus himself, dealing with images—the interpreter wrongly translates it as *On the Adoration of Images*—handed down only these things: that men adore one another, in the manner of greeting among the Orientals, inasmuch as we are made in the image of God; that what the unlettered could not read, their ancestors wished to represent in an image, for prompt remembrance; and finally, that he does not adore the image, the cross, the matter, but only by looking at the image does his memory return to the Crucified one, whom alone they adore by prostrating themselves.

Whence it is clear that all things are fabricated which are attributed to Damascenus in his *Life*, and his *Orations*, and the *Passions of the Martyrs*, which exceed these limits. And that the superstition had proceeded further, and that the Nicene Fathers were most fiercely defended by Hadrian, who accepted the Synod itself, the preceding sections have shown, and the entire Pontifical school that followed has taught. And a recent historian in Italy, after Baronius and his epitomizers, J. Horatius Scoglius, wrote: "The consenting voice of all of them (the Nicene Fathers) followed: The images of the saints are to be adored."

XIV. Let the recent historians go now, and contend hereafter that Charlemagne agreed in all things with Hadrian, the Franks with the Greeks, or the men of Frankfurt with the Nicenes! And yet, Charlemagne praised Hadrian with a distinguished funeral oration, and adorned his tomb with an epitaph! So they say, but from this to say that Charlemagne felt the same about images as Hadrian, and that those words, "he imbued the peoples with holy dogma," referred to images, no one would say except the audacious, who have lost all shame. Charlemagne certainly condoned in Hadrian, whose doctrine and piety he was otherwise persuaded of, that imprudence and indiscreet zeal concerning images, after the Pontiff had softened many of the Nicene positions as much as he could. But Charlemagne never retracted his own positions, or approved the responses of Hadrian. Indeed, these very responses were soon refuted by the Franks in the Synod of Paris under Louis the Pious, after the cause of images was recalled for examination, about which a word later, as often being very dissonant, superstitious, and incongruous. But why would you wonder, according to Maimburgius, that the opinion of the Nicenes coincides with that of the Franks, when he himself pronounces on images in such a way as to

approach both sides? He plainly wanted this, not his own Gauls of the age of Charlemagne, in these words: "There were not lacking those who did not know well enough how to extricate themselves, affirming that they held a middle ground between those who treated images contemptuously, and those who worshipped them more than is just."

Behold therefore, as a finishing touch, the candor, fidelity, and constancy of the Jesuit historian! And first, he either concedes or posits things that are plainly adverse to his own Nicenes. 1. That images are an indifferent matter, neither commanded nor forbidden in the Gospel; he was unwilling to say, not forbidden in the Law, and cautiously as is his custom. Again, that there is "no obligation to honor them, either all in general, or individual ones in particular," unless perhaps where scandal is given by the omission itself, which is the nature of indifferent things. But Charlemagne showed that a greater scandal arises from the non-omission and the practice of image-service. 2. He grants to the Fathers of Elvira, and to Epiphanius himself, who prohibited all pictures and images from churches and sacred places, that they had their "particular reasons" for doing so, and that "perhaps there was then still some danger of idolatry." By which very point, after the same danger, and indeed the vice itself, appeared throughout the whole Christian world, especially in the Roman Church, the English, Germans, Gauls, Belgians, and other Protestants rightly composed themselves according to the example of the most pious Fathers. 3. The same man confesses that the cult of images, according to Damascenus, such as it was in use after the Christians were mixed with the Saracens, "gave occasion to the Saracens to accuse the Christians of idolatry." Whence, certainly, in an indifferent matter, he must confess that this occasion was rightly removed, according to the rule of Christ and the Apostles. 4. The Jesuit also willingly concedes that "it would be open to anyone who so wished, to abstain from the words of religious cult or adoration." As if the Nicenes had abstained from them, or Hadrian, or the succeeding Rome, and as if the dispute of the Iconoclasts had been about words, and not rather about the thing itself. Thus, under the captious use of little words, they wish to palliate and obscure that which they both establish in reality and observe in practice, as Charlemagne more than once said. Tertullian would have said, "they are ashamed of their own religion." 5. Finally, the Jesuit says that it is also not a matter of faith to represent the Persons of the Holy Trinity in images, figures, or corporeal form, as was afterwards done. This was never approved, not by the Nicenes, nor by Germanus of Constantinople, nor by Damascenus, nor by the Greek Iconolaters, nor by the earlier Latins, not even in the age of Aquinas, but rather was condemned as a great wickedness; yet it was afterwards received by the use of the Roman Church, and indeed was defended and asserted by Cajetan, Sanders, Bellarmine, Vasquez, and others who are believed to be foremost, as is well known. Whence those horrendous images of the Father as an old man with a triple crown, in papal habit, while the Son appears with a simple crown, and the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove: but also sometimes that of the Virgin Mary, between the Father and the Son, with the

Holy Spirit descending upon her; and at other times, the Holy Trinity was expressed with one head having a triple face. So far Maimburgius, in the cause of images, is almost Calvinizing, or as the Gallic censors said plainly at other times, "This smells of the faggot or the stake."

XV. But take the man turning back on himself, who will consult more than enough for his own security and that of his cause! He who had conceded that perhaps the very use of images was condemned by the first Christians, by the Eliberitans, by Epiphanius, soon adds that it was "done without consequence for the future," at another time, in other circumstances, and not with the same danger of idolatry as of old (so he says). He who pronounced images to be a free matter, soon approves and defends the sentence of the Nicenes, on the "necessity of images, which not only could, but even should be exposed," for the sake of religion and of honorary adoration. He who studiously takes care, with a game almost equal to that of the Tridentines, not to seem to attribute adoration, but rather reverence and honor to images; elsewhere, however, mindful of the doctrine of the entire School, and also of universal practice, he confesses that by the use and interpretation of the Church, it is in reality a "species of adoration and of religious cult," although inferior to true Latria. He who, having observed the prudence of the Greeks, had said that images of the Persons of the Holy Trinity are not a matter of faith, tacitly condemning, if he was wise, the expression of God in colors; soon adds a remedy, that "in no way is the permission which the Church makes to be condemned, of representing them under the figure which they assumed, human and corporeal." He who, finally, contends more than once that images are to be honored not indeed in themselves, "because they are inanimate," but solely with respect to their prototypes, or with a relative cult only; yet, lest he seem to depart from Bellarmine and the universal doctrine of the Society, he cites Bellarmine, from *On the Triumphant Church*.

And so, this historian finally holds the same opinion as that of the purpled Bellarmine of his own Society. And thus he destroys whatever he just now seemed, for appearance's sake, to have conceded, lest he be set against his own Gauls under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. For this was the constant opinion of Bellarmine, following the chief men of his Society: 1. Images ought to be worshipped even "in themselves," and properly, and immediately, so that they themselves terminate the adoration, which the Frenchman just now denied. Although the Cardinal adds, with a lesser honor than the exemplar itself, or than the honor which is due to God. He certainly meant lesser in degree, since the question is about that species of honor, cult, and adoration which is religious, and which, being offered to the image, returns to the prototype. 2. Images, as they are adored with respect to the prototype, or exemplar, are to be worshipped and adored in all respects with the same kind of cult with which the exemplar itself is worshipped. And thus the image of the crucifix, insofar as it is joined with the exemplar, and this is conceived by the mind at the same time, or (as the

Nicenes often say) is referred to it, is adored with the adoration of latria, at least by accident. Whence it happens that Bellarmine excuses the opinion of Thomas Aquinas, Alesius, Bonaventure, Biel, Almayn, Marsilius, Cajetan, Carthusianus, Capreolus, Vasquez, Gregory de Valentia, of all the Jesuits, and of almost all the Schools, while they all also ascribed the cult of latria to the images of Christ and of the Cross.

Nor were they ever accused of heresy for this, or of detestable doctrine, by Pontifical Rome. Yet they confess that the Nicenes did not go so far, nor did Hadrian, and that this is the opinion which the Caroline Capitulary condemned. But what is the reason for excusing it? "They had not seen," says Maimburgius, but following his Bellarmine, Baronius, and Petavius, "the Nicene Council, nor the letter of Hadrian, which lay hidden for a long time, and only in this our century first saw the light." But whence did those monuments lie hidden? Forsooth, through those who in Italy first, then in the whole West, added immoderate measures to the iconodulia of the Nicenes and of Hadrian, as the universal practice of the Roman Church testifies. Who also knew how much, from the time of Charlemagne, whatever pious men there were in the West, had been indignant at the Pseudo-Synod in their writings, decrees, and invectives. But if Thomas Aquinas, Alesius, and the rest had used those pages of the Greeks and of Hadrian himself to the greatest extent, the Jesuit teaches that they would indeed have spoken differently, but that their opinion would have remained the same. Hence Baronius, in the year 787: "Since in reality the opinion of them (the Scholastics) and of all the Orthodox is one and the same concerning the cult of the sacred images, but that the same thing is found expressed in different and almost contrary words, I think it happened for no other reason than that such a firm, constant, and certain opinion of the later Nicene Council, so seriously treated and defined, and reduced into a canon, was by no means known to these same holy and learned men." And yet, it was at least known to Charlemagne, to the Synod of Frankfurt, and to those Gauls, Germans, Spaniards, Italians, and Britons, who with a marvelous consensus of both minds and writings reprobated that firm, certain, and constant opinion he speaks of.

"No respect can join contradictory predicates," the Angelic Doctor said somewhere; and what Charlemagne with his entire France considered wicked, impious, and superstitious, no veneration of distinctions could have made licit, pious, and religious. "What is simply impossible, or illicit, can be neither possible nor licit in a certain respect, nor anywhere, nor ever."

SECTION VIII.

Return to the East. All things turn out unfavorably for Irene. The deeds of Constantine against her will. The schism of Theodore the Studite and Plato. Maimburgius's confession concerning these Saints. The disposition of Constantine toward the Iconolaters. The end of Irene. The succession of Nicephorus Logothetes. He favors the Iconoclasts. Who were called the

Exocionites. The tolerance of the Iconolaters under him. The second schism of Theodore and Plato. The audacity of these monks. Theodore's invective against the Roman Pontiff himself. What does Baronius say? The end of Nicephorus. Michael Rhangabe succeeds through tyranny. Why he was more favorable to the Iconodules. The schemes of Theodore the Studite under him. The death of Plato. Maimburgius's judgment on miracles. Retorted upon the Jesuit. The times of Leo the Armenian. Maimburgius's injustice. A character sketch of Leo. The rare virtues and merits of the prince by everyone's consensus. The Empire twice refused. His unhappiness from the hatred of the Iconolaters. Horrendous curses against him. The putrid contradictions of the petty Greeks and Maimburgius. The more than childish fable about Leo. Refuted from the matter itself and from the earlier Byzantine historians. Maimburgius's lucid confession. And that of the Iconolaters. A most vain exception. A summary of the deeds under Leo in the cause of images. His prudence, his moderation. The pertinacity of Nicephorus and the monks. The sounder mind of others. The lies of the Byzantines. The petulance of Theodore the Studite. Leo's leniency toward him. His audacity in prison itself. Horrendous specimens of Iconolatry. The death of Theophanes the Confessor. A comparison of the Leonine persecution with the modern one, from Maimburgius. The end of Leo. The status of images under Michael the Stammerer. The equity and moderation of Michael. The legation and letter to Louis the Pious. The adverse studies of Theodore the Studite. His faction, his death. Mendacious pages about him. The virtues of Michael. Why Crete was lost under him. The praises of so great a prince. His actions against images. Hence the calumnies, above all from Maimburgius. Retorted. The end of Theophilus. Theodora the widow. Why she restored the images. Unwillingly at first. The history of the restoration of Iconolatry in the East. Maimburgius's execrable faith in all things. The manifold difference between the Greeks and the Latins.

I. Thus far we have seen the Iconomania of the Greeks opposed with great spirits and with most pious zeal by Charlemagne and by the bishops gathered from the whole West, a few years after the Nicene Pseudo-Synod. Nor have we dissimulated any of those things by which the most recent pair of writers might attempt to evade or escape the force of this Caroline opposition, which is the chief difficulty of this whole history for Louis Maimburgius. Now we are recalled to the East, and we narrate how difficultly this superstition of images could be established, and with what contests, immediately after the removal of Irene, though briefly now and as if within the space of a single tablet. How accepted it was by the heavens, Maimburgius above all would gather, but also Baronius, who were accustomed to impute every adversity of Leo and Copronymus to the iniquity of their cause, while from that time of Irene, all things are related to have slipped backwards, at home and abroad, as in Italy and the West, so in Constantinople and within the borders of the East, with the Bulgars and Saracens being victorious; you would have said that Earth and Heaven were acting against Irene by agreement.

Indeed, under Irene, force and fear contained Iconomachy, and Constantine was to be removed afterwards by his mother's crime in the year 797, with the Iconolaters being not at all unwilling, so that the images might be more secure. For almost all things that were done while Irene reigned were done against Constantine's will, as he suffered his mother to enjoy her wishes, to whose every nod he composed himself. For by her inducement alone, as Theophanes and the *Miscella* relate at length, besides the restored icons, it had been done that Constantine repudiated the daughter of Charlemagne who was betrothed to him, so that he might join Maria to himself as a wife, and then, with this one also dismissed, for no other reason than that the virtue of Maria was hateful to Irene, that he might bring in his mother's chambermaid. To which nuptials Tarasius, who generally conspired with Irene, reacted more softly, allowing them to be consecrated by Joseph, an abbot of Constantinople, and for Maria to be beaten; but a pair of monks, Theodore, then abbot of Stoudios, and another, Plato, resisted more sharply, accusing Patriarch Tarasius of softness and cowardice, from whom they seceded.

II. That Theodore, with the cognomen Studites, whose life a certain monk Michael, his disciple, forsooth, wrote, was in reality an impostor, and on whose sole faith most of what Baronius says about Theodore rests, was certainly the standard-bearer of the Iconolaters thereafter, under the emperors Constantine and Irene, Nicephorus, Leo the Armenian, and Michael the Stammerer. The name Studites came to him from Stoudios, a monastery sacred to John the Baptist, of which Theodore was the archimandrite, later enclosed within the city, towards that angle in which the Fortress of the Seven Towers is seen to this day. A match for that Theodore was Plato, likewise a monk, later the Hegumen of the Saccudion monastery in the suburbs, also most addicted to the superstition of images, who was to die under Michael Curopalates, and whose life, on account of their common studies, they attribute to Theodore the Studite, a life most filled with fables and lies, in the monastic fashion. That the audacity of both monks, and their genius born for seditions, was a fury, no one would deny, and one can understand this partly from Theophanes and Cedrenus, partly from their lives themselves, and above all, from Baronius, in Volume IX of his *Annals*. And already under Constantine and Irene, on the occasion of Maria's repudiation, certainly on this pretext, they are not only said to be the authors of a schism from Patriarch Tarasius, but also rebels against the Emperor himself, whom, together with all the monks subject to them, they treated most contemptuously and pronounced excommunicated.

Theophanes, in the 6th year of Constantine's reign, says that "they opposed the emperor and assailed him with insults," and for this reason they were to be fostered by the impious Irene, who undertook to defend them. This fury of the monks, in a cause which did not concern them at all, the blame for which fell on Irene or Tarasius, expressed a not uncharming confession from Maimburgius: "And in reality, the procedure of these abbots exceeded the measure; but the

Saints are not impeccable while they live." He laughed, as it appears, at the petty Greeks, who inscribed men who were schismatics in the Church and seditious in the Empire among the Saints, and indeed, in that star-chart, of the first magnitude. Concerning whose sanctity, that is, now of foul adulation, now of schisms, seditions, and disturbances excited by them, more will be said immediately. Whence one may gather that the mind of Constantine was deservedly alienated from these most distinguished instigators of rebellions among the Iconolaters, just as it had been under Leo and Copronymus. But that the younger prince had threatened that "he would open the temples of the idols," Cedrenus alone has it; and the other threat, that "he would overthrow the images," is more true. But Irene did not allow it, nor did the ministers of her unspeakable parricide. And so the cult of images flourished as long as Irene flourished, until she was finally removed from the Empire by her eunuchs, on the last of October in the vulgar year 802, and thrust into a monastery, then to be relegated to Lesbos, and to be consumed by grief of mind, heavy not with years but with crimes.

III. Now we indicate in the fewest words what changes in the cause of images succeeded throughout the East, from the time of Nicephorus, Irene's successor, who was a patrician and General Logothete (which corresponds to the dignity of Arch-treasurer, more truly than, as Maimburgius renders it, Arch-chancellor). And whatever may be the case concerning the character of Nicephorus, which was inclined, as they say, to cruelty and avarice, I observe these things under that prince: 1. Nicephorus favored the oppressed Iconoclasts, to whom he restored the liberty that had been taken from them by the Nicene Council. This one thing was sufficient for all the Byzantines, and hence the *Miscella* and the chroniclers, and Maimburgius above the rest, to accuse him not only of tyranny, cruelty, and extortion, but also of impiety, incantations, Manichaeism, and of all the most execrable crimes. Thus, that the emperor defended and bound to himself a certain Nicolaus the hermit, and other Iconoclasts with Nicolaus, is related by Theophanes, the *Miscella*, and Cedrenus. But what Theophanes said, that Nicolaus lived "in the Exacionion," and Cedrenus, "in the outer little column," is not to be taken in the sense in which the same writers elsewhere call the Arians "Exocionites," and frequently the Byzantines, and the author of the Alexandrine Chronicle himself, in the time of Theodosius the Great and thereafter. The Arians were certainly so called, from the time Theodosius the Great had driven them from the city and ordered them to have their assemblies outside the city. *Exokionitai* from *exokionion*, a place outside the city walls, decorated with a column or statue of Constantine, and others. Afterwards, however, it is said that the *exokionion*, in which those solitary Iconoclasts then were, was enclosed within the city walls, below the Hebdomon field. 2. He did not, however, either overthrow the images or move any persecution against the Iconodules. An argument for this is that when Tarasius died, he allowed Nicephorus to be elected patriarch, although a layman and a secretary to the emperor, in the year 806, and in whom he thereafter had the greatest confidence. This is the same

Nicephorus whom it was pleased to inscribe in the catalogue of saints, to be celebrated for many great miracles, on account of his assertion of images under Leo the Armenian and his laceration of the Iconomachs. Thus Theodore the Studite, that most abject adulator and weathervane, in a letter sent to Emperor Nicephorus in the 5th year of his reign, though he was already accused of tyranny, cruelty, and insatiable avarice from the very beginning of his reign, called him "divinely appointed to the Empire, with God's Church under his care." In contrast, Michael the Monk, in his *Life of this Theodore*, for the same year writes: "Nicephorus I say, that wicked one, who invaded the Empire by force and injury," and more, as described by Baronius. Thus you may observe that these masked monks perpetually wrote contradictory things. 3. That Emperor Nicephorus took action against Plato and Theodore the Studite, he did not do so for the Iconoclastic cause, but for sedition and schism, of which they were again the leaders, under the guise of sanctity. Nor were they cast into exile by the emperor, but by a Constantinopolitan Synod, as Theophanes explicitly states. For these men made a second secession from Patriarch Nicephorus and the Church, first on the pretext of his lay status, then because of the restoration, after a synod was held, of Joseph the Oeconomus, who had consecrated the nuptials of Constantine and Theodota, by permission of Tarasius, years before, and on this account was to be deposed.

And indeed, that Joseph had been absolved and restored, having deprecated his fault in a synod, because he had performed that consecration under orders, after completing nine years of penance. What did the monks Plato and Theodore do? They seceded with their followers, among whom was Joseph of Thessalonica, Theodore's brother, and more than ten monks under Theodore alone: they write and pour out the most contemptuous things against the patriarch, and at the same time against the synod: they call the synod impious, Moechian, heretical, sacrilegious, etc., and in the most petulant manner, for a cause of mere discipline, which had been weighed in two synods, these monks rage out of hatred for that Joseph and for Patriarch Nicephorus, about to mix the lowest with the highest. Indeed, that Theodore who at other times would flatter the Roman Pontiff, after he learned that his schism was displeasing to Leo III, forthwith wrote letters to Rome full of anger, pride, and rebuke, not about to spare the Pontiff himself. "What is it to us about the Pope, whether he does this or that? He is caught by his own wings. He has derided the head of the Church. O Hierarchy!" etc. What does Baronius say to this powerlessness of Theodore, whom he everywhere sublimates as more eminent than all the saints? "They suffered," he says, "an eclipse, like the Sun and the Saint. Theodore suffered an eclipse for a moment under a cloud of black bile." Plainly, as he had already suffered under the previous emperor Constantine, as Maimburgius confesses, and as he will be established to have suffered most frequently thereafter, under Leo the Armenian and Michael. And surely neither the Gallican clergy, nor the emperor of the Gauls, would have decreed today that these turbulent and raging monks be punished by mere prison or exile, as was done by Emperor

Nicephorus, however much he was inclined to cruelty. And Maimburgius prudently judged that all these things were to be passed over in silence for the years 807, 808, 809, and 810, about to dissimulate the furies of his saints, but to assert, on the sole faith of the most hostile monks, that Nicephorus, because he had decreed exile for them and liberty for the Iconoclasts, had "perished in his sins like another Pharaoh," in a less than Christian manner.

IV. Nicephorus having been killed by the Bulgars, Michael Rhangabe, the Curopalates, or he who had the supreme care of the palace, the son-in-law of the deceased Nicephorus, was put in his place, in the month of October of the year 811, Indiction IV, against the rights of succession, by the faction of Patriarch Nicephorus and the monks. For Stauracius, the son of Nicephorus, was tonsured by them and violently thrust into a monastery, whom Tarasius had adorned with a diadem eight years before, having been named emperor by his father. But that Baronius, and hence Natalis and Maimburgius, might approve the tyrannical elevation of Michael, it was reason enough that he is reported to have favored the cult of images, and also the factious Theodore, Plato, and Joseph of Thessalonica, after he had ordered them to return to grace with the patriarch and had given them freedom from prison. He did so, however, solely out of a desire for peace, having perceived the power of the Iconolaters and the audacity of the monks. Whence, under this prince, those who were numerous even in the royal city in vain hoped that the yoke, by which the Iconomachs were being advanced, would be taken away. Michael, induced by the monks, and for the rest devoted to clemency and peace, ordered the sons of Constantine, who had long been blinded, to be deported, the Iconomachs (to be traduced, as was the custom, by the names of Paulicians, Athingani, and Manichaeans) to be afflicted with plagues, and Nicolaus the hermit to be killed with his tongue cut out, on account of his having scraped an image of the mother of God. For the rest, he was an idle and most timid prince, and hence to be shut away, either by the persuasion or with the consent of Patriarch Nicephorus, with Leo the Armenian, the commander of the eastern forces, being soon crowned by the same patriarch, in the month of July, A.D. 813. Concerning which matters, consult Theophanes and the Uncertain Author, who is much more recent and who, instead of July, designates June. And the son of this Michael was that Ignatius who was later to contend with Photius for the patriarchate, called Nicetas before his monastic tonsure.

But also under this Michael, the Baronial sanctity of Theodore the Studite is to be suspected anew. For that the peace with the Bulgars, which the emperor, the patriarch, and the metropolitans were urging on account of the afflicted state of affairs, was prohibited by his rash audacity, and on this most vain pretext, that a peace of this kind would rescind the mandates of God, is related at length by Theophanes for the second year of Michael's reign. And the same Theophanes most rightly calls this Theodore with his followers "wicked counselors, not knowing even what they were saying." And Baronius is in vain in defending the

Studite, and in seeking colors for the schemes of this meddler (whose place it was to contain himself within his cell and to be free for God) in disturbing and everywhere embittering matters of peace and war, in the court, in the church, and in the republic. And it would have been well done, we speak humanly, with the churches of the East, if in this year he had passed on to the majority with his Plato, whose death they refer to the 4th of April, in the year 813. Which day, as Jacobus Capellus observes, was Easter in that year, whence the mendacious circumstances of the Pseudo-Theodore, to whom the *Life of Plato* is attributed, become apparent, as do all the others.

V. Furthermore, a little digression of the historian Maimburgius comes to be noted. Theophanes had related that public prayers were poured out in Constantinople for the army of Michael, and that certain heretics, namely Iconomachs, having opened the sepulchre of Copronymus, poured out prayers at it, that he might succor the perishing Republic. Hence it was disseminated by some of them that Constantine, seated on a horse, had proceeded to battle against the barbarians. This was cause enough for Maimburgius to fill several pages with mocking such miracles. Hence he says, "nothing is easier than to abuse the credulity of the simple populace in matters of this kind: the common people always incline to superstition: if an imposture is but slightly veiled, it is immediately believed to be a miracle, etc.," which he clearly meant to be said of his own side, with the frequent impostures of the monks being accused on the one hand, and the credulous simplicity of both historians and the populace on the other. Lest, however, he might be arraigned as a defendant, he finally turns the accusation against the heretics: "But this is the fate of heretics, that they have never been able to produce miracles, and yet they always want to imitate miracles." They want to, forsooth! who judge this note to be of the Antichrist from Matthew, Mark, and John, and who laugh with Augustine at the miracle-mongers, "against whom God has made me cautious," said the man of Hippo. But that Maimburgius is playing a role on the stage and everywhere making a game of his readers has long been observed by the men of Port-Royal. Now certainly, he who with composed wit, as often elsewhere, scoffs at the miracles boasted of by his Catholics, although his pages are truly a "laughing-stock," it is nevertheless not unpleasant to observe this man, throughout this entire work of the Iconoclastic history, peddling and extolling with magnificent words the most absurd miracles and the most putrid fictions, drawn from legends and the petty Greeks, but in such a way that you see a Momus.

VI. There follow the times of Leo the Armenian, most hated by the Iconolaters, and hence also by Baronius, Petavius, and especially Maimburgius, who will apply all their industry to turn this Leo, no less than the former Isaurian, into a scapegoat. Whence we, from Theophanes, the *Miscella*, the continuators of Theophanes, the Pseudo-Michael, Cedrenus himself, and also Maimburgius, although he overflows with their fury against the Armenian, will give a brief

history of this prince. And at the same time, we will exhibit a brief conspectus of the lies, contradictions, fables, and of the Maimburgian fidelity, which he foreswore in his whole work. The reader should also observe this, that while the Jesuit is most concerned with the Iconodules oppressed by Leo, he shows the way by which the Reformed should be oppressed in his own France. Which insidious artifice of the historian we have already, in the persecution excited by Copronymus, submitted to the judgment of our readers. Now concerning Leo. That Leo was born in an illustrious place, Theophanes, Ignatius in the *Life of Nicephorus*, the *Annals of the Franks*, cited by the author of the *Byzantine History*, and also the continuator of Theophanes, the *Miscella*, and others, agree. He was the son of the patrician Bardas, already renowned under Copronymus, a patrician himself, then Praetor of the Orientals, a most brave commander, who had obtained this skill in waging war, and hence the glory of his name and esteem among all, only through long practice, with Maimburgius assenting, in his character sketch of him. That he was moreover conspicuous for piety, even before his accession to the Empire, Theophanes and the *Miscella* explicitly state, whence the Byzantines also report that he delighted in attending sacred services and singing the psalms publicly. But also that Leo was an enemy of all pleasures, sober, liberal, laborious, most vigilant, favoring all the best men, and most alien from accepting gifts, a supreme scorner of money, most tenacious of justice, punishing offenses without respect of persons, is confessed by Natalis and Maimburgius, from Cedrenus himself, Zonaras, and others. Whence that memorable example, in which he removed the Prefect of the City from office for not having punished a senator who was the ravisher of another's wife, and ordered the senator himself to be punished according to the laws. Besides, that Leo abhorred invading the tyranny, all things prove. Namely, that he had already declined the Empire, at the time when Michael Curopalates, refusing it, would cede it to Leo, as a pious, most brave, and in all things strenuous commander, but he, confessing himself unworthy of that high station: his fidelity to Michael and the Republic was proven in all things, and his extraordinary merit, and most recently his checking the attack of the barbarians by his own virtue while the prince was fleeing, and his saving the troops for the emperor by a strenuous battle, while the palatine cohorts were turning their backs: his vehement struggle and resistance, and the delay interposed when the soldiers were calling him emperor: his opposition, to those imploring his aid, of the fidelity to be kept to the emperors, his upright mind, immune from the stain of treachery, the difficulty of the times, the imminent barbarians, and what other reasons Leo alleged, is most explicitly stated by Theophanes, the chronicler of his time, who was most knowledgeable of affairs, and after him by the *Miscella* and Anastasius. And certainly, Leo's character, from what has just been conceded, was very alien from ambition, luxury, effeminacy, pleasures, the cupidity for treasures, injustice, and the other things which that height of power and the splendor of dignity are accustomed to offer, and was proven throughout the entire course of his Empire. Indeed, he resisted the offered tyranny to such an extent, until

Michael the Stammerer, with a drawn sword, threatened that he would inflict a lethal wound upon him, as the most slanderous historian himself reports, under the name of the Continuator of Constantine Porphyrogenetus.

VII. Since Leo was such a man, to be moved to the Empire unwillingly and reluctantly, by the consensus of the opposing historians themselves, observe the historical fidelity of Maimburgius, based on one or two impostors, but also the unhappiness of Leo, who, if he had but adored images, or added his patronage to those who adore them, would have been extolled above all princes by those very same men. Do you wish now to compare these Maimburgian vices of Leo with his prior virtues? "No greater impostor or cheat ever existed, no mind was ever fouler and more wicked, no one more skilled in dissimulating and deceiving, and in concealing under a fair appearance the execrable plans which his ambition suggested to him." And the Jesuit everywhere calls him a hypocrite, wicked, perfidious, impious, cruel, a traitor, attacked with infinite crimes, and if there are any things harsher than these. Do you wish to know Leo's birth, origin, condition? He who recently was the son of the patrician Bardas, a most experienced commander, is now "born in an obscure place, a most abject soldier, in the service of Bardanes scarcely two years before the death of Rhangabe, conspicuous for no dignity as yet." Do you wish to know the Armenian's character? He who before was valued by Maimburgius himself for his singular acumen, judgment, prudence, and marvelous dexterity in peace and war, has now become the "laughingstock of a sorcerer and an impostor," afterwards also of the monks, a man of credulous superstition, demented and terrified by the phantasms of visions and apparitions, and thinking himself lost if he did not destroy the images, on account of the mere word of a wicked Iconoclast. Do you wish to know the manner of his occupation of the Empire? He who before had far from him the causes of ambitioning it, having twice refused the Empire, according to the testimony of the earlier Byzantines, now "seized it tyrannically," having betrayed the army of Michael, the emperor having been secretly traduced and accused of cowardice among his own men, and the affairs of the empire having been brought into extreme danger by a detestable fraud, so that they might demand him as a helper. And they say that all those schemes of Leo, and his confidence in his future greatness, were based on the presages of certain seers, at a time when Leo was a little man of most abject fortune, just as they fabricated about Leo the Isaurian. But what sort of seers were these? On the one hand, some hermit or other, during the reign of Nicephorus, a distinguished scoundrel, wicked, a Manichaeon, a sorcerer, an impostor, who had predicted the tyranny to Leo and the Stammerer and Thomas, three soldiers then serving Bardanes, and of most humble fortune, and the event was to prove, with the utmost accuracy (in these three themselves), the prophetic spirit of that seer. On the other hand, a certain female servant, mad, maniacal, wretched, filling the court of Michael with inauspicious cries, and describing the successor to the empire as a certain courtier named Theodotus, not even seen by the seer herself, but that this same Theodotus would meet him at such a place and time, and

riding on a mule, who was Leo the Armenian. Whence the precaution of this Theodotus, the colloquy with Leo the Armenian, the stipulation for the future, then the concocted deceits, impostures, and schemes between the two for the destruction of images, and finally, the reward for so many frauds, the patriarchate of Constantinople for Theodotus. Whoever wishes for these trifles, let him seek them from Maimburgius himself, for they will fill almost the entire history of Leo.

And do not believe that there is room here for their refutation, which not even a most superstitious old woman would accept. And Maimburgius wove those tales, partly from his own invention, partly from Cedrenus, Zonaras, and some later centuries, partly and principally from the most mendacious Anonyms, among whom are the Continuator of Theophanes, another of Porphyrogenetus, and the author of the *Life of Theophanes*. All are shamefully at odds with Theophanes, the *Miscella*, Anastasius, Patriarch Nicephorus, and with themselves, and are profusely mendacious, even from those things which we have just compared. But no one has surrendered himself more shamefully than the French ex-Jesuit, who after befouling nearly a hundred Parisian pages with these trifles, and after narrating those things about Leo which would scarcely befit a fool, a madman, fed on chimeras, visions, dreams, and conspiring only with the most insipid scoundrels, finally after Leo's exit has been recounted (as he pleased), he begins thus: "Unless Leo had been the most wicked of mortals," repeating there the insult of his accusations, "he would have deserved the greatest glory, and would have been inscribed among the great princes for his brilliant virtues. He was strong in intellect, fortitude, and prudence, as much as is desired for the administration of a great empire. He was strenuous, the greatest of commanders, daring to attempt without temerity, executing with industry, fortunate in his undertakings, dexterous, vigilant, laborious, an enemy of pleasures, liberal, always solicitous for the public good, lest anything be lacking either for the advantage of the republic, or for the security of his subjects, or for the most exact administration of justice, which he himself administered within the palace on set days of the week, punishing offenses most severely, and in no way accepting persons," with the example of the senator subjoined, who through the Prefect of the City had with impunity ravished the wife of a man of lesser fortune.

The Jesuit continues: "What is most to be praised in that prince, he never looked at anything but merit, nor did he ever distribute provinces, prefectures, or offices, whether civil or military, except to the more worthy, giving nothing to favor, less to money, which as he greatly scorned, so he never suffered any account to be taken of it, but only of merit, lest justice bought for a price be sold for a dearer one." For which reason it happened that Patriarch Nicephorus, although removed from the patriarchate on account of his pertinacious iconodulia, nevertheless, on hearing of the slaughter of this prince, burst forth in this cry, according to Cedrenus: "The Roman state, alas, though he was impious,

has yet lost a great guardian." The Continuator of Porphyrogenetus has "a caretaker of the common good." "The Roman state, although he was less than pious," namely on account of the removed images, "has yet been deprived of a great guardian, for whom the republic was a true care." You, whoever you are, reconcile these things with the superior maledictions with which Leo is torn apart: while for Maimburgius and the most slanderous monks, he is entirely a crime, a monster, an enemy of God and men, who did not even think it honorable to name God. Hence the Jesuit alleges the error of Theophanes and Nicephorus, whom the "external appearance" of Leo deceived. Indeed! who were witnesses for some years of the Leonine empire, and were to be punished with exile and prison on account of their most pertinacious zeal for images, even to the point of sedition; with the *Miscella* and Anastasius confirming the history of Theophanes.

VIII. And these things were to be prefixed, so that all may understand what the Iconolaters dared in history, what the furious and most abject petty Greeks dared, long after the times of Leo, when the monks and the imaginers were triumphant everywhere, and finally what the Jesuit accomplished, having forgotten both himself and his shame. Therefore, even from that fury against Leo, it is sufficiently established that this prince was alien to the superstition of the Nicenes. But the same prudence and moderation which accompanied him throughout his whole empire, except towards criminals, also shone forth in this whole cause concerning images. The summary of his actions, in this matter indeed, comes down to this, from the certain faith of history. 1. It is certain that Leo felt the same things about images as Charlemagne in the West, and hence Louis the Pious and the men of Frankfurt. Whence also the splendid legation of Leo to Charlemagne, as soon as he took up the reins of the empire, but which fell to Louis the Pious in the year 814, Charlemagne having in the meantime passed away, and a treaty having been confirmed with Louis. 2. Such was the indulgence of Leo, that having been moved to the Empire in the year 813, he dealt most gently with the Iconodules, content with friendly conferences, colloquies, and a most diligent examination of the matter, finally indicting a Synod in Constantinople toward the end of the year 814, in which the iconolatriy of the Pseudo-Nicene Synod was condemned. And at last, in the year 815, Patriarch Nicephorus was driven from his station on account of his pertinacious iconodulia, he who had sat for nine years, from the year 806, as Maimburgius also confesses. Whence that fiction of the petty Greeks, that Leo was made from an Orthodox man into a heretical Iconoclast afterwards. But also concerning that Council of Constantinople under Leo, Theosterictus related most mendacious things in his *Oration on Nicetas*, with him as the sole witness; for example, about the feet of those bishops who dissented being trampled upon in the synod itself, about the cunning manner of proceeding at first, then the tyrannical one, plainly contrary to the prudence and morals of Leo. 3. Leo demanded especially that the cult of images be shown to him by Patriarch Nicephorus and the other Iconodules in the apostolic writings and in those of the Fathers of the first

antiquity, if indeed it were an "ancient tradition." They made the exception that unwritten tradition was sufficient, for many things had not been handed down in writing: also that things which an Ecumenical Council had already defined were not to be re-examined, such as the cult of images by the Nicenes. As if, indeed, the argument was not equal for the definition made in the general council under Copronymus, and thereafter in the general council of the West under Charlemagne. The Continuator of Theophanes, however, invidiously says that Leo wanted testimonies in which Christ had commanded word for word, "adore my image," which is the modern method of the Pontificals, of pressing for express terms of Holy Scripture. On the contrary, the emperor urged all those passages against that worship of images, from Moses and from the Holy Scriptures, which before him the seventh council under Copronymus, and in the West Charlemagne in his Capitulary, had used, about which at length above. Nor, however, is there certain faith in all the circumstances of the colloquy between Leo and Nicephorus, which are recounted by the party adverse to Leo, in the Continuator of Theophanes, Ignatius in the *Life of Nicephorus*, Theodorus Graptus in the fragment which presents that disputation, Michael the Monk in the *Life of the Studite*, and Theosterictus in *Nicetas*, who all marvelously serve their hypothesis, and are discordant in very many things.

4. At last began what they call the Persecution of Leo, in the year 815, which Baronius falsely calls "the beginning of the persecution begun in the previous year." For such was the obstinate mind of Nicephorus, with Theodore the Studite stimulating a man otherwise prudent, that after the moderate counsels of the prince availed nothing, he was moved from his dignity during the time of Lent, in the month of March, before the second year of Leo the Armenian was completed. He was soon transferred to a place near the city, built by himself, with Theodotus, an illustrious man and son of a patrician, being substituted into the patriarchal see. The same was the case with the contumacious monks, who would have provoked even the most indulgent prince to vengeance, as they had done to the Isaurian, Constantine, and the prior Leo, princes before them; with that Theodore, about whom more soon, being the standard-bearer thereafter, and hence Nicolaus his companion, Theophanes commonly called the Confessor, Nicetas the Abbot, and thereafter Methodius under Michael, etc. Whose lives, as of icono-martyrs, monks of unrestrained slander and superstition, long afterwards, under feigned names, wrote to be inserted into the Menologia and Lives of the Saints, in which things are recounted as the Iconolaters wished, true things are obscured or are silenced altogether, false things are invented, and posterity is imposed upon. 5. That very many bishops, abbots, and monks, however, either convicted by Leo, or induced by his gentleness and moderation—as he permitted them whatever they wished within their monasteries, provided they were not seditious nor schismatic—seceded from the factious Iconodules, is related by the Continuator of Theophanes. Most mendaciously does the other

Continuator of Constantine Porphyrogenetus, recently published from the Royal Library, say that Leo so overwhelmed and corrupted them with gifts to draw them to his opinion. This very thing is what the mind of Leo abhorred, namely all corruption and bribery, for whom there was nothing, no silver spears, and who wished not gold to speak, but reason, virtue, and merit, as was the consensus of all above, and of Maimburgius himself. And that they may betray their own fury, which is the character of Iconolatriy and Monachism, if any either omitted, or repudiated, or certainly did not urge the cult of images (which they recently confessed to be an indifferent matter, and still profess today) with that impetus with which Theodore the Studite and his followers did, they mark all these with the infamy of apostasy, but the rebellious, seditious, and raging Iconolaters they adorn with the names of martyrs, saints, divinities, and confessors, and present them to Christians to be consecrated and worshipped.

IX. Now we say a word concerning Theodore the Studite—who by Baronius, Gretser, Petavius, Maimbourg, and Natalis is joined to the first order of Saints and to the Seraphic spirits—as it pertains to Leo the Armenian. The preceding parts have taught us of the man's powerlessness, his arrogance, his furies, and also his wicked art of flattery when he wished, from the time of Irene onwards. What did he do, after he learned that Leo felt about images what Charlemagne had felt in the West, and what the Gauls still felt, and that Nicephorus had finally been deposed? He who ought to have been contained within the cloisters of his monastery, turned to prayers, tears, and fasts, which are the arms of the Church and the character of the Ascetic Life, was here a fan of seditions and an inciter, leader, and kindler of disturbances everywhere, with that Michael as witness, in whose name the *Life of Theodore* is read, but also with his own epistles as witnesses, and from them, Baronius. *in Baronius ad An. DCCCXIV. and Maimbourg L. II. p. 187.* Hence, against the Prince's will, he celebrated images in public processions; he sang hymns, such as this one: "We adore thy Immaculate image, O Good One;" he blew the trumpets of war, by writing epistles everywhere, as if in the person of all the Superiors; he incited the Patriarch Nicephorus against Leo; he attacked the Synod convened by Leo as Iconomachic in his letters; and he urged that Apostolic saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men," namely in a matter purely external, and by their own confession neither divinely commanded nor necessary, not to say contemptuous of God and his Law. And how great was Leo's leniency toward this unrestrained audacity and improbity? He punished Theodore only with exile, and finally with prison, when the Emperor saw the man's spirit turning to fury, yet it was not a very harsh or hard prison, nor one similar to the prisons in modern France, whatever the Iconolaters may lie. *Maimbourg p. 191.* The invincible argument for this is that for the entire time he is said to have been bound and incarcerated, he had complete liberty to write and send innumerable epistles—full of wrath, seditions, accusations against Leo, threats, superstitions, and contumacy—to bishops,

abbots, the so-called confessors, to the Roman Pontiff, the Patriarchs of the East, and the dispersed brethren everywhere. *Vide Baron. ad Ann. DCCCXIV, DCCCXV, DCCCXVI, DCCCXVIII, &c.* And rightly now does Baronius say: "Meanwhile, Theodore does not rest. It is plainly to be held as a miracle that, being placed in the strictest prison, surrounded by so many guards, the faculty of writing should have been supplied to him." *Ad Ann. DCCCXVIII.* Indeed, Leo's indulgence is to be held as a miracle, who did not order the man, a firebrand of war, to be more strictly guarded and observed. And if this man had fallen into the times of Louis the Great, and with equal temerity had drawn his pen against the Prince and against the royal Edicts, he would have experienced the wrathful thunderbolts of Jove, and if not the bull of Phalaris, or the bronze bed of Agathocles, or the sack of the Parricides, certainly the force of the avenging flame, or the breaking of his bones, or whatever the laws decree for those guilty of treason.

But who would not almost shudder at the man's immoderate and insane superstition? For example, in his epistle to Naucratus, who was asking about the punishment to be established for the lapsed—that is, for those who had sent away their images, or had obeyed the decrees of Leo—he responds that they are to be held "as those who have denied the name of God, as Christ-o-machs, as deniers of Christ, and that there is no fellowship of light with darkness, etc." *Baronius ad A. DCCCXVI, N. XVIII, XXXI, etc.* That the negation of an image, or of the worship to be shown to an image, is the negation of the Prototype, the negation of Christ himself. That it is a Judaic and Ethnic impiety, for the image of Christ and the Mother of God is called by the same name as Christ and the Mother of God. That the one is inseparable from the other in adoration, the Archetype from the Image. That a martyr for images is a martyr for Christ and Mary, and conversely, a denier of their images denies Christ, denies Mary, etc. Thus for this Theodore, it was not to believe in Christ, if one did not place his trust in an image of the Crucified. It was to abolish Christ, if images were abolished. It was to deny that Christ is to be adored, if anyone denied that the image is to be adored. And according to the Studite, Christ reigning in heaven and His countenance, or the image of the Crucified on a panel, were to be held in the same place, by a certain identity, because the latter is called by the same name as the Prototype. And these very things, which not only Charlemagne would have shuddered at, but which even Maimbourg himself elsewhere attacks—teaching that images are "inanimate things, adiaphora, with no obligation to honor them"—these very things now place Theodore in Heaven, insert him into the Seraphic Order, and show him resplendent with the glory of a Martyr and almost the greatest of the Confessors, because he was the prince of Idolaters, but also the standard-bearer of rebels against the Emperor. *Vide supra Sect. VII. p. 521 & seq.* And the Jesuit still endures to complain, after his Baronius, that he was handed over to stricter custody, to be transferred to Smyrna, or perhaps was received with whips and scourges by the apparitors, with Leo sparing Theodore's life. *Baronius ad Ann. DCCCXVI. N. XX.* He who dared to attack Leo, the greatest of princes as shown above, as the "Lion of the Amorites,"

"Og king of Bashan," the "great Dragon," the "crooked Serpent," a "Vessel of wrath," the "Son of Tabeel," "Ahab," the "exemplar of Julian," the "complement of evil," the "adversary of Christ," etc.

More equitable toward the Armenian was the chronicler Theophanes, commonly called the Confessor—of images and statues, forsooth—who was abbot or prefect of the monastery of the Great Field at the Sigriane mountains on the maritime coast of Asia, which is adjacent to the Propontis, in the theme called Obsequium. *Const. Porph. Lib. II. L. I.* Nevertheless, on account of his pertinacity in asserting the public cult of images, he was at last to die in exile on the island of Samothrace, at the very end of Leo's reign, being different from Theophanes the Presbyter, of whom Baronius speaks in the time of the Empress Theodora.

X. The reader will forgive me if Maimbourg's every page—in which he portrays with lugubrious and tragic words the so-called persecution of this Leo the Armenian decreed against the Iconolaters, the sufferings of the monks, and their lauded constancy in this, "who would rather obey God than men"—recalls to my mind the modern furies in Gaul, unknown, to be sure, in the times of Leo, and those same furies to be excited by the Maimbourgian Society against the whole crowd of the Reformed. The Jesuit describes the times of the Armenian in such a way that he again seems to have been about to prescribe for the French persecutors a kind of tablet and method for extinguishing a religion that knows no idolatry, for most of the things about Leo are false. First he observes the ministers who embittered the spirit of the Great Leo against the Iconolaters. Namely, that there were immediately employed in the manner of a mission "Monks, capable of all crimes, for the sake of capturing the favor of the court." *Ibid. p. 187.* Hence Theodotus the Patriarch, entirely adapted to the manners of the court and to flattery; then bishops selling themselves to the Prince for some smoke of the court. Finally, a little council was assembled under the eyes of Leo, composed of bishops devoted to Leo and the Patriarch, and above all others the Protopsaltes, or Master of the Sacred Clergy of the Palace, "an outstanding hypocrite under the mask of sanctity," who would bind the Prince's conscience and secretly inspire counsels in him for the extermination of the Iconodules. By which things you would swear the Jesuit was intent upon the modern ministers and the most ascertained authors of the feral edicts for the extermination of the Reformed in Gaul.

He continues, and describes the manner of the savagery exercised against the Iconolaters—that is, against the seditious and rebellious monks or bishops—thus: "Leo envied them the glory and crown of Martyrdom, yet in such a way that all fury might be poured out upon them, that they might be afflicted with infinite torments, that they might be thrown into horrendous prisons, and there be oppressed with afflictions far more intolerable than death itself." *Ibid. p. 190, 196.* Let the walls of the Gallican prisons speak today, and the lamentable

voices, not now of this or that seditious bishop or monk, but of most innocent old men, matrons, widows, virgins, and infants throughout the whole kingdom, and the wails of mothers, weeping for their children because they are not, and for whom even nooses, and axes, and pyres, certainly capital punishment, would be a supreme solace, just as the extremity of punishments is not to have been allowed to die. They are guilty of certainly no other crime—which indeed Maimbourg falsely says of the Iconolaters—than that they "prefer to obey God rather than men," when these men command not that minimally necessary or essential things to Christianity like images be abdicated, but that Religion and Conscience be forsworn, or that they be made guilty of treason to the Royal Majesty, to whom there is an immediate dominion over consciences and into eternity. *Ibid.* p. 192.

Again the Jesuit, about to describe the forced and unwilling defections, partly by threats, partly by the blandishments of so great a prince, says that at last many "subscribed to the formula offered by the Patriarch, not sufficiently examining their own heart, with a detestable betrayal of their faith, with an infamous cowardice, having committed perjury against their God, they were to perform a late penitence, and wash away their lapse with tears, confession, and martyrdom." *Ibid.* p. 192, 193. Behold for yourself, in a far truer image, the modern subscriptions and defections, and the anguishes, sorrows, and plaints which follow them, and the remedy sought either in flight, far from the borders of their unfortunate fatherland, or in martyrdom! We pass over those most insulting and horrendous things he says against the Emperor Leo, according to the genius of the Society. For them, a favorable Prince is a Deity; one more alien from the Society is a Tyrant, to have removed whom from the world is the next step to martyrdom. Hence he also insults the dead Leo, whom (by their own confession) perhaps no prince surpassed in virtues, and few equaled, in a manner hardly Christian, following the example of Theodore the Studite and the rebels. I speak of Leo, who was cut down by the hands of parricides in the year 820, by the faction of Michael the Stammerer and the conspirators, on the very Feast of the Nativity, in the middle of the sacred rites, during the Matins praises, within the nave of the church of the Holy Palace, when he himself was leading the singing with a rather loud voice (as he was a most loving student of the sacred hymns and of "leading in the psalmody" with pious zeal) and was intoning this beginning of a sacred Ode: "They spurned all things for love of the highest Prince." *Hist. Compend.* p. 491. These things indeed are from Cedrenus, and from several Byzantines much later than Theophanes, who add Leo's prophetic words to his wife Theodosia, and his last words to the parricide: "Spare your Prince, I adjure you by the sanctity of the time and place!"

XI. What was done in the cause of images under Michael the Stammerer, the Stammerer, a native of upper Phrygia, first a familiar of Leo and a Count of the cohort of the Excubitors, hence a rebel and parricide, and finally his successor to the Empire from the year 820 to 829, must now be noted in the briefest terms,

while we observe the recent writers. The sum is this, with the monk Michael the Studite himself, G. Cedrenus, and the Annals of the Franks as witnesses: 1. That Michael, soon after the sons of Leo were removed and castrated, convoked a Synod in Constantinople to compose the cause of images, having recalled the exiles, including Theodore the Studite himself, with a place for both sides in the future Synod. This was not the same equity that Irene had shown in her Pseudo-Nicene robber council. But the factious Theodore resisted this salutary counsel, which had been approved in the Emperors from the time of Constantine the Great. His epistle, written in the name of the factious bishops, is confessed by Maimbourg as well. *Part. II. p. 240*. For in it, having declined the Synod and shamefully betrayed the liberty of the Eastern Church, they wish for a declaration to be expected from Old Rome, as the See of Peter, with Paschal then sitting, certain already of the sanction of Iconolatriy by that route. *Baronius ad A. DCCCXXI, N. XXXVI*. Whence the unrestrained audacity and supreme iniquity of the Theodorian faction is clear, since they wanted a Synod assembled from Iconodules alone, and moreover they appealed to a judge whom they knew to be devoted to the cult of images.

2. Soon the Emperor Michael, however much he might profess about himself that he had hitherto neither venerated nor adored any image, and that he would remain the same, intending in the meantime to approve the highest equity in this cause, gave Theodore and his followers the liberty of following their own opinions, leaving the images where they had been placed, provided that they erected no images in the Royal City. *Baron. ad A. DCCCXXI, N. XL*. Hence he also imposed silence on this controversy, and ordered both the Synod of Constantine and the other of Tarasius, that is, the Pseudo-Nicene, to be set aside, as George the Monk, recently edited from the Royal Library, explicitly says. *In Mich. p. 510, Script. post Theoph.* And let not Maimbourg say that he did this out of any fear, for he proclaims the Emperor's "intrepid and audacious spirit," which the very manner in which he invaded the tyranny, and his military fortitude, sufficiently evince. *Maimbourg L. II. p. 236*. 3. This constant equity of Michael is further confirmed by his legation to Louis the Pious in the year 823, and the epistle written in his and Theophilus's name to the King of the Franks, which Baronius presents in its entirety. It is "very Orthodox," says Maimbourg, "if you except the article on images." *Ad An. DCCCXXIV, Num. XVII*. Now let the reader judge of that article. For in it, first the Emperor recites the horrendous superstitions of the Iconolaters, by which they would set up images everywhere in place of the Cross, seek aid from images, make them godmothers for infants, mix colors scraped from them into the sacred oblations, communicate upon them or from their hands, etc. Then he teaches that these very things, and others which the Nicene Acts and the subsequent Iconolatriy of the Greeks sufficiently confirm (of which Natalis presents an example from the monk Pantaleon in Dissertation VI, and Rev. Allix in Dissertation on the Councils), were the

cause for Leo the Isaurian to remove images from the lower places, leaving, however, those which were placed in higher places, with only adoration, the lighting of lamps, incense, and insane superstition being prohibited. *Pag. 761 T. XIV. Cap. VII. p. 49.* Finally, he concludes that he now feels and holds the same, that those who study such malign inventions are to be cast out of the Church of Christ; at the same time a confession of Faith was published, and the consent of Louis was sought against the pseudo-Christian seducers, with legates and gifts even being sent to the Pope himself of old Rome, for the sake of establishing concord. For there was no other end of the legation than that Louis, who had still preserved for himself the rights of supremacy in Rome itself and everywhere in the Dominions donated to the Roman Pontiff, should strive with his might and authority toward this end, that "all the Greek calumniators and schismatic Iconolaters who had been carried there from the East might be ejected from Rome." *Maimbourg L. II. p. 257. Maimbourg L. II. p. 253.* And why? Because these whirlwinds were applying all their effort to impeding concord, in the unity of the Faith, between the East and the West. Than which, indeed, nothing more equitable or more worthy could be expected or instituted by a Christian Prince.

3. It should not seem strange, however, if Michael afterwards departed from that mildness toward the Iconolaters, to punish the seditious among them with the mildest penalty. This was when the faction of Theodore was openly working against these moderate counsels of Michael, persuading nothing moderate, nor putting any limit to superstition; and also when the same faction was favoring the Tyrant Thomas, who was inducing the Iconolaters to his side, but who was to be crushed by Michael in Asia and the East after a three-year war and a fruitless siege of Constantinople. *Vide Cedr. p. 499.* They had factiously joined him, as they had formerly joined the tyrant Artabasdu under Copronymus, then Irene, and Michael Rhangabe. For the rest, that Theodore the Studite was opportunely taken away in his extreme old age by a natural death, in the year 826, on the island of Chalcites. Concerning his pseudo-miracles, nearly infinite, his final illness, and his last words, the one witness is the Monk Michael, in his Life, found in Surius, Baronius, and hence our Maimbourg and his associate Natalis. Meanwhile, the Byzantine historians, who say little of that Theodore, or things not always favorable to that monk, are silent about these most absurd and mendacious things—certainly Theophanes, as shown above, and his Continuator, then another anonymous chronicler, Cedrenus, Curopalates, Zonaras, George the Monk, and others.

XII. We pass over in this place the putrid and insipid fables of the most mendacious Greeks about this Michael, because he was by no means an Iconolater, as also thereafter about Theophilus his son and successor, fables which Maimbourg, as is his custom, will also augment. That this Prince was certainly most vigilant is the consensus of all, an intrepid general, fortunate in

war, a tamer of factions, and a bulwark against the tyranny usurped by Thomas and also against the Saracenic power. Although these latter, while Michael was distracted by the civil war, most ruinous to the Republic, took possession of the island of Crete (and other Cyclades, and Sicily) in the year 822, and built a city on a suitable shore of Crete, to which they gave the name Chandax, whence the name of Candax and Candia has stuck to the whole island. *Cedr. Ed. R. p. 510. Georg. Mon. in Mich. p. 510.* Maimbourg himself has confessed above, from the letters to Louis the Pious and from his responses to the Iconoclasts, that this Michael also earned praise for his assertion of the Catholic Faith and of the six prior Universal Synods, and for his supreme equity in the cause of images, though he adds, calumniating, that "he did not act sincerely in this, but used dissimulation, on account of the grave war incumbent upon him." *p. II, pag. 243.* In a word, Michael, though an invader of the Empire, afterwards studied to reconcile to himself the grace of God and men, fulfilling all those things which could be desired from an Emperor, a general of war, and a governor of the Church. So that even George the Monk, though an Iconolater, describing the death of Michael in the month of October, 829, from difficulty of urination and nephritic pain, says that he was badly extinguished, "that he departed life badly," or to the detriment of the Christian Republic. *In Mich. p. 513.* But Theodore the Studite had also praised him intensely in the year 821, in Baronius, calling the Emperor "Christ-loving," a "new David," another "Josiah," a "King of a pacific Empire," etc., after liberty from exile was granted to him and his followers, thinking (says Baronius) that the Emperor was truly Orthodox. Good words!

Away, therefore, with the impostures of Cedrenus, Curopalates, the Uncertain Continuator, Zonaras, hence Baronius, and especially of both the most recent writers, by which this Michael is insipidly traduced as infected with the impiety of the Athingans, Sabbatians, Manichaeans, and Enchanters; as ascribing his successful military outcomes not to God, but to himself and his own prudence; as a favorer of all heresies, a Semi-Jew, a Sadducee; as polluted by sacrilegious and incestuous nuptials, namely on account of his legitimate marriage with Euphrosyne, a virgin princess brought out of a monastery, and joined to Michael after the death of Thecla, at the great insistence of the nobles and by the wish of all and with Christian rite. *Job. Scylitz. Zonar.* For the authors of all these calumnies were partly the Tyrant Thomas and his faction, and partly the Iconolater monks, by whom all those princes are called impious who have rejected the cult of images from the time of the Isaurian. If you do not know the Athingans, thus they called men devoted to pseudo-divination and magic arts, such as were commonly called Bohemians, Egyptians, Zingali or Zingari by the Italians; and because these were said to be most numerous in parts of Phrygia, and Michael was a native of Amorium in Phrygia, hence the occasion for the fable. With equal impudence they say that Michael proposed for himself one exemplar to imitate: Copronymus or Cabalinus. And yet the preceding history, from the Byzantines themselves and from the Annals of the Franks, proves that the Synod of Constantine was equally rejected by Michael, as was the Nicene of

Tarasius, and that he followed in the footsteps of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. *Maimbourg L. II. p. 247.* They are more absurd when they attribute whatever evils afflicted the Republic—earthquakes, the plague, disasters received, Crete occupied by the Spanish Saracens—to Michael, as do Cedrenus, Zonaras, and the later Greeklings; evils which they ought more truly to have ascribed to the rebellion of Thomas against the Prince, to the movements of seditions, to civil discords, to the foul superstition which fascinated minds, and to the common wickednesses throughout the Empire. Indeed, that Heaven favored Michael against the tyrant Thomas is demonstrated more lucidly by that wondrous earthquake by which the walls of the castle of Paneas collapsed like those of another Jericho, an opportune portent for the Emperor, and then by the disasters of the Saracens, and the frequent victories of Michael. *Baronius ad Ann. DCCCXXIV, N. VI.*

XIII. There remains the Emperor Theophilus, son of Michael by his first wife Thecla, a prince most adorned with virtues, to be equated with the greatest Emperors, a most rigid exactor of justice, and a severe vindicator of all impiety, "a better Tydides than his father," with Maimbourg himself confessing it, compelled by the force of truth. *Lib. VI. p. 310, etc.* So much so, that at the very beginning of his reign he struck with the sword all the accomplices in the death of Leo the Armenian, although that deed had made a step for his own father to the throne of the Augusti. Therefore, by the reckoning of all even his opposing writers—Nicetas the Paphlagonian, Cedrenus, Zonaras, George the Monk, etc.—when they speak of this Theophilus, not only was he an outstanding champion of justice, but also of clemency, with many examples in the Byzantines. He was the greatest hater of avarice and sordid arts, even in his wife Theodora. He was most religious toward God, Christ, and the sacred rites, with his own honor also being given to the Theotokos. He was most studious of the public good, and of public edifices, whether for the ornament of the city or for its fortification. Nor was the care for the poor, the aged, and the wretched object to this prince, with xenodochia and houses of charity being erected. He was, however, a strenuous and most brave general, whatever the outcome of the war might be, destined to fight with varied fortune. And at last, the Iconolaters found one thing lacking in this Theophilus: the patronage of images, and for this one thing they assail him with curses: the heresy of Copronymus.

For that he most severely interdicted the cult of images, rejected the Nicene Synod, removed even the images left by his father, and punished pertinacious Iconolaters with exile, prison, and also punishments, is the one voice of all the historians. But in exaggerating what was suffered by Methodius the Abbot, later Patriarch of Constantinople, the brothers Theodore and Theophanes, who came from the East to stir up trouble, Lazarus the contumacious painter of images, and hosts of seditious monks, not without frequent portents and miracles conspicuous in these men, the Greeklings again betray their genius—Curopalates, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Constantine Manasses, the

Pseudo-Acts of the Martyrs—with Maimbourg luxuriating in these and piling up trifles. *Ibid.* p. 313. For besides the fact that all those were not only insulting to the Prince, rebellious against his edicts, seditious in public, and given to effuse superstition towards images, and were firebrands of the imaginary war, it is also the case that most of their sufferings, contests, and often ludicrous circumstances rest on the sole faith of the Iconolaters, and are to be held in the same place as the Acts of the prior martyrs and confessors under Leo, Copronymus, Nicephorus, the Armenian, and Michael the Stammerer. Whence also most of the leading Iconolaters—Methodius, Lazarus, etc.—survived Theophilus, against whom he showed his indignation with exile or prison, rather than with capital punishment, or dire torments, or live burial, such as they fable about Methodius. These things were fabricated so that there might be a place for pseudo-miracles in those men, in whom no trace of the matter appeared. And since such was Theophilus, who was to administer the Empire most happily for twelve years and three months, until the year 842, in which he was extinguished by dysentery, after many brave deeds against the Saracens, it is no wonder if the virtues of so great a Prince were obscured by the malevolence of the Iconolaters.

And Maimbourg, after he had said that the glory of Theophilus had shaken the most celebrated Emperors, and that he was greater than his father in virtues, he himself it is who, propounding to the learned and eyewitness world the furies of mendacious Greece, thereafter presents Theophilus as the most wicked of princes, an impious heretic, "who surpassed all in cruelty, was given to furious wrath, violent, suspicious, credulous, devoted to the magic arts, accustomed to consult magicians," and one who would have elevated the most profligate of all men to the patriarchal dignity. *Lib. VI. p. 310, 311.* And this is the Patriarch John, of whose and his own brother's impiety, magic, debaucheries, and incests with married women, monks, and women outstanding in beauty, Baronius narrates horrendous things from the Iconodules. *Ad Ann. DCCCXLI. N. XXVIII.* And yet this man was not only to be tolerated by Theophilus, the most rigid exactor of justice of all, but was also to be placed as head over the whole Church. This John, in reality, as Maimbourg himself confesses, was a man already most acceptable to Michael for his erudition and merits, and hence was appointed, with Curopalates himself as witness, to oversee the education of Theophilus, whose genius he fashioned for all excellent things, except for Iconolatry, whence these tears. p. 313. And by a like example John was to be elevated by Theophilus to the priesthood, as their own preceptors were elevated to the Papacy, e.g., Sylvester II by Otto III, or Hadrian VI by Charles V. What now are you to do with a man who turns white into black, black into white, who out of Trajans makes Neros, out of Neros Trajans, at his pleasure, who attacks the latter when it suits his cause, and places the former in heaven, according to whether they are favorable or adverse to the Iconolatric cause, which is for them the one index of Christianity, Orthodoxy, piety, faith, and virtue? Thus, he who so often accuses of credulous simplicity, of frauds, of a faith at least suspect and laboring, the miracles, visions, apparitions, predictions of witches, magic incantations, and every kind of

sorcery mentioned everywhere by historians, that this same man in this whole work of the *History of the Iconoclasts*, in reviewing these trifles and adding to them the appearance of truth, is second to none, not even to the most superstitious monk, in the praise of trifles—who would not admire it?

Yet, not the love of Theophilus but the desire to stir up greater envy against him among his own, expressed for Maimbourg a true and indeed ingenuous confession: that Gennadius of Constantinople, famous around the middle of the 15th century, was most mendacious when he wrote, in his exposition for the Council of Florence, that Theophilus at the end of his life detested his heresy, with Baronius praising it. *Lib. V. p. 340*. When, on the contrary, Zonaras, concerning this Theophilus, reports that the Prince, about to die, commended with great ardor of spirit that images should not be restored after his death, or thereafter, leaving a great longing for himself among all, in the year 842, and was to seal his prior faith with his last words. This is also confirmed from the history of John Curopalates or George Cedrenus. *ad Ann. DCCCXLII, N. VI*. From which is also understood the bad faith of Baronius, and hence of Maimbourg, in accusing the savagery of the dying Theophilus, on account of the beheading of Theophobus, formerly a strenuous general, then accused of treason. For the Byzantine explicitly adds that that death was not ascribed by others to the command of Theophilus, but to the deed of the Drungarius or Prefect of the Watch, who "had taken Theophobus's life of his own accord, with no one ordering it." *Ibid. p. 533*. Now to the Byzantine, Baronian, and Maimbourgian praises of Theodora, the widow of Theophilus, because she was the restorer of images.

XIV. It was fated that Iconolatry should first be sanctioned in the East by women, as was done under Irene, and then, having been put to flight by pious Emperors and Synods, should be restored after a time, as under Theodora, the widow of Theophilus, who was to administer the Empire at the nod of the Iconolaters until the mature age of her son Michael, for almost fifteen years. Nor is there any reason why anyone should ascribe that turn of events, or the patronage granted by Theodora to the Iconodules, to the force of truth. First, the Byzantines confess, and Cedrenus or Curopalates at length, that the mother of Theodora, Theoctista, a most superstitious woman, had long been addicted to images while Theophilus was alive, and that she would seduce the daughters of Theodora with little images, as if with dolls. *p. 534, 535*. Then, immediately after the death of Theophilus, that mother, aided by the maternal uncles of Theodora, Patrician men and tutors of Michael, instigated her daughter, being "perpetually incited by her reproach," to consecrate the images again. It is also established that there is a certain natural propensity of the sex to superstition, and to those things which affect the senses. Especially if a greater force is added, and fear is injected by those whose authority is to be feared by a woman, then the specious mask of sanctity, and the fame of some recent miracle, as if of a divine voice. All these things concurred to bend the mind of the reluctant Theodora in favor of the

images, besides the superstition of her mother, by whom her nieces, the daughters of Theodora, were also corrupted. Namely, the authority of Theoctistus and Manuel, men then principes in the court and the army, Patricians, and "tutors and moderators" of the infant Prince, doubtless so that with the Iconomachs cast down, they might administer matters under Theodora at their pleasure. Theoctistus had been under Theophilus the *Logothete of the Course*, properly the supreme procurator of the couriers throughout the Empire, a dignity joined with that of *Protosecretis* or "of the inkstand," who presided over the chrysobulls or sacred diplomas, and kept the *canicleum* or inkstand, a vessel splendid with gems, in which was the red ink or purple liquid with which the Emperors would sign the golden bulls. Maimbourg, from others, renders this "Grand Chancellor." *George Mon. in Mich. p. 534*. Manuel, however, was a general of the legions, Magister and *Domesticus* or Procurator, Count, and Prefect of the *scholae* or *tagmata*, the military orders, as if not at all "at leisure," but under perpetual discipline.

To the authority of the men was added monastic fraud, namely by the promulgation of the plainly miraculous convalescence of Manuel, at the prediction of the monks of the Studium, on the condition that he would procure the restoration of the Sacred Images. When not even these things sufficed to overcome Theodora who, as Cedrenus says in express words, "resisted" this undertaking, alleging her husband's circumspection in proscribing the cult of images, who had done nothing "unadvisedly," but with the highest accuracy, according to the Laws and the Holy Scriptures; alleging also the religion of the oath by which she had been bound to Theophilus, and the last words of her spouse, then Manuel resorted to threats, to terrify the woman. He threatened Theodora with a "swift overthrow of her life and expulsion from the empire," from which she was "terrified," according to Cedrenus and Curopalates. But it pleased the more recent Byzantines, hence Baronius, and especially Maimbourg, to invert everything. *Lib. VI. p. 344. seq.* For he, at length, says that Theodora had always been Catholic, that is, an adorer of images, had dissembled while Theophilus was alive, but after he was dead, had secretly agreed about all these things which were done by Theoctistus and Manuel, that they all played a scene on a stage, that after these counsels of Theodora, Manuel first fell into a lethal illness, and hence was to be restored by a miracle, at the prophetic words of the disciples of Theodore the Studite, to the great joy of the Empress, to whom this one thing was lacking for innovating in sacred matters. Behold the faith of historians, and the security of their readers! This is now certain, that the factious Iconolaters interposed no delay after Theodora's mind was bent. Hence, soon the exiles for the cause of images were to be recalled, the Patriarch John to be deposed, Methodius, formerly a defender of images, to be substituted, and a council to be convoked in Constantinople in that same year 842, in which the Nicene Synod was confirmed, the heresy of the Iconoclasts was condemned, and the Sacred Images were "reduced to that veneration which was formerly owed to them," as the Synodal book says. *T. VIII, col. 1782, 1783*. And that the character of

this Synod may be established, at the very beginning Methodius was elected to moderate it, and it was held within the Palace, as Maimbourg confesses, "in the Canicleum," as if to say, in the Chancellery or in the Secretariat of the Holy Palace, over which Theoctistus presided. So that it was lawful for no Iconomach even to mutter. Scarcely had the bishops, abbots, and monks entered, in an innumerable multitude, so Maimbourg says, even those who had been promoted by the Iconoclasts, than they immediately, before anything had yet been proposed, erupted with as great a contention of voice as they could into anathemas against the Iconomachs. *Maimbourg L. VI. p. 356.* No sooner said than done, and the Synod having been dissolved after some appearance of an examination, the images were brought back into the churches as if in triumph. From which time the whole East, with the Armenians however excepted, marveled that it was Iconolater.

And here it is a pleasure to hear the encomia, praises, and effusive prayers of Baronius and those recent writers for Theodora, that for this reason she is to be inscribed in the canon of the Church, and among the Saints whom the Church venerates, with her feast being reported on the 11th of February in the Menologion of the Greeks. Whence Maimbourg says not inelegantly that "evils indeed have come through a woman, but sometimes also the greatest of goods through women," and that the glory of so great a thing is owed to Theodora alone. But the glory of restoring Arianism, Eutychnianism, and gentile superstition at times is also owed to women, as Charlemagne said of Irene, and the ecclesiastical annals testify that almost every heresy began to be propagated from the perversion of this sex.

XV. Nor should it seem very strange that after Theodora was secluded in the year 855, the images remained in the East. Nothing else was permitted by the most corrupt morals of Michael, equated with the Neros and Heliogabali, by the power of Bardas Caesar, the brother of Theodora, by whom the images were supported, and then by the empire of Basil the Macedonian, a nefarious parricide, in the year 867, when the contests were raging for the patriarchate of Constantinople between Photius and Ignatius. Ignatius, I say, the son of Michael Rhangabe, substituted for Methodius by Theodora, a man of effuse superstition. When he was ejected by Michael, Photius was instituted as Patriarch in the year 858. He was indeed the nephew of Tarasius, the prince of the Iconolaters, by his sister, and a creature of Bardas Caesar. He was certainly not going to change the face of things, or exacerbate it, while the Iconolaters held power everywhere, and he already had the supporters of Ignatius, and the Roman Pontiff himself, sufficiently hostile to him, with whom he also had a controversy over jurisdiction in the churches of the Bulgarians. For which reason, Photius, writing to Nicholas in 859, condemned the Iconomachs, and praised the Nicene Pseudo-Synod as the seventh in his book *On the Synods*, with his uncle the Patriarch Tarasius also being extolled with the highest praises. The Synod against Photius, assembled in Constantinople a decade later, in 869, which is

commonly called the Eighth General, is full of brandished anathemas against all Iconomachs from the times of the Isaurians, with the Seventh Synod being confirmed. *T. VIII. Concil. col. 1108.* And so also the author of the Synodal book, and all the subsequent epitomizers of the Synods and Canons in Greece, and the Greeks in the Synod of Florence, Session V, in which they confirmed the Nicene. *T. IX. Concil. col. 29.*

Although more than one difference from the Latins may be observed in the Greeks to this day. First, it is agreed, and Durandus of Mende also observed it, that the Greeks do not tolerate in their churches and sacred places sculpted statues, or statues either carved or cast, of whatever material, which are strictly "idols" to the Septuagint, prohibited as they are by the Law of Moses and proper to gentile idolatry. They admit only "painted images," which are made of colors or of tesserae, or any other fitting material. *Ration. L. I. C. III. §. 2. ad. Nic. II. T. VII. col. 555.* Second, it is likewise confessed, as Maimbourg above from the Nicene Acts, that neither this Synod, nor the subsequent Iconolaters in Greece, approved any images of the "invisible and incomprehensible" God, or of the Holy Trinity, a point which many of our theologians have proven against the recent Latins, and Daillé at the end of Book IV on Images. *Sect. VII. p. 523.* In which, and in many other superstitions concerning images, a huge increase has been added to the Iconolatry of the Greeks, as Durandus, Polydore, Vives on Augustine, Cassander, and many others have already complained in their obvious writings. Third, with whatever salutation they may otherwise venerate images, they ascribe *proskynesis*, which is done with genuflection, only to the images of Christ, and sometimes of the Theotokos, as was long ago observed, and at greater length by Edwin Sandys, on the State of the Eastern Church. *Relat. Cap. II. p. 398.* They certainly have never attributed any *latria*, with the Latins, to the wood of the Cross, or to the image of the Crucified. Fourth, they also wish the honor to be exhibited to images to be no other, at least in doctrine and words, than that which is exhibited to the sacred vessels, the books of the Gospels, the vestments, and the edifices consecrated to God, a point to which the arguments of the Nicene Fathers often seem to look, about which we spoke in Sections VI and VII. Although, as the author of the Byzantine History prolixly shows in Book III, the superstition of the Constantinopolitans concerning the images of the Mother of God was especially wondrous, and to this day some are cruder than others, especially the Russians, whom Olearius in his Itinerary reported to venerate images as gods, and also to call them such. *Constant. Christ. Ed. 1680, p. 89, 91.* For the most part, with uncovered head, they kiss the images with their lips, which for them is to adore, to kiss, to venerate, and the more prudent Greeks did not wish the Nicaeans to go further. That Iconolatric Rome has not stayed within these bounds, either in its doctrine, about which we spoke briefly above, or in its foul and universal practice, is now sufficiently established. *Supra Sect. VII. §. 525, etc.*

Fifth, this is certain, which Durandus of Mende also noted long ago, that the Greeks use painted images far more moderately and sparingly than the Latins. Hence you will observe fewer pictures in the basilicas of the Greeks, and sometimes none, which others have already reported of the temples of the Armenians, of the Christians inhabiting Persia, and sometimes also of the Russians, who fashion them on the gates, so that those entering may salute them. Finally, the images of the Greeks and Orientals are far more modest. Durandus warns that they paint images only from the navel up, and not below, "so that all occasion for foolish thought may be removed." The Dominican Vansleb, in his recent *History of the Alexandrian Church*, reports: "This most laudable thing I found among them, the Christians in Egypt, that all their images are most modest, and they all represent the Blessed Virgin in the same form, always with her head veiled and in a habit which covers her whole body, in the manner of the Orientals, so that no nudity of the virgin's breast, nor of the infant himself, whom she carries in her arms, equally veiled, appears." *Cap. VII. p. 53*. He adds that a great scandal arises for the Schismatics, and also for the Turks who laugh at our religion, at the sight of the images of the Blessed Virgin with bared breasts and a naked infant. For which reasons it long ago happened that the Greeks accused the Latins of immoderate superstition concerning images; but Pantaleon the monk, who wrote of the errors of the Greeks in the 13th century, would have retorted certain Constantinopolitan deeds, which the Byzantine history of the image of the Mother of God in Blachernae, or of the Mother of God Hodegetria, which they believed was painted by Luke, sufficiently confirms. Charles du Fresne wrote of this after others, in his *History of Constantinople*, Book III. *Bibl. Patr. T. IV. Alex. Nat. T. XIV. p. 761*. We say nothing now of the more recent confessions of the Orientals, in which, with all adoration of images being rejected and only the historical use being admitted, they have for the most part departed from the Iconolatriy of Nicaea and of subsequent Greece.

SECTION IX. AND LAST.

Oppositions in the West after the times of Charlemagne and the Synod of Frankfurt. By whom this work was occupied. What remains against Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander. The Iconomachs of Britain. Spain. Italy. Germany. The Gauls under Louis the Pious, and thereafter. The Assembly of Paris. Assenting Prelates and Theologians in the 9th century. Recent exceptions against the Parisian Synod. Maimbourg's arguments individually examined. Was it an Assembly, not a Synod? Other retorts. The difference shown between the Cross and Images. The evasions of Natalis Alexander concerning the opinion of the Gauls in the 9th century, broken and enervated. Proofs from the Gauls themselves against Images. The assent of more recent writers regarding the fact. The statements of Sirmond, Petavius, Baluze, Mézeray. And also of Maimbourg. The most unjust Jesuit against his own Gauls. His acrimony, his savageness. What kind of Gospel Spirit Maimbourg has. The continuation of Iconomachy

observed in the Gauls, still in the 12th Century and following. The moderate Judgments of the Gauls of a former age. Jesuitical Gaul has lapsed into the other extreme. The most recent persecution for having repudiated superstition.

I. At last, with favorable winds, after a long enough voyage, we reach port, having hitherto prolixly recounted and vindicated the entire origin and progress of Iconolatriy, especially from the beginnings of the Eighth Century to its establishment and confirmation in the East from the year 842. There remain the opinions of the Westerners, after what was asserted and historically demonstrated in Section VII concerning the definitions of Charlemagne and the Synod of Frankfurt, against the recent arguments of Petavius, Maimbourg, and Alexander. But in this labor, I have been relieved above all by the most learned men among our countrymen, after the Catalogues of the Witnesses of the Truth: Ussher, *On the Succession of the Churches in the West*; Jean Daillé, in Book IV *On Images*; John Forbes, in Book VII of his *Theological Instructions*; Peter Allix, in his *Dissertation on the definitions of the Councils. Cap. II, §. 9 & deinceps. Cap. V, VI, VII. Cap. X, § 29 & seq. Cap. VII.* What is more, the French Censors, and they Catholic, have offered their historical assent to us in this part, in their judgment on the Maimbourgian Histories, in which they discuss the deeds of the Gallicans under Louis the Pious, and thereafter, in the cause of images. *Entret. p. 179.* For these men, having set out principally from the history of the Synod of Paris, under Louis the son of Charlemagne, in the year 824, which was convoked on the occasion of the letters and legation of Michael the Stammerer, about which we spoke above, and having produced a series of the most bitter oppositions, especially among the Gauls, against the cult of images, have left almost nothing for us to do, except now to point a finger at the most recent fictions of Louis Maimbourg and Natalis Alexander (after Bellarmine, and Petavius from whom they mostly draw their wisdom). For to have indicated these things after the light of truth shining today in authentic writings, is to have confuted and destroyed them. Nor do we vindicate for ourselves the part of judge. *Num. X.*

II. Therefore, against the Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks, and the religious cult of images, whatever it may be, there are produced, after the Caroline Books and the Frankfurt Canon: 1. The consenting Britons, and the churches of the Britons, which by consensus were present through delegates at the Germanic Synod. To this was added the epistle of Alcuin on this matter, written in the name of the bishops and princes of Britain, after Charles had sent them the Synodal Book of the Greeks. Which some have absurdly wished to have been the Caroline Capitulary itself. But concerning the Britons execrating the adoration of images, see Ussher in the cited book, from Simeon of Durham, Roger of Hoveden, the author of the Roffensian History, and others. Among whom ought to be counted in the 9th century the renowned Scots John of Melrose, Claudius Clemens, Rabanus Maurus the disciple of Alcuin, and the great Alfred himself, the founder of the British schools. Who, being almost entirely devoted to translating, commending, and interpreting the Sacred Scriptures, were most alien from

Iconolatriy. Whence Spelman in his *Life of King Alfred*: "The king, according to the precept about not adoring images, substituted it himself against its omission confirmed by the Second Council of Nicaea." *Lib. II. p. 172*. See also the Centuries of Bale, from which it is also clear, and from the Catalogue of Witnesses from Fuller's *Ecclesiastical History of England*, from Ussher, and others, that there proceeded from this discipline, in successive times, men who abhorred every species of idolatry, and singularly the cult of images. Among whom in the late 14th century was John Wycliffe, who was to pass into exile among the Bohemians. The times of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth may be reviewed from the history of the excellent man, Burnet.

2. And no differently the Spaniards, whom the Germanic Synod also teaches to have resisted the cult of images and to have felt the same as Charles and the Frankfurians, of which they themselves were a part. But no one has said that Elipandus of Toledo or Felix, condemned for the adoptionist heresy, dissented from the Gauls and Germans on the head of images. Indeed, Platina in his *Life of Hadrian I*, John Nauclerus, Bernard of Luxembourg, Alphonsus a Castro, Gabriel Prateolus, and if there are more Heresiologists, describe them as Iconomachs. Natalis Alexander, on his own authority indeed, suspects that the aforesaid writers were hallucinating in this. Add that Claudius of Turin, an outstanding Iconomach, was a Spaniard, about whom more shortly. But neither in the Spanish tomes of the councils, before the times of the Saracens, does anything of imaginary superstition appear.
3. The accession of the Italians against image-service, in the dominions of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, whose bishops were present in the Synod of Frankfurt, is indubitable. But especially under Louis the Pious, when Claudius, Bishop of Turin, in great grace and esteem with Louis, intending to eradicate the superstitious and indeed pernicious adoration of images, to which some of the Italians had been devoted from ingrained custom, removed all images from the basilicas of his diocese, after the example of Leo the Isaurian and then Serenus of Marseille, whence the name Iconoclast for him. *Jonas Aurel. L. I. de Imag. Bibl. Patr. T. IV*. The Gauls would indeed rise up against that deed of Claudius, as an inconsiderate zeal, and would assert the historical use of images; but at the same time in their writings against Claudius they would most sharply condemn all adoration and the Nicene iconodulia. And from the times of Claudius, there always remained, in the tract of Piedmont and parts of Lombardy, Christians tenacious of the pristine simplicity, with the cult of saints and images being rejected, from whom the Albigenes arose, as J. Leger has collected many proofs from M. Aurelius Rorengo, the Inquisitor Reinerius, and ancient manuscript confessions, in his *History of the Waldensians*, after Illyricus, Ussher, Comenius, and others among our writers.

4. Many things teach that the Germans adhered for the longest time to the synod held among them under Charlemagne. Certainly Walafrid Strabo, a German himself, and an Abbot in the diocese of Constance, who died before the middle of the 9th century, a man illustrious for his knowledge of letters, in his book *On Ecclesiastical Matters*, is much engaged there in commending the utility of images for instruction, and here in reproving the superstition and dullness in venerating or adoring them. *Cap. VIII.* Natalis Alexander himself presents excerpts in the last article of his dissertation. *Dissert. VII. §. 5. T. XIV.* Nor is it to be believed that the outstanding pair of German prelates of that time, from among the abbots, thought differently on the question of images from their master Alcuin, and from the Germans and Gauls under the emperors Charles the Great, Louis, and Lothair: I mean Haymo of Halberstadt, and Rabanus Maurus, finally Archbishop of Mainz, who bent their whole efforts to interpreting the Holy Scriptures, to be praised in the Centuries of Bale, after Trithemius in his catalogue, who says of Rabanus that neither Italy nor Germany had produced his equal. Add the lucid testimony of Nicetas Choniates, describing matters under Isaac Angelus and the expedition of Barbarossa into the East, around the year 1188: "The Germans and the Armenians have dealings with each other, and agree with one another in most dogmas." *Lib. II. p. 258, Ed. R.* He continues: "For among both, the adoration of sacred images is equally interdicted." We pass over the Annals of Fulda, of Ursperg, Aventinus, other chronicles, and those who have written of the affairs of the Bohemian and Slavonic churches, and finally the times of Luther and his successors themselves.
5. That the Gauls, for the course of several centuries, were most tenacious of the doctrine of Charlemagne, and rejected the synod of the Greeks and all adoration of images, is the highest consensus of Pithou, Papirius Masson, Sirmond, Mézeray, Baluze, the Port-Royalists, and Maimbourg himself, as we said above. *Sect. VII. p. 51, 52.* Hence in the afore-praised writers, there is a prolix narrative of the Synod of Paris, assembled from the most outstanding bishops of the whole kingdom, in the Royal Palace itself, by the authority of Louis the Pious, in the month of November, 824, Eugenius II having been previously admonished by legates. And that the occasion of it was the legation of Michael the Stammerer, who had complained to Louis about the Iconolatriy of the Greeks, and about the schismatics who had fled to the Roman bishop, is already established from the preceding history of Michael.

III. But that this Synod, or if they prefer, the Assembly of Paris, after examining the letters of Hadrian and the definition of Nicaea, rejected both it and all cult or adoration of images, with a "Collection from the Books of the Holy Fathers" being joined, to be sent to Eugenius by the Emperors Louis and Lothair, whom they instruct by letters on what is to be done in this cause—this indeed is what

Natalis Alexander commemorates at length, from Daillé himself. *Differt. VIII. Art. I.* And in that Collection...

They reduced whatever pertained to the controversy of images to sixteen chapters, in the first chapter condemning the Iconoclasts, and in the second confirming the opinion of Gregory I on the use of historical pictures; in the remaining chapters, they inveighed against the synod of the Greeks and all superstition concerning images, overturning the evasions and responses of Pope Hadrian himself.

This doctrine was approved (Maimburgius calls it the error and heresy of the Gauls) in the middle of Gaul in this 9th century by men most eminent in doctrine and authority at that time:

Jonas, Bishop of Orléans, a participant in the Synod of Paris, author of the book which is badly inscribed *On the Cult of Images*, a cult he condemned, whence a frequent error.

Jeremiah of Sens, who with Jonas was to deliver the collections of the Synod of Paris against iconodulia to Rome.

According to Natalis Alexander for the 9th Century, page 757, Dungalus, a most learned theologian and monk of St. Denis, published a writing on this matter under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.

Agobard of Lyon, a contemporary, inserted into the catalog of the Saints, whose golden book *On Images* was recently edited by Stephanus Baluzius.

Theodemir the Abbot, whose lucid book is, however, desired, mentioned more than once by Jonas of Orléans.

Halitgarius, prelate of Cambrai and Arras, to be sent in this cause by Louis the Pious to Michael Balbus, Emperor of the Greeks.

Armalarius the Bishop, nor does he seem to be of Trier, as this one died at the beginning of the reign of Louis the Pious. But that he presided with Halitgarius over the collection against the Nicene Synod is testified by the letter of Louis the Pious, recorded in the seventh volume of the Councils, column 549.

Freculphus, Bishop of Lisieux, a member of the Parisian assembly against the iconodules, previously sent to Pope Eugene.

Hincmar the Elder of Reims, toward the decline of the 9th century, whom we have mentioned before, who was indignant at the pseudo-synod of the Greeks, as having been utterly destroyed by Charlemagne according to the path of the Scriptures and the tradition of the ancestors.

We omit the writers of chronicles: Eginhard, the author of the Annals of Fulda, Usuard, Aimoin, Regino, and others, from whom this constant opinion of the Gauls on images under Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and their immediate successors is abundantly confirmed. And that this doctrine flourished in Gaul for the course of several centuries, with Gerson, Chancellor of Paris, still of the same mind in the 15th century, and that the Gauls changed their opinion and adopted the Nicene Synod only later, a long time after the Parisian Synod, has already been indicated by me from Pontifical writers in Section VII. In addition to this, see Petavius himself, in the last volume of his *Dogmata Theologica*, in which he criticizes his own Gauls.

What do Maimburgius and Natalis Alexander say to the evident light of history, after the indignation of Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, and their followers against the Parisian Gauls, who even wished the whole history of the Synod of Paris, from the booklet which is inscribed *Synodus Parisiensis*, to be a fiction? Maimburgius indeed assails the fathers of that synod with a prolix declamation, though they elsewhere grant that they were the most splendid and holy lights of all Gaul. First, to them it is a pseudo-synod, merely an assembly, unworthy of the name of synod, "not very reasonable, rash, worthy of the utmost contempt," an assembly of "most absurd blind men," of conventiclers (*ces faiseurs de Conference, ces Messieurs*), and other eulogies of that kind. All of which are retorted with equal right upon all the assemblies, whether held in Constantinople by the iconolaters, or thereafter in Gaul by the authority of the kings against heresies or the Reformed, with a selection of bishops having been made. And whether you call it a convention, which the Greeks call a *σύνοδος*, or say synod, it is enough that the prelates of Gaul at that time, some of whom were even inscribed among the saints, consented against the iconodules. But the word "convention" was most familiar in Gaul for a synod indicted by the king, whence "synod" or "convention" appears several times in the collection of Sirmond. And Maimburgius says explicitly that the emperor sought permission from the Pope to hold a convention, as if a particular convention of a few bishops could not have been indicted by the emperor without the pontiff's indult.

Then, they attack certain sayings of the fathers in the Parisian collection, which had little to do with the cause. A like accusation was made against the Nicenes and Hadrian in the entire Caroline Work, and in the writing of these Parisians, and in the disputations of Agobard, Jonas, and others against images. And Maimburgius and Natalis ought to have just produced clearer documents from the early fathers in favor of the cult of images, about which we have spoken in Sections VI and VII. Third, as Natalis Alexander notes on page 756, they make the exception that the Gallican prelates submitted their opinion on the veneration of images to the Roman Pontiff, who did not approve it. But Maimburgius elsewhere, in his *Traité de l'Eglise de Rome*, taught expressly that the Roman Pontiff has no right to retract what has been defined concerning the faith by prelates in a synod. Thus, he has not dared to deny elsewhere that councils

can be convoked by the sole authority of kings and emperors, as was done by Constantine the Great, Constantius, the Valentinians, Theodosius, Justinian, etc., and thereafter by Pepin, Charlemagne, and his successors, by the Gothic and Suevic kings in Spain. These Gauls also submitted this their collection from the Fathers, inasmuch as it was to be sent to the Pontiff to be necessarily first read and examined, before he would join his legates to the Gallican ones in the legation to the Greeks. The legates of Louis were also instructed how far to proceed with the Pontiff, if Roman pertinacity should resist and could not be brought back to "the measure which is to be retained in having images," as noted in the seventh volume of the councils, column 554. Fourth, Maimburgius urges that the convention was held within the palace, not within the church. As if the place makes the synod, or the habit the monk. Unmindful also that innumerable synods were assembled within palaces, as were the Constantinopolitan ones in the Trullo of the palace, in that of Blachernae, and in the Canicleion under Theodora, and the later iconolatric one. Thus, several Gallican synods were held in royal residences, whether with the kings present in them, since the one at Gentilly under Pepin, or at least nearby, so that the bishops would be under the eyes, and sometimes under the nod, of the ruler.

Fifth, Maimburgius, on pages 265-266 of his second part, alleges that the Parisian fathers fought with themselves, when on the one hand they confessed that the wood of the Holy Cross was to be adored, and on the other denied that the image of Jesus Christ was to be adored, for the absurd reason that Christ died upon the cross, not upon an image. But 1. They derived the honor paid to the cross from the ancient discipline of the Christians and the practice of the universal church, whereas the ancient church had either been ignorant of the cult of images or had certainly condemned it. And thus also the emperors Michael and Theophilus in their letter to Louis the Pious, after the earlier Iconoclasts, revered the cross, as seen above on pages 217-218. 2. They venerated the cross as the instrument of the redemption accomplished by Christ affixed to the cross, if not the very same one, at least one which was similar in form, which could in no way be said of an image or a picture. 3. In the honor of the cross, they judged the danger of idolatry not to be equal, inasmuch as it was a figure of an inanimate thing, whereas it would be in the honor of an image, immediately representing Christ, whence the adoration due to Christ would be sacrilegiously transferred to the image. On which matter Augustine writes in his sermon on the Psalms: "Idols are more powerful for curving the unhappy soul, because they have a mouth, they have eyes, etc." Again, "the similarity of form and the imitated composition of the limbs leads and snatches the infirm hearts of mortals with a certain base affection." 4. They understood that the sign of the cross was established from sacred history, but not so the face of the Savior, as was shown above from Augustine, who held the then-represented visages to be fictitious and uncertain; the Gauls also not admitting the images of Veronica and Abgarus, and similar fables. 5. They did not so much intend the adoration, properly speaking, of the cross, as its veneration and honor, such as

Maimburgius notes they also rendered to sacred vessels, the Gospels, and relics, but not likewise to images, with Charlemagne in his Capitulary, and Augustine before him, showing the difference of the latter from the former in many ways. 6. Hence it happened that not only the Armenians, having reprobated images, retain crosses in memory of the Lord's passion, but also that other churches of the West, at times the British, having removed images, nevertheless believed that crosses should be kept in temples and oratories, and that this sign should be held in honor. Wherefore we grant that from the times of Constantine the Great, after that sign was shown to him in the sky, the sign of the cross began to be erected in palaces and public places, and everywhere to be marked on the very coins of the emperors, and gradually to become an object of religious veneration. But the principal origin of this superstition is from the tradition of the invention of the wood of the Lord's Cross, which arose in the 4th century and was thereafter confirmed in both parts of the world, about which we have written in our Introduction to the History of the Church for the 4th century.

V. Finally, Natalis Alexander has one refuge, after his master Petavius, namely that the Parisians, and Jonas, and Agobard, and Dungalus, and Walafrid Strabo, and the elder Hincmar did not condemn just any adoration of images, but that of a certain kind. What kind, I ask you? They permitted a "prudent, discreet, moderate, legitimate, and truly religious adoration"; they condemned a "superstitious, immoderate, indiscreet, properly so-called or that of latria"; such as they thought, by an error of fact from the words of Constantine of Cyprus, had been sanctioned by the Nicenes and was observed by the Greeks. Hence Natalis scrapes together from each of them certain places where they call the cult of images "superstition," "superstitious cult," "undue," "indiscreet," "divine honor," "cult of servitude," etc.

A marvelous kind of escape, indeed! 1. The Jesuit Maimburgius establishes that the Parisian prelates went even further in condemning images and reprobating the Nicene Synod than the author of the Caroline Books had done. Now, that Charlemagne reprobated every kind of cult, all adoration, even honorary, all veneration, salutation, observation, and bowing before an image, even the honor which we render either to sacred vessels or to the books of divine scripture, indeed, which we render to living men—this is what was asserted with great effort in the preceding sections against these little distinctions of Natalis, and has been proven to the learned world. 2. This is a new kind of argumentation! The Gallican prelates reject the cult of images as an "immoderate superstition," as a "superstitious, indiscreet, undue cult," a "divine honor" which is plainly owed to no inanimate things. They reject whatever honorary or relative adoration the Nicenes or Pope Hadrian had rendered to images, after the apology of this pontiff and the matter being sufficiently elucidated, and this for thirty-seven whole years after the Nicene Synod. For them, no adoration of images, by whatever name it may come, if it is only religious, or an act of religion or servitude in the Augustinian sense, if it is even a salutation, or a veneration, or a

bending of the neck, head, or knees—no (I say) is considered legitimate by them. Indeed, Agobard says that "these visible things are a hindrance to grasping the invisible; the faithful man is to be drawn inward from exterior things, not from interior things outward"; that images, which the sacrilegious and foolish call holy, are in this category of exterior things; that "it is much more religious for the images of the saints to be ground to powder and scraped away than it was for Hezekiah to destroy the bronze serpent"; that "we venerate God more purely without idols"; that "if men were to be adored, the living should be more than the painted, and where they have the likeness of God"; that "the ancients had images of the saints, whether painted or sculpted, but for the sake of history, for remembering, not for worshipping"; that "today all trust is placed in visible things"; hence "it was rightly defined by the orthodox fathers that pictures ought not to be made in the church, etc." And many more things, worth all the rest, from the Blessed Agobard, whose memory as a saint the Gallican church recalled on the eighth day before the Ides of June, from the martyrology of the church of Lyon and others. Whence Stephanus Baluzius in his notes says: "I would believe that Agobard wrote what everyone in Gaul at that time thought," as has also been observed by Sirmond. Now, from these premises, who would believe that some Natalis Alexander would arise who would dare to infer: "Therefore, according to the mind of Agobard and the Gauls of his time"—for they do not deny that all the aforementioned prelates were of one mind—"it is licit to adore images with a legitimate, discreet, moderate, truly religious adoration, to light candles, to burn incense, to offer gifts, to prostrate oneself before them, etc.?"

3. So far were the Pontifical writers prior to Natalis from understanding this, that on the contrary, besides Baronius, Bellarmine, Binius, and the rest, Sirmond himself, and more recent writers, and Maimburgius himself, accuse the Gallican prelates of error, indeed, of heresy. Sirmond, on that Parisian Convention in the tenth volume of the Gallican Councils: "Omitting what is contained in the Acts of this convention, because they reek of the heresy of the Gauls of that century, who abhorred the adoration of images, as has been said elsewhere." Baluzius, in the same place: "Entirely, while they were studying the truth, they seemed to do injury to the images." Petavius, in his *Dogmata Theologica*: "To this later kind of Iconoclasts seem to be numbered those Westerners, the Parisians, Jonas, Agobard, etc. Who indeed removed all honor, cult, and adoration whatsoever, whether interior or exterior, from images; and they thought that they should be admitted into churches in such a way as profane images are wont to be held, to which no signification of honor, nor σχετικῆ adoration is attributed, but which are wont to be set before the eyes of viewers for the sole cause of delight or of memory." Mézeray, in his *History*: "The fathers of the Parisian Convention afterwards discussed the question of images, and concluded that one must adhere to the opinion of Pope Gregory and the decision of the Council of Frankfurt."

VI. But Maimburgius must be heard. "There were at that time in Gaul prelates and doctors," the ones named above, "who thought the same thing on the chapter of images as the Emperor Michael had exposed in his letter to Louis." He adds, but from his own invention, that the Gauls did not sufficiently agree among themselves; but indeed, as far as the cult of images is concerned, there was the greatest consensus of the writers and prelates. Elsewhere, he says that the Acts of the Parisian Convention were omitted from the Collection of the Councils of Gaul because "Sirmond did not judge that there ought to be a place for them in that collection, since they reek of the heresy of the Gauls of that century, who abhorred the adoration of images." Again, he says: "It cannot be doubted that the two bishops, Jonas of Orléans and Jeremiah of Sens, who were the most ardent supporters of that error, used every effort to persuade the Pope, but in vain," he says. And yet he does not prove with any document that Pope Eugene reprobated either the opinion of the Gauls concerning images, which he grants flourished in Gaul for several centuries, or the moderate counsel of the Emperor Louis. Again the Jesuit says: "Claudius, elevated to the bishopric of Turin by Louis the Pious, had followed the opinion that was then quite in use in Gaul (*qui étoit assez à la mode*) concerning images, since many"—indeed all, with not one witness produced to the contrary—"did not want them to be adored. Among whom were the most learned Jonas, Bishop of Orléans, and Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon, who both wrote against the cult of images." Soon after: "Claudius presupposed this proposition, 'images are not to be adored,' to be true, along with the prelates of Gaul, who were of his opinion." Finally, in Jonas of Orléans, Maimburgius finds fault with two things: first, that his arguments against the cult of images are either of no force or can be retorted upon him; second, that there is a great deal of acrimony in his writing, which an honest man ought to shun.

Let the Jesuit have this for himself, and let him confess that in his most recent histories he has violated all the laws of an honest man, with his not just acrimony but Tartarean slander against the Reformed, whom most recently still, lying afflicted, in his letter to the king, he stabbed as "enemies of God and rebels." Add to this a savage inhumanity, which befits none but the bloodthirsty, and cannibals, and dragoons, while everywhere he either advises and urges, or commends and extols to the heavens, the extermination from the kingdom of the Reformed (whom he elsewhere called "brothers") by the sword, by flames, by tortures, by torments, by prisons, by exiles, and if there are any things far more bitter than these, even in the dedication of his most recently prefaced *History of Gregory I*. Formerly it was otherwise: "The reunion of our brothers with us ought not to happen except by that knowledge which charity animates, which has none of that acrimony that is familiar in disputations." For this, in the end, was the knowledge of his dragoons and torturers, this is now the charity by which that reunion today, far from all acrimony, most happily (as he thinks) succeeds, to the everlasting praise of Gallican clemency and the French name. He repeats in his last writing, on Gregory I, that the Most Christian King (after having sent in his

soldiers, that is, executioners unknown to Nero, Decius, and Diocletian for the novelty of their torments) has found the art, without violence, according to the spirit of the Gospel, with no other arms than those of royal charity and zeal and edicts, of bringing the rebels back into the bosom of the church. The Lord will restrain you one day!

VII. And thus I am confident that I have vindicated and restored, not entirely without diligence in such a cloud of opposing historians, the first origin, progress, and height of the entire iconoclastic controversy, especially up to the 8th and 9th centuries. From which time, whether in the East or in the West, all things rushed to the worse, and seemed to be obscured more and more by the densest shadows of superstitions. At this evil of growing iconolatry, together with the tyranny of the Roman pontiff, which would finally put down the deepest roots, very many pious men in every age groaned. Certainly in Gaul, which shone above other kingdoms with more excellent minds, less subject to Vatican domination, that more men remained beyond this century in the opinion of the Council of Paris, not even Maimburgius above denies; that very many for more than one century retained the ancient faith of their church, the recent members of Port-Royal have confessed after Pithou, Sirmond, and others, in their censure of Maimburgius. Indeed, a Gallic writer of the 12th century, who continued the work of Aimoin, cited by our Ussher and others, speaking of the Synod of Constantinople against Photius, which they call the Eighth Universal, assembled in the year 869, writes: "In it they established concerning the adoring of images otherwise than the orthodox doctors had before defined, and the Roman pontiff assented to their votes concerning the adoring of images."

And in the same 12th century, there arose in the Lyonnais and Narbonnais regions of Gaul, and the neighboring provinces, to be dispersed as far as Picardy in Belgic Gaul, the Poor of Lyon, the Waldensians, the Albigensians, and the Petrobrusians, who in this cause of images for certain, as in other most grave matters, thought what the Protestants do today, their doctrine being disseminated not only through all of France, but through almost all the shores of Europe, as Popelinière writes at length in Book I of his *History of the Franks*, a writer most praised by the Pontificals. Thus also Mézeray and others, to say nothing of our own. But soon these same were to be overwhelmed with calumnies, as if imbued with Manichaeism and other monstrous errors, and to be exterminated by fire and sword, with the Third Lateran Council first raising the standards against them in the year 1180, and then also the Fourth Lateran under Innocent III in the year 1215. About which matter we have written in our Introduction to the History of the Church for the 12th and 13th centuries. Nor was the truth ever deleted or extinguished in Gaul from that time, or the hatred of foul superstition, besides the remnants of the Albigensians in the previous age, as has already been noted above from P. Pithou, P. Masson, St. Baluzius, and the members of Port-Royal, Pontifical writers. And the third Council of Cambrai, in Belgic Gaul, in the preceding century under Emperor Maximilian,

produced by Baluzius in his notes to Agobard: "The people are to be admonished that the mind of one praying or venerating is to be referred to the thing signified, and not to the sign, the image, which neither hears, nor sees, nor feels."

But there was no other remedy than what the emperors of the East, Leo the Isaurian and Michael Balbus, first advised: if not by removing images altogether, at least by raising them from the lower places and putting them in more sublime ones, out of the danger of adoration. And Queen Elizabeth intended this at the beginning of the Reformation, to preserve the use of images while interdicting their cult, but she would finally understand the danger of the thing, after Edward VI, from the most grave arguments which the Anglican clergy would produce, and from the clearest proofs of the matter, which laws you may read in Burnet, toward the end of Part II and in the Collection of Acts.

Serious men in France had indeed given hope of finally proscribing superstition and enticing the Reformed, by bringing things back, of course, to their primitive state, such as it was under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. But the event proved deceptive, and now, in the midst of fires and racks, yet in such a way that they are denied to die except after infinite deaths, as in Revelation 9:6, the wretched are forced to bend the knee before man-made things, and with a confession extorted from them against their will, to confirm this article with an oath: "I profess that the images of Jesus Christ and of His Blessed Mother, ever Virgin, and of the other male and female Saints ought to be had and retained, exhibiting to them the honor and reverence which is due to them," that is, the cult of adoration.

The tree has fallen, recently excelling in its fruits, vigorous in its branches and leaves, finally cut down by the hand of men, but it will leave the stump of its roots in the earth, and is not to be plainly torn out by its trunk or roots, whatever fury may attempt. Coins are struck, with the name of the Reformed excised, the remnants are extinguished day by day, the foundations are laid bare, the very traces are deleted, trophies are erected, cunning plans against foreigners are fervent, wars are prepared, the kings of the earth conspire, the monks are in tumult, extremities are threatened from all sides, they say in their hearts, "let us do violence to them together!" But there is one "who makes the thoughts of the cunning void, so that they do not accomplish them"; there is a "God of strong retributions, Jehovah, who will surely repay."

VIII. Someone might perhaps desire that on the occasion of the iconoclastic controversy we should say certain things about another, very different one, but to which on the one hand the destroyers of images, and on the other, other assertors, might seem to have given some origin. This was concerning the symbols of the Eucharist: were they only τύποι, εικόνες, figures, images of the body and blood of the Lord, or indeed the most very and true body and blood, a

certain supernatural change having been made? That the Greek iconoclasts, under Constantine Copronymus, asserted the former in their Seventh Synod, in the year 754, has been seen above in the history of that synod. Namely, that the true and only image of the vivifying body of Christ is given in the Eucharist, to wit, τὴν τοῦ ἄρτου οὐσίαν, "the very substance of the bread," μὴ σχηματίζουσιν ἀνθρώπου μορφήν, "not figuring the form of a man." On the contrary, the Nicenes, responding in Action VI, denied that that Eucharistic sacrifice should be called an εἰκόνα, image, or a τύπον, figure, but αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα, "the body itself and the blood itself" of Christ. The same had been taught them before by Damascenus, a favorer of images, who was taught by Anastasius Sinaita, asserting a certain μεταποίησιν ὑπερφυσικὴν, a "supernatural change" of the symbols into the body and blood of the Lord, but such as it had been before the Resurrection. These, however, were far from the fiction of μετουσίωσις or transubstantiation, from the added exegeses and similes, such as that of nourishment which is changed into our body by assimilation, not by the annihilation of its substance. Far more removed were the iconomachs, for whom the symbols come under the names of εἰκόνας, τύπου, εἰκονίσματος, τοῦ εἶδους, σχήματα, ἀναμνήσεως, etc. Yet if you listen to Maimburgius and the other, Natalis, the Iconoclasts believed in the real presence, they agreed with the Catholics on the article of the real presence, securely rehashing things which they knew had been discussed at length by Albertinus, and then by Claude, most excellent men. But this controversy was to erupt into force in the middle of the 9th century, after the writing of Paschasius, Abbot of Corbie, was published, *On the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or on the Body and Blood of the Lord*, to which several in that century opposed themselves, and the first-rank champions were indeed John Scotus and Bertram the monk. But these things pertain to another matter, to be spoken of at greater length in our Historical Introduction to the 8th and 9th centuries, under the title of the errors either first taught or propagated in that century. The last to have dealt with this whole cause, against the Pontifical Arnould, with equal praise for doctrine, elegance, and accuracy, was the venerable Claude, recently a theologian of Charenton, especially in Books IV, V, and VI of his Response, to whom one may refer. Thus far the History of Images restored to its integrity. But whether it has fallen to our lot, to Maimburgius or to me who is perusing his pages, what he imputes to our side, to use credulous simplicity with nefarious daring, to smear the faith of history, everywhere to impose, and to betray the infamy of the cause, will be for others to judge.

THE END.