Struggles Over Images:

Byzantium and English Reformed Protestantism

Kenneth Dawson FRSN, FSAScot

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of

Master of Theology

in

The University of Glasgow

2024

ab adversario mota quaestio discendi existit occasio

(a question raised by an adversary gives an occasion for learning)

Augustine of Hippo 354 - 430
De civitate Dei contra paganos. 2.1

CONTENTS

ABREVIATIONS

ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (editors).
CC	*History of the Creeds of Christendom.* Philip Schaff (editor).
CEOC	*Concise Encyclopedia of Orthodox Christianity*. John McGuckin (editor).
N&PNF1	*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (1st series)*. Philip Schaff (editor).
N&PNF2	*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (2nd series)*. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (editors).
NCE	*New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Berard Marthaler (editor).
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. David Cannadine (editor).
PG	*Patrologia Graeca.* Ferdinand Cavallera (editor).
STC	*Short-Title Catalogue*, W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson and Katharine Pantzer (editors).
WCF	*Westminster Confession of Faith.*
WLC	*Westminster Larger Catechism.*
WSC	*Westminster Shorter Catechism.*

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND TERMINOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

In keeping with the proscriptions of the Second Commandment, Judaism and Christianity have always rejected idolatry. Notwithstanding, imagery of nature, the saints, and the persons of the Trinity have been present in Christian sacred spaces from the earliest times. The form of this, whether figurative or symbolic, including or excluding the divine persons, and its place in worship, has varied from denomination to denomination, both Eastern and Western, Roman Catholic and Protestant, and over time. Unfortunately, it has been the source of significant conflict within the Church, again, from the earliest times. Over two millennia, learned, devout and right-meaning Christians, hearts and minds open to the Holy Spirit, and basing their arguments in both scriptural exegesis and the traditional understanding and practice of the Church, have conscientiously arrived at mutually incompatible conclusions. This reached its most prominent (and unseemly) in the Byzantine iconoclastic controversy of the 8th and 9th centuries, and at the time of the Protestant Reformation in the 16th and 17th.

From their writings, it is clear that many English Protestant reformers saw themselves as theological descendants of the Byzantine aniconists.[1] The aim of this dissertation is to investigate whether this 'self-understanding' was correct. As always, historical investigation is limited by sources. In the case of the *Aniconists*, none of their own writings are extant, and their theology must be reconstructed from the epitome of their work recorded in the proceedings of the (image-affirming) 7th Ecumenical Council of 787, and from 'mirror-reading' of the arguments made against them. In the case of the English Reformed Protestants, while

[1] See discussion below, regarding the terminology of iconomachy vs iconoclasm, aniconist vs iconoclast, and iconophile vs iconodule. For the sake of brevity, throughout this dissertation 'Byzantine aniconists' will be abbreviated '*Aniconists*' (capitalised, italics) and the 'Byzantine iconophiles' as '*Iconophiles*'.

their extant literature is voluminous, how uniform their views were, between themselves and over time, is less clear.[2]

The dissertation begins with a brief note regarding terminology used within. Following this, Section 2 reviews the origins and the development of Christian art, as it was from these forms that the characteristic Eastern and Western iconography would evolve. Consideration is then directed to the rise to theological prominence of icons and relics, and their reception at the time. The third section progresses to consider the beginning of the Byzantine Iconoclasm (Iconomachy), the difficulties with the historical sources of the period, and its broad political history. The theology of the struggle is discussed, along with its reception and impacts in the contemporary West. Section 4 describes the development of doctrine and practice regarding religious imagery within the English Reformed Church, and Section 5, its literary context. In the sixth section the theologies of the Byzantine and English iconomachies are compared and contrasted. The dissertation concludes with a discussion of aspects of Byzantine and Reformed doctrine, and some reflections are made on their implications for modern Christian practice.

It will be demonstrated that while commonalities existed, the struggles over images between the Byzantines, and those amongst the early modern English Reformed, were fundamentally different. While both began in the Decalogue, they diverged on the underlying doctrines of spiritual hierarchy, veneration and invocation of the saints, corporeal presence in the Eucharist, and interpretation of the Second Commandment. The Byzantine iconomachy was

[2] *Epitome of the Definition of the Iconoclastic Conciliabulum, Held in Constantinople, A.D. 754* (*N&PNF2* 14.543). Henceforth, this document will be abbreviated simply to '*Epitome*' (capitalised, italics). That there were no less than 50 formal creedal statements formulated by Reformed communities in the 125 years preceding the publication of the *Westminster Standards* (*Confession*, *Shorter* and *Larger Catechisms*) in 1647, and that more have followed, identification or acceptance of a single 'Reformed theology' is inherently problematic. John H. Leith, *Assembly at Westminster: Reformed Theology in the Making* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1973), 19.

essentially Christological, and followed naturally from the controversies of the preceding centuries. Conversely, that of the English Reformed remained rooted in the Second Commandment, its synecdochical reading after the manner of John Calvin, and the development of a regulative principle of worship. Any tendency to conflate the struggles, or to view the Byzantine iconoclasts as 'proto-protestants' is incorrect, and should be rejected. The Byzantines were not the theological ancestors of English Reformed Protestantism, but were usefully co-opted into the latter's anti-Catholic and anti-papal polemic.

This dissertation was authored unashamedly by a Christian within a Reformed institutional setting. No history can be written without bias, but every attempt has been made to be honest and balanced in representing the views of those who can no longer answer any libel made against them. As disagreements over the creation and use of religious images were based both in the Decalogue and Christology, they remain current and important to the whole breadth of the Church. Regardless of what conclusions are drawn, due consideration should contribute to a deeper appreciation of God and His revelation in the incarnate Christ, and remind all Christians that we remain the wayward sheep of a single flock. We are brethren, both by divine institution and command: part of one and only one Church, and that with Christ at its head.

1.2 Terminology

In the West, the tendency has been to refer to the 8th/9th century struggle in the East as the *Byzantine Iconoclasm*, accentuating acts of destruction of icons. This proved expedient to condemn the events, and was embraced later by some of the more radical reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries, as a precursor or prototype of their own destruction of Roman Catholic imagery. The term *iconoclasm* for the ordered destruction of images dates only from the 16th

century.[3] It has never been used commonly in the East, where the events of the 8th and 9th centuries are typically described as the *iconomachy* – the struggle over images. This is the lead the current dissertation will follow, as it better represents the nuances of that period, and is equally appropriate to those of the Reformation. Likewise, it will avoid, where possible, the pejorative term *iconoclast* for the opponents of icons, in favour of *aniconist*, and employ *iconophile* in preference to *iconodule* (servant of icons), another term not used in the early medieval East. Although idiom not employed in the East, *Byzantine* will be retained. The Greek Septuagint was the form of the Old Testament to which the Eastern Church had access, and Jerome's Latin Vulgate and the Greek Textus Receptus in the medieval West. They are used accordingly.

[3] Jan N. Bremmer, "Iconoclast, Iconoclastic, and Iconoclasm: Notes Towards a Genealogy," *Church History and Religious Culture* 88, (2008): 2; James Noyes, *The Politics of Iconoclasm* (London: Taurus, 2016), 49.

SECTION 2: EARLY CHRISTIAN ART AND THE RISE OF RELIGIOUS ICONOGRAPHY

2.1 Early Christian Art

Where and when Christians first started making religious art is unknown, but a portrait of John being painted from life is described in the 2nd century (apocryphal) *Acts of John*.[4] Irenaeus of Lyon, describes Gnostic heretics as possessing, *'…..images, some of them painted, and others formed from different kinds of material; while they maintain that a likeness of Christ was made by Pilate at that time when Jesus lived among them*.'[5] Clement of Alexandria alludes to the existence, and speaks approvingly, of Christian iconography. He acknowledges its value in moral teaching and social statement, and clearly differentiates it from idolatrous imagery. Of particular consequence is the presence of the fish and the dove, emblematic acronymic or theophanic representations of the Divinity Himself, in the persons of the Son and the Spirit.[6]

Ironically, the earliest extant depiction of Christ is the *Alexamenos graffito*, a piece of blasphemous graffiti scratched in to plaster of a room near the Palatine Hill in Rome. The image mocks Christ, who appears on the cross, but depicted with the head of a donkey. The inscription, written crudely and misspelt, reads: *ΑΛΕ ΞΑΜΕΝΟC CEBETE ΘΕΟΝ*, translating

---

[4] *Acts of John* (2nd century), 27-29 in Montague James trans., *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 233-4.

[5] Irenaeus of Lyon (c. 130 – c. 202), *Against Heresies* (c. 180), 1.25.6 (*ANF* 1.351).

[6] '*And let our seals be either a dove, or a fish, or a ship scudding before the wind, or a musical lyre, which Polycrates used, or a ship's anchor, which Seleucus got engraved as a device; and if there be one fishing, he will remember the apostle, and the children drawn out of the water. For we are not to delineate the faces of idols, we who are prohibited to cleave to them; nor a sword, nor a bow, following as we do, peace; nor drinking cups, being temperate*.' Clement of Alexandria (c. 150 – c. 215), *Logos Paidagogos*. 3.11 (*ANF* 2.285); Lee M. Jefferson, "Picturing Theology: A Primer on Early Christian Art," *Religion Compass* 4, (2010): 410–425. This passage from Clement is also of interest regarding the development of Christian iconography. By specifying against swords, he demonstrates that this symbol (accompanied by book) as a distinctive of St. Paul, as it is commonly used in medieval imagery, is not yet established. *Cf*. the tetramorphic angel, lion, ox and eagle for the evangelists, of Irenaeus, Jerome and Augustine. Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430), *City of God*, 18.23 (*N&PNF1* 2.372-3); Alternatively to the Holy Spirit, Irenaeus posits on numerical grounds, that the dove might be an allusion to Christ. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 1.15.1 (*ANF* 1.339).

as ‘Alexamenos worships [his] God.’ Tertullian and Minucius Felix confirm that depictions of donkeys’ heads were used commonly by pagans to mock Christians and Jews. The graffito dates to the final decades of the 2nd century, and thus constitutes the first extant example of the crucifix – the symbol which will, with the unadorned cross, become the standard emblem of Christianity. Unfortunately, as the example is unique, it is impossible to determine whether the symbol was in common use by this time, or if it was novel.[7]

The oldest surviving Christian artworks are found in the catacombs in and around Rome, dating to about A.D. 200.[8] The burial rites and preservation of tombs being important to Christians with their new religion’s centrality in the hope of eternal life, the catacombs consist of kilometres of underground passages, resembling subterranean towns of sepulchres and funerary chapels.[9] These earliest inscriptions are simple: consisting of crosses, palms (martyrdom), the fish, and the anchor of salvation.[10] The walls and ceilings are often decorated with stucco or mural paintings portraying scenes related to the Christian belief in the soul’s afterlife.[11] The 4th century *Santi Pietro e Marcelino* in Rome, contains an example of this spiritual outlook. Stylistically Roman, the ceiling is divided into sections, the entire

[7] Thomas R. Young, *The Alexamenos Graffito and its Rhetorical Contribution to Anti-Christian Polemic,* University of North Carolina. 2014. Accessed 18 March 2021, *SSRN* 2546438, https://www.theuniversityatnorthcarolinacharlotte.academia.edu/RobYoung; Tertullian (c. 155 – c. 220), *Apology* 16, *To the Nations,* 1.14 (*ANF* 3.30-1, 3.123); Marcus Minucius Felix (d. c. 250), *Octavius*, 9 (*ANF* 4.177-8); Paul Carus, "The Crucifix," *The Open Court* 13, (1899): 673-90; John Hogg, “On a Profane Stylograph of the Crucifixion at Rome,” *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature (Second Series)* 9, (1870): 15-24.
[8] Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 1.290-1; Lawrence Nees, *Early Medieval Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 31-32; Jaś Elsner, “Archaeologies and Agendas: Reflections on Late Ancient Jewish Art and Early Christian Art,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 93, (2003): 114-128; Margaret R. Miles, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 48; Jefferson, “Picturing Theology,” 410–25; Robin M. Jensen, “Aniconism in the First Centuries of Christianity,” *Religion* 47, (2017): 408–24.
[9] Gina Pischel, *A World History of Art, Revised Edition* (London: Guild Publishing, 1976), 144; Ivor Davidson, *The Birth of the Church* (Oxford: Monarch, 2005), 16-8; *Charles Freeman, Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean, 2nd Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 574-575.
[10] Clement of Alexandria, *Logos Paidagogos*, 3.11 (*ANF* 2.285); Nees, *Early Medieval*, 32-6.
[11] Janetta R. Benton, *Art of the Middle Ages* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002), 26; Pischel, *World History of Art,* 146.

painting forming a cross in obvious reference to the dome of heaven. Jesus, represented as the Good Shepherd caring and watching over his flock, fills the centre, an allusion common in early Christian art.[12] The semi-circles created by the arms of the cross contain the story of Jonah. After three days in its belly, he emerges and finally reclines safely under vines. Jonah's story, as a prototype for the death and resurrection of Jesus, was also an allusion popular in early art.[13] Human figures between the semi-circles stand in *orant* pose, hands raised in supplication; petitioners before God.[14]

In addition to Jonah and the great fish, popular Old Testament subjects include Noah and the ark; Moses; Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the fire; Daniel in the lions' den; and the story of Susanna.[15] Frequent New Testament scenes, in addition to the Good Shepherd, include depictions of the healing of the paralytic, and the raising of Lazarus.[16] In common, they illustrate biblical stories of the promise of salvation, and emphasise the rewards of constant prayer: the belief that God is caring, and will intervene to save His faithful. Strikingly, given their physical context within a necropolis, catacomb paintings entirely omit scenes of the passion of Jesus. They ignore suffering and death, rather focusing optimistically on God's providence. Imagery of Jesus is common and unremarkable. He is but one character in a scene: unhaloed, and in an artistic type not differing from others present. From this it might be concluded that depictions of Him were for comfort and instruction, rather than devotional aids; differing from what will become common in later centuries.[17] Other early Christian painted catacombs in Rome include those of Priscilla, St. Domitila and St. Callixtus. Outside

[12] Davidson, *Birth of the Church,* 293.
[13] *Jonah* 1:15-2.10; *Matthew* 12.40; Nees, *Early Medieval,* 36-9.
[14] Benton, *Art,* 26; H. W. Janson, *A History of Art, Revised Edition* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 194-195.
[15] *Genesis* 6.9 – 9.17; *Exodus* 14.21-28, 32.15; *Daniel* 3.15-28, 6.16-21; *Story of Susanna / Daniel* 13.
[16] *John* 5.8, 11.38-44; *Mark* 2.9.
[17] A.D. Lee, "Veneration of Images," in *NCE*, 7.324-5.

Rome, decorated early Christian catacombs, all varying, are found in Campania, Sicily, Sardinia, Egypt, Cyrenaica, Tunisia and Algiers.[18] In quality, these early paintings are crude and unlifelike, resembling contemporaneous Jewish and Christian wall paintings from Syrian Dura Europos.[19] It is uncertain whether this represents limited technical skill on the part of the artists, or intent. Is the crudity intentional, conflicting less with biblical proscriptions regarding images?[20] This question will recur over the following 1,500 years.

Early Christian cells were subject to intermittent suppressions and persecutions for their refusal to take oaths or offer sacrifices to the traditional gods.[21] This changed in A.D. 313 when, in the light of his victory at the Milvian Bridge, the Emperor Constantine first emancipated, and then recognised Christianity as one of the official religions of the Roman state; permitting congregations to worship openly and to construct purpose-built churches.[22] With substantial financial support from the state, a sudden increase in Christian building and

[18] Benton, *Art,* 26-7; Pischel, *World History of Art*, 16.

[19] That traditional Jewish practice was anti-idolatrous rather than aniconic is explored and presented more completely in Joseph Gutmann, "The 'Second Commandment' and the Image in Judaism," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32, (1961): 161-174; and W. Barnes Tatum, "The LXX Version of the Second Commandment (Ex. 20,3-6 = Deut.5,7-10): A Polemic Against Idols, Not Images," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17, (1986): 177-195; A.D. Lee, "Veneration of Images," in *NCE*, 7.324.

[20] *Exodus* 20.4; E. H. Gombrich, *The Story of Art, 12th Edition* (London: Phaidon, 1972), 89; Nees, *Early Medieval,* 29; Davidson, *Birth of the Church,* 292; Robin M. Jensen, "The Fall and Rise of Adan and Eve in Early Christian Art and Literature," in Heidi J. Hornik and Mikeal C. Parsons eds., *Interpreting Christian Art: Reflections on Christian Art* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2008), 26-8; Jefferson, "Picturing Theology," 410-25; Elsner, "Archaeologies," 114-28. *Cf.* Nilus of Ancyra (d. 430) *Letter to Prefect Olympiodorus*, *op. cit.* Alan Cameron, "The Authenticity of the Letters of St Nilus of Ancyra," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 17, (1976): 181-196.

[21] Tacitus (56 – 120), *Annals,* 15.44; Pliny the Younger (62 – 113), *Letters,* 10.96; John Griffin, "Introduction," in *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, eds. John Boardman, John Griffin and Oswald Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 7-8; Davidson, *Birth of the Church,* 189-224.

[22] Constantine I (272 – 337, r. 306 – 337). Lactantius (c. 250 – c. 320) *On the Deaths of the Persecutors*, 44.5 (*ANF* 7.318); Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 265 – 339) *Life of Constantine* 1.28-9, 40.2, *Ecclesiastical History*, 9.9.10 (*N&PNF2* 1.490, 493, 363-5). The particulars of Constantine's 'conversion' to Christianity remain uncertain. Beard *et al*., *Religions,* 365-6; Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome,* 563, 582-584; Gombrich, *Story of Art*, 94-95. Of exactly what form the Edict of Milan consisted is not entirely clear. Davidson, *Birth of the Church,* 341-342; Ivor Davidson, *A Public Faith* (Oxford: Monarch, 2005), 14-23.

art was seen not only in Rome, but throughout the Empire. Many churches were built, some still extant, including that of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.[23]

In contrast to the temples of Greek and Roman traditional practice which primarily housed a statue of the deity, but with sacrifice and ritual performed outside, the Christian church building needed to be spacious enough to contain the worshippers internally.[24] Accordingly, it was the interiors, rather than the exteriors of these buildings, that were extensively adorned.[25] Based on the Roman basilica, the most common plan of an early purpose-built Christian church was axial, which had the effect of directing gaze toward the sanctuary and the apse. Consequently, this was the part of the church which tended to be the most highly decorated.[26] Of relevance to the iconomachy which was to come, the design and decoration of these new churches would come to be interpreted as theology in visual and structural form.[27]

Consistent with the Church's Jewish-inherited rejection of idol worship, sculpture was secondary to painting; although statuary, including that of Christ, did exist.[28] After the adoption of Christianity, the state continued to erect large statues of civic and military leaders in public places, but initially large-scale free-standing sculpture of a religious nature was not

[23] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine.* 3.29-40 (*N&PNF2* 1.528-30); Robin Cormack, *Byzantine Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8-10.
[24] Beard *et al., Religions*, 368-9. Christian ritual was, in distinction to traditional practice, performed within the building. Also differing from those of today, until the 18th century churches were generally open internally, without fixed seating.
[25] Davidson, *Public Faith,* 291-294.
[26] Julian Bell, *Mirror of the World* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007), 94-95.
[27] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, 10.2–4 (*N&PNF2* 1.370-8); Catherine B. Tkacz, "Iconoclasm, East and West," *New Blackfriars* 85, (2004): 542-550.
[28] Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 320 – 403), *Testament*, *Letter to the Emperor Theodosius, To John, Bishop of Jerusalem,* 9 in Jerome (c. 345 – 420), *Letter 51* (*N&PNF2* 6.83-9); Steven Bigham, *Epiphanius of Salamis: Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth* (Rollinsford: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008), 5-9; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History.* 7.18 (*N&PNF2* 1.304). Ernst Kitzinger, *Byzantine Art in the Making: Main Lines of Stylistic Development in Mediterranean Art—3rd–7th Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), 14-21; Benton, *Art,* 25; Cormack, *Byzantine Art,* 14-15.

favoured.[29] More commonly, sculptors turned to small scale relief on stone sarcophagi and carved ivory panels, for the use of the elite. Christian sarcophagi were produced at least as early as the mid-third century, for wealthier and more important members of the Church.[30] Carved with small figures in haut-relief on the front and occasionally the lid, they are among the earliest works of Christian art extant. Most follow the conventions of pagan Roman construction very closely, but the scenes depicted on them carry a Christian message.[31] As with the catacomb paintings, popular representations include those of the Good Shepherd, and Jonah and the great fish: confirmations of God's faithfulness to his people. Once again, images emphasising the humanity of Christ as manifest in his passion, are noticeably absent.

The most striking early sarcophagus is that of Junius Bassus, a prefect of Rome who converted to Christianity shortly before his death in 359. Two tiers of columns divide its front into ten sections. The subjects depicted are mostly derived from the Old and New Testaments. The upper row portrays the sacrifice of Isaac; Peter taken prisoner; Jesus (beardless and youthful as He is always depicted in art from the period) enthroned with Peter and Paul; and in two sections, His trial before Pilate. On the lower row are the misery of Job; the sin of Adam and Eve; the triumphal entry into Jerusalem; Daniel in the lions' den; and Paul led to his martyrdom.[32] The proportions of the carved figures on this and other sarcophagi are far from the classical ideal, with large heads supported by clumsy bodies, and unanatomically rendered arms and legs. The characters are stiff, and little movement or emotion is implied, even in what should be the most dramatic situations. Background detail is essentially non-existent.

[29] Gombrich, *Story of Art*, 95. *Cf*. Nees, *Early Medieval*, 50-2.
[30] Xavier Barral i Altet, "The Roman World," in Sculpture: *From Antiquity to the Present Day*, eds. Georges Duby and Jean-Luc Daval (Cologne: Taschen, 1991), 227-228.
[31] Pischel, *World History of Art*, 146-147; Bell, *Mirror,* 94.
[32] Gombrich, *Story of Art*, 90. Jesus was not depicted with a beard until the rise of the Arians in the 4th century. In the Sant'Apollinare Nuovo fresco (c. 504) he is also depicted as an older man with a beard, in keeping with (Theodoric's) Arian custom. Janson, *History of Art,* 200-201; Beard *et al., Religions*, 378.

Artistically, realism does not appear to be the sculptor's goal. Rather, the depictions function as *aides memoire* of tales already familiar to their audience.[33] A second, the *Dogmatic* [or *Trinity*] *Sarcophagus* (c. 320 – 350) also reflects the artistic style of the *Junius Bassus*. It is remarkable, however, in that in its depiction of the creation of Eve, three similar bearded figures stand together in clear reference to the Trinity; the first known anthropomorphic depiction of either the Father or Spirit in Christian art. Such depictions would remain uncommon in the West until the high middle ages, and never become so in the East.[34]

One class of early Christian sculpture which became of importance out of proportion to its physical size, was ivory carving. These were frequently in the form of diptychs or triptychs - small folding panels which could be transported conveniently. Alternatively made of precious metals, they were intended for the personal use and pleasure of wealthy individuals. As such, they offer insight into the personal rather than public tastes of the Roman elite.[35] Being small and readily transportable, they represent the first manifestation of the personal devotional icon that would rise to prominence in the 6th and 7th centuries.[36] Abhorrent of idolatry, as the early Christians might or might not have consistently been, ancient paradigms continued in these private works; maintaining pagan forms adapted to a Christian subject.[37] One extant ivory diptych, which was probably produced to celebrate a Christian marriage within the aristocracy, does so in a style very reminiscent of the *Ara Pacis* frieze (1st century B.C.,

[33] Benton, *Art,* 25.
[34] Robert Milburn, *Early Christian Art and Architecture* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1991), 68; Jensen, "Fall and Rise," 31-7.
[35] Barral i Altet, *Roman World,* 231-232; Dale Kinney and Anthony Cutler, "A Late Antique Ivory Plaque and Modern Response," *American Journal of Archaeology* 98, (1994): 457-472.
[36] Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era c. 680 – 850: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 50-51; Paul C. Finney, *The Invisible God: The Early Christians on Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 130-31, 152.
[37] Beard *et al., Religions*, 378.

Rome).[38] Another ivory diptych, shows the Archangel Michael in a form clearly derived from the winged victory (Nike) figures of Greek and Roman art, complete with his drapery rendered in the 'wet look' of 5th century B.C. Greek relief. Artistically, the ivory is carved with great skill, but despite the use of an architectural background, the perspective of depth is flawed. Michael's feet hang over three steps, and his hands are shown in front of the columns, although the columns are in front of the stairs. The superficial forms of antiquity have been copied and carved with technical precision, but the artist has, intentionally or unintentionally, failed to accurately demonstrate basic spatial concepts. This will be seen commonly in later religious iconography.[39]

From the early 5th century, soon after the creation of an imperial court in the East, a divergence of art forms between East and West began to develop. Within a century, the differences were sufficiently profound that the term 'Byzantine' is commonly employed to describe not only the political base but the cultural output of Eastern Christendom.[40] The (Byzantine) Emperor Justinian patronised the arts generously, and it was during his 32-year reign that the churches of San Vitale and Sant'Apollinare in Ravenna, and the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, were built. The internal artwork of these churches is opulent, and reflects the developing Caesaro-papist relationship between the Eastern Church and the state.[41] Mosaics

[38] The *Priestess of Bacchus*, c. 390 - 400, Victoria and Albert Museum. Janson, *History of Art,* 202-203; Alan Cameron, "A New Late Antique Ivory: The Fauvel Panel," *American Journal of Archaeology* 88, (1984): 397-402; Erika Simon, "The Diptych of the Symmachi and Nicomachi: An Interpretation," *Greece & Rome* 39, (1992): 56-65.

[39] *The Archangel Michael*, early 6th century, British Museum. D. Buckman, "The Emperor Justinian," in *Byzantium: treasures of Byzantine art and culture from British collections* (London: British Museum Press, 1994), 73-74; Cyril Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), xiv; Benton, *Art,* 25-26; Janson, *History of Art,* 203.

[40] Janson, *History of Art,* 203.

[41] Justinian (482/3 - 565, r. 527 - 565). As noted previously, the term 'Byzantine' would never be used in the East, rather emperors regarded and referred to themselves, simply as 'Roman'. Benton, *Art,* 29-30; Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome,* 604. This relationship '*Βασιλεὺς και ἱερεὺς εἰμί*' will be specifically rejected by John of Damascus in the 8th century. Leonid Ouspensky, *Theology of the Icon* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992), 1.109-10.

of haloed Justinian and Empress Theodora flank the altar of the San Vitale: displayed as perpetual worshipers in the church, despite that neither ever went there.[42] Between and above them in the apse, is St. Vitale with Jesus. Flanking, Bishop Ecclesius of Ravenna, Justinian offers the plate of eucharistic bread, and Theodora, the wine. On Theodora's gown, the magi are depicted bringing gifts to the infant Jesus, serving to identify the Empress with the Virgin.[43] Although Justinian, Theodora and certain others are specific individuals, all are portrayed very similarly.

With almond-shaped faces, large dark eyes, curved eyebrows, long noses, and small mouths, they are indicative of the new and characteristic Byzantine artistic type, and will become the model of Orthodox iconography. Like the *Junius Bassus* sarcophagus, the drapery is stiff, and unlike classical works, it gives no hint of what is beneath. As with the ivory diptych of the Archangel Michael, their feet hang as though not supporting their bodies. The overall effect is one of ethereal timelessness, standing in direct contrast to the (even if imperfectly executed) relative naturalism of early Christian mosaics, reliefs, and paintings.[44] To the modern eye, Byzantine figures may appear stylised and unrealistic, but there is no evidence that this was how they were perceived in their day. Rather, Nilus of Ancyra, reports that the mosaic characters allowed men to recognise visions of the saints, and are described as lacking, *'little but breath'*.[45]

[42] More recent work suggests that the panels were formed in two stages likely reflecting a changing imperial hierarchy during the period. Irina Andrescu-Treadgold and Warren Treadgold, "Procopius and the Imperial Panels of S. Vitale," *Arts Bulletin* 7, (1997): 708-723.
[43] *Matthew* 2.1-10. The veneration of Mary was particularly strong in the Eastern Church. The symbolic identification of Theodora with Mary *Theotokos* (Mother of God) could not have been accidental. Davidson, *Public Faith,* 275.
[44] Cyril Mango, *Art,* 104 n.239; Nees, *Early Medieval*, 56-60; Rudolf Arnheim, "Mosaics Old and New," *Parnassus* 13, (1941): 70-3.
[45] Nilus of Ancyra, *Letter to Heliodorus Silentiarius*, *op. cit.* Cameron, "Nilus of Ancyra," 181-196.

2.2 The Rise of Icons and Relics

The very earliest Christian art may have been circumspect in its depictions of Christ and the saints, but as has been demonstrated, their popularity increased markedly after the conversion of Constantine. The term 'icon' (εἰκών - image) in this context is used specifically to refer to physical depictions of Christ and the saints that are, unlike early artworks, intended for devotional purposes. While this definition might be extended to include statuary, it is generally reserved for two-dimensional representations, usually painted on wood. The rise of icons paralleled that of the cults of the saints and holy relics. Icons are thus not intended primarily as art, but as devotional tools.[46] Stylistically, icons are always of persons, either Christ, Mary, angels, or the saints, and generally in fully face-on view. They do not portray plants, animals, or scenes from nature. Likewise, they are always static, never depicting a scene of action. Thus, they are contemplative items, intended not to be descriptive as is the case in art, but to focus the viewer's attention upon their subject.[47]

By the time of Justinian, Christianity had a developed belief in the intercession of the saints. A hierarchy existed in worship: the Trinity at the top, beneath was Mary the '*Theotokos*' or 'Mother (bearer) of God', angels, the departed saints, living holy men and women, and then 'ordinary' Christians. For blessings from God, the Christian could proceed by seeking the intercession of another further up the 'holiness hierarchy'. This might be focused by the presence of something physical relating to the saint from whom intercession was sought. Thus, the rise of the cult of icons and relics was premised on a sense of spiritual hierarchy and

[46] Gombrich, *Story of Art*, 90; Jensen, "Aniconism," 408–24; Dimitrios Pallis, "Iconology of St. John of Damascus," *Heythrop Journal*, 56 (2015): 174 n.6; Accordingly, acts of destruction of these artifacts, or *iconoclasm*, should be recognised as different in essence from *vandalism*. Lauren Dudley, "Grammar of Iconoclasm," *Art Historiography* 11, (2014): 1-14.
[47] Theodore Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.

the intercession of the saints.[48] Christ, through the Spirit, is proclaimed as our great advocate with the Father,[49] yet throughout the New Testament, Christians are encouraged to be mutually supportive in prayer.[50] The developing doctrine of the 'communion of saints' related in the *Apostles' Creed*, opened that this might include also the 'saints in glory'.[51] The cult of saints also depended upon a high sense of the insufficiency of man: a perception that direct access to the Divinity was limited by man's profound unworthiness. In this context, whereas the supportive prayers of one's peers would be of assistance, the aid of one who was '*a friend of God'*, most commonly in the form of Mary or one of the saints, might be even more so.[52]

Along with the use of images, the Christian could gain direction in prayer from other holy objects; such as relics of the saints, or from visiting sites of religious significance, particularly the Holy Land. The veneration of relics is not a uniquely Christian practice. Rather, it represents a primitive tradition common to many religions.[53] Within Judeo-Christianity,

---

[48] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 32-33. This developing sense of 'hierarchy' is well demonstrated in the work of (Pseudo) Dionysius the Areopagite (fl. *c*. 500), recognising angels as existing in nine forms in three orders. This was embraced by Thomas Acquinas in the 13th century. [Pseudo] Dionysius, *Celestial Hierarchy*, 6-7 in John Parker, *Celestial Hierarchy* (Piccadilly: Skeffington, 1894), 26-31; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1.1.55, 108, in Thomas Aquinas, *The Complete Works of Thomas Aquinas*, multiple translators (Omaha: Catholic Publishing, 2018), 602-11, 1089-1105.

[49] For example: *1 Timothy* 2:5; *John* 14:16; *Hebrews* 4:15; *Ephesians* 6:18; *1 John* 2:1.

[50] For example: *1 Timothy* 2:1-4; *2 Corinthians* 1:11; *James* 5:14.

[51] The *Apostles' Creed* developed progressively between the 4th and 8th centuries. Its original roots are uncertain, perhaps to the apostolic fathers. The item '*communion of saints*' is present in the version of Eusebius Gallus in the mid-6th century. Schaff, *CC,* 1.45-51. *Revelation* 5:8, 8:3-4; Origen of Alexandria (c. 184 – c. 253), *On Prayer,* 6; Methodius of Olympus (c. 250 – c. 311), *Oration on Simeon and Anna*, 14 (*ANF* 6.393); Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 313 – 386), *Catechetical Lectures* 23:9 (*N&PNF2* 7.154).

[52] After *John* 15:14. John of Damascus (c. 675 – 749), *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, 4.15 (*N&PNF2* 9.86); John of Damascus, *Apologia Against Those Who Decry Holy Images* (Scotts Valley: Createspace, 2010), 17; Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 6.

[53] Legend states that relics of Theseus were secluded in the Parthenon of Athens. Those of the Buddha (d. 483 BC) were disseminated among his followers soon after his death. The first recorded veneration of the relics of Confucius dates to that of the Han emperor Kao Tsu in 195 BC. Likewise, those of Mohammed (c. 570 – 632), in the form of two hairs, are preserved in a reliquary on the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. This rock, itself, continues as a site of Muslim pilgrimage, held to be the site of Mohammed's ascension into heaven. Also, it should be noted that neither the Buddha, Confucius nor Mohammed claimed or are accorded divine status among their followers. Joan Cruz, *Relics* (Huntington: OSV Publishing, 1984), 1-2; W. Den Boer, "Theseus: The growth of a myth in history," *Greece and Rome* 16, (1969): 1-13.

attachment to physical objects followed scriptural precedent. This is seen in the carrying back to the Promised Land of the bones of Joseph and Jacob, and in the cult of the Temple.[54] The tablets of the Decalogue, Aaron's rod and the bowl of manna retained within the Ark of the Covenant can be understood as sacred relics.[55] That the relics of Christian martyrs were collected and preserved is attested as early as the mid-2nd century in *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*.[56] Gregory of Nyssa wrote of the relics of St. Theodore, *'Those who behold them embrace them as though the very body were living and flowering, and they bring all the senses – eyes, mouth, ears – into play; then they shed tears for his piety and suffering, and they address to the martyr their prayers of intercession as though he were present and whole.'* Gregory also records the use of relics, '…..*their ashes and all that the fire had spared have been distributed throughout the world so that almost every province has had its share of the blessing. I also myself have a portion of this gift and I have laid the bodies of my parents beside the relics of these warriors*.'[57]

Relics served to maintain a tradition of physicality in the working of miracles. Many of the healings performed by Christ involved physical contact between Him and the recipient, and the same was true of those worked by the apostles. Handkerchiefs and aprons which had been touched by Paul were able to effect healing, and raising to life by contact with Elisha's

[54] *Exodus* 13:19; *Joshua* 24:32-33; *Zechariah* 14:16-19; *Micah* 4:2; *Luke* 2:41-42.
[55] *Hebrews* 9:4; This view of the contents of the Ark as relics is supported by the assertion of Talmud *Bava Batra* that the remains of the broken (and therefore unusable) tablets also were retained in the Ark. Isidore Epstein ed., *Baba Bathra,* trans. Maurice Simon and Israel W. Slotki, 14b, https://halakhah.com/bababathra/index.html.
[56] '*Thus ashes we, at last, took up his bones, more precious than precious stones, and finer than gold, and put them where it was meet. There the Lord will permit us to come together according to our power in gladness and joy, and celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom, both in memory of those who have already contested, and for the practice and training of those whose fate it shall be*.' Anonymous, *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (c. 156), 18.2-3 (*ANF* 1.43).
[57] Gregory of Nyssa, *In Praise of Blessed Theodore the Recruit*, *the Great Martyr* and *On the Forty Martyrs*, *op. cit*. Cruz, *Relics*, 3.

bones.[58] These events were seen as clear evidence of the power of relics. Icons had the practical advantage that they were reproduceable, and thus could be accessed locally.

The nature of icons varied. Of particular note were those held to have been painted by contemporaries of Christ, including Luke the Evangelist.[59] Others were described as *acheiropoieta*, claimed to be of divine rather than human creation.[60] An example of a Western acheiropoieton is the Shroud of Turin, although its ancient and miraculous origin have been discredited.[61] Two of the most important acheiropoieta were the Mandylion of Edessa and the Image of Camuliana, the latter of which was held to have delivered protection during the Siege of Constantinople in 626.[62]

2.3 Early Disputes Over Images

Criticism of images and relics also existed from an early date. Notwithstanding his recognition of the value of Christian artistry, Clement of Alexandria argued that as images were material and the Trinity transcendental, they could neither be sacred nor divine. Rather, the true image

[58] Christ: *Matthew* 8:3, 15; 9:25, 29; *Mark* 1:30-31, 41; 5:41; *Luke* 4:40; 7:14-15. This extended even to a supplicant touching His clothing. *Matthew* 9:20-21; *Mark* 3:10; 5:28; *Luke* 8:44. Apostles: *Acts* 3:7; 9:41; 20:7-12; 28:8. Even Peter's shadow had the capacity to heal. *Acts* 5:15. Paul: *Acts* 19:11-12. Elisha: *2 Kings* 13:21.
[59] The *Salus Populi Romani*. See following.
[60] ἀχειροποίητον – made without hand. The claim of holy things coming not from outside the hands of men was not new, similar stories were common in pagan antiquity. It is reported of the sacred stone of Artemis in Ephesus in *Acts* 19:35. Pausanias (A.D. 110 - 180) in *Description of Greece* 1.26.6 recounts a similar legend, which he cannot verify, regarding the statue of Athene then present in her temple at Athens. Numerous examples are given in Mary Mowczko, *The thing that fell down from heaven (Acts 19:35)*, https://margmowczko.com/fell-down-from-heaven-acts-19-35, 2023.
[61] P.E. Damon, D.J. Donahue, B.H. Gore, *et al.,* "Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin," *Nature* 337, (1989): 611–615.
[62] μανδύλιον – cloth or towel. Theophanes the Confessor (758 - 817), *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813,* trans. Cyril Mango and Roger Scott (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 316; George of Pisidia (fl. 7th century), *Avarica, op. cit.* Leena Peltomaa, "Role of the Virgin Mary at the Siege of Constantinople in 626," *Scrinium* 5, (2009): 284-289; Peter Brown, "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *English Historical Review* 88, (1973): 1-34.; Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 36; Judith Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 314-5.

of God was the virtuous and pious Christian in whom the Spirit dwelt.[63] Irenaeus provides a vignette critical of the use of holy portraits. He describes an Alexandrian Gnostic named Marcellina hanging a wreath about an image of Christ, and proceeds to condemn her for acting like a pagan. It is unclear, however, whether it is the existence of the image, so much as the woman's use of it, that provokes his particular censure.[64] Tertullian asserted that Christians not only did not worship images supposed to be gods, but neither did they pay homage to likenesses of men. He condemned craftsmen who made such images as facilitators of idolatry. He did, however, comment approvingly of Christ as the Good Shepherd depicted on chalices.[65] Lactantius opines that '…..*it is undoubted that there is no religion wherever there is an image…..but* [only] *a mimicry of religion*', though his argument is based in the pagan believing the physical idol *is* the God, rather than just a material representation of a metaphysical divine being. If a man is to search for God, He is not to be found in '*an object of veneration*' made from the things which are made from under a man's footprints. Rather, a man should raise his eyes, and '…..*seek [Him] aloft, …..in the highest place*'.[66]

The bishops of the Synod of Elvira (306 or 309) concluded that, *'Pictures are not to be placed in churches, so that they do not become objects of worship and adoration'*. Granted the pre-Constantinian context of a pagan society, the Roman Church has disputed the ongoing

[63] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis.* 7.3, 5 (*ANF* 2.526-8, 530-1). Finney (1994) draws upon *Stromateis* 3, 6.17, and *Protreptikos* 4 (*ANF* 2.381-408, 515-8, 184-90) to produce an argument that Clement here speaks in polemic against those critical of Christian worship, but that he is not, however, innately aniconic. Finney, *Invisible God,* 42-43, 110-11.
[64] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies,* 1.25.6 (*ANF 1.351*); Thomas F. Mathews, *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art, Revised Edition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 177-178.
[65] Tertullian of Carthage, *On the Spectacles*, 13, *On Idolatry,* 4, 8, and *On Modesty* 7, 10 (*ANF* 3.85, 62-3, 64-5). Here, in *On Modesty*, Tertullian notes the sheep is the Christian, the flock represents the people in the church, and Jesus is the good shepherd*, 'whom you depict on a chalice'.*
[66] Lactantius (c. 250 – c. 320), *Divine Institutes*, 2.19 (*ANF* 7.67-8).

meaning and significance of this.[67] Likewise, Eusebius of Caesarea, replying to a letter from Constantia (c. 310 – 354), the daughter of Constantine, wrote, *'To depict purely the human form of Christ before its transformation, on the other hand, is to break the commandment of God and to fall into pagan error'*.[68] Notwithstanding, Constantia's mausoleum, the Santa Costanza in Rome, is decorated with figurative Christian art.

In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius suggests that the keeping of religious images, either of Christ or the saints, reflected continuing pagan practice. Having seen bronze statues (not inside a church) purportedly of Jesus and the woman with the discharge of blood, he observed, *'…..images* [εἰκόνας] *of His apostles Paul and Peter, and of Christ Himself are preserved in painting* [ὡς εἰκός]*, the ancients being accustomed, as it is likely, according to a habit of the gentiles* [pagans], *to pay this kind of honour indiscriminately to those regarded by themselves as deliverers.'* However, Eusebius, like Clement, Tertullian and Irenaeus, does not call this out as idolatry. Neither did Eusebius identify the practice as new; rather, the images being of indeterminate age, and having '…..*remained to our day*.'[69] His statement does not hint of any essential difference between images of Christ, His apostles and the woman; nor whether the εἰκόνας of Peter and Paul existed in two or three dimensions. Further insight into Eusebius's view of these issues, however, can be gleaned from his *Life of Constantine*. Regarding the construction of Constantinople, *'…..*[Constantine] *embellished it with numerous sacred edifices, both memorials of martyrs on the largest scale, …..he determined to purge the city which was to be distinguished by his own name from idolatry* [εἰδωλατρείαν] *of every kind.'* Rather, [Constantine] placed *'…..fountains in the midst of the marketplace'* and images

[67] A. Barnes trans., *Canons of the Synod of Elvira*, 36, https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05395b.htm; J.N. Hillgarth, "Council of Elvira," in *NCE,* 5.178; Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, ed. James Bastible (Rockford: Tan 1974), 320-1. Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 41.
[68] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Letter to Constantia, op. cit.* Mango*, Art,* 16-8.
[69] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History,* 7.18 (*N&PNF2* 1.304).

[εἰκόνας] of *'…..the good shepherd,*…..[and] *Daniel also with the lions.'* Additional to this [Constantine] had affixed to a gold panelled ceiling '…..*the symbol of our Saviour's Passion,…..composed of precious stones richly inwrought with gold.'* Such images were clearly seen as being essentially different to pagan idols.[70]

The mid-8th century *Parastasies syntomoi chronikai* attests to images of Mary and the baby in Constantinople from its inception. It describes the capital's forum as having once been adorned with large images of the early patriarchs and, *'…..with an image of the Mother of God and of Jesus who became a babe in the flesh,'* and that these had been consigned to the flames. Seemingly, this imagery had been erected during the reign of Constantine, and removed by his son (the Arian) Constantius (r. 337 – 361). Unfortunately, like Eusebius, in employing the generic εἰκόνες, it is unclear in what form these images existed.[71]

Throughout *Against the Heathen*, Athanasius of Alexandria, rails against the use of images in religious worship, mocking that profane materials, whether by moulding to a particular shape, or adorned in any way, can take on the form or nature of anything held to be divine. He observes '…..*that the invention of idols* [εἰδωλών] *is wholly due, not to good but to evil. But what has its origin in evil can never be pronounced good in any point — being evil altogether*.' As Lactantius, however, Athanasius's polemic is directed against pagans and their idols, rather than Christian religious imagery. Consequently, in this context, it should be cited with caution.[72]

Epiphanius, expressed his passionate rejection of an image in a church to John of Jerusalem, '…..*bore an image either of Christ or of one of the saints; I do not rightly remember whose the*

[70] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine,* 3.48-9 (*N&PNF2* 1.532).
[71] Anonymous (8th century), *Parastasies syntomoi chronikai*, *op. cit.* Mango, *Art*, 57.
[72] Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 296 – 373), *Against the Heathen*, 8 (*N&PNF2* 4.7-8).

image was. Seeing this, and being loth that an image of a man should be hung up in Christ's church contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, I tore it asunder.' Of note, while Epiphanius rejects all images in churches, he does not differentiate between those of Christ and the saints. An image of Christ, being God, appears not, in itself, to be of special import.[73]

Cyril of Alexandria and Jerome both caution the correct use of religious images and relics. Cyril asserts that, '*We by no means consider the holy martyrs to be gods, nor are we wont to bow down before them adoringly, but only relatively and reverently*.' Jerome that, '*We…..refuse to worship or adore…..the relics of the martyrs…..for we may not serve the creature rather than the Creator…..Still we honour the relics of the martyrs, that we may adore Him whose martyrs they are*.'[74]

Around 327, Helena, the mother of Constantine, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. At the site where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands, she reputedly discovered the remnant 'true cross'. Along with this, she also recovered the icon of Mary later known as the *Salus Populi Romani*, reputedly painted by Luke when Mary was visiting John the Evangelist in Ephesus.[75] From this time, and particularly after the late 6th century, with the identification of acheiropoieta of an ever-expanding number, icons and relics were increasingly credited

[73] Epiphanius (c. 394), *To John,* 9 in Jerome, *Letter 51* (*N&PNF2* 6.83-9); Theodore the Studite (759 - 826), *On the Holy Icons,* 2.49, in Catherine Roth trans., *Theodore the Studite: On the Holy Icons*, (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981), 74-5. Although generally accepted, the veracity of this work of Epiphanius (as translated by Jerome) has been questioned, as recorded by Damascene and Theodore. John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 29-30; Theodore, *On the Holy Icons.* 2.48-9, in Roth, *Theodore*, 73-5; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.157; Bigham, *Epiphanius,* 5-9.

[74] Cyril of Alexandria (c. 376 – 444), *Against Julian, op. cit.* F. Chiovard, "Relics," in *NCE*, 12.50-6; Jerome, *Letter 109: To Riparius*, 1 (*N&PNF2* 6.212-4).

[75] *Salus Populi Romani* (Saviour or Protectoress of the Roman People). Jan W. Drijvers, "Helena Augusta, the Cross and the Myth: some new reflections," *Millennium* 8, (2011): 125-74; Philipp Niewohner, "The Significance of the Cross before, during, and after Aniconism in Constantinople and Asia Minor," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 74, (2020): 185-242. Other purportedly Lukan portraits of Mary were discovered over time including the *Hodegetria* (She Who Points the Way) by the Empress Eudokia, wife of Theodosius II (c. 438). Robert L. Wolff, "The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria," *Traditio* 6, (1948): 319-328; John McGuckin, "Hodegetria," in *CEOC*, 247; Mango, *Art*, 34-5.

with status as 'intercessors'; having capacities in their own right.[76] These innate capabilities included an icon 'making its wishes known', defending itself, bleeding when damaged, or conveying victory to armies carrying it; although these attributes appear only to have been associated with images such as the acheiropoieta, and those which had acquired relic status.[77]

In 691 or 692, Emperor Justinian II called the Quinisext Council of Trullo, at which the question of the imaging of Christ was considered. Possibly preceding, but certainly contemporaneous with the portraiture of Christ, had been the use of symbolic images. These included the fish, grapevine, Christogram (Chi-Rho) and particularly, the use of the lamb. The decree of the Council was that Christ should not be depicted as a symbol but rather, fulfilled '*in His human form*,' as thus He had revealed Himself in the incarnation. Certainly, if it is accepted that Christ might be portrayed as He appeared when on earth, there seems little reason to make use of these other symbols. Indeed, to do so, tended to the sin of Jeroboam, representing *YHWH* as golden calves at Bethel and Dan.[78] Notwithstanding, the reason why the debate was held is unclear. Non-human symbols, in the form of the cross, were clearly neither discredited nor discarded, however, as it was also decreed that it should not be used in floor decoration, *'lest the trophy of the victory won for us be desecrated by the trampling under foot.'*[79] In the shadow of Trullo, Justinian II replaced his own head on the obverse of the gold coinage with that of Jesus, devoutly and humbly representing Christ as the true king in Constantinople.[80] In the form of Mary or the saints, though generally on the reverse, this would become a

[76] Herrin, *Christendom*, 308-9.
[77] Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 172; Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," in Cyril Mango ed., *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 154.
[78] *Canons of the Council of Trullo* (691-2), 82 (*N&PNF2* 14.401); *1 Kings* 12:28-29.
[79] *Canons of the Council of Trullo*, 73 (*N&PNF2* 14.398). Ironically, in response to the Council of Trullo, Pope Sergius in Rome, incorporated the responsorial *Agnus Dei* (*Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world: Have mercy upon us*), into the form of the Roman mass. Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes, 2nd Edition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 84.
[80] Timothy E. Gregory, *A History of Byzantium, 2nd Edition* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 188-189.

common feature of (non-aniconist) Byzantine coins.[81] Justinian was overthrown in 695, initiating a period of two decades of political instability and military catastrophe, and culminating in the beginning of the iconomachy.

[81] Judith Herrin, *Byzantium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 103.

SECTION 3: THE BYZANTINE ICONOMACHY

3.1 The Beginning of the Iconomachy

At the accession of Emperor Leo III in 717, the Roman state was 1,500 years old, and had been a major power for a millennium. Christianity had been embraced four-hundred-years earlier, yet despite periods of recovery, political fortunes had fallen progressively. The West had been lost to various tribes of Goths and Franks. By the early 8th century, under pressure from both Arab Muslims and Turkic Bulgars, that there was any future, even in the East, was uncertain. God's caring Providence was hard to discern in these events. Rather, it appeared that as He had placed the Jews into the hands of their enemies because of their unfaithfulness, so was to be His empire's fate. This was the setting of the inception of the iconomachy.

Konon, the man who would become Emperor Leo III, was born in Syrian Commagene around 685. Fluent in both Greek and Arabic, he entered the army of Justinian II during his counter rebellion of 703 - 705. Following Justinian's return to the throne, Konon was sent as a diplomat to Alania and Lazica, seeking to establish an alliance against the Umayyad Caliphate under Al-Walid I. Successful, he was appointed to command the Anatolian Theme by Emperor Anastasius II (r. 713 - 715), and on whose deposition, Konon and his son-in-law-to-be Artabasdos marched against the newly installed Theodosius III. Entering Constantinople in March 717, Konon overthrew Theodosius and had himself proclaimed Emperor. Leo resisted a siege of his capital by Umayyad forces, and raised it the following year. Having solidified power, he carried the war to the Arabs.[82]

[82] Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 171-172; Gregory, *History of Byzantium*, 198-200; Herrin, *Christendom*, 319-21.

The relationship between the rise of Islam in the 7th century, Byzantine iconophilia, and the outbreak of the iconomachy is unclear.[83] The use of icons and relics appears to have increased during the 7th century, culminating with Justinian's placement of the image of Christ on the coinage. However, the prevalence of images in public and religious settings, had been increasing before this time, and there is little evidence that it accelerated significantly during the period. In the Islamic culture then developing, the use of Byzantine currency had been common, ceasing with Justinian's use of the image of Jesus. Not only did human forms disappear from use on Muslim coinage, but so did that of other animals.[84]

The causes of the iconomachy likely originated in a progressively developing and geographically based theological split in the Church over the nature of worship in general, and the place of icons, in particular.[85] However, this opinion does not enjoy universal support.[86] Elsner and Brown describe a modern *'crisis of over-explanation';* considering this mostly speculative, rather than based on high-quality evidence.[87] One contemporary Byzantine account of the beginning of the iconomachy is by the Presbyter John, vicar of Oriental Patriarchs to the 2nd Council of Nicaea in 787. John lays the blame at the feet of, *'*[the Caliph] *Yazid…..and a lawless Jew who was a sorcerer and the instrument of soul-destroying demons, named Tessarakontapchys'* bent on destroying Christianity. Theophanes cites Tessarakontapchys prophesying the, *'senseless'* Izid would rule for 40 years if he were to

[83] How committed Islam was to aniconism in this period is debated, other than under the edict of the short-lived Caliph Yazid II, and hence it's true contribution to Byzantine attitudes is unclear. Christian C. Sahner, "The First Iconoclasm in Islam: A New History of the Edict of Yazīd II (AH 104/AD 723)," *Der Islam* 94, (2017): 5–56.
[84] Herrin, Christendom, 323.
[85] Eric Brown*, The Byzantine Empire* (Kindle, 2018), 25.
[86] Stephen Gero, "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eight Century," *Byzantion* 44, (1974), 23-44; Gregory, *History of Byzantium*, 209; G. R. King, "Islam, Iconoclasm, and the Declaration of Doctrine," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, (1985): 267-277; Georges Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History* 19, (1950): 77-96; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.107-8.
[87] Jaś Elsner, "Iconoclasm as Discourse: From Antiquity to Byzantium," *Art Bulletin* 94, (2012): 368-94; Brown, "Dark-Age Crisis," 1-34.

destroy all Christian icons in his domains, and that Leo, *'partook of the same error'*. Whether claims such as these made by Theophanes should be taken factually, rather than slander of the aniconist Leo, is unclear.[88] Mango reports the story of the destruction of an icon of the *Theotokos* by a Byzantine officer at the siege of Nicaea in 727, following which the town was saved.[89] Toynbee argues Byzantine frustration and jealousy of Islamic advances, and their own political and military weakness in the mid to later 7th century, as the precipitant.[90] Herrin suggests a significant sex difference regarding the iconomachy, with women more likely to be iconophiles and men aniconists, although evidence is lacking.[91] Recent scholarship has focussed on economic causes: an increasing divide between a wealthier urbanised west, and a poorer rural east. These tensions were exacerbated by the rise of Islam, with its periodic depredations in the eastern provinces.[92] The extent to which antagonism toward the power and wealth of monasteries contributed, is uncertain.[93] Likely, all of the preceding were factors, overlain with Leo's personal beliefs.[94] What cannot be denied, however, is that while the power struggles were not always primarily about religion, all parties wrapped their arguments in Christological definitions.[95]

---

[88] *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 4, (*N&PNF2* 14.538); Caliph Yazid II (c. 690 – 724, r. 720-724); Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 402; Herrin, *Christendom*, 322-3; G. E. von Grunebaum, "Byzantine Iconoclasm and the Influence of the Islamic Environment," *History of Religions* 2, (1962): 1-10. There is little evidence from Muslim writings or archaeology that any such iconoclasm actually took place under Caliph Izid / Yazid. Indeed, that the story exists of the attempt by Tessarakontapchys, speaks to destruction of Christian icons not being common practice. King, "Islam, Iconoclasm," 267-77; Alexander A. Vasiliev, "The Iconoclastic Edict of the Caliph Yazid II, A. D. 721," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 9/10, (1956): 23-47; Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 173.

[89] Cyril Mango, "Introduction," in Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin eds., *Iconoclasm: papers given at the ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975,* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1977), 3.

[90] Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History: Abridgement of Volumes VII-X*, ed. D. C. Somervell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 259-260.

[91] Herrin, *Byzantium*, 114.

[92] Warren Treadgold, "The Struggle for Survival (641 – 780)," in Mango, *Oxford History of Byzantium*, 149.

[93] Ouspensky, *Theology*, 21.1-13.

[94] Gregory, *History of Byzantium*, 209-210.

[95] Kristine Kolrud and Marina Prusac, *Iconoclasm from Antiquity to Modernity* (London: Routledge, 2014), loc 265.

3.2 Source Difficulties Regarding the Iconomachy

Study of the period is complicated by the limited availability and biased nature of the written record. These sources are also Constantinopolitan in perspective, providing little reflection on the provinces. The period was marked by highly polarised debate within the clergy and without, and with constant condemnation of opponents for heresy. Accordingly, both sides were inclined to destroy the writings of the other. It appears also, that many documents including histories, hagiographies, and theological writings, were edited or embellished to support partisan positions. Thus, separation of authenticity from fraud is problematic. Additionally, consequential to the victory of the *Iconophiles*, most of the literature of the *Aniconists* has been irretrievably lost. This necessitates scholarly attempts at reconstruction using *Aniconist* epitomes in iconophile documents, complicated by the questionable veracity of their renderings. The Muslim conquest of 1453, and the resultant conversion of churches into mosques, has also served to damage or limit access to physical remains.[96]

The most important historical source is the *Chronicle* of Theophanes the Confessor, who is unashamedly anti-*Aniconist*. Likewise is the *Short History* of Patriarch Nikephoros I, both of whom suffered during the iconomachy. The major theological sources are John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite, both prominent *Iconophiles*. Theological arguments of the *Aniconists*, including the *Peuseis* of Constantine V, are extant only within iconophile documents, principally the proceedings of the Second Council of Nicaea and the *Antirrhetics* of Patriarch Nikephoros, and educing *Aniconist* theology from the rebuttals of John and Theodore. Sources for the second period of aniconism (815 – 843) are even more problematic.

[96] Pınar Aykaç, "Contesting the Byzantine Past," *Heritage & Society* 11, (2018): 151-178. Herrin, *Christendom*, 326.

With the exception of a letter from Emperor Michael II to the Frankish emperor Louis the Pious, no writings of *Aniconists* exist, in either direct or derivable form.[97] The preserved histories of this second period, such as they are, were all written by *Iconophiles*. They post-date the events by up to a century, and are frequently contradictory. As might be expected, and in keeping with those of the first iconomachy, these deal only with higher political and theological affairs, and none reveal the true extent and nature of the second iconomachy, or the response of ordinary citizens.[98]

3.3 Political Chronology of the Iconomachy

3.3.1 First Iconomachy and the Council of Hieria (c. 726 – 775)

An accurate chronology and political history of the iconomachy is impossible due to the aforementioned paucity of reliable sources. What follows represents a reflection on the beliefs of modern historians; but the dates, accuracy, and perspectives are disputable.

In 726, Leo III began speaking against iconography.[99] Following this, his policies ignited a religious controversy which would last until 843. Sometime prior, Leo instituted forced baptism of Jews and Muslims.[100] Probably in 726, he issued an abbreviated law code, the *Ecloga*, written in Greek rather than Latin.[101] This code was remarkable for its movement away from capital punishment, and the expansion of 'mutilation' in its place. Certain facets

[97] Michael II (the Amorian) (770 – 829, r. 820 – 829). Michael's letter is extant only because it was retained in Western records.
[98] Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 153-4; Bury, J. B. (1912) A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene Until the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802 – 867), loc 2214.
[99] Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 404.
[100] Herrin, *Byzantium,* 107; Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 154.
[101] ἡ ἐκλογή τῶν νόμων – selection of laws. The date issue of the *Ecloga* is disputed. Traditionally taken as 726, modern scholarship is more inclined to date it later, possibly 741, at the beginning of the reign of Constantine V.M.T. Humphrey, *Law, Power, and Imperial Ideology in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 7.

of the *Ecloga*, such as the retention of death for sodomy, have been seen as inspired by the Old Testament.[102] In 726, an underwater eruption near the island of Thera caused significant destruction and loss of life. In conjunction with the political instability and generally poor military performance of the Empire over the previous fifty years, this was viewed by many as a judgement from God. Leo and others appear to believe that this punishment was due to the use of images. He directed the removal of the icon of Christ from above the palace (Chalke) gate and its replacement with a cross. Rioting ensued, and some of the emperor's men were killed by the crowd. Theophanes records that many were punished with mutilation, fines and banishment, but he does not report executions. [103]

Possibly in 730, Leo issued another decree, this time ordering removal of all physical representations of Christ, and the cessation of veneration of other religious icons; although evidence for this, independent from Theophanes, is scant.[104] It is not clear in what form and how extensive was this removal of images, or other suppression of *Iconophiles*.[105] The *Khludov Psalter* from the period, contains a miniature of two iconoclasts whitewashing an icon of Christ, and depicted in a way that directly compares them to the Roman soldiers at the foot of the cross: crucifying Christ a second time.[106] Patriarch Germanos objected, although the specifics of his objection are not recorded. He was deposed and replaced. Again, the limitation and reliability of extant sources make the true position of Germanos unclear. Among his surviving letters, two *circa* 726, admonish Constantine, Bishop of Nakoleia, for his negative attitudes to images; yet a third, to Bishop Thomas of Klaudioupolis, written after the

[102] *Leviticus* 20:13, *Romans* 1:24-32; *Matthew* 5:29-30; *Mark* 9:43-48. Humphrey, *Law*, 97-8.
[103] Mango, "Introduction," in Bryer and Herrin, *Iconoclasm*, 1-3; John Beckwith, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 169; Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 405.
[104] Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 154-155; Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 119.
[105] Stephen Gero, "Notes," 23-44.
[106] Nikephoros I (Patriarch), *Apologeticus Major*.

edict of Leo and the abdication of Germanos himself in 730, mentions the cross on the Chalke Gate approvingly. Taken at face value, these would suggest that aniconism existed in the provinces before the edicts of Leo, and that opposition to it in Constantinople, even by Germanos, was not complete.[107] In Rome, Gregory II refused to implement Leo's edict and declared aniconism heretical, opening a schism between East and West.[108] Theophanes claims that Gregory excommunicated Leo, but this is not recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis* or other Western sources.[109] A naval expedition against Gregory failed, but the patrimonies of Illyricum, southern Italy and Sicily were transferred to the Constantinopolitan Patriarchy. Military victory over the Arabs in 740, 'confirmed' the correctness of Leo's policy. Leo died of natural causes in 741 and left an adult son to succeed him. He was the first emperor to do so since Constantine IV in 685, there having been eight intervening emperors.[110]

Like his father, Constantine V, was opposed to the use of images. His reign was successful both culturally and militarily, but enthusiastic aniconism resulted in his negative portrayal by iconophile historians.[111] Constantine was accused of forcing immorality upon monks and nuns, burning monasteries and images, desecrating churches, and even converting them into stables. Repressive actions apart from the destruction of images clearly occurred, particularly in the latter part of his reign, but more recent scholarship has questioned many of Theophanes's assertions.[112] By contrast, the execution of the monk Stephen (c. 765), appears

[107] Niewohner, "Significance of the Cross," 185-242. Presbyter John held Constantine of Nakoleia as one of the prime instigators of the iconomachy. "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2* 14.549-51; Grunebaum, "Byzantine Iconoclasm," 1-10. Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 157.
[108] Bronwen Neil, "The Western Reaction to the Council of Nicaea II," *Journal of Theological Studies* 51, (2000): 533-552.
[109] Horace K. Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (London: Forgotten Books, 1902), 1.199-200.
[110] Constantine V (718 – 775, r. 741–775). Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 80-81.
[111] Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 176; Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 210-213.
[112] G. L. Huxley, "Hagiography and the First Byzantine Iconoclasm," *Proceedings of The Royal Irish Academy* 80, (1980): 187-196.

to be the first of an iconophile, and this was likely for political rather than theological crimes.[113] According to Theophanes, Constantine was called by the epithet *Copronymus*, having defecated into the font during his baptism.[114]

In 754, Constantine summoned the Council of Hieria. Approximately 340 bishops attended, and was the first church council to concern itself primarily with religious imagery. Constantine remained closely involved and, unsurprisingly, it endorsed his aniconist position. Of those assembled, 338 bishops declared,

'…..unlawful the art of painting living creatures [the saints in glory]*…..blasphemed the fundamental doctrine of our salvation – namely, the Incarnation of Christ, and contradicted the six holy synods.....If anyone shall endeavour to represent the forms of the Saints in lifeless pictures with material colours which are of no value (for this notion is vain and introduced by the devil), and does not rather represent their virtues as living images in himself…..let him be anathema.'* [115]

[113] St. Stephen the Younger (c. 713 – c. 765). Stephen is depicted amongst the *Iconophile* martyrs in the 14th century *Icon of the Triumph of Orthodoxy*. Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 157; Herrin, *Christendom*, 382.
[114] Κοπρώνυμος – faeces name. Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle*, 400. The following fuller quotation is instructive in the iconophile partisanship in Theophanes's work:
'[am 6211, ad 718/19] Leo, 3rd year. Oumaros, 2nd year. Germanos, 5th year. John, 14th year. This year a son was born to the impious emperor Leo, namely the yet more impious Constantine, the precursor of the Antichrist. On the 25th of the month of December, Leo's wife Maria was crowned in the Augustus hall and solemnly processed alone to the Great Church, without her husband. After praying in front of the sanctuary doors, she went over to the Great Baptistery, which her husband had entered earlier along with a few members of his household. While the archbishop Germanos was baptizing there the successor to their wicked empire, namely Constantine, a terrible and evil-smelling sign was manifested in his very infancy, for he defecated in the holy font, as affirmed by actual eyewitnesses. Whereupon the most holy patriarch Germanos declared prophetically that that sign denoted the great evil that would befall the Christians and the Church on account of Constantine.'
[115] *Epitome, N&PNF2*, 14.543-6.

While describing itself the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Hieria's legitimacy has been disregarded by both Orthodox and Western traditions, their having been no patriarchs or their representatives present.[116]

3.3.2 Iconic Restoration and the Second Council of Nicaea (775 – 813)

Constantine died in 775, and was succeeded by his son Leo IV. Leo was born in 750, son of Constantine and the Empress Tzitzak. In 768 he married Irene of Athens, who bore a son, Constantine, in 771. Leo continued the suppression of images, although he appears to have been less emphatic. Consumptive, he died in 780, leaving a son in minority under the regency of his mother.[117] Late in 780, Irene appointed a new Patriarch, the iconophile Paul IV; and his dead predecessor, the aniconist Niketis, was declared a heretic. The following year, Irene moved to call another ecumenical council, with view to re-instating icon veneration.[118]

The intention was announced to Pope Hadrian in a letter from Emperor Constantine VI and Irene in August 784. It first met in 786 in Constantinople, but following disruption by the army, re-formed across the Bosphorus at Nicaea in 787 (Nicaea II). While nominally under the direction of Papal legates, it was chaired by the successor of Paul IV, Constantinopolitan Patriarch Tarasios. In accordance with Irene's wishes, Nicaea II reversed the rulings of Hieria, and appropriated the title of Seventh Ecumenical Council. It consisted of 263 members,

[116] At the time, Constantinople was vacant; Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were under Muslim domination; and no representative was sent from Rome. In the West, the Council of Hieria was pronounced anathema by the Lateran Council of 769, and denounced at the subsequent Second Council of Nicaea in 787. Herrin, *Christendom*, 368; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.122; Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 189-197. By contrast, the Council of Hieria was afforded regard by Reformed Protestant writers in the 16th century, accepting its legitimacy over Nicaea II. See later in dissertation.
[117] Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.112; Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 177.
[118] Neil, "Western Reaction," 533-552.

including representatives of both Rome and Constantinople, and its status was recognised as ecumenical in both East and West, the last to be so accepted.[119]

Proclaimed in October 787, the Council's *Decree* re-iterated the theology of the six previous Councils, declared '*free from all innovation the production of representational art*,' and condemned those who '*…..failed to distinguish between holy and the profane, styling the image*s (εἰκόνας) *of our Lord and of His saints by the same name as the statues of diabolical idols.'* The *Decree* continues that '…..*should be set forth in the holy churches of God…..the figure of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of our spotless Lady…..honourable Angels, of all Saints…..*.[and] *to these should be given due salutation and honourable reverence* (ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις), *not indeed that true worship of faith* (λατρείαν) *which pertains alone to the divine nature; but to these as to the figure of the precious and life-giving Cross and the Book of the Gospels and to the other holy objects*…..[120] Numerous anathemas regarding the reception of images were also published.[121]

The icon over the Chalke Gate was restored. Irene consolidated her authority, arranging and then breaking off an engagement between Constantine and Rotrud, the daughter of Charlemagne, and then resisting her son's accession to full autonomy on obtaining his majority. Following military defeats and a clandestine marriage to his mistress, Irene

[119] Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 214; Matthew Pereira, "Ecumenical Councils," in *CEOC*, 165-7.
[120] "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2* 14.549-51.
[121] Anathemas included against image breaking; applying the words of Holy Scripture which were spoken against idols, to the venerable images; not saluting the holy and venerable images; saying that Christians have recourse to the images as to gods (idolatry); call the sacred images idols; knowingly communicating with those who revile and dishonour the venerable images; saying that another than Christ our Lord has delivered us from idols; spurning the teachings of the holy Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church, taking as a pretext and making their own the arguments of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, that unless we were evidently taught by the Old and New Testaments, we should not follow the teachings of the holy Fathers and of the holy Ecumenical Synods, and the tradition of the Catholic Church; saying that the Catholic Church has at any time sanctioned idols; and saying that the making of images is a diabolical invention and not a tradition of our holy Fathers. *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 1, (*N&PNF2* 14.534).

sponsored a *coup* against her son, had him blinded and imprisoned. The fate of Constantine VI is uncertain, but he is thought to have died soon after. With her son's death, Irene proclaimed herself Empress in her own right, the first female Byzantine (Roman) monarch. [122]

Refusing to accept a female Emperor, Pope Leo III declared the throne vacant, and on Christmas Day 800, crowned the Frank, Charlemagne, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.[123] A revolt in Constantinople in 802 overthrew Irene, and she was exiled to the Island of Lesbos, where she died the following year. Irene was succeeded by her finance minister Nikephoros I, his son Staurakios and son-in-law Michael I, all of whom continued in Irene's suppression of the *Aniconists*.

3.3.3 Second Iconoclasm and the 'Triumph of Orthodoxy' (813 – 843)

Michael was forced to abdicate, and was followed by a military commander, who ruled as Leo V.[124] Leo wrote to the Patriarch Nikephoros I (*cf*. the Emperor of the same name), in which he stated his devotion to icons.[125] However, Leo appears to have sought other advice, although from whom is unclear. The 10th century *Scriptor incertus,* reports it included that *'…..all the emperors, who took up images and venerated them, met their death either in revolt or in war; but those who did not venerate images all died a natural death, remained in power until they died, and were then laid to rest with all honours in the imperial mausoleum in the Church of the Holy Apostles.'*[126]

[122] J.B. Bury, "Charles the Great and Irene," *Hermathena* 8, (1891): 17-37; Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 217.
[123] Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 179; Bury, *History*, loc 4503.
[124] Leo V (the Armenian) (c. 755 – 820, r. 813 – 820).
[125] Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 502.
[126] *Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio*, in Leo Grammaticus, *Corpus Scripturom Historiae Byzantinae*, edited by B. Niebuhr (Royal Prussian Literary Academy: Bonn, 1842): 349.

Leo commissioned monks to look into the issue, who discovered the declarations of the Council of Hieria. Unable to resolve the debate between the advocates of Hieria and the opinions of Nikephoros, Leo seemingly accepted the correctness of Hieria. The icon over the Chalke Gate was removed and, again, replaced with a cross; accompanied with the inscription. *'Since the ruler does not bear Christ to be depicted as a voiceless image bereft of breath, by earthly matter, trampled down by the Scriptures. Leo with his son, the young Constantine engraves the thrice-blessed representation of the cross.'* Nikephoros was deposed, and the suppression of images was announced by a synod held in the Hagia Sophia in 815, but the stringency with which it was enforced appears to have been restrained. [127]

Leo was assassinated in 820 and succeeded by fellow general Michael II, who continued to support aniconism, but allowed the former Patriarch Nikephoros and the prominent iconophilic theologian Theodore the Studite to return from exile, yet their renewed presence failed to persuade the emperor to abandon aniconism.[128] In 824 Michael wrote in *'Christ-loving affection'* to the Carolingian Emperor Louis the Pious, on the wrongness of the veneration of images. In this letter Michael paints the *Iconophiles* as the desecraters and innovators, lamenting over the way they had, *'expelled the venerable and life-giving crosses*

[127] Hollingsworth, Paul and Anthony Cutler, "Iconoclasm," in *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 975-7; Niewohner, "Significance of the Cross," 185-242; Vladimir A. Baranov, "Visual and Ideological Context of the Chalke Inscription at the Entrance to the Great Palace of Constantinople," *Scrinium* 13, (2017): 19-42; Iakovos Menelaus, "Byzantine Iconoclasm and the Defenders of Icons, John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite," *Cairo Journal of Theology* 4, (2017): 49-65. According to Eusebius, in Constantine's day '*the salutatory symbol*' had been displayed over the gate leading to the palace. At what stage this had been replaced with an icon is uncertain. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine*. 3.2-3 (*N&PNF2* 1.520); Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 183-184. The *Scriptor* records that the icon over the gate was the same one which Leo III had removed and that Irene had replaced. He states that it had been placed there initially by Constantine at the foundation of the city. *Scriptor Incertus,* in Leo Grammaticus, *Corpus Byzantinae*, 354-355. Indeed, if the (seemingly but not certainly) original Chalke icon could be removed c. 726 - 730, replaced in 787, removed again in 815, and in 843, once more replaced, it speaks to the care with which it was handled by *Iconophiles* and *Aniconists* alike.

[128] Michael II (the Amorian) (770 – 829, r. 820 – 829). Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 225-226; Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 186; Theodore, *On the Holy Icons*, 8 in Roth, *Theodore*, 27-9.

from the holy churches…..setting up their images…..and giving them the same esteem as…..the cross which…..our true God, designed…..for the sake of our salvation.' Other excesses he listed included taking icons as godparents, using images to receive the cutting of children's hair and monastic tonsuring, the scraping of paint from images to be added to the Eucharist, and distributing the Eucharistic bread from the hands of icons. Baranov concludes these examples are likely genuine, although uncommon.[129] Louis summoned a synod at Paris the following year, which served partly to consider Michael's letter, but more to settle independent internal Carolingian debates regarding the place of images in Christian worship. No record remains of a reply from Louis. During Michael's reign, both Crete and parts of Sicily were lost to the Muslims.[130]

Michael died in 829 and was succeeded by his 16-year-old son, Theophilos. Unlike his father, who had been accused of lacking education, Theophilos was well schooled, including by the learned John the Grammarian, who would become Patriarch in 837. Domestically, Theophilos continued his father's modest aniconist policies, but his reign was marked by ongoing warfare with the Muslims. He died in 842 and was succeeded by his infant son Michael III.

Michael was the youngest of the seven children of Theophilos and the Empress Theodora. His regency was headed by his mother, who was of iconophilic tendencies. In 843, Grammatikos was deposed as Patriarch, and the veneration of icons re-instituted; by local synod rather than general council, and then by imperial decree.[131] Following the re-institution of image

[129] Michael II (824), *Letter of Emperors Michael II and Theophilus to Louis the Pious, op. cit.* Vladimir A. Baranov, "Constructing the Underground Community: The Letters of Theodore the Studite and the Letters of Emperors Michael II and Theophilos to Louis the Pious," *Scrinium* 6, (2010): 230-59.
[130] E. W. Brooks, "The Arab Occupation of Crete," *English Historical Review* 28, (1913): 431-443.; Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 225-226.
[131] Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 229; Bury, *History*, loc 2157-2176.

veneration, its practice was required; but the *Aniconists* themselves, were not persecuted.[132] This event continues to be celebrated in the Eastern Church on the first Sunday of Lent as the Feast of the Triumph of Orthodoxy.[133]

3.4 The Theology of the Iconomachy

When discussing the theology of the iconomachy, the first statement that must be made is that all parties were equally emphatic in their rejection of idolatry. Their difference was in how idolatry was constituted. Likewise, all those involved viewed themselves as avowedly orthodox (Niceno-Chalcedonian) in their theology, faithful to God, and preserving and protecting the beliefs and conventions of the past. Icons and their veneration are one of the distinctives of Orthodox Christianity, in the view of which they are linked closely with Christology.[134]

Any appreciation of icons must be premised on accepting them as theological, rather than artistic. The icon is understood in Orthodoxy to be a revelation rather than an artistic representation of the divine presence in the creation. Thus, it has something of the nature of a sacrament; the icon of Christ being a visible sign and means of grace, most complete in the incarnation.[135] It reveals the invisible God whom no-one has ever seen, and yet who made Himself visible in Christ Jesus. Accordingly, icons are viewed as complementary to, and in no way subversive of, the gospel; speaking of the same events. They, like the sacraments, exist in visual form, serving to remind the viewer of the salvific works of Christ. Trubetskoy

[132] Oman, *Byzantine Empire,* 189.
[133] Bury, *History*, loc 2176-2195; F. Nicks and J. Gouillard, "Iconoclasm;" *NCE*, 7.282-3 *Feast of Orthodoxy*; Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 229.
[134] Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), 38; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.120-1.
[135] Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71; Stamenka Antonova, "Council of Nicaea II (878)," in *CEOC*, 133-5. *Cf Westminster Larger Catechism,* 174, in Chad Van Dixhoorn ed., *Creeds, Confessions, and Catechisms* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2022), 399 on the reception of the Lord's Supper.

describes the icon as, *'contemplation in colour'*, and Florovsky, *'a reminder of the prototype in the highest'*. Alfeyev explains an icon, *'…..reminds us of God as the Prototype in whose image and likeness every human being is created. The theological significance of the icon is that it speaks in the language of art about dogmatic truths revealed to human beings in Holy Scripture and Church Tradition.'* The Orthodox argue that the Christian, in silent contemplation of an icon, opens his heart to God. In this way, the icon is a constant reminder and conduit of God's love, and our essential relationship with Him, as was made manifest in the incarnation. In their variation, icons might be seen to correspond with different translations of the scriptures.[136]

In antiquity and beyond, iconography also functioned as a gospel for the illiterate. Pope Gregory I, writing to Bishop Serenus of Marseilles, and complementing him on his actions suppressing the *adoration* of pictorial representations, condemns his destruction of those being, *'…..made use of in Churches for this reason; that such as are ignorant of letters may at least read by looking at the walls what they cannot read in books'*.[137] In this, Gregory differentiates between use and misuse. Likewise, John of Damascus observed the image functioning as, *'…..a memorial, just what words are to a listening ear. What a book is to the literate, an image is to the illiterate. The image speaks to sight as words to hearing; through the mind we enter into union with it'.* Theodore the Studite described iconography as, *'…..what is set forth in the Gospel on paper and in ink is depicted in the icon through various paints and other materials.'*[138]

---

[136] Hilarion Alfeyev, (Metropolitan of Volokolamsk), "Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church," Lecture given at St. Vladimir's Seminary, New York, 2011, https://mospat.ru/en/news/56024/; Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.

[137] Gregory I (c. 540 – 604, r. 590 – 604), *Letter 105 - to Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23).

[138] John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 17; Theodore the Studite, (*PG* 99, 340), *op. cit.* Alfeyev, "Theology".

The underlying debate regarding icons is best divided into two aspects: the imaging of Christ (being God); and the appropriate use of images and relics of Mary, angels, and the saints. In the iconomachy of the 8th and 9th centuries, the dispute was overwhelmingly about the first, but there is overlap between the two.

The arguments of the *Aniconists*, as far as they can be constructed granted the lack of their own sources,[139] appear to be centred not primarily on the unlawfulness of depicting Christ, but that it cannot be done validly. Following from this, if the image of Christ is not valid, then it can only serve to lead the Church into error. Their objections might be expressed under five headings:

1. The use of images of God was forbidden by the Second Commandment, and is idolatrous.
2. Any images made of Christ are lifeless, and thus cannot accurately represent Him who is life. Therefore, they are blasphemous.
3. For a religious image to be valid, it must be accurate of its prototype, both in appearance and in nature. Thus, the authentic representations of Christ are in the Eucharist, in which the elements become the true body and blood.[140]
4. For any image of Christ to be true, it must display Him in His whole self, both fully man (possible) and fully God (impossible). If the human Christ is depicted separated from His divinity, then the image teaches Nestorianism. Yet, even if it were possible to

[139] Mango, *Art,* 149-150.
[140] Further to this, Clement of Alexandria, living 600 years earlier, might have added that the true image of God is seen in the virtuous Christian, infilled with the Spirit. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis,* 7.5 (*ANF* 2.530-1).

display the divinity of Christ in a lifeless material object, His essences would be intermingled, and thus the icon would teach monophysitism.[141]

5. The use of images in Christian worship was an innovation, and not in keeping with traditional practice.

Each of these were addressed by the *Iconophiles*, of whom the sources are more complete. The most prominent theological writer of the period is John of Damascus. Born in Syria *circa* 675, as an adult, he entered the civil service of the Caliph, before becoming a monk, in or near Jerusalem. Thus, despite his involvement in Church affairs, he lived without the Empire, possibly advantageous granted his anti-aniconist beliefs. Theophanes describes him as a teacher. John published widely and many of his works are extant. His *Apologia* is the most important iconophilic work of the first iconomachy.[142]

[141] Although thorough discussion of this topic is beyond the remit of the current dissertation, the centuries leading up to the Byzantine Iconomachy had been characterised by Church-wide debates regarding the nature of the Godhead, and particularly that of the incarnate Son. This was manifest by six ecumenical councils addressing aspects of these issues (I. Nicaea (325) affirmed the full divinity of Christ (contra the Arians); II. Constantinople (381) defined the full divinity of the Holy Spirit and confirmed that of Christ; III. Ephesus (431) refuted Nestorianism and Pelagianism; IV. Chalcedon (451) rejected monophysitism; V. Constantinople II (553) and VI. Constantinople III (680-1) repudiated monothelitism and monoenergism). Of particular importance to the current discussion, and as more fully defined in the *Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed* (381) and *Definition of Chalcedon* (451), is the nature of Christ: fully and in all respects (apart from sin) man, while fully and in all respects God, yet without the two natures being either intermixed or divisible. Nestorianism was condemned as separating the divinity from the humanity of Christ; monophysitism for binding too tightly or intermingling them, asserting that Christ had only one nature (φύσις), the divine subsuming the human. The monophysitc view, therefore, held Christ not to be fully man. These Councils being conducted in Greek, questions of nature (φύσις), essence (οὐσία), substance (ὑπόστασις) and person (πρόσωπον) were further complicated by difficulties with their translation into the Latin of the Western Church. Similar issues with translation would be encountered regarding appropriate veneration or worship of images from the Second Council of Nicaea (787) and carrying through the Protestant Reformation, as will be discussed at length later in this dissertation. "Nicene Creed," in Schaff, *CC*, 1.24-9; *Definition of Chalcedon*, *N&PNF2*, 14.262-5; Tenny Thomas, "Nestorianism," in *CEOC*, 333-5; John McGuckin, "Monophysitism (including Miaphysitism)," in *CEOC*, 324-6; Robert Letham, *Systematic Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2019), 490-503, 933-5.

[142] Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 428; Andrew Louth, "St. John of Damascus (c. 675 – c. 750)," in *CEOC*, 434-5. Exactly when Damascene's writing became readily available in Constantinople are less clear. Pallis, "Iconology", n.16.

Addressing the Commandment[143] and idolatry, John observes that the Israelites were instructed not to make idols of *'…..anything, whatever things are in the heaven above, and whatever are in the earth beneath, and whatever are in the waters under the earth.'* Yet, the Lord directs Moses that the ark of the covenant should be adorned with images of cherubim in beaten gold, heavenly creatures which are not part of human experience, and the other representational ornamentation of the following chapters.[144] Likewise, *YHWH* instructs Moses to make a bronze serpent and raise it on a staff, that the people looking upon it, should be saved from the poisonous snakes which were afflicting them. This allusion is translated onto Christ. Particularly notable in the context of the dispute over icons, was the role of the image of the serpent acting as a conduit for God's salvation.[145] Similarly, Solomon decorated the temple with cherubim and carvings of palms and other plants, and cattle and lions.[146] Thus, *Exodus* 20:4 could not be a total proscription of realist art, either two- or three-dimensional; even in religious practice or in church decoration. As John describes, *Exodus* 20:5 continues, *'Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them…..'* It appears the bronze serpent was retained for five to eight centuries after the exodus, and was only destroyed by King Hezekiah, in a move against its later idolatrous use.[147] This demonstrated that the distinction between images and idols was based primarily on function.[148]

---

[143] The delineation and numbering of the commandments becomes an issue of debate in its own right during the 16th century, and impacts particularly on Reformed (*cf*. Roman Catholic and Lutheran) theology regarding images. This will be discussed at greater length later in this dissertation.

[144] Exodus 25:17-22; 26:1-2, 31; 28:33-4. *YHWH* is described as sitting (enthroned above or upon) the cherubim (ישב הכרבים) in *Isaiah* 37:16 and *Psalm* 99:1. A god enthroned upon beasts was a common feature of ANE cultic imagery, with those of the Canaanites, Hittites, and Arameans thus depicted. The Lord, however, differs in that He possesses no physical form – a transcendent creator, not a circumscribed deity. Gutmann, "Second Commandment," 161-174.

[145] *Numbers* 21; *John* 3:14-15.

[146] *1 Kings* 6:23-35; 7.

[147] *2 Kings* 18:5 (c. 700 B.C.) Details are limited, but it appears that the serpent had become an item of worship, and its destruction is mentioned in the comparison with Asherah poles. Exact temporal relationship is problematic due to uncertainties in dating to the exodus c. 15th – 13th century B.C.

[148] Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.

John quotes *Deuteronomy*, '*And the Lord spoke to you out of the midst of the fire a voice of words, which ye heard: and ye saw no likeness, only ye heard a voice…..And take good heed to your hearts, for ye saw no similitude in the day in which the Lord spoke to you in Choreb in the mountain out of the midst of the fire: lest ye transgress and make yourselves a carved image, any kind of figure, the likeness of male or female…..*[and] *thou shouldst go astray and worship them'.*[149] He then considers these together with *Deuteronomy* 12:3 and *Exodus* 34:17. God's prohibition of image making is on *'…..account of idolatry, and that it is impossible to make an image of the immeasurable, uncircumscribed, invisible God.'*[150] John concludes, therefore, the proscription relates to the production of idols that the people might worship, representing or in the place of *YHWH*, as with the golden calf of Aaron, and those of Jeroboam.[151] Before the incarnation, God could not be portrayed, because He had not yet made Himself seen. Accordingly, John considered the Commandment proscription against images as provisional and pedagogical; rather than absolute. Paul described the law as being inferior to Christ, and the author of *Hebrews*, *'…..as only a shadow of good things that are coming* [in the incarnation]'. Thus, while proscriptions on the imaging of the uncircumscribed and immaterial Father and Spirit remain; regarding the Son, the Mosaic law was but a '*faint shadow*', one which has been fulfilled in the incarnation. The incarnate Christ not only fulfils the requirements of the law, He is the *fulfilment* of it. The Christian being indwelt by the Spirit, Christ is the lens through which the law, and all the Old Testament, must be understood.[152]

[149] *Deuteronomy* 4:12, 15-19.
[150] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 5-7.
[151] *Exodus* 32; *1 Kings* 12:26-30.
[152] *Galatians* 3:23-25; *Matthew* 5:17; Hebrews 10:1; John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 26; Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71; McGuckin, "Christ," in *CEOC*, 95-100,

In his *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, John considers the contextual nature of images, comparing them with the offering of sacrifices. As scripture decried the worship of idols, it decried sacrificing to demons. But both the Jews and the pagans made sacrifices, the difference being to whom they were made. Similarly, to make idols to false gods (demons) is different from making icons of Christ; and their sinful worship (εἰδωλατρεία), different in essence to the veneration (προσκύνησις) of icons (εἰκόνων).[153]

The Council of Hieria had declared that, '*Any images made of Christ were lifeless, and thus could not accurately represent Him who is life'*.[154] John answers this assertion, '*Therefore, I venture to draw an image of the invisible God, not as invisible, but as having become visible'.*[155] He does not apologise, but interacts in a nuanced fashion with the aniconic argument, without acknowledging its monophysitic underpinning.[156] The image which he draws is most certainly not living, but what he draws is the flesh (*σάρξ*) of Christ. Yet the dichotomy is false. Christ's flesh was physical, like his drawing, and yet it is divine, mystically enduring after its assumption. Therefore, although none can draw the divinity of Christ's body, in capturing its material nature, the drawer also incidentally and necessarily captures the divine.[157]

The assertion that for a religious image to be valid, it must be an accurate rendition of its prototype, John rejected. *'An image is a likeness of the original with necessary differences, for*

[153] John of Damascus, *Exposition,* 4.16 (*N&PNF2* 9.88); Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.
[154] *John* 1:4, 11:25; *Epitome, N&PNF2,* 14.543-6; K. Georgiadis, "From a Christological controversy to an Iconoclastic one," *Theology & Culture* 1, (2000): 45-56.
[155] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 5-6. John died near Jerusalem in 749, 5 years before Hieria. Thus 'answers' is figurative, in that his writings refuted what would be decided at the Council, and were offered at Nicaea II.
[156] Both sides of the iconomachy accused the other of monophysitism: the *Iconophiles*, that in their icons they condensed Christ's two natures into a single physical object; and the *Aniconists*, that by asserting that an icon must represent both the spiritual and physical natures of Christ, they failed to accept that both were truly separate.
[157] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 5.

it is not an exact reproduction of the original.'[158] He makes the case that if any image were truly of the identical form and substance of its model, religious or otherwise, it would not be an image, but would actually be its model. God created man in His own image, yet it was from the dust Adam was formed. Christ is the image (εἰκών) of the Father, of the same substance as Him, but in different form (person).[159] To suggest that the drawer of an icon of Christ captures His *true* form and essence, rather than producing a material image of it, would be to 'make' God.[160]

'*Visible things*,' he continues platonically, '*are images of invisible and intangible things, on which they throw but a faint light*.' This is equally true, be they physical or rhetorical. Scripture is replete with imagery, and through it, God brings the intangible to the level of our senses. John cites Gregory of Nazianzus, *'For the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are made visible through images'* (*Romans* 1:20). '*We see images in creation which remind us faintly of God, as when, for instance, we speak of the Holy and Adorable Trinity, imagined by the sun, or light, or burning rays, or by a running fountain, or a full river, or by the mind, speech, or spirit within us, or by a rose tree, or a sprouting flower, or a sweet fragrance.'*[161]

Accordingly, Damascene argues the case is not valid that, because an image is an inaccurate rendition of its prototype, its appreciation begets the heresies of either Nestorianism or monophysitism; the image is not the same as that which it represents. This comes to the crux of the Orthodox use of icons. In Orthodoxy, the understanding is of the icon as a sign and proof of the divine presence in the world. It constitutes a focal point about which worship

[158] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 10.
[159] *Genesis* 1:26-27, 2:7; *Colossians* 1:15.
[160] Gerhart B. Ladner, "The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7, (1953): 1-34; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.122-5.
[161] Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 329 – 390), *Oration 16, op. cit*. John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 11-12;

might be organised, and like the serpent of Moses, in its contemplation it may constitute a conduit of God's blessing. But it is not an object of worship in its own right. That would be idolatry.[162]

John describes this relationship as being akin to a valued memorial. *'I have often seen lovers gazing at the loved one's garment, and embracing it with eyes and mouth as if it was himself.'*[163] The one looking at the garment does not believe that the garment is her lover, and neither does she worship it as she might him. Yet, it is an object she treats with deep respect, and gazing at it or holding it enhances the sense of her absent lover. Here John cites Basil of Caesarea who observes that, *'The honour paid to the image passes to the prototype'*.[164] This conceptualisation of Basil, was not new, however. Rather, it mirrors that of the Christian philosopher and apologist Athenagoras, describing the relationship between the idols and gods of the pagans, '…..*that the supplications and sacrifices presented to the images are to be referred to the gods, and are in fact made to the gods*.'[165] John also cites Severianus of Galbala speaking of John Chrysostom (c. 347 – 407), *'…..who was most fond of the Epistles of Paul, of whom he also had a portrait. As he read the epistles, John was known*

[162] Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.
[163] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 87-88.
[164] Although widely quoted, the context in which Basil speaks is not related directly to the veneration of religious iconography, except through Damascene's understanding of the Christ icon's incidental capture of the divine. More fully: '*For the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; since such as is the latter, such is the former, and such as is the former, such is the latter; and herein is the Unity. So that according to the distinction of Persons, both are one and one, and according to the community of Nature, one. How, then, if one and one, are there not two Gods? Because we speak of a king, and of the king's image, and not of two kings. The majesty is not cloven in two, nor the glory divided. The sovereignty and authority over us is one, and so the doxology ascribed by us is not plural but one;* ***because the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype****. Now what in the one case the image is by reason of imitation, that in the other case the Son is by nature; and as in works of art the likeness is dependent on the form, so in the case of the divine and uncompounded nature the union consists in the communion of the Godhead.*' Basil of Caesarea (330 – 379), *On the Holy Spirit,* 18.45 (*N&PNF2* 8.28).
[165] Athenagoras of Athens (133 – c. 190), *A Plea for Christians*, 18 (*ANF* 2.137).

to talk to the image as though he was talking to the apostle, honouring him and directing his thoughts to him.'[166]

In his work, *On the Holy Icons*, Theodore the Studite follows a similar vein of reasoning to Damascene, and was the leading *Iconophile* theologian of the second iconomachy.[167] Theodore concludes that primarily the iconomachy was neither about idolatry, nor the use of images. It was in essence, rather, a debate regarding a correct understanding of the incarnation.[168] Like John, Theodore's argument is that if God has made himself visible in the form of Jesus, it was not an accident or mistake, but rather a faultless divine act, and therefore, of intended divine revelation. In this he appeals to scripture. *Hebrews* 1:1-2 states, *'Long ago, at many times and in many ways, God spoke to our fathers by the prophets, but in these days he has spoken to us by His Son, whom He appointed the heir of all things, through whom He created the world.' John* 1:14, *'And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we have seen His glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.' Colossians* 1:15, *'The Son is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.'* God had become truly man, and us such could be truly seen and truly touched. He looked upon the world through truly human eyes and he healed with the gentle touch of truly human hands. *John* 20:28 emphasises the physicality of the risen Christ, *'Then he said to Thomas, "Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe."' Luke* 24:42-43 adds, *'They gave him a piece of broiled fish, and he took it and ate it in their presence.'*

---

[166] Severianus of Gabala (m. c. 408 – 430), *The Life of St. John Chrysostom, op. cit.* John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 50-51.
[167] John McGuckin, "St. Theodore the Studite," in *CEOC*, 448-9; Pallis, "Iconology of St. John of Damascus," 173-191.
[168] Theodore, *On the Holy Icons.* 1.2-4, in Roth, *Theodore*, 20-3.

Likewise, in His incarnation, Christ was temporal. He was born a baby, He grew into a child, and He matured into a man; yet was always Christ. Accordingly, depictions of Christ vary, because Christ's incarnate body changed, and proclaim it. Theodore draws comparison with the symbol of the cross, which, remaining the cross, *"…..can be seen small and large, wider and narrower, with blunt or sharp ends, with or without inscription."*[169]

Following from this, if God circumscribed Himself to be visible to His people at one time, and the divine will is unchanging (*James* 1:17), then He has made Himself visible to all His people, and at all times. Previously, the infinite God had, in His own freedom and perfect wisdom, chosen not to make Himself visible. To represent Him graphically was to create an unauthorised, circumscribed and false image: to presume to represent the invisible and transcendent God, who is spirit, in a physical form arbitrarily chosen by man; in the case of Aaron and Jeroboam, bovine.[170] This was proscribed in the Decalogue. But in the incarnation, God, once again acting in His own infinite freedom and perfect wisdom, extended His divine self-revelation into circumscribed visible form. Therefore, to despise images is impious. It is to deny what God did in the incarnation, and reject how God has willed to reveal Himself. If merely cerebral contemplation were sufficient, it would have been sufficient for Him to come to us in a merely mental way, or in an apparent but not actual form, as the Docetists believe. Consequently, man would have been, *'…..misled by the appearance both of his deeds…..and of his sufferings. But enough of this! As flesh He suffered in the flesh, He ate and drank likewise*

[169] Theodore, *On the Holy Icons*, 2.41-7, 3.5, in Roth, *Theodore*, 69-73, 79.
[170] It is unclear from scripture how arbitrary the depiction of *YHWH* in bovine form was. It has been suggested to signify the Apis Bull, a representative form of the Egyptian creator god Ptah, but in diminutive form; and later to the Canaanite god El in his bull manifestation of Shor-El. If that where the case, the creation of the calves was to deny the uniqueness of YHWH, making Him simply part of the pantheon. However, this cannot be proved. Lloyd Bailey, "The Golden Calf," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42, (1971): 97-115.

and did all the other things which every man does, except for sin.' To summarise, Theodore argues that *'…..we depict the Lord because He depicted Himself in human flesh for our sake'*.[171]

Of note, imagery of the Father and the Spirit is broached neither in the Canons of Trullo, Hieria or Nicaea II, and excepting Clement as previously noted,[172] neither does reference to it appear in Christian writings to that time. Both John and Theodore argue the incarnation as the justification for images of Christ, yet regarding the other persons of the Trinity, they are silent. Speculatively, from Theodore and his emphasis on the physicality of the incarnation, there was hesitation to extend the appearance of God in theophany – the Father in His appearance to Abraham and Jacob, and as the '*Ancient of Days*' to Daniel, or in John's visions in *Revelation*, or the Spirit in His presence as a dove at Christ's baptism or as tongues of flame at Pentecost.[173] To do so, to conflate theophany with incarnation, was to reduce incarnation to theophany, and to enjoin the heresy of the Docetists.

To the argument that the use of images in Christian worship was an innovation, and not in keeping with traditional practice, the rejoinder was exactly the reverse. As stated previously, Damascene viewed images as important in the teaching of the illiterate*, 'But seeing that not everyone has a knowledge of letters nor time for reading, the Fathers gave their sanction to depicting these events on images as being acts of great heroism, in order that they should form a concise memorial of them'*, and to reject them was akin to withholding the gospel from the poor. Here it should be noted that John's claim is not directed to the scriptures expressly,

[171] Theodore, *On the Holy Icons.* 1.7, in Roth, *Theodore*, 26-7; Elizabeth Klein, "St. Theodore and the Holy Icons," *Faith and Culture: Journal of the Augustine Institute*, November 2019, https://www.faithandculture.com/home/2019/11/12/st-theodore-and-the-holy-icons; Menelaus, "Byzantine Iconoclasm," 49-65; Tkacz, "Iconoclasm, East and West," 542-550.
[172] Clement of Alexandria, *Logos Paidagogos*, 3.11 (*ANF* 2.285).
[173] *Genesis* 18:2, 32:28-30; *Daniel* 7:9-10; *Matthew* 3:16-7; *Mark* 1:10; *Luke* 3:22; *John* 1:32; *Acts* 2:3; *Revelation* 4:2-3, 5:1.

but rather he cites the 'Fathers', the traditions of the Church.[174] This view of the importance of the traditions was affirmed at Nicaea II, where it was pronounced anathema *'…..to spurn the teachings of the holy Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church'.*[175] Veneration of icons, the *Iconophiles* offered, was the traditional practice of the Church, and their rejection, novelty.[176]

The aforementioned points of debate centred around the lawfulness of the depiction of God incarnate. On the basis of scripture cited previously, a total proscription of the creation of either two- or three-dimensional religious imagery is impossible to sustain. Following, it should be lawful to make physical representations of the *Theotokos*, angels and saints; none of whom are divine. This leads on to the second question outlined above – the appropriate and inappropriate use of icons and relics.

As discussed, the theological developments integral to the rise of the cults of images and relics were a sense of spiritual hierarchy, and the intercession of the saints.[177] These issues were both addressed by the aniconist Council of Hieria in a way which was not at variance with the views of contemporary Christendom, including what would have been the positions held by the *Iconophiles*. Hieria pronounced anathemas:

'If anyone does not confess that the holy Virgin is truly the Mother of God…..

[174] John of Damascus, *Exposition,* 4.16 (*N&PNF2* 9.88). In this, John offers the Pauline direction on keeping the entrusted traditions (*1 Corinthians* 11:2). Damascene cites a plethora of examples of the fathers in their attachment to images, including [Pseudo] Dionysius the Areopagite, Eusebius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Leo of Cyprus, Severianus of Gabala, and John Chrysostom. *Apologia*, 31-54. Damascene's self-perception as a bearer of antiquity rather than an innovator is well demonstrated in his statement ἐρῶ ἐμὸν οὐδὲν (I shall say nothing of my own) at the beginning of his *The Fount of Knowledge, op. cit.* Pallis, "Iconology of St. John of Damascus," 173-91.
[175] *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 1, (*N&PNF2* 14.534).
[176] Elsner, "Iconoclasm," 368-94.
[177] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 32-33.

'If anyone shall not confess the holy ever-virgin Mary, truly and properly the Mother of God, to be higher than every creature whether visible or invisible, and does not with sincere faith seek her intercessions as of one having confidence in her access to our God, since she bare him…..

'If anyone denies the profit of the invocation of saints…..'[178]

Thus, it can be seen that the *Aniconists*, as represented by Nicaea II in the preserved *Epitome*, embraced fully the core doctrines of invocation of the saints and the hierarchy of spirituality. However, Hieria did restrict the use of relics,[179] and resolved against the portrayal not only of Christ, but of the *Theotokus*, angels and saints:

'The Saints live on eternally with God, although they have died. If anyone thinks to call them back again to life by a dead art, discovered by the heathen, he makes himself guilty of blasphemy. Who dares attempt with heathenish art to paint the Mother of God, who is exalted above all heavens and the Saints? Is it permitted to Christians, who have the hope of the resurrection, to imitate the customs of demon-worshippers, and to insult the Saints, who shine in so great glory, by common dead matter?

'If anyone shall endeavour to represent the forms of the Saints in lifeless pictures with material colours which are of no value (for this notion is vain and introduced by the devil), and does not rather represent their virtues as living images in himself…..'[180]

Regarding Mary, angels, and the saints, the *Aniconists* rejection of iconography was based on the inherently inadequate nature of icons. Following from this, to use them in their

[178] *Epitome,* 3, 15, 17 (*N&PNF2* 14.543-6).
[179] It would appear, however, that the suppression of relics was less than that of icons, and no records exist of their intentional destruction. Kazdan, "Iconoclasm," 975-7.
[180] *Epitome,* Prologue, 16 (*N&PNF2* 14.543-6).

inadequacy was to teach theological error. Regarding the saints, this was underpinned by the Orthodox doctrine of *deification* (theosis). According to it, through right practice, belief and the action of the Spirit, the Christian grows progressively towards the (non-ontological) form of God, and the saints have done this much more so. Thus, like the non-Commandment-based objections to images of Christ; lifeless icons of Mary, angels, and saints undermined recognition of their deification. Despite cross-overs with sanctification, this was not a doctrine traditionally associated with Western Christianity. It may, however, be seen to have parallels in the Roman Church's process or institution of canonisation.[181]

Regarding the right use of images, Nicaea II:

'…..stood firm …..receiving the imaged representations (εἰκόνας) according to the ancient tradition of our holy fathers; and these we venerate (προσκύνησις) with firmly-attached affection, as made in the name of Christ our God, and of our Spotless Lady the Holy Mother of God, and of the Holy Angels, and of all the Saints, most clearly giving our adoration (λατρεία) and faith to the one only true God.'[182]

In this, the Council affirmed that it was the behaviour toward (Christian) images, which contains the sin of idolatry, rather than the image itself. In the Greek, this was described as

[181] Stephen Thomas, "Deification," in *CEOC*, 147-50. '*God became man in order that man could become God*.' Athanasius of Alexandria, *On the Incarnation of the Word*, 54.3 (*N&PN2F* 4.65). Aquinas made similar observations, '*The only begotten son of God, wanting to make us sharers in his divinity, assumed our nature, so that he, made man, might make men gods*.' Thomas Aquinas*, Opuscula,* 53, 57:1-4, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 10963, 10972-3; J.M. Carmody, "Apotheosis*,"* in *NCE,* 1. 440; Robert L. Fastiggi, "Divinization (Theosis)," in *NCE*, 4.410-2. A.E. Green, "Beatification," in *NCE*, 2.177; P. Molinari and G.B. O'Donnell, "Canonization of Saints," in *NCE*, 3.61-5. The true extent to which deification has been rejected in the West has been questioned in recent scholarship, Gavrilyuk (2009) associating its theological underpinning with authors as diverse as Anselm of Canterbury, John of the Cross, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Lancelot Andrewes, John Wesley and Jonathan Edwards. Paul L. Gavrilyuk, "The Retrieval of Deification: How a Once-Despised Archaism Became an Ecumenical Desideratum," *Modern Theology* 25, (2009): 647-659.

[182] *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 4 (*N&PNF2* 14.538). Example of the appropriate 'veneration' of the non-divine is demonstrated by Damascene by reference to scripture in *Genesis* 23:7, 33:3 (προσκύνησις), and *Joshua* 5:14 (ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν). John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 9.

the difference between offering the worship or adoration appropriate only to God (λατρεία), from fitting veneration (προσκύνησις); and remains a workable definition of correct behaviour towards religious images, to the extent they are accepted.

As was the case in the Christological controversies of the 4th and 5th centuries noted previously, poor translations and uncertainty of the exact meaning of foreign words resulted in misunderstandings. Λατρεία could be directly translated (or transliterated) as *latria* or *adorio* – worship or adoration which was appropriate to God alone. Προσκύνησις, on the other hand was often translated into Latin as *adorio,* rather than *venero* or *dulia*, which are more in keeping with the Orthodox and Thomistic understanding. These linguistic issues go back to translation of the Second Commandment itself. In *Exodus* 20:5 and *Deuteronomy* 5:9, the Hebrew לא־תשתחוה (you shall not bow down) is translated into the Greek Septuagint as *οὐ* προσκυνήσεις (you shall not bow down),[183] and in the Latin Vulgate as *non adorabis* (you shall not adore). Conversely, ולא תעבדם (nor shall you serve) is translated as οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσῃς (neither shall you worship) in the Septuagint*,* and *neque coles* (nor serve) in the Vulgate. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologica,* and following Nicaea II, describes *latria* as worship or adoration reserved only to God. Images and relics of the saints, like the saints themselves, are entitled to *dulia* (respect and service – veneration) and Mary to *hyperdulia*;

[183] Etymologically, προσκυνήσεις is derived from πρός (towards) and κυνεῖν (to kiss). In the 1000 years between the translation into the Septuagint and the iconomachy, προσκυνήσεις had developed in meaning to respect or venerate, as well as its original physically bowing or prostration to kiss in greeting, as might be performed before a king. *Letter of the Synod to the Emperor and Empress*, (*N&PNF2* 14.572-3); J. Diggle ed., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 1214; Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd Edition*, edited by Frederick W. Danke (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 882-3.

but not *latria*. As the respect paid is transmitted to the prototype, Aquinas held that *latria* was appropriate, through His images, to Christ alone.[184]

Similarly, and as will be of issue during the Protestant reformation of the 16th century, was the interpretation and translation of the words εἴδωλον and εἰκών, problematic.[185] When εἴδωλον occurs in the Septuagint, it translates a number of Hebrew words, but always in reference to a false god, and not even necessarily in the form of a physical object. Examples of this include *Exodus* 20:4 פסל translated in the Vulgate as *sculptile* (and into the *Douay-Rheims* English translation of the Vulgate as idol); *Leviticus* 26:30 במתיכם*, idolorum* (idols); *2 Kings* 17:12 הגללים*, inmunditias* (impurities). By comparison, *εἰκών* is used routinely to translate צלמ*.* Some examples of this are *Genesis* 1:26 בצלמנו*,* translated in the Vulgate as *imaginem* (picture); *Psalm* 73:20 צלמם*, imaginem* (picture); *Ezekiel* 16:17 צלמי, *imagines* (pictures), referring to things that are actual, rather than imaginary. This parallels the pre-classical usage found in Homer,[186] and the contemporary writings of Euripides and Plato, in which εἴδωλον denotes the unreal or phantasmal, and εἰκών the true or real.[187] Likewise in

[184] Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 1274), *Summa Theologica*, 3.25.5-6, 2.2.103, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 4255-8, 3252-3. The distinction between the rightful respect or veneration that is due to the saints and martyrs, as opposed to the worship which is God's right is clear from at least the mid-2nd century, '*For Him we worship (προσκυνοῦμεν) as the Son of God, but the martyrs we love worthily (ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως) as disciples and imitators of the Lord; and rightly, because of their unsurpassable affection toward their own King and Teacher'*, notwithstanding that the semantics are problematic*.* That the relics of martyrs were gathered and celebrated, at least for the sake of instruction, is likewise attested, as quoted earlier. *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (c. 156), 17.3, 18.2-3. Regarding the *latria* of images of Christ, Thomas makes clear that this is to Christ. It is in no respect to the image, as an image in itself. *Summa Theologica*, 3.25.3.

[185] This issue is noted and reviewed at some length by the 16th century Italian reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli, as will be presented later in the dissertation. Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499 - 1562), Anthonie Marten trans., *Common Places* 2.5.1-6 (*STC* 24669, 333-6), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A14350.0001.001.

[186] For example in Book 11 of *The Odyssey* (8th century B.C) where Odysseus greets the ephemeral εἴδωλον of his dead comrade Elpenor in the Underworld. Homer, *Odyssey*, 11:87.

[187] Septuagint Torah, 3rd century; Euripides, late 5th century; Plato, early 4th century. Evangelia G. Dafni, "Euripides's Helena and Pentateuch Traditions: The Septuagint from the Perspective of Ancient Tragedies," *HTS Theological Studies* 71, (2015): 2902.; Nadiya Zudilina, "Plato's Doctrine of Three Types of Images (*Eidos*, *Eikon, Eidolon*)," 2020; Terry Griffith, "'ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ' as 'Idol' in Non-Jewish And Non-Christian Greek," *Journal of Theological Studies* 53, (2002): 95-101; Georgiadis, "Christological Controversy," 45-56; Anca R. Purcaru, "Idol or Icon?" *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 92, (2013): 770-7. Theodore recognises this problem even

the New Testament, εἴδωλον is reserved for depictions of false gods (idols),[188] and εἰκών for images of things real: be that Christ, the Father, the world, Caesar, or other men.[189] By contrast, this essential non-existence of things described as εἴδωλον is aptly demonstrated in *1 Corinthians* 10:19.[190] The Western (Latin) εἰκών/εἴδωλον misunderstanding, that the words are interchangeable, is of long standing; Tertullian, possibly instituting the confusion in his *On Idolatry*.[191]

3.5 Reception in the West

The iconomachy of the 8th and 9th centuries was not a phenomenon in the West as it was in the East, although it did contribute to an already growing divide. The reaction in the West to the iconomachy was both theological and political, and occurred within its own historical context.[192]

Following his conversion and accession to the sole imperial throne, in 324 Constantine established a new Roman capital, which he named Constantinople (330). Politically, this

in Greek-speaking Byzantine society in the early 9th century. Theodore, *On the Holy Icons.* 1.16, in Roth, *Theodore*, 233-5.

[188] For example: *Acts* 7:41 Vulgate: *simulacro,* likeness, 15:20 *simulacrorum*, likeness; *Romans* 2:22 *idola,* idols; *1 Corinthians* 8:4 *idolum,* idol. Similarly *2 Corinthians* 6:16 μετὰ εἰδώλων; *Colossians* 3:5 ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία; 1 John 5:21 φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων.

[189] For example: *Matthew* 22:20 *imago,* image; *Mark* 12:16 *imago,* picture; *Luke* 20:24 *imaginem,* picture; *Romans* 1:23 *imaginis,* picture; *1 Corinthians* 11:7 *imago* picture, 15:49 *imaginem,* picture; Theodore, *On the Holy Icons*, 3.4, in Roth, *Theodore*, 101. There is irony in this. Julius Caesar was divinised by the Senate of Rome in 42 BC, two years after his death. Likewise Augustus, self-styled as *Imperator Caesar divi filius* (Commander Caesar son of the deified one) and was formally divinised after his death. The cult of the emperor as a god continued through their reigns in the time of Christ and the *New Testament* authors. In this, the εἰκὼν of *Matthew* 22:20, was the image not just of a ruler, but a 'god'. Despite this, Jesus does not describe Caesar's image as an εἴδωλον, suggesting that the status of an 'image' versus 'idol' (εἰκὼν vs εἴδωλον) is also contextual, and reflects its use (or non-use) as such by the Jews.

[190] 'τί οὖν φημι; ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν; ἢ ὅτι εἴδωλόν τί ἐστιν;'. '*What do I imply then? That food offered to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything?*' *ESV.*

[191] '*To establish this point, the interpretation of the word is requisite. Eidos, in Greek, signifies form; eidolon, derived diminutively from that, by an equivalent process in our language, makes formling. Every form or formling, therefore, claims to be called an idol*.' Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 3 (*ANF* 3.62); David J. Davis, *From Icons to Idols: Documents on the Image Debate in Reformation England* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), loc 3388 n.355.

[192] Neil, "Western Reaction," 533-552.

created tensions with the old Roman aristocracy and, with the establishment of the Patriarchy of Constantinople, with the bishops of Rome. In the context of ongoing Christological dispute, Emperor Theodosius II called the Second Council of Ephesus in 449. Western bishops complained that they had not been invited in reasonable time, and the written statement of the Roman Pope Leo was not read to the participants.[193] Leo objected to this, and in the wake of the Council of Chalcedon of 451, to the Patriarch of Constantinople claiming equality with, or even primacy over, Rome.[194] Following the fall of Rome to the Ostrogoths and the end of the Western Empire (476), Roman papal elections were conducted without imperial oversight, until its re-institution by Justinian. From 537 to 752 the Roman papacy was again subject to the emperor in Constantinople, but as seen in the Roman reaction to the Council of Trullo, this relationship was uneasy.[195]

In the wake of his suppression of images, relations between Emperor Leo III and Pope Gregory II deteriorated badly. Gregory refused to enact Leo's edict, and declared aniconism heretical; the patrimonies of Illyricum, southern Italy, and Sicily were transferred from the Pope to the Patriarch of Constantinople; and Theophanes claims that Gregory excommunicated Leo. Under increasing military pressure from the invading Lombards, and with the loss of the Exarchate of Ravenna in 751, imperial power in Italy effectively ended. Thus, popes looked elsewhere for support, in the form of the Franks under Pepin.[196] Fortunately, correspondence

[193] Leo I, Bishop of Rome (c. 410 – 461, r. 440 – 461) (449), *Letter XXVIII: To Flavian, commonly called "the Tome,"* (*N&PNF2 12.107-17*); Leo I, *Letter 75: To Faustus and Martinus Together condemning the Latrocinium and maintaining that Eutyches equally with Nestorius promotes the cause of Antichrist*, (*N&PNF2 12.173*).
[194] Leo I (452), *Letter 104: To Marcian Augustus,* (*N&PNF2 12.224-6*); Leo I (452), *Letter 105: To Pulcheria Augusta about the self-seeking of Anatolius* (*N&PNF2 12.227-9*); Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 236-237.
[195] *Canons of the Council of Trullo*, Canon 82 (*N&PNF2* 14.401); Duffy, *Saints and Sinners,* 84; Brown, *Byzantine Empire*, 26.
[196] Pepin the Short (c. 714 – 768, r. 751 - 768). Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners,* 64.

sent from Rome and the Frankish court from 739 - 791, is preserved.[197] The imperially sponsored Council of Hieria was rejected by Pope Stephen II.[198] Empress Irene's repudiation of iconoclasm, and the calling of Nicaea II, did something, however, to restore theological cohesion between Constantinople and Rome. Pope Hadrian accepted its canons and had them translated into Latin, but Nicaea II was not proclaimed ecumenical in the West, nor its canons formally accepted until 880; in part due to the Council's refusal to return the patrimonies confiscated by Leo III.[199]

While there was no Western iconomachy, neither was there complete unity; the separation of ecclesiastical and secular authority being greater in the West, consequent in part to the physical distance between Aachen and Rome.[200] Of particular interest in the period immediately following Nicaea II, was the production at the Carolingian court of four books, the *Libri Carolini* (791 – 793). The *Libri* summed up and expanded a now lost work, the *Caitulare contra synodum*, and expressed Carolingian reservations regarding Nicaea II.[201]

Again, issues of translation arose in the discourse between East and West. The translation commissioned by Hadrian was poor. It was re-translated under Pope Anastasis III (r. 911-913), and the original is now lost. However, the *Libri* addresses statements from the Nicaean *Acts* which are clearly incorrect, even the opposite of those found in the translation commissioned by Anastasis.[202] In part, this seems related to mistranslations of προσκυνήσεις and λατρεία, both being rendered *adorio* or its derivatives. A particular theme in the *Libri*, is that of the use

[197] The *Codex epistolaris Carolinus*. Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, 296.
[198] Stephen II (717 – 757, r. 752 - 757). Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 69, 80-81, 90; Gregory, *History of Byzantium,* 209.
[199] Hadrian I (c. 700 – 795, r. 772 – 795). Thomas F. X. *Noble, Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 287-95.
[200] Neil, "Western Reaction," 533-552; Herrin, *Formation of Christendom*, 304-5.
[201] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 285.
[202] Stephen Gero, "The Libri Carolini and the Image Controversy," *op. cit*. Neil, "Western Reaction," 533-552.

of images of Christ being restricted to didactics, mirroring Gregory the Great; and at odds with Orthodox understandings. The image was seen not as an object of revelation, as in the Orthodox teaching, but something to recall, remind and instruct; doctrines confirmed at the Synods of Frankfurt (794) and Paris (825). The Synod of Paris affirmed the letter of Hadrian to the Emperor Constantine VI and his mother Irene (787), in so far as it related to his rebuke of the iconoclasts in removing and breaking images; but his command to adore (*adorare*) them, the Carolingians rejected. Without approving the *Acts* of Hieria, they condemned Nicaea II despite its papal acceptance, again on the basis of the 'adoration' of images. The Synod declared its adherence to the content of the *Libri Carolini.*[203] Thus, despite sharing many of the same words, Eastern and Western understandings of the role of images were clearly at variance.[204] That the *Libri,* produced in response to mistaken assertions of the *Acts* of Nicaea II, was written in contradiction to Rome, demonstrates an inadvertent consequence of the iconomachy: the stimulation of independent doctrine in the Frankish Court. A copy of the *Libri* was forwarded to Rome, and there repudiated. Possibly in response to discovering the inaccuracy of Hadrian's translation, the *Libri* was never widely circulated.[205]

[203] Noble, "Images," 287-95; Neil, "Western Reaction," 533-552; H.G.J. Beck, "Pope Eugene II," in *NCE*, 443.
[204] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 282; Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23). *Cf.* Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.
[205] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium,* 283; J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 49–50.

SECTION 4: ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM AND RELIGIOUS IMAGERY

4.1 Religious Imagery in Late Medieval England

Whereas in the early middle-ages the Western Church had been suspicious of the Byzantine embrace of the centrality of the icon; as the medieval period continued, a proliferation of religious images occurred. This growth of image production and veneration, and its acceptance was, however, uneven. Free-standing statuary is documented in southern France, from both literary and physical sources, from the early 9th century. Yet in 1013, Bernard of Angers, upon seeing a gilt statue of Saint Gerard upon the altar of a church in Conques, observed to his travelling companion, '*Brother, what do you think of this idol? Would Jupiter or Mars consider himself unworthy of such a statue?*' The use of statuary, with the exception of that of the '*crucifix of Our Lord*', he saw to be the custom of simple people, and to be viewed by the learned as sign of unlawful superstition.[206]

Over time, however, the image became central to the practice of piety; images assuming a place intrinsic to its nature. Unlike in the East, this Western form of iconography took not only two-dimensional representations of Christ, *Theotokus* and saints, but extended to statuary 'in the round'; including imagery of the Father and the Spirit. Above all, the three-dimensional crucifix[207] (or 'rood') became ubiquitous.[208] Accordingly, it is necessary to consider devotional

[206] Ilene H. Forsyth, *The Throne of Wisdom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 7, 92-133; Bernard of Anger, *Book of Sainte Foy's Miracles*, 1.13, *op. cit*. Pamela Sheingorn, trans., *The Book of Sainte Foy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 93-7.

[207] While 'crucifix' can be used generically to describe a cross with or without a representation of Christ, within this dissertation, 'crucifix' is used to denote a three-dimensional depiction of Christ upon the cross. Without the image of Christ, 'cross' is used.

[208] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547 – 1603* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2001), 3.

images in the context of the communities and individuals who used them: the why, where, what, and how.[209]

Regarding the intentions for medieval veneration of the saints, in his hagiographic work *Legenda Aurea* (*The Golden Legend*), Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, lists six:

1. To honour God, '*who that doth honour to saints, he honoureth him specially which hath sanctified them'*;
2. For our benefit, that the saints might '…..*aid in our infirmity'*;
3. To celebrate their glory, '*for our hope and surety may be augmented and increased*'.
4. Pedagogically, '*for the example of following*';
5. Sacrificially, '*for the debt of interchanging neighbourhood*'; and
6. For our own honour, '*for when we worship our brethren we worship ourselves, for charity maketh all to be common*'.[210]

The English Augustinian John Mirk in his homily on the Feast of Saint Andrew, gives the reasons more succinctly as '*for his high holiness of lyvyng, another for gret myracles doing, the third for gret passion suffryng*'. That is, the incentive for veneration directed to the saints and their images can be seen as both as inherently seemly to do, and for reward.[211]

The 'where' of sacred imagery was, first and foremost, the church. However, it extended progressively beyond the walls of the building, and into the public space. Increasingly, in England as on the Continent, crucifixes and other statuary were seen at road junctions, in the

[209] Richard Marks, *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England* (Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 2004) 1.
[210] Jacobus de Voragine (c. 1230 – 1298), *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints*, ed. F. S. Ellis (London: J. M. Dent, 1900), 6.45-7.
[211] John Mirk, *Festal: A Collection of Homilies*, ed. Theodor Erbe (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, 1905), 6; Susan Powell, "Mirk, John (fl. c. 1382 – c. 1414)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18818.

public square, and in the private spaces of both the wealthy and the poor.[212] Bishop Reginald Pecock observed '…..*bifor a bare wal in a chirche, or in a corner of a chirche or of an other hous, or in the feeld,*' religious images were to be encountered, and that it was '…..*leeful and expedient to do these now rehercid deedis to God and to Seints*' before them. This might be either, '…..*a wal peinted with the passioun of God or…..a graued ymage of God or…..of a Seint*'.[213] The quality of images may have varied, but the artistic divide between consecrated and secular space appears to have all but disappeared, as did any true dichotomy between the secular and spiritual nature of life.

Regarding the 'what' of English religious imagery, little pre-1300 devotional church statuary is extant in its original context. Among that remaining, the dominant images are of the rood, and of the Virgin and Child. Wall paintings are more commonly preserved, as their later obliteration without destruction of the structural fabric of the building, either by iconoclasm or remodelling, resulted mostly in 'painting over' or whitewashing. Written sources, as above or in the form of wills and churchwardens' accounts, also attest to its presence. This testament becomes common from the 14th century.[214] Additionally, implied evidence may be obtained from the practice of naming churches after saintly patrons.[215]

---

[212] Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts: Laws Against Images* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 25-6.
[213] Pecock was Bishop of Chichester 1450 – 1461. Reginald Pecock, *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*, ed. Churchill Babington (London: Rolls Series, 1860), 169; Wendy Scase, "Pecock, Reginald (b. c. 1392, d. in or after 1459)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/21749.
[214] Emma Mason, "The Role of the English Parishioner, 1100–1500," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27, (1976): 17-29; Clive Burgess, "'By Quick and by Dead': Wills and Pious Provision in Late Medieval Bristol," *English Historical Review* 102, (1987): 837-858.
[215] Extant statuary from the period, though damaged either through the passage of time or the depredations of zealous Reformers in the 16th century and soldiers of the Civil War 17th, include a painted head of Christ (ex-rood) from Gloucestershire (c. 1130), and those of Virgin and Child from Wiltshire (late Saxon), Somerset (mid-11th century), York Minster (c. 1155) and Kent (c. 1175). Devoid of original context, dating other than by radioisotope means, for example on stylistic grounds, is problematic. Calculation of the frequency of different statue subjects is impossible, but implications might be drawn by the patronage ascription of churches. Combining a series of separate studies over six medieval counties, Marks (2004) lists 359 to the Virgin, 167 to 'All Saints', 86 to Saint Peter, 84 to Saint Michael, 71 to Saint Peter and Saint Paul, 68 to Saint Andrew, 67 to

Within the English medieval church, two centres of devotional practice developed. The first was the high altar, where it became customary for a crucifix to be located centrally, with a statue of the Virgin on the south, and that of the patron saint of the parish on the north. The second focus was the 'rood screen', a fenestrated panel separating the chancel from the nave, and overhung by the rood. These screens featured images of Christ, and Mary and John commonly, they having been present at the crucifixion, but became increasingly ornate over time. In larger churches, auxiliary altars were seen frequently in aisles or transepts; devotional images within them, and elsewhere inside the church.[216]

The method of veneration of religious images varied, and evolved over time. These included the lighting of tapers, and prayer and praise of Christ or the saint; either generally, or for intervention on behalf of the supplicant. One particular form of veneration popular in medieval England was 'creeping to the cross' on Good Friday. In this, the worshipper made his way to the cross or crucifix on his knees, in order to kiss it, while repeating prescribed prayers.[217] Veneration could also manifest in the provision to the material need of the image in its creation, maintenance or adornment. This might be either financial or practical, and included membership of saintly guilds. Reverence could include the performance of acts of charity in the name, and toward the honour of the saint or shrine. Finally, money or goods to the keepers of the image, relic or shrine might be offered.[218]

John the Baptist, 65 to Saint Nicholas, and 26 to Saint Mary Magdalene. Significant variation between counties is noted, however. Marks, *Image and Devotion,* 38-40, 68.

[216] Nicholas Orme, *Going to Church in Medieval England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 109-11.

[217] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 152; Orme, *Going to Church*, 278-9;

[218] Orme, *Going to Church*, 29-30, 120, 259-60; Marks, *Image and Devotion*, 162-7, 234; Desiderus Erasmus (c. 1466 – 1536), *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, fifth rule (*STC* 10486), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A00363.0001.001.

Acts of piety toward images and relics was not uniform, nor necessarily orthodox in the eyes of the Church. Ecclesiastical authorities recognised the risk of superstition and idolatry. Adoration of an image of Mary at Foston, was forbidden by Archbishop William Greenfield of York in 1315. A chapel to Mary at Frithelstock, was demolished at the direction of Bishop John Grandisson of Exeter in 1351, and the adoration of a wooden cross at Rippingale at which miracles were claimed, was prohibited by Bishop John Bokyngham of Lincoln in 1386, although this was overturned on appeal to Pope Gregory XI.[219]

4.2 Political Chronology of the Pre-Civil War English Iconomachy

4.2.1 Pre-Reformation (c. 1375 – 1509)

The Protestant Reformation was overtly historical; one of the reformers' stated aims, both British and Continental, being to return the Church to what they understood to be its early purity of doctrine and practice.[220] Disquiet in England regarding religious images, however, predated the Protestant Reformation. Notably, it was one of the defining characteristics of English pre-Reformation Lollardy, itself influenced by the earlier European movements of Catharism and Waldensianism.[221] In *Expositio Decalogi,* John Wycliffe observes the greatest

[219] William Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, eds., *The Register of William Greenfield Lord Archbishop of York 1306-1315* (Durham: Surtees Society, 1936), 215-217; Orme, *Going to Church*, 38, 190-1; Robert N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c. 1215 - c. 1515*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 255; *Marks, Image and Devotion*, 225-7.

[220] Leonard J. Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 235; David Manning, "'That is Best, Which Was First': Christian Primitivism and the Reformation Church of England, 1548-1722," *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 13, (2011): 155-7; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religio*n, trans. Henry Beveridge (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 4.1.

[221] W.R. Jones, "Lollards and Images: The Defense of Religious Art in Later Medieval England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34, (1973): 27-50; Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 2-3; Robert N. Swanson, "'Lollardy', 'orthodoxy', and 'resistance' in pre-Reformation England," *Usuteaduslik Ajakiri (Estonian Theological Journal)* 63, (2013): 12-26; Peter Marshall, "Catholic Puritanism in Pre-Reformation England," *British Catholic History* 32, (2015): 431-450. The extent of continuity between Lollardy and the English Reformation, as inspired by the Continental reformers, has been questioned. James Crompton, "Leicestershire Lollards," *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society* 44, (1969): 11-44. 12-5; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England,* 58.

obligation of man is to love and honour God before all things, and that he should '*hear the commandments of God read, preached, and taught, and to do after them as God has bidden*'. Wycliffe acknowledged, as had Gregory in the 6th century, that images might be useful in the instruction of the unlearned, regarding the saints and those things in heaven *'…..after whom these things are shapen'*. They were to be used correctly, within the limitations of Nicaea II, and not *'…..unduly delighted in for* [their] *beauty, costliness, or attachment to irrelevant circumstances'*. Yet, Wycliffe also describes them as *'*dead' or 'dumb', following from *Psalm* 115; terms which would be taken up by his followers and later Reformers, and identified by Church authorities as heretical.[222] Wycliffe's hesitation concerning images and their appropriate use was consistent with his objection to pilgrimages, (unauthorised) rendering of the Vulgate into English, and rejection of transubstantiation. In these things, Wycliffe recognised the propensity of men to superstition and idolatry, he undermined the need for special circumstances or artifacts, and rejected the centrality of sacerdotal mediation. His teachings were consolidated posthumously into *The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards* (c. 1396).[223]

From the late 14th until the early 16th centuries the 'heresy' of Lollardy was actively, if sporadically, suppressed in England. Prominent in this was the Lollard refusal to '*worship the*

[222] John Wycliffe (c. 1328 – 1384), *Expositio Decalogi*, *op. cit.* Robert Vaughan, *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe,* (London: Wycliffe Society, 1845), 1-3; Rachel Pyper, "An Abridgement of Wyclif's '*De Mandatis Divinis*,'" *Medium Aevum* 52, (1983): 306-9; Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23); Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*. 3.25, 2.2.103, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 4248-58, 3252-3; *Psalm* 115:5-7, *Deuteronomy* 4:28; Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm,* 12.

[223] Rebecca W. Lundin, "Rhetorical Iconoclasm: The Heresy of Lollard Plain Style," *Rhetoric Review* 27, (2008): 131-146; H. S. Cronin, "The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards," *English Historical Review* 22, (1907): 292-304. Idolatry is specifically addressed (Conclusion 4), that the doctrine of transubstantiation, *'inducith alle men but a fewe to ydolatrie',* because they think that the divine substance is enclosed in the communion wafer, and (Conclusion 8) that, *'pilgrimage, preyeris, and offringis made to blynde rodys and to deue ymages of tre and of ston, ben ner of kin to ydolatri',* true worship (*latria*) belonging to God alone. In much of their teaching, the *Twelve Conclusions* mirror those of Vigilantius, which were condemned by Jerome, and which was referenced in the *Roman Catechism* of 1566. Jerome, *Against Vigilantius* (*N&PNF2* 6. 417-23).

cross of Christ and images.' Stephen Gardiner (1547), disparaged iconoclasts in general and (historically) Lollards particularly, as '*…..grosser beasts than hogges be,…..denying images, thought therewithal the crafts of painting and graving to be generally superfluous and naught, and against God's laws*.'[224]

In 1395, Archbishop Arundel of York demanded from Lollards of Nottingham an oath, *'…..from this day forward I will worship* [*adorabo*] *images…..and also I shall nevermore despise pilgrimages'*.[225] In light of the Peasant's Revolt of 1381, and at the behest of the '*prelates and clergy of his realm*', in early 1401, Henry IV assented the *Act De Hæretico Comburendo* (*2 Hen.IV c.15*),[226] which uniquely recognised heresy as being of the same essence as treason: a (capital) crime against the royal authority.[227] This *Act* would presage the 1534 *Act of Supremacy* of Henry VIII, repealed by Mary in 1553-5, and Elizabeth's *Act of Supremacy* of 1558.[228]

In March 1401, priest William Sawtrey was charged with '…..*refusing to adore the true cross save as a symbol by vicarious adoration; with maintaining that priests might omit the*

[224] Mary A. Devlin, *Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-89* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1954), 85-6; Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester (1483 – 1555, r. 1531–1551, 1553–1555). James Muller ed., *Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933), 273.
[225] Margaret Aston, *Thomas Arundel: a study of church life in the reign of Richard II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 330-1. Arundel reigned as Bishop of Ely (1373 - 88), Archbishop of York (1388 - 1396) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1396 - 1414). Jonathan Hughes, "Arundel [Fitzalan], Thomas (1353–1414)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/713.
[226] Citations of English legislation are given in the format of 'regnal year - monarch - statute or capital'. That is, (*2 Hen.IV c.15*) refers to (2nd year of his reign – Henry IV – capital 15), or (*1 M.I st.2.2*) to (1st year of her reign – Mary I – statute 2, capital 2) and so forth.
[227] The name of the *Act* translates as 'On the burning of the heretic.' *De Hæretico Comburendo* (1401), https://w3.ric.edu/faculty/rpotter/heretico.html. Despite repeal by Elizabeth in 1558 (*1 Eliz.I st.1.6*), the Crown's access to it by writ was not removed until 1677; the last execution under the statute being performed in 1612. The reasons for its repeal have been speculated to include the potential for the prosecution of Protestants in any future Roman Catholic ascendancy. Elliott Visconsi, "The Invention of Criminal Blasphemy: Rex v. Taylor (1676)," *Representations* 103, (2008): 30-52.
[228] *26 Hen.VIII c.1*; *1 M.I st.2.2*; *1&2 Ph.II&M.I c.8*; *1 Eliz.I st.1.6*; "Act of Supremacy (1534)" and "Act of Supremacy (1559)," in Gerald Bray ed., *Documents of the English Reformation 1526 – 1701* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2004), 113-4, 318-28.

repetition of the 'hours' for more important duties, such as preaching; that the money expended in pilgrimages for the attainment of any temporal good might be more profitably distributed to the poor; that men were more worthy of adoration than angels; and that the bread of the eucharist after consecration, though it was the bread of life, remained bread'. He was tried before Arundel, condemned, handed over, and burnt for heresy after previous abjuration; the first victim of the *De Hæretico Comburendo*, and the original Lollard martyr.[229] John Badby (or Bradley), blacksmith of Evesham, was burned in 1410 for refusing to renounce the Lollard rejection of transubstantiation; the first English layman to be executed for heresy.[230]

4.2.2 Reformation – Henry VIII and Edward VI (1509 – 1553)

Early 16th century humanist theologians Desiderius Erasmus and Englishman John Colet criticised image veneration as tending to superstition.[231] On the continent, Martin Luther was circumspect regarding images, although English Chancellor Thomas More (1478 – 1535) did not view him so. However, active iconoclasm was advocated by Andreas Karlstadt, Huldrych Zwingli and other early Reformers, and from the mid-1520s, a significant increase in both the frequency and extent of acts of iconoclasm was seen, and particularly towards images of God, the Trinity and the Virgin Mary.[232] Corresponding events followed in England. Thomas Bilney at Stoke Newington, and Hugh Latimer in Cambridge, preached against pilgrimages and the

[229] Charles Kightly, "Sawtre [Sawtrey], William (d. 1401)," in *ODNB,* https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/24753; John Foxe (1516 – 1587), *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church (Volume 1)*, 518-20 (*STC* 11225), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A67922.0001.001.
[230] Peter McNiven, "Badby, John (d. 1410)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1012; Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 520-7 (*STC* 11225).
[231] John R. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images* (Berkeley: UCP, 1974), 31-39.
[232] Thomas More, *Complete Works of Thomas More* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963 – 1997), 6.1.50, 6.2.360, 706, 7.458; Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 167.

idolatry of images, something More denounced.[233] In 1533, occasions of images being wrenched from their mountings and burned in London and East Anglia are recorded, together with punishment, both for the acts and the heresies from which they proceeded.[234] The break with Rome in 1534 was not an endorsement of iconoclasm, but it is likely that the fall from grace, first of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, then More and other supporters of the 'old papal order', discouraged outspoken criticism.[235]

The *Ten Articles* of the Church of England was promulgated under Henry's authority in 1536. These *Articles* were not theologically Protestant in nature, confirming the salvific efficacy of baptism, the true presence in the mass, the necessity of works to salvation, and the honouring and invocation of the saints. Article six, regarding images, permitted their didactic use, but it was specific in the Nicaea II prohibition against idolatrous worship.[236] Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer publicly enjoined the debate against images, saintly invocation and purgatory in his St. Paul's Cross sermon of 1536, although the following year his additions to the *Bishops' Book* regarding images were vetoed by the King.[237] *Royal Injunctions* in August

[233] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments (Volume 2:1)*, 1001 (*STC* 11225), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A67926.0001.001; Foxe, *Actes and Monuments (Volume 2:2)*, 1730-6 (*STC* 11225), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A67927.0001.001; Marcus L. Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983), 17-9, 39, 98-9. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547 – 1603* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2001), 57. Bilney was arrested and tried for heresy and burnt at the Lollards Pit, Norwich, in 1531. Latimer would also perish by fire as a heretic at Oxford in 1555.

[234] Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm,* 2-3; Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 211-4; Eamon Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, *2nd Edition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 86-7.

[235] Sybil M. Jack, "Wolsey, Thomas (1470/71–1530)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29854; Seymour Baker House, "More, Sir Thomas (1478–1535)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19191.

[236] "The Ten Articles (1536)," in Bray, *Documents*, 162-174. The authorship of the *Articles* is uncertain, but it is likely that Thomas Cranmer, Edward Foxe (Bishop of Hereford) and the King himself were all involved. While acceptable in content to Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500 – 1558) in Rome (if not in the process of their declaration under the authority of Henry), and largely superseded by the *Institution of a Christen Man* (*Bishops' Book*) the following year, the *Articles* constitute the first doctrinal definition by the newly independent English Church. Thomas E. Marston, "The Ten Articles," *Yale University Library Gazette* 31, (1956): 81-83.

[237] Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (1489 – 1556, r. 1533 – 1555). Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), 159-166, 185-196.

1536 and September 1538, issued at the behest of Chancellor Thomas Cromwell, attacked idolatry, pilgrimages and other '*superstitions*'.[238] By late 1538, however, and as evidenced by the appointment of the conservative Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall to the Privy Council, and the relatively moderate tone of the *Royal Proclamation* of November that year, Henry's support for the reform of religious imagery seems to have begun to wane.[239] *A Necessary Doctrine* (the *King's Book*) was published and legislated in 1543. Authorship is uncertain, although the preface, at least, appears to have been written personally by the King. *A Necessary Doctrine* superseded the *Bishops' Book* of six years prior. More conservative in nature than its predecessor, the *King's Book* is a doctrinally conflicted document. Whereas it enumerates the Commandments by the Reformed reckoning, it expresses a doctrine of images in keeping with Nicaea II. It asserts the seven sacraments, and encourages prayer for the dead, yet strongly rejects Romish doctrine regarding purgatory. The *Salutation of the Virgin* (*Hail, Mary*) is retained, but only in its first part, rejecting the invocation '…..*pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death*.'[240]

Cromwell was executed in 1540, and in response to his outspokenness against the propriety of images in Church practice, accusations of heresy were made against Cranmer in 1543 (the Prebendaries Plot). Acquitted through the intervention of the King, Cranmer revised the

[238] Thomas Cromwell, Chancellor (c. 1485 – 1540, r. 1534 – 1540) "The First Henrician Injunctions (1536)," 4, and "The Second Henrician Injunctions (1538)," 6-7, in Bray, *Documents*, 175-8, 179-183. Contrary to the earlier experience of the Lollards, these injunctions also encouraged reading of the *Bible* (1536, 5), and commanded the placement of English language translations into all churches, and learning of the *Commandments* in the vernacular (1538, 2-4).

[239] D. G. Newcombe, "Tunstall, Cuthbert (1474–1559)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/27817. While the *Royal Proclamation* of 16 November 1538 denounces the cult of Thomas a'Becket strongly, its denouncement of images and relics is confined to Becket only, and does not extend in breadth as did the *Injunction* issued two months earlier. Henry VIII Rex, *Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St Thomas a'Becket from Calendar* (1538), https://www.copyrighthistory.org/cam/pdf/uk_1538_1.pdf.

[240] *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christen Man Set Furthe by the Kynges Maiestye of Englande &c.*, 305-11 (*STC* 5170), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A69104.0001.001; MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 309.

Litany, publishing it as the first liturgy in the English tongue. The revised service removed veneration of the saints, and their invocation was heavily reduced, with only Mary mentioned by name.[241]

If image destruction, at least in its physical and state-sponsored manifestation, had been restrained by Henry's hand, this was to change with the accession of Edward VI in 1547. At the time of his father's death in January that year, the new King was nine years of age, and a regency council was established, headed by his (Protestant) uncle, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. Cranmer's coronation address in February referred to the new king as a second 'Josiah', in invocation of the 7th century B.C. Judaean king who had cleared the temple and the land of idols and idolatry. This was a description of Edward which would be repeated commonly, both in England and on the Continent.[242]

The *Royal Injunctions* of July 1547 were strongly aniconic, demanding the destruction of all abused images, and the removal of all relics, images, pictures and paintings which constituted '…..*monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition*.'[243] Commissioners were appointed and empowered to judge which images fell under the *Injunction*. In consequence of ongoing dispute and inconsistency in the *Injunction's* application, the following February, the Privy Council decreed that *all* images were to be removed. Cranmer's *Catechism* or *Shorte Instruction into Christian Religion* of 1548, rejects all uses of religious

[241] *An Exhortation Vnto Prayer Thought Mete by the Kinges Maiestie* (*STC* 10620), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A00483.0001.001; MacCulloch, *Cranmer,* 326-330, 346-8; Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 443.
[242] *2 Kings* 22:17, 23:1-25; *2 Chronicles* 34:33; *Coronation of Edward VI*. https://www.tudorsociety.com/20-february-1547-the-coronation-of-king-edward-vi; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 62; Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 574.
[243] "The Edwardian Injunctions (1547)," in Bray, *Documents*, 247-57.

imagery, even making the extraordinary (or aspirational) claim that '…..*we Englyshe men haue no ymages in our churches*.'[244]

In 1550, a bill establishing a new *Book of Common Prayer* required the destruction or defacement of all *'…..images of stone, timber, alabaster or earth, graven carved or painted, which heretofore have been taken out of any church or chapel, or yet stand in any church or chapel*.'[245] Bishop Nicholas Ridley, author of *A Treatise Against the Worship of Images*, ordered the removal and destruction of all 'altars' from churches in his see of London (1550), an edict extended nationwide under the authority of the Privy Council in November. The following year, John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, directed the removal of all steps and partitions between church naves and from where the altars had been eliminated.[246]

In 1549, the noted aniconist German reformer Martin Bucer was exiled from Strasbourg. Taking up Cranmer's offer, he relocated to Cambridge. Bucer was asked by Cranmer to review and comment upon the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1549. Despite his death in February 1551, Bucer's influence over later developments in the English church are significant due to his input into the revised *Prayer Book* of 1552 (the major source document for the subsequent books of 1559 and 1662); formative interaction with John Calvin in Strasbourg (1538 - 1541);

[244] Thomas Cranmer (1548), *Catechismus,* 6, 19, 22 (*STC* 5993), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A19564.0001.001. Schaff observes *'…..was for the most part a translation of the Latin Catechism of Justus Jonas* [1493 – 1555]*, and retains the Catholic and Lutheran consolidation of the first and second commandments, and the sacrament of penance or absolution; but it was soon superseded*.' Schaff, *CC*, 1.655. However, in exegesis of the *First Commandment*, Cranmer observes his ordering to be '*of late tyme*' belonging to the *First Commandment*, '*manye aūcient autors*' interpret it as being separate from it.
[245] Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 5; Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 597; Phillips, *Reformation of Images*, 94-7.
[246] Bishop Nicholas Ridley (c. 1500 – 1555, r. 1550 - 1553). Bishop John Hooper of Gloucester and Worcester (c. 1495 – 1555, r. 1551 - 1554). Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 5.

friendships with future Archbishops of Canterbury Matthew Parker (r. 1559 – 1575) and Edmund Grindal (r. 1576 – 1583); and through Peter Martyr Vermigli, of John Jewel.[247]

4.2.3 Marion Recusancy (1553 – 1558)

Edward died, likely from tuberculosis, in July 1553. Following the debacle of the accession of Lady Jane Grey (r. 10 – 19 July), to whom Cranmer had lent support, Mary (r. 1553 – 1558) established herself on the throne, intent on restoring the pre-Henrician schism religious order.[248] Her coronation was performed by Stephen Gardiner on 1 October 1553, using '…..*holy oil which she had secretly obtained from the continent, thereby avoiding the use of oil tainted by consecration during her brother's reign*.'[249] In the *Royal Proclamation* of 18 August 1553, Mary had declared her own commitment to Romish belief, but that she was '…..*mindeth not to compel any her said subjects there unto,*' at least until such time '…..*as further order by common assent may be taken therein*.'[250] Despite this statement of pluralist intent, prominent clergymen including Thomas Cranmer, John Bradford, John Rogers, John Hooper, Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer were arrested and imprisoned. Following the revival of *Heresy Acts in 1554*, all were later executed.[251] Martin Bucer was tried posthumously for heresy, his remains disinterred, publicly burnt along with his books, and discarded.[252]

---

[247] N. Scott Amos, "Bucer, Martin (1491 – 1551)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3822; Vermigli was in England 1547 – 1553 (*ex*-Strasbourg), and held the Regis Chair in Divinity at Oxford 1558 – 1553. Like Bucer, he was a contributor to Cranmer's Prayer Book of 1552. Mark Taplin, "Vermigli, Pietro Martire [Peter Martyr] (1499–1562)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/28225.

[248] *1 M.I st.2.2; 1&2 Ph.II&M.I c.8*; Bray, *Documents*, 315,

[249] Ann Weikel, "Mary I (1516–1558)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18245; C.D. Armstrong, "Gardiner, Stephen (c. 1495–1555)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10364.

[250] *Queen Mary (I) Tudor's First Proclamation*, in Paul Hughes and James Larkin eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations II 1553-1587* (London: Yale University Press, 1969), 5-7.

[251] *1&2 Ph.II&M.I c.8*. The *Heresy Acts* of 1382 (*5 Rich.II st.2.5*), 1401 (*2 Hen.IV c.15*) and 1414 (*2 Hen.V st.1.7*) had been repealed under in 1533 and 1547 by Henry (*25 Hen.VIII st.14.1*) and Edward (*1 Ed.VI c.12*).

[252] "The Marian Injunctions, 1554," in Bray, *Documents*, 315-7. Amos, "Bucer," in *ODNB*. Peter Vermigli's wife, who had died in February 1553, was later disinterred and her remains discarded on a '*dung heap*', at the direction of Cardinal Pole. Taplin, "Vermigli," in *ODNB*.

The reforming statutes of Edward were largely repealed in the autumn of 1553, and the *Injunctions* of March 1554 restored previous worship practices, including public and private invocation of the saints, and the veneration of images and relics. Reconciliation with Rome was made official in November. Romish doctrine and English practice were summarised in 1555 by Bishop of London Edmund Bonner in his '*A Profitable and Necessarye Doctryne*', modelled on the *King's Book* and the *Six Articles* of Henry VIII. [253] Despite their re-institution, image and relic veneration were narrowed in breadth; in the church centring on the Rood (crucifix) and the High Altar. The extent to which this limitation reflects developing broader Catholic counter-reformation practice, as much as the practical and financial consequence of the preceding years of destruction, is unclear.[254] Whatever the ambitions of Mary's reign, it was limited by her early death in November 1558.

4.2.4 Elizabethan Settlement, the Stuarts and the Rise of Puritanism (1558 – 1642)

If Edward had been greeted as a second Josiah, expectant of her commitment to the Protestant cause, Elizabeth was seen as an English 'Deborah'.[255] Cardinal Pole having died, Elizabeth was crowned by Archbishop Nicholas Heath of York in January 1559. The Archbishopric of Canterbury was invested upon Matthew Parker in December.[256]

The day before the new Queen's coronation, a procession held in London mocked figures depicting superstition and idolatry, and acts of destruction were carried out against crucifixes,

[253] Edmund Bonner (c. 1500 – 1569, r. 1539-49, 1553-59), *A Profitable and Necessarye Doctryne* (*STC* 3283), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A16366.0001.001.
[254] Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 665-670, 708-9.
[255] Prophetess and Judge of Ancient Israel (c. 11th/12th century B.C.). *Judges* 4:4-5:31. At Elizabeth's accession, the Reformation in England was far from secure. This had been evidenced in Mary's reign, and unmarried and without children, Elizabeth's presumptive heir was the 16-year-old Roman Catholic Queen Mary of Scotland, at that time married to Francis, the *Dauphin* of France. This situation was only resolved by Mary's execution in 1587, and the presumption carrying over to her Protestant son James VI (from 1603 James I of England).
[256] John Hayward (c. 1564 - 1627), *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. John Bruce (London: Camden Society, 1840), 53-7.

images of the saints, and Marian installed church altars.[257] Elizabeth's *Act of Uniformity* of 1558/9 restored the use of '…..*such ornaments of the church and ministers*' that were customary in the second year of Edward's reign.[258]

By contrast, the *Royal Injunctions* of July 1559 specifically directed '…..*the suppression of superstition throughout all her highness's realms*'. All clergy were to '…..*not set forth or extol the dignity of any images, relics, or miracles; but, declaring the abuse of the same…..and grace…..looked for only of God,…..and of none other*.' Further, clergy were to '…..*take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; preserving nevertheless, or repairing both the walls and glass windows; and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses.'*[259]

Early Elizabethan England also saw the revision of the defined doctrine of the Church. The *Eleven Articles* of 1559, initially intended as a re-working of Cranmer's *Forty-Two Articles* of 1553, were drawn up by Parker and promulgated the following year. That, '*I do utterly disallow the extolling of images, relics and feigned miracles, and also all kind of expressing God invisible in the form of an old man, or the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove'*, were to be subscribed by all clergy twice-yearly.[260]

---

[257] Phillips, *Reformation of Images,* 107-9.
[258] J.E. Neale, "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," *English Historical Review* 65, (1950): 304-332; 'The Act of Uniformity" [*1 Eliz. 1 c.2*] in Bray, *Documents*, 329-34. Year ascriptions between 1 January and 25 March each year are complicated (for example 1558/9 here) due to the contemporary practice of beginning the new year at the Feast of the Annunciation (25 March), rather than 1 January as is modern practice (post 1751).
[259] "The Elizabethan Injunctions" in Bray, *Documents*, 335-48.
[260] "The Eleven Articles," in Bray, *Documents*, 349-51.

The promulgation of Parker's *Eleven Articles* saw an outburst of both authorised and unauthorised destruction of images. '*Inspectors and visitors*' were sent out, and Hayward records in his *Annals* of 1559, '*in many places, walls wer rased, windowes wer dashed downe, because some images (little regarding what) were paynted on them. And not onely images, but rood - loftes, relickes, sepulchre, bookes, banneres, coopes, vestment, altar-cloathes wer, in diverse places, committed to the fire'*. Writing to Peter Martyr in Zurich in April 1560, Edwin Sandys, Bishop of Worcester (r. 1559 – 1570) reported that after a recent inspection, '*all images of every kind were at our last visitation not only taken down, but also burnt, and that too by public authority*'. Particularly, he notes that of '*…..the image of Christ crucified,…..because the ignorant and superstitious multitude are in the habit of paying adoration to this idol above all others*'.[261]

This attitude toward image destruction was not universal, however. The views of the new Queen herself regarding images were complex. To the chagrin of her senior clergy, and while undisputedly Protestant in her beliefs, in her private chapel, Elizabeth maintained a crucifix supported by statues of Mary and John, before which she had candles lit. Sandys reports that, by extension, the Queen felt it beneficial to have images of the crucified Lord, the Virgin, and of Saint John displayed in churches, and that in consequence to his iconoclastic zealotry, Sandys considered himself very close to deposition from his office.[262] Writing to Peter Martyr (February 1560), Bishop Jewel describes a disputation, invoked by the Queen, between Parker and Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely on the one hand, and Grindal and Jewel himself on the other, regarding the place of the rood. This debate appears not so much regarding the validity of images, as all were fundamentally aniconist, but concerning the maintenance of seemly

[261] Hayward, *Annals*, 80-7; Hastings Robinson ed., *The Zurich Letters* (London: Parker Society, 1842), 72-5.
[262] Robinson, *Zurich Letters*, 67-8, 72-5.

behaviour in their classification, assessment and removal. In September 1560, Elizabeth issued a *Proclamation Against Breaking or Defacing of Monuments*, restraining the further destruction of images in churches '…..*without consent of the ordinary* (bishop)', and financial liability for any breach of the order, in an attempt to control the destruction.[263] In 1563, Jewel published his *Homily Against the Peril of Idolatry*, but this had been reviewed and revised by the Queen personally prior to its publication and its adoption as a work of Protestant orthodoxy.[264]

Regardless of any personal reservations on the part of the monarch, under Elizabeth's reign, the case of Protestantism and the removal of images from the life of the English Church continued. The *Eleven Articles* were superseded by the *Thirty-Eight Articles* of 1563, more closely based on Cranmer's work of 1552, and finalised in the similar *Thirty-Nine Articles* of 1571. Again compulsorily subscribed by the entire clergy, Article XXII states,

'*The Romishe Doctrine concernyng Purgatorie, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration as well of Images, as of Reliques, and also inuocation of Saints, is a fonde thing vainly invented, and grounded vpon no warrantie of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God*'.[265]

[263] Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 8; Elizabeth Regina, *Proclamation Against Breaking or Defacing of Monuments* (*STC* 791), https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A21612.0001.001.
[264] David Samuel ed., *The Homilies* (Rochester: Christian Focus, 1986), "Forward". An example of the Queen's editing: Jewel's original '*Which place both enforceth that neither the material church or temple ought to have any images in it, (for of it is taken the ground of the argument,) neither that any true Christian ought to have anything ado with filthy and dead images, for that he is the holy temple*…..' the Queen amends to '*Which place enforceth both that we should not worship images and that we should not have images in the temple, for fear and occasion of worshipping them, though they be of themselves things indifferent, for the Christian is the holy temple*…..' Gerald Bray ed., *The Books of Homilies : A Critical Edition* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2015) 227.
[265] The *Forty-Two Articles* were written by Cranmer, and received by the Privy Council in November 1552. They were not, however promulgated until after receiving royal assent in June 1553, the month before the King's death. The *Thirty-Eight Article*s differ from the subsequent *Thirty-Nine* primarily in the absence of Article 29 '*Of the wicked which do not eate the body of Christe in the vse of the Lordes Supper*.' Likely it was delayed by the Queen holding out an 'olive branch' to her recusant Catholic subjects. *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 22 (*CC,* 3.501).

Elizabeth held herself and her Church of England to be truly Protestant, and much had been done to reform Church practice and to remove religious images. Despite this, there arose a movement in England from the 1560s, based initially in returning 'Marion exiles', which sought further reform. These were the 'Puritans'.

Despite its ubiquity, the term 'Puritan' is notoriously difficult to define. Thomas Fuller (c. 1608 – 1661) dates the first use of the word to Archbishop Parker in 1564, who used it and '*precisian'*, in the modern understanding of *particular* or *stickler*, rather than any defined doctrine or creed. Percival Wiburn (1581) described '*Puritanes*' (of whom he was one) as the '*hotter sort of protestantes*', which he contrasted with both other Protestants and '*hot and cold Catholikes*', because '*…..they are precise in…..religiō, & shew thēselues vnspotted seruants and irreprehensible*.' Among Puritans, however, the most common choice for self-description was 'the godly'.[266]

'Puritan' can neither be limited to members of a movement within the Church of England nor outside it; engaging in a variable and evolving 'grab-bag' of issues of civic practice, and Church doctrine and observance, which they believed compromised true religion. Puritans constituted both *conformists* such as William Perkins and Archbishop James Ussher, who stayed within the established Church; *dissenters* such as Thomas Cartwright who rejected episcopacy in favour of presbyterianism; Thomas Hooker who broke with the Church of England entirely; and those, like Robert Browne, who moved between. Accordingly, it must be recognised that such a disparate group were not all of the same mind on any given issue, or over time. Sufficiently problematic has 'Puritan' been considered, that C. H. George in 1968

[266] Charles Pastoor and Galen K. Johnson. *The A to Z of the Puritans* (Lanham: Scarecrow, 2009): 250; Percival Wiburn (c. 1534 – 1606), *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets vntimely shreeching* (*STC* 25586, 9), https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A15295.0001.001.

advocated abandoning the term completely. Notwithstanding, it has facility, and continues to be used widely, accepting its lack of precision.[267]

Patrick Collinson (1986) considered hostility toward '*false*' or idolatrous art as an essential strand of 'hotter Protestantism', progressing over time, from '*iconoclasm*', defined as '*a spirited attack*', to '*iconophobia',* the *'total repudiation'* of images; and this extending beyond the religious setting, into secular art, theatre, music and games. Contemporarily, Ben Johnson parodied uncompromising Puritan zeal in *Bartholemew Fair* (1603), and the avowedly Protestant and Reformed James I/VI reportedly told his last parliament in 1624 *'…..that as you have two hands you ought to use them both, that as with the one hand you labour to suppress Papists, so with the other you be careful to sweep out the Puritans'*.[268]

Puritans argued, as for example set out in John Field's *A View of Popish Abuses yet remaining in the English Church* (1572), that reformation in England was incomplete; the Church still preserving aspects of Catholic practice.[269] Among these aspects of unreformed custom, Puritans held, were the maintenance of aspects of the liturgy, the wearing of vestments such as the white surplice, and the retention of idolatrous symbols and objects. Granted the extensive clearing of the churches which had already taken place, what constituted a '*superstitious monument*' from the *Injunctions* of 1559 and what actions to take regarding

[267] John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689: Social History in Perspective* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 1998), 3; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation*, 31; C.H. George, "Puritanism as History and Historiography," *Past & Present* 41, (1968): 77-104;

[268] Patrick Collinson, *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact on the Second English Reformation* (Reading: University of Reading, 1986), 8, 22-7. Spraggon (2003) agrees on the centrality of image rejection but, as with other aspects of Puritanism, struggles with Collison's description as overly simplistic, his terminology lacking specificity, and his implied uniformity of Puritan belief and practice, incidentally and temporally, inadequately supported. *Puritan Iconoclasm*, xiii-xv; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560 - 1700* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 1-3, 30-1, 106.

[269] Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 98; Margaret Aston, "Puritans and Iconoclasm," in Durston, *English Puritanism*, 97.

them, was to neither Puritans, the Church, nor the civil power, entirely clear. This was the case particularly regarding crosses and stained-glass windows.

Aquinas had advocated the cross worthy of the highest level of veneration because of its particular association with Christ and His salvific work.[270] But to many of the reformers, especially those of Puritan inclination, this leant it the status of a symbol of idolatry; translating not only to physical structures, but also the symbolic action in benediction. By comparison with other religious images, crosses and even roods had been relatively spared from English Protestant iconoclasm; possibly because many of them were in secular rather than religious settings, and thus perceived less likely to promote idolatry. Notwithstanding, Edmund Grindal, enthroned as Archbishop of York in 1570, moved to discover and eliminate remaining rood-lofts in churches, and acted against crosses in churchyards.[271] In 1606, King James described crucifixes as '*relics of popery*' to be removed, and three-years later, wooden crosses as '*piece*[s] *of stick*'.[272] Puritan Robert Parker (1607) pronounced the sign of the cross as the '*principal badge of popery*'.[273]

The other images of particular controversy were stained-glass windows, having been explicitly protected under Elizabeth's *Injunctions* of 1559. Likely, this reflected not only the Queen's

---

[270] '*Hyperdulia*' but not '*latria*' - that worship to which God alone is entitled. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 3.25.3, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 4252-4.

[271] Aston, "Puritans and Iconoclasm," in Durston, *English Puritanism*, 95-7.

[272] *3 Jac.I c.5*; C.H. MacIlwain ed., *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), 125.

[273] Robert Parker, *A scholasticall discourse against symbolizing with Antichrist in ceremonies: especially in the signe of the crosse*, 7, 10-1 (*STC* 19294), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A09002.0001.001. In this denunciation Parker seems unaware that making the sign of the cross was common in the early Church, attested as routine and wholesome in both East and West dating back to at least the 2nd century. Tertullian (c. 201), *De Corona,* 3 (*ANF* 3.106); Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 350), *Catechetical Lecture 13*, (*N&PNF2* 7.92); Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 360), *Life of St. Anthony*, 36, 78-80 (*N&PNF2* 4.199, 216-7); John Chrysostom (c. 380), *Homily 54 on Matthew,* 7 (*N&PNF1* 10.321). While seemingly reflecting many of the King's own opinions, *A Scholastic Discourse* is indicative of the ambiguous place of Puritans under the crown, whether they be conformist or non-conformist. The work was sufficiently contentious that it resulted in Parker's exile to the Netherlands, where he died in 1614. Keith L. Sprunger, "Parker, Robert (c. 1564 – 1614)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/21334.

hesitations regarding complete iconoclasm, but also practicality; the removal or destruction of windows making churches unusable, and their replacement expensive and time consuming. Added to this, windows, like secular crosses, may have been seen as inherently less likely to promote idolatrous behaviour.[274] Indeed, that Cranmer (1548) could describe an English Church free of images, demonstrates stained-glass windows as somehow different from other church ornamentation.[275] In 1577, William Harrison reported in *A Description of England* that, to the frustration of the Puritans, whereas '*all other images, shrines rood-lofts and other monuments of idolatry*' had been removed from English churches, '*stories in glass*' remained although decaying, to be replaced in '*white glass*' when the requirement arose.[276] Puritan-inspired unauthorised destruction of windows occurred at Corpus Christi and Trinity Colleges in Cambridge (1565-6), and continued sporadically elsewhere in the Kingdom into the 17th century. Prosecution was variable, reflecting the convictions of local episcopal and civil authorities. When performed under the auspices of the gentry, fines for window destruction often addressed replacement, but in plain glass. The official, if muted, destruction or neglect of glass windows, together with the reduction of secular crosses and monuments, was maintained in continuity under James until his death in 1625. This, however, would change under his successor Charles, and his Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud.[277]

4.2.5 William Laud, 'Laudianism', and the Outbreak of Civil War

William Laud was born in Reading in 1573, and ordained a priest in 1601. In 1621, he was enthroned as Bishop of St. David's in Pembrokeshire, translated to Bath and Wells in 1626 by

[274] *Injunction of 1559,* 23 in Bray, *Documents*, 340-1; Aston, "Puritans and Iconoclasm," in Durston, *English Puritanism*, 98-9.
[275] Cranmer, *Catechismus, 6* (*STC* 5993).
[276] William Harrison, *A Description Of Elizabethan England*, ed. Lothrop Withington (London: Scott, 1876), 68-71.
[277] Aston, "Puritans and Iconoclasm," in Durston, *English Puritanism*, 99-111.

the new king, and then to London in 1628. He entered court as the Dean of the Chapel Royal, and in 1633 was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, succeeding George Abbot. [278]

The eponymous 'Laudianism' was a 17th century reform movement within the Church of England characterised by preference for (Arminian) free-will over (Calvinist) predestination, and emphasis on liturgy and clerical hierarchy.[279] Ceremonially, it attempted to blend Protestant theology with aspects of Roman Catholic practice, or as Laud perhaps viewed it, returning the English Church to its original reformation purity.[280] With Charles II's backing, in the 1630s, Laud's *high church* policies, particularly those regarding church worship and adornment, played a significant part in the deepening estrangement between the Puritan and orthodox wings of the Church of England, and between members of (the prorogued) Parliament and the King.[281]

In his *Declaration* of November 1628, Charles indicated a clear intention to restore uniformity to the English and Scottish Churches, and in the following year issued a proclamation '*for preventing the decayes of Churches and Chappels*'.[282] Following his enthronement at

[278] Tristram Hunt, *The English Civil War* (London: Penguin, 2002), 11-2; Anthony Milton, "Laud, William (1573–1645)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16112.
[279] In this, Laud followed in the footsteps of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, chaplain to Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift, and then successively Bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester under Elizabeth and James. Andrewes oversaw the *Authorised* translation of the *Bible* (1604 – 1611), and preached regularly before the King. P.E. McCullough, "Andrewes, Lancelot (1555–1626)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/520.
[280] Churches more '…..*beautied and adorned than ever since the more Reformation.'* P. Heylyn, *Antidotum Lincolniense* (1637), o*p. cit.* Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke*, Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 227; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation*, 68; Durston, *English Puritanism*, 27; Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 388.
[281] Hunt, *Civil War*, 12-3; Martin Ingram, "Puritans and the Church Courts," in Durston, *English Puritanism*, 89; David Anderson, "Internal Images," *Renaissance and Reformation* 26, (2002): 23-42.
[282] *The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion* (November 1628), in Bray, *Documents*, 481-2. Charles prorogued Parliament briefly in 1628, and then again in January 1629. From 1629 until 1640, Parliament did not sit, and Charles ruled without it. Most of Laud's tenure as Archbishop of Canterbury was, therefore, throughout this period of 'Personal Rule'. Mark A. Kishlansky and John Morrill, "Charles I (1600–1649)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5143. Merritt (2008) suggests that this did not so much amount to an increasing spend on ecclesiastical buildings from Jacobean times, as an increasing emphasis on decorative aspects, '*superstitious vanities*', of church fabric. Julia F. Merritt, "Puritans, Laudians, and the

Canterbury, as he had in London, Laud began the beautification and standardization of physical space within churches. Overturning the reforms of Edwardian and Elizabethan times, new stained-glass windows were created, and two-dimensional and free-standing religious imagery, including crucifixes, re-appeared. Ceremonial practice was increased, instrumental and choral music re-introduced, and the wearing of more elaborate clerical vestments encouraged. Communion tables were ordered relocated to the east end of churches, elevated, and separated from the congregation by rails.[283] Notwithstanding, Laud did not support the veneration of images. Testifying (as Bishop of London) in early 1633, he dismissed that '*gross Council of Nice'*, and the '*absurd*' distinction between '*Latria and Doulia &c.'* Their existed '*a great deal of difference between an Image and an Idol*', and '*…..if men give worship to them as to the other, it is unlawful*'.[284]

In the wake of defeat in The first 'Bishops' War' of 1639, the King reconvened Parliament, but in an atmosphere of mutual hostility. The second 'Bishops' War' of 1640, likewise ended in English defeat at the hands of the Scots, with the abolition of episcopacy in the northern kingdom, and was accompanied by a widespread outbreak of iconoclasm among disaffected conscripted soldiers.[285] On 8 September 1641, Parliament decreed unilaterally the '*removal of railed altars*' and the demolishing of all statues and images, including stained glass, and articles of impeachment were drawn up against Laud, who was arrested and imprisoned.[286]

Phenomenon of Church-Building in Jacobean London," *The Historical Journal* 41, (2008): 935-60; Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 25-6.

[283] Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 388; Fincham, *Altars Restored*, 227-9.

[284] Evidence given at the trial of Puritan Henry Sherfield of Salisbury in the Star Chamber regarding the destruction of a stained-glass window of God creating the universe. Sherfield was convicted and fined £500. Slack, "Public Conscience," 151-2; Thomas Howell ed., *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials* (London: Bagshaw, 1809), 3.550.

[285] Spraggon, *Iconoclasm*, 29-30.

[286] Kishlansky and Morrill, "Charles I," in *ODNB*; John Rushworth (1612 – 1690), *Historical Proceedings of Private Passages of State*, 4.385-7; Milton, "Laud," in *ODNB*; Hunt, *Civil War*, 52. Laud would be executed for treason on 4 January 1645.

Richard Baxter, a non-conforming minister in Kidderminster in Worcestershire, described the tearing down of graveyard crucifixes and church images, '*of which there were divers left since the time of Popery*', and the riotous, drunken resistance of '*village swains*' to this outrage.[287] Nehemiah Wallington, a wood-turner from Eastcheap, described similar events at his parish church in October, something of which he thoroughly approved; as did Lucy Hutchison, an Army officer's wife in Nottingham.[288]

The political situation worsened, with impasse between the King and the Parliament. Rebellion broke out in Ireland in 1641, civil discord in London increased, and following the abortive attempted arrest of five parliamentarians and one member of the Lords, the King departed London. The security situation continued to deteriorate, and the Queen was evacuated to France in February. On 22 August 1642, Charles raised his royal standard at Nottingham, and England descended into civil war.[289]

4.3 The Westminster Assembly

4.3.1 The Calling and Purpose of the Assembly

In May 1643, a year into the Civil War, the Puritan-dominated Commons moved an ordinance for the establishment of an Assembly of Divines.[290] This was followed by the House of Lords nominating a committee of peers to sit with the Assembly, ahead of formal approval on 12 June. A similar bill (the *Great Remonstrance*) seeking to affirm Church of England doctrine and

[287] Richard Baxter (1615 – 1691), *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, o*p. cit*. Tristram Hunt, *Civil War*, 77.
[288] Nehemiah Wallington (1598 – 1658), *Historical Notices of Events Occurring Chiefly in The Reign of Charles I* (London: Richard Bentley, 1869): 1.259; Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (Kindle, 2015), loc 1303.
[289] Kishlansky and Morrill, "Charles I," in *ODNB*.
[290] Chad Van Dixhoorn, *Confessing the Faith* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2014), xvii. Henceforth, for the sake of brevity, 'the Westminster divines' – the members of the Westminster Assembly – will be referred to simply as 'the *Divines*' (capitalised, italics).

promote reform of Church practices, had passed the parliament in 1641, but royal assent had been withheld.[291]

The mandate of the Assembly was the '…..*settling of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from all false calumnies and aspersions*'.[292] In this, and in keeping with *Ephesians* 4:15, it was intended, at least in part, to serve as an agent for Church unity, both internally and also (optimistically) with Reformed and Lutheran Churches on the Continent.[293] Yet, while the Assembly's *raison d'etre* was doctrinal and ecclesiastic, it was established under parliamentary rather than ecclesiastic (or royal) authority, and was intended and authorised only to provide advice to Parliament in the facilitation of civil legislation.[294]

Although not clearly defined, the '*settling*' would need to be sweeping in extent, addressing not only divisions which had arisen since Elizabethan times, but also following the effective removal of royal control from August 1642. For example, when it came to matters of worship, the two Houses had sent out conflicting messages about ongoing observance of the existing liturgy, and destruction of images and communion rails. It was not until August 1643 that any clarity was established, when Parliament issued an ordinance that sanctioned the removal of rails and images (a decision favouring the Commons).[295]

---

[291] Robert Letham, *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context* (Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2009), 30; Alexander F. Mitchell (1822 – 1899), *The Westminster Assembly: Its History and Standards* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work [Kindle], 1897), loc 131.
[292] "Ordinance for an assembly of Divines to settle the doctrine of the Church," in Charles H. Firth and Robert S. Rait eds., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1911), 180-4.
[293] Chad B Van Dixhoorn, "Unity and Disunity at the Westminster Assembly (1643—1649): A Commemorative Essay," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 79, (2001): 103-4.
[294] Letham, *Westminster Assembly*, 34-5; Van Dixhoorn, *Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1.39-40.
[295] Van Dixhoorn, *Minutes*, 1.7; "An Ordinance for the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry," in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances,* 265-266.

4.3.2 The Composition of the Assembly

In keeping with its establishment by the civil authority, membership of the Assembly was not chosen by the Church. Rather, selection was by the parliament itself, on the recommendation of the gentry of each county. As a consequence, personal contacts and patronage played a significant part in its composition.[296]

Ultimately, 119 clergymen or 'divines' were appointed, plus ten members from the Lords and twenty from the Commons. Following the English ratification of the *Solemn League and Covenant* in September 1643, seven non-voting 'commissioners' from the Church of Scotland were also welcomed. Actual participation was variable. Some members were present regularly, while others, including Archbishop Ussher, never attended.[297] The country embroiled in civil war, the membership and attendance was not representative of the broader English Church: geographically, theologically or ecclesiologically. Members residing closer to London were more frequently present, and theologically of Puritan/Calvinist and Presbyterian leaning. Prominent episcopalians were appointed, yet of these, only Daniel Featley participated meaningfully. In September 1643, however, he was expelled from membership, deprived of his *living,* and imprisoned. Accordingly, Van Dixhoorn concludes plurality was absent, and the appointment of episcopalians was merely to provide the Assembly '…..*credibility and the appearance of fairness*'.[298]

---

[296] Van Dixhoorn, *Minutes*, 1.12-4.

[297] James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh (1581–1656, r. 1625 - 1656). Having travelled to England in March 1640, the outbreak of the Irish revolt prevented his return to Armagh. Ussher was in Oxford throughout the Civil War. Loyal to the King, he did not take the offered place at the Assembly. Alan Ford, "Ussher, James (1581–1656)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/28034.

[298] Ironically, one of the charges brought against Featley was that of communicating with Archbishop Ussher. Arnold Hunt, "Featley [Fairclough], Daniel (1582–1645)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9242; Letham, *Westminster Assembly*, 35; Chad Van Dixhoorn, "Westminster Assembly (act. 1643–1652)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/92780. An indication of the unrepresentative nature of the *Divines* might be implied from the reaction of the clergy to the Restoration of Charles II. Fifteen years after the legislation of the

4.3.3 The Workings and Produce of the Assembly

The first major undertaking with which the Assembly was tasked was a revision of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*; intended not as a replacement, but rather an expansion and development to correct and prevent their misrepresentation by '*high-church divines and those of the Arminian persuasion*', such as had occurred under Archbishop Laud.[299] Between July and September 1643, 14 of the first 15 articles were addressed and revised.[300]

Political and military necessity intervened, and following the signing of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, the revision was suspended in favour of writing a new confession in entirety. Ultimately, six major documents '*intended for establishing uniformity of religion*' were produced, but their use within the English Church would be short-lived.[301] Of these, the *Confession,* and the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* touch on issues associated with religious imagery.[302] Although records of when debates regarding the 21st chapter of the *Confession,* and the relevant questions of the *Catechisms* occurred, and even which of the Divines were most closely involved is extant, unfortunately, no details of the discussion or grounds for the final documents are retained. Warfield, however, observed that the theology of the *WLC* is

Westminster Confession of Faith (*WCF*) in 1647, at the re-legislating of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Book of Common Prayer*, and their required subscription, only about 20 percent of the clergy refused. Bray, *Documents*, 547.

[299] Letham, *Westminster Assembly*, 37.

[300] Article 8, '*Of the Creeds*', was debated and postponed. Among the *Divines* there was disagreement, not on the content of the *Creeds*, but whether by accepting them to be '*thoroughly to be received and believed*', they were being afforded the status of scripture. This '*incomparable*' respect for scripture is evidenced in the numbering of the chapters of the *Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF)*. Letham, *Westminster Assembly*, 153-8; John R. Bower, *The Confession of Faith: A Critical Text and Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2020), 16-7.

[301] The *WCF* was legislated by Parliament April 1647, and repealed with other Commonwealth legislation at the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. The *Thirty-Nine Articles* was reinstated as the doctrinal standard of the Church, which it remains. Uniformity to the *Articles* and the *Book of Common Prayer* was legislated under the *Act of Uniformity* (*14 Charles II, c.4*) in 1662. Bray, *Documents*, 483, 546-7.

[302] *Westminster Confession of Faith*, *Larger* and *Shorter* Catechisms abbreviated *WCF*, *WLC*, and *WSC* subsequently.

clearly influenced by Ussher and Perkins, and epitomises the Calvinist strand of mid-17th century English Reformed thought.[303]

The 21st chapter of the *Confession* prohibits worshiping God *'…..under any visible representation or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture*.' In chapter 29, regarding the Supper, that '…..*worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration*' is '*contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ*.'[304]

Exploring the Second Commandment, the *Shorter Catechism* observes the '…..*commandment forbiddeth the worshiping of God by images, or any other way not appointed in his word*.' Correspondingly, the *Larger Catechism* demands the '…..*keeping pure and entire,* [of] *all…..religious worship*…..[and in]…..*the administration and receiving of the sacraments*.' The '…..*sins forbidden…..*[are]*…..any religious worship not instituted by God himself; the making of any representation of…..any of the three persons, either inwardly in our mind, or outwardly in any kind of image or likeness of any creature whatsoever; all worshiping of it, or God in it or by it*'; recognising '…..*all false worship, as being a spiritual whoredom*', and something which will necessarily incur the wrath of God.[305]

4.4 The Council of Trent

Responding to the challenges of the Reformation, the position of the Roman Catholic Church regarding the place of images in the practice of the faith was outlined in the *Second Decree* of the 25th session of the Council of Trent in 1563. Prompted by the Reformation, and

[303] Regarding the importance of Ussher and his *Irish Articles*, Mitchell and Schaff are also in agreement. Benjamin B. Warfield (1851 – 1921), *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work* (Cherry Hill: Mack, 1972), 64-5; Mitchell, *Westminster Assembly*, loc 5467; Schaff, *CC*, 3.526; Bower, *Confession*, 46.
[304] *WCF,* 21.1, 29.4, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 216-7, 231.
[305] *WLC*, 108-10, *WSC* 51, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 371-3, 422.

following a gestation prolonged by rivalries between the Papacy, Holy Roman Emperor Charles and King Francis of France, and aborted attempts in Mantua and Vicenza, the Council was convened by papal bull in 1542. It assembled at Trent in December 1545, and over the following 18 years, met in three diets.[306] Commissioned in the 18th session (1562), in 1566, an associated *Catechism* was composed under the superintendence of Charles Borromeo. This was promulgated by Pope Pius V, although as the Council had dispersed, it lacked formal conciliary approbation. The *Catechism* was intended to enhance theological understanding by the clergy, commensurate with the '*necessity of religious instruction*', and that this '…..*should be accommodated to the capacity of the hearer*'. Organizationally, it consists of a structured exposition of the *Apostles' Creed*, the Decalogue, the sacraments, and prayers, particularly the *Lord's Prayer*.[307]

Entitled *On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics, of Saints, and on Sacred Images,* the *Decree* inextricably links doctrine regarding images and relics to that of the invocation of the saints. It cites and confirms the doctrines of Nicaea II, that '…..*images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints…..due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity, or virtue, is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or, that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which those images represent; in such wise that by the*

[306] Paul III, Bishop of Rome (1542), "The Bull of Indiction of the Council of Trent," in *The canons and decrees of the Council of Trent celebrated under Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV, Bishops of Rome faithfully translated into English* (*STC* 34416, 1-8), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A33267.0001.001. While being convened by Paul III, the Council continuing over such a long period, it was also overseen by Popes Julius III (r. 1550 – 1555), Marcellus II (r. 1555), Paul IV (r. 1555 – 1559) and Pius IV (r. 1559-1565). Its diets were 1545-7, 1551-2 and 1562-3.

[307] Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan (1538 – 1584, r. 1564 – 1584). Theodore Buckley trans., *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (London: Routledge, 1852), i-vi; Ott, *Catholic Dogma*, 318.

images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear: as, by the decrees of Councils, and especially of the second Synod of Nicaea, has been defined against the opponents of images.' Notably, images are not to be worshipped, and that neither divinity, virtue, nor power reside or are inherent in them. Like Nicaea II, the *Decree* differentiates sharply between appropriate veneration (ἀσπασμὸς, τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις) and idolatrous worship (λατρεία) of religious images. While repeating the Nicaea II doctrine regarding referral of veneration from object to prototype, and not in any way repudiating him, the *Decree* is ambiguous or falls short of the Thomistic open advocacy of true worship (*λατρεία*) of images of Christ.[308]

The *Decree* addresses the responsibilities of Bishops and clergy that, in accordance with tradition received '*from primitive times',* they '*instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of the saints, the honour paid to relics, and the legitimate use of images*.' Christ is recognised explicitly as the '*one mediator of God and man*', but that the saints in heaven continue to pray to God the Father, through His Son, for the circumstances of men. Neither Mary nor the saints, and certainly not the images or relics themselves, have the power to intervene in the affairs of men, but through the inspiration brought by them, intercession with God might be obtained. Accordingly, images and relics are to be retained for devotional and didactic purposes, so that by their contemplation, the faithful might give thanks to God, and '…..*order their own lives and manners in the imitation of the saints*.'

[308] Schaff, *CC,* 2.201-2; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*. 3.25.3, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 4252-4; Ott, *Catholic Dogma*, 320.

Abuses in the '*holy and salutatory observances*' are condemned, and are to be abolished in order that the use of images might not promote '*false doctrine, and furnish occasion of dangerous error to the uneducated*', and that every superstition, all filthy lucre, and all lascivious adornment be removed. Likewise, celebration of the saints, relics and holy days must be conducted with honour, and any occasion of drunkenness or revelling forbidden. Formal structures were put in place for the recognition of new saints and relics, and the resolution of disputes regarding these issues; beginning with the local bishop and ultimately to the level of the Roman Pontiff.[309]

The *Roman Catechism* addresses the issues of the 25th *Decree* in its third part, that on the First Commandment.[310] *Exodus* 20, verse 3 is expounded to be a demand for the exclusive worship of God, and following from God's example, demands faith, love and charity. It expands this to place (Roman) Church theology and teaching as central to the Faith, and to describe as heretical all who '…..*reject what Holy Mother the Church proposes for our belief*'. The offering of honour and reverence to the non-divine, including parents, angels, kings and holy men, is commanded or demonstrated in scripture.[311] The *Catechism* continues, '*veneration and invocation of holy Angels and of the Blessed* [saints]*…..are not forbidden by this Commandment*', but they must be provided in a way which neither assumes nor transgresses

[309] Schaff, *CC,* 2.199-205.

[310] The *Roman Catechism* (1566) is also frequently referred to as the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. P. De Letter and R. I. Bradley, "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," in *NCE*, 239; Buckley trans., *Catechism of Trent*, 317-331. The issue of numbering of the Decalogue and its implications will be discussed at greater length in Section 5 of this dissertation. The Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches maintain a tradition of including Exodus 20: 2-6 as a single 'First' Commandment, in contrast with the Reformed Churches which split it into two: verses 2-3 as the First Commandment and verses 4-6 as the Second. This, in turn, differs from a traditional Rabbinic tradition. In this dissertation, the numbering will follow the usage of the sources being considered.

[311] *Exodus* 20:12; *Leviticus* 19:32; *Genesis* 18:2 (those accompanying the theophany of *YHWH*), 19:1, 23:7; *Joshua* 5: 13-5; *Tobit* 12:15-6; *I Chronicles* 29:20; *1 Timothy* 5:17; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 2.2.103, 2.2.122.2, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 3252-3, 3375-7.

'…..*that honour which is due to God alone*'.[312] The efficacy and appropriateness of invocation of the saints and of relics is demonstrated in scripture, in miracles attested by the church fathers, was supported by ancient synods, and strongly supported by Jerome and John of Damascus.[313]

Regarding the prohibition of images, the *Catechism,* once again, refers back to Nicaea II. That not all images are proscribed, it cites God's command regarding the cherubim of the Ark, and the brass serpent of Moses. Like Damascene, it concludes the proscription of images to be in the misrepresentation of God, and their idolatrous misuse. That images of God are permissible, and the proscription of the Commandment is provisional awaiting the incarnation, once more follows that of Damascene and his use of *Deuteronomy* 4:15-6.[314] Regarding depictions of the Father, authorisation is provided in the scriptural word-picture painted of the '*Ancient of Days*' of *Daniel* 7:9-10. By extension, this would also justify the portrayal of the Spirit in the form of a dove or a tongue of flame.[315] In doing so, Tridentine theology extends beyond that of Damascene and Theodore, which was rooted in the incarnation rather than vision or theophany, and neither of whom proposed the imaging of the Father or the Spirit.[316]

---

[312] *Revelation* 19:10, 22:9. Buckley trans., *Catechism of Trent*, 317-20.
[313] *2 Kings* 13:21, *Acts* 5:15, 19:12; *Sirach* chaps 44-49; Ambrose of Milan (c. 339 – 397), *Letter 22* (*N&PNF2* 10.436-40); Augustine of Hippo, *City of God*, 22.8 (*N&PNF1* 2.484-91); *Canons of the Synod of Gangra (4th Century),* 20 (*N&PNF2* 14.100-1); Jerome, *Against Vigilantius* (*N&PNF2* 6. 417-23); John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 16, 35-6.
[314] *Exodus* 25:18; *1 Kings* 6:23; *Numbers* 21:8-9; Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71; John of Damascus. *Apologia,* 5-7. Buckley trans., *Catechism of Trent*, 321-6.
[315] *Matthew* 3:16-7; *Mark* 1:10; *Luke* 3:22; *John* 1:32; *Acts* 2:3. Buckley trans., *Catechism of Trent*, 325-31.
[316] It was not, however, until the 1667 Synod of Moscow that the Orthodox Church canonically forbade the depiction of God the Father or the Trinity in icons. Oleg Tarasov, *Icon and Devotion: Sacred Spaces in Imperial Russia*, trans. Robin Milner-Gulland (London: Reaktion, 2002), 185.

SECTION 5: ENGLISH LITERARY CONTEXT REGARDING IMAGES

The development of doctrine regarding images within the Reformed Church of England which produced the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Westminster Standards* did not occur in a vacuum. Rather, it is best understood by examination of the literature which it produced, and that with which clergy of the Church of England, including the *Divines*, would have been conversant. These include the relevant writings of Cranmer, Ridley and Jewel; that of other Reformed theologians influential of English Church practice, such as Bucer, Vermigli, and Calvin; and prominent Puritans such as William Perkins. These will be reviewed. Familiarity with the *Augsburg Confession*, the *Helvetic Confessions*, the *Belgic Confession*, James Ussher's *Irish Articles*, the *Heidelberg Catechism,* and the Tridentine works might also be assumed.

5.1 Martin Bucer: *Treatise Against Images* (1535)

Martin Bucer's *A Treatise Declaring and Showing that Images are not to be Suffered in Churches* is the first major (14,000-word) Reformed writing specifically addressing images in the new Church. It constitutes the paradigm after which numerous similar works would follow. The *Treatise* is structured as a preface, followed by explanation in three parts: '…..*fyrst out of holy scriptures. Secondarily of the writynges of the fathers. And thyrdly of the decrees of emperours agaynst pyctures and ymages*.' Bucer begins by commending the senators of Strasbourg, that they have '*decreed and ordeined*' the removal of all '……*pyctures or ymages hath ben wont to be worshypped in holye places…..be clene taken away and avoyded out of sight*.' From its title, Bucer's *Treatise* is directed primarily at churches, rather than private homes. Also, he notes that images have been removed, rather than destroyed. Altars have

been eliminated, masses suspended, and '…..*more pure ceremonyes…..brought into their places*.'[317]

Discussing scripture, Bucer roots his argument that '…..*forbydden in the fyrste of goddes comaundementes that any maner of images shulde be had amonge his peple*.'[318] This he supports citing *Matthew* 5:17, that Christ came not to abolish the law but, rather, was the first to fulfil it. He acknowledges the difference between the ceremonial law under which the Christian no longer struggles, and the moral law, as found in the Decalogue, which continues to be binding. Images serve no place in honouring God, rather, their presence in churches and use within worship, '*subuert'* from God something which is due Him alone; representing '*euyll wyll & hatred*' toward God. They engender superstition, encouraging people to place trust in things not real, to have confidence in things which cannot help them, and they divert charities away from the poor. This impotence and falseness of images is described reflecting the language of *Psalm* 115:5-8, having '…..*mouths but cannot speak, and eyes but cannot see*.' Accordingly, Bucer rejects the efficacy of images as '…..*bokes of laye men*.' The (continuing) imaging of Christ is not countenanced by the incarnation, noting that '…..*Christ dyd playnly wytnesse that his bodily presence was nothynge profytable. It is the spyrit (sayth he) that quyckeneth. It was therfore for our profyte that he shulde bodily departe from vs.*'[319] Christ, being God, '…..*is to be worshipped in spyrite and truthe…..syttynge on the right hande of his father*', and not '…..*honoured in Images of woode of stone or of syluer*.' Bucer does not assert, however, that honour of Christian (*cf.* pagan) images constitutes idolatry.[320]

---

[317] Martin Bucer (1491 – 1551), *A Treatise Declaring and Showing that Images are not to be Suffered in Churches*, "Preface" (*STC* 24238), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A13931.0001.001.
[318] This is the numbering of the Decalogue is used by Bucer. Throughout his *Treatise*, Bucer translates *εἴδωλον* as image rather than idol, seemingly making no distinction in the terms.
[319] *John* 6:63, 16:7.
[320] Bucer, *Treatise*, 1 (*STC* 24238).

Secondly, Bucer cites the Fathers against images. The rise of images accompanied the depredations of the '*Gothyans and Vandalyanes*', the church prior to that time being '…..*more pure* [in] *knowlege of the truthe*.' Of this he offers an extensive quote from Jerome's translated letter regarding Epiphanius and the veil; Bucer's inference being that by the act of translation, Jerome demonstrates agreement with the views of Epiphanius. Likewise he cites Eusebius on the purported pagan origins of image making.[321]

Lactantius is quoted in his statements against the worshiping of things made from profane materials. Likewise, Bucer notes and paraphrases Athanasius, questioning how God can be known from images, '…..*is it by the mater & stuffe put rounde about them: or els is it by ye shape and facion brought i to the stuffe?'* Accepting that there can be nothing special about the materials, he questions whether the power or significance of the image is in its shape or context. Further he asks '…..*why dyd nat god appere as well by all maner of stuffe before that any ymages were made?*' In expounding from Athanasius as Bucer does, he highlights what he sees as the preposterous or even comical nature of attaching religious significance to images, the superstition from which they arise, and which they encourage.[322] Finally of the Fathers, Bucer alludes to Origen of Alexandria and his *Contra Celsus*. Like Origen, Bucer believes that being made from profane materials, and the work of human hands, an image cannot point forward to God. Rather, it distracts the eye, turning it backwards toward the man who created it; to the creature, and not the creator. Bucer extends the writings of the

[321] Epiphanius, *To John,* 9 in Jerome, *Letter 51* (*N&PNF2* 6.83-9); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, 7.18 (*N&PNF2* 1.304).
[322] Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 2.19 (*ANF* 7.67-8); Athanasius of Alexandria, *Against the Heathen,* 14-5 (*N&PNF2* 4.11-2).

Fathers forward to his own time, seeing no essential difference between the images of the pagans and those of the Catholic Church.[323]

The third topic is the pronouncements of the emperors and the councils of the Church. Bucer asserts that Christian emperors and councils consistently ruled against the presence of images in churches, but they continue '…..*through the slouthfulnesse & neglygence of bysshoppes*.' The interaction of Pope Gregory I and Bishop Serenus is presented. Following this, the example of Emperor Leo III is commended, but that Pope Gregory disobediently and seditiously failed to implement the emperor's lawful policy. Bucer recalls the Council of Hieria and its iconoclastic character, and the subsequent intrigues of '…..*the cruell woman Hirene*' in undoing its canons.[324]

Interrupting the narrative of the Byzantine iconomachy, Bucer references *De honesta disciplina* by Peter Crinitus (1474 – 1507), regarding the Emperors Valens and Theodosius.[325] He quotes Crinitus applauding that they did '…..*forbid any maner to graue or make the image of christ our sauyour*.' This extended not only to statuary, but also to paintings. These, Crinitus reports, following in the footsteps of Constantine, and that emperors before Leo III '…..*dydde dilygentlye prouyde that the superstityon of Images shulde natte by anye manner meanes pollute and defyle the churches of Christen men*.' In this, it would appear, the history of Crinitus, and of Bucer, is flawed.[326]

[323] Bucer, *Treatise*, 2 (*STC* 24238).
[324] Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23); Bucer, *Treatise*, 3 (*STC* 24238).
[325] Valens (328 – 378, r. 364 – 378), Theodosius I (347 – 395, r. 379 – 395). Valens is misidentified here by Crinitus, rather, he is actually referring to the Emperor Valentinian III (419 – 455, r. 425 – 455). This error recurs in Ridley's *Treatise* and Jewel's *Homily on Idolatry*, serving to demonstrate the interdependence of many of the works of the time. Bray, *Homilies*, 236 n.5.
[326] Bucer, *Treatise*, 3 (*STC* 24238).

Bucer returns to the Byzantine iconomachy, based in Crinitus, in which he recounts the calling of Nicaea II and its annulment of the decrees of Constantine V, the blinding and murder of Constantine VI, the overthrow of Irene, and the treasonous crowning by the Pope of Charles of France (Charlemagne) as emperor. It was following the removal of the oversight of Constantinople, Bucer reports, that papal and French inspired image worship and pilgrimage became established, and which continued as '…..*men with lyke superstityon haue begon to set vp welnere in euery corner & to worshyp them*', until Bucer's time. Again, Bucer's Crinitus-based account differs from other understandings.

The *Treatise* concludes with a discussion of the '…..*gret abhomination*…..[the]…..*masse is in the sight of god*.' The mass he rejects entirely, the laity not taking the sacrament, and there being '…..*no cōmunion had although the wordes whiche the prest reherseth do make mentyon of it*'. The congregation being taught, rather, '…..*to trust vnto the merytes & intercessyon of saintes*.' Bucer does not, however, here reject transubstantiation, nor call out the 'changed' elements as deceitful or idolatrous.

Finally, Bucer calls on the faithful to follow '…..*the exāple of Iames* (Jacob) *the patriarch…..to clense & rid his house of* [all images or idols].' The casting out of images from public places and churches, however, is the responsibility of the public official, not the private citizen; and that all actions of Christian men need to be performed with moderation and compassion, and not to the injury or offense of others.[327]

[327] Bucer, *Treatise*, 3 (*STC* 24238).

5.2 Nicholas Ridley: *Treatise on the Worship of Images* (c. 1549)

The first major work regarding images written within the Protestant Church of England is Nicholas Ridley's 4,000-word *Treatise on the Worship of Images*. Addressed to King Edward on behalf of the whole clergy, it was written *circa* 1549, and published by John Foxe in his *Actes and Monuments* of 1563.[328] It is written in three parts, paralleling those of Bucer, and contains much of the same material. The first part regards '*Certaine reasons which mooue vs that we cannot with safe consciences, geue our assentes that the Images of Christ, &c. should be placed and erected in Churches*.' The second of '*Probations out of the Fathers, Councels, and histories'*, and the third, '*To recite the processe of histories and councels about the matter of Images.*'[329]

Without introduction, Ridley begins his *Treatise*, '*Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image*', which he follows immediately with, '*Cursed is the man which maketh a graven or molten image, &c., and sitteth it in a secret place'*. In this, Ridley moves beyond Bucer, denouncing not only public religious imagery, but also images held in private. That is, at all places where there is '…..*peril for idolatry*'. He explains that God, knowing human inclination to idolatry, '*Least peraduenture thou beyng deceiued, should bow downe to them and worship them.*'[330] Ridley acknowledges the serpent of Moses and the cherubim of the Ark, but explains that they are special cases, analogous to the marriage of Moses to Jethro's daughter or that of Boaz to Ruth, despite the prohibition against marriage with strangers, as particular acts of

[328] Like Bucer, throughout his *Treatise*, Ridley uses 'image' and 'idol' interchangeably. This is first demonstrated Ridley's footnote on Athanasius, *Against the Heathen*, 1.8 (*NPNF2* 4.7-8). Here he quotes the Greek text of Athanasius, 'ἡ τῶν εἰδώλων εὕρεσις οὐκ ἀπὸ ἀγαθοῦ…..' translating this, 'The invention of images came of no good…..', εἰδώλων as '*images*' rather than 'idols'. *1 John* 5:21 is treated similarly. Nicholas Ridley (c. 1549), *A Treatise of M. Nich. Ridley, in the name, as it seemeth, of the whole Clergie, to King Edward the VI concernyng Images not to be set vp, nor worshipped in Churches,* 1 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments,* 2129 (*STC* 11225).
[329] Ridley, *Treatise,* 1 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments,* 2128, 2130 (*STC* 11225).
[330] *Exodus* 20:4; *Deuteronomy* 27:15, 11:16.

God's will, and in no respect negating the general law.[331] Being a 'moral law', this Second Commandment is binding on the Christian Church, as it was the Jews, who at no stage consented to the placement of images within the *Temple*.[332] Implied in this analogy is the parallel between image and adultery, a thread which will recur through Reformed writings. Ridley restates his thesis that, '*Gods Scripture doth in no place commend the vse of Images, but in a great number of places doth disallowe and condemne them*.' In this, he cites multiple injunctions in the '*Psalmes and prophets*', the *Book of Wisdom*, and John.[333]

Ridley proceeds to discuss the dangers of images in the church, that they could serve either '…..*to edify or to destroy*', although he finds no scriptural teaching suggesting they might edify. Citing scripture,[334] he opines those *'learned and confirmed in knowledge*' have no need of images, '*simple & vnlearned*' are led astray by poor teaching regarding them, and to those '…..*superstitious a confirmation in error*': images have been used to offend and wound the weak, actions condemned by scripture.[335] Ridley rejects that sound instruction can avoid these injuries, '*reason and experience*' teaching otherwise. Rather than stir up devotion, images '…..*distracte the minde from prayer, hearing of Gods word & other godly meditations*.' Supporting this, oddly, he offers the political practice of the Lacedaemonians.[336] The benefit

[331] *Exodus* 2:21-2; *Ruth* 4:13; *Deuteronomy* 7:3-4.
[332] Ridley's (Reformed) numbering of the Commandments. He makes no reference to its context associated with the First, which might be expected if using Augustine's ordering. Regarding images in the Temple, Ridley cites Flavius Josephus (c. AD 37 – 100), *Antiquities*, 17.8 and 18:5, 11. The Temple being image-free, however, is not entirely correct (see above regarding its decoration). Rather, and unlike the temples of the surrounding pagan societies, including the Greeks and Romans, it contained no cultic images.
[333] *Book of Wisdom* (14:12-15); *1 John* 5:21 '…..*little children, beware of images*' (Τεκνία φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων). At least as quoted by Foxe, Ridley does not appear to discriminate between εἰκών and εἴδωλον. Ridley, *Treatise*, 1 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 2128-9 (*STC* 11225). This usage, however, is in keeping with the (then current) translations of Tyndale and Coverdale, although superseded by the *Geneva Bible* and, later, the *Authorised Version* of King James.
[334] '*Little children, keep yourselves from idols'* (*1 John* 5:21)*; 'or put a stumbling block before the blind'* (*Leviticus* 19:14)*; 'Cursed be anyone who misleads a blind man on the road'* (*Deuteronomy* 27:18).
[335] *1 Corinthians* 8:12; *Matthew* 18:6.
[336] Plutarch (c. 46 – 119), *Life of Lycurgus*, 6.

of images, if any, '…..*is very smale*', and the '*daunger*' very great, and it is the duty of the magistrates to see them removed.[337]

The second part of Ridley's *Treatise* turns to the Fathers. He asserts that '…..*in the primitiue church images were not commonly vsed in Churches, Oratories, and places of assembly for religion*.' Ridley cites Origen *Against Celsus*, Irenaeus *Against Heresies*, Lactantius *Divine Institutes*, and Zephyrus in his *Commentary on Tertullian*. Augustine is quoted praising the Roman polymath Marcus Varro who reckoned that '…..*religion might bee kepte more purely without Images*'.[338] Augustine is further multiply quoted in his *Commentary on Psalm 113*, including that '*Images haue more force to bowe downe and crooke the sillie soule, then to teach it.'* Ridley's quotes, however, are problematic, as they differ significantly from the text of Augustine he purports to reproduce.[339] As did Bucer, Ridley continues with *To John of*

---

[337] Ridley, *Treatise,* 1 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments,* 2129 (*STC* 11225).

[338] Marcus Terentius Varro (116 – 27 BC). Augustine of Hippo, *City of God*, 4.31 (*N&PNF1* 2.81-2).

[339] For example, Ridley quotes Augustine:

'*Quivis puer, immo quaevis bestia scit, non esse Deum quod vident: cur ergo Spiritus Sanctus totiesmonet cavendum quod omnes sciunt? Quoniam cum ponuntur in templis, et semel incipient adorari a multitudine, statim nascitur sordidissimus affectus erroris.*'

'Every child, indeed, every animal, knows that what they see is not God: why then does the Holy Spirit so often warn us to beware of what we all know? For when they are placed in the temples, and once they begin to be worshiped by the multitude, the most sordid feeling of error is immediately born.'

Whereas the original text of Augustine is:

'*Quis puer interrogates non hoc certum esse respondeat, quod simulacra gentium os habent et non loquuntur, oculos habent et non videbunt, et cetera quae divinus sermo contextuit – cur ergo tantopere Spiritus Sanctus curat scripturarum plurimis loc is haes insinuare, atque unculcare velut inscientibus, quasi non omnibus apertissima ataque notissima, nisi quia species membrorum quam naturaliter in animantibus viventem videre atque in nobismetipis sentire consuevimus, quanquam ut illi asserunt in signum aliquod fabrefacts atque eminenti collocate suggest, cum adorari atque honorari a multitudine coeperit, paret in unoquoque sordidissmum erroris affectum.*'

'When asked by a child, who does not answer that this is certain, that the idols of the Gentiles have mouths and do not speak, have eyes and will not see, and the other things which the divine word has woven together - why, then, does the Holy Spirit take so much care to insinuate these things in many places of the scriptures, and trample upon them as if they were ignorant, as if not the most open attack known to all, except because the species of limbs which we are accustomed to see naturally living in animals and to feel in ourselves, although, as they assert, a platform erected as a sign and elevated, when it has begun to be adored and honoured by the multitude, conceals in each a sordid feeling of error.'

It is clear that the inconsistency here is more than accidental. Either Ridley is working from a very poor document or, more likely, Augustine's text is being manipulated for polemical purposes. With the extant

Jerusalem, the communication between Gregory and Serenus; condemning Gregory that since him, the '…..*Westchurch, hath bene ouerflowed with Idolatry*.'[340]

The third part of Ridley's *Treatise* recounts the Byzantine iconomachy, citing the *De honesta disciplina* as his source. Ridley's account is briefer, but otherwise differs little from that of Bucer. He quotes Hieria pronouncing, '*not lawfull for them that beleeue in God through Iesus Christ, to haue any Images neither of the Creator, nor of any creatures set vp in temples to be worshipped, but rather that all Images by the law of God, and for the auoiding of offence ought to be taken out of churches.*' Differing from Bucer, Ridley cites the Council of Elvira, demonstrating that the Western Church not always '…..*retained and commended Images*.' Incorrectly, Ridley states that Nicaea II commanded not only the displaying, but the worshipping of images, which Charlemagne confuted.[341]

5.3 John Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1559)

Calvin addresses the issue of images in the 7,500-word eleventh chapter of the first book of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.[342] Within the chapter there are three divisions, the first and largest containing '…..*a refutation of those who ascribe a visible form to God*'; the second regards the origin and adoration of images; and the third, their use and abuse.

resources, however, whether this misrepresentation is the work of Ridley, of Foxe, or an inaccurate original text is impossible to determine. Henry Christmas ed., *The Works of Nicholas Ridley* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 89-90.

[340] Ridley, *Treatise*, 2 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 2130 (*STC* 11225).

[341] Ridley, *Treatise*, 3 in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 2130-1 (*STC* 11225); "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2*, 14.549-51.

[342] The *Institutes* was produced and revised in both French and Latin between 1536 and 1560. The referenced text is the final Latin version of 1559. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religio*n, trans. Henry Beveridge (Peabody: Hendrickson) 2007.

In the first division, Calvin's rejection of images of God rests in the Second Commandment.[343] Accordingly, he quotes *Exodus* 20:4 divorced from the previous verse, and understands this to be a complete proscription. Moses, Isaiah and Paul are cited offering explanations of this proscription: Moses in that, '…..*ye saw no manner of similitude*'; Isaiah, representing all the prophets, rejecting the idolatry of both Israel and the surrounding peoples, that idols purport to make corporeal that which is incorporeal; and Paul, that '…..*we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto*…..'[344] He rejects that the prohibition stems from any particular proneness of the Jews to superstition, rather that all men are '*infatuated*' to idolatry. Theophanies in the ephemeral form of cloud, smoke, and flame, and of the Spirit in the fleeting form of a dove, he interprets as supporting that God has not revealed Himself in physical form; that of human-like theophanies, as anticipations of Christ. Strikingly, in his use of '*God*', Calvin fails to engage with Christ's incarnation as a basis for imagery. Of Mary no reference is made, and neither does Calvin comment on imaging of the saints.

The cherubim and seraphim, Calvin sees as belonging '…..*to the old tutelage of the law*', their presence emphasising the incomprehensibility of the essence of God.[345] Even apart from God's proscription, he views it as '*absurd*' that men might believe that anything made from profane materials might possess, or be possessed, by divinity; something which even educated pagans understood.[346] Calvin rejects Gregory's claim that images can have an educative purpose. Rather, their presence reflects the instructional neglect of the Roman

[343] Second Commandment after the ordering of Philo and the Orthodox / Reformed tradition.
[344] *Deuteronomy* 4:15; *Isaiah* 40:18, 41:7&29, 45:9, 46:5; *Acts* 17:29. Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.1,2,8.
[345] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.3.
[346] Calvin, *Institutes* 1.11.4, 3.9.2. Cites *Psalm* 115:4&8, 135:15; *Isaiah* 2:8, 31:7, 44:16; *Hosea* 14:3; *Micah* 5:13; Juvenal, *Satires*, 14; Horace, *Satires*, 1.8.

clergy. He relates that images were condemned at Elvira, cites Augustine's quotation of Varro, and condemns the misplaced luxurious ornamentation of images.[347]

In the second division of his chapter, Calvin posits that idols grew out of ancestor worship, citing its presence even in the time of the patriarchs. This represented a rapid development in the generations after the Flood, indicative of men's abiding propensity to idolatry. By this, he concludes that it is in the mind which the idol is first conceived, and only secondarily formed by the hands. Consequential, was the desire of the Israelites for an image of their God in Sinai, and that '…..*adoration*…..[of such images]…..*forthwith ensues*', and it was for this reason that God forbade images. The Jews had not forgotten that *YHWH* had brought them out of Egypt, it was that without Moses, they required another visible presence.[348] Citing Augustine on *Psalm* 113, no-one truly believe that the idol is the god, rather they worship the false god and view the corporeal image as somehow inhabited by the deity. Yet still, both pagans and Papists will, irrationally, seek out differing images of the same god or saint in different places, and attached differing powers to them; providing only '*common honour*' to one, yet worshipping the other with '*highest solemnities*'. This behaviour (after the manner of pagans) is camouflaged under a defence of '*εἰδωλοδουλεία*' (idol service) and '*εἰδωλολατρεία*' (idol worship) - *dulia* rather than *latria* - a distinction he rejects as '*sophistry*'.[349]

---

[347] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.5-7; Augustine of Hippo, *City of God*, 6.10 (*N&PNF1* 2.119-20).
[348] *Genesis* 31:19; *Joshua* 24:2; *Exodus* 22:1; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.8-9.
[349] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.11. Whatever the merits of his argument, Calvin is disingenuous here, taking recourse to terms used by neither the Eastern nor Roman Churches to describe their practices, or that are found in the canons of Nicaea II. Indeed, the use of εἴδωλο- rather than εἰκόνο-, intentionally evokes 'idol' rather than 'image', as discussed previously. That Calvin does so innocently, simply confusing εἴδωλο- rather than εἰκόνο- is difficult to accept; the *Geneva Bible* of 1560 distinguishing and translating *Colossians* 1:15 (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου) as '*image of the inuifibie God*', yet *1 John* 5:21 (Τεκνία φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων) as '*Babes, kepe your felues fro iidoles*'. As a rhetorical tool, this usage is akin to asking people how they feel about 'female genital mutilation' or 'rape within marriage'. By using the words 'mutilation' or

The third division begins with Calvin declaring that he does not reject all imagery; art being a gift of God. However, it does not have a place within the religious setting. God has forbidden their use because any comparison between Him in His majesty, and the works of men, cannot help but '*tarnish*' His glory; even if artistically faultless, they have no utility in worship or teaching. He asserts that the primitive Church was for 500 years '…..*completely free of visible representations*', their entry occurring only after the deterioration of ministry.[350] Augustine is cited on the inherently misleading nature of religious images, and that this is the reason John cautions against idols. Rather, if the Christian should seek visual signs, he should do so in the sacraments and the ceremonies of the Church. The chapter concludes with reference to the '*so-called*' [Second] Council of Nicaea, which he rejects, and refutes a list of misquotes and misinterpretations of scripture by the '*Papists*' regarding images. Calvin makes passing [untitled] reference to the *Libri Carolini* of Charlemagne, and its repudiation of Nicaea II.[351]

5.4 Peter Martyr Vermigli: *Common Places* (c. 1560)

Peter Vermigli in the 33,000-word fifth chapter of the second part of his *Common Places* addresses things '*which concern images*.' He begins by outlining his form of argument: first

'rape', the questioner has directed the respondent into the only acceptable answer, as no-one can approve of either 'mutilation' or 'rape'.
The author of the current dissertation would argue that 'sophistry', like 'heresy', is a term which should be used with extreme prudence in theological debates, as it is intensely subjective and frequently pejorative. For example, regarding the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper, four views are generally recognised: the Orthodox and Roman Catholic view of the 'real physical presence' replacing the accidentals through transubstantiation; the Lutheran 'consubstantiation' were the real presence is physical, but the accidentals are retained; the Calvinist / Reformed who spiritually, non-corporeally yet really, receive and feed upon Christ crucified (*WCF*, 29.7 [Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 231-2]; *Thirty-Nine Articles,* 28, 29 [*CC*, 3.505-7]); and the simple memorialist. An outsider might reasonably distinguish the 'real presence' of transubstantiation or consubstantiation from the simple memorial; but could be forgiven for dismissing the Reformed subtlety of 'real *spiritual* presence' as 'sophistry'. Similar observations might be made by the unsympathetic Jewish or Muslim commentator regarding the mono- (versus tri-) theistic doctrine of the Trinity. Too readily, 'sophistry' can be used to cover failure to truly engage with a nuanced argument, as perhaps Calvin is doing here.

[350] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.13, 4.4.9. Calvin does not explain the basis of this assertion.

[351] Cited are Augustine, *City of God* 4.31, *Commentary on Psalm 112,* and *1 John* 5:21(*N&PNF1* 2.81-2); Calvin, *Institutes* 1.11.13.

considering the beginning of images, followed by their use and its lawfulness. Thirdly, he considers their utility, particularly within '*temples and holie assemblies*'.[352]

Regarding their origin, Vermigli considers Hebrew, Greek and Latin terminology, recognising a number of words which carry related, but varying meanings.[353] An image is no absolute thing in itself, but a '*certeine similitude*' of another thing, signifying it. It is different from that which it represents, but may be compared to, and differentiated from it, in some aspect of either quantity, quality, or both. In contrast to image*s* (εἰκόνες) he cites Tertullian on the origin of 'idol' in εἶδος (form); an εἴδωλον constituting a small 'form' or 'formling'. Consequently, idols are essentially conceptual, and in physical manifestation, a sub-division of images. Images may be used as idols, but may also be made for artistic, honorific or other purposes. In this Vermigli stands apart from his Reformed predecessors, clearly recognising an essential difference between εἰκών (image) and εἴδωλον (idol). When an image is false, representing things that never are or were, it is an εἴδωλον. As such, any object or person held to be God, even be they a saint or the Virgin, necessarily becomes an idol. Regarding origins, Vermigli mirrors Bucer, Ridley and Calvin, including that even pagans do not truly worship their idols, but the false gods they represent.[354]

Having dealt with idols of false gods, Vermigli progresses to discuss images of God, which he considers always unlawful. His argument begins citing *Deuteronomy* 4:12, that the Lord was

---

[352] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.1 (*STC* 24669, 333).

[353] '*…..called Temuna, Tselem, and (as some will) Teraphim; of the Gréeks, εἰκόνες; of the Latins Imagines & signa, that is, Images and pictures*.' Vermigli, *Common Places,* 2.5.1 (*STC* 24669, 333).

[354] Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 3 (*ANF* 3.62). Plato in his conception of 'forms' uses *εἶδος* (visible form) and the related *ἰδέα* (invisible form) interchangeably. Joseph Morabito, Ira Sack and Anilkumar Bhate, *Designing Knowledge Organizations: A Pathway to Innovation Leadership* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2018), 33. Indeed, Diogenes Laertius (AD 180 – 240), refers to Plato's '*Theory of Ideas'* rather than 'Forms' - Πλάτων ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν ἰδεῶν ὑπολήψει. Diogenes Laertius "Plato," in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 3.15.
For example, Christ and the image (*εἰκὼν*) of Caesar on the coin from *Mark* 12:16. Vermigli, *Common Places* 2.5.1-6 (*STC* 24669, 333-6).

not seen at Horeb. He follows with *Isaiah* 40:18, '*To what will you resemble God?*', continues with both Isaiah and the psalmist on the inadequacy of any representation of God, and *John* 1:18 that none have ever seen God. As God is infinite he cannot be imaged in anything finite. The pagans Varro and Seneca are cited through Augustine regarding the impurity of religion containing images, and this is contrasted with the practices across Christendom in Vermigli's own day. Of particular note is the '*common*' image of the Trinity: an old man with a young man standing before him, between whom is a dove; or a man represented with three heads or faces. The frequency of these images Vermigli blames on Nicaea II, although he cites Damascene's rejection of images of God (uncircumscribed).[355] He describes, and rejects, its proponents reasoning as based on theophanies and visions, and the use of anthropomorphic language of God's hands or face or nostrils or feet. It is in Christ's incarnation and His actions, revealed plainly in scripture, rather than His representation, that the image of God is seen in its fulness. Further, we have the visible sacraments, '*wherewith the word of God is joined*.' This he supports in the lack of references to images by the apostles, and by the assertion of their absence from the primitive Church. Vermigli notes and commends Hieria, agreeing with its criticism of images of Christ: of their nature, separating His divinity from His humanity, but does so in nuanced fashion. Like Bucer and Ridley, he cites Crinitus.[356]

Vermigli addresses the imaging of angels and men, accepting that being creatures and circumscribed, they can be portrayed. Likewise with '*the crosse of the Lord*', as long as they are not '*religiouslie and deuoutlie worshipped*.' He does not reject all religious use of imagery, but granted the dangers of idolatry, that '…..*if things should be painted, the profitable and*

[355] This is surprising, as noted previously, Nicaea II does not engage with representations of the Father or Spirit.
[356] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.7-10 (*STC* 24669, 336-41).

holie histories should chéeflie be painted; whereby the beholders may receiue some edifieng.' Notwithstanding, Vermigli believes they should not be present within churches.[357]

Having elucidated what is '*lawfull to picture*', Vermigli proceeds to examine the question of adoration and worship, rejecting both in any form. He presents his opponents arguments, beginning with language, and answers these views in turn. Of the recognition of ευσέβεια or *pietas* (godliness), he has no objection. He describes divine worship in two Hebrew verbs: '*lare*' (fear) and '*avad*' (serve), which Augustine differentiated in Greek as λατρεία and δουλεία. According to Vermigli, he was the first of the fathers to do so.[358] Vermigli argues against this distinction citing Laurentius Valla; that λατρεία might be used for subjects other than divine worship, and that there is significant cross-over with the use of δουλεία.[359]

Progressing from words, Vermigli turns to '*the matter it selfe*.' That the greatest honour is due to God alone is self-evident. He cites Basil regarding the transfer of honours to their prototype, but quotes Augustine that '…..*the humanitie of Christ must be worshipped with diuine honour, bicause it hath the Godhead ioined therewith: which, if it should be sundered from him, as it cannot be, he should not be worshipped with diuine honour*.' Accordingly, Vermigli dismisses any concept of ὑπερδούλια directed to Mary or the human image of Christ. Princes, prophets and holy men are to be given the honour which is their due: they are '…..*to be honoured by imitation*…..*not adored with religious rites*.'

[357] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.11 (*STC* 24669, 341-2).
[358] Cites Augustine's *Ad Deo gratis* 20, *Against Faustus* 21, and *The City of God* 20.1 (*N&PNF1* 2.484-91).
[359] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.12 (*STC* 24669, 342). Lorenzo Valla (c. 1407 – 1457), was an Italian humanist scholar. He was notable (and celebrated in Protestant circles) for using philological means to demonstrate that the *Donation of Constantine*, an underpinning of Papal secular authority, was a medieval (c. 8th century) fraud. Vermigli is difficult here, however. Clearly, he recognises the difference in the words in text and the difference of the concepts in practice, yet does not seem to be able to relate that to their conceptual use as defined and used in Nicaea II, Aquinas (or at Trent).

This being the case, and that no image can be entitled to greater honour than its prototype; artifacts are worthy of less honour than that which might be accorded to godly men. Further to this, to worship objects such as crosses because they resemble the true cross, is '*absurd*.' Christ commands us to '…..*beare his crosse*,…..[not]…..*worship the same*'. Peter forbids Cornelius to bow before him, and the angel twice reproves John '…..*that he would haue worshipped him*.'[360]

Vermigli re-states biblical injunctions against idolatry, and for the first time quotes explicitly the Second Commandment;[361] even Gregory, the '*patrone of superstitions*', recognising the danger, forbad the worshipping of images. He criticises money ill spent on images, and the practice of pilgrimage, as though God was more present in one place than another; or a saint in one image or relic than another. Vermigli dismisses the distinction between pagan idols and the common behaviour of '*Papists*' if images be wrongly used; yet despite his earlier remarks, translates *I John* 5:21 as '…..*defend yourselves from images*', rather than 'idols'.[362]

Having '*plentifullie enough confirmed*' that images are not to be worshipped or adored, Vermigli investigates whether it be lawful to have them in churches. This he decides against, as experience and the teaching of the Fathers has proved it a '*verie dangerous thing*.' He cites Augustine, Epiphanius and Gregory. Further, Vermigli cites the Second Council of Ephesus (449); '*Grecian*' emperors Philippicus I, Leo III, Constantine [V] and Leo IV; and the Council of

---

[360] Basil, *On the Holy Spirit,* 45 (referenced by Vermigli as 27); Augustine, *de verbis Domini* (referenced by Vermigli as *Homily 58*), *City of God*, 22.10, *Of True Religion* 55.108 (referenced by Vermigli as 25). Among 'artifacts', Vermigli includes statues, images, relics touched by saints, or even the true cross. The inclusion of the true cross in this list (*cf*. other crosses) does not follow logically, for if it was touched by Christ, by the same reasoning, it would only necessarily be worthy of less esteem than Christ Himself. *Matthew* 16:24-6; *Acts* 10:25-6; *Revelation* 19:10, 22:9. Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.13-4, 17-8 (*STC* 24669, 342-4, 346-7).

[361] *Exodus* 20:4-5.

[362] *Deuteronomy* 6:13; *Matthew* 4:10; *1 Corinthians* 10:7 '*μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε*'; 1 John 5:21 '*φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων*'; *1 Peter* 4:3 '*ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις*'. Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.15-6 (*STC* 24669, 344-6). This issue of the mistranslation of *1 John* 5:21 is doubly confusing, considering that the *Geneva Bible* of 1560 renders the verse, '*Babes, kepe your felues fro iidoles*'.

Elvira. Vermigli identifies the brass serpent and the cherubim of Moses not falling under normal constraints, as their construction was commanded directly by God, who cannot be held subject to even His own laws. And regarding them, the serpent was destroyed by Hezekiah when it became an object of worship, and the cherubim positioned where the many could not observe them. The utility of images as '*the bookes of laie men*', as Gregory believed, is rejected by Vermigli, reasoning that if this were the case, God would have commanded their use. Preaching is the scripturally commanded form of teaching, the '…..*primitiue church* [having] *had alwaies before their eies Christ crucified, although it vsed no idols nor images*.'[363]

The work concludes with an extended discussion of cherubim, seraphim, teraphim, human sacrifices, and the visitation of God's wrath on succeeding generations of those who hate Him. In this latter, Vermigli again interacts directly with the Second Commandment.[364]

5.5 Thomas Cranmer and John Jewel: The *Homilies* (1547-71)

The *Homilies* consist of thirty-three sermons to be read in churches. They develop the Reformed (and authorised) doctrines of the Church of England, as outlined in the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, but in greater depth. Consisting of two books composed and revised between 1547 and 1571, they were appointed for public use under the 11th and 35th articles. Together with the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Book of Common Prayer*, the *Homilies* constitute a core formulary of the Reformed English Church. Authorship is not ascribed, and multiple, but Thomas Cranmer edited and is credited with much of the *First Book*, and John Jewel of the

[363] Augustine, *Commentary on Psalm 113*, *Ad Deo gratias, Sermon 6*; Epiphanius, *To John,* 9 in Jerome, *Letter 51* (*N&PNF2* 6.83-9); Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23). Curiously, Vermigli describes each of these emperors as monothelites, when true only of Philippicus, and gives this as a reason that their aniconism was rejected. Even more surprising is that he cites Ephesus II, the Council having been repudiated by Chalcedon only two years later. Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.22-9 (*STC* 24669, 350-6); *N&PNF2*, 186-7, 233.
[364] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.30-52 (*STC* 24669, 356-67).

Second.[365] Jewel's contribution includes the 37,000-word *Against the Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches* of 1562/3; taken together with his *Apology of the Church of England* (1562), it is the most comprehensive work on images by the English Church.[366]

Against Idolatry is structured in three parts. The first begins referencing and reviewing the previous *Homilies* regarding the *Right Use of the Church*, and the *Repairing, Keeping Clean, and Comely Adorning of Churches*. The church is the place of *'…..public prayer, hearty thanks*…..[and]…..*his holy Sacraments duly and reverently ministered*', and not of '…..*infinite multitude of images…..decked with gold and silver, painted with colours…..and glistening with gold and precious stones…..greatly hurt*[ing] *the simple and unwise*.' These things Jewel repudiates based on three grounds: Scripture, the Fathers and Doctors, and the poverty of the opponents arguments.[367]

Jewel commences, reviewing the language of the Greek εἰδωλών (idol) and the Latin *imago* (image), which is alternatively expressed as *simulachra*, but the Greek εἰκών is not mentioned. Referencing Jerome and Tertullian, he concludes that the (Latin) terms are interchangeable, and this will be followed in his work. The Old Testament abhors not only idolatry, but idols

[365] Samuel, *Homilies*, "Forward"; Additional to the thirty-three authorised for use by the Church of England, another thirteen were written under the auspices of Edmund Bonner during the rule of Mary. Inspired by the work of Cranmer, together with *A Profitable and Necessarye Doctrine*, these 'homilies' were directed at restoring Roman Catholic worship and piety. Bray, *Homilies,* xiv-xvi, 10.

[366] The authorship of *Against Idolatry* is uncertain, but the homily is adapted from Heinrich Bullinger's *De origine erroris, in divorum ac simulachrorum cultu* of 1528 (published 1539). Likely the version which appears in the *Homilies* is the work of Jewel, and for convenience will be ascribed so here. Stephen Buick, "Little children, beware of images: 'Homily Against Peril of Idolatry'," *Reformation* 2, (1997): 301-330; Bray, *Homilies*, xvi-xvii; Jonathan Sheehan, "Sacred and Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism, and the Polemics of Distinction in the Seventeenth Century," *Past and Present* 192, (2006): 35-66. Part of the history Jewel bases in Crinitus, and carries a number of inaccuracies (for example the citing of Emperor Valens in the place of Valentinian III) which also appeared in Bucer's and Ridey's treatises, and carried over through these earlier works. It also serves to demonstrate the interdependence of the works of Crinitus, Bullinger, Bucer, Ridley and Jewel. Bray, *Homilies*, 236 n.5.

[367] John Jewel, *An Homily Against Peril of Idolatry, and superfluous Decking of Churches*, 1, in *Certain sermons or homilies appointed to be read in churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory and now reprinted for the use of private families, in two parts*, 175-6 (*STC* 13646), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A32977.0001.001.

themselves. *Deuteronomy* instructs that nothing is to be added or subtracted from the words of the Lord, and God commands, that having not made Himself visible, images of *YHWH* are not to be made.[368] Like Bucer and Calvin, Jewel recites multiple scriptures speaking to the patent inadequacy of any image made from profane materials. Along with the rejection of idols is the duty to destroy them. This, however, and echoing Ridley and Sandys, is the duty of the magistrate, and not '*private persons*' acting under their own authority. Lest any believe these things '*pertain*…..[only]…..*to the Jews*', Jewel proceeds to the New Testament, citing comparable scriptures against idolatry under the Christian covenant.[369]

The second part of the *Homily* progresses from scripture to the Fathers and Doctors. This Jewel begins recapitulating, and stating clearly that these arguments alone are in all respect sufficient; that '…..*our Saviour Christ taketh not or needeth not any testimony of men, and that which is once confirmed by the certainty of his eternal truth hath no…..need of the confirmation of man's doctrine and writings*.' Yet, for the hearer's '*further content*', he will survey the teachings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. Notably, Jewel's commentary is nuanced: regarding both Ambrose and Gregory, clear distinction is made between the existence of images for teaching, or of the relic of the True Cross, and their sinful worship.[370] Like Bucer, Jewel holds that worshiping images only began in the late-5th century, when the '…..*Goths, Vandals, Huns and other barbarous and wicked nations…..destroyed cities and*

[368] *Deuteronomy* 4. Jewel goes on to cite *Deuteronomy* 27:15; *Wisdom* 13-5; *Psalm* 97, 135, *Isaiah* 40, 42, and finally and definitively, the Second Commandment prohibition. Jewel, *Idolatry* 1, in *Certain Sermons*, 177-84 (*STC* 13646).

[369] Citations include *1 John* 5; *1 Corinthians* 10; *Acts* 10, 14; *Matthew* 4; *Luke* 4. Jewel, *Idolatry* 1, in *Certain Sermons*, 185-91 (*STC* 13646).

[370] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2 in *Certain Sermons*, 191-2 (*STC* 13646); *John* 5:34. He cites Tertullian, *De Corona*, 10 (*ANF* 3.98-9); Clement of Rome (c. 35 – 99), *Recognitiones*, 5.26 (*ANF* 8.149); Origen, *Against Celsus*, 7.64-8 (*ANF* 4.636-7); Athanasius, *Against the Heathens*, 20 (*NPNF2* 4.14-5); Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 2.19 (*ANF* 7.67-8); Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.18.3 (*NPNF2* 4.14-5); Augustine, *City of God*, 4.31 (*N&PNF1* 2.81-2); Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23); Epiphanius, *To John,* 9 in Jerome, *Letter 51* (*N&PNF2* 6.83-9); Jerome, *Against Bishop John*, 4 (*N&PNF2* 6.224-47); Ambrose of Milan (395), *Death of Theodosius*, 46; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentaries in John*, 11.5. Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 192-205 (*STC* 13646).

burnt libraries, so that learning and true religion went to wrack'. Specifically, he associates the '*triumph of images*' in the West, with the consent to their painting in the entrance of St. Peter's at Rome by Pope Constantine.[371]

Jewel concludes this section by recounting the Byzantine iconomachy, and the political usurpation and idolatrous tendencies of the bishops of Rome. In this, and also citing Crinitus, his account closely resembles those of Bucer and Ridley.[372] The Council of Elvira (c. 307) is reported, but as consequential to the aniconic movement in the East, an error of over four centuries.[373] As with Bucer, Ridley and Vermigli, it is unclear from Jewel's account whether he is familiar with events in the East after Nicaea II, including the writings of Theodore; that image veneration returned permanently in the 9th century 'Triumph of Orthodoxy'; or of contemporary Orthodox theology and practice regarding images and the invocation of the saints. Rather, ongoing Eastern aniconism in the face of Roman image-worship is cited as the reason for the West's refusal to aid the Byzantine Emperor against the Muslim Turks.[374]

The third and longest part consists of a '…..*confutation of the principal arguments, which are used to be made for the maintenance of images'*, this being to '…..*instruct the curates*

[371] Constantine (664 – 715, r. 708 – 715). Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 203-7 (*STC* 13646).
[372] Jewel also makes use of the *Historia miscella*, a later expansion of Paul the Deacon's (d. c. 799) 8th century *Historia Romana*, which he appears to access via Bullinger's *De origine erroris* of 1528. Certain inaccuracies with dating were corrected in the 1568 edition of Bullinger's work, but persist in Jewel. Bray, *Homilies*, 239 n.1.
[373] Ian Lancashire ed., *An Homilie Against the Perill of Idolatrie, and Superfluous Decking of Churches,* http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm; Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 213-4 (*STC* 13646). Sources vary in some of which (Lancashire) Jewel errs dating Jerome rather than Tertullian to '…..*about one hundred and threescore years after the death of our Saviour Christ*'. That is to say, around 190 AD rather than late 4th century. Accordingly his dating of Epiphanius (c. 320 – 403) would necessarily be at least two centuries too early, but this is not obvious elsewhere. It would also demand that Jewel was unaware that Jerome and Augustine were contemporaries, which would seem surprising. Conversely, and more likely, Jewel simply confuses Jerome with Tertullian. This may be associated with Jewel mistaking the authorship of *De corona militis* between Tertullian and Jerome, likely due to quoting from derived rather than original sources.
[374] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 207-18 (*STC* 13646).

themselves, or men of good understanding.'[375] Firstly, Jewel addresses the claim that the scriptures and the Fathers referred only to the idols of pagans, and not images of God. This he dismisses arguing from *Deuteronomy* 4:12, the Lord speaking from the fire; *Isaiah* 40:18-20, '*To whom then will you liken God?*' and elsewhere, and *Acts* 17:29. He addresses the theophanies and visions of Isaiah and Daniel, restating the general proscription on images, and scripture's assertion that God is '*most pure spirit, whom man never saw*'. These prohibitions, Jewel reiterates, extend not only to wrong use, but to the idols and images themselves. Likewise, this proscription is not capricious, but based in practical concerns regarding idolatry, and extend to images of Christ and His saints.[376]

Jewel engages with the argument that Christ, having taken upon Himself flesh, images might be made of Him. Consistent with the anti-Nestorian case of the *Aniconists*, he rejects this, asserting as the divine, that '*most excellent part*' of Christ cannot be imaged, the whole image lies, and stems from the devil, the '*father of lies*'. The same is true of the saints, whose '*souls reign in joy with God*.' The '*more excellent parts of them*' cannot be represented, only that part '…..*which as yet lie putrified in the graves*.' Accordingly, as these images be lies, they cannot serve as truthful '*layman's books*'. Indeed, even if any image of Christ or the saints could be '*truly made*', it would still be unlawful due to the '…..*great and unavoidable danger of Idolatry*.'[377]

Jewel now addresses the question of images being '*things indifferent*', that it is only in their intention and use, that they are forbidden. Here he specifically challenges the views of Gregory and Damascene, although without truly engaging them. Doing so, Jewel

[375] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 220 (*STC* 13646). In this, Jewel takes on a similar responsibility to Borromeo in the *Roman Catechism*. Bray, *Homilies*, 249 n.2.
[376] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 221-4 (*STC* 13646).
[377] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 224-6 (*STC* 13646).

differentiates between profane and sacred spaces, that it is not only the improper use of images that must be avoided, but the danger of placing them in a setting where this might occur, those '…..*placed publicly in Temples, cannot possibly be without danger of worshipping and idolatry*.' He cites the abuse of the serpent in the Temple, contrasting it with the cherubim of the Ark, which were '…..*set in secret where no man might come nor behold*'. Jewel observes that it was in the context of scriptural scenes that Christians first painted images. Following from this was the progression to relief and then to statuary. Likewise, was the creeping from private houses to churches and temples. After this they began to be worshiped, as condemned by Gregory. He resolves, all images '*so set up publicly*' have been worshipped both by the simple and the learned; in the past and at the present also. Images and idolatry are thus inseparable, and consequently, the only way the '*abominable*' can be avoided is by their '*abolishing and destruction*…..[in all places]…..*appointed peculiarly to the service of God*'. Again, it is the Second Commandment proscription which is cited.[378]

Jewel proceeds to extend his argument to the issue of saintly patronage. Holding as examples Belus to the Babylonians and Assyrians, Osiris and Isis to the Egyptians, Minerva to the Athenians, and others, all of whom he notes, appear to have left their temples '…..*and have forsaken their altars*.' To this, Jewel directly equates Christian sites of pilgrimage such as those of '*our Lady*' at Walsingham, Ipswich, and Wilsdon; and extends it to the usurpation of divine honour in sayings such as, '*GOD and Saint Nicholas be my speed*', '*God help and Saint John*', or the attribution to all diseases and occupations their own saint. The common, underlying thread, he identifies, are the images which underpin these '*idolatrous*' practices. Jewel does

[378] Cited in support of Jewel's argument are *Leviticus* 26:1; *Deuteronomy* 5:8 & 27:15, *Exodus* 20:4; and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 1.25.6 (*ANF 1.351*), Lactantius *Divine Institutes*, 2.19 (*ANF* 7.67-8), and Augustine, Origen and Cyprian, as previously noted. Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 226-31, 240-1 (*STC* 13646).

make clear, however, that he speaks not disrespectfully of the saints, but of their abuse by '*Gentile idolaters*' masquerading as Christians. Thus does Jewel draw a tight relationship between '*idolatrous*' invocation or patronage of the saints, and the presence and worship of religious images. Explicitly, he does not take from the honour due to the saints as God's faithful servants, but that through incorrect practice, the Church has made of them idols; according to them '*power and honour*' which is God's alone, and made them victims of '*spiritual fornication*'.[379]

The *Homily* goes on to explore the relationship between man and image. A creator is greater than his creation, yet men kneel before images made from crude materials, when they would not before the artificers who made them; and they kneel before and honour the saints in representation, when neither Peter nor the angel of God would have Cornelius or John do so.[380] Jewel rejects any *dulia/latria* distinction, and the pronouncements of Nicaea II regarding the transfer of honour to prototype; '*outward worshipping'* of the non-divine serving only to follow Satan and usurp God's honour. He references Augustine, Lactantius and Clement, and rejects the authenticity of many relics, the '*madness*' of miracles ascribed to them, and any claims of acheiropoiesis. Chrysostom is cited in his rejection of relics.[381]

Jewel concludes his *Homily* by extensive re-iteration and re-framing of his previous arguments. He denounces '…..*too costly and sumptuous decking and adorning of them* [places of worship]*, as also the lewd painting, gilding, and clothing of idols and images*.' In these, churches and temples become idols in their own right, substituting lifeless images for the

[379] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in Bray, *Homilies*, 230-6. The relationship between adultery and idolatry as spiritual fornication features strongly in Thomas Becon's 1547 homily *Against Whoredom and Uncleanness, Certain Sermons*, 119-37 (*STC* 13646); Bray, *Homilies*, xiii, 96-108.
[380] *Acts* 10:25-6, 14:13-8; *Revelation* 19:10, 22:8-9.
[381] John Chrysostom, *Homily on 1 Maccabees*, 1, *op. cit*. Bray, *Homilies*, 265; Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 237-50 (*STC* 13646).

preaching of God's living word. He exhorts the hearer to follow God only, avoiding the '*stumbling-blocks*' which are '*dead and dumb*' images; approaching His throne directly through Christ's intercession, and rejecting anything which might distract or detract from the honour rightly afforded to God alone.[382]

5.6 William Perkins: *A Reformed Catholike* (1597) and *A Golden Chaine* (1592)

William Perkins was a prolific writer and a foremost Puritan theologian. Sections of two of his works directly address the question of images: the 9th chapter of *A Reformed Catholike*, and the 21st chapter of *A Golden Chaine*. Authored in 1597 and 1592 respectively, these works differ from those summarised above in that they were written after the formalising of Roman Catholic doctrine at Trent.[383]

The 2,700-word 9th chapter of *A Reformed Catholike*, '*Of Images*', begins with an acknowledgement of the consensual opinion with Rome on the use of images for civil purposes. The arts of painting and sculpture are the gifts of God and, therefore, in themselves, lawful and good. They are suitable for the adornment of buildings, the distinction of coins and the memory of departed friends; they recall events past, and testify to the majesty of God. The Second Commandment does not preclude all images: for example, it is lawful to paint biblical histories in private places, but it imposes limitations. Regarding Christ, the most

[382] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 250-81 (*STC* 13646).
[383] William Perkins (1558 – 1602), *A Reformed Catholike: or A declaration shewing how neere we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundrie points of religion* (*STC* 19736), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A09453.0001.001; *A Golden Chaine: or The description of theologie containing the order of the causes of saluation and damnation, according to Gods word* (*STC* 19660), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A09339.0001.001.

perfect image of Him with all His benefits, is to be found in the preaching of the word, and in the righteous works of Christian men.[384]

Differences with Rome arise in three matters. Firstly, Perkins rejects that it is lawful to make images in any form resembling God. This he bases in *Exodus* 20:4. He states that the Papists take the Commandment to refer only to false gods. Rather, this extends to imaging of the true God also. Both scripture and the Fathers are referenced in support.[385] He further argues that this confusion is created by the Papists' conflation of the First and Second Commandments.

The second matter of difference is the Roman Church's teaching that '…..*images of God and of Saints may be worshipped with religious worship, specially the crucifix*.' In this statement Perkins cites Aquinas on the crucifix, but glosses over his fuller teaching on appropriate veneration (*dulia* vs *latria*) of Mary and the saints in contrast to God, the *Decree* of Nicaea II, and the teachings of Trent. Again, this rejection he bases in the Second Commandment, but also cites Hezekiah's destruction of the serpent, and Augustine and Gregory in their rejection of image worship.[386]

The third matter relates to the lawfulness of worshipping God using images. Again, this Perkins rejects. He reports the Papists basing their practice in the theophanies and visions of the Father and the Spirit, but includes with it the Son '…..*in the image of a man crucified*.'

---

[384] Cites *Exodus* 35:30-5; *Matthew* 22:20-1; Origen, *Against Celsus*, 8 (*ANF* 4.641-70); Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 170-3).

[385] Cites *Isaiah* 40:18-21; *Deuteronomy* 4:15-6; *Acts* 7:41; Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 3; Isidore of Seville (c. 560 – 636), *Of Etymology*; Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah*, 37; Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 2.19; *Council of Elvira*, 36; and Epiphanius, *To John, Bishop of Jerusalem*, 9. This list is long, but is variable in what each addresses, not all being directly relevant to the point which Perkins is making. Specifically, Perkins addresses the cherubim of the temple, the theophanies of *Genesis* 18 and *Daniel* 9, and that being created in the image of God, it is yet lawful to create images of men. These he answers using the common arguments of the previously presented Reformed authors. Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7).

[386] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 3.25.4-6, 2.2.103, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 4254-8, 3252-3; "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2* 14.549-51; "Decree," in Schaff, *CC*, 2.201-2; Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 177-83).

Once more, the Second Commandment, together with the '*worshipping the golden calfe'* as a representation of *YHWH* being *'…..condemned as flat idolatrie*', that are cited to disprove these claims.[387]

A Golden Chaine or *Description of Theologie*, while lacking the customary format of questions and answers, has something of the nature of a catechism or confession, addressing theology systematically, yet with specific reviews of key issues such as the Decalogue and the sacraments. In its 7,000-word 21st chapter, Perkins sets out his understanding of the Second Commandment. He begins by separating the First (*Exodus* 20:2-3) from the Second (vv. 4-6), describing the former as an invocation to choose only *YHWH*, and the latter, *how* He is (or is not) to be worshipped. The *Second*, he takes to be in two parts: forbidding the making of idols, and prohibiting the inappropriate use of images.[388]

By the first part, Perkins understands 'idol' to refer to not only an image of '*some fained God*', but to extend also to '*the true Iehouah*'. This extension (against the Papists) is justified on two grounds: *Deuteronomy* 4:15-6, and the idolatrous worship of the golden calf (*Exodus* 32:5; *Acts* 7:41). This first part moves from more specific (idol), drawn from cause, to a more general (*likeness of anything*…..), drawn from means. The second part of the Commandment (*Exodus* 20:5) forbids any improper means in the worship of God.

Exodus 20:6 then provides a '*confirmation*' of the Commandment, setting out four reasons. The first is that God is capable of delivering punishment. The second, '*jealous God*', is language taken from '*the estate of wedlocke*'. God is a husband to His people, the Church, and straying from Him to another causes a rupture in this relationship. Thirdly, as this adultery

[387] Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 183-4).
[388] Perkins, *Golden Chaine,* 21 (*STC* 19660, 42-3).

represents hatred toward God, His punishments will extend not only to the perpetrators, but to the third and fourth generations. The fourth reason is the reverse of the above: consolation of abiding mercy upon those that love Him; that '…..*Gods mercie exceedeth his iustice*', recognising that both '…..*godly Isaak had godlesse Esau to his sonne, and godlesse Saul, had godly Ionathan*.'[389]

Perkins interprets the meaning of the Commandment widely, understanding it to forbid:

1. The representation of God by an image. Such an image is a lie, and it teaches lies.[390]
2. The least approbation of idolatry. This includes presence at the Mass, even if done so with a pure heart.
3. All relics and monuments of idols. Once idols are erased, so must also be all memory of them.[391]
4. Association with '*infidels*'. This includes marriage with non-believers,[392] alliances with them in time of war, and buying and selling materials to be used in non-Christian (idolatrous) worship.
5. '*Will worship*'. Any form of worship not based on God's own direction.

[389] Cites *Hebrews* 10:31; *Hosea* 2:16; *Isaiah* 54:5, *Ephesians* 5:25-7; *Jeremiah* 2:2. Perkins appears to view this intergenerational punishment, as had Vermigli (*Common Places*, 2.5.42-52), not as direct and unjust, and in no way questioning God's sovereignty or right, primarily '*to make notice, and apprehend them in the same faults'*, recognising the inclination of children to walk in their fathers' footsteps. Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 21 (*STC* 19660, 43-4).
[390] *Habakkuk* 2:18, *Zechariah* 10:2, *Jeremiah* 10:8. Also cited are the Council of Elvira, Augustine's *Commentary on Psalm 113*, Hezekiah's destruction of the brass serpent, Origen's *Against Celsus*, 7, and the letter of Epiphanius, *To Bishop John of Jerusalem*.
[391] *Exodus* 23:13, *Isaiah* 30:22
[392] Cites *Genesis* 6:2; *Malachi* 2:11; *Ezra* 9:14; *2 Kings* 8:18. In the *Westminster Confession*, this proscription on marriage is further specified to '…..*should not marry with infidels, papists, or other idolaters*'. *WCF*, 24.3, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 223.

6. '*Popish superstitions*'. These include those related to sacrifices, food, holy days, apparel, '*bead-ridden*' prayers, indulgences, pilgrimages, building of altars and pictures, monastic vows, and the use of musical instruments in churches.
7. Failure or neglect of God's service.
8. Corrupting of God's worship. This includes the hierarchy of the '*Romish*' Church, the elevation of the bread at the Lord's Supper, administration of bread alone, and the '…..*fearefull abomination of the Masse*.'
9. Religious reverence directed at creatures including angels and saints, and their invocation.
10. Worshipping of devils. This includes magic, soothsaying, divination, necromancy, '*juggling*',[393] enchantment, and consulting magicians.[394]

Affirmatively, the Commandment directs worship of the Lord '*in spirit and in truth*' (*John* 4:24). Although Perkins adds to this, '*For so soone as any man beginneth to worship God after an ouerthwart and vnlawefull manner, he then adoreth an idoll, howsoeuer he seemeth to colour his impietie*. The appropriate forms of worship, as given by Perkins, are:

1. True and '*ordinarie meanes'.* This is characterised by '…..*humble supplication, hartie thanksgiuing: and the ministerie of the Word*.'[395]
2. A holy use of the means: outwardly by behaving with modesty, honesty and care not to give offence; inwardly by praying, hearing the word read and receiving the

[393] From Latin *joculari* – to jest. The modern meaning of keeping multiple balls or clubs in the air dates from late 19th century. In Late Medieval English it referred to the performance of tricks, or moving objects by sleight of hand; as it were, acts of visual fraud.
[394] Perkins, *Golden Chaine,* 21 (*STC* 19660, 44-51).
[395] Cites *Acts* 2:41-42; *1 Timothy* 2:1-2; Tertullian, *Apology*, 39 (*ANF* 3.46-7).

sacraments. We must attune our hearts to God, demonstrating confidence in his mercy and forgiveness.[396]

3. Helps and furtherances of worship. These Perkins lists as two: vows and fasting. Vows must be made advisedly, humbly, lawfully and honestly. Fasts may be either public or private, but are always directed at seeking blessing from the Lord, in humility, and as are best for us.[397]
4. Leagues of amity. By this, Perkins commends co-operation with other believers, be it in marriage or in military affairs, but always lawfully, and without any confidence in the power of man. To these, he suggests, might be added the covenant between '…..*the magistrate and people make among themselues, and with God, for the preseruation of Christian religion*.'[398]

5.7 Ordering of the Decalogue

As can be seen from the above works, the proscriptions of the Second Commandment occupy central place in the Reformed rejection of images in Christian practice and worship. Notwithstanding, the term 'Ten Commandments' does not appear in scripture. Rather, it is a traditional English rendering of עשרת הדברים, more directly translated as the ten 'words', 'statements', or 'things'. This is rendered in the Septuagint as δέκα λόγους (ten words) or δέκα ῥήματα (ten breathings); the Hebrew word for 'commandment', מצוה (plural מצות), not being used in either *Exodus* 34:28, or *Deuteronomy* 4:13 or 10:4.[399]

[396] Cites *1 Corinthians* 11:23, 14:40; *Ecclesiastes* 5:1; *Hebrews* 4:2; *Psalm* 26:6.
[397] Regarding vows, Perkins cites *Genesis* 28:20-22; *Deuteronomy* 23:21-2; *Psalm* 66:14. Regarding fasting, *Matthew* 9:15; *Joel* 2:12-3; *2 Chronicles* 20:3; *Esther* 4:16.
[398] Cites *2 Chronicles* 19:2; *Malachi* 2:11; *2 Chronicles* 15:12-4. Perkins, *Golden Chaine,* 21 (*STC* 19660, 51-4).
[399] מצוה and its derivatives occur 62 times in the *Pentateuch*, including in *Exodus* 20:6 and *Deuteronomy* 5:10, but nowhere associated with עשרת, the number ten. Likewise in the *New Testamen*t, ἐντολὴ (commandment) occurs 67 times, but never as δέκα ἐντολαί. The *Authorised Version* of King James is partly to blame here, translating דברים as 'commandments' rather than 'words' in *Exodus* 34:28, and *Deuteronomy* 4:13 & 10:4.

Exodus 20:1-7 and its correspondent in *Deuteronomy* have always been accepted by Jews and Christians as the precepts of God's will, written by His own finger, but any numbering or division among them is not immediately clear, nor beyond dispute. Neither are the precepts given in the two biblical sources identical.[400] Within the Eastern Church the numbering of the 'commandments' has followed that of Philo of Alexandria and Jerome, in separating verse 3 from verses 4-6; while the Western Church has followed that of Augustine and Clement, holding *Exodus* 20:2-6 as a single precept.[401]

Beginning with Tyndale's *Pentateuch* of 1530, members of those who were to become the Reformed, rejected the ordering used by the Western Church, in favour of that of the East.[402] The Eastern ordering is used by the English Church in the *Bishops' Book* of 1537, issued under Cranmer's authority, and in the subsequent *King's Book* (1543). Hooper employs it in his *Declaration of the Ten Holy Comaundements* (1548), as does Ridley in his *Treatise*, and even Bonner in his (anti-Protestant) *Profitable and Necessarye Doctryne* (1555).[403]

[400] Jonathan Willis, *The Reformation of the Decalogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 28.
[401] Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BC – c. AD 50), *On the Decalogue*, 64-6; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 3.5.5; *Jerome on Hosea 10:10*, *op. cit.* Thomas Aquinas, Summa, 2.1.100.4, in Thomas Aquinas, *Complete Works*, 2101-10; Augustine of Hippo, *Questions on Exodus*, 71; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 6.16 (*ANF* 511-5). The Augustinian ordering of the Commandments (at least to the extent of the first two), dates back at least to the time of Tertullian in the late 2nd / early 3rd century. Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, 2.22 (*ANF* 3.314).
[402] William Tyndale (c. 1494 – 1536).
[403] Cranmer, however, reverts to the old numbering in his *Catechesmus* (1548), but as previously noted, this likely reflects the origin of the text in the work of Justus Jonas. Following the accession of Elizabeth, the Augustinian numbering is rarely, if ever, seen in English tests. By 1592, Perkins, for example, makes no reference to competing numbering systems. Perkins, *Golden Chaine* (*STC* 19660); MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 192; Willis, *Decalogue*, 29-35.

Word or Commandment	Roman Catholic and Lutheran (verses)	Orthodox and Reformed (verses)	Jewish Rabbinic (verses)
Prologue	20:1	20:1-2	20:1
1	20:2-6	20:3	20:2
2	20:7	20:4-6	20:3-6
3	20:8-11	20:7	20:7
4	20:12	20:8-11	20:8-11
5	20:13	20:12	20:12
6	20:14	20:13	20:13
7	20:15	20:14	20:14
8	20:16	20:15	20:15
9	20:17a[404]	20:16	20:16
10	20:17b	20:17	20:17

Table 1. The Ordering of the Decalogue. Verse references are *for Exodus*.

Traditional rabbinic Jewish scholarship, however, accepts neither the Reformed and Orthodox ordering of the Decalogue, nor that of the Roman and Lutheran churches. The Augustinian ordering it rejects as lacking a grammatical or contextual basis for the breaking apart of *Exodus* 20:17 and *Deuteronomy* 5:21; the sub-units altering in order. In *Exodus* 20:17 this being neighbour's house, wife, manservant, maidservant, *et cetera*; whereas in *Deuteronomy* 5:21 the order is neighbour's wife, house, field, manservant, maidservant, and so forth; yet it keeps *Exodus* 20:3-6 and *Deuteronomy* 5:7-10 as single units. That of Philo is rejected as it divides these units, separating *Exodus* 20:3 and *Deuteronomy* 5:7 ('*You shall have no other gods before me'*), from the verses following. The grammatical continuity is supported by the uniform lack of conjunctions in *Exodus* 20 at the beginnings of verses 20:3 (לא יהיה־לך), 20:4 (לא תעשה־לך), and 20:5 (לא־תשתחוה), and their Deuteronomic equivalents. Likewise, while the

[404] The Roman Catholic and Lutheran numbering reverse the order of the precepts regarding coveting, the Lutherans tending after the ordering of *Exodus*, the Roman Catholics that of *Deuteronomy*.

plural form אלהים אחרים (θεοὶ ἕτεροι in Septuagint) is used in verse 3, the singular פסל (carved image - εἴδωλον) and תמונה (likeness - ὁμοίωμα) is used in verse 4, yet the plural forms תשתחו לא (you shall not bow down to them - αὐτοῖς) and ולא תעבדם (and you shall not serve them - αὐτοῖς) follow in verse 5.

It is argued, the plural pronoun recognises the uniformly idol-based nature of worship in the Ancient Near-East, and is against *both* having other gods *and* the inexorably linked practices of making and worshipping of their idols; and does so as a single unit. This is in keeping with the preface to the Decalogue in *Deuteronomy* 4:15-40, and is recognition of the uniqueness of *YHWH* and His worship, explained or embodied in the rejection of idols. Thus, as one concept, other gods are not to be had, nor their idols made, nor (through their idols) are they to be worshipped. The idol-based pattern of contemporary religious practice is demonstrated in the *Exodus* 32 account regarding the golden calf. The people have a god, *YHWH*. Without the steadying influence of Moses and reverting to Egyptian habit, they build an idol of Him (the calf), and then they begin to worship their god through their idol. Accordingly, to separate *Exodus* 20:3 and *Deuteronomy* 5:7 from the verses following, represents ignorance of historical context, and constitutes anachronism. It follows that the four-verse unit should thus be viewed as a single 'word' (*cf.* 'commandment'), like to *Exodus* 20:17 and *Deuteronomy* 5:21, the individual verses representing sub-units of a conceptual singularity.

By Rabbinic reckoning, therefore, the 'first' of the 'ten words' (*cf*. 'commandments') is the statement of *YHWH*'s place as Israel's God (*Exodus* 20:2: '*I am the LORD your God…..the house of bondage'*). The 'second word' constitutes verses 3-6: '*You shall have no other gods…..them that keep my commandments*', and seen to consist of three 'commands':

(a) not to have any other (false) gods (θεοὶ ἕτεροι);

(b) not to create of it a likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of one, which would necessarily also be false, and therefore an idol (εἴδωλον); and

(c) neither to worship strange gods directly, *nor* as was universal contemporary practice, through their idols.

If restricted to a discussion regarding sacred images, this ordering conforms more closely with Augustine, and the Roman and Lutheran churches, than that of the Orthodox and the Reformed. Indeed, Sarna reports that in differentiating between 'words' and 'commandments', Jewish exegesis, such as that of the 13th century *Sefer ha-Hinnukh*, derives thirteen, rather than ten 'commandments' from the ten 'words' of the Decalogue.[405]

These debates regard the arrangement of the Commandments, and not their content; something recognised by Edmund Bonner, who considered the ordering as a matter of '*indifference*.'[406] For the Reformed, however, the re-ordering of the Commandments was of theological rather than philological import; suiting better their priorities. Separating the proscriptions of images from the verses proceeding served to elevate the sin of idolatry, something which Duffy has described as the '*central sacrament of the* [Edwardian] *reform*', and the driver of English Protestant iconoclasm.[407] Puritan John Rainolds accused the 'Romish' numbering of effectively concealing the Second Commandment. William Fulke

[405] Maimonides of Cordoba (1138–1204), *Sefer Ha-Mitzvot*, positive 1; B. Jacob, "The Decalogue," *Jewish Quarterly Review (New Series)* 14, (1923): 141-187; Gutmann, "Second Commandment," 161-174; Nahum M. Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Exodus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 107-11; Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The JPS Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Service, 1996), 46-58.
While rendered the text in differing language and with varying punctuation, structurally, neither the Vulgate nor the English translations of the 16th and early 17th centuries (*Douay-Rheims* or Protestant, excepting Tyndale), arrange *Exodus* 20 into paragraphs in order to strengthen their respective theological arguments. Rather, and unlike later versions, the texts are without paragraphs, the chapters divided only as sequential, numbered verses.

[406] '*Therfore no man ought with thys our dyuisyon wherein for certayne good consideratyons, we folowe Origene, & Saint Hierome* [Eastern and Reformed numbering] *to be in any wyse, offended*.' Bonner, "First Commandment," in *Profitable and Necessarye Doctryne* (*STC* 3283).

[407] Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 612.

described Catholics like '*rattes*…..[having]…..*cleane gnawen out the seconde commanundement, …..to hide it under the first*'; Thomas Drant, '…..*hath wiped out the second*'; and William Charke as Catholics having '*blotted* [it] *out'*. Archbishop Ussher depicts the old ordering as '*concealing*' the Second Commandment '*under*' the First; using *latria* and *dulia* to make God the author of idolatry, just where He expressly forbids it.[408]

[408] John Rainolds (1584), *Summe of the Conference*, 75 (*STC* 20626), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A10345.0001.001; William Fulke (1579)*, A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*, 39 (*STC* 11433), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A01309.0001.001; Thomas Drant (1570), *Two Sermons Preached*, 101 (*STC* 7171), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A20794.0001.001; William Charke (1586), *An Answeare for the Time, Vnto that Foule, and Wicked Defence of the Censure*, 67 (*STC* 5009), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A18440.0001.001; James Ussher (1624), *An Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland,* 432 (*STC* 24542). Granted the propensity of the Reformed to quote Augustine, the old ordering of the Commandments is rarely associated with his name, and never in polemic. Ussher's language here is interesting, resembling closely that found in the *Epitome*.

SECTION 6: BYZANTIUM AND REFORMED ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM

The English Reformed developed a theology of aniconism, as manifest in their writings, and their two statements of faith: the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Westminster Standards*. They were aware of their historical forebears in Constantinople, and identified with them. Accordingly, it is meet to compare their theologies systematically.

6.1 '*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image…..*'

6.1.1 Images of the Divine

The Westminster Divines were explicit in their rejection of the imaging of God: Father, Spirit or Son, and do so based on the proscriptions of the Second Commandment. This is consistent not only with the *Aniconists*, but with developing Church of England dogma, and wider Reformed thought. The *Aniconists* held that as the '*name Christ signifies God and man*', images of Christ were proscribed, however, the Commandment is not cited explicitly within the *Epitome of Hieria*.[409] Regarding the Commandment, debate relating the Word to the Father and Spirit, is more fully appreciated in the contrary writings of John and Theodore, and in the *Decree* of Nicaea II.[410]

In *An Answer to Valentin Compar*, Zwingli states, '*No one is forbidden from having a portrait of the humanity of Christ*.' Images might be allowed with two restrictions: they should never be venerated, nor displayed anywhere designated for worship. He cautions that everyone '*…..who now has the image of Christ…..should take care that he not make it into an idol; …..no*

[409] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2*, 14.543-4.
[410] John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 5-7; Theodore, *On the Holy Icons*, 3.5, in Roth, *Theodore*, 101; "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2,* 14.549-51.

pictures become idols faster than those of Christ.'[411] In this, Zwingli expresses that it is incorrect intention and use which makes an image into an idol.

Bucer begins his *Treatise* by citing the Decalogue proscription of '*images'* (*cf*. idols), particularly relating this to places of worship, and on account of man's propensity to distraction and idolatry. He does not assert, however, that honour of Christian (*cf.* pagan) images constitutes idolatry. Ridley follows in a similar vein, that no images should be displayed which could become focuses of idolatry, but also rejects that images might be held privately. Neither are clear whether they refer only to images of God (and by 'God' whether this includes the incarnate Word), or also to those of (the non-divine) Virgin and saints.[412] Calvin is direct in his '…..*refutation of those who ascribe a visible form to God*', based in *Exodus* 20:4, and explained by *Deuteronomy* 4:15. Further, he rejects representing God by '*other symbols*'.[413] Vermigli rejects all images of God, reflecting the Second Commandment, and citing *Deuteronomy* 4:15 and *Isaiah* 40:18. He commends the *Epitome*, and cites Damascene's rejection of images of the Father or Spirit, particularly singling out images of the Trinity. Vermigli is, however, less clear regarding the Decalogue as proscribing images of Christ; the biblical account of His life and actions expressing the image of God in all His fulness.[414] Jewel

[411] Huldrich Zwingli (1525), *An Answer to Valentin Compar*, *op. cit.* Charles Garside, *Zwingli and the Arts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 171.
[412] Bucer, *Treatise*, 1 (*STC* 24238).
[413] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.1-3. *Deuteronomy* 4:15: '*Therefore watch yourselves very carefully. Since you saw no form on the day that the LORD spoke to you at Horeb out of the midst of the fire*, …..'. Problematically, Reformed writers are wont to employ 'God' when it is unclear whether they refer only to the Father, or whether the term is inclusive of the Spirit, and particularly, the incarnate Son. Sometimes context clarifies this, but often it does not. Regarding symbols, among the Reformed this could be held to include the Lamb or the Dove. Unfortunately none comment on the old IXΘΥΣ symbolic acronym of the fish. The יהוה tetragrammaton became popular in England from the 1560s to replace images of the Father, as did *IHS* (after IHΣ, the first three Greek letters of Jesus) for Christ, although the latter became an issue of debate among more radical Puritans from the 1590s. Margaret Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 575-92.
[414] *Colossians* 1:15-20; Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.7-10 (*STC* 24669, 336-41). *Isaiah* 40:18: '*To whom then will you liken God, or what likeness compare with him*?' *Cf*. 2.5.4. '*Wherefore, images doo either represent God the Creator of all things, or else, things created, which be the sundrie workemanships of GOD. And among*

rejects any imaging of God, citing the Second Commandment, again explaining this with *Deuteronomy* 4:15 and other texts. He disallows the imaging of Christ made incarnate, but on non-Second Commandment grounds.[415]

The *Thirty-Nine Articles* reject images and relics; the *Irish* following them closely, save also explicitly prohibiting images of Christ. The *Second Helvetic Confession* denounces representations of God and Christ incarnate (separate paragraphs), citing the Decalogue, and dismisses that images of the divine might be regarded as '*things indifferent*'.[416] The *Heidelberg Catechism* takes the Second Commandment to forbid the making of '…..*an image of God in any way*'. Of the early English Protestant catechisms, both Cranmer and Nowell (1571) prohibit the imaging of God, but Cranmer's extension to the incarnate Word is unclear. Hooker prohibits the imaging of '*god inuisible and incōprehensible*', but Christ is not mentioned specifically.[417]

The *Fruitfull Exposition* of Gervase Babington (1583) sees the First Commandment speaking of the uniqueness of YHWH, and the Second as '…..*the waie and maner how he wilbee serued*'.

---

those things, which be created, we place euen Christ himselfe as touching his humanitie. This being set downe, it séemeth méet to be determined, that all creatures may be represented by images: yea the verie angels themselues, I meane not in respect of their spirituall nature, but in such sort as they haue exhibited themselues to be séene of men. Wherefore the godlie men, which either be dead, or yet liuing, kings, stars, plants, stones, earth, sea, and such like may be represented by pictures.'

[415] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 1, in *Certain Sermons*, 185 (*STC* 13646).

[416] *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 22 (*CC,* 3.501); Ussher, *Irish Articles,* 53, 102 (*CC,* 3.536, 544); Heinrich Bullinger (1566), *Second Helvetic Confession*, 4, 27 (*CC*, 3.836-7, 903-5). Bullinger's proof texts (*Deuteronomy* 4:15, *Isaiah* 44:9) speak to the prohibition of images of God under the law, and Christ's denial (*Matthew* 5:17) that he had come '*to abolish the law and the prophets*'.

[417] Zacharias Ursinus (1563), *Heidelburg Catechism*, 96-7 (*CC,* 3.343); Cranmer, *Catechismus*, 19, 22 (STC 5993); Alexander Nowell (1572), *A Catechism, or Institution of Christian Religion*, 25 (*STC* 18734), https://www.anglican.net/works/alexander-nowell-middle-catechism-or-the-institution-of-christian-religion-1572. As noted earlier, in 1548 Cranmer still deals with the Augustinian ordering of the Commandments, but he does so advisedly. John Hooper (1548), *A Declaration of the Ten Holy Comaundementes of Allmygthye God*, 71-4 (*STC* 13746), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A03622.0001.001. It might be implied that this includes the incarnate Christ, as Hooper denies that there were any images used in the Church for the first 500 years. This, however, he states in the context of images of the apostles and prophets not being used in the early Church.

This Babington understands to prohibit worship using any visual form, because He '*neuer was seene*', and man-formulated worship, such as by Nadab and Abihu, the Lord rejects vengefully. Images of Christ are not mentioned explicitly, but Babington holds the proscription is without exception.[418] Perkins is clear that the prohibition extends to the incarnate Christ. The Second Commandment speaks to more than images. Rather it is the guiding principle for all lawful worship.[419]

6.1.2 Images of the Non-Divine

If images of Christ, being God, might be rejected on the basis of the Second Commandment, it must be considered how this projects to the non-divine. The *Aniconists* abjured images of Mary and the saints, although this was not tied to the Decalogue. In religious practice, they explicitly supported veneration and invocation of the saints, but not in conjunction with their images.[420]

Bucer accepts the validity of artwork, and the making of images of men, but not their place in religious worship. This he bases in the First (by his Augustinian reckoning) Commandment, supported by *Matthew* 5:17. Specifically, his concern is the placement of images in churches, were they might subvert the honour due to God, and lead the people into the superstition and idolatry of invocation of the saints. Ridley views image proscription of the non-divine as associated with their use. Similarly, Calvin accepts that images of the non-divine are not inherently wrong; art is a gift from God. His rejection is based in their improper use in religious

[418] Gervase Babington (1583), *A Very Fruitfull Exposition of the Commaundements*, 85, 92, 108, 110 (*STC* 1098), https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A00831.0001.001. That God '*neuer was séene*' could be seen as reflecting *Deuteronomy* 4:15 (which he references on page 108), but could, likewise, as *John* 1:18 or *1 John* 4:12. Unfortunately, he does not specify. Nadab and Abihu, *Leviticus* 10:1-2. Like other Puritan writers, Babington does not expound on the incarnation regarding *John* 6:46.
[419] Perkins, *Golden Chaine,* 21 (*STC* 19660, 42-3); *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7).
[420] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2*, 14.543-6.

worship. He acknowledges the serpent of Moses and the cherubim of the Ark, but these are exceptional, at God's specific command, and do not abrogate any Decalogue proscription; like the Seraphim, belonging '…..*to the old tutelage of the law*.'[421]

Vermigli accepts that angels, being creatures and circumscribed, can be portrayed lawfully, likewise with '*the crosse of the Lord*', although done with care to avoid idolatry. This extends, to the Virgin and holy men '…..*which either be dead, or yet liuing.*' Implicitly, Vermigli recognises a *dulia/latria* divide, although aware of the inherent danger. Jewel is sceptical of all images, and of relics such as those of the True Cross. However, he notes Christ's acceptance of the image of Caesar, it demonstrating (non-divine) images '*indifferent*' unless abused. Perkins identifies any use of images of the non-divine in worship as idolatry.[422]

Of the prominent Protestant creeds, confessions and catechisms, most speak of religious images with disapprobation, but vary regarding their overt reference to the Second Commandment. Neither the *Augsburg* nor *Belgic Confessions* address images directly. The *Thirty-Nine* and *Irish Articles* reject them, together with relics, but do not reference the Commandment. All four, however, reject invocation of the saints. The *Scots Confession* (1560) does not mention images, but rejects all '*idolatry and superstition*'. The *Second Helvetic*

[421] *Matthew* 5:17, '*Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them*.' Bucer, *Treatise*, 1 (*STC* 24238); Ridley, *Treatise*, 1; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.3, 12. Calvin's language of '*old tutelage*' is clearly based in *Galatians* 3, but is offered by assertion rather than an argument. Thus, his reasoning is unclear.

[422] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.4, 11-2 (*STC* 24669, 341-2); Jewel, *Idolatry* 2-3, in *Certain Sermons*, 191-206, 225-33 (*STC* 13646). William Perkins (1601), *A Warning Against the Idolatrie of the Last Times and an Instruction Touching Religious, or Diuine Worship*, 679 (*STC* 19764), http://www.digitalpuritan.net/Digital%20Puritan%20Resources/Perkins%2C%20William/The%20Works%20of%20William%20Perkins%20%28vol.1%29%20Ind%20Works/%5BWP%5D%20On%20Idolatry%20and%20the%20True%20Worship%20of%20God.pdf.

Confession forbids images of saints, but its proof texts are functional, citing the apostles' rejection of god-like worship of men and angels.[423]

The *Heidelberg Catechism* directs that non-divine things must never be imaged '…..*in order to worship them or to serve God through them*'. In this, Ursinus is unclear whether his proscription is in intent, or secondary to their inevitable misuse. Neither Cranmer nor Hooper address images of the non-divine in their catechisms, and Nowell finds them lawful in themselves. In his commentary on the Second Commandment, Babington does not exclude all images, as the serpent and cherubim were constructed at God's personal command; nor in non-religious applications. His rejection is in their use in religious worship, as is that of Perkins.[424] Puritans John Dod and Robert Cleaver, equate all images, divine or non-divine, with idols; and caution against even entering into their presence. All gestures of reverence being '*idolatrie*', they reject any *dulia*/*latria* divide.[425] Likewise, Edward Elton (1623) defines (outward) idolatry as, *'when men make an image or similitude, and erect and set it vp for religious vse*.' This he extends also to 'inward' idolatry, which will be discussed below.[426] Opinion within the early 17th century English Church, though, was not uniform. Lancelot Andrewes, the (non-Puritan) Bishop of Ely (1612) rejected Roman Catholic accusations of

[423] Luther *et al*., *Augsburg Confession*, 21 (*CC,* 3.26); Guido de Bres (1522 – 1567), *Belgic Confession*, 26 (*CC,* 3.413-6); *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 22 (*CC,* 3.501); Ussher, *Irish Articles*, 52-3, 102 (*CC,* 3.535-6, 544); John Knox (c. 1514 – 1572) *et al.*, *Scots Confession* (1560), 24-5, (*CC,* 3.474-8). To what Knox is referring to here is not specified: images, the sacrament of the mass, or something else, but the encouragement of Knox to iconoclasm of '*odiouse monuments of idolatrie*' was well demonstrated at Perth in 1559. Margaret Aston, *Broken Idols,* 19-20, 68-9; Bullinger, *Second Helvetic Confession*, 4 (*CC*, 3.836-7). Bullinger's proof texts are *Acts* 3:12 f., 14:11 ff., and *Revelation* 14:7, 22:9.

[424] Babington, *Fruitfull*, 91 (*STC* 1098); Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 183-4); Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 21 (*STC* 19660, 44-51).

[425] Jon Dod and Robert Cleaver (1634), *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments*, 55-69 (*STC* 6939), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A20559.0001.001.

[426] Edward Elton (1623), *An Exposition of the Ten Commandements of God*, 5, 12 (*STC* 7620), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A69277.0001.001.

unconsidered iconoclasm, that to '…..*have a story painted, for memory's sake, we hold it not unlawful*'.[427]

6.1.3 Mental Images

One extension of the *Divines*' polemic against idolatry is the *Larger Catechism*'s prohibition of '…..*the making of any representation of God, of all or of any of the three persons …..inwardly in our mind*'.[428] Neither the *Epitome*, its antagonists John or Theodore, Nicaea II, nor the *Decrees* of Trent make mention of 'mental imagery', supportive or critical. 'Inward' representation is likewise absent from the *Thirty-Nine* and *Irish Articles*, the *Augsburg, Helvetic, Scots and Belgic Confessions*, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and those of Cranmer, Hooper and Nowell. Neither Ridley's *Treatise* nor Jewel's *Homily* make reference to this form of idolatry.

Conceptually, debate over mental imagery was not new. Augustine cautions against overliteral understanding of Christ sitting at the Father's right hand, risking, '…..*we should fall into that profanity*…..[changing]…..*the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of corruptible man*'; concluding '…..*unlawful*…..*for a Christian to set up any such image for God in a temple; much more nefarious is it…..to set it up in the heart, in which truly is the temple of God*.' Augustine refers, however, to imaging Christ in heavenly session with the uncircumscribed Father, rather than the incarnate Son in the context of His earthly ministry.[429]

---

[427] Ursinus, *Heidelberg Catechism*, 96-7 (*CC,* 3.343); Nowell, *Catechism*, 23 (*STC* 18734); Lancelot Andrewes (1555 – 1626), *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron* (Oxford: Parker, 1854), 32.
[428] *WLC*, 109, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 372.
[429] *Romans* 1:23; Augustine of Hippo (c. 393), *On Faith and the Creed*, 7.14 (*N&PNF1*, 3.326-7).

Luther defined a 'god' as anything '…..*from which we are to expect all good…..to take refuge in all distress*'. Accordingly, that to '*set your heart and put your trust*' in anything other than God is to make an idol of it, and to break the commandment to '*have no other gods before me'*. The essence of an idol is not primarily its structure or form, but its apprehension. Idolatry is a crime in the heart, and an idol exists not from the time of its construction, but from the moment of its conception: mental necessarily preceding physical idolatry. Conversely, an image not intended or used in contravention of scriptural direction cannot be considered an idol, nor its appropriate use, idolatry. Thus, while Luther does speak of mental idolatry, his intents differ from the *Divines*, and are better considered regarding the appropriate use of images.[430] Zwingli's general rejection of images is based largely in his rejection of mental imagery; like Luther, mentation, rather than physicality, is the essence of idolatry.[431]

Bucer engages the issue, but differently to the *Divines*. Non-condemnatory, and rather than physical images, the Christian should have '…..*Iesus nayled faste vpon the crosse set vp before the eyes of oure mynde*…..*bothe the deth & the resurrectyon of Christ*'. Then, '*so oftentymes as he shall see either a shepe or a shepherde a gate a way a vynetree or a stone forthwith he conceyueth an image and symilytude of his lorde christ which wyllyngly suffred him selfe to be slayne & offred vp for the reconcylyation of the worlde which bosteth him selfe to be a good shepherde whiche is the waye and the yate by whiche men go & entre in to heuen which wytnesseth hīselfe to be the trewe vynetre the cornerstone & set for a foundatyon*'. Rather than condemnatory, for Bucer, the mental image supersedes the physical.[432]

[430] Martin Luther (1529), "Large Catechism," in *Martin Luther, The Collected Works of Martin Luther*, trans. C.M. Jacobs *et al.* (Kindle, 2018), 730.
[431] Garside, *Zwingli*, 161-70.
[432] Bucer, *Treatise,* 1 (*STC* 24238).

Cranmer offers caution to '…..*take hede of suche ymaginations that you frame not to your selfes with in the temple of youre hartes anye straunge god or ydoll*.'[433] Ridley does not discuss mental imagery. While recognising idolatry '*standeth chiefly in the mind*', Jewel does not engage with images divorced from material forms.[434]

Calvin explores the relationship between Christian worship, religious images, idolatry, and the mind. The mind is '…..*a perpetual forge of idols…..stuffed as it is with presumptuous rashness…..dar*[ing] *to imagine a god suited to its own capacity*.' In line with Luther, he describes the relationship between mental and physical idols. Whereas the mind '…..*conceives the idol…..the hand gives it birth*'; a view with which Hooper concurs.[435] Elsewhere, and expounding upon *Acts* 17:29, Calvin observes that '*God doth far surpass the capacity of our mind, whosoever attempteth with his mind to comprehend him, he deformeth and disfigureth his glory with a wicked and false imagination. Wherefore, it is wickedness to imagine anything of him according to our own sense*.'[436] Here, and unlike the *WLC,* Calvin offers as rationale for his anathema, not the Second Commandment, but the inadequacy of any image the human mind can create.

Resembling Bucer, Vermigli engages the issue only obliquely; observing that good men wish to keep God present with them always in their minds, and that this might be one of the drivers behind the production of religious images. Like Luther, to Vermigli it is the mental intent which makes an image into an idol. He denies the need for physical images of the incarnate

[433] Cranmer, *Catechismus*, xvi (*STC* 5993).
[434] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 232 (*STC* 13646).
[435] Following from *James* 1:15. Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.8. Calvin mirrors Luther's statement from *A Brief Explanation of the Ten Commandments* (1518), that *'…..all sons of Adam are idolaters'*. Luther, *Collected Works*, 572; Hooper, *Ten Holy Comaundements,* 71-4 (*STC* 13746).
[436] John Calvin (1554), *Commentary Upon the Acts of the Apostles*, in Calvin, *Calvin's Complete Bible Commentaries*, multiple translators (Kindle, 2014), loc 339271.

Christ as '…..*the holy scripture, which most perfectly paints out God to us, so much as is requisite to the painting out of him*.'[437] Sadly, neither Vermigli nor Calvin reflect on how the mental image might be related to, or even separated from, the narratives of the Gospels: their vivid portrayal of Christ, incarnate and interacting with material people and things.

In *A Golden Chaine*, Perkins observes that the '…..*creature cannot comprehend the Image of the Creator'*. Continuing, though, he expands '…..*and if it could, yet God would not be worshipped in it, because it is a dead thing, yea, the workes of man's hands, not of God's*', suggesting that the mental image, here, is not the focus of his argument.[438] Perkins does not make reference to mental images in the *ninth point* of *A Reformed Catholike*, that part of the work which deals with the issue of imagery within the church.

In his *Warning Against Idolatrie*, however, Perkins engages directly with mental images. He entreats Christians to reject them, tying the 'internal' and 'external' images together: '…..*when we thinke on God, wee conceiue an internall image or forme of him in our minds…..*[and if the]…..*forme of God be lawfully conceiued, why not the externall be made? I answer, the right way to conceiue God, is not to conceiue any forme: but to conceiue in minde his properties and proper effects.*' Ultimately, while regarding mental imagery as unsafe, Perkins does not describe it as idolatrous, nor the equivalent of physical images; continuing, '*And the formes of things internall conceiued in mind are never worshipped of vs, as painted and carued images be. Lastly, God who allowes internall images rightly conceiued, forbids the*

[437] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.1, 8 (*STC* 24669, 333-4, 338-9).
[438] Perkins, *Golden Chai*ne, 21 (*STC* 19660, 45).

externall in vse of religion.'[439] John Donne, poet and cleric, looks to the mental image as one of the consolations and blessings of the faith.[440]

Elton poses and answers a question: '*How is this one God to be conceiued of vs? Not by framing any image of him in our mindes: neither can we conceiue him in his glorious nature, but we are to conceiue God, as he hath reuealed himselfe in his word, by his properties and works.*'[441] He follows Perkins, grasping God in His actions rather than in His appearance, yet extends this to prohibit mental images, '*Inward Idolatrie of the heart, which is when men misconceiuing God, do worship him according to that misconceit…..Outward Idolatry of the hand, which is when men make an image or similitude, and erect and set it vp for religious vse.*'[442] In this proscription of both inward and outward idolatry, Elton's language approaches that which will appear in the *WLC*. Perhaps, as Aston observes, and partly in response to the successful removal of physical images from churches during the Elizabethan and early Jacobite reigns, '…..*the purifiers [Puritans] became focused on the errors of mental images*'.[443]

6.1.4 The Mass as Image Worship

The attitude to the accidents of the Supper necessarily impact any appreciation of Christian responses to religious imagery. The *Epitome* recognises that in the sacrament of the mass, the bread is made divine by the descent of the Spirit. Therefore, it is worthy of true worship (λατρεία); it being made, through the priest, not only a figure of the divine, but the true substance of Christ, in visible form.[444] In this, the *Aniconists* were in conformity with both

[439] Perkins, *Warning Against Idolatrie*, 685-6 (*STC* 19764).
[440] Donne, while accepting, is much more cautious where physical images are concerned, with their associated risk of idolatry. Anderson, "Internal Images," 23-42.
[441] Edward Elton (1616), *A Forme of Catechizing Set Downe by Questions and Answers*, 4 (*STC* 7616), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A21263.0001.001.
[442] Elton, *Exposition of the Ten Commandements*, 5,12 (*STC* 7620).
[443] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 458-9.
[444] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2*, 14.544.

their contemporary iconophile opponents, and Tridentine doctrine.[445] Luther, likewise, recognised the reality of the presence of Christ '*in and under*' the elements at the Eucharist, yet he did not allow their worship.[446] The change of the elements into the corporeal (*cf.* spiritual yet real) body and blood of Christ, both in concept and in practice, was rejected by the English Church, this being distinctive between Reformed and Lutheran theology.[447] This rejection is enunciated uniformly in Reformed confessions.[448]

Bucer rejects the mass as an '*impyetie*' and an '*abhomination*', and specifically the saving of '*the resydewe*', but notwithstanding the topic of his work, does not tie it directly to idolatry.[449] Ridley rejects transubstantiation, as Christ's natural body remains in heaven and not in the host. Accordingly, any worshipping of the consecrated elements is idolatrous, this carrying into the *Thirty-Nine* and *Irish Articles*.[450] Vermigli repudiated the '*Papist*' mass as an

---

[445] John of Damascus, *Exposition,* 4.13 (*N&PNF2* 9.86); Borromeo, *Catechism of Trent,* 1347; Ott, *Catholic Dogma,* 379-81.

[446] Luther, "Large Catechism," in *Collected Works,* 841; Jakob Andrea (1528 – 1590), Martin Chemnitz (1522 – 1586) *et al*., *Formula of Concord* (1576), 7.19 (*CC,* 3.143).

[447] '*Transubstantiation…..is repugnaunt to the playne words of scripture….. The body of Christe is geuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall maner: And the meane whereby the body of Christe is receaued and eaten in the Supper, is fayth*.' *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 28 (*CC,* 3.505-6); '…..*they still remain truly and only bread and wine….. Worthy receivers…..inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally or corporeally, but spiritually, receive and feed on…..the body and blood…..really, but spiritually, present*'. *WCF*, 29.4-7, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 231; The nature of the 'presence' was the irresolvable disagreement between Luther and Zwingli at the Colloquy of Marburg (1529), and their attempt to form a single Protestant theology. Carl Trueman and Eunjin Kim, "The Reformers and Their Reformations," in *Reformation Theology*, ed. Matthew Barrett (Wheaton: Crossway, 2017), 115, 120; Keith Mathison, "The Lord's Supper," in, Barrett, *Reformation Theology*, 643-4; Rudolph Heinze, *Reform and Conflict* (Oxford: Monarch, 2006), 128-30, 334-5.

[448] Knox, *Scots Confession*, 21 (*CC*, 3.467-70); Bullinger, *Second Helvetic Confession*, 21 (*CC*, 3.891-6); de Bres, *Belgic Confession*, 35 (*CC*, 3.428-31); Ursinus, *Heidelburg Catechism*, 78-80 (*CC*, 3.334-6); Ussher, *Irish Articles*, 93-5 (*CC*, 3.542-3).

[449] Bucer, *Treatise*, "Preface", 3 (*STC* 24238).

[450] Nicholas Ridley (1555), *A Brief Declaracion of the Lordes Supper*, 19 (*STC* 21046), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A68658.0001.001; *Thirty-Nine Articles, 28* (*CC,* 3.505-6); *Irish Articles*, 93-8 (*CC*, 3.542-4). Specifically, the *Irish Articles* describe the accidents as *symbolic* in their representation of Christ's body and blood, and both that they are not to be '*reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped*'. This rejection is well demonstrated in Elizabeth, only a month after her accession, walking out of Christmas service (1558) when Bishop Oglethorpe of Carlisle elevated the host, against her direction. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 297. The '*Black Rubric*' appended to Cranmer's prayer book of 1552 had specifically addressed worshipping of the host. While kneeling was to be the ordinary fashion in which the Sacrament was to be received for '…..*our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers*.' It asserted that no *'…..adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and*

'*abhomination*'. Calvin rejected any adoration of the accidents, the *Heidelberg Catechism* describes the Catholic mass as '*accursed idolatry',* and the *Belgic Confession* abjures any man-made *'desecrations'* compounded into the sacrament.[451] Likewise, Perkins rejects the Roman understanding of the physical (*cf*. symbolic) presence of Christ in the mass and, by implication, any adoration of the bread and wine.[452] Notwithstanding, in their attitude to the sacramental elements, the Reformed incidentally reflect on the appropriate and inappropriate use of images or symbols of the divine. At Christ's command they are present within the worship service, and illustrative of His presence, yet they are not to be accorded outward veneration or adoration.[453]

6.2 Christology

6.2.1 The Accuracy and Validity of Images

The greater part of the *Epitome* is taken up with discussion of the inadequacy of images, both of Christ and the saints, and how this precludes their use.[454] These arguments regarding adequacy, accuracy, validity and completeness have been presented; as have their rebuttals by John and Theodore; and as summarised by Nicaea II, and repeated in the *Decrees* and *Catechism* of Trent.[455] In brief, the *Aniconists* deny the validity of images because they fail to

blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians', and likely reflects the input of Knox, Hooper, Ridley and Vermigli. "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," in *Booke of Common Prayer*, 14-5 (*STC* 16281), https://archive.org/details/secondprayerbook00chur; MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 538; Duffy, *Stripping Altars*, 715.

[451] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 4.12.6 (*STC* 24669, 217-8); Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.17.36-7; de Bres, *Belgic Confession,* 35 (*CC,* 3.428-31); Ursinus*, Heidelberg Catechism*, 80 (*CC,* 3.335-6).

[452] Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 10-11 (*STC* 19736, 185-204, 214); Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 34 (*STC* 19660, 113).

[453] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.8 (*STC* 24669, 338-9); Ursinus, *Heidelberg Catechism,* 75 (*CC,* 3.332); *WCF*, 29.5, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 231.

[454] *Epitome*, anathemas 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16 (*N&PNF2*, 14.545-6).

[455] Sections 3 & 4 of this dissertation (above).

capture the completeness of their subjects, the divinity or the theosis of the prototype, and in the case of Christ, intermingle His natures.

Adequacy is also addressed by some of the Reformed writers; constant through their works being quotation of *Isaiah* 40:18. This verse, however, is better seen in the context of their rejection of imaging God, than on the Byzantines' critique of the inherent invalidity of images themselves. Bucer holds man-created images to be inadequate, rather than inaccurate in their substance; reflecting God, the better image being His own handiwork in nature.[456] Ridley is silent. Calvin, rejecting all imaging of the divine, disputes that even angels or saints can be legitimately rendered, citing the faces of the cherubim being covered by their wings, or veiled.[457] In this he agrees with the *Aniconists*.

Jewel is consistent with the anti-Nestorian contention of the *Aniconists*, rejecting the validity of images both of Christ and His saints. The divinity, that '*most excellent part*' of Christ cannot be imaged, neither '*the more excellent parts*' of the saints, only that '…..*which as yet lie putrified in the graves*.'[458] This case Vermigli rejects, arguing by extension, it would prohibit the portrayal of any man as '…..*the soule, which is a spirit, cannot be expressed*', a view developed by later Puritans such as Thomas Tuke. Like Damascene, Vermigli recognises that image and prototype are necessarily different, and this difference does not invalidate the

[456] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 226-8 (*STC* 13646).
[457] *Exodus* 25:18-22; *Isaiah* 6:2-3; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.3. This argument is not entirely convincing, though. Scripture gives no indication that the makers of the ark did not carve the faces of the Seraphim. In *Revelation* 4:8 the (unnamed) six-winged heavenly creatures reciting, '*Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty*' clearly do not have veiled faces, they being 'covered with eyes all around'. Likewise at the annunciation of Mary, neither *Matthew* 1:18-25 nor *Luke* 1:26-38 record that the face of Gabriel was in any way veiled.
[458] Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 224-6 (*STC* 13646).

image, or make Christ '…..*destitute of his godhead.*' However, the point of accuracy is moot, because even pagans understand that the idol is not the god.[459]

Ironically, this view of insufficiency is reflected in attitudes to different types of images. While rejecting their broader agenda, Calvin diverges from the *Aniconists*, acknowledging the (iconic) '*Greek*' favouritism for two-dimensional icons over statuary, seemingly recognising its decreased likelihood for promoting idolatry. In his *Homily*, Jewel also notes a difference in idolatry-provoking behaviour, men being '…..*not so ready to worship a picture on a wall, or in a window, as an imbossed and gilt Image, set with pearle and stone*.'[460] Perkins and later Puritans do not discuss the physical limitations of images, as those of both the divine, and of the *Theotokus* and saints, are forbidden in religious practice by the Second Commandment.

6.2.2 Proclamation of the Incarnation

Debate regarding images in the 'proclamation of the incarnation' continues from the above. Ware observes that the incarnation was at the very heart of the Byzantine iconomachy.[461] The *Aniconists* directly contrasted idolatry with the incarnation of Christ, who '…..*turned us away from the error of worshipping idols, and taught us the worshiping of God in Spirit and in*

[459] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.10 (*STC* 24669, 340); John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 10. Puritan minister and associate of William Perkins, Thomas Tuke (c. 1580 – 1657), uses the Second Commandment in his rejection of 'face painting' in women, arguing that in the wearing of lipstick or make up, they supplant God as the creator, and deface or distort the image of God (which all bear in their humanity). Thomas Tuke (1616), *A discourse against painting and tincturing of women Wherein the abominable sinnes of murther and poysoning, pride and ambition, adultery and witchcraft are set foorth & discouered. Whereunto is added The picture of a picture, or, the character of a painted woman*, 7 (*STC* 4312), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A14007.0001.001; Perkins, while accepting the validity of civil and royal imagery for commemoration, warns secular portraiture risks distortion of the self or loved one into an idol. Perkins, *Warning Against Idolatrie*, 675 (*STC* 19764). Romana Sammern, "Idol and Face: Thomas Tuke's Puritan Discourse on Face Painting and Idolatry," *Kritische Berichte* 45, (2017): 27-32. Tuke's observation echoes the accusation of Hamlet to Ophelia, '*God hath given you one face, and you make yourselves another.*' William Shakespeare (1601), *Hamlet*, 3.1.

[460] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.4; Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 269-72 (*STC* 13646).

[461] Kallistos Ware, *Orthodox Church*, 30-3; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.120-1. Others have rejected this, claiming (as discussed earlier) that the beginning of the iconomachy was political, and that Damascene was responsible for establishing Christology as its theological focus. Whatever the precipitant, that Christology became the defining feature of the iconomachy, however, cannot be disputed. Pallis, "Iconology of St. John of Damascus," 173-91.

truth.' The makers of images, they argued, '…..*brought back idolatry under the appearance of Christianity*'. In this, images not only distract men from '…..*the lofty adoration (λατρείας) of God*', but have '…..*blasphemed the fundamental doctrine of salvation…..the incarnation of Christ*.'[462] By contrast, the *Iconophiles* regarded images of the Saviour, rightly used, as the very proclamation of the incarnation. If the incarnate Son, circumscribed in human flesh according to His own infinite freedom, wisdom and love, cannot be imaged (as can any other finite thing), then His very incarnation cannot be held to be true, and the actuality of incarnation, which is at the centre of the faith, cannot be held. To deny the lawfulness of images is apostasy against the incarnate Word. In this might be seen the Orthodox view of icons as analogous to sacraments: visual manifestations and means of grace.[463] This relationship of image to incarnation is not explored by Reformed writers; seemingly rejected in silence.

6.3 Books for the Unlettered and the Appropriate Use of Images

The *Epitome* does not reference the use of images as 'books for the unlettered', but it follows that if images cannot but teach blasphemy or heresy, they have no educational value, nor 'appropriate' use.[464] That Damascene engages the issue, however, demonstrates it was of contemporary interest. He cites Gregory on the value of images in didactics. Theodore parallels images used pedagogically with scripture, differing only in form and extent.[465]

---

[462] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2,* 14.543.
[463] Theodore, *On the Holy Icons*, 1.7, in Roth, *Theodore*, 26-7; Klein, "St. Theodore"; Menelaus, "Byzantine Iconoclasm," 49-65; Tkacz, "Iconoclasm, East and West," 542-550.
[464] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2,* 14.543-4.
[465] John of Damascus, *Apologia*, 17; Gregory I, *To Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23); Theodore, *Icons* (*PG* 99.340), *op. cit.* Alfeyev, *Seventh Council, 5*; Basil of Caesarea, *Homily 19 - On the Forty Martyrs* (*PG* 31.509A); Nilus of Ancyra, *Letter to Prefect Olympiodorus* (*PG* 79.577-80); Alfeyev, *Seventh Council,* 6. This view is taken up again at Trent. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* Session 25 (*STC* 34416, *147*).

As, like the *Aniconists*, the *Divines* held imagery in worship to be blasphemous or idolatrous, its 'appropriate' use was not something in need of address. Regarding images of creatures, away from the context of worship, the *Westminster Standards* do not comment. Of earlier reformers, Wycliff recognised the efficacy of images in pedagogy regarding the gospels and the saints, observing that '…..*often man is more steryd be sight than be heryng or redyngge.'*[466] Zwingli recognised '*process of a story*' imagery acceptable, as long as it remained outwith the church, though he repudiated its pedagogical value. '*If teaching with images assists towards a knowledge of faith, then there is no doubt that Christ would have taught us to make images*'; a view echoed by Ursinus, and with which Hooper agrees.[467]

Bucer rejected that images are useful in any way for the Christian. Rather they '…..do *hyndre fayth & trew godly lyuynge*', serving as a distraction from God's true worship. He rejects images as '*bokes of laye men*', God at no time setting up '*such maner bokes & monumetes*' for educational purposes, as surely He would have done if it were beneficial; '…..*scripture alone a christen man hathe regarde vnto as vnto the shote ankre in all thynges*.' Bucer is less clear regarding the private possession of images of the saints, but as Paul teaches, liberty must never be given an occasion to hurt '…..*them which ar weke.*' Ridley concurs.[468]

---

[466] Priscilla H. Barnum, *Dives and Pauper* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 82; Vaughan, *Tracts Wycliffe*, 1-3; Pyper, "Abridgement," 306-9.

[467]Zwingli, *Eine kurze christiche Einleitung*, *op. cit*. Aston, *Images*, 406; Zwingli, *Answer to Valentin Compar*, 122.9-11, *op. cit.* Garside, *Zwingli*, 172-3. '*Christ dyd playnly wytnesse that his bodily presence was nothynge profytable*', after *John* 6:62-3. Hooper goes on to assert that, '*A man may lern more of a liue ape then of a ded ymage if boothe shuld be browghte in to the scole to teache*.' Hooper, *Ten Holy Comaundements*, 70-8 (*STC* 13746); The *Heidelberg Catechism* follows in the reasoning of Zwingli in noting that God has never instructed teaching through images. Accordingly, '…..*we should not try to be wiser than God.*' Ursinus, *Heidelberg Catechism*, 98 (*CC,* 3.343).

[468] Bucer, *Treatise*, Preface, 1, 2 (*STC* 24238). Ridley quotes from *Wisdom* 14. Like Bucer, whether Ridley considers the prohibition to extend beyond the church building is less clear. He quotes Augustine and Paul, '…..*St. Augustine doth well open how weak a reason it is to say, images are a thing indifferent in chambers and in churches. For the alteration of the place, manner, and other circumstances, doth alter oftentimes the nature of the thing. It is lawful to buy and sell in the market, but not so in churches. It is lawful to eat and drink, but not so in churches. And therefore saith St. Paul, "Have you not houses to eat and drink in? Do you contemn the church of God?"*' Ridley, *Treatise*, 1, in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments,* 2128-9 (*STC* 11225).

Vermigli and Jewel observe that while images of the non-divine, used outside the church for education and not worship, is non-idolatrous, yet they are still to be rejected for this purpose. For Vermigli, their use is not instituted by God, and unprofitable. Jewel recognises that a graphical scriptural scene of action may retain a teaching purpose not found in a '…..*dumb idol or image standing by itself*', but always constitutes a '*place of perill for idolatry*'. Didactic images are '*the trap & snare of the feete of the ignorant*'. For the learned, neither '*necessary nor profitable*', and for the superstitious, '*a confirmation in error*'.[469] Jewel's contemporary, James Calfhill, observed that many had been deceived, seeking Christ, '…..*not in holy bokes, but in paīted walles*'. Puritan Anthony Gilby described images, rather than instructive, as capable of acting only as '…..*monuments of superstition*.'[470]

Calvin held the use of images in religion, having '*no authority…..detestable*.' Images are '*teachers of lies*', and for teaching of the unlearned, '*futile and false*'.[471] He did accept, however, that historical '…..*representations of events*,…..[exhibiting]…..*bodily shapes and figures*…..[may be of]…..*some use for instruction or admonition*'. They are not, however, expedient in churches, and their presence reflective of Romish neglect of preaching.[472] Perkins rejects all images, including those depicting '…..*the history of the Bible painted*' within the church, but holds them permissible privately. How this might impact on instruction of the young and the illiterate, Perkins does not discuss.[473]

---

[469] Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.11, 17-8, 28 (*STC* 24669, 341-2, 46-7, 55); Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 224-8 (*STC* 13646).
[470] James Calfhill (1565), *An Aunsvvere to the Treatise of the Crosse,* 84 (*STC* 4368), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A17591.0001.001; Anthony Gilby (c. 1581), *A Dialogue Between a Souldier of Barvvick, and an English Chaplain* 5-6 (*STC* 11884), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A68098.0001.001.
[471] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.4-5. Cites *Isaiah* 2:8, 31:7; *Hosea* 14:3; *Micah* 5:13; *Jeremiah* 10:8; *Habakkuk* 2:18.
[472] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.12-3.
[473] Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7); Perkins, *Warning Against Idolatrie,* 675 (*STC* 19764). That Perkins does not explore the didactic use of images more fully is disappointing, as while disapproves of the practice in sermon preparation, he recognises the usefulness of images as *aides memoire*. Perkins, *Art of Prophesying*, 9 (*STC* 19735), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A09449.0001.001.

Dod and Cleaver warn that use of statues for teaching stood to leave the student as ignorant as the blocks from which these '*idols*' were made. *Divine* John Carter, far from seeing efficacy in teaching, viewed images (and other activities) as corrupting, rather even than the product of corruption. Another *Divine*, Edmund Gurnay, rejects images for instruction on three grounds. Firstly, they can, at best, attest to matters of fact, and not to matters of spirit or intent. Secondly, they can attest to nothing certainly, reflecting only the artist's intent. Thirdly, they can speak only to the eye, and not the ear. In this, and by comparison with scripture, they are ineffective. For Gurnay, and many of the Reformed, eye or ear is a dichotomy; there is no consideration of one as an augment to the other.[474] Conversely, Donne viewed images as '*important spiritual and intellectual aids*'; what Philips describes as bridging '…..*the gap between sense and spirit*.'[475]

6.4 Return to Antiquity

Inherent in any closed-canon, monotheistic faith is a rejection of innovation. This is illustrated in the maxim of Vincent of Lerins, '…..*we hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all*.'[476] The authors of the *Epitome* make claim to antiquity. The apostles and disciples were entrusted with Christ's '*glorious doctrines*', and they had been maintained inviolate by the '*holy Fathers and the six Ecumenical Councils*' of the Church. These, before recent times '*could not endure the sight of* [the] *adornment*' which was subsequently brought into the Church. The creation of painted images of '*living creatures*' [saints], but particularly

[474] Dod and Cleaver, *Exposition of the Ten Commandments*, 75 (*STC* 6939); John Carter (d. 1655), *op. cit.* Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 15; Edmund Gurnay (1639), *Toward the Vindication of the Second Commandment*, 58-9 (*STC* R40533), http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A42355.0001.001.
[475] Anderson, "Internal Images," 23-42; Phillips, *Reformation of Images*, 3. The true nature of Donne's ecclesiology, high churchman or conforming moderate Puritan, and conflicting views regarding it and any change over time, is discussed at some length by Anderson, who comes down in favour of the latter (conforming Puritan). Donne is a good example of the imprecision of a term such as 'Puritan'.
[476] Vincent of Lerins (d. c. 445), *Commonitorium*, 2.6 (*N&PNF2* 11.132).

the incarnate Christ, contradicted the Councils, and were, therefore, an unlawful innovation.[477] Both Nicaea II and Trent make the same claims on antiquity and tradition, but in support of the opposite cause.[478]

Through its claim of '*sola scriptura*', all Protestant doctrine is, either directly or indirectly, underpinned by a claim to the primacy of antiquity.[479] Apart from scripture also, Reformed writers sought support for their rejection of images historically. Bucer's *Treatise* argues against images on three grounds: scripture, the Fathers, and the decrees of the emperors. The latter two of these are express claims to antiquity. Likewise, Ridley supports his aniconism with '*Probations out of the Fathers, Councils and Histories*', and asserts '…..*it is manifest that in the primitive Church images were not commonly used*…..[but]…..*generally detested and abhorred.*' Both Bucer and Ridley cite not only the '*primitive Church*', but also the '*Greek*' (Byzantine) aniconists in their rejection of images. Like Bucer and Ridley, Jewel acknowledges the early Fathers' rejection of imagery for many centuries. He engages at length, and favourably, with the Byzantines, but demonstrates little understanding of Eastern theology after Nicaea II, appearing to believe that, thereafter, the Orthodox re-embraced aniconism.[480]

---

[477] *Epitome*, *N&PNF2,* 14.543-5. The *Aniconists*' claim to antiquity and continuity with the Fathers is explicit in anathemas 1 and 19, but pervades the list.
[478] *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 1 (*N&PNF2* 14.534); Schaff, *CC*, 2.80.
[479] Ironically, in the 4th century Basil of Caesarea considered and rejected '*sola scriptura*'. Accordingly, while scripture itself is the indisputable and ultimate claim to antiquity (as well as divine authority), the claim of '*sola scriptura*' itself, is of questionable antiquity. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, 66-7 (*NPNF2* 8.40-3).
[480] Bucer, *Treatise*, Preface, 1-3 (*STC* 24238); Ridley, *Treatise*, 2; Jewel varies in his 'image free' status of the early Church between almost four to almost seven centuries. Antiquity is something which he stresses through his *Homily*. Jerome is described as '*ancient Doctor*', Athanasius as '*very ancient, holy and learned*', Lactantius – '*olde and learned*', Cyril – '*olde and holy*', Augustine – '*best learnd of all ancient Doctors*', Eusebius – '*most ancient author*', and Clement as '*most ancient and learnd Doctor*'; the '*primitive Churche*' as being '*most pure*' at least nine times. Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 206-17 (*STC* 13646). Jewel's confusion regarding the post Nicaea II East is difficult to assess, but may be the case. He was instrumental in the 1563/71 editing of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, of which Article 19 (*On the Church*) states: '*As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioche hath erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their liuing and maner of ceremonies, but also in matters of fayth.*' In this list, Constantinople among the five ancient patriarchies, alone and notably, is not condemned. *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 19 (*CC*, 3.499). It is changed only from Article 20 of Cranmer's *Forty-Two Articles* of 1553 in the addition of '*and maner of ceremonies*'.

Hooper and Bullinger reject images on historical grounds, observing even the pagan Romans did so, and long before the time of the gospel. Babington dismisses images, that they were absent from the early Church.[481] Perkins recognises that in Elvira and the Fathers, the ancient tradition of the Church was aniconic, but while traditions of the Church are important, they are always subservient to God's law. That adoration of images was an innovation and unlawful was recognised by the Carolingian Synod of Frankfurt in its rejection of Nicaea II, something which Calfhill and Jewel had also observed.[482]

Calvin asserts that for five hundred years, during which '*pure doctrine flourished*', the church was '…..*completely free from visible representations*'. In tension with this, however, he sees images as having grown out of earlier pagan practice. Calvin does not engage the *Aniconists* directly, but Nicaea II he rejects. Vermigli also considers antiquity: both the early Church and the Byzantine iconomachy. Like others, he blames Nicaea II for the profusion of religious imagery. Vermigli cites Augustine and Elvira, that the early Church was aniconic. He also engages the Byzantine iconomachy, like Bucer and Ridley, identifying Hieria, rather than Nicaea II as the legitimate council.[483]

---

[481] Hooper, *Ten Holy Comaundements,* 70-8 (*STC* 13746); Henry Bullinger, *The Decades* (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1849), 201; '*Which of the Prophetes or Apostles went about euer to haue images made, either to put themselues in minde of any thing which the Lorde taught them, or their people of any thing which they deliuered to them from the Lorde?*' Babington, *Fruitfull*, 108 (*STC* 1098).

[482] Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 176); Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 21.3,6 (*STC* 19660, 44, 47); Perkins, *Warning Against Idolatrie*, 696 (*STC* 19764); Calfhill, *Aunsvvere to the Treatise of the Crosse,* 155-6 (*STC* 4368); Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 213 (*STC* 13646); John Jewel (1562), *Apology of the Church of England*, trans. Ann Bacon, (*STC* 14591, 171-2), https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/17678/pg17678-images.html.

[483] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.13-4, 4.4.9; Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.14 (*STC* 24669, 343-4); Bucer, *Treatise*, 3 (*STC* 24238); Ridley, *Treatise*, 3, in Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 2130-1 (*STC* 11225). Vermigli lays much of the blame for images in the Church at the foot of Gregory I (c. 600), identifying him as the '*the patrone of superstitions*' over his response to Serenus [*Letter 105 - to Serenus* (*N&PNF2* 13.23]. It is an assessment with which Bucer, Ridley, Calvin and Jewel concur.

SECTION 7: ICONOMACHY - CHRISTOLOGY OR REGULATED WORSHIP

In 2002, Patricia Karlin-Hayter noted, '*No other topic of Byzantine history has received as much attention on the part of western scholars, chiefly because the iconoclasm of the 8th and 9th centuries has been seen as the ancestor of similar initiatives stemming from the Reformation, starting with Calvin and going on to the Puritans and even the French revolutionaries of 1789. The iconoclasts, enemies of 'superstition', have generally enjoyed sympathetic press*'; a view, the substance of which, the English Reformed might have shared.[484] But to what extent was their belief correct? Were the English Reformed really in continuity with their Byzantine iconoclastic forebears?

To both Byzantine and Reformed aniconists, the obvious starting point was the Second Commandment: the visceral rejection of Christians on their knees, worshipping before physical objects.[485] For the *Aniconists*, the preceding four centuries had been of Christological exploration and definition: six ecumenical councils, the most recent addressing the issue of monothelitism and monoenergism.[486] Christ was truly God: eternal, infinite and uncircumscribed. But in His incarnation, and remaining what He was, He was born naturally of a human mother, matured into a truly corporeal and circumscribed man, and remaining incarnate, had ascended into heavenly session.[487] To refuse that in His incarnate being Christ

[484] Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 153.
[485] Roth, *Theodore*, 9; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.107-8, 119-21; Ware, *Orthodox Church*, 38. *Epitome*, *N&PNF2*, 14.543.
[486] Ecumenical Councils: I. Nicaea (325) had affirmed the full divinity of Christ (contra the Arians); II. Constantinople (381) defined the full divinity of the Holy Spirit and confirmed that of Christ; III. Ephesus (431) refuted Nestorianism and Pelagianism; IV. Chalcedon (451) rejected monophysitism; V. Constantinople II (553) and VI. Constantinople III (680-1) repudiated monothelitism and monoenergism. The Quinisext (5th/6th) Council of Trullo (692), other than pronouncing on how Christ was to be imaged, dealt largely with the implementation of the 5th and 6th Councils, hence its descriptor.
[487] Hilary of Poitiers (c. 310 – c. 367), *On the Holy Trinity*, 3.16 (*N&PNF2* 9.66)

could be imaged, was to deny that He had become truly man.[488] As might be expected, the *Aniconists'* rejection of images was defined and answered in Christological terms.

Images made by human hands were invalid, the *Aniconists* argued, because they either separated Christ's humanity from His divinity (Nestorianism) or mixed His natures (monophysitism). They could never be sufficient to the task, and their use blasphemous, defaming the incarnate Word. Indeed, and unsurprising in the historical context, it is this issue which was of central import.[489] Worship of Christ, and veneration of the *Theotokus* and saints was demanded of the Christian, but not through the medium of images. The *Iconophiles* countered by consideration of the prototype/image relationship,[490] regarding the appropriateness of use by context,[491] and defining the veneration/worship (*dulia* [or *proskynesis*]/*latria*) divide.[492] Insufficiency was also expressed by the Reformed, such as Jewel, but considered irrelevant in itself by Vermigli and Perkins. Either way, the inaccuracy or inadequacy of the image was not of primary import.[493] Any *dulia*/*latria* divide as expressed in Nicaea II, Aquinas and Trent, mired in loose usage, poor translations, and a seeming unwillingness to provide consequential consideration, the Reformed dismissed. [494]

---

[488] *Canons of the Council of Trullo*, 82 (*N&PNF2* 14.401); Theodore, *On the Holy Icons.* 1.2-4, 1.7, in Roth, *Theodore*, 20-3, 26-7; John of Damascus, *Exposition,* 4.11 (*N&PNF2* 9.80) "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2*, 550.

[489] *Epitome*, anathemas 8-14 (*N&PNF2*, 14.545-6). Problem here is the lack of *Aniconist* sources. The assumption of centrality is based on the weight given in the *Epitome* preserved by their opponents, and its preponderance in the rebuttals of Damascene and Theodore.

[490] John of Damascus, *Apologia,* 5*,* 11-2, 87-8; Ouspensky, *Theology*, 1.122-5.

[491] John of Damascus, *Exposition,* 4.16 (*N&PNF2* 9.88); Damian, "Icons," in *CEOC*, 267-71.

[492] "Decree of the Holy, Great, Ecumenical Synod, the Second of Nice," *N&PNF2* 14.549-51. This decree was confirmed and repeated by Trent. Schaff, *CC,* 2.201-2.

[493] At the beginning of the second part of his *Homily*, Jewel is explicit that the Second Commandment is in all respect sufficient, Christ, *'taketh not or needeth not any testimony of men, and that which is once confirmed by the certainty of his eternal truth hath no…..need of the confirmation of man's doctrine and writings.'* Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 191-2, 226-8 (*STC* 13646); Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.10 (*STC* 24669, 340); Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7).

[494] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.11; Jewel, *Idolatry*, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 237-50 (*STC* 13646); Ussher, *Answer to a Challenge,* 432 (*STC* 24542); William Laud described the distinction as '*absurd*'. Slack, "Public Conscience," 151-2, in Howell ed., *Cobbett's Complete Collection*, 3.550. Regarding the dulia/latria divide, implicit in their

By contrast, for the English, the rejection of images was rooted firmly in the Second Commandment,[495] one they believed 'hidden' within the Augustinian ordering of the Decalogue.[496] The question of the numbering of the Commandments, while significant in the West, cannot be transposed to the *Aniconists*; *both* they and their *Iconophile* rivals coincide with the Reformed. The *use* of the Second Commandment by the Reformed, however, differed substantially from that of the *Aniconists*.

Trent and Western tradition explicitly related image veneration to the invocation of saints,[497] a doctrine which the Reformed rejected.[498] The basis of this abjuration, despite credal acceptance of '*the communion of saints*,'[499] was the Second Commandment's implications for worship more generally. Developing through Calvin was a broad, synecdochical reading of the Commandment. Rather than simply prohibiting the imaging of *YHWH*, and the production and worshiping of pagan idols (its plain reading), the Commandment was understood to indicate *how* God was to be worshipped.[500] Christian devotion was to be based only in what was affirmatively taught by scripture, rather than scripture being considered a limit to the way

recognition of the intentional nature of idol making – that an image only becomes and idol through its apprehension and use – both Luther and Vermigli demonstrate they must have appreciated a difference between appropriate (dulia, proskynesis) and inappropriate (latria) attitude to images, crosses or even Bibles. Luther, "Large Catechism," in *Luther, Collected Works,* 730; Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.1 (*STC* 24669, 333-4).

[495] Bucer, *Treatise*, 1 (*STC* 24238); Ridley, *Treatise,* 1, in Foxe*, Actes and Monuments,* 2128-30 (*STC* 11225); Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.11.1,2,8; Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.15-6 (*STC* 24669, 344-6); Jewel, *Idolatry*, 1, in *Certain Sermons*, 177-84 (*STC* 13646); Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7); Perkins, *Golden Chaine,* 21 (*STC* 19660, 42-3); *Heidelburg Catechism*, 96-7 (*CC,* 3.343); Nowell, *Catechism*, 25 (*STC* 18734).

[496] Perkins, *Reformed Catholike*, 9 (*STC* 19736, 174-7); Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 75 (*STC* 20626); Fulke*, A Defence*, 39 (*STC* 11433); Drant, *Two Sermons Preached*, 101 (*STC* 7171); Charke, *An Answeare for the Time*, 67 (*STC* 5009); Ussher, *An Answer to a Challenge,* 432 (*STC* 24542).

[497] Schaff, *CC,* 2.199-205; de Voragine, *Golden Legend*, 6.45-7; Mirk, *Festal: A Collection of Homilies*, 6.

[498] Luther *et al*., *Augsburg Confession*, 21 (*CC,* 3.26); de Bres, *Belgic Confession*, 26 (*CC,* 3.413-6); *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 22 (*CC,* 3.501); Ussher, *Irish Articles*, 52-3, 102 (*CC,* 3.535-6, 544).

[499] "Apostles' Creed," in Schaff, *CC*, 1.45. The *Apostles' Creed* was accepted by the English Church, '*ought throughlye to be receaued and beleued: for they may be proued by moste certayne warrauntes of holye scripture.*' *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 8 (*CC*, 3.492). As previously noted, the three *Creeds* were not similarly accepted by the *Divines*, but the doctrine of communion of the saints they conformed*. WCF,* 26, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 226-7.

[500] The First Commandment – who is to be worshipped, and the Second, by what means.

that devotion might be offered; what would become the 'regulative' *cf.* 'normative' principle of worship.[501] The veneration or adoration of Mary and the saints was disavowed, whether through, or in the absence of, images and relics; likewise, their invocation. This was directly in contradiction to the position of the *Aniconists*, and also that of the *Iconophiles* and the Roman Church.[502]

The removal of images by the *Aniconists* had been accompanied by an expanded use of the cross in churches and public places.[503] Again, this is a point of distinction with the developing regulative principle of the Reformed. Bucer considered the cross a perennial reminder, yet Calvin that its presence in churches was of no use. Vermigli was comfortable with crosses, as with images of any other non-divine creature or thing, as long as they were neither objects of worship, nor present in churches. As both the cross and the saints are created things, it followed that they might be considered similarly; images of God, incarnate or uncircumscribed, being the exception. The *Aniconists*, however, saw no essential difference between the imaging of God incarnate and the saints; through theosis the saints also having taken on a (non-ontologically) divine character. Ultimately, Jewel concluded that images of

[501] This 'regulative' vs 'normative' principle of worship was not accepted universally within the English Church. The *Thirty-Nine Articles* are explicitly 'normative', though nuanced, and clearly mindful of the supremacy of scripture in Church practice; Article 20 '*Of the Authority of the Church*', stating '*The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authoritie in controuersies of fayth: And yet it is not lawfull for the Church to ordayne any thyng that is contrarie to Gods worde written, neyther may it so expounde one place of scripture, that it be repugnaunt to another, Wherefore, although the Churche be a witnesse and keper of holy writ: yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be beleued for necessitie of saluation.*' The Puritan-authored Westminster Standards, however, are overtly 'regulative', the *WCF* stating, '*But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed will, that he might not be worshiped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visual representations or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture*.' The influence of Perkins being obvious in this later work.
Thirty-Nine Articles, 20 (*CC*, 3.500); *WCF,* 21.1, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 216-76; Perkins, *Golden Chaine* (*STC* 19660, 42).

[502] *Epitome*, anathemas 15, 17 (*N&PNF2* 14.546); *Extracts from the Acts* [of Nicaea II], Session 4 (*N&PNF2* 14.538); Schaff, *CC,* 1.201-2, 2.199-205.

[503] Mango, "Introduction," in Bryer and Herrin, *Iconoclasm*, 1-3; Beckwith, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, 169; Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle,* 405.

the saints were nowhere directed by scripture, and carried such a certainty of idolatrous abuse, that they were not lawful; following the Second Commandment, but on functional rather than essential grounds.[504] Later Puritans would broaden their understanding of idolatry based in the Commandment, going on to reject both physical and symbolic uses of the cross.[505]

A further extension of the synecdochical reading of the Commandment, was the question of mental images. This is nowhere discussed by the *Aniconists*, but developed progressively among the Reformed, culminating in the proscription found in the *Larger Catechism*.[506]

The Eucharist was a signal point of difference between the English Reformed and the *Aniconists*. For the Byzantines, the consecrated elements were truly the body and blood of Christ; the one '*admissible figure of the humanity of Christ*'; the only '*type*' in which He had '*chosen to represent his incarnation*.'[507] Accordingly, they were entitled to true worship (λατρεία). The distinctive doctrine of the Reformed was the spiritual but non-corporeal presence of Christ in the Supper. This too is Christological in basis, but rooted in the actuality of the bodily ascension, and Christ's continuing indivisible and circumscribed humanity in heavenly session, rather than the Chalcedonian definition of two natures, alone.[508] Further to

---

[504] Bucer, *Treatise*, 1 (*STC* 24238); Calvin, Institutes, 1.11.7; Vermigli, *Common Places*, 2.5.11 (*STC* 24669, 341-2); Jewel, *Idolatry* 2, 3, in *Certain Sermons*, 191-2, 225 (*STC* 13646); *Epitome*, anathema 16 *cf.* 8-9 (*N&PNF2* 14.546).

[505] Parker, *A scholasticall discourse*, 7, 10-1 (*STC* 19294). Even the Reformed but anti-Puritan King James would deride wooden crosses as *'piece*[s] *of stick'.* MacIlwain, *Political Works of James I*, 125. Destruction of crosses would feature prominently in the iconoclasm of the Civil war period. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 86-7, 159-63; Aston, *Broken Idols*, 766-79.

[506] Calvin, *Commentary Upon the Acts*, in Calvin, *Calvin's Complete Bible Commentaries*, loc 339271; *WLC*, 109, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 372.

[507] *Epitome* (*N&PNF2*, 14.544)

[508] Ridley, *Brief Declaracion of the Lordes Supper*, 95-6 (*STC* 21046); "The Order for Holy Communion," in *Booke of Common Prayer*, 159 (*STC* 16281); *Thirty-Nine Articles,* 28 (*CC,* 3.505-6); *Irish Articles*, 93-8 (*CC*, 3.542-4); *WCF*, 29, *WLC* 170, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 230-2, 397; Mathison, "The Lord's Supper," in Barrett, *Reformation Theology*, 657; Robert Letham, "The Person of Christ," in Barrett, *Reformation Theology*, 313-4; Heinze, *Reform and Conflict*, 141-3.

this, increasingly the corporeal presence was seen to be inherently idolatrous, and inexorably intertwined with necessary unlawful adoration of the elements.[509]

It is evident from the foregoing, that while both were orthodox Niceno-Chalcedonian Christians, and both rejected the use of religious images, a substantial gulf existed between the theologies of the Byzantine aniconists and the English Reformed. Why then were the Greeks held up as a model?

Explanation comes in the desire for the warrant of antiquity: that the '*primitive*' and '*most pure*' Church was without images. First and foremost, this came from scripture, and secondarily from the Fathers. With modern scholarship, the *De honesta disciplina* of Crinitus, as used by Bucer, and repeated by Ridley and Jewel, is seen to be flawed. However, in the context of 16th century England, its inaccuracies were neither appreciated nor significant. What it usefully framed, or re-enforced, was the narrative of a pure, ancient and orthodox Church, its godly emperors usurped by an illegitimate, innovative and idolatrous Roman papacy.[510]

Claims and fear of papal usurpation need be appreciated in the setting of a Church and state in which Protestantism was not yet secure. This had been evidenced by Mary's coronation and reign. At Elizabeth's accession, she was 25-years-old and in good health, yet unmarried and without children. Her presumptive heir was the 16-year-old Roman Catholic Queen Mary of

[509] Ursinus, *Heidelberg Catechism,* 75 (*CC,* 3.332); *WCF,* 29.5, in Van Dixhoorn, *Creeds*, 231.
[510] As noted earlier, antiquity and purity are things which Jewel stresses through his *Homily*. Jerome is described as '*ancient Doctor*', Athanasius as '*very ancient, holy and learned*', Lactantius – '*olde and learned*', Cyril – '*olde and holy*', Augustine – '*best learnd of all ancient Doctors*', Eusebius – '*most ancient author*', and Clement as '*most ancient and learnd Doctor*'; and the '*primitive Churche*' as being '*most pure*' at least nine times. Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 206-17 (*STC* 13646). Regarding treason or usurpation: Bucer, *Treatise*, 3 (*STC* 24238); Vermigli, *Common Places* 2.5.19 (*STC* 24669, 348); Jewel, *Idolatry*, 2, in *Certain Sermons*, 209-10 (*STC* 13646); Jewel, *Apology of the Church of England*, 160, 179-80 (*STC* 14579). These issues were of similar relevance to European reformers such as Bucer, manifest in the ever present threat from the (Catholic) Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, the imperial descendant of the papally-crowned Charlemagne.

Scotland, at that time married to the *Dauphin* of France. As had been the case with Edward, the succession was uncertain; underscored when, four years into her reign, and within months of Jewel's *Apology* and *Homily*, the Queen contracted small-pox. This contextuality is manifest in the French crown's refusal to recognise Elizabeth's legitimacy (favouring Mary of Scotland), papal deprivations of her sovereignty, the 'Armada' of the Spaniards, and in the 'Gunpowder Plot' of 1605 against King James.[511] These tied into English rejection of papal authority, and the sovereign's position as 'Supreme Governor' of the Church of England.[512] Thus, by facilitating iconoclasm as anti-Catholic and anti-papal polemic, the Byzantines served to provide not only doctrinal antiquity, but Protestant dynastic support. Conversely, by the time of the Westminster Assembly, parliament in open rebellion against the king, citation of the Byzantines is absent from these later Puritan writings.

The 16th century English Reformed were familiar with Nicaea II, and through it the *Epitome* and Byzantine practice, but this was not the time to draw attention to what might have otherwise been seen as the Eastern 'heresies' of veneration, invocation and transubstantiation.[513] The past influences the future by its artifacts, but history (the study of

[511] Concern regarding Elizabeth's smallpox in October 1562 and the likelihood of her death was such that the Privy Council met to discuss the succession and the enforcement of the exclusion of descendants of Margaret Tudor (Mary of Scotland) as had been set out in the will of Henry VIII. Elizabeth's recovery precluded the need for the Council to identify a Protestant successor, but in view of the failure of the installation of Lady Jane Grey in 1553 (despite the backing of Cranmer and Ridley), the succession in the event of Elizabeth's death had been truly uncertain. Even afterwards, it remained an item of national concern due to Elizabeth's childless state and her refusal to nominate a successor. Ultimately, the issue was resolved by Elizabeth's rapprochement with James VI of Scotland in 1586, and his mother's execution the following year.
Contextual events: French rejection of Elizabeth's legitimacy (1558); papal deprivations of sovereignty (by Pius V in 1570, and Sixtus V in 1588); Spanish Armada (1588). Additional to these were Catholic backed plots against the Queen's life by Ridolfi (1571), Throckmorton (1583) and Babington (1586). Proof of Mary's complicity with the plot of Babington ultimately resulted in her trial and execution for treason in 1587, in turn a precipitant of the Armada of Spain the following year. Patrick Collinson, "Elizabeth I (1533–1603)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/8636; Jenny Wormald, "James VI and I (1566–1625)," in *ODNB*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14592; Heinze, *Reform and Conflict*, 251,456-7 n.55; Wilson, *English Reformation*, 362.

[512] *26 Hen.VIII c.1*; *1 Eliz.I st.1.6. Cf. 1 M.I st.2.2; 1&2 Ph.II&M.I c.8.*

[513] The use of 'transubstantiation' here is anachronistic, it being defined only at the 4th Lateran (Western) Council in 1215, but fairly represents Orthodox understanding of the real corporeal presence set out in the

the past), by the consciousness of the society which grows out from it. For the English, it was this latter effect which was ultimately of greater import, and what was required in the struggles of the time.

The true purpose of history, however, is neither hagiography, polemic, nor to *'…..sit upon the ground and tell sad stories of the death of kings.'*[514] Rather, it is to engage with the past honestly, even-handedly, and on its own terms: to understand how we have arrived at where we are now, and to garner insights which might be useful for the future.[515] The first requisite, therefore, is to set aside modern preconceptions and biases, and assume the ethos of the times; something which the author of the current dissertation has attempted to do.

The use of images and symbols has been common in Christianity and Christian sacred spaces from the earliest times, and continues to be so. Their forms have varied from symbols including the cross and Chi-Rho, to emblematic acronyms or narrative representations such as the fish and the lamb, and figural depictions of Christ, Mary and the saints. From the 5th century, and reflecting the development of doctrines of spiritual hierarchy and the invocation of the saints, the production and use in worship of figurative images increased. In keeping with Old Testament proscriptions; the existence, form, appropriate use and misuse of religious images in worship has been the cause of dispute within the Church, again, from the earliest times. Conflicts over images were at their most intense and acrimonious in the East

Epitome (*N&PNF2*, 14.544). C. Vollert, "Transubstantiation," in *NCE*, 14.158-60, M.C. Steenberg, "Eucharist," in *CEOC*, 186-7.

[514] William Shakespeare (1597), *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second*, 3.2.

[515] Leopold von Ranke (1824), *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations* (Kindle, 2016), loc 1318; Lord Acton (John E. E. Dalberg-Acton), "Inaugural Lecture on the Study of History," in *Lord Acton: Lectures on Modern History*, eds. John Figgles and Reginald V. Laurence (London: Macmillan, 1906), 27. Acton famously commended to contributors to the *Cambridge Modern History*, regarding the writing of history and the necessity for the author to attempt to remove himself and his biases from the text, '*…..that our Waterloo must satisfy French and English, Germans and Dutch alike*', *op. cit.* Donald Bloxham, *Why History? A History* (Oxford: University Press, 2020), 237; '*Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it*.' George Santayana, *The Life of Reason* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), 1.284.

in the 8th and 9th centuries, and in the West at the time of the Reformation. Consequently, these have been the occasions of the deepest contemplation and development of doctrine regarding the place, or otherwise, of iconography within Christian worship.

As has been described, disagreement between Byzantine Christians regarding the creation and use of religious icons was primarily Christological, following on from the controversies of earlier centuries. By contrast, the debates over images of the Reformed centred on the synecdochical reading of the Second Commandment prohibition against idolatry. For the English Reformed to consider the *Aniconists* as 'proto-protestants', in any way, was erroneous. The Byzantines were useful in anti-papal polemic, but were not the theological ancestors of aniconic English Reformed Protestantism.

Following on from their Reformation forebears, has been a natural tendency of Protestant scholars, and those of unreformed origin, to talk past one another, rather than engage in truly interactive debate.[516] The question of images is complex, yet it remains current and important to the whole breadth of the Church. For all Christians, and irrespective of the denominational affiliations or doctrinal standards they affirm, a more complete consideration should contribute to a deeper appreciation of God, and His revelation in the incarnate Christ. Regarding the place of religious imagery and the Reformed Christian, familiarity with the issues raised in the Byzantine iconomachy, the Reformation, and the Council of Trent, cannot help but provide grounding for the proscriptions of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the

[516] A succinct example of this 'talking past' might be seen in the following quote the marginal notes of *Exodus* 20:5 from the *Douay-Rheims Bible* (London: John G. Murdoch, 1853), 75. '*Adore* [Lat.] *Protestants translate again, with the same view as in the preceding verse, "thou shalt not bow down thyself to them," in condemnation of Catholics who kneel before the cross. But do not they kneel, when they receive their sacramental bread, or when they ask for their parents' blessing? Did not S. John, and other saints, bow down out of respect to angels? And were these all idolators? We are forbidden, therefore, to show any respect to strange gods. But we must honour the true God in his saints, referring all the glory to him.*'

Westminster Confession of Faith. This should be accompanied by an enhanced understanding of the basis of contrary views held by fellow Christians, and stimulate a culture of mutual respect, and informed and edifying debate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acton, Ld., (John E.E. Dalberg-Acton), "Inaugural Lecture on the Study of History." In *Lord Acton: Lectures on Modern History*, edited by John Figgles and Reginald Laurence. London: Macmillan, 1906.

Alfeyev, Hilarion. "Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church." Lecture given at St. Vladimir's Seminary, New York, 2011, Accessed December 28, 2022. https://mospat.ru/en/news/56024/.

Anderson, David. "Internal Images: John Done and the English Iconoclast Controversy." *Renaissance and Reformation* 26, (2002): 23-42.

Andrescu-Treadgold, Irina and Warren Treadgold. "Procopius and the Imperial Panels of S. Vitale." *Arts Bulletin* 7, (1997): 708-723.

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron*, edited by James Bliss. Oxford: Parker Society, 1854.

Aquinas, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Aquinas.* Multiple translators. Omaha: Catholic Publishing, 2018.

Arnheim, Rudolf. "Mosaics Old and New." *Parnassus* 13, (1941): 70-73.

Aston, Margaret. *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Aston, Margaret. *England's Iconoclasts: Laws Against Images*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Aston, Margaret. *Thomas Arundel: a study of church life in the reign of Richard II.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Aykaç, Pınar. "Contesting the Byzantine Past: Four." *Heritage & Society* 11, (2018): 151-178.

Bailey, Lloyd. "The Golden Calf." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42, (1971): 97-115.

Baranov, Vladimir A. "Constructing the Underground Community: The Letters of Theodore the Studite and the Letters of Emperors Michael II and Theophilos to Louis the Pious." *Scrinium* 6, (2010): 230-259.

Baranov, Vladimir A. "Visual and Ideological Context of the Chalke Inscription at the Entrance to the Great Palace of Constantinople." *Scrinium* 13, (2017): 19–42.

Barnes, A. (translator). *Canons of the Synod of Elvira*. Accessed March 2, 2023. https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05395b.htm.

Barnum, Priscilla H. *Dives and Pauper* (English Early Text Society, 275: 1.1). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Barral-i-Altet, Xavier. "The Roman World." In *Sculpture: From Antiquity to the Present Day,* edited by Georges Duby and Jean-Luc Daval. Cologne: Taschen, 1991.

Barrett, Matthew (editor). *Reformation Theology*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2017.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd Edition*, edited by Frederick W. Danke. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Beard, Mary, John North and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Beckwith, John. *Early Christian and Byzantine Art.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Bell, Julian. *Mirror of the World.* London: Thames and Hudson, 2007.

Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Benton, Janetta R. *Art of the Middle Ages*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2002.

Bigham, Steven. *Epiphanius of Salamis: Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth*. Rollinsford: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008.

Bloxham, Donald. *Why History? A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Boardman, John, John Griffin and Oswald Murray (editors). *Oxford History of the Roman World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Bower, John R. *The Confession of Faith: A Critical Text and Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2020.

Bray, Gerald (editor). *Documents of the English Reformation 1526 – 1701*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2004.

Bray, Gerald (editor). *The Books of Homilies: A Critical Edition*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2015.

Bremmer, Jan N. "Iconoclast, Iconoclastic, and Iconoclasm: Notes Towards a Genealogy." *Church History and Religious Culture* 88, (2008): 1-17.

Brenton, Lancelot. *Septuagint: Greek and English (1851).* Peabody: Hendrickson, 2019.

Brooks E.W. "The Arab Occupation of Crete." *English Historical Review* 28, (1913): 431-443.

Brown, Eric. *The Byzantine Empire.* Kindle, 2018.

Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Brown, Peter. "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy." *English Historical Review* 88, (1973): 1-34.

Brown, William and A. Hamilton Thompson (editors). *The Register of William Greenfield Lord Archbishop of York 1306-1315*. Durham: Surtees Society, 1936.

Brubaker, Leslie and John Haldon. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era c. 680 – 850: A History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Bryer, Anthony and Judith Herrin (editors). *Iconoclasm: papers given at the ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1977.

Buckley, Theodore (translator). *Catechism of the Council of Trent (1566).* London: Routledge, 1852.

Buckman, D. "The Emperor Justinian." In *Byzantium: treasures of Byzantine art and culture from British collections*. London: British Museum Press, 1994.

Buick, Stephen. "Little children, beware of images: 'Homily Against Peril of Idolatry'." *Reformation* 2, (1997): 301-330.

Bullinger, Henry. *The Decades*. Cambridge: Parker Society, 1849.

Burgess, Clive. "'By Quick and by Dead': Wills and Pious Provision in Late Medieval Bristol." *English Historical Review* 102, (1987): 837-858.

Bury, J.B. "Charles the Great and Irene." *Hermathena* 8, (1891): 17-37.

Bury, J.B. *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene Until the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802 – 867)*. Kindle, 1912.

Calvin, John. *Calvin's Complete Bible Commentaries*. Multiple translators. Kindle. 2014.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Translated by Henry Beveridge. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007.

Cameron, Alan. "The Authenticity of the Letters of St Nilus of Ancyra." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 17, (1976): 181-196.

Cameron, Alan. "A New Late Antique Ivory: The Fauvel Panel." *American Journal of Archaeology* 88, (1984): 397-402.

Cannadine, David (editor). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004-24. https://www.oxforddnb.com.

Carus, Paul. "The Crucifix." *The Open Court* 13, (1899): 673-90.

Cavallera, Ferdinand (editor). *Patrologia Graeca*. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1912.

Christmas, Henry (editor). *The Works of Nicholas Ridley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843.

Collinson, Patrick. *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact on the Second English Reformation*. Reading: University of Reading, 1986.

Cormack, Robin. *Byzantine Art.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Coronation of Edward VI. Accessed February 6, 2023. https://www.tudorsociety.com/20-february-1547-the-coronation-of-king-edward-vi.

Crompton, James. "Leicestershire Lollards." *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society* 44, (1969): 11-44.

Cronin, H.S. "The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards." *English Historical Review* 22, (1907): 292-304.

Cruz, Joan C. *Relics*. Huntington: OSV Publishing, 1984.

Dafni, Evangelia G. "Euripides's Helena and Pentateuch Traditions: The Septuagint from the Perspective of Ancient Tragedies." *HTS Theological Studies* 71, (2015): #2902.

Damon, P.E., Donahue, D.J., Gore, B.H. *et al.* "Radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin." *Nature* 337, (1989): 611–615.

Davidson, Ivor. *The Birth of the Church.* Oxford: Monarch, 2005.

Davidson, Ivor. *A Public Faith.* Oxford: Monarch, 2005.

Davis, David J. *From Icons to Idols: Documents on the Image Debate in Reformation England*. Kindle, 2016.

De Hæretico Comburendo. Accessed January 26, 2023. https://w3.ric.edu/faculty/rpotter/heretico.html.

Devlin, Mary A. *Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-89.* London: Royal Historical Society, 1954.

Diggle, J. (editor). *Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Drijvers, Jan W. "Helena Augusta, the Cross and the Myth: some new reflections." Millennium 8, (2011): 125-174.

Dudley, Lauren. "Grammar of Iconoclasm." *Art Historiography* 11, (2014): 1-14.

Duffy, Eamon. *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes, 2nd Edition.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Duffy, Eamon. *Stripping of the Altars, 2nd Edition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Durston, Christopher and Jacqueline Eales. *Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996.

Dionysius the Areopagite. *Celestial Hierarchy.* Translated by John Parker. Piccadilly: Skeffington, 1894.

Elsner, Jaś. "Archaeologies and Agendas: Reflections on Late Ancient Jewish Art and Early Christian Art." *Journal of Roman Studies* 93, (2003): 114-128.

Elsner, Jaś. "Iconoclasm as Discourse: From Antiquity to Byzantium." *Art Bulletin* 94, (2012): 368-394.

Epstein, Isidore (editor). *Baba Bathra*. Translated by Maurice Simon and Israel W. Slotki. Accessed May 15, 2023. https://halakhah.com/bababathra/index.html.

Fincham, Kenneth and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Finney, Paul C. *The Invisible God: The Early Christians on Art.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Firth, Charles H. and Robert S. Rait (editors). *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1911.

Florovsky, Georges. "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy." *Church History* 19, (1950): 77-96.

Forsyth, Ilene H. *The Throne of Wisdom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Freeman, Charles. *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean, 2nd Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Garside, Charles. *Zwingli and the Arts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Gavrilyuk, Paul L. "The Retrieval of Deification: How a Once-Despised Archaism Became an Ecumenical Desideratum." *Modern Theology* 25, (2009): 647-659.

George, C.H. "Puritanism as History and Historiography." *Past & Present* 41, (1968): 77-104.

Georgiadis, Konstantinos. "From a Christological controversy to an Iconoclastic one." *Theology & Culture* 1, (2020): 45-56.

Gero, Stephen. "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eight Century." *Byzantion* 44, (1974): 23-44.

Gombrich, E.H. *The Story of Art, 12th Edition.* London: Phaidon, 1972.

Gregory, Timothy E. *A History of Byzantium, 2nd Edition.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

von Grunebaum, G.E. “Byzantine Iconoclasm and the Influence of the Islamic Environment.” *History of Religions* 2, (1962): 1-10.

Griffith, Terry. “’ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ’ as 'Idol' in Non-Jewish And Non-Christian Greek.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 53, (2002): 95-101.

Gutmann, Joseph. “The ‘Second Commandment’ and the Image in Judaism.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32, (1961): 161-174.

Harrison, William. *A Description Of Elizabethan England*, edited by Lothrop Withington. London: Scott, 1876.

Hayward, John. *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, edited by John Bruce. London: Camden Society, 1840.

Heinze, Rudolph W. *Reform and Conflict*. Oxford: Monarch, 2006.

Herrin, Judith. *Byzantium*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2008.

Herrin, Judith. *The Formation of Christendom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Hogg, John. “On a Profane Stylograph of the Crucifixion at Rome.” *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature (Second Series)* 9, (1870): 15-24.

Howell, Thomas B. (editor). *Cobbett’s Complete Collection of State Trials*. London: Bagshaw, 1809.

Hughes, Paul and James Larkin (editors). *Tudor Royal Proclamations II 1553-1587*. London: Yale University Press, 1969.

Humphreys, M.T. *Law, Power, and Imperial Ideology in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Hunt, Tristram. *The English Civil War*. London: Penguin, 2002.

Hussey, J.M. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. Kindle, 2015.

Huxley, G.L. "Hagiography and the First Byzantine Iconoclasm." *Proceedings of The Royal Irish Academy* 80, (1980): 187-196.

Jacob, B. "The Decalogue." *Jewish Quarterly Review (New Series)* 14, (1923): 141-187.

Jackson, W.A., F.S. Ferguson and Katharine Pantzer. A *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640 (Revised)*. London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991.

James, Montague (translator). *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Janson, H.W. *A History of Art, Revised Edition*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Jefferson, Lee M. "Picturing Theology: A Primer on Early Christian Art." *Religion Compass* 4, (2010): 410-425.

Jensen, Robin M. "The Fall and Rise of Adan and Eve in Early Christian Art and Literature." In Heidi J. Hornik and Mikeal C. Parsons (editors). *Interpreting Christian Art: Reflections on Christian Art*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2008.

Jensen, Robin M. “Aniconism in the First Centuries of Christianity.” *Religion* 47, (2017): 408-424.

John of Damascus. *Apologia Against Those Who Decry Holy Images*. Scotts Valley: Createspace, 2010.

Jones, W.R. “Lollards and Images: The Defense of Religious Art in Later Medieval England.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34, (1973): 27-50.

Josephus. *Antiquities*. Translated by William Whiston. Accessed February 20, 2023. https://penelope.uchicago.edu/josephus/ant-3.html.

Justice, Stephen. “Inquisition, Speech, and Writing: A Case from Late-Medieval Norwich.” *Representations* 48, (1994): 1-29.

Kazhdan, Alexander P. *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

King, G.R. “Islam, Iconoclasm, and the Declaration of Doctrine.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, (1985): 267-277.

Kinney, Dale and Anthony Cutler. “A Late Antique Ivory Plaque and Modern Response.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 98, (1994): 457-472.

Kitzinger, Ernst. *Byzantine Art in the Making: Main Lines of Stylistic Development in Mediterranean Art 3rd-7th Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Klein, Elizabeth. “St. Theodore and the Holy Icons.” *Faith and Culture: Journal of the Augustine Institute*, November 2019. Accessed December 16, 2023. https://www.faithandculture.com/home/2019/11/12/st-theodore-and-the-holy-icons.

Kolrud, Kristine and Marina Prusac. *Iconoclasm from Antiquity to Modernity.* London: Routledge, 2014.

Ladner, Gerhart B. "The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7, (1953): 1-34.

Lancashire, Ian (editor). *An Homilie Against the Perill of Idolatrie, and Superfluous Decking of Churches.* Accessed July 6, 2023. http://www.anglicanlibrary.org/homilies/bk2hom02.htm.

Leith, John H. *Assembly at Westminster: Reformed Theology in the Making.* Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1973.

Letham, Robert. *Systematic Theology*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2019.

Letham, Robert. *The Westminster Assembly: Reading Its Theology in Historical Context*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2009.

Loane, Marcus L. *Masters of the English Reformation*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.

Lundin, Rebecca W. "Rhetorical Iconoclasm: The Heresy of Lollard Plain Style." *Rhetoric Review* 27, (2008): 131-146.

Luther, Martin. *The Collected Works of Martin Luther*. Translated by C.M. Jacobs, C.H. Jacobs, Henry Cole *et al*. Kindle, 2018.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 2002.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2001.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. London: Yale University Press, 1996.

McGuckin, John (editor). *The Concise Encyclopedia of Orthodox Christianity*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.

MacIlwain, C.H. (editor). *The Political Works of James I*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Maimonides of Cordoba. *Sefer Ha-Mitzvot*. Translated by Francis Nataf. Accessed February 20, 2023. https://www.sefaria.org/Sefer_HaMitzvot.

Mango, Cyril. *Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Mango, Cyril. *Oxford History of Byzantium.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mann, Horace K. *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages.* London: Forgotten Books, 1902.

Manning, David. "'That is Best, Which Was First': Christian Primitivism and the Reformation Church of England, 1548-1722." *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 13, (2011): 153-193.

Marks, Richard. *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England*. Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 2004.

Marshall, Peter. "Catholic Puritanism in Pre-Reformation England." *British Catholic History* 32, (2015): 431-450.

Marston, Thomas E. “The Ten Articles.” *Yale University Library Gazette* 31, (1956): 81-83.

Marthaler, Berard (editor). *New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd Edition*. Farmington Hills: Gale, 2003.

Mason, Emma. “The Role of the English Parishioner, 1100-1500.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27, (1976): 17-29.

Mathews, Thomas F. *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art, Revised Edition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Menelaus, Iakovos. “Byzantine Iconoclasm and the Defenders of Icons, John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite.” *Cairo Journal of Theology* 4, (2017): 49-65.

Merritt, Julia F. “Puritans, Laudians, and the Phenomenon of Church-Building in Jacobean London.” *The Historical Journal* 41, (2008): 935-60.

Milburn, Robert. *Early Christian Art and Architecture*. Oakland: University of California Press, 1991.

Miles, Margaret R. *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

Mirk, John. *Festal: A Collection of Homilies*, edited by Theodor Erbe. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, 1905.

Mitchell, Alexander F. *The Westminster Assembly: Its History and Standards.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work (Kindle), 1897.

More, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas More*, multiple editors. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963-1997.

Mowczko, Mary. *The thing that fell down from heaven (Acts 19:35)*. Accessed April 14, 2023. https://margmowczko.com/fell-down-from-heaven-acts-19-35.

Muller, James (editor). *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.

Neale, J.E. "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity." *English Historical Review* 65, (1950): 304-332.

Nees, Lawrence. *Early Medieval Art.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Neil, Bronwen. "The Western Reaction to the Council of Nicaea II." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 51, (2000): 533-552.

Niewohner, Philipp. "The Significance of the Cross before, during, and after Aniconism in Constantinople and Asia Minor." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 74, (2020): 185-242.

Noble, Thomas F.X. *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Noyes, James. *The Politics of Iconoclasm*. London: Taurus, 2016.

Oman, Charles. *The History of the Byzantine Empire: From Its Glory to Its Downfall.* Kindle, 2018.

Orme, Nicholas. *Going to Church in Medieval England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021.

Ott, Ludwig. *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, edited by James Bastible. Rockford: Tan, 1974.

Ouspensky, Leonid. *Theology of the Icon*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992.

Pallis, Dimitrios. “Iconology of St. John of Damascus.” *Heythrop Journal* 56, (2015): 173-191.

Pastoor, Charles and Galen K. Johnson. *The A to Z of the Puritans*. Lanham: Scarecrow, 2009.

Pecock, Reginald. *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*, edited by Churchill Babington. London: Rolls Series, 1860.

Peltomaa, Leena M. “Role of the Virgin Mary at the Siege of Constantinople in 626.” *Scrinium* 5, (2009): 284-289.

Phillips, John. *The Reformation of Images*. Berkeley: UCP, 1974.

Philo of Alexandria. *On the Decalogue*. Translated by Charles D. Yonge. Accessed February 20, 2023. http://palimpsest.stmarytx.edu/thanneken/th6314/content/Philo(40)DeDecalogoExcerpts.pdf.

Pischel, Gina. *A World History of Art, Revised Edition*. London: Guild Publishing, 1976.

Henry VIII Rex. *Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St Thomas a’Becket from Calendar* (1538). Accessed February 2, 2023. https://www.copyrighthistory.org/cam/pdf/uk_1538_1.pdf.

Purcaru, Anca R. “Idol or Icon?” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 92, (2013): 770-777.

Pyper, Rachel. “An Abridgement of Wyclif's *De Mandatis Divinis*.” *Medium Aevum* 52, (1983): 306-9.

von Ranke, Leopold. *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations*. Kindle, 2016.

Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson (editors). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1867–1873.

Robinson, Hastings (editor). *The Zurich Letters*. London: Parker Society, 1842.

Roth, Catharine (translator). *Theodore the Studite: On the Holy Icons*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981.

Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State*. Accessed September 2, 2023. https://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol4/pp385-397#h3-0002.

Samuel, David (editor). *The Homilies*. Rochester: Christian Focus, 1986.

Sahner, Christian C. "The First Iconoclasm in Islam: A New History of the Edict of Yazīd II (AH 104/AD 723)." *Der Islam* 94, (2017): 5-56.

Sammern, Romana. "Idol and Face: Thomas Tuke's Puritan Discourse on Face Painting and Idolatry." *Kritische Berichte* 45, (2017): 27-32.

Santayana, George. *The Life of Reason*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

Sarna, Nahum M. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Exodus.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.

Schaff, Philip (editor). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (1st series)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1886.

Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace (editors). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (2nd series).* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1891.

The Septuagint. Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. Accessed January 13, 2023. https://www.septuagint.bible/#.

Sheehan, Jonathan. "Sacred and Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism, and the Polemics of Distinction in the Seventeenth Century." *Past and Present* 192, (2006): 35-66.

Sheingorn, Pamela (translator). *The Book of Sainte Foy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Simon, Erika. "The Diptych of the Symmachi and Nicomachi: An Interpretation." *Greece & Rome* 39, (1992): 56-65.

Slack, Paul. "The Public Conscience of Henry Sherfield." In John Morrill, Paul Slack, and Daniel Woolf (editors). *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford Academic, 1993.

Spraggon, Julie. *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003.

Spurr, John. *English Puritanism, 1603-1689. Social History in Perspective*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 1998.

Swanson, Robert N. *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c.1215-c.1515*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Swanson, Robert N. "'Lollardy', 'orthodoxy', and 'resistance' in pre-Reformation England." *Usuteaduslik Ajakiri (Estonian Theological Journal)* 63, (2013): 12-26.

Tarasov, Oleg. *Icon and Devotion: Sacred Spaces in Imperial Russia*. Translated by Robin Milner-Gulland. London: Reaktion, 2002.

Tatum, W. Barnes. “The LXX Version of the Second Commandment (*Ex*.20,3-6 = *Deut*.5,7-10): A Polemic Against Idols, Not Images.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17, (1986): 177-195.

Theophanes the Confessor (758-817). *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813.* Translated by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. *The JPS Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Service, 1996.

Tkacz, Catherine B. “Iconoclasm, East and West.” *New Blackfriars* 85, (2004): 542-550.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History: Abridgement of Volumes VII-X*, edited by D.C. Somervell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Trinterud, Leonard J. *Elizabethan Puritanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Van Dixhoorn, Chad. *Confessing the Faith*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2014.

Van Dixhoorn, Chad (editor). *Creeds, Confessions and Catechisms*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2022.

Van Dixhoorn, Chad (editor). *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Van Dixhoorn Chad B. “Unity and Disunity at the Westminster Assembly (1643-1649): A Commemorative Essay.” *Journal of Presbyterian History* 79, (2001): 103-117.

Vasiliev, Alexander A. “The Iconoclastic Edict of the Caliph Yazid II, A. D. 721.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 9/10, (1956): 23-47.

Vaugh, Robert. *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe*. London: Wycliffe Society, 1845.

Visconsi, Elliott. “The Invention of Criminal Blasphemy: Rex v. Taylor (1676).” *Representations* 103, (2008): 30-52.

de Voragine, Jacobus. *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints*, edited by F.S. Ellis. London: J.M. Dent, 1900.

Wallington, Nehemiah. *Historical Notices of Events Occurring Chiefly in The Reign of Charles I.* London: Richard Bentley, 1869.

Ware, Kallistos (Timothy). *The Orthodox Church*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Warfield, Benjamin B. *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*. Cherry Hill: Mack, 1972.

Willis, Jonathan. *The Reformation of the Decalogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Wolff, Robert L. “The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria.” *Traditio* 6, (1948): 319-328.

Wood, Christopher S. “In Defense of Images: Two Local Rejoinders to the Zwinglian Iconoclasm.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, (1988): 25-44.

Zudilina, Nadiya. *Plato’s Doctrine of Three Types of Images (Eidos, Eikon, Eidolon).* V.I. Vernadsky Crimean Federal University. 2020. Accessed March 29, 2023. https://www.researchgate.net/institution/VI_Vernadsky_Crimean_Federal_Univer.