



St Nicodemus Of The Holy Mountain

Canons of the Seven Ecumenical Councils.

Content:

[Canons of the](#)

[Seven Ecumenical Councils.](#)

[Introduction.](#)

[The First Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Second Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Third Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Fourth Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Fifth Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Sixth Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Quinisext Ecumenical Council.](#)

[Seventh Ecumenical Council.](#)

Introduction.

In the area of church discipline, the work of the first four ecumenical councils has an obvious interest for the knowledge of the law and institutions of early Christianity. During this period, 325 to 451, which corresponds to the flowering of the great patristic literature, we can follow — through the canonical legislation of the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon as well as other decisions made by these assemblies on specific questions — the evolution of the structures of the Church, of her discipline, and of her relations with the surrounding society. If we compare this and the ante-Nicene period, we see that all sorts of new problems come up while others fade in importance. The canons issued by these councils constitute the core of Church Law in the Christian East, even today. They also formed an important part of the Western Church's law during the first millennium and influenced, in no small way, the western medieval synthesis.

In considering the canonical legislation elaborated and approved by the first four ecumenical councils, it appears quite clear that this was a period of particularly fruitful creativity in the field of the Eastern Church's written law. Although it was not the intention of the Fathers gathered at Nicea to substitute a written, universal law for the already existing customary law with its local variants, many factors since then have turned the scales in favor of written law. In the first place, the unequaled prestige of this “great and holy council” conferred an unquestioned authority on its legislation. Thus around 330, Eusebius of Caesarea, having been asked to become bishop of Antioch, refused the offer by invoking the regulation established by the Fathers of Nicea.¹ St. Basil, writing to a priest to order him to stop living with a woman, expressly made reference to the canon of Nicea relevant to this case.² In the West, the regulations of the great council were held in equally high esteem. Pope Julius spoke of “divine inspiration” in referring to canon 5.³ As for Pope Leo, he declared the legislation of Nicea to be inviolable.⁴

Another factor favored the predominance of written law. During the first centuries of Christianity, the consciousness of a permanent disciplinary tradition was very strong in each local Church. In the fourth century, many new dioceses were created due to missionary expansion on the one hand and to the reinforcement of one or another theological trend during the Arian crisis on the other. For the same reasons, episcopal transfers, completely exceptional in earlier times, became more numerous; this phenomenon contributed to the breakdown of the links between the bishop and his church. Structures of common and coordinated action were set up, and the working of these new organs had to be made clear. Under these conditions, it was no longer possible to appeal solely to ancient customs; it was necessary to issue regulations intended to apply to the whole Church. Finally the tendency which was sketched out after the reign of Constantine and which took final form under Theodosius I — namely, giving the force of state law to the decisions of the church hierarchy — implied the existence of a body of canonical law.⁵ This evolution was later fully established by the legislation of the Emperor Justinian which confirmed the juridical validity of the canons issued by the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon as well as of those local councils accepted by these ecumenical assemblies.⁶

In many cases, the canons merely endorsed customs which were seen to be legitimate. To the extent that written law (canons and imperial laws) gained ground, custom was more or less limited to the domain of precedents. We could, it is true, quote the statement of Metropolitan Zachary of Chalcedon at the time of the Council of St. Sophia (879-880): “custom has a tendency to outweigh canons,”⁷ but we must not overestimate the significance of a statement formulated during a discussion or take it as a fundamental principle of Byzantine church law. Appealing

to custom remains limited, as we can clearly see in reading the *Nomocanon in XIV Titles* and the commentaries of Balsamon on this work.⁸

In the Byzantine East, there was no break in continuity between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages on the political and socio-cultural level, as there was in the West, but there was constant evolution. The Church had to make concrete adaptations of the old canonical regulations to meet new situations. Canonical creativity was certainly not extinguished after the end of the ninth century, but it was limited to certain areas, principally to marriage and monastic law. No council issued regulations changing church structures already established by the end of the ancient period. Since the canons of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages had hardly touched the question of patriarchal privileges,⁹ it is, therefore, not surprising to find that many Byzantine interpretations of the canons on this question appear to us to be arbitrary and erroneous.¹⁰ Many other canons created problems in regard to their meaning and applicability. Given their respect for tradition and their uncontested legal formalism, the Byzantines avoided as much as possible an appeal to the idea of laws being “out of date.”

After the eleventh century, Byzantium more and more felt the need to have authorized commentaries on the canons. Probably the renaissance of legal studies stimulated an interest in the serious exegesis of canonical texts.¹¹ But we have to wait until the twelfth century to see the first systematic work on this subject. Between 1118 and 1143, Alexis Aristenos, deacon and nomophylax of the Great Church, at the request of the Emperor John II Comnenus, wrote some concise annotations on the *Synopsis* which was compiled in the sixth or seventh century by Stephen of Ephesus and completed during the second half of the tenth century by Simeon “magistros and logothete.”¹² Not very long after 1159, no doubt, John Zonaras wrote his commentary (*Εξήγησις*) on the canons, a work which has always been well-received and rightly so. Zonaras classified the canonical documents of the *Syntagma in XIV Titles* according to an order of the weightiness of the sources. He placed the Canons of the Holy Apostles first; then came those of the ecumenical councils and the general councils of 861 and 879-880. Zonaras put the canons of the local councils and of the Holy Fathers last.¹³ Although this classification had already been used previously, he made it, henceforth, the accepted order. Zonaras was above all concerned to set out the exact meaning of the texts, also giving necessary clarifications. When required, he compared canons on the same subject and proposed a reasoned reconciliation.¹⁴

While he was still deacon and nomophylax in Constantinople, Theodore Balsamon, at the request of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143-1180) and the Ecumenical Patriarch Michael III (1169-1176), elaborated his commentaries on the *Nomocanon in XIV Titles*. In his interpretation of the canons he showed little originality; he often followed Zonaras to the letter but differed from him in consciously referring to the case law of his time. At the same time, Balsamon was concerned with relating the canons and the civil laws, in conformity with the main goal of his work.¹⁵

In Byzantium, the interpretations of these three canonists had a quasi-official position¹⁶ and have continued in subsequent periods to be given great weight. Consequently they have influenced the canonical praxis of the whole Orthodox Church. For the historian of institutions, these commentaries are especially interesting in that they show how their authors understood the ancient canons and also how they applied them. Furthermore, references in Balsamon's commentaries to decisions of the patriarchal synod in Constantinople are very valuable for the study of jurisprudence in Byzantium. These works, however, have only a limited use in trying to determine the real thinking of the Fathers who issued these ancient canons.

We must not neglect the anonymous scholia (explanatory notes) found in the manuscripts. We can say the same thing for these notes that was said for the interpretations of the great Byzantine commentators. Nevertheless, it is fitting to underline the fact that these notes are strictly the private opinions of their authors.¹⁷

The “Syntagma arranged in alphabetical order according to subject” (Σύνταγμα κατά στοιχείον) by hieromonk Matthew Blastares occupies a singular place. This work, written in Thessalonica around 1335, is a collection of canons, civil laws, synodical decrees and commentaries.¹⁸ Because of its convenient ordering and the richness of its content, this work was a great success not only among the Greeks but also among the southern Slavs and later among the Russians and Romanians.

The era of Ottoman domination is far from being devoid of interest for the historian of canon law. Nonetheless, even more than in the Middle Ages, the actions of the hierarchy on this subject were taken in the field of case law.¹⁹ We have to wait till the turn of the eighteenth century to see the appearance of a new commentary on the corpus of received canons in the Greek Orthodox Church. In 1800, the first edition of the *Pedalion* was published.²⁰ The text of each canon is followed by a paraphrase in modern Greek along with a commentary often based on Byzantine canonists. Moreover, we find digressions on different canonical or liturgical points among these numerous and often wordy notes. According to the title of the work, the editors were hieromonk Agapios and the monk Nicodemus (St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite). In reality the essential parts of the work are the work of the latter.²¹ After some delays, the book received the official approval of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The reservations set out in the letter of Patriarch Neophyte VII, August, 1902, concerned only changes introduced by hieromonk Theodoret without the knowledge of the authors.²²

The *Pedalion* has always enjoyed a great reputation in Greek-speaking Churches; this is obvious from its many reprintings, without, of course, the far-fetched additions of Theodoret. We can explain this success in different ways: the translation of the canons was done in paraphrases; the commentaries and the notes make for relatively easy reading, even for churchmen and monks having little education. The liturgical and pastoral directives, as well as other additional material, are of obvious practical interest for the clergy. This recension of the canons is on the whole correct, as we can see by comparing the present text with critical editions which we now have. St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite was no stranger to the concerns of textual criticism; this is obvious from his notes, which give the most characteristic variants of the recension of John the Scholastic. Having said this, we must not, however, overestimate the value of the *Pedalion*. It constitutes, first and foremost, a valuable witness for the understanding of the milieu in which it was formed.²³ As for treating the *Pedalion* as the perfect and therefore untouchable expression of Orthodox canon law, such an attitude is a manifest exaggeration which we often meet in a strict, integrist environment. St. Nicodemus' position on the invalidity of Roman Catholic baptism is particularly appreciated in that milieu.²⁴

For a long time, the Orthodox Slavs were content to reproduce translations of the works of Byzantine commentators on the canons. But in the nineteenth century, Slavic canonists took over the first place. Chronologically speaking, it is proper to mention first the work of Archimandrite John Sokolov, published in St. Petersburg in 1851.²⁵ Nicodemus Milash rightly considered this Russian canonist as the father of Orthodox canonical studies in the modern period.²⁶ Fr. G. Florovsky underlined the scientific value of this work; he wrote that “for the first time, the ancient and fundamental canons of the Church were presented in Russian more in historical than in doctrinal fashion.”²⁷

A work consisting of the canons of the Orthodox Church with commentaries was published in 1895-6 by Nicodemus Milash, who later became Bishop of Dalmatia;²⁸ this work is still of great interest today and shows itself as the fruit of considerable study.²⁹ The interpretations and explanations found in this work, although they must obviously be revised and completed on the basis of more recent studies, are not at all to be minimized. Moreover, it is still used today as a reference work by Orthodox canonists. As for canonical commentaries in Romanian, we can mention the works of Metropolitan Andrew Saguna, N. Popovici, and C. Dron.³⁰

In the West, starting with the seventeenth century, we find some quite worthy works which interpret the ancient canons. We can mention the names of Christian Wolf³¹ and John Cabassut;³² William Beveridge particularly stands out because of the value of his study of the canons. When he was vicar of Baling, later Bishop of St. Asaph (1704), this erudite Anglican clergyman published his *Σννοδικόν*.³³ It was successful not only in the West but also in the Orthodox East. Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem (1669-1707) sent a copy of Beveridge's *Synodikon* to Patriarch Adrian of Moscow (1690-1700) so that the latter could correct the text of the *Kormchaya Kniga*.³⁴ Zeger-Bernard Van Espen (1646-1728), the most famous canonist of the old University of Louvain, found himself entangled in the controversies of his time between the advocates and opponents of the absolute authority of the Roman pontiff; he resolutely took the side of the opponents.³⁵ Van Espen's commentary on the canons is found among the posthumous works of this great scholar; in this work, his point was to make known the authentic church discipline which was eclipsed in the medieval West by canons based on the False Decretals.³⁶ It is not at all surprising, then, that from that time on the works of this Belgian canonist were put on the Index by the Roman curia.

We should also note the work of William Bright, professor at Oxford from 1868-1901.³⁷ His commentaries on the canons of the first four ecumenical councils are still of scholarly interest.³⁸ Henri Leclercq was often inspired by this work. Karl-Joseph Hefele (1809-1898), professor at Tübingen and later bishop of Rottenburg, was the author of a great scholarly work on *The History of the Councils*, published in seven volumes from 1855 to 1874.³⁹ Even though it has been surpassed on many points by subsequent scientific studies, this work remains a classic reference work. In 1907 the Benedictine monk, Henri Leclercq d'Ornancourt undertook a French translation of the *Concilienge-schichte* of Hefele,⁴⁰ which was really to be a complete reworking and enlargement of the German scholar's work.⁴¹

Finally, we can mention the book of Henry R. Percival, which constitutes volume 14 in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series.⁴² It is true that this volume is not an original work, properly speaking, since the comments are completely drawn from the works of ancient and modern canonists. However, we believe it is necessary to note this book because the *excursus* often represent the personal synthesis of the author. Moreover, the volume is readily available.

The disciplinary legislation issued by the first four Ecumenical Councils undoubtedly constitutes the historical core of Orthodox canon law. This appears to be even more obvious if one takes into account the canonical legislation of the local synods contained in the collection used and therefore approved by the Fathers of Chalcedon.⁴³ Subsequent legislation universally accepted in the Orthodox Church did not introduce basic alterations.⁴⁴ Such alterations would not have been accepted in the East because of a widespread feeling that not only the Church kerygma but also the fundamental norms of Church order were part and parcel of Holy Tradition. The Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, with some exaggeration, applied the words of Deuteronomy in the Torah to canonical rules: "To them nothing is to be added, and from them nothing is to be taken away."⁴⁵ Thus, changes are always presented as duly justified adjustments of particular details.⁴⁶ Nowadays, in the light of historical data, we share a far more nuanced view of the real evolution of ecclesiastical institutions. Be that as it may, in Byzantine times and even later on no doubts affecting the validity of the old legislation were expressed.

The understanding of the ancient canons does not interest just the historians of institutions but also all Orthodox practitioners of canon law, since the canons' stipulations constitute the core of all legitimate law still in force.⁴⁷

The point of all interpretations is obviously to determine the exact meaning of each canon. We must, therefore, investigate the intention of the legislator, *mens legislatoris*. This is not always an easy task, not just because of the time that separates us from them. Research must be concerned as much with the historical context as with the canonical text itself; we must care-

fully investigate what the lawgiver wanted to correct, suppress, add, or simply recall to mind. We also properly take into account that the technical terms in canon law had not yet been rigidly fixed.⁴⁸ Moreover, we must not forget either that the Holy Fathers, the authors of the canons, were not necessarily specialists in legal terminology. Consequently we cannot automatically apply to canon law principles of interpretation established by specialists in civil law. For example, we would really be misled if we strictly applied the rule which says that the lawmaker always “expresses what he wants to say and refrains from saying what he does not want to say.”⁴⁹ In some cases, uncertainties flow from the wording, which can be understood in several ways due to editorial ambiguities in grammatical construction or punctuation.⁵⁰ The exact meaning of terms must be determined by taking factors of time and place into account. To neglect these data and arbitrarily put elements together necessarily leads to serious misinterpretations.⁵¹ Research into the *mens legislatoris* interests the historian and the canonists, but the canonist has another preoccupation. It is frequently the case that a canon is presented as an act involving a local and limited situation; can we, then consider it as a law in the proper sense, which has general application? Certainly, there are some cases where the purely limited nature of the canon evidently stands out.⁵² Sometimes only a knowledge of the historical context permits us to affirm that despite its formulation, a canon has an application strictly limited to a moment in church history.⁵³ One of the essential, and at the same time most delicate, problems in interpreting the canons is the use of analogy. There is no doubt at all that this method is perfectly legitimate in itself since, taken in their individual cases, the canons are only concrete expressions on a given subject of the Church's general order. The ancient legal adage is applicable to canon law: *Non ex regula ius sumatur sed ex iure quod est, regula fiat*.⁵⁴ It is even possible that this definition has influenced the usage which eventually restricted the term to disciplinary rulings of church authorities.⁵⁵ The application of analogy to the canons is nonetheless delicate; it supposes that the canon in question is perfectly clear.⁵⁶ Moreover, the similarity of each case must be solidly grounded. We must correctly avoid any subjectivism which in a particular case argues on the basis of superficial resemblances.⁵⁷ Therefore, an analogical interpretation, also called “extensive,” is not arbitrary as long as it conforms to the general intention of the legislator, even if that interpretation materially goes beyond his thought.⁵⁸

In what measure can we categorically affirm that an ancient canon ought no longer to be applied? In principle, such is the case when a disciplinary measure has been abrogated or modified by a canon adopted in some later time; this is in line with the adage *lex posterior derogat priori*, which assumes that the conciliar authority issuing the abrogation or modification possess the necessary authority.⁵⁹ It is still necessary to take into account the reasons underlying the more recent canon. Thus, canon 8 of the Synod in Trullo begins by recalling the norm which requires semiannual synods in each province. However, in the face of a practical impossibility (ἀδυνάτως), such as barbarian invasions, the Fathers of the Synod in Trullo decided in favor of a single annual session.⁶⁰ It is clear that the meeting of semiannual synods is still preferred and must be held unless there are major obstacles.⁶¹

An ancient canon can partially or fully lose its legal force; partially when it is only capable of being applied analogically⁶² or else when an ecclesiological principle is decreed on the occasion of a strictly limited decision.⁶³

Let us also note although “economy” excludes by nature an automatic application of analogy, a canon concerning an individual case can serve as an indication to help resolve comparable cases.⁶⁴ It would appear logical to allow without restriction the principle that abrogates a canon when its *ratio legis* disappears; that is, the reason which prompted its adoption in the first place. But a long tradition expressing a consensus in the Church can block the application of this principle. Thus the first place of the See of Constantinople is not really in question even though this city has long since ceased to be “honored by the presence of the emperor and the senate.”⁶⁵ In reality, the primacy of honor of the Archbishop of Constantinople is most probably founded

on the extension to his see of the axiom applied by the Fathers of Nicea to the privileges of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch: "Let the ancient customs be maintained."⁶⁶ Total nullity is certain when a canon shows itself to apply only to a specific case and not capable of being extended by an analogical interpretation.⁶⁷ Nullity can result automatically from the disappearance of an institution: thus canon 15 of Chalcedon which fixes the minimum age of forty for deaconesses lost its force after the Church ceased to ordain deaconesses.⁶⁸

Investigation into the meaning and extent of a canon requires, as we have said above, research into the social and historical background as well as an analysis of the texts themselves. It is very evident that these exegetical studies suppose previous enquiries into the value of the texts which we have received through time. In this case, when dealing with the canonical stipulations of the first four ecumenical councils the investigator does not run up against insurmountable obstacles. These texts have on the whole been rather faithfully transmitted in the Greek manuscript tradition. This is true first of all due to the nature of the subject. As P.P. Joannou pertinently noted:

The letter of a legal text is of prime importance; it is quite normal, therefore, in the innumerable manuscripts of these canonical collections to find a very careful transcription which has been done by a copyist familiar with the material or else reviewed and corrected by a jurist. From one manuscript to another, we can expect to find very few variants that deeply alter the sense of the text.⁶⁹

Let us add that the ancient canons and especially those of the ecumenical councils were considered to have been issued under divine inspiration, which explains the great care taken to preserve the exactness of the texts.⁷⁰

From the beginning of this century on, a remarkable job has been carried out in establishing a critical edition of ancient canonical collections. It is, of course, these works that we have primarily used in our research. We must first mention the excellent editions of the *Synagoge* and of the *Syntagma in XIV Titles* done by V.N. Benesevic.⁷¹ For the disciplinary ruling issued by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, we also have the monumental work of Edward Schwartz.⁷² With certain exceptions, the Greek text of the canons of the first four ecumenical councils found in *Fonti* is that of the *Synagoge*, sometimes with some interesting variants; it is nonetheless difficult to appreciate their importance because of deficiencies in the way the critical apparatus is set out.⁷³ The old Latin versions of the canons, above all those of Nicea I, are worthy of careful consideration. Certain ones in fact show signs of being based on a Greek text earlier than those which have come down to us. At least in the one case, the old Latin text allows us to reconstruct with near certainty the original form of the canon and to understand the *mens legislatoris*.⁷⁴ We can also add that the old Latin versions have an interest all their own. The variety of Latin translations of Greek terms found in these versions calls for theological reflection.⁷⁵ Moreover, certain interpretive translations, indeed additions, constitute precious testimony to the history of Church institutions in the West.⁷⁶ The research of Strewe⁷⁷ and, above all, the work of Turner,⁷⁸ as complete as it is serious, give the scholar access to correctly edited Latin texts. The Syriac translation of the canons done at Hierapolis of Euphratesia (500-501) is far from being as interesting as the old Latin versions. It is in fact very close to the oldest Greek editions we have. At the most, when a variant is found simultaneously in this Syriac version and in the Latin translations of Dionysius Exiguus, we can infer that it must reflect the text of the Antiochian *Graeca auctoritas*. The critical edition of the manuscript containing the Syriac translation mentioned above has been published by F. Schulthess.⁷⁹

We have already drawn attention to the work of Stephen of Ephesus, the *Synopsis*, edited by Aristenos and completed by Symeon the Logothete. No critical edition of this *Epitome canonum* exists; we have, therefore, used the work of Rhalles and Potles. We have done the

same for the commentaries of Aristenos, Zonaras, and Bal-samon.⁸⁰ For the anonymous scholia, we have used the publication of V.N. Benesevic.⁸¹

Archbishop Peter L'Huillier

The First Ecumenical Council.

The First Ecumenical Council was held in Nicea, Asia Minor, in 325 on the occasion of the heresy of Arius (Arianism). In order to expedite the assembling of the Council, the emperor Constantine placed at the disposal of the bishops the public conveyances and posts of the empire; moreover, while the Council lasted he provided abundantly for the maintenance of the members. The choice of Nicaea was favourable to the assembling of a large number of bishops. It was easily accessible to the bishops of nearly all the provinces, but especially to those of Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Thrace. The sessions were held in the principal church, and in the central hall of the imperial palace. A large place was indeed necessary to receive such an assembly, though the exact number is not known with certainty. St. Athanasius, a member of the council speaks of 300, and in his letter "Ad Afros" he says explicitly 318. This figure is almost universally adopted. Most of the bishops present were Greeks; among the Latins we know only Hosius of Cordova, Cecilian of Carthage, Mark of Calabria, Nicasius of Dijon, Donnus of Stridon in Pannonia, and the two Roman priests, Victor and Vincentius, representing the pope. The assembly numbered among its most famous members St. Alexander of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, Macarius of Jerusalem, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Nicholas of Myra. Some had suffered during the last persecution; others were poorly enough acquainted with Christian theology. Among the members was a young deacon, Athanasius of Alexandria, for whom this Council was to be the prelude to a life of conflict and of glory.

The Council was opened by Constantine with the greatest solemnity. The emperor began by making the bishops understand that they had a greater and better business in hand than personal quarrels and interminable recriminations. Nevertheless, he had to submit to the infliction of hearing the last words of debates which had been going on previous to his arrival. Eusebius of Caesarea and his two abbreviators, Socrates and Sozomen, as well as Rufinus and Gelasius of Cyzicus, report no details of the theological discussions. Rufinus tells us only that daily sessions were held and that Arius was often summoned before the assembly; his opinions were seriously discussed and the opposing arguments attentively considered. The majority, especially those who were confessors of the Faith, energetically declared themselves against the impious doctrines of Arius. St. Athanasius assures us that the activities of the Council were nowise hampered by Constantine's presence. To St. Athanasius may be attributed a preponderant influence in the formulation of the symbol of the First Ecumenical Council, of which the following is a literal translation:

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance [*ek tes ousias*] of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, begotten not made, of the same substance with the Father [*homoousion to patri*], through whom all things were made both in heaven and on earth; who for us men and our salvation descended, was incarnate, and was made man, suffered and rose again the third day, ascended into heaven and cometh to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. Those who say: There was a time when He was not, and He was not before He was begotten; and that He was made out of nothing (*ex ouk onton*); or who

maintain that He is of another hypostasis or another substance [than the Father], or that the Son of God is created, or mutable, or subject to change, [them] the Catholic Church anathematizes.

The adhesion was general and enthusiastic. All the bishops save five declared themselves ready to subscribe to this formula, convince that it contained the ancient faith of the Apostolic Church. The opponents were soon reduced to two, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais, who were exiled and anathematized. Arius and his writings were also branded with anathema, his books were cast into the fire, and he was exiled to Illyria.

Other matters dealt with by this council were the controversy as to the time of celebrating Easter and the Meletian schism.

Of all the Acts of this Council, which, it has been maintained, were numerous, only three fragments have reached us: the creed, or symbol, given above; the canons; the synodal decree. In reality there never were any official acts besides these. But the accounts of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Rufinus may be considered as very important sources of historical information, as well as some data preserved by St. Athanasius, and a history of the Council of Nicaea written in Greek in the fifth century by Gelasius of Cyzicus. There has long existed a dispute as to the number of the canons of First Nicaea. All the collections of canons, whether in Latin or Greek, composed in the fourth and fifth centuries agree in attributing to this Council only the twenty canons, which we possess today. Of these the following is a brief résumé:

Canon 1: On the admission, or support, or expulsion of clerics mutilated by choice or by violence.

Canon 2: Rules to be observed for ordination, the avoidance of undue haste, the deposition of those guilty of a grave fault.

Canon 3: All members of the clergy are forbidden to dwell with any woman, except a mother, sister, or aunt.

Canon 4: Concerning episcopal elections.

Canon 5: Concerning the excommunicate.

Canon 6: Concerning patriarchs and their jurisdiction.

Canon 7: confirms the right of the bishops of Jerusalem to enjoy certain honours.

Canon 8: concerns the Novatians.

Canon 9: Certain sins known after ordination involve invalidation.

Canon 10: *Lapsi* who have been ordained knowingly or surreptitiously must be excluded as soon as their irregularity is known.

Canon 11: Penance to be imposed on apostates of the persecution of Licinius.

Canon 12: Penance to be imposed on those who upheld Licinius in his war on the Christians.

Canon 13: Indulgence to be granted to excommunicated persons in danger of death.

Canon 14: Penance to be imposed on catechumens who had weakened under persecution.

Canon 15: Bishops, priests, and deacons are not to pass from one church to another.

Canon 16: All clerics are forbidden to leave their church. Formal prohibition for bishops to ordain for their diocese a cleric belonging to another diocese.

Canon 17: Clerics are forbidden to lend at interest.

Canon 18: recalls to deacons their subordinate position with regard to priests.

Canon 19: Rules to be observed with regard to adherents of Paul of Samosata who wished to return to the Church.

Canon 20: On Sundays and during the Paschal season prayers should be said standing.

Canons.

1. If anyone has been operated upon by surgeons for a disease, or has been excised by barbarians, let him remain in the clergy. But if anyone has excised himself when well, he must be dismissed even if he is examined after being in the clergy. And henceforth no such person must be promoted to holy orders. But as is self-evident, though such is the case as regards those who affect the matter and dare to excise themselves, if any persons have been eunuchized by barbarians or their lords, but are otherwise found to be worthy, the Canon admits such persons to the clergy.

(Ap. cc. XXI, XXII, XXIII; c. VIII of the 1st-&-2nd.)

Interpretation.

Various Canons of the Apostles include decrees concerning eunuchism. But since they were disregarded, as it would appear, on this account it became necessary that it be made the subject of the present Canon, which says: Whoever has been made a eunuch by surgeons because of a disease or ailment, or by barbarians during the time of an invasion, if he is a clergyman, let him perform the functions of the clergy. But whoever while in good health has made himself a eunuch, even though he is a clergyman, must cease from the activities of the clergy. And of as many such persons as are laymen not even one must henceforth be made a clergyman. But as we say this in regard to those who affectedly and wilfully dare to make themselves eunuchs, in the same vein again we say that if there be any persons that have been made eunuchs by barbarians or by their masters (or owners), that is to say, against their will and tyrannically, but that are worthy, the Canon (either the present Canon, that is to say, or Apostolical Canon XXI) allows them to be admitted to the clergy. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXI.

2. Inasmuch as many things, whether of necessity or otherwise urgently demanded by men, have been done contrary to the ecclesiastical Canon, so that men who have but recently come to the faith from a heathen life, and have been catechized for only a short time, have been conducted directly to the spiritual bath, and as soon as baptized have been given an episcopate or a presbytery, it has seemed well henceforth to have no such thing occur. For the catechumen needs more time and a longer trial after baptism. The Apostolical letter, too, is plain which says, "*not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the Devil's snare*" (1 Tim. 3:6). If, on the other hand, in the course of time any psychical (i.e., animal) sin be found against the person, and it is exposed by two or three witnesses, let such a person be dismissed from the clergy. As for anyone acting contrary hereto, as having the hardihood to do things opposed to the great council, he himself shall be in danger of losing his standing in the clergy.

(Ap. c. LXXX; c. XVII of the 1st-&-2nd; c. X of Sardican; c. III of Laodicea; c. IV of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands what Ap. c. LXXX ordains. For it says: Since in times past many things have occurred that were contrary to the ecclesiastical Canon (that is to say, Ap. c. LXXX), whether of necessity, or on account of persons motivated by other considerations, so that they have almost immediately baptized persons that before had been converted to the Orthodox faith from the life of a heathen and infidel only a short while before, and had been catechized only a short time in the mystery of piety (i.e., of the Christian religion), and right after baptism they promoted them to an episcopate or a presbytery, which is to say, they ordained them presbyters or bishops; since, I say, these things formerly used to be done thus illegally, it has appeared reasonable that from now on they should not be done. For a catechumen needs sufficient time¹ even before being baptized to be properly catechized and instructed concerning all the dogmas of the faith; and after being baptized he again needs to undergo a long trial as a test of his worthiness. For the Apostle says to Timothy: "Let not a novice (be ordained, that is to say), or one newly catechized and recently planted in the vineyard of Christ, lest, after being puffed up with pride, he fall into the same sin and into the same snare as the Devil fell

into, or, in other words, into pride. If, on the other hand, with the passage of time, in the subsequent interval of trial and after he has been catechized and baptized and ordained, it should happen that he is found to have committed any animal (i.e., soul-wrought) sin² and is convicted thereof by two or three witnesses, he shall cease officiating in holy orders. As for anyone that does otherwise, he shall be in danger of forfeiting his claim to holy orders, that is to say, he shall be deposed from office, on the ground that he has impudently defied the great council. See also the Interpretation of Ap. c. LXXX.

3. The great Council has forbidden generally any Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon, and anyone else at all among those in the clergy, the privilege of having a *subintroducta*. Unless she is either a mother, or a sister, or an aunt, or a person above suspicion.

(c. V of the 6th; c. XXIII of the 7th; c. XIX of Ancyra; C. XIX of Carthage; c. LXXXVIII of Basil.)

Interpretation.³

Men in holy orders and clergymen ought not to cause the laity any suspicion or scandal. On this account the present Canon ordains that this great Council — the First Ecumenical, that is to say — has entirely forbidden any bishop or presbyter or deacon or any other clergyman to have a strange woman in his house, and to live with her, excepting only a mother, or a sister, or an aunt, or other persons that do not arouse any suspicion.

The ordinance of the first title of the Novels, which is Justinian Novel 123, says as follows: “We too forbid, in accordance with the power of the divine Canons presbyters and deacons and subdeacons and all other clergymen that have no lawful wife to keep any strange woman in their house. Except that they may keep a mother, a daughter, and a sister, and any other persons that are exempt from suspicion. If, however, anyone fails to observe these rules, but, even after reminded by the prelate or by his fellow clergymen, he refuses to throw the woman out whom he has been keeping, or, after being accused, he is proved to be associating with her indecently, such a man shall be deposed, and shall be turned over to the civil authorities of that city where he is serving as a clergyman.” But if a bishop lives with a woman at all, he shall be deposed.⁴ Note two things here, though: one, that those who have unsuspectable persons in their home, as we have said, namely, a mother, or a sister, or an aunt, or other, must not at the same time have also suspicious persons serving, not them, but those unsuspectable persons; because again in this manner they become violators and incur the penalties prescribed by the Canons. Instead, they ought either to serve themselves, or have servants to serve them who are unsuspectable. Another thing is that monks ought not to live with unsuspectable persons alone when they have such. Because if the above-mentioned c. XXII of the 7th prohibits one from eating with his female relatives only, who are unsuspectable, how much more does it not prohibit them from living with them? For Basil the Great says (in his discussion of virginity) that the pleasure of flesh has overcome even brothers and sisters born of the same mother and has led to every sort of sin against mothers and daughters, just as it stigmatized also Amnon, the son of David, as a result of his debauching his own sister Tamar (II Sam. ch. 13), because the seductive and magnetic power of sexual love of men for women, which has been placed in men’s bodies, in defiance, he says, of every right reasoning — such as, let us say, that she is a mother, or a sister, or an aunt — spontaneously and all on their own initiative prompts the mingling of bodies of men with bodies of women, regardless of whether they are strangers or relatives, and in spite of the fact that their inward thoughts struggling against it are averse thereto.

4. It is most fitting that a Bishop should be installed by all those in his province. But if such a thing is difficult either because of the urgency of circumstances, or because of the distance to be travelled, at least three should meet together somewhere and by their votes combined with those of the ones absent and joining in the election by letter they should carry out the ordination thereafter. But as for the ratification of the proceedings, let it be entrusted in each province to the Metropolitan.

(Ap. c. I; c. III of the 7th; c. XIX of Antioch; c. VI of Sardican; c. XII of Laodicea; and cc. XII, LVIII, LIX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that a bishop ought to be ordained by all the bishops in the province whenever this is feasible; but in case it is difficult for all of them to be gathered together at a meeting for this purpose, whether on account of some urgent necessity, or because of the long distance of travel involved, let at least three bishops meet together in any event, and let those absent contribute their votes by letter in the ordination, and then let them ordain him. As for the validity and ratification of everything that has been done — that is to say, the validity of the election held by all the bishops, and the appointment of the one of the three candidates — because three must be voted for, according to ecclesiastical formality — the appointment, I say, of the one to receive notification of the ordination, must be left and referred to the metropolitan of each province as the supreme authority.⁵ But inasmuch as the annotators, namely, Zonaras and Balsamon, explain the text as meaning to be appointed, instead of meaning to be voted for; and others say that instead of ordination we ought to know that previous thereto and properly necessary thereto the election signifies installation. Accordingly, I prefer the word *install* to the word *make*. So even here the expression “it is fitting that he should be installed” as previously necessary is a comprehensive term denoting that he should be elected, chosen, ordained by all of them. I said “previously” and “comprehensive” because this order of procedure is sacred: that is to say, one must first be voted for and afterwards be ordained. Accordingly, we thus obtain a most complete understanding that he has been installed; that is to say, that he has actually been made a bishop. There hence appear to be two significations inherent in the words of the expression “to be installed,” just as there are also in the words of the expression “to be elected”: one implying action by all, and the other implying action by three, both in accordance with the present Canon and in accordance with Ap. c. I. This is about the same as the explanation given by the Seventh Ecum. C. in its own c. III: therefore when only three carry out the ordination, it must previously have been voted for by all of them, those absent signifying their choice by letter.

5. As regards those who have been denied communion, whether they be members of the clergy or belong to a lay order, by the bishops in each particular province, let the opinion prevail which expressed in the Canon prescribing that those rejected by some are not to be received by others. But let an investigation be made as to whether or not they have been unchurched on account of small-mindedness or quarrelsomeness or any other such disgustfulness of the Bishop. In order, therefore, that a proper investigation may be made, it has seemed well that synods be held every year twice a year in each province and in a common discussion held by all the Bishops of the province assembled together for this purpose let such questions be thrashed out. And thus those who have admittedly clashed with the Bishop would seem to be reasonably excluded from communion until such time as by common consent of the bishops it may seem better to let a more philanthropic vote be given in their behalf. As for these synods, let one of them be held before Lent, in order that, with the elimination of all small-mindedness, the gift may be offered to God in all its purity; and let the second one be held sometime in autumn.

(Ap. cc. XII, XIII, XXXII, XXXVII; c. XIX of the 4th; c. VIII of the 6th; cc. VI, XX of Antioch; cc. X, XX of Sardican; cc. XXVI, XXXVII, CIV, CXVI, and CXLI of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees the following things: In regard to clergymen and laymen who have been excommunicated by the bishops of any particular province, let the opinion prevail and remain in force and effect which has already been expressed in legislation, just as that old Canon (i.e., Ap. c. XXXII or even XII) decrees, to wit, that persons excommunicated by the bishops of one province must not be admitted to communion by other bishops. Yet let an investigation be made as to the possibility that the ones excommunicated have been excommunicated because of some small-mindedness or quarrelsomeness or some other grudge on the part of the bishop. Hence, in order that this matter and other such questions may be properly investigated, it has appeared reasonable to hold local synods twice a year in each province, and to assemble all the bishops together in a common meeting for the express purpose of considering them. And thus, after such an investigation has been made, as touching those who have been sinning against the bishop and who have been rightly and justly excommunicated, by him, let them remain excommunicated, in accordance with grounds of congruity and justice, also by all the rest of the bishops, until it appear reasonable to the common assembly of the

bishops to render a more philanthropic (or more humane) decision regarding those who have been excommunicated. For if the one who excommunicated them, let us assume, is so hardened even after some time as to refuse to liberate them from the excommunication, or if he should die in the meantime, permission is given to the synod to release them from it after it deems that a sufficient length of time has been passed in penance. These synods are to be held one sometime before Lent, in order to take advantage of the fact that at this time every small-mindedness and mistake that either the prelate has made in dealing with the clergy and the laity, or, conversely, that the clergy and the laity have shown towards the prelate, is dissolved, in order to allow a pure and unblemished gift of fasting to be offered to God. Let the second synod be held in the time of autumn. Read also Ap. cc. XXXII and XXXVII.

6. Let the ancient customs prevail which were in vogue in Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis, to allow the bishop of Alexandria to have authority over all these parts, since this is also the treatment usually accorded to the bishop of Rome. Likewise with reference to Antioch, and in other provinces, let the seniority be preserved to the Churches. In general it is obvious that in the case in which anyone has been made a bishop without the Metropolitan's approval, the great Council has prescribed that such a person must not be a Bishop. If, however, to the common vote of all, though reasonable and in accordance with an ecclesiastical Canon, two or three men object on account of a private quarrel, let the vote of the majority prevail.

(Ap. c. XXXIV; cc. II of the 2nd; c. VIII of the 3rd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; c. XXXVI of the 6th; c. XIX of Laodicea; c. XIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.⁶

The present Canon ordains that the old customs of the three Patriarchs are to be kept in vogue, chiefly and mainly as regarding the Patriarch of Alexandria, and secondly as regarding the Patriarch of Antioch, and the Patriarch of Rome, succinctly and comprehensively. (Concerning the Patriarch of Jerusalem the present Council devote special and separate treatment in its c. VII; and concerning the Patriarch of Constantinople the Second Council set forth its views in its c. III). So that the Patriarch (whom it calls a Bishop here, owing to the fact that it had not yet become customary to designate one by calling him the Patriarch⁷) of Alexandria came to have authority over all the bishops and metropolitans in Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis. In fact, the same custom also came to prevail with regard to the Patriarch of Rome⁸ in that he was allowed to have authority and presidency over all the occidental bishops and metropolitans. Likewise the Patriarch of Antioch is given authority over the bishops and metropolitans of Syria, of Middle Syria, of each of the two regions called Cilicia, of Mesopotamia, and of all the other dioceses subject to his jurisdiction. The present Canon, in fact, commands that not only the privileges of these Patriarchs are to be preserved, but even the privileges of other provinces and churches that are subject to the metropolitans. What is said of the Patriarchs in existence is also true of the independent Patriarchs, then and now — that is to say, the autocephalous Patriarchs, such as those of Asia, of Pontus, of Thrace, of Cyprus, of Africa, and of other countries. (Though others say that the Canon names here also other provinces, embraced, concisely speaking, in the dioceses subordinate to the other two Patriarchs, of Constantinople and of Jerusalem; and that of metropolitans it names only patriarchs. But the first interpretation is better; see also Dositheus, in the Dodecabilus, pp. 117, 123.) Thus the effect of this Canon is that nothing relating to the administration of church affairs can be done without their consent and approval or sanction. Now, inasmuch as the greatest and chiefest of all ecclesiastical affairs is ordination, the Canon accordingly adds that if anyone is made a bishop without the approval of his own metropolitan, as this great Council has decreed, he is not to be a bishop, because in spite of the fact that the multitude of bishops voted for the bishop, the ratification of the election had to be made by the Metropolitan, and whoever was approved by the Metropolitan had to be made a bishop (and see the footnote to the present Council's c. IV). Yet if all the bishops in common elect a candidate to an episcopate in accordance with ecclesiastical Canons, but two or three object to his election, not for a good reason and justly, but cavilously and spitefully, the vote of the majority shall decide the matter.⁹ Canon XIX of Antioch decrees the same thing. Canon XIII of Carthage says that if any one of those who took part in the voting and signed should afterwards oppose his own confession and signature, he shall deprive himself of the honor of (being) a bishop. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXIV.

7. Inasmuch as a custom has prevailed, and an ancient tradition, for the Bishop in Aelia to be honored, let him have the sequence of honor, with the Metropolitan having his own dignity preserved.

(Ap. c. XXXIV; cc. II, III of the 2nd; c. VIII of the 3rd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; c. XXXVI of the 6th; and c. XIX of Antioch.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon is susceptible of two different interpretations. For Balsamon and the Anonymous annotator of the Canons, with whom some Papists (i.e., Roman Catholics, as they are called in common parlance) and Calvinists agree, have interpreted it to mean that inasmuch as an ancient tradition and custom has prevailed for the Bishop of Aelia (i.e., of Jerusalem)¹⁰ to be specially honored on account of the fact that the Lord became incarnate and suffered therein, and the salvatory declaration came forth therefrom through the sacred Apostles into all the world, let him have the honor next after the preceding one, even in subsequent times, yet only honor without any authority and office, because the authority and office ought to be preserved to the Metropolitan of Palestine whose seat was the metropolis called Caesarea¹¹ of Straton, to whom, as they say, Jerusalem was subject. That is to say, just as c. XII of Chalcedon prescribes that in the case of as many cities as received by virtue of imperial letters the honor of being entitled to the name *metropolis*, the bishops thereof were the only ones allowed to enjoy the honor, whereas the rights proper thereto were to be preserved to the real metropolis, in the same way as Marcianus (an emperor of the Eastern Empire) honored Chalcedon, and Valentinian (another emperor) honored Nicaea, according to Act 13 of the Council. But Zonaras and others would have it that just as the preceding Canon accorded seniority to the bishops of Alexandria and of Antioch, or rather to say renewed it, as an innovation (for the seniority of Rome was not renewed, because, as we have said, it had been left intact and unchanged), so and in like manner the present Canon bestowed a special honor on Jerusalem. This is tantamount to saying that just as that Canon sanctioned their being granted not only patriarchal privileges and honors, but also the order of precedence of such honors, in that the bishop of Rome came first, the bishop of Alexandria second, the bishop of Antioch third, so did this Canon sanction the granting to Jerusalem not only of patriarchal privileges and honors but also the order of precedence of such honors. On this account it did not say, let him have (special) honor, but “let him have the sequence of honor.” That is the same as saying, let him have fourth place in the sequence of honor after the other three. The expression “with the Metropolis having its own dignity preserved” denotes that this patriarchal honor is not one attaching to the person and individual (concerning which see the second footnote to c. VI of the present Council), but is consecrated to the metropolis of Jerusalem, so as to provide for its devolving to all the bishops successively acceding to the throne, and not to this or that person alone. Witnesses to the fact that Jerusalem was a metropolis are both Josephus, who says, in his book VII on the Jews, that it was a large city and the metropolis of the entire country of the Jews; and Philo, who says that it was the metropolis, not of a single land of Judea, but also of a plurality of lands. For the Apostolic throne of Jerusalem not only stands first in nearly the whole world, but also enjoyed patriarchal privileges from the beginning, and still enjoys them even today. First, because it had provinces subject to it, and a diocese which belonged to the Patriarch. Hence it was that the neighboring officials of the churches, and not the bishop of Caesarea, ordained Dion bishop of Jerusalem when Narcissus departed. But when Narcissus reappeared, again he was called by the brethren, according to Eusebius, and not by the Brother, or the bishop of Caesarea. Narcissus, by the way, held a council with fourteen bishops concerning Easter before the First Ecumenical Council was held. Secondly, because the Bishop of Jerusalem was the first to sign at the First Ecumenical Council, while Eusebius of Caesarea was the fifth. And, generally speaking, metropolitans change round in the order of signatures, and in the places of seats at council meetings, and in the order of addressing emperors, sometimes taking the lead, and sometimes following others. But the Bishop of Jerusalem always comes first among the Fathers attending a council, and on every occasion is numbered with the patriarchs, and never with the metropolitans. Read also Dositheus in the Dodecabiblus, Book II, ch. 4. But even if we grant that Jerusalem was subject to Caesarea, what of it? Just as Byzantium was formerly subject to Heraclea, but later, after Byzantium became the seat of a patriarch, Heraclea was made subject to it; so and in like manner, if we allow (what is not a fact) that Jerusalem was subject to Caesarea, after Jerusalem was honored by being made the seat of a patriarch, Caesarea, true enough, retained its own dignity thereafter, in that it

remained a metropolis of Palestine, yet it became subordinate to Jerusalem, since it is merely a metropolis, while Jerusalem is a patriarchate (i.e., the seat and headquarters of a patriarch). Read also Ap. c. XXXIV.

8. As concerning those who call themselves Puritans and who are claiming to be adherents of the catholic and apostolic Church, it has seemed right to the holy and great Council, when they have had hands laid upon them, to let them remain in the clergy. Above all, that it is fitting for them to confess to this in writing, to wit, that they will agree to and will adhere to the dogmas of the catholic and apostolic Church. That is, that they will hold communion with persons married a second time, and with those who in time of persecution have lapsed from the faith; regarding whom a length of time has been fixed, and a due season has been set, for their penance. So that they may adhere to the dogmas of the catholic Church in everything. Wherever they are the only ones found to have been ordained, whether in villages or in cities, they shall remain in the same habit (or order). But wherever there is a Bishop of the catholic Church, and some of them are joining it, it is obvious that, as the Bishop of the Church will keep the dignity of bishop, the one called a bishop among the so-called Puritans shall have the honor of a Presbyter, unless it should seem better to the Bishop that he should share in the honor of the name. But if this does not please him, he shall devise a position either of a chorepiscopus or of a presbyter, with the object of having him seem to be wholly in the clergy, lest there should be two bishops in the same city.

(Ap. cc. XLVI, XLVII, LXVIII; c. VII of the 2nd; c. XCV of the 6th; cc. VII, VIII of Laodicea; c. LXVI of Carthage; cc. I, XLVII of Basil; c. XII of Theophilus; c. XIV of the 7th; c. XIII of Ancyra; c. XIV of Neocæsarea; cc. VIII, X. of Antioch.)

Interpretation.

The ones called Puritans here were the Novatians.¹² The man Novatian himself was a presbyter in the Church of the Romans who would not accept those who had reneged in time of persecution, but had repented, nor would he give communion to persons that had married twice. He had also declared that after baptism a sinner could no longer have mercy bestowed upon him, according to Epiphanius, Haer. 59, and Augustine, Haer. 38. So, although this man did not err as respecting the dogmas of the faith, nor was he a heretic, but was instead a schismatic (or sectarian), according to c. I of St. Basil, yet, because of his hatred of brethren, and his being of an unsympathetic frame of mind, and proud, he was anathematized by the Council held in Rome in the time of Pope Cornelius, according to Eusebius, and by the councils held in Carthage in the time of Cyprian, and by the councils held against him in Antioch and in Italy. Those who adhered to his misbelief were called after him Novatians. These facts being assumed to be known, the present Canon asserts that in case any such Novatians join the catholic Church, it has appeared reasonable that they should have hands laid¹³ upon them, and thus be received, and be allowed to remain in their clergy, those, that is to say, who really were clergymen in the habit (thus c. LXVI of Carthage accepted the Donatists with an imposition of the hands); nevertheless, they must confess in writing that they have to keep all dogmas of the catholic Church, that they will accept those who have married twice, and those who were forced by necessity to deny Christ, and that they will accommodate them, according to fixed times, with the Canon of repentance applicable to deniers; and thus, wherever they happen to be, whether in cities or in villages, they shall be left in the clergy and rank in which each of them found himself when he was ordained: that is to say, a bishop shall remain a bishop; a presbyter, a presbyter; and a deacon, a deacon. However, a bishop shall remain a bishop where there is no Orthodox bishop of the catholic Church. But if in the same church there is also an Orthodox bishop, the latter shall have the office and dignity, and all the business, and the name of bishop, while the bishop formerly a Novatian shall have only the honor of a presbyter, and the nominal title of bishop,¹⁴ but he shall not perform any priestly act as a bishop, in order to avoid having this improper and absurd situation arise in which two bishops are officiating in one and the same city (concerning which see Ap. c. XXXV, and c. XVI of the 1st-&2nd;¹⁵ in case, however, he refuses to be content with this arrangement, the Orthodox bishop must allow him to have a position as a chorepiscopus,¹⁶ or as a presbyter, in order that he too may be numbered among those who are in holy orders and clergymen, and not appear to be wholly deprived of the clergy.

9. If some persons have been promoted to Presbyters without due examination, or when given a hearing confessed their sins to them,¹⁷ and after they confessed, the men, acting contrary to the Canon, laid hand upon such persons, the Canon will not admit them. For the catholic Church insists upon irreproachability.

(Ap. cc. XXV, LXI; cc. IX, X of Neocaesaria; cc. III, V, VI of Theophilus).

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that those who are about to be admitted to holy orders must be clear from sins that preclude holy orders, and that their life and their behavior and conduct must be looked into. If, however, some persons have been made presbyters without being examined, or upon examination confessed their sins, such as preclude admission to holy orders, and the prelates who examined them, acting contrary to the Canons, ordained them priests, such persons, I say, having been invested with holy orders unworthily, are not admitted to the privilege of performing sacred rites. For after being exposed by others, or they themselves confessed to sins incapacitating one for holy orders which they had committed before applying for ordination, they can be defrocked according to Zonaras and Balsamon. Or they may cease to perform sacred rites, according to the Anonymous annotator of the Canons. But the Canon also adds an explanation of the reason why those who have fallen into sins are not admissible to holy orders. Because, it says, the catholic Church demands and wants priests to be irreproachable, or, in other words, exempt from the charge of sins, just as St. Paul commands that a bishop should be, by saying: "A bishop then must be irreproachable" (mistranslated in the Authorized Version "blameless") (I Tim. 3:2), or, in other words, not only unchargeable at law, but also entirely unimpeachable and free from every accusation, as touching his moral character.¹⁸

Concordantly with the present Canon c. IX of Neocaesarea also decrees relevantly hereto, by saying: If any presbyter before his ordination committed the sin of carnal mingling, and after his ordination confesses it, let him function in holy orders no more. Likewise if even a deacon has thus sinned, and has confessed after he was ordained, let him serve only in the capacity of a servant, in accordance with c. X of the same Council. Canon III of Theophilus says that if anyone has been ordained a presbyter through ignorance without his being worthy of serving in this capacity, and has been exposed after his ordination, he is to be ousted from holy orders. Likewise in the case of a deacon that has been ordained in spite of his being unworthy, he is to be deposed in accordance with c. V of the same saint. It is also to be observed that all sins that entail deposition from holy orders when committed before admission to holy orders, similarly entail deposition also when committed after admission to holy orders, when exposed, or when confessed after admission to holy orders. Not only do they entail deposition, but they also act as a barrier to becoming a priest.

10. As many persons as have been guilty of serious lapses and have been ordained in ignorance thereof, or even after the ordinator has become aware thereof, will not be admitted under the ecclesiastical Canon. For when they have become known, they shall be deposed.

(Ap. c. LXII; cc. I, III, XII of Ancyra; c. X of Peter.)

Interpretation.

All those who have offended by lapsing seriously, i.e., by denying our Lord Jesus Christ, and have afterwards repented, are incapable of becoming priests. For how can anyone become a priest that is prevented according to the canons of the Church from partaking of the divine mysteries until he dies? On this account the present Canon says that as many persons as have been ordained from among God-deniers, either because the prelate who ordained them did not know about the denial, or because, though knowing about it, he blinked or scorned the fact, and thought that ordination would purify them as does baptism, in accordance with the interpretation given by Balsamon — this fact, I say, of their having been ordained, that is to say, in ignorance or in spite of knowledge of the facts, does not offer any bar or obstacle to the application of the ecclesiastical canon, so as, that is to say, to prevent its operating to exclude them from holy orders. Because once they have been detected or have revealed themselves, so as to show in what manner they have been ordained, they have to be deposed. All those persons, on the contrary, who before baptism sacrificed to idols are nevertheless qualified to be admitted to holy orders after they have been baptized, on the ground that they have received a bath of redemp-

tion, in accordance with c. XII of Ancyra. All those persons, furthermore, who have undergone torture for the sake of Christ, and for His sake have been imprisoned, and have been forcibly compelled to have their hands defiled with incense or to take sacrificial offers of food in their mouth — all such persons, provided the rest of their life has been fairly good, may be ordained clergymen, according to c. III of the same council. Note also that not only those persons are to be deposed who have denied Christ before ordination and have afterwards been ordained, but also those who have denied Him after ordination; read also Ap. c. LXII.

11. As concerns those persons who have transgressed without any need, or without being deprived of goods, or without being in any peril or in any such strait as obtained during the tyranny of Licinius, it has deemed fit to the Council, notwithstanding that they did not deserve philanthropic (or humane) treatment, to be kind to them. As many, therefore, as genuinely repent and are remorseful shall pass three years among audients as believers, and for seven years they shall do penance as succumbents. In addition, for two years they shall commune without oblation in prayers with the laity.

(c. VI of Ancyra; c. III of Peter; cc. LXXIII, LXXXI of Basil; c. II of Nyssa.)

Interpretation.

There are other Canons which deal with those who deny the faith as a result of great violence or dire necessity. The present Canon deals with those persons who deny it without being forced to do so. It says in effect: As for those who have transgressed the faith in Christ without being prompted to do so by any necessity, or peril, or deprivation of their property, as happened to those who lived in the time of the tyrant Licinius,¹⁹ though they, I say, have not deserved to be treated philanthropically and clemently, it has appeared best nevertheless to the Council to show them mercy. So, as many as truly and from the depth of their heart, and not feignedly and falsely and lyingly, are repentant on account of the sin they committed, shall be obliged to spend three years with the so-called “listeners” (audients). This means that they shall have to stand in the narthex (of the church) at the “beautiful and royal gates” of the temple (or nave), and of the church, in order to listen to the Holy Scriptures until the deacon pronounces the words “All catechumens come forward”; thereupon they shall leave the church. For seven (*Note of Translator.* — The original says “two,” apparently by mistake) years they shall be succumbent; that is to say, in other words, they shall enter the nave, and shall stand, when there, in the rear of the pulpit, but shall leave along with the catechumens when the deacon pronounces the words “all catechumens come forward.” And for two years they shall join in prayer with the laity. That is to say, in other words, they shall stand together with the faithful and pray, and not leave with the catechumens, though without partaking of the divine mysteries (communion) until the two years are ended.²⁰

All those persons who denied the faith simply because the tyrants threatened to torture them, which is tantamount to saying without being forced to do so, are excluded from the divine mysteries for six years, according to c. VI of Ancyra. Those, on the other hand, who have denied the faith of their own accord, without suffering anything terrible, but only cowardice and fear, after showing fruit worthy of repentance over a period of four years, shall be allowed the benefit thereof, according to c. III of Peter. But according to c. II of Nyssa whoever denies Christ of his own accord, shall have his whole lifetime as his term of repentance, without being allowed to pray together with the faithful in the church, or to partake at all of the divine mysteries. In identically the same manner his brother Basil, too, commands the same things in his c. XIII, by saying that anyone that has denied Christ is under obligation to remain all his life long with the “weepers” (called *flentes* in Latin), or, in other words, to stand outside of even the narthex in the vestibule of temple (or of the nave), and to beg the laity entering the church to pray for him to the Lord. In c. LXXXI of the same saint it says that those who without any great necessity denied the faith and ate of the table of the demons, and swore Greek oaths, are to be excommunicated for three years, and after eight more years are to be allowed to commune.²¹ In order to enable you to understand better, O reader, what positions were occupied by “weepers,” by “listeners,” by “kneelers,” and by “costanders,” behold, at the end of this book we have inserted a diagram, or drawing, or architectural plan, of the church building; and you should carefully and diligently examine it. Concerning “weepers,” and concerning penitents in general, a historical account is given by Sozomen, who says (Book VII, ch. 16): “In the beginning it seemed fitting to the priests for sinners to tell about their sins with the congregation of the church acting as witnesses like spectators in a theater. Later, however, the best policy prevailed, which was indeed one of discreetness and sageness, whereby sinners approached and confessed their

life deeds . . .” And again he says: “In the church of the Romans the place of penitents is exposed to view . . . So there penitents stand downcast and mournful, and after the divine liturgy is over the poor wretches, instead of partaking of communion, fall to the ground upon their face with much sobbing and wailing. From the other direction comes the Bishop running and he too likewise falls to the ground weeping tears and uttering laments, and along with them the entire congregation burst out crying and shedding copious tears. Afterwards the Bishop is the first to lift himself up from the ground and stand up, and he lifts up the penitents, and after praying aloud to God on account of their sins, he dismissed them and they go their way.”²²

12. As for those persons who were summoned by the grace, and after displaying a preliminary enthusiasm and taking off their belts, they returned, like dogs to their vomit, in such a fashion that some of them even wasted money in an effort to re-establish themselves in the army by means of *beneficia* (a Latin word meaning much the same as the English word *gift*), let them be succumbents for ten years after devoting three years to “listening” (as audients). But in addition to all these requirements it is requisite to examine into the will (or inclinations) and the kind of repentance. For as regards all those who with fear, and tears, and patience, and the doing of good to others have displayed proofs of their conversion by actual performance and not by mere pretense, after they have fulfilled the time fixed for their “listening” period, they shall participate in prayers unrestrictedly, with the further concession of a right to the Bishop to devise some more philanthropic (or humane) treatment regarding them. But as for those who acted unconcernedly, and who thought the pretense of going to church a sufficient proof of their conversion, let them fulfill the time to the utmost limit.

(cc. IX, XI of Peter; c. CII of the 6th; cc. II, V, VII of Ancyra; cc. I, II of Laodicea; cc. II, III, LXIV, LXXXIV of Basil; cc. IV, V, VII and VIII of Nyssa.)

Interpretation.

This Canon, too, appears to be speaking of Christian soldiers living in the time of Licinius. It decrees thus: As regarding all Christian soldiers who having been called and having been strengthened by divine grace displayed at first courage and eagerness for martyrdom, and cast aside their belts, which were their army decorations, but thereafter returned, like dogs to their own vomit, which is to say, repented, and denied the faith, inasmuch that some of them even spent money and by means of *beneficia*, or, more plainly speaking, with gifts and benefactions (for that is what this Latin word signifies) they regained their former status in the army; as for them, I say, after they have done three years in the place assigned to “listeners,” let them do also ten years more in the place assigned to “kneelers.” That is to say, in other words, though allowed to enter the church, they must leave together with catechumens. Besides all this, however, the prelate and the spiritual father ought to examine into the likings and proclivities of such faith-deniers, and the kind and mood of their repentance.²³ For all those who repent with fear of God, and who propitiate God with tears and penitential contrition, and patiently endure hardships, and do good to others in a charitable way, as, for instance, by giving alms, and other virtues, and, generally speaking, who repent truly and genuinely, and not fictitiously and in appearance only; as for these persons, I say, after they fulfill the said three years with “listeners,” they may rightfully pray with the faithful, and need not leave the church (ahead of time). In addition to this concession, the prelate is permitted to show them still more kindly treatment and mercy. But as for all those who repent unconcernedly and carelessly, and think that it is enough evidence of repentance for them to go to church ostensibly with “kneelers” and to leave again with catechumens; as for these persons, I say, let them fulfill all three years of “listening,” and the entire ten years of succumbency.²⁴

Canons II, V, and VII of Ancyra, and cc. I and II of Laodicea agree that penances ought to be accommodated to the repentance and complaisance of penitents. So do cc. CII of the 6th and II and III and LXXIV and LXXXIV of Basil, and cc. IV, V, VII, and VIII of Nyssa. In this connection, too, c. XXVIII of Nicephorus says that if a secular person of his own free will confesses his mistakes, the spiritual father (i.e., the confessor) may make him an “economy,” i.e., may allow him an adjustment in regard to the matter of penances. Read also cc. IX and XI of Peter.

13. As concerns those who are making their exit, the old and canonical Law shall be kept even now, so that, if anyone is exciting, let him not be deprived of the final and most necessary²⁵ equipment (or viaticum). If, however, after all hope has fled, and he has been given communion, he again comes to be looked upon as being among the living, let him stay with those who participate in prayer only. In general, moreover, as concerning anyone at all that is on the point of making his exit, if he asks to partake of the Eucharist, let the Bishop impart to him the oblation with a trial.

Interpretation.

After these divine Fathers prescribed concerning penance, and in what way, and for how long a time Christ-deniers ought to be excluded from communion, now in the present Canon they are prescribing that all such persons as are in danger of dying are to be accorded the benefit of the old and canonical law (which appears to be c. VI of the Council held in Ancyra, this being an earlier one than the First Ecumenical). So that, in effect, whoever has been despaired of as being about to die, let him not be deprived of the last and final and most necessary equipment for that journey and departure, which equipment consists in partaking of the divine mysteries.²⁶ If, however, the one who has been thought to be dying, and has already partaken of the mysteries of communion, again becomes alive and regains his health, let him stand only with the faithful, and let him pray with them, not, however, to partake of communion. But Balsamon says that such a person as this one of whom the Canon is speaking here, if he was occupying the place assigned to consistents (or “costanders”), he ought on this account to be ordered to stay in that place again; but if he was in the place assigned to audients (or “listeners”), again he ought to stay there. And, in general, everyone in danger ought to return to that canon after communion in which he had been before communion.²⁷ And to lay down a catholic and common canon, let the Bishop, or even the spiritual father, with a trial, impart the divine Mysteries to any person that is in mortal danger and asks to partake of the Holy Eucharist.

14. As concerning catechumens and lapsers,²⁸ it has seemed proper to the holy great Council to let them off with only three years’ listening and to allow them thereafter to pray together with catechumens.

(c. V of Neocaes, c. XIX of Laod.; c. XX of Basil; c. VI of Timothy; c. V. of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

They are called catechumens because this word is one derived from the Greek verb *catecho* (altered to “catechize” in English), which is defined as meaning to teach beginners the faith by word of mouth, because these persons had to be catechized and taught the dogmas of the Orthodox faith. They were divided into two classes. The first class, which was the more perfect and complete, was called that of “knee-bowers,” they having embraced the faith and having deferred only the rite of baptism. Wherefore they were allowed to come to church and stay there until the time came for the catechumens’ prayer, according to c. XIX of Laodicea, and after they had said this prayer under their breath (or, as the Greek has it, “mystically”) and had had the priest lay his hand upon them, they bowed their knee. But when the time came for the pronouncement of the words “All catechumens come forward,” they had to leave the church. The second class was the more imperfect and incomplete, and was called that of the “listeners,” who stood in the narthex towards the “royal gates” and listened to the Holy Scriptures, and after hearing the divine gospels they would leave, according to Blastaris and the commentator on Armenopoulos in the latter’s Epitome of the Canons (Section 5, Heading 3). These two classes are to be seen clearly depicted in the drawing of the temple which we have traced. Cardinal Bonas (Book I concerning liturgical matters) and some others, in addition to these two classes, enumerate two more classes, which they gleaned from the writings of the Western Fathers. One of these classes was called that of the “petitioners” (because they were requesting to be baptized), and the other was known as that of the “elect,” who were thus called after being enrolled in the list of persons to be baptized, who were designated the illuminated, or *illuminati*, in ch. 7 of Book VIII of the Apostolical Injunctions. The same name is applied to them also by St. Cyril in his catechism. Chapter 8 of the same Book of the Injunctions refers to them as being baptized, and these persons are likewise mentioned in c. VI of Timothy.²⁹ These facts being as stated, the present Canon proceeds to say: As for all catechumens that belong to the first and higher class and have denied the faith, it has appeared reasonable to this holy great Council for them to stand for three years in the ranks of the second and

lower class of catechumens, namely, the audients, or “listeners,” in the narthex of the church, and after three years have passed for them to pray together with the first and higher class of catechumens inside the church. But one likely as not might justifiably wonder why the councils impose penances upon sinful catechumens. St. Basil the Great in his c. XX says: “And in general the events in the life of a catechumen do not entail responsibilities.” By way of solving this apparent contradiction it may be said, according to Zonaras, that St. Basil the Great did not say for the catechumens not to be penanced for sinning before baptism. For in that case he would have been contradicting the Canons of the Councils; but what he really said was simply that the sins of the catechumens did not entail responsibilities, or, in other words, any liability to punishment after they have been baptized, since everything sinful that the catechumens did while they were catechumens, but also even whatever sinful acts they committed before becoming catechumens, i.e., when they were unbelievers, are all pardoned and wiped out by virtue of the rite of holy baptism. But the catechumens are penanced nevertheless, because, though not really in the church nor actually members of the Church, yet, with respect to yearning and willingness of soul and virtually, they are in the Church. For, according to (Gregory) the Theologian (in his Discourse on the Lights) these persons are on the threshold of piety, and have been caught in the faith, even though they have not yet been reborn through baptism (seeing that they are not utterly without hope of salvation, either, in case they should die unbaptized as a matter of necessity), as is shown by the funeral oration of St. Ambrose respecting Emperor Valentinian, who died while still being catechized. So the Councils on this account penance catechumens, on the ground that they already are intimates, and have accepted the faith, and are nominally Christians; accordingly, whatever the law says to them, it is speaking to them as to persons in the law, according to the Apostolic statement (Rom. 3:19).

15. Because of much disturbance and the mutinies which took place, it has seemed best to do away altogether with the custom which obtained contrary to the Apostolical Canon in some places, so as riot to allow either a Bishop or a Presbyter or a Deacon to go from one city to another. If, after the holy and great Council’s definition, anyone should attempt to do such a thing, or has actually undertaken to do such a thing, let the resulting affair be invalidated by all means, and let him be reinstated in the church in which the Bishop or Presbyter³⁰ in question was ordained.

(Ap. cc. XIV, XV; c. VI of the 4th; cc. III, XXI of Antioch; cc. I, XVI of Sardican, c. LVII of Car.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon ordains these decrees: It has seemed reasonable to abolish definitively the custom which had been in vogue in some places contrary to the ordinance and legislation of the Apostolical Canon (namely, Ap. c. XIV, and most especially XV), because of numerous disturbances, and fights with one another, which had ensued as a result of this transgression. That is to say, not to allow a Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon to go from one city to another. If, after this holy Council has laid down the present Canon, anyone should try to do such a thing as this, and go from one city to another, this change of station is to be held void and invalid without fail; and the Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon shall be restored to his original position in that church in which he was ordained, since not only bishops but also presbyters and deacons must be ordained in a definite church, and not detachedly, according to c. VI of the 4th. Read also Ap. cc. XIV and XV.

16. Any Presbyters or Deacons, or other persons covered by the Canon, who take the risk, without having the fear of God before their eyes, or keeping aware of the ecclesiastical Canon, of departing from their own church, they must not be admitted at all in another church, but they must be stringently forced to return to their own parish, or, in case they insist, it is proper for them to be excluded from communion. If, on the other hand, anyone should surreptitiously snatch away one belonging to another and ordain him in his own church, without the consent of his Bishop, from whom the one covered by the Canon departed, let the ordination be invalid.

Interpretation.

The Canon next preceding this one ordains for presbyters and deacons to be reinstated in the church in which they were ordained, while the present Canon punishes them with suspension if they refuse to return, by decreeing that any presbyters or deacons, or others enumerated in the Canon along with such persons, and listed among the clergy,³¹ without fearing God or knowing the Canon of the Church (i.e., Ap. c. XV), rashly depart from that church in which they were ordained, they must not be admitted to another (without letters commendatory and dimissory, that is to say), but, on the contrary, must be forced to return to their own church; if, however, they insist on having their own way, they are to be denied communion, not with the Mysteries, not with the laymen and faithful in the church (for in this case the present Canon would be contrary to Ap. c. XV, which does not exclude such offenders from communion with laymen in the church), but with their fellow presbyters and deacons in the same order. That is to say, in other words, they are not to be allowed to officiate along with those in holy orders, but are to remain idle, or interdicted. But if any Bishop should dare to grab a strange clergyman fraudulently and ordain him (to a higher rank perhaps) in his own church, without the Bishop of that clergyman being willing to allow this, from whom he departed, such an ordination is to be void and invalid. Read also Ap. c. XV.

17. Because of the fact that many persons covered by the Canon, out of greed and in pursuit of shameful profits (willfully) forgot the divine passage of Holy Writ saying “who hath not lent out his money at interest” (Ps. 15:5), and in lending demanded a percentage commission or profit, the holy and great Council has deemed it just and right that in case anyone is found after the adoption of this definition receiving interest for the use of money, or otherwise exploiting the matter, or demanding commission, or through any other subterfuge contriving to exact shameful profits, he shall be deposed from the clergy and shall be an alien to the Canon.

(Ap. c. XLIV; c. X of 6th; c. IV of Laod.; cc. V, XX of Car.; c. IV of Basil.)

Interpretation.

Various Canons prohibit the charging of interest on money, but the present one expressly ordains this, to wit: Since many canonic, or clergymen, being fond of greed and shameful profits, have forgotten the saying in the Psalm of David which says that the chosen man is one “who hath not lent out his money at interest,” meaning the righteous man who is destined to dwell in the holy mountain of the Lord, or, in other words, in the heavenly kingdom, and in lending money have been exacting a percentage charge³² from their debtors, consisting, for example, of twelve cents, or pennies, say, per hundred (or per dollar), which was an excessive interest — because, I say, clergymen were actually doing this, this holy and great Council deemed it right and just that if hereafter any clergyman should be found to be charging interest, or treating the matter as a commercial proposition, or turning it to his own advantage in any other way (while pretending not to charge interest, that is to say, when lending his money to those in need of it, yet agreeing with them that he too is to receive some part of the interest and profit accruing from the money, thus calling himself, not a lender, but a sharetaker or partner), and be caught doing this, or demanding a commission (or half the percentage, which would amount, in this case, to six cents, or six pennies, instead of the twelve comprised in the full amount of total interest, i.e., of interest at 12%), or should invent any similar means of making a shameful profit, any such person shall be deposed from the clergy and shall be estranged from the canonical order. Read also Ap. c. XLIV.

18. It has come to the notice of the holy and great Council that in some regions and cities Deacons are giving the Eucharist to Presbyters, which is something that neither the Canon nor custom has allowed those who have not the authority to offer, to give the body of Christ to those offering it. It has also further been learned that already some Deacons touch the Eucharist even before the Bishops. Let all these things, therefore, be done away with, and let Deacons conform to their own standards, well knowing that they are servants of the Bishop, and that they are inferior to Presbyters. Let them take the Eucharist in due order after the Presbyters, with either the Bishop or the Presbyters administering it to them. But neither let it be permissible for Deacons to sit

among Presbyters, for to do so is contrary to the Canon, and is contrary to due order: if, in disregard of these definitions, anyone refuses to obey, let him be dismissed from his diaconate.

(c. XX of Laodicea; c. VII of the 6th Ecum. C.)

Interpretation.

Good order must be observed everywhere, and especially among those in holy orders; for this reason the present seeks to correct anything that is done in disregard of due order. For it says that it has come to the knowledge of this holy and great Council that in some regions and cities the deacons are giving the divine Eucharist to presbyters, a thing which neither any written Canon nor any custom has sanctioned, that is to say, for deacons to administer, or impart, the body of Christ to the priests who conduct the rite connected therewith, seeing that deacons themselves have no authority to perform the office of administering this sacred rite.³³ It has also been revealed in addition to this that some of the deacons are communing before the presbyters have done so. So let all these disorderly proceedings be eliminated, and let deacons remain within their bounds, or, that is to say, let them neither administer the Eucharist to priests, nor partake thereof before the priests do, since they know well enough that they are servants of the Bishop, as is indicated also by their very name (i.e., in Greek the word deacon signifies servant, just as does the word minister in English); for *deacon* (as a Greek word) really means servant. They are inferior to and lower than presbyters; and what is inferior must be blessed by what is superior, as the Apostle says, and not the opposite way round (Heb. 7:7). Let them receive the divine Eucharist in due order after the presbyters have partaken thereof, letting the Bishop administer it to them, or it may be administered to them by a presbyter (in case the Bishop is not present). But neither have deacons any right to sit among presbyters, since this too is disorderly and contrary to canon; for it tends to intimate that deacons are peers of presbyters, which is not really so. But if, after this Canon has been formulated, any of the deacons should be unwilling to submit to this rule, let them be deprived of their diaconate.

In keeping with the present Canon c. VII of the 6th is also in effect. For it commands that any deacon that has the audacity to take a seat before the presbyters (have done so) is to be lowered in rank and to become the lowest servant and least menial in his own order, no matter what ecclesiastical office he may occupy;³⁴ except only if he go to another city as the personal representative of his own Patriarch, or Metropolitan, he is then to be honored more than the presbyters. But even c. XX of Laodicea says that a deacon must not sit in front of a presbyter. Canon LVI of the same Council prohibits priests from sitting down in the Bema before the Prelate makes his entrance. Note that according to Zonaras and Balsamon c. XVIII of the present Council has reference to those deacons who during divine service within the Bema sit down before the presbyters have done so, and on this account it punishes them with a severer chastisement, or chastening, by depriving them, that is to say, of their diaconate. Canon VII of the 6th refers to those who sit down before the presbyters do, not in church, but in outside assemblies, and on this account it chastises them more lightly, by merely lowering their proper station.

19. As concerns Paulianists who afterwards took refuge in the catholic Church, it is made a definition that they be rebaptized without fail. If any of them in the past have been covered in the clergy under examination as to whether they appear to be blameless and irreproachable, after being rebaptized let them be ordained by a Bishop of the catholic Church. But if the investigation finds them unfitted, let them be deposed. Likewise as concerning deaconesses, and all those who are embraced by the Canon in any way and are being examined, the same form shall be observed. We have referred to the deaconesses who have been examined under cover of the habit, since they have neither any claim to appointment to any order, so that they are to be examined without fail among the laymen.

(Ap. c. XLVII; c. II of the 1st Ec. C.; c. XCV of the 6th; cc. VII, VIII of Laodicea; c. LXVI of Carth.; c. XV of the 4th; c. XIV and XL of the 6th; c. XLIV of Basil; cc. VI, LI, CXXXV of Carth.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees with reference to persons that had been followers of the heresy of Paul of Samosata,³⁵ but who later resorted to the catholic Church, that the Canon and form requires such heretics to be rebaptized by decision (note that the Council improperly designates the baptism of Paulianists as a baptism, and in

comparing it with our baptism, and not with itself, it employed also the verb “rebaptize,” which means to baptize a second time; and see the prolegomena to the Council of Carthage with respect to their not being baptized in identically the same manner as Orthodox Christians). But if some of them had been ordained clergymen before their Orthodox baptism, because the prelates who ordained them were not aware of the fact that they were heretics or that they had been ordained in the clergy according to the Paulianists; then and in that case, I say, after being rebaptized with an Orthodox baptism, if their life appears to have been blameless and unimpeachable,³⁶ let them be ordained by a Bishop of the catholic and Orthodox Church, since the former ordination which they had received while heretics is not considered an ordination at all. For how can anyone that has not been baptized in accordance with the Orthodox faith receive a visitation of the Holy Spirit, and grace, in ordination? But if when examined they are found to be unworthy of holy orders, they must be deposed, or, in other words, they must be ousted from the clergy. For the word depose was employed here improperly instead of the word oust, since, properly speaking, one who has previously been elevated to the height of holy orders and of the clergy, is said to be deposed. But as to these men who have never received any ordination at all, from what height shall they be deposed? From none, of course. Or perhaps it means for them to be deposed from the (height? of the) holy orders and clergy claimed by the Paulianists. For just as it called what they instituted baptism, it also called what they had proposed clergy, and by the same token deposition, in the same way as c. VIII of Laodicea calls the ones set up by the Montanists clergy. But this which we have asserted as concerning men must also be observed in identically the same manner in regard to women: that is to say, in other words, if any Orthodox Bishop has ordained any of the women of the Paulianists deaconesses, because of his being unaware of their heresy, or if they had been ordained in the order of deaconesses instituted by the Paulianists, in this case, I say, let them be rebaptized; and thereafter if they appear to be worthy of a diaconate, let them be ordained deaconesses too. (See also Ap. cc. XLVI and XLVII, and c. VII of the 2nd.) As for that which the Canon proceeds to add, to wit, “We have referred to the deaconesses who have been examined under cover of the habit, since they have neither any claim to appointment to any order, so that they are to be examined without fail among the laymen,” notwithstanding that these words are hard to understand, yet their meaning is this: We have referred to deaconesses separately, who wore this habit when they were with Paulianists, or, at any rate, who were following the profession of deaconesses, since they too, like their other clergymen, ought to be reckoned as laymen, because just as those clergymen possessed no real ordination, being destitute of divine grace, so too the deaconesses among them possessed only the habit of deaconesses, but no true appointment impartitive of grace; so that they ought to be reckoned as laywomen after baptism, just as they were prior thereto.

Canon XCV of the 6th says in identically the same manner as does the present Canon: It is made a definition that Paulianists be rebaptized, by which name is meant those who have been adherents of Paul’s heresy ever since they were born. Canon XV of the 4th, however, commands that a deaconess be ordained such when forty years old (as does also c. 14 of the 6th, and c. XL of the same council says the same thing); but it anathematizes her if after staying a short while in the liturgy³⁷ she later gets married. Canon XLIV of St. Basil excommunicates from the Mysteries any deaconess that commits fornication for a period of seven years, though it does not deprive her of prayer and communion with the faithful. The second ordinance of the first Title of the Novels (Photius, Title VIII, ch. 14) says that a deaconess ought not to live with anyone of the male sex who might arouse a suspicion of immodesty or indecency. If when ordered by the Bishop to oust him from sharing her dwelling or sleeping quarters, she postpones the time, she is deprived of the diaconate and is shut up in a convent for the rest of her life. Read also the footnote to Ap. c. XLVII.

20. Since there are some persons who kneel in church on Sunday and on the days of Pentecost, with a view to preserving uniformity in all parishes, it has seemed best to the holy Council for prayers to be offered to God while standing.

(c. XC of the 6th; c. XV of Peter.)

Interpretation.

The customs handed down by the Apostles and the Fathers ought all to be observed in common by all the churches, and not some of them by some churches alone. For this reason the present Canon ordains that inasmuch as some Christians bow their knee even on Sunday and on the days from Easter to Pentecost, which is contrary to the Canons and improper, to the end that all Apostolical and patristic traditions — one of which is not to bow the knee on Sunday and throughout Pentecost — may be kept in all Orthodox churches the world

over, it has seemed reasonable to this holy Council for all Christians to offer their prayers to God on these days, not while kneeling, but while standing upright.

Second Ecumenical Council.

Prolegomena.

The holy and ecumenical Second Council was held during the reign of Theodosius the Great, A.D. 381, and is also referred to as the First Ecumenical Council in Constantinople. Of the Fathers attending it the most notable were Nectarius the bishop of Constantinople, Timothy the bishop of Alexandria, Meletius the bishop of Antioch, Cyril the bishop of Jerusalem, Gregory the Theologian and Gregory of Nyssa; and many other bishops from the East made up a total number of 150. Not even one bishop from the West attended it; nor did Pope Damasus in person or by a legate, nor does even a conciliar letter of his appear therein.³⁸ Later, however, they agreed and acceded to the things it decreed, including Damasus and the whole Western Church, and even to this day they accept and recognize this Council as a truly ecumenical council. It was held primarily against Macedonius, who was blasphemously declaring that the Holy Spirit was a thing constructed or created by the Son, secondarily against Apollinaris, and against the Eunomians, including the Eudoxians and the Sabellians, and against the Marcellians, and against the Photinians,³⁹ and in general anathematized every heresy that had risen during the reign of Constantius, of Julian, and of Valens, emperors preceding it. After correcting the glorification and adoration of the Holy Trinity which had been altered by the Arians,⁴⁰ it renewed the doctrine of the Nicene Council, on the ground of its being thoroughly Orthodox in all respects. Hence, in order to let it appear that it professed the same beliefs as the Council held in Nicaea, it did not draw up a creed of its own, but, by simply making a small change in the Creed adopted by the Nicene Council, and adding the clause “of whose kingdom there shall be no end,” on account of the heresy of Apollinaris the millenarian,⁴¹ and by developing the meaning of Article 8 in reference to the Holy Spirit, and also by supplying what was missing in the remaining four articles to the end,⁴² it made identically the same as that which is now read by all Orthodox Christians, as it is seen in this Second Council (p. 286 of vol. i of the collection of the Councils) and in the fifth act of the same council (p. 155 of the same volume). Nevertheless, although this Second Council did make these additions to and changes in the Creed adopted by the First Council held in Nicaea, yet the Councils held thereafter accepted the Creed of the First and Second Councils as a single Creed. As to why this Council made these additions, see the Footnote to c. VII of the Third. In addition to all these things, it also adopted and promulgated the present seven Canons pertaining to the organization and discipline of the Church, indefinitely confirmed by c. I of the 4th, but definitely by c. II of the 6th and by c. I of the 7th. (See Dositheus, p. 222 of the *Dodecabilus*.)⁴³

Canons.

1. The holy Fathers assembled in Constantinople have decided not to set aside the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers who met in Nicaea, Bithynia, but to let it remain sovereign, and that every heresy be anathematized, and especially and specifically that of the Eunomians, including that of the Eudoxians, and that of the Semi-Arians, including that of the Pneumatomachs, and that of the Sabellians, and that of the Marcellians, and that of the Photinians, and that of the Apollinarians.

(c. V of the 2nd; cc. I and V of the 6th; c. II of Car.)

Interpretation.

This first Canon of the present Council asserts that the 150 Holy Fathers who convened in Constantinople decided that the Orthodox faith, meaning the creed adopted by the 318 Fathers who had convened in Nicaea, Bithynia, should remain solid and inviolable, and that every heresy should be anathematized. In particular, the heresy of the Eunomians,⁴⁴ or of those called Eudoxians, the heresy of the Semi-Arians,⁴⁵ or of those known as

Pneumatomach (i.e., spirit-fighters), the heresy of the followers of Sabellius,⁴⁶ the heresy of the adherents of Marcellus,⁴⁷ the heresy of the pupils of Photinus,⁴⁸ and the heresy of those of Apollinaris.⁴⁹

2. Bishops must not leave their own diocese and go over to churches beyond its boundaries; but, on the contrary, in accordance with the Canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria administer the affairs of Egypt only, let the Bishops of the East govern the Eastern Church only, the priorities granted to the church of the Antiochians in the Nicene Canons being kept inviolate, and let the Bishops of the Asian diocese (or administrative domain) administer only the affairs of the Asian church, and let those of the Pontic diocese look after the affairs of the diocese of Pontus only, and let those of the Thracian diocese manage the affairs of the Thracian diocese only. Let Bishops not go beyond their own province to carry out an ordination or any other ecclesiastical services unless (officially) summoned thither. When the Canon prescribed in regard to dioceses (or administrative provinces) is duly kept, it is evident that the synod of each province will confine itself to the affairs of that particular province, in accordance with the regulations decreed in Nicaea. But the churches of God that are situated in territories belonging to barbarian nations must be administered in accordance with the customary practice of the Fathers.

(Ap. cc. XXXIV, XXXV; cc. VI, VII of the 1st; c. VIII of the 3rd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; cc. XX, XXX, XXXIX of the 6th; c. IX of Antioch; cc. III, XI, and XII of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

Since, as is attested by Socrates (Book 5, ch. 8), officiation beyond the boundaries of one's own diocese was formerly a matter of indifference on account of persecutions, and, as Theodoret says, blessed Eusebius of Samosata did it as a matter of extraordinary zeal. On this account, when peace reappeared in the Church as a whole, the present Canon was adopted and promulgated. It relates neither to autocephalous Metropolitans alone, as Balsamon interpreted it, nor to Patriarchs⁵⁰ alone, but to both these classes of dignitaries alike, according to Dositheus (p. 233 of "Those who have served as Patriarchs"), in order that each of them may serve his own province and diocese, and not interfere in one that is alien, and not confound the rights of the churches; but, on the contrary, in accordance with the Canons (cc. VI and VII, that is to say of the First, and much more in accordance with Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV), that the bishop of Alexandria may manage only the parishes in Egypt (the Council expressly mentioned the bishop of Alexandria because the Bishop of Alexandria with his party cooperated to have Maximus the Cynic ordained in Constantinople, while, on the other hand, great St. Gregory was ousted from office in spite of its being his diocese and parish). The metropolitans of the East are to attend to the affairs of the East, with the proviso that the prerogatives of the bishop of Antioch be duly respected, in accordance with the Canon (sc. VI) of the Nicene Council; and the metropolitans of the Asian, Pontic and Thracian domains are to manage only the provinces belonging to them (these dignitaries, according to c. XXVIII of the 4th, have to be ordained after the bishop of Constantinople). It commands, in addition, that both patriarchs and metropolitans alike refrain from interloping beyond their own dioceses and provinces with the object of ordaining others or performing other ecclesiastical services in the parishes of others, without being invited to do so; and that the synod of each particular province shall manage the ecclesiastical matters of each province of the metropolitans, whether they be elections, or ordinations, or penances, or absolutions, or any other such matters; likewise, as regarding the affairs of each diocese of the patriarchs, the diocesan synod shall govern such matters of the diocese in question, as the Nicene Council has decreed (c. VI). For the same thing is involved in the decree of the Nicene Council that no bishop shall be ordained without the consent of the metropolitan, and in which the present Council says to the effect that the synod of each province (of the metropolitan, that is to say) shall govern the affairs of each province, respectively. As for the churches of God that are situated in the midst of barbarian nations, where there either were not enough bishops to make up a synod, or it was necessary for some scholarly bishop to go there in order to bolster up the Christians in their faith. These churches, I say, ought to be managed in accordance with the prevailing custom of the Fathers. To be more explicit, neighboring and abler bishops ought to go to them, in order to supply what is missing for a local synod. Which, though contrary to Canons, yet as a matter of necessity was allowed by the Council. Read Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV, and c. I of the Sixth.

3. Let the Bishop of Constantinople, however, have the priorities of honor after the Bishop of Rome, because of its being New Rome.

Interpretation.

The preceding Canon dealt with patriarchs as a group (and especially with those of Alexandria and of Antioch), whereas the present Canon deals with the Patriarch of Constantinople specially, and says that he is to share the prerogatives of honor after the Pope and Patriarch of Rome, since Constantinople itself is also called New Rome.

The preposition *after* here does not denote being later in point of time, as some say in company with Aristenus, but neither does it denote any abasement and diminution, as Zonaras incorrectly interprets it (because, in view of the fact that the bishop of Alexandria is after the bishop of Constantinople, and the bishop of Antioch is after the bishop of Alexandria, and the bishop of Jerusalem is after the bishop of Antioch, according to c. XXXVI of the Sixth Ec. C., there would result four removes of honor, and consequently five different degrees of honor one higher than the other, which is contrary to all the catholic Church, and acceptable only to the Latins and the Latin-minded); but, on the contrary, it denotes equality of honor, and an order of disposition according to which one is first and another second. The fact that it denotes equality of honor is to be seen in the fact that the Fathers assembled in Chalcedon, in their c. XXVIII, assert that these 150 Bishops gave equal priorities to the Bishop of old Rome and to the Bishop of new Rome; and in the fact that the Bishops who convened in the Trullus (i.e. the First Trullan Council, herein designated the Sixth Ecumenical), in their c. XXXVI, say for the Bishop of Constantinople to enjoy equal priorities with the Bishop of Rome. That it refers to order of disposition is to be seen in the fact that both the former and the latter in the same Canons call the Bishop of Constantinople second after the Bishop of Rome, not the second in point of honor, but the second in order of honor. For in the very nature of things it is impossible for there to be any two equal beings called first and second with respect to one another, without any order. That is why Justinian, in Novel 130 to be found in Book V of the Basilica, Title III, calls the Bishop of Rome first, and the Bishop of Constantinople second, coming in order after the one of Rome. Note that inasmuch as Zonaras, however, in interpreting the Canon, prefixed this decree of Justinian, it is evident that as for the diminution and abasement which he ascribed above to the Bishop of Constantinople with respect to the one of Rome, was ascribed only with reference to the order of honor, and not with reference to the honor in general, according to which the one precedes and the other follows both in the matter of signatures and in the matter of seats as well as in the matter of mentioning their names. Some, it is true, assert that the present Canon grants only an honor to the Bishop of Constantinople, but that later urgent need gave him also the authority to ordain the Metropolitans in Asia and Pontus and Thrace. But the Council held in Chalcedon in its letter to Leo says that he held such authority to ordain them by virtue of an ancient custom; but its c. XXVIII (i.e., of the Fourth Ec. C.) merely confirmed this.⁵¹ Read also c. XXVIII of the Fourth.

4. As concerning Maximus the Cynic, and the disturbance caused by him in Constantinople, it is hereby decreed that Maximus neither became nor is a Bishop, and that neither are those ordained by him entitled to hold any clerical rank whatsoever. Let everything connected with him or done by him be annulled.

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that this Maximus⁵² is to be regarded as never having been a bishop at all nor as being one; and any persons ordained by him to any rank whatever are to be regarded as never having been ordained at all: because all has been annulled, including the ordination conferred upon him by the Egyptians in violation of parish and contrary to canons, as well as ordinations he conferred upon others.

5. As concerning the Tome of the Westerners, we have accepted also those in Antioch who confess a single divinity of Father and of Son and of Holy Spirit.

(c. I of the 2nd; c. I of the 6th; cc. I, II of Car.)

Interpretation.

This Canon is a special and particular one. For it says that, just as the Fathers of this Council accepted the Tome of the Westerners, that is to say, the definition confirming the holy Creed of the Nicene Fathers and anathematizing all those who hold beliefs contrary thereto, which definition the Western Fathers assembled at Sardica⁵³ adopted and promulgated, so and in like manner they accepted also the definition of the faith set forth by those assembled at Antioch.⁵⁴ Who confess one divinity of Father, and of Son, and of Holy Spirit, in the same manner, that is to say, as the Fathers who assembled in Nicaea.

6. Because many men, in a spirit of enmity and for purposes of slander being desirous to confound and subvert ecclesiastical discipline, connive to fabricate certain charges against Orthodox Bishops managing the churches, in an attempt designing nothing else but to sully the reputation of the priests and to raise disturbances among peoples who are at peace; on this account it has pleased the holy Council of the Bishops who have convened in Constantinople to decree that informers are not to be admitted without examination, nor are all men to be allowed to bring accusations against those managing the churches, nor yet are all to be excluded. But if anyone lay a personal grievance, that is, a private complaint, against a Bishop, on the ground that he has been a victim of the Bishop's greed or other unjust treatment, in the case of such accusations neither the personality nor the religion of the accuser is to be inquired into. For then the conscience of the Bishop must be clear in every respect, and the man who claims to have been wronged should receive justice whatever be his religion. But if the indictment brought against the Bishop be of an ecclesiastical nature, then the personality of the informers must be considered, in order, first of all, not to allow heretics to make charges against Orthodox Bishops in regard to ecclesiastical matters. We call heretics those who have of old been proscribed from the Church, and those who have thereafter been anathematized by us; and in addition to these those who, though pretending to confess the sound faith, have schismatically separated and have gathered congregations in opposition to our canonical Bishops. Further, as regarding those who have previously been condemned by the Church on certain charges and have been ousted therefrom or excluded from communion, whether they belong to the clergy or to the ranks of laymen, neither shall these persons be allowed to accuse a Bishop until they have first cleared themselves of their own indictment. Likewise as regarding those who are themselves being accused from before, they are not to be permitted to accuse a Bishop, or other clergymen, until they have first proved themselves innocent of the charges placed against them. If, however, certain persons are neither heretics nor excluded from communion, nor condemned, nor previously charged with any offenses, should declare that they have an accusation of an ecclesiastical nature against a Bishop, the holy Council bids these persons to lodge their accusations before all the Bishops of the province and before them to prove the charges against the Bishop involved in the case. But if it so happen that the provincial Bishops are unable to or incompetent to decide the case against the Bishop and make the correction due, then they are to go to a greater synod of the Bishops of this diocese summoned to try this case. And they are not to lodge the accusation until they themselves have in writing agreed to incur the same penalty if in the course of the trial it be proved that they have been slandering the accused Bishop. But if anyone, scorning what has been decreed in the foregoing statements, should dare either to annoy the emperor's ears or to trouble courts of secular authorities or an ecumenical council to the affrontment of all the Bishops of the diocese, let no such person be allowed to present any information whatever, because of his having thus roundly insulted the Canons and ecclesiastical discipline.

Interpretation.

What the present Canon says may be stated as follows. Since many men wishing to confound the discipline and good order of the Church inimically slander Orthodox bishops, without accomplishing any other result than that of blackening the reputations of those in holy orders and disturbing the laity, on this account it has pleased this holy Council to decree that neither all accusers of Bishops be admitted nor again that all be excluded or refused admission. But if the charges are personal ones involving only financial loss, or, more specifically speaking, if anyone accuse a Bishop by complaining that he has treated him unjustly or greedily, by depriving him perhaps of some real or personal property, in such cases the person of the accuser must not be examined into, nor his religion; but, on the contrary, no matter what may be his religious views, he must have justice done to him in any circumstances. But if his accusations are of a criminal nature, such, that is to say, as might lower his ecclesiastical standing, as, for instance, sacrilege, the performance of sacred rites outside the confines of the parish, and the like, then and in that case the accusers ought to be examined, in the first place as to whether they are heretics, mistaken in doctrine, including both those who were anathematized by the Church long ago and those who have but now recently been anathematized by us. Secondly, as to whether they are schismatics⁵⁵ or not, or, more specifically speaking, whether or not they have separated from the Church on account of any curable habits, according to c. I of Basil the Great, and contrary to the Canons, or, in other words, the catholic Bishops who have been ordained in the Orthodox manner and in accordance with the Canons, while they themselves are congregating apart by themselves. Thirdly, whether they are entirely excommunicated from the Church for some misdeeds of theirs, or have been temporarily excommunicated from the clergymen or the laymen. As for those, however, who have already been accused by others, they are not to be permitted to accuse a Bishop or other clergymen until they prove themselves innocent of the crimes imputed to them. In case, however, those bringing these ecclesiastical and criminal accusations against a bishop happen to be free from all the above enumerated defects, the holy Council commands that these persons first present their indictments of the accused bishop before the synod of all the bishops of that particular province. But if the synod of the province cannot dispose of such a case of crimes, then the accusers may carry the matter up to the greater synod of the bishops of the Diocese,⁵⁶ and have the case terminate there. Because of the fact that in Book LX of the Basilica, Title XXVI, ch. 6, it is written that whosoever turns out to be a traitor and liar in the accusations which he makes, when it comes to the matter of punishment for this crime, shall receive that punishment which the accused one would have received if he had been found guilty, the present Canon pursuant to the civil law adds that provision that the accuser is not to commence a recital of his allegations unless he first gives a written promise to accept the same sentence and punishment as a rightly and truly and justly accused bishop would have to undergo, if it be proved that he accused him unjustly and falsely. Whoever scorns these regulations and affronts all the bishops of the Diocese, and should dare to appeal his case to the Emperor,⁵⁷ or to civil courts of secular authorities, or to appeal to an ecumenical council,⁵⁸ shall be completely estopped from lodging an information, seeing that he has insulted the Sacred Canons and has violated ecclesiastical discipline.

Concord.

In much the same manner c. IX of the 4th decrees that when clergymen are at variance with one another and quarreling, they are liable to Canonical penances in case they leave their Bishop and resort to civil courts. Canon XIV of Carthage, on the other hand, says that any bishop or presbyter or deacon or clergyman shall forfeit his position in case he leaves an ecclesiastical court and goes to a civil court. But, besides this, c. XII of Antioch expressly decrees that if a presbyter or deacon deposed by his own bishop, or if a bishop deposed by a synod or council, does not resort to a greater synod or council of bishops, but, instead of doing so, annoys the emperor, he shall no longer have any right to submit an apology (i.e., enter a plea in his own defense) or any hope of restoration (sc. to his former ecclesiastical status). Canon XXXVI of Carthage excludes from communion clergymen and bishops that appeal their case to “peramatic” (a Greek word with a signification akin to “crossing” or “fording”), or what are more properly designated “hyperhorial” (a Greek word meaning about the same thing as the word *extralimitary* derived from the Latin, with reference to passing or going beyond the boundaries of a territory), tribunals, and not to the superiors of their own provinces. This very thing is what is decreed by c. CXXXIV of the same Council.⁵⁹ Note, however, that lower ecclesiastical judges are not penalized by the higher ones to whom the decision of a case is appealed, unless they be proved to have judged wrongly and unjustly either by way of favoring someone or because of enmity. See also Ap. c. LXXIV and c. IX of the 4th.

7. As for those heretics who betake themselves to Orthodoxy, and to the lot of the saved, we accept them in accordance with the subjoined sequence and custom; viz.: Arians, and Macedonians, and Sabbatians, and Novatians, those calling themselves Cathari (or “Puritans”), and (those calling themselves) Aristeri⁶⁰ (*Note of Translator.* — This designation may be based upon the Greek word *aristos*, meaning “best,” though as a word it signifies “lefthand.”), and the Quartodecimans (quasi “Fourteenthists,” to use the English language in this connection), otherwise known as Tetradites (though in English this term is applied to an entirely different group of heretics), and Apollinarians we accept when they offer libelli (i.e., recantations in writing) and anathematize every heresy that does not hold the same beliefs as the catholic and apostolic Church of God, and are sealed first with holy myron (more usually called “chrism” in English) on their forehead and their eyes, and nose, and mouth, and ears; and in sealing them we say: “A seal of a free gift of Holy Spirit.” As for Eunomians, however, who are baptized with a single immersion, and Montanists, who are here called Phrygians, and the Sabellians, who teach that Father and Son are the same person, and who do some other bad things, and (those belonging to) any other heresies (for there are many heretics here, especially such as come from the country of the Galatians:⁶¹ all of them that want to adhere to Orthodoxy we are willing to accept as Greeks. Accordingly, on the first day we make (*Note of Translator.* — The meaning of this word here is more exactly rendered “treat as”) them Christians; on the second day, catechumens; then, on the third day, we exorcize them with the act of blowing thrice into their face and into their ears; and thus do we catechize them, and we make them tarry a while in the church and listen to the Scriptures; and then we baptize them.

(Ap. cc. XLVI, XLVII, LXVIII; cc. VIII, XIX of the 1st; c. XCV of the 6th; cc. VII, VIII of Laod.; c. LXVI of Carth.; cc. I, V, XLVII of Basil.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon specifies in what way we ought to receive those coming from heresies and joining the Orthodox faith and the portion of the saved. It says that, as for Arians and Macedonians, of whom we have spoken in Canon I of the present Council, and Sabbatians⁶² and Quartodecimans, otherwise known as Tetradites,⁶³ and Apollinarians, we will accept them after they give us *libelli*, or issue a written document (libellus is a Latin word, interpreted, according to Zonaras, as meaning “publication or issue”)⁶⁴ anathematizing both their own heresy as well as every other heresy that does not believe as the holy catholic and apostolic Church of God believes (just as the First Ec. C. demanded this stipulation in writing from Novatians particularly in its c. VIII), whose forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears we first seal with holy myron, saying in each seal, “a seal of a free gift of Holy Spirit.” And we will accept thus all these converts without rebaptizing them, since, according to Zonaras, in respect of holy baptism they nowise differ from us, and baptize themselves likewise as do the Orthodox. But as for Arians and Macedonians, who are manifestly heretics, the Canon accepted them without rebaptism “economically” (*Note of Translator.* — This term, and the corresponding noun “economy” and verb “economize,” in the peculiar idiom of the Orthodox Church can hardly be said to be translatable into genuine English; as a first approximation they may be taken as signifying something like “managing a disagreeable set of circumstances with tact and shrewdness, instead of insisting upon precision”), the primary reason being the vast multitude of such heretics then prevalent, and a second reason being that they used to baptize themselves in the same way as we do. As regards Eunomians, on the other hand, who practiced baptism with a single immersion, and the Montanists, who there in Constantinople were known as Phrygians;⁶⁵ and the Sabellians, who used to say that the Father and the Son were one and the same person, and who used to do other terrible things, and all the other heresies of heretics (a great many of whom were to be found there, and especially those who came from the country of the Galatians); as for all these persons, I say, we accept them as Greeks, or, in other words, as persons totally unbaptized; for these persons either have not been baptized at all or, though baptized, have not been baptized aright and in a strictly Orthodox manner, wherefore they are regarded as not having been baptized at all). Accordingly, on the first day (of their reception) we make them

Christians, that is to say, in other words, we make them accept all the dogmas of Christians (while they are standing) outside the Narthex of the church, the priest meantime laying his hand upon them, in accordance with c. XXXIX of the local synod or regional council held in Illiberia, a country in Spain;⁶⁶ on the second day we make them catechumens, or, in other words, we place them in the class called catechumens; on the third day we read to them the usual exorcisms, at the same time blowing three times into their face and into their ears. And thus we catechize them in regard to particular aspects of the faith, and make them stay in church a long time⁶⁷ and listen to the divine Scriptures, and then we baptize them.⁶⁸

Canon VII of Laodicea too would have Novatians and Quartodecimans returning to Orthodoxy treated economically in exactly the same way as they are in this Canon: that is to say, with anathematization of their heresy, and with the seal of the Myron. But Phrygians returning are required by c. VIII of the same C. to be baptized. But it must be said also that c. XCV of the 6th is nothing else than a repetition of the present Canon, except that it goes on to say that Manichees, and Valentinians, and Marcionists must be baptized when they turn to Orthodoxy; but Eutychians, and Dioscorites, and Severians may be accepted after anathematizing their own heresies — as may also the Novatians, that is to say, and the rest. Canon XIX of the First Ec. C. wants all Paulianists to get baptized in any case without fail, as is also witnessed by c. XCV of the 6th. Canon XLVII of Basil says for Encratites, and Saccophori, and Apotactites (concerning whom see c. XCV of the 6th) to get baptized when they become converted. Canon V of the same saint says for us to accept those heretics who repent at the end of their life, though not to do so indiscriminately, but only after trying them out. Read also Ap. cc. XLVI and XLVII.

Third Ecumenical Council.

Prolegomena.

The holy and ecumenical Third Council was held in Ephesus, a city situated in Asia, in the large church of that city which is called Mary Theotoke,⁶⁹ in the reign of Emperor Theodosius the Little (i.e., Theodosius II), in the year 431 after Christ, numbering upwards of 200 Fathers. The “hegemons” (i.e., principal actors) therein were St. Cyril, the bishop of Alexandria illustrious among Fathers, who, acting in the place of the bishop of Rome Celestine I at first, was attending the meeting for the latter, but afterwards legates of Rome were sent from the West, namely, Arcadius, and Projectus, both of whom were bishops, and Philipp the presbyter, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Memnon of Ephesus. The Council was convoked against Nestorius, who hailed from the town of Germaniceia in Antiocheia, according to Theodoret, and by divine concession had ascended the throne of Constantinople. For, after quaffing and absorbing the muddy and heretical water from the outpourings of Diodorus and of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the wretch became wrong-minded in regard to the Mystery of the Incarnate Economy;⁷⁰ for he divided the one Christ into two persons and substances, remolding Him into a mere human being with a humanlike substance, apart from the conjoined Logos, and a God only by stretching a point, destitute of the assumption of humanity. That is to say, he divided the one Son into two sons, calling one of them the Son of God, and the other the son of the Virgin. Wherefore he was unwilling to call the Virgin, who was His mother with respect to the flesh, a Theotoke (a Greek word meaning “she who has given birth to God or to a God,” and much used in the Orthodox Church as a designation of the Holy Virgin). So, therefore, this holy Council anathematized⁷¹ Nestorius on account of these views, and drew up its own definition of faith,⁷² wherein it dogmatized Christ to be one with respect to substance, a perfect God the same, and a perfect human being the same, not another, and another, but one Son, the same, above motherless out of a Father, but below fatherless out of a mother. But it has delivered and handed down through all later generations the sacred injunction to the effect that His ever-virgin Mother is properly and truly to be called the Theotoke, on the ground that she truly and properly speaking gave birth in the flesh to God.⁷³ For when the exarch of this Council, I mean Cyril of Alexandria, proclaimed therein the following: “We are not preaching a deified human being, but, on the contrary, we are confessing a God become incarnate. He who was motherless with respect to essence, and fatherless with respect to economy on the earth, subscribed to His own handmaid as His Mother.” In the letter to Nestorius, on the other hand, which this Third Council made a definition of its own (as Dositheus says, and as is made manifest by the minutes of the Fourth Council, on p. 61 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records), which commenced as follows: “They spend their time in idle twaddle, as I learn. The same Cyril says the following: To become incarnate and to assume a human personality (called in Greek *ensarcosis* and *enanthropesis* respectively) betokens the Logos derived from God; since it was not that the na-

ture of the Logos was transformed into flesh, but neither that it was changed into a whole human being consisting of a soul and body. Rather it is to be said that the Logos united to Himself, with respect to substance and substantiality flesh animated by a rational soul, and in an incomprehensible and inexpressible manner He became a human being, and actually lived as a son of man, not merely with respect to will and volition or complaisance, but neither as in an assumption of a personality alone; and that the natures conjoined for the purpose of unity were different, but from both there resulted one Christ and Son, not because the difference of the natures was eliminated or abrogated on account of the union, but rather that the two natures formed for us the one Lord and Christ and Son, of divinity and of humanity, through and by virtue of the inexpressible and ineffable concurrence for unity. . . . And again, if we forego the union with respect to substance either as unattainable or as having no attraction, we fall into the error of asserting that there were two Sons. . . . And again, this is professed everywhere by the words of the exact faith. Thus we shall find the Holy Father to have believed. Thus they have had the courage to call the Holy Virgin a Theotoke, not as the origin of the nature of the Logos, or, more specifically speaking, of His Godhood, as having received being from the Holy Virgin, but as having been the source out of which His holy body was begotten and furnished with a rational soul, to which body having become united with respect to substance, the Logos is said to have been begotten with respect to flesh.” (See this letter also in the second volume of the Conciliar Records on p. 436 thereof.) And the bishop of Cyzicus at that time in the great (or large) Church, Proclus, while Nestorius the heresiarch was sitting there, retorted in the following fashion: “We have been called together here by the holy and virgin Theotoke Mary, the untarnished jewel of virginity, the rational Paradise of the second Adam, the workshop wherein was wrought the union of the two natures, the panegyris of the salvatory exchange, etc.” After ordaining that no one may dare compose or write any other Creed than the one issued by the First and Second Ecumenical Councils, or even add anything thereto, or subtract anything therefrom, and anathematized all who might violate this command. In addition, this Council confirmed the condemnation of Pelagius and of Celestius, which they had received from many local synods and regional councils, and especially from the Council held in Carthage. Besides all these things, it also promulgated the present eight Canons, and published this letter to Pamphylia in its seventh and last act. These are necessary¹ to the discipline and constitution of the Church, and they were confirmed indefinitely in c. I of the 4th, and by name and definitely in c. II of the 6th and in c. I of the 7th.

Canons.

1. Since those who for any reason, whether of an ecclesiastical or of corporeal nature, are absent from the holy Council and have remained in their own town or district, ought not to be left in ignorance of the Councils regulations regarding them, we make known to your holiness and love that if any Metropolitan of the province has apostatized from the holy and ecumenical Council and joined the convocation of the apostasy, or has joined it thereafter, or has adopted the sentiments of Celestius or intends to adopt them, he shall have no power whatsoever to perpetrate anything against the Bishops of the province, being already expelled and bereft of every function and of all ecclesiastical communion by the Council here. Moreover, he shall be liable in any case, to be expelled from the rank of the episcopate by the very Bishops of the province and by surrounding Metropolitans who adhere to the beliefs of Orthodoxy.

Interpretation.

This Canon notifies those absent from the Council of the deposition from office of John of Antioch, of Theodoret the bishop of Cyrus, of Ibas the bishop of Edessa, and of the thirty bishops who stayed with them or sympathized with them,⁷⁴ by saying: Since the bishops who failed to appear at this holy Council on account of any obstacle, whether ecclesiastical or corporeal ought to be apprised of all proceedings affecting them, we notify your loving group that any metropolitan that has separated from this holy and Ecumenical Council and has joined the congress of apostasy, the one of Nestorius, that is to say, and of John and his party, or that intends to join it hereafter, or that has entertained the heretical views held by Celestius,⁷⁵ the same shall have no power to do any ill turn to the bishops, or even to the laymen, that are Orthodox, that is to say, because he (sc.

any such metropolitan) has been deprived of every ecclesiastical communion and sacred function by this Council, and because he is to be rendered utterly destitute hereafter and henceforth of the rank of the episcopate even by those same Orthodox bishops and surrounding metropolitans.

2. If, on the other hand, any provincial Bishops have failed to attend the holy Council and have joined the apostasy, or should attempt to do so, or even after subscribing to the deposition of Nestorius have receded to the convocation of apostasy, all such persons, in the judgment that has seemed best to the Holy Council, have alienated themselves from holy orders and have forfeited their rank.

Interpretation.

This Canon, too, like the first one, says that in case any bishops from the province of Antiocheia have absented themselves from the Council, whether it be that they have united with the apostasy of the other one held in Antiocheia, or that they intend to join it hereafter, or that even after signing and confirming the document deposing Nestorius from office they have turned back to his apostatic group — as for these persons, I say, it has appeared reasonable to the Holy Council for them to be strangers to holy orders and outcasts from the rank of the episcopate.

3. If some of the clergymen in any city or district have been shorn of holy orders by Nestorius and his party on account of their believing rightly, we have adjudged it right and just that they be restored to their own rank. We collectively bid the clergymen who agree in their beliefs with the orthodox and ecumenical Council not to submit in any way whatever to the Bishops who have apostatized or have deserted us.

Interpretation.

Because of the fact that when Nestorius was Patriarch of Constantinople he excommunicated and deposed those clergymen who did not agree with him, and, moreover, even the bishops in other countries who held his views did the same, therefore the present Canon judged it right for those who had been thus deposed to receive back their own rank. Accordingly, speaking generally, it ordered that those clergymen who were of the same mind as this orthodox and Ecumenical Council should take care not to submit in any way whatever to the apostate bishops.

4. If any of the clergymen should apostatize and dare, either publicly or privately, to hold the beliefs of Nestorius or of Celestius, the holy Council has deemed it just and right that these men too should be deposed from office.

Interpretation.

This Canon too, like the preceding one, deals with those clergymen who should apostatize, and, either in public or in private, should dare to believe or teach the dogma, or doctrine, of Nestorius and of Celestius, who shared his sentiments, by saying that it has been deemed but just by the holy Council for any such persons to be deposed from their rank.

5. As for all those who have been condemned by the holy Council, or by their own Bishops, for improper acts, and to whom Nestorius and those sharing his views and beliefs have sought, or should seek, to give back communion or rank, uncanonically and in accordance with the indiffer-

ence shown by Nestorius in all matters, we have deemed it right and just that they too remain without benefit and that they be left nevertheless deposed from office.

Interpretation.

The present Canon specifies that as regards all those clergymen who on account of any sins calling for excommunication or deposition from office were excommunicated or deposed from office by this holy Council or by their own bishops, and whom Nestorius and his sympathizers either dared to give a pardon absolving them from excommunication or restoring them to the operation of holy orders, or shall dare to do so hereafter, without discriminating between what is allowable and what is not allowable, we have judged it but right, I say, that all such persons shall remain without the benefit of any such uncanonical pardon and be left again deposed from office precisely as before.

6. Likewise in regard to any persons who should wish to alter in any way whatsoever anything that has been enacted in the holy Council in Ephesus concerning anyone, the holy Council has prescribed that if they be Bishops or clergymen, they are to lose their own rank entirely, while if they be laymen, they are to be excluded from communion.

Interpretation.

The preceding Canons are more particular, while this one simply decrees in a general way that all those persons who dare to alter in any way whatever has been enacted as concerning any question in the Council held in Ephesus, are to be deposed from office if they are bishops or clergymen, or excommunicated if they are laymen.

7. These things having been read aloud, the holy Council then decreed that no one should be permitted to offer any different belief or faith, or in any case to write or compose any other, than the one defined by the Holy Fathers who convened in the city of Nicaea, with Holy Spirit. As for those who dare either to compose a different belief or faith, or to present one, or to offer one to those who wish to return to recognition of the truth, whether they be Greeks or Jews, or they be members of any heresy whatever, they, if Bishops or Clergymen, shall be deprived as Bishops of their Episcopate, and as Clergymen of their Clericate; but if they are Laymen, they shall be anathematized. In an equally applicable way, if any persons be detected or caught, whether Bishops or Clergymen or Laymen, in the act of believing or teaching the things embodied in the exposition (or dissertation) presented by Charisius the Presbyter concerning the inhomination (i.e., incarnation) of the Only-begotten Son of God, or, by any chance, the unholy and perverse dogmas of Nestorius, which have even been subjoined, let them stand liable to the judgment of this holy and Ecumenical Council. As a consequence, that is to say, the Bishop shall be deprived of his Episcopate, and be left deposed from office, while the Clergyman likewise forfeit his Clericate. If, on the other hand, any such person be a Layman, let him too be anathematized, as aforesaid.

Interpretation.

In view of the fact that at this holy and Ecumenical Council's meeting there were read both the Creed of the holy and Ecumenical First Council held in Nicaea, and the Creed of Jewish-minded Nestorius, in which his unholy dogmas were set forth and which Charisius the presbyter of Philadelphia brought to the Council, after they had been read, this holy Council issued this Canon decreeing that it is not permissible for anyone to compose and write, or to offer to those converted from any other faith to Orthodoxy another Creed⁷⁶ than the Symbol of the Faith denned and decreed by the Holy Fathers who assembled in the city of Nicaea and were enlightened by the Holy Spirit. As for those persons who shall dare to compose any other symbol of faith (or

creed), or to present it openly, and to offer it to any of the Greeks and Jews and heretics turning away from faith to recognition and knowledge of the truth, such persons, if they be bishops and clergymen, are to be expelled from their episcopate and clericate, respectively, but if laymen they shall be anathematized. Similarly, too, all those who are discovered to be thinking to themselves or to be teaching others the unholy and heretical dogmas of Nestorius concerning the incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God, contained in the exposition of faith composed by him, but brought to this Council by the presbyter named Charisius, these persons also, I say, if they be bishops and clergymen, are to stand deposed, and expelled from their episcopate and clericate, respectively; but if they be laymen, they are to be anathematized, as we said before.

8. Our fellow Bishop Reginus, most beloved by God, and with him the most God-beloved Bishops of the province of the Cypriotes Zeno and Evagrius, has announced an innovation, a thing which is contrary to the ecclesiastical laws and the Canons of the Holy Apostles, and one which touches the freedom of all. Hence, since common ailments require more drastic treatment, on the ground that they do greater damage, and especially in view of the fact that the Bishop of Antioch, far from following the ancient custom, has been performing the ordinations in Cyprus, according to information given in libelli and by oral statements made by most pious gentlemen who have approached the Holy Council; therefore those who preside over the churches in Cyprus shall retain their privilege unaffected and inviolate, according to the Canons of the Holy Fathers and ancient custom, whereby they shall themselves perform the ordinations of the most reverent Bishops. The same rule shall hold good also with regard to the other diocese and churches everywhere, so that none of the Bishops most beloved by God shall take hold of any other province that was not formerly and from the beginning in his jurisdiction, or was not, that is to say, held by his predecessors. But if anyone has taken possession of any and has forcibly subjected it to his authority, he shall regive it back to its rightful possessor, in order that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, nor the secular fastus be introduced, under the pretext of divine services; lest imperceptibly and little by little we lose the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, has given us as a free gift by His own blood.⁷⁷ It has therefore seemed best to the holy and Ecumenical Council that the rights of every province, formerly and from the beginning belonging to it, be preserved clear and inviolable, in accordance with the custom which prevailed of yore; each Metropolitan having permission to take copies of the proceedings for his own security. If, on the other hand, anyone introduce any form conflicting with the decrees which have now been sanctioned, it has seemed best to the entire holy and Ecumenical Council that it be invalid and of no effect.⁷⁹

⁷⁸(Ap. c. XXXV; c. II of the 2nd; c. XX of the 6th; cc. XIII, XXII of Antioch; cc. III, IX, XII of Sardica).

⁷⁹(Ap. c. XXXIV; cc. VI, VII of the 1st; c. XX of the 2nd; cc. XXXVI, XXXIX of the 6th; c. IX of Antioch.)

Interpretation.

Inasmuch as Cyprus, so far as concerned secular administration, was subject to the Duke of Antioch, and was wont to send it an army commander (or general), it came to pass that the Bishop of Antioch, in imitation of this secular and civil form and law, undertook to show authority over that same Cyprus, with regard to both the religious and the ecclesiastical administration, by ordaining the bishops in Cyprus extra-territorially and not as a matter of ancient custom. This, however, was a thing that was contrary to Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV. After receiving Archbishop Reginus of Constantia, which used to be called Salamis but is now known as Amochostos, and the bishops accompanying, namely, Zeno of Cyrene, and Evagrius of Solon, who in writing as well as viva voce reported these facts, the Council decrees by the present Canon that, in accordance with the Canons and in accordance with ancient custom,⁷⁸ the Metropolitans of Cyprus are themselves to ordain the bishops in Cyprus, and to be left unmolested and unconstrained by anyone else. But, making the Canon general and catholic, the Fathers of this Council add that this same rule shall hold also in regard to diocese (or administrations) and provinces everywhere else, to the end that no bishop be permitted to usurp and appropriate any other province that has not formerly and from the beginning been subject either to his authority or to that

of his predecessors. If, nevertheless, anyone should appropriate it forcibly, he must return it, in order that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, and in order that prelates, under the pretext of sacerdotalism, may not cloak a secret ambition and vainglorious yearning for secular or worldly authority, and hence becoming slaves to injustice lose little by little the freedom which the liberator of all men Jesus Christ has graciously given us with His own blood; it has appeared reasonable to this holy Ecumenical Council that the righteous and just privileges be kept clear and inviolable which formerly and from the beginning as a matter of ancient custom each province has been entitled to. Accordingly, each Metropolitan shall have permission to receive a transcript of the present Canon for security and confirmation of the privileges of his metropolis. If, on the other hand, anyone should come out with a form, i.e., a civil law or royal decree, contrary to the present Canon, it has appeared reasonable to all this holy Council for that civil law to remain invalid and ineffective.⁷⁸ Read also the Interpretations of Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV.

Letter of Third Council addressed to the sacred Synod in Pamphylia in favor of Eustathius.

Seeing that the God-inspired Bible says, “*Do everything heedfully*” (Prov. 25:29 Seirach), those who have had the fortune to be admitted to holy orders ought indeed to give especial consideration to what is to be done in every case with all exactitude. For thus will they live through life with their affairs hopefully arranged and will be carried onward as though by a favorable wind to the goal which is the most desirable; and it seems that this argument is reasonable enough. Yet in the course of time a bitter and unendurable sorrow overwhelmed the mind and terribly muddled it, and failing to reap its expectations, it found little of benefit to comfort it in regard to the unjust circumstances of its plight. We have seen some such misfortune overtake most reverent and most godly Eustathius. For though he was indeed ordained canonically, as has been attested, yet, having been embarrassed, as he says, by some persons, and having met with unseemly circumstances, and owing to his being too much accustomed to idleness he got tired of the cares heaped upon him, and being unable to put up with the fear of incurring defamation as a result of developments, we know not how, he turned in an account. For, once having accepted the responsibility of sacerdotal cares, he ought to have kept on with spiritual staunchness and to have made every effort to discharge his duties even at the expense of much pain and perspiration voluntarily as one receiving remuneration. But since, once having failed to cope with the situation, he proved incapable, though rather as a result of idleness than of laziness and indolence, your godliness necessarily ordained our most reverent and most godly brother and fellow Bishop Theodore to take care of the church. For the position could not be left open and remain without anyone to look after the flocks of the Savior. But inasmuch as he came back weeping, not about losing the city or by way of quarreling over the fact that the church was turned over to the said most godly Bishop Theodore, but begging for the honor and title of bishop he had been enjoying up till then, we all felt sorry for him because of his being an old man, and deeming his tears a common ground of sympathy, we hastened to learn whether the man had suffered any legal deposition or had been charged by other persons with improprieties while muttering things to the detriment of his reputation, and, indeed, we learned that nothing of the sort had occurred, but that instead of any indictment being brought against him the man himself had submitted his resignation. Hence we could not blame your godliness for dutifully replacing him by the said most reverent Bishop Theodore. But since there is no strong reason to quarrel with his incapacity, we ought rather to have mercy on the old man, who had been away from his city and far from home for a long time, we have deemed just and have decreed without any argument that he should retain both the name of bishop and the honor and communion of the episcopate; but in such manner as not to permit him to perform ordinations nor to officiate in divine services in church on his own account, unless by any chance taken along or allowed to do so by a brother and fellow bishop, in pursuance of affection and love in Christ. But if you care to give him a better position of any kind, either now or hereafter, this will please the holy Council.

Interpretation.

This Eustathius, of whom the present letter speaks, was bishop of Pamphylia, a province in Attaleia. But after becoming engrossed in the cares and matters of the episcopate, and getting tired on account of his faintheartedness and inexperience in regard to the affairs and temptations of the episcopate, he tendered a written resignation. Hence the Synod there ordained another bishop in place of him. However, he afterwards came to this holy Ecumenical Council with tears in his eyes and begging, not for the episcopate which he had resigned, but to have the honor and name of a bishop. Feeling sorry for him and sympathizing with him on account of his advanced age and tears and the fact that he was far from home and hearth, and particularly because of the fact

that his resignation had not been submitted after a threat of deposition for viciousness, not on account of his carelessness and indolence (for if such had been the case, of course the Council would not have been warranted in showing him mercy, nor would it have bestowed upon him the mere name of bishop), but because of his faintheartedness and incapacity for affairs, the Council decreed that he should have the title of bishop, or, in other words, the right to call himself a bishop, and the honor, or, in other words, the right to sit down with bishops, and the communion, or, in other words, the right to partake of communion along with them, and to officiate with them, and to assist in ordinations the other bishops, though not to perform any himself of his own accord, but only with the permission of the local bishop. In addition the Council says to the bishops of Pamphylia, that in case they should think of something better and higher to give to Eustathius, either now or hereafter, this will please the Council too. This means nothing else, according to the exegete Anonymus, than the possibility of their appointing him bishop in some vacant province.⁷⁹

Fourth Ecumenical Council.

Prolegomena.

The holy and Ecumenical Fourth Council was held in Chalcedon, an important city in Bithynia, during the reign of Emperor Marcianus and Pulcheria⁸⁰ in the year 451 after Christ. The number of Fathers attending it was 630, the most notable of whom were Anatolius of Constantinople, Paschasinus and Lucinsius, bishops, together with Boniface and Basil presbyters, and with these were also Bishop Julian, Maximus the Bishop of Antioch, and Juvenal the Bishop of Jerusalem, acting as legates of the most holy Leo, Bishop of Rome. They condemned and consigned to anathema unfortunate Eutyches, an archimandrite, and his aid Dioscorus, who had become the Bishop of Alexandria after Cyril. For these men, having fallen into the error which was the opposite of that of Nestorius, shared also the latter's fate, and went to perdition like him. For Nestorius had divided the one Christ into two persons and two substances, while these men boldly confused the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, of which He is composed and in which He is known and adored, and conflated them into one single nature, the fools failing to understand that this recusant belief led to the conclusion that Christ was not of the same nature as the Father and of the same nature as human beings, but of some other and different nature.⁸¹ Hence this holy Council, following the Creed of the First Nicene Council and that of the Second Constantinopolitan Council and the letter of Cyril of Alexandria, which is the same as saying the definition laid down by the Third Council, held in Ephesus, but indeed also the letter of the most holy Leo of Rome,⁸² left unaltered the common Creed of the First Ec. Council, held in Nicaea, and of the Second one, held in Constantinople, and it anathematized those who might dare to add anything to or to subtract anything from it; and it made it its own definition of the Orthodox faith, which runs as follows (Act 5): "Pursuantly therefore to the divine Fathers we all consonantly join voices in teaching outright that we confess one and the same Son or Lord Jesus Christ, perfect the same in divinity, and perfect the same in humanity. Truly a God, and truly a human being the same (composed) of a soul and body and one who is at the same time of like essence with the Father as respecting divinity, and of like essence the same with us as respecting humanity, in all respects like us, apart from sinfulness. Though begotten before the ages out of the Father as respects divinity, yet in latter days born out of Mary the Virgin and Theotoke, as respects humanity, the same for us and for our salvation. One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten (composed) of two natures unconfusably, inconvertibly, indivisibly, inseparably identifiable,⁸³ there being nowhere anything removed or annulled in the difference of the natures on account of the union, but rather on the contrary the peculiarity of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one substance. Not being divided or parted into two persons, but (forming) on the contrary one and the same Son and only-begotten God Logos, Lord Jesus Christ, precisely as the Prophets formerly had prophesied concerning him and as he himself, the Lord Jesus Christ, did explicitly teach us, and the Symbol (i.e., Creed) of the Fathers has imparted the matter to us." On the other hand, this Council annulled and invalidated the Latrocinium (or Robber Synod) which had previously been assembled in Ephesus A.D. 448, at which Dioscorus presided, and spoke in defense of Eutyches, but the legates from the Bishop of Rome were not listened to, while St. Flavian of Constantinople, after being kicked and beaten with many whips, died. In this Council (Act 8) blessed Theodoret said: "Anathema to Nestorius, and to whoever refuses to call Mary the Holy Theotoke and whoever divides the one and only-begotten Son." In addition he also anathematized Eutyches, and every heresy, and after subscribing to all that had been decreed and adopted by the Council, he was justified and took the seat assigned to him in the Council, and undertook the representation of his province. Besides all these matters, the present Council also issued and promulgated the present

thirty Canons, which are to be found in its Act 15, ratified and confirmed by name and definitely by c. II of the Sixth, and indefinitely by c. I of the Seventh; which Canons are necessary for the decorum and constitutional organization of the Church. As for the Minutes of the present Council, they are divided into three volumes. The first volume contains various letters and the transactions endorsed in Constantinople by Flavian, and those endorsed in Ephesus by the Latrocinium (or Robber Synod). The second volume comprises the sixteen Acts of this same Council which was held in Chalcedon. The third volume contains various letters of the Council and of the Emperors, and some other matters which were done after it was held and which related to it.⁸⁴ (See Dositheus, from p. 331 to p. 397; and the second volume of the Conciliar Records.)

Canons.

1. We pronounce it just and right that the Canons promulgated by the Holy Fathers, in each and every Council down to the present time, continue in full force and effect.

(c. II of the 6th; c. I of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon deems it just and right that all the Canons issued by the Holy Fathers from the beginning down to the present day, whether serving the purpose of a more exact formulation of the dogmas, or that of providing for ecclesiastical discipline, at each and every Ecumenical and regional Council or any local Synod, should continue in full force and effect, that is to say, should remain valid and enforceable.

Canon II of the Sixth and Canon I of the Seventh Ec. C., dealing with the same matters as the present Canon deals with, expressly decree that the Apostolical Canons, and the Canons of Councils and Synods held theretofore, and those of the Fathers of the Church should remain confirmed. See also what is said of Canons in general at the commencement of this Handbook in the Prolegomena (p. xvi).

2. If any Bishop ordain anyone for money, and make merchandise of the unvendible grace, and perform the ordination of a Bishop, Chorepiscopus, Presbyter, Deacon, or any one on the roll of the Clergy, with a view to gain; or nominate any Steward, Ecdicus, or Paramonarius, or anyone else that belongs to the canon, for money, with the object of making a shameful profit for himself: let him who is found guilty of having undertaken this stand in peril of his office; and let him who has been thus ordained have no benefit from such traffic in ordinations or nominations, but, on the contrary, let him be without any claim upon the dignity or job which he has thus obtained by means of money. If, in fact, anyone even appear as a middleman or factor or intermediary for such shameful and illicit deals, let him too, if he be a clergyman, forfeit his office, but if he be a layman or a monk, let him be anathematized.

(Ap. cc. XXIX, XXX; cc. XXII, XXIII of the 6th; cc. III, IV, V, XIX of the 7th; c. XCI of Basil; c. XII of Laodicea; the letters of Gennadius and of Tarasius.)

Interpretation.

According to Zonaras, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are ordained by carrying out the rite called *chirotonia* (or chirotony); Anagnosts (or Readers, or Lectors), on the other hand, and Psalts (or Cantors or Choirmen), and Hegoumeni (or Priors) are ordained by carrying out the rite called *chirothesia* (or chirothesy) and sealing them;⁸⁵ others are merely nominated, without a seal, such as Stewards (*Oeconomi*), and Defensors (*Ecdici*), and Churchwardens (*Paramonarii*, i.e., *Prosmonarii*).⁸⁶ So the present Canon prescribes that if any bishop qualifies any of these or other clergymen for money, and out of greed sells the unvendible grace of the Spirit, he shall be deposed from the prelacy. In addition, the one so ordained is not to be allowed to profit by or derive any advantage from the ordination or nomination gained by this trafficking, but, on the contrary, he shall be expelled from the holy orders and office thus acquired. If anyone acts as middleman or intermediary in connection with these dealings of greed, in case he is a clergyman he is to be deposed, but if he is a monk or a layman, he is to be anathematized. Read also Ap. cc. XXIX and XXX.

3. It is come to the (knowledge of the) Council that some of those who had been listed in the roll of the Clergy hire other men's estates for the sake of filthy lucre, and undertake to negotiate secular affairs, to the neglect of the Divine liturgy, and betake themselves to the families of secular men, whose estates they undertake to manage out of love of money. Therefore the holy and great Council decrees that no Bishop, Clergyman, or Monk shall henceforth be allowed to farm any estate or office, or to involve himself in secular cares, unless he be unavoidably called by laws to the guardianship of minors, or the Bishop permit him to take care of the affairs of the church, or of those of orphans or widows unprovided for, and of persons in especial need of ecclesiastical assistance, for the fear of God. If anyone presume to transgress hereafter any of the rules herein decreed, that person shall be liable to ecclesiastical penalties (or penances).

(Ap. cc. VI, LXXXI, LXXXIII; c. VII of the 4th; c. XI of the 1st-&-2nd; c. XVIII of Carthage; and c. X of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that inasmuch as it has come to the ears of the Council that some clergymen, for the sake of making a shameful profit, are wont to rent the real estate of others, and to undertake outside work as contractors,⁸⁷ or, in other words, to involve themselves in secular affairs for pecuniary profit, while neglecting the services attached to holy orders, and, on the other hand, entering the homes of secular persons and assuming the management of their property on account of avarice. For this reason this holy Council has decreed that henceforth no bishop or clergyman or monk shall rent real estate or involve himself in the management of secular affairs, except only in case he should be called upon by the laws to become a guardian of minors⁸⁸ (children are called minors from the time they are born until the fourteenth years of their age), or a curator, by which term is meant one who takes care of and attends to the needs of adolescents (persons are called adolescents from the fourteenth to the twenty-fifth years of their age), and unless the bishop of the city should urge him to take care of the affairs of the church, or orphans, and widows unprovided for, and other persons that are in especial need of ecclesiastical help and assistance, nor for the sake of any profit or gain, but only for the fear of God. If anyone, on the other hand, should dare at any time hereafter to transgress these rules, such person shall become liable to the ecclesiastical penalties. But what are these? They are those prescribed by the Apostolical Canons. Their forfeiture, that is to say, of the clericate. Read also Ap. c. VI.

4. Let them who sincerely and truly enter upon monastic life be accorded due honor. But inasmuch as some use the monk's garb to disturb the affairs of the Church and civil government, by going round in the cities negligently disregarding their duties, and even undertaking to build themselves monasteries, it is decreed that no one shall anywhere build or establish any monastery or any oratory (i.e., prayerhouse) without the consent and approval of the Bishop of the city; and that Monks in every city and country be subject to the Bishop, and embrace quietude, and pay heed only to fasting and prayer, while continuing in the places patiently whereunto they have been assigned, without intruding upon or meddling in ecclesiastical affairs, nor leaving their own monasteries, unless at any time they be permitted to do so by the Bishop of the city on account of some exigency; and that no one shall receive a slave into the monasteries to become a monk, without his owner's consent and approval. We have decreed that anyone transgressing this rule of ours shall be excluded from communion, in order that the name of God be not blasphemed. The Bishop of the city, however, is required to make proper provision for monasteries.

(Regarding this first part of this Canon, cf. c. XXIV of the 4th; c. XXI of the 7th; and c. I of the 1st-&-2nd. Regarding the second part, Ap. c. LXXXII; cc. XL, XLII of Basil; cc. LXXXIII, XC of Carthage; c. LXXXV of the 6th and c. III of Gangra.)

Interpretation.

The following things are prescribed by the present Canon. Those who truly and without any hypocrisy adopt the monastic life deserve to be duly honored. But since some employ the monastic habit as a pretext and lure to get themselves honored, and bring about confusion in ecclesiastical and civil affairs by wanting to meddle therein and by carelessly going about the cities, and make it their endeavor to build monasteries of their own, therefore it has seemed reasonable that no monk, either in a village, or in a city, or in the wilderness, or in a desert, or in any other place shall be allowed to build and establish a monastery or an oratory, without the consent and approval of the bishop of the region in question.⁸⁹ Monks living in any city or village shall be subject to the authority of the bishop of the region in question, and shall observe quietness of life and engage in only fasting and praying, and shall remain in those monasteries wherein they were shorn, without leaving them (see c. XXI of the 7th) and involving themselves in ecclesiastical and civil affairs,⁹⁰ unless as a matter of need and necessity they be appointed to do so by the bishop, after he has judged them to be fitted for such an undertaking. It has seemed reasonable in addition that no slave be admitted into a monastery to be shorn as a monk without the consent of his owner, lest other men seeing the monks engaged in worldly affairs, and the masters grieved about their slaves, be led to blaspheme the order of the monks, and hence through them the name of God be blasphemed. Anyone that violates this Canon or transgresses it shall be excommunicated. Yet, just as monks ought to confine their activities to the works that belong to monks, so ought also bishops to have diligence and foresight in providing for their monasteries, by protecting the monks and bestowing alms in exigencies either out of their own pocket or out of the poor money of the church, in accordance with Ap. c.XLI and c.XXV of Antioch, for two reasons: 1) in order that the monks may remain quiet and free from temptation; and 2) in order that he may himself derive therefrom something in the way of benefit to his soul.⁹¹

Canon XVII of the 7th Ec. C. likewise commands that the bishop shall prohibit monks from leaving their monasteries, and from undertaking to build oratories without having the expenses requisite to finish and furnish them. In addition thereto, c. I of the 1st-&-2nd refuses permission to anyone to build a monastery without the consent of the bishop, or after building one to become its owner and lord. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. LXXXII, and c. XXIV of the present Council.

5. As regards Bishops or Clergymen who go from city to city, it has seemed fitting that the Canons laid down by the Holy Fathers should remain in effect and be enforced.

(Ap. cc. XIV, XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; c. XVII of the 6th; cc. III, XVI, XXI of Antioch; cc. I, II, XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica; and cc. LVII, LXIII, and XC of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

This Canon prescribes that those Canons shall remain valid which were issued by the Holy Fathers to prohibit bishops as well as clergymen from going from one city or province to another city or province. Read them also in Ap. cc. XIV and XV.

6. It is decreed that no one shall be ordained at large either a Presbyter or a Deacon, nor anything else at all in the ecclesiastical ranks unless he be particularly assigned to the church of some city, or to a martyr, or to a monastery. As for those ordained at large the holy Council has determined that any such chirothesy shall be null and void, and that such ordainees shall not be allowed to officiate anywhere, to the dishonor of the ordainer.

(c. XIII of Neocaesarea.)

Interpretation.

Wishing to prevent easily those in holy orders from going or being transferred from one locality to another in violation of the Canons, the cause and root of this evil being that they are ordained at large and indefinitely, the holy Council decrees in its present Canon that henceforth neither a priest nor a deacon nor any other ecclesiastic shall be ordained in such a manner, but must in any case be assigned to a church of a city or village, or to a monastery, or to the church of some martyr, to be mentioned by the prelate in the course of reciting the ordination prayer, by saying "The divine grace ordaineth so-and-so a Presbyter or Deacon of such or such a

church, or monastery, by name — in identically the same manner, that is to say, in which the name of the province is pronounced aloud in the ordination of every bishop. As for all those who have been ordained indefinitely, the holy Council has ruled that the ordination be invalid, and that those so ordained shall not be allowed to officiate in any region; in order that the prelate performing the ordination contrary to the Canons be dishonored in consequence of this lack of the right to officiate, and be led to sobriety as a result of this dishonor, and be discouraged from doing so again.⁹² But please bewail the fact, O reader, that in spite of the present Canon during the ordination of a deacon or presbyter today the name of a particular church or of a monastery is not specially mentioned, as required by the terms of this Canon, though this prescription appears to be an element of the ordination along with the other components thereof, notwithstanding that the violators of this rule fail to take this into account at all.

7. We have decreed in regard to those who have once been enrolled in the Clergy or who have become Monks shall not join the army nor obtain any secular position of dignity. Let those be anathematized who dare to do this and Jail to repent, so as to return to that which they had previously chosen on God's account.

(Ap. cc. LXXXI, LXXXIII; cc. III, VI of the 4th; c. XI of the 1st-&-2nd; c. XVIII of Carthage; and c. X of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prescribes that clergymen and monks must not become soldiers, nor assume secular dignities. Those who do these things and fail to return again to their former occupation in life, which they chose on God's account, are to be anathematized. But why is it that Ap. c. LXXXIII only deposes these men from office, whereas this Canon anathematizes them? Either the former Canon is referring to those, according to Zonaras and the other interpreters, who engage in such things while wearing the habit of the clergy; whereas the present Canon is speaking of those who discard even the clergyman's or monk's habit before engaging in such things. Or perhaps the present Canon is referring to those who, after once daring to do such things, refuse afterwards to repent and to return to their former life (which the Ap. c. does not say), and for this reason it has made them liable to severer punishment on the ground that they are unrepentant.⁹³ See also Ap. c. VI and c. XVI of the present Fourth.

8. As for the Clergymen attached to poor houses or monasteries or martyries, let them remain under the authority of the bishop of the city in question, and not disrespectfully desert their own Bishop, in accordance with the teaching imparted by the holy Fathers. As regards those who dare to defy any such formal ruling, in any manner whatever, and who refuse to submit to their own Bishop, in case they are clergymen let them be liable to the penalties prescribed by the Canons, but if they are monks or laymen, let them be excluded from communion.

Interpretation.

The decree of the present Canon is as follows. That as for any clergymen or persons in holy orders who are in churches belonging to poorhouses, orphan asylums, homes for the aged, hospitals, or monasteries, or to churches of martyrs, they must remain always subject to the bishop of the city in question, in accordance with the tradition received from the Holy Fathers, and not abscond from the authority of their own bishop disrespectfully. All those who dare to violate the present Canon in any way, and who refuse to submit to their own bishop, in case they are in holy orders or are clergymen, they are to be liable to the penalties prescribed by the Canons, and deemed reasonable by this same bishop of the region in question; but if they are monks or laymen, they are to be excommunicated. But why does the Canon, after mentioning further above only clergymen and monks, say also laymen further below? In order to expose those laymen on whose boldness and protection the clergymen and monks rely in showing disrespectfulness to the prelate and refusing to submit to his authority.⁹⁴

9. If any Clergyman has a dispute with another, let him not leave his own Bishop and resort to secular courts, but let him first submit his case to his own Bishop, or let it be tried by referees chosen by both parties and approved by the Bishop. Let anyone who acts contrary hereto be liable to Canonical penalties. If, on the other hand, a Clergyman has a dispute with his own Bishop, or with some other Bishop, let it be tried by the Synod of the province. But if any Bishop or Clergyman has a dispute with the Metropolitan of the same province, let him apply either to the Exarch of the diocese or to the throne of the imperial capital Constantinople, and let it be tried before him.

(Ap. c. LXXIV; c. VI of the 1st; cc. XVII, XXI of the 4th; cc. XIV, XV of Antioch; cc. VIII, XII, XIV, XV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXVI, LXXXVII, XCVI, CV, CXV, CXVIII, CXXXIV, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, CXXXIX.)

Interpretation.

When one clergyman has a dispute with another clergyman, the present Canon prescribes that he must not leave his own bishop and present his case to secular courts, but, on the contrary, he must first present it to his bishop, or else, with the permission and consent of his bishop, he may have his case tried by referees (or chosen judges), with whom both parties, the plaintiff and the defendant, are well pleased. As for any clergyman that does otherwise, let him be subjected by the bishops to canonical penalties. But when a clergyman has a dispute with his own bishop, let the case be tried before the Synod of the province. When, again, a bishop or a clergyman has a dispute with the Metropolitan, let him go to the Exarch of the diocese,⁹⁵ or to the throne of the imperial capital Constantinople, and let the case be tried by him.

Canon XVIII of Carthage prescribes that if presbyters and deacons are accused, the presbyter shall choose six, and the deacon three, bishops from neighboring districts, and let their own bishop try their case in conjunction with these others; and that two months' time shall be allowed them too, and that the persons of their accusers be examined in the same way as in the case of a trial by the bishop alone. But as for the other clergymen, they are to be tried by the local bishop alone. But a single bishop cannot decide the case of any bishop or presbyter or deacon, according to c. CXVIII of the same Ec. C. of Carthage. Canon LXXXVII of the same C. says that if clergymen charged with any crime fail to prove themselves innocent within a year, they shall no longer have the right to present a defense. Canon CXV of the same C. says that if a clergyman quarreling with anyone asks the Emperor for a civil trial court, and refuses to accept the bishop's decision, he shall be deposed from office. Justinian Novel 123 (found in Book III of the Basilica, Title I, ch. 35) further decrees that anyone who has any matter of dispute to be tried in court with a clergyman, or a monk, or a deaconess, or a nun, or any ascetic woman, he shall first take his case to the bishop to whom the litigants in question are subject; and if the bishop decide the case to the satisfaction of both parties, the ruler (i.e., the civil magistrate) is obliged to carry out the sentence pronounced by the bishop. And in the same Novel, ch. 36, it is declared that if the matter is an ecclesiastical one, the civil magistrates are to have nothing to do with it at all, but only the bishops, in accordance with the Canons, are to decide it. But in the same Novel, ch. 8, it is decreed that "if the accused one is a bishop, his Metropolitan shall examine into the facts of his case; if, on the other hand, the accused one himself is a Metropolitan, the Archbishop to whom he is subject shall examine into the facts of his case; but if the one accused is a presbyter, or a deacon, or a clergyman, or an abbot, or a monk, his bishop shall consider his case, and, according to the gravity of each one's offense, shall impose the proper Canonical penances (or penalties)." Read also Ap. c. LXXIV and c. VI of the First.

10. Let no clergyman be entitled to be on the roll of the churches of two different churches at the same time, i.e., of that in which he was originally ordained, and of that to which he has resorted on the plea that it appeals to him more than the other because of its being a larger church, when in reality he is actuated by vainglory. As for those who do so, let them be reinstated in their own church, wherein they were originally ordained, and let them officiate there only. If, on the other hand, anyone has been already translated from one church to another, let him have nothing to do with the affairs of the former church, as regards the martyr connected to it, or the poorhouses, or the inns, administered by it. As for those who dare to do anything hereby prohibited, after the

definition of this great and ecumenical Council, this holy Council has decided that he shall forfeit his own rank.

(Ap. c. XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. V, XX of the 4th; cc. XVII, XVIII of the 6th; c. XV of the 7th; c. III of Antioch; cc. LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage; cc. XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that it is not permissible for a clergyman to be enrolled at the same time in the churches of two different cities (or even of one and the same city, according to c. XV of the 7th), namely, in the one in which he was ordained in the beginning, and in another to which he went thereafter on the pretext of its being a larger church, on account of vainglory and greed. As for all those who do this hereafter, they are to be compelled to return to their former church, where they were ordained, and are to perform the functions of the clergy there only. But if anyone has succeeded already in having himself translated, or transferred, from one church to another, and remains thus translated, let him no longer receive any apportionment from the affairs of the former church, by which is meant inns, poorhouses, and martyric temples. Whoever should dare after this Canon of the great Council to do any of these things, he is to be deposed from office. Novel 16 (found in Title III of Book III of the Basilica) prescribes that if the clergyman of any church should die, another one is not immediately to take his place, but that if there are more clergymen in other churches among those already ordained, let one of them be taken to fill the place left vacant by the clergyman in question, until the clergymen of each particular church reach the number prescribed in the beginning. See also Ap. c. XV.

11. As for all those who are indigent and in need of assistance, upon proof, we have made it a rule that they are to travel only with pacific ecclesiastical letters, and not with recommendatory letters; for recommendatory letters are to be granted only to persons who are under suspicion.

(Ap. cc. XII, XXXIII; c. XIII of the 4th; c. XVII of the 6th; cc. VII, VIII, and XI of Antioch; cc. XLI, XLII of Laodicea; cc. VII, VIII of Sardica; cc. XXXI, XCVII, and CXVI of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

All those who are indigent and in need of help, the present Canon decrees, are first to be investigated as to whether they are truly in need of aid, and, this being ascertained, after examination, to be a fact, they are to receive from the bishops little letters called “pacific” letters on account of the fact that they used to afford peace to those who were suffering from wrath and the unjust decision of civil magistrates and dynasts (such letters were also called letters dimissory); but they are not to receive also letters recommendatory. For letters recommendatory are to be given for the most part to those persons whose reputation, or repute, had previously been besmirched, and who are recommended and declared innocent in the recommendatory letters.⁹⁶ Read the Interpretation of and the Footnote to Ap. c. XIV.

12. It has come to our knowledge that some persons, by resorting to the civil authorities, have obtained pragmatics whereby they have contrived to divide one province into two, contrary to the ecclesiastical Canons, and as a result there are two Metropolitans in one and the same province. The holy Council has therefore made it a rule that no Bishop shall hereafter be allowed to do such a thing. For, if anyone shall attempt to do so, he shall forfeit his own rank. As for all those cities which have already been honored with the name of Metropolis by letters of the Emperor, let them enjoy only the honor, and likewise the Bishop who is administering its church; it being left plain that the rights properly belonging to the real Metropolis are to be preserved to this Metropolis (alone).

(c. VIII of the First; Ap. c. XXXIV; ec. VI, VII of the First; cc. II, III of the 2nd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; cc. XXXVI, XXXIX of the 6th; c. VIII of the 3rd.)

Interpretation.

Inasmuch as some ambitious bishops by applying to the Emperors have contrived to get Imperial edicts (for these are what are called “pragmatics” in the Canon here), whereby they have sought to have their bishoprics

honored with the name of Metropolis, and have thus virtually divided the one province and metropolis into two, so that as a result of this two metropolitans came to be in one and the same metropolis (which is contrary to the Conciliar Canons, and especially to c. VIII of the 1st), and the bishops of that province were hence led to quarrel among themselves;⁹⁷ therefore and on this account this holy Council has made it a rule that no bishop shall dare henceforth to do this. As for anyone that merely attempts to do such a thing, without succeeding in doing it, he shall be deposed from office. But as for all bishoprics and cities that hitherto succeeded in attaining, by means of imperial letters, to the honor of being allowed the name of Metropolis, let them have only the honor of this name, and the same as touching the Bishop to whom they appertain. The rights, however, and the authority to govern the affairs of the metropolis are to be preserved to the city which had originally and truly and from the beginning styled metropolis, and which is really the Metropolis;⁹⁸ without allowing the new Metropolitan, who bears this title only as an honorary title, to usurp anything therefrom. The right of a true metropolis, it may be observed, consists principally in its being the one whose Metropolitan ordains the Bishop of the honorary metropolis, in accordance with c. VI of the First Ec. C., which says that one who has not been ordained with the consent and approval of the Metropolitan is not a bishop. Read also Ap. c. XXXIV.

13. Strange Clergymen and Anagnosts are not to be allowed to conduct services anywhere in a different city without having letters recommendatory from their own Bishop.

(Ap. cc. XII, XV.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prescribes that strange clergymen and anagnosts are not to be allowed to perform any function of their clericate unless they are provided with letters recommendatory attesting both their ordination and their orthodoxy and the guiltlessness of their past life; though as laymen that may commune there. Read also the interpretations of Ap. cc. XII and XV, together with the series of parallel Canons; for the space afforded by the present Canon would not suffice even to admit of their enumeration.

14. Inasmuch as Anagnosts and Psalts in some provinces have been permitted to marry, the holy Council has made it a rule that none of them shall be allowed to take a wife that is of a different faith. As for those who have already had children as a result of such a marriage, if they have already had their offspring baptized by heretics, let them bring them into the communion of the catholic Church. But if they have not baptized them, let them no longer have any right to baptize them with heretics, nor, indeed, even to contract a marriage with a heretic, or a Jew, or a Greek, unless they first promise and undertake to convert the person joined to the Orthodox Christian to the Orthodox faith. If, on the other hand, anyone transgresses this rule of the holy Council, let him be liable to a Canonical penalty.

(Ap. c. XXVI; cc. VI and LXXII of the 6th; cc. X and XXXI of Laodicea; cc. XIX, XXIX, XXXIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Notwithstanding that Ap. c. XXVI commands that Anagnosts and Psalts may marry after being installed by chirothesy, it appears from what the present Canon says that this was not permitted everywhere (and especially in Africa, according to its c. XIX). So this holy Council makes it a rule that in those regions where this is allowed that no Anagnost or Psalt shall take a woman of a different faith to wife. All those, on the other hand, who have already begotten children by such an unlawful marriage must bring them into the catholic Church. Accordingly, if they have baptized a child with the baptism of heretics, in case that heretical baptism with which the child has been baptized does not differ from the Orthodox baptism so far as concerns the matter and form, but, on the contrary, is acceptable to the Orthodox Church, they shall have the child anointed only with myron (or chrism), as Zonaras says (though it would be more correct and safer for them to be baptized, seeing that the baptism of all heretics is in the nature of a pollution, and not a baptism; read also the Interpretations of Ap. cc. XLVI, XLVII, and LXVIII). But if that baptism was not acceptable the child is to be rebaptized. But if, on the other hand, they have not yet baptized the children, they are not to baptize them any longer with the

heretical baptism, nor are they to join them in marriage with a heretic, that is to say, either with a Jew or with a Greek, with one, in other words, who is an infidel and idolater. But if the heretic should promise to become an Orthodox Christian, let him first become one in accordance with his promise, and then let the marriage be performed. If anyone transgresses these rules, let him be liable to the penalties prescribed by the Canons, that is to say, by the foresaid Apostolic Canons.

Concord.

In a similar manner c. XXXI of Laodicea commands Christians not to give their children (in marriage) to heretics, but rather to take any from them provided that they promise to become Christians. In addition, c. X of Laodicea, i.e., of the same Council, prohibits ecclesiastics from joining their children in marriage with heretics. This same rule is also laid down by c. XXIX of Carthage; while c. LXXII of the 6th even goes so far as to annul and invalidate any marriage contracted, not only by a clergyman, but also by any Orthodox Christian man or woman in general with heretics. But as for those who from the first and originally were heretics, and the one of them was later baptized by them, and they do not want to be separated, let them not be divorced, according to the same Canon and according to St. Paul, though St. Paul prohibits marriage with infidels, by saying: *“Be ye not unequally yoked with infidels”* (II Cor. 6:14). Read also Ap. c. XXVI.⁹⁹

15. Let no woman be ordained a deaconess before the age of forty, and even then after a strict test. But if she, after receiving the gift of chirothesy and remaining for some time in the ministry, proceeds to give herself in marriage, thus insulting the grace of God, let any such actress be anathematized together with the man who has joined himself with her in marriage.

(c. XIX of the 1st; cc. XIV and XI of the 6th; c. XLIV of Basil.)

Interpretation.

Owing to the ease with which women are deceived and the ease with which they are ruined, the present Canon commands that no woman shall be ordained a deaconess if she is less than forty years old. Yet even if she is forty years old, again, it forbids her to be ordained at random and perfunctorily; on the contrary, it requires the ordination to be performed only after a strict investigation of her life and past habits. In case, however, even after being thus ordained and serving as a deaconess for some time, she afterwards scorns the grace of God and marries, any such woman is to be anathematized together with the man who has married her. Armenopoulos, moreover, says (Book VI, Title III) that those who have induced deaconesses and nuns to become prostitutes are to have their noses cut off along with those of the women whom they have led into prostitution. See also the Interpretation of c. XIX of the First Ec. C. and the third Footnote thereto.

16. If any virgin has dedicated herself to the Lord God, or any men likewise have become monks, let them not be permitted to engage in marriage. If, however, they be found to be doing this, let them be denied communion, and be excluded therefrom. But we have made it a rule that the local Bishop is to have control of kindness in regard to the treatment of them.

(c. VII of the 4th; c. XLIV of the 6th; c. XIX of Carthage; and cc. VI, XVIII, XIX, XX, and LX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

In times of old some women wearing lay garb would dedicate themselves to God, as becomes plain from what is said about this in c. XLV of the 6th, and they would agree while in full possession of their reasoning powers to remain virgins; and after being further tried and found true to their promise, they would be numbered among the other virgins (for, according to c. XVIII of Basil, any such woman used to be called a virgin. Moreover, they assumed the black habit, according to c. XLV of the 6th). Hence it is that the present Canon decrees that these virgins, and equally so monks in particular, who either as an inference justified by their keeping silent about it are inclined to celibacy, or when asked about it actually agree to remain virgins, in accordance with c. XIX of Basil, are not permitted to marry and to violate the agreements and stipulations which they have made with God. For, if the agreements which men make with one another are confirmed by the name of God being taken in the midst thereof, as St. Gregory the Theologian says, how great indeed is the danger of their being found to be violators of those agreements which they have made with God directly! And if, accord-

ing to Basil the Great (Ascetic Ordinance 21) a monk, as having reaped fruit and having dedicated his body to God, no longer has control over what has been dedicated to God nor any right to have it for the use and convenience of his relatives, how much more he is unable to have it for the purpose of carnal intercourse!¹⁰⁰ If, nevertheless, there be found some to have done this, let them be excommunicated. But let the local bishop have the power to treat them with philanthropy or kindness, and either to mitigate their punishment or to shorten the time of their penance. This does not mean that the marriage tie may remain indissoluble, but, on the contrary, it is implied that the parties to the marriage are to be divorced from each other. For, in point of fact, it is a case of fornication, or rather to say of adultery, and not a marriage that occurred, according to St. Basil the Great in his c. VI and his VIII; see also c. VII of the present Council.

17. As touching rural parishes, or country parishes, in any province, they shall remain in the undisputed possession of the bishops now holding them, and especially if they have held them in their possession and have managed them without coercion for thirty years or more. But if during a period of thirty years there has arisen or should arise some dispute concerning them, those claiming to have been unjustly treated shall be permitted to complain to the Synod of the province. But if anyone has been unjustly treated by his own Metropolitan, let him complain to the Exarch of the diocese, or let him have his case tried before the throne of Constantinople, according as he may choose. If, on the other hand, any city has been rebuilt by imperial authority, or has been built anew again, pursuant to civil and public formalities, let the order of the ecclesiastical parishes be followed.

(Ap. c. LXXIV; c. VI of the 1st; cc. IX, XXI of the 4th; cc. XIV, XV of Antioch; cc. VIII, XII, XIV, XV, XVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXVI, LXXXVII, XCVI, CV, CXV, CXVIII, CXXVIII, CXXIX, CXXX, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, and CXXXIX; cc. XXV and XXXVIII of the 6th.)

Interpretation.

Rural parishes are small parishes which are situated in outlying and distant parts of the country, and being inhabited by few human beings they used to be called *monoecia* (which word meant, in Greek, “lone habitations”). Country parishes, on the other hand, are parishes which were near cultivated fields and villages, and had a greater number of inhabitants. So it is these parishes in every province that the present Canon commands to remain inalienable and indetachable from the bishops to whom they belong, and especially if they have belonged to them and been under their authority for as many as thirty years in good faith and without coercion, that is to say, without their being forced to submit to it and without their being grabbed up on an unjust or unfair pretext.¹⁰¹ But if during the course of the thirty years there had arisen any dispute concerning them, or if after the enactment of the present Canon there should arise any dispute concerning them, those who claim to have been unjustly treated in regard thereto are given permission to have their dispute considered by the Synod of the province. If, again, anyone should claim to have been unjustly treated in regard thereto by his Metropolitan, let him refer his case to the Exarch and chief head of the diocese (whose function, however, was abolished or fell into desuetude after this Fourth Ec. C. was held, as we said in Footnote to c. IX of the present C.), or to the Bishop of Constantinople, as previously stated. If, on the other hand, there has heretofore been built any city by imperial authority, or if any be so built hereafter, then the neighboring bishop shall not try to subject it to his own authority and claim it as a parish of his own, since the order of the parishes of that church have to follow the civil laws and ordinances which may be decreed by the emperor in regard to the newly-built city, not vice versa.¹⁰²

Note that, after dividing this Canon into two sections, the Sixth Ec. C. incorporated in its own c. XXV that part of this present canon which ends with the words “complain to the Synod of the province,” while it incorporates the words following these to the end in its own c. XXXVIII. Note also that c. CXXIX of Carthage prescribes that if any bishop succeeds in converting any region of heretics to Orthodoxy and holding it for three years straight, without its being reclaimed by the one who ought to have reclaimed it, it shall no longer be subject to being reclaimed by him. The same Council’s c. CXXVIII declares that heretics converted to the catholic unity shall be subject to that throne to which the catholic union of Orthodox Christians situated therein had been subject of old. In addition, c. CXXX says that in case anyone deems any laity belonging to another to be wrongly held by him and appropriates it as his own, not by virtue of letters of the bishop possessing it, or

at the request of the Council or Synod, but by despotism and assault, he shall lose that laity, even though it really were his, and even though he assert that he had letters from the chief head. Read also the Interpretations of Ap. c. LXXIV, of c. VI of the First Ec. C., and c. IX of the present Fourth Ec. C.

18. The crime of conspiracy, or of faction (i.e., of factious partisanship), already prohibited by secular laws, ought still more to be forbidden to obtain in the Church of God. If, therefore, there be found any Clergymen, or Monastics, to be conspiring or to be engaged in factiousness of any kind, or hatching plots against Bishops or Fellow Clergymen¹⁰³ they shall forfeit their own rank altogether.

(Ap. c. XXXI; c. XXXIV of the 6th; cc. X, LXII of Carthage; c. VI of Gangra; c. V of Antioch; and cc. III, XIV, XV of the 1st-&-2nd.

Interpretation.

A conspiracy is a combination of men leagued together and with one another by oaths; a faction, on the other hand, is a combination of men leagued together and with one another by agreement and resolution not to give up the undertakings to which they have bound or committed themselves against another person until they have carried them out to completion. Those Jews entered into a conspiracy who conspired against St. Paul, as historically recorded by sacred Luke in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 23:21) wherein the latter says: “more than forty men who have bound themselves with an oath that they will neither eat nor drink till they have killed him” (sc. St. Paul). So, therefore, what the present Canon means is that though the crime of conspiracy and that of faction are prohibited even by the secular, or civil, laws themselves of Greek¹⁰⁴ as well as of Orthodox emperors, who indeed adopted the most of their laws from the Greeks,¹⁰⁵ this thing ought still more to be forbidden to occur in the Church of God. So if some clergymen or monks be found to be engaged in conspiracy or faction, or in plotting any other callous and cunning machinations or intrigues (for that is what is denoted by the Greek word corresponding to the verb “hatch,” in accordance with the Scriptural passage saying “their heart hath become as crusty as cheese,” instead of saying “hath become as callous or hard as cheese”) against their bishops or fellow clergymen, let them be deposed from office. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXI.

19. It has come to our ears that the canonically prescribed Synods of Bishops are not held in the provinces, and as a result of this fact many ecclesiastical matters in need of correction are neglected. The holy Council, therefore, has made it a rule, in accordance with the Canons of the Holy Fathers, for the Bishops to meet twice a year in convention somewhere in each province, wherever the Bishop of the Metropolis designates, and for all matters to be corrected that may come up. As for those Bishops, on the other hand, who fail to attend the meeting, but who, instead of doing so, remain at home in their respective cities, and lead their lives therein in good health and free from every indispensable and necessary occupation, they are to be reprimanded in a brotherly way.

(Ap. c. XXXVII; c. V. of the 1st; c. VIII of the 6th; c. VI of the 7th; c. XX of Antioch; cc. XXVI, LXXXI, LXXXIV, LXXXV, and CIV of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

In view of the fact that the two Synods which were canonically arranged to take place twice in every year were not being held, and as a result of this many ecclesiastical affairs in need of adjustment were being neglected, the present Canon on this account decrees that the bishops shall meet twice a year in each province wherever the Metropolitan may deem fit, and adjust whatever affairs may arise from time to time for correction. As for any bishops, on the other hand, who, in spite of their being in good health and free from any necessary care, fail to attend the meeting, they are to be given a brotherly reprimand. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXVII.

20. As we have already decreed, it is not permissible for clergymen officiating in a church to be given a church in another city; but, on the contrary, they must rest content with the one in which they were originally deemed worthy to conduct divine services: except those who have gone over to another church as a result of their having been forced to flee from their own country. If any Bishop nevertheless admits a clergyman belonging to another Bishop, after promulgation of this rule, it has been decided that both of them, i.e., the Clergyman so admitted and the Bishop admitting him, are to be excluded from communion until such time as the Clergyman who has left his own city see fit to return to his own church.

(Ap. c. XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. V, X, XXIII of the 4th; cc. XVII, XVIII of the 6th; c. XV of the 7th; c. III of Antioch; cc. LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage; cc. XV, XVI, and XIX of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

Clergymen (as has been stated in c. VIII) who are conducting services in one church are not permitted to be transferred to another in another city, but, on the contrary, they are obliged to stay in the one in which they happened originally to be appointed to officiate; except only those who have been compelled to flee from their motherland or home city by any necessity, or who have suffered an incursion of barbarians, and on that account have been transferred to another church (and who themselves must return to their own church whenever the incursion of barbarians has passed, according to c. XVIII of the 6th). Any bishop, after the present Canon has been put forth, who accepts a clergyman of another bishop, as well as the clergyman he accepted, shall be excommunicated from communion with his fellow bishops and fellow clergymen, until such time as the strange clergyman decides to go back to his own church. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XV.

21. Clergymen or laymen accusing Bishops or Clergymen are not to be allowed to file charges against them promiscuously and without investigation until their own reputation has been examined into.

(Ap. c. LXXIV; c. VI of the 2nd; cc. VIII, XXVII, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, and CXXXIX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prescribes that those clergymen or laymen who accuse bishops or clergymen in regard to any matter that is not of a financial or private nature, but of an ecclesiastical and criminal nature, are not to be allowed to bring charges against them simply as a matter of course and without any previous investigation unless their own reputation has first been looked into to make sure that they are not persons that have been aspersed and accused. See, in this connection, also Ap. c. LXXIV and c. VI of the 2nd Ec. C.

22. Clergymen, after the death of their own Bishop, shall not be allowed to seize his effects, as is prohibited even by the Canons of old,¹⁰⁶ on pain of being shorn of their own offices.

(Ap c. XL; c. XXIV of Antioch; c. XXXV of the 6th; cc. XXX and LXXXIX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Upon the death of their bishop, says the present Canon, clergymen must not seize their effects — a thing which even the Canons of old forbade them to do (as, e.g., Ap. c. LX and c. XXIV of Antioch). Those who do this are to incur the penalty of losing their own rank and office. Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XL.

23. It has come to the ears of the holy Council that certain Clergymen and Monastics, without being handed any permission by their own bishop, and in fact, sometimes even after he has excluded them from communion, have resorted to the imperial city of Constantinople, and stay there a long time, causing disturbances and meddling the ecclesiastical situation, and engender

upheavals in the households of some persons. Hence the holy Council has decreed that they first be reminded, through the Defensor of the most holy Church of Constantinople, to take their departure from the imperial city. But if they impudently persist in doing the same things, they are to be expelled from the city even against their will through the same Defensor, and are to betake themselves to their own regions.

(Ap. c. XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. V, X, XX of the 4th; cc. XVII, XCVIII of the 6th; c. XV of the 7th; c. III of Antioch; cc. LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage; cc. XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

Since this Council has learned that some clergymen and monks, notwithstanding that they have not any ecclesiastical authority in their hands, because their own bishop has not judged them worthy of such permission, and even at times in spite of the fact that they have been excommunicated by him, go to Constantinople and stay in that city for a long time, disturb the conditions of the Church and cause disorder in the homes either of Christians who receive them or of fellow clergymen who have imitated them; this Council therefore by means of its present Canon decrees that they first be notified through the Defensor of the church to depart from Constantinople peaceably. But if they impudently persist in doing the same things in spite of this admonition, they are to be driven out against their will by means of the same Defensor and are to hie themselves back home. As for what a defensor is, see the Footnote to c. II of the present Council. See also Ap. c. XV.

24. As for Monasteries which have once been consecrated with the consent of the Bishop, they are to remain Monasteries perpetually, and the property owned by them is to be kept safe, and no more be permitted to serve as mundane haunts of vice. Those who permit this to occur are liable to the penances provided by the Canons.

(c. IV of the 4th; c. XLIX of the 6th; cc. XII, XIX of the 7th; c. I of the 1st-&-2nd; c. II of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prescribes that all monasteries that have once been established and consecrated with the consent and permission and approval of the Bishop having jurisdiction of that particular region in which they are situated (as we have previously asserted in connection with c. IV of the present Council, q.v.), they are to remain monasteries forever, and henceforth no more to be converted into common and mundane haunts of vice or the like. All real and personal property belonging to them must likewise be kept inalienable and undiminished. All persons who, though not themselves converting them into mundane resorts, nor removing any of their property, give permission to others to do so, are to be held responsible for their acts and liable to the penalties provided by the Canons. But what are these penalties? They are the ones mentioned by the 7th Ec. C. in its c. XIII, wherein it deposes the clergymen from office, and excommunicates those laymen and monks who have seized monasteries and bishoprics, and have converted them into common resorts and refuse to return them in order to let them become sacred again just as they were formerly.

Canon XLIX of the 6th not only commands that monasteries are not to be permitted to become common and mundane habitations, but also that they are not to be turned over to seculars by anyone, in order, that is to say, that they may be protected and managed. Canon XII of the 7th also prohibits any abbot from alienating the monasteries' own works and effects. Canon XIX of the same Council will not allow a monk to take back things which he has given to his monastery if he departs of his own accord. And c. II of Cyril specifies that jewels and other valuable articles and real estate are to remain inalienable from the churches to which they belong.¹⁰⁷

25. Whereas some Metropolitans, as we have been informed, neglect the flocks committed to their care, and postpone the ordinations of Bishops, the holy Council has decreed that they must perform ordinations within three months, unless some unavoidable necessity require the time to be lengthened. If they fail¹⁰⁸ to carry out this rule, they shall be liable to ecclesiastical penances;

and the means profits of the widow church shall be preserved to be retained by the Steward (or *Oeconomus*) of the same church.

(Ap. c. LVIII; c. XIX of the 6th; c. XVI of the 1st-&-2nd; cc. XI, XII of Sardica; cc. LXXIX, LXXXII, LXXXVI, CXXXI, CXXXI, CXXXII of Carthage, and c. X of Peter.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prescribes that Metropolitans must not neglect their flocks, and postpone the ordination of the bishops subject to them; but, on the contrary, after the death of the bishop who has passed away, they must ordain another bishop for the vacant bishopric within three months, unless there be some unavoidable necessity forcing them to prolong the time of postponement (for perhaps that particular bishopric may have been captured by barbarians, or some other woe may have befallen it, and for this reason no one can go there). Any Metropolitan that is remiss in this respect, becomes liable to canonical penances. The income, however, from the affairs of that bishopric must be kept by the steward safe and intact until he surrenders it to the bishop-to-be. See also Ap. cc. LVIII and XL.

26. Since in some churches, as we have been informed, the Bishops are administering the ecclesiastical affairs with the services of a Steward, it has seemed most reasonable and right that each and every church that has a Bishop should also have a Steward selected from its own Clergy to manage the ecclesiastical affairs of that particular church in accordance with the views and ideas of its own Bishop, so as to provide against the administration of the church being unwitnessed, so as to prevent the property of the same church from being wasted as a result of such stewardless administration and to prevent any obloquy from attaching itself to holy orders.

(Ap. cc. XXXVIII, XL; cc. XI, XII of the 7th; cc. XXIV, XXV of Antioch; c. VII of the 1st-&-2nd; cc. XXXIV, XLI of Carthage; c. VII of Gangra; c. XV of Ancyra; c. LXX of Theophilus; and c. II of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

Since, says the present Canon, we have been told that in some provinces bishops are administering the affairs of the church by themselves without the help of a steward and just as they please, for this reason it has appeared reasonable that the bishop of every church should have a steward, selected, not from his own intimate servants or relatives, but from his clergymen, to manage the affairs of the church in accordance with wishes based upon the best judgment of the same bishop, so that there should be no witness wanting to prove where, and how, and when the income of the church is spent, and to prevent the prelate from arousing any suspicion among the laity and giving it cause to accuse him of wasting the funds of the church. As for any prelate that fails to live up to this Canon, he shall be liable to the penalties provided by the divine Canons. But just as a prelate ought to have a steward to manage the affairs of the church, so ought an abbot to have a steward to manage the affairs of his monastery.¹⁰⁹ Read also Ap. cc. XXXVII and XLI.

27. The holy Council has made it a rule regarding those who take women by force¹¹⁰ under pretense of marriage, and their accomplices and abettors, that if they should be Clergymen, they shall forfeit their own rank, but if they are laymen, they shall be anathematized.

(c. XCII of the 6th; c. XI of Ancyra; cc. XXII, XXX, XXXVIII, XLII, and LIII of Basil.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon, dealing with the forcible seizure of women in a harsher way than the other Canons do, penances those who seize women forcibly with a view to taking them to wife. For it deposes from office not only those clergymen who seize them by force, but also those who helped them to do so, and those who incited them to such a seizure by words of advice or encouragement; or if they be laymen, it anathematizes them, and in a manner which is quite just. For the one who seizes them can offer as a pretext the allegation that he is impelled by the urge of his absurd and improper love of women, but his accomplices and abettors are not impelled to this absurd and improper act by any such incentive, save the viciousness of their head and their bad judgment.¹¹¹

28. Everywhere following the decrees of the Holy Fathers, and aware of the recently recognized Canon of the one hundred and fifty most God-beloved Bishops who convened during the reign of Theodosius the Great of pious memory, who became emperor in the imperial city of Constantinople otherwise known as New Rome; we too decree and vote the same things in regard to the privileges and priorities of the most holy Church of that same Constantinople and New Rome. And this is in keeping with the fact that the Fathers naturally enough granted the priorities to the throne of Old Rome on account of her being the imperial capital. And motivated by the same object and aim the one hundred and fifty most God-beloved Bishops have accorded the like priorities to the most holy throne of New Rome, with good reason deeming that the city which is the seat of an empire, and of a senate, and is equal to old imperial Rome in respect of other privileges and priorities, should be magnified also as she is in respect of ecclesiastical affairs, as coming next after her, or as being second to her. And it is arranged so that only the Metropolitans of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses shall be ordained by the most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople aforesaid, and likewise the Bishops of the aforesaid dioceses which are situated in barbarian lands; that is to say, that each Metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses, together with the Bishops of the province, shall ordain the Bishops of the province, just as is prescribed by the divine Canons. But the Metropolitans of the aforesaid dioceses, as has been said, are to be ordained by the Archbishop of Constantinople, after the elections have first been conducted in accordance with custom, and have been reported to him. (Ap c. XXXIV; c. III of the 2nd and c. XXXVI of the 6th.)

Interpretation.

Since at this Fourth Council c. III of the Second Council was read, which decrees that the Bishop of Constantinople is to enjoy priorities of honor with the Bishop of Rome, seeing that it is New Rome, therefore the fathers of this Council too, by means of their present Canon, renew and confirm the said Canon, and they decree and vote the same things as regards the priorities of the same city of Constantinople which is also known as New Rome. For, they say, just as the Fathers bestowed privileges upon the throne of Old Rome on account of the fact that it was the capital of an empire, and were fully justified in doing so, owing, that is to say, to his being first in point of order among the rest of the Patriarchs. In exactly the same way and motivated by exactly the same object and aim, the one hundred and fifty most God-beloved bishops of the second Council have bestowed exactly the same and equal privileges of honor also upon the most holy throne of New Rome¹¹² — of Constantinople, that is to say — deeming it quite reasonable that this city, in view of the fact that it has been honored by being made the seat of an empire and of a senate, in a similar manner as has also (old) Rome, ought to enjoy the same and equal privileges in a similar manner as has also (old) Rome, and to be magnified herself also in exactly the same way as the latter is in connection with ecclesiastical matters, with the sole difference that old Rome is to be first in order, while new Rome is to be second in order. In addition to these things we decree and vote that only the Metropolitans (but not also the Bishops, that is to say, that are subject to the Metropolitans; for each of these is ordained by his own Metropolitan together with the bishops of the province, just as the divine Canons prescribe, especially c. VI of the First) shall be ordained by the aforesaid most holy throne of Constantinople. Not only are the Metropolitans of the said dioceses to be ordained by him, but indeed also the bishops located in barbarian regions that border on the said dioceses, as, for instance, those called *Alani* are adjacent to and flank the diocese of Pontus, while the Russians border on that of Thrace. Nevertheless, the said Metropolitans are not to be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople just as he pleases and decides, but he must take the votes of the Synod under him into consideration as reported to him in accordance with established custom, and then ordain those men on whom the voters have agreed, either unanimously or as a majority.¹¹³

29. For a Bishop to bear the rank of Presbyter is sacrilege. If, however, any just reason determines their removal from practice as Bishops, then neither ought they to occupy the position of

Presbyter. But if for any cause than some crime they have been deprived of the dignity and office, they shall be restored to the dignity and office of the Episcopate.

Interpretation.

In Act 4 of the present Fourth Council it is written (on p. 150 of the second volume of the Collection of the Councils) that Photius, the Bishop of Tyre, called the attention of Emperor Marcianus to the fact that Eustathius, the Bishop of Beyrut (or, as others say, Eusebius of Tyre, though the preceding identification is more likely to be the true one) detached from Tyre various bishoprics, to wit, Biblus, Botrys, Tripolis, Orthosias, Areas, and Antarandus, and, deposing the bishops whom he had ordained, degraded them to the rank of presbyter. The Senate of the rulers accordingly brought this matter to the attention of the Council; by way of reply, on the part of the legates of the Pope as well as the Bishop of Constantinople and the entire Council, the present Canon was issued, wherein they declare that it is sacrilege for anyone to degrade a bishop to the rank and position of a presbyter; for if he is deposed on account of any crimes and is excluded from the functions and offices of the prelacy, such a person cannot be even a priest. If, on the other hand, without having any impediment in the way of crime he has been expelled from the prelacy, he is to be allowed to regain his office and dignity on the ground that he has lost it unjustly, and it is but his just due that he should be restored to his rightful position and be a bishop again. Zonaras, in fact, declares that it is worse than sacrilege for a bishop to be unjustly reduced to the rank of presbyter; for, says he, it is not something sacred that is being treated sacrilegiously and stolen, but something more than sacred, because, says he, through the invocation of the prelate churches and temples and other sacred objects are consecrated and hallowed and sanctified by virtue of the visitation of the Holy Spirit, and it must be admitted at all events that that which sanctifies is greater than that which is sanctified. As for why this Canon prohibits this, whereas c. XX of the 6th reduces to the position of presbyter any bishop that goes teaching beyond his boundaries without the consent and approval of the bishop holding sway over the region in question, see the solution of this puzzling question in Ap. c. XXXV.

30. Whereas the most reverent Bishops of Egypt postponed subscribing to the epistle of the most holy Archbishop Leo for the present, not because they opposed the catholic faith, but on the allegation that it is a custom in the diocese of Egypt to do nothing of this sort without the consent and formal approval of their Archbishop, and therefore request to be excused until the one who is to be the Bishop for the great city of the Alexandrians has been ordained: it has appeared to us reasonable and consonant with the spirit of philanthropy that they be excused and allowed to remain upon the like habit in the Imperial City till an Archbishop has been ordained for the great city of the Alexandrians. Let them therefore give security that they will not leave this city till the city of the Alexandrians has been accommodated with a bishop.

Interpretation.

It has been written in Act 4 of the present Council that after the deposition of Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, ten (or, as others say, thirteen) bishops of the same Patriarch of Alexandria anathematized Eutyches and Dioscorus himself, and their dogmas; but they could not be prevailed upon to subscribe to the letter of St. Leo, the Pope of Rome, which he had sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople St. Flavian (and which, as we have said, was called a pillar of Orthodoxy because it contained all the Orthodox belief of the faith), not because he was opposed to the Orthodox dogma which it contained, but because they asserted that it was a custom in the diocese (or see) of Alexandria's Patriarch for his bishops¹¹⁴ not to make any move without first consulting him and obtaining his consent and approval. Yet the prelates in the Council would not believe these things even after they had heard them asserted by the Alexandrians, but, on the contrary, they even suspected the latter to be heterodox heretics and sought to depose them. But the ruler and the Senate, having conceived something more humane as regarded these men, advised the Council not to depose them, but to give them time within which to remain as they were, undeposed, that is to say, in the Imperial City until another Archbishop of Alexandria could be ordained (for, as we have said, the Archbishop of Alexandria Dioscorus had previously been deposed). Yielding to the advice of the rulers, the Council decreed that they should remain as they were

and demanded security that they would not leave the city of Constantinople until the Archbishop of Alexandria had been ordained. The one who became ordained Archbishop of Alexandria as the successor of Diocorus was Apolinarius (though this name is commonly spelled Apollinaris in English), and the latter was succeeded by Proterius (see p. 241 of the second volume of the Collection of the Councils.¹¹⁵ See also Ap. cc. XX and XXXIV.

Fifth Ecumenical Council.

The Holy and Ecumenical Fifth Council (which was the second one held in Constantinople) was held in the year 553 in the reign of Emperor Justinian I. According to Dositheus (Book V, ch. 16 of the *Dodecabiblus*), its proceedings and transactions were contained in eight Acts written in Latin, and, according to the Collection of the Councils (p. 261 of vol. ii), in five written in Greek. It was attended by Fathers to the number of 165, among whom Menas shone with the greatest splendor at first, and afterwards in succession Eutychius, both of them having served as Patriarchs of Constantinople; followed by Vigilius, the Bishop of Rome, who, though at the time in Constantinople, was not actually present at the Council itself either in person or by proxies (as, for instance, was done at the Second Ecumenical Council), but who nevertheless sanctioned the Council later in a written publication; Apolinarius of Alexandria, Domnus of Antioch, Didymus and Evagrius, these two taking the place of and representing Eustochius of Jerusalem. The Council anathematized the written works of Diodorus of Tarsopolis (or Tarsus) and those of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and indeed even Theodore himself, and Diodorus, according to Photius, Code 18, and the respective Act of the Seventh Ec. C. See also p. 14 in the first volume of the Series concerning the Reporters, who, holding the tenets of Nestorius, left these records in writing upon their death (especially Theodore of Mopsuestia, who served as the teacher of Nestorius and declared the Logos to be a different God than the one called Christ, who was troubled by the passions of the soul and by the desires of the flesh). It also anathematized what had been written by blissful Theodoret against the twelve “heads” (or “chapters”) of St. Cyril¹¹⁶ (of Alexandria), and the so-called letter of Ibas, the Bishop of Edessa, to Mares the Persian.¹¹⁷ It further anathematized even Origen himself, and Didymus, and Evagrius, and their detestable tenets, who foolishly affirmed that souls were existent prior to bodies,¹¹⁸ and that upon the death of one body they enter another; that there is an end to the punishment suffered in hell; that demons are going to recover the original dignity of angelic grace which they used to have; that souls are going to be resurrected naked without a body; and that the heavenly bodies have souls; and still other cacodoxical notions. It also anathematized Anthimus of Trebizond for entertaining the ungodly beliefs of Eutyches, and also Severus, and Peter the Bishop of Apameia, and Zooras.¹¹⁹ But this Council did not promulgate any Canons relating to the ecclesiastical constitution, but only fourteen anathematisms against the said heretics and others, and twenty-five more directed solely against the Origenists (p. 341 of the second volume of the Councils).

Sixth Ecumenical Council.

The Holy and Ecumenical Sixth Council (which was the third one to be held in Constantinople) was held in the year 680 after Christ in the time of Constantine Pogonatus, a descendant of Heraclius, in the secret chamber of the divine palace (which chamber was called the Troullos, its proceedings and transactions being comprised in eighteen Acts (p. 527 of the second volume of the Councils). The Fathers who attended it numbered one hundred and seventy, according to Photius, Nicephorus, Nilus, and Anonymus, or three hundred and eighty-nine according to others. Among those who distinguished themselves as leaders of them were George of Constantinople; Theodore and Sergius, presbyters, together with John, a deacon, who acted as exarchs of Agatho of Rome, Peter the monk who represented the Archbishop of Alexandria, George the presbyter representing the Archbishop of Jerusalem. There were also present three bishops representing the Westerners who were assembled at that time in Rome. This Council condemned

Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, all of whom were Patriarchs of Constantinople; Honorius the Pope of Rome,¹²⁰ Cyrus the Patriarch of Alexandria, a certain man by the name of Theodore who had served as Bishop of Faran, according to Zonaras and Balsamon, or who had been born in Faran, according to Leo II of Rome in what he wrote to the Emperor; Macarius of Antioch, together with Stephanus his disciple, and the infantile-minded old man named Polychronius, who all had dared to dogmatize by attributing a single will and predicating a single energy to and of Christ, respectively. But this Council dogmatized to the contrary that our Lord Jesus Christ, though but one person, after His incarnation possessed two natural wills and two natural energies¹²¹ just as He also possessed two natures — that is to say, in other words, a divine will and energy and a human will and energy, both of them being at the same time indivisible and inconfutable. For neither the Divinity nor the humanity, the two natures of Christ, remained without a will and an energy after the union. For if the peculiarities of the natures should be refuted, which are the will and the energy, the natures themselves should inevitably be refuted too, along therewith. For every nature consists of and is indentical with its natural peculiarities, and without these it could not become existent. Accordingly, this Council dogmatized, in brief, that “in the hypostasis of the God-man Logos each form acted in communion with that of the other one, which it had had as its own.” This means, in other words, that the Logos wrought that which was the function of the Logos, whereas the body performed that which was the function of the body — just as the Fourth Ecumenical Council had dogmatized, that is the say, previously by means of Leo’s letter. For, as most wise Photius says, it was not within the ability of one and the same energy to restore a cripple and to become tired of traveling afoot; to resurrect Lazarus and to weep over him; nor, again, was it within the adaptability of one and the same will to request that the cup of death might pass away from Him and to call it on the other hand His glory, and to want what was unwanted. For the first activities were due to the energy of the Divinity, whereas the second activities were due to the energy of the humanity. And conversely, the first will was that of the humanity, while the second will was that of the Divinity. But this Council too failed to promulgate any Canons.

Quinisext Ecumenical Council.

The Holy and Ecumenical¹²² Quinisext (or Quinisextine), or more properly speaking, Sixth¹²³ Council was assembled in the imperial and lustrous palace called the Troullos (or, according to the Latin spelling, Trullus), in the reign of Justinian II, who was the son of Pogonatus and was surnamed Rhinotmetus (a Greek word meaning “with the nose cut off”), in the year 691 after Christ.¹²⁴ The number of Fathers who attended it was 327 according to Balsamon and Zonaras, but 340 according to the author of the Conciliar booklet, of whom the leaders were Paul of Constantinople,¹²⁵ Basil the Bishop of Gortyna, a province in Crete, a certain Bishop of Ravenna who acted as the legate of the Pope of Rome,¹²⁶ Peter the Patriarch of Alexandria, Anastasius the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and George the Patriarch of Antioch. It was assembled at the command of the Emperor, not in order to examine into any special heresy, not in order to settle questions of faith, in such a way as to warrant its being called a special and separate Council, but for the purpose of promulgating necessary Canons relating to correction of outstanding evils and the regulation of the internal polity of the Church. Which Canons are the following, as confirmed by Acts 2 and 4 and 8 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and by the latter’s Canon I. They are further confirmed by three Popes, namely, Adrian I, Gregory II, and Innocent III, by Gratian, by the legates of the Pope who were present at the Seventh Ec. C., by the so-called First-and-Second

Council, which mentions its c. XXXI in its own c. XII. They are also confirmed or attested by Cedrenus, by John of Damacus (or John Damascene), who says, “consult the definitions of the Sixth Council and you will find there the proof.” They were also confirmed or attested by the interpreters of the Canons, by Photius, by the personal signatures both of the Emperor and of the legates of the Pope of Rome, as well as those of the Patriarchs and of the Fathers who attended it. Thus, summarily speaking, it may be said to have been attested and confirmed by the whole catholic Church, notwithstanding that the modern Latins calumniously traduce them because they censure and controvert their innovations. Adrian I in his letter to Tarasius has left us this admirable testimony concerning these Canons in the following words: “I accept the decisions made by the same holy Sixth Council, together with all the Canons it has duly and divinely uttered, wherein they are expressed.” In certain inscriptions of the venerable icons is to be found added also the whole text of its eighty-second Canon (p. 747 of the Collection of the Councils). Pope Gregory in his letter to St. Germanus (which is recorded in Act 4 of the Seventh Ec. C.) says in reference to this same Canon of the present Sixth Council: “Wherefore the assembly of the holy men have delivered this chapter to the Church by God’s design as a matter of the greatest salvation.” Note, too, the fact that he called this Council a holy assembly and said that its Canons were issued by God’s design. But the testimony of Patriarch Tarasius concerning these Canons is sufficient to shut and gag the mouths of the adversaries. In fact it is rather the testimony of the entire Seventh Ecumenical Council and runs word for word as follows: “Some men who are painfully ignorant in regard to these Canons are scandalized and blatantly say, ‘We wonder whether they really are Canons of the Sixth Council.’ Let such men become conscious of the fact that the holy and great Sixth Council was convoked in the reign of Constantine against those who were asserting the energy and the will of Christ to be a single energy and a single will, and that the bishops who attended it anathematized the heretics and stated clearly and emphatically the Orthodox faith, after which they left for home in the year fourteen of Constantine’s reign. Thereafter, however, let it not be forgotten that . . . the same Fathers gathered themselves together in the reign of Constantine’s son Justinian and promulgated the aforementioned Canons, and let no one have any doubt about them. For those who signed their names in the reign of Constantine are the same ones as those who signed their names to the present paper in the reign of Justinian, as becomes plainly evident from the exact likeness of their respective signatures as written by their own hands. For it was incumbent on them after declaring an Ecumenical Council to proceed to promulgate also ecclesiastical Canons (Act 4 of the Seventh Ec. C., p. 780 of the second volume of the Collection of Canons).” In the same Act 4 of the 7th it is written that this very same identical and original paper, which had been signed by the Fathers of the present Sixth Council, was read aloud to the Seventh Ec. C. Peter the Bishop of Nicomedeia stated, though, that there was also another book containing the present Canons of the Sixth Council (see also Dositheus p. 603 to p. 618 of the *Dodecabiblus*).

Canons.

1. In beginning either a discourse or an action of any kind the thoughtful find it best to begin with God, and to rely upon God, in accordance with the utterance of the Theologian. Hence, inasmuch as we have already preached piety in a clarion voice, and the Church in which Christ¹²⁷ has been laid as the foundation is continually growing apace and waxing more and more capable, insomuch that it may be said to have outgrown the cedars of Lebanon, and now in commencing a recital of sacred words, by divine grace we decree that the faith which has been handed down to

us shall be and remain exempt from any and every innovation and mutilation just as it has been delivered to us by those who have been both eye-witness and servants of the word of the God-approved Apostles, and further by the three hundred and eighteen holy and blissful Fathers who convened in Nicaea in the reign of Constantine, who became our Emperor, against ungodly Arius and the heathenish deity of a diverse god, or one might more aptly say of a multitude of diverse gods, which was dogmatized by him; and who in their unanimous consensus of opinion regarding the faith revealed and stated to us with convincing clearness the fact that the three hypostases of the thearchic nature are of the same essence, without allowing this important point to remain hidden under a bushel of ignorance, but, on the contrary, openly taught the faithful outright to adore the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit with one adoration, and deposed and denounced the opinion that divinity is of unequal grades (or ranks), and efficiently overthrew and demolished the puerile toys which the heretics had built up and erected upon sand in opposition to Orthodoxy. Likewise it is to be noted that we are determined to strengthen as much as we can the faith which was proclaimed by the one hundred and fifty Holy Fathers who convened in the Imperial City itself in the reign of Theodosius the Great, who also became our Emperor, embracing the utterance of the Theologian and driving out profane Macedonius along with previous enemies of the truth, on the ground that he impudently and arrogantly opined the head of lordship to be a servant and slave, and as having preferred as a matter of choice to split the indivisible unit in robber fashion, as though the mystery of the hope were not sufficient to sustain us. Along with this abominable fellow who waxed rabid against the truth they courageously condemned also Apolinarius the monstrous initiate of wickedness and vice, who vomited forth an ungodly view proclaiming the Lord to have been taken up in body without a mind and without a soul, so that it is hence evident that he too was addicted to the unwelcome conclusion that we have been left with an imperfect hope of salvation. But as a matter of fact we also gladly ratify the teachings set forth by the God-bearing Fathers who earlier assembled themselves in the city of Euphesus in the reign of Theodosius, who was the son of Arcadius and who also became our Emperor, and we hold them to be an unbreakable and mighty power of piety, preaching one Christ the Son of God who became incarnate, and the intemperate Ever-Virgin who seedlessly gave birth to Him, holding her to have been properly speaking (*Note of Translator.* — Lest the exact meaning of this exceedingly important phrase be lost upon the unwary reader, it may not be amiss here to state that it would be more usually expressed in ordinary English by the word *literally*) and “*in truth a Theotocos*” (i.e., when interpreted into plain English, “a woman who gives birth to God or to a god”), and driving away into banishment the driveling dissension of Nestorius on the ground that it has lost all contact with the Divine Oracle, while at the same time it seeks to renew the prevalence of Jewish ungodliness and aversion to piety, and we dogmatize the one Christ to be human being in due form and a God in due form. But we do not stop here. We Orthodoxly confirm the faith which was engrossed upon a pillar in the Metropolis of the Chalcedonians in the reign of Marcianus, who also became our Emperor, by the six hundred and thirty God-approved Fathers, which conveyed to the ends of the earth in a loud voice the one Christ the Son of God composed of two natures and in these two same natures glorified; and we have driven out of the sacred precincts of the Church Eutyches the vain-minded, who declared it to be his opinion that great mystery of the Economy was only seemingly consummated, as something sinister and miasmatic, and along with him also Dioscorus and Nestorius, the former being a defender and champion of dissension, the latter of confusion, and both of them being diametrically opposite outlets of impiety, fallen out in the same direction towards one and the same yawning chasm of perdition and godlessness. But neither do we stop here. We take the pious utterances of the one hundred

and sixty-five God-bearing Fathers who assembled upon the ground of this Imperial City in the reign of Justinian, who became our Emperor and who passed away at the termination of his pious career, and, recognizing them to have been inspired and uttered by the (Holy) Spirit, we teach them outright to our posterity; which Fathers indeed as a Council anathematized and consigned to abomination Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, and in addition Origen and Didymus and Evagrius, who joined hands in refashioning the Greek myths and recounting to us periods and mutations of certain bodies and souls, prompted by raptures and hallucinations of the mind, and in drunken revelry impiously exulting over the resurrection of the dead; as well as what had been written by Theodoret against the right faith and correct belief and against the twelves heads (or chapters) of blissful Cyril; and also the so-called letter of Ibas. And again we faithfully join together in the promise and vow to preserve and safeguard and keep inviolable the faith declared by the Sixth holy Council recently assembled on the grounds of this Imperial City in the reign of Constantine, who became our Emperor and passed away at the termination of his divine career, and which received still greater validity by virtue of the fact that the pious Emperor himself sealed up the volumes containing it by impressing them with his own seals with a view to ensuring their safety in every succeeding age; and which has with the love of God clearly enabled us to entertain an Orthodox conception of the straightforward dogma which they outlined of the truth that there were and are two natural wills, or, that is to say, wishes, and two natural energies inherent in the incarnate economy of our one Lord Jesus, the true God; and which Council by a vote of piety condemned those who teach their laities outright the doctrine of a single will and of a single energy inherent in our one Lord and God Jesus Christ, among whom we cite by name Theodore the Bishop of Faran, Cyrus (the Patriarch) of Alexandria, Honorius (the Pope) of Rome, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, all four of whom have acted as presiding chairmen in this God-guarded city, Macarius who became the Bishop of the Antiochians, Stephanus his disciple, and foolish (or witless) Polychronius. Hence we solemnly decree that this Council, while preserving intact the common body of Christ our God, and, succinctly speaking, of all the men who have distinguished themselves in the Church of God and have become luminaries in the world, *“holding forth the word of life”* (Phil. 2:16), is committed to holding the faith firm and sure, even till the consummation of the age, and that it shall remain immutable and unaltered, as well as their God-imparted writings and dogmas; and rejecting and anathematized, on the ground that its authors were enemies of the truth, and snortingly and ravingly uttered vain things against God and made injustice and unrighteousness the highest objects of their study and meditation. If, however, there be anyone in the world who does not care to hold and embrace the aforesaid dogmas of piety, and believe and preach thus, but, on the contrary, attempts to by-pass them, let him be anathema, in accordance with the definition (or rule) already previously promulgated by the aforesaid holy and blissful Fathers, and let him be erased and expunged from the Christian Roll like an alien, and as one not belonging to our faith. For we are fully resolved and have been determined not to add anything to or to remove anything from what has previously been decreed, or any words whatsoever that we have been able to understand.

Interpretation.

This first Canon was not explained by Zonaras, nor by Balsamon. The result is that there is nothing else than a brief summary both of the dogmas and of the definitions (or rules) of the faith of the holy and ecumenical six Councils which were held before this present Council was held; and of those heretics against whom each one of them was held, as well as the time and place in which each was held. And not only a repetition, but also a ratification of their dogmas. Hence, follow-

ing those same interpreters, as concerns the definitions and dogmas of the said holy Councils, and the times and places, and above all the heretics against whom each of them was held, we refer readers to the original sources of the Canons of each Council, where they will learn about them in greater detail. We do this in order to avoid repeating here in vain what is said there. We shall therefore confine ourselves to elucidating only a few words which are not so easily intelligible to the unlearned. We proceed, therefore, to note that, starting with a maxim of St. Gregory the Theologian,¹²⁸ which says that it is the best policy for one who is about to commence any discourse or work to begin with God, and to end with God (*Note of Translator*. — This sounds plausible and may be true, although the Greek text of the Canon does not strictly say “end,” but instead employs the Greek word signifying “repose,” for which in my translation of the Canon I substituted the English word *rely* as better adapted to the English idiom). It decrees that there shall be no innovation or alteration in the faith which has been imparted and handed down both by the Holy Apostles¹²⁹ and by the Fathers of the First Council (who were the ones that abolished the doctrine of the deity of a diverse god,¹³⁰ or rather to say the doctrine of the deity of a multitude of diverse gods, of Arius; and who proclaimed that the Holy Trinity is coessential (or homousian), or, in other words, of the same essence and nature), and by the Fathers of the Second Council (whose theological utterances the Fathers of this Council assert that they embrace. These are those which were added by the Second Council into the Symbol of the Faith in regard to the Theology of the Holy Spirit. For in proximity to “the Holy Spirit,” which were words of the First Council, this Council added the words “the Lordly, the Life-producing, which Proceeds out of the Father, and which is adored and glorified together with the Father and The Son, which hath spoken through the Prophets”), and by the Fathers of the Third¹³¹ and Fourth, and Fifth, and Sixth Council;¹³² and, briefly speaking, the Fathers of the present Council solemnly decree that the faith shall remain firm and sure, and immutable and unaltered, even to the consummation (or finish) of the age, as well as the God-imparted dogmas of all the Holy Men who have shone in the Church of God and who have stood in the world as life-giving luminaries. And they too join hands in anathematizing all those enemies of the truth, the heretics, that is to say, whom their predecessors had anathematized. At the same time they go on to state this, that they neither know how nor can by any means whatever add anything to or remove anything from the dogmas of their predecessors. Furthermore, as for anyone who fails to keep the aforesaid Holy Fathers’ dogmas of piety, and who neither believes them with his mind nor preaches them with his tongue, but, on the contrary, tries to oppose them, let him be anathema, they say, and be removed and wiped off the Roll of the Christians, as an alien person and rotten member.

2. This too has appeared best to the this holy Council, as well as most important, that the 85 Canons handed down to us in the name of the holy and glorious Apostles, and as a matter of fact accepted and validated by the holy and blissful Fathers preceding us, be henceforth retained and left firm and secure for the care of souls and the cure of diseases. But inasmuch as we are ordered in these Canons to accept the Injunctions of the same holy Apostles (as transmitted) through Clemens, into some of which certain spurious passages destitute of piety have been interpolated long ago by the heterodox to the detriment of the Church, and have tarnished the becoming and natural beauty of the divine dogmas for us, we have suitably weeded out such ordinances in furtherance of the edification and security of the most Christian flock, not in the least way being minded to approve the fantastic inventions of heretical mendacity that have been inserted in the genuine and uncorrupted *didache* (or teaching) of the Apostles. On the other hand,

we ratify all the rest of the sacred Canons promulgated by our holy and blissful Fathers, to wit: the three hundred and eighteen foregathered in Nicaea, those convened in Ancyra, and furthermore also those who met in Neocaesarea, likewise those who attended the meeting in Gangra, but in addition to these also those who convened in Antioch, Syria, and furthermore also those who held a Council in Laodicea; further, again, the one hundred and fifty who convened in this God-guarded and imperial capital city, .and the two hundred who assembled at an earlier time in the metropolis of Ephesus, and the six hundred and thirty holy and blissful Fathers who met in Chalcedon. Likewise those who convened in Sardica; furthermore those in Carthage. Further and in addition to all these those now again convened in this God-guarded and imperial capital city in the time of Nectarius the president of this imperial capital city, and of Theophilus who became Archbishop of Alexandria. Furthermore also of Dionysius who became Archbishop of the great city of Alexandria, and of Peter who became Archbishop of Alexandria and a Martyr withal, and of Gregory the Thaumaturgus (or Miracle-worker) who became Bishop of Neocaesarea, of Athanasius the Archbishop of Alexandria, of Basil the Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, of Gregory of Nyssa, of Gregory the Theologian, of Amphilochius the Archbishop of Iconium, Timothy a former Archbishop of the great city of Alexandria, of Theophilus an Archbishop of the great city of the Alexandrians, of Cyril an Archbishop of Alexandria, and of Gennadius who became a Patriarch of this God-guarded imperial capital city. Furthermore, the Canon promulgated by Cyprian who became an Archbishop of the country of Africa and a martyr, and by the Council supporting him, who alone held sway in the places of the aforesaid presidents, in accordance with the custom handed down to them; and no one shall be permitted to countermand or set aside the Canons previously laid down, or to recognize and accept any Canons, other than the ones herein specified, that have been composed under a false inscription by certain persons who have taken in hand to barter the truth. If, nevertheless, anyone be caught innovating with regard to any of the said Canons, or attempting to subvert it, he shall be responsible in respect of that Canon and shall receive the penance which it prescribes and be chastised by that Canon which he has offended.

Interpretation.

Since at every Council, and especially one that was Ecumenical, there was also a definition within which were comprised the dogmas of the faith, and Canons were composed in writing to serve in the way of contributions to the polity and good order of the Church, therefore and on this account, after having ratified and confirmed in its Canon I the definitions of the faith of the holy and Ecumenical Councils (preceding it), the present Council now in this Canon II ratifies and confirms also a) the Canons of the Holy Apostles, numbering eighty-five in all, which it says that the Fathers preceding it accepted and sanctioned (for it excludes the Apostolic Injunctions transmitted through Clement, because they had been garbled in certain parts by heterodox heretics to the injury of the Church, for the security of Christians. Nevertheless today, as they are found formulated, they appear to me to contain nothing improper or spurious. See concerning them also in Ap. c. LXXXV). b) Those of the four (previous) Ecumenical Councils. c) Those of the regional Councils and local Synods named.¹³³ And d) those of the Holy Fathers individually, each by name. It goes on to add that no one has permission or any right whatever to corrupt or to refuse to recognize and accept any of the Canons previously mentioned, or to accept others instead thereof that have been given false titles. If, nevertheless, anyone should appear to be attempting to corrupt them, or to suppress any Canon among them, he is to receive the penalty prescribed by that Canon which he corrupts or suppresses. That is to say, in other words, if the Canon in ques-

tion contains and prescribes excommunication, or deposition, or anathema, he that corrupts or suppresses it is to suffer these penalties, in order to compensate for his offense by paying the penalty fixed by the very Canon which he has violated.¹³⁴ Read also Ap. c. LXXXV, c. I of the 4th, and the Prolegomena to the Apostolic Canons.

3. Whereas our Pious and Christ-loving Emperor, in his address to this holy and Ecumenical Council, has suggested that those enlisted the Clergy and conveying to others the Divine truths should be pure and faultless ministers, and worthy of the intellectual sacrifice of the great God and victim and high priest, and eliminate the hatred due to friction resulting from illicit marriages; and, in addition to this, seeing that the most holy Church of the Romans is disposed to observe the Canon of strict conformity; while, on the other hand, we under the throne of this God-guarded and imperial capital city, have neither carried meekness to excess nor have left on acrid impression of austerity; and especially in view of the fact that failure due to ignorance extends to a multitude of not a few men — therefore we concur in decreeing that, as regards bigamists who have been enslaved to sin and have not chosen to recede therefrom, as of the fifteenth day of the month of January last past, in the last fourth Indiction, in the year six thousand one hundred and ninety, they are to be subjected to canonical deposition; but as for those bigamists who have taken cognizance of their own interest before we had notice of their doing anything wrong, and who cut out the evil besetting them, and chased this foreign and spurious engagement far away; or even those whose wives by a second marriage have died, if they too have seen their way to return to good sense after later learning sobriety, and have quickly come to forget their former misdeeds and violations of the law, whether they happen to be Presbyters or Deacons — it has seemed best to us for these men to be dismissed from every sacerdotal office, or priestly activity, having already been penanced for an express length of time. But we have decided that in the case of those who have committed the iniquitous act unwittingly and who are weeping to the Lord to be pardoned therefor, they deserve to share in the honor of standing and sitting in the place reserved for the presidency: for to bless one that ought to take care of his own wounds is inconsistent. But, on the other hand, as for those who have contracted but one marriage, and this with a woman that was a widow, and likewise as for those who after ordination have involved themselves in an illegal marriage,¹³⁵ that is to say, Presbyters and Deacons and Subdeacons, not long ago excluded from the sacred liturgy and penanced, we order them to be restored to their former ranks, without being in any way promoted to any higher rank, it being obvious that their illegal marriage has been dissolved. We have made these decrees effective as of the said fifteenth day of the month of January, in the fourth Indiction, in regard to those guilty of the offenses before specified and in priestly offices; but besides this we henceforth decree and renew the Canon prescribing that anyone who has become involved in two marriages after baptism, or has acquired a concubine, “cannot become a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon, or anything else in the roll of the priesthood. Likewise in regard to anyone that has taken a widow, or a divorcee, or a harlot, or house servant, or an actress to wife, we decree that he cannot be a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon, or anything else in the roll of the priesthood.”

Interpretation.

The Fathers of the present Council, both correcting the evil condition then obtaining, and securing matters as respecting the future, issued the present “economic” Canon. For inasmuch as the Emperor had asked them to cleanse those in holy orders at that time from the uncleanness of il-

licit marriages, and unlawful ones, into which they had fallen; and, on the one hand, the legates and representatives of Rome had proposed that the strict letter of the Canons be observed in regard to them, while, on the other hand, the bishops under the Patriarch of Constantinople were disposed to allow them some leniency and philanthropy, they themselves, deeming it wise to conjoin both — to temper strictness, I mean, with leniency — (and especially in view of the fact that a great number of those then in holy orders had fallen into marriages unwittingly as a result of ignorance), on account of the Emperor's request, they decreed that, as concerning all those in holy orders who had married a second time and had remained unrepentant down to the time of this Council, and had not abandoned the illegal marriages, they were to be deposed altogether and to be made laymen. All those, on the other hand, who were bigamists in holy orders — Presbyters, that is to say, or Deacons — before the Council was held, and who had repented and had abandoned that illegal marriage, or who had returned to sobriety and repentance because of their second wives' having died, they, I say, it was judged reasonable for them to cease officiating or performing any functions in connection with the duties of holy orders for a certain length of time, but to participate in the honor outside the sanctuary of sitting and standing with those in holy orders, while weeping to God to be pardoned for the iniquitous act which they had committed as a result of their own ignorance, and not blessing anyone. For it is not fitting anyone to bestow a blessing upon others when he himself ought to be healing the wounds of his soul through the process of repentance, just as c. XXVII of St. Basil the Great says. All those Presbyters, again, Deacons, and Subdeacons, on the other hand, who have taken a widow to wife, or who, after being ordained, married likewise too, after being suspended from every sacred office for a short while, are again to perform the duties of their priestly offices; yet they are not to be elevated to any higher rank, but each one of them is to stay in the rank in which he happened to be at the time when he was suspended. This, however, is to occur only after they have dissolved the illegal marriages. Having decreed these things “economically,” and as a matter of leniency, these Fathers, in regard to those in holy orders previously mentioned, henceforth renew, or, in other words, vote for the continuance in force of, Canons XVII and XVIII of the Holy Apostles, that is to say, those which they set forth *verbatim* — the Interpretation of which see, together with that of Ap. c. XIX.

4. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or Subdeacon, or Anagnost (Reader), or Psalt (Chanter), or Janitor (Doorkeeper), has (carnal) intercourse with any woman that has been consecrated to God, let him be deposed from office, on the ground that he has contributed to the delinquency of a bride of God. If, on the other hand, he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.

(Ap. c. XXV; c. IX of the 4th; c. XVI of the 4th; cc. XXI, XL, XLIV, XLV of the 6th; c. XIX of Ancyra; c. IX of Neocaesarea; cc. III, VI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXXII, LI, LX, LXX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon deposes clergymen who commit fornication with a woman consecrated to God — that is to say, more explicitly speaking, a nun; but it excommunicates laymen who do this or have done this: the reason being that it regards them as having corrupted and violated a bride of the bridegroom of souls Christ the God, whether she had been a virgin thitherto, or had become a nun, or was even a widow. But those in holy orders and clergymen are deposed from office not only if they commit fornication with a nun, but even if they commit fornication with a lay-woman. Read also Ap. c. XXV and c. XVI of the 4th.

5. Let no one on the sacerdotal list acquire a woman or housemaid except persons mentioned in the Canon as being above suspicion, but let him safeguard his reputation in this respect. Let even eunuchs safeguard themselves in this very same situation too, by providing themselves with a blameless character. As for those who transgress this injunction, if they are Clergymen, let them be deposed from office; but if they are laymen let them be excommunicated.
(c. III of the 1st; cc. XVIII, XXII of the 7th; c. XIX of Ancyra; c. XLV of Carthage; and c. LXXXIX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

What the present Canon decrees is the following. Let none of those in holy orders who are living modestly have a woman staying in their house, or a servant girl, unless she be among those specified in a Canon as being above suspicion — this refers to c. III of the First Ec. C. — such persons being a mother and a sister and an aunt; so as to keep himself from becoming liable to incur blame from either the father or the mother in relation to the laity. Anyone among persons that transgresses this Canon, let him be deposed from office. Likewise eunuchs, too, must keep themselves safe from any accusation against them, and therefore let them not dwell together with suspicious persons. In case they dare to do this, if they are clergymen (as having been involuntarily, that is to say, or by nature made eunuchs), let them be deposed from office; but if they are laymen, let them be excommunicated. Read also c. III of the First Ec. C.

6. Inasmuch as it has been declared in the Apostolic Canons that of those being promoted to the Clergy only Anagnosts and Psalts may marry, we too, in keeping with this prohibition, decree that henceforth no Subdeacon, or Deacon, or Presbyter at all, after the ordination bestowed upon him, has permission to contract a matrimonial relationship for himself: if he should dare to do this, let him be deposed from office. But if anyone wants to contract a legal marriage with a woman before being admitted to the Clergy as a Subdeacon, or a Deacon, or Presbyter previous to ordination, let him do so.

(Ap c. XXVI; cc. XIV, XV of the 4th; c. XIII of Ancyra; and cc. XIX, XXXIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Since Canon XXVI of the Holy Apostles decrees that only Anagnosts and Psalts may marry after being ordained, the Fathers of this Council confirm that Canon by means of the present, and decree that from now on no Subdeacon, or Deacon, or Presbyter, after being ordained shall be permitted to marry. If he should do so anyhow, let him be deposed.¹³⁶ But if any of these wants to marry, let him marry before being ordained a subdeacon, deacon, or presbyter.

7. Since we have learned that Deacons having ecclesiastical offices in some of the churches have hence had the impudence and self-assertion to sit down ahead of the Presbyters, we decree that no matter in what office, that is to say, ecclesiastical position, a Deacon may happen to be, he must not sit down before the presbyter does so, unless he is acting as the personal representative of his own Patriarch or Metropolitan and has come to another city on some errand. For then, on the ground that he is filling the place of the latter, he shall be honored. If, nevertheless, anyone should dare to do such a thing, by resorting to tyrannical audacity, let that person, after being deprived of his proper rank, become the lowest of all those who belong to the list in which he is en-

rolled, in the church to which he belongs, in view of the fact that our Lord admonishes not to enjoy being called the first, according to the teaching of our Lord and God Himself as found in the Gospel of the Evangelist St. Luke. (Luke 14:7). For he told those called something like the following parable: *“When you have been invited by anybody to a wedding, do not take your seat at the first call, lest someone else more honorable than you have been invited by him, and when he who has invited both you and him comes, he tell you bluntly, ‘Give this man your seat’; and then to your shame you will begin taking the last seat in the house. But, instead, when you have been invited, slump into the last seat, so that, when the host comes round, he may say to you: ‘Friend, take a better seat.’ Then glory will be yours in the midst of those making up the rest of the company: since whoever exalteth himself shall be humbled, and whoever humbleth himself shall be exalted.”* The same rule shall be observed also with respect to the other sacred orders, since we know spiritual dignities to be superior to mundane offices. (c. XVIII of the 1st; c. XX of Laodicea.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that since some deacons, on account of their having ecclesiastical offices (which are called “incumbencies” and “positions of honor,” and “benefices” (i.e., sources of income), according to Balsamon (such as are, for instance, those of clerical magnates — like the grand Steward, that is to say, the grand Sacellarius, Skevophylax, Chartophylax, the lesser Sacellarius, and the Protecducus), wax audacious and sit down ahead of Presbyters, henceforth no deacon, in whatever ecclesiastical office he may be, has any right to take his seat ahead of the Presbyter, except only in case he should happen to be acting as the agent and personal representative of a Patriarch or Metropolitan, sent to another region, on any ecclesiastical matter. For in such a case as that he will be given the preference and precedence over all Presbyters, not because he is a deacon, but because he is acting in the place of a Patriarch or Metropolitan, as we have said. Any deacon that, assuming tyrannical audacity and impudence, goes right ahead and sits down before the Presbyter does, shall, if so be he has precedence over the rest of the deacons, become the last and least and lowest of all deacons. For the Lord teaches us not to enjoy first and highest seats of honor, in the sacred Gospel of St. Luke, wherein He says: “For he himself used to tell them such a parable as this when they were invited to suppers and dinners: ‘Man, when you are invited by anybody to a wedding, don’t sit down in the first place, lest there be some other guest who is your superior, and the host who has invited both him and you come round and tell you unceremoniously, “Give this man the seat you have taken so that he may sit down.” And then you will shamefacedly retire to the lowest and least honorable seat. But, instead of incurring such a predicament, when you are invited, sit down in the lowest seat, so that your host may come and say to you, “My friend, take a higher and better seat for yourself, and sit down, and make yourself at ease.” And then you will be enveloped in a halo of glory before the glances of all those sitting at the table. For anyone that tries to exalt himself shall be humbled and humiliated, but anyone that humbles himself shall be exalted. But not only must deacons not take precedence of Presbyters and sit down ahead of them, but neither must any of the lower members of holy orders and lower clerical ranks presume to sit down ahead of the higher ranks; that is to say, neither Subdeacons ahead of Deacons, nor Anagnostes ahead of Subdeacons: since if in relation to secular and mundane office, those of lower dignity do not take their seats in advance of those of higher dignity, nor have they the preference and precedence of honor over their superiors, who have a higher office or higher dignity, far more ought this to be observed as an inviolable principle in the case of spiritual dignities and office bestowed as gifts by the divine

grace of the Spirit, which dignities and offices are superior to and higher than the mundane.¹³⁷
Read also c. XVIII of the First Ec. C.

8. With a desire to hold fast to whatever our Holy Fathers have decreed, in everything, we hereby renew the Canon prescribing that synods or councils of the Bishops in each province must be held every year, in whatever place the Bishop of the Metropolis may designate. But since on account of incursions of barbarians and on account of other incidental causes, the presidents of the churches find it impossible to hold synods or councils twice a year, it has seemed best for a synod or council of the aforementioned Bishops to be held by all means once a year for ecclesiastical matters that naturally arise in every province, to last from the festival of Holy Easter till the end of the month of October in each year, in the locality which the Bishop of the Metropolis, as we have said, shall designate. As for those Bishops who fail to attend the meeting, but who, instead of doing so, remain at home in their respective cities, leading their lives therein in good health and free from every indispensable and necessary occupation, they are to be reprimanded in a brotherly way.

(Ap. c. XXXVII; c. V of the 1st; c. XIX of the 4th; c. VI of the 7th; c. XX of Antioch; cc. XXVI, LXXXI, LXXXIV, LXXXV, and CIV of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

These Fathers confirm and renew the Canon of the Holy Fathers preceding them which commands that two synods or councils be held in each province every year. But inasmuch as the prelates find it difficult to assemble twice a year, on account of incursions and fears of barbarian foes, and on account of other occasional circumstances, they command that a synod of Bishops be held in any event and by all means once a year in each province (or eparchy), for the purpose of considering and correcting or adjusting ecclesiastical matters that come up. This synod, or council, has to be held, as respects the time, from Holy Easter to the end of the month of October, and as respects the place, wherever the Metropolitan of each province (or eparchy) may deem it advisable. As for any bishops that remain in their bishoprics, and are in good health, and free from every necessary care, and fail to present themselves at the meeting of the synod, they are to be reprimanded in a brotherly way. Read also Ap. c. XXXVII.

9. No clergyman shall be allowed to operate a tavern or dramshop. For if such a person is not permitted to enter a tavern, much less is he permitted to serve others in one and do what it is not lawful for him to engage in. But assuredly if he should perpetrate such an enormity, let him either be suspended, or be deposed from office.

(Ap. cc. XLII, XLIII, LIV; c. XXII of the 7th; c. XXIV of Laodicea; cc. XVIII, XLVII, and LXIX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that it is not permissible for any clergyman to own or operate a tavern or dramshop of any kind, and to serve therein. For, if it is not permissible for him even to enter taverns at all, it is still less permissible for him to stay in one and serve customers and do things that are not in keeping with his profession. As for anyone that should employ himself in such a capacity, let him either be suspended or else be deposed. If, on the other hand, he owns a tavern, but employs others to serve in it, this does not amount to causing him any harm or impediment,

according to Zonaras. It is better, however, for him to sell it, and buy some other more decent property that is more in keeping with the profession of clergyman.¹³⁸ Read also Ap. c. XLII.

10. Let any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon who takes interest, or what is called a percentage, on money either cease doing so or be deposed from office.
(Ap. c. XLIV; c. XVII of the 1st; c. IV of Laodicea; cc. V, XX of Carthage; c. XIV of Basil.)

Interpretation.

As for any bishop (says the present Canon), or any presbyter, or any deacon, that charges interest on money which he has lent, or takes twelve or six per cent, say, for the use of money, let him either cease doing so or be deposed from office. Read also Ap. c. XLIV.

11. Let no one enrolled in the sacerdotal list, or any layman, eat the unleavened wafers manufactured by the Jews, or in any way become familiar with the Jews or call them in case of sickness, or take any medicines from them, or even bathe with them in public bathing beaches or bath-houses. If anyone should attempt to do this, in case he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; or, in case he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands that no person in holy orders and no layman may eat any unleavened wafers sent him by Jews, nor indeed be in any way friendly with Jews, nor when he finds himself ill may he call them and take their remedies,¹³⁹ or even bathe with them in baths and bathing places. In case anyone should do this, or any of these things, if he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he is a layman, let him be excommunicated. Read also Ap. cc. VII and LXX.

12. And this too has come to our knowledge, that both in Africa and Libya and other regions the most God-beloved Presidents there continue living with their own wives even after the ordination has been conferred upon them, and will not abandon their wives, thus becoming an object of offense and a scandal to others. We have therefore made it a matter of great concern to us to do everything possible for the benefit of the flocks under hand, and it has seemed best not to allow such a thing to occur hereafter at all. We assert this, however, not with any intention of setting aside or overthrowing any legislation laid down Apostolically, but having due regard for the salvation and safety of peoples and for their better advancement with a view to avoiding any likelihood of giving anyone cause to blame the priestly polity. For the divine Apostle says: *“Do all for the glory of God. Give none offense, neither to the Jews, nor to the Greeks, nor to the Church of God: even as I try to please all men in everything, without seeking any advantage of mine own, but the advantage of the many in order that they may be saved. Become ye imitators of me, just as I also am (an imitator) of Christ”* (1 Cor. 10:32–33 and 11:1). If anyone should be shown to be doing this, let him be deposed from office.

Interpretation.

Since we have learned that in Africa and Libya (either two names are applied to the same region, since one of the four continents of the earth which is situated to the south was formerly called

Libya, and the name was afterwards changed to Africa, according to Chrysanthus, or else the name Libya is applied generally to the whole of that continent, and the name Africa to a particular province contained therein, according to Meletius), and in other regions, the prelates there, even after being ordained, keep on living with their wives, and thus cause others a scandal. Hence we are making it our serious business to do everything possible that is calculated to contribute to the common benefit of the Christians who are being pastured and shepherded by us, and to this end we decree that from now on no prelate may live with his wife after he has been ordained.¹⁴⁰ We decree this, not with a view to overthrowing and setting aside so much the common Canon of the Apostles, their c. V, that is to say, which excommunicates any bishop who on the pretext of reverence forcibly separates his wife, as the injunction which St. Paul addresses specially to Titus in saying: “*Ordain elders (or presbyters) in every city, as I have appointed thee, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife*” (Titus 1:5–6) (in this passage the word “elders” means bishops, according to St. Chrysostom, since a bishop also takes the name of elder, as we have said previously at the beginning of Ap. c. I. This fact is plainly evident also from what the Apostle goes on to say, when he adds “*For a bishop must be blameless,*” etc.): no, I say, we decree this not by way of refuting them, but by way of providing for their salvation, and for the advancement of Christians to a state of greater perfection, and to prevent their causing any accusation against the prelacy. For though prelates may live with their wives in sobriety and continence, yet the common people are scandalized and are inclined to accuse them, supposing the contrary to be the actual result of their living together in such a manner. The divine Apostle commands that whatever we do we must do it for the glory of God, and that we must not become a scandal to Jews and Greeks and Christians. Just as I, says he, try to please all persons by not seeking my own interest, but that of the multitude, that they may be saved, “*become ye imitators of me, just as also I am an imitator of Christ.*” If any of the prelates is living with his wife, let him be deposed. See also Ap. c. V.

13. Since we have learned that in the church of the Romans it is regarded as tantamount to a canon that ordinands to the diaconry or presbytery must solemnly promise to have no further intercourse with their wives. Continuing, however, in conformity with the ancient canon of apostolic rigorism and orderliness, we desire that henceforward the lawful marriage ties of sacred men become stronger, and we are nowise dissolving their intercourse with their wives, nor depriving them of their mutual relationship and companionship when properly maintained in due season, so that if anyone is found to be worthy to be ordained a Subdeacon, or a Deacon, or a Presbyter, let him nowise be prevented from being elevated to such a rank while cohabiting with a lawful wife. Nor must he be required at the time of ordination to refrain from lawful intercourse with his own wife, lest we be forced to be downright scornful of marriage, which was instituted by God and blessed by His presence, as attested by the unequivocal declaration of the Gospel utterance: “*What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder*” (Matt. 19:6); and the Apostle’s teaching: “*Marriage is honorable, and the bed is undefiled*” (Heb. 13:4), and: “*Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be freed*” (1 Cor. 7:27). We are cognizant, though, that those who met in Carthage and made provision of decency in the life of ministers declared that Subdeacons and Deacons and Presbyters, busying themselves as they do with the sacred mysteries, according to their rules are obliged to practice temperance in connection with their helpmates, in order that we may likewise keep the injunction handed down through the Apostles, and continued from ancient times in force, well knowing that there is a proper season

for everything, and especially for fasting and praying. For those who assist in the ceremonies at the sacrificial altar have to be temperate in all things at the time when they are handling holy things, so that they may be able to gain whatever they ask God for. If, therefore, anyone acting contrary to the Apostolic Canons require any person who is in sacred orders — any Presbyter, we mean, or Deacon, or Subdeacon — to abstain from intercourse and association with his lawful wife, let him be deposed from office. Likewise, if any Presbyter or Deacon expel his own wife on the pretext of reverence, let him be excommunicated; and if he persist, let him be deposed from office.

Interpretation.

What the present Canon decrees is this. Since we have learned that in Rome it is kept as inviolable canon that those who are about to become deacons and presbyters must promise and agree at the time of ordination that after the ordination they will have intercourse with their wives no more, we, following the old Canon of the Holy Apostles, Ap. c. V, that is to say, desire and hereby decree the marriage ties of those in holy orders to remain solid and inseverable, without requiring their separation after ordination from intercourse with their own wives when held at the proper time — when, that is to say, there is no fast, and when they are not engaged in celebrating the divine and sacred mysteries.¹⁴¹ So that whoever is married with a lawful wife and is worthy to become a Subdeacon, Deacon, or Presbyter, let him become one; and let him not be obliged necessarily to promise that he will separate from his wife — lest as a result of this we be forced to dishonor marriage, sanctioned by the laws laid down by God, and blessed by His presence, at the wedding in Cana, that is to say. For even the Lord's utterance in the Gospel says unequivocally: Let no man sunder those who have been united by God; and the Apostle teaches that marriage is honorable and the marriage bed is undefiled; and again, if you have been tied up with a wife, do not try to separate from her. But just as the Fathers of the Council held in Carthage, in providing for the decency of those in holy orders, decreed that subdeacons, deacons, and presbyters who come in contact with the divine mysteries must practice temperance by abstaining from their helpmates (or consorts), in accordance with their own rules (or definitions)¹⁴² in accordance with c. XXXIII, in order that we may keep likewise ourselves the tradition handed down through the Apostles from antiquity, in accordance with c. III of the same Council (that is to say, both the written traditions and the unwritten traditions, according to Zonaras and Balsamon), so and in like manner do we, who say the same things as these Fathers, decree that the above three ranks of those in holy orders must temperately abstain from their wives in time of fasting and of praying, in accordance with the words of St. Paul. For those who presiding at the sacrificial altar ought to be temperately abstinent from everything at the time they are engaged in the celebration of sacred rites, in order that by means of this abstinence they may obtain from God that which they seeking in general, or indiscriminately, that is to say, according to Zonaras, or for the common interest of the laity (according to c. III, that is to say, of the same Carthaginian Council). So whoever dares, in disregard of the Apostolic Canons, to prevent subdeacons, deacons, and presbyters from lawfully mingling with their wives, let him be deposed from office.¹⁴³ It ingeminates word for word Ap. c. V, the Interpretation of which you may read for yourself.

14. Let the Canon of our holy and God-bearing Fathers be observed also in respect to this, that a Presbyter may not be ordained before he is thirty years old, though the man be thoroughly worthy; but, instead, let him be obliged to wait. For our Lord Jesus Christ was baptized when He was

thirty years old, and then He began teaching. Likewise, let no Deacon be ordained before he is twenty-five years old, nor a Deaconess before she is forty years old.
(c. XIX of the 1st; c. XV of the 4th; c. XI of Neocaes.; c. XXI of Car.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon ingeminates word for word the fifteenth of the C. in Neocaesarea. Accordingly, it decrees that no one must be ordained a presbyter until he has reached the age of thirty, even though the candidate for ordination be otherwise quite deserving of holy orders; on the contrary, let him await his time. For even the Lord was baptized in His thirtieth year and began to teach the preachment of the Gospel. ("And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," says Luke, 3:23). Certainly He ought to be imitated by presbyters, who are ordained through the presbytery to act as teachers of the faithful.¹⁴⁴ Likewise neither can anyone be ordained a deacon until he has reached the age of twenty-five. That is exactly what c. XXI of Carthage also says. Nor can a woman become a deaconess until she has reached the age of forty. But may God be lenient in regard to the present-day transgression of these Canons. And even though the transgressors of these Canons are not abashed by the sacred and God-bearing and holy Fathers, let them at any rate be abashed by a mundane layman such as was Emperor Justinian, who in his Novel 123 says: "We do not allow a man to become a presbyter below the age of thirty, nor a deacon below the age of twenty-five, nor a subdeacon below the age of twenty." Read also c. XIX of the 1st, and the Footnote to c. XI of Neocaesarea.

15. Let no one be ordained a Subdeacon if he is less than twenty years old. If anyone should be ordained in any sacerdotcy whatever without having reached the years decreed, let him be deposed from office.

Interpretation.

As for a subdeacon (says the present Canon), let no one be ordained such when he is less than twenty years of age. If anyone has been ordained in any of the four classes in question, outside the age specified, let him be deposed from office.

Concord.

According to c. XIX of Carthage a young man could be ordained an Anagnost (or Reader) when he reached the age of adolescence, or, more explicitly, the fourteenth year of his life. But according to Novel 123 of Justinian (recorded in Book III of the Basilica, Title I, ch. 28) he had to be eighteen. (For the Novel purporting to ordain him when eight years of age was omitted when the laws were purged, and was not entered in the Basilica; and consequently it fell into desuetude). As for how old one must be in order to be ordained a bishop, see the Interpretation of Ap. c. I. Inasmuch as the civil law bids like to be judged by like, of course both an Anagnost and a Bishop when ordained before the fixed time, are to be deposed from office like the others, in accordance with the present Canon of the Sixth.¹⁴⁵

16. Since in the Book of Acts the Apostles instruct us to appoint seven Deacons, the Fathers of the Council held in Neocaesarea have thus clearly asserted in the Canons they promulgated that there must be seven Deacons according to the Canon, even though the city be a quite big one: witness the Book of Acts. In the course of fittingly harmonizing the sense of the Fathers with the

Apostolic saying, we discovered that their words in this connection did not pertain to the men serving as ministers to the mysteries, but to those attending to the needs of the table, the text of the Book of Acts being as follows: *“And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, because their widows were being neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples to them and said, We do not like to forsake the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of a good reputation, full of Holy Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint for this task. We will apply ourselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word. And their assertion pleased the whole multitude. And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Par-menias, and Nicolas an Antiochian proselyte; whom all they set before the Apostles”* (Acts 6:1–6). In the course of interpreting this passage, John Chrysostom, the teacher of the Church, dilates thus: “It is to be marveled that the multitude did not split apart in choosing the men! that the Apostles were not frowned upon by them! It is to be wondered what sort of dignity of office they possessed, and what sort of ordination they received. This is something that needs to be learned. Was it the ordination of Deacons? we well might wonder. But then, that is not in the churches. Or was the arrangement one of Presbyters? So far, though there had been no Bishop, but only Apostles. Hence, I opine, it is plain and obvious that neither the name of Deacons nor that of Presbyters is appropriate.” Resting upon these words, therefore, we too proclaim that as respects the aforesaid seven Deacons they were not selected to minister to the mysteries, according to what has been said in connection with the previous interpretation of the teaching, but, on the contrary, that they were selected to serve the common need of the Christians then gathered together; and that they continue to be an example to us, as they actually became, of philanthropy and diligence in regard to the needy.
(c. XV of Neocaesarea.)

Interpretation.

This Canon corrects, or rather improves, c. XV of Neocaesarea. The latter decreed that there should be but seven deacons, and not more, even in the largest city, as recorded in the Book of Acts. The Fathers of the present Council, therefore, say that after comparing the interpretation given by the Fathers with the assertions concerning these seven deacons contained in the Acts of the Apostles, they found that these deacons were not ministers (or deacons) of the Mysteries, but of the (dining) tables. For the Acts say: “In those days, because the Christians had multiplied, the believers among the Greeks (or according to others among the Jews who accepted the Old Testament, not as provided by the Hebrew original, but according to the Greek translation of it), because at the daily service (or ministration) of the common dinners then being given their widows who had need of them were being ignored.” At the suggestion of the Apostles, therefore, the multitude selected these seven deacons by name, men full of Holy Spirit, and held in good repute by all; and appointed them to serve at table, while the Apostles busied themselves in prayer and the service of teaching. In interpreting these words, after first marveling that that multitude did not split apart on account of such a selection of the deacons, others wanting this man, and others wanting that man, divine Chrysostom goes on to say that those deacons did hold the office of either deacons or presbyters of the Mysteries, since such offices had not yet been created in the Church, owing to the fact that the Church was then in her initial, and infantile, so to speak, stage. Hence these Fathers, in agreement with divine St. Chrysostom, hereby proclaim that these deacons, as we have said, are not deacons of the Mysteries, but of the common need and of the mess tables of the Christians of that time,¹⁴⁶ who became an example to us of philanthropy and care

which we ought to exercise in behalf of the poor. Not only did these Fathers not follow the instructions of the Canon of the Council held in Neocaesarea, but even of the Emperors preceding them Justinian appointed a hundred deacons, and Heraclius more than a hundred, in the great church. And in general all churches have the number of deacons and of clergymen apportioned to their requirements.¹⁴⁷

17. Inasmuch as Clergymen of various churches have abandoned their own churches, in which they were ordained, and have run over to other Bishops, and without the consent of their own Bishop have had themselves enrolled in the others' churches, and as a result of this they came to be insubordinate, we decree that, beginning with the month of January of the last fourth induction, not a single one of all the clergymen, regardless of what rank he happens to be in, has permission, unless furnished by a written dimissory of his own Bishop, to be enrolled in a different church. For, whoever fails to abide by this rule hereafter, but, on the contrary, so far as lies in his power disgraces him who bestowed the ordination on him, let both him and the one who illogically accepted him be deposed from office.

(Ap. cc. XII, XV, XXXII; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. V, X, XI, XIII, XX, XXIII; c. XV of the 7th; cc. III, VII, VIII, XI of Antioch; cc. XLI, XLII of Laodicea; cc. VII, VIII, XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica; cc. XXXI, LXIII, XCVII, XCVIII, CXVI of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon does not permit clergymen to leave their churches and go to others without the consent and a dimissory letter of their own bishop, because this results in their becoming insubordinate. So, beginning with month of January, and the fourth indiction last past (for indiction is meant by the word *epinemesis*, as is evident from c. III of the present Council), which is the same as saying, from now on, whoever dares to do this, and disgrace and scorn the one who ordained, by such an act, let both him and the one who unreasonably took him in be deposed from office. Read also Ap. cc. XII and XV.

18. Clergymen who on the pretext of an incursion of barbarians, or as a result of any other circumstance, have emigrated, whenever their exigency has ceased, or the incursions of barbarians, on account of which they made their departure, are commanded to return to their own churches, and not to stay away from them for a long time without a good excuse. If anyone fails to conduct himself agreeably to the present Canon, let him be excommunicated until he returns to his own church. Let this same rule apply also to the Bishop who is keeping him.

(Ap. c. XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. V, X, XX, XXIII of the 4th; c. XVII of the 6th; c. XV of the 7th; c. III of Antioch; cc. XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica; cc. LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Not only does this Canon refuse to let clergymen leave their churches without cause, but not even those who depart from them either on account of an incursion of barbarians, or perhaps on account of heavy debts or taxes, or on account of hunger, or on account of a deadly visit of the plague, or on account of any other circumstance. For it commands that when that cause ceases on account of which they departed, they must return again to their churches. Whoever, on the other hand, fails to comply with this Canon, let him be excommunicated, as well as the bishop who is

keeping him in his eparchy (or bishopric), until he goes back where he belongs. See also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XV.

19. We declare that the deans of churches., on every day, but more especially on Sundays, must teach all the Clergy and the laity words of truth out of the Holy Bible, analyzing the meanings and judgments of the truth, and not deviating from the definitions already laid down, or the teaching derived from the God-bearing Fathers; but also, if the discourse be one concerning a passage of Scripture, not to interpret it otherwise than as the luminaries and teachers of the Church in their own written works have presented it; and let them rather content themselves with these discourses than attempt to produce discourses of their own, lest, at times, being resourceless, they overstep the bounds of propriety. For by means of the teaching afforded by the aforesaid Fathers, the laity, being apprised of the important and preferred things, and of the disadvantageous and rejectable, are enabled to adjust their lives for the better, and do not become a prey to the ailment of ignorance, but, by paying due attention to what is taught, they sharpen their wits so as to avoid suffering wrongly, and for fear of impending punishments they work out their own salvation.

(Ap. c. LVI; cc. II, XVI of the 1st; c. XIX of Laodicea; cc. LXXIX, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXXXIII of Carthage; c. X of Peter; c. VI of the Easter.)

Interpretation.

The Canon decrees that the Deans of churches, by which term is meant preeminently the Bishops, but secondarily also the Presbyters, must teach all the Clergy and the laity every day in the week, and especially and above all on Sundays¹⁴⁸ (or even other holidays). For on these days, since Christians are wont to rest from their manual work, they congregate in the churches and listen to the divine words. Consequently those teaching therein afford them additional benefit. But such men must not teach with their own words and thoughts, but with those of divine Scripture, without straying away from the definitions adopted and confirmed by Councils and the dogmas of the faith, or away from the teaching handed down by the God-bearing Fathers. And if at any time they repeat words of the Bible, they are not to explain them in any other way than as the teachers of the Church have explained them in their written works; and they must endeavour more to make headway by teaching the discourses of the divine Fathers than by composing sermons of their own, lest by employing thoughts and conceptions of their own, and being unable sometimes to understand things aright, they fall out of line with what is proper and the truth. For by learning things from this teaching of the doctrines taught by the Fathers, the laity learn what things are of advantage to their souls, and what are disadvantageous, and they accordingly change their mode of living from viciousness to virtuousness, and are freed from the darkness of ignorance. By paying attention, again, to that teaching, and hearing about the chastisements and punishments which bad persons are bound to suffer, for fear of these they abstain from vices and bring about their salvation. Besides this, however, c. XIX of Laodicea says that the Bishop must first give a *didache* (or “teachment”) in the liturgy. Read also Ap. c. LVIII.

20. Let not any Bishop teach publicly in another city that does not belong to his see. If anyone be caught doing this, let him be deposed from the office of Bishop and perform the functions of a Presbyter.

(Ap. c. XXXV; c. II of the 2nd; c. VIII of the 3rd; cc. XIII, XXII of Antioch; cc. III, XI, XII of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

It is not permissible (says the present Canon) for any bishop to teach openly and publicly in a foreign province, without the consent, that is to say, of the local bishop, since this public teaching would be done to the dishonor of the latter, by making it seem to indicate that he himself is a learned teacher, while the former is one that is unlearned and ignorant. Therefore if anyone is found to be doing this, let him be removed from the office of bishop, and let him perform only the functions, or sacred duties, of a presbyter. The Canon states definitely that a strange bishop may not teach publicly, because if he merely answers questions asked him in private by certain persons, he is not sinning by doing so. The present Canon does not conflict with c. XXIX of the 4th, on account of what is said in Ap. c. XXXV, which you may read for yourself.

21. Those who become responsible for canonical crimes, and on this account are subject to complete and permanent deposition from office, and are thrust into the status of laymen, if with a view to returning they voluntarily forgo the sin on account of which they lapsed from grace, and render themselves utter strangers thereto, let them be tonsured in Clerical guise. But if they fail to do this of their own accord and as a matter of choice, let them grow back the hair of their heads, on the ground that they have preferred the return into the world to the heavenly life. (Ap. c. XXV; c. IX of the 1st; e. IV of the 6th; c. IX of Neocaesarea; cc. III, XVII, XXXII, L, LXX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

Those in holy orders who have been completely and permanently deposed from office, and have assumed the guise of a layman, and have to stand with the laymen, on account of canonical crimes, such as fornication, say, or adultery, or other such sins, commands the present Canon, if they themselves voluntarily and spontaneously repent, and actually effect complete abstinence from the sin on account of which they lost the grace of holy orders, let them tonsure the hair of their head, or, in other words, let them have a so-called *papalethra* (or “patch”) at the point of the head, which was a guise and token of clerics.¹⁴⁹ But if they fail to repent willingly and spontaneously, they must let the hair of their head grow back like worldlings, in order that the lay guise may so shame them as to bring them sooner or later to a sense of their viciousness and cause them to repent. Read also Ap. c. XXV.

22. We command that those men be deposed from office, whether they be Bishops or Clergymen whatsoever, who have been ordained or are being ordained for money, and not in accordance with a test and choice of life. (Ap. c. XXIX; c. II of the 4th; c. XXIII of the 6th; ec. IV, V, XIX of the 7th; c. XCI of Basil; letters of Gennadius and Tarasius.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands that bishops and all other clerics whatsoever that are ordained for giving money, and not for their worthiness and virtuous life; and not only they themselves, but also those who ordained them, are to be deposed from office. See also Ap. c. XXIX. Read, and sigh, my brother, at the violation of such sacred and such momentous Canons; for today that is the manner in which simony is practiced, as though it were a virtue, and not a heresy detested by God, as most saintly Gennadius calls it. If in consulting the abstracts of the sacred Canons any-

one should chance to look for the ecclesiastical affairs connected with the present set of conditions, he will find plenty to wonder at and not the slightest similarity to the former conditions to abate his wonder. For all ecclesiastics take orders illegally, and in like manner live and die. On this account the iron collar of slavery is being tightened more and more and keeps getting more painful, yet we remain insensible and break the law more impudently than ever.

23. Concerning the rule that no one, whether a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon, that imparts of the intemperate Communion shall collect from the partaker coins or any compensation whatsoever in exchange for such communion. For neither is grace bought, nor do we impart the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit for money; but, on the contrary, it must be imparted to the worthy without the incentive of knavishness. If, however, any person enrolled in the Clergy should be found to be demanding compensation of any kind of him to whom he imparts of the intemperate Communion, let him be deposed from office, on the ground that he is votary of Simon's delusion and maleficence.

(Ap. c. XXIX; c. II of the 4th; c. XXII of the 6th; cc. IV, XV, IX of the 7th; c. XCI of Basil; letters of Gennadius and Tarasius.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that no bishop, or presbyter, or deacon¹⁵⁰ shall demand money of those to whom he imparts the divine mysteries, nor shall he ask for any other compensation, even though it should be the very slightest, for the sake of partaking of the divine communion. For the grace of the Mysteries cannot be sold, nor do we impair the sanctification of the Holy Spirit for money, but, on the contrary, we impart it without being bribed to do so, to those who are worthy of it. For it is on this account that the divine Communion is called among the masses the gift (or *dorea*), because, according to Balsamon, it is imparted without gifts. As for anyone that should do this, let him be deposed from office, as having become an imitator of the delusion and heresy of Simon the Sorcerer, who thought that the grace of the All-holy Spirit could be sold for money.

¹⁵¹ Read also Ap. c. XXIX.

24. Let none of those enrolled in the sacerdotal list, nor any Monks, attend horse races or become involved in pastimes. But if any Clergyman should be invited at a wedding, whenever fraudulent games are introduced, let him rise up and protest, and thereupon let him depart, since the teaching of our Fathers thus commands. In case anyone is caught and found guilty of this, let him either cease or be deposed.

(Ap. cc. XLII, XLIII; cc. LI, LXII, LXVI of the 6th; c. XXII of the 7th; cc. III, LIV of Laodicea; cc. XVII, LXX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

No one in holy orders, nor any monk, according to the present Canon, is permitted to go to those places where men race horses, or to look at and listen to effeminate games. If, on the other hand, any clergyman be invited to a wedding, he may go, but when it comes to playing such deceptive and Satanic games, he must get up at once and depart, just as the Fathers' teaching commands, that is to say, c. LIV of the Council held in Laodicea (though that Canon adds that those in holy orders must not look at other spectacles either that mark weddings and suppers, and that they

must depart before the time has even come for the games). As for anyone caught doing this, either he must cease or he must be deposed.¹⁵²

25. In addition to all the others we renew the Canon which prescribes that the rural or district parishes belonging to each church are to remain immutably assigned to the Bishops holding them, and especially in the case of those who managed to hold them for a period of thirty years without resorting to force. But if within thirty years there has been, or should be, any dispute about them, those who claim to have been wronged shall be permitted to bring the matter before the Synod of the province.

(c. XVII of the 4th; c. CXXVIII, CXXIX, CXXX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon renews c. XVII of the 4th, which it quotes verbatim, though not all of it, but only a part of it; wherefore see also the Interpretation of it there.

26. As for a Presbyter who has unwittingly entangled himself in an unlawful marriage, let him retain his rights to sitting with his rank, in accordance with what has been prescribed to us as legislation by the sacred Canon, but let him refrain from the rest of functions and activities. For a pardon is sufficient for him; but for him to bless another person when he ought to be looking after his own wounds, is inconsistent: for blessing is the impartation of sanctification. But how can one who lacks this, on account of his lapse as a result of ignorance, impart it to another? Let him therefore bless no one either publicly or privately; neither let him distribute the body of Christ to others, nor perform any other liturgical office. On the contrary, while contenting himself with the presidency, let him persistently weep to others, and to the Lord, to be pardoned for the iniquitous deed which he has unwittingly perpetrated. For it is obvious that any such unlawful marriage must be dissolved, and that the man will have no essential share in the sacred office of which he has been deprived.

(Ap. c. XIX; c. III of the 6th; c. II of Neocaesarea; cc. XXIII, XXVII, LXXVIII of Basil.)

Interpretation.

This Canon is the same as the twenty-seventh Canon of St. Basil the Great, which prescribes that that priest who unwittingly marries any female relative of his, must, because of his not knowing about the relationship, be pardoned, and must also retain the honor of sitting with the priests, but must refrain from all other activities of the priesthood. For it is enough that such a person is not subjected to canonical penances, but is pardoned. But for him to bless another person when he himself ought to be trying to heal his own wounds, or, in other words, to be repentant of his unlawful marriage, is not at all becoming. For blessing is an impartation of sanctity. So, inasmuch as such a priest is destitute of that sanctity, how can he give it to another person? Therefore let him neither openly nor secretly pronounce any blessing upon or administer any communion to others, or do anything else of the kind; but, on the contrary, contenting himself as best he may with the honor of occupying the high seat, as we have said, let him set himself to praying, first of all to God, in order to have his unwitting iniquity pardoned, and, as a further recourse, to others, in order that they too may entreat the Lord in his behalf. Up to this point it is the Canon of St. Basil. But the Council adds that he is to enjoy this honor of sitting in the high seat only after he has first annulled that illegitimate marriage on account of which he has been deposed from holy

orders. For if he does not annul it, not only will he be deprived of the honor of sitting in the high seat, but he will even be compelled to undergo penances. Read also Ap. c. XIX.

27. Let no one on the Clerical List don inappropriate clothing, either when living in the city or when walking the road; but, on the contrary, let him wear costumes that have already been assigned to the use of those who are enrolled in the Clergy. If anyone should commit such a violation, let him be excommunicated for one week.

(c. XVI of the 7th; cc. XII, XXI of Gangra.)

Interpretation.¹⁵³

Clergymen and all who are in Holy Orders ought to be modest and decent even in respect of their outward guise. For God looks into the heart, it is true, but human beings look at the external condition of the body, according to what has been written: “*A human being will look at a face, but God at a heart*” (Sam. 12:7). Hence from what they can see on the outside they draw inferences as to what is in the heart. That is why the present Canon commands that no clergymen shall wear clothes that are not becoming to his profession; that is, for instance, costly and silk garments, or military uniforms, neither when he is staying in the city nor when he is walking on the road: on the contrary, he must wear the garments that are habitual to clerics — decent, that is to say, and frugal. Should anyone do the contrary, let him be excommunicated for one week.

Concord.

It is further to be noted that c. XVI of the 7th imposes penances on those in holy orders who wear splendid garments and fail to correct matters; likewise on those who anoint themselves with perfumes. Though it is true that c. XII of Gangra anathematizes those who criticize persons wearing silk garments with reverence, it does not conflict with the present Canon: 1) because this is speaking specifically of clerics wearing them, whereas that speaks of both clergymen and laymen in general who are wearing them; 2) because this Canon is speaking of those who are wearing garments of an uncustomary kind; 3, and lastly) because the same Council is correcting what it asserted in its said c. II by what it asserts in its c. XXI, which says: “We praise frugal and cheap garments, but we detest garments that are ornamented and soft.” And if that Council disparages soft garments in regard to worldlings, it disparages them far more when they are worn by clerics. So that not only is that Council not opposed in principle to the present one, but indeed it is in agreement with it and more strict in regard to this matter. But the Lord also says: “*Beware of those who want to walk about in costumes*” (Luke 20:46). And if the Apostle Peter forbids women, who are by nature a race of beings that love adornment, to wear luxurious garments (1 Peter 3:3); and if Paul forbids the same things to the same creatures (1 Tim. 2:9), do they not still more firmly forbid these things to clergymen? St. Basil the Great, too, wants us to have clothing that is decorous; and in his Homily 11 on the Six Days of Creation he says that if you see anyone clothed in a robe adorned with flowers or flowery figures, and dressed up with silk threads, scorn him outright. And St. Chrysostom, too, in his Homily 12 on the First Epistle to Timothy says: “Seest thou a human being wearing silk garments? Laugh him to scorn.” Isidorus Pelousiotes (in his seventy-fourth letter) when commenting on the question, What was the tunic of Christ that was woven from above and unsewed? says: “But who is ignorant of the paltriness of that dress which the poor among the Galileans used to wear, and that indeed with them it used to be a garment woven by some art and with some skill as close as corsets.” And at the end he says: “If,

then, you desire these garments, imitate the paltry dress of Jesus. For luxuriousness here becomes stupidity there, and not a bright illumination.”

28. Since we have learned that in various churches when grapes are offered at the sacrificial altar, in accordance with a certain custom which has gained prevalence, by affixing them to the bloodless sacrifice of the offering (or oblation), the ministers thus distribute both to the laity, we have seen fit to decree that no one in holy orders shall do this any more; but, on the contrary, for the purpose of vivification, and remission of sins, they shall impart to the laity of the oblation only, regarding the offering of grapes as first fruits offered by way of thanks to the giver of fruits, whereby our bodies, in accordance with the divine definition, is enabled to grow and to be nourished. If, then, any Clergyman does contrary to what has been commanded, let him be deposed.

(Ap. cc. III, IV; cc. XXXII, LVII, XCIX of the 6th; c. XL of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Since in some regions, in accordance with a certain custom, some persons used to offer grapes at the Holy Table, which the priests would combine with the intemperate mysteries and then impart both together to the laity, on this account and for this reason the present Canon from now on and henceforth commands that no priest shall do this,¹⁵⁴ but, on the contrary, he must give the Holy Communion alone to the worthy, for vivification, and for remission of their sins,¹⁵⁵ whereas he blesses the grapes as first fruits of the season with a special prayer and hands them out to the laity, by way of thanking God for giving us such fruits, by means whereof our bodies are nourished and grow. As for anyone that does anything in violation of this Canon, let him be deposed from office. Read also Ap. c. III.

29. The Canon of the Fathers met in Carthage prescribes that the holy rites of the sacrificial altar, unless performed by men under a fast, are not to be celebrated at all, except on one day of the year on which the Lords Supper is celebrated, perhaps having decided to employ such an economy of the divine Fathers on account of certain pretexts advantageous to the Church in such seasons. Since there is nothing to compel us to abandon rigorism, we decree, pursuantly to the traditions of the Apostles and of the Fathers, that the fasting during the Thursday which falls in the last week in Great Lent (or Tesseractoste) must not be omitted, and the whole fast of Great Lent dishonored by being prematurely broken.

(Ap. c. LXIX; c. LXXXIX of the 6th; cc. XLIX, L, LI, LII of Laodicea; cc. XLVIII, LVI of Carthage; c. I of Dionysius; cc. VIII, X of Timothy.)

Interpretation.

Just as our Lord Jesus Christ on the evening of the Great Thursday first ate a common supper and thereafter delivered the divine mysteries to the Apostles, in the same manner it may be said that a custom came to prevail in Africa for the people there to eat certain more luscious foods on Great Thursday, according to Zonaras, which served to break the usual course of eating dry things on other days of Great Lent, and thereafter to celebrate and to partake of the divine mysteries. So the present Council, as an improvement over c. XLVIII of Carthage which contained this custom, decrees that perhaps those Fathers employed this economy for some beneficial reasons of benefit to those regions, but inasmuch as we have no reason that would compel us to abandon the

strictness of the Canons, we follow the instructions handed down by the Apostles, in their c. LXIX, that is to say, which makes it incumbent upon all to fast throughout Great Lent (both Great Thursday and the entire Great Week are included in the period of Great Lent, as well as during the fasts of the Fathers, that is to say, those in c. L of the Fathers of Laodicea, which decrees that no one shall break the fast of the Thursday in the last week in Great Lent (that is to say, of Great Thursday), and by breaking it dishonor and disparage the fast of the entire Great Lent, but, instead, everyone must fast throughout the period of Great Lent by eating nothing but dry things, including, of course, Great Thursday itself.¹⁵⁶

Concord.

Note, however, that not only this c. XLVIII of Carthage decrees that priests must officiate on an empty stomach (as we say in English, though in Greek the same idea is expressed differently by saying “fastingly”), but c. LVI of the same Council states that this was also confirmed by the Council held in Nicaea. Nevertheless, if anyone is in danger of dying, he must commune even after having eaten, according to c. IX of Nicephorus. When St. Chrysostom was blamed for having administered the communion to some persons after they had eaten, and wrote in his letter to Bishop Kyriakos: “If it is true that I did this, may my name be stricken from the book of bishops. But if they say this to me once, and start quarreling, let them consider St. Paul, who baptized a whole household right after supper. Let them also consider Christ Himself, who gave the Communion to the Apostles right after supper.” Hence it is evident that those who are about to commune have permission up to midnight to drink water, and thereafter they must not put anything in their mouth until they have communed. Read also Ap. c. LXIX.

30. Wishing to do everything for the edification of the Church, we have decided to make concessions to priests in Barbarian churches, so that if they are seeking to circumvent Apostolic Canon V by not expelling their wife, on the pretext of reverence, and to do what is beyond the limits set by it, by coming to a private agreement with their spouses to abstain from intercourse with each other. We decree that these priests shall cohabit with these wives no more, in any manner whatsoever, so as to afford us thereby positive proof that they are carrying out their promise. We make this concession to them, not for any other reason, but because of the pusillanimity of their thought, and the bizarre character of their ideas of morality, and the unsettled state of their mind. (Ap. c. V; cc. XII, XIII, XLVIII of the 6th; c. IV of Gangra; cc. III, IV, XXXIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Since those in holy orders who are located in Barbary, Africa, as we have said, in the desire to circumvent, or get round, the legislation embodied in Ap. c. V, which commands that no one in holy orders shall separate his wife on the pretext of reverence, agree with their wives and abstain from carnal intercourse, therefore the present Canon decrees that those who have done this are not to cohabit with their wives any longer in any way: for one thing, in order to show, by this abstinence from cohabitation, that they made this promise and agreement not on account of any hypocritical and false reverence, but truly on account of a longing after sobriety and virginity; and for another thing, because continual sight of and association with their wives prompts them to have carnal intercourse with them again. Nevertheless, says this Canon, we have given them this permission, not for any other reason, but simply on account of the pusillanimity of their way of thinking, on account of their wild character, according to Zonaras, or on account of their having a strange notion of what constitutes good order as respecting ecclesiastical morals, according

to Balsamon, and because of their lack of firmness of faith (and notice that this same thing which the Council permits in regard to Barbary for these reasons, it does not permit to occur in Rome, on account of the docility of the moral character of the Romans, on account of their ecclesiastical orderliness, etc.; and in spite of the fact that this custom originally came from Rome to Barbary, according to c. IV of Carthage). Read also Ap. c.V, cc. XII and XIII of the 6th.

31. As for those Clergymen who hold a liturgy in oratories or prayerhouses or in private residences, or who carry out a baptism therein, without having obtained the consent of the local Bishop to do this, we decree that if any Clergyman fail to guard against doing this, let him be deposed from office.

(Ap. c. XXXI; c. XVIII of the 4th; cc. XXXIV, LIX of the 6th; c. XII, XIII, XIV, XV of the 1st-&2nd; c. VI of Gangra; c. V of Antioch; c. LVIII of Laodicea; cc. X, LXII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon does not permit those in holy orders to conduct a liturgy or to baptize inside a room or in the parlor of a private dwelling, or in a house of prayer, or one called an oratory and devoted to prayer, which has not been consecrated in the Orthodox manner, without the permission and consent of the local bishop: because this would amount to a conventicle (or “parasynagogue”) and apostasy; but they may do this with his consent and permission. Anyone who fails to abide by this rule, let him be deposed from office.¹⁵⁷

Concord.

This same Canon is iterated *verbatim* by the 1st-&2nd Council in its c. XII, and confirmed, and that Council adds that priests who are to officiate in the oratories of private houses must be appointed by a prelate. Anyone that dares to officiate in them without being duly appointed and permitted by a bishop is to be deposed, and laymen who have joined with him in communion are to be excommunicated. Canon LVIII of Laodicea, on the other hand, which says that neither bishops nor priests may conduct sacred services in houses, does not conflict with the present Canon, because it does not specify that sacred rites may not be performed in the oratories of houses, as this Canon says, but only in houses in general, that is to say, more plainly speaking, in ordinary houses, a thing which is prohibited except in case of great necessity.¹⁵⁸ Canon LIX of the present 6th deposes those clergymen who baptize anyone inside the prayerhouse of anyone, and not in the common church; and it excommunicates laymen who have joined in communion with them.¹⁵⁹ Read also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXI.

32. Since it has come to our knowledge that in the country of the Armenians those conducting the bloodless sacrifice are wont to offer wine alone at the sacred table, without mixing water with it, on the alleged ground that the teacher of the Church John Chrysostom said in his commentary of the Gospel according to St. Matthew the following: “On what account did He not drink water after He rose, but wine? — another wicked heresy being thus eradicated, roots and all. For since there were some who used water in the Mysteries, He showed both when He delivered the Mysteries and when He rose from the grave, that he set a mere table without mysteries and used wine, derived, he says, from the product of the vine” (Homily 82). But a vine produces wine, not water. Hence they infer that the teacher disallowed the offering of water in the sacred sacrifice (Matt. 26:29). Lest they remain henceforth in ignorance of the facts, we proceed to reveal the father’s meaning Orthodoxically. For, in view of the fact that the wicked heresy of the

Aquarians was an old one, wherein they use water alone instead of wine in their own sacrifice,¹⁶⁰ by way of refuting the unlawful doctrine of that particular heresy and showing that they are contravening the Apostolical tradition, this God-bearing man asserted the said words. Since even in the church of his jurisdiction, where he had the pastoral rulership in his hands, he taught that water should be admixed whenever it was requisite to perform the blood sacrifice, pointing out that from the precious flank of our Redeemer and Savior Christ the God there had exuded a mixture of blood and water, which mixture was shed, or poured out, for vivification of all the world and redemption from sins. And in connection with all churches where the spiritual luminaries shone forth, this God-given procedure prevails. For this is also in keeping with the fact that both James the carnal brother of Christ our God, who was the first to be entrusted with the throne of the church of the Jerusalemites, and Basil the Bishop of the Caesareans and one whose renown rapidly spread over the whole inhabited earth, having each of them handed down to us in writing the mystical hierurgy, have given out that the sacred chalice (or cup) is to be filled full of water and wine in the Divine Liturgy. And the devout Fathers assembled in Carthage, too, thus expressly mentioned that in the holy elements nothing more than the body and the blood of the Lord should be offered, just as the Lord Himself taught, that is, bread and wine, mixed with water. If, therefore, any Bishop, or Presbyter, fail to follow the procedure taught by the Apostles, and, mixing water with wine, thus to offer the intemperate sacrifice, let him be deposed from office, on the ground that he has been divulging the mystery imperfectly or deficiently and novating the rites handed down.

Interpretation.

The present Canon corrects the bad custom which came to prevail in the country of the Armenians — that of conducting the liturgy, that is to say, with wine alone, without combining it with water in accordance with the tradition of the Church. Since they adduce in support of such custom evidence resting upon the explanation which John Chrysostom gives to the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and think that that divine Father, by saying there that both before and after His resurrection the Lord used wine, is denying in these words the admixture of water in the Mysteries, therefore, owing to this mistaken view of theirs, these Fathers are making known the true meaning of the saint's words, which say that because there was an old heresy called that of the Aquarians, who used water alone in the Eucharistic celebration, and not wine, divine Chrysostom, in refuting this heresy, employed these words thus, and not as one accepting that wicked custom of the Aquarians, since the same Chrysostom himself in his divine Liturgy taught the church of Constantinople that in the bloodless sacrifice of the Mysteries water must be mixed with the wine by way of representing the blood and water which emerged from the precious side of the Lord's body while it was hanging on the cross, for the remission of the sins and the vivification of all the world, according to that Gospel saying that "*one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water*" (John 19:34).¹⁶¹ But not only St. Chrysostom, but also James the brother of God and first hierarch of Jerusalem,¹⁶² as well as St. Basil the Great in their Liturgies gave directions for the holy chalice to be filled full of wine and water. In addition, the Fathers in Carthage in c. XLIV, which they set forth *verbatim*, do so too. So if any bishop or priest in the divine service of the hierurgy fails to mix water with the wine, in accordance with the Apostolic tradition, let him be deposed from office. For by failing to do so, he renders the mystery of the divine Eucharist incomplete or imperfect, and upsets what has been handed down. Read also Ap. c. III.

33. Since we have learned as a matter of fact that in the country of the Armenians only those who are of hieratical (or priestly) lineage are eligible to the clergy, pursuantly to Jewish customs, in an attempt to practice these, and that some of them do not even tonsure their Psalts and Anagnosts when installing them in the divine Temple, we have seen fit to concur in decreeing that from now on those who wish to promote certain persons to the clergy are not allowed to pay any regard to the lineage of the ordinee. But, on the contrary, after first testing them as to whether they are worthy according to the definitions laid down in the sacred Canons to be enrolled in the clergy, they shall ordain them ecclesiastics, whether they have been born of ancestors who were priests, or not. Nor, furthermore, shall they permit anyone to speak from the pulpit to the laity the divine words, in accordance with the order of enrollment in the clergy, unless such person has something to show in the way of a priestly tonsure and receives the blessing canonically from the proper pastor. If anyone be caught acting contrary to the rules prescribed, let him be excommunicated.

(Ap. c. LXXVII; c. XIV of the 4th; c. XXIII of Laodicea; c. XXII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

This Canon too corrects those who inhabit the country of the Armenians, who not only made priests only of those who were descended from a priestly line, following the custom of the Jews, who made priests only of those who were descendants of the tribe of Levi, but also appointed psalts and anagnosts in the church with the formality of the bishop's laying his hands on them. Decreeing that henceforth they are not to pay regard to whether the candidate for ordination is or is not descended from a priestly line, but are to test him as to whether he is in truth worthy to become a member of the clergy, the Fathers of this Council further decree that they must not let anyone read on the pulpit the divine words to the laity¹⁶³ unless he first receives the canonical seal of an anagnost from the prelate. If anyone does anything contrary to these rules, let him be excommunicated.

Concord.

Canon IV of the 7th also prohibits anyone from reading from the pulpit, even though he be a monk, without having received a chirothesy, or imposition of the hands, from the bishop. Canon XXII of Carthage, on the other hand, forbids anagnosts to bow to the laity after reading. Read also Ap. c. LXXVII

34. In view of the fact that the sacerdotal Canon clearly states that as the crime of conspiracy or of faction is utterly forbidden even by civil laws, it is much more fitting still that this be prohibited from occurring in the Church of God, we too are sedulous to insist that if any Clergymen or Monks be found either conspiring together or engaging in factional intrigues or hatching plots against Bishops or fellow Clergymen, they shall forfeit their own rank altogether.

(Ap. c. XXXI; c. XVIII of the 4th; cc. XIII, XIV, XV of the 1st-&-2nd; c. V of Antioch; cc. X, LXII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

This Canon is the same as c. XVIII of the 4th; and read its Interpretation there, but also see the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXI.

35. Let none of all the Metropolitans, when a Bishop dies who is under his throne, have any right to remove or to usurp his belongings or those of his church, but let them be under the safe keeping of the Clergy of the church of which the deceased happened to be president until the induction or installation of another Bishop, unless there be no Clergymen left in the same church. For the Metropolitan shall safely keep all such things undiminished and hand all of them over to the Bishop who is to be ordained.

(Ap. c. XL; c. XXII of the 4th; c. XXIV of Antioch; cc. XXX, LXXXIX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

No Metropolitan, says the present Canon, has any right or permission, when any bishop dies, to plunder and appropriate his belongings or those of his episcopate; but, on the contrary, these are to be held for safe keeping by the clergymen of the episcopate until another bishop has been installed. But if no clergymen have been left in that bishopric, then the Metropolitan shall take charge of them and keep them safe and nothing missing until he can turn them over to the bishop who is going to be ordained. See also Ap. c. XL.

36. Renewing the laws made by the one hundred and fifty Holy Fathers who assembled in this God-guarded imperial capital city, and by the six hundred and thirty of those who assembled in Chalcedon, we decree that the throne of Constantinople shall enjoy equal seniorities (or priorities) with the throne of older Rome, and in ecclesiastical matters shall be magnified like the latter, coming second after the latter; after which the throne of the great city of the Alexandrians shall come next, then that of Antioch, and after this the throne of the city of the Jerusalemites.

(Ap. c. XXXIV; c. III of the 2nd; c. XXVIII of the 4th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon renews¹⁶⁴ c. III of the 2nd Ecum. C. and c. XXVIII of the 4th, which deal with the privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople, prescribing that he shall enjoy equal and same privileges with the one of Rome, and shall be magnified in ecclesiastical affairs in a similar manner to him, coming second after him only in point of order, while the Bishop of Alexandria is third, the one of Antioch fourth, and the one of Jerusalem fifth, solely in the matter of this order of prenumeration and subnumeration so conceived and so called. Read also the above-mentioned Canons, and c. VI of the First Ecum. C. and the Footnote thereto, in which we speak about the five Patriarchs.

37. Since at various times there have been inroads of barbarians, and many cities have as a result become subject to the iniquitous, so that the President of such a city has been unable after ordination to take possession of his own throne and to be installed therein in sacerdotal state, and thus to act and employ himself in accordance with the prevailing custom of bestowing ordinations and to do everything that pertains to a Bishop, we, being determined to safeguard the rights of the priesthood to honor and respect, and being nowise disposed to consent to any curtailment of ecclesiastical rights or to allow the heathen influence to be exercised over those so ordained, and on account of the cause recited above since they are unable to gain possession of their own thrones, we have seen fit to concur in decreeing that no prejudice shall result therefrom to prevent them from bestowing ordinations canonically upon various Clergymen, and from employing

the authority of the presidency in accordance with the same definition; and that any and all administration advanced by them shall be sure and duly established. For the definition of economy shall not be restricted or limited by the circumstances of necessity or be circumscribed as touching its rigor.

(Ap. c. XXXVI; c. XVIII of Ancyra; cc. XVII, XVIII of Antioch.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that inasmuch as some prelates after being duly ordained have been unable to go to their thrones and eparchies,¹⁶⁵ owing to the fact that their thrones have been captured by incursions of barbarians, for this reason, maintaining the respect and honor due to the prelacy, and being unwilling to let the fact of capture by barbarians become an obstacle to thwart ecclesiastical rights, we decree that those who have been thus ordained, and owing to the occasion and fear of barbarians have been unable to seat themselves upon their thrones, shall not be prejudiced as to their right to perform ordinations of various clergymen within their eparchy, even though they are far away from it (and see the Footnote to c. XVI of Antioch), as the Canons prescribe, and to have the honor and authority of the presidency in accordance with the same definition, or, more plainly speaking, according as their eparchy has been defined to be the first, say, or the second, the third, and so on; and anything they may do by virtue of any prelatical right, or, in other words, as prelates, is to be firm and legal.¹⁶⁶ For although rigor, meaning the theoretical possibility of their going to their thrones and doing such things, has been lessened by the necessity of the time and of barbarians, yet the definition of economy, or more plainly speaking the right to do these things on their same throne even though far away from it, shall not be lessened on that account. Read also Ap. c. XXXVI.

38. We too retain the Canon which was laid down by our Fathers and which reads as follows: If any city has been rebuilt by imperial authority, or has been built anew again, pursuant to civil and public formalities, let the order of the ecclesiastical parishes be followed.

(c. XVII of the 4th.) (The present Canon is included in c. XVII of the 4th, and see the Interpretation of it there.)

39. Seeing that our brother and fellow minister John the president of the island of the Cyprians has departed thence with his laity and has come to the eparchy of the Hellespont, both because of barbarian assaults and because they have been freed from heathen slavery and have become subject to the ruling powers of the most Christian empire, by the providence of the philanthropic (or man-loving) God, and by the hard work of our Christ-loving and pious emperor, we see fit to concur in decreeing that the privileges conferred upon and granted to the throne of the man aforesaid by the God-bearing Fathers who convened in Ephesus long ago shall be preserved without any innovations, so that the new Justinianopolis shall have the right of Constantinople, and the most God-beloved Bishop appointed over it shall preside over all those in the eparchy of the Hellespontians and be ordained by his own bishops, in accordance with the ancient custom. For our God-bearing Fathers have already decided that the customs obtaining in each Church are to be continued, the Bishop of the city of the Cyziceni being subject to the president of the said Justinianopolis, in imitation of the rest of all the Bishops who are under the said most God-beloved president John, by whom, if the need arises, the Bishop of the same city of the Cyziceni shall be ordained.

(Ap. c. XXXIV; cc. VI, XII of the 1st; cc. II, III, VIII of the 2nd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; c. XXXVI of the 6th; c. IX of Antioch.)

Interpretation.

In the time of Emperor Justinian II the Archbishop of Cyprus John departed from his eparchy (or province) together with his laity and came to the eparchy of the Hellespont (the Hellespont, according to Balsamon, is the eastern territory extending from Abydus, or, in other words the eastern Castron from the outside, to Thrace; but according to Chrysanthus the strait extending from Tenedus to Callipolis, or Gallipoli), as much on account of incursions of the barbarians as because of the fact that he was freed from their captivity, by the providence of God and through the diligence of the Emperor, and became a subject of the Roman Empire. For this reason the present Canon decrees that the privileges conferred upon the Bishop of Cyprus by c. VIII of the 3rd Council shall be preserved entire, and that this new city of Justinianopolis is to enjoy the right of Constantinople (that is to say, the right to be like her autocephalous, or, just as the Asian, the Pontic, and the Thracian provinces became subject to the Bishop of Constantinople, as we have said in c. XXVIII of the 4th, so and in like manner is the Hellespontian province, or eparchy, subject to Cyprus); and its Archbishop is to be ordained by his own bishops, in accordance with the ancient custom. So that the Metropolitan of the city of Cyzicus shall be subject to him, just as are also all the bishops in Cyprus, and whenever there is need he shall be ordained by him.¹⁶⁷ Read also c. VIII of the Third Council.

40. Since it is very conducive to salvation for one to become closely attached to God by retiring from the turmoil of life, we must not welcome without examination those who unseasonably choose the solitary (or monastic) life, but must observe the definition handed down to us by the Fathers even in these matters, so as to make it incumbent upon us to welcome the confession (or promise, as we say in English) of a life in accordance with God then, when it is already certain and has been done with consent and judgment, after the completion of the reason. Therefore let anyone who is about to submit to the monastic yoke and who is not less than ten years old, the test for this resting with the president, if he deems the time to be more advantageous for growth as preparation for entrance into and continuance in the solitary life. For even though St. Basil the Great in his sacred Canons welcomes the girl who voluntarily offers herself to God and embraces virginity when passing through her seventeenth year, and makes it a law for her to be enrolled in the battalion of Virgins, yet, even so, following the example with respect to widows and deaconesses closely we have allowed those choosing the solitary life the said time proportionately. For in the divine Apostle it is written: *“Let not a widow be taken into the number under sixty years old if she has been the wife of one husband”* (1 Tim. 5:9). The sacred Canons, on the other hand, give instructions to the effect that a deaconess can be ordained only when she is at least forty years old, the Church having by the grace of God become mightier and advancing forward, and the tendency of the faithful to keep the divine commandments having become firmly fixed and secure, after exquisitely perceiving which fact quite recently we have seen fit to decree the blessing of grace upon the one about to undertake the struggle of living in accordance with God, impressing it precisely like a seal quickly and hence seeking to prevent him from lingering too long, and urging him forward into the arena, or rather indeed we might say impelling him to the choice and state of what is good.

(c. XIX of the 1st; c. XV of the 4th; c. XIV of the 6th; cc. VI, LI, CXXXV of Carthage; cc. XVI-II, XXIV of Basil.)

Interpretation.

Those who wish to become monks or nuns ought not, according to the present Canon, to be accepted without examination, and at an unseasonable or improper time and in defiance of the definition prescribed by the divine Fathers (and especially St. Basil the Great), but only then ought the confession and promise they make to God to be accepted as reliable and representative of their state of mind, when the judgment of their reasoning faculty has reached its maturity,¹⁶⁸ as Basil the Great asserts in his c. XVIII and especially in his Definition 15 *in extenso*. So, in sum, let the one who is about to become a monk be not less than ten years old; but, nevertheless, let it be in the power of the bishop to try him out and to increase the number of years for him (in proportion, that is to say, to his natural knowledge) if he deems it more to the person's interest. For although Basil the Great specifies in his aforesaid Canon that a virgin girl over sixteen or seventeen years may be admitted to the battalion of virgins, we nevertheless, following the example of the widows and deaconesses, have reduced the sixteen or seventeen years of St. Basil to ten years, because the Apostle prescribes that a widow may be admitted to the Church if she is not less than sixty years old, while the Fathers of the 4th say that a woman may be ordained a deaconess when she is forty years old, in their c. XV,¹⁶⁹ seeing the Church of God to be advancing with the grace of God, and the constancy shown by Christians in the keeping of the divine commandments. Giving these facts due thought, we have decreed this Canon, engraving in the tender soul of the one about to commence the spiritual struggles of monks, as a seal, the blessing of divine grace, and bracing him by means of this Canon, not to neglect the business of virtue for a long time, but rather to choose the good portion so much the sooner. But c. VI of Carthage says also that virgins ought to be consecrated to God by only the bishop; and c. LI of the same Council says that they ought to be provided for by him also, or, in his absence, by the presbyter.

41. Those wishing to depart from cities or villages where they are living in cloisters, and to look after themselves alone by themselves, must first enter a Monastery, and become duly accustomed to anchoritic conduct, and to submit for three years straight to the Prior of the Monastery in fear of God, and to fulfill obedience fittingly in all respects; and thus while confessing a predilection for such a life, they may embrace this with all their heart, and the fact must appear and be verified by test of trial by the local president. It is wishable, though, that they may spend another year staying outside by waiting with fortitude in the cloister so that their aim may come to light more clearly. For they shall afford such clear evidence that they are not hunting empty glory, i.e., are not in pursuit of vainglory, but are striving after this quietude for the sake of what is really good itself. When such a long time has been completed, those who persist in the same preference shall be shut up and it shall no longer be possible for them to leave this solitary confinement when they want to, except and unless it be for the common advantage and benefit, or some other necessity forcing them towards death, and they are being drawn towards this alternative, and thus, with the blessing of the local Bishop. But apart from the said pretexts, in case they should attempt to make an exit from their resorts (or dungeons), the first formality is that they must be duly imprisoned in the said cloister against their will, and must be forced to fast again and again, and to submit to other hardships, so as to be made well aware of the fact that “*No one who, after putting his hand to the plow, looks back, is fit for the Kingdom of Heaven*” (Luke 9:62.)

Interpretation.

It is a great and bold stroke for one to depart mundane life right at the very start and be shut up inside of cloisters, and from one extravagation to jump over to another extravagation — from the turbulent sea, I mean, of

life into the untoward and difficult sea of quietude. For this reason these Fathers in the present Canon decree that those who wish to do this must go to a monastery, and after showing obedience to the prior in every respect for three years, they must be examined by the bishop and confess that of their own accord and with all their heart they are yearning for such a departure. Afterwards, following this, they are to quietly rest themselves and remain quiet for a year outside of the cloister, in order to furnish still more convincing evidence that it was not out of vainglory, but out of a desire for the good of quietude that they have been longing for this kind of life. And if after all these steps they stand solidly on the same conclusion and eagerness, then they are to be shut up and are no longer to have permission to get out when they wish, except only if this be for the common benefit of the people and on account of a danger of dying. Nevertheless even then they are to come out with the blessing and permission of the local bishop. But if without having any such reasons as these they should try to get out, they are to be forcibly shut up again in their said cloister, and be penanced (or “canonized”) canonically both with fastings and with other kinds of hardships and harsh treatment in order to be taught that, as the Lord said, whoever puts his hand to the plow, or, in other words, whoever commences a career in accordance with God’s way and afterward goes back to a worldly life, cannot succeed in traveling straight to the Kingdom of Heaven.

42. As touching so-called hermits, who dressed in black and with a growth of hair on their head go about the cities and associate with laymen and women, and insult their own profession, we decree, if they choose to tonsure their hair and adopt the habit (or garb) of other Monks, that they be installed in a Monastery and be enrolled with their brethren there. But if they do not prefer to do so, they must be driven out of the cities altogether and be forced to dwell in deserts, from which they formed the name they have applied to themselves.

Interpretation.

Because of the fact that of old many deceivers of the people calling themselves hermits, wearing black and growing hair on their head, roamed round cities, mixing with men and women, and discrediting their monastic profession, the present Canon decrees that if such men are willing to cut off their hair, like the rest of monks who live in monasteries,¹⁷⁰ and to be settled down in a monastery, well and good; but if they are unwilling, let them be driven out of the cities entirely, and let them go and dwell in the deserts, from which they falsely, and not truly and truthfully, came to call themselves “hermits.” (*Note of Translator.* — This word *hermit* in English has somehow or other acquired an initial *h* which does not belong to it. It is derived from the Greek word for desert *eremia*, whence the Greek word in question is *eremites*, meaning “(a monk) inhabiting the desert or wilderness.”)

43. It is permissible for a Christian to choose the ascetic mode of life and abandoning the turbulent whirl of ordinary life to enter a Monastery, and to take a tonsure in accordance with monkish habit, even though he should have been found guilty of any offense whatsoever. For our Savior God said: “*Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out*” (John 6:37). As therefore monachal life represents to us a state of repentance as though engraved upon a pillar, we join in sympathizing with anyone that genuinely adopts it, and no manner of means shall prevent him from accomplishing his aim.

(c. II of the 1st-&-2nd; c. XXVII of John the Faster.)

Interpretation.

It would seem that some persons who wished to lead a monastic life were being prevented from doing so by others, perhaps because of sins they had committed. Hence the present Canon decrees that every Christian (who is under his own control, that is to say, and not under the authority of another person; and see Ap. c. LXXXII) is permitted to renounce and abjure the world, and to go to a monastery and get tonsured,¹⁷¹ even though he may have committed the greatest sin, seeing that the Lord said, “I won’t chase away anyone that comes to me.” So, then, inasmuch as the life of monks is a picture of repentance, just as a pillar is a picture of

what is engraved upon it, therefore and on this account we too are pleased to congratulate those persons who prefer it, and no cause (of any sin, that is to say, and not of any allegiance to authority) shall prevent such persons from carrying out their avowed aim. Canon XXV of Nicephorus, too, says that if anyone who is ill asks for the monachal habit, it must be given to him at once without postponing the time, or procrastinating, and that the grace must not be withheld from it on any account. Both Balsamon and Symeon of Thessalonica say this same thing too. Without an “old man,” however, at hand to welcome into admission and submission, no monk ought to be solemnized, according to c. II of the 1st-&2nd.

44. Any Monk that is found guilty of the act of fornication, or of accepting a woman for the purpose of matrimony and with a view to living with her (as his wife), shall be compelled to suffer the penalty of undergoing the penances prescribed by the Canons.

(c. XVI of the 4th; c. XIX of Ancyra; cc. VI, XVIII, XIX, XX, LX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

If any monk be proved to have committed fornication, or if he marries, he is to be penanced as a fornicator, i.e., for seven years, in accordance with the Canons; the unlawful marriage being first dissolved. That is what the present Canon decrees. As for the Canons it refers to, these are c. XIX of Basil. Read also c. XVI of the 4th.¹⁷²

45. Since we have learned that in some convents (or nunneries) the women about to be deemed worthy of that sacred habit, first dress themselves up in fine style with silken and all sorts of fancy costumes, and, what is more, worn in worldly fashion and ornamented with gold and precious stones, and show themselves off before those who are inducting them, and that while they are approaching the altar they take off all these materials, and that thereupon and without further ado the blessing of the habit is pronounced upon them and they are clothed in the black garment; we decree that henceforth this shall no longer be done. For it is not pious or meritorious for any woman that has already of her own free will and preference renounced every pleasure of delightfulness of life and has embraced the career modeled after God, and has confirmed this with undeviating strict vows, and thus has come to the Monastery, once more in remembrance to pass through this repetition of that perishable and flowing world whereof she has already committed herself to forgetfulness. As a result thereof she is rendered doubtful, and her soul is agitated, like as though billows were surging over it, and turning it this way and that, so that after all they do not even shed a tear, be it only once in a while, nor do they exhibit any contrition in their heart through their body. But even if a tear do for an instant, as is but natural, well up and leap out, it is less on account of any disposition in favor of the ascetic struggle than for their having abandoned the world and the things in the world, and rather with a thought to having others see it.

(c. CXXXV of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prohibits women from adorning themselves in attractive costumes and silk dresses when they are about to become nuns, and with jewelry of gold and gems, and while thus adorned to approach the holy Bema of the church in a convent (or nunnery) for nuns, and there to take off all these vain ornaments and at once put on the black garments of nuns, and receive the blessing of the habit. For it is not becoming in a woman who of her own free will has previously rejected every pleasure of life and has fallen in love with a career modeled after God, and with firm vows has confirmed this choice of hers, and has gone to the monastery thus on a solid basis, to recollect again such ornaments of those things which she previously had scorned and forgotten.¹⁷³ And not only this, but also for her soul to be agitated as a result of these ornaments and because worldly imaginations rise up against her like billows, so as not to let her shed even a tear as she is being tonsured and show thereby that contrition which ought to be in her heart. But even if she should let one little tear

drop from the corner of her eye, it is perhaps just to make onlookers think that she shed it not so much because of her having been deemed worthy of the angelic habit, as because she has forsaken the world and all that is in the world.

46. As touching women who prefer the ascetic life and are enrolled in a convent, in general let them not step outside of it, but if they are compelled to do so by any inexorable (or “indispensable”) necessity, let them do so with the blessing and permission of the abbess. Even then let them not go out all alone by themselves, but let them be accompanied by some presbyteresses and mother-superiors in the convent provided with a warrant from the Prioress. They must not be permitted to sleep outside of the building at all. But men who are leading the solitary life (of monasticism) may themselves step out, when there is urgent need of their doing so, only with the blessing of the one in charge of the monastery. So that those who violate the rule which we have now made, whether they be men or women, must be subjected to suitable penances.

(c. XLVII of the 6th.)

Interpretation.

These Fathers do not want nuns to go away from their convents at all. But if any unavoidable and urgent need arise that compels them to do so, let them fare forth with the blessing and permission of the Abbess; even then, however, not alone, but with other women who are much older both in point of age and in point of prudence. For them to sleep at night outside of their convents is utterly forbidden them in any case whatsoever. But monks, too, when similarly compelled by some urgent and unavoidable need, may go out from their monasteries only with the blessing of the Prior. All those who do otherwise are to be reprimanded with suitable penances, which the Prior or Prioress is acquainted with, whether the delinquents be men or women.

Concord.

St. Basil the Great also commands (in his Epitome of Definitions, Def. 120) that a monk go to no place without permission of the prior. As for any monk that should go away from the monastery without a blessing, he says for him to be deprived of communion (Penance 1); but not even for the sake of visiting their relatives may monks depart from their brethren, and live an unwitnessed life (*in extenso* Def. 32). The second ordinance of Title I of the Novels in proceeding forward makes it a law that even with the foresight and diligent care of the bishop neither monks nor nuns ought to go away from their monastery or convent, respectively, and roam about town, but only through the medium of *menytæ* and *apoctisiarii* make any replies that are necessary, while they themselves stay inside their monasteries (in Photius, Title XI, ch. 4).

47. Let neither any woman sleep in the men’s quarters in a Monastery, nor any man in the women’s quarters of a Convent. For the faithful believers must be remote from any offensiveness of scandal, and must regulate their own life to be seemly and accordant to the Lord. If anyone do this, whether he be a clergyman or a layman, let him be excommunicated.

(cc. XVIII, XX, XXII of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

This Canon decrees that neither may any woman in general sleep at night in the monastery of monks, nor may any man in general sleep at a convent mutually with any of the nuns there. For Christians in general must not cause any others any scandal or suspicion, but must pass their life in a seemly manner and in a manner agreeable to the Lord. But much more ought monks to guard themselves against committing this impropriety. As for women sleeping in a monastery of monks, and conversely for men to sleep in a convent of nuns, this should cause them to be scandalized themselves because of its kindling the innate fire of desire both in the men and in the women; and it should scandalize others too still worse because of its inducing them to entertain improper

suspicious about them. As for anyone that does this, he is to be excommunicated, no matter whether he be a clergyman or a layman.

48. As touching any woman who is the wife of a man who is being elevated to the presidency of an Episcopate, and who by mutual agreement gets divorced from her own husband in advance after his ordination to the Episcopate, let her enter a Convent that is in a location far removed from the home city of the Bishop, and let her be taken care of by the Bishop. But if she also appears to be worthy, let her also be elevated to the office of Deaconess.

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands that any woman who is the wife of a man who is about to become a bishop must first divorce by common consent of both her and him. And after he has been duly ordained, she must enter a convent (or monastery) that is far away from his eparchy, or province, by which expression it is implied that she is to become a nun in some remote convent,¹⁷⁴ but is to be provided with the necessities of life by him (if, that is to say, she is needy). The Canon commanded this to be done, in order that they might not from seeing each other be led to recollect their former conduct and association in life, and consequently be burned up with a desire for carnal love. But if the wife, however, is worthy, she may be made a deaconess. Read also Ap. c. V, and c. XII of the 6th, and the second Footnote to c. XL of the same 6th. From this Canon Blastaris rightly infers that neither ought the wife of deceased priests marry a second time.

49. Renewing this sacred Canon too, we decree that Monasteries that have once been consecrated and established in accordance with the consent and approval of a Bishop shall remain Monasteries unto perpetuity, and the property that belongs to them shall be kept safe in the Monastery, and that they can no longer become worldly resorts, nor be let out by anybody whatever to any worldly tenants whatever. Though this has been done up till now, we nevertheless decree that it shall not be continued in any way whatever. Those who attempt to do this hereafter shall be subject to the penances provided by the Canons.

(c. XXIV of the 4th; c. XIII of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon renews c. XXIV of the 4th, which it repeats *verbatim*, and see the Interpretation there. All it adds thereto is this, that neither shall monasteries be let out by anybody (whether a clergyman or a layman or a monk, that is to say) to worldly men,¹⁷⁵ to manage them, that is to say; and though this has been the practice hitherto, from now on, however, and hereafter it must not be done.

50. From now on nobody, whether a clergyman or a layman, is permitted to gamble (or to play dice). In case anyone be caught doing this, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office, but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

(Ap. cc. XLII, XLIII.)

Interpretation.

These Fathers forbid everybody to gamble, or, in other words, to play dice, or cards, or draughts, or any other such games, no matter whether he be a clergyman or a layman. Anyone that should play these games after publication of this Canon, if he be a clergyman, shall be deposed from office, but if he be a layman, he shall be excommunicated. See also Ap. c. XLII.

51. The holy and ecumenical Council universally prohibits so-called pantomimes and their theatrical exhibitions; afterwards, in keeping with this, also the spectacles of wild-animal fury and of hunters' prowess, and the execution of dances on the stage. If anyone flouts the present Canon, and gives himself over to any of the things herein prohibited, in case he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but in case he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.

(cc. XXIV, LXII, LXVI of the 6th; cc. XVII, LXX of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

With a vengeance the present Canon prohibits the doings of so-called pantomimes, some of whom were Arabs mimicking gestures, while others were Armenians, at other times slaves, sometimes even slapping each other's face, and moving the spectators to uncontrollable laughter. What is here called "spectacles of wild-animal fury and of hunters' prowess" as translated into English (though but two words in Greek, meaning, approximately, "hunting scenes" — translated, however, as above in order to bring out the implications more clearly) are the spectacles¹⁷⁶ beheld when one sees wild beasts, such as, for instance, lion, say, or bears, or other savage animals, fighting, either among themselves, or with human beings who have been condemned to death. For it is a piece of great inhumanity and barbarity to look at such bloodshed and laugh at it. But in addition to these spectacles, the Canon also forbids dances and indecent wriggles performed whether by men or by women on the stage. The stage was a tent within which they used to engage in all kinds of theatrical presentations and pretenses, or where someone would stand up and display examples of skillful acting, according to Title XIII of Photius, ch. 21, and hence they are called actors who at times pretend that they are masters or lords, and at other times that they are slaves or servants. As for anyone that flouts the present Canon and gives himself to watching such displays, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office, but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated. Read also c. XXIV of the same 6th.

52. On all the days of the holy Lent devoted to fasting, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday and the days of the holy Annunciation, let the sacred liturgy of the presanctified be celebrated.

(Ap. c. LXIX; cc. XLIX:LI of Laodicea).

Interpretation.

The days of holy Lent are days of mourning and of contrition and of penitence. But for a perfect sacrifice to be offered to God, and indeed in the commemorations of saints, is deemed by the majority of people to be a matter of heyday, and of joy, and of festivity. That is why they are wont to indulge in merry-making during this period. For this reason the present Canon commands that on the other days of Lent there shall be a celebration of the liturgy of the presanctified,¹⁷⁷ which is the same as saying the second offering of the finished and offered sacrifice, whereas on Saturdays and Sundays, as more hilarious days and not devoted to fasting, likewise also on Annunciation Day, as being the commencement of our salvation and the exordium, and consequently as a feast day and festival, it allows a perfect sacrifice and liturgy to be celebrated.

Concord.

Canon XLIX of Laodicea is in agreement with the present Canon in decreeing that bread is not to be offered during Lent, or, in other words, a perfect liturgy, but only on Saturday and Sunday. Furthermore, c. LI of the same prohibits the celebration of commemorations and birthdays of martyrs on fasting days in Lent, but allows it only on the Saturdays and Sundays therein. Balsamon, in his Interpretation of c. LI of this C. of Laodicea, and, above all, Blastaris, in ch. 5, stich. 300, say that not even memorials for the sleeping are to be held on the other days in Lent, the sole exception being Saturday,¹⁷⁸ just as the rituals conformably prescribe. See also Ap. c. LXIX.

53. Since familiarity with respect to the spirit is superior to the association of bodies, while, on the other hand, we have learned that some persons, after becoming sponsors to children subjected

to the formalities of a holy and salvatory baptism, have entered into a marriage contract with the widowed mothers of those children, we decree that henceforth nothing of the kind shall be done. If any persons be detected doing this hereafter, first and foremost let such persons desist from such unlawful state of matrimony, and afterwards let them be compelled to undergo the penances prescribed to be suffered by those guilty of fornication.

Interpretation.

The present Canon forbids anybody to take to wife the mother of his goddaughter who has become a widow and whose child he has stood sponsor for at holy baptism, since this relationship based upon the spirit, whereby the godfather and the spiritually related mother of the child he has sponsored become spiritually brother and sister, is superior (superior, however, not in respect of quantity and rank; for blood relationship holds as an obstacle only to the third degree of rank — but in respect of quality and familiarity: and see in the section concerning marriage contract, ch. 8). As for any persons that may dare to do this, they are first of all to be divorced from this unlawful wedding, and next they are to be canonized (i.e., canonically punished) as fornicators on account of that unlawful marriage. This same provision, however, which the Canon makes in regard to sponsorship, ought to apply likewise to adoption solemnized by sacred rites and prayers, according to the twenty-fourth Novel of Leo the Wise.

54. In view of the fact Holy Scripture clearly teaches us that which is embodied in the following passage, to wit: *“Thou shall not intrude upon any relative of thy flesh to expose his private parts”* (Lev. 18:6), God-bearing Basil merely enumerated some of the forbidden marriages in his Canons relating thereto, passing over most of them in silence, and pointing out to us on both hands that which is of benefit. For after eschewing the multitude of obscene appellations, as though to avoid defiling his discourse with the words, he dealt with the filth in general terms, in which he pointed out concisely the marriages that are unlawful. But inasmuch as such silence and inability to discern what marriages are prohibited as illicit led nature to get confused, we have concurred in seeing fit to present the facts concerning this matter more nakedly. Accordingly, we decree that henceforth anyone who enters into matrimonial relationship with his own (female) cousin; or any father and his son who likewise take a mother and her daughter, or two sisters; or a mother and her daughter likewise take two brothers; or two brothers take two sisters — shall incur a seven years’ canon (or penance), after they have canceled the unlawful marriage contract.

Interpretation.

Since the divine Scripture clearly teaches us by telling us, “O man, thou shalt not take in marriage any carnal relative of thine,” in reference to this saying St. Basil the Great in his c. LXXVI enumerated some marriages forbidden in his Canons (as, for instance, in his c. LXXVI that of a man taking his sister-in-law to wife; in his c. LXXVIII, that of one who takes two sisters; and others in other cc.), but passed over the most in silence, on the ground of their being too shameful to mention, in order to avoid defiling his discourse with the names of them, but concisely alluded to all unlawful marriages by the general designation of them as filth (but as for what the Council says that Basil said, Basil asserts that Scripture has said it — which is to say, divine St. Paul, who said: “But fornication and all (other) filth, let it not even be named among you,” etc. (Eph. 5:3). As a result of this silence men’s nature was confused by consanguinity, and for this reason we define these matters more clearly in the present Canon by decreeing that from this time forth whoever takes to wife his (female) cousin, or any father and his son if they take to wife a mother and her daughter, or two sisters, or if two brothers take a mother and her daughter, or two sisters — all these persons must first be separated from this unlawful marriage contract, and afterwards be canonized (i.e., penanced) seven years. St. Basil, however, in his c. LXXVIII decrees generally that marriage within forbidden degrees of relationship is to be canonized with the penalty of adulterers, i.e., 15 years. See also in the teaching concerning marriage contracts.

55. Since we have learned that those in the city of the Romans during the holy fast of Lent are fasting on the Saturdays thereof, contrary to the ecclesiastical practice handed down, it has seemed best to the holy Council for the Church of the Romans to hold rigorously the Canon saying: “If any Clergyman be found fasting on Sunday, or on Saturday, with the exception of one only let him be deposed from office. If, however, a layman, let him be excommunicated.”

Interpretation.

By the present Canon this Council forbids the old Romans to fast (either by abstaining entirely from food of all kinds, that is to say, or by eating only dry food in the ninth hour) on the Saturdays of holy Lent (for on these the consumption of wine, oil, and shellfish is allowed), and decrees that c. LXIV of the Holy Apostles must be kept rigorously in Rome too, iterating it verbatim — read the Interpretation of it.¹⁷⁹

56. Likewise we have learned that in the country of the Armenians and in other regions on the Saturdays and on the Sundays of holy Lent some persons eat eggs and cheese. It has therefore seemed best to decree also this, that the Church of God throughout the inhabited earth, carefully following a single procedure, shall carry out fasting, and abstain, precisely as from every kind of thing sacrificed, so and especially from eggs and cheese, which are fruit and produce from which we have to abstain. As for those who fail to observe this rule, if they are Clergymen, let them be deposed from office; but if they are laymen, let them be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

It would seem that the Christians living in Armenia, being told that the Apostolic Canon forbids one from fasting on Saturday and Sunday, and not understanding it aright, were wont to eat eggs and cheese on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent. Hence this Council in the present Canon decrees that the entire Church of Christ, which is spread over the whole inhabited face of the earth, must follow one and the same procedure and fast on these days (by consuming on these days only wine, oil, and shellfish),¹⁸⁰ and just as it abstains during Lent from animals that are sacrificed, so must it also abstain from cheese and eggs, which are fruit and produce of such animals.¹⁸¹ As for those who fail to keep this rule, if they are clergymen, let them be deposed from office, but if they are laymen, let them be excommunicated. Read also Ap. cc. LXIV and LXIX.

57. That honey and milk must not be offered at the Altars.
(Ap. c. III.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that milk and honey must not be offered in the holy Bema on the holy Table, in agreement with Ap. c. III; see the Interpretation of the latter. This Canon, however, improves and corrects c. LXIV of Carthage, which decrees that such are to be offered, in accordance with some local custom.

58. Let no one ranked among Laymen administer the divine Mysteries to himself, when a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon is present. Let anyone that dares to do any such thing be excommunicated for a week on the ground that he is doing contrary to what has been ordered. Thus will he be instructively persuaded “*not to think contrary to what he ought to think*” (Rom. 12:3).

Interpretation.

For a layman himself to partake of the divine Mysteries by himself, i.e., by helping himself thereto, without there being any need of doing so (when a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, that is to say, is not present, according to Zonaras), is a work of presumption, and whoever does it is usurping unlawfully the office of the

priesthood. For this is the function of priests, not of laymen. So for this reason the present Canon excommunicates from the Church for a week anyone that dares to do this, in order to teach him not to think in excess of what he ought to think according to the Apostle.¹⁸²

59. Let no Baptism be performed for anyone that is in an oratory within a house at the time; but let those who are going to be deemed worthy of the intemperate illumination come to the catholic churches and there enjoy this gift. If, however, anyone be caught not keeping what has been laid down by us as rules, if he should be a Clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he should be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands that no baptism is to be carried out in an oratory contained in a private house, but only in catholic, and consequently enthroned, churches. As for anyone that fails to keep this rule, if he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he is a layman, the one who concerned in such a baptism, let him be excommunicated. See also Ap. c. XXXI.¹⁸³

60. In view of the fact that the Apostle loudly proclaims that “*he that cleaves to the Lord is one spirit*” (1 Cor. 6:17), it is obvious also that he that makes himself intimate with the adversary becomes one with him by association. As touching, therefore, those who pretend to be possessed with demons, and who with their vileness of manners are wont to sham the habits of those persons, it has seemed best to penalize them by all means and to subject them to such hardships and pains as those who are really possessed with demons would be deservedly subjected to for the purpose of ridding them of the demon’s energy.

Interpretation.

Some persons, because of the vileness of their frame of mind and with an eye to making a profit, were wont to pretend that they were possessed with a demon, and to go through the gesticulations of persons under the control of demons and make irregular motions by pretense while going about the cities and causing people a disturbance and making a theatrical show of themselves. Hence the present Canon commands that such persons be penalized by all means and be subjected to such great hardships and pains as would be inflicted upon persons really possessed with demons in order to free them from the demon accompanying them, with which these men too who feign themselves to be under the control of demons have become familiar and have become one with them, just as he that cleaves to the Lord and becomes intimate with the Lord becomes one spirit with Him, as St. Paul says. Balsamon states that such persons at various times were actually chained and shut up in prisons by many Patriarchs and Bishops. See also Ap. c. LXXIX.

61. Those who consult soothsayers or so-called “hecantontarchs” of other such fortune-tellers in the hope of learning from them whatever may be revealed to them, in accordance with what the Fathers had formerly decided in regard to them, let them incur the canon of six years. The same penalty ought to be inflicted also upon those who lead bears after them, or other such animals, for the purpose of sport and harm of the more simple-minded, and who tell the fortune, and fate, and genealogy, and other such things to the populace, in accordance with the rigmarole of delusion. As for those who are called cloud-chasers and enchanter and amuletics and soothsayers, if they persist in these professions, and refuse to change their occupation and to eschew these ruinous practices and Greek “rackets,” we decree that they be thrown out of the Church altogether, in conformity with what the sacred Canons also prescribe. “*For what communion hath light with darkness?*” as the Apostle says; “*or what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? Or what portion hath a believer with an infidel? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?*” (II Cor. 6:15–16).

Interpretation.

Christians must not affect any of those wicked things which the Greeks used to affect — divination, that is to say, and charms, and other similar things. On this account the present Canon decrees that those Christians shall be compelled to abstain from the Mysteries for six years who consult soothsayers,¹⁸⁴ and men calling themselves hecantonarchs,¹⁸⁵ and others of the kind, with a view to learning from them whatever occult things they wish (in order to find money or other things they have lost, for instance), just as previous Fathers have canonically penalized them. It also in like manner with the above canonizes for six years also those who drag bears¹⁸⁶ or other such animals along with them for sport and harm of simple-minded persons; and also those who tell fortunes of men and what they are to get in the future and that they were born on a lucky or unlucky day and other such delusive sayings. It likewise canonizes also those persons who were called “cloud-chasers,”¹⁸⁷ and “enchanters,”¹⁸⁸ and “amuletics”¹⁸⁹ and soothsayers. Accordingly, all of them are to receive this canon if they repent and abandon such ruinous, devilish, and Greek “rackets.” If, however, they persist in this wickedness and delusion, and do not give it up, they are to be driven away from the Church of Christ altogether and are to be excluded from the society of Christians, just as the divine Canons prescribe. For what communion has light with darkness? or what union has the temple of God with the altar of idols? what portion has a believer with an unbeliever? or what concord has Christ with the Devil, as St. Paul says? But we must note that the penalty provided by the present Canon is provided for laymen only, as much for those who perform such diabolical works and magic as we have enumerated above, as for those who consult them. For any clergymen and persons in holy orders that should do such things would surely be deposed from office, according to Balsamon and Zonaras,¹⁹⁰ without fail.

Concord.

As regarding persons engaged in divination and following Greek customs, and bringing wizards¹⁹¹ to their homes in order to discover the bewitchments certain persons may have cast a spell upon them, the Fathers of the Council in Ancyra canonize them five years in their c. XXIV, while Basil the Great makes it six in his c. LXXXIII, which this Council followed mentioning as previous Fathers both him and those in Ancyra. Canon XXXVI of Laodicea expressly throws out of the Church those who wear amulets, and prohibits clergymen and priests from becoming wizards, or enchanters,¹⁹² or mathematicians,¹⁹³ or astrologers, and from making amulets. It is mainly this Canon that the Council is referring to in saying “in conformity with what the sacred Canons also prescribe, but perhaps it is referring also to the ones following. For c. III of Nyssa decrees that those who go to fascinators and soothsayers must be well questioned, and if it turn out that they became small-souled (or pusillanimous) as a result of being forced by any unendurable necessity and were deluded by such men, they are to be more leniently dealt with (or canonized), just as are those who have been induced by tortures to deny Christ. But if it be as a result of their having flouted the faith of Christ and of their having failed to believe that Christ is a God and well able to free them from every ill plight and calamity, they are to be canonized like those who have voluntarily denied Christ, which is the same as saying, that they are not to commune throughout the duration of their lifetime, unless at last they separate from the Church, and pray only by themselves alone, as the same Gregory of Nyssa in his c. II plainly states this. But also c. VII of Basil also in dealing likewise with those Christians who have sacrificed to idols and have consequently been separated from the Church of Christians, penalizes sorcerers.¹⁹⁴ The same Basil, on the other hand, in his c. LXV canonizes as willing murderers those who declaim about the fascination and sorcery which they have practiced, and also those who give themselves to soothsayers in his c. LXXII.

62. We wish once for all to extirpate from the life of the faithful the so-called (festival of) the calends, or kalends, and the so-called Vota, and the so-called Brumalia, and the public festival celebrated on the first day of March. Furthermore, the public dances of women, which are calculated to wreak great harm and injury. Furthermore we dismiss also the dances and ritualistic ceremonies performed by men or women in the name of what are falsely called gods among Greeks, after an old custom which is alien to the life of Christians, at the same time decreeing that no man shall put on any feminine costume, nor shall a woman put on any that befits men. But neither shall anybody put on comic, or satyric, or tragic masks; neither shall anybody shout the

name of abominable Dionysus while engaged in squeezing grapes in the wine-presses; nor, when pouring the wine into the casks shall they provoke laughter by a show of ignorance or of vanity, by producing the effects of demoniacal delusion. As for those who from now on attempt to carry out any of the aforesaid improprieties, while well aware of what they are doing, if they should be clergymen, we command that they be deposed from office; but if laymen, that they be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The calends (also spelled kalends) were the first days of every month, on which the Greeks were accustomed to celebrate in order as they hoped to pass the whole month merrily.¹⁹⁵ The Vota and Brumalia, on the other hand, were Greek festivals. The Vota, referring to grazing and sheep, were celebrated in honor of the god Pan, who was supposed by the Greeks to be the patron of sheep and other animals. The Brumalia were celebrated in honor of Dionysus; for the epithet of Dionysus among the Greeks of the north was Bromius, derived from *bromos*, a Greek word signifying a peal as of thunder. By the Romans he was called Brumalius, and his festival *Brumalia*, in the plural, which is the equivalent of Dionysia, as the Greeks called it. So the present Canon commands that such festivals, but especially the public one celebrated on the first day of March, for the pretended purpose of securing good weather in spring, be eliminated altogether from the public and private life of Christians. Nor must public dances in general of women be held, nor festivals and dances by men or women in honor of the name of the pseudo gods of the Greeks. It decrees in addition that neither must men wear women's clothing, nor women men's clothing. But neither must they disguise themselves with false faces and masks that are comic, or, in other words, calculated to provoke laughter, or tragic, or calculated to provoke laments and tears, or satyric, or, in other words peculiar, to Satyrs and Bacchi, who in honor of Dionysus were wont to dance ecstatically and as if demon-possessed.¹⁹⁶ And that no one should invoke, or call upon, the name of despicable Dionysus (who was supposed to be the giver and patron of wine) when treading the grapes in the winepresses, nor laugh and guffaw when the new wine is being transferred to the *pitharia*, as these are called in modern Greek, being a kind of earthen casks. So whoever from now on, after becoming fully aware of these prohibitions, shall attempt to do any of the aforesaid things which are demonish and Greekish, if he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office but if he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Concord.

Note also that in Deuteronomy (ch. xxii, v. 5) God prohibits a woman from wearing men's clothing, and a man from wearing women's clothing: "a woman shall not wear the apparel of a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all who do so are an abomination unto the Lord thy God." The Council held in Gangra does not even allow a woman to wear masculine attire for the sake of supposed exercise. For it anathematizes any woman doing so, c. XIII. Read also c. XXIV of the present Council.

63. With regard to the falsely compiled martyr-lists fabricated by the enemies of the truth, as if with an intention to dishonor the Martyrs of Christ and to lead those paying attention to it into disbelief, we command that it must not be read publicly even in the churches, but that these things must be consigned to fire. As for those who accept them and recognize them as veridical, or those who bestow any attention upon them as true, we anathematize such persons.

Interpretation.

Infidels and enemies of the truth, wishing to bring accusations against Christians' records, composed, it would seem, certain ludicrous and grotesque utterances and deeds with the allegation that the Martyrs of Christ said and did those things, in order that the Martyrs might incur insults as a consequence thereof, and the Orthodox faith be laughed to scorn. Hence the present Canon commands that no such fictitious lists be read publicly in churches, but instead that they be burned up. Those, on the other hand, who accept them as true are anathematized.¹⁹⁷ See also Ap. c. LX.

64. That a layman must not publicly make a speech or teach, thus investing himself with the dignity of a teacher, but, instead, must submit to the ordinance handed down by the Lord, and to open his ear wide to them who have received the grace of teaching ability, and to be taught by them the divine facts thoroughly. For in the one Church God created different members, according to the utterance of the Apostle, in interpreting which St. Gregory the Theologian clearly presents the right procedure in these matters by saying:¹⁹⁸ “Let us have respect for this procedure, brethren, and let us observe it. First, let one man be a listener, as the hearing recipient; another, the tongue; another, a hand; another, something else; let one man teach, and let another man learn; and after short periods, as touching one who learns in a state of obedience, and one who leads the chorus in hilarity, and one who renders service in cheerfulness and willingness, let us not all be a tongue, heeding the most apt saying: “*Let us not all be Apostles; let us not all be Prophets; let us not all be Interpreters*” (1 Cor. 12:29), and after somewhat: “Why are you making out that you are a shepherd, when you are a sheep? Why are you becoming a head, when you happen to be a foot? Why are you attempting to be a general, when you are placed in the ranks of (ordinary) soldiers? And from another quarter Wisdom bids: “*Be not hasty in words; vie not with a rich man when thou art indigent*” (Prov. 23:4); nor seek to be wiser than the wise. If anyone be caught disobeying the present Canon, let him be excommunicated for forty days.

Interpretation.

The present Canon prohibits any layman from teaching openly and in church as a teacher; instead he should rather himself be taught by those who have received the gracious gift of teaching. For, just as there are various members belonging to one and the same body, as St. Paul says, so and in like manner there are various persons in the one Church, in the order in which placed each of them. Hence in interpreting this saying of the Apostle's (in his Homily concerning due order in discussions) he says that one person in the Church must be an ear, another a tongue, another a hand, and another some other member; and neither must all of them be a tongue, or, in other words, teachers, nor must all of them be Apostles, nor all of them Prophets. So, O man, being a sheep, why are you trying to make yourself out to be a shepherd? Being a foot, why are you trying to be a head? Being a soldier, why are you undertaking to be a general? or a leader of soldiers? Solomon, too, says: “Be not glib of speech and ready to say things; nor, when poor, quarrel with the rich; nor seek to become wiser than the wise, or more learned than the learned.” If anyone does things in violation of this Canon, let him be excommunicated for forty days. But if any layman chance to be experienced in discourse and modest in manner, he is not prohibited from answering and teaching in private those asking questions, as Zonaras states, and ch. 32 of Book VIII of the Apostolic Injunctions declare. For they shall be, it says, all taught of God: in which manner Apollos spoke, and taught the facts about the Lord, and in spite of the fact that he only knew the baptism of the Lord (Acts 28:25), and Aquilas and Priscilla, who taught the same Apollos the way of God more exactly (*ibid.*).

65. We command that henceforth the bonfires lit by some persons on the occasion of the New Moon in front of their own workshops or houses, and over which some persons even leap, in accordance with an ancient custom, it is babled, shall be abolished and done away with. Whoever, therefore, who does any such thing, if he be a Clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated. For it is written in the Fourth Book of Kings: “*And Manasseh built an altar to the whole host of heaven, in the two courts of the Lord's house, and passed his children through fire, and consulted augurs, and appointed ventriloquists, and multiplied seers, and he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to wrath*” (II Kings 23:4–6).

Interpretation.

Since, and in imitation of the Greeks and heathen, some Christians used to light a bonfire in front of their workshops and houses, over which bonfire they would leap and pass over it and above it, this Council deposes any clergymen that do such a thing, while, in the same connection, it excommunicates laymen guilty of the same offense. Wishing to show that if such Greek customs when observed by the imperfect Jews sufficed to provoke God to indignation and wrath, how much more they provoke Him when observed by us Christians who are perfect and disciples of the Gospel! It says that King Manasseh built an altar, implying that he offered sacrifices to the host and force of heaven, to the stars, that is to say (and especially to the moon; just as is written in Jeremiah: “to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out libations unto her” — unto the moon, that is to say) within the two courts of the temple, and he passed his children through the fire, and consulted augurs,¹⁹⁹ and was wont to divine future events by auspication,²⁰⁰ and appointed many ventriloquists and seers.²⁰¹ And he perpetrated wickedness in the eyes of the Lord and provoked His wrath. Note, too, that the expression “he passed his children through fire” is taken by the Council here to mean that Manasseh made his children hop over or through the fire, whereas Cyril of Alexandria, in his Commentary of Isaiah, interpreted it to mean that he made a burnt-offering of his children in the fire as a sacrifice to the demons.

66. The faithful are required to spend the time in a state of leisure without fail in the holy churches from the holy days of resurrected Christ our God to New Sunday in psalms and hymns, and in spiritual songs called odes, while taking cheer in Christ and celebrating, and paying close attention to the reading of the divine Scriptures, and delighting themselves to their heart’s content in the Holy Mysteries. For thus shall we be jointly resurrected and jointly exalted with Christ. Therefore during the days in question let no horse races or other popular spectacle be held at all.

Interpretation.

Inasmuch as all of Novation week is reckoned as a single day devoted to the name of the Lord, therefore does the present Canon decree that all Christians during this week ought to remain in the churches, taking cheer and celebrating the Resurrection of the Lord with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, paying attention to the words of the divine Scriptures and partaking of the divine Mysteries. For in this sort of way we shall be resurrected and exalted jointly together with Christ.²⁰² Hence on these days horse racing must not be indulged in, nor must any other popular spectacle, disorderly game, that is to say, or dances, or wrestling matches, and any other such amusement. See also Ap. c. IX and c. XXIV of this 6th.

67. Divine Scripture has commanded us to “abstain from blood, and strangled flesh, and fornication” (Gen. 9:3–4; Lev. ch. 17 and 18:13; Acts 15:28–29). We therefore suitably penance those who on account of their dainty stomach eat the blood of any animal after they have rendered it eatable by some art. If, therefore, anyone from now on should attempt to eat the blood of any animal, in any way whatsoever, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon commands that no Christian eat the blood of any animal, no matter in what manner or by what art it may have been prepared, and even though it be mixed with other foods, whether these be “suntzukia” or any other things. For the divine Scripture of the Old Testament, and especially that of the New expressly commanded Christians to abstain from blood, from strangled meats, and from fornication (and from things sacrificed to idols). If a clergyman should eat this, let him be deposed from office; but if a layman do so, let him be excommunicated. Read also Ap. c. LXIII.

68. As regards the fact that it is not permissible for anyone to destroy, or to cut up, or to turn over to book stores or to so-called druggists, or anyone else whatsoever for destruction any of all the

books of the Old and New Testaments, or of our holy and eminent Preachers and Teachers, unless it be completely useless because of having been damaged by bookworms or water or in some other way. Anyone caught doing such a thing from now on, let him be excommunicated for a year. Likewise anyone buying such books, unless he keeps them for his own use and benefit, nor should he give them away to others to keep, but who attempts to destroy them, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

It is not permissible, says the present Canon, for anyone to destroy or to cut up²⁰³ books of the Old and New Testaments, and of the eminent teachers, or, in other words, of those who have been approved and accepted after tests (for many books have been written, but have been rejected and disapproved); nor must he give these away to book stores, or to persons who extinguish or otherwise destroy books, or to those selling drugs and perfumes, or to anyone else to destroy or make away with them — except only if they have been entirely eaten up by worms, or have rotted and have become illegible from having become too old to be read.²⁰⁴ As for anyone who might do such a thing, let him be excommunicated for a year. Likewise let him be excommunicated who buys such books, not in order to benefit himself by reading them, nor in order to give them to anyone else to have the benefit of them, but in order to spoil them or to destroy them.

69. Let it not be permitted to anyone among all the laity to enter within the sacred altar, with the exception that the Imperial power and authority is in no way or manner excluded therefrom whenever it wishes to offer gifts to the Creator, in accordance with a certain most ancient tradition.

Interpretation.

The holy Bema is consecrated to those in holy orders. For this reason the present Canon prohibits every layman from entering it, except only that person who is the Emperor or King; and he is excepted not as a layman, but as having power and authority and as one anointed of the Lord, who has been permitted to enter it, in accordance with a most ancient tradition, whenever he wishes to offer gifts to God his Creator, and to partake of the Holy Mysteries.²⁰⁵

Concord.

That explains why c. XLIV of Laodicea forbids women to enter the sanctuary of the sacrificial altar. Canon I, however, of Patriarch Nicholas allows those monks to enter the Holy Bema who are not guilty of any transgression reflecting upon the modesty of the monastic habit, in order to light the candles or wax tapers. But even St. Nicephorus, in his c. XV, says that nuns ought to enter the Holy Bema for the purpose of lighting the lights and setting things in order and sweeping it. If, however, a person is not a monk but only a novice, he cannot go into the Holy Bema, according to what Balsamon says in his interpretation of c. I of Nicholas, q.v.

70. Let it not be permissible for women to talk during Holy Mass, but in accordance with the words of Paul the Apostle, “let your women remain silent. For it has not been permitted them to talk, but to obey, as the law directs. If they wish to learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home.”

“As in all churches of the saints,” says Paul the Apostle, “*in the churches let your women remain silent. For it has not been permitted them to talk but to obey, as the law directs. If they wish to learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home*” (1 Cor. 14:33–35.)

“*Let the women learn quietly with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to exercise authority over a man, but to be quiet. For Adam was formed first, and then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman having been deceived became at fault. But she shall be*

saved through child-bearing, if they abide in faith and love and sanctity with sobriety" (1 Tim. 2:11–15).

Interpretation.

According to the words of this Canon and according to the words of St. Paul, women are prohibited from teaching either in holy temples (churches) or outside thereof, for St. Paul does not mean by "church" the temple itself, but a "congregation of people" anywhere; and still more are they prohibited from chanting either in a choir of their own or along with men.

"For it is a shame for women to talk in church" (1 Cor. 14:35). This means that women should keep silent in church, and out of church wherever there is a congregation of people. The fact that the word *talk* is used here, and not the word *speak*, controverts and overthrows the allegation put forward by some persons that only teaching is forbidden to women but not chanting; for talk includes any sort of vocal utterance, and not merely articulate speech. In fact, women are not allowed to let their voice be heard at all within the sacred temple of the church. They may, of course, sing and chant in their hearts praises and blessings to God, but not with their lips.

Before God formed Eve, He said: *"It is not good that man should be alone; let us make for him a helper meet for him"* (Gen. 2:18). This means that woman was created, not to rule man, but to help him and to be ruled by him. Woman is a teacher of every virtue by word and deed within her own province at home; but she is not allowed even to speak or sing within the sacred precincts of the church. Woman's job is to bear children and rear them in the belief and love of God, to uphold the sanctity and sobriety of marriage, and to shun adultery as a thing that is odious to God. By so doing she will be saved, and not otherwise; by leaving this path and failing in these duties, she invites perdition.

"If anyone think himself a prophet or a spiritual agent, let him acknowledge that what I write unto you are commandments of the Lord. But if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant" (1 Cor. 14:37–38). A true prophet or teacher or spiritual agent has the spirit of Christ and does not disagree with Christ's Apostle; he easily discerns and believes that St. Paul's commandments are commandments of Christ. Whoever, on the other hand, does not discern and believe this, yet thinks that he is a prophet or a spiritual agent, is merely deluding himself; he is a false prophet lacking the spirit of Christ.

Teaching and chanting are inconsistent with the nature and destiny of a Christian woman, just as are the priesthood and the bishopric. Eve, the woman formed by God, was the first to teach Adam once, in Paradise, and she ruined everything; that is why women are forbidden to talk in churches. The greatest adornment of women is silence. Let their example be Mary, the New Woman and Child of God, who alone has the honor of having had her speech recorded in history and handed down in the ninth ode of the Church; this refers to her speech and that of Elizabeth. Therefore let Christian women emulate her. The ancient idolaters had priestesses to officiate at the altars and in the temples of idols, in which demons were worshiped; and hence it is that deluded heretics derived this impious custom of theirs of letting women teach and sing and govern in their churches. Shall we Orthodox Christians imitate them? By no means!

It is recorded in the *Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius* (Book 7, ch. 30) that a council of bishops met in Antioch in the third century after Christ from various cities for the purpose of trying Paul the bishop of Samosat, who was rather a sophist and magician than a bishop and who, in addition to other heresies, had introduced a choir of women into the church of Antioch. That council addressed a letter to bishops Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria containing the following phrases: "Having suppressed the psalms to our Lord Jesus Christ on the pretext that they are modern psalms and the writings of modern men, who is preparing women to chant to himself in the midst of the church on the great day of Easter whom one would *shudder* merely to listen to."

Women were never permitted to teach or to chant in the church along with the sacred cantors or in a choir of their own. Female choirs are an unexampled innovation involving many perils and capable of leading to many scandals, for woman's voice is more attractive and more pathetic than man's. The appearance of women in the church choir constitutes a stumbling block; for the eyes and ears of the congregation are at once turned to them, and, becoming intoxicated with the sight and sound of the highstrung melodramatic voices of women, they are languorously effeminized in mind and rendered incapable of enjoying the modest and contrite songs of the Church; thus the church choir gradually becomes transformed into a theatrical chorus!

Canon LXXV of the Sixth Ecumenical Synod decrees the following with reference to church choirs: "It is our wish that those who come to church to chant should neither employ disorderly yelling and strain their natural voices to scream, nor recite anything inappropriate and not suited to a church, but that they should offer

such psalmodes with great care contrition to God, who listens and looks on in secret.” “*The children of Israel shall be reverent,*” saith the sacred saying (Lev. 15:31).

The holy liturgy and sacred hymnody presented in church has the purpose of offering prayers to propitiate God for our sins. Whoever prays and supplicates should be of humble and contrite mind; yelling indicates rudeness and irreverence of mind. But voices and faces of female choirs and the psalmody of European quartets represent a theatrical mind rather than a modest ecclesiastical mind. What is it that is unsuited to the church? Effeminate songs (melodies) and trills (which means the same thing as the warbles of old) and an excessive variety of tones that inclines to whorish songs, Zonaras, an interpreter of the Canons, says.

The children of Israel after Christ are the pious Christians, who should be imbued with fear of God and reverence while within the church. God is not pleased with variety of melodies and voices, but with contrition and repentance of the heart. This is easily understood when we remember that man is pleased to listen to melodies and to look at pretty faces, whereas God looks into man’s soul in the depths of the heart and delights in its reverence, which is manifested by *humbleness* of behavior.²⁰⁶

71. Those being taught the civil laws (i.e., civil law) must not resort to the Greek customs, nor moreover must they appear upon the theater stage, or engage in so-called *cylistrae*, or garb themselves in robes not in common use, either at the time they are commencing their course of study, or at the time they are finishing it, or, to speak more generally, at any time in the midst of their education. From now on if anyone dare to do so, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

Just as the more foolish of the learned men among the Athenians used to fight with their adversaries, as St. Gregory the Theologian writes in the epitaph of St. Basil the Great, and block up the cities and streets, and to do other such things usual to the young sophists, in like manner were Christians who were being taught civil law wont to adopt these Greek customs, and would let themselves be judged on the stage as to who was the best of them in argumentation, and would engage in what were called *cylistrae*,²⁰⁷ or would don clothes out of the ordinary. The present Canon prohibits them from doing any of those things either at the commencement or in the midst or at the end of their law course. Anyone doing such things thereafter is to be excommunicated.

72. Let no Orthodox man be allowed to contract a marriage with a heretical woman, nor moreover let any Orthodox woman be married to a heretical man. But if it should be discovered that any such thing is done by any one of the Christians, no matter who, let the marriage be deemed void, and let the lawless marriage tie be dissolved. For it is not right to mix things immiscible, nor to let a wolf get tangled up with a sheep, and the lot of sinners get tangled up with the portion of Christ. If, therefore, anyone violates the rules we have made let him be excommunicated. But in case persons who happen to be still in the state of unbelief (i.e., infidels) and to be not yet admitted to the fold of the Orthodox have joined themselves to each other by lawful marriage, then and in that event, the one of them having chosen the good start by running to the light of truth, while the other, on the contrary, has been held down by the bond of delusion for having failed to welcome the choice of gazing at the divine rays (whether it be that an infidel woman has looked with favor upon a man who is a believer, or vice versa an infidel man upon a woman who is a believer), let them not be separated, in accordance with the divine Apostle: “*For the infidel husband is sanctified by the wife, and the infidel wife by the husband*” (1 Cor. 7:14).

(c. XIV of the 4th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon declares that it is not permissible for an Orthodox man to marry a heretical woman, or for an Orthodox woman to get married to a heretical man. But if anyone should do this, the marriage is to be void, and this unlawful matrimonial tie is to be sundered. For no wolf should ever be united with a sheep, and the lot

of sinners and heretics with the portion of Christ and of Orthodox Christians. Whoever transgresses the present Canon, let him be excommunicated.²⁰⁸ If, however, both parties were married while infidels in infidelity and community of religion, but afterwards one party believed in Christ, while the other remained in the darkness of infidelity, though the infidel party is still pleased to cohabit with the believing party, let the couple not be separated, as St. Paul says, and indeed even St. Basil's c. IX. For one thing, because the infidel husband becomes sanctified by living with his believing wife, or the infidel wife by living with her believing husband. And for another thing, because perhaps as a result of such cohabitation the other party may be led to piety. "*For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?*" demands the same St. Paul, "*or how knowest thou, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife?*" (1 Cor. 7:16). See also c. XIV of the 4th.

73. Seeing that the vivifying Cross has shown us the way to Salvation, we ought to make every endeavour to render the honor deserved to that which has been the means whereby we have been saved from the old lapse. Hence both in mind and in word and in sentiment paying it adoration, we by all means command that imprints of the Cross on the ground made by some persons be erased, lest the symbol signifying the trophy of victory to us be desecrated by being trodden upon by people walking over the ground. We therefore decree that henceforth those who make the sign or imprint of the Cross upon the ground shall be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

By virtue of the vivifying Cross we have been saved²⁰⁹ and have been freed from the bondage of sin. Hence (says the present Canon) we ought to make endeavour to render due honor and adoration to it, both with the mind, by remembering how many good things we have gained through it; and with words by telling these things to others and thanking Christ who was crucified upon it; and with feeling by kissing and honoring it wherever we see it. But inasmuch as certain simple-minded people mark the figure of this precious Cross everywhere, so far even as upon the ground of the earth, under the pretext of supposed reverence and in order to pay more honor to it, on this account the Council commands that wherever the figure of the Cross be found printed upon the ground it shall be erased and spoiled in order to prevent its being trodden underfoot and consequently dishonored by people walking upon the victorious trophy of our salvation.²¹⁰ As for all those who hereafter make the figure of the Cross upon the ground, let them be excommunicated.

74. That so-called agapae, or love-feasts, must not be held at the Lord's suppers, or at the churches, and that one is not to eat them inside of a house, or to lay a table with accubita (or couches). As for those who dare to do this, let them either cease or be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon is word for word the same as c. XXVIII of Laodicea, which prohibits Christian people from holding agapae, or so-called love-feasts (i.e., banquets held as a token of love, and designed to lead the banqueters to love and union), on the occasion of the Lord's suppers, or, as we may say, in the churches. Nor must they provide soft and high couches thereat, which it calls "accubita," using a Latin word derived from the verb *accumbo*, which means in Latin to lean or recline upon, and thus to sit at table; for Christians were wont to sit on these when eating.²¹¹ As for any persons that might dare to do this, they must either cease or be excommunicated. We must first note that Balsamon opines that by "Lord's suppers" the Canon means here any place dedicated to the Lord, including, that is to say, both the Narthex and the Pronaos, reserving the word "church" for the Temple itself. Hence the particle "or" is not to be taken as explanatory, as Zonaras asserts, but as disjunctive: so that, according to him, one must not eat, not only in churches, but not even in the Narthex of churches.

Concord.

Likewise c. XLIX of Carthage prohibits bishops, clerics, and laymen from holding banquets except when some passing guests have to be entertained. Note that though the Canons forbid the holding of agapae, or love-

feasts, they do not forbid their being held at common houses. Hence c. XXVII of the same Council of Laodicea commands that those in holy orders and laymen shall not take any portions of meals away with them as tidbits when they are invited to such love-feasts. Canon XI of Gangra anathematizes those who scorn those who hold such love-feasts (outside of the church, that is to say) and invite the brethren to assemble in honor of the Lord, and those who make light of the affair by refusing to attend them. Canon LXXVI of the present 6th excommunicates those who sell wine and food stuffs or other merchandise within the sacred precincts. But, besides this, c. XCVII of the same deposes clerics and excommunicates laymen who bring any domestic animal into a sacred temple, except as a result of some great necessity. See also the Footnote to c. LXXXIII of this same 6th.

75. We wish those who attend church for the purpose of chanting neither to employ disorderly cries and to force nature to cry out aloud, nor to foist in anything that is not becoming and proper to a church; but, on the contrary, to offer such psalmodies with much attentiveness and con-triteness to God, who sees directly into everything that is hidden from our sight. “*For the sons of Israel shall be reverent*” (Lev. 15:30), the sacred word has taught us.

Interpretation.

The chanting, or psalmody, that is done in churches is in the nature of begging God to be appeased for our sins. Whoever begs and prayerfully supplicates must have a humble and contrite manner; but to cry out manifests a manner that is audacious and irreverent. On this account the present Canon commands that those who chant in the churches refrain from forcing their nature to yell, but also from saying anything else that is unsuitable for the church. But what are the things that are unsuitable for the church? The expositor Zonaras replies that they are womanish members and warblings (which is the same as saying trills, and an excessive variation or modulation in melodies which inclines towards the songs sung by harlots). The present Canon, therefore, commands that all these things be eliminated from the Church, and that those chant therein shall offer their psalmodies with great care to God, who looks into the hidden recesses of the heart, i.e., into the psalmody and prayer that are framed mentally in the heart rather than uttered in external cries. For the sacred word of Leviticus teaches us sons of Israel to be reverent to God.²¹²

Concord.

David the prophet, too, says, “chant ye understandingly” (Ps. 47:7). In expounding this text St. Basil the Great (Epitomized Definitions, No. 279) says: “Understanding the words of the Holy Scripture is like the quality of meals which the mouth eats; since, according to Job (12:11), ‘The throat tastes foods, but the mind discerns words.’ So if anyone’s soul discerns the power of every word just as the sense of taste discerns the quality of every food, he is fulfilling that commandment of David’s.” St. Basil himself adds (Epitomized Definitions, No. 281) that whoever does not go to chant in church eagerly should either be corrected or be ousted. If there are enough psalms available — many, I mean — the same saint (Epitomized Def., No. 307) says that they should practice chanting in rotation, once a week, that is to say. Canon XV of Laodicea, on the other hand, commands that no one else must chant in church but canonical chanters, or psalms, and parchment-chanting chanters, or psalms, or, in other words, except those who chant with a membraneous or other paper chant. In addition, c. XXIII of the same Council says that psalms are not to wear an oration when they are chanting. Between the chants there ought to be reading (or praying) too, according to c. XVII of the same Council.²¹³

76. That within the sacred precincts no tavern or showcase for the display of perfumes²¹⁴ or of other kinds of merchandise must be set up; for the respectability of the Church must be preserved, seeing that our Savior and God, instructing us by His conduct while living in the flesh, bade us not to make His Father’s house a house of merchandise (John 2:16). He even poured out the coins of the money-changers, and drove them all out of the temple who were making it a market place. If, therefore, anybody be caught in doing what is here prohibited, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The Lord told the Jews (19:46): “*It is written, ‘My house shall be called a house of prayer’* (Isa. 56:7); *but ye have made it a ‘robbers’ cave’*” (Jer. 7:11). Hence, in order to avoid having these fearful words said to the faithful, the Fathers prohibited by means of this Canon the establishment of a tavern, or, in other words, the sale of wine, or of raki, or even of other kinds of comestibles, according to Zonaras, or of perfumes, according to Balsamon or of other kinds of merchandise within the sacred precincts, or, in other words, within the confines of the vestibule and the grounds of the divine Temples and Churches, in order to keep up respect for them. For even the Lord admonished us and said for us not to make the house of his Father a house of merchandise, and He even dumped out the money of the money-changers, or, more explicitly speaking, he scattered their small coins; and turning upon those who were making the temple a common house, he drove them away with a scourge of cords. As for anyone that may do this, let him be excommunicated.²¹⁵ Read also c. LXXIV for the same 6th.

77. That those who have been admitted to the priesthood, or clerics, or ascetics ought not to bathe in public baths with women, nor ought any Christian layman do so. For this is the first thing heathen find to condemn. In case, however, anyone be caught in the act of committing this impropriety, if he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon is word for word c. XXX of the Council held in Laodicea, except only for the penance. It says, then, that those in major holy orders, or clergymen admitted to the Holy Bema, or monks and ascetics, or in general any Christian layman ought not to bathe in a public bath together with women; since this impropriety in the eyes of heathen appears to be an offense of the first magnitude, and the greatest scandal as against Christians. But the Apostle commands us to become sentinels to the Jews and Greeks, and to the Church of God (1 Cor. 10:32). And if, as Zonaras says, merely meeting a woman in general on the street or at a house is enough to disturb the reasoning process, how can the mind of those men who are bathing together with women fail to be overwhelmed and moved to desire. But not even married couples ought to bathe together, according to Balsamon, either at a public bath, that is to say, or in the sea, or in a river. For they possess their bodies for the purpose of procreating children, and not in order to strip themselves and look at their ugly parts. The Canon adds that whoever appears to be doing this, if he is a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he is a layman, let him be excommunicated.²¹⁶

Concord.

The Apostolic Injunctions, Book 1, ch. 9, prohibit the bathing of a woman with a man. This disorderly act is also mentioned by Epiphanius (Haer. 30) and by Clement of Alexandria (Book 3, ch. 5, of his *Pedagogus*).

78. That those being enlightened (through baptism) must learn all about the faith, and on every Thursday must recite to the Bishop or to the Presbyter.

Interpretation.

This Canon too is likewise word for word c. XLVI of Laodicea, which says that those who are getting prepared for enlightenment and baptism as catechumens (see the Interpretation of c. XIV of the 1st) ought throughout the period of their catechization (but what was the length of this period? See the Footnote to c. II of the 1st) to learn the dogmas of the Orthodox faith well and on Thursday of each week, according to Zonaras, they have to recite them by heart to the bishop, or to the presbyters who are catechizing them, lest, being ignorant of the mystery involved in our religion, they be baptized, and lest, being without supporting knowledge as a result of their ignorance, they be easily deceived by heretics.²¹⁷

Concord.

Canon XLVII of the same Council of Laodicea says that those who are baptized while ill must learn the particulars of the faith when they get well.

79. Confessing the divine childbirth to have resulted from the Virgin without confinement (i.e., childbed), as well as without its being induced by seed; and preaching to all the flock, we require those who have done anything that was not proper to submit to correction. Hence, in view of the fact that after the holy birthday of Christ our God some persons are shown to be boiling fine flour (called in Greek *semidalis*) and giving thereof to one another, on the pretext of paying honor to the alleged puerperium of the All-intemperate Parthenometor (i.e., the perfectly immaculate Virgin Mother), we decree that nothing of the kind shall be done by the faithful. For this is no honor to the Virgin, at any rate, who gave birth to the Logos in the flesh who is incapable of being spatially bounded and whose birth was beyond the mind and reason of man, from common knowledge and our own experience to define and subscribe to the events attending Her ineffable childbirth. Henceforth, therefore, in case anyone should be caught in the act of doing this, if he be a cleric, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

Inasmuch as some Christians, actuated by their lack of positive knowledge, on the second day after Christmas boiled fine flour and other foodstuffs, which they ate and gave one another to eat, doing this for the sake of allegedly honoring the puerperium of the Theotoke (just as it is the custom to do in the case of other women who gave birth to children in a natural manner). On this account and for this reason the present Canon decrees that hereafter such a thing shall not be done by Christians. For by such a custom to liken the inexplicable childbirth of the Ever-Virgin to the common and humble birth of us human beings cannot be considered any honor to Her, who beyond the conceivability of man's mind and reason gave birth in the flesh to the God Logos, who cannot be bounded spatially; on the contrary, it is rather a dishonor. For just as we confess the Conception of the Theotoke to have been seedless and to have resulted from action of the Holy Spirit, so and in like manner we also join in confessing Her childbirth to have been one above every accompaniment of any confinement due to what is commonly called childbed, which consists in giving birth to an infant with the accompanying pangs of childbirth and is followed by a flux of blood, according to Zonaras.²¹⁸ Whoever should do this, if he be a Cleric, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Concord.

See also St. Epiphanius (Haer. 79), who in speaking against *Collyridiani* says that certain are wont to place a baked ring-cake on a square bed provided with linen bedclothes, and afterwards to eat it; and that they do this under the pretense of offering adoration to Mary the Theotoke, and say certain other things that are blasphemous.

80. In case any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or anyone else on the list of the Clergy, or any layman, without any graver necessity or any particular difficulty compelling him to absent himself from his own church for a very long time, fails to attend church on Sundays for three consecutive weeks, while living in the city, if he be a Cleric, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be removed from Communion.

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any clergyman in general, or any layman, without being under any grave necessity or difficulty forcing him to stay away from his church, while he is living in the city, fails to attend church along with the rest of the faithful on three consecutive Sundays, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated. For one of

two things must be true: either such a person is not a believer; or, though a believer, he scorns the common offering of hymns and prayers to God.

Concord.

The present Canon is gleaned word for word from c. XI of Sardica — though, on the one hand, the statement that a bishop under no graver necessity or difficulty forcing him to absent himself from his own church is contained as a separate item in the Sardican Canon, which says that bishops must not leave their eparchy for a long time, whereas the present Council has taken it that bishops must not absent themselves from the congregation of the faithful in the church, conjoining this statement with the one below it. Instead of the words “while living in the city, . . . three consecutive Sundays,” etc., the Sardican Council says these words with regard to laymen only, whereas the present Council says them with regard also to bishops. Just as c. XII of the same Sardican Council, that is to say, would have it that even a bishop who is living on his real estate, which is in some foreign eparchy, for three consecutive Sundays, he must join the other faithful in the neighboring church; whereas c. V of Gangra anathematizes anyone that scorns the Church and the congregation of the faithful therein. Likewise also c. XX of the same Council anathematizes those who haughtily disparage the “*memoriae*” of martyrs and the congregations and liturgies thereat. Canon XXI, too, of the same Council praises congregation in the church as being of public benefit.

81. Precisely because we have learned that in some countries, in the hymn called the Trisagion, by way of addition after the words “Holy and Immortal” there are inserted the words, “who was crucified for our sake, have mercy upon us,” but this addition was elided from that hymn by the Holy Fathers of old on the ground that it is alien to piety, considering that such an utterance must be due to some innovating and disloyal heretic, we too, hereby confirming and ratifying the decisions piously made in the way of legislation by our Holy Fathers heretofore, do anathematize those who still persist after this definition in allowing this utterance to be voiced in church, or to be joined to the Trisagion hymn in any other manner. Accordingly, if the transgressor of the rules laid down here be a member of the Clergy, we command that he be shorn of his sacerdotal standing; but if he be a layman, that he be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

Peter Fullo (i.e., “the Fuller”) and the Theopaschites following him were the first to add to the Trisagion Hymn the words “who was crucified for our sake,” after the words “Holy and Immortal.”²¹⁹ These heretics, therefore, together with such addition, were condemned by the Council which was held in Rome A.D. 487 under Pope Felix before the Fifth Ecum. Council, and Peter Fullo indeed was anathematized by it (see the Preface to the Fifth Ecum. C.O. But inasmuch as there are still some successors to the heresy of Fullo to be found reciting the Trisagion hymn together with this blasphemous addition, the present Council anathematizes those who accept it and who either in church and publicly or in private join this addition to the Trisagion. Accordingly, if they happen to be clerics, it deposes them from office; but if they happen to be laymen, it excommunicates them.

82. In some of the paintings of the venerable icons, a lamb is inscribed as being shown or pointed at by the Precursor’s finger, which was taken to be a type of grace, suggesting beforehand through the law the true lamb to us, Christ our God. Therefore, eagerly embracing the old types and the shadows as symbols of the truth and preindications handed down to the Church, we prefer the grace, and accept it as the truth in fulfillment of the Law. Since, therefore, that which is perfect even though it be but painted is imprinted in the faces of all, the Lamb who taketh away the sin of the world Christ our God, with respect to His human character, we decree that henceforth He shall be inscribed even in the icons instead of the ancient lamb: through Him being enabled to comprehend the reason for the humiliation of the God Logos, and in memory of His life

in the flesh and of His passion and of His soterial death being led by the hand, as it were, and of the redemption of the world which thence accrues.

Interpretation.

Since some painters paint Christ as a sheep and lamb, with the Forerunner pointing his finger at him and saying, “Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,” therefore and on this account the present Canon commands that hereafter in the future this shall not be done, but instead Christ Himself shall be painted a full-grown man, with respect to His human character, in order that by means of the human aspect we may be enabled to recall to memory His life in the flesh and His passion and His death, and the salvation of the world resulting therefrom. For, as regarding those old types of the Law, we honor and value them, out of consideration for the fact that they prefigured the truth of the Gospel and of grace, among which one was that of the lamb slaughtered on the occasion of the Passover (or Easter), taken in the image of Christ, the true Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world. But now that this truth and the realities themselves have come, we prefer it and accept it rather than the types.²²⁰

83. Let no one impart of the Eucharist to the bodies of the dying. For it is written, “*Take, eat*” (Matt. 26:26); but the bodies of dead persons can neither take nor eat anything.

Interpretation.

This Canon is nearly the same as the twenty-fifth of Carthage. For since it used to be, according to Zonaras, an old custom to impart the Eucharist, or, more explicitly speaking, the divine Mysteries, to the bodies of dying persons,²²¹ this Canon prohibits this as does also that Canon, explaining that when the Lord gave the mystic bread to His disciples, and through them consequently to all the faithful, He said, “Take, eat.” But the bodies of the dead can neither take it nor eat it. But neither ought one to baptize the dead, according to the remainder of the same c. XXV of Carthage. St. Chrysostom, in his homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews, excommunicates from the Church for a long time as an idolater any Christian that pays and hires women called *moerologetriae* (corresponding to what the Irish call *keeners*, i.e., professional mourners) to lament and mourn his dead relatives, and when admonished not to do so will not listen. On top of this, he also excommunicates even the *moerologetriae* themselves if they dare to go to wail.

84. Closely following the Fathers’ institutions, we decree also as concerning infants, whenever there can be found no reliable witnesses who can state beyond a doubt that they have been duly baptized, and neither are they themselves owing to their infancy able to give any information at all in reply to questions respecting the mystagogical rite administered to them, they must be baptized without putting any obstacle in the way, lest any such hesitation may deprive them of such purifying sanctification.

Interpretation.

This Canon too is likewise word for word c. LXXX of Carthage, decreeing that whenever no witnesses can be found to testify that infants have been baptized (perhaps because they were captured by barbarians and abducted to distant regions,²²² and were thereafter redeemed from captivity by Christians), nor can they themselves give any information that they have been baptized, owing to infancy, or, more explicitly speaking, owing to the infantile age at which they were baptized. Such infants, I say, ought to be baptized without any hindrance, lest any doubt as to whether they have been baptized or not result in depriving them of the purification effected through and by virtue of the bath. And see the Footnote to Ap. c. XLVII.

85. “*By the mouth of two or three witnesses must every word be verified*” (Deut. 17:6 and 19:15; cf. Matt. 18:16), we are taught by Scripture. In the case therefore of those slaves who are being freed by their masters, we prescribe that they shall enjoy this honor pursuant to the testimony of

three witnesses. Those having present knowledge shall offer verification to the freedom which they are bestowing of their own accord.

Interpretation.

Since according to the civil laws the freedom of slaves was a thing which had no honor attached to it, therefore and on this account whenever any testimony was being offered concerning it, five or even more witnesses had to be presented, in order to insure the proof of it. In annulling this, the present Canon decrees that only three witnesses are sufficient to verify the liberation of such a slave: since the Holy Writ says that every word must be established, or, more explicitly speaking, must be verified by the mouth of two or three witnesses. See also Ap. c. LXXXII.

86. As for those who procure and train prostitutes and harlots to the detriment of souls, if they should be Clerics, we decree that they be excommunicated and deposed from office; but if they be laymen, that they be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

Even the civil laws forbid and punish the practices of whoremongers,²²³ or, at any rate, the collection and nurture of whores, harlots, and prostitutes (the Greek language making no distinction between these species of the same genus) to the injury of souls with a view to gaining reward from their prostitution; and much more do the ecclesiastical laws do so. On this account the present Canon excommunicates and at the same time also deposes from office those Clerics who do this (which penalty is a very severe one and double chastisement, since for the most part deposition alone suffices to punish Clerics), while, on the other hand, it excommunicates laymen.

87. A woman who has abandoned her husband is an adulteress if she has betaken herself to another man, according to sacred and divine Basil, who most excellently and aptly extracted this item of knowledge from the prophecy of Jeremiah, which says that *“if a wife transfers herself to another man, she shall not return to her husband, but by polluting herself she shall remain polluted”* (Jer. 3:1); and again, *“Whosoever hath an adulteress (as his wife), is foolish and impious”* (Prov. 18:22). If, therefore, a woman appears to have departed from her husband without a good reason, the man deserves to be pardoned, while the woman deserves a penance. The pardon shall be given to him so that he may have communion with the Church. Any husband, however, who abandons his lawful wife, and takes another, according to the Lord’s decision, is subject to the judgment attached to adultery. It has been canonically decreed by our Fathers that such men shall serve a year as weepers, two years as listeners, three years as kneelers, and during the seventh year shall stand together with the faithful, and thus be deemed worthy to partake of the prosphora if indeed they verily repent with tears.

Interpretation.

The present Canon is composed of three Canons of St. Basil the Great. Thus, the commencement of this Canon is gleaned from c. IX of Basil. It says in effect that any wife who leaves her husband and takes another is an adulteress, just as divine Basil wisely concluded both from the prophecy of Jeremiah which says in effect that if a wife takes another man, she can no longer return to her first husband (without his wanting her, that is to say, according to Zonaras), since she has become polluted; and from the Proverbs of Solomon, who says that any man is impious and wanting in sense who keeps his wife in his house after she has been adulterously employed by another man. The rest of this Canon is gleaned from c. XXXV of St. Basil. It says: If, therefore, it should appear that a wife has departed from her husband without a good reason and cause (which means without the reason based on fornication; so that from this it is easy to understand by contradistinction that a

wife may with good reason leave her husband: but no other occasion is a good reason except the reason of fornication or adultery), the husband deserves to be pardoned on the ground that he has afforded no just cause for this unreasonable departure of his wife, and he can take another wife. But the wife, on the contrary, deserves the penances attached to the commission of adultery, on the ground that she has become the cause of this departure. The pardon which the husband shall receive because thereof is that he may stand along with the faithful in the church and not be excommunicated, though he is not entitled to partake of the divine Mysteries. The rest of this Canon is word for word c. LXXVII of St. Basil the Great. It says: He, however, who (except on grounds of fornication) leaves his lawful wife and takes another is subject to the penance attached to adultery, in accordance with the Lord's decision, which says: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, save on account of fornication, is causing her to commit adultery." By concession, however, if he repent with tears, such a man and his likes are canonized by the Fathers (assembled, that is to say, in Ancyra, in their c. XX; and by St. Basil the Great, in his c. LXXVII) to abstain from Communion for seven years,²²⁴ passing two of them with the weepers, two with the listeners, three with the kneelers, and during seventh year standing together with the co-standers, or consistentes, and thus acquiring the right to commune. Read also the Interpretation and Footnote of Ap. c. XLVIII, and c. XX of Ancyra.²²⁵

88. Let no one introduce into a sacred Temple any beast whatsoever, unless it be that when someone is journeying, and being under the greatest necessity and without a habitation or resort of any kind, he puts up in such a Temple. For if he does not let his beast stay inside, it will perish. But with the loss of his beast of burden and as a result of his being thus left without any means of carriage he will expose himself to the danger of death. For we are taught that "*the sabbath was made for man*" (Mark 2:27), so that through all it is preferable to consider the salvation and safety of the man. But if anyone should be caught introducing a beast into the Temple without there being any real necessity, as has been said, if he be a Cleric, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The present Canon prohibits anyone from introducing into any sacred temple any kind of animal. For sacred things deserve honor and respectful reverence, save only if anyone be engaged in a long journey, and there arise a great need due to wintry weather and a heavy rain, and he has no place to take refuge, he takes his beast into the temple in order to avoid leaving it outside to perish and himself exposed to the danger of death, as not being able to make the journey from here on with his own feet alone, or as being grieved because he has no money wherewith to buy another. The Canon adduces testimony from Scripture, which says that the Sabbath was made for man. This can be taken in two different senses: either that just as the Sabbath was declared a holiday by the law in order to allow the slave a day of rest, and likewise the beast of burden in the service of man, so that it might as a result of such rest be able to serve its master the better, so and in virtually the same way it maybe said that the animal is allowed to rest in the Temple on such an occasion not for the sake of the animal itself, but for the sake of the man who owns the animal. Or that just as the holiday of the Sabbath used to be interrupted in order to enable men to water their animals (Luke ch. 13), or to get them out of a pit if they happened to fall into one on a Sabbath, in order that as a result of all such exceptions man might be served. Thus too is the honor of the Temple temporarily shelved in order to provide for the salvation of the man owning the beast. But if anyone should take any animal into a temple without any such necessity, in case he be a clergyman, let him be deposed; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated. Read also c. LXXIV of this same 6th.

89. The faithful celebrating the days of the soterial Passion with fasting and prayer and contrition must cease their fast about the middle hours of the night after Great Saturday, the divine Evangelists Matthew and Luke having signaled us the lateness of night, the one by adding the words "*at the end of the sabbath*" (Matt. 28:1) and the other by saying "*very early in the morning*" (Luke 24:1).

(c. I of Dionysius.)

Interpretation.

This Canon decrees that Christians must celebrate all the Great Week of the Holy Passion with fasting²²⁶ and prayer and contrition of the heart — real contrition, that is to say, and not hypocritical (exceptionally, however, and especially on Great Friday and Great Saturday they ought to be forced to spend the entire day without any nourishment at all); but about midnight — that is to say, after the midnight of the past Great Saturday — of the coming Great Sunday they must cease fasting,²²⁷ since the Lord has already risen, as is plainly evidenced by the divine Evangelists. For St. Matthew by saying that the women came at the end of the Sabbath to inspect the sepulcher revealed that the day of the Sabbath had past as well as a large part of the night after the Sabbath; while Luke, on the other hand, by saying that they came “very early in the morning” revealed that there still remained a large part of the night until Sunday dawned. Hence, from the statements of both of them it may be inferred that the Lord rose about midnight, the sixth hour having passed and the seventh having begun.²²⁸

Concord.

As concerning the precise time of the Lord’s Resurrection c. I of Dionysius goes into the matter more fully; in fact, it was from him that the present Council derived its information on these matters. He adds that those who broke their fast before midnight were accused of being pusillanimous and intemperate, whereas those who waited with fortitude till daybreak were praised as being magnanimous and temperate. But even the Apostolic Injunctions, Book V, ch. 19, say that Christians must cease fasting at the dawn of the first hour of Sabbath, or, more plainly speaking, at the dawning of Sunday. See also the Interpretation and Footnote to c. XXIX of the present 6th and Ap. c. LXIX.

90. We have received it canonically from our God-bearing Fathers not to bend the knee on Sundays when honoring the Resurrection of Christ, since this observation may not be clear to some of us, we are making it plain to the faithful, so that after the entrance of those in holy orders into the sacrificial altar on the evening of the Saturday in question, let none of them bend a knee until the evening of the following Sunday, when, after the entrance during the Lychnic, again bending knees, we thus begin offering our prayers to the Lord. For inasmuch as we have received it that the night succeeding Saturday was the precursor of our Savior’s rising, we commence our hymns at this point spiritually, ending the festival by passing out of darkness into light, in order that we may hence celebrate en masse the Resurrection for a whole day and a whole night.

Interpretation.

Since we have received it traditionally (as the present Canon decrees) not to bend the knee on Sundays, from the God-bearing Fathers of the First Synod, i.e., St. Peter and St. Basil the Great, for the resurrection of the Lord, we bring it to the notice of the faithful that they are to refrain from genuflection after the entrance which the priests make into the Holy Bema during Saturday vespers; this is the same as saying from the one evening to the next. For taking the night after Saturday to be the precursor and preamble of the Lord’s resurrection, we begin chanting the resurrection hymns called the Anastasimi, and from the darkness of the night after Saturday (which is counted as that of Sunday) we commence the festival, and keep it up until the light of day of Sunday, when we end it, in order that in this manner we may celebrate the Resurrection en masse for a whole night and day. See also c. XX of the 1st.²²⁹

91. As for women who furnish drugs for the purpose of procuring abortion, and those who take foetus-killing poisons, they are made subject to the penalty prescribed for murderers.

Interpretation.

Some women, who happen to conceive as a result of secretly practicing coition with men, in order to escape detection swallow certain poisonous draughts or herbs by means of which they kill the foetus in their womb and thus expel it dead. For this reason the present Canon condemns to the penalty of murderers all women (or men) who furnish such means, as well as the women who take these and swallow them.²³⁰

Concord.

Canon VIII of Basil decrees this same thing *verbatim*. But treating such women more kindly, the Fathers in Ancyra, in their c. XXI, and St. Basil the Great, in his c. II, do not canonize for life, but only for ten years. Drugs for procuring abortion, termed *abortifacients*, are, as some note, and more especially Suidas, the destructive herb named in c. XXI of Ancyra, but the same term is also applied (in Greek) to the foetus destroyed by it. Even in Book LX of the Basilica, Title 39, both women furnishing and those taking these poisonous herbs are condemned as murderesses. Athenagoras, too, in his Apology for Christians, says this very thing. See also Ap. c. LXVI.

92. As for those who grab women on the pretext of marriage, or who aid and abet those who grab them, the holy Council has decreed that if they be clergymen, they shall forfeit their own rank, but if they be laymen, they shall be anathematized.

Interpretation.

This present Canon is word for word the same as c. XXVII of the 4th, and read its interpretation there.

93. After her husband's departure and when he has vanished, yet before becoming convinced of his death, any woman that cohabits with another man is committing adultery. Likewise the wives of soldiers, who, when their husbands have disappeared, get married (again), are subject to the same rule precisely as those who fail to await the return of their husband when he has left home. Nevertheless, in this case there is room for condoning their conduct because there is more suspicion of death. The woman, on the other hand, who has unwittingly married a man who has been temporarily abandoned by his wife, and has been left afterwards because of his former wife's return to him, is indeed guilty of having committed fornication, but unknowingly. Though she shall not be denied the right to marry, yet it would be better if she should remain as she is. If the soldier should ever return in time whose wife on account of his protracted absence has taken another husband, he shall have the right, if he so should choose, to take back again his own wife, a pardon being granted to her on account of lack of knowledge and to the man who has cohabited with her in the course of a second marriage.²³¹

Interpretation.

This Canon is composed of three Canons of St. Basil the Great (for its beginning is word for word his c. XXXI) saying that if the husband of a woman departs and does not come back for a long time, and she, before hearing and being informed that her husband has died, takes another man she is an adulteress²³²; (the part following this is word for word the same as c. XXXVI of St. Basil. Likewise if the wives of soldiers get married a second time, on account of not having heard that their husbands are coming back, are adulteresses. However, these women who marry a second time have some claim to pardon (more, that is to say, than have wives of non-soldiers who have married a second time) inasmuch as their husbands, being soldiers and engaged in wars are more to be suspected of having died than of being still alive).²³³ That woman, on the other hand, who (this part of the Canon is word for word c. XLVI of Basil) takes to husband that man who was left a long time before by his wife, without knowing that he was married, and who afterwards lets him go when his former wife returns to him, has indeed committed fornication, but quite unwittingly, and she is not to be condemned as adulteress. Hence she shall not be prevented from taking a lawful husband if she wish to do so. It would be better, however, and safer for her not to get married. The rest of the Canon is a decree framed by the Council itself. But if the soldier should return from war after years whose wife has got married a second time because

of his having been many years in foreign lands, he, I say, if he so wish, can take back his wife, pardoning both her and her second husband because they married without knowing that he was still alive.²³⁴

94. As for those who take Greek oaths, the Canon makes them liable to penances; and we decree their excommunication.

Interpretation.

Greek customs ought to be hated by Christians. For this reason the present Canon excommunicates those Christians who in accordance with the custom of the Greeks swear, either by the gods falsely so called of the Greeks, by saying, for instance, “by Jupiter” or “by Zeus,” or who swear by the elements, by saying, for instance, “by the Sun,” or “by the Heaven above us,” and the like; just as c. LXXXI of Basil subjects them to penances. St. Basil, however, canonizes eleven years those men who without any great necessity due to tortures deny the faith or eat things that have been sacrificed to idols and take the oaths of the Greeks, just as they themselves, that is to say, believe in them. The present Canon of the Council excommunicated, as Balsamon says, not only these men, but also Christians who have not denied the faith but have taken oaths in accordance with the custom of the Greeks. Wherefore no such oath, nor indeed any other oath taken in the face of an unrecognized or disreputable religion, is to be kept, according to ch. 19 of Title XIII of Photius.

Concord.

Not only are oaths that are taken in accordance with the custom of the Greeks forbidden to Christians, but every oath in general. For the Lord says that we are not to swear at all under any conditions whatsoever, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by Jerusalem, nor by our own head; but, instead of any oath, we are to say only yea, yea, and nay, nay; whatever else we say beyond this is of the Devil (Matt. 5:34–37).²³⁵ This very same thing is affirmed also by James the Brother of God. But then again even the prophet of the Old Testament Hosea prohibits oaths by saying: “*and swear not, As the Lord liveth*” (Hosea 4:15; James 5:12). That is why St. Basil the Great in his c. XXIX says that swearing an oath is forbidden once for all, and so much the more that oath which is taken with a view to injuring someone else. Hence those rulers who swear to injure the ones who are ruled and who are their subjects, are commanded by him to repent because of their having taken an oath all too rashly and not to insist upon those oaths to wreak injury on others. But also in his c. X he accuses Severus of acting contrary to Canon and binding the Presbyter Kyriakos by an oath contravening the legislation of the Gospels. So much for the fact that one ought not to take oaths. But in case anyone should actually do so anyhow, and violate it, he is canonized in a general way and indefinitely in c. LXIV by the same St. Basil to abstain from Communion for ten years. But in his c. LXXXII the delinquent is canonized definitely and according to circumstances: if it were due to violence and necessity that he violated the oath, he is penanced six years; but if he violated it without being under any necessity to do so, he is sentenced to seven years’ penance. In his c. XXVIII, and particularly in Def. 137 of his Epitomized Definitions, the same St. Basil says that it is ludicrous for anyone to promise God not to eat pork, or to sentence himself to abstain for such a length of time from some other food or drink. Accordingly no such uneducated promises ought to be made, and the use of foods should be a matter of indifference. If, nevertheless, in accordance with his c. XVII he allowed Bianor to celebrate the Liturgy notwithstanding that he had sworn not to celebrate the Liturgy, the fact is that he did not do this as a matter of course, but, on the contrary, 1) because that man had taken the oath as a result of violence and under threat of danger; 2) he allowed him to conduct the Liturgy secretly and in another place, and not there where he had taken the oath; and 3) he adds that he must repent because he took an oath. But as for all perjurers that are in holy orders and those that are clerics, they are deposed from office according to Ap. c. XXV; see the Interpretation of the latter.

95. As for heretics who are joining Orthodoxy and the portion of the saved, we accept them in accordance with the subjoined sequence and custom. Arians and Macedonians and Novations, who called themselves Cathari²³⁶ and Aristeri,²³⁷ and the Tessarakaidkatitae, or, at any rate, those called Tetradites and Apolinarists, we accept, when they give us certificates (called *libelli*); and when they anathematize every heresy that does not believe as the holy catholic and Apostolic Church of God believes, and are sealed, i. e., are anointed first with holy myron on the fore-

head and the eyes, and the nose and mouth, and the ears, while we are anointing them and sealing them we say, “A seal of a gift of Holy Spirit.” As concerning Paulianists who have afterwards taken refuge in the Catholic Church, a definition has been promulgated that they have to be rebaptized without fail. As for Eunomians, however, who baptize with a single immersion, and Montanists who are hereabouts called Phrygians and Sabellians, who hold the tenet *Hyiopatoria* (or modalistic monarchianism) and do other embarrassing things; and all other heresies — for there are many hereabouts, especially those hailing from the country of the Galatians²³⁸ — as for all of them who wish to join Orthodoxy, we accept them as Greeks. Accordingly, on the first day, we make them Christians; on the second day, catechumens; after this, on the third day we exorcise them by breathing three times into their faces and into their ears. And thus we catechize them, and make them stay for a long time in church and listen to the Scriptures, and then we baptize them. As for Manicheans, and Valentinians, and Marcionists, and those from similar heresies, they have to give us certificates (called *libelli*) and anathematize their heresy, the Nestorians, and Nestorius, and Eutyches and Dioscorus, and Severus, and the other exarchs of such heresies, and those who entertain their beliefs, and all the aforementioned heresies, and thus they are allowed to partake of holy Communion.

Interpretation.

As for the present Canon, from the beginning of it to the point where it says “and then we baptize them,” it is word for word the same as c. VII of the 2nd. The interval beginning “As concerning Paulianists” to “without fail” is taken from c. XIX of the 1st *verbatim*. For this reason we do not even trouble to interpret these parts here again; see their interpretation there. The rest of the Canon is a decree of the present Council’s own, which says that the Manicheans,²³⁹ and Valentinians,²⁴⁰ and Marcionists,²⁴¹ when they join Orthodoxy, must be baptized, as also the Eunomians and Montanists, according to the interpretation given by Balsamon. Nestorians,²⁴² and Eutychians, Dioscorites, and Severians,²⁴³ have to anathematize in writing their own heresy and their heresiarchs, and all those persons who believe in their heresies, among whom are numbered also the Monotheletes, as well as the Novatians and the Macedonians, and after doing so they are allowed to partake of the divine Mysteries.

Concord.

St. Basil the Great, in his c. XL, says that Encratites,²⁴⁴ and Saccophori,²⁴⁵ and Apotactites,²⁴⁶ all have to be baptized, because their heresy too is an offshoot of the Marcionists and holds their wicked dogmas.²⁴⁷

96. Those who have put on Christ through baptism have solemnly promised to emulate and imitate the manner of life He led in the flesh. As touching, therefore, those who arrange and dress the hair of their head by contriving to plait or wave it in a fashion which has disastrous effects on beholders, and hence offers a lure to unbolstered souls, we undertake to treat them in a fatherly fashion with a suitable penance, while training them like children and teaching them how to live in a sober and sane manner, with the object of enabling them to lay aside the deception and vanity resulting from materiality in order that they may bend their minds towards a life which is perpetually unruffled and blissful, and to enjoy chaste association in fear, and to approach God as near as possible through their purity of life, and to adorn the inner rather than the outer man with virtues and benignant and blameless manners, so that they may not have any trace left in them of the rudeness of the adversary. If, however, anyone should conduct himself in a manner contrary to the present Canon, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

“As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ” (Gal. 3:27), says the great Apostle Paul. Hence the present Canon adds that those who have put on Christ must also adopt his mode of life and practice every chastity and purity, and not adorn their body in a manner that is both superfluous and artificial. On this account it excommunicates those Christians who braid the hair of their head, and comb it and wave it and flaunt it as a lure to those souls who are of weak faith and easily led astray, as much of men as of women,²⁴⁸ and while training such persons with the penalty of excommunication it teaches them to abandon every deception and vanity and embellishment of matter, and of this perishable body, and, on the other hand, to lift their mind up to that blissful and imperishable life, approaching God as near as possible with their purity of life, and preferring to adorn themselves, that is to say, the inner man, or soul, with virtues and benignant manners, without paying attention to the outer man, or body, with such deceptive and vain adornments or embellishments, in such a way as to avoid bearing any longer any sign of the wickedness of the Devil, whom they have renounced through holy baptism.

Concord.

It is on this account that God commands in Leviticus (19:27) that no shall form a topknot from the hair of his head — or, in other words, a lock of hair, according to an unknown commentator. Hence it is that all the Apostles in common in their Injunctions, Book I, ch. 3, command men not to exercise undue care in combing their hair or to perfume their hair, or to braid it into one or more pleats, in order to prevent them from thereby attracting women into love, but to cut their hair off. But in particular St. Paul, with special regard to this artificial hairdressing and the idea of prohibiting it, said that if a man has hair it is a mark of dishonor in him; and in the same vein divine Epiphanius, too, said that long hair is a thing that is alien to the Catholic Church. Note, however, that just as one is forbidden to refrain from cutting his hair for the sake of beautification and good looks, and a bad purpose, so, on the other hand, it is also forbidden to cut it and to shave it with certain circularities roundabout, and, generally speaking, for the purpose of improving its appearance and enhancing its attractiveness. On this account, indeed, it was that as regards the topknot mentioned in Leviticus, Symmachus said: “You shall not shave round in a circle the face of your head.” Aquila, on the other hand, says: “You shall not encircle the crown of your head.” So the conclusion from all these facts is that the laity ought to cut their hair unaffectedly, unpretentiously, and inartificially.

97. As regards those who are living with a wife or are otherwise indiscreetly commonizing sacred places and treating them contemptuously, and thus domiciling therein, we command them to be evicted even from the catechumenates in the religious houses. In case anyone should fail to observe this rule, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

The Canon does not employ the expression “sacred places” here to designate the divine temples, but the habitations connected with the divine temple, such as the so-called catechumenates, in which some persons dwell with their wives and which they treated like other, ordinary places, indiscreetly, that is to say, without drawing any distinction between a holy and a profane place. On this account it commands that such persons be ousted from them. Anyone failing to observe this rule, if he be a clergyman, let him be deposed from office; or if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated.²⁴⁹

Concord.

That is why Book V of the Basilica, Title I, ch. 12, in agreement with the present Canon decrees that those who, on account of any cowardice or other wickedness, take refuge in a church building, throwing away their weapons at the same time, shall enjoy security and safety as far as the boundaries of the church. But they are not to have any right to eat, or to drink, or to sleep inside the temple, but are to stay in the gardens or grounds outside of it, or else in the vaults, or in the courtyards, or in the residences which are roundabout attached to the temple (in Photius, Title V, ch. 2). According to Armenopoulos, no one could remove persons that took refuge within the confines of a church and take them away, except only if they were murderers or adulterers or had ravished virgins (according to ch. 21 of Book V of the Basilica).

98. Whoever takes by way of matrimonial union any woman betrothed to another man, while the man to whom she has been betrothed is still alive, shall be deemed liable to the penalty provided for the crime of adultery.

Interpretation.

An engagement which is entered into in accordance with laws, at the legal age, that is to say, of a man and of a woman, and which has been duly signaled by a gift of wedding rings or other earnest, and solemnized in church, and accompanied by the usual exchange of kisses on the part of the engaged — such an engagement, I say, has the same force and effect as a complete wedding (and see the Footnote to Ap. c. XVII). For this reason the present Canon decrees that anyone taking to wife a woman who has been engaged in such a manner as this to another man, who, as her betrothed, is still alive, let him be penalized as an adulterer, precisely, that is to say, like a man who takes to wife a woman married to another. That is why a man betrothed to a woman is also called the conjugate of his own fiancée, in the same way, for instance, that just Joseph the Bridegroom is called in the Gospels the husband of the holy Virgin, and conversely the holy Virgin is called the wife of Joseph, because even in the old Law a betrothal had the force of a marriage.²⁵⁰

99. And this too occurs in the country of the Armenians, we have learned, to wit, that some persons, roasting pieces of meat within the space of the sacrificial altars of sacred temples, offer parts assigned to priests, distributing them in a Jewish fashion. Hence, with the object of maintaining the unblemished sanctity of the Church, we decree that none of her priests shall be permitted to accept consecrated pieces of meat from those offering them, but shall be content with only what the offerer is pleased to offer, any such offer being made outside of the church. If anyone fail to do so, let him be excommunicated.

Interpretation.

Zonaras, and Balsamon, and Aristenus, and the Anonymous Expositor all in common explain that the Armenians were wont to roast meat inside of the sacrificial altars. But to me it seems that these expositors, failing to punctuate, but, on the contrary, running together the words “roasting pieces of meat” with the words “within the space of the sacrificial altars,” fell into an error. Such was not the meaning intended. For the phrase “within the space of the sacrificial altars” is not to be combined with the phrase “roasting pieces of meat,” but, on the contrary, being divided off with a comma, it should be combined with the phrase “offer parts assigned.” For it is highly improbable and too absurd to believe, that meat should be actually roasted within the space of the holy Bema wherein is situated the sacrificial altar of the church, thus turning it into a kitchen. So what the present Canon says is that this custom which was practiced in Armenia, where some persons would roast meat at home and afterwards offer parts of it in the holy Bema to the priests (just as the Jews offer the breast or a leg or some other part of the animals being sacrificed to their priests) — that custom, I say, is not to be followed hereafter, but neither are priests to have permission to take those parts of an animal which they want, but, on the contrary, must be content with whatever parts a Christian offers them; the offer of such meat, moreover, must take place outside of the church, and not inside of the sanctuary, or sacred Bema, of the church. Hence the sense of the words as set forth by us above becomes evidently manifest from the context. For had it been an actual fact that they were roasting that meat in the Bema, the Canon ought necessarily to have prohibited this, as something highly improper, as it prohibited the offering of the meat. Let anyone guilty of violating this rule be excommunicated. But Balsamon states (in his interpretation of Ap. c. III) that he saw an abbot-priest deposed and ousted from the abbacy because he brought meat and cheese into the holy Bema. See also the Interpretation of Ap. c. III.

Concord.

Note, according to Zonaras, that the Canon permitted priests to take parts of the meat, not in common and on a universal basis, throughout the world, but only in Armenia, and this on account of the custom, which had then come to prevail among the Armenians.²⁵¹

100. *“Let thine eyes look aright, and keep thy heart with all diligence”* (Prov. 4:25 and 23), wisdom bids us. For the sensations of the body can easily foist their influence upon the soul. We therefore command that henceforth in no way whatever shall any pictures be drawn, painted, or otherwise wrought, whether in frames or otherwise hung up, that appeal to the eye fascinatingly, and corrupt the mind, and excite inflammatory urgings to the enjoyment of shameful pleasures. If anyone should attempt to do this, let him be excommunicated.

(No interpretation of this Canon is in the Greek edition.)

Concord.

Inasmuch as some men were wont to paint or draw on walls and boards lascivious pictures, such as women stark naked or bathing or being kissed by men, and other such shameful scenes, which deceive the eyes of beholders and excite the mind and heart to carnal desires, therefore and on this account the present Canon commands that no such pictures shall by any means whatsoever be painted or drawn or sketched. If anyone should make any such pictures, let him be excommunicated, since all the five senses of the body, and especially the first and royalest one, the eyesight, is easily led to impress the pictures of those things which it sees into the soul. That is why Solomon recommends that our eyes look aright at things that are fine and good and beautiful, and that everyone of us keep his mind and heart away from the shameful objects of the senses.

101. The divine Apostle loudly proclaims the man created in the image of God to be a body of Christ and a temple. Standing, therefore, far above all sensible creation, and having attained to a heavenly dignity by virtue of the soterial Passion, by eating and drinking Christ as a source of life, he perpetually readjusts both his eternal soul and his body and by partaking of the divine grace he is continually sanctified. So that if anyone should wish to partake of the intemperate body during the time of a synaxis, and to become one therewith by virtue of transessence, let him form his hands into the shape of a cross, and, thus approaching, let him receive the communion of grace. For we nowise welcome those men who make certain receptacles out of gold, or any other material, to serve instead of their hand for the reception of the divine gift, demanding to take of the intemperate communion in such containers; because they prefer soulless (i.e., inanimate) matter and an inferior article to the image of God. In case, therefore, any person should be caught in the act of imparting of the intemperate communion to those offering such receptacles, let him be excommunicated, both he himself and the one offering them.

(1 Cor. 12:27; 2Cor.6:16.)

Interpretation.

In that time there prevailed a custom of laymen communing, just like priests, by taking the holy bread in their hands, in the manner in which they nowadays receive the antidoron. But since some men, on the pretense of reverence, and of paying greater honor to the divine gifts, used to make gold vessels, or vessels of some other precious material, and were wont to partake of the intemperate body of the Lord by receiving it in such vessels; therefore, and on this account, the present Canon will not admit this procedure, even though it be employed for the sake of reverence. Because, in view of the fact that a man is one who has been made in the image of God, and who eats the body and drinks the blood of Christ, and thereby becomes sanctified, and since he is in fact a body and temple of Christ, according to the Apostle, he transcends all sensible things and inanimate creatures, and consequently his hands are far more precious than any vessel. Hence anyone that wishes to partake of the Lord's body, let him form his two hands into the shape of a cross,²⁵² and let him receive it therein. As for any layman that may receive the body of the Lord in a vessel, and any priest who may impart it in any such thing, let both of them be excommunicated, because they prefer an inanimate (i.e., soulless) vessel to the human being molded in the image of God.

102. Those who have received from God authority to bind and to loose must take into consideration the quality of the sin, and the willingness and readiness of the sinner to return, and thus offer a treatment suited to the sin in question, lest by employing an immoderate adjustment in one direction or the other, they fail in compassing the salvation of the one ailing. For, the diseases called sin are not simple affairs, but, on the contrary, various and complex, and they produce many offshoots of the injury, as a result whereof the evil becomes widely diffused, and it progresses until it is checked²⁵³ by the power of the one treating it. So that a person who is professing the science of treating ailments as a spiritual physician ought first to examine the disposition of the sinner, and ascertain whether he tends to health or on the contrary provokes the malady to attack him by his own actions; at the same time bearing in mind that he must provide against any reversion, and considering whether the patient is struggling against the physician, and whether the ulcer of the soul is being aggravated by the application of the remedy; and accordingly to mete out mercy in due proportion to the merits of the case. For all that matters to God and to the person undertaking pastoral leadership consists in the recovery of the straying sheep, and in healing the one wounded by the serpent. Accordingly, he ought not to drive the patient to the verge of despair, nor give him rein²⁵⁴ to dissoluteness and contempt of life, but, on the contrary, in at least one way at any rate, either by resorting to extremer and stringent remedies, or to gentler and milder ones, to curb the disease, and to put up a fight to heal the ulcer for the one tasting the fruits of repentance, and wisely helping him on the way to the splendid rehabilitation to which the man is being invited. We must therefore be versed in both, i.e., both the requirements of accuracy and the requirements of custom. In the case of those who are obstinately opposed to extremities, we must follow the formula handed down to us, just as sacred Basil teaches us outright.

Interpretation.

After this Council had decreed concerning many different penances, lastly in the present Canon it leaves everything to the judgment of the bishops and spirituals (i.e., confessors), the authority to bind and to loose, saying that they ought to conjecture, or surmise, both the quality of the sinfulness, whether it be pardonable or deadly, and the disposition of the sinner with respect to repentance, and thus to offer the right treatment for his illness; lest by giving persons who are magnanimous and willing to repent lenient penances, and persons who are more unconcerned and pusillanimous on the contrary extreme penances, they fail to correct either the former or the latter, but rather wind up by losing both. Because sin is so complex and various, and grows so fast, that it resists, that is, overcomes, the power and art of the spiritual physician (or, it may be, so complex and various is sin, and so fast does it grow, before it can be checked and overcome by the art of the spiritual physician). So, for this reason, the physician of souls must first and foremost conjecture the disposition and inclination of the sinner, and discern whether he loves the health of his soul with fervid repentance, or, on the contrary, whether he actually is coaxing sin to attack him, and how he behaves in regard to sin, whether he is not opposed to the salutary remedies which he is giving him (as is done by the demented who are opposed to the salutary remedies of physicians of bodies), and whether he is not actually aggravating, or increasing, the lesion of sin with such measures. The confessor, I say, must first of all make conjectures respecting all these things, and thus with due proportion mete out mercy, mitigating, or lightening, the penances in dealing with the man who is unconcerned and pusillanimous, but intensifying, or making them heavier, in the case of a man who is magnanimous; and doing both for mercy's sake, in order, on the one hand, to cleanse the magnanimous man from sin, and, on the other hand, to avoid making the pusillanimous man's case worse. And, generally speaking, the whole aim both to God and to the confessor is simply this, to bring about the return of the straying sheep, to cure the one who has been wounded or hurt by the figurative serpent commonly called the Devil, and neither to drive him to despair by heavy penalties, nor again to let him take the bit in his teeth, like a horse, by light penalties, and hence encourage him to contemptuousness and unconcern, but in every possible way, whether with austere or with mild remedies, to endeavor to restore the sinner to health and free him from the wounds of sin, so that he may taste the fruits of repentance, and with wisdom managing to help him to ascend

to the splendor of the Holy Trinity above (which is the kingdom of heaven, according to St. Gregory the Theologian). So, then, the confessor must have knowledge of both requirements (just as is said *verbatim* in c. III of Basil), to wit, accuracy and custom.²⁵⁵ In case sinners do not care to observe this accuracy, on account of which they are compromisingly allowed a reduction of years and of penances for their sin, let him at least command them to observe the custom, the entire number of years, that is to say, and the penances prescribed by the Canons.

Seventh Ecumenical Council.

The holy and Ecumenical Seventh Council was held in Nicaea, Bithynia, the second to convene in that city, during the reign of Constantine and his mother Irene, A.D. 783.²⁵⁶ Of the Fathers attending it, 350 were Orthodox,²⁵⁷ but seventeen others joined it who had formerly been iconomachs, but who later repented and were accepted by it. So that in all there were 367. Outstanding and distinguished ones among them were Tarasius the Patriarch of Constantinople, Peter the Archpresbyter of Rome, and Peter, he too another presbyter and the abbot of the monastery of St. Sabbas in Rome, all of them acting as representatives of Pope Adrian. Thomas the Syncellus and hieromonach and John the hieromonach,²⁵⁸ filling the places of the Apostolic thrones, or, more explicitly, acting instead of Apollinarius of Alexandria,²⁵⁹ Theodore of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem.²⁶⁰ The monks also exercised great influence in this Council, seeing that there were 136 of them present as archimandrites of monasteries. This Council was assembled against the ungodly iconomachs who used to disparage the Christians. The Council anathematized them, and especially Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas, the pseudopatriarchs who held office during the time of the iconomachs, on the ground that they not only refused to kiss and bow down in adoration before the holy icons, but they even called them idols,²⁶¹ and burned them up, and trod them underfoot, and dragged them about in the streets, and in every way treated them insultingly and contemptuously. After abrogating (Act 6) the falsely so-called definition of the pseudocouncil held in the reign of Constantine Copronymus in Blachernae, with deacons Epiphanius and John reading it; and after proclaiming St. Germanus, and John Damascene, and George Cyprius Orthodox and Saints, it issued a definition in its Act 7 worded as follows: "We define the rule with all accuracy and diligence, in a manner not unlike that befitting the shape of the precious and vivifying Cross, that the venerable and holy icons, painted or mosaic, or made of any other suitable material, be placed in the holy churches of God upon sacred vessels and vestments, walls and panels, houses and streets, both of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ, and of our intemperate Lady the holy Theotoke, and also of the precious Angels,²⁶² and of all Saints. For the more frequently and oftener they are continually seen in pictorial representation, the more those beholding are reminded and led to visualize anew the memory of the originals which they represent and for whom moreover they also beget a yearning in the soul of the persons beholding the icons. Accordingly, such persons are prompted not only to kiss these and to pay them honorary adoration, what is more important, they are imbued with the true faith which is reflected in our worship which is due to God alone and which befits only the divine nature (worship is defined by St. Basil the Great as being an intense and continual and non-avolating culture respecting the object worshiped: see his *Epitomized Definitions*, p. 850). But this worship must be paid in the way suggested by the form of the precious and vivifying Cross, and the holy Gospels, and the rest of sacred institutions, and the offering of wafts of incense, and the display of beams of light, to be

done for the purpose of honoring them, just as it used to be the custom to do among the ancients by way of manifesting piety. For any honor paid to the icon (or picture) redounds upon the original,²⁶³ and whoever bows down in adoration before the icon, is at the same time bowing down in adoration to the substance (or hypostasis) of the one therein painted.²⁶⁴ For thus the doctrine of our Holy Fathers, it was the tradition of the universal Church. The 7th Ec. C. is recognized by the c. of Holy Wisdom and all interpreters of the c. The proceedings of this 7th are found in vol. 11 of the Synods, pg. 719.

Canons.

1. For those who have been allotted a sacerdotal dignity, the representations of canonical ordinances amount to testimonies and directions. Gladly accepting these, we sing to the Lord God with David, the spokesman of God, the following words: *“I have delighted in the way of thy testimonies as much as in all wealth,”* and *“thy testimonies which thou hast commanded witness righteousness, . . . Thy testimonies are righteousness forever: give me understanding, and I shall live”* (Ps. 119:14, 138 and 144). And if forever the prophetic voice commands us to keep the testimonies of God, and to live in them, it is plain that they remain unwavering and rigid. For Moses, too, the beholder of God, says so in the following words: *“To them there is nothing to add, and from them there is nothing to remove”* (Deut. 12:32). And the divine Apostle Peter, exulting in them, cries: *“which things the angels would like to peep into”* (1 Pet. 1:12). And Paul says: *“Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you any gospel besides that which ye have received, let him be anathema”* (Gal. 1:8). Seeing that these things are so and are attested to us, and rejoicing at them *“as one that findeth great spoil”* (Ps. 119:162), we welcome and embrace the divine Canons, and we corroborate the entire and rigid fiat of them that have been set forth by the renowned Apostles, who were and are trumpets of the Spirit, and those both of the six holy Ecumenical Councils and of the ones assembled regionally for the purpose of setting forth such edicts, and of those of our holy Fathers. For all those men, having been guided by the light dawning out of the same Spirit, prescribed rules that are to our best interest. Accordingly, we too anathematize whomsoever they consign to anathema; and we too depose whomsoever they consign to deposition; and we too excommunicate whomsoever they consign to excommunication; and we likewise subject to a penance anyone whom they make liable to a penance. For *“Let your conduct be free from avarice; being content with such things as are at hand”* (Heb. 13:5), explicitly cries the divine apostle Paul, who ascended into the third heaven and heard unspeakable words (2 Cor. 12:2-4).

(c. I of the 4th; c. II of the 6th.)

Interpretation.

The divine Canons are testimonies²⁶⁵ so far as concerns those in holy orders in that they attest and reveal to them how they ought to conduct themselves both publicly and privately. They are directions in that when they are observed by them they direct and steer their life. Joyfully accepting these Canons through the present Canon, this Council offers up those prophetic words of David as a song to God which run as follows in paraphrase: *“I have rejoiced, O Lord, in Thy testimonies just as I should rejoice if I owned all the wealth of the world. And Thou hast commanded me to keep Thy testimonies forever, wherewith be Thou pleased to wisen me, and I shall live in them.”* And if this utterance of the prophet’s com-

mands us to keep the testimonies of God forever, and to live in them, it is manifest that they themselves are permanent and rigid (for, according to Zonaras, the Greek word for “unwavering” denotes the weak and fragile branch of a fig-tree; unwavering things, therefore, are things that are solid and unmovable). That is the reason, too, why Moses says that no one is to add anything to the words of the Law, nor to take anything out of them. The Coryphaeus of Apostles, St. Peter, exulting in them, says that the angels would like to look into those things, viz. which the apostles preaching the gospel in a spirit of God have revealed to us. And St. Paul anathematizes anyone, even though he be an angel, that preaches anything as gospel that lies outside of what has been handed down and delivered as the faith. For this reason, rejoicing in the divine Canons just as soldiers rejoice when they happen to find a great amount of booty on their vanquished enemies, as David says, we too joyfully embrace them, and corroborate them, and confirm them all, including those set forth by the holy apostles, as well as those of the six ecumenical councils and of the regional councils, and those of the individual Fathers; anathematizing those whom they anathematize; deposing those whom they depose; and excommunicating those whom they excommunicate — and, generally speaking, disciplining those whom they discipline. For, just as those who are not of an avaricious disposition are content with whatever money they have at hand, as St. Paul says, so too do we refrain from adding or removing anything, but, on the contrary, content ourselves with the Canons²⁶⁶ which have been enacted by the holy Fathers. See also c. I of the 4th, and what has been said in the beginning of this book in the Prolegomena to the Canons.

2. Since as a matter of fact we are binding ourselves to God by chanting: “*I will meditate in thy rights; I will not forget thy words*” (Ps. 119:16), it behooves all Christians to keep this for their own salvation, but more eminently so those invested with a sacerdotal dignity. Hence we decree that anyone who is about to be promoted to the rank of bishop shall by all means know the psalter, in order that he may be able to admonish all the clergy about him to become initiated; and that he be scrupulously examined by the metropolitan as to whether he is cheerfully willing to read searchingly and not cursorily the sacred Canons and the holy Gospel, the book of the divine Apostle, and all the divine Scripture, and in accordance with the divine commandments to hold intercourse with and teach the laity about him. For the essentiality of our prelacy is the words taught by God, or, at any rate, the true science of the divine Scriptures, just as great Dionysius declared. But if he should be in doubt, and not care to do and teach thus, he must not be ordained. For God has said prophetically: “*Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee from acting as my priest*” (Hos. 4:6).

(c. XXIV of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

While all Christian laymen ought to meditate in the rights of God, and not forget His words, just as they chant and promise every day with the prophet, this is eminently so in the case of those in holy orders. For this reason the present Canon decrees that anyone who intends to become a bishop must without fail be acquainted with the thoughts in the psalter, in order to teach his laity therefrom so that they may learn them too. Likewise any such person must be examined by the metropolitan scrupulously as to whether he is cheerfully willing to read, not superficially and as to the words alone, but with regard to depth and with understanding of the thoughts, the sacred Canons, which we have enumerated above, the holy Gospel, the

Apostle, and all the divine Scripture, and not only to know these, but also to conduct himself both publicly and privately just as they prescribe, and to teach his fold in accordance with them. For, as Dionysius the Areopagite²⁶⁷ declares, the essence and structure of the ecclesiastical prelacy is the words taught by God., or, more precisely speaking, the true comprehension and exact knowledge of the divine Scriptures. If not, and he is in doubt, and is not minded to do these things himself, and to teach others too, let him not be made a bishop; for God says through the prophet Hosea (in paraphrase): “Since thou hast spurned knowledge of my laws, I too will spurn thee as a priest of mine.”

Concord.

In agreement with the present Canon, c. XXIV of Carthage expresses the following decree: that those who intend to ordain a bishop, or a clergyman, must first teach him the Canons of the sacred Councils, in order that, by acting in accordance with the definitions and canons of the Fathers, they who are to be ordained may not repent later, as transgressors of them.²⁶⁸ For this reason, too, God commands the one who has become a ruler of the people not only to read the book of Deuteronomy throughout his life, in order to learn therefrom to fear the Lord, and to keep all His commandments, but He even makes it necessary for him to copy it himself with his own hand. “*And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write himself a copy of this Deuteronomy in a book obtained from the priests who are Levites*” (Deut. 17:18). And the reason why He commands him to copy it himself is that a person who merely reads it easily forgets the thoughts that are read, whereas a person who also writes it impresses the thoughts upon his memory, because he takes time and leisure to think about each particular one of them, and until he has comprehended a sentence well he takes care not to write another: thus does Philo Judaeus interpret the matter. And if God compels secular rulers to do this, much more does He the ecclesiastical prelates who are the shepherds of his people.

3. Every appointment of a bishop, or of a presbyter, or of a deacon made by (civil) rulers shall remain void in accordance with the Canon which says: “If any bishop comes into possession of a church by employing secular rulers, let him be deposed from office, and let him be excommunicated. And all those who communicate with him too.” For it behooves anyone who is going to be promoted to a bishopric to be appointed by bishops, as was decreed by the holy Fathers assembled in Nicaea, in the Canon saying: “It is most fitting that a bishop should be installed by all those in his province. But if such a thing is difficult either because of the urgency of circumstances, or because of the distance to be traveled, at least three should meet together somewhere and by their votes combined with those of the ones absent and joining in the election by letter they should carry out the ordination thereafter. But as for the ratification of the proceedings, let it be entrusted in each province to the Metropolitan.”

(Ap. cc. I, II, XXX, LXI; c. IV of the 1st; cc. V, XIII of Laodicea; c. LIX of Carthage; c. VII of Timothy.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon is composed of Ap. c. XXX and c. IV of the 1st. Since we have already explained these Canons, see the interpretation of them there, in order to spare us from repeating the same things about them here. The only thing in this Canon that is not found there, is that every appointment or election of a bishop, or of a presbyter, or of a deacon that

is made by authority and power of civil rulers shall remain void and invalid; and that bishops are to be elected by bishops, in accordance with a process previously described; that is to say, on the other hand, that the fact that both presbyters and deacons are elected is made plain indeed by the present Canon, concerning which see the Footnote to Ap. c. II; as for the fact, moreover, that Christians ought to vote subsequently after the bishops for those about to be admitted to holy orders, this is made plain in the Interpretation of Ap. c. LXI. See also Ap. cc. I and II, and the Footnote to c. V of Laodicea.

4. The preacher of the truth Paul, the divine Apostle, as if laying down a Canon to the presbyters of the Ephesians, but rather to every sacerdotal aggregate, spoke openly and aboveboard as follows: *“I have coveted no one’s silver, or gold, or apparel. I have shown you in all things that by thus laboring you ought to assist the weak, and remember that . . . It is more blissful to give than to receive”* (Acts 20:33, 35). Wherefore we too, having become pupils and disciples of His, decree that no bishop shall devise or think of ways of making shameful profits, alleging lame excuses such as are offered in the case of sins in general, to the effect that bishops, or clergymen, or monks serving under him demand gold, or silver, or any other commodity. For the Apostle says: *“The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God”* (1 Cor. 6:9), and *“children ought not to lay up treasure for their parents, but parents for their children”* (2 Cor. 12:14). If, therefore, on account of any demand for gold, or for any other commodity, or on account of any idiosyncrasy,²⁶⁹ anyone be found to be excluding from the liturgy and excommunicating anyone among the clergymen under him, or shutting a venerable temple, to prevent liturgies of God from being conducted therein, venting his rage upon insentient objects, he himself is in reality insentient, and will become subject to self-torture, and *“his mischief shall return upon his own head”* (Ps. 7:16), as transgressor of a commandment of God, and of the Apostolic Ordinances. For Peter, the coryphaean summit of the Apostles, also commands: *“Tend the flock of God which is among you, not coercingly, but voluntarily after the manner of God. Not for the sake of shameful profits, but willingly. Not as lording it over the charges allotted to you, but as having become models for the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear in person, ye shall receive the reward of an unwithering crown of glory”* (1 Pet. 5:2-4).

Interpretation.

Because great St. Paul both by word and by deed commanded the bishops of the Ephesians, and through them all bishops subsequent thereto, not to desire silver, or gold, or clothes, but by labor of their own hands to assist the weak and needy, and to bear in mind that it is more blissful to give than to receive,²⁷⁰ therefore the present Canon commands that no prelate or bishop shall seek to extort gold or silver or anything else of value, with a view to shameful profits, from bishops, or clergymen, or monks that are subject to his jurisdiction, since any such demand is unjust and unrighteous, but *“the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God,”* according to the Apostle; and since children are not obliged to amass treasure to give to their parents, but, on the contrary, parents ought to give to their children. So any bishop who is found suspending or excommunicating any priest or clergyman, or closing a church in order to obtain money or on account of any other personal animus, let him suffer what he is doing, to wit, let him be suspended, and *“let him be excommunicated, if he is a bishop by his Metropolitan, or if he is a Metropolitan by his Patriarch.* For the Coryphaeus of Apostles St. Peter gives the following orders to prelates: *“Tend the flock of God, not co-*

ercingly and tyrannically, but voluntarily and after the manner of God; not for the sake of shameful profits, but with cheerful willingness; not as domineering over the clergy, but as furnishing models and examples to the flocks, in order that when the chief shepherd Christ becomes manifest in His second advent, you may receive from Him the reward of an unwithering crown of glory.” Read also Ap. c. XXIX.

5. It is a deadly sin when any sinners remain incorrigible. But what is worse than this happens if they insist upon rising up against piety and truth, preferring Mammon to obedience to God, and failing to cling fast to His canonical ordinances. Among those persons God is not the Lord, unless by any chance they be humiliated and again become sober enough to see their own mistake. For it rather behooves them to approach God, and with a contrite heart to ask for remission of this particular sin, and for pardon, instead of pluming themselves on their lawless behavior. For “*the Lord is nigh unto them that are contrite of heart*” (Ps. 34:18). As for those boasting that by giving gold they have obtained some rank in the Church and trusting to this wicked custom, which is alien to God and alienates men from God, and from every holy order; and as a result thereof with an impudent face and unbridled mouth dishonoring by reproachful words those who have been elected and installed through virtuousness of life by the Holy Spirit, without the giving of any money, those who have been doing this at first, are to receive the lowest rank in their own battalion. But if they insist and persist, they are to be corrected by means of a penance. If, on the other hand, anyone ever should appear to have done this with a view to ordination, let him suffer in accordance with the Apostolic Canon which says: “If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon gain possession (of this dignity by means of money, let both him and the one who ordained him be deposed from office, and excised, or cut off, altogether from communion, as was Simon by me Peter.” Likewise also in accordance with the second Canon of the devout Fathers assembled in Chalcedon, which says: “If any bishop ordain anyone for money, and make merchandise of the unvendible grace, and perform the ordination of a Bishop, Auxiliary Bishop, Presbyter, Deacon, or anyone on the roll of the Clergy, with a view to gain; or nominate any Steward, Ecclisic, or Paramonarius, or anyone else that belongs to the canon, for money, with the object of making a shameful profit for himself: let him who is found guilty of having undertaken this stand in peril of his office; and let him who has been thus ordained have no benefit from such traffic in ordinations or nominations, but, on the contrary, let him be without any claim upon the dignity or job which he has thus obtained by means of money. If, in fact, anyone even appear as a middleman or factor or intermediary for such shameful and illicit deals, let him too, if he be a clergyman, forfeit his office; but if he be a layman or a monk, let him be anathematized.”

(Ap. c. XXIX; c. II of the 4th; John 1:16.)

Interpretation.

Some persons who intended to get themselves enrolled in the clergy of a certain church, offered money to it of their own free will with a God-loving frame of mind, not in order to get the clergyship therewith, but as devoting or consecrating the money to God, according to Balsamon. But later, boasting of giving the money, and preferring mammon and wealth to the sacred canons, they sought and asked for chief seats (Matt. 23:6), and shamelessly and brazenly reproached those clergymen who, being elected by the Holy Spirit, on account of their virtuous conduct in life, were enrolled in the clergy without giving any money. So for this reason the present Canon commands that those who boast of this money and reproach

the others because they gave none be reduced to the lowest rank of the clergymen of the same order. But if they persist in this any further, they are to be corrected by the chief priest with a suitable severer penalty. Referring to the passage in the Epistle of St. John, these Fathers call the incorrigible boasting of such clergymen²⁷¹ about money a deadly sin; and they call their shameless and insolent treatment of the other clergymen a worse than deadly sin, and assert that among those men the God is no Lord, in accordance with the Bible; while, on the other hand, they call their giving of money lawless, not in itself — for it was good at first and God-loving — but on account of the later boasting of the givers and their brazen shamelessness. So take care not to take this gift of money for ordination, since this Canon appears to consist of two parts. The first part forbids them to give money, not to be ordained, for this comes in later but to get themselves enrolled in the parish of a certain church, and afterwards to wax insolent and to hold the poor and reverent clergymen in contempt: so it is this kind of giving that it forbids as lawless. Then it goes on to present the second part, by saying that if they should offer such money for ordination they must be deposed from office, in accordance with Canons already issued. But this Canon adds that whoever should give money to be ordained a clergyman or a priest is to receive the penalties provided by Ap. c. XXIX and c. II of the 4th, both of which are quoted *verbatim*: and see the Interpretation of them there.

6. Since there actually is a Canon which says canonical discussions must be held twice a year in each province through an assembly of Bishops, but on account of the inconvenience and the lack of means of traveling those who were called upon to assemble had to face, the devout Fathers of the Sixth Council decreed that one assembly be held each year, by all means and on any pretext, and wrong things be corrected: therefore we renew this latter Canon. Accordingly, if any (civil) ruler be found attempting to prevent this, let him be excommunicated. If, on the other hand, any one of the Metropolitans should fail to see that this is done, except in case of necessity and violence, or some reasonable excuse, he is to be liable to the penalties. When a Council has been convoked in regard to canonical and evangelical matters, the Bishops assembled must engage in meditation and careful consideration of how the divine and vivifying commandments of God are to be kept. For “*in keeping them there is great reward*” (Ps. 19:11); and seeing that “*the commandment is a lamp; and the law is a light and reproof with instruction in the way of life*” (Prov. 6:23), and “*the commandment of the Lord shineth afar, illuminating the eyes*” (Ps. 19:8). But no Metropolitan shall have any right to demand a beast or other possession among the chattels which a Bishop takes along with him. But if he be proved to have done so, he shall pay back the value of it fourfold.

(App. c. XXXVII; c. V of the 1st; c. XIX of the 4th; c. VIII of the 6th.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon renews c. VIII of the 6th, which decrees that inasmuch as two Councils of bishops cannot be held each year in regard to ecclesiastical canonical questions, as the Canons prescribe — Ap. c. XXXVII, that is to say, c. V of the 1st, and c. XIX of the 4th — owing to the difficulty of traveling, one Council must be held by all means every year, in order to correct incidental mistakes. But this Canon adds that any one among the (civil) rulers that tries to prevent the holding of such a Council is to be excommunicated; and that any Metropolitan that is remiss in regard to this (unless it be prevented by reason of some necessity or logical reason), he shall become liable to penalties. But since the object of holding a

Council is to investigate whether the canonical rules are being observed, relating, say, to excommunications, administrations of ecclesiastical affairs, and other matters, as well as evangelical decrees, therefore the bishops assembled must see to it that the vivifying commandments of the Gospel are kept by their laities, because for the keeping of them a great reward is given, according to David; and because, furthermore, the commandment and law of God are a lamp and a light, and a way of life, according to the author of the Book of Proverbs. But no Metropolitan has any permission to demand of any bishop of his any animal or any other thing that he may have with him: but if he should nevertheless do so, he must pay the bishop the fourfold amount of its value. See also Ap. c. XXXVII.

7. Paul the divine Apostle said: “*Some men’s sins are plainly evident, . . . whereas those of other men follow inferentially*” (1 Tim. 5:24). Sins, therefore, being committed in advance, other sins follow them. Thus the impious heresy of accusers of the Christians was followed by other acts of impiety. For precisely as they removed the face in the venerable icons from the Church, they have also abandoned certain other customs which must be renewed, and in accordance with both the written and the unwritten law they must thus prevail. As to any venerable temples, therefore, that have been consecrated without holy relics of Martyrs, we decree that in them there shall be made a deposit of relics together with the usual prayer. Let anyone, then, that consecrates a temple without holy relics be deposed from office, on the ground that he has transgressed ecclesiastical traditions.

(c. XCI of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

St. Basil the Great interpreted this apostolic saying otherwise, but the present Council has taken it more naively, since it says that the previous sins one commits are followed by other sins, just as happened in the case of the iconomachs who used to accuse the Christians and who, just as they deprived the Church of the holy icons, also flouted some other things of the Church and cast them out, which things must be renewed, in order that both the written legislation and the unwritten tradition²⁷² may prevail. So all the divine temples that have been consecrated by them without relics of martyrs are to have such relics deposited in them, while at the same time the prayer is said which relates thereto in the ceremony of dedication.²⁷³ As for any prelate that consecrates a temple hereafter without holy relics of martyrs, let him be deposed from office as a transgressor of ecclesiastical traditions.

Concord.

Canon XCI of Carthage decrees that those sacrificial altars in which there is treasured no body or relics of martyrs are to be wrecked or disapproved.

8. Inasmuch as some persons who have been misled by their inferences from the religion of the Jews have seen fit to sneer at Christ our God, while pretending to be Christians, but secretly and clandestinely keeping the Sabbath and doing other Jewish acts, we decree that these persons shall not be admitted to communion, nor to prayer, nor to church, but shall be Jews openly in accordance with their religion; and that neither shall their children be baptized, nor shall they buy or acquire a slave. But if any one of them should be converted as a matter of sincere faith, and confess with all his heart, triumphantly repudiating their customs and affairs, with a view to censure and correction of others, we decree that he shall be accepted and his children shall be baptized,

and that the latter shall be persuaded to hold themselves aloof from Jewish peculiarities. If, on the other hand, the case is not thus, they are not to be accepted under any other circumstances whatever.

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that no one is to join in communion or prayer with, or even admit into church, those Jews who only hypocritically have become Christians and have joined the Orthodox faith, but secretly deny and mock Christ our God, while keeping the Sabbath and other Jewish customs (or, more explicitly, circumcising their sons, deeming anyone unclean that takes hold of a corpse or leper, and other similar vagaries); but, on the contrary, such persons are to be Jews as they were before, and no one shall baptize their children nor let them buy a slave or acquire one by exchange or gift or in any other fashion. But if any Jew should be actually converted in good and guileless faith and with all his heart confess the orthodoxy of Christians, openly disparaging the religion of the Jews, in order that other Jews may be reproved and corrected, we ought to accept such a person, and baptize his children, ordering them persuasively to abstain from Jewish superstitions. But as for those who do not become converted in such a manner, we must not admit them on any account whatever.²⁷⁴

Concord.

In agreement with the present Canon ch. 44 of Title I of Book I of the Basilica decrees that if any Jew accused of any crime or owing a debt should on account thereof pretend that he has become willing to be a Christian, he is not to be accepted thus until he has paid his debt or has been acquitted of the crimes of which he has been accused. Likewise ch. 47 of the same Title and Book decrees that no Jew shall have a slave who is a Christian, nor circumcise anyone who is being catechized; neither shall any other heretic have a slave who is a Christian, but the moment he acquires him, the slave shall become free. Read also the Footnote to c. II of the 1st.

9. All boyish whimwhams and mad bacchanalia, the false writings that have been brought forth against the venerable icons, must be turned in to the Bishopric of Constantinople to be put away together with the rest of heretical books. If, on the other hand, anyone should be found hiding these, if he be a Bishop, a Presbyter, or a Deacon, let him be deposed from office; but if he be a layman or a monk, let him be excommunicated.

(Ap. c. LX; cc. II and LXIII of the 6th; c. LI of Laodicea.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that all the false writings which the iconomachists composed against the holy icons and which are flimsy as children's toys, and as crazy as the raving and insane bacchantes — those women who used to dance drunken at the festival of the tutelar of intoxication Dionysus — all those writings, I say, must be surrendered to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, to be put together with the other books by heretics — in such a place, that is to say, that no one will ever be able to take them therefrom with a view to reading them. As for anyone who should hide them, with a view to reading them himself or providing them for others to read, if he be a bishop, a presbyter, or a deacon, let him be de-

posed from office; but if he be a layman or a monk, let him be excommunicated. See also Ap. c. LX.

10. Inasmuch as some of the Clergymen, flouting the canonical ordinance and leaving their own parish, run off into another parish, and for the most part into this God-guarded and imperial city, and become attached to civil magistrates, conducting services in their oratories, it is therefore not allowable to receive these persons in any house or church without the permission of their own bishop and of that of Constantinople. If anyone should do so persistently, let him be deposed from office. As for any of the Priests who do this notwithstanding what has been said in the foregoing, it is not for them to undertake secular and mundane cares, as they are forbidden to do so by the divine Canons. But if anyone be caught red-handed in the employ of the so-called magnates (*meizoteri*), let him be dismissed, or let him be deposed from office. To come at once to the point, therefore, let him keep re-reading the divine Scriptures with the object of teaching children and servants and slaves. For it was to this that he was called when holy orders fell to his lot.

(Ap. cc. XV, LXXXI, LXXXIII; cc. III, V, X, XXIII; c. XI of the 1st-&-2nd; cc. XVIII, LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. XVII, XVIII of the 6th; c. III of Antioch; cc. XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon forbids two unlawful things in the same paragraph: the action of clergymen in going from city to city, and especially to Constantinople; and that of their applying to civil magistrates and officiating in their prayer-houses without the permission both of their own bishop, from whom they have gone away, and of the Patriarch, into whose parish they have resorted, as both are contrary to the prescription of the divine Canons. So it commands that any clergyman is to be deposed from office if without permission of the above he comes to Constantinople, or officiates in oratories, and persists in doing so. Clergymen, on the other hand, who have been admitted with their permission must not undertake secular cares, but rather let them teach the children and slaves and servants of Christians. If any clergyman should engage in superintending the *lati-fundia* of civil magistrates (as this same thing is decreed in c. XI of the 1st-&-2nd), the superintendents of which used to be called *meizoteri* (i.e., magnates), perhaps owing to their superintending the largest and most profitable estates, either let him leave this employment or, if he will not leave it, let him be deposed from office. See also Ap. cc. VI and XV.

11. All of us being obliged to keep the divine Canons, we ought to maintain by all means inviolable the one saying that there should be Stewards in every church. Accordingly if each Metropolitan appoints a Steward in his church, it is well and good; but if not the Bishop of Constantinople is given permission to appoint a Steward in the same church *ex officio*. Like permission is given also to Metropolitans if the Bishops under them do not care to appoint Stewards in their own churches. The same rule is to be observed also in the case of Monasteries.

(Ap. cc. XXXVIII, XLI; c. XXVI of the 4th; c. XII of the 7th; c. VII of the 1st-&-2nd; c. XV of Ancyra; c. VII of Gangra; cc. XXIV, XXV of Antioch; cc. XXXIV, XLI of Carthage; c. X of Theophilus; c. II of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

Inasmuch as c. XXVI of the 4th commands that every church shall have a steward to manage its affairs with permission and approval of the bishop, therefore the present Canon, while confirming that one, adds that if any Metropolitan appoints a steward of his own accord, it will be all right; but if he fail to do so, the Patriarch of Constantinople has authority to appoint a steward for that same Metropolis and for other ones, too, which are subject to him, that is to say. Likewise in case bishops fail to appoint a steward for their bishoprics their Metropolitan is to be allowed to appoint them. This same thing is to be done also in the case of monasteries that have no steward — that is to say, stewards are to be appointed for them by their abbot, or, if he will not do this, by the bishop, or if he will not appoint one in this event by the Metropolitan, or if even the Metropolitan neglects to take care of the matter, by the Patriarch. See also Ap. c. XXXVIII.

12. If any Bishop or any Abbot be found disposing of productive property of the bishopric or monastery respectively into the hands of lay rulers, or of any other person, the transfer is to be invalid and void, in accordance with the Apostolic Canon saying: “Let the Bishop have the care of all ecclesiastical matters and let him manage them on the understanding that God is overseeing and supervising. Let him not be allowed to appropriate anything therefrom or to give God’s things to his relatives. If they be indigent, let him provide for them as indigents, but let him not trade off things of the Church²⁷⁵ under this pretext.” If it be alleged as an excuse that the property is actually a liability involving a loss or overall expense and that the fields are not rendering any profit or benefit, even so the place must not be sold or let out to the civil rulers of the region, but to Clergymen or to farmers (i.e., husbandmen). But if by employing some cunning rascality, a civil ruler should buy the fields from a Clergyman or a farmer, even so let the sale be invalid and void, and let the property be restored to the Bishopric, or to the Monastery, as the case may be, and let the Bishop, or the Abbot, respectively, who does this be driven out — the Bishop out of the Bishopric, and the Abbot out of the Monastery — on the ground that they are plundering wrongfully what they did not gather together.

(Ap. cc. XXXVIII, XLI; c. XXVI of the 4th; c. XI of the 7th; c. VII of the 1st-&-2nd; c. XV of Ancyra; c. VII of Gangra; cc. XXIV, XXV of Antioch; cc. XXXIV, XLI of Carthage; c. X of Theophilus; c. II of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

By the phrase “productive property” is meant all those things that produce an income, and especially real estate: such as arable fields, vineyards, olive groves, etc. So as concerning these things the present Canon decrees that if anyone who should alienate them, as bishop from the bishopric, or an abbot from a monastery, and turn them over to civil rulers, either by sale or by exchange, any such transfer is to remain invalid and of no effect, and the things are to revert to the bishopric or monastery, as the case may be, just as Ap. c. XXXVI-II decrees, which the present Canon quotes *verbatim* and in full. But if it should happen that the bishop or abbot alleges that such or such a field, or vineyard, is not producing any income or profit, but rather a loss, let them sell it, not to civil rulers and autocrats, but to clergymen or farmers,²⁷⁶ men, that is to say, who are humble and paltry. But if by employing some villainy they should first have given them to the latter with the object of letting them be taken from them later by a civil ruler, this sale is to be invalid and void, while the bishop who has sold the property in such a manner is to be ousted from the bishopric, and any abbot who has done so is to be ousted from the monastery, because they have wrongfully dis-

sipated and lost the property which had been rightfully gathered together and consecrated by others. See also the Interpretation of Ap. c. XXXVIII.

13. In view of the fact that on account of the disaster attending our sins certain charitable institutions have been pillaged by men, including both bishoprics and monasteries, and have been made into common resorts; if those who now have possession of them are willing to return them, in order that they may be restored to their pristine condition, it is well and good: but if not, in case those men who now have them in their possession are on the sacerdotal list, we command that they be deposed from office, or, if they be monks or laymen, that they be excommunicated, on the ground that they stand condemned by the Father, and by the Son, and by the Holy Spirit; and let them be relegated thither where *“their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched”* (Isa. 66:24; Mark 9:44, 46, 48), since they are opposed to the Lord’s utterance saying: *“Make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise”* (John 2:16).

(cc. IV, XXIV of the 4th; c. XLIX of the 6th; cc. XII, XIX of the 7th; c. I of the 1st-&-2nd; c. II of Cyril.)

Interpretation.

In the time of the iconomachists, besides other evils that occurred, many prelates were ousted by them on account of the holy icons from their bishoprics and metropoleis, and many monks were ousted from their monasteries. These institutions being left in a state of desolation certain secular persons snatched hold of them and converted them into secular habitations. So for this reason the present Canon commands that in case those holding possession of these bishoprics and monasteries are willing to give them back, in order that they may be restored again as bishoprics and monasteries to their former condition, it is all right. But if they are unwilling, in case they are clerics let them be deposed from office, but in case they are monks or laymen let them be excommunicated, as persons condemned on this account by the Holy Trinity; and let them be relegated to that region where *“their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched,”* according to the utterance of Isaiah and of the Gospel, since they are opposing the words of the Lord which say, *“Make not the house of my Father a house of merchandise,”* etc. Read also cc. IV and XXIV of the 4th.

14. It is perfectly plain to everybody that order reigns in the Church, and that it is pleasing to God for the transactions of the Priesthood to be maintained with rigorousness. Since, then, we behold some persons receiving the tonsure of the Clergy from infancy and without imposition of hands, and reading from the pulpit at the synaxis, but doing so in an uncanonical fashion, we forbid the doing of this from now on. The same rule is to be observed also with reference to Monks. As for the appointment of an Anagnost (or Reader) by imposition of hands, each Abbot is given permission to do this but only in his own Monastery, provided that imposition of hands has been laid upon that very same Abbot himself by a Bishop to enable him to have the presidency of an Abbot — that is to say, more plainly speaking, if he is a Presbyter (or Priest). Likewise also in accordance with the ancient custom, Auxiliary Bishops may only with the permission of the Bishop appoint Anagnosts (with imposition of hands).

(c. XXXIII of the 6th ; c. XXII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

Since some persons have been consecrated from infancy to God, and have donned garments befitting clerics, and have also received the tonsure at the hands of their own parents, in accordance with a certain custom, on the pretext that they have been and are, allegedly, consecrated, and these same children on coming to age have had the temerity to read the divine books to the laity (perhaps trusting to that tonsure received in their infancy), without having had the requisite imposition of hands and without having received the requisite seal and tonsure of an Anagnost from a prelate; therefore the present Canon commands that such a thing be not done, on the ground that it is disorderly and uncanonical. Not only are laymen forbidden to act as Readers without a bishop's seal, but so are monks too. But it is permissible for the abbot of a monastery, provided he is a priest and has been made an abbot by imposition of the hands of a prelate, to ordain Anagnosts (or Readers), but only in his own monastery, and not elsewhere. Likewise even Auxiliary Bishops (*Chorepiscopi*) are permitted to ordain Anagnosts, in accordance with an ancient custom²⁷⁷ (respecting which see also the Footnote to c. VIII of the First). Read also c. XXXIII of the 6th.

15. From now on let no Clergyman be attached to two churches. For this is a mark of commerciality and of greediness for profits, and is alien to ecclesiastical usage. For we have been told by the voice of the Lord Himself that “no one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will cling to the one, and despise the other” (Matt. 6:24). Each person, therefore, in accordance with the Apostolical utterance, wherever he happens to be, ought to stay there and serve in one church. For things done on account of greediness for profits in connection with ecclesiastical matters are alien to God's institutes. To supply the needs of this life there are various occupations. Let anyone, therefore, who so wishes gain the needs of the body from them. For the Apostle has said, “*these hands have ministered unto my needs, and unto those of them who were with me*” (Acts 20:34). Accordingly, what is said here is to be applied in this God-guarded city; but in small towns outside of it, for want of men, let there be concessions. (Ap. c. XV; cc. XV, XVI of the 1st; cc. X, XX, XXIII of the 4th; cc. XVII, XVIII of the 6th; cc. X, XV of the 7th; c. III of Antioch; cc. XV, XVI, XIX of Sardica; cc. LXIII, XCVIII of Carthage; Matt. 6:24; 1 Cor. 7:20; Acts 20:34.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prohibits the enrolling of any clergyman in the clergy of two churches situated either in the same city or in two cities, because this is being done for the sake of shameful profits, in order, that is to say, that the clergyman so enrolled may gain the emoluments of both churches; but what is done for the sake of shameful profits is foreign both to God and to ecclesiastics. For the Lord says that nobody can serve two masters; for either he will hate and despise one of them, or he will love and embrace the other. And St. Paul commands that everybody stay in the place whither he has been called by God. If these clergymen allege as an excuse that they cannot get along with the emoluments of the one church, why, behold, there are many kinds of manual work in the world that are more decent; accordingly, let them work with their hands to obtain the needs of the body. For even St. Paul obtained his needs and the needs of those with him by the work of his own hands, as he himself says. So for a clergyman to be attached to two churches, in this imperial city at any rate, is not to be tolerated because of the great number of clerics already in it; but as for the villages and towns outside of it, let it be allowed to be done on account of the scarcity of priests and clerics. See also Ap. c. XV.

16. Every luxury and adornment of the body is alien to the sacerdotal order. Bishops or clergymen, therefore, who adorn themselves with splendid and conspicuous clothes need to be corrected; but if they insist upon it, they must be condemned to a penance. Likewise as regards those who anoint themselves with perfumes. But inasmuch as a root of bitterness growing up, the heresy of *Christianocategori* (i.e., accusers of Christians), has become a pestilence, and those who have joined it not only have deemed iconic representations in paintings to be an abomination, but have even rejected every form of reverence, being inclined to loathe those who live decently and piously, and that which has been written has been fulfilled in them, viz., “*Godliness is an abomination to a sinner*” (Sirach A.28) I’m not sure what the true citation for this verse is. If, therefore, persons are found laughing at those clothed in cheap and decent vestments, let them be corrected with a penance. For ever since the days of old every priestly man has contented himself with moderate and decent vestments. For everything that is worn not because of any real need or necessity, but for embellishment incurs the discredit of being frippery, as Basil the Great has said. But neither did they put on any garments made of silk fabrics and embroidered with various designs; nor did any of them add any differently colored appendages to the edges of their vestments. For they had been told by the Speaker of God’s language that those who wear soft raiment are in the houses of kings (Matt. 11:8).

(c. XXVII of the 6th; cc. XII, XXI of Gangra.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that bishops and clerics who wear splendid clothes, as well as those who anoint themselves with perfumes, ought to correct this impropriety, since every embellishment and adornment of the human body is foreign to those in holy orders. But if they insist on doing so and will not correct themselves, let them be canonized with a suitable penance. Moreover, the iconomachists, besides rejecting holy icons, rejected also everything making for decency in the matter of clothing, and were wont to laugh at those wearing cheap or paltry garments (that is why they were wont to call monks “darkies,” that is to say, wearers of dark-colored clothes, making fun of the decency of the monkish habit, according to Metaphrastes in his Life of Stephen the Younger); accordingly, I say, let these men be corrected with a penance, for ever since the beginning men in holy orders have been wearing humble clothes. Hence St. Basil the Great (see his Epitomized Def. 49) describes as frippery²⁷⁸ every piece of clothing that is not designed to meet some need of the body, but only for embellishment or beautification; and they were not accustomed to wear garments embroidered with silk (for silkworms are called in Greek *seres* after the Seres, or Chinese, who used to cultivate these worms, and from there they were carried to other regions); nor did they attach to the edges of their garments pieces of a different color from that of their garments.²⁷⁹ For they had heard from the utterance of the Lord that those wearing soft clothes are found in palaces, and not in bishoprics and churches. See also c. XXVII of the 6th.

17. Some of the monks, after leaving their monasteries, having become imbued with a yearning to rule and with a loathness to obey, undertake to build prayer-houses without having the needments to finish them. If, therefore, anyone shall undertake to do this, let him be prevented by the

local bishop. But if he has the needments for their completion, let him carry out his plans. The same rule is to be observed also as regards laymen and clerics.

(c. IV of the 4th; c. XXI of the 7th; c. I of the 1st-&-2nd.)

Interpretation.

Seeing that some ambitious monks inclined to rule and not to obey others, having left their monasteries, attempt to build prayer-houses without having the expenses required to complete them, therefore the present Canon commands that such persons be prevented by the bishop from engaging in such an enterprise. But if they have sufficient capital for this end and the accomplishment of their object, let them undertake the work. This same rule applies also to laymen or clerics if they undertake to build oratories.²⁸⁰ See also c. IV of the 4th, and c. XXI of the present Council.

18. Be ye unoffending even to outsiders, says the Apostle (1 Cor. 10:32). But for women to be dwelling in bishoprics, or in monasteries, is a cause for everyone's taking offense. If, therefore, anyone be caught in possession of a female slave or of a free woman in a bishopric, or in a monastery, for the performance of any service, or ministration, let him be penanced; and if he persists, let him be deposed from office. If, on the other hand, it should happen that in the suburbs there are women, and a Bishop, or an Abbot, wants to go to there, while the Bishop or Abbot is present, let no woman perform any sort of service whatever for him during that time, but let her keep to herself in a different place until the Bishop takes his departure, to avoid any reproach.

(c. III of the 1st; c. V of the 6th; c. XXII of the 7th; c. XIX of Ancyra; c. XLV of Carthage; c. LXXXIX of Basil.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon prohibits women from being within bishoprics and monasteries in order to act as servants, since such a thing causes great scandal and brings great discredit upon prelates and monks both among secular Christians and among the heathen. In fact, the Apostle orders us not to give any offense to even Jews and Greeks outside the Church. So if any prelate or abbot should be caught doing this, let him be duly canonized. But if he should persist in doing it and be incorrigible, let him be deposed from office. If, on the other hand, in the latifundia of a bishopric or of a monastery there should be any women, and the prelate or the abbot should go there to any part of them, as long as these men are there the women are not to perform any act of service, but are to keep away until they depart, on account of the necessity of avoiding any offense or reproach. See also c. III of the First.

19. Among the headmen of the Church the hatred of avarice has been abated to such an extent that even some of the men and women called reverent, having forgotten the Lord's commandment, have been deceived or misled into allowing the admission for money of those joining the Sacerdotal Order, or the monastic life. The result is that, as Basil the Great says, what is disreputable from the start is wholly rejectable. For neither is it possible to serve both God and Mammon. If, therefore, anyone be found doing this, in case he is a Bishop, or an Abbot, or anyone in the Priesthood, either let him cease or let him be deposed in accordance with the second Canon

of the holy Council held in Chalcedon; but if the offender is an Abbess, let her be driven out of the Nunnery, and let her be delivered to a different Nunnery for subordination. Likewise, too, in the case of an Abbot who lacks ordination as a Presbyter. As regards property of any kind given by parents to their children by way of dowry or personal belongings that have been donated by donators who acknowledge them to be things consecrated to God, we have decreed that whether they stay or leave, those things are to remain in the monastery, in accordance with his promise, unless his departure has been caused by the Prior.

(Ap. c. XXIX; c. II of the 4th; cc. XXII, XXIII of the 6th; c. XCI of Basil; Epistles of Genadius and of Tarasius; Matt. 6:24.)

Interpretation.

“Headman” is a designation for prelates and priests, and for abbots of monasteries, since they have been appointed to stand at the head of the laymen, both with respect to the right faith and with respect to good works. So the present Canon says that inasmuch as these men have been so overcome by avarice as to take money as an inducement to admit those coming to the Sacerdotal Order or to monastic life; and thus is fulfilled in them the saying of St. Basil the Great to the effect that if the beginning of anything is inefficient and bad, the whole of it thereafter will be inefficient and bad. If any bishop, or abbot in holy orders, or anyone else on the sacerdotal list, does this hereafter, let him either cease or be deposed from office, in accordance with c. II of the 4th C., which decrees that anyone is to be deposed from office who in exchange for money should nominate even a *Prosmonarius*.²⁸¹ But if the person doing this be an abbot not in holy orders²⁸² or an abbess, let them be driven out of their monasteries and be put in other monasteries, in order to render them obedient, as not being worthy of the abbotship and of the right to subordinate others, seeing that they demand money in advance in order to consent to admit those applying as candidates for the position of caloyer or monk. As for those things (whether they are chattels, that is to say, or real estate of any kind) which a person may possess either as dowry from his parents or as belongings of his own and which he may consecrate to the monastery in which he has decided to take up his abode as a monk, the present Canon decrees that these things are to remain inalienable from the monastery²⁸³ in accordance with the promise or vow of the one who consecrated them, no matter whether he stays in the monastery or departs from it for reasons of his own and of his own free will. But if he should depart from the monastery in consequence of any occasion (such as we shall mention in the Interpretation of the following c. XXI of this same 7th) due to the abbot, he can take them back.²⁸⁴

20. As from now on we decree that no double monastery is to be made, because this becomes a scandal and offense to many persons. But if certain persons with their relatives choose to renounce the world and to follow a solitary life, the men must retire to a monastery for men, and the women must enter a nunnery (or monastery for women). For it is in this that God takes pleasure. As for those which have been double hitherto, let them be maintained, in accordance with the Canon of our Holy Father St. Basil, and in accordance with his injunction let them be so formulated. Let not monks and nuns dwell in a single monastery. For adultery will creep in where there is a chance due to their dwelling together. Let no monk have the liberty to address a nun, or a nun to address a monk, with a view to speaking in private. Let no monk look into a nunnery, nor let any nun eat with a monk alone. And when the necessities of life are being conveyed from the men’s quarters to those of the canonesses, let the abbess of the nunnery receive these outside

the gates with some aged nun. If it should happen that any nun should want to see a monk who is her relative, let him speak with her briefly and in a few words in the presence of the abbess.²⁸⁵
(cc. XLVI, XLVII of the 6th; cc. XVIII, XX, XXII of the 7th.)

Interpretation.

Zonaras asserts that a double monastery was two neighboring monasteries so near together that voices could be heard from one to the other. Some other authorities, with whom Balsamon agrees, say that it was one and the same monastery, within which men and women lived in the same building, though not strangers to another in respect of the flesh, but relatives of one another. I would say that this second opinion seems nearer the truth, in so far as it is confirmed by the style in the beginning and the context of this Canon. But the injunction which the Canon cites further below of St. Basil the Great, concerning double monasteries, proves the first opinion to be most true and incontestable. But whether one takes it this way or that, the present Canon commands that henceforth such double monasteries are not to be made, on the ground that they are causes of scandal. If, nevertheless, certain men and women, who are relatives of one another, wish to become monks or nuns, as the case may be let the men go apart to monasteries for men and let the women go to a nunnery, or monastery exclusively for women; for it is in this way that God is pleased. But as for all monasteries that have survived till now and are double, let them live in accordance with the injunction and legislation of St. Basil the Great, which is as follows, that is to say: monks and nuns are not to be allowed to dwell together in one and the same monastery, because adultery will follow in the wake of this dwelling together. Let no monk have the liberty to speak privately with a nun, or a nun with a monk. Let no monk sleep in a nunnery, nor let one eat with a nun. And when monks from a monastery are conveying the necessities of life to the nuns, they are to leave them outside the doors of the nunnery, and from there the abbess with some other aged nun is to take them in. But if any monk wishes to see a nun who is a relative of his, let him see her, and let him speak a few words to her, with the abbess present, and let him depart quickly.²⁸⁶

Concord.

The second ordinance of Title I of the Novels also decrees that monks and nuns must not remain together (Photius, Title XI, ch. 1). Perhaps, too, it may be that even the prophet Zechariah says on this account for the tribes of Israel to mourn, men separately and women separately, hinting by means of the word “mourn” at the mournful life of monks and nuns, and by means of the word “separately” at the fact that men and women cannot live together in one and the same monastery, according to the decree of the present Canon. “And the land shall mourn, every tribe separately; the tribe of the house of David separately, and their wives apart; . . . and the tribe of the house of Levi separately, and their wives apart” (Zech. 12:12-13).²⁸⁷ See also cc. XLVI and XLVII of the 6th.

21. A monk or nun must not leave his or her monastery or nunnery, respectively, and go away to another. But if this should occur, it is necessary that he or she be afforded a hospitable reception as a guest. But it is not fitting that he or she be entered without the approval of his abbot, or of her abbess, as the case may be.

(c. IV of the 4th; c. XIX of the 7th; cc. III, IV, V of the 1st-&-2nd; c. LXXXVIII of Carthage.)

Interpretation.

The present Canon decrees that a monk or nun must not leave that monastery or nunnery in which he or she, respectively, has been tonsured, and go to another. But if anyone should do this, such a one ought to be received as a guest and hospitably treated by the Fathers of that strange monastery (or the Mothers of that strange nunnery, as the case may be) for some days (lest as one not accorded a proper welcome he or she be compelled to betake himself or herself to the world and to associate with indifferent persons). Nevertheless, he or she must not be held to be enrolled in the brotherhood or sisterhood there, as the case may be, without the approval and a dimissory letter from his own abbot (or from her own abbess, if it be a nun).²⁸⁸

Concord.

Canon IV of the 1st-&-2nd C. excommunicates any monk who departs from his monastery and goes to another monastery, or to a worldly shelter, and even the person who welcomes and admits him, except only in case the prelate wished to transfer him to a different location, either for improvement of another monastery or for salvation of some family. For in that case the monks and those admitting him are not responsible. Moreover, c. LXXXVIII of Carthage commands that a stranger must not communicate with a monk unless the laity themselves with that bishop who has admitted him from a monastery belonging to another province and makes him a cleric, or an abbot of his own monastery, and the monk in question, it says, shall be neither a cleric nor an abbot. And c. IV of the 4th decrees that monks must not leave their monasteries unless they be allowed to do so by the bishop for a necessary need. Canon III of the 1st-&-2nd, on the other hand, excommunicates any abbot who fails to bring back to his monastery his escaped monks.²⁸⁹

22. For everything to be dedicated to God, and not to be slavishly subject to one's own will, is undoubtedly a great thing in itself. For whether you are eating or you are drinking, the divine Apostle says, you are doing everything for the glory of God. Christ, therefore, our God, in His Gospels has ordered us to cut out the origins of sins. For not only is adultery chastised by Him, but even a mental tendency to attempt adultery is condemned, in that He says: "*Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart*" (Matt. 5:28). Taking a cue from this assertion, we ought to purify our thoughts. "*All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient*" (1 Cor. 10:23), we are taught by an Apostolic utterance. It is therefore indispensable for every man to eat in order to live. Accordingly, for those whose life is one of marriage and children and popular amusement it is proper for men and women to eat in mixed company, though to avoid calumny and reproach they ought to take food merely in order to obtain nourishment, and not for the enjoyment of it, and in absence of theatrical arts, or what may be called Satanic songs, music of harps, and whorish twistings of the body. For upon such as participate in these things the prophetic curse descends speaking as follows: "*Woe unto them who drink wine with harp and lute, but regard not the work of the Lord, neither have considered the works of his hands comprehendingly*" (Isa. 5:12). And if there ever should be such among the Christians, let them correct themselves or be corrected; but if not, let the rules laid down by those before us canonically and promulgated prevail in regard to them. But as for those persons whose life is quiet and monotonous, he who has joined hands with the Lord God "*ought to bear the yoke solitary . . . as he sitteth alone and broodeth in silence*" (Lam. of Jer. 3:27-28).

But what is more even for those who have chosen a priestly life, it is not at all permissible for them to eat privately in the company of women, unless it be somewhere together with God-bearing²⁹⁰ and reverent men and women, in order that the banquet itself may lead to some spiritual guidance. And in the case of relatives, too, let him do the same. If, again, during a journey a monk or a priestly man should happen to be in want of what he needs, and as a matter of necessity wishes to put up somewhere, be it at an inn or in someone's home, he is to have the right to do this, on the ground of the exigency.²⁹¹

¹ The duration of catechization is not fixed the same by all. The Apostolical Injunctions ordain that a catechumen is to be catechized for a year. Canon 42 of the regional council held in Illiberia, a town in Spain, a little before the First Ecumenical Council, prescribed two years. Justinian Novel 144 also prescribed two years for Samaritans joining the faith. Canon 25 of the local council held in Agatha in the year 506 fixed the time as eight months for converted Jews. Canon VIII of the 7th Ecum. C. will not have us accept Jews feigning belief, but only those who really believe and who criticize the practices of the Jews. Some writers, however, think that catechization occupied only as many days as there are in Great Lent, inferring this from c. XLV of Laodicea, and from Jerome's letter to Pammachius, and from the first catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem. But perhaps from these premises nothing less is to be inferred except the fact that during Great Lent the last and more accurate part of catechization was completed, because at that time catechumens used to be baptized during the night of Great Saturday and of Easter. Sometimes, however, the duration of catechization was curtailed on account of necessary circumstances. That is why catechumens in danger of dying used to be baptized before the time fixed for catechization had expired, according to c. XII of Neocaesarea, c. XLVII of Laodicea, c. LII of Carthage, c. V of Basil, and c. V of Cyril. But the Burgundians, too, a nationality of France, on account of the fervid faith they showed in Christ, and on account of the need they had to fight the Huns, with whom they were at war, were catechized in only seven days, and on the eighth day they were baptized by the bishop in one city of France (Socrates, Book VII, ch. 30). Yet, according to this Canon, it is better to let a long time pass that is sufficient to test the catechumen more efficaciously.

² Zonaras calls every sin a psychical (or animal) sin that is due to an aberrancy of the three faculties of the soul, namely, the reasoning faculty, the affective faculty, and the desiderative faculty. Balsamon says that a psychical (or animal) sin is any sin that causes an injury to the soul (the Greek name of which is *psyche*, and the Latin *anima*), whether the origin of it be traceable to an appetite of the body or to a craving of the soul. Others have considered a psychical sin to be one resulting from passions of the soul, such as presumption, waywardness, etc. Properly, however, the psychical sin spoken of in this Canon is the state of being puffed up, and supercilious, and proud. For it is only this passion that belongs to the spiritual and immaterial nature of the soul; and this is the condemnation and snare into which the Devil fell, according to the saying of the Apostle which the Canon mentions here, and according to the interpretation placed upon it by St. Ambrose. That is why St. Augustine (in Book III concerning the City of God) says that the Devil is not a drunkard or anything else of such a nature, but is, in fact, a conceited and witchlike being. So if a bishop falls into the passion of pride and reveals this by what he says or does, and is exposed by two or three witnesses, let him be dismissed from the clergy, perhaps in order that he may be humbled and moderate his sentiment, and thus become entitled to be restored to holy orders. But if he keeps on getting prouder, and refuses to cease, let him be completely deposed from his rank. The fact that open pride is a sufficient cause for deposition is also evident from the Novatians, who were ousted from the Church on this account, because out of presumption and pride they called themselves pure and refused to admit those who had denied in time of persecution and had repented, nor would commune with persons married twice. Some authorities, however, have asserted that by "psychical sin" the Canon means here a cacodoxical and impious sentiment or belief or frame of mind. But if this were meant, anyone entertaining it ought not only to cease therefrom, but also to be sternly deposed and to be outlawed and proscribed from the Church. So, inasmuch as pride is a mortal sin, and those who commit a sin involving death forfeit their rank, according to c. XXXII of Basil (which you are advised to read), the present Canon chastises anyone that has fallen into such a sin by unfrocking him.

³ Not only do ecumenical and regional councils commonly blame and place under a penance those clergymen, or even laymen, who have strange women in their home, whether it be in order to have them do work as servants, as was presbyter Gregory against whom Basil the Great complains, or it be that as an excuse they are alleged to be unprotected and have no one to provide for them, but also separately as individuals every one of the divine Fathers took care to stigmatize this evil. For St. Gregory the Theologian in his epic verses wonders and is at a loss among whom to class those who keep women in their house or have women staying with them in their home, whether they ought to class them among married men, or among unmarried and virgin men, or in a middle group between married men and virgin men; on which account he says:

"As for the subintroductors, as all of them allege indeed,

I know not whether to allow them a marriage, or to keep them with the unmarried.

Or to place them in the middle somewhere between both these groups.

For I at any rate will not praise this thing even though I be criticized."

The saint of the same name, Gregory of Nyssa, in his discussion of virginity, finds fault with such persons and says: "They not only provide their belly with whatever gives it pleasure, but they even cohabit openly with women, and call such living together a fraternity." Divine Chrysostom (discourse on those having subintroductae, p. 214 of vol. vi) says the following: "There are some who take virgin girls without a marriage and intercourse, place them in their home permanently, and live with them continuously until extreme old age, not for the sake of giving birth to children (since they claim not to have any sexual intercourse with them), not for the sake of fornication and licentiousness (because they claim to be keeping them virgins and chaste). But if one were to ask them for what reason they are doing this, they have a lot of excuses to offer in reply; yet they have no reasonable and decent excuse. For the real reason of their living with these girls in this fashion is none other than a passionate craving and pleasure which affords them a more intense and vehement sexual appeal than that enjoyed by men living with a lawful wife. Because a wife allows the man living with

her unrestricted intercourse and allays vehement sexual love, and often leads the man to satiety of pleasure and inhibits unlimited desire; besides these differences, there are also the parturient pangs of a lawful wife, the inconveniences of giving birth to children, and bringing them up, and the illnesses and weaknesses which she incurs from all these causes ultimately wither the flower of her beauty, and consequently make the center of pleasure less attractive to the man. But in the case of the *subintroducta* virgin these consequences do not follow. For neither sexual intercourse with her can make the man living with her abate the passionateness of his irresistible desire, nor do parturient pangs and child-rearing wither their flesh; on the contrary such women retain their beauty for many years, because of their remaining untouched by any of the causes destructive of their beauty we have mentioned; in fact they get to be forty years old and nevertheless appear as pretty as girls and young women who have not yet made their debut. Hence a double desire is aroused in men living with such girls, first, because they do not allay their passionate craving and lust for them with the act of mingling and indulgence in sexual intercourse, and secondly, because the object of their passionate craving remains for a long time at its prime and strongly provocative, which object is the pretty face and the beauty of the women. So, according to Basil the Great (ascetic ordinance 4), such men are so overcome by their passions that they have no feeling, but, instead, are like frenzied and drunken men. According to the same Chrysostom (discourse on the fact that an ascetic must not joke) they are all the time being wounded, all the time being preyed upon by wild beasts, all the time indulging in adultery (probably meaning fornication), and being rendered languid by exceeding the bounds of sobriety. And can it be said (asks the saint) that you are a senseless stone and are not scandalized (probably meaning tantalized)? You are a man subject to the passions of human nature. Well, then, how can it be thought possible for one to put fire inside his bosom, or to walk upon burning coals, without getting burnt, when he is an easily inflammable straw. Nevertheless, again Basil the Great (ascetic ordinance 4) says that even though we allow that he (sc. the one who is keeping *subintroductas*) is not irritated nor even tantalized by the passion of desire, yet if he be not suffering he cannot in spite of this easily persuade others that he is not actually suffering. But to scandalize the common run of men, without any show of virtue, is not without danger to one who does so. Besides, there is also another consequence to be reckoned with: even granting that the man himself is not injured by looking at the woman, it nevertheless cannot be maintained that the woman is not subject to the passions of the body. Hence she, either being weak in reasoning power or having a most acute passion, has conceived a passion of love for the man who has been so indiscreet as to associate with her; and though he himself has not been wounded, he has wounded her many times without even knowing it." So in order to avoid having all these consequences follow, every man ought to guard himself, and if possible shun the company of women altogether, or if this is impossible, and he cannot avoid frequent and prolonged meetings with women, and of all others especially women that are leading a monastic life or have grown old as nuns. All clergymen as well as laymen, and especially monks and nuns; since nuns have the same trouble in fighting shy of monks, as monks have in fighting shy of nuns. That is why Abbas (i.e., abbot) Isaac, in admonishing a monk, tells him in addition to these things to avoid *canonicae*, that is to say, nuns, as though they were fire. But if saints forbid a man to associate with women and nuns, how much more do they not forbid him to live with them? These things which we have said in regard to men keeping *subintroductae* women, apply also to those who keep beardless young men in their house as *subintroducti* and are living with them. Hence it is that Gregory the great saint recommends in his epic verses that not only a virgin man, but every other man, and especially every clergyman and monk, should refrain from living with such young men. In fact he says verbatim:

"Beware of every male, but especially of having one as a *subintroductus*."

In the ascetic discourse which Basil the Great composed concerning renunciation, he says: If you are a young man with respect to the body, or are an old man with respect to the body, but a young man with respect to sentiment, avoid association with young men as you would a flame. For the enemy having burnt up many men with a desire for such young men, consigned them to the everlasting fire after hurling them down into a yawning chasm of sodomites under the pretext of spiritual love. For those keeping such young men (as the same Basil says in his discourse concerning virginity) are excited to a desire for that object in particular to which they are naturally inclined by an erotic impulse, or, in other words, to a desire for a woman. Hence as a result of the relation they bear to what is natural, they are forced to violate the law with respect to what is unnatural, in seeking the female in the male. Being unable to attain their object, nor being themselves in any position to allay their absurd and improper erotic passion by unnaturally mingling with a male, they suffer the very same consequences as are suffered by those who keep *subintroductae* women. "For when they gaze" (says the same Basil in the above discourse concerning renunciation) "at the face of the beardless young men and receive a seed of desire from the enemy and sower of evils and woes commonly called the Devil, they reap sheaves of destruction and of perdition. The woes deserving many tears are also plainly visible to those who know history, for they have been time and again inflicted upon the world as a result of beardless young men. For many great lavras (i.e., monastic retreats) and monasteries have been wiped out, and the souls of many men have been swallowed up by Hades."

⁴ Note the present Novel and the above Canons.

⁵ That is why Theodoret, in his Ecclesiastical History (Book I, ch. 9), says that "all the Fathers of the present First Council in Nicaea, sending in a conciliar letter to the bishops in Alexandria, stated in writing that the ordinations of bishops ought to be ratified by the Bishop of Alexandria, voting along with them and ratifying the election by the general assembly in Alexandria. Hence Synesius when corresponding with Theophilus says in a letter of his concerning a

man named Anthony, who was about to be made a bishop, that the most important point connected with his ordination that needed to be attended to was: "the hand of Theophilus. . . . may it be my lot to join in electing him to an equal rank in holy orders. But there is still one most important point to be attended to, though, by thy sacred hand." And even the Council held in Chalcedon, in mentioning the present Canon in its Act XIII, says: "This Canon prescribes that ratification of what is done in each particular province must be left to the Metropolitan, and the latter must ordain all the bishops subject to his jurisdiction. For the sacred formality, according to sacred Symeon of Thessalonica, is interpreted as meaning that the synod (or council) must vote for three candidates and they are to be referred to the Metropolitan or to the Patriarch; one of the latter two will then decide which one of the three in question is to receive notification of his ordination; and either he himself will ordain the one chosen with the other prelates assisting in the ceremony, or with his permission others may ordain him.

⁶ The reason why the present Canon was issued by the Council was as follows. It used to be the custom with bishops of Egypt and of Libya and of Pentapolis to have the bishop of Alexandria as their chief, and without his approval not to engage in any ecclesiastical action, as Epiphanius says in his *Haer.* 61. By exercising this authority, Peter the sacred martyr, who was Bishop of Alexandria, deposed Meletius, a Bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais, as Athanasius the Great bears witness in his second apology. The same saint notes further that before Peter's time, since some bishops in Pentapolis in Upper Libya had accepted the opinion of Sabellius, and his spurious doctrines came to prevail so widely that the Son of God was hardly being preached in the churches, when Dionysius of Alexandria learned about this, he dispatched envoys to them for the purpose of converting them to the orthodox doctrine of the Church. From these facts it becomes evident indeed that even before this First Council was held the Bishop of Alexandria enjoyed Patriarchal privileges also by virtue of an ancient custom (which, in fact, prevailed in consequence of Ap. c. XXXIV, which says that the bishops of each nation ought to recognize one of their number as their chief, and so forth). He had authority not only to govern the ecclesiastical affairs of the provinces and dioceses there, but also to depose bishops and metropolitans of that clime. But because the said Meletius had been deposed by the Bishop of Alexandria, he attempted to violate this custom and to dare to ordain other bishops in the diocese of Alexandria, this present Nicene Council renewed the ancient custom by the terms of the present Canon and again ratified the rule giving the Bishop of Alexandria authority over all the bishops in Egypt, etc. And this was the meaning attached to the present Canon by the Bishops from Egypt at the Council held in Chalcedon, in Act 4 (according to Dositheus, in the *Dodecabiblus*). This authority is also conferred in c. XXX of the 4th.

⁷ For the name Patriarch first began being used in the time of Theodosius the Little. For seeing that the Patriarchs had formerly been called specially Bishops of the Apostolic thrones, this Theodosius first called the Bishop of Rome a Patriarch, and also applied the term to St. Chrysostom, according to what is stated by Socrates in Book VII, ch. 31. This appellation was also mentioned in the Council held in Chalcedon; and it was indeed by Justinian that patriarchs were actually and officially called Patriarchs. This noun signifies two different things: either the bishops who were made superintendents and exarchs in some provinces and dioceses by a common synod, as this was done also by the Second Ecum. Council, according to Socrates (Book V, ch. 8). One of such bishops was St. Gregory of Nyssa, being subject to the Bishop of Caesarea. These prelates were called Patriarchs not by reason of any superiority of their throne, but as a result of a conciliar decision in order that they might have greater authority to exercise for the purpose of implanting and uprooting, because of their being equal to the other Patriarchs. That is why, in writing to Flavian of Antioch, against the Bishop of Caesarea who had treated him scornfully, the Bishop of Nyssa said: "If the dignity be judged sacerdotally, the privilege of both of us has been made equal and one by the Council, but rather it may be said that the care taken in correcting common matters depends upon having the benefit of equality. Or it properly signifies the bishops who have the first honor in the Church by reason of the superiority of their own thrones and the chief office, not being a personal one like that of those, but belonging to their thrones by succession, which were five in number, namely, that of Rome, that of Constantinople, that of Alexandria, that of Antioch, and that of Jerusalem. These bishops were called on the principle of acrostic, *Caraj* (or in Greek, *Karai*). For the letter *C* stands for Constantinople, the first letter *a* for Alexandria, the letter *r* for Rome, the second letter *a* for Antioch, and the letter *j* for Jerusalem. But because of the fact that the one first mentioned (i.e., the so-called Pope of Rome) bolted the reins, the Patriarch of Constantinople was left as the first among the remaining four. Later a fifth Patriarch was added, namely, the Patriarch of Greater Moscow (i.e., of Russia). But he too is no longer. Although it is a fact that Peter of Antioch in writing to the Bishop of Aquileia said that he alone was specially designated as Patriarch, to which Balsamon assented, yet we do not pay regard to what bishops say about themselves, but to what the catholic Church says about them. Dionysius, too, and Timothy Ailourus called the Bishop of Ephesus a Patriarch, but the Fourth Ecumenical Council disregarded this. Theodore the historian also called the Bishop of Thessalonica a Patriarch, but he addressed him thus either in accordance with the style of address accorded to exarchs, as did the Second Council, as we have said, or, as others say, on account of the many episcopates which he had, totalling some forty in all. (Dositheus in the *Dodecabiblus*.)

⁸ Those belonging to the Roman Church do not interpret this Canon correctly. Hence Pope Felix in a dispute with the Patriarch of Constantinople Acacius, after corrupting it, asserted that the Bishop of Rome possessed sovereign authority in every council, as the Canon (meaning the present one) of the Council in Nicaea intended. Even before him Paschasianus, the legate of Pope Leo, cited the same Canon pervertedly in the Fourth Council. Nevertheless, we can ascertain the

true meaning of this Council by considering the words themselves of the Canon. We assert, then, because Meletius trespassed upon the rights of the Bishop of Alexandria, as we have said, he gave occasion to this Council to formulate the present Canon and to ordain nothing new, but merely to confirm the practices which had been preserved from an ancient custom, not only in connection with Patriarchs, but also in connection with Metropolitans, and not only in connection with ordinations, which Meletius had abused, but also in the matter of every other right that belongs to Patriarchs and Metropolitans with respect to the churches subject to their jurisdiction. These facts being presupposed, the Canon says: Let the ancient customs prevail which were in vogue in Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis, so that the Bishop in Alexandria will enjoy the privilege of exercising authority over all these territories, since this sort of privilege is allowed also to the Bishop in Rome. At this point note that the pronoun “*touto*” in the Greek text of the Canon, translated hereinabove “this,” refers to nothing else than the custom, for the sake of brevity of speech. “Since *this* is also the treatment usually accorded to the Bishop of Rome,” it says. What treatment is that? That of allowing him to have authority over all persons and territories subject to his jurisdiction. For just as the Bishop of Rome possesses this customary privilege like the Bishop of Alexandria, in like manner he possesses the same authority as does the latter. That this is the meaning of the Canon is attested also by the Arabic translation of the same Canons, available in the Alexandrian edition. Joseph the Egyptian also attests the same fact, who is an ancient annotator of the Canons of this Council. The same fact is also attested by Dionysius Exiguus in the Latin translation which he made. The fact is further attested and confirmed by the edition of Isidorus of Mercantor; and lastly it is also confirmed by the translation made by Tyrannius Rufinus the presbyter of Aquileia. So, inasmuch as this is the truth of the matter, and the diocese of Rome is limited like that of Alexandria, it is in vain that the Romans imagine that this Canon entitles them to unlimited authority over the whole world. Note further that owing to the fact that the seniority of Rome had remained intact, the present Canon did not renew it. If it had not been the same as it said concerning the Bishop of Alexandria, it would have explained the matter as concerning Rome too. (Dositheus, in the *Dodecabiblus*.)

⁹ Note that the seniority and privileges of the Bishops of Rome, of Alexandria, and of Antioch spoken of by the Canon here are not those of a metropolitan, as certain writers have asserted, but those of a patriarch; for both Balsamon and the Anonymous annotator of the Canons assert that the Canons are speaking of patriarchs. Moreover, John of Antioch, in the Collection of the Canons, and John Scholasticus, in the Nomocanon, in reference to the present Canon, as well as (the same Council’s) c. VII, and c. II of the 2nd, and c. VIII of the 3rd, use the heading: “Concerning the honor accorded to Patriarchs by the Canons,” and the paraphrasis which Joseph the Egyptian made of the present Canon says the same thing. And the edition of Melchitae of the Arabic text calls the bishops of Alexandria and of Rome patriarchs here (Dositheus, *ibid.*). Only the Patriarchs were privileged to wear sacks, chasubles adorned with multiple crucifixes, and tunics bearing letters of the alphabet and triangles, and not any other persons, according to Balsamon (p. 449 of the *Juris*). (According to Zonaras, however, chasubles adorned with multiple crucifixes alone were allowed also to the bishops of Caesarea, of Cappadocia, of Ephesus, of Thessalonica, and of Corinth; and see the footnote to c. IX of the 4th). They held divine services (i.e., celebrated liturgy) but thrice a year with the sacks, to wit, on Easter Sunday, on the day of Pentecost, and on Christmas, according to Demetrius Chomatianus (p. 318 of the *Juris*). The word *patriarch* is defined by Leo and Constantine the emperors thus: “A patriarch is a living image of Christ and animate, therein characterizing the truth by deeds and words. Finally, upon the patriarch depends the salvation of the souls entrusted to him, and it is for him to live according to Christ and to be crucified to the world. It is the nature of the patriarch to be didactic, and to level himself to equality without embarrassment with all other men high as well as low” (Title III of the selection of laws, p. 8, of the second book of the *Juris*).

¹⁰ Note that according to Josephus (concerning the Jews, Book VII, ch. 18) the city was named Jerusalem because Melchisedec, who first built the city, and having built therein a sacred temple, he called the city, in allusion thereto, Jerusalem, because it had previously been called Salem and a temple is called (in Greek) “*jeron*.” Others, however, and perhaps more correctly, say, like Procopius (p. 198, vol. I of the Octateuch), that the name is derived from Jebus (1 Chron. 11:4) and Salem (Ps. 76:2), other names of the same city, by forming a compound name Jebusalem, which became corrupted to Jerusalem. Howbeit, the name Jerusalem is wholly Hebrew, and denotes “vision of peace,” according to the Fathers (though one may say that it is a compound derived from Hebrew and Greek, precisely as the word *antimensium* is derived from Greek and Latin. But in that case it will not longer signify “vision of peace,” of course). Though formerly called Jerusalem, the city was subsequently named Aelia capitolia, according to Dion. The name Aelia was derived from Aelius, a surname of Hadrian, who renamed Jerusalem Aelian, according to Theodoret and Eusebius, after it had been torn down and excavated before and plowed under with oxen, and scarcely recognizable on the surface, according to Gregory the Theologian. The descriptive appellation Capitolia was added to the name Aelia because the city was built on the site of the temple of God which, according to the same Dion, the same Hadrian called by the name of the temple in honor of Jupiter which stood in the Capitolium of Rome.

¹¹ It was named Caesarea because, according to Eusebius, Herod built it to honor the name of Augustus Caesar, though it had formerly been named Tower of Straton. In it, according to Josephus (Book XV, ch. 13, on the Jews), there were statues of Caesar and of Rome. But there were three cities named Caesarea in Asia. One was this metropolis in Palestine; a second Caesarea was that in Cappadocia, though it was also called Caesar’s Maza, according to Sozomen, Book

V, ch. 4, as well as Mazaca; and a third Caesarea was Caesarea Philippi.

¹² Thus did they call themselves in accordance with their conceited way of thinking, as Eusebius states in his Book VI, ch. 43.

¹³ The laying on of hands here is not ordination, as one might perhaps suppose, but it consists in the action of those in holy orders laying their hand on the heads of such heretics, and thus accepting them as penitents. For c. XLIX of Carthage also insists that penitents be accepted thus with laying on of hands, and not, of course, with any ordination. That my words are true is attested by the Seventh Ecum. C. For when this same Canon was read in the first act of the same Council, and it was asked how the expression “laying on of hands” was to be understood, most saintly Tarasius said that the phrase “laying on of hands” was employed here in the sense of blessing, and not with reference to any ordination. Hence spiritual fathers ought to learn from this Canon to lay their hands on the heads of penitents when they read to them the prayer for pardon, as c. XXXV of Carthage expressly says this. For such a laying on of hands is necessary to the mystery of repentance. Listen also to what the Apostles say in their *Injunctions* (Book II, ch. 18): “Accept a sinner when he weeps over his sin, and after laying a hand on him, let him remain thereafter in the flock.” And again (*ibid.*, chapters 41 and 43): “Just as you accept an infidel after baptizing him, so shall you restore to the spiritual pasture as purified and clean a sinner after laying a hand upon him.” This laying on of hands serves him in lieu of baptism, since by imposition of the hands the Holy Spirit used to be bestowed upon believers. The custom of this imposition of hands in connection with the new grace came into prevalence from the old. For thus the high priest used to accept by imposition of hands the sacrifices of burnt offerings and those made on the score of sin. See also chapters 1 and 3 and 4 of Leviticus. Note, however, that it was by way of “economy” (or concession) that this Council accepted the Novatians, as St. Basil notes in his c. I. See also the Interpretation of c. VII of the 3rd, where c. XXXIX of the council held in Illyberia says that heretics are to be accepted by the process of laying on of hands.

¹⁴ Just as Meletius, after being subjected to an examination, and judicial trial, was compelled by the first synod held in Lycos to continue life with the mere name of bishop; and thenceforth to ordain no one, either in a city or in a village (Sozomen, Eccl. Hist., Book X, ch. 14; and Socrates, Book X, ch. 9).

¹⁵ In Book IV, ch. 14, of his Ecclesiastical History, when narrating the facts concerning Felix and Liberius, bishops of Rome, Sozomen states that after God had governed matters in this fashion, allowing Felix to die, that is to say, and He left Liberius by himself, in order to avoid having the throne of St. Peter dishonored by being occupied by two functionaries, which is a sign of discord and alien to the ecclesiastical Canon. St. Epiphanius, in his Haer. 68, states that Alexandria never had two bishops. And (Pope) Cornelius, the bishop of Rome, in writing to Phanius the bishop of Antioch, accuses Novatian of trying to make himself, and, in fact, of actually making himself, a bishop of Rome, when as a matter of fact Cornelius himself was the lawful bishop in that city. “How, then, is it,” he goes on to say, “that he did not know that there can be but one bishop in one church, and not two?”

¹⁶ Because it is not permissible in a village or small city, where there is need of but one presbyter, to enthrone a bishop, lest the name of bishop be thus brought into disgrace, according to c. VI of Sardican. On this account in such small cities and villages and districts sparsely peopled it was the vogue to appoint a so-called *chorepiscopus*. So, according to c. X of Antioch, the chorepiscopus was appointed by the bishop of that city to which he was subject and to which his territory belonged. The same Canon also says that such a chorepiscopus may ordain anagnostes (readers or lectors), subdeacons, and oath-takers (i.e., catechists); but that he shall be deposed if he dare to ordain a presbyter or deacon without the consent of the bishop in the city, even though he has had the imposition of hands of a bishop. Canon VIII of the same council permits unaccused chorepiscopi to grant letters pacifical, i.e., dimissory, to those requesting them. Likewise c. XIII of Ancyra decrees that without the written authorization of a real bishop chorepiscopi have no right to ordain presbyters and deacons either in their own territory or in any other town. Canon XIV of Neocaesarea says that chorepiscopi, being in the nature of types of the seventy Apostles, officiate as assistant ministers and are honored on account of the interest they show in the poor by distributing among them the money collected in church. Moreover, c. XIV of the 7th says that it was an ancient custom for chorepiscopi to ordain anagnostes at the behest of the bishop. That is what c. LXXXIX of Basil, too, declares in his letter to chorepiscopi. These chorepiscopi, in fact, appear to be in some cases presbyters only, and in other cases to have had the imposition of hands of a bishop, as may be inferred from what is said in cc. VIII and X of Antioch. But there is a considerable difference between a bishop and a chorepiscopus. For a chorepiscopus is in charge of only one district; a bishop is the overseer of many districts. A chorepiscopus is appointed by the bishop to whom he is subject, whereas the bishop is appointed by the metropolitan. Accordingly, the chorepiscopus has to get written permission from his bishop for every ordination that he performs, whereas the latter executes each ordination on his own venture. So that the so-called chorepiscopi of today (i.e., as the term is now used in Greece), as not having these functions, possess a mere name, destitute of actuality.

¹⁷ John of Antioch in the collection of the Canons, instead of the expression “confessed their sins to them,” substitutes the words “confessed the sins they had committed,” which is more correct.

¹⁸ 1 We note here, however, a catholic and general axiom that all who have been ordained contrary to the Canons and unworthily, are nevertheless true priests until they are deposed by a council. Because, as divine Chrysostom says, “God does not ordain all men, but He does act through all men, even though they themselves are unworthy, in order that the people may be saved” (Homily 2 on 2 Tim., p. 337 of Vol. IV). And again: “Because grace operates through the unworthy not on their account, but for the sake of those who are destined to be benefited” (Discourse 11 on 1 Thess., p. 216 of Vol. IV). And again: “But now, it must be said, God is wont to operate also through unworthy persons, and the grace of baptism is in no respect injuriously affected by the life of the priest” (Discourse 8 on 1Cor., p. 290 of vol. iii). Moreover, in Discourse 3 on the Ep. to the Col., p. 107 of vol. iii, he proves this by means of numerous arguments, among which he says these things too: “God’s grace is also operative in an unworthy person, not for our sake, but for your sake.” And again: “It is not me that you are treating scornfully, but the holy orders. If you see these naked, then treat them scornfully; then not even I will tolerate any imposition. But as long as we are sitting on this throne, as long as we have the presidency, we possess the dignity and the power, even though we really are unworthy.” Symeon of Thessalonica (Reply 13) says: “in regard to ordination grace operates in them, whether they are prelates or priests, for the salvation of those coming to church; and all the mysteries they celebrate are in very truth mysteries. Woe, however, (says the same Symeon *ibidem*) “to such men, who, whether they sinned before the ordination or after the ordination, are unworthy of holy orders. And if they want to repent and to be saved, let them refrain altogether from the most holy works of holy orders, because there is nothing else that can help them to repent, if they fail to abstain beforehand from holy orders.” See also the testimony of Chrysostom concerning resignation, in the Form of Canonical Resignation, at the end of this handbook.

¹⁹ Impious Licinius, who was brother-in-law to Constantia the sister of Constantine the Great, and enjoyed second place in the royal honor after Constantine himself, but later conceived an envy against the brother of the latter’s wife, and launched a fierce war upon God. Hence he first of all drove every Christian out of his house; afterwards he commanded that all Christian soldiers in every city in the realm should be deprived of the honor of their military office unless they sacrificed to the idols (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., Book X, ch. 8; and concerning the life of Constantine, Book I, ch. 54). But after he was gone, most pious Constantine made a contrary law to the effect that all former Christians who had been in military service and had been persecuted on account of their faith in Christ by Licinius and had been deprived of the honor, should be given the choice of remaining imperial soldiers, just as they had been formerly, or, if they did not care for the honor, of being allowed each his freedom. (Eusebius, concerning the life of Constantine, Book II, ch. 33; and Sozomen, Eccl. Hist. I, ch. 1).

²⁰ Concerning Audients (or “listeners”), Succumbents (or “kneelers”), and Consistents (or “costanders”), see c. LXXV of Basil.

²¹ The present-day custom of the Church treats faith-deniers for the most part considerately, in accordance with the formulation of Methodius of Constantinople. On this basis, if anyone was made a captive when a child, and as a result of fear or ignorance he denied the faith, when once he has returned thereto, after listening to the usual propitiatory prayers for seven days, on the eighth day he is bathed, and is anointed with Holy Chrism, and thus he partakes of communion, remaining thereafter in the church for eight days, and listening every day to the sacred liturgies and services. But if he was an adult and denied the faith after being tortured, in this case he is obliged to fast first for a period of twice forty days, abstaining from meat, and cheese, and eggs, and on three days in the week (namely, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) abstaining from oil and wine. (Notice that the fast of Wednesday and Friday which is obligatory on all Christians was given to this person as a canon by way of philanthropy and clemency). For seven days he listens to the same prayers, and thus he too is bathed, like the one above, and is anointed, and communes. If, on the other hand, he willingly went and denied the faith, he too has to fast for two years in identically the same manner as the one above fasted, and, according to his ability, he must make one hundred or two hundred genuflexions thereafter he also listens to the propitiatory prayers, and is bathed, and receives the other treatments, like the ones above. (Blastaris, in his synopsis of the Canons of the Faster; and Armenopoulos, Section 5, Heading 4, of his Epitome of the Canons. See also this formulation in the Euchologium, where these prayers are to be found, more in *extenso*.)

²² In some such manner as this a confessor (or spiritual father) ought to shed tears and mourn over the sins of Christians who confess to him; not, however, when they are confessing to him, but after their confession, when he has to advise them, because these tears of his show that he loves sinners as a father loves his children, and is sorry for them as Jacob lamented Joseph, and as Moses as well as Jeremiah lamented for the Israelites, and just as the Lord shed tears over Jerusalem. Notice also in the discourse of Gregory of Nyssa concerning repentance how stipingly therein he urges spiritual fathers to mourn for sinners.

²³ Hence divine Chrysostom (in his Discourse 2 concerning holy orders) says: “A pastor ought not to inflict penalties or penances proportionately to the sins, but ought to take into consideration also the will of the sinners, lest in trying to mend a tear or torn place he tear it worse than ever, and in making hasty attempt to help the fallen one to his feet he hurl

him still farther down. For those who have a weak will . . . If they are penanced a little at a time, they can free themselves, if not entirely, at any rate to some extent, from their sins and passions. But if one overwhelm them suddenly with all the penances they deserve, he will deprive them of even that small amount of correction which they ought to receive . . .” And again: So for this reason a pastor ought to possess a great deal of discretion, and countless eyes, in order to see the habitude of the soul from all sides. For just as some men, being unable to endure an austere canon, become stiff-necked and, leaping away, fall into despondency, so too, in a contrary fashion again there are some who as a result of their not receiving a canon along with their sins become careless, and grow worse, and are egged on to sin more than ever. On this account, too, in the time of Patriarch Luke one Bishop who had penanced (or, as the original says, “canonized”) a soldier in too short a time, because of his having committed a willful murder, and who had given him a written document attesting the remission of his sin, was called to account by the Synod for the excessively lenient concession he had made. The Bishop, on his part, offered in witness the present Canon of this Council. He was told, however, by the Synod that though permission was given, true enough, to prelates to augment or to reduce the penances prescribed by the Canons, yet they are not permitted to employ an excessive and inconsiderate concession. Hence the Synod inflicted the penances of the Canon on the murderer, on the one hand, and chastised the Bishop, on the other hand, with suspension from his prelacy for the prescribed length of time.

²⁴ Note that in the present Canon there are observed those two points which Basil the Great mentions in his c. III, to wit, custom and form, and strictness and extremity. The custom and the form, which is the three years of “listening,” and the ten years of succumbency (or “kneeling”). The strictness and the extremity, which is the tears, and the patience endurance of hardships, the doing of charitable deeds to others, and, in general, genuine and true repentance. Accordingly, to those who tolerated the strictness, there was made the concession of exemption from the obligation of keeping the requirement of three years’ succumbency. But to those who would not tolerate this penance, no concession was made at all; on the contrary, they were ordered to keep all the years. For this reason divine Chrysostom, in his Homily 14 on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, says: “I am not asking for a multitude of years, but for correction of the soul. So show me this, whether the sinners have been contrite, whether they have changed their manner of living, and everything is finished. But as long as this is not so, no benefit will accrue from protraction of the period of penance. For even in the matter of bodily wounds, we are not concerned about how many times the wound has been bandaged, but whether the bandage has been of any benefit. So if there has been benefit in a short time, let it be no longer bandaged. But if it has been of no benefit, let it be bandaged for a longer time, even for more than ten years, until the wounded one has derived some benefit from the bandage.” And again in the same Homily he says that it is not the multitude of time that suffices to characterize true repentance, but rather the change of the sinner’s mind. For (according to the same saint, in the pre-amble of his commentary on the Gospel according to St. John) it is possible, if one repent in a single moment of time, and change his manner of living, for one to avail himself of God’s philanthropy and mercy. St. Gregory the Theologian, on the other hand, in his Discourse on the Lights, says that “we ought not to accept those who neither repent nor humble themselves, whereas we ought to accept those who fail to repent as they should, and who fail to display repentance equal to the wrong they did, and that we ought to sentence them to keep the forms of repentance that befit their sins. As for those, finally, who truly repent to such an extent that they actually wither as a result of their tears, we ought to admit them to communion. From these statements it will become easy to find the solution to the bewildering question why some Canons penance an adulterer, a person guilty of bestiality, a sodomite, a sorcerer and wizard, and others, with a greater number of years, while other Canons prescribe a smaller number of years for the same offenses. The reason is that the repentance of such sinners is not judged by the number of years, but by the disposition of the soul, and according to their greater or lesser degree of repentance, the number of years of penance is prescribed as more or less.” Hence John the Faster judges by the fasting and genuflexions and other hardships which the penitent has consented to do in determining how much to reduce the number of years of penance the penitent deserves.

²⁵ In other codices it is found written thus: “of the perfect last and most necessary,” etc.

²⁶ Dionysius of Alexandria also writes to Favius in his correspondence that “a faithful old man named Serapion, who was sacrificing to idols, and fell gravely ill and for three days was dumb, after recovering a little on the fourth day, called his nephew and told him to fetch a priest. The boy went to the presbyter. It was night-time. But the priest happened to be ill, so that he could not go. Since, however, I (sc. Dionysius) had given orders to the priests to allow persons at the point of death to commune, especially if they beggingly asked to do so, in order that they might die and depart the present life with a good hope, the priest gave the boy a portion of the all-holy bread and told him to wet it and pour it into the mouth of the old man; and after the boy did this the old man, having swallowed a little, immediately gave up his spirit” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, Book VI, ch. 44). Elias, too, the Metropolitan of Crete, in writing to some monk by the name of Dionysius, says that if a person is still breathing a little, and is not entirely dead, though he is senseless, and can neither take nor eat anything, or in another way spits out that which is placed in his mouth; if, I say, the person is such a one, the priest ought with a prayer to seal his lips and his tongue with the contact and affusion of the Mysteries (p. 337 of the *Juris Graecoromani*).

²⁷ Though it is said that Dionysius of Alexandria (as found in a comment on the present Canon) in his letter on a Canon, in speaking of those who lapsed in the midst of the persecution and asked to participate in the mysteries of communion

while dying, he says that if a priest absolves from their sins and they are permitted to partake of the divine mysteries, and are consigned to that life absolved and free, this is a veritable imitation of godlike philanthropy and benevolence in that by virtue of such pardon and communion they are led to believe that they are going to receive a mitigation and alleviation of their future punishment. If, on the other hand, such persons should live, says he, thereafter, they must be bound again (i.e., their absolution must be revoked), and they who had formerly been pardoned, and become partakers of divine grace, and had been sent off to the Lord absolved and free, must again be made liable for their sins, without having done anything wrong since they communed. This, I say, appears to me to be inconsistent, and most unreasonable. If, I say, sacred Dionysius does say these things, it would nevertheless appear that the opinion of this Ecumenical Council is preferable to the opinion of an individual Father. Wherefore wise Photius declared quite aptly that decisions of ecumenical and common councils ought to be respected by all men, while the private declarations of any one Father or decrees of a local synod or regional council (that have not been confirmed by an ecumenical council, that is to say) leave one respecting them characterizable as superstitious, and yet, on the other hand, if one fails to accept them, it is dangerous to ignore them. For let it be granted, in accordance with the opinion of sacred Dionysius, that such persons commune as a matter of necessity, they ought not to be rebound on account of the pardon they had previously received. But, first of all, that pardon and communion was not legal and canonical, but necessitous. Secondly, no one can persuade others not to be scandalized when they see persons that are unworthy and have produced no fruit of repentance being allowed to partake of the divine Mysteries. After taking these views into consideration, the Council decreed that such persons should return again to the prior forms of repentance. For, moreover, even divine Dionysius himself, as if presumably correcting himself, adds: "If, however, any one of such Christ-deniers appear after the recovery of his health to need further conversion and repentance, we advise him to humble and inflict severe hardships upon himself, either for his own interest or in order to prevent other men from blaming him and becoming scandalized at his conduct. Accordingly, if he be persuaded to do this, he will be benefited; but if he be not persuaded, this refusal to be persuaded will become an indictment to him entailing his excommunication from the Mysteries and the faithful a second time." But perhaps this opinion is not that of Dionysius of Alexandria, but one of Dionysius of Corinth. I surmise this because this diction is like the diction used by this Dionysius in comments on Job.

²⁸ John of Antioch in the collection of the Canons has it "As concerning lapsed catechumens."

²⁹ Concerning catechumens Dionysius the sacred martyr says, in chapter 3 of his Hist. Hierar.: "The lowest rank is assigned to catechumens; they are destitute of any share in and are wholly uninitiated in every sacerdotal mystery."

³⁰ In the Collection of Canons by John of Antioch is found also the additional inclusion "or Deacon," as is mentioned in the Canon itself further above.

³¹ Clergymen are called "canonics" and said to be "covered by the Canon," with an implication that their life and their mind and their discourse are all governed and directed in accordance with the sacred Canons, including under this designation Apostolical, Conciliar, and Patristic Canons (see also Footnote 1 to Ap. c. II). In addition the name "canonic" is also given to monks, as may be seen in many of the Canons themselves, and most especially to nuns, on the same assumption are named canonic, that is to say, that laymen and laywomen live for the most part according to laws of their own, or, otherwise speaking, uncanonically, and conduct themselves publicly and privately in an indifferent manner (i.e., without particular pains to obey the Canons).

³² This percentage charge is mentioned also by divine Chrysostom, in his 56th homily on the Gospel of St. Matthew, saying that one (i.e., a debtor as a human being) gives barely a percentage, whereas the other (sc. God) grants a hundredfold and life everlasting.

³³ That is why Symeon of Thessalonica says: "Deacons must not offer portions; all Deacons (must receive theirs) through the Presbyters." And again: "Since they (sc. deacons) have not the gracious gift of formally offering to God (the sacrifice). For they are deacons solely in virtue of their having a ministerial dignity. If, then, at any rate they are not permitted to put on sacerdotal vestments without the blessing of a prelate, or of a priest, nor to commence any ceremony without a presbyter, how can they have any right to administer communion through themselves?" Divine Epiphanius, too, says the same thing in his Haer. 79: "For it is to be noted that neither have deacons been entrusted with the performance of any mystery in the ecclesiastical order, but only with acts of assistance as servants in the celebration thereof." The Apostolical *Injunctions*, too, in Book VIII, ch. 46, say "Neither is it licit for a Deacon to offer sacrifice, or to baptize anyone, or to pronounce any blessing whether small or great."

³⁴ "For this reason, then, the written order of Emperor Alexius Comnenus ought to be annulled which decrees that in gatherings outside the Council and Synod the Chartophylax of the Great Church is to take his seat ahead of not only the priests but even of the prelates themselves, in spite of the fact that he is nothing more than a deacon, without having any other excuse to disregard these Conciliar Canons than the mere fact that it had prevailed as a custom for a long time: since this excuse is not reasonable. For Canons ought to have rather the superiority of authority wherever custom comes

into conflict with Canons. For in spite of the fact that custom does have effect as an unwritten law even in civil matters, and long custom is recognized as having validity in lieu of a law, yet this is not the case in general, but only in regard to those matters respecting which there is no written law and in regard to those matters with respect to which it does not conflict with a written law, or a Canon: and this is so even according to Balsamon himself, who lends his sanction to the absurd decree of the emperor (for he was a chartophylax). Also, according to the fourth decree of the third title of the first book of ordinances, which is Book II of the Basilica, Title I, ch. 41, even the sixth Novel of Leo the Wise ordains that an unwritten custom ought not to have any validity if it is overruled by the Canons. Read also the Footnote to Ap. c. XXIX, and that to c. I of Sardica. How greatly that imperial order of this sort actually disturbed the prelates of that time on account of its absurd character can be learned by anyone who will take the trouble to read the text of the order itself which can be found in Balsamon's comment on the present Canon.

³⁵ Paul, hailing from Samosata, a city situated in Mesopotamia near the Euphrates River, and on this account called Paul of Samosata (and not because he served as Bishop of Samosata, as Balsamon, or even others, has said), was a son of a Manichean woman named Callinica, according to Cedrenus, Blastaris, and Balsamon, and was also made Bishop of Antioch after the death of Demetrianus, the previous Bishop of Antioch, in A.D. 260; according to Eusebius (Eccl. History, Book VII, ch. 27) he believed wrongly not only in connection with the mystery of theology in that he declared that there was but one God, not because the Father is the source of divinity, but by denying the hypostasis of the Son and of the Spirit, like Sabellius, and taking God to be but one person together with His Logos, in the same manner as a human being is one with his own *logos* (i.e., reason), and believing nothing more than the Jews, according to divine Epiphanius (Haer. 65), but also even waxed blasphemous in connection with the incarnate economy; according to Theodoret (Conversation II), Artemon, and Theodosius, both Sabellius and Marcellus, Photinus, and Paul of Samosata, all declare Christ to have been only a mere human being, and they all deny the divinity which had been existing in Him ever since before all the ages. In A.D. 272 the regional Council held in Antioch deposed him and anathematized him. Whereof even the Conciliar letter is to be found in Eusebius *ibidem*, which even states that Paul used to assert that the Son of God had not come down out of heaven, but, on the contrary, that he had commenced from below out of Mary. Note, furthermore, that Cedrenus, Blastaris, and Balsamon say that the Manicheans had their names changed by this same Paul to Paulicians, who sprang up a few years after Paul. See also the prolegomena of Dionysius of Alexandria. See also page 155 of the dogmatic *Panoply*, wherein it is written that the Paulicians are descended from the Manichees, being called Paulicians barbarically instead of Paulojohns.

³⁶ Indictment is one thing and reprehension is another (says divine Chrysostom in his Second Discourse on the Book of Job). An indictment (charge or accusation) is suffered in the case of grave offenses; a reprehension (reproach or censure) is incurred in the case of light trespasses. Whoever is not liable to either of these two treatments is called unindictable. For a person that cannot be indicted as an adulterer, or as a murderer, or the like, is unindictable. A person, on the other hand, that can be reprehended as an insulter, or calumniator, or vituperator, or drunkard, or the like, though exempt from indictments, is liable, nevertheless, to reprehension. On this account Job is called irreprehensible because he was far from being guilty of even the slightest offenses. That is why God said to Abraham "*Be thou complaisant towards me, and become irreprehensible*" (Gen. 17:1). The Apostle, wishing to appoint shepherds of the inhabited earth, since the good things of virtue were then rare, says to Titus: Appoint Bishops, as I have ordered thee, if there be anybody that is unindictable (Titus 1:7). The word irreprehensible (or blameless) would not have been applicable at that time. . . . Irreprehensibility was too comprehensive a term. The middle ground was that reflected in the term unindictable. Even a small good can be great in evils . . . not because He laid this down as a law, but because He condescended to allow delusion. For He knew that when piety blossomed, the very nature of the fact of the matter would of its own accord prefer what is good, and that there would result a selection of those things which are superior and better. Note also that according to the assertion of Chrysostom this Canon demands that those who are about to be admitted to holy orders should be not only unindictable but also irreprehensible; since piety blossomed after St. Paul, although even during the time of St. Paul the term irreprehensible was of limited applicability. For St. Paul himself wrote to Titus as well as to Timothy, saying: "*A bishop, then, must be irreproachable*" (1 Tim. 3:2). This word irreproachable is almost entirely indistinguishable from the word irreprehensible, which word Chrysostom himself interprets by asserting that in saying "irreproachable" St. Paul was alluding to every virtue . . . so that if anyone's conscience upbraids him for having committed some sins, he is not doing right if he desires a bishopric and holy orders, of which by his own deeds he has made himself unworthy. Even the present Canon, too, demands irreproachability of priests, and so does c. IX of the same Council. But if it demands this of priests in general, how much more must not it demand of prelates?

³⁷ Note that a Deaconess, though apparently ordained later by a Presbyter and Deacon, according to c. XIV of the 6th, and authorized to officiate in the liturgy, according to c. XV of the 4th, yet according to the Apostolical Injunctions she does not appear to carry out the male deacon's service in the liturgy of the divine Mysteries in the Bema, but only that service which is performed outside the Bema. For these *Injunctions* say, in Book III, ch. 9, in connection herewith: "Though we have not allowed women to teach in church (because St. Paul expressly says, in his First Epistle to Timothy, ch. 2, v. 12: "*I suffer not a woman to teach*"), how can anyone permit them to serve as priestesses? For this reason it is a mistake of the godlessness of Greeks to ordain priestesses to their female goddesses and not of the legislation of Christ. So this deaconess was ordained at first (*ibid.* ch. 15 and 16) for the sake of women being illuminated, i.e., being

baptized, whom, after the Bishop anointed their head with holy oil, and the deacon only their forehead, she took charge of and anointed their whole body, owing to the fact that it was not proper for a woman's naked body to be seen by men. Secondly, for the other services to women. For in those homes where women were dwelling together with unbelieving men, to which it was not perfectly decent for male deacons to be sent, on account of the risk of evil suspicions, a woman deaconess was sent, according to the 15th ch. of the 3rd book (of the Injunctions), to watch at the doors of the church lest any uncatechized and unfaithful woman might enter (Book II, ch. 17); and she examined those women who went from one city to another with letters commendatory as to whether they really were Orthodox Christian women; as to whether they were tainted by any heresy; as to whether they were married or were widows: and after the examination she would provide a place in the church for each one of them to stand according to her luck and attitude (Book III, ch. 14 and 19). But a deaconess was also needed to render services to those widows who were listed in the church roll, by offering them the alms donated by Christians; and they were useful also in connection with other services too. But most of all, according to chapters 20 and 28 of the eighth book (of the Injunctions) she was ordained for the purpose of guarding the holy gates and serving the presbyters when they were baptizing women with a view to decency and propriety, wherein it is written that "A Deaconess can neither bless nor do anything that presbyters and deacons do." In addition Epiphanius (Haer. 9) says concerning them that the ecclesiastical order needed womankind only by way of deaconesses, whom it called widows, and the older ones among whom it called *presbytidas*. Nevertheless it did not command anywhere for presbyteresses or priestesses to be made such. For neither did deacons in the ecclesiastical order receive any authority to perform any mystery, but only to serve as assistant in connection with the rites being performed by the priests. And again, it is said that the battalion of deaconesses is in the Church, not to serve in the capacity of priests, nor to undertake to pardon anything, but for the sake of preserving the decency of the female sex, either in connection with rite of baptism, say, or in connection with the function of visiting the sick or those in distress, or, in time of necessity of denuding a woman's body, in order that it may be beheld only by her, and not by the male dignitaries officiating in the process of performing the sacred offices. Though it is true that Balsamon says, in reply to Question 35 of Marcus of Alexandria, that Deaconesses enjoyed a rank in the Bema (or Sanctuary), but that the complications due to menstruation dispossessed them of their rank and removed their service from the Bema, yet he himself again in the same reply says that in Constantinople deaconesses are ordained who have no share or privilege in the Bema, but who perform many ecclesiastical services and help to correct women ecclesiastically. Clement of Alexandria, surnamed Stromateus, in his Book III, says that the Apostles had women with them as sisters and fellow deaconesses in the matter of preaching for women confined to the house, through whom the Lord's teaching penetrated into the chamber and private apartment of women. It is also found stated in some books that the appointment (or quasi ordination) of a deaconess consisted in her bowing her head while the prelate laid his hand upon her, and in his making the sign of the cross three times, and repeating some prayers over her. Concerning deaconesses St. Paul writes in his First Epistle to Timothy: "*Even so must their wives be modest, not calumniators, sober, faithful in all things*" (1 Tim. 3:11). Note that although deaconesses were not the same as widows, nor the same as *presbytides*, yet, in spite of this fact, it is true that deaconesses were recruited and ordained from the battalion of widows enrolled in the church. Read also the second footnote to c. XL of the 6th, and the footnote to c. XXI of Laodicea. If anyone fond of learning things would like to know the particular way in which such deaconesses were ordained, he may learn this more in detail from Blastaris. For the latter states that in old books it was found written that the women in question were forty years old when they were ordained, and that they wore a full monachical habit (which means that of the great habit), and that they were covered with a *maphorion*, having its extremities hanging down in front. That when the prelate recited over them the words "The Divine Grace," they did not bend their knee like the deacons, but only bowed their head. Afterwards the prelate would place on their neck underneath the maphorion a deacon's stole (or scarf), bringing the two extremities of the stole together in front. He would not permit them, however, to serve in the Mysteries, or to hold a fan, like the deacons, but only to commune after the deacons, and, after the prelate communed the others, they could take the cup from his hands and replace it upon the holy table, without communing anyone. Blastaris, however, adds of his own accord that they were later forbidden by the Fathers to enter the Bema or to perform any such services, on account of dire results of menstruation, as Balsamon stated further above.

³⁸ One thing which occurred at this Council is particularly noteworthy as constituting a refutation of the imaginary prerogative of the present Popes of Rome, the claim, that is to say, that Popes have sole authority to convoke and assemble ecumenical councils. For, behold, the present ecumenical council is one which Pope Damasus neither convoked nor even attended either in person or by deputies, nor by the usual conciliar letter; yet, in spite of all this, all the Westerners concurred then and concur now in recognizing as a truly ecumenical council.

³⁹ Concerning each of these groups, see the Footnote to c. I of the present Council.

⁴⁰ For the Arians, as well as the Semi-Arians and Pneumatomachs, had altered the ancient glorification (or doxology) of the Holy Trinity to which the Church was accustomed. For instead of saying "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit," they would say "Glory be to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit," in order that, by means of the difference of prepositions, the recusants might draw a distinction of the essence, rank, and honor belonging to the thearchic persons of the coessential and equally honorable Trinity. That is why Leontius the bishop of Antioch, who made himself a eunuch, though seeing the Orthodox Christians apply a conjunction to the Son, while the Ari-

ans, on the other hand, used the preposition “through,” and the preposition with reference to the Holy Spirit, passed over both the one and the other in silence, uttering only the end, that is to say the words “and unto the ages of ages” (Page 247 of the first volume of the Conciliar Records). During the reign of Emperor Anastasius surnamed Dicorus, when Trasmund, leader of the Arian Vandals blockaded the churches of the Orthodox in Africa and banished 120 bishops to the island of Sardinia, an Arian by the name of Barbarus (but according to others the one about to be baptized was called Barbarus), wishing to baptize someone, said: “So-and-so is being baptized in the name of the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit,” when, what a miracle! the baptismal font in the meantime had become entirely dry. (Dositheus, p. 446 of the Dodecabiblus.)

⁴¹ Led astray by the words in ch. 20 of the Book of Revelation (v. 3 to 7), where it says that Satan was shut up and bound for a thousand years, and that the righteous who participated in the first resurrection reigned together with Christ as kings for a thousand years, many men have imagined that after the second advent and common judgment take place, the righteous are to reign here on the earth as kings for a thousand years together with Christ, and thereafter to ascend to heaven; and on this account they have been called millenarians or millennialists. There have been two battalions of millenarians. For some of them used to say that during those thousand years they are to enjoy every enjoyment, and bodily pleasure; these men were followers of Cerinthus, a pupil of Simon, in the first century, and the Marcionists in the second century of the Christian era. Others said that they were not to enjoy passionate pleasures, but rather intellectual pleasures befitting rational human beings, of whom the leader was Papias the bishop of Hierapolis (in Euseb. Eccl. Hist, book 3, ch. 34) and others. Hence it is evident that Apollinaris became such a millenarian of the first battalion, as is plain from what St. Basil the Great says (letter 332), and from what the Theologian says (Discourse 51), and from what Jerome says (Book 18 on Isaiah). On this account in refutation of this heresy this Council added to the Creed of the Nicene Council that statement, which it borrowed from the sentence which the Archangel Gabriel spoke to the Virgin, viz.: “*and of his kingdom there shall be no end*” (Luke 1:33). As for the thousand years referred to by St. John, they are not to come to pass after the second advent of Christ; and the kingdom of the Lord is not describable in terms of years, nor food and drink, as St. Paul said (Rom. 14:17): but, on the contrary, a thousand years are to be understood, according to those versed in theology, to mean the interval of time extending from the first advent of Christ to the second, during which Satan was bound, according to the words of the Lord, saying, “*Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the ruler of this world be cast out*” (John 12:31). The first resurrection, by contrast, took place for justification of souls through mortification of infidelity and wickedness, concerning which Christ said “*He that heareth my words, and believeth in him who sent me, hath life everlasting, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life*” (John 5:24); and the Apostle said “*If then ye be risen with Christ . . . set your mind on the things that are above*” (Col. 3:1-2). And thereafter in this interval of time the reign of the righteous with Christ took place, being their union with Him through (i.e., by means of) the Holy Spirit, and the contemplation and enjoyment of His divine illumination, respecting which the Lord said, “*Some of them that stand here shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power*” (Mark 9:1).

⁴² It developed and completed this Creed, as Nicephorus Callistus and others say, through Gregory of Nyssa, but as Dositheus says (p. 1028 of the Dodecabiblus) by the hand of Gregory the Theologian, who in the midst of this Council thundered out and theologically set forth these things through the Holy Spirit like a heavenly outburst of thunder: “If he is indeed a God, he is no creature. For with us a creature is one of the non-Gods. If, on the other hand, he is a creature, he is not a God. For (if so) he had a beginning in time. Whatever had a beginning, was not. But that of which it may be said that it was earlier non-existent, is not properly speaking a being. But how can what is not properly speaking a being be a God? Therefore, then, he is neither a creature of the three, nor one” etc. (These words were spoken in his inaugural address.)

⁴³ I said that this Council anathematized every heresy that had risen during the reigns of Constantius, of Julian, and of Valens, because in spite of the fact that Constantius professed the eternity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, yet when once lured into the argument that the word coessential (or, in Greek, homoousian) was the cause of a scandal, owing to its not being in the Bible, he relentlessly combated those who held this belief. Hence he exiled, pauperized, and scorned many men of this belief, and assembled various councils and synods in the West and East against the doctrine of co-essentiality. He showered favors upon the heretics, and elevated some of them to great thrones, who ordained their own friends ecclesiastics. Julian did everything that the emperors and persecutors preceding him had failed to do. Valens not only did whatever Constantius had done, but, being an Arian, he commenced a persecution of the Church that was worse than that inflicted by the idolaters. So that Lucius the bishop of Alexandria, who shared his views, even beat the ascetics of the desert themselves, and slew, exiled, and confiscated the property of the clergy. In fact, not only these emperors, but also the other heresies, and the Greeks and Jews had a free hand in their times, while the Orthodox Christians were persecuted. These three emperors kept persecuting the Church for forty years, until there remained but some few Orthodox saints to criticize the heresies, who, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, seized the opportunity to assemble in this ecumenical council.

⁴⁴ Note that the followers of Arius subsequently to the First Nicene Council were divided into three classes, according to St. Epiphanius (Haer. 73 and 74), and some were called Anomoeans, because they said that the Son was in all re-

spects unlike the Father. They were led by Eunomius the Gaul, the bishop of Cyzicus, who was wont to rebaptize those joining his cacodoxy with a single immersion, holding their feet up and their head down. He also pratingly asserted that there is no hell or gehenna in reality, but that fear of it is instilled as a threat; and his views were held also by Aetius. Though called Eunomians, they were also known as Eudoxians from Eudoxius, who was like-minded with Eunomius and had served as a Patriarch of Constantinople, and had ordained Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus.

⁴⁵ Others were called Semi-Arians because they entertained half the heresy engendered by Arius. They said the Son was like the Father in all respects and coessential with the Father, but they refused to admit the word *coessential* as above in spite of the fact that it had been in use among the ancient Fathers even before the First Ecumenical Council (see the Prolegomena to the First Council). Their leader was Basil the bishop of Ancyra. Being one of this faction of Semi-Arians, Macedonius even proceeded to wage war upon the divinity of the Holy Spirit; but the present Second Council condemned him, since his followers were called Pneumatomachs (i.e., spirit-fighters, or opponents of the spirit). A third group called the Son neither like nor unlike the Father, but took a view midway between that of the Arians and that of the Semi-Arians.

⁴⁶ Sabellius, who hailed from Lydia and had served as a bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis, after becoming attached to the heresy of Noetus, a Smyranean according to Theodore and Epiphanius, but an Ephesian according to Augustine, disseminated it to such an extent that those who were driveling it came to be called after him Sabellians, instead of Noetians. He asserted that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit were three names for one and the same person, and that that person was called at times the Father, and at times the Son, and at other times the Holy Spirit according to the diversities of that person's activities and operations.

⁴⁷ Marcellus was from Ancyra. But he embraced the heresy of Sabellius, and not only called Christ a mere man, but also prated that after the second judgment the body of the Lord has to be thrown away, and to go into non-being, according to Euseb. Eccl. Hist., book 3; and that consequently His kingdom will come to an end.

⁴⁸ Photinus, who hailed from Sirmium and had served as bishop of Sirmium, entertained the same views as Paul of Samosata. For he neither recognized the Holy Trinity as a God, calling it only a Spirit creative of the universe, and declaring the Logos to be only the oral word, serving as a sort of mechanical instrument, nor did he call Christ a God, but only a mere human being who had imbibed that oral word from God and had received existence from Mary. According to Sozomenus, Eccl. Hist., book 4, ch. 6. Concerning this see also c. VII of Laodicea.

⁴⁹ Apollinaris, who became a bishop of Laodicea, Syria, embraced the heresy of Arius, who asserted among other things that the Logos (or rational faculty) served the body of Christ in lieu of a soul. According to both Athanasius and Epiphanius, at times he used to say that the Logos received a body without a soul, while at other times, being ashamed of his ignorance or want of knowledge, he would say that He received a soul, but a mindless one and an irrational one, separating, in accordance with the Platonists the soul from the mind. He even went so far as to say that we ought not to adore or worship a God-bearing human being; but, taking him up on this point, Gregory the Theologian countered that we ought to adore or worship not God-bearing flesh, but man-bearing God (see St. Gregory the Theologian's letter 2 to Cledonius). He even went on to prate that Christ possessed the flesh from ever since the time the world began (or, as the Greek idiom has it, "from the age"), because he misunderstood the phrase "the second man (came) from heaven" (1 Cor. 15:47), and consequently took it that He had received no flesh from the Virgin, as Basil attests in one of his letters.

⁵⁰ Note that although Socrates (in his book 5, ch. 8) says that the Second Council distributed the churches among the Patriarchs by the present Canon, yet Sozomen, as those interpreting Socrates, says, in regard to those whom the latter called patriarchs, that it appeared reasonable to the Council for the faith of the Nicene Fathers to be delivered to all the churches through the agency of the bishops in communion and of like mind with Nectarius of Constantinople and Timothy of Alexandria. So, then, the ones whom Socrates called patriarchs are referred to by Sozomen as those in communion, so that he said that they were improperly called patriarchs, instead of exarchs.

⁵¹ Note that because recusant Dioscorus disregarded the present Canon and at the latrocinium (Englished *Robber Council*, held A.D. 449) seated the Bishop of Constantinople St. Flavian in the fifth place, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, after going away to Rome, and in the presence of clergymen of Constantinople, read this Canon to the most holy Pope of Rome Leo, who accepted it.

⁵² This Maximus was an Egyptian and a Cynic philosopher by profession (they were called Cynics on account of the insolence and impudence which they had and which was like that of dogs, the name of which animals in Greek is *cynes*). Having gained the friendship of St. Gregory the Theologian in Constantinople, he was catechized and baptized by him, and indeed was even admitted to be enrolled in the clergy after becoming a defender of the doctrine of coessentiality (called also homoousianity). Later, however, when he plotted to get possession of the throne of Constantinople, he sent money to Peter the Bishop of Alexandria, and the latter sent some men and they ordained him Bishop of Constantinople.

in the house of a yokel, according to St. Gregory's pupil Gregory, who wrote his biography. But as Theodoret (Discourse 5, ch. 8) and Sozomen (book 7, ch. 9) say, after the Egyptian bishops came to Byzantium together with Timothy of Alexandria, they stole the ordination and installed Maximus as Bishop of Constantinople. But the Council, which had become aware of the imposition, deposed him and rendered void the ordinations performed by him. Since the same Maximus was discovered to be holding the beliefs of Apollinaris, he was also anathematized by the Council in addition. The Papists say, and indeed they even boast, that this Dog (i.e., Cynic) visited the Pope and upon repenting was pardoned by him. Against this Maximus St. Gregory the Theologian also wrote some verses and some prose, e.g.: "This man, I say, rent the Church asunder and filled it with disturbance and noise, turning out to be a wolf instead of a shepherd (or pastor), and readily pardoning everything to those at fault for the one object of treating the dogmas impiously. It was by this Maximus that Sisinius, the Bishop of the Novatians, together with Emperor Julian, was given lessons in philosophy." (According to Socrates, book 5, ch. 21.)

⁵³ The reason why this Tome was issued is in brief as follows. Because Emperors Constantius and Constans had learned that Eusebius and his party were troubling the church and that they had deposed Athanasius the Great and Paul of Constantinople, they commanded that a Council be held at Sardica, a city in Illyria, to be made up of Western as well as Eastern Fathers. The Easterners, it is true, when going to the Council, wrote from Philippopolis to the Westerners to deny Athanasius and Paul seats in the Council on the ground that they had been deposed; for they were enemies of the doctrine of coessentiality. But the Westerners replied to them that they had no knowledge of their being deposed or at fault. Upon learning these things, the Easterners left the Council and returned to Philippopolis. The Westerners, though left alone, went through with the meeting of the Council and acquitted Athanasius and Paul, confirmed the faith of the Fathers set forth in Nicaea, without adding anything thereto or subtracting anything therefrom. So it is this exposition and confirmation of the faith that the present Canon calls the Tome of the Westerners alone, and not of the Easterners, because the latter had bolted.

⁵⁴ Socrates (book 2, ch. 10) relates that the adherents of Eusebius of Nicodemeia in the Council held at Antioch during the reign of Constantine, though they did not utterly condemn the faith set forth in Nicaea, in another style and other words composed a definition of faith wherein they appear to confess a single divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, which faith may be found in the work of Socrates in the same place. So it is this definition of faith that the present Canon says that the Council accepted (though this definition may have been first composed by the Eusebians insidiously with a view to gradually attracting the masses to the belief of the Arians, as Socrates himself suggests in the same place), which definition and Tome are mentioned also by Theodoret (book 5, ch. 9). For in the Conciliar letter which the present Second Council sent to the Romans mention is made of this. The letter says *verbatim*: "The details respecting the faith openly preached by us are such, then, as have been stated. Concerning them one may obtain a fuller understanding by consulting the Tome of Antioch made by the Council held there, and that set forth last year in Constantinople by the Ecumenical Council in which we confessed the faith more *in extenso*. Just as the twenty-five Canons, then, of the Antiochian Council were accepted, so too its above definition of faith has been accorded acceptance by this Second Council on the ground that it is correct (notwithstanding its having been insidiously put forth)."

⁵⁵ That is why Athanasius the Great in his apology to the Emperor says the following: "My accusers are Meletians, who ought not to be believed at all, for they are schismatics, and have become enemies of the Church, not now, but from the time of blessed Peter the martyr." As for why the Canon called all schismatics and dissenters "heretics," see the second footnote to c. I of St. Basil the Great.

⁵⁶ The noun "diocese" in Greek is one of many different significations, even in relation to ecclesiastical matters. For, A) it signifies the episcopate and bishopric of each bishop at any time, according to c. LXII of Carth. B) the province of a Metropolitan, according to c. XXVIII of the 4th. C) the provinces of many Metropolitans lying in one diocese, according to this c. VI of the 6th. D) the parish of each Patriarch, as it is also called in many places in the records of the councils and synods, as in those of the council held in Ephesus, "the holy Synod of the Eastern diocese." And E) the combined parishes of two or three Patriarchs taken together, as is said in the Seventh Council: "Of John and Thomas, the legates of the Eastern Diocese, or, more specifically, of Antioch and Jerusalem." These facts having been thus stated, the phrase "The Synod of the Diocese" is never used in the first and second senses, but in the fourth and fifth senses it has been used most especially, both of old and even down to this day being in force. As for the third sense it was in force of old in accordance with the present Conciliar Canon and in accordance with cc. IX and XXVIII of the 4th, but after the Fourth Ec. C. such a synod ceased to be operative. That is why Justinian, in ordinance 29 of the fourth Title of Book I (Photius Title IX, ch. 6), does not mention it at all, wherein concerning differences between bishops and clergymen he says: "For whether a metropolitan alone or together with his synod tries the case of a bishop or clergyman" (which is the same as saying that if the synod of a province tries a case, the Patriarch of the diocese keeps his eye on it), whatever decisions he makes are valid, as though he had tried the cases from the start. For neither can the decisions of Patriarchs be appealed." That which the Canon here calls a "synod of the diocese" is called the exarch of the diocese in cc. IX and XXVIII of the 4th, the exarch being another dignitary than the Patriarch, as we shall state in connection with the interpretation of those Canons. Note, however, that Macarius of Ancyra misexplained this c. VI when he said that this Council calls Patriarchs exarchs of the diocese, because he mentions only the Synod of the province the Synod of

the diocese, and the ecumenical Synod (i.e., Council). But in order to make the matter clearer we must state that the Synod of a Diocese was the assembly, or convention, of the metropolitans of a single diocese together with their chief the Exarch. Now, however, that this sort of Synod has fallen into desuetude, the Synod of each particular Patriarch decides all the ecclesiastical cases of the metropolitans of the diocese subject to his jurisdiction, as though this Synod had become a greater one than the synod of the diocese, since the Patriarchs received full authority to ordain their own metropolitans in the Fourth Ec. C. — an authority which they did not thitherto possess in all its fullness and completeness, according to Dositheus, page 388. By adding in the present Canon that one has no right to take a case to an ecumenical council after it has been decided by the synod of the diocese, this Council has given us to understand that an ecumenical council is the final judge of all ecclesiastical matters, and is the one to which any appeal has to be carried, concerning which see the Preface to the First Ecum. C. in the first Footnote thereto.

⁵⁷ If it be objected that Balsamon asserts that an emperor can do anything and everything, and for this reason can also grant an external (i.e., non-ecclesiastical) judge to try the case of a bishop or of any clergymen in general, and according to a legal observation can convert an ecclesiastical court into a civil court, we reply that we admit that he can do everything that is licit and right, but not, however, anything that is illicit and unjust. Because according to Chrysostom (in his discourse on the fact that sin introduced three modes of slavery) laws are authoritative to rule even the rulers themselves (*Note of Translator.* — The meaning of this observation is that laws have an inherent authority to overrule even the rulers ruling a country, and even though the latter be absolute monarchs.) For, according to the Apostle (sc. St. Paul), “no law is applicable to a righteous person” (1 Tim. 1:9) — (*Note of Translator.* — A correct translation of this passage requires almost perfect familiarity with the Greek language, which, of course, the translators of the English Versions of the Bible were far from possessing. Consequently it appears in both the King James and the Revised Versions so badly mistranslated that I have taken especial pains here to present the exact meaning of the original.) Read also the Interpretation of c. IX of the 4th in order to assure yourself that even the emperors themselves decree that ecclesiastical affairs are not to be decided by secular authorities. See also the Footnote to c. III of St. Sophia.

⁵⁸ Though Paul of Constantinople, and Athanasius together with Pope Julius did appeal to Constans and Constantius to have the Ecumenical Council convoked which is called the Sardican, to consider their case; and Chrysostom and Innocent appealed to Arcadius and Honorius to have an ecumenical council convoked to consider the case of Chrysostom, though, I say, these saints did appeal to an ecumenical council, they are not liable to the penalty of this Canon, for one thing, because, being Popes and Ecumenical Patriarchs, they had no higher court than themselves to pass judgment upon them, and, for another thing, because they made this appeal as a matter of necessity, seeing that the Eusebians who were about to judge Athanasius locally, and those about to judge Chrysostom, were manifest enemies.

⁵⁹ It is written also in the ecclesiastical edict in Book I of the Code, Title IV, No. 29, that no one is to be allowed to try a clergyman before the Patriarch in the first instance, but before his bishop. If he has a suspicion against the bishop, let him bring his case up before the metropolitan. If the latter too is open to suspicion, three superiors in point of seniority of ordination must try the case along with him on behalf of the whole synod. If even this arrangement is not satisfactory, let the case be carried up to the Patriarch, and let his judgment stand as though he had tried the case in the first instance, since decisions of Patriarchs are not subject to appeal, or, in other words, to being carried up to any other higher tribunal (in view of the fact, it is well to explain, that one Patriarch cannot become a judge in regard to the decision of another Patriarch, according to Dositheus, p. 390. Concerning which see Footnote 1 to the Prolegomena of the First Ec. C.).

⁶⁰ In the letter which was sent from Constantinople to the bishop of Antioch Martyrius, containing the whole of the present Canon verbatim and dealing with the way heretics ought to be received, it is written thus: “those calling themselves *cathari* and *catharoteri* (i.e., purer). Hence the name *aristeri* is found among others in the form *aristi* (signifying “best”).

⁶¹ In the aforesaid letter to Martyrius it reads thus: “since there are many (heresies) here, coming especially from the country of the Galatians.”

⁶² Sabbatius, according to Socrates (book 5, ch. 21), left the Jews and became a Christian, and was ordained a presbyter by Marcianus the bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople. Even after betaking himself to Christianity, however, he continued following the Jewish customs, celebrating festivals with the Jews, and celebrating even the Passover (or Easter) with them; and, moreover, according to Balsamon, observing Saturday as Sabbath after the manner of the Jews (and perhaps on this account bearing the name Sabbatius). Those following him were called Sabbatians, though they were also Novatians. These Novatians are called *Aristeri*, this being perhaps a corruption of the Greek word *aristos*, signifying “best.” They may have styled themselves thus as being “purer” than all other Christians, on the ground that they would not accept persons who had been married twice or who had lapsed during persecution, and would keep aloof from the uncleanness, or impurity, of these persons; or perhaps it was because they loathed the left hand (called *aristeri* in Greek) and would not receive anything with it, according to Balsamon. It is a matter of wonder, however, why the First Ecum. Council, in its Canon VIII, accepted these Novatians with a mere confession, whereas this Second Council

insisted upon the seal of the Holy Myron. In an attempt to solve this perplexing question, we answer that the First Council decided to accept them on easy terms mainly and primarily as a matter of compromise and “economy” (i.e., shrewd “management”), in order to avoid making the Novatians loath to return to Orthodoxy because of their being ashamed of having to be anointed by the Orthodox like persons lacking by reason of not having received an application of myron. But, acting on a second principle, this Second Council accepted them only after they had received the seal of the myron, because, according to Theodoret, the Novatians did not anoint themselves with myron; for he says of them the following: “And to those who are baptized by them they do not offer the all-holy chrism.” That is the reason, I assure you, why the Renowned Fathers made it mandatory to anoint those joining the body of the Church from this particular heresy, as did, that is to say, those of this Second Council, and also those of the Council held in Laodicea in their c. I.

⁶³ They were called Quartodecimans, or otherwise Tetradites, because they celebrated Easter not on Sunday, but on whatever day the moon happened to be fourteen days old, by fasting and keeping vigil.

⁶⁴ That is why Pope Liberius asked Macedonians for a written documentary confession, and they gave him a book in which was written the Symbol of Faith (usually called the Creed in English) of the Nicene Council, according to Socrates (book 4, ch. 11). Basil the Great, in his letter 72, says of the Arians: “If they claim to have changed their mind (in repentance), let them show a written repentance, and an anathematization of the Constantinopolitan (sc. their) faith and separation from heretics, and let them not deceive the more honest.”

⁶⁵ Montanus, who lived during the second century after Christ, appeared, according to Eusebius (book 5, ch. 15, of his historical account in reference to events in Mysia, situated in Phrygia — wherefore those under him were called Phrygians), as a false prophet energized by a demon (in this sense usually spelled “daemon” in English) and calling himself a Paraclete, and opposed the Apostolic traditions. Having as followers two women, namely, Priscilla and Maximilla, he called them prophetesses. He taught that marriages should be dissolved, and that men should abstain from foods on account of a loathing thereof. He and his followers perverted the festival of Easter. They conflated the Holy Trinity into a single person; and mixing with flour the blood of a child whom they had lanced, and making bread thereof, they employed it in their liturgy, and partook thereof. These Montanists were also known as Pepouzians, because they overpraised a village in Phrygia named Pepouza, which they even called Jerusalem.

⁶⁶ For it was in this manner too that c. VIII of the First accepted the Novatians, by an imposition of the hand. This local synod, or regional council, was held in Illiberia a short while before the First Ec. C. But it may also be said that all heretics and schismatics returning to the catholic Church ought to be accepted only after an imposition of the hand.

⁶⁷ As for how long a time is required for catechization see Footnote 1 to c. II of the First Ec. C.

⁶⁸ Inevitably, indispensably, and by every necessity this Canon also baptizes the Latins too as having been baptized with no immersion at all. For if it does so in the case of those who have been baptized with only a single immersion how can it be said not to do so in the case of those who have been baptized with none at all? Sufficient has been said and proved in regard to these persons in the Interpretation of Ap. c. XLVI; and what was said there is applicable here. Yet it is not amiss to add here by way of repleteness of discussion the good conclusion in fine that just as this Council decrees that Novatians returning to the fold must be myroned (i.e., anointed with genuine myron) because they were hitherto unmyroned (i.e., unanointed), so too does the Council of the Easterners baptize Latins returning to the fold, for the good and sufficient reason that they are unbaptized. See also the last Footnote to c. XCV of the Sixth Ec. C., in order to realize that Latins ought to ask to be baptized of their own accord, and not wait to be urged to do so by others.

⁶⁹ This is stated in the letter of Cyril addressed to the clergy of Alexandria, and in the first act of this Council.

⁷⁰ I said that Nestorius *became* wrong-minded and blasphemous in regard to the mystery of the incarnate economy, because in the matter of the theology of the Holy Spirit he had not been blaspheming, since he confessed in his Creed: “We do not deem the Holy Spirit either a Son or to have acquired Its existence through the Son, being as It is of the essence of God, not a Son, but being in essence a God, as being of that very same essence that God the Father is of, out of whom It really derives Its essence.” That it was only in regard to the incarnation of Christ that he became blasphemous is manifest: A) from c. VII of this same Council, wherein the Council states that “all bishops and clergymen or laymen that entertain the unholy dogmas or doctrines, of Nestorius concerning the incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God shall forfeit their office.” Do you see that it specifies definitely that it is speaking of the dogmas of Nestorius concerning the incarnation of the Only-begotten? B) from the letter which the same Council sent to the emperors concerning Nestorius, in which it wrote as follows: “After examining the impious dogmas which he (sc. Nestorius) has set forth in writing concerning the incorporation of the Lord Christ, we anathematized those very ones.” But what is there to show that he did not blaspheme in regard to the theology of the Holy Spirit? Two other facts: A) that, since the theology concerning the Trinity is greater than that concerning the incarnate economy, as is acknowledged by all theologians, how could divine Cyril possibly have taken him to task as concerning the incarnation, yet have maintained si-

lence as concerning the theology of the Holy Spirit, at a time when Chrysoloras denounced Demetrius Cydones by saying, “he that has blasphemed in regard to the Son shall be forgiven, but he that has blasphemed in regard to the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven”? and at a time when, as Macarius the bishop of Ancyra said in ch. 67, that it was the more necessary and urgent to ascertain the matter of the theology first, and that of the economy afterwards? for the former has precedence of the latter. B) It is proved from the pusillanimity and dispute which arose between St. Cyril and blessed Theodoret, and which, though not a fine thing nor anything to be praised, was nevertheless economically allowed by God to occur, in order that the true notion concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit might be conspicuously manifested. For when St. Cyril wrote in his ninth anathematization that the Spirit is something belonging to the Son, Theodoret said in refuting him: “True enough, the Spirit is something belonging to the Son: if he means something of the same nature and proceeding out of the Father, we shall agree with him, and shall accept his utterance as a pious one; but if he means to say that the Holy Spirit is derived from the Son, or that It has Its existence through and by virtue of the Son, we shall reject this notion as blasphemous and as recusant. For we believe the Lord when He says “the Spirit, which proceedeth out of the Father” (page 580 of the first volume of the conciliar records). When Theodoret put the matter thus, divine Cyril offered no objection, but, on the contrary, admitted that what he said was true, and merely explained in what way he had meant that the Spirit belonged to the Son. For he says in the apology (i.e., answer) which he wrote in reply to Theodoret’s refutation: “Though the Holy Spirit does proceed out of the Father, as declared by the Savior, yet It is something not alien to the Son” (*ibid.*). But what is the meaning of the expression “something not alien to”? Divine Cyril himself undertook to elucidate this further in his conciliar letter to Nestorius, by saying: “It is something not alien to the Son in respect of essence” (which is the same as to say that It is of the same essence, or co-essential. Accordingly, in interpreting the Creed the same saint says: “The Spirit is effused, or poured forth, or, in another word, proceeds, from God the Father precisely as from a wellspring, though It is supplied to creation through the Son.” Wherefore in view of the fact that Cyril had capped this apology as a reply from Alexandria to Antioch with Paul of Ephesus Theodoret wrote to John of Antioch as follows: “What has now been sent is embellished with evangelical nobility. For it is proclaimed therein that God is perfect, and our Lord Jesus Christ is perfect, and that the Holy Spirit is not derived from the Son and does not have Its existence through and by virtue of the Son, but that It proceeds out of the Father, though it is said to belong to the Son, on the ground that It is co-essential, or of the same essence.” So that inasmuch as Nestorius and Theodoret believed aright in regard to the theology of the Holy Spirit, therefore divine Cyril did not censure them, either before they were reconciled with Theodoret or later after they had been reconciled; but then again neither did anyone else besides Cyril do so, nor did this Third Council. That is why Joseph Bryennius as well as Nile of Thessalonica agree in saying that the strongest and most ingenuous proof of the Orthodoxy of us Eastern Christians is the fact that Nestorius wrote in his Creed that the Holy Spirit proceeds out of the Father, and not out of the Son, nor that It has Its existence through or by virtue of the Son, and the fact that the Third Council accepted this Creed and did not object to it in the least. So prattling Aquinas is slandering, yes, slandering the Eastern Church when he describes it as Nestorian because it dogmatizes that the Holy Spirit does not proceed also out of the Son, as the Papists blasphemously assert. For if our Church were indeed Nestorian on this account, divine Cyril would be a Nestorian, the Third Ecumenical Council would be Nestorian, and the subsequent Church too, for all of them have likewise accepted and recognized this dogma, and it was and is a catholic tenet of the Church. But, as a matter of fact, Cyril, and the Third Council, and the subsequent Church were not Nestorian. Hence it is logically evident that neither is the Eastern Church Nestorian, as she agrees with Cyril and all the Church. But if it be objected that the Papists assert that the Creed of Nestorius was condemned in the Third and Fourth Councils, we reply that it was condemned, true enough, but only as pertaining to the incarnate economy, and not as concerning the theology of the Holy Spirit. For divine Cyril wrote to Eulogius that we ought not to eschew and abandon everything that heretics say. And Athanasius the Great stated that the Arians held correct views in addition to their heretical views (see pp. 495-7 of the Dodecabiblus).

⁷¹ After recusant Nestorius was anathematized by the present Council, since, instead of becoming quiet, he went on preaching again his cacodoxical heresy, first, according to Theophanes, he was exiled to Thasus, and afterwards to the oasis of Arabia with the co-operation of John of Antioch. While living there the scoundrel experienced afflictions of divine indignation. His tongue rotted, according to Evagrius, and all his body, according to Cedrenus, and Nicephorus (book 14 of his history); and in upper Thebais he met with a fearful and painful death, as told by St. Germanus of Constantinople in what he relates about the holy Councils. For in the reign of Emperor Marcianus, with the co-operation of some of his friends, Nestorius was enabled to receive letters recalling him from exile. After receiving these, then, and upon entering the privy, before sitting down he said aloud, as some listeners standing outside heard “I have shown thee, Mary, that thou gavest birth to a human being.” Thereupon, what a miracle! directly with the utterances of this blasphemy, an angel of the Lord smote him a terrible blow and his entrails exuded into the vessel containing his excrements, and he expired then and there. Because of his delay in coming out of the place and the fact that the imperial magistrate sent with the letters was in a hurry, his servants knocked on the door. As Nestorius failed to answer, they took out the door and they and the magistrate came in and found him dead in the privy in which all his entrails were spilled. Then those who had heard the blasphemy told it to the magistrate, and they all saw that it was solely on account of this that he met with such a death, similar to that of Arius, and they exclaimed: “It was in reference to this man that Isaiah said, ‘Woe unto this man! They shall not weep for him, O Lord. Neither shall they even say to him, Alas, O brother! and, What a pity, O Lord! A burial now he shall not be given, but, after joining those who have croaked, he shall be hurled beyond the gate’” (Jer. 22:18-19). Note, however, that after the heresy of Nestorius became neglected, it was renewed

later during the reign of Justinian the emperor by a certain bishop of Nisibis named Barsoumas, who spread it in the East, and on this account there are exceedingly many Nestorians in the East, and especially in the land of the Persians and Assyrians, and in the vicinity of the Euphrates and Nisibis.

⁷² Some say that because it was ordained in the present Council that the All-holy Virgin should be called the Theotoke, as in truth she is the Theotoke (because of the fact that she gave birth to a God), St. Cyril wanted to have this written into the holy Creed of the First and Second Ecumenical Councils, but out of reverence for the Creed he gave up this intention and all that is referred to in the Footnote to c.VII of the present Council in this connection may be found there. Having made a sole definition of their own, the Fathers dogmatized it in that Canon. For though they recognized the unity, with respect to substance, of the God Logos — which is the same thing as to say the one substance of Christ as revealed by the Creed, they did not want to add it therein. For in view of the fact that the Fathers confessed therein the Son of God, begotten out of the Father, come down (out of heaven), and having become incarnate as a human being, it is obvious that they confess one and the same Christ with respect to substance, a real God, and a real human being the same, but not another, and another. The union with respect to substance, however, according to the holy Patriarch of Constantinople Nicephorus, “one with the other one, the two out of which the Savior derives (sc. His two natures), as who should say, the unseen and the seen, the possible and the indefectible. Not another and another, God forbid! But a God the same perfect, and a human being perfect the same” (in the letter he sent to Pope Leo; page 912 of the second volume of the Councils). This is the same thing as saying that the union, with respect to substance, in Christ signifies both the two natures unconfused and the single substance with respect to which these natures were inconfutably united. Concerning union with respect to substance, see also the Footnotes to the Prolegomena of the Fourth Ec. C. But note that the Lord’s human nature (i.e., His humanity as distinguished from His divinity) possessed all the substantial properties that the substances of the rest of men have, except for the total property, according to the said Cyril, which is, that of not really being by itself, like those, but, on the contrary, of having received being in the substance of the God Logos. For this property of substances is, so to speak, the basis and foundation of all their other properties. It is for this reason that it is called the total property, too.

⁷³ Note that just as the (the Greek word meaning the same thing as the English) word co-essential was one to which the Fathers were accustomed even before the First Ecum. Council, though the latter sanctioned the use of this word, and imparted it to the whole world, so and in like manner had other Fathers called the Virgin Mary a Theotoke even before this Third Council. But this Council, having sanctioned this sweetest appellation of the Virgin, imparted it as a dogmatic definition to the whole world and handed it down through all later generations. Origen was the first one to call the Virgin a Theotoke, in interpreting verse 33 of chapter 22 of Deuteronomy (pp. 15 and 54 of the first volume of the series of the Fathers (in the *Patrologia*); but also Socrates (in Book 7 of his History, ch. 32) says that Origen himself while engaged in a comprehensive examination of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans found out how the Virgin came to be called the Theotoke. Cyril of Alexandria, in writing to Nestorius, says that even Athanasius the Great called Her the Theotoke, and Amman the Bishop of Adrianoupolis concurred, just as Alexander of Alexandria called the All-holy Virgin the Theotoke in writing to Alexander of Constantinople (the one, that is, who presided at the First Ec. C.). Again, Basil, in his discourse on the birth of Christ, says: “The Theotoke never ceased being a virgin, because She would not displease the ears of Christ-lovers.” Those testimonies, I take it, are self-sufficient. But it may be added here that Gregory the Theologian, in his first letter to Cledonius, says: “If there be anyone that does not consider Mary to be a Theotoke, he is destitute of divinity.” And in his first discourse concerning the Son, in addressing the Greeks, he says: “For where among your deities have you known a Virgin Theotoke?” Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine (ch. 43) and Socrates (Book 7, ch. 32) say: “Wherefore indeed the most God-revering Queen (i.e., Helena) with wonderful tombstones gorgeously decorated the Theotoke’s birthplace” (i.e., Bethlehem). Dionysius of Alexandria said to Paul of Samosata: “the one who became incarnate out of the holy Virgin and Theotoke Mary.” St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (or Miracle-worker) of Neocaesarea, in his discourse on the Annunciation, says these following words: “The holy Theotoke, therefore, gave voice to the song of this prophecy by exclaiming, ‘My soul doth magnify the Lord’” (Luke 1:46). Only the All-holy Virgin is called a Theotoke, according to the explanatory remark of Zonaras in commenting upon some troparion of the canons of the Octoechus of Damascene, by way of contrast with the women among the Greeks who were mythologically asserted to have given birth to their inexistent pseudo gods.

The Virgin is called the Theotoke as having truly given birth to God, the accent being upon the last syllable, and not Theotocus, with the accent on the antepenult, which would signify “having been begotten by God spiritually,” as recusant and man-worshipping Nestorius called her. For in this manner all human beings have been begotten spiritually through and by virtue of baptism. But the Holy Virgin is said to be a Theotoke in two ways. One of these ways is on account of the nature and the substance of the God Logos which was given birth out of Her and which assumed humanity; and the other way is on account of the humanity assumed, which became deified as a result of that union and assumption, and attained to God-hood. (John Damascene, Concerning the Orthodox Faith, book 3, ch. 12, and elsewhere.) The holy and ecumenical Sixth Council proclaimed Her a Virgin (in its act 11 by means of the libellus of the faith of Sophronius of Jerusalem) before giving birth, and in giving birth, and after giving birth: which is the same as saying ever-virgin. Concerning St. Epiphanius (Haer. 78) says: “Who, having said Mary, and having been asked whom he meant, ever failed to answer by adding the Virgin?” And St. Jerome (Dialogue Second against Pelagius) said: “Christ alone opened the closed portals of the Virgin’s womb, and thereafter these remained thenceforth shut (this word “opened” de-

notes that the Lord fecundated the womb, just as, in the opposite case, the womb is said to be shut in the sense that the womb is barren because of sterility: in accordance with that passage in Genesis saying: “*God had shut fast every womb from without*” (Gen. 20:18); or it may be said to denote “parted asunder,” but without injury, and not like the rest of infants). She is declared to be ever-virgin also the first Canon of the Sixth Ecum. C., held in the Trullus.

⁷⁴ Note that the minutes of this Council are divided into three parts. Thus, the first part contains various homilies and letters. The second part contains its acts, which were seven, according to Dositheus, but five according to the Collection of the Councils, and these include the second minutes of the apostatic convocation (or council) gathered round John of Antioch. The third part embraces St. Cyril’s interpretation in regard to its twelve chapters, or to say the same thing in other words, the twelve anathematizations directed against the unholy dogmas of Nestorius, and the objection of the Easterners to them, and the apology (or reply) of St. Cyril to their objections; it also contains the refutation of the same anathematization by Theodoret, and the apology again of the same Cyril to these refutations; it further contains the promotion of Maximianus to the throne of Constantinople, and the pacification of Cyril with John by aid of the emperor’s co-operation; all of which matters are to be found written in Dositheus from page 279 to page 287 of the Dodecabilus, as well as in the first volume of the Collection of the Councils from page 357 to page 654, that is to say, to the end thereof.

⁷⁵ Celestius, a follower of his teacher Pelagius, agreed with Nestorius in his heresy, according to sacred Photius (Anagmosma 54), since he blasphemed the Son of God, while Celestius blasphemed the Holy Spirit, as Cyril wrote to Theodosius. For, on the one hand, Nestorius asserted that “Since Christ is of our nature, while God wishes all men to be saved, and everyone can mend his fault with the exercise of his own free will, therefore not the Logos of God that was born, but the human being who was begotten out of Mary, on account of the meritoriousness of his natural free choice, had the Logos of God following (i.e., investing) him, solely by reason of his worthiness, and partook of divinity by virtue of a similarity in sense attached to the word.” Celestius, on the other hand, asserted that “it is not God, that is to say, in other words, the Holy Spirit, that apportions to whomsoever He wills the means of attaining to piety and salvation, but the nature of the human being himself which has forfeited bliss on account of sin. This, according to the meritoriousness of his free will, is either attracted (or invited) or repelled (or repulsed) by the Holy Spirit.” He also maintained that self-control (or self-assertion) takes precedence of or leads the way to grace. Hence, said he, a man’s will is sufficient for the fulfillment of God’s commandments. These wicked doctrines of Celestius were anathematized both by this Third Council and by one held before it in Carthage at the same as that of Pelagius. Concerning the heresy of this man divine Augustine also wrote something in his discussion of heresies (ch. 88). There has been found also a comment on the present Canon written by Nicholas of Hydrous and saying for one not to spell the name of Celestius with an *n*, as it is written in some manuscripts owing to ignorance, but without the *n*, Celestius. For the man named Celestinus was an Orthodox Pope, whose place, as has been said, in this Third Council was filled by Cyril, whereas Celestius was a heretic and like-minded with Nestorius, as we have said.

⁷⁶ The reason why the Council anathematized those who should undertake to compose another Creed (called in Greek “Symbol of Faith”) is as follows. St. Marcus of Ephesus in the fifth Act of the Council held in Florence says that heretics had composed more than thirty creeds against the doctrine of coessentiality (or homoousianity). One of them, recusant Nestorius, took the opportune occasion to compose a creed of his own, and he was wont to hand it to the Greeks who were joining the Orthodox faith, and to the Jews and heretics who were doing likewise, as is explained in the present Canon. So this Third Council, foreseeing the possibility that this liberty of writing creeds might result in the introduction of some innovation into Orthodoxy, decided to forbid the writing of creeds henceforth other than that of the First and that of the Second Ecumenical Council together (for these two creeds are regarded as one) and their delivery to the public. But it did not forbid the writing of a different creed in general, or, more explicitly speaking, of one that is avowedly heretical. For this had always been forbidden even before the Third Ecumenical Council was held, not only by councils and synods and bishops, but also by every Orthodox Christian. Nor did it forbid heretics a different creed than the (Symbol of) faith of the Bishops who convened in Nicaea, even though this alone is Orthodox. For whatever the law says, the Council necessarily accedes to it. But as for the Orthodox Christians, and not this one or that one, but all of them in general, councils as well as everyone else in general, “to no one,” it says, “is this permissible,” etc. The phrase “no one,” which is one word as written in Greek, is a general and universal adjunct (or amplifier). On this point see also the explanation of the Creed of this Council which divine Cyril makes in his letter to Acacius. But, with an eye to brevity, the Council did not explicitly say: “to no one let it be permissible to compose any other exposition of faith.” Yet, that which in its Canon it neglected to say *totidem verbis*, this its exarch, which is the same as saying the Council itself, divine Cyril, I mean, in his letter to the Bishop of Melitine elucidates precisely, by saying: “The holy and Ecumenical Council assembled in the city of Ephesus provided that it was necessary to decree that the Church of God must not approve the admission of any exposition of faith other and different than the one really and actually adopted by the thrice-blissful Fathers speaking on behalf of the Holy Spirit.” This passage means that not only must no one compose any other Orthodox Creed than the one of the Nicene Council, but that it is not even at all permissible to offer the same Orthodox Creed itself differently worded or paraphrased, a point which was gallantly admitted and pointed out by divine Marcus of Ephesus and by Bessarion of Nicaea at the Council held in Florence. But what am I saying, “differently worded?” Why, it is not permissible for anyone to change, from the text of the holy Creed, not merely a single word,

but even a single syllable. And that this is true, we have the testimony again of that very same divine Cyril himself as a witness. But when I say the name Cyril, I am saying, in effect, the whole Ecumenical Third Council. For he was its Exarch, but rather I should say that it was the Council itself that spoke through the mouth of Cyril. For the latter in writing to John of Antiocheia says *verbatim*: "We will under no conditions and by no means tolerate the making of the least change by anyone in faith defined, or, in other words, the Symbol of Faith of our holy Fathers who convened in Nicaea, composed at various times. In fact, we will not allow ourselves or others to change a word in the text of it, or even to transgress a single syllable of it." But, if nobody is permitted to change a single syllable, much less is anyone permitted to add anything to it or to take anything away from it. That is why Pope Agatho at the time of the Sixth Ec. C. in writing to the Emperors of Rome said: "One thing and a fine thing too we prayerfully wish and believe to have a right to expect, and that is that nothing shall be determined of all that has been canonically defined, nor any change made therein, nor anything added thereto, but, on the contrary, that these same (dogmas) shall be preserved intact both in word and in thought." The Seventh Ecumenical Council says: "We preserve intact the decrees of the Fathers. We anathematize those who add (anything to) or remove (anything) from the Church." And can it be said that they said one thing and did another in point of reality? No; on the contrary, even in point of reality they actually confirmed their own words by what they did, and none of the Ecumenical Councils following the Third added anything to or removed anything from the common Creed, notwithstanding that they were hard pressed to do so. For the Third Council, although urgently pressed to add these most necessary words, as much more for complete extinction of the Nestorian heresy as for confirmation of the Orthodox belief, the union, I mean, with respect to substance, and the view concerning the Theotoke, yet, in spite of all this temptation, it did not dare to modify the sacred Creed at all, but, instead, contented itself with making a definition of its own and extraneously inserted into it these words and whatever others were needed to explain them. The Fourth Council, again, was faced with the need of adding to the common Creed the doctrine concerning the two natures of the Logos incarnate, on account of the heresy of the Monophysites, yet it did not do this. Likewise even the Fifth Council felt the need of adding something to affirm the everlasting duration of punishment in hell. And the Sixth was urged to add a declaration concerning the two activities (i.e., energies). And the Seventh was likewise hard pressed to add to the Creed an elucidation or approbation of the doctrine of the adoration of the holy icons (i.e., pictures of the saints, etc.), on account of the heretics who entertained contrary beliefs. Yet the Fathers of that Council did not dare to do this, but, instead, they preserved the common Creed free from every innovation. This, too, in spite of the fact these additional features were not really additions of independent thoughts to the Creed as respecting the faith, but were merely developments or expansions of what was already concisely or implicitly embodied in the Creed, and constituted additions of words only. Why, then, did they balk at such suggestions? Assuredly it was because the Councils were so reverently disposed towards the venerability of the Nicene Creed, and towards the definition of the Third Ec. C. which placed under anathema any addition to the Creed whether with respect to points of faith or with respect to words, that is to say. That very same venerability of the Nicene Creed, however, and this same definition of the Third Ec. C. ought, in emulation of the sacred Councils, to have been respected likewise by the Church of the Westerners, which ought not to have added thereto that illegal addition of the expression *Filioque* (meaning "and out of the Son"), which was enough to provoke a schism, or split of the Westerners and the Easterners and to give rise to a fierce war between them, and to lead to the terrible woes, deserving tears but needlessly ensuing, which are recorded in histories and other books. But the Westerners argue captiously that just as the Second Ec. C. did not sin by adding to the Creed of the First, so must it be admitted that neither did the Church of the Westerners sin by permitting this addition. But it must be said that the likeness or similarity they allege to exist here is altogether imaginary. For the Second Ec. C., possessing the same official status as the First, added, as a matter of fact for the real and main reason that it had not been prohibited or debarred by any previous Council for anyone to add anything to the Creed (though the Council held in Sardica before the Second Ec. C. forbade anyone to propound any faith other than that of the Nicene Council, yet, inasmuch as this Council was a particular and regional council, and in view of the fact that it had spoken with reference to the Arians propounding another faith as against the doctrine of coessentiality, and not with reference to any Orthodox Ecumenical Council, it had no claim to become a teacher of the Second Ecumenical Council, which stood as the representative of the whole Church. For a regional council and a particular one always gives way to an ecumenical council, but not vice versa). A second reason is that those additions which the Second Ec. C. made to the work of the First were additions merely of words, and did not involve the matter of faith, being rather expansions of thoughts already concisely or implicitly included in the Creed. And what is the evidence for this? The Councils, which accepted the Creed of the First and that of the Second as one single Creed, called only the Nicene Creed; but not so with the words of the Second Council, held in Constantinople, because they were only a development of what was concisely and implicitly contained in the Creed of the First Ec. C.; for the Third Council in the present Canon expressly decreed that no one should be allowed to compose any different faith (or Creed) than that defined by the holy Fathers assembled in the city of Nicaea. And divine Cyril says the same thing in his letter to the Bishop of Antioch. Besides, even the Bishop of Constantinople John, and of Rome Virgilius in writing to Eutychius of Constantinople say but this one thing. And in the fifth convention held in Florence it is written as follows: "These expositions of the faith, or creeds, of the First and Second Councils, or rather the Creed." That the Fathers of the Second Council expanded rather than added to the Creed of the First is attested by the express statements of many. For the Sixth Ecumenical C. in its edict states: "The 150 Fathers with the inspiration of the All-holy Spirit construed the Creed called great and venerable, on the subject of the Holy Spirit, since they affirmed it to be a God in what they developed and expanded so as to make the sense stand out more boldly." And in Justinian's Novel addressed to Epiphanius of Constantinople Justinian himself says: "on account of the Scriptural testimonies the same lesson (that is to say, the Nicene Creed) was emphasized by the 150 holy Fathers aforesaid when they explained it

more clearly.” In addition, St. Gregory the Theologian in his letter to Cledonius says: “We have never at any time preferred anything to the Nicene faith, but, on the contrary, we ourselves are of that faith, with the help of God, and we shall continue to be of that same faith, adding merely the article deficiently expressed therein concerning the Holy Spirit.” Yet, in spite of the fact that these additions of the Second Ec. C. are properly speaking but developments, as has been proved, it would be a gross violation of law for that Council to dare to add such developments if any previous council anticipating this sort of thing had prohibited any addition whatsoever in the Creed with an anathema, as did the Third Ecum. C. Hence by consequence the Westerners’ addition in the Creed is a gross violation of law and is under an anathema, not only because it is an addition that is of a nature contrary to the faith, in that it represents the Son as a caused cause, and introduces two origins into the Godhead, and a multitude of other improprieties; but also because, though supposedly a development, as they would have it appear to be, and merely an addition of words, yet it ought not on any account to have been added to the Creed, owing to the definitions of the Third Council as well as those of succeeding Ecumenical Councils, which command that the common Creed be preserved intact and altogether unchanged, and which place any addition thereinto under anathema. That is why sacred Theophylactus of Bulgaria said in writing a letter to Nicholas Diaconus: “Any innovation in the Symbol of Faith, then, is that greatest mistake, and the very one alluded to by Solomon is saying ‘making them meet under the roof of Hades.’ ” And again: “And to pardon the Westerners, therefore, would be unpardonable if anything pertaining to the dogma be changed by them to the prejudice of the faith of the Fathers, such as that which has been added in the Creed concerning the Holy Spirit, where the danger is exceedingly grave, this being left unconnected.” But, indeed, even Peter of Antioch, too, called the addition the worst of all evils. It was on account of that addition, moreover, which is wrongly chanted along with the Creed in the Church of the Romans, and has to be corrected, that Sergius of Constantinople omitted Pope Sergius IV from the commemoration, and thereupon arose the great chasm between us and the Westerners. But why should I be telling what our own churchmen say? Even John himself the Pope of Rome, who was also present by his legates Pearus, Paul and Eugenius at the Council held during the reign of Emperor Macedon, in the year 879, and accepted that Council’s definition, which runs as follows: “If anyone in defiance of this sacred Creed dare to set forth any other, or to add, or to subtract, or to name a term, or to make an addition, or a subtraction, in this Creed which has been handed down to us, he is condemnable and an alien to every Christian confession. For to subtract, or to add, is to render the confession of ours imperfect which has been looking from above down upon the Holy Trinity to this very day.” Even the Pope himself, I say, having accepted this definition, condemned the addition in the Creed, by saying: “We again are trying to make it plain to Your Reverence, in order that you have complete confidence in us as concerning this article, which was the cause of the scandals that have arisen between the Churches of God, that not only do we not assert this belief that the Spirit proceeds out of the Son, but we even deem those who first did so, emboldened by their madness, transgressors of the divine words, and garblers of the theology of the Lord Jesus Christ and of the Fathers, who, after convening in a council, imparted the holy Creed; and we put them in the same class as we do Judas.” But, then, that is not all. Even before this Pope John the Third Council held in Toledo during the reign of King Richard of Spain, A.D. 589, commanded the holy Creed to read without the addition in Spain and France, in precisely the same manner as Emperor Justinian I ordered it to be read before the Lord’s prayer, beginning “Our Father who art in heaven,” in all the churches of the East in the year 545. And Pope Leo III of Rome, in the beginning of the ninth century, when a Council was held in Aquisgrana, and therein John Monachus Hierosolymite was valiantly fighting against the addition in the Creed, upon being asked by Charles the Great what he thought about this matter, not only denounced the addition, but even went so far as to engrave the entire holy Creed without it upon two silver plaques, on the one in Greek, and on the other in Latin, which plaques he deposited in the tombs of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and placed under an anathema those who might dare to add anything to, or to subtract anything from its text, according to Cardinal (Caesar) Baronius and the Jesuit Petrovius. See also the Council held in Florence from its third to its seventeenth session, at which most courageously and gallantly our Greek representatives repudiated and stigmatized this execrable addition, while the Latins stood agasp and speechless.

We have said all this with reference to the common Symbol of Faith called the Nicene Creed. But for anyone to set forth his own personal belief in a private confession (and let it be supposed to be in the form of a creed of his own), that is not prohibited, since from the beginning and down to this day the Fathers of the Church have been making confessions of what they personally believed, and especially those to Acacius the Bishop of Melitine goes to great lengths in offering apologies in defense of certain bishops of Phoenicia, who had been blamed for making an exposition of their own creed. But this is not all. Even divine Marcus of Ephesus in Florence appears to allow this. Nevertheless, such creeds, by some called personal creeds, converted from a heresy and under suspicion. That is why divine Cyril in his letter must have the following six characteristics: 1) They must not diverge from the common confession. 2) They must not conflict with the common Creed. 3) No one must be baptized in them. 4) They must not be offered to converts from heresies. 5) They must not be presented as the common faith in private lessons. And 6) one must not add anything to or subtract anything from the common Creed and represent it as his own by incorporating it in a creed of his own. (Dositheus, in the Dodecabilus; and others.)

⁷⁷ Note that formerly and from the beginning as a matter of ancient custom Cyprus had been autocephalous in respect of ecclesiastical administration. This privilege was sanctioned as belonging to it both by Emperor Zeno and by Justinian II, surnamed Rhinotmetus (as having had his nose cut off). For in the times of Zeno, when the Monophysites called Eutychians had a free hand, owing to the fact that Peter Knapheus of Antioch was doing his utmost to gain control of the Cyprians, on the pretense that the Cyprians had received their faith and Christianity from Antioch, it came to pass that the

bishop of Amochostos named Anthemitus discovered through revelation the sacred remains (or relics) of the Holy Apostle Barnabas underneath the underground roots of a carob tree, bearing upon his breast the Gospel according to St. Matthew written in Greek by Barnabas himself with his own hands, for two reasons, to wit: first, in order to shame the followers of Eutyches by means of that divine Gospel because of the fact that the latter affirms the true humanity of Christ, and His two natures; and secondly, in order to shut the mouth of Peter who had his eye on Cyprus. For divine Barnabas said to Anthemitus: "If the enemies assert that the throne of Antiocheia is an Apostolic one, tell them that so is Cyprus Apostolic because it has an Apostle in its ground." Taking the Gospel with him, Anthemitus departed for Constantinople and went to Zeno, who rejoiced greatly when he beheld it with his own eyes, and, keeping it safely in his possession, he ordered it to be read every year on Good Friday (called in Greek "Great Friday"), according to the Chronicle of Joel. And not only did he appoint Acacius to consider the case of Cyprians and Antiochians (wherein, presenting the present Canon of the Third Ec. C., and the words of the Apostle, Anthemitus shamed the Antiochians), but he even made Amochostos an archdiocese free from any molestations attempted by the bishop of Antioch, according to Cyril the monk and Theodore the anagnost and Suidas. After renewing the decorations of that same Amochostos or Salamis, according to Balsamon, Justinian Rhinotmetus renamed it New Justiniana. Hence those who assert that it was a second Justiniana are mistaken. For Achris was the first to be called Justiniana; the second to be called Justinana was Ulpiana, some town that was situated in Dardania and was renewed and redecorated by Justinian, on which account c. XXXIX of the Sixth Ec. C. calls Cyprus New Justinianopolis. And, confirming the present Canon, it says for the Bishop of Cyzicus to preside over the whole province of the Hellespontians, too, and to ordain its bishop. But Chrysanthus (p. 84 of the Syntagma) says that Carthage was the first autocephalous archdiocese; and Cyprus was the second, because this c. VIII of the 3rd had honored it as autocephalous even before Justinian, that is to say; the third was Achris, because it was honored as autocephalous during the reign of Justinian in the time of the Fifth Council; the fourth was lower Iberia, as having been honored in the time of Leo III (the Isaurian); the fifth was upper Iberia, as having been honored during the reign of Monomachus; the sixth was that of Pecius, as having been honored in the time of the emperors in Nicaea.

⁷⁸ See the commencement of this handbook in order to learn that civil laws conflicting with the Canons are invalid.

⁷⁹ Many have concluded from this letter that prelates are permitted to resign from their own province, but yet to retain the honor and activity of the prelacy. Such persons, however, are in error. Quite the contrary is rather to be inferred from the letter, according to Zonaras, Balsamon, and Blastaris. Thus, first of all, it is patent from the words of the letter that resignations ought not to occur. For it says, in paraphrase, that "once having been given the care of an episcopate, Eustathius ought to have borne it with spiritual courageousness, to have made every effort to cope with the troubles involved in the situation, and voluntarily to have endured the perspiration deserving reward in behalf of the episcopate." This same inference may be drawn also from the surprise felt by the Council when it saw the written resignation of Eustathius. For if it had been customary and allowable for resignations to be offered, how could it have been astonished at such an event as though some new and strange thing had occurred; for it says, in paraphrase, "we do not know how and why he came to turn in an account in resignation of his office." But this is confirmed also by the exarch of this Council Cyril (who appears, from the wording and phraseology of this letter, to have been the composer of it), who says in his c. III: "This thing is not agreeable to the Canons of the Church, that is to say, for prelates to offer written resignations. For, if they are worthy to officiate, let them do so, and not resign; but if they are unworthy, let them not evade the episcopate with a resignation, but as persons condemned for things they have been charged with by many outcries. This same conclusion may be inferred also from c. XVI of the 1st-and-2nd. For, if that Canon deposes anyone that leaves his province for more than six months, and commands that another bishop be ordained in his stead, much more does it forbid anyone to resign his province altogether. Though that Canon does say for no one else to be ordained in the place of a living bishop unless the latter voluntarily resign his episcopate, yet it must be understood as implying that he is resigning on account of some professionally inhibitive and hidden reason. But further on this same Canon seems to correct even this. For it says for another bishop to be ordained after the cause of the living one be investigated and his deposition has been consummated." Athanasius the Great, too, writes in his letter to Dracontius: "Before being installed as a bishop, a bishop lives for himself; but after being installed he no longer lives for himself, but for those Christians for whom he was installed in office." But if they aver that St. Gregory the Theologian resigned, as is asserted also by Balsamon, let them learn that he did not resign an episcopate of his own, which was that of Sasima, but a strange episcopate, namely, that of Nazianzo, as he himself informs us. For in writing to St. Gregory of Nyssa he says: "Not of Nazianzo, but of Sasima we have been offered as candidates; though not without a little shamefacedness before the Father and the supplicants as strangers we have accepted the protection" (*Note of Translator*. — By "protection" is meant *office*). In writing to Philagrius, on the other hand, he says the following: "If it is dangerous, as you state, for one to leave his church, what church do you mean? If you mean our own, that of Sasima, that is to say, I too say the same thing, and the statement is correct. But if we have left the strange one, the one which has not been proclaimed to be connected with our name, that is to say, that of Nazianzo, we are exempt from responsibility. But if we are being held to account because we had charge of it for a while, there are plenty of others who will have to be held to account likewise, all those, in fact, who have had charge of strange provinces for a while." As for the fact, first, that resignations are not allowable, this is plain from what has been said; and as for the fact, secondly, that those resigning (especially as a result of laziness and indolence) must not be permitted to retain the honor of a bishop and the name and activity, this too is evident from this letter. For it says, in

paraphrase, that “Eustathius came to the Council, begging for the honor and title of bishop. But if he is begging for these things, it is evident that he resigned them along with his resignation from the province; and as having resigned them he no longer possessed them; and justly so.” For the name bishop is not absolute, but relative. For a bishop must be the bishop of an episcopate. Whoever, therefore, has resigned his episcopate, evidently ought not even to be called a bishop (unless it be with the modification “former” or “formerly”), according to Blastaris and Zonaras. But if he ought not to bear the name of bishop, much more ought he not to enjoy either the honor or the activity of a bishop. For the honor and activity of the bishop are bestowed as a prize and reward by Ap. c. XXXVI as well as c. XVIII of Antioch, not upon the one resigning his province, but upon the one who goes indeed to his province, but on account of the withdrawal and disorder of the laity, he does not accept it. Hence in the case of those who resign from their province without any calamitous reason, and go to other provinces where there is greater profit and more money to be made, Synesius as well as Theophilus want no one to admit them to the altar, and not to call them to the presidency, but, when they enter the church, to ignore them like so many cattle occupying public seats of authority. That is why c. I of St. Cyril says that Bishop Peter “either ought to have the functions of a bishop, or, if he is not worthy to preside over the sacrificial altar, neither ought he to be honored with the name of bishop.” But what am I saying that those resigning ought not to have the honor and title of bishop? Why, they ought even to be excommunicated in case they fail to accept the protection of the flock which has been entrusted to them, in accordance with the above Canons, Ap. c. XXXVI and c. XVII of Antioch, until such time as they decide to take it in hand. For this reason it is amazing that this 3rd Ec. C. did not reprimand the bishops in Pamphylia for failing to force Eustathius to accept the Church entrusted to him, but, instead of him, ordaining someone else. It appears, however, from the words of the letter that the bishops in Pamphylia wrangled a good deal about the inactivity of Eustathius, and that they opposed him and sought to coerce him. For it said, “there is no strong reason to quarrel with his incapacity.” Finally, when they saw that he could not be persuaded, and that the flock of Christ had been without a protector for a long time (that the time was long is evident from the use of the verb “remain” contained in the letter), they ordained Theodore in his stead. But if anyone should ask why the Council should have given Eustathius the honor and title and activity of a bishop at all, we answer that it did so mainly and primarily because, as we said, it was not because of any viciousness or negligence on his part, but solely because of his faintheartedness that he submitted this unreasonable resignation, on account of which, had Theodore not been ordained so soon, the Council certainly would have tried to compel him to take back his province, on the ground that he had no canonical excuse for not doing so. Incidentally the Council did this when it sympathized with his tears and his old age. Canon X of Peter the martyr, too, does not consider it reasonable for men to remain in the ministry after they leave the flock of the Lord and go of their own accord to martyrdom, and first deny, and then struggle again, and finally confess the faith. Note also the further observation that in case a prelate wishing to resign from his province offers the pretext that he is unworthy, he must not be listened to, unless he be proved to be unworthy of the prelacy. For it is one thing for one not to be worthy, in a negative sense, and another thing for one to be unworthy, in a privative sense. For any man is unworthy of the prelacy who has committed canonical offenses and has been deprived of worthiness on that account. For, according to philosophers, privations come second after habits. Wherefore he ought to be deposed. But one is not worthy not only who is guilty of such canonical offenses, but also one who is not guilty of such offenses, but rather to say who is virtuous and saintly, yet who as respecting the magnitude and sublimity of the gift of the prelacy is not really worthy, as St. Basil the Great expresses it, and as divine Chrysostom says in his liturgies, in the prayer of the cherubic hymn, which prayer includes the following words: “No one addicted to carnal desires and pleasures is worthy to approach and to come near, or to minister, unto Thee, O King of glory. For serving Thee is something great and fearful even to the heavenly powers themselves.” On this account, as Balsamon says in his commentary on c. XVI of the 1st-&2nd, the resignation of Theodoulos of Makre, though accepted without examination by Patriarch Luke, yet, when thereafter examined synodically by Patriarch Michael of Anchialos, it was not accepted, but, on the contrary, was rejected because it stated that he was resigning the episcopate, not as unworthy, but as not worthy. For every unworthy person may be described as not worthy, but it is not conversely true that whoever is not worthy is also unworthy. For anyone that asserts himself to be unworthy becomes self-condemned, whereas anyone that says that he is not worthy ought rather to be praised as being humble-minded. Accordingly, in order to finish this Footnote, I may say that there is no excuse for a prelate’s resigning from his province, excepting only this, that he has been involved in offenses that inhibit the exercise of prelatical functions, either hidden and undisclosed offenses only confessed to a father confessor, or plainly evident, and consequently not deposed by the Council. For at that time being rebuked by his own conscience, he has a good excuse for resigning the prelacy at the same time, and no one can prevent it. Such a person, in fact, is not prevented from becoming a monk. See also c. II of St. Sophia, and especially c. III of Cyril, and the testimony of Chrysostom contained in the footnote; and the commentary on c. XXVI of the 6th and the Footnote thereto, and the Footnote to c. IX of the First Ec. C. See also the form for a canonical resignation at the end of this Handbook.

⁸⁰ Marcianus was a brother-in-law of Theodosius the Little by the latter’s sister Pulcheria, whom he took as his wife but with whom he had no intercourse. For she lived as a virgin to the end of her life, according to Evagrius (book 2, ch. 1 of his Ecclesiastical History). Not only did Marcianus, but also Pulcheria too, along with him, take pains to assemble the present Council. Present at this Council were both of those who at the Sixth Council sat upon the thrones in front of the chancel.

⁸¹ For, were there but one nature in Christ, it would have to be either divine or human, or else neither divine nor human, but something else than either. Accordingly, if it were divine, where was the human? But if human, how could it be claimed that those saying this were not deniers of the divinity? Or, on the other hand, if it were something else than either, how could it be said that Christ was not being reformed of a different nature than the nature of the Father; and of a different nature than the nature of human beings? Than which could there be anything more recusant or more foolish? Than their saying, in other words, that the God Logos became a human being only to corrupt His own divine nature and assume the human nature? These things are what Photius says in opposing the recusancy of the Monophysites in the case of the Fourth Ec. C.

⁸² This holy St. Leo (whose memory the Church celebrates on February 18th) sent this letter to St. Flavian of Constantinople against the Monophysites. They say, moreover, that after composing it he placed it upon the tomb of the holy Apostle St. Peter, and with fasting and while keeping vigil, and with a prayer he begged St. Peter if there were any mistakes in the letter to correct it. The Apostle then appeared to him in person and said to him, "I have corrected it." The excerpt from that letter which treats theologically of the two natures of Christ and of the one substance of Christ in a manner at once exact and sublime, reads as follows, word for word: "For each form operates with the concurrent communion of the other, which had the characteristic peculiarity of the Logos functioning to bring about that which is of the Logos, while the body executes that which is of the body. Accordingly, the one of them shines through in miracles, whereas the other succumbed to abuse, when ill treated and insulted. Accordingly, just as the Logos is inseparable from the Father's glory, so and in like manner His body did not let go and give up the nature of our human genus. For truly it may be said that He is one and the same Son of God, and one and the same son of man. He is a God in this respect, to wit, that in the beginning He was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God; while He is a human being, on the other hand, in this respect, to wit, that the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us." Hence when this letter was read aloud at the present Council, the Fathers shouted: "That is the Faith of the Fathers; that is the Faith of the Apostles. St. Peter uttered these things through Leo." That is why it also called that letter a pillar of Orthodoxy. Sophronius of Jerusalem also writes about this letter to the effect that Bishop Theodore (whose bishopric was in Libya), who was cubicularius of the Patriarch of Alexandria Eulogius, beheld in his sleep a tall man deserving much honor and reverence, who told him, "Convey word to Pope Eulogius that the Pope of Rome Leo has come in order to meet him in person." Theodore lost no time in hastening to the Patriarch, and told him what had been said. Thus, then, the two Popes met each other and exchanged greetings; and in a short while Leo said to Eulogius: "Do you know why I came? I came in order to thank you because you very well understood my letter and interpreted it correctly. Know, then, that you did me a great favor, and not a favor to me, but also to the chief Apostle Peter." Upon saying these words, he disappeared and vanished. In the morning Theodore recounted this fact to Eulogius; and the latter, weeping, thanked God, who had made him a preacher of the truth (Dositheus, p. 527, of the Dodecabiblus). This man Eulogius lived during the reign of Emperor Mauricius.

But inasmuch as the Papists (i.e., Roman Catholics) wrongly conclude from this letter that the Pope is entitled to be the monarch of the whole world and to have charge of all ecclesiastical councils and synods, we retort as follows. First, that although this letter is in truth a most orthodox epistle, yet it was not accepted by this Council simply as it happened to come to notice, but was first examined as to whether it was in agreement with the Creed of the First and Second Councils, and with the transactions adopted by the Third Council under the chairmanship of Cyril; and only after it was found to be in complete agreement therewith was it signed by the prelates in the fourth act of the present Council. Secondly, that just as this letter was called a pillar of Orthodoxy in the Fourth Ec. C., so and in like manner at the Seventh Ec. C. the letters sent to Tarasius by the prelates of the East were described as a column of piety, while the letter of Tarasius to the Easterners was called a definition of Orthodoxy (Act fourth of the Seventh Council). But a pillar of Orthodoxy, a column of piety, and a definition of Orthodoxy are simply designations of one and the same thing. I need scarcely say that Leo's letter was not called simply a pillar, but a pillar of Orthodoxy, since there are also other pillars of Orthodoxy: the letter of Tarasius was called simply a definition of Orthodoxy; and the letters of the Easterners were called simply a column of piety. Thirdly, that just after Leo's letter was read aloud the Council shouted, "That is the faith of the Fathers," so and in like manner after the minutes of the First and Second Councils were read aloud, they shouted, "That is the faith of Orthodox Christians; thus do we all believe." And when Cyril's letter was read aloud, the Council said: "Leo and Anatolius believe thus, and we ourselves believe thus. Cyril believes thus; blessed be the memory of Cyril." And I have to add also this fact too, that after the letter of Leo was read aloud the Council also added this: "Cyril believed thus. The Pope has thus interpreted it." And again: "Leo taught, Cyril taught thus. Leo and Cyril taught the same things alike." Fourthly and lastly, that the Third Council made Cyril's letter to Nestorius a definition of its own; and see in the Preface to the Third Ec. C. But the Fourth Council did not make Leo's letter a definition of its own, in spite of the fact that the legates of Rome made strenuous efforts to this end; instead, it said that there could be no other definition. The definition confirmed the letter. All that was added to the definition from the letter was merely the assertion that the two natures are united indivisibly and unconfusably in Christ. Hence as a result of all these facts the imagined monarchical office of the Pope is demolished and refuted, and it is shown that the Pope, even when his beliefs are strictly Orthodox, can be judged and examined by an Ecumenical Council, which is the final and supreme judge in the Church. Concerning this see the first Footnote to the Prolegomena of the First Ec. C.

⁸³ By way of giving a clearer notion of the two natures inconvertibly and unconfusably united in Christ, it appeared to me advisable to add here the interpretation set forth by Theodore the presbyter of Raithos and included in the *Bibliotheca of the Fathers*, because it is in truth a most theologically perfect work (Dositheus, p. 469 of the *Dodecabiblus*). It runs as follows: “Orthodox Christians confess the two natures to be essentially united, the union being one which respects the hypostasis, yet in such a way as to be unrupturable and unconfusable (explanation of the definition). The expression ‘two natures’ denotes the difference in kind and the difference in essence of the two conjoined natures, which are, to wit, the previously existent divinity and the humanity assumed at a later time. The term “essentially” denotes the absence of co-operative good will, or, in less ambiguous words, the fact of not being the result of a special grace, or of some particular activity, or out of consideration of merit or worth, or by way of allotting an equality of honor or recognition of peerage, or the tracing of a relation or establishment of a reference, or the limitation of power, or any other relative union (such as Nestorius used to allege); but, on the contrary, admitting it to be actually and really consubstantial and compositive itself in point of essence and substance in the sense of substratum. The expression “the union being one which respects the hypostasis” denotes the fact that the humanity had not been previously created and molded into shape, and that the divinity had not come after it, but, on the contrary, that at the very point of subsistence of the first principle and beginning of existence it was (already) united to the divinity — (for at the very same time while it was created and molded into shape as flesh, it was also at the same time flesh of the God Logos, according to another theologian). The terms “unrupturably” and “unconfusably” used together signify the fact that the two natures when combined together did not undergo any innovation or modification of any kind on account of the union, but, on the contrary, the union is one which is preserved throughout eternally and alike, and each of the two natures remains undiminished in strict conformity with the essential definition and discourse.” Hence from this interpretation we learn that wherever the fathers call the union of the two natures in connection with Christ a union with respect to nature or a natural union, they are not employing the adjective *natural* with any implication that the union of the humanity, or human nature, in connection with Christ took place in nature, or in accordance with nature. God forbid! For if this had been the case in reality, there would necessarily have resulted from the two natures a single composite nature, which was the recusant belief of the Monophysites, and not the Orthodox belief of the catholic Church, which dogmatizes that the two natures of Christ were united, not in accordance with nature, or in nature, but, on the contrary, with respect to hypostasis, and in the hypostasis of the God Logos. That is why there is but one hypostasis of Christ composed of the two natures, distinguished as the divinity and the humanity. Instead, with the adjective *natural* and with the phrase *according to nature* or *with respect to nature*, the Fathers make it clear that this union truly and actually and really took place, as the aforesaid Theodore of Raithos interpreted the matter, and in an exceptionally and especially apposite discourse so did superlatively divine Cyril of Alexandria, the clarion interpreter of this inenarrable and inconceivable union. For in his third Anathematization he said: “If anyone in reference to the one Christ divides the hypostasis (or, otherwise speaking, the existential and subsistential natures, or, that is to say, actual natures or real natures) after the union, by conjoining them with a conjunction alone, as depending upon merit or value or worth, or, more specifically, authority or dynasty, and not indeed rather attributing it to the coalescence resulting from a natural union, let him be anathema.” After, I say, he uttered these words, he went to explain in the course of the sequel to this anathematization and in offering an apology (i.e., plea in defense thereof) in reply to the objection of the Easterners, and in his apology in refutation of the argument of Theodoret, and in the three parts together, to the effect that the natural union he had spoken of denotes the true and actual and real union: and in illustration of his meaning he cited that Apostolic saying that “*and (we) were by nature children of wrath*” (Eph. 2:3), instead of saying “and we were truly children of wrath.” Some other theologians, however, interpret this natural union as being intended to mean a hypostatic, or substantive, union, on the basis of a conception that the word *substance* or (hypostasis) is also defined to denote essence, and nature together with permanent peculiarities by those discussing theological matters or philosophical questions, and especially by the Seventh Ec. C. in its Act 6.

⁸⁴ Note that Eutyches at one time used to say that the flesh of the Lord was not of the same essence, or co-essential, with the Mother, nor with us, while at other times he used to say that before the union, true enough, there were two natures in Christ, but after the union only one. Wherefore they used to say that Christ consisted of two natures, before the union, that is to say, but not also in two natures, after the union, that is to say. And it was for this reason that this Council asserted in its definition above that Christ is of the like (or same) essence with the Father as respecting divinity and of like (or the same) essence with us as respecting humanity. From this Monophysite named Eutyches, as from some many-headed Hydra, there grew up thereafter numerous heresies. For instance: The Theopaschites, who used to say “The one crucified for us is holy and immortal,” of whom the chief leader was Peter Knapheus (concerning whom see c. LXXXI of the 6th). For, according to the Monophysites, humanity was converted into divinity. So the entire Holy Trinity underwent suffering — oh, spare us, O Lord! — since Godhood was but of one nature. That is why the bemused heretics uttered this blasphemy even to the Holy Trinity which is lauded in the Thrice-holy Hymn. From the Monophysites arose the Severians, led by a man named Severus, who was a monk and became Bishop of Antioch. From these heretics sprang a group known as Jacobites, led by a certain man of Syros called Jacobus and of base extraction, named Zanzalus, or Tzantzalos, who also became the leader of the heresy of the Armenians. From them arose the Gaianites, their leader Gaianus being a follower of the heresy of Julian, a bishop of Halicarnassus, by whom he was also ordained Bishop of Alexandria. These heretics used to say that Christ was entirely impassive, or, in Greek, *apathes*, on which account they styled Apathites, though John Damascene calls them Egyptians, whom the Copts also followed. From the roots of the Monophysites there sprouted thereafter also the heresy of the Monotheletes. For if, according to them, there was but

one nature in Christ, it followed as a matter of course that this single nature had but a single will too. From them arose the Agnoites, whose leader was Themistius. These persons used to assert that Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment (i.e., that He did not know precisely when it would be in the future). They had split off, according to John Damascene, from the Theodosian Monophysites. From them came the Tritheites, who in connection with the Holy Trinity were wont to assert a common essence and nature, individualized as in the case of three human beings. Their leader was John Alexandrus the Philoponus. All Monophysites used to be called in a word *Acephali*, or headless men, in allusion to the fact that they had split off from the Patriarch of Alexandria named Mongus either because, as Leonius says, he did not anathematize the Fourth Ec. C., or because they used to hold various unorthodox assemblies and perform unorthodox baptisms, and used to do other things in the way of innovations and schisms, as Nicephorus Callistus states, or because there arose a schism in their midst between Severus and Julian concerning perishability and imperishability, and some of them followed the one, and some the other leader. Accordingly, it may be said, generally speaking they were called *Acephali* because of the fact that they did not pay allegiance to any one head, but some to one, and some to another leader, and split into groups differing from one another and from the Church. (See the discussion in Dositheus, p. 470 of the *Dodecabiblus*, and the discussions by other writers.) All the Monophysites and Theopaschites refused to accept the icon (or picture) of Christ, according to Act 6 of the Seventh Ec. C., because they maintained that the nature therein described and depicted as that of His humanity had been mingled and converted into the nature His divinity. But the criticism made by Alamundarus, the chief of the Saracens, was a joke. For this fellow, after becoming a Christian, seeing that Severus sent two bishops with a view to enticing him into his heresy, wishing to rebuke them, said: "But know ye not that they have sent me letters and therein the writers of them declare unto me that the Archangel Michael died?" The bishops of Severus replied to him that it was impossible for that thing to have happened. Then Alamundarus in reply said: "And if Christ hath not two natures, as you say, how could He have died and have suffered on the Cross? Since His divinity is impassive, and does not die (Dositheus, p. 424 of the *Dodecabiblus*).

⁸⁵ Note, however, that the tonsure of clergymen performed by the prelate is called by Balsamon the tonsorial seal (*sphragis epikouridos*) and episcopal tonsurate (*epikouris episkopike*) and the tonsure of monks, monachal tonsurate (*epikouris monachike*) (in his interpretation of c. XXXIII of the 6th; and of c. LXXVII of the 6th).

⁸⁶ *Stewards* were appointed to manage the affairs of the church in accordance with the ideas of the bishop, according to c. X of Theophilus, c. XXVI of the 4th, and c. XI of the 7th Ec. C. Defensors were appointed to help those who were being unjustly treated, to redeem those who were being tyrannized by some, and to protect those who took refuge in the church on account of any ill treatment or influence. There were two kinds of defensors; to wit: ecclesiastical defensors, referred to in the present Canon; and nonecclesiastical, or secular, and imperial, or royal, defensors, referred to in cc. LXXXIII and CVII of Carthage. According to Balsamon they were called *Defensors*, and according to Justinian *Ecclesiastici*. There were twelve of them in the church of Constantinople, the chief one being known as *Protecdicus* (i.e., Chief Defensor), and with two other defensors the latter was empowered to hear minor cases that arose in the church. *Prosmonarii* were appointed to watch over churches to which they were assigned and to welcome those coming there to worship.

⁸⁷ Contractors, properly speaking, are those artisans who put up security or an earnest of some sort and undertake a job with the proviso not to abandon it until they have finished it (according to Armenopoulos, Book 3, Title 8).

⁸⁸ The reason why this Canon allows bishops and monks to become guardians and curators, whereas Justinian Novel 123 prohibits them from doing so, is, according to Balsamon, either that it prohibits them from doing so of their own accord or when only the laws require them to do so, but not when they are called upon to do so by the bishops. Peter the Chartophylax says that monks must not become godfathers to children being baptized (except in cases of urgent necessity; see also the Footnote to c. XXIV of the Faster), nor must they become parties to the agreement by which persons are adopted as brothers or sisters (in accordance with the custom called in Greek *adelphopoeia*). For these things are contrary to the Canons (page 395 of the *Corpus Juris Graecoromanus*). Nicephorus the Chartophylax also says that the Church mandatorily prescribes it as a law to abbots and exarchs of monasteries that the monks are not to be allowed to form relations as godfathers with the parents of children or to enter into any compact of brotherhood; and that the law will not recognize the relationship of brotherhood established by *adelphopoeia in toto* (page 342 of the same book); see also the Chapter on *Adelphopoeia* in that on *Synoekesia* (or Matrimonial Contracts).

⁸⁹ That is why the seventh ordinance of the first Title of the Novels, which is Justinian Novel 67, and the third of the second Title, which is Justinian Novel 138, embodied in Book V of the Basilica, Title III, ch. 4 and ch. 5 (in the *Nomicon* of Photius Title III, ch. 14, and Title XI, ch. 1) prescribe that anyone that shall build a monastery or an oratory or a church must speak about it first with the bishop, and must agree to give him all the fuel needed for lamps and lights of the church, all that is needed for the sacred liturgy, for the food of *prosmonarii* (or churchwardens) and of those who are to reside therein in the future; and then the bishop shall make the matter known to all, and going in person to the spot where the building is to be erected he shall utter a prayer and plant a cross therein; and then the building may commence. They say in addition that whoever begins to build these from the start, or to rebuild old ones, he as well as his heirs shall be obliged by the bishop and the stewards and the executive of the region to finish the building which he

commenced and not to leave it incomplete.

⁹⁰ So that according to this Canon those called monks must neither be ordained nor engage in any way in doing parish work in connection with the churches in the world. For according to the meaning of their name monks they are lone men, or *solitaries* (in that the Greek word, *monachos*, means lone or solitary), and they are following the profession of virginity; wherefore they ought to be ordained to monasteries, and to perform the functions of holy orders therein, and not in the world. Hence, by way of confirming this, Michel of Constantinople, the greatest of all philosophers, decreed that all sacred acts performed in the world are to be performed by worldly priests, and not by (sacred) monks. The (sacred) monks are to keep within their monasteries, as Balsamon says (comment on ch. 3 of Title I of the *Nomicon* of Photius). In addition, Peter the chartophylax of the great Church says that a monk can neither bless a wedding outside nor inside a monastery (page 395 of the *Corpus Juris Graecoromanus*). Hence it is evident that prelates are violating the Canons when they ordain monks in cities or towns; and they will do well to correct the impropriety. For as regards all the evils and sins these monks do in the world and in associating with the desires of the world, the prelates who ordain have to pay the penalty. For divine Chrysostom says the following: "For do not tell me that the presbyter sinned, nor that the deacon did so. The blame for all these is chargeable to and falls upon the head of those who ordained them" (Discourse 3 on the Acts, p. 627 of vol. IV). According to this Canon those monks are not doing right who leave their monasteries, or their cells and hermitages, and go into the world in order to beg alms. For in so doing they are bound to fall into many traps of the Devil and suffer injuries of the soul. Though it is true that Basil the Great does allow monks to leave the monastery and to journey in quest of the necessary wants of the convent of cenobites, and in a way he rebukes those who resign out of sheer unconcern and refuse to go out (Ascetic Ordinance XXVI), it is nevertheless to be noted that the same Basil says for the head of the monastery to send on errands for the needs of the convent of cenobites that monk who can keep himself uninjured and unharmed and who can benefit those conversing with him. If no such fit and strong brother can be found in the monastery, it is better for the brethren to endure patiently every tribulation and discomfort to the point of death, rather than for bodily comfort to ignore or overlook the evident harm to the soul of that one who is destined to be sent away. Accordingly, after the brother has returned, the head of the institution must examine him as to how he got along during his absence in other regions. As concerning whatever he has done right, he should praise him; but as concerning whatever he has done wrong, he should correct him, etc. (see C. XLIV for detailed explanations).

⁹¹ The present Canon is found exactly the same also in Act 6 of the same Fourth Council, except that it contains two more prohibitions not in this Canon, to wit: 1) that no monastery shall be built upon lands without the consent of the owners of the lands: and 2) that not only slaves, but even enlisted men, that is to say, soldiers, must not be admitted into monasteries and shorn.

⁹² So that just as the Council here considers this ordination to be invalid, so must c. XIII of Antioch be considered. See also the Footnotes to Ap. c. XXVIII.

⁹³ "Novel 123 of Justinian also decrees in agreement with the present Canon. For it says for no one to leave his clericate and become a secular, because he will be deprived of the dignity or military position which had been given to him, and will be turned over to the senators of his own city. Novels 7 and 8 of Leo, on the other hand, command that clergymen and monks who change their habit and become laymen, are to be reinstated in the habit of the clergy or monks again even against their will." (From Armenopoulos, Section 3, Heading 2, of his *Epitome of the Canons*.)

⁹⁴ That is why in Act 10 of the Synod held in the time of Basil the Macedonian it was quite rightly written in regard to this circumstance, that "no layman whatever is allowed to provoke an argument about ecclesiastical matters or to resist an entire church or an ecumenical council. For the tracing and examining of such questions is the task of the patriarchs and priests and teachers of the Church, to whom God has given the privilege of binding and loosing. For a layman, even though replete with every learning and reverence, is nevertheless a layman and a sheep, whereas a prelate, even though he displays every irreverence, is nevertheless a shepherd as long as he occupies the position of a prelate. Hence it behoves the sheep not to turn against their shepherds.

⁹⁵ Like bees round a hive, various opinions have surrounded this part of the present Canon. For our own authorities, being opposed to the rule and authority of the Pope, and desirous to honor the patriarch of Constantinople, have inclined to exaggeration. Hence Macarius the bishop of Ancyra understands by "exarchs of the diocese" the other Patriarchs, while to the Patriarch of Constantinople he refers the final appeal, and he wants him to be the chief and supreme judge over all the Patriarchs. Macarius was followed also by Alexias in her History, and by Nicholas the bishop of Methone in writing against the principle of the Pope. The Papists, again, wish to establish the monarchical status of the Pope, follow our authorities and concede that the Bishop of Constantinople is chief judge over all, because the Bishop of Rome is chief even of the Bishop of Constantinople according to the Canons. So the Bishop, or Pope, of Rome is the ultimate and common judge over all the Patriarchs, and ahead of even the Patriarch of Constantinople in respect of judicature; accordingly, it is to him that any appeal must be taken from the four Patriarchs of the inhabited earth (called in Greek

the “*oecumene*”). These Papists are Bassarion the apostate, Binius, and Belarminus. Pope Nicholas, again, in writing against Photius to Emperor Michael represents the Canon as meaning the Bishop of Rome by the phrase “Exarch of the Diocese,” and that the word “Diocese” which it employs in the singular number is to be taken to have a plural meaning of “dioceses,” just as, he says, the divine Bible often uses the singular number instead of the plural, as, for instance, where it says “there went up a mist from the earth” (Gen. 2:6), instead of saying “there went up mists from the earth.” And that the Canon says that anyone having a dispute with the Metropolitan ought to have it tried first and chiefly before the Exarch of the Diocese, that is to say, the Bishop of Rome, though by concession and on secondary grounds it may be tried before the Bishop of Constantinople. All these men, however, are wandering far astray from the truth. For the fact that the Bishop of Constantinople has no authority to officiate in the dioceses and parishes (or districts) of the other Patriarchs, nor has he been given by this Canon to grant a decision in reference to an appeal on the part of the whole Church (which means a change of judicature from any court to another and higher court, in accordance with or according to Book IX of the Basilica, Title I), is plain — first, because in Act 4 of this Council held in Chalcedon the Bishop of Constantinople named Anatolius was blamed by the rulers as well as by the whole Council for overstepping his boundaries and taking Tyre from its Bishop, namely, Photius, and handing it over to Eusebius, the Bishop of Berytus, and for deposing and excommunicating Photius. Notwithstanding that he offered many pretexts, in spite thereof whatever he had done was annulled and invalidated by the Council, and Photius was justified, and he received back the bishoprics of Tyre. That is why Isaac the Bishop of Ephesus told Michael, the first of the Palaeologi, that the Bishop of Constantinople does not extend his authority over the Patriarchates of the East (according to Pachymeres, Book 6, ch. 1); — secondly, because the civil and imperial laws do not state that only the judgment and decision of the Bishop of Constantinople is not subject to appeal, but merely says indefinitely that no appeal can be taken from the decision of any Patriarch or of the Patriarchs in the plural. For Justinian Novel 123 says to let the Patriarch of the Diocese ordain or prescribe those things which are consistent with the ecclesiastical Canons and with the laws, no party having any right to object to his decision. And Leo the Wise in the first title of his Legal Epitome says that the court of the Patriarch is not subject to appeal, while he is described by another as the source of ecclesiastical decisions; for it is from him that all courts derive their authority, and they can be resolved into him again. Even Justinian, too, in Book 3, ch. 2, of his Ecclesiastical Compilation, says: “Let the competent Patriarch examine the decision without fearing an appeal” (from his judgment); and in Book 1, Title 4, of his Ecclesiastical Injunction: “The decisions of Patriarchs cannot be appealed;” and again, in Book 1, Title 4, ch. 29: “It has been made a law by the Emperors preceding us that no appeal can be taken from the decisions rendered by Patriarchs.” So, considering the fact that according to these emperors, who agree with the sacred Canons, the decisions of all Patriarchs are insusceptible of appeal, or, in other words, they cannot be carried to the court of any other Patriarch for review, how can the Patriarch of Constantinople grant them a hearing? And if the present Canon of the 4th, or even c. XVII of this Council, had intended the Bishop of Constantinople to entertain appeals over the heads of the rest of the Patriarchs, how could the emperors have decreed the diametrically opposite and contrary view, at a time when they well knew that civil laws at variance with the Canons were null and void? — thirdly, because if we grant in accordance with the foregoing Papists that the Bishop of Constantinople can judge the Patriarchs, and that he can review their decisions and judgments, since the Canon makes no exception of which or which Patriarch, he is therefore as a logical inference to be considered to have the right to judge himself and also the Bishop of Rome as well, and thus the Bishop of Constantinople becomes the first and the last and the common judge of all the Patriarchs and even of the Pope himself. So, then, with the inventions by means of which they are trying to establish the monarchical office of the Bishop of Rome, they are wrecking and demolishing it with the very same arguments; — fourthly, because no one, even though he be a Metropolitan or a Patriarch, has any right to impose anything upon churches outside his jurisdiction, excepting only the ones subject to him, according to Ap. c. XXXIV and XXXV, and cc. VI and VII of the 1st, and cc. III and VIII of the 2nd; and cc. XX, XXXVI, and XXXIX of the 6th, and cc. III, XI, and XII of Sardica, and c. IX of Antioch, as well as others: this being so, how can the present Canon and the others have ordained the opposite and contrary of all these? — fifthly, because if the Bishop of Constantinople had received any such privilege, how is it that the patriarchs of Constantinople, when quarreling oftentimes with the Pope, did not claim any such right, but merely insisted that the priorities (of all) were equal? or, be that as it may, how is it that no other Christian amid their quarrels and differences ever called the Bishop of Constantinople greater than the Bishop of Rome? So the Lord liveth, He liveth! The true explanation of the Canon is this. The Exarch of the Diocese, according to Balsamon, is not the Metropolitan of the province (since a Diocese comprises many provinces and metropolis), but the Metropolitan of the Diocese; nor the Patriarch, for, as c. VI of the Second Ec. C. says, if anyone dishonors all the Bishops of the Diocese, which is the same thing as saying the Exarch of the Diocese, which indeed the present Canon does say; whereas a Synod of the Diocese and an Exarch of the Diocese occupies a different position from that held by each Patriarch together with the bishops subject to him. So the Exarch of a diocese is the Metropolitan of the diocese who has some privilege over and above the other Metropolitans of the same diocese. But this privilege of Exarchs is not today in effect. For though certain Metropolitans are called Exarchs, yet the other Metropolitans in their dioceses are not subject to them. So it appears, from what the same Balsamon says, that in those times the Exarchs of dioceses were certain others (among whom, according to Zonaras, were those of Caesarea, Cappadocia, Ephesus, Thessalonica, and Corinth) who wore polystauria in their churches. These *polystauria* were in reality chasubles embroidered with many crosses, as Balsamon says, on page 447 of the *Juris Graecoromanus*. Nevertheless, that privilege ceased to be exercised either immediately or not long after this Fourth Ec. Council was held. That explains why Justinian fails to mention it in what he says concerning disputes between clergymen, notwithstanding that he enumerates the other courts or tribunals of clergymen.

So it is evident that the Canon means that if any bishop or clergyman has a dispute or difference with the Metropolitan of an exarchy, let him apply to the Exarch of the diocese; which is the same thing as saying that clergymen and metropolitans subject to the throne of Constantinople must have their case tried either before the Exarch of the diocese in which they are situated, or before the Bishop of Constantinople, as before a Patriarch of their own. It did not say that if any clergyman has a dispute or difference with the Metropolitan of some other diocese, or if a Metropolitan has a dispute or difference with the Metropolitan of any diocese or parish whatever, they must be tried before the Bishop of Constantinople. Nor did it say, Let him apply first to the Exarch of the diocese, or to the Bishop of Constantinople, as Pope Nicholas above garbles and misexplains the Canon; but, on the contrary, it left it to the choice of the ones to be judged to determine with equal rights whether they should go to the Exarch of the diocese or to the Bishop of Constantinople and be tried in precisely the same manner and equally well either before the one or before the other. That is why Zonaras too says that the Bishop of Constantinople is not necessarily entitled to sit as judge over all Metropolitans, but (only) over those who are judicially subject to him (interpretation of c. XVII of the present 4th C.) And in his interpretation of c.V of Sardica the same authority says: "The Bishop of Constantinople must hear the appeals only of those who are subject to the Bishop of Constantinople, precisely as the Bishop of Rome must hear the appeals only of those who are subject to the Bishop of Rome." Now, however, that the Synod and the Exarch of the diocese are no longer active or in effect, the Bishop of Constantinople is the first and sole and ultimate judge of the Metropolitans under him, but not of those under any of the rest of the Patriarchs. For it is only an ecumenical council that is the ultimate and most common judge of all Patriarchs, as we have said, and there is none other. See also the Footnote to c. VI of the 2nd Ec. C., which spoke about the matter of diocese at greater length.

In view of the fact that, as we have stated, these Exarchs mentioned by the Canon were long ago displumed, those who are now called Exarchs, as representatives sent abroad by the Church, are mere names for ecclesiastical services.

⁹⁶ I happened to discover in one place that the letters given to the indigent were of such a character and superscribed in such words as follows: The earth is full of the Lord's mercy. As for how these letters are worded at present, see at the end of this Handbook Sozomen (Book 5, ch. 16) calls these letters "passwords" of episcopal letters. The Theologian, on the other hand, in writing against Julian, calls them "epistolary passwords," saying: "With epistolary passwords with which we are wont to equip those needing them in going from one nation to another."

⁹⁷ Something of this kind is narrated by St. Gregory the Theologian in his epitaph to St. Basil as having taken place in the metropolis of Cappadocia when the bishopric of Tyana was honored by being converted into a new Metropolis.

⁹⁸ In this manner after Chalcedon was honored by being converted into a Metropolis by Marcianus, and Nicaea by Valentinian, it was decreed that the rights and dignities belonging to the old cities which were really and truly metropolis should be preserved to them, as appears from what is said in Act 4 of the present Council. On this account, in spite of the fact both Byzantium and Aelia were also honored by being converted into Patriarchates, yet as respecting Aelia c. VII of the First specifies that to its metropolis Caesarea there shall be preserved the dignity rightfully belonging to it, as we have stated. As respecting Byzantium, Balsamon and Nicephorus Gregoras assert that in their times the Bishop of Constantinople was ordained Patriarch by the Bishop of Heracleia. But now he only receives his crozier from him, because before he became a Patriarch Byzantium used to be the episcopate of the Bishop of Heracleia.

⁹⁹ Photius, too, in Title XII and Title XIII, says that since ordinance One of Book XXIII of Title II lays down the principle that marriage is a consociation of a man and a woman and a co-reception of all life, and a communion in a divine and human right; those consociated ought, according to this definition, to be of the same religion. The first book of the Code, in Title V, ordinance twelve, says that in case there is a dispute between the parents (when, that is to say, they are of the same religion, but one of them has come to be Orthodox in belief, or in some other way they have come to be consociated in a state of unlikeness of religion), that party ought to have control who wants to make his children Orthodox. And again in ordinance eighteen of the same Title it says that if one of the parties cohabiting together is an Orthodox, while the other is a heretic, their children must become Orthodox. It is written, at any rate, in Book I of the Basili-ca, Title I, ch. 35, that no Jew must take a Christian woman to wife, nor must a Jewess be taken to wife by a Christian man. For anyone that does this shall undergo the punishment of adulterers. As for an Orthodox person, on the other hand, who has taken a heretodox and heretic, he is not allowed to commune in the divine mysteries unless he first get divorced and do his penance, according to what Balsamon says in his Thirty-third Reply. Symeon of Thessalonica (in Reply 47 says the same thing, adding that he may partake only at the end of his life when he is being given the last rites of unction (provided he repents, that is to say); but the priest is not to take a contribution of any such person, nor to accept his offerings and services, save for candle and incense alone, and sometimes (not always, that is to say) he may give him a sprinkling of holy water and a bit of holy bread (i.e., of that which is usually distributed to all at the close of the Liturgy), and this is only done, too, in order to prevent his falling into a state of despondency, and to command him to give alms.

¹⁰⁰ Hence it is that the same Theologian in his Epic Verses says that a chaste marriage is as much superior to that which seeks to have both virginity and marriage, as virginity is superior to marriage; consequently, says he, one ought either to

remain a virgin in reality or to marry, and not to want to mix virginity with marriage, honey with gall, wine with mud, and Jerusalem with Samaria. Thus he says these things in poetical verses as follows:

“As much as virginity is preferable to marriage,
On which account either embrace it altogether, my fine fellow,
Or make the best of marriage like a song they sing.
To shun an unyoked life, and a yoke-fellow too,
And to sacrifice unredeemed Samaria to sacred Salem.
So much is a chaste marriage better than vacillating virginity.
If any wrath and anger have stirred up in thee such virginity,
The second course is better than the first, for partaking of both
Is like mixing honey and gall, and mud wine.”

Besides, even divine Epiphanius says (Haer. 61): “It is better, therefore, to have but one sin, and not more. It is better when you have fallen from the way to take yourself a woman to wife openly and in accordance with the law, than to change your mind after many years of virginity and be introduced again into the Church.” St. Chrysostom says in his letter to Theodore that the sin which a monk commits when he marries, by marrying, is no less grievous than God is above men. St. Basil, in fact, in number 14 of his *Definitions in extenso* goes so far as to forbid any brother to open the door of his home to admit any monk that has broken his promise to God, even though it be cold weather and he comes in search of shelter — not out of hatred, but in order to shame him, as St. Paul advises. In his letter in regard to a fallen monk, on the other hand, he says that we must not even greet such a person. Divine Nicephorus, too, says the same things in his c. XIV. In his c. XXXIV he even declares that a monk who has married and fails to repent must be anathematized, and be compelled to don the habit (of a monk) even against his will, and be shut up for the rest of his life in a monastery. Even if he return and repent after having violated his pledge to the habit, he must don it without prayers, according to c. XIV of the same saint. As for anyone that dons the habit under compulsion, or on account of knavery and hypocrisy, as one deriding it, and afterwards when the necessity and sham have passed discards it, he is to be reprimanded, and must pass three times forty days of penance, and only thus shall he be allowed to partake (of communion), according to c. XXI of the same saint. This divine Nicephorus, in his c. XX, says: “If any nun be ravished by barbarians or disorderly men, provided that her former life was not blame-worthy, she shall be penanced for only forty days; but if she had already been polluted or defiled prior thereto, she shall be penanced as an adultress. Note that those who ravish an ascetic woman or a woman that has taken the veil, or, in other words, a sacred virgin, even those who have abetted the ravishment are liable to capital punishment, and all their property is confiscated by the (civil) ruler, and is turned over to the monastery of the one ravished, according to the second ordinance of the First Title of the Novels (Photius, Title IX, ch. 30). Likewise anyone that abducts or tries to take such a sacred virgin to wife is also liable to capital punishment, according to Book I, Title III, Ordinance 5. The woman herself, together with her things, is placed in a monastery and is securely guarded. Blastaris also adds the following fact, to wit, that even a man who has become a monk in the last days of his life and who failed to understand thoroughly what rites were administered to him when they made him a monk, cannot discard the habit and remain any longer in the world. See also the Footnote to c. VII of the 4th, and c. VII itself of the same Council, which anathematizes the monk that discards the habit and assumes some secular position of whatever worth. See also the Footnote to c. XXXIX of Nicephorus.

¹⁰¹ Note that this Canon does not conflict with c. VIII of the 3rd. For while the latter says with reference to provinces in which bishops were being ordained that they are not to be grabbed up greedily by any bishops when as a matter of fact they have not been under their predecessors’ authority; the former, on the other hand, relates to small parishes that were apt to be overlooked or disregarded as being useless or niggardly by those who used to possess and exploit them.

¹⁰² The Council allowed the emperor to make decrees regarding those parishes only which were in cities he himself had built, and not in general all parishes, as Balsamon concludes. For according to c. XII of the present Council, metropolis honored with imperial letters, and their bishop, enjoyed only the honor, whereas the rights and privileges were preserved undiminished to the metropolias which had been in reality and truth pre-existent.

¹⁰³ In his Collection of Canons, Title 82, John of Antioch says “Fellow Monastics,” instead of “Fellow Clergymen.”

¹⁰⁴ As this is historically stated by Vulpian.

¹⁰⁵ Photius, in Title IX, ch. 37, says that the civil law punishes conspiracies and factions. Book LX of the Basilica, Title XXXVI, states that anyone that enters into a conspiracy against the state is guilty of the crime of high treason (or what is called in Greek *cathosiosis*, i.e., a violation of the holy immunity of the sovereign). As for what constitutes high treason (or *cathosiosis*), see the Footnote to Ap. c. LXXII. Note that Balsamon, with reference to the present Canon, says: “Do not assert that a conspiracy is punished on account of any evil already done, and not on account of any good; for every conspiracy, whether for good or for evil, is punishable.”

¹⁰⁶ But in other manuscripts the Canon is found worded as follows: “Exactly as the receivers have been forbidden to do. Zonaras and Blastaris (line 5) take the word “receivers” to mean those who take the effects of the bishop in order to provide for their safe keeping, and who, if they purloin anything therefrom, are deposed from office in like manner as are those who seize them.

¹⁰⁷ Book XI of the Basilican Ordinances, in Title VIII, Ordinance 51 (in Photius, Title II, ch. 1) asserts that sacred things have a divine right and are not actually owned by anyone. A sacred thing is anything that has been publicly consecrated. And again, in Ordinance 10, Title I, it is stated that a sacred thing is that which has been rightly and through a priest consecrated to God, as, temples and vessels. That which, on the other hand, one makes sacred by his own authority and arbitrary will is not really sacred. Even if the (building called the) temple of such a sacred temple or sacred object should fall to the ground, the place itself remains sacred and no one, according to Armenopoulos (Book Title XI), can actually own it. For whatever has once been made sacred never ceases being sacred thereafter. Notwithstanding that Ordinance 36, in Book XI, Title VII, says that when sacred things are “enslaved” by enemies at war, they cease to be sacred, just as a free person also ceases under like circumstances to be free, yet after the period of enslavement in question, they become sacred again. By this I mean that they merely cease being actually sacred, but they do not also cease being potentially sacred: according to that authority they are always and everlastingly sacred, and this is especially so if they happen to be sacred and movable things, which indeed even after being enslaved may in many instances manifest the inherent power of their holiness even by evincing an energetic action, just as was shown by the Ark of God when it was captured by the Philistines and knocked down their idols, and filled their lands with rats, and even inflicted wounds upon their fundaments (Sam. I, ch. 4), as well as by the sacred vessels which were captured by the Babylonians and removed from the Temple of Jerusalem, and which actually killed Belshazzar (Dan. ch. 5) because he treated them as though they were common and unsacred vessels. Nevertheless and in spite of all these facts, that which Basil the Great says (see his Ethic 30) is as true as it is fearful. For he asserts that anything that has been consecrated to the name of God deserves honor as something holy as long as it serves the purpose of keeping God’s will; which amounts to the same thing as saying that it is sacred if the priests worshiping Him therein keep His will. One could not own sacred things by eating them, even though he fed himself on them for many years, according to Title VI of Ordinance 10. We cannot claim any title to sacred things as our own; that is to say, with a view to gaining ownership of them as property — according to Ordinance 13, Book VI, Title I. If in the middle between two common and unsacred localities there is situated a locality which is sacred, there can be no crossing or thoroughfare from the sacred locality to the unsacred. According to Ordinance 14 title I one is prohibited from building on any spot that is sacred, according to the fourth Institute (or introduction to the laws), Title XV. No one can sell, or exchange, or give away, or mortgage a monastery wherein there has been established a sacrificial altar and wherein sacred services have been held and monastic austerity of life has been practiced. If any such an act is done, it is void and invalid; and if it has been sold, the seller shall lose even the price he received for it, as well as the monastery itself or the property of the monastery which he sold; and the purchaser likewise shall lose also the price which he paid, and the monastery which he bought. The price paid shall be turned over to the monasteries of the region in question and to the churches of the region in question, according to the first Ordinance of Title II of the Novels (in Photius, Title XI, ch. 1). The second Ordinance of Title II of the Novels (Photius, Title X, ch. 1), as well as Armenopoulos (Book 3, Title 4), commands that stewards and trustees and other governing officers of churches and of religious houses, and chartularians, and their parents and children, are warned against giving anyone anything ecclesiastical to plant or to rent or to mortgage or to pawn, and taking money in consideration thereof; because those who plant or rent or hold a mortgage on it or have taken it in pledge will lose it and the money which they gave therefor, and the expense they went to in planting it. Accordingly, all the foregoing persons that gave anything, not only will lose whatever price they paid for it, but will also suffer damages to the amount of the expenses incurred by those who undertook to plant it; and this amount shall be given to the divine house and temple (or church) whose property the thing in question was. The third Introduction, in Titles IX and XXIII, ordains that no one can buy a sacred temple (*Note of Translator*. — The reader should bear in mind that “temple” here, as elsewhere, means “church building,” as distinguished from the church, or institution, itself; though in common parlance no such distinction is usually made), knowing that it is a sacred temple. If, however, he has been deceived into buying as private property, he has a right to bring suit against the one who deceived him and sold it to him. If the temple falls down, the spot on which it stood does not become unsacred. Hence neither can it be sold, according to Ordinance 73 of the first Title (in Photius, Title II, ch. 1).

¹⁰⁸ This means anyone.

¹⁰⁹

¹¹⁰ Instead of this word, John of Antioch substitutes the word “girls” (in his Collection of Canons, Title 42).

¹¹¹ The Council and likewise the civil laws mete out stern chastisement to those who take women by force, because it is a thing that is dishonorable in itself and subversive of whole households, exciting men to murders and disturbances of the peace, and in general being the cause of many woes. Even if, let us say, the parents, the masters, of the women seized afterwards consent to the wedding, it is never-the-less true that they have been compelled to consent to it against

their will, owing to the dishonor and defloration which their daughters and female slaves suffer before being seized for the most part, and because after such occurrences nobody else is willing to marry them. I have said that it was most certainly for this reason that this Canon and the civil laws chastise severely those who seize women by force, because it is not merely a matter of control or ownership, for, behold, in Basil's c* XXII it is decreed that marriages of daughters taken from their parents by force shall remain valid by virtue of the consent of their parents, as we said hereinabove, whereas the civil laws dissolve marriages resulting from the exercise of force, even though the fathers of the women seized consent to them later, as we have stated. If, however, according to ch. 39, Title XII, Book LX, anyone seizes or snatches away a female slave who is of foreign extraction and in reality a prostitute, and hides her, he cannot be punished either as a thief or as a slaver, since it was for pleasure, and not for the sake of theft or robbery, that he did it. In such a case, however, if he is a rich man, he shall pay damages in money; but if he is a poor man, he shall be cudgelled.

The Sixth Ec. C. makes this same Canon its c. XCII by incorporating it *verbatim*. Canon XI of Ancyra, on the other hand, decrees that women betrothed to men but seized by other men shall be given to their fiancées even though they have suffered violence at the hands of the other men. Canon XXII of Basil also says the same thing; but if they were not betrothed, they are to be returned to their parents or relatives, the same Canon adds, and if the latter are willing, a wedding may be performed, but if they will not consent to this, they are not to be coerced. In case their captors deflowered them secretly or forcibly, they are to be punished with four years as fornicators. Canon XXX of the same Basil excommunicates for three years those who seize women by force or who abet others that do so. But as for any woman that merely pretends to have been seized by force (who wants to follow the man, that is to say), and in general any wedding that is not due to compulsion, it judges such a case to be one that needs no punishment if no defloration occurred before the wedding. Canon LIII of the same saint judges any widowed slave to be unindictable if she pretended to be seized by force but in reality wanted to contract a second marriage.

¹¹² The principal reason for issuing the present Canon were five, of which three were remote, while two were necessary and proximates: 1) Since c. XXXIV of the Apostles commands that the bishops of each nation ought to have one of their number as chief, and to regard him as their head, and since cc. VI and VII of the First made some dioceses subject to the Bishop of Rome, and others subject to the Bishop of Alexandria, and others to the Bishop of Antioch, and others to the Bishop of Jerusalem, the dioceses of Asia, of Pontus, and of Thrace, being autocephalous, ought by the same to be ordained by him, because he was their neighbor, and especially because such a custom had ensued from the beginning. For the Patriarch of Constantinople had ordained many Metropolitans from among them. For St. Chrysostom ordained Heracleides Bishop of Ephesus, and by going to Ephesus and returning to Constantinople he deposed thirteen bishops from office. The Bishop of Ancyra, too, and Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus (who acted as the primate of the Third Ecum. Council) were ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople. So that it appears that what we said above is true as the solution of the puzzling question in the Footnote to the ninth Canon. Accordingly, then, it appears that it subordinates the Metropolitans of these dioceses to the judgment of the Patriarch of Constantinople. 2) Since the Second Ec. C. also in its c. III accorded priorities of honor to the Bishop of Constantinople, it was in keeping therewith to bestow upon him also priorities of authority. 3) The fact that the Bishop of Constantinople ought to receive privileges of authority because various Patriarchs and Prelates used to come to the Emperor to beg for his help in their exigencies, and it was necessary for them first to meet the Bishop of Constantinople, in whom they found a man to co-operate with them and to lend them assistance, and through him they were enabled to approach the Emperor, just as, in confirmation of the ancient custom, Justinian prescribed this. This is why, in Act 16 of the Fourth Council, the Bishop of Laodicea, Nunechius, said, when the legates of the Bishop of Rome were displeased by the priorities granted to the Bishop of Constantinople: "The glory of Constantinople is our glory, because it undertakes our cares." 4) The Bishop of Constantinople ought to have received the privileges of authority over the above-mentioned three dioceses because, as appears from Act 13 of the Fourth Ec. C., many scandals arose in Ephesus on account of the illegal ordinations of Stephanus and Basianus, as well as in Asia and Pontus and Thrace similar scandals ensued, where, upon the death of bishops, many disturbances followed in the wake of the votes and on the heels of the ordinations, owing to the fact that they were without a governing head, according to the letter of the same Fourth Council addressed to Leo. And between Eunomius the Bishop of Nicomedia, and Anastasius the Bishop of Nicaea, a great many noisy brawls occurred in regard to the bishopric of Basilioupolis. 5) And finally, because ungodly Dioscorus at the Latrocinium, or Robber Synod, held in Ephesus, placed the Bishop of Constantinople Flavian, not first, but fifth in order, contrary to the Canons, which even Leo the Great, who was the Pope of Rome, and his legates resented, in this Fourth Council, wherefore they reproached Dioscorus.

For all these reasons, then, the Council, renewing c. III of the 2nd by means of the present Canon, conferred upon the Bishop of Constantinople the same and equal privileges of honor that had previously been bestowed upon the Bishop of Rome, namely, the Patriarchal dignity and office, and also the same and equal privileges of authority that had previously been bestowed upon the Bishop of Rome, namely, the right of ordination in the three said dioceses of the Metropolitans, not only as a matter of custom, but also as one established by means of a Canon, on the ground that they are included in the territorial jurisdiction of Constantinople. For precisely as the Bishop of Rome has the priorities of honor and of authority, which amounts to saying the Patriarchal dignity and office, comprising the right of ruling his own parish in the West, so and in like manner the Bishop of Constantinople has the same priorities — that is to say, the Patriarchal dignity and office and the right to rule the above-mentioned Metropolitans who are comprised in his own

parish. Accordingly, these are the ecclesiastical affairs mentioned here in the Canon, wherein the Bishop of Constantinople is magnified just as is the Bishop of Rome, without any difference save this, that the Bishop of Rome is first in point of order, while the Bishop of Constantinople is second in point of order. These privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople were confirmed and ratified not only by the Fathers of this Council, but also by the entire Senate of civil rulers, notwithstanding that the legates of the Pope, though they had previously reproached Dioscorus, yet perceiving that the bounds of Constantinople were being widened, nearly fainted in their desperate attempt to oppose them. Hence the Pope-worshippers are manifestly lying when they say that the primacy and priority of Rome, and its right to be magnified in ecclesiastical affairs, lend the Pope a special privilege of authority in the Church as a whole, which amounts to saying, in other words, a monarchal and inerrable dignity. For if these facts indicated any such thing, the Bishop of Constantinople too would have to possess the same dignity, since the Bishop of Constantinople, according to the Canons, is a measure and standard of exactly the same and equal value respecting honor of authority and respecting grandeur as is the Bishop of Rome. But, as a matter of fact, that was never bestowed upon the Bishop of Constantinople by the Canons, nor, it may hence be inferred, upon the Bishop of Rome. But neither are the priorities of Rome those which were conferred by the legendary edict of Constantine the Great upon Silvester, the Pope of Rome, as they allege — which is to say, more plainly speaking, the privilege of walking about with the decorations of imperial majesty in imitation of an emperor; the right to wear upon his head a brilliant riband in place of a wreath or garland; the right to wear an imperial pallium (or *omophorion*) and a purple robe and a scarlet tunic; the right to have his horse caparisoned in imperial style, with all the imperial insignia and emblems, and to hold the bridle of his horse like a strator, after the manner of an emperor; and the privilege of conceding to the clergy of his Church, as well as to the Senate thereof, the right to magnify themselves and to put on airs of grandeur both in the matter of wearing apparel and in the matter of footwear as well as in the matter of cavaliership. These external manifestations of splendor and luster, I say, are not the priorities and dignities conferred upon the Bishop of Rome by the Canons. By no means. Firstly, because if they were, they would have had to be conferred similarly and equally upon the Bishop of Constantinople also; and secondly, because, according to c. XVI of the 7th Ec. C. and c. XXVII of the 6th, splendid and lustrous clothes, and every other stultification and adornment of the human body are alien to and inconsistent with clergymen and the priestly order, and because the smokelike puffiness (or pretentiousness) of mundane authority must be taboo to priests of God, according to the letter of the Council of Carthage to Pope Celestinus. Ap. c. LXXXIII, too, deposes those who wish to exercise both Roman imperiousness and sacerdotal government. The Lord, too, in the Gospels, commands us to beware of those who wish to walk about in costumes. On this account, again, the vain and legendary edict is judged to be spurious and fictitious. But even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that it is true, yet, in view of the fact that it is obviously opposed to the sacred Canons, it is invalid and void and no longer in force. For when at any time or place current forms conflict with the Canons, they are invalid and void, as we stated in the beginning of this Manual. The priority and primacy of Rome's Bishop, therefore, consists, as we have said, in his having authority over all the bishops and metropolitans included in the see, or diocese, of Rome, so that he, together with the other bishops of the see, has the right to ordain them, and in his being entitled to come first in order among the Patriarchs, the other Patriarchs coming second, third, etc. He received these privileges, not because Rome was the seat of St. Peter, not because the Bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ, as the Roman Catholics vainly insist — by no means, but primarily because Rome was honored as the capital of an empire. For, says the present Canon, "the Fathers naturally enough granted the priorities to the throne of Old Rome on account of her being the imperial capital"; consequently, because of the ancient custom which it followed, exactly as Rome was a capital city, it becomes proper to concede the first place to her Bishop and to regard him as the first, or most notable, bishop — or, as we say in English, the primate — and, by further consequence of this fact, because just in the same way that the same privilege was bestowed upon the Bishop of Constantinople too owing to Constantinople's being (at that time) an imperial capital, and New Rome, the Canons conferred such a privilege upon the Bishop of Rome for the same identical reason. Thus, too, because it was an imperial capital, it became an ancient custom for the Bishop of Constantinople to ordain the bishops in Asia, Pontus, and Thrace; and because it became a custom, the Canons were adopted and the ancient custom was ratified. Note that in addition to the equal privileges with the Bishop of Rome which the Bishop of Constantinople received, he further received also these two titles, namely, the appellation of "All-holiest" and of "Ecumenical," by way of differentiation from the other Patriarchs. The appellation of "All-holiest" was first accorded to the Bishops of Constantinople Sergius and Peter by Macarius of Antioch at the Sixth Ec. C. in the seventh century A.C.; while that of "Ecumenical" was bestowed by the clergymen of Antioch and the Orthodox Christians in Byzantium upon the Bishop of Constantinople named John the Cappadocian in the reign of Justin the Thracian during the sixth century. I said that the Bishop of Constantinople was given the appellation by way of differentiation, because, although the Bishop of Rome was given by many the appellation of "All-holiest," and so were the Bishops of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem, and, in fact, all Patriarchs in common were called "All-Holiest" by various persons and at various times, yet, in spite of this, usage won out ultimately in the custom of according this appellation exceptionally and exclusively to the Bishop of Constantinople. Likewise the appellation of "Ecumenical" was also used by some in reference to the Bishop of Rome, though very seldom; whereas from the time that the Bishop of Constantinople began being called Ecumenical Patriarch he never ceased being called such. Hence in times subsequent to the Cappadocian the Bishops of Constantinople Epiphanius, and Anthimus, and Menas, and Eutychius were called Ecumenical Patriarchs by Justinian in his Novels and Edicts, insomuch that at the Seventh Ecum. Council Peter the legate of the Pope called Tarasius the Ecumenical Patriarch. That is why divine John the Faster in the reign of Muri-cius, following the practice of continuing the use of such a title which had been initiated by others in deference to the Bishop of Constantinople, became the first to subscribe himself as Ecumenical. As for the title of "All-holiest," this de-

notes (speaking of the corresponding Greek word “*Panagiotatos*”) “in all respects most holy”: in the same vein, that is to say, as Tarasius and Photius wrote to Popes Adrian and Nicholas “To in all respects most holy brother and fellow minister Adrian (or Nicholas), the Pope of Rome.” The title of Ecumenical,” on the other hand, denotes two different things: for it is either taken in general as applying to the Church as a whole, by way of describing a bishop as being entitled to exercise personal and monarchical authority in the Church as a whole; or else it denotes a major part of the inhabited earth — that is to say, more exactly speaking, that a bishop’s authority extends over a major part of the inhabited portion of the earth’s surface. This is in conformity with the fact that many emperors, notwithstanding that they are not lords of the whole inhabited earth (called in Greek the “*Oikoumene*,” or, according to another method of transliteration “*Ecumene*”), are nevertheless called (in Greek) lords of the inhabited earth, as Evagrius called Zeno (or Zenon), in allusion, that is to say, to the fact that they exercise authority over a major part of the inhabited surface of the earth. In the first sense of the word, therefore, the Bishop of Constantinople is never called an Ecumenical Patriarch, nor is the Bishop of Rome, or anyone else, excepting only Christ, who is indeed truly a Patriarch of the whole inhabited world and to whom was given all authority in heaven and on earth. But he is called Ecumenical in the second sense of the word on account of the fact that he has under him a major part of the inhabited earth, and furthermore on account of the zeal and providence which he exercises in watching over the faith and preserving the traditions and teachings of both the Councils (including Synods) and the Fathers, not only in his own See (or Diocese), but also in all the rest of the Sees (or Dioceses) throughout the length and breadth of the various lands of the earth. It was hence a result of the double entendre involved in the word *Ecumenical* that scandals arose between the Father, who was Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Popes of Rome named Pelagius, and Gregory Dialogus. For these Popes, taking the word Ecumenical in the first sense, characterized this title as blasphemous, diabolical, and many other opprobrious epithets; and they further declared that whoever wishes to be called and styled “the Ecumenical Patriarch” is a forerunner of the Antichrist (letter of Gregory to Mauricius), and in this respect they were within the truth. The Father, however, and Mauricius, and the succeeding Patriarchs and Emperors, understanding the title in accordance with the second signification of the word, were unconcerned, and in this respect they too were within the truth. That is why the Council held in St. Sophia states clearly that the one called Ecumenical (Patriarch), on the ground that he has authority over the greater part of the inhabited earth, is not the Antichrist. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that both these titles are designations conferred, not by any Canons of the Councils or of the Fathers of the Church, but given by custom to the Bishop of Constantinople. The contents of this Footnote have been gleaned also from other sources, but more especially from the *Dodecabiblus* of Dositheus.

¹¹³ Note that this Fourth Council in its Act 15 promulgated these thirty Canons; but I know not how it came about that this Twenty-eighth Canon and the Twenty-ninth and the Thirtieth are not to be found either in the Collection of Canons of John of Antioch, or in the *Nomocanon* of John of Constantinople surnamed the Scholasticus, or even in the Arabic paraphrase of Joseph the Egyptian. They are included, however, in all the others.

¹¹⁴ See also Ap. c. XXXIV and c. VI of the First Ec. C.

¹¹⁵ Note that these two Canons, the Twenty-ninth and the Thirtieth, were issued by this Council only as evulgations written into its Act 4; but later either interpreters of the Canons or someone else before the times of these interpreters recapitulated or summarized these evulgations and interlocutions and made them into Canons and Definitions. Hence, seeing in the present Thirtieth Canon that Paschasinus, the legate of the Pope, which is as much as to say the entire Council speaking through him, consented to let the ten bishops of the Egyptians merely give others as sureties for themselves to serve as a pledge that they would not leave the city of Constantinople without first subscribing to the letter, while, on the other hand, the secular rulers of the Emperor, actuated by the civil law, added the recommendation that if they could not furnish sureties they might take an oath that they would not leave the city: — seeing, I say, these things, we included in the Canon the securities which the sacred Council demanded through Paschasinus, while, on the other hand, we left out the oath on the ground that it was not demanded by the Council, but by the imperial rulers, and was merely a requirement of the civil law, and not of the divine Canons (for nowhere do the divine Canons require anyone to take an oath, either to God or to the Emperor, as such a requirement would be contrary to the holy Gospels), though the Council for the present kept silent and did not care to gainsay the rulers, for fear of causing them confusion.

¹¹⁶ Note that what had been written by Theodoret against St. Cyril was not anathematized in general (i.e., *in toto*), like what had been written by Theodore of Mopsuestia and like the Letter of Ibas, not only as much therein as defended the cacodoxy of Nestorius and through misunderstanding represented Cyril as a heretic. It does not include, as is plain from the objections offered by St. Cyril, the idea that “Theodoret calls the union of the God Logos with the human being a relative union (or a relational union), and anathematizes those who call the union a substantive (hypostasis or substantial) union, on the alleged ground that it is alien to the Divine Scriptures and to the Divine Fathers.” Nor the idea that a hypostasis substantive union is superfluous, and all the other points that St. Cyril controverts and deems blasphemous: for anathema anyone that praises these ideas. But it is not true that the Council also anathematized this dogma, namely, that the Holy Spirit does not have its existence either from the Son or through the Son, which Theodoret therein asserts, since this tenet was not one held by Nestorius, but was and is a dogma of the catholic Church. That is why neither divine Cyril at any time in his life, nor Pope Celestinus in writing against Nestorius, or John of Antioch, or Acacius of Verroia in his recommendations to Nestorius, nor any of the emperors in their *Sacrae* against Nestorius, say that Nesto-

rius blasphemed as regarding the Theology of the Holy Spirit, but only as regarding the incarnate economy, as we have said.

¹¹⁷ I said “so-called” because Cedrenus also characterizes it thus, as does also Evagrius (page 346 of Vol. II of the Collection of the Councils, and page 347 *ibid.*), and especially because in Act 6 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council it was said to have been written from Ibas, but nevertheless it is not true that it was also written by him. That is why the Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council did not anathematize Ibas himself, but only this letter, on the score that it accused the Council held in Ephesus of having condemned Nestorius without a trial, that it rejected the twelve “heads” (or “chapters”) of St. Cyril, that it praised Nestor and Theodore of Mopsuestia, whom it accepted as a saint and Orthodox Christian, and that it acknowledged Christ to be a mere human being. For even Ibas himself acknowledged at the Fourth Ecumenical Council that the letter was not one of his own, and at the same time confessed all the Orthodox dogmas contrary thereto (page 372 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records, and page 390 *ibid.*).

¹¹⁸ This pre-existence of souls was declared by Origen to be the reason for predestination and damnation. For if the souls in the transmundane world have done right, they are predestined to the kingdom; but if they have done wrong, they are damned and consigned to hell. Jerome wrote a letter against this opinion to Pammachius, and Leo denounced it in his letter 93, and Cyril of Alexandria refuted it by means of twenty-four arguments.

¹¹⁹ Nicholas Boulgaris in his Sacred Catechism, page 133, says, I know not on what grounds, that the Fifth Ecumenical Council anathematized Peter Knapheus for saying: “The immortal Holy One who was crucified for us.” For that man was not anathematized by the Fifth Council, but a goodly number of years before the Fifth Council by a Synod or Council held against him in Rome during the time of Felix of Rome, and of Acacius of Constantinople, and of Emperor Zeno.

¹²⁰ The Latins move heaven and earth, as the saying goes, in endeavoring to establish the innocence of their great pontifex, the Pope of Rome named Honorius. Being unable to brook being told that the one whom they profess to have been inerrable was an ungodly heretic and that he was anathematized by an Ecumenical Council, at times the audacious and impudent fellows dare to assert that this Ecumenical Council itself erred because it failed to investigate the charges against him properly, but condemned him without due investigation; while at other times they allege that Honorius believed that there was a single will only in connection with the humanity of Christ, since all the powers of the soul were subject to the dominant mind of Christ, and there was not in His humanity a different belief of the flesh and a different belief of the Spirit (divided, that is to say, just as it is in other men); and again at other times they assert many other driveling and idle views. In reply to all these allegations it is to be said that a single Ecumenical Council like the present one is enough to offset tens of thousands of Latins, and its vote and decision, being inerrable is to be preferred to all the inventions hatched by the Latins, which are precarious and erroneous. But what am I saying “a single” for? Even two or three Councils, and not a single one only; and two or three Popes, too, I might say. For not only the Sixth, but also the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Act 6) joined hands in condemning Pope Honorius. Again, the one held thereafter, which is called the Eighth by the Latins, also condemned him (Act 10). Moreover, even Leo II not long after the Sixth Ec. C. admitted and accepted the condemnation of Honorius together with the Acts of the Sixth Ecum. C. and wrote the following lines to the Emperor: “We anathematize the inventors of the new error Theodore the Faranite, and Honorius, who not only did not add to the splendor of this Apostolic Church by teaching the Apostolic doctrine, but actually permitted the undefilable Church to be defiled with profane preaching.” And Adrian II asserts that the throne of Rome cannot be judged (adversely) by anyone unless the argument be one concerning heresy, and it was for this reason that Honorius was anathematized. And Pope Agatho in writing to Pogonatus attested the fact that Honorius was a heretic. How, then, can anyone say that all the Fathers of so many Councils, and especially Popes Leo and Adrian and Agatho, should have been so blinded as to have condemned one unjustly whom they had considered righteous? or how could the legates of Rome who were present at the Council have remained silent if the Council had condemned Honorius unjustly? Again, how could Emperor Constantine, a most godly man and a friend of the Roman Church, have suffered this, who was present at the Council and actually ratified the Council’s Definition with the seal of his imperial ring so as to prevent anybody from adding anything more to it or from taking anything away from it? Veritably, therefore, the God who spoke through this Ecumenical Council is veracious, whereas every human being and every quibble of the adversaries is vain as well as false, as the Apostle says. On the other hand it is an amusing and comical dilemma about this Honorius that one of our own great and most wise teachers of the present time proposes to the adherents of Roman Catholicism who make much of the Pope. It may be restated here as follows: Pope Honorius either was a heretic or was not. If he was, here, admittedly, we have a Pope who erred in regard to the faith. But if he was not a heretic, Leo and Adrian erred in regard to the faith by wrongly condemning and anathematizing him as a heretic. And thus, either by the former or by the latter horn of the dilemma, the legendary inerrability of the Pope as regarding matters of faith has been annihilated, or reduced to a state of inexistence. Accordingly I omit saying that Pope Marcellinus was an idolater; that Pope Liberius was an Arian; that Pope Anastasius II collaborated with the Arians; and that countless others erred in regard to the faith.

¹²¹ We ought to call the wills and energies of Christ natural, and not hypostatical (or even substantive). For if we call them hypostatical (or substantive), we shall be compelled to attribute three wills and three energies to the Holy Trinity,

since It consists of three hypostases. But precisely as the Holy Trinity is said to have and actually has but one will and one energy, since It has but one nature, so and in like manner may it be said that there are two wills and two energies inherent in Christ, since there are also two natures inherent in Him, of which, and in which, or one might rather say, which themselves are He. Divine John of Damascus has dealt most theologically and in the best fashion with the two wills and two energies of Christ which are indivisible and at the same time and in the same way inconfutable (or unconfusable) in his sublime dissertation wherein he says: "Being a single hypostasis with two natures, the Divine and the human, Christ did some things divinely and other things humanly: as one and the same person He willed and energized the divine works, and in a divinely human manner performed the human acts. For though as a God He willed the divine works, and as a human being the human acts, yet it was neither as a naked God that He willed the divine works, nor as a mere man that He willed the human acts, but, instead, it was as a God who had become a man, that is to say, who had humanized himself by becoming incarnate, by virtue of a natural and divine will and energy, the same person acting both as a God and as a human being in willing and energizing the human acts, being by nature capable of willing and energizing human acts as a human being. For each of the two natures wills and energizes its own activities in communion with that of the other. This means that the Divinity with its own self and everything else under its immediate control is acting through and by His humanity; whereas, on the other hand, the humanity, having its own self under its control and responding with respect to everything else to His divine will (i.e., in obedience thereto), wishes whatever the Divine will wishes because it itself also wishes these things, on account of the oneness of the hypostasis." (Taken from the *Libellus* concerning the right belief, as dictated by John Damascene, and delivered by the Bishop Elias to Peter the Metropolitan of Damascus.)

¹²² For many reasons the present Council is called and is an Ecumenical Council. Firstly, because in the salutatory address which it makes to Justinian, as well as in its third Canon, it labels itself Ecumenical. Secondly, because the Seventh Ecumenical Council in its Act 8 and in its first Canon also calls it an Ecumenical Council. In addition, Adrian I, the Pope of Rome, in his letter to Tarasius, recorded in Act 2 of the 7th Ec. C. (page 748 of the Collection of the Councils), counts this among the Ecumenical Councils. Thirdly, because in its Canons it lays down legislation and pronounces decrees relating, not to any one part of the inhabited earth, but to the whole inhabited portion of the globe, both to the Eastern Churches and to the Western ones; and it specifically refers to Rome, and to Africa, and to Armenia, to the provinces in Barbary — as appears in Canons XII, XIII, XVIII, XXIX, XXXV, and XXXVI. It would be ridiculous, of course, for it to lay down legislation for so many and so widely distributed provinces, and especially to improve upon Canons of many local and regional Councils and Synods, were it not in reality an Ecumenical Council, and had it not in reality the dignity and office of an Ecumenical Council. As concerning this see the Footnote to its c. II. Fourthly, because all of the four Patriarchs of the inhabited earth attended it, and so did the Pope of Rome through his legates (or lieutenants, or proxies, or deputies); and the churches everywhere on the face of the earth recognized it and accepted it — a fact which serves as an essential mark of identification and a constitutive characteristic, or constituent feature, of Ecumenical Councils. Fifthly, and lastly, because it agrees in its Canons with the divine Scriptures and with the Apostolic and Conciliar and Synodic traditions and instructions and injunctions, a fact which in itself is a sign and a peculiar token of Ecumenical Councils, as we said in the prologue to the First Ecumenical Council, if it be not their most specifically peculiar feature.

¹²³ I said that more properly speaking this Council is or ought to be designated the sixth, because, though the later exegeses of the Canons sometimes call it the Quinisext (or Quinisextine), and others do too, by reason of the fact that it may be said to have supplied what the Fifth and Sixth Councils failed to provide — that is to say, that it furnished Canons to help in the regulation of the ecclesiastical polity, such as those Councils failed to promulgate — yet, in spite of the significance of this fact, it may be averred that, properly and truly speaking, this Council is and ought to be called the Sixth Ecumenical. Firstly, because, according to the author Romanus in his *Prolegomena* to the present Council, the prelates who convoked the Sixth Ecumenical Council in the reign of Pogonatus convoked also this one in the reign of his son Justinian. For, according to him, forty-three of the bishops who attended the former were present also at the latter. It would appear, however, that there were more of them, judging from the words of St. Tarasius which he addressed to the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Secondly, because the Seventh Ecumenical Council, in its Act 4 and its Act 8, and in its first Canon, specifically calls it the Sixth. Adrian II, too, in his letter to Tarasius, accepts its Canons as if considering it the Sixth Ecumenical Council proper (page 748 of the Collection of Councils), and in writing to Emperor Charles of France he calls it the Sixth and Holy Council. The legates of the Pope, too, confirmed it as the Sixth at the Seventh Ecumenical Council; and Pope Innocent III says in reference to c. XXXII of the Council, "it was arranged at the Sixth Council"; and Gratian (i.e., Franciscus Gratianus) refers to it by its proper name as the Sixth. And thirdly, also because this Council is identical with the Sixth more than with the Fifth Ecumenical Council, both as being closer to it in point of time and as having been held in the same geographical locality, since it convened in the very same palace of the Troullos (or Trullus) as that in which the Sixth Ecumenical Council convened.

¹²⁴ For this is the date of it according to chronological calculations. For the Council called the Sixth which was held before it convened in the Ninth Indiction and finished its work A.D. 681 in the first month of the Tenth Indiction, as the minutes of its meetings bear witness. But this Council (which we are considering to be the real Sixth Ecumenical Council) assembled in the year 6199 after Adam, and 691 after Christ, as its Third and Seventeenth Canons bear witness; this

means that it took place in the Fifth Indiction immediately following the past period of fifteen years of the preceding Indiction in which the Sixth Council which was held prior thereto finished its business. So that from the Sixth to the present Council ten or eleven years passed in point of fact, and not twenty-seven, as the Latins allege.

¹²⁵ That this Council convened in the time of Paul of Constantinople is attested by the Collection of the Councils, on page 698 thereof; and not in the time of Callinicus, as Binius and Baronius babblingly assert.

¹²⁶ Not only does Balsamon say that he discovered in old codices of *Nomocanons* that these men were representing the Pope at this Council, and that the Bishops of Sardinia, of Thessalonica, and of Corinth were also acting as legates of the Pope, but even c. III of this same Sixth Ec. C. obviously bears witness that there were legates and representatives of the Pope of Rome attending it (concerning these see *ibidem* in the Collection). The Bishop of Gortyna, the Bishop of Thessalonica, and the Bishop of Corinth acted in place of the Pope at this Council, not because they were subject to the Pope, by any reason of their having been ordained by him, but on account of the distance, says Blastaris, from Rome to Constantinople.

¹²⁷ In other manuscripts it stands “under which.”

¹²⁸ Note that the Theologian borrowed this maxim from the first letter of Demosthenes, in which that orator says: “I take it that anyone commencing any important discourse or work ought to begin first with the gods.”

¹²⁹ Some would have it that when the Apostles were about to separate and go forth to preach in the year 44, they held a large and impressive convention (as we said previously), at which they also composed a Symbol of the Faith (i.e., what is termed in English a creed), and they cite many Western Fathers as witnesses to this, that this Symbol (or Creed) is one which originated with the Apostles (just as some of our own modern theologians adduce evidence from this in regard to some points in their own theological works); which perhaps is what is meant in what the Canon here says about the faith which has been handed down by the Apostles. But inasmuch as most holy and most learned Marcus of Ephesus replied to the Latins at Florence concerning this Symbol (or Creed) sufficiently when he said: “We have not even seen a Symbol of the Apostles, as the great ecclesiarch Silvester states (in Section VI, ch. 6). On this account it must be taken that what is meant here by ‘the faith handed down by the Apostles’ is either a summary of the dogmas of the faith which was not embodied in writing but was handed down orally by the Apostles, or else the faith — that is to say, the dogmas of the faith — gathered together by the holy Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles or even Injunctions.” It appears that this Symbol (or Creed) really is contained in the Apostolic Injunctions (Book VII, ch. 42).

¹³⁰ The doctrine of the deity of a diverse god of Arius consisted in his declaration that the Father was one God and the Son another God. For in respect to the former he asserted that He was inbuilt (i.e., uncreated), whereas in respect to the Son he asserted that He was a *ctisma* (meaning something built, i.e., a creature). Consequently he maintained that the Father was the greater, and that the Son was the lesser; and this is the opinion that divinity is of unequal grades (or ranks), which the Canon says here was abolished by the First Council.

¹³¹ Note that the Canon is referring to the Fathers of the Third Council who convened in Ephesus the first time, because unfortunate Eutyches, in pretending to oppose the dissension of Nestorius, drifted into a new heresy himself, by believing and teaching that a single nature inhered in Christ after the incarnation. Hence, when it came to pass that a disturbance arose in the Church as a result of this heresy, the same Emperor Theodosius the Little assembled a second Council in the same city of Ephesus, appointing the Archbishop of Alexandria Dioscorus its Exarch, in the hope that he would turn out to be another Cyril, of whom he had become the immediate successor, but he was found to be rather the contrary. For he was a Monophysite, entertaining the same beliefs as and speaking in defense of Eutyches. Hence he even confirmed the *cacodoxy* of the latter, and deposed St. Flavian the Patriarch of Constantinople. As a result countless disorders and evils occurred in that city, culminating in the murder of blissful Flavian. On this account indeed this Council was called the “Robber Council,” or, in Latin, “*Latrocinium*.”

¹³² At this point in the Canon there is a note in some of the codices saying that since the wretched and evil-minded iconomachs (otherwise termed in English iconoclasts), being reproved by the Fathers of the present Council on the ground that they (*sc.* the Fathers) were in favor of adoration of the icons, were accusing them of being Monotheletes, this calumny is branded false by this Canon. For these Fathers together with the Sixth Council join hands in explicitly anathematizing in this Canon the heresy of the Monotheletes, and they confess that they recognize two natural wills and energies inherent in our Lord Jesus Christ. It is plain, then, that the Iconomachs bear a strong resemblance to the Eutychianists and Dioscorites, who called the Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council Nestorians because they overthrew their heresy. It may even be said that they resemble the Jews, or rather to say the demons who impelled the Jews to call the Lord possessed, or controlled by demons, simply because He used to drive them out of human beings with His divine authority and power.

¹³³ Some Canons of certain local Synods are excepted, which were not so much ratified as corrected, or rather to say improved, by the present Council. Such are, for example, cc. IV and XXXIII of Carthage, modified by c. XIII of the present; c. XV of Neocæsarea, modified by XVI; c. XLVIII of Carthage, modified by the present Council's c. XXIX; and other canons likewise by other of its Canons. Note, however, that the Canons of the Faster, though not mentioned in this Canon (I don't know for what reason; perhaps it was on account of the leniency they show), have nevertheless been accepted by all the Church — and see in the Prolegomena to the Faster. The Canons made later by St. Nicephorus, and the Canonical Replies to Inquiries made in answer to Nicholas, have likewise been recognized and accepted by the Church.

¹³⁴ As to which was the Council held in Constantinople again in the time of Nectarius and mentioned in the present Canon, see this after the one in Sardica. In addition to this, note that this Canon calls the Canons, Canons of Timothy the Elder by way of distinction from Timothy of Alexandria, surnamed the Cat, who lived in the time of the Fourth Council, and therefore subsequently to the other Timothy. Note also that, inasmuch as the Latins declaim against this Council because it did not mention the local Synods held in the West, nor the Canons of the Latins which had been collected by Bartholomew Carantzas and many others before him; we reply as follows to this objection. We point out that the Council enumerated those Canons of Councils and Fathers which were in use in the Church, but at the same time also recognized and accepted all the Canons of local Synods and regional Councils held in the West that agreed with the Canons of the Ecumenical Councils. And, in general!, just as the Fifth Ecumenical Council recognized and accepted the declarations of St. Augustine and of St. Ambrose, not, to be sure, in general, but only as many as pertained to the right faith and had been issued in refutation of heretics. So do we too recognize and accept whatever is right and correct in what the Councils held in the West have declared, but not everything, seeing that the Pope of Rome has decreed many things therein that are strangely incongruous. Hence it must be remembered that most of the local Synods and regional Councils held in the West erred and spoke amiss; and, indeed, to them was due the addition to the Creed that was the first and worst of evils and the primary and incipient cause of the schism.

¹³⁵

In other editions the word “illegal” does not occur.

¹³⁶

That is why the second ordinance of Title I of the Novels (Photius, Title IX, ch. 28) decrees that the ordinator of an unmarried man must ask him whether he can live with sobriety and virginity; and that any bishop is to be deprived of his bishopric and episcopate if he gives permission to a subdeacon or deacon to marry after ordination: and also why Novel 6 of Leo adds that if the candidate replies in the affirmative to the question asked him by the prelate, he may be ordained; but if anyone gives permission for a deacon to marry after ordination, he is to be deposed from office. Ordinance 44 of Title III decrees that children begotten by priests, deacons, and subdeacons who have married after ordination are not to be accounted either as natural or as spurious children, but neither are they to receive anything from their such fathers, either in the way of heritage or as a gift or pretended loan or any other conveyance, either themselves or their mothers: but, instead, all their property is to be given to the Church to which they belong. Such lawbreakers, after being divested of holy orders, can neither be raised to any mundane office or dignity nor be enlisted in the army, but, on the contrary, are obliged to spend all their lifetime as private citizens and plebeians (Phot., *ibid.*). But why is it that such persons cannot be allowed to marry after ordination? The reason is told in the third Novel of Leo the Wise, which states it as follows: “It is not right and proper, after they have been elevated to a spiritual ascent of holy orders from the carnal humbleness of matrimony, for them to return back to it again; but, indeed, the contrary ought to be done.” That is to say, in other words, after the carnal humbleness of matrimony (i.e., after they marry) they may mount to the sublime ascent of the divine state of holy orders; but those who refuse to do so, shall be deposed. (See the same views expressed in Balsamon's Reply 36 on page 381 of the *Corpus Juris*.) Note in addition to these facts that which is the sternest of all, to wit, that Novels 7 and 8 of Leo decree that clergymen and monks who discard their habit (or garb) and become laymen shall be compelled to wear it against their will.

¹³⁷ Hence Balsamon, too, adducing the present Canon in evidence (Reply 61, page 392 of the *Juris Graecorum*), says that an Anagnost who receives a commission from an abbot to govern the monasterial affairs must not sit down ahead of the priests, or be mentioned after the abbot in the divine services, excepting only if he go to some place and therein acts instead of the abbot himself.

¹³⁸

Note that Armenopoulos (in his Epitome of the Canons, Section 3, Title II) and even Balsamon say that Patriarch Luke in a note (or *semeioma*, as it is called in Greek) prohibited clergymen from serving in perfumery workshops, or in baths in view of the fact that these places are calculated to engender mendacity and greed; and he prohibits deacons from practicing medicine, and excommunicates clergymen who engage in mundane and public businesses and affairs.

¹³⁹

That is why St. Chrysostom says in agreement herewith for no one to go to Jewish Physicians to be treated (page 360 of vol. VI).

¹⁴⁰

Note that it was for three principal reasons that this Council prohibited by an Ecumenical Canon prelates from having a wife: 1) Because in view of the fact that prelates belong to the consummate class and highest order of all ecclesiastical or-

ders, they ought to be perfect in respect of virtues in general and in respect of virginity and purity in particular and above all: hence they ought to regulate their life with a view to strict sobriety. 2) Because prelates possessed of a wife and children were wont to bequeath the episcopate to their children at their own death as a legacy, and many of the things belonging to the Church would be plundered wrongfully and with evil consequences, just as Canon VI of the Apostles says this very same thing. And 3) Because the trouble of taking care of a wife, of children and of a whole household prevents them from giving due attention to the matter of exercising proper diligence in behalf of their flocks, since, as St. Paul says, “*he that is married careth for the things of the world how he may please his wife*” (1 Cor. 7:33). So in order that all these absurdities and improprieties may be prevented from occurring, the present Ecumenical Council prohibited marriage to prelates by means of this Canon. I said “by an Ecumenical Canon” because even before this Council marriage was forbidden to prelates, but by a local, and not by a catholic, Canon. And how do we know about this? First, from divine Chrysostom where he interprets the saying of St. Paul (which in speaking of bishops says: “*If any be blameless, the husband of one wife*” (Titus 1:6) and says “It was on this account that he said, ‘the husband of one wife,’ not that nowadays this restriction is observed in the Church, for a prelate must be adorned with perfect sanctity and purity, but that in those times for the Greeks who were living in a state of constant fornication it was deemed a great thing for a husband to have but one wife” (Discourse 2 on Job). And secondly, from the Canons of the regional council held in Carthage number IV and XXXIII which were prevailing in the regions of Africa and which decreed that bishops, presbyters, and deacons had to make a definition, or, in other words, a definite promise to abstain from their wives (with the mutual consent, that is to say, of the wives). The present Council, on the other hand, decreed by means of the present Canon that the principle that bishops must abstain from their wives and not even live with them at all is to be enforced everywhere in the world. But as for the principle that presbyters and deacons should be obliged to abstain from their wives too, in its Canon XXX it is true that it did allow this, though not everywhere, but only in those barbarian regions because of their savage character and the instability of the faith. That such persons used to continue living, as the Council says, with their wives even after they had promised not to do so, is plainly evident from c. XXXIII of the same council of Carthage.

The present Canon, however, does not conflict with Apostolic Canon V, or with the injunction of St. Paul, nor does it overthrow or refute these. First, because although the divine Apostles merely allowed prelates to have wives, but did not make this a law; on the contrary, in fact, they only made a concession to the weakness of people of those days, and to the matters of Jews and Gentiles: for the prelates of both Jews and Gentiles used to have wives. Hence divine Chrysostom (in the same Discourse) says: “Appoint bishops, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife”: not that he made this a law, but because he made a concession to error. But the present Council, seeing that the Church was advancing by strides and that the republic of Christians was flourishing in virtues, adjusted matters so that the republic of prelates might flourish with celibacy and sobriety. That, too, is why divine Chrysostom says, in interpreting the above saying of St. Paul’s, that the only reason that St. Paul allowed marriage was because he knew that as soon thereafter as piety came to flourish, nature of herself would prefer the good of celibacy and of virginity, and the choice would favor the superior things and the better ways, of unmarried, that is to say, and virgin prelates. Secondly, the fact that although the Apostolic Canon prohibits a bishop from divorcing his wife, or at any rate from forcing her to separate, without her agreeing and consenting to it, yet it does not forbid him to separate from his wife by agreement with her. The present Council, however, in its c. XLVIII, though allowing the wife of a man about to be ordained a prelate to get a divorce from him beforehand with their mutual consent, and after the ordination to enter a convent, does not at the same time allow the wife to be separated forcibly and against her will. For if it said so, it would obviously be in conflict with the Apostles, and even with the very words of the Lord, which command that a marriage remain indissoluble. But since it does not say this, it is therefore evident that neither does it conflict, but, on the contrary, rather agrees, with the Apostolic Canon. Accordingly, briefly speaking, this Council, being encouraged by the advancement of the Church for the better, prefers unmarried men, or, more explicitly speaking, monks, for the prelacy; it does not want the married men, not because it has any fault to find with marriage or because it blames and opposes marriage, but because it prefers celibacy as something better. For this reason it admits to the prelacy even those who have been married, but have separated from their wives, either at death or by mutual agreement, in accordance with the Apostle. Accordingly, it does not itself dissolve the marriage, but ordains any man a prelate that it finds free and unbound by marriage ties, of his own accord and by agreement; and it deposes any prelate that continues to live with his wife even after the ordination. First, because as a result of living with her he may become so excited as to be prompted to fall so low as to have carnal intercourse with her, which is no longer lawful intercourse, as it was formerly; but, on the contrary, such intercourse is considered fornication and adultery, on account of the violation of the agreement and promise which he had made to observe continence with her. And secondly, on account of the scandal which such living together causes the laity, as the present Canon states word for word.

Note that the Patriarch Kyr Luke (*Note of Translator*. — The word “Kyr” here is a transliteration of an abbreviated form of the Greek word *Kyrios*, meaning, approximately, Lord, Sir, or Mister), when asked for how many days those about to partake of communion must have abstained from womankind, declared synodically (or *ex cathedra*) that for three days they must not have been near their wives, whether they were men in holy orders or married worldlings. For if God commanded the Hebrews not to go near their wives for three days, in order to conform with the old law saying, “*Be ye ready: for three days come not at your wives*” (Exod. 19:15), it is far more imperative that men should keep these days who are about to conform, not with the law, but with the lawgiver Himself, God, through the divine Eucharist. And if Abimelech (or Abiathar) the prelate (or high priest), when about to give the showbread to David and his

stalwarts, asked them whether they were uncontaminated by womankind, and they replied that for three days they had kept from having any carnal intercourse with a woman: *“And David answered the priest, and said unto him, Of a truth we have kept away from women (it was) for the third day yesterday”* (1 Sam. 21:5), how can it be said that those who are about to partake of the Lord’s Body need not be uncontaminated by womankind? In fact, even those who are about to marry ought to confess with their wives, and fast, and prepare themselves so as to be ready, before the divine liturgy commences, to be nuptially crowned (or garlanded). Then, after they are imptially crowned, let the divine liturgy commence; and when this is finished, let them approach to partake of the divine mysteries; and let them beware of having carnal intercourse that night after divine communion, thus conforming with such a most holy custom and order which had been kept and is still being kept even now by true Christians who really wish to be saved. It was for this reason, according to Balsamon, that the above-mentioned Kyr Luke subjected to penances newly-married couples who mingled with each other carnally on the same day after divine Communion. Hence we infer from the major premise the minor premise that if three days’ abstinence from carnal intercourse is sufficient as preparation for divine Communion, much more is three days’ fasting sufficient therefor, in spite of the fact that fasting before partaking of Communion is not decreed by the divine Canons. Nevertheless, those who are able to fast even a whole week before it, are doing the right thing. See also Footnote 2 to Ap. c. LXIII, and that to c. VII of Neocaesarea.

¹⁴² The expression “in accordance with their own rules” is taken by the Carthaginian Council to signify “in accordance with their own promises,” which such men in holy orders had made to practice temperance by abstinence, or, in other words, to maintain themselves aloof like virgins from their wives by agreement. But this Ecumenical Council, improving the decisions of that Council, which was a regional one, took the expression “their own rules” to signify “at the time of divine services and their own curacy,” as Zonaras and Balsamon interpret it. Likewise the expression saying “have to be temperate in all things,” as used by the Carthaginian Council, concerned temperance in curacies as regarding womankind, and not at all times, according to this Council, which captured the thought of that Council in more unambiguous terms, lest as a result of any promise on the part of those in holy orders to abstain permanently from their wives many of them be compelled to fornicate and to indulge in lewdness. There used to be barbarian churches situated in Libya and Barbary. That explains why c. XII of the present Council mentions Libya and Africa by name, for it was there that such a custom prevailed.

¹⁴³ The Latins blaspheme in asserting that the present Council sinned in legislating to the Church in Rome regarding marriages of priests; and they are manifestly clashing with the Holy Spirit, who spoke through this Council. For, being an ecumenical council, this Council legislated officially to all the inhabited earth, without any exception. For even Popes have to obey the (Ecumenical) Councils, like any other prelate, just as Pelagius II states. This Council did not err in what it decreed in regard to the marriage of priests, since it followed the Bible, which declares that a marriage must remain indissoluble; and it also followed the First Ecum. C., which avoided this, the possibility, that is to say, of a forcible divorce in the case of the marriage of priests. But inasmuch as this inviolable custom, or rather canon, in Rome compelled many priests to divorce their wives forcibly (I say forcibly because who loved the value of holy orders and could not secure them when they had wives, were forced for the glory of the office to divorce their wives against their will), and thereafter to fornicate and to indulge in lewdness, and to have housekeepers (as the Latins have indeed even today undisguisedly and by permission), on this account the Council prohibited this. For it had to prohibit prelates from marrying, for the reasons which we have explained in connection with c. XII, and especially in order to prevent them from handing over the affairs of the Church to their children. But as regards priests there is not so much need of such a prohibition, in view of the fact that a priest is ordained to act as the watchman of a small parish, and village, and vicinity. Besides, even if one of the priests, with the consent of his wife, gets a divorce, or abstains for a time, the work is acceptable. But to be forcibly divorced, as was caused by the canon in Rome requiring priests to agree to it, is a violation of the law, and is in fact a counter law enacted in defiance of the Holy Spirit. But then again, if the Latins blame this Council as erring in this respect, why is that they actually practice what it decreed? For when it comes to the nation of the Marionites, situated round about Mt. Lebanon and Phoenicia, and adherents of the Latin faith, they allow the priests to have their wives. So let the wretches blame themselves because they allow the priests of the Marionites to mingle carnally with their wives and on the same day to conduct sacred services, thus clashing with St. Paul and the Canons, including this one and c. III of Dionysius and cc. V and XIII of Timothy, which forbid this; and because they allow Orthodox priests in Lechia who have married twice to remain in holy orders provided they accept Papism, or Roman Catholicism, which is contrary both to the Canons and to all antiquity, and is tantamount to a maxim that one married a second time cannot become a priest.

¹⁴⁴

See also St. Gregory the Theologian in his Discourse on the Lights, where he says: “Jesus was purified when thirty years old, and so how is it that you are trying to teach old men before you have even grown a beard, or you believe that you are teaching them, though have neither the age nor the skill to command respect? What a Daniel, and so and so, modern judges, and plenty of examples at their tongue’s end (for every wrongdoer is ready to produce excuses). But rarities are not laws of the Church, any more than one swallow makes it spring.”

¹⁴⁵

Note that Zonaras says in his interpretation of c. XXXIII of Carthage that the subdeacon does not come into contact with the holy things, adducing in support of his statement the Council held in Laodicea, which forbids a servant to do

so; and from such testimony it would appear that he considers a subdeacon and a servant to be on the same footing. Yet they do not appear to be one and the same on many accounts. First, because the subdeacon does touch the sacred Mysteries, according to the said c. XXXIII of Carthage and c. XIII of this 6th; and the liturgical vessels, according to Inj. XXI of the eighth book of the Apostolic Injunctions, whereas a servant cannot touch sacred utensils, nor has he any place in the diaconicon, according to c. XXI of Laodicea. Secondly, because a servant must not neglect to watch the doors of the church, according to c. XXII of Laodicea, when he is the doorkeeper; but the subdeacon is not the same person as the doorkeeper, being distinct from the latter, according to c. IV of the 6th, which mentions them as distinct, and according to Justinian Novel 3 (contained in Book III of the Basilica, Title II, ch. 1; in Photius, Title I, ch. 30), which appoints others to be subdeacons, and others to be doorkeepers (of whom there were a hundred), in the great Church. So that it appears hence that blessed Eustratius Argentes, on page 273 of his disquisition concerning the Mysteries, made a mistake where he says that ch. 57 of the second book of the Injunctions says for subdeacons to stand at the doors of the women. For by careful observation of the location we have ascertained that the deacons stood at the doors of the women, just as is also appropriate, and not the subdeacons. Chapter II of the eighth book of the Injunctions, mentioned by him, contains no reference to such a thing at all. And thirdly, because some insist that the ministers of the divine service mentioned by St. Chrysostom in his commentary on the parable of the prodigal son were the deacons and the subdeacons (because the subdeacons also, according to Zonaras, in his interpretation of c. XXII of Laodicea, were wont to call out "Approach, ye catechumens," just as the saint mentions there, that is to say, connection with these ministers), and that the thin cloth which they had on their left shoulder was that which is now called the orarion, which orarion a servant is forbidden to wear by c. XXII of Laodicea (though as regards the orarion it is not true). For only deacons could wear it, on the ground that it was of use to them (see also the Footnote to c. XXII of Laodicea, and that to c. XXI-II of the 6th), and not the subdeacons, on the ground that it was of no use to them. So from these various activities it appears that servants were different from subdeacons, and that it was only by a general name, and not by any law, that subdeacons, anagnostes, psaltes, exorcists, doorkeepers, ostiaries, and all clergymen in general that were outside of the Bema, were often called servants, in accordance with cc. XII and LXXXIX of Basil, and c. XXIV of Laodicea, but especially c. XX of the same Council, as we said also in the Interpretation of Ap. c. XVII, and more particularly in accordance with c. XIV of Sardica. Nevertheless, others thereafter allot these services to the subdeacons, as, for instance, Gabriel of Philadelphia (on the mystery of holy orders) says that they were given the work of getting ready and furbishing the holy vessels, and the sacred vestments, and safeguarding them. This same fact is also stated by Symeon of Thessalonica, who adds (ch. 164) that they were wont to guard the sacred doors to keep anyone from entering the Bema and to put out the catechumens when the deacon called out "Approach, ye catechumens." It is on this account too that even today the subdeacons are wont to say "All ye faithful," and at the great entrance they take the surplus holy vessels, and give them to the servants to guard; in the litanies they march in the van holding the cross; they also furbish the lights attached to the Bema, the chandelier, and the tricerion; and before the doors of the Bema they receive communion from the prelate or priest after the deacons. See also c. LXIX of Basil, where the servant is evidently a different person from the subdeacon.

¹⁴⁶ Taking a cue hence, some assert that these seven deacons ought not to be painted as deacons of the Mysteries with a censer, sticharion, and orarion, and bareheaded. But, seeing on the one hand that God-bearing Ignatius in his letter to the Trallians states that Archdeacon Stephen performed a pure and faultless liturgy for James the Brother of God, and on the other hand seeing in chapters 4 and 47 of the eighth book of the Apostolic Injunctions that the seven deacons are classed with bishops and presbyters and numbers with them, one of whom was Stephen, I deem that the same persons were also Deacons of the Mysteries, and consequently that it is not improper to picture them also as Deacons of the Mysteries.

¹⁴⁷ True, Sozomen says (in book VII, ch. 19) that although in other cities the number of deacons was a matter of indifference, in Rome, down to his time, there were seven deacons, after the likeness of these seven whom the Apostles selected, which is attested also by divine Maximus in commenting upon chapter 3 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Divine Dionysius, which deacons the same Dionysius calls "select" (or, in Greek, *eccritoi*).

¹⁴⁸ Attached to the present Canon there was found a note reading as follows: "Note the present Canon, and wonder at the way it is being neglected today. For that most devout Patriarch Sir John, surnamed the Chalcedonian, who lived and served during the reign of Alexius Comnenus, used to teach every Sunday. That is why his teachings were contained in a special volume. And there is also found a Kyriakodromion of John, or George, Xiphilinus, a Patriarch of Constantinople, and of other Patriarchs and Bishops." In agreement with the present Canon St. Justin also speaks of the Dean in his second Apology for the Christians. For he says that on Sunday Christians from all parts of the country used to congregate in the church; and after the appropriate passages of the New and Old Testaments would be read in the liturgy, the Prelate would give a teaching (or *didache*). "Afterwards when the Reader ceased reading, the Dean in a sermon would offer the admonition and invitation to emulate these good men and imitate their good works." But that the Presbyters were also deans of the churches is shown by the fifteenth Discourse of St. Gregory the Theologian (on page 226) where he calls the Presbyters "Pastors" (or shepherds), and the Bishops "Archpastors" (or chief shepherds). Zonaras, too, states that they are assessors to the Bishops (i.e., entitled to sit with them) on the Bema (or Sanctuary). St. Chrysostom, too, says that they have the teaching and protection of the laity. But if these assertions are true, it is obvious that they

themselves are also co-deans of the churches. See also the testimony of St. Chrysostom in the Footnote to Ap. c. LVIII, and c. XIX of the 7th.

¹⁴⁹ The *papaethra*, which is also called a *garrara*, according to Peter of Antioch in his letter to Caerularius, is a more or less circular tonsure of the hair at the point of the head, similar to a wreath. It is not a custom confined to the Latins, but one that was adopted by the entire Church, both the Eastern and the Western, as is corroborated both by the present Canon and by the Holy Fathers: for St. Jerome in writing to St. Augustine says, "I wish I had your halo"; likewise St. Augustine wrote to Bishop Proculianus, "by our halo." It is wont to be affected, not in honor of the Apostle Peter, as the Westerners say, but originally and properly, in order to serve as an outward sign of the guise of clerics, by which the latter differed from those who were not clerics, according to the present Canon. Consequently, and in a more allegorical way, it served as a type of the crown of thorns of the Lord, according to the interpretation given by St. Germain in his dissertation on mystical contemplation. Be that as it may, the clerics of us Easterners, unskillfully cut the hair of the head above and a little below, crosswise, that is to say, and leaving the crown untoussured in the center, and wholly untouched, thus today inexpertly and inartistically contrive this *papaethra*; whereas the Westerners, because they affect this for adornment, make it by shaving the hair from the head above and below, and cutting off the central part entirely and making it unlike the halo of the saints. For this reason Maximus Margunius, in his thirty-fifth note on the Canons of Antioch, called the *papaethra* of the Latins a "whorish garland." See Dositheus in the *Dodecabilus*, p. 778. As for the fact that our own clerics ought to wear this halo at the point of the head, let them learn it from this Canon. For it is not right to do away with eternal devices which our Fathers devised. Two things, however, in the present Canon are noteworthy: one is that those in holy orders who were being deposed on account of canonical crimes first put off the guise of the Clergy, and thus dropped into the status of laymen (for it would have been unbecoming for them to have stood with laymen with the guise of the Clergy). That is why Balsamon, in interpreting c. XLIV of Basil, says that those who have been deposed change guise, and on this point Ap. c. XXV and c. III of Basil can be reconciled with each other, as well as all other Canons that say for the deposed to be dropped into the status of laymen. Accordingly, others say that if the deposed themselves afterwards come to hate the sin willingly and spontaneously, and keep away from it altogether, and repent, they may regain the guise of the Clergy which they lost. If this is true, it is plain that such men used to be elevated to the status of those in holy orders and enjoyed the honor attaching to the rights of sitting and standing with them. And on this point again cc. I and II of Ancyra, cc. IX and X of Neocaesarea, cc. III and XXVI of the present Council, and c. XXVII of Basil can all be reconciled, which say that those who are degraded from holy orders may enjoy the honor attaching to the rights of sitting and standing with those in holy orders, and in general only the outward honor of holy orders, concerning which see the Footnote to c. XXVI of the present Council.

¹⁵⁰ It may be inferred both from the present Canon and from c. LVIII of this same Council that deacons too were wont to impart the divine mysteries to lay persons. Hence in consonance with these the Apostolic Injunctions (book VIII, ch. 26) also say that after the prelate or priest has celebrated the liturgy, the deacon takes the mysteries from them and imparts them to the laity, not that he is a priest, but as one ministering to the priests. This function of the deacon consisted chiefly and properly in imparting of the chalice, according to the same Injunctions (book VIII, ch. 13). Let the deacon, it says, hold the chalice, and, while in the act of bestowing it, let him say, "Blood of Christ; a Cup of Life." This same fact is also attested by Cyprian in his fifth discourse concerning the lapsed; and by St. Ambrose of Milan, in volume I concerning duties; and by John Chrysostom, in his Homily 83 on St. Matthew. See Argentes, page 306. Those who partook of the chalice used to wipe their mouths on the deacon's orarion, which need was what required him to wear it, as we shall have occasion to state in connection with c. XXII of Laodicea. I said "chiefly and properly" because St. Justin, in his second Apology, says that deacons were also wont to administer the communion to others in the way of the holy bread too. "Those called among us Deacons give to each of those present to partake of the Eucharistic bread and wine and water, and to those not present they take away." This appears to be what is meant also by c. II of Ancyra.

¹⁵¹ From this Canon it becomes manifest that those spirituals (i.e., confessors) must needs be deposed who, deeming piety to be a regular business, as St. Paul says, and being traffickers in Christ, demand money from the Christians who confess their sins to them, and who therefor give them permission, even though they be unworthy, to commune in the divine mysteries. This is exceedingly great impiety, which most learned and most theologically well-grounded Joseph Bryennius censures and speaks of despisingly in one of his discourses, saying that this is what caused the race of us Orthodox Christians to be taken captive and to be delivered into the hands of the impious and godless Hagarenes. "What will you give me if I allow you to commune?" But what else is this than that which Judas said to the Jews in betraying the Lord into their hands? "What are you willing to give if I deliver him to you?" Most all-sacred and holy prelates, take care, for the love of God, to extirpate this great evil from your provinces, the result of which is that every day gentle Jesus Christ, who was sold but once for the sake of our race, is being sold over and over again.

¹⁵² Although Balsamon in his interpretation of the present Canon does say that such theatrical shows and such games are prohibited only on Sundays and the great holidays, but not on the other days, inferring this from that which c. LXX of Carthage says to the effect that these shows must be transferred to other days, we say, principally and primarily, that c. LI of this Ecumenical Council prohibits their being held, not on some days and on other days not so, but not at all on any days whatsoever. Consequently, and because the same Council of Carthage in its c. XVII says that it is ever and al-

ways preached to all Christians not to go near any place where there are blasphemies and other improprieties that attend or mark such theatrical shows. Moreover, we say what St. Basil the Great says (see *in extenso* XX). No blamed thing in itself can ever become good on account of the season in which it is done. “None of the things that have been condemned is suited to us for the time being.” But since these spectacles and theatrical shows have been blamed, they are not to be praised and are not good even when held on non-festival days. For these things are really demonish works. St. Chrysostom, too, says (Horn. 12 on the First Ep. to the Corinthians, page 318 of volume III): “And talk not to me of custom. For if a thing is wicked, let it not be done even once; but if it is good, let it be done again and again.” Or, in other words, if the thing is an evil, let it not occur even once; but if it is not, let it occur at all times. The same Chrysostom calls theaters and circuses and horse races pomp of Satan (Discourse 20 on statues, page 610 of volume VI). And again the same saint says: “Frequenting theaters has given birth to fornication, licentiousness, and lewdness of every sort. And watching horse races, prize fights, burlesque shows, and boxing, and exhibitions of insolence, and the exchange of insults have engendered constant aversions” (Discourse 15 on statues, page 564 of volume VI). See also the discourse which he prepared specially to show how improper it is for anyone to go near theaters, since these make men perfect adulterers (page 89, of volume V).

¹⁵³ From this Canon it can be proved that as regards all priests that are deposed from holy orders on account of their manifest crimes, or who have been obstructed by a spiritual father as a matter of advice on account of their hidden sins, or even by themselves when stricken by remorse if they abdicate the rights of holy orders, none of them, I say, can either bless or sanctify or perform any other sacred office, either secretly or openly. But if this is true, it follows as a matter of logic that such men can neither chant sanctifications nor administer the communion to anyone, nor comforting assurances, nor baptisms, nor unctions of holy oil, nor other such services, since all these sacred rites and acts inevitably involve the impartation of a blessing and sanctification, which sanctification is something that they do not possess, according to the contents of this Canon. But neither can such men accept accountings and become spiritual confessors. For, according to Symeon of Thessalonica (Reply 11), the one accepting accountings must also bless, and say a prayer designed to grant a pardon, and must perform a liturgical service, and administer the communion to those who are confessing their sins, and must intercede in behalf of penitents, and, briefly speaking, the Confessor needs to have an active part in the exploitation of holy orders, according to Kitros (and see the Footnote to Ap. c. XXXIX). As for the assertion that the above are unqualified to perform these things, there are many proofs that such is the case. 1) Because if a priest who has unwittingly fallen into an unlawful marriage, which is the same as saying, has committed an involuntary sin (for, according to Nemesisius, a sin is involuntary if it is committed as a result of force or as a result of ignorance), cannot either bless or sanctify or perform any other sacerdotal operation, according to this Canon, still less can one do these things who has been deposed on account of a voluntary sin that renders him liable to deposition from holy orders, or who has resigned. 2) If c. III of the present Council, mentioning this same Canon of St. Basil, decrees that those suspended for a while must not pronounce a blessing or conduct a sanctification, still less can those who have been deposed or who have resigned pronounce a blessing or conduct a sanctification, seeing that their condemnation to deposition is permanent, according to c. III of Basil, and they can no longer return to the holy orders out of which they have fallen. 3) In view of the fact that c. VIII of Nicholas prohibits one who has resigned from holy orders of his own accord either to pronounce in advance the words “Blessed is God,” or to pronounce in subsequence the words “Christ is the true one,” or to partake of the Eucharist within the Bema, or even to waft incense with the censer, but, on the contrary, must be confined to the status of laymen — and, be it iterated, if it prohibits them even from plying the censer, much more so does it evidently prohibit them from pronouncing a blessing, and from conducting a sanctification, and from performing the above sacred offices we have named. Even though c. IX of Neoeaesarea does say that a priest who has committed a carnal sin before ordination and has confessed it himself shall not offer, or, in other words, officiate, but may remain entitled to all other privileges — if, I say, that Canon does say this, on which Canon alone those rely who want to have those who resign from holy orders on account of their sins to be entitled to pronounce blessings and to conduct sanctifications and to perform the above sacred offices, we interpret it in accordance with its true intent, which is also consonant with the rest of the Canons. So when the Canon says for such a priest not to officiate, together with officiation the higher and more catholic operation of holy orders, it is to be noted that the lower and more particular sacred acts of holy orders were included by it. As for the other prerogatives which it says are to remain unaffected, they are: a) the right to wear the guise of the cleric, and not to be relegated to the status of laymen — which rights are forfeited by those who have been deposed for canonical crimes, according to c. XXI of the 6th; b) the right to sit in company with the priests, according to the present Canon of this Ecumenical Council, c. I of Ancyra, and c. XXVII of Basil; c) the right to stand in company with the priests, according to c. III of the present 6th; d) the right to enjoy the outward honor, according to c. I of Antioch, or, in other words, the honor to participate in conventions held outside of the churches, or, according to Balsamon, the honor to participate in activities conducted outside of the Bema, or rather to say the honor attaching to the outward guise of the presbyters, which they wear; e) the right to retain the name of priest, according to Balsamon. Zonaras and Balsamon, however, say further, in interpreting the same c. IX of Neocaesarea, that such priests are even to be allowed to commune within the Holy Bema (though the Canon of Basil merely allows priests who have not committed the sin to completion to commune in company with presbyters and deacons when they have been suspended for only a while). So these privileges and these honors are the rest of the prerogatives in regard to which the Canon says that they are to be retained by presbyters who have confessed their sin; but not also any active operation, or blessing, or any other sacerdotal act. For nowhere do the above Canons bestow upon those who have been degraded from holy orders the right to perform any and every sacerdotal function, but only the right to sit and to stand

with their fellow functionaries, and, generally speaking, the outward honor, and nothing more. Hence how can it be said that this one Canon alone of Neocaesarea is in conflict with and contrary to six other Canons and two Ecumenical Canons, namely, cc. III and XXVI of the present Council, cc. I and II of Ancyra, c. I of Antioch, and c. XX of Basil? But, at any rate, there can be no antinomy and strife between erudite men of the Spirit on account of the absurdity. So the one Canon ought to be understood in accordance with the six Canons. But as for the view that the expression “let him offer” used in c. IX of Neocaesarea includes every sacerdotal function and service, and that the expression “the rest” used therein denotes sitting and honor, even Balsamon took it thus in interpreting the present Canon of the 6th, but as for the “sacred Canon” which it mentions, he thought that this referred to c. IX of Neocaesarea, and that the present Canon of the 6th is consistent with that one. These things having been thus stated, I marvel whence the present-day custom has arisen of letting priests degraded from holy orders pronounce blessings and conduct sanctifications, at a time when neither the Canons say this nor do the exegetes themselves. But even though it is true that Novel 79 of Leo the Wise says for presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons married and on this account deposed from office are not to get the mundane guise, or to be condemned to be denied the right to perform other service in the church that it is not illicit (or, in other words, that is not unlawful and contrary to the Canons) for them to undertake, yet the fact remains that it says that this service is something else — that is to say, suited to servants, and to ecclesiastics (and see the Footnote to c. XV of the 6th), and not blessing and sanctification, and the sacred acts of holy orders which it is illicit for such persons to undertake and contrary to the Canons. I realize that when these facts are stated, they appear severe and grievous to priests who have been deposed or have resigned on account of some sin of theirs. But once we have taken in hand to interpret the Canons, we are determined to tell whatever is pleasing and right of all that is in the Canons, and those who possess fear of God and a good conscience owe it to themselves to take cognizance of the truth and to correct themselves accordingly. These things are what spiritual fathers ought to tell those in holy orders who have not been duly taken to task and censured; and they should do this not by way of reprimand but by way of advice, leaving everything to their conscience, so that if they wish to do so of their own accord, they may either resign from the duties of holy orders or not resign.

¹⁵⁴ Hence both priests and prelates must employ some shift in time of a plague to enable them to administer communion to the sick without violating this Canon; not, however, by placing the Holy Bread in currants, but in some sacred vessel, so that the dying and the sick may take it thence with tongs or the like. The vessel and the tongs are to be placed in vinegar, and the vinegar is to be poured into a funnel, or in any other manner that they can that is safer and canonical.

¹⁵⁵ Holy Communion must be administered or imparted not only separately from the grapes, but also separately from the fragments (of holy Bread). That is why Symeon of Thessalonica (ch. 94) says that priests must be very careful not to administer the communion to Christians by giving them these fragments (more usually called, in Greek, *antidora*), but must be sure to give them pieces of the very body of the Lord itself. If those who are about to commune are not numerous (as happens especially on Great Thursday, during the Christmas festival, on the occasion of the feast of the Holy Apostles, and of that of the Theotoke), let them not place the fragments in the Holy Chalice, in order to avoid making a mistake and administering the communion to anyone by giving them the fragments: instead, let them leave them on the Holy Disc, and after administering the communion to the Christians, then let them put them forth and let them celebrate the holies, just as it is the custom to do so in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain. For notwithstanding that the fragments were united with the blood and the body of the Lord, they did not actually become a part of the Lord's body.

¹⁵⁶ Hence we inferentially conclude that this custom of breaking the fast on the occasion of Great Thursday came to prevail in Africa, or even in other parts of the earth, at a time before the Second Ecum. Council had yet been held, since the custom is censured in this Canon by the Council which was held in Laodicea before the Second Ecumenical Council was convoked. But one might wonder why c. LXXXIX of the 6th says for us to celebrate the Great Week (i.e., Passion Week) with fasting. And the first Canon of Dionysius asserts that some Christians pass these six days without eating any food at all, while others pass four of them, and others three, and others two in that fashion. Moreover, the Injunctions of the Apostles (book V, ch. 18) expressly say that on these days of the Passion one must not eat anything else but bread, water, salt, and vegetables, without tasting wine or meat. This is further corroborated by c. L of Laodicea and c. XXIX of the 6th, as we have said. Why, I ask, do these Canons say these things, whereas the Rituals permit one to break the fast on Great Thursday by partaking of oil and wine? (though it must be noted that the more accurate manuscript rituals of the Imperial and great Monasteries of the Holy Mountain permit the fast of Great Thursday to be broken only in respect of wine, and not also in respect of oil; and it is they which we ought to follow. For it is thus written in them: “We partake of wine, and of a stew without oil.”) It seems to me that this is due to two opposite opinions having come into vogue as respecting Great Thursday. Accordingly the Canons of Carthage allowed the eating of only dry things to be abolished on that day; whereas all these other Canons, as we have said, decree that only dry things are to be eaten on that day. For this reason and on this account the God-bearing Fathers who compiled the rituals, plodding the middle path, so to speak, between these two opinions, decreed that on that day the fast might be abolished, or rather abated, only in respect of oil, having decided to make this concession in honor of the Lord's Supper, which took place in the first instance on that day of the week. Nevertheless, one would do better to fast even on Great Thursday both from wine and from oil. But as for those persons who right after the liturgy of Great Saturday indulge in wine and oil, are obviously breaking the law. For the divine Apostles in their Injunctions (book V, chapters 18 and 19) command

Christians to fast throughout Great Friday and Great Saturday, just as they themselves were accustomed to fast on those days, since fasting on these two days is laid down as a law by Christ Himself, who said: “But days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast” (Matt. 9:15). Now, it was on Great Friday and Great Saturday that the Lord was in fact taken from the Jews and crucified and buried, for our salvation. But if anyone should offer an objection to this view by citing the statement in the Ritual to the effect that on the evening of Great Saturday the Cellarman comes and gives a piece of bread and glass of wine, we reply to this objection, that this glass of wine and this piece of bread are not ordinary wine and ordinary bread, but, on the contrary, are bread and wine that have been blessed by the priest: 1) because further above it says for the bread to be blessed, and further below it mentions this; 2) because in most of them it is found written in the following fashion, to wit, — with a single piece, not of bread, indefinitely, but of *the* bread, definitely and relatively, of the above blessed bread, that is to say; and 3) because this glass of wine was the blessed wine, which, after being mixed with water, was wont to be given to the brethren for the purpose of sanctification, and especially to those who had communed in order to rinse, that is to say, in other words, in order to wash out their mouth, just as it is the custom to do right after divine Communion. Many persons fast for three days during Holy Lent. Accordingly, why should they not fast also for the two days of Great Friday and Great Saturday, which is more necessary? Indeed, if they cannot do both fasts, it is better for them to fast on these two days, than to do so on the three days in question. For divine Chrysostom says, in his Homily on the Great Week, that just as the Great Week is the head and greater than all the other weeks in the year, so again is Great Saturday the head of the Great Week. The fact that the above blessing of the bread is that which is the customary solemnization carried out by breaking the five loaves is more plainly and more explicitly presented by the manuscript Ritual of the Monastery of the Pantocrator. It says, however, also this, that of the blessed loaves of bread a sufficiently large piece must be given to each brother, and similarly as regards the blessed wine. Hence it is to be inferred that the loaves of bread must be of a large size, and the wine must be of a correspondingly large quantity, in order to suffice for all.

¹⁵⁷ Photius notes (Title III, ch. 14) that if anyone should celebrate a liturgy in a private place (meaning a common place, and not a prayerhouse, as some interpret the word), in a barn, or in a farmhouse, or allows others to celebrate it than those who have been appointed to do so by the prelate, the particular place in which the liturgy was held with the landlord’s knowledge, shall be dedicated to the church of that village, through the bishop and steward and ruler. But if the landlord had no knowledge of the affair, he is not liable to punishment, but those who knew about it are to be exiled and their property is to be confiscated and dedicated to the church of the locality in question. Balsamon, on the other hand, asserts that antimensia are consecrated by the prelate to this end that they may be laid on the holy tables of prayerhouses and be considered, in accordance with the meaning of their name as being employed *instead of* a consecrated holy table (this is understandable in view of the fact that the Latin word *mensa* signifies table, and so *mensalia* too is the name for the cloths spread over the tables); and the priests who receive these from prelates, it would appear, by implication receive at the same time also permission from them to celebrate the liturgy with them in such prayerhouses. John of Kitros, on the other hand, in his Reply 13, asserts that a priest is sinning who celebrates a liturgy or performs a baptism with an antimension in a special place in a house or boat separated with holy icons, as also the priests of kings and emperors perform sacred rites out in desert plains in rush huts. Balsamon also says this same thing in his Reply 14, and one who officiates in such places without an antimension is to be deposed. These antimensia must have portions of the relics of martyrs sewed to them in order to be able to fulfill the function of a Consecrated Table truly, as is required by the ordinance concerning antimensia in the Euchologion. That is why they never use antimensia in Moscow without any relics of martyrs. See the Footnote to c. VIII of the 7th.

¹⁵⁸ I said “except in case of great necessity” because according to St. Basil the Great (in Epitome by Definition What) one must neither eat an ordinary supper in church, nor the Lord’s Supper in an ordinary house, unless it be in case of necessity that one chooses a cleaner place and house. That is why even in time of persecution command the bishop to have a gathering in houses in order to avoid having any pious person go to church or to a gathering of the impious. In fact, many noteworthy things appear to have occurred in ecclesiastical history under the stress of necessity. For we read that the sacred martyr Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, when in prison, conducted divine services upon his breast, having the clergymen and faithful ones present stand in a circle to serve as a temple. Moreover, Theodoret the Bishop of Cyprus, when in the desert and at an unsheltered place, used the hands of the Deacon instead of a holy table and performed the divine liturgy upon them, because the breast and hands and arms of the priest are more precious and more sacred, according to St. Chrysostom, than a stone table and the inanimate vessels thereon. But such cases are altogether rare. For oratories, however, and any other place where it becomes necessary to perform sacred rites, the so-called antimensia are indispensable. If anyone wonders, on the other hand, what becomes of that house wherein Mysteries were offered, when it comes to be enslaved by wars — whether it remains sacred, that is to say, or becomes ordinary, let him consider the Footnotes to c. XIV of the 4th, which may be read with due regard for what Synesius says to the effect that that house or place in which men assembled and prayed as usual in time of an incursion of heathen does not become sacred on that account; for all the private houses that afforded a reception to prayers and Mysteries in the time when Arianism was rife remained again private and ordinary dwelling places just as they were previous thereto.

¹⁵⁹ Though the present Council in this c. XXXI allows a baptism to be performed in a prayerhouse with the permission of the bishop, yet in its c. LIX it appears to prohibit altogether any performing of a baptism within a prayerhouse, just as

Zonaras says, not that it is conflicting with itself, but perhaps on account of these supporting points, in order that a large number of Christians assembled in common churches may stand as witnesses to the baptism on every occasion and in order that the name and date of those baptized may be recorded in the archives of the catholic church, thereby preventing the occurrence of the unlawful anomaly of a person's having been baptized twice over owing to the circumstance that there are no witnesses to the fact that he was baptized at any previous time, according to c. LXXX of Carthage and according to c. LXXXIV of the present Council likewise, and in order that the sponsor (or godfather) of the one baptized may be known to all, and therefore that the spiritual relationship thus resulting may not be ignored when it comes time for the one baptized to get married. Both the foregoing possibilities could easily occur if a person were to be baptized in a prayerhouse when no such number of Christians were assembled there. Perhaps, however, it prohibits baptism in oratories (only) when it is performed without the consent of the bishop, precisely, that is to say, as it prohibits also the holding of liturgical services in a house of prayer without his consent and approval. There is, however, also a third reason why baptism should be performed in churches, and not in oratories; to wit, that the priest must first make the offertory and afterwards, wearing all the sacerdotal vestments, must come out and baptize the child, and after the baptism must commence the divine liturgy, and at the end of it must administer communion to the child baptized. For just as nature had milk ready for the nourishment of the body of the infant directly when it was born corporeally, so and in like manner grace prepares divine communion ready for the spiritual nourishment of the infant directly when it is reborn spiritually through baptism. If, however, the infant is in danger, it may be baptized at any time, and at any place it happens to be.

¹⁶⁰ The Aquarians — those, that is to say, who offered water instead of wine — had as the leader of their heresy Tatian, who had formerly been a disciple of St. Justin. (Theodoret, *Cacomythia* of Heretics, Book I, ch. 20).

¹⁶¹

The miracle of the Lord's indefectible body was a double one, not only because of the fact that it spurted blood and water, the blood like that of a human being but the accompanying water like that of a supernatural source, according to St. Gregory the Theologian, but also because it spurted them warm and alive, as though that side of the body were living, and life-producing because of the substantial union therewith of the life-producing Divinity, according to Symeon of Thessalonica. Hence, in order to represent the first miracle, it was made a law for blood and water to be placed in the holy chalice; and in order to represent the second, it was ordered from above and in the beginning, as Balsamon and Germanus of Constantinople say, that this water be poured in hot and boiling at the time of the communion troparion (or hymn), not cold, or lukewarm, in order that the priest himself and the others, by partaking of the blood and water while thus hot, may be disposed to think that they are partaking of them just as they came out of the Savior's life-producing flank. So those priests who are neglectful in this regard are making a mistake, a great mistake, when they fail to heat the holy element to boiling, but pour it lukewarm into the holy chalice. For it must be boiled and be bubbling hot when it is poured in (so that the holy chalice itself will be heated by it to the boiling temperature), as the name of it denotes. For *zeon*, in Greek, signifies *boiling* water. That is why divine Nicephorus in his c. XIII says that a presbyter must not conduct the liturgy without boiling hot water. The Latins, on the other hand, who conduct their mass with water that is not hot, represent the living Divinity as dead, as well as the Savior's divine flank which is vivified by that Divinity. But priests must be careful and put less water in the chalice when first pouring water in at the time of the prothesis, but later they must pour in more of the hot water for two reasons: both in order to heat up the previous combination in the chalice, and in order that the mixture of wine and water may be moderate, and not become the contrary, and afford the Latins occasion to accuse us of corrupting the mixture in the chalice with excessive water. It is fitting in regard to the present Canon and most necessary to priests that we add in this Footnote what ought to be done if the divine Mysteries should happen to be spilled or be eaten by insects or other small animals. In this connection Symeon of Thessalonica (Question 81) says that if they happen to be spilled when the Great Entrance is ended (which is the same as saying before the sanctification and transessentiation), or the bread happens to be eaten by rats or mice during the preparative (called in Greek *proskomide*, or *proskomide*, according to a different system of transliteration), or prothesis, and this fact is not perceived until after the Great Entrance, the priest must make a second union (i.e., mixture) in the chalice, and bring forward other bread with the prophetic words, and adding, or saying in addition thereto, the prayer of the prothesis. Afterwards he must begin saying the prayers that follow the Great Entrance, as lustrative (for those said before the Entrance need not be repeated, as not being lustrative). The spilled holy elements, on the other hand, must be gathered up together with the dirt and other matter by the priest in a holy vessel, and be thus reserved or placed aside in the crucible, or in some other sacred place that is safe and not liable to be stepped upon, lest they be trodden underfoot or suffer anything else that is unbecoming. Accordingly, if the place where the holy elements were spilled is strewn with small and easily removable pieces of marble, he must take them away entirely and put them in a separate place; if, on the other hand, they are big and cannot be moved, let him not take them away, but he must excavate them deep with a chisel over all the surface where the holy elements may have spread, and he deposit all the particles of marble chipped off and the accompanying marble dust in the crucible, after cleaning all the region as thoroughly as he can. If not all the holy elements were spilled, but a part of them remained, he must add some more, as much as may be needed for the sacred rite. If, however, before the sanctification is finished the holy elements be spilled upon the sacred vestments of the priest, which are luxurious and costly, they must be washed out well in a separate vessel, so as to leave nothing of them in the vestments; and the wash-water must be thrown into the crucible. But if they are spilled upon the vestments after the finish and transessentiation, that part of the raiment on which they spilt must of necessity and indispensably be cut away and be made a sacred wrapper or cover by being washed out in that place in which the holy chalices are washed.

As for the priest who spilled the elements, he must first confess the sin to the bishop. Then, if it appear that this was a result of his negligence and carelessness, he must be canonized (i.e., penalized canonically) sufficiently and be suspended for a time, unless a priest is not available to replace in that territory; for in that event he is not suspended, but penanced (by way of reprimand) with fasting, prayer, and genuflections. Balsamon, in Reply 20, according to the manuscripts, though in his published Replies this is not found, that if the Holy Elements are spilled before the sanctification, the matter may be remedied by means of a moderate penance. But if they are spilled after the transessentiation, in case it be due to the priest's negligence, he is to be canonized with a severe penance, and with suspension from his holy orders, or priesthood; but in case it be due to some demoniacal complicity, his static sin is to be penanced more lightly with a canonical penance, lest the Devil appear with that method and complicity to be gaining an advantage by preventing the priest from officiating uninterruptedly, or, in other words, in order that the Devil may not be furnished an occasion to prevent the priest from exercising the liturgical function continuously. This very same identical thing is said also by John of Kitros in his Reply 11, preserved in manuscripts. Manuel Charitopoulos, on the other hand, of Constantinople, in a synodical decision, decreed that if the presanctified bread be eaten by cats or rats, the priests are to be penanced because they failed to keep them safe and in a secure place (page 239 of *Juris Graecorum*). All priests that are celebrating in chapels must be very careful lest any rat snatch a piece of the prepared bread from the holy paten. Hence they ought to wrap up the paten well with its cover and have a servant to watch over the holy prothesis, or they themselves must take care of it, lest on account of their carelessness the divine bread be devoured and consequently they themselves be penanced on this account. If, on the other hand, the holy pieces of bread should get mouldy (in the accidents only, that is to say, of the bread, and the dampness inhering in the accidents, according to Coresius), the priest ought not to burn them up or throw them in the crucible, but ought first to dry thoroughly at the fire of a coal fire, with proper skill, according to the directions of Nectarius of Jerusalem; afterwards, he ought to work them up with sweet wine and eat them, as is prudently recommended by those who are possessed of experience and discernment in such matters. Nevertheless, in order to prevent the occurrence of such moldiness, the priests ought to let the holy bread be aired enough until the dampness of the accidents thereof be dried out. Or better, as others more discerning say, the priests ought more safely and more easily exsiccate the holy bread at the fire of a coal fire of burning coals with great skill, and thus preserve it. Symeon of Thessalonica (Reply 83) says that if the priest happens to forget to make the union, and covers the chalice when it is empty, but discovers this during the Great Entrance, he must at once make the union on the holy table, and read the prayer of the prothesis, and thus finish the liturgy. But if he discovers it when he is to commune, he must make a union, and say the prayer of the prothesis, and repeat from the beginning all the prayers from the time of the Great Entrance, and at the invocation of the Holy Spirit he must seal the chalice, and do whatever follows, and thus commune.

¹⁶² Note from the present Canon that the Liturgy of the Brother of God is acceptable which was formerly celebrated in Palestine, but has now fallen into desuetude, and is performed only in some places at some times. Balsamon, however, though seeing that an Ecumenical Council accepts it, says nevertheless in Question 1 of Marcus of Alexandria that it is not acceptable, perhaps because it appears to be adulterated at some points. For the hymn "He rejoices in Thee," which he says is to be chanted after the one commencing "Exceptionally of the All-holy Virgin Intemperate," is not an old one, but a later one, and see the Catechism. But then again Emmanuel Malxus in ch. 220 of the *Nomocanon* records the historical fact that the Church used the Liturgy of St. James down to the time of St. Basil the Great.

¹⁶³ Note that, according to Book II, ch. 57, of the Apostolic Injunctions, the Anagnost used to read the other words of the Divine Scriptures to the laity while standing on a high place in the middle; but as for the Gospels, the deacon or the president read them, according to St. Gregory the Theologian, or, as some say, the anagnost reads also the Gospels. For he himself appears to say, in his Stricture No. 1 against Julian: "But what, was not the one who was once the reader (or lector) of the divine words, and the one deemed worthy of the honor of the great Bema (i.e., Julian), going to know these things (sc. the Evangelical commandments) exactly?" But perhaps the divine words which he used to read were other Scriptures, but not the Gospels, which the saint indeed says that he used to read, without, however, asserting that he read them as a lector, though the context would seem to indicate this to be the meaning of his words. Or it may be that the Theologian said this because of the fact that in the reading done by lectors in church, or anagnosts, there are also many passages of the Gospel interspersed therein.

¹⁶⁴ The privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople being enviable, they have been disregarded by many at times. But inasmuch as they are canonical, they were renewed by many at various times. Thus, for instance, Dioscorus placed the Bishop of Constantinople fifth in order, and disregarded and violated c. III of the 4th. But the Fourth Council renewed it. When Basiliscus the tyrant disregarded these privileges with his golden-seal edict (called in Greek *chrysoboullon*), though he himself again restored them with antencyclical letters, Justinian renewed them. Afterwards when the tyrant Phocas accorded the primacy to the Bishop of Rome (though Heraclius annulled it), the present Trullan Council, laying claim to being an Ecumenical Council, restored them again. Hence it did not sin in doing this, as the Papists are moved by envy to prate. For it did not do this on its own authority, but pursuant to the lead of previous Councils. See concerning the privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople in the Volume of the Atonement (or *Catallage*), ch. 19, page 29, where it has Zeno instead of Justinian.

¹⁶⁵ What is called a throne is not any and every parish, or district, in general, but only one that is populated by Christians and clergymen. So that those who are ordained to the name of certain cities which cannot be regarded as other than spots uninhabited by Christians and clergymen, are themselves among the absolutely ordained, as not being in charge of any aggregation (or body) of faithful believers and clergymen, according to the Popish idolatry of the Patriarchs of the East — a thing which is contrary to the Canons, according to c. VI of the 4th. On this account such persons ought not to be honored with the presidency of the bishop. For the end of such persons is not the protection of the laity, but ambition and greed; and see in the Footnote to the Letter of the Third Council. Notwithstanding that Balsamon asserts that an order was given by Emperor Alexius for prelates to be elected by vote in the Eastern churches even though they cannot go there because of the incursions of heathen, it must be stated that he does not say for them to be ordained in places that are devoid of believers and clergymen, as we say, but in those places that are populated by Christians and clergymen but yet are occupied and held by barbarians and heathens, as this Canon of the Council decrees. For it is inconsistent for a shepherd (or pastor) to be without a flock, and a bishop without a bishopric.

¹⁶⁶ Note that although the prelates of thrones captured by barbarians cannot go to them for fear of exposing themselves to foreseeable and manifest dangers, which is to tempt God, according to St. Chrysostom (Homily 26 on the Epistle to the Hebrews), yet even while standing afar off they ought to bolster up their flock by means of letters or in other ways, until the barbarians depart.

¹⁶⁷ Inasmuch as Justinian II, called Rhinotmetus (i.e., “having had his nose cut off,”) was himself the one who assembled the present Sixth Council, and who had liberated Cyprus from slavery, and who had called this city Justinianopolis after his own name, therefore and on this account the Fathers of the Council by way of honoring and thanking the Emperor made the eparchy of the Hellespont subject to Cyprus. But Zonaras says that whether the Bishop of Cyzicus was once subject to the Bishop of Cyprus or not is something that he does not know, but that it is not subject thereto now lie knows full well. The Anonymous commentator says that after Cyprus was liberated from the heathen, and the Bishop of Cyprus returned to his throne, the provinces of the Hellespont also returned to the Bishop of Constantinople.

¹⁶⁸ Let no one be surprised to see that while St. Basil the Great, on the one hand, asserts, in his c. XVIII, that completion and discretion of the reasoning faculty is attained in virgins over sixteen or seventeen years of age, the present Council, on the other hand, in the Canon in hand, says that it is attained in the tenth year of one’s age, since such maturity of the reasoning faculty is attained in some persons more quickly, and in others more slowly. For some persons, being of an acuter and finer nature, acquire more rapidly than others the power of discerning and distinguishing what is good and what is bad, according to Balsamon. Hence it is that sacred Timothy in his c. XVIII says that sins of some persons are judged by God beginning with the tenth year of their age, while those of others are not judged till later years. But if sins are judged by God beginning with the tenth year of a person’s age, it is manifest that these sins are done after the attainment of the age of discretion, or of the complete development of the reasoning faculty. For divine Basil (in Definition 15 *in extenso*) says that “after the perfect development of the reasoning power both honors and punishments are bestowed on those sinning or those succeeding by the righteous Judge according to the merit of their works.” Divine Chrysostom, too, would have it (in his sermon to a faithful father) that young people ought to wrestle with their passions and vice beginning with the tenth year of their age and ought to be punished for the sins they commit from then on. Hence John of Kitros, in his c. IV, says that male children ought to confess their sins to confessors from the fourteenth year of their age and up, whereas female children ought to do so beginning with their twelfth year. I need scarcely remark in passing that some modern teachers would have it that in the present wicked generation girls should begin confessing their sins when six years old, and boys when eight years old, “because iniquity increased” (Matt. 24:12), and “because the imagination of man’s intellect is assiduously inclined to evil things from his youth” (Gen. 8:21). But others again, being of a denser and more sluggish nature, acquire the discernment of what is good and what is bad later and at a more advanced stage in their life, i.e., when they come to be older. Hence God says that the Israelites could discern good and evil when over twenty years old. “And the Lord’s anger was kindled in that day, and he swore, saying, Surely none of the men that came up out of Egypt, from twenty years old and upward, shall see the land which I swore unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, knowing as they do well enough what is good and what is evil” (Num. 32:10-11). Canon CXXXV of Carthage, on the other hand, says that virgins are to take the habit when they become twenty-five years old, except only in case there should arise any necessary circumstance, such as that of rapine or danger of death. And, generally speaking, to repeat what the said c. XVIII of Timothy asserts, the perfect and complete development of the reasoning faculty of everyone, and consequently the ability to discern good and evil, is to be judged in accordance with his natural knowledge and prudence. And if we care to tell the truth, with the advancing years of our period, children constantly grow more and more wicked and evil-minded, and consequently even before the tenth year of their age some of them are able to discern what is good and especially what is evil. On all these grounds, therefore, the present Council, not only for the advancement of the Church and of Christians, as it itself says, but also for the acuter discernment of good and evil as a result of natural processes of the mind, which it does not say, would have them become monks beginning with the tenth year of their age, since it is told by Solomon that prudence (*Note of Translator.* — Because the English language possesses no word exactly equivalent to the corresponding Greek word, most persons try to express the idea by means of the English word *wisdom*, instead of *prudence*, but by doing so they deprive the language of word signifying what the Greeks call *sophia*, usually translated into English by the word *wisdom*) in men is gray hair and agedness, “wisdom is gray hair unto men” (Wisd. Sol. 4:9); and by Elijah in Job: “It is not the aged that

are wise, neither do old men know how to judge; but it is a spirit in mortals, and a breath of the Almighty that teacheth" (Job 32:9-10). Besides, since this Council did not stand upon ten years as the limit, but gave the prelate leave to increase them, while the 1st-&2nd decrees that those wishing to become monks or nuns should try it out for three years, in its c. V, herein, behold, you can see for yourselves that again the number of years becomes nearly enough to coincide with the sixteen years specified by St. Basil, during which the one about to become a monk or nun being adolescent, and consequently able to discern whether he can maintain virginity or not, his or her confession (*Note of Translator*. — Here, as also often elsewhere, by the term "confession" is meant, in reality, what is denoted in English by the word *promise* or *vow*) is to be considered reliable and authenticated. But we ought to note here in addition that it would in truth be an exceedingly fine thing if, in accordance with this Canon, "young and beardless men" became monks as soon as they passed the tenth year of their age, or even the thirteenth year thereof (allowing three years, that is to say, for trial), and started at this tender and gentle age of theirs contending and fighting against their passions, and against the ruler of the world (usually called the "Devil" in English, a Greek word which in reality means "traducer"), and were introduced directly in the beginning to the exercise of all good things (or, in plainer English, all virtues), according to St. Basil the Great (Definition 15 *in extenso*). "For," says Jeremiah, "*it is a good thing for a man when he lifts up a yoke from his youth*" (Jer. 2:20). But inasmuch as this generation of ours has become prone to passions, the bishop, as is commanded by this same Canon, ought to increase the number of years in regard to those about to adopt the monastic style of life until they reach the point of growing a beard, since this is also more to the interest of the very persons themselves who are going to become monks, in order that the judgment of their reasoning faculty may be rendered more perfect (i.e., more maturely developed), and consequently the trial likewise, and in order to preclude their becoming a cause of scandalization and perdition to the monks dwelling with them, as a result of their beardless and girlish face. And see in the Footnote to c. III of the First, and c. XVI of Gangra.

¹⁶⁹ The example of the widows and deaconesses which the Canon adduces here is not inept, as some have said, in view of the fact that the reference is to widows in the one case and to deaconesses in the other. But neither is it with regard to temperance in marriage, which the deaconesses are able to exercise in their fortieth year, and the widows in the sixtieth year, of their age, that the Canon introduces these women into the midst of the argument. But then, on the same ground, neither is it that which Zonaras asserts, to the effect that the deaconess, being a virgin and never having tasted of pleasure (of the sensual kind, one must add in English, which language lacks a word corresponding to the more intelligible Greek word *hedone*, whence we have the useful term *hedonism*), if she has succeeded in preserving her chastity up to the fortieth year of her age, shall be convinced that she can safely remain a virgin henceforth, whereas the widow, having tasted of the pleasure (of the sensual kind) afforded by her husband, needs all the sixty years to complete a more satisfactory test by trial to ensure that henceforth she shall be able to abstain from it: for these two hypotheses are inconsistent with the meaning and acceptance of the present Canon. Reconciling as much as possible the example, we say that the widow whom St. Paul mentions, notwithstanding the fact that she used to be enrolled in the Widowed Battalion without any ritual imposition of hands, according to chapters 1 and 2 of Book III of the Apostolic Injunctions, in order to be ministered to by the Church, according to c. XXIV of St. Basil, and to be furnished with a sufficiency to supply her with the necessities of life. Just as St. Paul himself goes on to say by adding: "*If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let him or her relieve them, and let not the Church be burdened, so that she may relieve those women who really are widows*" (1 Tim. 5:17). Although, I say, this widow used to be enrolled in the Widowed Battalion, and not in the Battalion of Deaconesses, yet, in spite of this fact, since deaconesses were also ordained also from these once-married (or monogamous) widows, it is obvious that these deaconesses used to be ordained when sixty years old. And the reason is that if the lower battalion of widows were enrolled after so many years, i.e., at such an advanced age, in order to preclude their slipping away from Christ, how much the more ought not the widows, and deaconesses by virtue of an imposition of hands, to be ordained after so many years, whose marriage after ordination would have been incomparably more unlawful than the marriage of (unordained) widows, and consequently the fear engendered on this account, by comparison, would have been greater? Not only, however, is this shown by argument, but also by the facts. For Sozomen (Book VII, ch. 17) bears witness to the fact that Emperor Theodosius made a law (before the Fourth and the present Council were held) that no woman should receive any ministration (i.e., relief or assistance) unless she had children or unless she had become sixty years old. "This is the cause that led Emperor Theodosius to provide for the (enhancement of the) good report and decency of the Churches by making a law that women should not be allowed God's relief unless they had children and became over sixty years old, in accordance with St. Paul's express command." But the Fourth Ecum. C. reduced these sixty years of deaconesses to forty, by decreeing in a general and indefinite manner that no deaconess should be ordained until forty years of age, irrespectively, that is to say, of whether she was one of the virgins or one of the once-married (or, in Greek, monogamous) widows. So for the reasons reckoned up here the example of the widows and deaconesses which the Canon cites is germane to the issue and is eminently consistent with its meaning. For it compares deaconesses with deaconesses that have been drawn from the ranks of the widows. As for the fact that deaconesses actually were ordained from among these once-married widows, that is corroborated: a) by the Apostolic Injunctions, which say, in Book VII, ch. 17: "Let a chaste virgin become a deaconess; or, otherwise, one that is a believer and honest"; b) c. XLVIII of the present 6th, which says that the wife of one destined to become a bishop, may, if she be worthy, become a deaconess; and c) that famous Olympias who, though a widow, was a deaconess. The fact, too, that the marriage of deaconesses was more unlawful than the marriage of widows is shown by reference to c. XV of the 4th and c. XXIV of Basil: for the former anathematizes any deaconess that has married together with the man

who married her; while the latter, of Basil, only excommunicates any widow that has married by denying her Communion until she ceases from her dirtiness. This too is perfectly reasonable in view of the fact that the widows were wont to promise and solemnly undertake not to get married a second time, just as did Anna the daughter of Phanuel, and in accordance with ch. 1 of Book III of the Apostolic Injunctions, and in accordance with that which St. Paul says, to wit: “*Having been damned because they disregarded their first faith*” (1 Tim. 5:12). See also the Footnote to c. XIX of the First.

¹⁷⁰ Note from the present Canon that monks living in monasteries and coenobitic communities must cut their hair symmetrically; for it appears that monks affect a symmetrical haircut both from this Canon and from the discourse of Athanasius the Great concerning virginity, and also from the first sermon on Peace by St. Gregory the Theologian, and from many historical narratives of Lausaicus. Since the present time is (considered to be) a time of mourning among monks, according to divine Chrysostom (Homily on the Gospel of St. Matthew No. 56) and John Climax. God, by the way, says through Isaiah that shaving the head is a sign of mourning and weeping and of beating the breast (Isa. 22:12). And if, as St. Paul says, any man in general is ugly when he has hair (and see the Footnote to c. XCVI of the present (C.)), how much more ugly monks are who grow hair! But if all monks in general ought to cut their hair symmetrically, how much more ought young monks living in monasteries or cells, and deacons, to cut their hair! For such persons scandalize others with their beardless face as much as they do with their long combed hair. Against these incongruities those living in cities, and especially those living in the imperial capital city ought to be on their guard at all times.

¹⁷¹ By *tonsure* here the Canon means the great and angelic habit, since, according to Balsamon (in his Interpretation of c. II of St. Sophia), tonsure properly speaking is the garb of the great and angelic habit. We must know, too, that in the beginning and originally the habit of monks was but one, to wit, the “great” habit, as St. Theodore the Studite refers to it in writing in his will. You cannot give anyone that which is called the small habit (or little habit), and afterwards the great habit; for there is but one habit, precisely as there is but one baptism, in the sense in which the Holy Fathers employed the word. And divine Gregory Palamas in a letter written to a monk by the name of Paul says: “This is the great and monachal habit. The Fathers know of no little habit of monks, though some of the later writers appear to have sundered it two; but since they ask the same questions and make the same replies and promises both in regard to the little and in regard to the great habit, they again restore it to a single habit.” And Symeon of Thessalonica (ch. 20) says that just as baptism is one and one only, so too is the habit of monks. For the little habit is an earnest, or pledge, and preamble to the great habit, and was invented by certain later Fathers on account of men’s weakness (or even negligence). Both the Euchologion and Balsamon (in his Interpretation of c. II of St. Sophia) call the little habit an earnest of the great habit. But Job, surnamed the Sinner, in his discourse on the Mysteries (included in the *Syntagmaton* of Chrysanthus of Jerusalem), adds also a third habit, saying thus: “The monachal habit advances from the lesser to the more perfect one, from that of the person called a *microscheme* (or “little-habited”) and *rasophore* (or “wearer of the monk’s black outer garment”) to the holy habit of the tonsure, and from this again to the one called the angelic great habit.” In a similar fashion, too, the Euchologion divides the services of the habit into three, namely, the service of the *rasophore*, that of the *microscheme*, and that of the *megaloscheme* (i.e., of one wearing the great habit). Accordingly it does not call the *rasophore* a *microscheme*, as does Job, but applies this noun to one commonly called a *staurophore* (i.e., “wearing a cross”), which Job called the habit of the tonsure further above. These facts having been thus stated, it is plain that all those who arrive at the point of being *rasophores* (i.e., of having donned the *rason*, or monk’s habit, or the black garb affected by monks in general) can no longer throw aside their *rason* and marry. God forbid! For how could they possibly dare to do this at a time when they have already cut off the hair of their head, a fact which denotes that they have rejected from their head any and every worldly concern and have consecrated their life to God? How could that be possible when in point of fact they have even donned the *rason* with the auspicious adjuvant of a blessing, and have put on the *calymmauchion* (formerly, but incorrectly, transliterated as “*kamelaukion*” or “*kalymmaukion*”), and have changed their name; and two special prayers have been read to them by the priest in which he thanks God for having redeemed them from the vain and worldly life and having called them to the decent and modest profession of monks, and begs Him to accept and welcome them into His soterial yoke? Again we ask, if one who has merely promised to become a caloyer (i.e., a monk), without so much as having donned the *rason* (or monk’s habit), ought not to break, but, on the contrary, ought to carry out his promise (and see the Footnote to c. XXVIII of Basil), in accordance with the Scriptural passage saying, “*Thou shalt perform thy vows to the Lord*” (Matt. 5:33; Deut. 23:23), how much more is it not incumbent upon one to do so after he has actually put on the *rason*? That is the reason that Balsamon (in his Interpretation of c. V of the 1st-&-2nd) says that a person who has put on the *rason* is not permitted thereafter to become a layman, but, on the contrary, he will be for this compelled to carry out his earlier aim. If he is unwilling to do this, says Balsamon, he is to be punished severely, as the law commands in Title II of Book IV — see also the Footnote to c. XVIII of Basil, who says there the same things as Balsamon does. All those, again, who are *microschemes* and *staurophores* are also situated between two narrows — that is to say, in other words, they must both observe and maintain the rigorous requirements of the *megaloscheme*, because they too have given identically the same promises and have made the same vows to God as have the *megaloschemes*, and have been adorned with the same vestments (except for some of these) as they have by God been deemed worthy to wear (except for three) — without offering any lame excuse such as people often allege in extenuation of sins, on the alleged score that they are not *megaloschemes* and on this account are not under any obligation to observe and maintain the rigorous career. In addition, too, they ought not to ne-

glect, but, on the contrary, ought to make it their most serious and constant endeavor and aim to succeed in ultimately assuming the great habit which is the perfect one. For, just as the earnest (or betrothal) is incomplete and imperfect as compared with the wedding (or marriage), so and in like manner it may be said that the little habit they are wearing, since, as we have said, it is but an earnest to the great habit, is also and to the same extent incomplete and imperfect, and consequently they themselves too who are wearing it are incomplete and imperfect. Let them take notice of what Symeon of Thessalonica says (in ch. 360) to the effect that all who are incomplete and imperfect in respect of their habit ought by all means to become complete and perfect, lest they die incomplete and imperfect, without the most complete and perfect perfection of the habit . . . and that, just as a person who fails to get baptized is not a Christian, so too any one that fails to become perfected in respect of the habit is not a monk (that is to say, more plainly speaking, he is not perfect). But note this too, that notwithstanding the fact that Athanasius, the monk in Athos, and devout Dunale the confessor mentioned in the Synaxarist (December 17), and some others assumed the little habit first and the great habit afterwards, at different times, those persons, nevertheless, are doing better and being more rigorously compliant who become megaloschemes at once without first becoming microschemes, because, owing to the fact that they do this once for all and on a single occasion, they are proving more plainly the fact that the habit of monks is a singular one and unique, which is precisely what the tradition handed down by the saints desires. As for the special prayer found printed in the book of catechetical notes by the Studite, who states that the originator of it assumed the little habit first and the great habit afterwards, that prayer, I say, though it is contrite and penitential and soul-benefiting, is not one composed by Theodore the Studite, but, on the contrary, is one composed by a certain Theodosius, as is to be seen therein plainly enough, and gleaned from various sources. Furthermore, though any time may be considered fitting for one to become a monk, yet the period of the forty days of Lent is more fitting than any other because it is a time of mournful repentance, according to Reply 25 of Symeon of Thessalonica. In addition be it noted that Job says that a plurality of monks or nuns cannot be solemnized in one and the same liturgy by a single “old man,” but that they must be solemnized one at a time. The habit of monks is called the angelic habit for other reasons too, but more especially for the two following reasons: for one thing, because as long as a monk is in the flesh he ought to emulate and imitate the disincarnate (i.e., fleshless) life and virginity of the angels; and for another thing, because a monk ought always and at all times to be engaged in uttering doxologies (i.e., glorifying hymns) to God, as do the angels in heaven, according to Symeon of Thessalonica. Finally, it is most noteworthy of all that Dionysius the Areopagite, in his work on the subject of monastic perfectionization, asserts “that the renunciation not merely of living particulars, but, what is more, even of imaginations, evinces the most perfect philosophy of monks as put into practice scientifically by keeping the unifying commandments.”

¹⁷² In view of the fact that a married monk is “canonized” by the present Canon as a fornicator, just like a worldling, Balsamon says that this concession is made to those monks who of their own accord and voluntarily dissolve their unlawful marriage and hasten to confess and repent, and not to those who repent involuntarily.

¹⁷³ From these words of the Canon we conclude that this forgetfulness resulted from some delay in the convent and the time spent in undergoing her trial, or test of fitness, and that in those times monks and nuns were wont to undergo the trial, or test of fitness, dressed in worldly clothes, and not wearing the rason. For, it says, they would take and put on the black garments after they came to the monastery or convent. This became more plainly evident from c. CXXXV of the Council in Carthage; see also c. I of Nicephorus concerning this. And note that, according to Pachymeres, in his paraphrasis to St. Dionysius, the black garment of monks denotes that they are leading a monastic life as their career, secluded to themselves, just as black paint secludes itself to the eye. The monastic order lives monastically twenty-four hours a day. For that is what the black color of their clothing denotes. That is why divine Athanasius in his discourse concerning virginity says, “let thy coat be black, not dyed with a dye, but of material naturally of that color.” It is not only black clothing, however, that befits monks and nuns, but also gray clothing that is neither very dark nor very light in color, but of a color compounded of black and white. That is why Chrysostom, in his discourse concerning virginity, says that “virginity does not consist in gray clothes and colors.” Zonaras the historian also notes this fact. But the color black also denotes mourning and grief, which every monk and nun ought to be engrossed in. For those who are mourning and grieving over dead relatives of theirs are accustomed to wear black clothes. But since we have been speaking about the garments of monks and nuns, it is convenient here to proceed to interpret also what each one of them denotes, when taken by itself. Thus, then, it should be said that the tunic (or *chiton*), which was in shape and appearance like a shirt, and which nowadays is called the “inner rason” (*esorason*) and the “cingulum” (*zostikon*), denotes the robe of rejoicing, and the divine righteousness, which a monk or nun puts on in lieu of leathern jackets, and instead of the nakedness of Adam, according to the Euchologion and Symeon of Thessalonica. The pallium, which was a garment and cloak in shape and appearance like that which is nowadays called the *epanorason* (or “outer rason” or over-coat), or *mandorason* (or “cloak-rason”), just as Symeon of Thessalonica calls it a *peribolaion* (or “wrapper”). And when Abba Isaac says, “wrap up your pallium,” he meant a garment like a coat, and not, as the monks nowadays discard the pallium, and instead thereof use the so-called “*paramandy*,” what at that time would have been called a *paramandyas*, denoting a sort of cloaklike garment which might be described as a “second cloak” (that is why, it would seem, that the Euchologion calls the little habit a *mandyas*, or cloak) — and not that square piece of cloth measuring but a handsbreadth and nowadays worn by microschemes behind over their shoulders. The pallium, I say, denotes the costume of imperishability and modesty, and the divine protection and envelope, according to the Euchologion and Symeon of Thessalonica. The girdle, or belt, which is of leather and drawn tightly round the waist, where the kidneys and the seat of desires are,

denotes the mortification of the carnal desires, and sobriety and sanity, and the fact that the monk is ever ready to perform ministrations, according to the Euchologion, Symeon, Cyril of Jerusalem, Dorotheus, and Sozomen (Book III, ch. 13). The sandals and boots denote that the monk must run readily on the road of the Gospel of peace, without stumbling, but tread upon figurative serpents (i.e., snakes that beset his path). And that just as boots are subject and subordinate to the rest of the body, so and in like manner ought the body to be subject and subordinate to the soul, according to the Euchologion, Symeon, and Cyril of Jerusalem. These are the vestments of the microscheme and of the staurophore. The megaloscheme also wears these three garments, but in addition thereto also a *cocuoulion* (or hood), and an *analabus* (or mantle), and a *mandyas* (or cloak). The coucoulion denotes the crest of salvation, according to the Euchologion, the overshadowing of the divine grace, which rejects all thoughts of the world, according to Symeon and Cyril of Jerusalem, innocence and humility, because such coucoulia or hoods are worn also by innocent children, according to Sozomen and Dorotheus. The *analabus* (which is also called *anaboleus* by Sozomen) was of leather, according to Symeon, and is now called the *polystaurion*. It denotes that the monk takes up (cf. the Greek word “*apalabon*,” meaning “who has taken up”) the Cross of the Lord and follows Him, according to the Euchologion and Symeon and Dorotheus. The fact that he wears crosses both in front and behind denotes, according to Cyril of Jerusalem, that the world must be crucified to a monk the instant he sets forth on his departure from it, and that monk, on the other hand, must be crucified to the world, because of his lack of interest in it, in accordance with the Biblical passage saying, “*the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world*” (Gal. 6:14). Sozomen asserts that its being drawn tightly over the shoulder-blades denotes that a monk must always be ready to perform services. The *mandyas* (which Sozomen calls a sleeveless tunic, and Dorotheus a *colobius*, or jacket), being comprehensive of all the others, denotes that a monk is wrapped up in his *mandyas* as though he were in the grave, according to Symeon. Sozomen and Dorotheus say that the fact that the *mandyas* has neither cuffs nor sleeves denotes that a monk ought not to lift up a hand against anyone, nor do anything that comes under the purview of the “old fellow.” The spreading, on the other hand, of the *mandyas* denotes the equipment of wings possessed by the angels, according to Cyril of Jerusalem. This is confirmed by the fact that the habit of monks is called the angelic habit. The four corners of the *mandyas*, again, denote the four cardinal virtues, namely, prudence, sobriety, righteousness, and bravery. But the *mandyas* used to have also a red (or scarlet) mark, which meant, according to Abba Dorotheus, that it served as a badge to identify the caloyers (the common name for monks in the Greek vernacular), and that they are soldiers of the heavenly King. As touching the fact that the *mandyas* is a garment which belongs only to the megaloscheme, that is vouched for by Symeon of Thessalonica. For that authority says (in ch. 273) “last, as comprehensive of all, he envelops himself in the *mandyas*.” But this is still more emphatically and clearly brought out by what the priest says, to wit: “Our brother so-and-so has received the great and angelic habit,” — though the Euchologion makes no mention at all of the *mandyas* of the megaloscheme. As for the *calymmauchion* and the *epanocalymmauchion* (which may be englished as “overcap”), they have no special blessing. Some persons, however, say the blessing belonging to the *coucoulion* also over the *calymmauchion* of the staurophore. These facts having been thus stated, the priest ought to bless the *epanorrason*, instead of that square piece of cloth measuring but a handsbreadth (referred to hereinabove), and to give it to the monk being tonsured by him to wear, lest when he is giving the *epanorrason* he be left ridiculously at a loss for a prayer and a blessing. But if anyone should care to wear that square piece of cloth measuring but a handsbreadth over the *esorrason* instead of a cross, it seems to me that he would be doing nothing improper.

¹⁷⁴ Hence that man John Glycys, though a logothete of the streets and roads and having a wife and children, directly he became a Patriarch, his wife became a nun, according to Nicephorus Gregoras (his Rom. Hist. book). Note, however, that in accordance with the similitude of the wife of one about to become a bishop, the wife of one about to become a monk ought to do the same. This means: 1) She ought to get divorced from him by mutual consent and agreement. 2) She ought to remain unmarried forever thereafter. And 3) she herself too ought to become a nun, precisely as he became a monk — after his tonsure, of course. She must be divorced from her husband by mutual consent, and not by compulsion, because the Apostle tells married couples: “*Deprive ye not yourselves of one another, unless it be by agreement*” (1 Cor. 7:5); and “*Art thou tied to a woman? seek not to be freed*” (1 Cor. 7:27). And again: “*A wife hath not control over her own body, but her husband has it; and likewise also a husband hath not control over his own body, but his wife has it*” (1 Cor. 7:4). But if it is true that they have not the control over themselves, or their own bodies, but are under the control of one another, and not under their own respective control as individuals, then neither can they be divorced or separated without their common and mutual agreement. And the Lord says: “*What therefore God hath yoked together, let no human being put asunder*” (Matt. 19:6). St. Basil the Great too agrees with the Apostle. For when he was asked how married persons ought to be treated in connection with the monastic life, he replied (Def. in extenso 32) that they must first be asked whether they are doing this by mutual consent and agreement, as St. Paul says; and, if so, they must be admitted in the presence of many witnesses. But if one party of the couple, the husband, that is to say, or the wife, does not agree to this, but contests such a separation less stubbornly than the other party, being more solicitous of pleasing God, which is done, of course, by means of the monastic life, then let them not be admitted; nor in such a case let the one testing them be upset, but let him remember the saying of St. Paul, that “*God hath called us in peace*” (1 Cor. 7:15); and also that which the Lord said, to wit: “*Whoever hateth not his father, and mother, and wife, and his children, cannot be my disciple*” (Luke 14:26). For inasmuch as they have failed to fulfill this requirement, they cannot become disciples of Christ by resorting to the monastic life, “since there is nothing in the world that is preferable to obeying God, or, in other words, His commandments and injunctions, among which is that requiring such consenters to

be admitted, and that forbidding those who do not hate each other from being accepted as disciples of Christ. For that is the reason why St. Basil asserted the same thing twice, above and below. His words are susceptible also of the following interpretation. If one party is at odds with the other, let him who is asked to admit them tell them to remain in peaceful marriage, to which God has called them, and that they cannot become disciples of God unless they hate each other. The saint adds, however, that that party who was prevented from taking up the monastic life by the other may, even while in the state of matrimony, succeed in achieving his aim of monastic purity of life by fervently praying and fasting. Further, divine Augustine (in his Letter No. 45), in writing to Armentarius, says that one party cannot become a monk or nun without the consent and desire of the other party. But if one, contrary to the desire of the other, becomes a monk or nun, as the case may be, he or she ought to be obliged and compelled to reunite with the other party. Accordingly divine Jerome (Letter 14) severely censures Galatia for becoming a nun without obtaining her husband's consent. So much for the fact that a woman must get divorced from one about to become a monk by mutual consent. As for the fact that she ought thenceforth to remain forever unmarried, that is manifest. For were she to marry a second time, she would in consequence be committing adultery, both according to the words of the Lord, who said: "everyone that divorces his wife, except on the ground of fornication, is causing her to commit adultery," and according to the words of St. Paul, saying, "*So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she is acting as an adulteress*" (Rom. 7:3) — by the word "liveth" here is meant, of course, leading a bodily, and real, life, such as the life lived by a monk. Chrysostom (Hom. 19 on the seventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians) says that since because of continence and other pretexts and pusillanimities it used to happen that divorces of married couples occurred, it were better that they had not married to begin with; but that, if the marriage has actuality occurred, let the wife stay with her husband, if not for the sake of coition, at least in order to prevent her from having access to some other man on the sly — which is the same as saying, let her remain unmarried for the rest of her life. But that the consequence of these two propositions is that the wife of one who is destined to become a monk is herself compelled to become a nun (which was the third) is something that is equally manifest. For the agreement she made with her husband that he might become a monk compels her perforce to refrain from getting married thereafter and to remain unmarried throughout the rest of her life. And this celibacy, again, in order to ensure its being preserved inviolable, and free from danger and suspicion, necessitates her departing from the world and entering a convent and getting tonsured as a nun. Hence it may be said that Leo the Wise decreed concerning married couples, in his Novel 20, the following in a manner worthy of his name and in accordance with his wisdom: "Since marriage used to be dissolved by agreement for consideration of sobriety, we decree that no divorce shall be granted otherwise except on condition that both parties, as soon as divorced, become a monk or nun, respectively, each of them taking his own belongings" (Armenopoulos, Book IV, Title XII). These facts having been thus stated, Balsamon is not correct in saying that a wife can become a nun even without her husband being willing. As for those, on the other hand, who express the opinion that one spouse may marry a second time after the other has adopted the monastic style of life, on the supposition that the latter is dead, because of having chosen another life, they too, I say, are muzzled by the present Canon, which, in spite of the fact that the one destined to be ordained a bishop has chosen another life for himself, will yet not allow his wife to marry a second time, because that would be adultery. Even though ch. 4 of Justinian Novel 22, to be found in Title VII of Book XXVIII of the Basilica, does say that the husband and the wife may, after betaking themselves to the better style of life of monks and nuns, be divorced and depart, yet it is to be borne in mind that this separation which has resulted from their coming to a private understanding with each other must of course have been obtained by mutual agreement. See also Dositheus, of celebrated memory among Patriarchs, page 745, concerning those who have served as Patriarchs in Jerusalem, who asserts that it is an error for anyone to express the opinion that one party to a marriage may marry again after the other has adopted the monastic mode of life; and he further asserts that those who do not obey the rules of the Fathers, but allow one party to become a monk or nun against the wishes of the other person, are under an anathema. Notice, however, that the fact that the vows and promises of a wife who is under the control of her husband (as well as vice versa) are unreliable, is verified by the thirtieth chapter of the Book of Numbers. For it says that if a wife make any promise to God, and her husband happens to hear her and keeps silent, she must fulfill her promise. If, on the other hand, her husband does not keep silent, but, on the contrary, objects, that promise is not to be actualized and put into effect, and the Lord will not condemn her on this account. See also the Footnote to Ap. c. XXII. I omit to state that not merely is it a fact that a married couple may adopt the monastic mode of life only with the consent of both parties, but also that the wife ought to be asked whether she is willing either to become a nun herself or to have her husband become a monk; and if after three months have elapsed she still persists in that good aim, then they may be tonsured, even though the woman is forty years old and of firm belief, according to the comment of Balsamon which is recorded in ch. 2 of Title I of the *Nomicon* of Photius. See also Job the Sinner, page 1333 of the *Syntagmation* of Chrysanthus, and note that he wants married couples to become monks and nuns by mutual agreement.

¹⁷⁵ Note that Patriarch Sisinius, and even John of Antioch, in agreement with this Ecumenical Canon, issued a Tome prohibiting the letting out of monasteries to worldlings. But Patriarch Sergius, to the contrary, issued another Tome ordering the monasteries to be turned over to worldly men, not, however, in order to have them converted into worldly resorts, which is forbidden by the Canon, but in order that they might rehabilitate and improve them. It would seem, however, if one thinks the matter over well, that Sergius did not order this with sound judgment. For if it was in reality the object of the Fathers to prevent these institutions from being turned over to worldlings and being turned into common resorts, why should the present Canon add that monasteries must not be let out by anybody whatever to worldly tenants,

at a time when c. XXIV of the 4th says this expressly? For that addition would have been superfluous and vain verbosity. Besides, c. VIII of the 4th commands that the clergymen and superiors of monasteries shall be subject to the authority of the bishop. But if in accordance with the Tome of Sergius monasteries may be let out, it is an inconsistency that the superiors of monasteries ought to be subject both to the bishop and to the worldlings, and consequently be compelled to serve two masters. But inasmuch as this is impossible, as the Lord said, and a cause of dissensions and of scandals, the bishop ordering one thing, and the worldlings another, it is evident, then, that neither ought monasteries to be turned over to worldlings for rehabilitation and improvement, but only to clergymen and monks. For things that are sacred must be given to priests, and not to laymen. To do otherwise would be improper, and utterly inconsistent. And I do not even go to the trouble of saying that it is also harmful to men's souls, and ruinous to the households of laymen who take over monasteries.

¹⁷⁶ From this Canon it may be inferred that no clergymen, or any persons in holy orders, or monks, whatsoever ought to be hunters of hares, rabbits, and other animals, or of birds of any kind. For if this Canon prohibits clergymen from even looking at the hunting of animals and of wild beasts, much more does it prohibit them from being hunters themselves. Hence those in holy orders who are hunters shall be deposed from office unless they cease, while monks guilty of the same misconduct shall be excommunicated, according to this Canon.

¹⁷⁷ Note that the presanctified liturgy is not one of Gregory Dialogus, since he was unacquainted with the Greek language, according to Letter 29 of his sixth book, and since this liturgy is not found in his written works. On the contrary, it dates from the times of the successors of the Apostles, according to Reply 56 of Symeon of Thessalonica, and existed before the time of Dialogus, as is shown by c. XLIX of Laodicea, and especially by the custom which obtained in the East, as St. Basil says in his letter to Patricia Caesaria, and in the West, as St. Jerome says in his letter to Pammachius, of letting Christians commune on Wednesdays and Fridays with presanctified bread. For it is obvious that in communing these persons were wont to say something in the way of prayers before actually partaking of the host and after partaking thereof, which prayers, briefly speaking, were the liturgy of the presanctified then in vogue, and that is what Argentes says. See also the Footnote to c. XII of Laodicea. But we mention Dialogus in the dismissal of the presanctified liturgy either because Dialogus, by communicating this liturgy to the Romans in the days of fasting in Lent, according to Mauritius, the deacon of the great Church who was the author of the synaxaria, and according to their translator Maximus Marganius, and Michael Constantinopolite, furnished the Easterners the idea of celebrating it on every day in Lent, as some insist (see Dositheus, Concerning those who served as Patriarchs in Jerusalem, page 526); or else it was because, though in existence long before, it was afterwards embellished by Dialogus, and brought to the state in which it is now seen. The presanctified liturgy was invented by the Fathers in order to provide a way of becoming participants also on days of fasting of the heavenly life and of the grace which come from the holy Mysteries. For Blastaris, in chapter 5 of stich. 300, says: "Just as soldiers at war, after the war is over, in the evening of the day it ends, partake of food and nourishment prepared beforehand, in order to strengthen their bodies by means of it and to be able to fight the enemy the next day, and so in a similar manner we Christians (those of us, that is, who are worthy and prepared), while fighting the passions and the Devil during the days of Lent, are wont to partake of the body and blood of the Lord during the evening of the day, which have been presanctified from Saturday and Sunday, in order to strengthen ourselves therefrom and enable ourselves to fight the figurative enemies again more valiantly (though Blastaris does not say this out of his own head, but has translated it from some previous and older comment which we have discovered). This same thing is also embodied in the presanctified prayers of this very liturgy." Note that the presanctified liturgy must be celebrated during the evening of the day, according to the rituals and the Western Council held in Cabilone. Hence those who celebrate it morning are making a mistake, and let them correct themselves. For how can they say in the morning, "Let us fulfill our evening prayer (or devotion) to the Lord," which is not even one to be said at noonday. Not only at four, and six, but also at two, and three, and five, according to this Canon, the presanctified liturgy may be freely celebrated by those who so wish. As for those who do not wet the holy Bread with the all-indefectible Blood, as is prescribed in the Eucharistion, and who neither keep it prepared to serve in the celebration of the presanctified liturgy, they are obviously Latin-minded. For one of the characteristics of the ungodliness of the Latins is this one of not giving the laity but of one kind, or, in other words, giving them of the bread only, the Mystery of the Eucharist, as the Western Council held in Constance, Germany, in the year 1414 unlawfully legislated. As for the many reasons why presanctified bread was kept, see Eustratius Argenetes, page 284, and the Footnote to c. XIV of Laodicea. Presanctified wine, too, used to be kept in the churches, as is attested by St. Chrysostom in his first letter to Pope Innocence, and also by St. Jerome in his letter No. 4 to Rufinus, and by St. Gregory the Theologian in his epitaph to Gorgonias, and by the local Council, or Synod, held in Toledo, and others. See also the Footnote to c. XLIX of Laodicea.

¹⁷⁸ Since we here on the subject of memorials, we note that the *trita* which are held for our sleeping brethren denote, according to sacred Symeon of Thessalonica, that the sleeping brother was composed from the beginning by the Holy Trinity. The *ennata* of the sleeping signify that the one decomposed into his constituents is going to be numbered with the nine immaterial battalions of angels, on the ground that he too is immaterial. The *tessracosta* denote that in the future resurrection, after being composed again in a more sublime manner, he too is to be "assumed" (or taken up into heaven) like the Lord, and after being snatched up in clouds, he is to be allowed to meet the Judge. These three conditions of man are also represented, or signified, by the *trimena* (or three-month periods), and the *hexamena* (or six-month

periods), and the *enneamena* (or nine-month periods), and generally speaking, these are celebrated with a view to the purification of the deceased one. And the same is true of the *tessaracosta*, as is plainly evidenced by the example of our Lord, who in all three of His births kept three entire Lents (called *Tessaracostae* in Greek), thus typifying in Himself our life. For the death of every Christian is called a birthday, according to c. LI of Laodicea. The Apostolic Injunctions, indeed, say (in Book VIII, ch. 42) that the *trita* are celebrated for the purpose of reminding people that Christ rose on the third day, while the *ennata* serve as reminders of the living and dead, but the *tessaracosta*, in accordance with the old form. For it was thus that the laity (or people) mourned for Moses. Some, however, say that the *trita* are celebrated for purification of the tripartite soul, while the *ennata* are celebrated for purification of the five senses of the body, and of the fecund, natural, and transitive; and that the *tessaracosta* are intended for purification of the four elements in the body, of which each lent itself to the transgression of the ten commandments — for four times ten make forty.

¹⁷⁹ Since the present Canon pierces the hearts of Papists like a two-edged sword, for this reason the daredevils accuse the present Ecumenical Council of not having decreed this rightly; but their accusation animadverts upon the Apostles themselves, following whose Canon the Council decreed this.

¹⁸⁰ Note that the Orthodox Church allows the consumption of wine, oil, and shellfish on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent, as Meletius the Confessor also bears witness by saying: “and to all who are chaste in general, and so on likewise, on Saturday and Sunday we allow a breaking of the fast” (Degree xxxvi). Accordingly, by means of this moderate breaking of the fast, he wisely provides for the keeping of each of the two requirements, to wit, both the respectability of the fasts of Lent, that is to say, by not allowing meat or cheese or eggs and fish, and of Ap. c. LXIV, which decrees that one is not to fast on Saturday and Sunday with complete abstinence from everything, and by making the eating of food on these days to be refrained from.

¹⁸¹ Even though one may say that fish too are called things sacrificed (for perhaps they may be), since the divine voice said to Peter, “*Rise, Peter, sacrifice, and eat*” (Acts 10:13; 11:7). What should he sacrifice? Cattle and wild beasts, and reptiles. But fish too are called reptiles in accordance with the passage saying, “*Let the waters bring forth reptiles of living souls*” (Gen. 1:20). Therefore we must also abstain from the eggs of fishes, or, to be more explicit, botargo and caviar, during Lent. But if these are not called things sacrificed, this expression being confined to land animals and fowls of the air, we are not prejudicing our case by eating botargo on Saturdays and Sundays of Lent. Nevertheless, those who refrain from eating it are doing better.

¹⁸² But monks who happen to be in deserts or wildernesses and are in need because of there being priests present, have permission from the Bishop, as Symeon of Thessalonica says (Reply 41), to keep presanctified elements in the artophorion and to partake thereof with great reverence in such a manner as to spread some sacred vestment over a clean place and upon it to place a cover, and over the cover to place the tongs holding a portion of the all-holy Body, and in this fashion, after first chanting psalms or prayers, or the Trisagion, and burning incense, and bowing three times in adoration, thus may they partake thence, not with the hand, but with the mouth. Afterwards, holding a cup (or glass) of wine and water, they are to wash out their mouth. This same thing that Symeon the bishop of Thessalonica avers, is stated also in the life of Luke who became an ascetic in Mt. Steirion. For when the latter asked the then Metropolitan of Corinth whether one who is in a desert or wilderness ought to partake himself by himself on account of the absence of a priest, he received permission from him to commune, in much the same way as this. See also the Footnote to c. XIV of Laodicea. Any anagnost or layman may administer communion to one who is dying or in danger of dying, according to the same Symeon (Reply 41). See also the Footnote to c. XIII of the First, if, that is to say, there is no priest or deacon present.

¹⁸³ But here one is justified in wondering why it is that the present Council in its c. XXXI permitted a baptism to be performed in an oratory, with the permission of the bishop, but in the present Canon forbids this entirely. So, then, it is to be noted that according to Zonaras it is neither completely permissible for a baptism to be performed in an oratory nor is it completely forbidden. But, he says, the priests must be persons that are known, and not strangers, and they must conduct the ceremony with the permission of the bishop because of the parasynagogue.

¹⁸⁴ “Soothsayers” are persons who have consecrated themselves to demons and who are supposed to be able to foresee future events by looking in the palm of the hand or into a bowl of water, or by sacrifices and other deceptive arts and signs. Hence the thirteenth ordinance of the law prescribes that anyone making forbidden sacrifices, or, in other words, divining by means thereof, shall be punished like a murderer; and furthermore that anyone paying that person or putting him up to do these things shall be exiled and his property shall be confiscated in accordance with ch. 23 of Book IX of the Code.

¹⁸⁵ Hecantonarchs was the name given to the wisest and oldest of soothsayers, and they were regarded with greater respect than the others.

¹⁸⁶ Those who used to drag along bears hung dyed cords from the head and all the body of these animals, and cutting off hairs of the bears they would give these together with dyed cords to people to use as amulets to ward off diseases and what is called in English “the evil eye,” or in Greek *baskaniai* of eyes. Others had snakes in their bosoms and worked magic charms by means of them.

¹⁸⁷

“Cloud-chasers” was the designation of those who used to observe the shapes of clouds, especially about the time of sunset, and to foretell the future in accordance with those shapes. For instance, if they saw clouds shaped like men with swords in their hands, they would predict that a war was to occur, and other such nonsense. The name cloud-chasers could also have been given to those who with the collaboration of demons were wont to drive clouds away so as to prevent them from raining or hailing upon one region and compelling them to do so on another region.

¹⁸⁸ “Enchanters” were those who used to interlard their invocations of demons with the Psalms of David, the names of saints, and even with the name of our Lady Theotoke; in regard to those enchanters divine Chrysostom says that even though they name the name of the Holy Trinity, or that of saints, or make the sign of the Cross, Christians must shun them and turn away from them. And again the same saint in his Sermon on Statues says: “Are you not ashamed, O Christian, to bring into your home old women that are drunk and out of their mind, though you assert that those old women say nothing but the name of God? And for this reason indeed you ought to shun them, namely, because they, although being old Christian women, employ the name of Christ wrongly, and do the works of the Greeks; for even the demons used to say the name of Christ, true enough, but they themselves were demons and were bad, on which account Christ gagged them and drove them out.”

¹⁸⁹ Those called “amuletics” comprised not only those who made amulets, winding them with silk threads and inscribing them with invocations of demons, but also those who bought them from the makers of them and hung them round their neck in order to have a preventive of every evil.

¹⁹⁰ For this reason those priests, too, ought to be deposed from office who read to sick persons what is called the “paper of Jalu”; and those, too, who take pitch candles and, going into mountains and valleys, light them and read the Solomonic, or rather to say, Diabolic, Bible, or other invocations, and the names of demons, and thereby excommunicate and execrate their enemies, and cause either them themselves to die or their cattle, horses, and other animals to die, or to sustain some other serious loss or damage. On this account such books, too — including, I mean, the Solomonic, and the paper of Jalu, and the “Words of Thunder,” and the “Words of Lightning,” and the “Book of Days,” and in general all magical and curious books ought to be destroyed by the local judge, as Book VIII of the law, Title I, ordinance 35 (in Photius Title IX, ch. 25) prescribes, and be burned up, just as at Ephesus believers burnt books on magic which were valued at fifty thousand pieces of silver (Acts 19:18). The penalties provided in this Canon ought to be inflicted also on those old hags who divine with barley, or with broad beans, or by dumping coal, or by yawning, or by strangling infants, or who are snatched up in the air by demons and go from region to region, like that wizard named Heliodorus, and like those named Cynops in Patmus and Simon. Likewise those shepherds who put some little bone in the feet of sheep, or of goats, in order to make them grow fast and augment their flock. Likewise those who pass their children through rigols. And, speaking generally, all sorcerers and witches, and all men and women who go to sorcerers and witches, if they all repent, are to receive the penance prescribed by the present Canon; if, on the other hand, they persist in this diabolic delusion, they are to be driven away from the Church of the Christians altogether as being a portion of Satan, and not of Christ. Note that divine Chrysostom (Homily 3 on 1 Thess.) says “Those who fall sick and refuse to be enchanted or to have their illness alleviated with incantations and bindings, but, instead, prove brave and remain patient, receive the halo of martyrdom like martyrs.” And against Jews (Discourse 5) he says thus: “And you, if you firmly decline incantations and sorceries and spells, and die from the disease, you are consummate martyr, because notwithstanding that others promised a cure with piety, you preferred death with piety.” Novel 65 of Leo the Wise, too, says that “whoever appears with completeness to produce magic effects, whether it be for the cure of bodily disease, or for prevention of damage to fruits, shall be chastised with the most severe punishment and be given the penalty received by traitors against the Emperor.”

¹⁹¹ Wizards are those who invoke demons that are in a way beneficent, and this in spite of the fact that they themselves are fiendish and maleficent.

¹⁹² Enchanters is the name applied to those who lure demons into whatever things they will with some incantations and invocations; and those who bind wild beasts, such as wolves, etc., (by a spell of some kind) in order to prevent them from eating their cattle when they are outside at night or those who grasp snakes in their hands and cause them not to bite. The name enchanters is also bestowed upon those who bind married couples with diabolic art and witchery. Oh, the thrice-accursed! Oh, the villains! Oh, the baiters of God! Woe and alackaday to those who engage in such a Satanic racket. Ah, and the wretches do not realize what a dreadful punishment awaits them as their inheritance because of their becoming the cause of an honorable marriage being dishonored, and of a married couple hating each other and becoming separated for all time thereafter, whom God had joined together. Some persons recommend that those couples who are about to be wedded, in order to remain unharmed by any such binding (or spell), should first confess all their sins,

fast, and partake of the divine Mysteries, and afterwards get married, as we have said. Some order that the bridegroom carry on his person the volume of the four sacred Gospels when they are being married. And experience has shown the efficacy of faith in many persons. For, according to divine Chrysostom, wherever there is (an Orthodox edition of) the Gospel, the Devil does not dare to approach; accordingly, it is an ancient custom for women and young children to hang Gospels round their neck by which they obtain great protection (Homily 32 on the Gospel according to St. John, page 686 of the second volume, stich. 5; and Homily 19 on Statues, page 594 of the sixth volume, stich. 35). As regards enchanter and conjuring ventriloquists God says that they are to be stoned (Lev. 20:27): “*Any man or woman who becomes of them a ventriloquist or an enchanter shall both of them surely be put to death. They shall stone them with stones. They are guilty.*”

¹⁹³ Mathematicians appear to have been the same as astrologers, as may be inferred from the words of Zonaras and of Blastaris. But they were not any of those who rightly use the four main branches of mathematics, namely, Arithmetic, Geometry, Music and Astronomy, and who investigate their natural propositions, but, instead, those who monstrously insist that the movements made by the free will of human beings are steered and governed by the motion of the heavenly bodies, and they attribute altogether the passions and impulses of human beings to the stars, and represent the occurrences in the life of human beings to be dependent on the different configuration of the luminaries and stars, while divining with the co-operation of demons by means of the stars whatever things gods assign to stars; and, speaking in general, those who employ mathematics in a curious way.

¹⁹⁴ The word “sorcerers” designates those who by magical art prepare poisonous draughts either in order to put somebody to death or to muddle his brain or to allure him to their love; which draughts women are especially wont to employ as a means of drawing men into love. Such women are canonized as murderesses — twenty years, that is to say, according to c. VIII of Basil the Great. Book XLVII, Title III, ordinance 2 provides that anyone is to be chastised as a murderer that makes such philter in order to kill anybody, or who sells it or has it in his possession. Those men or those women who prepare philters in order to incite anybody to love are to be exiled and their property is to be made authentic (i.e., turned over to the lord paramount having jurisdiction). And see in the *Nomicon* of Photius, Title IX, ch. 25.

¹⁹⁵ Both Balsamon and others assert that Calandus, Nonnus, and Idus were rich brothers who fed Rome in time of war and hunger — Calandus for 12 days, Nonnus for 10 days, and Idus for 8 days; the three together for a whole month. Hence, in order that the benefaction due to these personages might remain remembered forever, and in order to perpetuate the obligation of gratitude to them, the Romans called the first twelve days *Calends*, after Calandus, the next ten days *Nones*, after Nonnus, and the remaining eight days *Ides*, after Idus. According, they used to celebrate during these days, and were wont to do many indecent things during such celebrations. Those people were imitated later by those Christians who on this first day of January participate in what are called the *Kalanda* (in modern Greek), playing games, dancing in front of the doors of private houses, ambling about, and uttering many nonsensical things and telling ludicrous stories, and singing some lines purporting to be addressed to St. Basil the Great which ought to be suppressed by the bishops and spirituals; and they ought to be canonized so as to refrain from doing such heathenish and Greekish things, just as the present Canon says.

¹⁹⁶ These same things are done even today by Christians, and often by persons in holy orders and clergymen during the weeks of the *Apokreos* (or Carnival) and of the *Tyrine* (or Cheese-eating Week), and in many other regions, especially in the islands, where there are Latin inhabitants. In fact I must say that the men wear masks and various false beards, and even women’s clothing, and sometimes women even wear men’s clothing, and all of them engage in public dancing, as concerning whom God says that “*a woman shall not wear the apparel of a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment; for all who do so are an abomination unto the Lord thy God*” (Deut. 22:5). And really these things are abominations to God, and are in truth affectations of Greeks and alien to Christians, and the holy prelates ought to put forth every effort to prevent them, on the ground that they cast reproach upon Christianity, with the penalty of excommunication.

¹⁹⁷ For this reason we Easterners owe St. Symeon Metaphrastes an acknowledgment of special thanks (acknowledged, as I am told, also by the Westerners), who with great industry wrote the lives of the holy Martyrs and of the Devout Ones, after ridding them of every lie and adulteration, and going in person to various places and collecting some accounts from what he saw with his own eyes, and some from reliable information.

¹⁹⁸ Discourse on the keeping of good order in discussions.

¹⁹⁹ Properly speaking augury is the observation of future events by means of words and calls, the corresponding Greek term being derived from this word *call* Greek *klo*, *kalo*, as a learned writer states, and especially Theodoret (page 193 of the second volume of the Octateuch). This Greek custom of augury is still practiced today in many parts of the country, and especially in the islands, where men and women place water and various fruits in vessels and cover them, and afterwards, assembling together, they take them out, accompanying each act of removal with a diabolical song and by means

thereof pretending to foretell the fate and fortune of each of them. These auguries are held during the time of the Fore-runner's birthday, as well as the bonfires in front of the doors of every house, which ought to be prohibited with excommunications as penalties by the bishops and spirituals, as ought also the May Day celebration, or, in other words, the various flowers and buds which some persons put on their doors on the first day of May, since this too is a Greek custom and also a heathen custom, and one which is alien to Christians, just as that Patriarch Michael, of celebrated memory, who was the prince of philosophers, displayed great diligence in abolishing all such Satanic and Greek "rackets." For Christians safeguard themselves against every evil and against all bad luck, and at the same time secure for themselves plenty of good luck, by having the priest sanctify their house, and by sprinkling themselves on the first day of each and every month, instead of May Day celebrations and auguries and bonfires, as Blastaris says (ch. 3 of stich. 5); just as in olden times sanctification used to be secured by means of precious bits of wood from the holy Cross, but also with a litany of the first day of August for the purpose of warding off the illnesses which occur then for the most part because of the hot weather, as is related by St. Gregory of Thessalonica (Homily on the first day of August), and by the manuscript Synaxarist. I mean for them to make the sanctification which is called the minor, or little, sanctification, and not that which is called the major, or great, sanctification. For the minor sanctification can be carried out on the first day of every month, and not only so, but also on the occasion of every illness and need. The major sanctification, on the other hand, is performed but twice a year, as a rule: once on the evening of the eve of the Lights, which sanctification is given in the type of the baptism of John, according to Paisius of Gaza in his solution of certain questions. For this reason it is also performed humbly. The other time is that which coincides with the day proper to the Lights, which sanctification is given in the type of the baptism of the Lord, according to the same Paisius. For this reason it is performed with open display and a fitting escort.

²⁰⁰ Auspication, according to Theodoret, is a process wherein one foretells what is going to occur by observing the flight or the various cries of birds, and especially of ravens, from which (word) indeed the name is derived (in Greek, that is to say, the corresponding Greek term is derived from the noun *oionos*, meaning a raven or vulture). In auspication are included also those who believe that there are good and bad coincidences (or concomitant circumstances), or interrogations good and bad, or good and bad omens, and other such things, which ought to be eliminated from Christians, on the ground that they provoke God's wrath upon them.

²⁰¹ By the term ventriloquists are designated those persons who utter words from their belly and tell Satanic myths and divinations. Seers are those who by cutting up the entrails of animals divine the future, whence also the term hepatoscopy has been applied to this process. And, in general, all ventriloquists are called *enteromanteis* (i.e., haruspices) in Greek, according to Photius and Theodoret.

²⁰² Let Christians of these days learn from the present Canon what sort of holy life was led by those persons on these holy days of the Resurrection, and what sort of disorderly life, or of irregular life, they themselves are now living on the other hand, and let them correct themselves by refraining from amusements, dances, games, songs, and other such absurdities as they commit in Moscow, I am told. There Christians go from one church to another on every day in this week and hold litanies, lest they find time to engage in some other impropriety. That is what ought to be done also in the case of our own Christians, to prevent them from deviating into disorders and improprieties. Another very holy custom is known to many which prevails in Moscow, to wit, that wherein the more reverent husbands refrain from sleeping with their wives throughout Novotain Week, and by consequence no weddings are held during that period either. Really a most holy custom in truth which our own Christians ought to imitate. For, as we have said, this entire week is counted as a single day of Easter devoted to the name of the Lord. See also c. IV of St. Nicephorus which is in the preface.

²⁰³ Hence it becomes evident how blameworthy those are who cut sacred books of parchment, in order to provide themselves with fish bait or in order to pack tobacco in them, or any other stuff; or who cut the saints and in general the ornaments contained in the books, or throw them into the furnace to burn up, or write barbarous and depraved remarks in their margins. Nor in general ought anyone to write anything at all in sacred books, even though what is written is for the purpose of correcting or interpreting the words in the book, except only if the book belongs to the writer or he does this with the permission of the owner of the book. For all these things amount to deterioration and impairment of the books, which is condemned to excommunication by the present Canon.

²⁰⁴ Nevertheless, even then one ought not to use such sacred and holy books in fontanelles, or in other dishonorable and shameful services; neither ought one to give them to others who are going to use them in similar services. But, instead, one ought either to burn them, or to throw them away, or better to bury them in an untrodden spot somewhere, in order that things containing holy and sacred words may not be profaned. For that saying of Isaiah fits this particular situation most admirably, to wit: "*And it shall come to pass in that day, that . . . his resting-place (i.e., of Christ the God) shall be an honorable one*" (Isa. 11:10). I say these things because in the time of this Council, books, most of which were of parchment, could become completely illegible as a result the written characters in them becoming worn out and undecipherable. But in books of today, which are of paper, the written or printed characters will remain legible no matter how old they grow; wherefore they ought not to be treated dishonorably or abusively.

²⁰⁵ Note that, according to the Ecclesiastical History of Theodoret (Book V, ch. 17), notwithstanding the fact that the believer Emperor Theodosius was absolved by St. Ambrose of guilt due to the foul murder he had caused, yet, in spite of this, when he offered the gifts to God inside the Holy Bema and expected to commune there, St. Ambrose would not let him in, telling him that “the inner sanctuary, O Emperor, is accessible to priests alone”; and he was ordered to stay out of the Bema. Thereafter even when the Emperor went to Constantinople, he offered the gifts to God inside the Holy Bema, but immediately stepped outside, and did not go back in to commune, according to custom. For, says Theodoret, after offering the gifts at the sacred table, he at once went out, the most faithful emperor thus showing by his example that emperors who have committed foul murders ought not to commune inside the Bema. See also Nicephorus Callistus, Book XII, ch. 41. Hence let priests and confessors be induced to see to it that the unlawful custom prevailing in many places be cut out — the custom, I mean, of letting laymen come into the Holy Bema, which, failing to distinguish between priests and laymen, causes the latter to incur the penalty which befell King Ahaz, who, though a layman, undertook to perform the functions of those in holy orders. For they too, in such a case, are in a way usurping the functions of priests by entering the place allotted to priests. But if it is unlawful for laymen even to enter the Bema, how much more unlawful must be that which some ignorant priests do in having laymen or anagnostes prepare the holy elements in the holy prothesis on Maundy Thursday inside the Bema! So, for the love of God, let them cease doing this, lest they incur deposition from their holy order. Symeon of Thessalonica, on the other hand, says (ch. 143) that an emperor may commune within the Bema only at the time when he is being anointed as emperor, after from the deacons, and not at the Holy Table, but at a credence table placed beside it and having an antimension laid upon it.

²⁰⁶ That is why *divine* Chrysostom also says: “Woman taught once (i.e., Adam in Paradise) and destroyed everything. For this reason, let her not teach.” And again: “For so silent must she remain,” he says, “that not merely as regarding temporal, but also even as regarding spiritual matters she must not speak a word in church. That is an ornament, that is modesty; that can ornament her far more than clothes” (Sermon 9 on 1 Tim., p. 283 of vol. IV).

²⁰⁷ The *cylistra*, according to Balsamon, appears to have been a device employed by those teaching law when they were disputing as to which one of them should get such or such a pupil. For when something they rolled in this device would happen to roll one way or another it would be a sign that the teacher thus indicated was to get the pupil in question. Accordingly, it may be said in general that the *cylistra* was something on the order of the device called a lottery.

²⁰⁸ Let those prelates fear the penance of the present Council who are in the island provinces and all those regions where there are Latins; and by no means and on no account whatsoever let them allow a Latin man to marry an Orthodox woman, or a Latin woman to take an Orthodox man to husband. For what communion can there be of the Orthodox party with the heretic? But if it should so happen in any way that without their cognizance such lawful marriages are actually contracted, let them at once proceed to separate them, in accordance with this Canon, unless the Latin-minded person be baptized in a strictly Orthodox manner. But if both parties were in the heresy of the Latins to begin with, and one party afterwards takes to Orthodoxy, their children must all be brought up as Orthodox Christians, in accordance with the civil laws; and see the Footnote to c. XIV of the 4th.

²⁰⁹ In connection with what is here said, concerning the Cross divine Chrysostom says: “let us hang it (sc. the cross) over our bed instead of a sword; let us inscribe it upon our door instead of a bolt or bar; let us surround our house with it instead of a wall” (page 881 of vol. V). Hence it may be said that the Christians of today, whether men or women, young or old, great or little, instead of any other charm or talisman ought to carry a cross upon them, either wooden or gold or silver or brass, hanging round their neck, as the Christians of olden times used to carry one round their neck. For St. Orestes, one of the five martyrs, by wearing a gold cross round his neck came to be recognized as a Christian by the Greeks; and Pancratius of Tauromeneia used to give a cedar cross to everyone he baptized to wear upon his person. St. Meletius the Confessor, in his discourse on the Morals of the Italians, says that the Latins used to have the custom of marking a cross upon the ground and kissing it, and then stamping it out. As for us, however, not only must we not do this at all, but we must also honor the cross that is printed in books or even written upon letters and written documents of any kind, together with the divine names of Christ, and of the Panagia (or All-holy Virgin), or of the Saints, which are written in letters, by avoiding the use of these letters and documents in connection with dishonorable or base purposes, and instead burning them or throwing them somewhere where they will not be trodden upon, after tearing out these holy names, in order that we may keep from sinning gravely by profaning things that are holy. See also in the Footnotes to XCI of Basil, and the Footnote to c. LXVIII of the present 6th.

²¹⁰ From the decree of the present Canon let the two-horned Pope of Rome learn how antichristian an act he is doing by imprinting under his foot the Vivifying Cross and giving it to his visitors to kiss. For in this way he is treading upon the victorious trophy of our salvation, which not only Orthodox emperors wore upon their head and took greater pride in it than in their imperial diadems, but even the Calvinists themselves, though having discarded every trace of adoration of the Saints, keep in their churches on a high place and with respect bow down to it in adoration. What am I saying, emperors and Calvinists, why, even the Turks themselves who were captured during the reign of Mauricius had a cross marked upon their forehead, as is narrated by both Theophanes and Simocates (Book V, ch. 10); and when asked why

they had it, they answered that because a deadly plague once fell upon their land, the Christians advised them to be marked with the cross, after doing which they regained their health, and that they then became accustomed to printing the cross upon themselves. Concerning the Cross St. Gregory the Theologian says against Julian: "He resorts to the Cross, and the ancient remedy, and with this he signs himself against fears, and makes the one pursued a helper; (and the following still worse things) the seal has prevailed; the demons are defeated, the fears are dissolved." He says these things about Julian the Apostate, who, when he found himself with wizards, and demons were gathered together, made his Cross, and the demons instantly dispersed, and he himself was freed from his fear. In his Hom. 54 on St. Matt., Chrysostom says: "Like a halo, thus do we carry about the Cross of Christ. And this is not strange, seeing that everything is accomplished for us through the Cross, whether it be that we have been nourished with that mystic food, or have been ordained to office, or have done anything else whatsoever, this symbol of victory presents itself to us."

²¹¹ Christians began the custom of holding love-feasts in the church in Apostolic times. When they were going to commune, especially on Sunday, the richer ones used to bring bread and wine to church, and after partaking of the divine Mysteries, as Zonaras says, and as St. Chrysostom does too in his 27th Homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, they would invite the poorer ones, and all of them would sit down and eat. But since the Corinthians spoiled this order, and each of the richer ones would eat his own meal alone, and would not give anything to the poor, things came to such a pass that one man (a poor man, that is to say) would go hungry, while another man would get drunk (a rich man, that is to say), divine St. Paul on this account, in the eleventh chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians censures them both because in so doing they were scorning the Church of God, and because they were disgracing and shaming in a way the poor people who had nothing to eat at such common banquets. Premising these words of the Apostle, St. Basil the Great (in his "Epitomized Definitions") concludes therefrom that one must not eat the common supper in a church. This is said in agreement with c. XXVIII of Laodicea, that is to say, and with this c. LXXIV of the 6th. Note that the Lord's supper, which Paul mentions in speaking of these common suppers of the Corinthians was mistaken by St. Paul the Great for the divine Supper of the Mysteries (*ibidem*) and also by c. XLVIII of Carthage. St. Chrysostom, on the other hand, thought them to be the one common to all and held in imitation of the Lord, who confided and consigned the Mysteries to all His disciples without excepting any of them. See also Eustratius Argentes concerning the Lord's Supper, p. 308. But the Lord's suppers mentioned in the present Canon were thus called because the divine liturgy was celebrated at them for the most part on Sundays (called in Greek "the Lord's days"). In connection with praises bestowed upon the Lord's suppers by Constantine, Eusebius says that they were called thus after the Lord, to whom they were dedicated: "Holy temples are to be dedicated to the one king of all God, who is indeed also the Lord of all. Hence what has been dedicated is deemed worthy of the appellation of the Lord, as not having acquired its title from human beings but from the Lord of all Himself: on which account they have been accorded the name of Lord's suppers." Note that these feasts called agapae, and these common banquets were called in some cases Birthday Suppers, held in memory of martyrs; in other cases Wedding Suppers, held in celebration of nuptials; and others were called Funeral Suppers, held at the burial of the dead (p. 8 of the Book on Religious Toleration).

²¹² That is why divine Chrysostom (Hom. on "I saw the Lord sitting on a throne," p. 120, vol. v) strenuously prohibits theatrical singing, dances of gesticulators, and prolonged cries and yells, and disorderly intonations. For in interpreting that passage in the Psalms saying "*Serve the Lord in fear*" (Ps. 2:11), he severely censures those who mingle the secular gestures of theaters with spiritual songs, and who admix therewith theatrical postures and meaningless intonations (such as are nowadays the trills and quavers and other meaningless utterances); and he says that these things are natural, not to those engaged in doxologizing God, but to those playing, and mingling the sports of demons with angelic doxology. By means of many arguments he teaches that we ought to offer up doxologies to God with fear and a contrite heart, in order that they may be welcome, like fragrant incense. What Meletius Pegas, a very learned man, says in his third discourse concerning Christianity is in truth to be praised and deserving of all admiration: "Precisely, therefore, as modesty and symmetry of music is attractive, it is adapted to render hearts more robust, by drawing the soul up from the body. For harmony is most agreeable to the spirit, having as it does an intermediate nature partaking of the crassness of the body, combined with the immateriality of the spirit. Thus again excessive music, pursuing what is sweet beyond moderation fails to excite pleasure, but, on the contrary, tends to enervate . . . for it is on this account that only the human voice finds acceptance in the Church, on the ground that it is inherent in nature and unartificial, whereas the percussions and efflations produced by instruments are sent packing by the divine Fathers on the ground that they are too artificial." Yet some of the musicians of today are striving to put these things back into the Church with their instrumental songs. The trills and quavers that are now being chanted do not appear to be old, but, on the contrary, modernistic, in view of the fact in the songs ascribed to John Damascene and other musicians of olden times such meaningless words and prolongations; they appear to have come into existence about the time of John Koukouzelos. But the prolongations which the psalms of today are chanting in the vigils, being double and often triple the standard length are in truth nauseating and become offensive to reverent listeners. Wherefore we beseech canonical psalms to chant their songs more quickly, in order that their songs may at the same time be more tuneful, and in order to leave time for reading to be done; accordingly, the canons may be chanted more slowly, in which is rooted all the soulful (or psychical) fruit of the vigil. Some say, however, that these meaningless trills were introduced into the Church with a view to attracting the simple laity by means of their pleasant effect on the ear.

²¹³ Just as is now usually done in connection with the vigils, and especially those held in the Holy Mountain, and just as used to be done, as St. Basil (in his letter to the clergy of the church in Neocaesarea) mentions in writing: “The customs now prevailing in all the churches of God are consonant and consistent. For among us the laity commences morning prayer in the nighttime lastly leaving off prayers they turn to psalmody, and, being now divided into two, they chant to one another alternately.” Afterwards again: “Having allowed one to commence the song, the rest of them maintaining the balance; and thus in variety of psalmody they divide up the night, praying betweenwhiles.” But note that psalmody differs from prayer, since psalmody is done with singing, whereas prayer is done without singing. And that among the ancients psalmody was done in connection with the psalter of David. That is why there are to be found old psalters all provided with musical notes. But today the contrary is done, and our prayer is the psalter read aloud, not sung (except for the first three psalms and the Very Merciful), whereas our psalmody consists of the troparia alluding to the new grace. Our God-bearing Fathers, however, the so-called Neptics, call praying by mouth and spoken words *psalmody*, and praying done by means of the mind alone *prayer*.

²¹⁴ Instead of the word *perfumes* (which in Greek is *aromata*), others have the word *edibles* (which in the Greek is *bro-mata*), as Zonaras has interpreted it too.

²¹⁵ St. Basil the Great (Definitions in Extenso, No. 40) in addition discountenances sales and purchases carried on in the churches of the Martyrs and Saints during their festivals, saying that Christians have no other reason for congregating in temples and the grounds of temples than to pray, and to recall the resistance and struggle unto death which the Saints showed for the sake of piety, and in order to afford themselves an incentive to a like display of zeal, and not in order to make their festival and temple a market and a lot of merchandise. He adds this observation too, that God is made so sorely wroth by those who buy and sell things in temples, or in the yard surrounding temples, that Jesus Christ, who was always and everywhere meek and humble-hearted, yet lifted up a scourge to strike those alone who were buying and selling in the temple, because their merchandise was converting the house of prayer into a cave of robbers and thieves. And note that the Lord called the sellers and merchants in general robbers and thieves on account on the injustice and mendacity they practice in their barterings.

²¹⁶ Bishop Philo (p. 163 of the first volume of the Octateuch) says that “even the Jews will not bathe with their fathers, to avoid seeing the nakedness of their father, as did Ham that of Noah. Hence by consequence, neither ought the children of Christians bathe together with their fathers. St. Diadochus, the bishop of Photica, says (in ch. 52 of his Philocal., p. 216) that it is a brave and sensible thing for one to abstain from the baths, and especially in the case of those who wish to become united with the beauty of sobriety — which is the same thing as saying those in holy orders and monks who have vowed virginity; for that hedonic moisture of the bath enervates and emasculates the body, and the nudity involved in bathing recalls that inglorious nakedness which marked Adam after the disobedience. And, generally speaking, baths afford no other good besides carnal pleasures and improper imaginings, unless one is bathing on account of a necessity created by sickness.

²¹⁷ Note that some persons have taken the Thursday mentioned here by the Canon to be only Great (i.e., Maundy) Thursday, on which it was the custom for catechumens who were going to be baptized on the evening of Great Saturday to recite the dogmas of the faith which they had learned by heart to their catechizers. These persons were induced to take this view by the preceding c. XLV of the same Council in Laodicea, where it is speaking of those who were being baptized on Great Saturday. To me, however, the above sense of the Canon appears to be better, because not only on Great Thursday, but on every Thursday in general of the week which happened to come after the time they were enrolled in the list of those being enlightened they had to say the lessons of the other days of the week, in order to avoid forgetting them. That it was not one week but many weeks that intervened until the time came for baptism is plainly evident from the liturgy of the ones being enlightened, which begins with Wednesday of the mid-fast week of Lent.

²¹⁸ Hence artists painting pictures ought not to depict the Theotoke on the occasion of the feast of Christmas, at the Nativity of Christ, to be lying upon a bed and apparently exhausted by the pain; but, on the other hand, neither ought the words “Epilochia of the Theotoke” (meaning the Puerperium of the Woman who gave birth to God in the flesh) to be even so much as mentioned in print in the Menaia on the second day after Christmas, but only the words “Synaxis of the Theotoke.” For according to St. Gregory of Nyssa, who is in agreement on this point with this Council, the birth of Christ alone occurred without any concomitant of childbed; accordingly, the term childbed and synonyms thereof cannot properly be applied to the incorrupt and fully conserved body of the Virgin who never had any experience of matrimony whatsoever. For certain women, on the other hand, to be depicted as washing Christ in a basin, as is to be seen in many icons representing the Nativity of Christ, is an absurdity and impropriety of the rankest kind, and is an invention of carnal men; wherefore it ought by all means be discarded. Since, however, it is a fact that the divine melodists and hymnographers and song-writers often call the childbirth of the Theotoke a *locheia* in Greek (for which we substitute in English the inept word *childbed*), let this term be applied catachrestically to Her childbedless childbirth as a painless childbed and be taken in the sense of being used to avoid calling it simple childbirth. (*Note of Translator* — Owing to the lack of English words corresponding to the highly specific terms of the Greek language in this connection, an adequate translation of this part of the book is impossible. It would seem, however, that the English term “Nativity” might

well enough be substituted for the Greek term "*locheia*" in this case.)

²¹⁹ The Church received the Trisagion Hymn from God. For Theophanes records the historical fact that, an earthquake having occurred in Constantinople, the civilians becoming frightened, went out into the plain and conducted a mass supplication (in which they were joined by Emperor Theodosius the Little and Proclus the patriarch of Constantinople, both of them barefoot, according to Glycas). Then in the course of a single day it came to pass that a child was snatched up bodily into the air and heard a divine voice which told him to tell the bishop and the laity to conduct their supplication with the following words, to wit: "Holy is God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal, have mercy upon us." Nicephorus asserts that the particular place where the child was elevated was named Divine Elevation, but now it is called Psomatheia (with the accent of the second *a*). Thenceforth, therefore, the Emperor ordered that this hymn should be chanted everywhere in the Greek tongue. Hence it was too that even of old St. Sabbas the Great permitted the Armenian Christians to chant their service in the Armenian language, except for the Trisagion, which they were permitted to chant not in Armenian, but only in Greek. Accordingly, even to this day the Latins in the litany of their sepulchral ceremony chant the Trisagion in Greek, and not in Latin, out of respect for the language in which it was uttered by God. And note, according to Dositheus in the Dodecabitulus, p. 342, that this miracle occurred even before the time of Peter Fullo. For thereafter Fullo was in the reign of Emperor Zeno, but not even before the Fourth Ecum. C. was there any separate division of Theopaschites. This Trisagion hymn is composed of three elements, viz., Holy, Holy, Holy; it is taken from the Hymn of the Seraphim, just as Isaiah the prophet heard it. The part consisting of the words God, Mighty, Immortal is taken from that Psalm of David wherein he says: "*My soul hath thirsted for God, for the strong, the living God*" (Ps. 42:2), in which the word "strong" stands for the same Greek word as is here rendered "Mighty," while the word "living" is equivalent to the word "Immortal." The expression "have mercy upon us" is borrowed from the thirty-third chapter of Isaiah, and from the one-hundred and twenty-second Psalm; and it is a petition and a supplication. This hymn, in fact, relates to the Holy Trinity. For the words "Holy is God" have reference to the Father, who is the God-generating source of the divinity of the Son and of the Spirit. The words "Holy and Mighty" denote the Son, who is also mighty, and a power, and an arm of the Father, and the one through whom everything was made that ever was made. The word "immortal," on the other hand, denotes the Holy Spirit, which is called the Grantor of Life. The words "have mercy upon us," being construed in the singular (i.e., have thou mercy upon us) signifies the single Lordship and Godship of the three Persons. But insane Peter Fullo by adding thereto the words "who was crucified for our sake" not only virtually crucifies the Father and the Holy Spirit along with the Son, as St. John Damascene says (in Book III, ch. 57), but even insinuates a fourth person into the Trinity, and places the Son of God separately and the crucified Christ separately, apart from each other, according to Balsamon. See also the theological exposition and interpretation of the Trisagion in Dositheus (*ibid*). and in Damascene (Discourse concerning the Trisagion; and Book of Orthodox., ch. 3).

²²⁰ This Canon is mentioned also by George Cedrenus. Hence the Papists are also silenced on this score who are persistent in traducing and misrepresenting the Canons of the Council and saying that no historian has mentioned them. Even Pope Adrian accepts this one in writing to Tarasius. Note that according to this Canon painters ought not to depict, either in the Cross of Christ or in any other holy icons the four animals alone which prefigured in the old law the four Evangelists, but, instead, greatly preferring the truth, let them depict the four Evangelists with respect to the human character. I said the four animals alone because if the four Evangelists are painted with a human character, and together with them the animals which prefigured them are also depicted, this, it seems to me, would involve no sin. This canon of the Sixth Ec. C. is mentioned also the the Seventh Ec. C. in its sixth act and in its fourth; and also by Adrian, in his first letter to Tarasius; and through the reading of this Canon Ellas, the Presbyter of the Church of the Blachernae, though formerly an iconoclast (or iconomach), was corrected (page 789 of the Collection of the Councils. See also in the Prolegomena of this same Council). That explains also why the Seventh Ec. C. (Letter to Alexandria, p. 905 of the second volume) says for the Lady Theotoke to be painted rather as a girl (i.e., as a damsel), and not as an ark and a rod and candlestick and all the other things that used to be types of Her. If, however, all roundabout the Theotoke there be depicted also the things that served to prefigure Her, it would not, methinks, involve any sin.

²²¹ Zonaras says that although the expression "the dying" does not in strict accuracy mean the dead, but those who approaching their death and in the process of dying, and are not yet actually dead, yet in spite of this the following words of the Canon interpret the words as implying that this must be vnderstood instead of "those who have died and who are actually dead." That is why in other codices instead of "dying" it is written "who have died." For even though a person be at the point of death, breathing his last gasps, the divine Mysteries ought to be administered, according to c. XIII of the 1st and the historical account of St. Dionysius contained therein. Note also the important fact that not even inside of a church ought on to bury dead persons, and that those who do so are greatly sinning. For St. Gregory Dialogus (pp. 10 and 49 of Evergetinus) relates that "a nun who was temperate and continent in respect of shameful pleasures, yet unable to stay sober in respect of untimely words, was once buried inside the church. And what a miracle! that same night the man who was guarding the church as watchman saw by revelation that some persons had brought this nun in front of the Holy Bema, and that they sawed her apart in the middle through the waist, and that they threw one half of her into the fire, and it was burning up, while the other half remained as it was. The next morning he narrated this strange vision to the Christians who happened to be present. The same Saint relates in addition to this story that since Patricius Valerianus, who was living in those times, had died in the city called Briza, the Bishop of that city took money from his rela-

tives and gave them a space inside the church in which to bury the corpse of Valerianus, who had lived badly into old age. Well, the next night the holy martyr Faustinus, to whose name the church had been dedicated when it was built, appeared to its prosmonarius and watchman, and said to him: “Go and tell the Bishop to throw that stinking corpse out of my church. But if he won’t do this, he is going to die within thirty days.” The prosmonarius was afraid to announce the vision to the Bishop; accordingly, the saint reappeared and told him the same things again. But he got scared again, and did not make the matter known to the Bishop. Hence, when the thirtieth day arrived, the Bishop, who was in sound health, lay down in the evening to sleep, when, *mirabile dictu!* he rose no more, but died a sudden death. Hear ye, O Prelates, hear ye, O Priests, hear ye, all ye Christians in general, who allow the bodies of the dead to be buried inside the holy churches; and most especially those of you who reside in the islands, where that God-hated and damnable custom prevails, and learn what sort of condemnation and sentence the souls of those who have died are bound to receive from God (as St. Gregory himself avers) because of the fact that they are buried inside the church, and the same fate awaits also the relatives of the dead, who want to have them buried there, and the Prelates and Priests, who permit them to be buried there. You think that you are conferring a benefit upon the dead when you bury them in the church; and you don’t know that on this very account you are causing them to suffer dread punishment. For if that nun who was merely overcome by untimely words, and slowly so at that, was sawn apart and burned in fire because she got buried inside the church, what fate, it is to be wondered, awaits those who have sinned both in words and in deeds and who, after death, have afterwards been buried in the churches? For the love of God, holy Prelates, prevent this dire evil from befalling your Christians, and order them to construct the tombs of the dead outside of the churches. Oh, what a great evil! they on the one hand offer incenses and fragrances in order that God may be propitiated in these, in order that the church may be filled with sweet odors, and the Christians attending it may be favored with whiffs of incense, while they themselves, on the other hand, are burying there the stinking corpses of their dead, from the stench of which even God Himself turns away, and the whole church is stunk up, and the Christians have to hold their noses, and they flee from the church as though from fire, and oftentimes they anathematize the buried. And can there be found any greater show of ignorance and absurd impropriety than this? Canon XCVII of the Sixth Ec. C. commands that nobody shall remain even when alive in the “*catechumena*” of the churches. How much more ought the dead not remain in the church, teeming as they are with fetor and stench! Hence it is that John of Citrus expressly says for bodies of dead persons not to be buried inside a church after it has been dedicated. The same thing is asserted also by Balsamon (Reply 38, p. 382 of the *Corpus Juris Graecoromanus*). Then, again, St. Ephrem in his last will and testament adjures persons not to bury him inside a church, saying: “I adjure you not to let me be placed in a house of God, or underneath an altar, or in any other spot in the temple of God, for it does not become or befit a rotten worm and stinking body to be buried in a temple and sanctuary of the Lord. Whoever may dare do this, may he never see the heavenly altar! nor may he be deemed worthy to visit a temple in the kingdom of heaven!” Let us shudder with horror, brethren, and let us tremble with terror. For if a God-bearing man like St. Ephrem did not judge himself worthy to be buried inside a church, how much more must sinners be accounted unworthy to be buried inside a church! Woe and alas for those who do this! In like manner ought those persons to be canonized (i.e., canonically penanced) who refuse to go to that church where some relative of theirs has been buried. What are you doing, O unthinking man? Don’t you know that by what you are doing in not going to the church you are incurring the enmity of God and of His Saints? And are you fighting with them because your relative died? And who are you to be warring with God, who arranges everything to the best advantage, both life and death? In addition, take those women, or men, who go to the tombs of their relatives to weep over them, as if they had no hope that they will be resurrected, they too ought to be canonized by spirituals and be forbidden to do so. For they are so wanting in knowledge that they cannot even understand that the death of Orthodox Christians is not a death, but merely a sleep, from which they are to awake on the day of resurrection. This exceedingly barbarian and wrong custom prevails even to this day in Moldavia-Walachia, in which provinces are often found wise and sensible leaders and rulers and prelates, and they are well aware of this depraved and harmful wrong custom.

²²² As the minutes of the Council held in Carthage state. Or because they were found thrown into the street or left at the door of churches, as happens in the case of illegitimate children, and there is no knowing whether they were ever baptized.

²²³ That is why Book LX of the Basilica, Title XXXVIII, ch. 1, commands that a daughter be freed from the control exercised over her by her father, and a slave girl be freed from the control exercised over her by her master, if her father or her master, respectively, tries to make whores of them. If, however, the girls themselves do not want to be freed from such control, they are to be exiled, and their property, if they have any, is to be confiscated. Then, again, the second chapter likewise punishes whoremongers, if they are taxable, with exile, but if they are soldiers, it punishes them with confiscation of whatever property they own. Photius, in Title XIII, ch. 21, says that the term whoremonger is also applicable to any husband who knows that his wife is whoring, but keeps silent, according to Book XXIV of the Basilica, Title II, ch. 14.

²²⁴ I said “by concession” because the seven years are the penance provided for fornicators, and not adulterers, according to c. LIX of Basil. Consequently those covered by the present Canon are penanced only as fornicators, and not as adulterers. But inasmuch seven years is the penance provided for adultery in c. XX of Ancyra, these offenders are not being penanced by concession. For it’s as adulterers, and not as fornicators, that they are being canonized. See also the

²²⁵ I said that the husband can marry a second time if without grounds of adultery the wife deserts her husband and takes another. If, however, the wife merely deserts her husband without grounds of adultery and does *not* take another man as husband, but remains as she is, then her husband is not allowed to take another woman to wife; but, instead, both parties ought either to remain single or become reconciliated and reunite again in accordance with c. CXIII of Carthage.

²²⁶ That is why divine Epiphanius in agreement with this Canon says: “All peoples pass the six days before Easter with the eating of plain food, by which expression I mean bread and salt and water being partaken of then towards evening.”

²²⁷ The cessation of fasting which the Canon mentions ought to take place after midnight. Balsamon says that in those days the Christians of old had a different custom of doing it in a different way, which way is nowadays completely disused. Others say that by the expression “cease their fast” (or, in Greek, “*aponestizesthai*”) is meant the eating of cheese, eggs, and Easter foods in general, this being inferred from ch. 19 of Book V of the Apostolic Injunctions. Yet, whether this be true or what was said before, Christians after midnight must first listen to the whole of the matins of resurrection and wait till divine Liturgy has ended, and thereafter finish fasting and begin eating the Easter feast with cheerfulness and joyfulness. For the Apostolic Injunctions say (*ibid.*): “On this account, when the Lord hath risen, you too must offer your sacrifice, concerning which He commanded you through us by saying, ‘*this do in remembrance of me*’ (Luke 22:19); and thereupon cease fasting and partake of good cheer.” Here you can see that they say that first the Liturgy must be celebrated, and afterwards the celebration of Easter must commence. Hence it is to be observed that those persons deserve to be condemned, and are indeed inordinate belly-slaves and gluttons, who the moment they hear the cry “Christ is risen” at once, having eggs and cheese they have brought with them in their pockets or bosoms, begin stuffing them into their mouth. Accordingly, let them take pains to correct this impropriety here and now and henceforth. But parents, too, ought not to allow their children to become guilty of any similar disorderly conduct.

²²⁸ For it is for this reason too that on Sunday we are wont to say that the Lord is risen, since according to Blastaris (Eta, ch. 3) and Chrysanthus of Jerusalem (in his Geography) the day commences, among ecclesiastics, with the seventh hour of night and ends with the sixth hour of the next night. Accordingly anything that occurs in the interval during the twenty-four hours of this period, appears and is said to occur in that (perhaps one) day. But note here that in the day of resurrection it used to be the custom to kiss one another twice: once in the morning, in the Royal Palace, and particularly in churches, while the “Day of Resurrection” was being chanted, at the end of the morning; and again in the evening, thereafter, in the great church of St. Sophia, when the kissing was done together with the Emperor and all the magistrates of the empire, as is historically recorded by Curopalates, who says: “The Emperor sits on the throne wearing the broadsword of the Grand Domesticus, and as all the magistrates come in each, even to the least of them and last of them, kiss first of all the right foot (owing to the imperial character of the kingdom), then the right hand (because the Emperor has been anointed of the Lord and is the Defender of the Church, as Symeon of Thessalonica comments), and after that his right cheek (because “king and soldier, rich man and poor man, are all equal in Christ”). For this reason many persons ignorantly call this second kiss the Second Resurrection. As concerns the red eggs eaten at the time of the Resurrection, many persons say many things that are destitute of verification. In solving certain questions for the Emperor of Russia, a learned man named Gazes Paisius, says that when the Jews exclaimed “*His blood be on us and on our children*” (Matt. 27:25), everything they had in their houses at once turned red, and consequently even the eggs. Hence in remembrance of this miracle we too dye our eggs red at Eastertide on the occasion of the Resurrection then being celebrated. This miracle, he says, has come down to us through a tradition of old.

²²⁹ When and by whom was this Evangelical, Apostolical, and Patristical custom of genuflection abolished from our Eastern Orthodox Church? We cannot say with accuracy. We conclude, however, as a matter of guesswork or conjecture, that this custom was abolished after the schism, perhaps as a result of some of our own excessively zealous adherents being inclined to oppose the customs of the Western Church, and consequently also this canonical custom. In verification of this conclusion of ours, see our Meletius Pegas, at the end of his third book concerning Christianity where he mentions genuflections (on p. 240 of the Bucharest edition). For even the so-called *papalethra* — or, more plainly speaking, the *stephanos* worn by clerics on their head — in vogue among the Westerners, though a canonical custom, was abolished by our officials; and see c. XXI of the present C. Though even continuous communion of the mysteries as practiced by the Latins is canonical, it was abolished by us; and see the preface or preamble to the Tome of Love. And other canonical customs suffered the same fate. In saying genuflection, however, I do not mean what are commonly called “penitences” (or, in Greek, “*metanoiae*”), but that which we practice when kneeling to pray.

²³⁰ Emperors Leo and Constantine, in their Eclogae of Laws (Title XXVIII) say that if a woman become pregnant in consequence of fornication shall enter into a secret plot or design against her belly, with a view to aborting the child, shall be beaten and exiled.

²³¹ That is why King David too took back his wife Melchol who had contracted a second marriage with Phaltiel, after pardoning both of them, because, according to Theodoret, Saul harried them into marriage and Melchol took that second husband against her will (II Sam. 3:14). Note also that in case the wife of the returned soldier, if she does not want him, is in no way or manner pardoned and allowed to keep the second man, since both she and he are called adulterers.

²³² That is why Nicetas of Heracleia says: "If a man departs from his wife for another land and there acquires a concubine, and his wife waits three years with fortitude for him (to return), and he fails to come back, her husband himself shall be separated from his concubine, but not also from his wife; his wife, on the other hand, cannot take another husband, but must remain as she is. For she is free to contract a second marriage only when her husband dies, according to the Apostle (page 310 of the Corpus Juris Graecoromani), and while he is alive. The Novella of Leo decrees that if one party of a matrimonial couple be enslaved, the party who remains free cannot remarry. But if he should remarry, he has a right to recover the party who has been enslaved when she is liberated (from bondage), and to dissolve the (second) marriage.

²³³ In agreement with the present Canon Justinian Novella 117, contained in Title VII of Book XXVIII of the Basilica (in Photius, Title XIII, ch. 3), saying: "If a soldier or scholarian or foederatus or anyone else under arms is on a campaign and at war no matter for how many years, his wife must wait for him to return even though she has received no letters from him. But if she be told that he has died, she shall not get married unless she herself or her parents inquire of the Priors and Chartularies and of the Tribune of that battalion to which her husband belonged, who shall affirm in writing with the Gospels as witnesses that her husband actually died; then, after receiving the letter from them shall not get married for a year thereafter. If, on the other hand, she does not get married in this manner, she shall be punished as an adulteress herself, and the man who takes her shall likewise be punished as an adulterer; and they shall pay ten pounds of gold to the soldier who was her real husband when he returns from war; and he has a right, if he so desire, to take his own wife back again."

²³⁴ Blastaris says that these Fathers decreed that those women should be entitled to a pardon for a second marriage who are ready to let their second husband go and who do not insist on adhering to the sin of the second marriage committed unwittingly. Not, however, that those who refuse to do so shall be pardoned, who do not care to divorce their second husbands (Gamma, ch. 5).

²³⁵ That is why divine Chrysostom, in opposition to those who want to have oaths taken, says (Hom. 8 on statues): "Well, then (you tell me), what is one to do when it is necessary to swear (take oath)?" And he replies: "Wherever there is a transgression of the law, there can be no necessity. And is it possible (you ask me) for one not to swear at all? What do you say?" He answers: "God commanded, and you ask whether it is possible to keep His commandment. It is more impossible not to keep His commandment than to keep it." And again he says (Catechism I for those about to be enlightened [by baptism]): "I wish to eradicate an evil of long standing which has been a custom. I want to eradicate, I mean, not only wicked and false oaths, but also the good and true oaths. But, you tell me, such or such a person, a virtuous man, a man in holy orders, a sober and reverent person, swore an oath. Well, if you want to, you may tell me that St. Peter or St. Paul or an angel from heaven was the one who took an oath. For even those who are supposed to have taken an oath are supposed to be so great, I myself will not stand abashed at their greatness. Because the law which forbids every oath in general, and which I will read to you, is not Peter or of Paul or of angels, or in general of fellow servants, but of God Himself who is the king of all. When royal letters are read, servants ought to remain silent, no matter how high officials they may be. For if you are going to assert that Christ Himself commanded us to take oaths, or that Christ Himself does not chastise those who take oaths, show me where He says this, and I will be persuaded. But if Christ is so insistent in forbidding us to take oaths, and is so careful to provide against the taking of oaths entirely as to class the man who takes an oath with the Evil One (by which is meant the Devil), since He says "*for whatsoever is more than these cometh from the Evil One*" (Matt. 5:37), what is the idea of your referring to such or such a man? For God will not judge a person who takes an oath because some fellow servant before him took an oath as a result of indolence, but, instead, He will condemn him because he transgressed the express command of His law. 'I commanded,' He will tell the person in the day of judgment; 'you ought to have obeyed my command, and not bring forward the example of this man or that, and be looking at the transgressions of others as though they were something to whet one's appetite for more.' And further below he goes on to say: "Though the transgressor of the law concerning oaths were ten thousand times wonderful and great, he would have to expiate this transgression without fail by paying the penalty due for it, since God is not a respecter of persons." Hence it is that St. Basil the Great in regard to the penances which he provides excommunicates men for a week in case they swear any other oath than yea, yea and nay, nay; whereas he excommunicates women for two weeks if they happen to take any such oath. But even Chrysostom himself (Hom. 15 on statues, and 17 on the Gospel of St. Matthew) canonizes anyone that swears the vain oaths to which the majority of men are accustomed by obliging him not to eat his supper, but to go to sleep supperless, if he will be corrected. But if he will not be corrected, he is to be cut off from holy Communion and from the Church, like fornicators, adulterers, and murderers. The same Chrysostom (Hom. 5 and 14 and 15 on statues, and sel. discourse 28 concerning an oath) condemns to the same penances also those who perjure themselves, and those who force them or compel them to perjure themselves, or to take oaths. These things being as stated, let Balsamon (in his interpretation of c. XXIX of Basil), as well as those fol-

lowing him, be ashamed and keep their mouth shut, instead of saying that it is a lawful thing for good and true oaths to be taken, for one thing because the imperial laws permit oaths to be taken, and for another thing because for one not to swear at all is only for the perfect, but for one to swear is for the imperfect, and it is consequently impossible for the commandments to be kept by all men. As respects the first allegation, we reply what we have previously said in various places, viz., that emperors and kings often fail to make laws for the best, according to Chrysostom, and that, according to the emperors and kings themselves, all laws that conflict with the divine law ought to be annulled, and especially those which are opposed to the divine Scriptures and the Gospels. As respects the second allegation, we reply that all commandments, and consequently that concerning oaths, must be kept by all human beings. For this reason on the one hand the Lord commanded the Apostles to teach the faithful to keep not some of the commandments, and to ignore others, but to keep all commandments without exception that He Himself gave them; and that anyone who violated or ignored even one of the least of His commandments will be called least in the kingdom of heaven. On the other hand St. Basil the Great (Preamble to Definitions *in Extenso*) says that it is a great piece of arrogance for us to become judges of God the Legislator, and to approve some of His laws as good, but to frown upon others as bad, at a time when He Himself has commanded us to keep all His commandments. For if all of them were not necessary for our salvation, it would not have been written, nor would it have been commanded, that all of them must be kept. We know that in the Old Testament true and lawful oaths were permitted (Deut. 6:13; Ps. 63:11; Jer. 4:2; and *alibi*). Yes, they were permitted; but they were not required by legislation. Permission is one thing, and legislation is quite another. They were permitted on account of the imperfectness and infantileness of the Jews for the sake of keeping them free from idolatry. The divine Gospel, with firm decisiveness, not only does not permit anyone to take an oath in the name of God, but not even on his own head, by commanding that unless our righteousness shall exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, we shall by no means enter the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 5:20). For one must not swear by any of the creatures, since in such a case the oath would be one involving the Creator, according to St. Chrysostom. The expression, on the other hand, "Yea, by your own boasting," or "I adjure you by the Lord," and whatever else St. Paul says in connection with the name of God by way of affirmation, these are figures of a semblance to oaths, but not a veritable oath, as St. Chrysostom says. (It may be that St. Paul is saying these things, first as a result of great necessity and compulsion, and secondly, by no means because of anything human, or anything in any way growing out of this world, but to avoid imperiling the faith, and in general by way of upholding God and things divine, and as a matter of economy, and not of exactness and of legislation.) If anyone should swear by God, let us suppose, for all the tens of thousands of pounds of gold in the world, he would be conflicting with and violating the third commandment of the Decalogue, which decrees that no one shall take the name of God in vain; for the whole world, and everything that is in the world, is vain because it is paltry and perishable. Knowing this fact from an innate law of consciousness that is common to all men, that man by the name of Clinias who was a disciple of Pythagoras, and a heathen, and was in a position to avoid the loss of three talents by taking a true oath, did not, however, take an oath, but, instead, paid the talents, as St. Basil the Great bears witness as respecting this very fact. Note, moreover, that while the civil laws, after an oath has been investigated, that is, has been examined and proved false, then proceeds to chastise the perjurers, the sacred Canons, on the other hand, in dealing with those perjurers whose oath has been scrutinized, assigns to the places of penitents, but as for those whose oath has not been investigated and proven, they merely exclude them from Communion, and not from the Church and from praying along with the faithful. See the 18th ch. of Title XIII of the *Nomicon* of Photius, and the comments of Balsamon in connection therewith, but in particular and above all Armenopoulos, Book I, Title 7. It should be borne in mind, too, that an oath taken on the holy Gospel is taken on the God Himself whom it represents and who speaks through it. I wish to add also that which Athanasius the Great says with respect to the third commandment of the Decalogue: "If one is at all worthy to pronounce the name of God, of course he is trustworthy and credible and deserves to be believed even without an oath. For anyone that is capable as to what is greater, is capable also as to what is lesser. But if, on the other hand, he does not deserve to be believed without an oath, then neither is he worthy to pronounce the name of God." And note how this great Father in two words proves that it is a matter of superfluity for an oath to be taken in any case. That explains why the civil laws themselves do not require trustworthy witnesses to take an oath. Moreover the 7th Ecum. C. in its sixth Act says: "Let us not accustom the mouth to swearing, but let us listen to the Lord's voice saying '*But I say unto you, Swear not at all*'" (Matt. 5:34). And see the Footnote to Ap. c. LXXV. In addition to all that has been said, Chrysostom adds this brief and remarkable observation: "If you believe that the man is truthful, do not compel him to take an oath; but if you know that he is a liar, do not compel him to commit perjury" (Sermon 15 on statues, page 566 of volume VI). See also in Sermon 14 on statues how vehemently he prohibits oaths). But do please note also the Novella of Basil the Macedonian, Leo, and Constantine (page 135 in Book II of the *Corpus Juris Graecoromani*) who explicitly prohibit anyone from taking an oath and who assert that swearing is prohibited by the divine Gospel and the Scriptures, and furthermore that the turns and cases of this world being nothing but vanity, in accordance with Solomon's statement, it is plain that whenever anyone swears in connection therewith by the name of God, he is taking this name in vain, as we too have declared.

²³⁶ In other manuscripts: "those calling themselves *Cathari* and *Catharioleri*."

²³⁷ In other manuscripts: "aristi."

²³⁸ In other manuscripts: "and coming."

²³⁹ Manes the Persian, having served as a slave for a long time, received the appellation of Scythian, according to Theodore (Haeretic. Cacomyth., book I, ch. 26). He was also called Cubricius, according to Epiphanius (Haeres. 66). His name was later changed to Manicaeus by his followers; and he disseminated the cacodoxy of Basileides and of Marcion in the third century, according to St. Augustine (Concerning Heresies, ch. 46). He used to say, besides other assertions, that after death the souls of men enter birds and cattle and reptiles, according to Theodore (*ibid.*).

²⁴⁰ Valentinus used to say, in the second century, that after assuming an ethereal body, Christ passed through the Virgin like as if through a tube, without taking anything from Her (Tertillian, Book against Valentinians, ch. 15). The Valentinians denied the resurrection of bodies, thus ignoring the Old Testament, and in reading the prophets they rehashed some myths in their interpretations of them, and uttered some other impious drivel, according to the Anonymous Interpreter of the Canons.

²⁴¹ Marcion was a disciple of a man named Cerdon, who served as a disciple of Basileides and Satorinus, who were followers of Simon the Sorcerer, according to Tertillian (book concerning the flesh of Christ). When this man Marcion once asked St. Polycarp whether he knew who he was, the saint answered that he knew him quite well to be the first-begotten son of the Devil (Iren. Book III, ch.3). He used to say that there were three principles. The first one was the invisible God; the second was the visible God and creator of the world; and the third was the Devil. He was wont to baptize not with a single immersion, but with three immersions, allowing even women to baptize. According to c. XLVII of Basil he abhorred marriage and wine; he used to say that creation was wicked, and called God the creator of evils. He appeared during the second century.

²⁴² Concerning these heretics we have said enough in the Preface to the Third Ecum. Council.

²⁴³ Concerning these heretics see the Preface to the Fourth Ecum. C.

²⁴⁴ They were called Encratites because they practiced “*encrateia*,” or what is called in English vegetarianism, and did not eat of any animate thing. They rejected marriage like Marcion, and did not drink wine, according to Balsamon. The leader of their heresy was Tatian, a disciple of St. Justin, according to Theodoret. They celebrated the Mysteries with water alone, like the Aquarians, according to Epiphanius (Haer. 47). See also c. LXXXVI of Basil.

²⁴⁵ They were called Saccophori because they wore sacks and thereby pretended to extreme temperance (or “*encrateia*”) and a rough-and-hard life.

²⁴⁶ They were called Apotactites because they renounced (Greek *apotasso*) their appetites and did not eat anything that the Encratites did not eat.

²⁴⁷ Note that this same Canon is mentioned by Balsamon in his Reply 29, and he quotes it as follows: “And the Manicheans too and the Valentinians, and the Marcionists, and those from similar heresies, we receive as Greeks (as impious persons, that is to say). But as for the Nestorians, they must give us certificates and anathematize their heresy and Nestorius and the other things.” If anyone wonders why this Council mentioned here this Canon of the 2nd Ec. C., which was issued against the Arians and the Macedonians who were then rampant but who at the time of this 6th Council had disappeared almost entirely, we reply that this Council found it necessary to renew the Canon of the 2nd perhaps on account of the remaining vestiges of the above heretics, but mainly because of the Monothelites, who had increased to a large number in its days. They are alluded to in accordance with the figure of silent omission in those words which it mentions, to wit: “and those who entertain their beliefs.” For the heresy of the Monothelites was a scion and offshoot of the heresy of the Monophysites. For it is obvious that those who hold that there is but one will inhering in Christ would also by consequence believe that He had but one nature. For if according to the former He had but one nature, He necessarily had according to the latter but a single will. In order, therefore, to define how these heretics of its own days ought to be baptized, this Council found it necessary to renew the Canon of the 2nd, and to refrain from promulgating another of its own, out of deference to the 2nd Ecum. Council. As for you, my dear reader, if you want to learn that the baptism of all heretics in general is impious and blasphemous and has no community with that of the Orthodox, read ch. 9 of book VII of Eusebius; and there you will learn that a person who has been baptized by heretics, but who has later seen how the Orthodox are baptized, wept and could not be solaced, but fell at the feet of Dionysius of Alexandria, begging him to baptize him in the Orthodox baptism and saying that the baptism which he had received was replete with blasphemies and had no community with the Orthodox. So, then, get it into your head and understand from this that both heretics and Latins, when they join the Orthodox Eastern Church, ought of their own accord and on their own account to seek to have themselves baptized, and not have to be urged to do so by the Orthodox.

²⁴⁸ Those too incur the excommunication of this Canon, according to Zonaras, who do not put a razor to their head at all, nor cut the hair of their head, but let it grow long enough to reach to the belt like that of women, and those who

bleach their hair so as to make it blond or golden, or who twist it up and tie it on spills in order to make it curly; or who put wigs or “rats” on their head. This excommunication is incurred also by those who shave off their beard in order to make their face smooth and handsome after such treatment, and not to have it curly, or in order to appear at all times like beardless young men; and those who singe the hair of their beard with a redhot tile so as to remove any that is longer than the rest, or more crooked; or who use tweezers to pluck out the superfluous hairs on their face, in order to become tender and appear handsome; or who dye their beard, in order not to appear to be old men. This same excommunication is incurred also by those women who use rouge and paint on their face, in order to look pretty, and in this way to attract men beholding them to their Satanic love. Oh, and how the miserable women have the hardihood to dishonor the image which God gave them with their wicked beautifications! Ah! how is God to recognize them and tell whether they are His own creatures and images, at a time when they are wearing another face which is devilish, and another image, which is that of Satan? Hence it is that St. Gregory the Theologian says the following in his epic verses :

“Build yourselves not towers of spurious tresses on your head, women,

While petting soft necks of rocks invisible;

Nor apply shameful paint to forms of God’s,

So as to be wearing masks, and not faces.

Lest God requite you for such things when He has come to resent them.

Who? Whence is the Creator? Avaunt, get thee away from me, strange female!

I did not paint thee a bitch, but created an image of myself.

How is it that I have an idol, a specter instead of a friend?”

And the poor wretches do not know that by what they are doing they are managing only to make themselves like that hag and whore called Jezebel (II Kings 9:30), and are themselves becoming new and second Jezebels, because she too used to paint her face in order to please the eyes of men, just as is written: “*And when Jehu was come to Jezreel, Jezebel heard of him; and she painted her face, and attired her head, and peeped through the window*” (*ibid.*). So all men and all women who do such things are all excommunicated by the present Ecumenical Council. And if these things are forbidden to be done by the laity in general, how much more they are forbidden to clerics and those in holy orders, who ought by their speech and by their conduct, and by the outward decency and plainness of their garments, and of their hair, and of their beard, to teach the laity not to be body-lovers and exquisites, but soul-lovers and virtue-lovers. Note that the present Canon censures the priests of the Latins who shave off their moustache and their beard and who look like very young men and handsome bridegrooms and have the face of women. For God forbids men of the laity in general to shave their beard, by saying: “*Ye shall not mar the appearance of your bearded chin*” (Lev. 19:27). But He specially forbids those in holy orders to shave their beard, by saying to Moses to tell the sons of Aaron, or, in other words, the priests, not to shave the skin of their bearded chin (Lev. 21:5). Not only did He forbid this in words, but He even appeared to Daniel with whiskers and beard as the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7:9); and the Son of God wore a beard while he was alive in the flesh. And our Forefathers and Patriarchs and Prophets and Apostles all wore beards, as is plainly evident from the most ancient pictures of them wherein they are painted with beards. But, more to the point, even the saints in Italy, like St. Ambrose, the father of monks Benedict, Gregory Dialogus, and the rest, all had beards, as they appear in their pictures painted in the church of St. Mark in Venice. Why, even the judgment of right reason decides the shaving of the beard to be improper. For the beard is the difference which in respect of appearance distinguishes a woman from a man. That is why a certain philosopher when asked why he grew a beard and whiskers, replied that as often as he stroked his beard and whiskers he felt that he was a man, and not a woman. Those men who shave their beard are not possessors of a manly face, but of a womanly face. Hence it was that Epiphanius blamed the Massalians for cutting off their beard, which is the visage peculiar to man as distinguished from woman. The Apostles in their Instructions, Book I, ch.3, command that no one shall destroy the hair of his beard, and change the natural visage of the man into one that is unnatural. “For,” says he, “God the Creator made this to be becoming to women, but deemed it to be out of harmony with men.” The innovation of shaving the beard ensued in the Roman Church a little before Leo IX. Gregory VII even resorted to force in order to make bishops and clerics shave off their beard. Oh, and what a most ugly and most disgusting sight it is to see the successor of St. Peter close-shaven, as the Greeks say, like a “fine bridegroom,” with this difference, however, that he wears a stole and a pallium, and sits in the chief seat among a large number of other men like him in a council called the college of cardinals, while he himself is styled the Pope. Yet bearded Popes did not become extinct after insane Gregory, a witness to this fact being Pope Gelasius growing a beard, as is stated in his biography. See the Dodecabilus of Dositheus, pp. 776-8. Meletius the Confessor (subject 7, concerning unleavened wafers) states that a certain Pope by the name of Peter on account of his lascivious acts was arrested by the king and one half of his beard was shaven off as a mark of dishonor. According to another authority, in other temples too there were princes, even on the sacerdotal list, who had a beard, as in Leipzig they are to be seen painted after Martin Luther in the church called St. Paul’s and that called St. Thomas’s. I saw the same things also in Bardislabia.

St. Nicephorus says, in his c. III, that if anyone should happen to remain for a short time, say for twenty-four hours, in the narthex of a church building of necessity, he is not to be condemned; but if he should stay there for a long time, let him be ousted from there, and let the temple be restored to its rights, to the condition, that is to say, of not being turned into a common and plain house. The imperial laws command further that whoever should seize by dint of exercise of overpowering force and authority any person that has taken refuge in the church should be flogged and have his head of hair shorn off, and afterwards be exiled. The bishops and ecclési (or officers) are in duty bound, however, to record the names of refugees, and the reasons why they sought an asylum, and to divulge these to the civil authorities in order that

the latter may institute the proper proceedings.

²⁵⁰ In agreement with this Canon ch. 2 of Title LVIII of Book LX of the Basilica, as well as the third Theme of ch. 12 and Title XXXVII of the same Book LX, prescribes that anyone that takes to wife a woman engaged to another man is to be judged as an adulterer. See ch. 11 of the doctrine concerning marriage contracts.

²⁵¹ Hence prelates ought to apply very severe penalties to prevent Christians from participating in what are called in the Turkish language *kurbans*, which are in vogue today and which are a renewal of the sacrifices offered by the Greeks and the Jews. For just as those people believed that they were propitiating God with the blood and slaughter of sheep and other animals, so too do these deluded and foolish persons think that they are propitiating God by means of the slaughter and sacrifice of their *kurbans*. And for this reason it is to be seen that these *kurbanists* do not buy any sheep slaughtered by others and ready at hand, but insist upon slaughtering them themselves, and lighting candles upon their horns, and incensing them with incense, and roasting them whole, and laying them out, freshly roasted and still exhaling the odor of roast meat, before the holy icons. They dedicate the skin of the animal to the temple or monastery. To their relatives and friends, some of them offer portions when they return from the celebration, in order that they be sanctified by it. Oh, what a Greekish delusion, and what a Jewish superstition! And the deluded and erring creatures do not realize that what God wants is mercy, and not sacrifice; and that the only sacrifice that is acceptable and pleasing to Him is not the meat of sheep and calves, but a contrite frame of mind and a humbled heart, as divine David chants in his Psalms. Read concerning this the book of St. Campanias, ch. 57. Though it is true that Nicetas the chartophylax and the bishop of Thessalonica (page 350 of the *Corpus Juris Graecoromani*) say that it is not reprehensible for Christians to offer the breasts and skins, of lambs, outside of the church, or doves and pigeons at commemoration services, to the priests; yet, on the other hand, they themselves assert that this is not to be reprehended only if such things are offered by way of perquisites to the priests, and not in the way of sacrifices, and as a matter of so many and such egregious superstitions, as we have said above, on account of which such sacrifices ought to be done away with entirely.

²⁵² The manner in which laymen in those days used to take the holy bread in their hands is more clearly described by Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. Mystag. 5), who says: "When you approach the Mysteries, do not hold out the palms of your hands, nor spread your fingers apart, but, placing the left hand underneath, and the right hand on top, as though it were about to welcome an emperor or king, and forming a hollow in the palm of it, take the body of Christ in this way, at the same time pronouncing an "Amen!" in acknowledgment thereof. But after you have received it, do not fail to sanctify your eyes by touching it cautiously, and thus partake of it, taking care not to drop any pearl (i.e., precious particle) of it," etc. Note, however, that the present Canon contradicts those who assert that divine Chrysostom invented the tongs. For the custom of taking the holy bread in the hands obtained among Christians after Chrysostom, at least four hundred years, as becomes plain also from the present Council and from John Damascene, who describes this custom (concerning the Orthodox faith, Book IV, ch. 14). But then again St. Chrysostom himself also describes and tells about this custom in many of his discourses and sermons (Commentary on Psalm XLIX; Discourse 26 on the Seraphim; Sermon 21 on Statues; see also his biography by Metaphrastes). One ought, however, to know that in the Western Church women were not wont to receive or take the holy bread in their naked hands, but, instead, spreading out some white oraria — that is, small white napkins — they would thus receive the holy bread (*Note of Translator*. — The authors of this work call it "bread" here either by courtesy or by oversight, and in the same way they accord it the epithet "holy." It is, in point of fact, not bread at all, in the Greek sense of the term, because it is an unleavened substitute; consequently, neither is it holy.), as is decreed by the local Synod held in the city of Antisiodorus, in its c. XXXVI; and St. Augustine also gives instructions about it in his Discourse 252). That little napkin is called a *dominical*, which word means in Latin "the Lord's." The name is due to the fact they used to take it to church with them on Sundays in order to receive the body of Christ. The cause which led to the invention of the tongs was the fact some men, either feigning to be Christians, or being heretics, or superstitious, when taking the holy bread in their hands, either let it drop or hid it, or used it in magic or other wicked devices. Hence, through the invention of the tongs, by which the holy communion could be administered directly into the mouth of the recipient, every cause and reason and excuse for such flouting of the mystery was obviated. See also Eustratius, in his discourse concerning the administration of the mystery, pp. 301–2). But some other persons have conjectured also another reason that is more plausible, viz., convenience, or facilitation of administration, because in olden times nearly every church had also its deacon. Hence, in accordance with the Apostolic tradition, the priest would give the divine body, while the deacon, standing near, with the holy cup, would serve out the divine blood. But owing to the fact that deacons later became scarce and disappeared from most churches, as we can also see for ourselves by actual experience, where they are lacking, and especially in the villages and in the poor churches, and there ensued a difficulty which made it hard for the same priest to administer them separately, each by itself, in a very economical and expeditious manner, the tongs were invented, in order that, after the union was effected, he might administer them easily, and especially to infants.

²⁵³ In other manuscripts it says "stayed."

²⁵⁴ In other manuscripts it says "give him more."

²⁵⁵ By the word “custom” is meant the term of years and the various penances, or penalties, with which the Canons customarily and for the most part take sinners to task and bring them to their senses, or sober them up, whether they be laymen or clergymen. By “accuracy,” on the other hand, is meant the eventuality whereby sinners add to these years and penances a hatred of sin, and a painful feeling in the heart, and tears, and bodily hardships, and other benefactions. For little correction can be expected to result from the years and penances alone. Both these requirements, accuracy and custom, are recommended by the same Canons of the Fathers, and especially by c. XII of the 1st, q.v. The fact that every confessor must be *actively* invested with holy orders, and must not have been deposed for open crimes, nor have resigned for secret ones, is attested also by Symeon of Thessalonica, who says (Reply 11): “The man who receives thoughts must also pronounce blessings, and utter a prayer for pardon, and officiate as a minister, and administer communion to those confessing their misdeeds, and intercede in behalf of the repentant.” And John of Cirtus expressly says in some reply (extant in manuscript) that: “whoever voluntarily or involuntarily has resigned from holy orders cannot receive thoughts. Any priests who without permission of their bishop receive thoughts and confess, they, according to the above-mentioned Symeon (in the same Reply), so far as sinfulness is concerned, are close to the man who, though unsacred, performs the functions of holy orders. According to Balsamon (interpretation of c. VII of Carthage) Michael the Patriarch said that these men ought to be deposed from office just as those are deposed from office who perform any act outside their own parish, and like transgressors of the Canons. Men unsacred and monks ought not to confess, nor nuns. For this is contrary to the Canons. That is why Balsamon (Reply 32) says that if an unsacred abbot of a monastery cannot receive thoughts, even though he be given permission by his bishop, how much more this holds in the case of an abbess and nun, even though her virtuousness outshine the sun! Nicephorus the charto-phylax, too, says that monks who are not priests, and who receive thoughts, should be apprised that they are doing this uncanonically, or, without undergoing the penances prescribed by the Canons” (page 342, *Corpus Juris Graecoromani*). See also the Footnote to Ap. c. XXXIX. The above-mentioned Symeon adds (in Reply 11) that if there should happen to arise any great necessity and there should be present neither a bishop nor a confessor, a plain monk may receive thoughts, but thereafter he must reveal them either to the bishop or to the one having permission and the ministry of spiritual paternity.

²⁵⁶ Spyridon Milias, in his *Collection of the Councils*, vol. II, says that this Council was held in the year 783. Others say in the year 788. The most accurate chronologers, however, say that it was held in the above-mentioned year.

²⁵⁷ Epiphanius, the Deacon of Catana, in the eparchy of Sicily, attending as the legate of Thomas, the archbishop of the island of Sardinia, in his wonderful encomiastic speech (page 890 of the second volume of the *Conciliar Records*) says that that was the number of Fathers attending it. Psellus says so too. Photius says that there were 367, in his letter to Michael the King of Bulgaria. The same number is recorded in the *menologion* of Emperor Basil.

²⁵⁸ These legates, according to Theophanes, became the Metropolitan of Thessalonica and the Patriarch of Alexandria, respectively.

²⁵⁹ Photius calls him Apollinarius; but the report of an anonymous writer concerning the seven Councils calls him Politianus, with whom Ignatius, a modern author, agrees.

²⁶⁰ These Patriarchs were unable at that time to attend the Council in person, because of the incursion of the Hagarenes. For the Patriarch of Jerusalem (whom Dositheus calls Theodore, I know not why) had been exiled by them a thousand miles away from Jerusalem. Worse woes were suffered by the Christians in Alexandria and Antioch, and consequently their Patriarchs suffered along with them (Dositheus, page 631 of the *Dodecabiblus*).

²⁶¹ An idol is one thing, a statue is another thing, and an icon (or picture) is a different thing. For an idol differs from an icon in that the icon is a likeness of a true thing and its original, whereas the idol is an image of a false and in-existent thing, and is not the likeness of an original, according to Origen and Theodoret — just as were the idols of the false and in-existent gods of the Greeks. We call those images which embody the whole figure statues and carved or sculptured figures in general. As for this kind of images, namely, the statues, the catholic (Orthodox) Church not only does not adore them, but she does not even manufacture them, for many reasons: 1) because in its present definition this Council says for images to be produced with paints (or colors), with mosaic, or tessellated work, and with any other suitable material (which means with gold and silver and other metals, as Theodosius the bishop of Amorion says in Act 4 of the same Council) upon the sacred utensils, and robes, including sheets and cloths; upon walls and boards, and houses and streets. It did not mention a word about construction of a statue. Rather it may be said that this definition of this Council is antagonistic to statues; 2) because neither the letters written by patriarchs in their correspondence with one another, and to emperors, nor the letters of Pope Gregory to Germanus and of Pope Adrian to the present Council, nor the speeches and orations which the bishops and monks made in connection with all the eight Acts of the present Council said anything at all about statues or sculptured figures. But also the councils held by the iconomachs, and especially that held in Blachernae in the reign of Copronymus, in writing against the holy icons, mention oil paintings and portraits, but never statues or sculptured figures, which, if they existed, could not have been passed over in silence by the iconomachs, but, on the contrary, they would have been written against with a view to imputing greater blame to the Orthodox; 3) because although the woman with an issue of blood made a bronze statue of Christ in memory of and by way of

giving thanks for the miracle and the benefaction which it had conferred upon her; and she set it up in the Panead, at the feet of which there sprang up a plant, or herb, which cured various ailments; and, as some say, that statue was smashed to pieces by the Emperor Maximinus, before Constantine the Great, and the bronze was seized by him; or else Julian the Apostate seized it, and put in its place the statue of Jupiter, as an anonymous writer says. Though, I say, the woman who had an issue of blood did make this statue (which the Christians took into the Church and honored; and people went to see it out of a yearning for the original of it, as Philostorgus the Arian historically records), yet, as a matter of fact, that work of the woman who had an issue of blood was a concession from God, who, for goodness' sake accepted it, making allowances for the imperfect knowledge of the woman who set it up; and because that was an embodiment and mark not of the grace of the Gospel, but of the old Law, as Pope Gregory II says in writing to St. Germanus (for the old Law had the two Cherubim, which were gold statues and sculptured figures containing all the body of the angelic powers, according to ch. 38 of Exodus, which Cherubim, according to an unknown expositor, had the face of a calf, and adored the Ark of the Covenant (here called the Ark of the Testimony, and by this adoration separated the Israelites from the idolatry of the Egyptians, who used to adore the calf. For the Jews learned from this that if a calf adored the Ark, it followed that the Egyptians were wrong in adoring it as a god). Not only the old Law, but also the custom of the Greeks fostered the erection of statues and sculptured figures, as St. Germanus writes in a letter to Thomas of Claudiopolis which is to be found in Act 4 of the present Council, and which says: "It being obvious that the Savior leveled His own grace to condescension with the faith of the woman, and showed what has been made evident to us above, namely, that it is not that what is performed is in general the object, but that it is the aim of the one performing it that is being reduced to experience" And again: "We do not say this, so that we may find an excuse for exercising the art of making bronze pillars, but merely in order to make it plain that the Lord did not discard the national custom at this point, but, instead, availed Himself of it to exhibit therein for a considerable length of time the wonder-working and miracle-working efficiency of His own benevolence; on which account it is not devout to disparage the custom of a somewhat more pious nature which has prevailed among us." You see here three things as plainly as day, to wit: 1) that the erection of the statue of Christ was moral, and that the Lord accepted it as a matter of compromise with the times; 2) that statues ought not to be manufactured; and 3) that it is more pious and more decent for the venerable images to be depicted, not by means of statues, but by means of colors in paintings. For the same saint said above by way of anticipation that in historically recording the facts concerning the statues, he historically recounts the fact that the icons of the Apostles Peter and Paul, painted in colors, were still extant . . . Canon LXXXII of the 6th, moreover, says that we ought to perfer the grace of the Gospel to the legal form, and ought to set up the human character, or figure, of Christ in icons instead of the olden lamb even in oil paintings. So that from all that has been said it is proved that the Westerners are acting contrary to the definition of this holy and Ecumenical Seventh Council, and contrary to the tradition of the Church in making statues and sculptured figures and plaster of paris replicas, and setting them up in their churches. We said hereinabove those representations which embody the whole of that which they represent are called statues and sculptured work and plaster of paris figures in general, whereas those representations which do not embody the whole of the person or other object which they are intended to represent, but at most merely exhibit them in relief, projecting, that is to say, here and there above the level and surface of the background, are not called statues or sculptured work or plaster of paris figures or any such name, but, instead, they are called holy icons (or, if they are not holy, simply pictures). Such are those which are to be found engraved or stamped or otherwise delineated upon the sacred vessels, on divine Gospels, and other holy books, on precious crosses, of silver and gold, according to Dositheus (p. 656 of the Dodecabiblus); to the same class are assigned also images cast in wax and more or less in relief, that is to say, projecting at various points above and receding at other points below the plane surface of the image, concerning which divine Chrysostom (in his Discourse wherein he argues that one and the same Lawgiver is the author of both the Old and the New Testament; and in Discourse 307 on the vesture of priests, the origin of which is to be found in the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ) says the following: "I myself have loved the images cast in wax as a matter of piety. For I beheld an angel in an image driving back hordes of barbarians. I saw barbarian troops being trodden underfoot, and the words of David coming true, wherein he says: 'Lord, in thy city Thou wilt do their image havoc' (p. 852 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records, in Act 6 of the 7th C.; and p. 647 of the sixth vol. of Chrysostom). Oecumenius, too, accepts and approves this kind of image which is cast in wax in the manner above described (in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews). Hence, in writing to Symeon the bishop of Bostra, Anastasius the Patriarch of Antioch says: "though, as a matter of fact, an image is nothing else than a piece of wood and colors mixed and mingled with wax" (p. 845 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records). In the same class with these images are placed also the images which are carved in wooden crosses (crucifixes) and medallions. They, too, likewise are wrought in relief and project above the plane of the level surface, and do not compromise the whole body of the person or thing represented. The reason and cause why statues are not adored or venerated (aside from the legal observation and custom noted hereinabove) seem to me to be the fact that when they are handled and it is noticed that the whole body and all the members of the person or thing represented are contained in them and that they not only reveal the whole surface of it in three dimensions, but can even be felt in space, instead of merely appearing as such to the eye alone, they no longer appear to be, nor have they any longer any right to be called, icons or pictures, but, on the contrary, they are sheer replications of the originals. Some persons, though, assert or opine that the reason why the Church rejected or did away with statues was in order to avoid entirely any likeness to idols. For the idols were statues of massive sculpture, capable of being felt on all sides with the hand and fingers.

²⁶² Hence, in Act 5 of the present Council, after the reading of the speech delivered by John of Thessalonica, wherein he pointed out that angels ought to be depicted (in icons) as they have many times been sensually seen by many men and women with the veritable shape of their own bodies, Tarasius replied that this Father had pointed out how angels ought to be painted, since they are circumscribable and therefore capable of being described, and since they appeared to many men and women like human beings. The Council agreed to what Tarasius said in his opinion of the matter. But certain modern theologians explain that the bodies naturally belonging to angels are those bodies which are transitory, or (in English perhaps we had better say) extemporaneous, and which they assume in order to make themselves visible to human beings, such bodies having been developed out of ectoplasm, or an airy essence. The said John, on the other hand, in the same Act 5, says that the reason why angels can be depicted in icons is that they really possess exiguous, or extremely tenuous, bodies, and he cites as witnesses to this fact St. Basil the Great, St. Athanasius the Great, and divine Methodius. "For, according to them," says he, "even angels are possessed of a tenuous body, and are not utterly and altogether incorporeal like God." For St. Basil the Great actually does say in the sixth chapter of his discourses concerning the Holy Spirit, concerning Angels: "Wherefore they are also in space, and become visible, and in the veritable shape of their own bodies proper they actually appear and become visible to the eyes of worthy men and women." And divine St. Hilary asserts that whatever has been built (or created) must needs also possess a body (ch. 2 on the Gospel according to St. Matthew). Besides, even Origen took the Angels to be possessed of a tenuous body (Concerning Principles and Origins, Book I, ch. 7, and Book II); and Tertullian, too, in many places, and especially in his discourse concerning the body of Christ (ch. 6), and St. Justin, and Clement of Alexandria (otherwise known as Clement Stromateus), in his Book III of Stromata, and Athenagoras in his Apology, and Cyprian (concerning the dress of virgins), and St. Ambrose (in his book concerning Noah and the Ark), and Eusebius (Book V concerning Evang. Prep.), and Sulpicius Severus (concerning Ecclesiastical History), and Lactantius (Book II of the Institutes), and St. Augustine, all avouch the same truth. But in addition to all these authorities Macarius the Great also testifies to the same truth. And see ch. 67 of Symeon Metaphrastes, on page 720 of his work entitled *Philocalia*.

²⁶³ This dictum is one delivered by St. Basil the Great, as the same Council in its Act 6 says, and as does St. Basil himself in ch. 18 concerning the Holy Spirit. St. Athanasius also says: "Whosoever pays adoration to the icon, is thereby paying adoration also to the King." Likewise St. Chrysostom: "Knowest thou not that if thou insult the picture, or icon, of the King, that thou art transferring the insult to the original of the merit?" (page 859, of the second volume of the Conciliar Records). Nevertheless, this honor is paid to the original in a different way, and to the icon in a different way (according to Blastaris): to the former by way of worship; to the latter relatively.

²⁶⁴ The word *icon* is derived from the Greek *eoikenai*, meaning to "look like," or, in other words, it is so called because of the fact that it presents a likeness to the eye that recalls the original. But in Greek the word *icon* means simply a picture of any kind whatsoever, and is by no means confined to the pictures of divine personages, or of persons at all, for that matter, being commonly used by the Greeks in a general way with reference to pictures hung on walls as well as illustrations printed in books, etc. Accordingly, in Greek, one may use it in the sense of "natural image," as is in fact every natural son in relation to his natural father (that is why divine St. Basil, in his assertion above respecting honor due to an icon in the case of a "natural image" took that of the Son and Logos in relation to God the Father). Another kind of "icon," or picture, is that which may be called the imitative and artistic, such as is that which is painted with oil colors or other suitable materials, and, indeed, it is this kind that we are discussing here. But a natural picture differs with respect to and in respect of its hypostasis from the cause of it, i.e., from the one who produced or begot it, seeing that father and son are two hypostases; it does not, however, differ with respect to and in respect of its nature, seeing that they are but one in so far as respects the nature of humanity. An artistic picture, on the contrary, with respect to and in respect of its essence differs from the original, because the original is an animate and living human being, whereas his picture (or icon) is inanimate and lifeless matter. That is why the Seventh Council said in its Act 6 (page 836 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records) that: "An icon (or picture) is not like the original with respect to and in respect of essence, but with respect to and in respect of hypostasis, or, more explicitly speaking, in point of imitation of the hypostasis, it is one with the original (i.e., it is of the same hypostasis as the original). For the hypostasis of the picture (or icon) and that of the original (or person whom it represents) is one and the same, as is proved by the fact that the original can be seen in the picture (or icon), while, on the other hand, the picture (or icon) subsists in the original, precisely as does a shadow in the body it portrays, and cannot possibly be separated therefrom: and as is further proved by the fact that it is the hypostasis, and not the nature, that is depicted or portrayed in the picture (or icon). And as is further proved by the fact that in every icon (or picture) there is inscribed, not the name of the nature of the hypostasis, or, for instance, such words as "This is the picture of a human being" simply, but the name of the hypostasis, or, for instance, words stating that it is a picture of Christ, or of John, and so on. Wherefore the present Council, in its Act 6, page 836, *ibidem*, asserts that an icon or picture resemble the original only in point of name and in point of position of the members therein portrayed. There is, however, also a third kind of picture (or icon), which is called a figurative or symbolic picture. Thus, for instance, the mysteries of the grace of the Gospel and of the truth of the Gospel were originals, while the pictures thereof are the symbols consisting of the old Law and the Prophets. This is proved by the fact that in the glorificative part of the vespers of the Sunday of Orthodoxy it is asserted that the grace of the Gospel, and the Church herself, prescribed beforehand the type, or form, of the Tabernacle of the Testimony. Because the former, being the original and causeless, pre-existed prior to the type, or form, of the Tabernacle; whereas, on the other hand, its type, or

form, arose later and subsequently to the grace, though not with respect to time, but because of the fact that any picture is an effect (in that it is not the cause of itself, but is caused by, or is the effect of, that which it represents). And again the things in the future age are the originals whereof the pictures are the mysteries of the grace of the Gospel. That is why divine St. Paul said that having a shadow the Law did not furnish a veritable picture of the facts, where by “picture” he meant the grace, and by “facts” the facts of the future age. In like fashion and with equal aptness St. Basil the Great, in his c. XCI, said that Sunday is a picture of the future age. Hence some Fathers called the divine Eucharist after the sanctification an antitype of the Body and Blood of the Lord, comparing it with the facts to be revealed nakedly and impressively in the future age, though at present it is covered up and hidden underneath the accidents of the bread and wine, as St. Maximus explains). In the case of holy icons adoration and salutation (commonly called kissing) are one and the same thing. For, in the ancient Greek language, the main verb *kyno* (in the compound verb *proskyno*, meaning to adore) means “to embrace and kiss.” The preposition *pros* indicates an intensification of the meaning “embrace and kiss” and implies longing and yearning. Hence, in order to express the full meaning of the Greek word in English we should have to employ some such circumlocution as “to embrace and kiss longingly and yearningly.” That is why the present Council, in its Act 7, said “in all respects to accept and recognize the venerable icons, and to adore them, or, more explicitly speaking, to embrace and kiss them.” Both notions, or what amounts to saying the same thing, is expressed in its above definition by the words “and to bestow upon these an embrace and kiss and honorary adoration.” But the word adoration may be taken in a broader sense, in which case it denotes every honor and prostration and homage that is done to holy icons, as St. John Damascene said in his discourse concerning icons. Most especially to be noted is that fact that what is distinguished as “worshiping adoration” is a quite different matter from that which is termed irrelative adoration and that which is termed relative adoration. Worshiping adoration is rendered only to God and to Christ Himself, and to the bread and wine which are being transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ in the ceremony of the divine Eucharist. For whoever pays adoration to Christ, according to Blastaris, is at the same time and conjointly therewith paying adoration to the Father and the Holy Spirit, the one nature in the Trinity; and whoever pays adoration to Christ is paying adoration to Him as a God and Lord Paramount for His own sake, and not for the sake of anyone else, according to the Synod, or local Council, held in the year 1084 during the patriarchate of Nicholas and the reign of Alexius Comnenus (page 981 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records). Since the word *worship* (or its Greek equivalent *latreia*) properly denotes slavery, according to St. Augustine (ch. 45, concerning the true religion) and implies faith as a hope for our salvation. But we do not adore the holy icon of Christ worshipingly, in identically the same manner and spirit, that is to say, the image, or icon, with the one imaged or iconized. Nor do we worship the holy icons as gods, or as Gods, as the iconomachs accuse us of doing. Heaven forbid! For this is something altogether alien to the tradition of the Church. That is why this Council said in its definition: “Accordingly, such persons are prompted not only to kiss these and to pay them honorary adoration, but, what is more important, they are imbued with the true faith which is rejected in our worship which is due to God alone and which befits only the divine nature.” And God Himself has said: “*Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and him alone shalt thou worship*” (Deut. 6:13; cf. Matt. 4:10, and Luke 4:8). You see that He let adoration be paid also to others, but did not allow worship to anyone else except Himself. Just as Anastasius of Theoupolis interpreted this passage in a most excellent manner. If the word *worship* is said of anyone else, it is taken in an accidental sense, and not in its proper sense; accordingly, in such a case it means merely honor. Just as is the case in that which is said in a certain troparion with reference to St. Basil: “O Basil, thou wise worshiper of the Theotoke.” (For this reason also the adoration which rendered at the divine Mysteries after the transubstantiation, since it is of the “worshiping” kind, ought to be carried out differently from that adoration which is paid to them before the transubstantiation, with slavish, that is to say, and groveling prostration.) As for irrelative adoration, that is what is done when one adores merely the one represented by the picture, in the picture, and not also both the picture and the one therein pictured. But this kind of adoration is not paid to holy icons. Because in this way there may be a lot of other pictures unadored, since they are only kept in mind and conceived as memories of certain persons or things (in this sense of the word, in fact, all creatures can be conceived to be pictures of their Creator). Relative adoration, on the other hand, standing midway between worshiping adoration and irrelative adoration, is that which is paid to the holy icons. It is called relative because of the fact that in this case the picture itself is not called such in itself (or by itself) and *absolutely*, but with respect (or in relation) to something else and *relatively*. For a picture is the picture of that which is pictured, or represented by it. Hence, on account of this relation and reference which it bears to that which is pictured, with respect to the likeness, that is to say, of the hypostasis, and with respect to the name in the inscription inscribed upon it, it is honored and adored conjointly with the one who is pictured, with a single act of adoration, true enough, yet homonymically and relatively, and not this in all respects and in identically the same respect, as Theodore the Studite (called by some “Theodore of Studium”) says in his letter to St. Athanasius. For, as we have said, we adore the person represented in the picture by paying Him worshiping adoration as Christ, but we adore His picture, or icon, relatively on account of its reference to Him. Likewise as for the Saints and their relics, we adore them as servants and slaves of Christ with servile adoration, that is to say, with slavish adoration, or adoration befitting a slave (as adorer), and not a freeman, on account of familiarity or association with Christ. But as for their pictures, or icons, we adore these only relatively, on account of the reference which they bear to the persons themselves whom they are intended to represent to the eye, by reason of the likeness of their hypostasis, and by reason of the name inscribed upon them, or the title bestowed upon them, just as the above Synod held during the patriarchate of Nicholas decreed. Likewise, as for the Theotoke Herself, we adore Her with super-servile honor, on the ground that She is a superholy Mother of God; while, on the other hand, as regards Her icon, or picture, we accord it relative adoration (and see Dositheus, page 655 of the Dodecabilus). Note, however, that although it is said in Act 4 of the present Council (p. 780 of the 2nd vol. of the Con-

ciliar Records) that the precious icons are equivalent to the Gospel and to the precious Cross, in that all these things are adored with relative adoration, that is to say, yet, in spite of this, in order of adoration, the holy Gospel is the first to be adored (perhaps, as St. Chrysostom says, because the things said by the Saints are pictures of their souls: p. 852 of vol. II of the Conciliar Records; Act 6 of the 7th; and consequently because even the words of the holy Gospel are pictures of the soul and heart of the Lord — on which account they are entitled to first place); then comes the Cross; then the picture of Christ, the picture of the Theotoke, and following these the pictures of the Saints, as is made plain in the same Act, p. 779, from the speech delivered by St. Maximus, and generally speaking, the order of adoration of their pictures follows the order of the originals and of their merit, or worthiness to be honored. The holy icons are not adored on account of the material, but on account of the likeness which they possess to the ones pictured by them. Hence the Fathers of the present Council in some addresses said that when the wood forming the shape of the Cross in crucifixes becomes decomposed, it is to be burned; and when the paint and outlines of the pictures in the icons become utterly effaced — i.e., so as to be no longer recognizable — the wooden board left is burned as useless wood. Some persons, however, bury such icons out of reverence. It is not necessary to anoint the holy icons with myron (or chrism oil), nor to have them sanctified by the bishop with special prayers: 1) because we do not adore the holy icons because they are anointed or have had prayers said over them, but irrespectively, as soon as we lay eyes on a holy icon, without pausing to examine into the possibility of its having been anointed or having had a special prayer said over it, we at once proceed to pay adoration to it both on account of the name of the Saint and on account of the likeness it bears to the original. That is why in Act 6 of the present Council, the Council of the iconomachs in the reign of Copronymus disparaged the holy icons by asserting that the name of the pictures neither has any sacred prayer sanctifying it, in order that from what is common it might be transferred to what is holy, but that, on the contrary, it (sc. the picture) remains common and dishonorable (i.e., not entitled to honor), just as the painter made it. To these allegations the holy Seventh Council replied through Deacon Epiphanius, by asserting that it did not say that any special prayer is said over the icons, but said that like many other sacred objects they were incapable of receiving (benefit from) any special prayer, but, on the contrary from their very name they are replete with grace and sanctity, in the same way that the shape of the vivifying Cross is, which is entitled to veneration and adoration among us in spite of the fact that it is made without having any special prayer said over it; and we believe that with its shape alone we acquire sanctity, and with the adoration which we pay to it, and the marking of it upon our forehead, and the seal of it which is made in the air with the finger (note that in days of yore the sign of the Cross was not made with three fingers, as it is today, but with one finger alone, which fact is stated by St. Chrysostom in one of his discourses; and see concerning this the Footnote to c. XCI of Basil) in the hope of chasing away the demons. Likewise, in the same way that we have many sacred vessels, and kiss and embrace them fondly, and hope to receive sanctity from them, in spite of the fact that they have not had any special prayers said over them, so and in like manner by fondly kissing and embracing and paying honorary adoration to a holy icon that has not had special prayers said over it we partake of sanctity, and are anagogically lifted up and carried back to the honor of the original through the name of the icon. But if the iconomachs cannot assert that the sacred vessels are dishonorable and common because of their not having had any special prayers said over them for the purpose of sanctifying them, but are just as the weaver, the painter, and the goldsmith finished them, yet they regard them as holy and precious; in the same way they ought to regard the venerable icons as holy and precious and sacred even though they have not had any special prayers said over them to sanctify them (p. 844 of vol. II of the Conciliar Records). The holy icons do not need any special prayer or any application of myron (or chrism), because, according to Dositheus (p. 658 of the Dodecabilus) it is only the Papists (or Roman Catholics) that perpetrate the iniquity of qualifying pictures with certain prayers and devotions. For they boast that the Pope manufactures pictures from pure wax, holy oil, and water of sanctification, and that he reads marvelous prayers over them, and that because of these special features these pictures perform miracles (just as they lyingly state that Leo III sent such a picture to King Charles of France, and he revered it; and that Pope Urban sent another picture to John Paleologus, and this one was honored with a litany in the Church). Do you see that the prayer which is read over holy pictures is a Papal affair, and not Orthodox; and that it is a modern affair, and not an ancient one? For this reason no such prayer can be found anywhere in the ancient manuscript Euchologia. In fact, we have noticed that this prayer is not even found in Euchologia printed only a hundred years ago! 3) It becomes evident that holy icons do not need any special prayer or application of myron (i.e., holy oil), because the pictures painted on the walls of churches, and in their naves and in their aisles, and in general in streets and on doors, and on the sacred vessels, are never anointed with myron and never any special prayer said over them, and yet, in spite of this, adoration is paid to them relatively and honorarily by all on account of the likeness they bear to the originals. That is why the erudite Bishop of Campania Sir Theophilus the Saint did not conceal this truth, but stated in the book which he has just recently produced that the holy icons do not need any anointing with myron nor the saying of any special prayer by a bishop. We must note that since the present Council in the letter it is sending to the church of the Alexandrians pronounces blissful, or blesses, those who know and admit and recognize, and consequently also iconize and honor the visions and theophaniae of the Prophets, just as God Himself formed these and impressed them upon their mind, but anathematizes on the contrary those who refuse to accept and admit the pictorial representations of such visions before the Incarnation of the divine Logos (p. 905 of Vol. II of the Conciliar Records) it is to be inferred that even the beginningless Father ought to have His picture painted just as He appeared to Daniel the prophet as the Ancient of Days. Even though it be admitted as a fact that Pope Gregory in his letter to Leo the Isaurian (p. 712 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records) says that we do not blazon the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet it must be noted that he said this not simply, but in the sense that we do not paint Him in accordance with the divine nature; since it is impossible, he says, to blazon or paint God's nature. That is what the present Council is doing, and the entire Catholic Church; and not

that we do not paint Him as He appeared to the Prophet. For if we did not paint Him at all or portray Him in any manner at all to the eye, why should we be painting the Father as well as the Holy Spirit in the shape of Angels, of young men, just as they appeared to Abraham? Besides even if it be supposed that Gregory does say this, yet the opinion of a single Ecumenical Council attended and represented by a large number of individual men is to be preferred to the opinion of a single individual man. Then again, if it be considered that even the Holy Spirit ought to be painted in the shape of a dove, just as it actually appeared, we say that, in view of the fact that a certain Persian by the name of Xenaëas used to assert, among other things, that it is a matter of infantile knowledge (i.e., that it is a piece of infantile mentality or an act of childishness) for the Holy Spirit to be painted in a picture just as It appeared in the semblance of a dove, whereas, on the other hand, the holy and Ecumenical Seventh Council (Act 5, p. 819 of the second volume of the Conciliar Records) anathematized him along with other iconomachs, from this it may be concluded as a logical inference that according to the Seventh Ecum. Council It ought to be painted or depicted in icons and other pictures in the shape of a dove, as It appeared. This same view is confirmed also by Dositheus (p. 655 of the *Dodecabilus*). Plato the very learned Archbishop of Moscow notes in connection with the second commandment of the Decalogue in his *Orthodox Catechism* that one must not think one picture holier than another, nor expect more from one picture than from another, or place greater trust in one than in another. Dositheus, on the other hand, says (p. 658 of the *Dodecabilus*) that the holy icons perform miracles either because they have been painted by a certain Saint (but this view is not admitted by the majority of persons), or on account of some other cause (perhaps on account of the reverent state of mind of the persons paying it adoration) and divine economy; and that so far as concerns the fact that the Orthodox Christians are wont to engrave the frames of holy icons, or to hollow out the gold or silver that is in the icon, and thereinto to insert parts of precious wood (i.e., wood taken from the original cross on which Christ was crucified) or of holy relics, and to honor them conjointly and on a par with the icons, that is not prohibited. We ought to pay adoration to the holy icons with trembling, and ought to believe that the divine grace actually attends upon them, which imparts sanctity to us, according to Blastaris. But we ought to become worthy of the privilege of paying adoration to the holy icons, by keeping our five senses pure and clean, and thus acquire the right to pay adoration to them, according to Act 6 of this 7th Ec. C. As for those who only have the holy icons in order to enjoy the contemplation of them, and not in order to embrace and kiss them fondly, are half villains and specious liars, according to its Act 6. There are some six points or favoring circumstances to justify the practice of painting and paying adoration to holy icons: 1) the fact that they adorn and decorate the temples (i.e., church buildings); 2) the fact that they teach letters to those who do not know these, prophecies of Prophets, and struggles of Devouts (i.e., devout monks), and exploits of Martyrs, the sufferings and miracles of Christ, according to St. Nilus, in Act 4 of the 7th Ec. C.) 3) the fact that they remind lettered persons of things they may have forgotten. Hence the icons are called books of the learned and of the unlearned, as Dialogus says in his book to Secundus; 4) the fact that they increase the longing of Christians who see them; wherefore the Council declared that persons who behold them are led to elevate their minds to remembrance and longing directed towards their originals; 5) the fact that they incite beholders to imitate the works of Saints, according to St. Nilus, and St. Basil the Great in his *Encomium of Gordius*, and this 7th Ec. C.; 6) because they incite those beholding them to invoke, with faith and hope, on the one hand God as a Savior, and the Saints, on the other hand, as intercessors in communication with God, "in order that through their intercession He might be prevailed upon to grant them all requests for salvation." The iconomachs comprised not only those who became such in the immediate times of the iconomachic emperors, but also the Arians previously, and all the Monophysites subsequently, and nowadays all the Luthero-Calvinists. From what has been said it is shown that the Latins do wrong in failing to inscribe the names of all Saints upon their images (or icons), since according to the definitions arrived at by the present Council and stated in the form of decrees, a picture or icon resembles the original, though it is admittedly sanctified as much by the character as it is by the name of the one depicted. Divine Gregory of Thessalonica declares that the name of Jesus Christ ought to be inscribed even upon the unblazoned crucifixes which are implanted in streets or upon doors or in other places, in order that they may be known from the name to be the Cross on which Christ was crucified, and not either of the crosses on which the robbers were crucified along with Christ. It is also necessary that we add also this to the present Footnote, to wit, that those who carry the holy icons of certain Saints' feasts and festivals, and go about with them here and there, conducting themselves in a disorderly manner and leaping to and fro, like persons possessed with demons, and who pretend to foretell future events, and who pretend to reveal things hidden, and who make other false prophecies and divinations — those men, I say, ought to be most heavily canonized by the Confessors and holy Bishops, because they are renewing the superstitions of the Greeks and heathens, and they ought to be corrected by the holy and great Church of Christ with stern chastisements. As for the fact that the Holy Spirit is to be painted in the shape of a dove, that is proved even by this; to wit, the fact that the Fathers of this Council admitted the doves hung over baptismal fonts and sacrificial altars to be all right to serve as a type of the Holy Spirit. (Act 5, p. 830). As for the assertion made in the *Sacred Trumpet* (in the *Encomium of the Three Hierarchs*) to the effect that the Father ought not to be depicted in paintings and the like, according to Acts 4, 5, and 6 of the 7th Ecum. Council, we have read these particular Acts searchingly, but have found nothing of the kind, except only the statement that the nature of the Holy Trinity cannot be exhibited pictorially because of its being shapeless and invisible. We ought to know, though, that an unpainted crucifix is inferior to an icon of Christ. For St. Nicephorus says (in the ten chapters which he has written about the holy icons, extant in manuscripts) that while on the one hand by the icon of Christ we are paying adoration to Christ Himself, on the other hand by an unpainted crucifix we are not paying adoration to Christ, but to that original Cross on which Christ was crucified. This amounts to an assertion that through the crucifix we are paying adoration to the Cross. And we add the further observation here that since this holy and Ecumenical Council in many places declares that that which the Bible and the Gospel reveal by means of words, the painter repre-

sents by means of the icons: on this account painters ought to take great care to familiarize themselves first with what the Bible and the Gospel say, and then paint their icons in accordance with the Gospel and the Bible. Or, if they are not familiar with them, they ought to ask those who are familiar with them and who moreover are well educated, in order to learn what they say, and not go ahead and paint one thing instead of another, and that often contrary to the Gospel and most absurd on the whole. Just as it is, for instance, for them to paint the Lord as a beardless youth teaching in the Mid-Pentecost days, at a time when the Lord was then a full-grown man perfected after baptism. For them to paint Paul the Apostle at the Assumption, and at Pentecost, at a time when St. Paul had not become a disciple of Christ until after the Assumption and after Pentecost, and after the stoning of St. Stephen. For them to paint the Resurrection of Christ, not coming out of the sepulcher of Christ, and with the soldiers standing round the tomb and watching, and the Angel sitting on the rock, just as the Gospel says, but painting Christ, on the one hand, as descending into Hades, while Adam and Eve are being held by His hands, and on the other hand the gates and locks of Hades lie crushed to pieces; and with many dark demons lurking thereabouts, and all the fore-fathers and prophets — which things do not constitute a picture of the Resurrection, but a picture of the Lord's descent into Hades. The Resurrection and the Descent into Hades are very different things. For in the descent into Hades the Savior's soul had been separated from His body, and it was only His soul that descended into Hades, whereas His body lay dead in the tomb. In the Resurrection, on the other hand, His soul became united again with His body, and that is the Resurrection itself. In addition, they ought not to paint in the icon of Pentecost a human being underneath the Apostles and inscribe "World" on the picture of him; but, instead thereof, they ought to paint a picture of the prophet Joel saying: "*I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh*" (Joel 2:28), as seen in some old pictures. These and similar improprieties are ones which painters of icons are prone to commit as a result of ignorance and of bad use and wont. Accordingly, let these men take pains to rectify them, endeavoring further to become capable and good artists and painters, in order that the icons they paint may resemble the originals, just as this Council prescribes, and not be something bizarre and unlike.

²⁶⁵ Note here how respectable and reverend the divine Canons are. For this holy Council, by calling them "testimonies" and "justifications," and the like, dignifies these very same divine Canons with those titles and names with which the divinely inspired and holy Bible is dignified.

²⁶⁶ That is why Photius, in Title I, ch. 2, says that the third ordinance of Title II of the Novels invests the Canons of the seven Councils and their dogmas with the same authoritativeness as the divine Scriptures.

²⁶⁷ Note that the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite are confirmed as genuine by the present Ecumenical Council, and those who say that they are spurious or dubious are gagged. For this passage is taken from the first chapter of his ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*, just as is also that one which is cited in the following c. IV of the same Council, concerning Peter, which says: "Peter the coryphaean summit, of the Apostles," a phrase of the same Dionysius, taken from the third chapter of his *Divine Names*. Both these books, in fact, are the ones from which those incorrectly traduce the works of Dionysius draw the material of controversy. Not only this present Council, but indeed the Sixth Ecumenical confirms the writings of Dionysius, in its Act 6, in what it says concerning the Theandric activity, having taken this word from the saint's fourth letter to Caius. Yes, indeed, even the Council held in Rome in the time of Martin against the Monothelites; and Sophronius in the Council held in Jerusalem; and Andrew Cretes paraphrases the contents of the third chapter concerning Divine Names which relate to the dormition of the Theotoke; and divine Maximus comments upon him; and Damascus mentions him in his book I, ch. 12, of Dogmatics; and Pope Agatho in his fifteenth letter to Emperor Constantine. If, on the other hand, it be objected that the ancient Saints do not mention the writings of Dionysius, the reply to this is that they do so, according to Coresius; for they wanted to prove their own assertions by testimonies of the Bible alone. And notwithstanding that Peter Lancelius and Corderius, the Jesuits, prove that the assertion of St. Gregory the Theologian in his discourse on the Nativity of Christ that "which has been philosophically expressed, in the finest and most sublime manner, by someone before us," was said with reference to Dionysius the Areopagite's interpretation of the Hymn of the Seraphim, who lived before St. Gregory, and not with reference to St. Athanasius, as Nicetas says: for St. Athanasius was alive when St. Gregory lived, and not before him. We could adduce here the justifications of the controverters, and prove them incorrect, but we have deemed it superfluous, since two Ecumenical (and two regional) Councils, and so many other Saints, are sufficient to counterbalance many myriads of controverters.

²⁶⁸ Novel 123 of Justinian, too, commands that a person intending to become a prelate be taught the divine Scriptures and the sacred Canons for three months; and that anyone who has not been ordained in such a manner be deposed from office, and that the one who ordained him be suspended; since it is a shameful and illogical thing for one who ought to teach others to be taught by others after his ordination. But see also (page 440 of *Jus Graeco-Romanum*) where after the Creed (or Symbol of the Faith) every bishop at the time of his ordination utters also the following commitment: "In addition I accept the seven holy and Ecumenical Councils which convened for the purpose of safeguarding the venerable dogmas, solemnly promising to recognize and keep the Canons decreed by them, and all the holy ordinances that have been formulated at various times by our sacred Fathers, accepting all which they accept and rejecting all that they reject."

²⁶⁹ In other manuscripts it says "*idian empatheian*," i.e., private animus.

²⁷⁰ As for this saying, St. Paul in the Acts says that the Lord said it. But a certain bishop of Soule named Euthalius, a contemporary of St. Athanasius the Great, asserts that St. Paul took it from the Injunctions of the Apostles. For this saying is found in the third chapter of the fourth book of the Injunctions. But even there it is stated that the Lord said it; and see the preamble to the same Injunctions.

²⁷¹ Metrophanes, bishop of Smyrna, in interpreting the Epistles General, says that a sin unto death, concerning which St. John says, "*there is a sin unto death, and there is a sin not unto death,*" (1 John 5:16), is every sin that used to be punished by the old Law with the death penalty, as was, for instance, blasphemy against God, willful murder, bestiality, adultery, and the other crimes designated as felonies. A sin not unto death is one that was not punished with the death penalty, like involuntary homicide and other crimes. Anastasius the Sinaite (Question 54) says that a sin unto death is one committed knowingly, whereas one not unto death is one committed unwittingly. Thus, blasphemy against God is unto death, but so is also any great sin, such as murder, adultery, etc., since these crimes put the soul to death. But the present Council calls the sin of a person that is incorrigible and impenitent a sin unto death. In agreement with this Council Ecumenius too says that a sin unto death is one that is not corrected by a return, such as the sin of Judas, and that of the rancorous, concerning whom it is said that "the ways of the rancorous lead unto death" (Prov. 12:28). See also the Footnote to the third chapter of instruction for the confessor, which by the grace of Christ has now been reprinted recently (in Greek).

²⁷² As concerns the unwritten traditions see cc. XCI and XCII of Basil.

²⁷³ The relics of martyrs are deposited in the following fashion, according to the ordinance of the old Euchologion. After the ceremony of consecration, or, in other words, of enthroning the temple, the bishop takes three portions of relics of martyrs, and, having put them in a case and having poured holy chrism over them, he shuts the case. And if the Holy Table rests upon legs, he conceals the case on the floor underneath the legs that face the east. (Some persons, however, to enhance the solemnity, assert that the case containing the relics of martyrs ought to be placed, not upon the floor, but in one of the legs facing the east, if, that is to say, the portions of the relics are small; but if they are large pieces, they are concealed in the floor.) If, on the other hand, the Table is supported by a single post or pedestal, the case is to be deposited in the post or pedestal, and upon the latter is then placed the Holy Table. Four things are worthy of note in connection with the present matter of dedication ceremonies.

1) The fact that the dedication ceremonies of every church building must be performed by a prelate in accordance with the ordinance and representation in the Euchologion. Hence, though in many regions the prelates allow others to perform the dedication ceremonies connected with the consecration of church buildings, as, in fact, in Moscow the prelates allow archimandrites to dedicate divine temples, this, I say, is done in violation of the ordinance in the Euchologion. For everywhere both the Euchologion and Symeon (archbishop) of Thessalonica, whenever they mention the subject of dedication, specify a prelate or bishop, and not a mere priest. As for a small dedication, it is neither mentioned in the Euchologion nor known in Moscow at all what it is. It appears to be a later invention.

2) The fact that the relics that are to be collected as treasure ought to be relics of martyrs, and not of devout persons or of hierarchs. For this reason the practice followed in Moscow is to be praised. For there the relics of martyrs are kept in the archbishopric; and whenever there is need of dedicating any temple, the prelate alone takes them from there, in order to prevent the occurrence of any mistake whereby instead of relics of martyrs, either common relics or other holy relics, and not those of martyrs, might be treasured up as such. Some authors would have also relics of devout martyrs and of sacred martyrs, notwithstanding that the Euchologion does not specify these.

3) The fact that these relics of martyrs must be treasured up underneath the Holy Table, and not in any other place or part of the temple, in order that that saying may be fulfilled which says: "A divine chorus of Martyrs is the basis of the Church." All those who put them in any other place or part of the building, are sinning abominably.

4) And last, the fact that in the case of the dedication of every church building, whether it be a small one or a large one, there must of necessity and indispensably be relics of martyrs treasured up underneath the Holy Table. Hence all prelates who perform great dedications, and all prelates who perform so called small and shorter dedications without relics of martyrs, must be purified, in accordance with the prescription of the present Canon. For it must be noted that the structural and essential difference between dedications of temples is the arrangement by which relics of martyrs are treasured up in them; accordingly, without these no dedication is possible. Antimensia, on the other hand, because of their possessing a sanctifying power, which is conferred upon them by the consecration of some temple, and the ceremony of prayers said on the occasion of the consecration, and further the seven days' sacred rite carried out in the Table of the consecrated temple, supply the place of the consecrated Holy Table. For it is on this account, too, that these are given freely wherever there is need of them, and they are not restricted to that parish alone where they were consecrated, just as the holy chrism, or myron, and other holy things are not restricted, but are placed upon those Tables which have not been consecrated, according to the first Reply of Peter, and according to Manuel Charitopoulos the patriarch (page 239 of Jus Graeco-Romanum). For, according to Balsamon, these things are sufficient to serve instead of a consecration, or what is called an enthronement, and instead of the opening of the doors, that is to say, of the temple, which is something that occurs whenever the dedication ceremonies of any temple are performed, the doors being thrown wide open and the hymn being chanted which begins with the words "Lift high the gates, ye who are our rulers," etc. Never-

theless, in order to supply the place of a consecrated Table truly and exactly, the sanctification of all the other things is not enough alone to consecrate it, without relics of martyrs being treasured up in it. In the same way, too, in the case of antimensia used instead of Holy Tables, the sanctifying power residing in them is not sufficient alone on the occasion of the dedication of a temple unless they have relics of martyrs sewed up with them. That is why the ordinance in the Euchologion applying to consecration of antimensia prescribes that these are to be consecrated by means of relics of martyrs. Besides, even in Moscow antimensia are never used unless they contain holy relics, as we said in the Footnote to c. XXXI of the 6th. Note, however, also this fact that according to John (bishop) of Kitros without the consecration of a new temple there is no other way whatever in which antimensia can be made (p. 331 of *Jus Graeco-Romanum*). Symeon of Thessalonica (ch. 127, p. 226) says that if there be need of antimensia, and there has been no consecration, the antimensia are spread over a sacred Table, and the formality of their consecration can be utilized (just as the consecration of antimensia, that is to say, is described in the Euchologion with reference to the consecration of a temple). The same author says also that two other pieces of cloth of the size of antimensia must be sewn together with the antimensia: one by way of representing the flesh, as in the Table, in the place of the sheet; the other by way of a table-cover, in honor of the fact that it is to serve as a throne of God; in the middle of this scrolls are to be sewn together. Likewise portions of relics are to be sewn together, too, in a small piece of linen cloth; and everything is to be done in them that is done in the divine consecrated Table and in the same manner exactly. The same author adds (*ibidem*) that the formality of this consecration is carried out *par excellence* by a prelate, but if necessary it may be carried out even by a reverent priest who is experienced at the instance and with the permission of a prelate. Balsamon, furthermore, says that a prelate ought not to officiate in an undedicated temple, but only in one that has been duly dedicated and provided with a throne, so that there will be a throne in it on which he can sit enthroned while reading the Apostle (i.e., the Epistle). But as a certain prelate officiated in such a temple in the time of Luke the patriarch, though others said for him to be deposed from office, patriarch Luke himself ruled that he should be chastised with a different chastisement to be decided upon by the Synod as reasonable. John of Kitros says further, in his c. IX, that corpses ought not to be buried in the same consecrated church as relics of martyrs. Balsamon also says this same thing in Reply 38 (p. 382 of *Jus Graeco-Romanum*).

²⁷⁴ Socrates, in the seventh book of his Ecclesiastical History, narrates that a Jew feigning piety had himself baptized many times as a trade, so that in this way he made a lot of money. But, while going from one heresy to another, at last he came to Paul the bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople, pretending that he wished to become a Christian really and to perfection. So, the necessary water having been put into the font, when the Jew entered it to be baptized, wonderful to relate! the baptismal font dried up. Those present marveled at the occurrence, and, after stopping all the holes that afforded some suspicion, they filled the font again. Yet, when the Jew entered it again, the water vanished instantly and completely; and all the persons there were amazed. This miracle appears to have occurred either on account of the hypocritical faith in which the capricious Jew had sought to be baptized, and consequently it teaches bishops and priests not to admit a Jew easily into Orthodoxy, but only after a long time and trial; or else on account of the unlawful multiplication of baptism.

²⁷⁵ It is found worded “things of God” in other manuscripts.

²⁷⁶ The reason why the Canon does not want things of the churches or monasteries to be sold to civil rulers, but only to clergymen or farmers, it seems to me, is this: These things have been consecrated to God, and whatever has been consecrated is also called sacred and churchly. In respect, then, that they are sacred, they ought to be given to priests and men consecrated to God, such as clergymen are; while in respect, on the other hand, that they are churchly, they ought to be given to “churchly,” or poor, men, such as farmers are. Hence such giving is analogous with the “takers,” or recipients, just as, on the contrary, were they to be given to civil rulers, the transfer would be altogether unbecoming, both on the score of their not being sacred persons, and on the score of their not being poor or “churchly” persons. But perhaps the Canon says that these things may be sold only to farmers and poor persons, in order that the church or monastery, as the case may be, may buy them back from them in case it should hereafter find the means of doing so, which it could not easily do if they were sold to rich persons. Note, however, that according to law and Blastaris, what is called the “disposal” of anything is the transfer of real or personal property to another owner or landlord that is made either as a gift or as a sale or by implantation or by exchange, or in any other similar way — which amounts to saying, when the property is completely alienated and given to another. What is called “letting out” is when anything is given, not completely and forever, but only for a time to certain persons. Letting out, however, is also improperly called disposal, and conversely, disposal is also improperly called letting out; just as this Canon has taken the terms letting out and disposal in the second sense. Notwithstanding, though, that present Canon does say that things belonging to churches or monasteries must not be alienated, Novel 120 of Justinian decrees that even fruit-bearing real estate belonging to churches or monasteries may be sold when there happens to be need of giving the proceeds for the liberation of Orthodox captives. See also the Footnotes to Ap. c. LXXII and c. XXIV of the 4th.

²⁷⁷ Canon VI of St. Nicephorus allows such a Presbyter-Abbot to ordain also a Sub-deacon. But the divine laws of Orthodox emperors, supplementing the sacred Canons in this regard, add directions how an Abbot is to be made. Or, at any rate, they state that a Bishop must not make an Abbot in monasteries according to rank, but must make that one whom either all the monks themselves, or at least the most virtuous ones, choose by confessing on pain of their con-

science that they are choosing him not as a matter of friendship or favor, but because they know him to be orthodox and sober (i.e., sensible or sane) and well fitted to govern the monks and the monasteries well. This same rule is to hold good also in the case of the Abbess of a nunnery.

²⁷⁸ The word “frippersy” properly signifies any vain and unseasonable thing. The corresponding Greek noun (*perpereia*) is derived from the brothers of the Cecropides, who were named Perperi, who labored vainly and unseasonably, while loving unworthy persons (according to Dositheus in his *Dodecabiblus*, p. 514). That explains why the Apostle said, “*Love is not addicted to frippersy*” (1 Cor. 13:4. *Note of Translator*. — This sentence is mistranslated in the A.V. “charity vaunteth not itself,” while in the R.V. only the word “charity” has been corrected to “love,” leaving the incorrect “vaunteth not itself” stand as in the A.V., in proof of the fact that the translators could not understand the Greek word at all and were only guessing at its meaning. The Douay Version of the Roman Catholics is worse yet: it says, “charity dealeth not perversely.” I have taken pains to translate the Greek word *perperevetai* here by its nearest English equivalent simply because it serves to show how ineptly the Scriptures have been translated into English by men unfamiliar with the Greek tongue, which to them is practically a puzzle), or, in other words, it does nothing in vain. Taken in a broader sense, however, the noun *perpereia* (like the corresponding English noun *frippersy*) denotes vainglory and ostentation.

²⁷⁹ For the Bible prohibits the weaving together of different kinds and different colors of threads in one and the same fabric, where it says: “*Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woolen and linen goods together*” (Deut. 22:11), in expounding which divine Isidorus the Pelousiote says that Moses would not let even linen garments be interwoven with purple and scarlet, thus inciting his subjects to philosophy, and banning them every luxury. For by prohibiting the interweaving of wool and linen he precluded the manufacture of garments parti-colored or variegated with interwoven threads of different materials. By not allowing purple and scarlet threads to be woven with linen clothes he prohibited all luxuriousness and adornment of garments. And if God forbids these things to secular Jews, how much more He forbids them to Christians, and especially to His Prelates and Priests! But if these things are forbidden to Prelates and Priests and Clerics, how much more they are forbidden to monks and caloyers, all of whom have renounced the world and all its fantasy. Hence the garments worn by some monks today, which are embellished with more adornment than is to be found even among laymen, are indeed a veritable abomination.

²⁸⁰ It is for this reason, too, that St. Basil the Great says (in his Ascetic Ordinance 10) that if any ascetic or caloger would like to become a cleric and be admitted to holy orders, or craves to become an abbot and the protector of others, he is ailing with a diabolical disease and is liable to the charge of philarchy (i.e., a penchant for ruling Others).

²⁸¹ I found a note to the present Canon (apparently due to Zonaras) asking why c. II of the 4th decisively decrees that anyone who ordains or nominates a person for money shall be deposed from office, whereas this Canon says that he must either cease doing so or be deposed from office. He then proceeds to solve the perplexity, and says that the canon of the 4th is speaking of those who ordain others for money; this canon, on the other hand, is speaking not of those who ordain others, but of those who admit others to the clergy, which is tantamount to saying, of those who for money consent to enroll among the clergy of any particular church persons who have already previously been ordained and are clerics, on which account too it has prescribed a lighter penalty. It becomes plain that this solution is correct also from the assertion in the Canon. For it says that if the person doing this is one on the sacred list, he is to be deposed from office, but a priest in general ordains no one a cleric. Note, however, that according to this Canon those coenobiarchs and abbots ought to be driven away from their monasteries who today are trying to possess themselves of money and who admit those persons who apply to them with money, but without money refuse to admit them into the monastery.

²⁸² From the present Canon it becomes plain that even a monk who is not in holy orders may be made the abbot of a monastery, provided he is sensible and prudent and worthy of the abbotship.

²⁸³ For this reason the second ordinance of Title I of the Novels decrees that if a monk leaves one monastery and goes to another, his belongings must remain in the first monastery. And the thirty-eighth ordinance of Title II of Book I of the Code says that those who leave their own monastery are not to take the personal property which they brought there, no matter how great the quantity of it may be even though no consecratory document concerning them was made out (Photius, Title XI, ch. 4). But even real estate that anyone consecrates must remain with the monastery. For even the land which Ananias and Sapphira his wife consecrated to God was real estate. On account, however, of the fact that he kept back part of the price for which he sold it, thus becoming guilty of theft, he was condemned to an exquisite death (Acts, ch. 5).

²⁸⁴ He cannot, however, recover it by himself, on the ground of its having been consecrated to God, and again consecrate to another monastery.

²⁸⁵ In other manuscripts there is included the addition “and let him depart quickly.”

²⁸⁶ This same Basil the Great in his *Definitions in Extensa*, No. 33, says that “in the conversations which monks have to have with nuns, the persons who are to hold the conversation ought to be chosen, as well as a suitable time and place; and it is necessary that everything be decent and modest, and above suspicion. So the persons who are to speak together, so far as respects the monks, ought to be the oldest ones and modest, and reverent, and sage enough to ask every question and to give a reply; as respects the nuns, on the other hand, likewise the oldest and sagest of them ought to be chosen. But when they are conversing two or three monks as well as two or three nuns ought to be together. For two are better than one, and more credible as witnesses. One person representing one side, and one person representing the other side must not hold a conversation alone, both on account of the suspicion that may arise therefrom, and because neither one is credible as a witness to what was said, or even to corroborate each other. As for any other brethren that may need to converse with any nun, let them not converse with her directly themselves, but only through the medium of the more aged ones; and let chosen monks offer those things which they wish to speak about to those chosen and more aged nuns, and let these in turn tell the things to the sisters they have sought to communicate with. Moreover, even those monks who take the necessities to the nuns and perform services, ought to be tried and tested men and modest and well advanced in age, so as not to rouse any bad suspicion whatever. This same thing is decreed by him also in his *Epitomized Definitions*, No. 220. In his *Epitomized Def.* No. 281, on the other hand, he decrees that if two monasteries are closely adjacent to each other, and one of them is poor while the other has the means, the one having the means of managing to help the poor one, as having an obligation, ought to lay down or risk its soul in behalf of the other, in accordance with commandment. But if, nevertheless, it fails to do so, the one which is poor ought to be longsuffering, and, imitating Lazarus, it ought to rejoice in the hope which lies in the future age, on account of this poverty, as the sole comfort and joy remaining available to them. In agreement with what was said above by Basil the Great with reference to the more aged monks who have to render services to the nuns, St. Nicephorus also decrees something. For he says in his c. XXII that if a presbyter-monk — that is to say, a monk-priest, or hieromonach — who is young performs services for nuns, one ought not to partake of the Mysteries from him, in order, as it appears, to be shamed by this and be corrected. And see also the three Canons of John the Faster found later, and the Footnote to the same c. XXII of Nicephorus.

²⁸⁷ Just as Basil the Great cites this passage in regard to such a matter also in his discourse on Virginity.

²⁸⁸ The imperial laws also decree the following supplementary provision: that parents may not take those children of theirs away from monasteries who have chosen the monastic life, but must nevertheless bestow upon them whatever legacy belongs to them, even though any cause (i.e., blame or accusation) had been incurred by them previous to their becoming monks (or nuns). Read also the testimony of St. Chrysostom in the Footnote to c. XV of Gangra.

²⁸⁹ In view of the fact that the present Canon was set forth and promulgated in. an indefinite manner, without exhibiting the reasons on account of which one may depart from his monastery, after doing as much research as we could, we discovered the following reasons, to wit: 1) a monk may depart from his monastery if the abbot is a heretic, according to c. XVII of Nicephorus; 2) if women enter the monastery, according to the same c. of Nicephorus; 3) if worldly children are being taught letters in the monastery; since through these children whatever occurs in the monastery becomes published abroad, according to the same Canon of Nicephorus — add also that it is on account of the scandal arising therefrom. But Basil the Great (see his *Def. in Ext.*, No. 36) allows a monk to depart from his monastery only for one reason, which is to say, if he has any psychical injury which, he says, he ought first to reveal to those possessing the power or ability to correct it, and if they fail to correct, then he is to separate, no longer as from brethren, but as from strangers. But if any monk on account of the unsettled condition and frivolity of his mind, and not, that is to say, on account of any injury, departs from his monastery, he must either cure this illness and unsettled condition, by persisting in the monastery, or, if he is unwilling to be cured in this manner, he is to be refused admittance to any other monastery. Another reasonable cause for separation and departure, however, is mentioned by the same Saint: reason and teaching will admit no excuse other than injury of the soul — that is to say, the reason we have mentioned (but if on account of the Lord's commandment another brother goes to another place, these brethren are not separating from each other, but, on the contrary, they are fulfilling an economy). In agreement with divine Basil c. VI of Nicephorus also decrees that if anyone is injured psychically, he ought to tell about his injury to the prior, and if he fails to correct it, yet the danger is evident, let him depart from the monastery. Even though the abbot places him under bond not to depart, he must pay no attention to this bond, but must depart anyhow. Some authorities also add another reasonable cause for departure, viz., if at any time any obedientiary and coenobite should prove worthy for quietude; for then and in that case he may leave with the permission of the abbot, in order that he may converse with God alone all by himself, in accordance with what John of the Climax says (in his discourse concerning obedience). Nevertheless, close attention must be paid to this point, since it is not for every monk that departure and quietude are possible. So much for voluntary departure. For against his will and involuntarily even an abbot may be driven from his monastery and shut up in another if he accepts money for admitting those who intend to betake themselves to a monastic life, according to c. XIX of the present C. And one who is tonsured without a sponsor is sent to another monastery, according to c. II of the 1st-&-2nd; and one who is tonsured without first undergoing three years' trial and test, according to c. V of the same. And with the object of improvement and correction, a prelate may transfer virtuous monks, according to c. IV of the same.

²⁹⁰ In other manuscripts it reads "God-fearing," which appears to be more correct.

²⁹¹ In other manuscripts it says in addition, "only let it be done with reverence," as Zonaras also interprets it.