

HYPATIUS OF EPHEBUS

A NOTE ON IMAGE WORSHIP IN THE SIXTH CENTURY *

In a recent article Professor Norman H. Baynes discussed the evidence for opposition to religious art prior to the outbreak of the Iconoclastic Controversy.¹ In the course of his illuminating article, he called attention to an important fragment of patristic literature which was first published in recent years and which but for Professor Baynes might have remained unnoticed. It is an excerpt taken from the Miscellaneous Enquiries (*Συμμικτὰ Ζητήματα*) by Hypatius of Ephesus, who was archbishop of this most important see from 531 to about 538 and in addition one of Justinian's most trusted theological advisers.² Professor Baynes used the text to illustrate the fact that prior to the Iconoclastic Controversy "any general cult of the icons in such extreme forms as later appears in the apologies of the iconodules would seem dangerous and a wrongful use of a practice which was tolerated only in the interest of the weaker members of the church." (p. 95). The text, however, is

* Professor Ernst Kantorowicz, of the Institute for Advanced Study, has kindly read the typescript of this article and discussed it with the writer. He has made several important suggestions for which I wish to thank him in this place. The author is also grateful to Professor A. D. Nock for several helpful suggestions. The article was written while the author was a fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and a member of the Institute for Advanced Study.

¹ Baynes, Norman H., "The Icons before Iconoclasm," *Harvard Theological Review* XLIV (1951), 93-106, esp. 93-95.

² Ed. Diekamp, Franz, "Analecta Patristica etc.," in *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* CXVII (1938), pp. 127-129 (text), pp. 118-120 (commentary). The edition is based on Paris. gr. 1115, ff. 254^v-255^r, written A.D. 1276. The ms. is interesting from the paleographical point of view. It contains a collection of dogmatic florilegia. In the colophon the thirteenth century scribe states that it was copied from a codex "found in the old library of the Holy Church of the Older Rome, which codex was itself written in the year 6267" (=759 A.D.). On this ms. see Melioranski, B. M., *Georgii Kiprianin i Ioann Ierusalimlianin etc.*, in *Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskago fakulteta imperatorskago S.-Peterburgskago universiteta* LIX (1901), pp. 78ff. and Schermann, Theodor, *Die Geschichte der dogmatischen Florilegien etc.*, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N.F. XIII (1904), 6-10, with the corrections made by Fr. Diekamp in his review of Schermann's book (*Theologische Revue* IV [1905], 445-450) and in Diekamp's edition of the *Doctrina Patrum* (Münster i. W., 1907), p. xx. In his review (col. 449) Diekamp cautions us, rightly, against accepting the evidence of the colophon at face value. Yet for the part of the ms. which interests us here only extraordinary circumstances, such as provenance from an outlying region, could account for the fact that a thirteenth century ms. preserves a passage in favor of image worship which had escaped all the iconophile writers during the one hundred and twenty-odd years of the Iconoclastic Controversy. In P.G. CIX 499-516 (=P.G. XCVI 1347-1362) an *Invektiva contra Haereticos* was edited from this codex, see (Combes's?) *prolusio*.

also important from other points of view. Since it is difficult Greek and since the trend of Hypatius' thought, though entirely logical, may not be clear at first sight, it is advisable to submit here a translation of the document, accompanied by explanatory notes. The writer gratefully acknowledges that he owes much to Diekamp and Baynes for an understanding of the document.

"Hypatius archbishop of Ephesus, from the *Miscellaneous Enquiries* addressed to Julian bishop of Atramytiun, Book One, Chapter Five, concerning the objects in sacred buildings.³

You say that those who set up in the sanctuaries what is revered and worshipped, in the form of paintings and carvings alike, are once again disturbing divine tradition.⁴ And you say that you understand clearly that the Sayings [of the Bible]⁵ prohibit this, that is, they prohibit not only to make [carvings] but even ordain that they be destroyed⁶ once they are coming or have come into existence.

We must examine why the Sayings state this, and at the same time consider for what purpose the sacred objects⁷ are moulded in the way in which they [actually] are. For inasmuch as certain people believed that, as Holy Scripture says, "the divine nature is like gold or silver or stone or the imprint of the art of man,"⁸ and improvised in accordance with their view material gods and "worshipped what he had created, instead of the Creator,"⁹ it is said: "Tear down their altars"¹⁰ and "cut down,"¹¹ and "the carved images of their gods you must burn up,"¹² and "watch your souls well (since you knew no likeness on the day when the Lord spoke to you at Mount Horeb out of the fire), that you do not act perniciously by carving an image for yourselves."¹³ For no existing thing is like or identical or the same as the good and divine Trinity which transcends all existing things and is the creator and cause of all existing things, for it is said

³ *περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις οἰκοῖς*. The term "church" is not used at all in our fragment. Instead we find everywhere, except in the title, τὰ ἱερὰ, which I translate "sanctuaries." Are the ἀγιοὶ οἰκοὶ churches, or sacred buildings of a more general or more specialized character? The term occurs, in the sense of "church building," in a fragment attributed, perhaps wrongly, to St. Epiphanius, see Georg Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Breslau, 1929, pp. 67 ff. (frg. III 6, p. 68).

⁴ *παρακινεῖν δὲ αὐτὸς φῆς τὴν θείαν παράδοσιν τοὺς ὁμοίως τὰ σεπτὰ καὶ προσκυνητὰ γραφαῖς ἢ γλυφαῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνατιθέντας*. Julian says that this is done "once again" (αὐθὶς) because it had been done a first time by the pagans.

⁵ Ex. 20:4-5 and similar passages. [In my translation, I have used as basis for the rendering of biblical passages the Chicago translation, but adjusted it where the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew or where Hypatius, who is quoting from memory, differs from the text of the Greek Bible. The biblical passages have been identified by Diekamp.]

⁶ Reading *καθαίρειν* (for *καθαίρειν*). Cf. Diekamp p. 118 ". . . die vorhandenen zu zerstören befehle."

⁷ Here τὰ ἱερὰ does not mean "sanctuaries" but "sacred objects." Cf. note 3.

⁸ Acts 17:29.

⁹ Romans 17:25.

¹⁰ Deut. 7:5.

¹¹ Deut. 7:25.

¹² Deut. 7:25.

¹³ Deut. 4:15-16.

“who is like thee?”¹⁴ and we hear the divines sing “who will be likened to Thee?”¹⁵

But since this is so, you say: We allow the paintings to be worshipped in the sanctuaries but we who often prohibit carvings in wood and stone do not allow this [sculpture] either to be sinless [i.e. like paintings] except on the doors.¹⁶

Yet, oh beloved and holy man,¹⁷ we own and record that, whatever the divine essence be, it is not like, or identical with, or the same as any of the existing things. We ordain that the unspeakable and incomprehensible love of God for us men and the sacred patterns set by the Saints be celebrated in holy writings¹⁸ since so far as we are concerned we take no pleasure at all in sculpture or painting. But we permit simpler people, as they are less perfect, to learn by way of initiation about such things by [the sense of] sight which is more appropriate to their natural development, especially as we find that, often and in many respects, even old and new divine commandments lower themselves to the level of weaker people and their souls for the sake of their salvation.¹⁹ Indeed even the holy priest Moses, who issued these laws on God’s prompting, sets up, in the Holiest of Holies, golden images of the Cherubim in beaten work.²⁰ And in many other instances we see

¹⁴ Ps. 70:19 (Sept.).

¹⁵ Ps. 82:2 (Sept.).

¹⁶ This is a difficult and important sentence: ἀλλὰ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων φῆς· προσκυνητὰς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐῶμεν εἶναι γραφάς, ἐπὶ ξύλου δὲ καὶ λίθου πολλάκις οἱ τὰ τῆς γλυφῆς ἀπαγορεύοντες οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀπλημελὲς ἐῶμεν, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ θυραῖς. Diekamp, p. 118 comments: “Das . . . Fragment . . . handelt . . . von den heiligen Gemälden und Skulpturen in den Gotteshäusern. Der Bischof Julian hatte das Bedenken, das Anbringen solcher Bildwerke [I suppose Diekamp means: of sacred paintings and sculptures] in den Kirchen sei gegen die Überlieferung und gegen die heilige Schrift. . . . Höchstens auf den Türvorhängen will er Malereien zulassen, nicht auf Holz oder Stein, auch keine Skulpturen.” According to Baynes, p. 94, Julian “will allow representations (γραφάς) in the churches but none on wood or stone and no sculpture. These γραφαί may be on the door-curtains (ἐπὶ θυραῖς: I suppose this is how the words must be translated), but no more is permissible.” But clearly Julian distinguished paintings (γραφαί) from carvings (τὰ τῆς γλυφῆς). He does not prohibit the paintings, although his approval seems somewhat grudging (ἐῶμεν); he merely objects to those who set up “what is revered and worshipped in the form of paintings and carvings equally” (above note 4). The ἐπὶ θυραῖς must therefore refer to sculptural decoration of the doors, not to door-curtains. The οὐδὲ τοῦτο I take to mean that Julian permits paintings, but he will not in addition approve of carved works.

¹⁷ The ms. reads ὀφείλη καὶ ἡ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ. Diekamp proposes ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ which seems unnecessarily violent. I suggest: ὦ φίλη καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ.

¹⁸ The text is corrupt. The ms. reads: τὴν ἄρρητον δὲ καὶ ἀπερίληπτον εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνας ἐν γράμμασι μὲν ἡμεῖς ἱεροῖς ἀνευφημῆσθαι διατυπούμεν κτλ. Diekamp emends τοὺς ἱεροὺς into τὰς ἱερὰς. Professor Kantorowicz calls my attention to the use of εἰκών in the sense of “example” or “pattern.” In fact, Liddell and Scott, *verbo eikῶn*, refers to [Timaeus Locrus] *De Anima Mundi et Naturae*, ed. C. F. Hermann, 99D where the demiurge creates mortal beings ἐν ᾗ τέλος ποτὶ τὰν εἰκόνα παντελῶς ἀπειργασμένος (sc. ὁ κόσμος) and where εἰκών is used in the sense of “archetype” or “pattern.” Baynes (p. 94) takes the γράμματα ἱερὰ to be “sacred representations.” But Hypatius uses γραφαί in the sense of “paintings” and γράμμα in the sense of “writing.”

¹⁹ A difficult phrase: καὶ αὐτὰς πολλάκις καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς τὰς θείας παλαιὰς τε καὶ νέας διατάξεις εὐρόντες τοῖς ἀσθενέσι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας αὐτῶν συγκατακλινομένας. (I have translated the last word in the light of κατακλίεται p. 128:19 = Diekamp.) Yet the sense is clear from the illustrations which follow in the text.

²⁰ Exodus 25:18. Should we write τορευτὰς (for τορευτὰς)?

the divine wisdom in saving love of men sometimes remit the strictness for those souls which still need guidance. And for this reason it is said that even magi were led to Christ by a star of heaven at the time of His earthly birth.²¹ [Scripture] leads Israel away from sacrifices to the idols but allows them to make these [sacrifices] to God.²² And it names a certain "Queen of the Heavens"²³ although there exists no other king except Him who truly is king of kings in heaven and on earth. But it also mentions stars and uses pagan Greek language [as well as concepts],²⁴ calling some of them Pleiad and Bear and Orion,²⁵ but it does not lower itself to any of the myths and stories told about them by the Greeks, since it knows well and sings the praise of Him who "numbers the multitude of the stars and gives names to all of them."²⁶ It teaches those who cannot otherwise learn them, the same stars with the help of the nomenclature which they know and use. For these reasons we, too, allow even material adornment in the sanctuaries, not because we believe that God considers gold and silver and silken vestments and gem-studded vessels venerable and sacred but because we permit each order of the faithful to be guided and led up to the divine being in a manner appropriate to it [the order] because we think that some people are guided even by these [gold, silver, etc.] towards the intelligible beauty and from the abundant light in the sanctuaries to the intelligible and immaterial light.²⁷

And yet some who have pondered about the higher life have held that "in every place" spiritual worship should be offered to God and that holy souls are the temples of God.²⁸ For the Sayings are said to speak thus: ²⁹ "I want the men in every place to offer prayer lifting to heaven hands that are holy,"³⁰ and "Bless the Lord in every place of his dominion,"³¹ and it is said: "The heavens are my throne, and the earth is my footstool,"³² and "What house can you build for me?"

²¹ Matthew 2:9.

²² Exodus 34:13; Leviticus 1-7. The ms. reads: τὸν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπάγει μὲν θυσίων εἰδώλων, ἐνδίδωσι δὲ ταύτας τῷ θεῷ θύειν. I see no reason to emend, with Diekamp, ταύτας τοῦτα. It refers to θυσίων.

²³ Jeremiah 51:17 (Sept.).

²⁴ συνεξελληνίζουσα τῇ φωνῇ. There is, of course, here the ambiguity of the word "Hellen" which means "Greek" as well as "pagan."

²⁵ Job 9:9; 38:31.

²⁶ Ps. 146:4 (Sept.).

²⁷ ὡς τινων καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων ἐπὶ τὴν νοητὴν εὐπρέπειαν χειραγωγουμένων καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ ἱερὰ πολλοῦ φωτὸς ἐπὶ τὸ νοητὸν καὶ αἴλλον φῶς. I have discussed the meaning of the last sentence at some length with Professor Kantorowicz. It represents, as it were, the application of what precedes. Just as Scripture had made certain concessions to the uneducated, so the clergy ("we") has permitted the adornment of the Churches with all kinds of beautiful objects.

²⁸ καίτοι γέ τισι τῶν τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν ζωὴν φιλοσοφησάντων καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τὴν ἐν πνεύματι λατρίαν θεῷ προσάγειν ἔδοξε καὶ ναοὺς εἶναι θεοῦ τὰς δόσις ψυχάς. This is a reference to the famous argument, repeated by many theologians since the days of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, that the only true image of Christ is the virtuous (just, pious, etc.) soul. I intend to deal with it in a larger context. For the moment I merely refer to the stimulating article by Florovsky, George, "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," Church History XIX (1950) 3-22, esp. p. 17 f.

²⁹ φησιν εἰρηκέναι τὰ λόγια. Should we emend into φασιν, i.e. those τινες "who have pondered about the higher life"?

³⁰ I Tim. 2:8.

³¹ Psalms 102:22 (Sept.).

³² Isaiah 66:1.

says the Lord,"³³ and "Was it not my hand that made it all?"³⁴ and the Highest "does not live in temples built by human hands,"³⁵ and "For whom shall I have regard if not for the one who is gentle and quiet and who trembles at my word?"³⁶ and "He who loves me will observe my teaching, and I shall love him, and I and my Father will come and live with him."³⁷ For Paul says to the Saints: "You are God's temple, and God's spirit makes its home in you."³⁸

We do not, then, disturb the divine [commandments] with regard to the sanctuaries but we stretch out our hand in a more suitable way to those who are still rather imperfect, yet we do not leave them untaught as to the more perfect [knowledge] but we want even them to know that the divine being is not at all identical or the same or similar to any of the existing things."

The translation and the notes have, I trust, made clear both the trend of the thought and the intention of the author. Julian of Atramythium had been concerned about the use and worship of religious images, presumably in his diocese. His objections had been based on the Old Testament prohibitions of art (Ex. 20:5, etc.). Julian had, however, not questioned the use and worship of religious *paintings* at all. He had approved, though perhaps somewhat grudgingly, both their use and the practise of prostration (*προσκύνησις*) before painted images (cf. note 16). Julian had objected, however, to religious *sculpture*. Hypatius, in replying to these scruples of his suffragan, examines the reason for the Old Testament prohibitions, as well as the reasons for the legitimacy of Christian sculpture. The Old Testament prohibitions were meant for people who believed in the similarity or identity of cult-statues on the one hand and the Divine on the other. The Christians of the sixth century are no longer in danger of accepting such a view. Therefore Hypatius will permit the use of religious sculpture for the uneducated although he himself, as a learned theologian, maintains that the true praise of God and of the Saints must continue to be performed by the written word. For the benefit of the uneducated, Hypatius even thinks that acts of worship before sacred paintings and sculptures³⁹ will serve a useful pedagogical purpose. He then passes in review a number of instances where the Bible itself records concessions to the uneducated. Hypatius declares himself in full agreement with those

³³ Isaiah 66:1.

³⁴ Acts 7:49.

³⁵ Acts 17:24.

³⁶ Isaiah 66:2.

³⁷ John 14:23.

³⁸ I Cor. 3:16.

³⁹ There may be some doubt whether Hypatius authorizes the *worship* (not only the use) of religious *sculpture*. Yet when he anticipates the objection of "some who have pondered about the higher life," he makes them proponents of "spiritual *worship*." The target of their protest, therefore, are all other (non-spiritual) kinds of worship.

who recognize only acts of spiritual worship performed by holy souls. Yet he feels that his concession will not vitiate this requirement as long as the clergy constantly emphasizes to the simpler people Hypatius' oft-repeated principle as to the total difference of material objects and divine being.

If my interpretation of the fragment has merits, a number of interesting conclusions follow:

(1) Baynes is, of course, quite correct when he emphasizes the hesitations which both Julian and Hypatius show in their attitude towards religious images. It also is true that neither Julian nor Hypatius allow more than pedagogical functions for the images. In particular, not a word is said about any miraculous power residing in them.

(2) There is, at least on the part of Julian, a much greater hesitancy towards religious sculpture than towards Christian paintings. This is interesting, in view of the almost complete absence of religious sculpture in the Byzantine Church after the restoration of images.

(3) But it is at least as interesting that neither Julian nor Hypatius as much as raise the question of the legitimacy not only of using but even of *worshipping* religious *paintings*. In all probability, individual acts of worship had occurred much earlier without objection from the clergy. Yet this is, to the best of my knowledge, the earliest ⁴⁰ clear evidence of official approval, on the part of two members of the higher clergy, one of them even prominent.⁴¹ If from Julian's and Hypatius' attitude towards painted images inferences may be drawn as to the

⁴⁰ I know of only one earlier text: certain craftsmen in fifth century Rome seem to have attributed an apotropaic effect to images of Symeon the Older Stylite (+459/60), and the historian who reports this feature *may* share this feeling (Theodoret, *hist. rel.* 25, PG 82, 1473 A, cf. Holl, Karl, "Der Anteil der Styliten am Aufkommen der Bilderverehrung," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II*, Tübingen, 1928, 390). Yet this case is quite different from that at Atramyntium: (1) the Roman images of Symeon are set up in craftshops not in churches; and (2) no ritual act of worship (prostration) is reported. Basil's letter 360 (PG 32, 1100B) is probably spurious; cf. Elliger, Walter, *Die Stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern etc.*, in *Studien über christliche Denkmäler XX* (1930) p. 61. Bréhier, Louis, *La Querelle des Images*, Paris, 1904, p. 7f. cites no other approval of image worship prior to the seventh century.

⁴¹ Holl, *loc. cit.*, 388: "Angesichts der Schärfe, mit der das Christentum sich ursprünglich gegen die Idole und ihre Verehrung wendete, bleibt es immer überraschend, wie ungehindert und fast unbeachtet sich später der heidnische Brauch in der Kirche selbst festsetzen konnte. Nur gegen den ersten noch harmlosen Schritt in dieser Richtung, gegen die aufkommende Sitte, Bilder in den Kirchen aufzubringen, hat sich im 4. Jahrhundert ein gewisser Protest erhoben. Der schlimmere, zweite Schritt, die Herübernahme der heidnischen Auffassung und Verehrung des Bildes, ist ohne solchen Widerspruch erfolgt. . . . Syrien und Kleinasien sind, sofern nicht alles trügt, in unserem Fall die Länder gewesen, wo der Gang der Dinge sich entschied."

feelings of the high clergy in the capital of the Empire, new light is shed on the appearance of images, one generation later, on the columns separating the sanctuary from the choir in Justinian's newly rebuilt Church of St. Sophia — of images of Christ among the angels, of Christ among the prophets, of Christ among the apostles, and of the Virgin Mary.⁴²

(4) Hypatius, however, does not stop at religious paintings but sanctions likewise the use and worship (cf. note 39) of religious sculpture towards which the Byzantine Church always had felt, and continued to feel, greater scruples than towards the painted icons.

The reader of Hypatius' remarks will inevitably be reminded of a kindred document from the West which dates not quite a century after the new fragment and which has always played a large rôle in discussions of attitudes towards religious art: the letter of Pope Gregory the Great to Serenus, bishop of Marseille.⁴³ Serenus had broken the images of some Saints to prevent people from worshipping them. Pope Gregory writes that he would have praised his correspondent if he had merely prohibited their worship but now blames him for having broken them.⁴⁴ Like Hypatius, Gregory recognizes that the images have a pedagogical function, especially for pagans.⁴⁵ Yet how fundamental is the difference between the archbishop of Ephesus and his suffragan on the one hand, and the Roman Pope, two generations later, and the bishop of Marseille on the other! In the first place, Serenus had taken immediate action and broken the images while Julian was much more cautious and consulted his superior before he acted. Are we dealing here just with two different individual temperaments? Or is Serenus' behavior char-

⁴² Paulus Silentarius, Description of the Temple of Holy Wisdom, verses 668ff., ed. Friedländer, Paul, Leipzig and Berlin, 1912, p. 246f. and 287–289. The poem dates of the year 563. The columns, it seems, were not part of a regular iconostasis, but the prominent position of the icons, on a part of the church which clearly was the forerunner of the later iconostases, recommended them to the special attention of the congregation.

⁴³ Gregorius Magnus, Epistolae, XI, 10, ed. L. M. Hartmann, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolarum Tomus II (Berlin, 1899) pp. 269ff. The letter dates from October 600. For comment, see Koch, Hugo, Die altchristliche Bilderfrage, in Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments XXVII (1917), p. 77ff. (where other texts from the same author about religious images are cited). It is difficult to say whether Serenus had "broken" sculptures or paintings, but the former is perhaps more likely.

⁴⁴ Loc. cit.: *Et quidem quia eas adorari vetuisses, omnino laudavimus; fregisse vero reprehendimus.*

⁴⁵ Loc. cit.: *Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per picturae historia, quid sit adorandum, addiscere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa ignorantes vident quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt; unde praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est.*

acteristic for the energetic Western missionary to the heathens while Julian's is typical for the bishop of a region where Hellenic Christianity had been the established religion since times immemorial? Or, finally, is the trend towards image worship much stronger in the diocese of Atramyntium so that Julian has to assure himself of support before taking action? Possibly all these factors have to be taken into account together to explain the different behavior of Julian and Serenus. But Hypatius and Gregory take as different an attitude as Julian and Serenus. Hypatius had permitted acts of worship before the images; Gregory explicitly prohibits them. More important even, Hypatius had approved of Christian images as means of spiritual, perhaps even mystical, pedagogy which would guide men towards "the intelligible and immaterial light." Gregory, on the other hand, sees in the images pedagogical devices through which a pagan could learn to worship the Christian God rather than his heathen gods and in which he could find patterns of conduct — in a word, devices for practical and moral instruction. A comparison of the two documents demonstrates clearly a fundamentally different attitude towards the images between East and West. Yet both in the Ephesian and the Roman documents we see at work the powerful force of popular piety which, in the East at any rate, was to impose concession after concession upon the theologians,⁴⁶ until in the eighth and ninth centuries the Iconoclastic Controversy probed all the theological and philosophical depths of the issue.

⁴⁶ Holl, loc. cit., p. 389: "Erst in zweiter Linie ist die Theologie an diesem Prozess [i.e. the development of image worship] beteiligt. Sie hat nicht geschoben, aber — was vielleicht ebenso wichtig war — das Gefühl für das, was vorging, abgeschwächt und das sich behauptende Heidentum mit ihren Prinzipien gedeckt."

PAUL J. ALEXANDER

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY, AND
HOBART COLLEGE, GENEVA, NEW YORK.