

always to be orthodox. Two, that the letter of Honorius to Sergius failed to reject the false doctrine and to define the true one but did not explicitly affirm a heresy. Three that the council of Const. possessed the force of an ecumenical Council only in so far as approved by the pope. That is their modern theory, of course, which the council never would have admitted then, ^{Four} ~~so~~ that Pope Leo II approved the condemnation of the for the stated reason that he had not extinguished a flame of heretical teaching from the beginning, but rather had fanned it by his negligence. But let me read again the condemnation which he quotes from the Council passed by the Ecumenical Council, the 6th, approved by the pope of ~~today~~, ^{the} approved by the next pope and it included in the a ation of Honorius as something required of every pope when he became pope for the next four centuries. Though he doesn't state those particular sentences, those, Schaff states, and they are given elsewhere. But he does make this statement, that the condemnation approved by two popes, he says, not one more, but he does say definitely by two, and established by the council says, we anathematize Honorius who did not attempt to sanctify the apostolic church with the teaching of the apostolic ~~tradition~~ ^{tradition} but by profound treachery permitted the teaching to be . Well, that is pretty strong language to use about an infallible head of the church and one who is given authority over all the . (question 2½) No, that is just Const. None of the early great ecumenical councils met in Rome, everyone of them was in the east. Well, now you have your assignment for tomorrow and it is a matter on which there, you could study a great deal, there is tremendous amount written on the iconoclastic controversy and I don't expect you to put over a couple of hours on it, but get the main facts of it, when it began, the general ~~facts~~ ^{facts} of its course , what are its results, the iconoclastic controversy (question 3¼) (end of lecture) look at D the monophysite controversy. There are many interesting lessons in connection with the history of that controversy which are interesting for our understanding of the history of the church and of our human life in general, but the outstanding historical features of it from