

# THE SCHISM OF THE ROMAN CHURCH \*

BY

JOHN N. KARMIRIS  
PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS

## III

Unfortunately, the reconciliation and communion between the two Churches which was attained through the initiative of Photius did not last for long. The schism of the Roman Church which began in 867 at the time of Photius, on the responsibility of Pope Nicholas I, was destined to be completed in 1054 during the patriarchate of Michael Cerularius. At that time communion between the Eastern and the Western Churches was definitely interrupted by synodical decision, Rome again having given cause for it. Because, with very few exceptions, Nicholas' successors, Popes of Rome, who were ardent devotees of the absolute papal primacy and undesirous of rectifying Nicholas' great sin against the Unity of the Church, continued his same policy of attempting to humiliate and subdue the Eastern Church. Besides, they permitted the multiplication of Latin innovations<sup>1</sup>. Benedict VIII even accepted in 1014 and in Rome itself the Filioque, which had been strongly attacked by the Orthodox and characterized as an heretical teaching<sup>2</sup>. The Filioque now became a fatal schism-making element in the same way as it did during the time of Photius, resulting in the erasing of the Pope's name from the diptychs of the Orthodox Church. Until this day, no Pope's name has been recorded in them<sup>3</sup>. Besides, Pope Sergius III (904 911)

---

\* Continued from p. 433.

1. See J. Karmiris, *The symbolical texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, p. 54 seq.

2. Chrys. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.* pp. 185/6: «This painful event was a serious portent of the schism of the Roman Church. By officially accepting the addition which was unknown to the whole Church, but contrived in Spain for the first time and until then rejected by the Popes of Rome, she was destined to cut off and separate herself from the whole Church».

3. See also B. Stefanides, *op. cit.* p. 344: «The first cause for the definite schism of the two Churches was the addition of the Filioque to the Creed of the

dared to make a new anti-canonical intervention in a foreign jurisdiction, i. e. in the Church of Constantinople, by confirming the fourth marriage of the emperor Leo VI, the Wise, which was not permitted in the East, and releasing him from the excommunication which the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticos had imposed upon him<sup>1</sup>. All these things intensified the growing tension between Constantinople and Rome which at last came to a head in 1054.

Pope Leo IX, through his imperialistic politics in southern Italy and his delegation to Constantinople under the Cardinal Humbert, chiefly gave occasion for the completion of the schism. In fact, Pope Leo IX, together with his cousin the emperor of Germany, Henry III, sought first to extend his sovereignty over southern Italy<sup>2</sup> which belonged to Byzantium. He even introduced there Latin ecclesiastical customs, as his predecessor Nicholas I had formerly done in Bulgaria, abolished the Byzan-

---

Church of Rome. The bishop of Rome Sergius IV (1009) cited according to custom in his enthronement letter the Creed of faith in a free rendering, but with the addition of the Filioque clause. According to the prevailing opinion this addition was introduced into the official Creed of the Roman Church five years later by Benedict VIII (1014), under pressure from the emperor of the West Henry II. The Patriarch of Constantinople Sergius, a nephew of Photius and a contemporary of these Popes, following a synodical decision, crossed out the name of the forementioned bishop of Rome Sergius from the diptychs of the Eastern Church with the result that to this day no papal name has been put in them». See also A. Demetrakopoulos, *History of the Schism of the Latin Church from the Greek Orthodox*, Leipzig 1867, p. 20/1.

1. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 183 seq. B. Stefanides, op. cit. p. 348 seq. Regarding this new arbitrary intervention of Sergius and his conflict with Nicholas Mysticos, J. Gay, *L' Italie méridionale et l' empire byzantin*, Paris 1904, p. 189, observes: «La vie scandaleuse (of Pope Sergius) fait un contraste étrange avec la noble et austère figure du patriarche byzantin Nicholas Mysticos.

2. See Th. Popescu, *Why the Patriarch Michael Cerularius attacked the Latins?*, in «Inaugural of the 35th anniversary of Chrys. Papadopoulos, Athens 1931, p. 371/3 (in Greek): «Leo IX was German (Bruno von Toul), a relative (2nd cousin) and a devoted friend of Henry III, who had effected the election of Bruno as Pope. He was then an agent of the German emperor» who sought (to make) «southern Italy belong to the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation and to unite western Christendom under his own sovereignty.. This Pope wanted and was able to advance the work of Henry, whose work was becoming his own. In fact, the imperial ideal was being identified for the most part with the papal. Leo IX, inspired by the desire to restore the papal power of Nicholas I, was between the latter and Gregory VII the most signi-

tine archdiocese of Sipontus, and deposed her archbishop, effecting also other similar interventions<sup>1</sup>.

Afterwards, the same Pope, having received occasion from a letter of Leo, archbishop of Bulgaria, to the bishop John of Tranes (Apuleia)<sup>2</sup>, who was subject to the Patriarchate of Con-

stantinople, a significant representative and evident embodiment of Rome's policy of absolute primacy. Besides, in the person of Leo IX this policy was German and imperialistic. Both offices, that of the emperor and the pope, were united».

1. See also B. Stefanides, *op. cit.* p. 345. The Patriarch Michael Cerularius considered it his duty to oppose these. Towards this end he closed the Latin churches and monasteries of Constantinople which were imparting Latin customs to the Orthodox by propagandism. These the Patriarch criticized in his letters to the Patriarch of Antioch Peter, as did Leo of Bulgaria in his letter to John, bishop of Tranes. It seems that Cerularius' chief attempt was exactly this, to hinder the introduction of Latin ecclesiastical customs in the Orthodox East. See also G. Every, *op. cit.* p. 166 seq.

2. The letter of Leo of Bulgaria was published by C. Will. *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis Ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant*, Lipsiae 1861, p. 56—60. Migne P. G. 120, 836—844. It must be noted that this letter was written in the spring of 1053, but not by the Patriarch Michael and the Archbishop Leo, as the Cardinal Humbert, who took a leading part in everything, noted as regards this and the Latin translation. It was written only by Leo of Bulgaria, as the following writers have already proved: C. Will, *op. cit.* p. 53 seq., B. Georgiades, Michael Cerularius and the schism of the Churches, in «Ecclesiastiki Alitheia» 3 (1886) 373 seq. (in Greek), A. Michel, Der Autor des Briefes Leon von Achrida. Eine Vater-versammlung des Michael Kerullarios, in «Byzantinisch—Neugriechische Jahrbücher» 3 (1922) 50 seq. and others. See also J. Gay, *op. cit.* p. 495. The Patriarch Michael Cerularius in the year 1053, that is one decade after his elevation to the patriarchal throne, permitted—or perhaps exhorted—Leo of Bulgaria to write the forementioned letter and the abbot of the monastery of Studion, Nicetas Stethatus, to publish his study against the Latins (C. Will, *op. cit.* pp. 127—136. Migne P. L. 143, 973—984. A. Demetrakopoulos, *Ecclesiastiki Bibliothiki*, Leipzig 1866, I, 18—36). He also ordered the closing of the Latin churches and monasteries in Constantinople certainly not in order to provoke the schism between the two Churches and to insure his independence which was never in danger (E. Amann, *op. cit.* pp. 1681/2), or to become emperor by the schism! (L. Bréhier, *Le schisme etc.*, pp. 213, 215, 217, 368), nor for other equally improbable reasons which heterodox writers imagine (for these see Th. Popescu, *op. cit.* p. 368 seq.), but to counteract on the one hand the provocations of the Latins in Constantinople and the dissemination of Latin innovations and customs among the Orthodox. On the other hand, his purpose was to oppose the anti-canonical intervention of Pope Leo IX in southern Italy, the dissemination there of Latin ecclesiastical customs, and the attempted subjection under him of the Greek archdiocese of Sipontus to the Latin of Veneventus. In general he aimed to oppose the expansion of the

stantinople, sent to him (Leo of Bulgaria) and to the Patriarch Cerularius a very long and indecent, or rather insulting, letter in which, instead of refuting the contents of Leo's letter, he seized the opportunity to present the papal primacy in a form worse than Nicholas I had done. He asserted that the bishop of Rome is infallible and by divine right possesses double authority, ecclesiastical as well as political («*imperialis potestas*»!), citing almost the entire pseudo-«Gift of Constantine» in order to prove it<sup>1</sup>.

It was the first time that the astonished Eastern Church heard these things which were contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the Gospel, namely, that the Pope is infallible and that he is the source of all power<sup>2</sup>. But in spite of all this, the

papal sovereignty over the entire of southern Italy and even Constantinople, which was sought in co-operation and alliance with the emperor Henry III and the «argironite» (bought by silver) magistrate and duke of Italy Argyros (See Th. Popescu, op. cit. p. 370 seq). Contemporary historical sources testify that during those times the position of the Latins against the Orthodox was very provocative. Not only were the Latins in Constantinople and the papal delegation under the very abusive Cardinal Humbert provocative, but also Pope Leo IX himself, who in southern Italy intervened ecclesiastico-politically and in his letters to Cerularius «made such accusations and generally spoke in a way so threatening that it was evident that he was seeking excuses for disputes. The way in which his vicars conducted themselves in Constantinople and especially their superior, Cardinal Humbert, makes this even more indisputable» (K. Paparregopoulos, op. cit. vol. IV p. 345).

1. The letter of Pope Leo IX was published by C. Will, op. cit. p. 65—68, Mansi, Concil. 19, 635/84. Latin theologians confess with pride that no one—not even Gregory VII, expressed the papal primacy with such emphasis as Leo IX did (L. Bréchier, op. cit. p. 192/3). According to C. Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, vol. IV, p. 770, Leo IX in doing this «theilte nur die Gebrechen der Kritik seiner Zeit»! But Leo proceeded further, «accusing the Greeks of altering the Creed of the Catholic Church, being in no way ashamed either of his office or history» («Encyclical letter of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church to the Orthodox everywhere», 2nd edition, Constantinople 1863, p. 29, in Greek), and even as producing more than 90 heresies: «diverso tempore ex diverso errore ad corruptendum virginitatem catholicae Ecclesiae matris emergentes». In addition, he criticized the folly of Cerularius and Leo of Bulgaria and brandished the power of the Roman throne, because they had dared to censure the Roman Church, which no one is supposedly able to judge and censure. For this reason he called them to repentance so that they might not be included in the tail of the dragon which dragged «the third of the stars of the heaven and did cast them to the earth»! (Rev. 12,4).

2. Earlier the Popes Nicholas I and Hadrian II ventured to formulate this in the libellus which was submitted to the Latin Synod of 869/70 at Constantinople for signing (see Mansi, Concil. 16, 27/8, A. Pichler, op. cit. p.

Patriarch Michael Cerularius, who had not failed to send his enthronement letter to Rome according to ancient custom, answered the arrogant letter of Leo IX «with much humbleness», as he himself affirms in a letter to Peter of Antioch<sup>1</sup>, being concerned with ecclesiastical peace and unity and overlooking the insolent and arrogant claims of the bishop of Rome, to whom he expressed his sorrow for the division of the Church. He thus left the door open for reunion.

Leo IX<sup>2</sup>, however, was unsatisfied with this and sent a delegation to Constantinople for ecclesiastical reasons<sup>3</sup>, members of which were the Archbishop of Amalfi Peter and the deacon and

189). Pope Marinus afterwards repeated it, as well as Stephen V in a letter to the Byzantine emperor Basil the Macedon in 885 (Mansi, Concil. 18, 12/3). A. Pichler acknowledges that «der ganzen Kirche waren diese Ansprüche fremd, dass der Papst die Quelle aller geistlichen und weltlichen Jurisdiction und Unfehlbarkeit sei» (op. cit. p. 257). Nektarius Kephalas, op. cit., I, 159/61. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. pp. 193/4.

1. Migne P.G. 120, 784. The moderate and prudent Patriarch of Antioch Peter, who read this letter, confirms this (ibid. p. 813), as well as the Pope Leo IX, who wrote to the emperor Constantine the Monomachos: «præterea confrater noster archiepiscopus Michaël exhortatorias ad concordiam et unitatem direxit nobis litteras» (C. Will, op. cit. p. 88, Mansi, Concil. 19, 669). F. Mercenier acknowledges that the answers of the Patriarch and the emperor were indeed «extrêmement modérées de fond et de forme» (op. cit. p. 80).

2. It must be noted that Leo IX had earlier written a letter to the Patriarch of Antioch Peter concerning both Michael Cerularius and the patriarchal throne of Constantinople in which he «had sought allies beforehand» against Cerularius. (Migne P. L. 143, 170 seq., Th. Popescu, op. cit. p. 386/7).

3. This papal representation had been asked for by the emperor Constantine the Monomachos chiefly for a political reason, namely to discuss and reach an understanding on the Byzantine and papal possessions in Italy, which were being threatened by the Normans. Humbert, however, probably with the approval of Pope Leo IX, gave it also an ecclesiastical character. See Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. 193/4. J. Gay, op. cit. p. 491 seq. C. Hefele, op. cit. p. 771 seq. and the letter of Leo IX to the emperor, C. Will, op. cit. p. 85 seq. Mansi, Concil. 19, 667 seq. Negotiations, that is, were being transacted between Constantinople and Rome for the purpose of making a military alliance against the Normans, against whom «in Mai 1053 zog Leo mit einem aus allerlei Bestandtheilen zusammengebrachten Heere», but he was defeated and taken as a hostage! Herein a sufficient number of Roman Catholics, as «Petrus Damiani, Hermann der Gebrechliche u. A. die Niederlage des Papstes für eine göttliche Strafe erklären, weil es einem Priester nicht zustehe, die Waffen zu ergreifen», to whom Hefele answers, «dass der Papst auch Fürst sei, und als solcher die Pflicht habe, das Patrimonium Petri zu vertheidigen!» (op. cit. p. 764).

chancellor Frederick. This delegation was under the leadership of the rude and intolerant Cardinal Humbert, «an ambitious man, intriguer and devotee of the papal claims»<sup>1</sup>. Humbert himself on behalf of the Pope composed his letters of introduction to the Patriarch and to the emperor. In these he included a long and in many respects groundless indictment against Cerularius; as for example, that the latter ascended the patriarchal throne anti-canonically, supposedly being a neophyte. This was inaccurate, and so were other similar accusations<sup>2</sup>. Having arrived about the end of March or early April of the year 1054 at Constantinople, Cardinal Humbert immediately began political negotiations with the emperor for the purpose of making an alliance between him and the Pope against the Normans, who were threatening the papal and Byzantine possessions. As a result, he postponed for a considerable time his visit to the Patriarch<sup>3</sup>, against whom he let loose a violent polemic all the while that the delegation was in Constantinople<sup>4</sup>. When at last the papal legates decided to call upon the Patriarch, they displayed to him, as well as to the emperor, an indecent attitude and a behavior unbecoming to clergymen or, as Cerularius confirms, «conducted themselves with pride and impertinence»<sup>5</sup>. They appeared in Constantinople as critics and judges of the Patriarch on the one hand «with excessive authority and shamelessness», and on the other as teachers of the Orthodox, because supposedly «what was orthodox was corrupted» by them<sup>6</sup>. This was happening while for about four decades,

1. Ph. Vafeides, op. cit. p. 124.

2. See B. Stefanides, op. cit. p. 347.

3. See also E. Hermann, *I Legati inviati da Leone IX nel 1054 a C/pli erano autorizzati a scomunicare il patriarca Michele Cerulario?* in «*Orientalia Christiana periodica*» 8 (1942) 214.

4. Nektarius Kephalas, Metropolitan of Pentapolis, op. cit. II, 21 seq.

5. For example they began «par créer un incident sur une question de protocole: Humbert et ses collègues prétendirent avoir le pas sur les métropolités siégeant au synode permanent, ce que ni le patriarche, ni les métropolités ne voulurent accepter. Les légats se contentèrent donc de lui remettre la lettre qui lui était destinée et puis se retirèrent en protestant.» (F. Mercenier, op. cit. p. 82).

6. Letter of Michael Cerularius to Peter of Antioch, Migne P.G. 120, 816. C. Hefele did not hesitate to acknowledge that «die päpstlichen Legaten traten zu Con/pel im Bewusstsein und mit den Ansprüchen ihrer hohen Stellung auf; sie wollten und mussten den Vorrang Roms an den Tag legen» (op. cit. p. 775). Humbert had even composed a complete treatise, or to be more exact, a

that is from the patriarchate of Sergius II, as we have seen, the name of the Pope was crossed out from the diptychs in Byzantium. Almost simultaneously news was arriving that Pope Leo IX had died on the 13<sup>th</sup> of April 1054. Consequently, the delegation had lost both its authorization and authority until a new authorization be given by the Pope to be elected.

For these reasons and moreover because the Patriarch found the seals of the papal letter tampered with—which fact made him suspect its entire content as not genuine<sup>1</sup>—he deemed it right to discontinue communion with the papal legates, and decided to discuss and co operate with them only in a synod and in the presence of the Orthodox hierarchs and representatives of the other Patriarchs<sup>2</sup>. This claim of Cerularius, though in accordance with Orthodox theory and practice, the papal legates rejected, firmly holding to the absolute papal primacy, which in this circumstance also played its anti-canonical role.

---

libellus against the Greeks, which was translated into Greek (C. Will, op. cit. p. 93—126), that according to A. Pichler, «war nicht eine solide Erörterung, sondern eine von der rohesten Leidenschaft dictirte Schmahschrift, welche nicht nur das alte Lied, dass der Orient das Vaterland aller Häresien sei, wiederholte, sondern zugleich dem Patriarchen und der Griechischen Kirche Dinge zum Last legte, die reine Erfindungen waren» (op. cit. p. 258). See also C. Hefele, op. cit. pp. 774/5, and a summary of this libellus, as well as that of a similar one against Nicetas Stethatus by the insultingly mad Humbert in «Ecclesiastiki Aletheia» 7 (1886/7) 6 seq. by B. Georgiades.

1. It seems that Michael Cerularius really believed that the papal letter was forged not only because he found the seals tampered with and because Pope Leo from Sept. 1053 until March 1054 was a hostage of the Normans, dying after his release in April 1054, but also because its content was incompatible and unworthy «of the virtue and politeness and knowledge of the Pope (as he himself wrote to Peter of Antioch, Migne P. G. 120, 784). On the contrary, it agreed with everything that he had formerly heard from the Greek duke Argyros of southern Italy, who «not only once but twice already and three times and four was thrown out and expelled by us from communion and partaking» (ibid.) Argyros was not only ecclesiastically but also politically at one time in the service of the Byzantine emperor, at another against him and leader of the Normans, and still at another on the side of the Pope. Besides, he was always a personal enemy of Cerularius. With reason then the Patriarch suspected that neither the delegation, nor the letter really came from Pope Leo IX, but that everything was forged by the intolerant Humbert and the fickle Argyros. This, which was confirmed by John of Tranes (letter of Cerularius to Peter of Antioch, Migne P. G. 120, 788), is also explicitly mentioned in the Synodical decision of July 20, 1054 (ibid. p. 741 and 745).

2. Second letter of Michael Cerularius to Peter of Antioch, Migne P. G. 120, 816. C. Will, op. cit. p. 186.

Such being the situation, Humbert and the Latins with him, unconscious of their obligations toward brother Christians who were defending paternal dogmas and traditions, and deciding beforehand, it seems, to put the finishing touches to the existing ecclesiastical schism, boldly and irreverently entered the church of Hagia Sophia on the 16<sup>th</sup> of July 1054<sup>1</sup> during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and placed upon the altar a blasphemous libellus<sup>2</sup> with which they excommunicated «the whole Church of the Orthodox» and chiefly the Patriarch Michael for other reasons, but particularly because «they did not want to shave their beards similar to the Latins, nor did they discriminate in

1. A. Fortescu describes this sacrilegious act as follows in «The Orthodox Eastern Church», London 1920, p. 185/6: «It was Saturday, July 16, 1054, at the third hour (9 a.m.). The Hagia Sophia was full of people, the priests and deacons are vested, the prothesis (preparation) of the holy Liturgy has just begun. Then the three Latin legates walk up the great church through the Royal Door of the Ikonostasis and lay their bull of excommunication on the altar. As they turn back they say: Videat Deus et iudicet. The schism was complete...one realizes this and sees that the words of the Legates were heard and that God has seen and judged»! A simple comparison between the decision of the Orthodox Synod of Constantinople which met four days later and the Latin libellus, including the forementioned excerpt of Fortescu, is enough to confirm in how different a tone it was composed. While these events establish clearly that the papal Legates provoked the completion of the schism, there are Roman Catholic theologians who speak about the supposed «Schism of Michael Cerularius»! about whom they even think that «plus encore peut-être que Photius mérite le titre de père du schisme»!, as for example lately M. Jugie (op. cit. p. 187 seq., 232) who admits, however, that the Latin act was «a tout point de vue, ce geste théâtral était regrettable..» (ibid. p. 205) and makes the confirmation that «tous les membres du synode permanent constantinopolitain faire cause commune avec Michel Cérulaire, aucun de ces prélats n'élève la voix en faveur des légats romains, et il faut reconnaître qu'il leur eût été difficile de le faire» (ibid. p. 219).

2. Migne P. G. 120. 741/5. C. Will, op. cit. p. 153/4. About this A. Pichler observes: «Diese Bulle wiederholte alle Beschimpfungen, welche Humberts Abhandlungen enthielten und fügte die gräulichsten Flüche bei». Therefore «mit Mühe entkamen die Legaten ohne Schläge, die sie recht wohl verdient hätten» (op. cit. p. 259). And K. Paparregopoulos writes: «The greatness of the tolerance and moderation of our own people was never before more splendidly proved than during that terrible moment when one nod of the Patriarch was able to bring on a dreadful punishment for the crime. But instead, our Hierarch permitted their harmless exit from the church; likewise after two days they were able harmlessly to leave Constantinople, after they had bidden the Emperor farewell and had received from him the customary gifts...» (op. cit. vol. IV p. 346/7).



partaking from married presbyters, but even offered enzymes (leavened bread) and in the Creed did not say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, as in the Symbol of our faith, but only from the Father»<sup>1</sup>.

These were the chief but groundless accusations and explanations of that unbecoming and desperate step of the Latins, who condemned the Orthodox for their persistence in what was delivered unto them and anathematized them as «Simoniacs, Valesians, Arians, Donatists, Severians, Nicolaitans, Pneumatomachoi, Manichees and Nazarenes»<sup>2</sup>.

It is self-evident that the libellus of the Latins «contained an absurd and ignorant polemic»<sup>3</sup>, worthy of its writers, just as the contention of Leo and Humbert that the Greeks allegedly corrupted the Creed of faith, while exactly the opposite occurred, also betrays an ignorant and clumsy inaccuracy.

After this previously unheard of and impious venture of the Latins, and in the midst of the common indignation and uprising of the Orthodox, the Patriarch Michael Cerularius called together instantly on the 20<sup>th</sup> of July, 1054 a resident large synod which put under anathema the «sacrilegious and abominable do-

1. Migne P. G. 120, 817; see also p. 739. Particularly the papal legates were turned against the Patriarch Michael whom or «rather the whole Orthodox Church of God and all those who do not accept their impious acts they anathematized simply because they wanted to remain pious and not betray Orthodoxy... This anathema their master, the most reverend Pope, issued against Michael and his followers» (ibid. p. 737, 745).

2. F. Mercenier (Roman Catholic), addressing Roman Catholics, comments on the forementioned step of the Roman Catholic delegation as follows: «Pour monter toute la ville contre les Romains, Cérullaire n' eut qu'à le faire traduire et à le lancer dans le public. L' effet fut immédiat. La stupeur et l' indignation furent générales. Tellement que l' empereur doutant de l' exactitude de la version patriarcale fit revenir la légation qui avait quitté la ville et ordonna que sous leurs yeux on en fit une traduction nouvelle: elle ne put que confirmer l' exactitude de la première. Cependant le peuple avait appris ce retour. Aussitôt l' émeute se mit à gronder et l' empereur, qui jusque là avait cru possible une reprise des négociations, se vit obligé d' éloigner au plus tôt l' ambassade pour ne pas exposer la vie de ses membres. Voilà dans quelles circonstances se consumma le schisme qui continue à désoler l' Église; en pleine vacance du Siège Apostolique, du fait de légats qui étaient sans pouvoirs. Et dire que rentré à Rome, le cardinal Humbert crut pouvoir se donner un large satisfecit et que l' Occident crut qu' il avait remporté une éclatante victoire sur Cérullaire!» (op. cit. pp. 84/5).

3. K. Amantos, op. cit. p. 229.

cument» (Latin anathematization) that was thrown on the holy altar, as well as those who wrote and consented to it. He avoided, however, excommunicating the Pope<sup>1</sup>. Thus one door was intentionally left open for reconciliation and reunion. This explains the attempts for union which were made later on the part of both, which unfortunately remained fruitless<sup>2</sup>. At any rate, at this moment the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem sanctioned the synodical decision of the 20<sup>th</sup> of July and, imitating the Patriarchate of Constantinople, eliminated the Pope's name from the diptychs and discontinued communion with him, the Church of Russia following suit. Thus, both Churches, Eastern and Western, officially and mutually denounced each other, the Roman Church again having given the occasion. The Latin excommunication proceeds from one of the following two initiatives: either directly from Pope Leo IX, as the Orthodox Synod of July 20, 1054<sup>3</sup> confirms on the basis of the papal representation's confession, which A. Michel<sup>4</sup> also accepts, or indirectly from the delegation, which must have acted on the basis of a special order or wide authorization of Leo IX. In fact, the papal legates themselves were declaring that «auctoritate apostolicae sedis, cuius legatione fungimur... anathemati, quod dominus noster reverendissimus papa itidem Michaeli et suis se-

1. Migne P. G. 120, 736/48. Mansi, Concil. 19, 812/21. C. Will, op. cit. p. 155/68. See the opinion of the Patriarch of Constantinople Joseph about this Synod in A. Demetrakopoulos, History of the Schism, p. 26 seq.

2. A. Demetrakopoulos, op. cit. p. 29 seq. Nektarius Kephalas. op. cit. II, 78 seq. J. Karmiris, The division of the Church and the attempts for union, Jerusalem, 1946, p. 7 seq.

3. Migne P. G. 120 737, 745, above p. 565 note 1.

4. A. Michel, Die Rechtsgültigkeit des römischen Bannes gegen Michael Kerullarios, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift 42 (1942) 192-205. On the basis of sources, A. Michel (who repeatedly occupied himself with the schism of the 11th century in general, particularly in his work «Humbert und Kerullarios», Paderborn 1924/30) concludes (ibid) that «Papst Leo IX had selbst den Patriarchen Michael Kerullarios bedingt gebannt und nach dem kurialen Gesandtschaftsrechte der Frühreform wäre der Bann der Legaten auch nach dem Tode des Papstes gültig gewesen» (p. 205). Because even if «wollte man wirklich vom bedingten Banne des Papstes völlig absehen, der sich am Schlusse des ersten Briefes und am Schlusse des Dialoges sowie am Schlusse des zweiten Briefes findet (see p. 197 seq.), so wäre doch die Gültigkeit des Bannes der Legaten nach dem damaligen kurialen Gesandtenrechte nicht zu bezweifeln» (p. 201).

quacibus, nisi resipiscerent, denunciavit, ita subscribimus»<sup>1</sup>. In either case, the guilt of the Roman Church is obvious<sup>2</sup>, more so inasmuch as she did not consider it her bounden duty to invalidate officially in a general synod, as she ought undoubtedly to have done, the anti-canonical and unjustified excommunication. On the contrary, she approved of it and since then has retained it<sup>3</sup>.

1. C. Will, *op. cit.* p. 154. See also A. Michel, *op. cit.* p. 195 seq., and Anonymous, *Le consommateur du schisme grec, ou vie de Michel Cérulaire*, Constantinople 1849, p. 123.

2. On the point in question M. Jugie thinks, on the contrary, that «les légats romains n'ont pas lancé les leurs (anathemas) contre l'Église byzantine, mais contre un de ses patriarches et certains de ses clercs. Leur sentence elle-même paraît, du point de vue canonique, dénuée de toute valeur et n'a jamais été approuvée par le Saint-Siège. Quant à l'excommunication des légats par Michel Cérulaire et son synode permanent, elle n'atteint ni le pape ni l'ensemble de l'Église d'Occident; c'est une simple mesure de représailles contre des étrangers insolents, qui ont osé élever contre Cérulaire et son clergé les accusations les plus fantaisistes et en qui l'on n'a voulu voir que des émissaires du duc d'Italie, Argyros» (*op. cit.* p. 230, see also p. 298).

3. Nektarius Kephalas, *op. cit.* II, 33 writes: «Pope Victor II, successor to Leo IX, not only did not renounce, did not reject, did not invalidate the blasphemous excommunication of the legates, but even approved of it and confirmed it. So great did this act of the legates appear to the Pope and to his successors, that it seemed good to them to perpetuate and successively confirm it». The Latin synod of 1098 in Bari is censured as somehow confirming the excommunication of Humbert by condemning the Orthodox Catholic Church as heretical for not having accepted the latin Filioque. But, according to the Archbishop of Athens Chrys. Papadopoulos, «this synod did that which the synods of those who were breaking away from the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church were customarily doing. They would condemn her as heretical, for not accepting their mistaken teaching! The synod at Bari dared to condemn as heretics those who were not accepting the error of the Filioque. Thus, this synod broke the Roman Church away from the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church» (*op. cit.* p. 206). It must be noted that similar ideas are also found with later Latin theologians, including our contemporaries: as for example, M. Jugie writes that Photius' teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, which is the same as saying of the entire Orthodox Church or of the ancient united Church, «introduit le schisme dans la Trinité en même temps que dans l'Église, telle est la nouveauté hérétique dont Photius est le père»! (*op. cit.* p. 145), and K. Algermissen, who asserts that in this dogma «muss die Orthodoxe Kirche von einer Lehre zurücktreten, die tatsächlich irrig ist und der Lehre der grossen Väter der Ostkirche nicht entspricht»!! (*Konfessionskunde, Hannover 1939, p. 515*).

That Pope Leo IX, together with his representative Humbert, bears the responsibility for the completion of the schism of 1054, is inferred from the forementioned. They were the agresors, while Cerularius was rather the defender, whatever reservations one may have as to some of his actions or to the expressions of his character<sup>1</sup>. Because, as it has already been observed, the position of Cerularius on this point «formed, properly speaking, not an attack, but a defense and opposition to the provocative politics of Leo IX. Competent historians acknowledge this explicitly as, for example, W. Norden, W. Giesebrecht, G. F. Herzberg, L. von Heinemann, Otto Kaemel, W. Fischer, G. Ficker, A. Michel, J. Gay and others»<sup>2</sup>.

Undoubtedly the Synod of July 20, 1054 would not have convened and would not have returned the excommunication if the unqualified and unjustified Latin excommunication of July 16, 1054 had not preceded. In this way, the schism was forced upon Cerularius above all by Humbert. The deeper cause for the painful events of 1054 was the conversion of the old canonical honorary primacy of the bishops of Rome to absolute ecclesiastico-political primacy and their attempt also to impose it on the Eastern Church. At this moment the primacy was expressed by the ecclesiastical and political penetration of Leo IX in southern Italy, by the

---

1. Contrary to the opinion of certain heterodox, Michael Cerularius is considered by the Orthodox as «a most saintly man» (Dositheus of Jerusalem, History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Bucharest 1715, p. 756 in Greek), and «a man of great education and most-holy life» (Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 190. B. Georgiades, op. cit. p. 333), or as «the one who had adorned value and had correctly taught the saving word» (A. Demetrakopoulos, Orthodox Greece, Leipzig 1872, p. 5 in Greek).

2. See Th. Popescu, op. cit. p. 385 for related references. On pp. 386/8 he writes: «The actions of both Leo IX and Argyros contain sufficient reason for Michael Cerularius' opposition to the Latins... the Patriarch sought neither political nor personal purposes through them, but only to defend Orthodoxy and his rights. Not ambition but zeal for Orthodoxy, as Gay also states, and the intervention of Leo IX in southern Italy incited the Patriarch to oppose the Latins. His opinion was that of the clergy, of the people and at last even that of the peacemaker Peter of Antioch... Since these events in themselves adequately explain the act of the Patriarch of Constantinople, it is obvious that it was not the work of ambition... As a sufficient number of non-Orthodox historians recognize this distinctly, it is absurd and awkward to consider any longer the great and historically well-explained event of 1054 as a triviality of a personally interested individual».

anti-canonical activities of his delegation in Constantinople, as well as by his association and alliance with his cousin, the German emperor, against everything that was Greek Orthodox<sup>1</sup>. Thus we have in this case also an expression of the root disagreement concerning church government between the Orthodox East, on the one hand, which held firmly to the ancient synodical system and to the pentarchy of the Patriarchs, and the papal West on the other, which had accepted the monarchic and totalitarian system. Furthermore Rome's pursuit of political aims, namely the separation from Byzantium of southern Italy, as had happened with Bulgaria during the time of Photius, forced Byzantium to assert its opposition, going so far as the schism<sup>2</sup>. These two causes then provoked the completion of the schism of 1054, while on the contrary the chief dogmatic differences do not seem to have played at that moment a serious role, except for certain liturgical differences and customs which were thrown into the center of the principal dispute.

In this way then, according to the able canonist, the Patriarch of Antioch Theodore Balsamon, «the once celebrated fulness of the Western Church, i. e. Rome, was split off from the spiritual communion of the other four holy Patriarchs and fell into customs and dogmas alien to the Catholic Church and to the Orthodox»<sup>3</sup>.

---

1. According to K. Papparegopoulos, «the closest causes of the dissension during the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries were the establishment of the new western empire, which the eastern refused to recognize, and the uninterrupted effort of the Church of the Romans to change her rights to sovereignty» (op. cit. vol. IV p. 340).

2. On the Roman Catholic side it is recognized that «l'empire byzantin était en lutte pour ainsi dire permanente avec les titulaires allemands de l'empire d'Occident pour la possession de l'Italie méridionale. Or presque toujours les papes faisaient figure d'alliés ou de simples chapelains de ses ennemis: circonstance bien faite pour que là-bas l'Église romaine fut traitée elle aussi en ennemie» (F. Mereenier, op. cit. p. 75/6).

3. Rhalles and Potles, op. cit. vol. IV, p. 460. In his weighty «study», «An answer on behalf of patriarchal privileges», Balsamon writes: «The daemon of selfishness made the Pope stand aloof from the assembly of the remaining most-holy Patriarchs and only in the West was it oppressive» (ibid. p. 553).

## IV

So much for the beginning and the completion of the schism of the Roman Church which was the cause of many evils in Christianity. Judging it now in general from the standpoint of its two phases, we think that no doubt can remain in the mind of the inquirer who searches for and judges the historical facts objectively and without bias that the true and real cause of the division of the Church was the anti-canonical evolution of the Papacy with its absolute primacy, its accompanying heterodox teachings and its ecclesiastico-political pursuits. For this reason, historical responsibility for the schism lies with it first and foremost<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. A. Pichler (Roman Catholic) concludes: «Wir glauben gezeigt zu haben, dass diese Frage über den Ursprung und die Fortdauer der Trennung nur aus der Geschichte des Papstthums, der Entwicklung der Rechte desselben, vor Allem der theologischen Doctrinen hierüber und aus manchen anderen mitwirkenden Factoren richtig beantwortet werden könne, und dass jedenfalls auch, der abendländischen Kirche ein Theil der Schuld an dem Ursprung und der Fortdauer der Spaltung und damit ein Theil der Pflicht an deren Beilegung zu arbeiten, zugewiesen werden müsse» (op. cit. p. 544). And elsewhere: «Hätte die Griechische Kirche auch keinen Cärlarius gehabt, die durch ihn geschehene Erweiterung der Kluft wäre nicht unterblieben» (ibid. p. 257). Pope Gregory XI, writing to John Cantacouzenus, negatively accepted the papal primacy and its non-acceptance by the Greeks as the cause of the genesis and the perpetuation of the schism: «Hujusmodi primatus negatio olim praesumpta per Graecos dissidii Latinorum et ipsorum Graecorum fuit causativa et conservativa schismatis subsequenti» (ibid. p. 380). Similarly, the Catholicos of the Armenian Church, rejecting on February 23, 1869 the invitation of Pope Pius IX to the Vatican Council, wrote to the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople that «Rome aurait d'abord dû reconnaître qu'elle est la cause du schisme par ses efforts pour asseoir sa domination sur tous les autres sièges orientaux». (Ceconi, Histoire du Concile du Vatican, d'après les documents originaux, Paris 1887, t. III σ. 47 seq. Document 94. «Irénikon» 6 (1929) 513/4). Lastly in the «Reply of a certain Orthodox to a brother Orthodox about the dynasty of the Catholics, about who made the schism, who were the schismatics and about Uniatism», Halle 1775, it is correctly observed that «neither Photius nor Mark (Eugenicus) was the cause of the schism, nor were they the makers of it. But, the causes of the schism were the addition to the sacred symbol (Filioque) as well as the unacceptable sinlessness, monarchy and worship of the Pope and all the illegal novelties and innovations of the Roman Church...The cause of the schism is the addition to the Creed; they who broke away and cut themselves off, that is, they who made the schism, being the dividers of the union, were the ones who

The Orthodox Patriarchs Photius and Cerularius, having found themselves fatally before the violent stream of the Papacy, which was threatening to carry along with it the doctrinal and administrative system of the ancient Church and to derange the canonical bases of ecclesiastical life, had the sacred duty to block its path toward the Eastern Church and Empire and to turn it back to the West. In this way they were insuring the ecclesiastical and political liberty and independence of the Greek Orthodox world. We think that all that concerns this ecclesiastical schism ought to be examined and judged from this viewpoint. For behind the ecclesiastical events which took place during the ninth and eleventh century, stood the egotism and desire for power and ecclesiastico-political imperialism and totalitarianism of papal Rome. Driven by these same motives, she likewise stood behind the so-called Crusades and the Crusaders, who 150 years later overthrew the Byzantine empire and subjugated the Orthodox East ecclesiastically and politically, causing countless, inexpressible sufferings<sup>1</sup> and making the chasm between the Orthodox East and the papal West deeper, wider and more permanent<sup>2</sup>. No doubt then can remain that not only religious but also political reasons played an important part in the opening and in the perpetuation of the schism, especially the effort of the Popes from the time of Nicholas I to Humbert II and his successors to subject southern Italy, Bulgaria and more generally the Illyricum, as well as the whole of the Orthodox Christian world<sup>3</sup>. Because,

---

initiated the addition; schismatics are the ones who accepted the addition and by it separated themselves from the Catholic Church of Christ and established their own party, i. e. the (Roman) Catholic. So that, both the ones who made the schism, i. e. the schismatics, and the ones who separated from the whole Church are the same. They then slander the Orthodox treacherously and unjustly and unreasonably when they call them schismatics» (pp. 65, 78).

1. Some of these are described in A. Demetrakopoulos, *History of the schism*, p. 44 seq., and Pope Innocent III indirectly admits a few, N. Képhalas, *op. cit.* II, 97 seq.

2. See N. Zernov, *The Church of the Eastern Christians*, London 1946, p. 11 seq. F. Mercenier is right in saying that until the Crusades «le schisme est encore le fait des hautes autorités ecclésiastiques et la masse du peuple chrétien commence à peine à en prendre conscience» (*op. cit.* p. 88).

3. The Dominican Humbert considered the quarrel for the occupation of the Greek empire as the highest and chiefest cause of the schism: «Maxima est dissensio de imperio, quod Ecclesia (Romana) vult haberi et teneri a La-

unfortunately, the Papacy had already begun to succumb to the greatest temptation, that of worldly power. In the Church of the Papacy «the conceit of worldly power had begun to slip in under the pretense of a divine service»; this power the 3<sup>rd</sup> Oecumenical Synod had criticized<sup>1</sup>. Hence the Papacy, having tried unsuccessfully until the end of the eleventh century to subjugate the Orthodox East ecclesiastically and politically in a peaceful way, by word and persuasion and ecclesiastical synods, subsequently attempted to succeed by force, i. e. by the wars of the Crusades<sup>2</sup>. And lastly, from the conquest of Constantinople it has sought the same aim through the deceit of Uniatism and various other deceptive means of propaganda which are used for the proselytism of Orthodox people.

We accept, certainly, that in the unfolding of the events of the schism and in the handling of the problems that arose, it was natural for certain mistakes to be made on the part of the Patriarchs Photius and Cerularius and generally by the defending Orthodox Greeks. However, we can only confirm that the cause of the schism was given generally by the Latins, on the one hand in the ninth century by Pope Nicholas I, and on the other in the eleventh century by Pope Leo IX and his representative Humbert, both applying the well-known policy of absolute papal primacy<sup>3</sup>.

*tinis, ipsi vero a suis»* (Mansi, Concil. 24,126). K. Paparregopoulos exaggeratedly thinks that «the division of the Churches did not result from dogmatic differences, but because of political interests» (op. cit. vol. IV p. 349), a one-sided and baseless opinion.

1. Canon 8, in Rhalles and Potles, op. cit. vol. IV p. 203.

2. The Roman Catholic F. Mercenier acknowledges that «en Occident, peu à peu, s'introduisait la pensée de s'emparer de Constantinople pour châtier l'empire de ce qu'on appelait sa trahison et rétablir de force l'unité que l'on avait cessé de croire réalisable par la persuasion» (ibid p. 89). Continuing he confirms that the occupation of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade by the Latins «fut marquée par des faits d'une sauvagerie inouïe qui firent plus pour populariser la séparation que des montagnes de libelles et accumulèrent dans le monde grec une haine presque inextinguible contre les Latins» (ibid). And the Pope Innocent III hastened to recognise «le fait accompli se flattant d'y trouver la voie de l'union toujours désirée et recherchée» (ibid).

3. See also Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 207 seq.: «These events testify that the contention of those who consider Photius and Cerularius responsible for the schism is absurd...The primacy of the Bishop of Rome, as it was shaped particularly from the time of Nicholas I and Leo IX, was the chief cause of the schism of the Roman Church; unfortunately, the primacy



Consequently, the chief responsibility for the ecclesiastical schism undoubtedly lies with these two Popes and their successors<sup>1</sup>, amongst whom not one Pope was found truly a peacemaker and capable of acting in the spirit of Christian love and within the framework of the canonical tradition of the Church in a way able either to avert her division or even after the outbreak of division to unite immediately the divided parts. This, in addition to other reasons, must be attributed to the condition of the Papacy during that period, which after Nicholas I and until Gregory VII (1073), namely for about 200 years, went through its «saeculum obscurum», as ecclesiastical historians from Baronius onward characterized it indeed with the darkest colours<sup>2</sup>. It is self-evident that the

was destined also to become the chief obstacle for the union of the Churches... The Latin Church prepared the schism, from which alone its causes came. Photius the Great and the other defenders of Orthodoxy did not seek to impose anything new on the Latin Church, but resisted that which was new and alien to the teaching and tradition of the whole Church... From the time that the bishop of Rome, forsaking his honorary position, sought to govern the whole Church and to enforce new teachings upon her without due discussion, he was necessarily destined sooner or later to carry along with him to schism the Western Church, over which he had already imposed himself, and to cut her off from the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Because, the latter adhered to those things which were delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles and which were formulated and decreed by the Fathers in Synods. But now certain new things alien to her were being asked by Rome to be introduced, and they who rejected them were being condemned as heretics» (ibid. pp. 207, 208, 213, 214).

1. It must be noted here that the Jansenists also in their second great provincial Synod at Utrecht in 1763 proclaimed: a) «The Popes alone are responsible for the opening and the continuation of the schism of the two Churches. b) The Greek Church is not responsible as regards both these. c) No Synod in which the Greeks did not participate is able to be considered as oecumenical etc. etc». (Acta et decreta synodi cleri romano-catholici provinciae Ultrajectensis, mense Septembri 1763, p. 65/6). See also Meletius, Metropolitan of Athens, Church History, Vienna 1783—1795, V, 179/80, in Greek.

2. See F. Heiler, op. cit. p. 250 seq. A. D. Kyriakos, Church History, vol. II p. 26. A. Demetrakopoulos, op. cit. p. 17 seq. Nektarius Kephalas, op. cit. II, 9. seq. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 182. A. Pichler (Roman Catholic) confirms, «dass Rom in dieser Periode (between Photius and Cerularius) 46 Päpste hatte, Constantinopel nur 16 Patriarchen, dass unter den ersteren die allermeisten nichtswürdig, unter den letzteren, mit Ausnahme des einzigen Theophylact, sämtliche durch Tugend und Character ausgezeichnete Männer waren, dass von Rom fast auf jede Anfrage von Seite der Griechen nur eine gehässige oder unbillige Entscheidung erfolgte» (op. cit. p. 204). Re-

decline of the Papacy during that period ought to be recognized as one of the not too insignificant reasons for the realization and the perpetuation of the schism.

But beyond this, impartiality compels us to confirm that the Orthodox Greeks of that time were distinguished for the strength, depth, purity and stability of their faith, though they extended it to different ecclesiastical ceremonies and customs, expanding it more than was necessary. For this reason, to the real differences between the two Churches they also added liturgical ones. As such these did not have a dogmatic character, but they helped widen and enlarge the ecclesiastical chasm. The Latins, on the other hand, were distinguished for their tendency to innovate in faith and worship and especially in the form of church government. They were marked out, as well, by the so-called «latin high-brow», haughtiness, arrogance, love for primacy, greediness, obstinate animosity and enmity against the Greeks, especially as shown by the Popes of Rome against the Patriarchs of Constantinople. Thus, supported also by mutual ignorance and differences about language, ecclesiastical customs and ecclesiastical life in general<sup>1</sup>, as well as by racial and political antithesis and enmity, Christian love, which was indispensable to the reconciliation and bridging of the chasm, was frozen. That love, which according to the Apostle Paul, «suffereth long, is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth»<sup>2</sup>, had disappeared from both sides, especially on the part of the Latins. There was, therefore, no necessary balance

---

cently another Roman Catholic theologian, F. Mercenier, wrote : «Entre la seconde déposition de Photius et le patriarcat de Cérulaire (886—1043) Constantinople vit seize Patriarches dont plusieurs vraiment remarquables et Rome quarante—quatre Papes et antipapes, dont vingt—deux régnèrent moins d'un an, dont huit périrent de mort violente, dont six furent déposés, et dont plusieurs étonnèrent par leurs scandales un monde pourtant habitué à toutes les violences et à toutes les immoralités. Dans ces conditions, rien d'étonnant que l'Orient, où la civilisation était d'un raffinement exquis, n'ait eu que mépris pour ces pontifes qui avaient si peu de respect de leur caractère et pour une ville qui donnait de tels spectacles» (op. cit. p. 75).

1. M. Jugie confirms that «chacune d'elles (the Roman and Byzantine Churches) avait sa vie autonome et l'on n'entraît en relations qu'en de rares circonstances» (op. cit. p. 141).

2. I Cor. 13, 4—6.

between faith and love which would have been able to prevent the final tearing asunder of the seamless garment of our Lord. Brotherly hate and religious and racial fanaticism replaced the love between Christian brothers. One of the two champions of Orthodoxy, Mark of Ephesus, Evgenicus, made the most upright confirmation when he said before the Synod at Florence «that the Roman Church had overlooked love, and peace was thus dissolved» between the Churches<sup>1</sup>.

Noteworthy is the fact that while the Orthodox were attributing to the Latins true and serious dogmatic and other innovations, criticizing them for heresy and schism, they in return had nothing true and well-founded to attribute to them, but only argued about primacy and precedence or about the simple patriarchal title «oecumenical». They were further plotting for the ecclesiastical and political subjugation of southern Italy, Bulgaria, eastern Illyricum and finally of the entire Orthodox East, without being able to bring forth against the Orthodox accusations of a dogmatic character, entailing a charge for heresy.

---

1. Silvester Syropoulos, *Memoirs of the Synod in Florence*, ed. Creighton, Chagae 1660, p. 167. Nicetas [Stethatus also wrote to the intolerant Cardinal Humbert and the Latins in Constantinople: «Neighborly love is good, oh Romans, the wisest and noblest of all nations. Because, by loving your neighbor, humility also superabounds in the person who has that love. Superabounding love makes her sharer sustain everything, endure everything, as the Apostle says, and not be puffed up against his neighbor, nor boast against him, nor seek only after his own, nor envy after him or show jealousy; all these things drive love and humility away, and make man walk not according to God, but according to the desire of pleasing men». (See A. Demetrakopoulos, *Ecclesiastiki Bibliothiki*, vol. I, p. 18). This was written by the Greeks, while the haughty and reviling Humbert was insulting them in Constantinople as heretics, because they had not accepted the Filioque, the use of unleavened bread, the fast of Saturday and the celibacy of the clergy!, he even characterized the Orthodox East as the country of all heresy, and called Stethatus an arch-heretic, most wretched, an adventurer, ignorant, «Saravaite», «more stupid than an ass», adding: «you are not a presbyter but one who is accursed and has aged in evils, a child of a hundred years, one who is more fittingly called an Epicurean than a monk. Nor does it appear that you are living in the monastery of Studion, but in an amphitheatre and a place of ill-repute; you are rightly called Stethatus (Pectoratus), because with the ancient serpent you are dragged on the breast» (Migne P. L. 143, 983. C. Will, op. cit. p. 136 seq.). The simple comparison of Stethatus and Humbert's words reveals the spirit which animated the persons who represented the two Churches during those times and, therefore, the degree of their guilt in the ecclesiastical schism.

This truth is witnessed by the fact that only in the year 1098 did the Latin Synod, which convened at Bari under the Pope Urban II, venture to criticize the Orthodox as heretics with the ridiculous, as we have seen, criticism that they refused to accept the Latin heterodox teaching about the procession of the Holy Spirit «and from the Son» and its unlawful addition to the sacred Creed<sup>1</sup>.

Undoubtedly, the Patriarchs Photius and Cerularius<sup>2</sup> were roused up principally against the Papacy—its monarchy and impetuous and tyrannical despotism—having sought to restrain and check it in its irresistible course and tendency to overthrow the ancient democratic ecclesiastical form of government and to change it and the dogmatic teaching of the Church<sup>3</sup>. If they had succeeded, surely the Patriarchate of Rome would have remained in communion with the other four ancient historical Patriarchates of the East and the enactment of all those new Latin dogmas and institutions, which were introduced into the Roman Church from the ninth century until the Vatican Synod of 1870, would have been prevented<sup>4</sup>. Those Orthodox Patriarchs did exactly

1. Mansi, Concil. 20, 947. In the same spirit did Petrus Damiani († 1072) write prior to the Synod of Bari: «Contra Graecorum errorem de processione Spiritus Sancti» (Migne P. L. 145, 633 seq.) and later Anselm of Canterbury († 1109): «De processione Spiritus Sancti, Contra Graecos» (Migne P. L. 158, 285 seq.).

2. Even the Patriarch «Ignatius was as fierce a defender of his Church's rights as Photius. We must not forget that the Council of 869—870, called the eighth oecumenical, was in many ways a failure for the Papacy... Ignatius had the same ideas about Bulgaria as Photius» (F. Dvornik, *The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion?*, op. cit. p. 30/1).

3. According to A. Demetrakopoulos, «the monarchy of the bishops of Rome was chiefly the initial cause of the separation of the Latin Church from the Orthodox East»; it began to appear «from the third and fourth century and became more audacious during the ninth century» (*History of the schism*, p. 1). Lastly p. 173, he concludes: «The cause then of the schism of the two Churches was the addition to the sacred Creed made by the Latins, the desire for power, and the infallibility, monarchy and worship of the Pope and the lawless novelties and innovations of the Latin Church...»

4. Not only the infallibility, observes A. Pichler, but «auch die beiden anderen den Umfang der Papstgewalt betreffenden Theorien, die Zuteilung beider Schwester und aller Jurisdictionsgewalt nach göttlichem Rechte, wären ohne diese Kirchentrennung wohl nie entstanden und haben sich erst nach derselben ausgebildet, als die Gränzen der allgemeinen Kirche mit dem römischen Patriarchat zusammenfielen. Diejenigen Theologen, welche diese Theorien noch immer aufrecht erhalten und ihnen sogar dogmatischen Charakter

what all the great reformers of the Western Church did later who, imitating in one way or another their example, fought the new teachings and abuses of the Papacy and struggled together with the people of the West against the wordly power and tyranny of the Popes; as for example, the conveners of the reforming Latin Synods of Piza, Constance and Basel, the so-called precursors of the religious Reformation, the reformers of the 16<sup>th</sup> century who were about Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, the French theologians of the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the German bishops of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the Old Catholics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, to omit the rest<sup>1</sup>.

This is the most important reason for which Photius and Cerularius became the target of the violent attacks on the part of Popes, Latin Synods, theologians and papal legates, attacks which were made by means of depositions, excommunications, anathemas, insults and slander. Unfortunately these are continued until today by Roman Catholic writers who unjustly criticize them as the only ones responsible for the schism and improperly censure them<sup>2</sup>. However, the pure historical truth is that those

---

vindiciren, mögen wohl zusehen, ob sie nicht hiemit der (Roman) Kirche den Vorwurf zuziehen, sie sei von ihrer Tradition abgefallen» (op. cit. p. 547).

1. They sharply discerned and averted from their Church the papal tendency towards ecclesiastical sovereignty and absolutism, which was difficult to discern during the time of Photius and Cerularius. This tendency had to be developed in the work of the Vatican Synod one whole millenium later for the Old Catholics to be awakened and, imitating Photius, to revolt against the papal claims and proclaim through their declarations of Utrecht in 1889: «We reject the papal decisions (dating) from the 18th of July 1870 about the infallibility and the universal episcopacy or the ecclesiastical absolutism of the Popes of Rome as contradictory to the faith of the ancient Church...We reject likewise the declaration of Pius IX in 1854 concerning the Immaculate Conception of Mary as being unsupported by Holy Scripture and the Tradition of the first centuries etc.» («Ecclesiastiki Aletheia» 16 (1896/97)274). In a similar way did many of the greater Roman Catholic scholars and theologians express themselves. We cite, for example, the Cardinal Nicholas Cuzanus who shortly before the Synod of Ferrara-Florence wrote the following very rightly, which Photius and every Orthodox theologian would be able to countersign: «Romanus pontifex est membrum Ecclesiae, et infallibilitas non cuilibet membro, sed toti Ecclesiae promissa est... Est caput dignitativum et honorificatum, quamvis non directivum vel potestativum jurisdictionaliter» (A. Pichler, op. cit. p. 250).

2. «Catholics are used to regard Photius as the first great schismatic, the Father of Schism between East and West, the inventor of a heresy con-

ever-memorable Greek Patriarchs had been repeatedly provoked by the Latins and were thus driven to a just and lawful defense by Popes who created quarrels and strifes and even schisms for the sake of primacies, leadership, and ecclesiastico-political sovereignty. Being conscious of their sacred duty to safeguard the Orthodox Faith and Tradition, which were in danger of being falsified, and to defend the endangered independence and freedom of the ancient Eastern Churches, they were forced to answer to the provocations of Rome in mutual agreement with the other Orthodox Patriarchs and the whole Eastern Church and to retaliate in equal measure, condemning the Latin heterodox teachings and innovations, according to the spirit and example of the ancient Church. For this reason, the whole Orthodox Catholic Church sanctioned their action and position against the totalitarian and sovereign claims and innovations of Rome. In their protests and accusations and anathematizations against the Papacy, the Orthodox Catholic Church heard and discerned her own voice and recognised them as champions of Orthodoxy<sup>1</sup>.

cerning the Filioque, an usurper of the patriarchal See, a man full of vanity and deceit, the falsifier of papal letters and the acts of a Council, excommunicated by the Western and Eastern Church, a man whose memory is rightly detested by all Christendom etc.» (F. Dvornik, op. cit. p. 20). They have written more and worse things henceforth from the time of Cardinal Humbert against Michael Cerularius. See for example the two anonymous propagandist pamphlets from the papal agents in Constantinople (in Greek and French): *Le père du schisme grec ou vie de Photius, Constantinople 1848*, and *Le consommateur du schisme grec ou vie de Michel Céruleire, Constantinople 1849*.

1. In relation to this, the four Orthodox Patriarchs of the East in their well-known encyclical in answer to Pope Pius IX wrote in 1848: «Our predecessors and fathers of blessed memory in common pain and decision, ~~having seen the traditional teachings of the Gospel forged and the divinely-woven garment of our Savior torn in two by wicked hands,~~ wept for the loss of so many Christians for whom Christ died, being moved by fatherly and brotherly love. They showed much earnestness and honor privately and in Synods in order to be able to sew together the divided parts, saving the Orthodox teaching of the Holy Catholic Church. As acknowledged doctors they deliberated for the salvation of the suffering part, having endured much affliction, contumely and persecution, only that the body of Christ be not dismembered, only that the horos of the divine and venerable Synods be not violated. Truthful History has handed down to us the relentlessness of western persistence in error. These ever-memorable men experienced in deed, in this case also, the truth of the words of our Father Saint Basil the «ouranophantor», who even in his time spoke from experience about the bishops of the West and particularly about the

The fact that the laity of the Orthodox Greek nation sensed and intimated in time the double danger from the Papacy against its ecclesiastical and national independence and autonomy is indeed worth special praise. He who investigates the position of the Orthodox Greek people against the Papacy's aim at subjugating them confirms with astonishment that together with the leaders of their Church they always discerned earlier and more clearly and fully than their political and intellectual leaders the great ecclesiastical and national danger from Rome. They perceived that the subjugation of the Eastern Church to Rome, under the form of the imposition of the papal sovereign primacy over her, would have resulted inevitably in the latinization<sup>1</sup> and assimilation of the Orthodox Greeks and, consequently, in the loss of both their orthodoxy and nationality<sup>2</sup>. This explains why the Orthodox Greek people took the lead in the opposition of the Orthodox Catholic Church against papal expansion and totalitarianism during the opening of the schism in the ninth and eleventh century, during the time of the Crusades and the domination of the Franks in the Orthodox East, and after this in the

Pope: «they know neither the truth nor tolerate learning, quarrelling with those who proclaim the truth to them and verifying the heresy by themselves» (to Eusebius Samos.). Thus, after the first and second brotherly admonition, having known their impenitence, «having shaken them off» and «given up, they gave them over to a reprobate mind»; («because war is better than peace which separates from God», as our Father Saint Gregory said about the Arians). Since then, there has been no spiritual communion between us and them; because, with their own hands they had opened the deep chasm between themselves and Orthodoxy». (Encyclical letter of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church to the Orthodox everywhere, edit. 2, Constantinople 1863, p. 11—12). Similarly, F. Dvornik specially observes about Photius that «for the Orthodox, Photius is one of the greatest Eastern Fathers, the last great doctor of the Greek Church, a saint officially canonized by all Eastern Churches, the valiant defender of the freedom and autonomy of his Church against all encroachment from the Papacy, a great teacher, and a great Prince of the Church» (op. cit. p. 19).

1. F. Mercenier acknowledges that the papal West «arrivait à ne concevoir d' autre voie à la cessation du schisme que la latinisation plus ou moins complète» (op. cit. p. 92). For example, Bessarion advised the tutor of Thomas Palaeologus' children that he make them live entirely in a Frankish way, namely, to follow the Church in all things as Latins and not otherwise, to dress in a Latin way, learn to kneel before their superiors the Pope and Cardinals, etc. (A. Demetrakopoulos, *Orthodox Greece*, p. IX).

2. See A. Demetrakopoulos, *ibid.* p. VIII seq., and *History of the Schism*, p. 28. A. Kyriakos, *Studies*, p. 92-93.

initiative which was undertaken purely for political reasons by the last dynasty of Palaeologus towards «union» with Rome. As characteristic examples we limit ourselves to mentioning the popular uprising against the unionist Synods of Lyons in 1274<sup>1</sup> and Florence in 1439<sup>2</sup> and against the Byzantine emperors Michael VIII and John VII Palaeologus who had participated in them personally or through their representatives and finally the popular uprising in Constantinople against the «union»<sup>3</sup> with Rome during the eve of the Turkish capture of Constantinople. Even during the duration of the Turkish occupation and after it the distrust and opposition of the Greek people continued against every unionist action or, more accurately speaking, proselytizing attempt of Rome and encroachment in the Greek East. Unfortunately, she sought this and continues to this day even in the center of Athens by different lawful and unlawful means, by fraudulent intrigues and religio-political intermeddling and pursuits in the midst of Orthodox people, by her Jesuit and other monastic orders and agents, by her ecclesiastical, monastic, educational, philanthropic and other institutions and above all by the treacherous proselytizing method of «Unia», by which the so-called «Uniate» clergymen travel «land and sea to make one proselyte»<sup>4</sup> orthodox, exercising in hardly Christian fashion the anti-evangelical proselytism of Orthodox Christians, instead of going out to teach «the nations»<sup>5</sup>.

1. See J. Karmiris, *The Latin Confession of Faith of 1274*, ascribed to Michael VIII Palaeologus, Athens 1947, p. 21 seq. (in Greek). N. Kephalas, op. cit. II, 118 seq. A. Demetrakopoulos, *History of the Schism*, p. 58 seq.

2. J. Karmiris, *The Symbolical texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, p. 25 seq. A. Demetrakopoulos, op. cit. p. 105-173. N. Kephalas, op. cit. II, 208 seq.

3. See K. Paparregopoulos, op. cit. vol. V p. 302 seq.

4. Mt. 23,15.

5. Mt. 28,19. To achieve the end sought, the following were founded: the «Congregatio de rebus Graecorum» by the Pope Gregory XIII (1579-1585), the «Congregatio de propaganda fide pro negotiis ritus orientalis» by the Pope Pius IX in 1862 and the «Congregatio pro Ecclesia orientali» by the Pope Benedict XV in 1917, which functions to this day. Besides, as an organ suitable for the same purpose Pope Gregory XV in 1622 founded the «Congregatio de propaganda fide», successfully operating since then. He arranged that its work be the spreading of the Christian faith also in the Orthodox Christian East, as in «Ecclesiam in partibus infidelium»! So that, that Pope and the Jesuits did not hesitate to number the heretical and schismatical Greeks in the Turkish State among the unfaithful who,



But unfortunately, even today the Church of Rome, inspired by the idea of her oecumenicity and the absolute papal primacy, as it is recorded in the official document for its founding, «remain now in a condition of stupidity, have undertaken almost the nature of wild animals and are maintained only to serve for the population of the inhabitants of Hades for the sake of the devil and his angels». In A. D. Kyriakos, op. cit. vol. III p. 113/4 : «Si enim mentis nostrae aciem convertimus ad innumerabilem populorum multitudinem jam tot saeculis Agarenorum impurissima dementia captam insanique errori, ac mendacii tenebris obcoecatam, miseratione commoverunt viscera nostra, cernentes tam multis et variis coelestibus donis olim celebres nationes per ignorantiam et pestilentis persuasionis stuporem humanitatem in bestiarum naturam fere mutasse atque ad aeterno incendia diabolo et angelis suis parata ali ac propagari». We repeat with K. Algermissen that under the *Congregatio de propaganda fide* «untersteht das «Päpstliche Werk der Glaubensverbreitung» und das «Werk des heiligen Petrus» für Herandildung eines einheimischen Klerus in den Missionsländern (op. cit. p. 137), and working side by side in this same direction is the «*Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali*», which «leitet die wichtigen Arbeiten an der Union des Ostens» (ibid), is understood not in the true meaning of the word «union», but in the papal understanding of «subjection» of the Orthodox East. As known, just as in modern times, so in the former did the papal missionaries, who were sent by the «*Congregatio de propaganda fide*» to the Turkish held East and who continued with fanaticism the work of the Crusades and the dominion of the Franks, commit those and similar sufferings at the expense of the Orthodox. See Ph. Vafeides, *Church History*, vol. III p. 53 seq. Thus, the Patriarch of Alexandria Gerasimus described as follows the sufferings of the Orthodox at the hands of the Latins : «All know the murders, the confiscations, the Latin persecutions and the forcible signatures, out of which came the misfortunes of our Race; cities have vanished, districts were altogether destroyed, we were made desolate of all goods; after the Israelites we starve laboring with clay and brick. This is the condition of our Church which sees clearly the utmost danger; and if God does not come to aid more quickly, it is impossible otherwise to be maintained. Because, we see this war as the most destructive of all events yet». («*Ecclesiastiki Aletheia*», 29 (1909) 396). This «war» of the Papacy forced the autocephalous Orthodox Churches to take a position «of precaution and defence» (see : «On the relationship of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches and on other general ecclesiastical problems, the Patriarchal and Synodical Encyclical of 1902, the responses to it of the holy autocephalous Churches and the reply of the Oecumenical Patriarchate», Constantinople 1904, «Acts of the preliminary committee of the Holy Orthodox Churches which met at Mt. Athos, June 8—21, 1930», Constantinople 1930 (both in Greek). These were written against the Roman Church which did not understand that she enlarged still more and distended the chasm which separates the two Churches and that she increased the abhorrence and anti-papal disposition of the Orthodox peoples against her, particularly that of the Greeks who defend their own orthodoxy and nationality.

has marked out and fanatically seeks to realize the well-known foreign policy of the Vatican, which consists in the subjugation and subordination of all the Christian Churches, and by preference that of the Orthodox, under the power and «absurd authority of the Pope»<sup>1</sup>. Hence, in the Greek State itself, in which only about thirty thousand Roman Catholics<sup>2</sup> live, she strives to apply her politics, mentioned above, respecting neither the official Orthodox Church to which almost the whole of the Greek people belongs, nor the sovereign rights and laws of the State. In this manner, she furnishes not a few difficulties to the official ecclesiastical and state authorities and scandals to the pious Orthodox Greek people, as it happened lately for example, by the naming of Roman Catholic bishops to Latin bishoprics in Greece, which are unrecognised by law and consequently nonexistent, by the arbitrary maintenance in Athens of her unrecognized three archbishops: the Catholic, Uniate and Armenian, as well as by the maintenance of her chargé d'affaires, also unrecognized, and by the preservation of various propagandist institutions, schools, hostels, monasteries etc., which have a disproportionately large number of personnel with foreign citizenship and students and inmates who are mostly Orthodox etc<sup>3</sup>. We deem it superfluous

1. Gerasimus, Patriarch of Alexandria, op. cit. p. 396.

2. According to the registration of the population of Greece in the year 1928, in a total of 6,204,684, 5,961,529 registered as Orthodox Christians; 35,182 as Roman Catholics; 9,003 as Protestants in general; 126,017 as Mohammedans; 72,791 as Israelites; 45 of other confessions, and 117 belonging to none. According to the census of 1940 in a total of 7,344,860 registered, the Orthodox Christians numbered 7,090,192; Roman Catholics 29,137; Protestants 6,335; Monophysite Armenians 16,350; other Christian groups 504; Mohammedans 134,722; Israelites 67,591 (diminished to about 10,000 as a result of the Nazi cruelty); other confessions 2, and belonging to none 25. According to this census while in 1928 heterodox represented only 7.51 to a thousand of the total Greek population, in 1940 their number was reduced, and today as a result of the second World War there will have been an even greater decrease especially of the Israelites, of the Monophysites and particularly of the Armenians, of the Roman Catholics etc. L. Ravasz writes in «World Christian Handbook», ed. Grubb, London 1949, p. 51: «The Church of the Kingdom of Greece, which is for practical purposes the most important of the Greek Orthodox Churches... is the Church of almost all the people living in the Greek peninsula. To be Greek is almost synonymous with being Orthodox or Christian».

3. See A. Alivisatos, State and Vatican, article in «Tribune» (Greek) I/2.7. 1947. G. Konidaris, Concordata and Papal State from a Greek national

to add that prompt arrangement is necessary by mutual understanding and comprehension of this condition which the Vatican has arbitrarily created for us—a condition unacceptable from an ecclesiastical and state point of view.

## V

We have examined briefly and along general lines the separation of the Roman Church from the first Mother of all Christian Churches, the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East. We have tried to show that the Papacy was chiefly responsible for the outbreak of the schism as it is also responsible for its perpetuation by means of the Crusades and its increasing expansion up to this day at the expense of local Orthodox Churches. Besides the purely human claims of the bishop of Rome, stated earlier, concerning primacy and ecclesiastico-political world rule, the objective and unprejudiced examination and criticism of the events of the schism forces us to recognize that this schism was generally due to many and various other causes, but pre-eminently to the racial, political and economic differences, to the pursuits of individuals and peoples on both sides, to individual differences and the variety of intellectual and psychological inclinations and tendencies, to a different understanding of the Christian faith and life, as well as to the imperfections and deficiencies of human nature, to the lack of Christian love, and to human sin under its various forms and expressions, especially to the arrogance, desire for power and the pursuit for primacy, pre-eminence and precedence etc.

Undoubtedly, that first and great ecclesiastical schism was the most grievous and tragic event of the history of the ancient Church. By this schism the ancient, united and undivided Catholic

---

and Orthodox Catholic point of view, in «Church Pharos» 47 (1948) 50 seq., 97 seq., and Greece, Papal State and Concordata, in «Ecclesia» 24 (1947) 276 seq. Methodius, Metropolitan of Ceryra, Encyclical in protest against the pursuits and interventions of the Roman Papacy in Ceryra and in Greece generally, Ceryra 1948.—Memorandum to the venerable Holy Synod and to all the respectable Hierarchs of the Church of Greece against the interventions of the Roman Papacy, Ceryra 1948. Chrysostom, Metropolitan of Zacynthos, The Symplegades, article in «Ecclesia» 24 (1947) 227 seq. Th. Speranza, The indispensable presupposition of agreement with the Vatican, article in «Ethnos» 25.6.1947 (all in Greek).

Church was separated into two Catholic Churches: the Orthodox and the Roman, being separated by those differences mentioned earlier and certain others of a dogmatic, administrative, and liturgical nature, which were sometimes exaggerated out of misconstruction or lack of good will and understanding. However, the common ecclesiastical tradition of eight whole centuries unites them. Both try to maintain and continue this tradition, the Orthodox Church on the one hand without innovating and the Roman Church on the other by making a sufficient number of innovations.

In spite, however, of the historical events of the past, which are stated above, we believe that the understanding and peaceful arrangement by «œconomia» of the differences which separate them is not completely impossible, provided that this is made under the light of the Holy Bible, the ancient and genuine Holy Tradition, and after the long and serious preparation of the minds and hearts of the Clergy and laity of both Churches. We believe that the breach separating the two sister Churches is not completely unbridgeable, but on the contrary, can and must be bridged. Whatever the lack of Christian love and human sin has separated, particularly the desire for power and the different personal, ecclesiastical, political, racial and economic pursuits, Christian love and brotherhood must reunite.

Fortunately, it seems that on the part of both Churches consciousness of unity between them has not been wanting, just as consciousness of responsibility was not lacking for the division and dissension which each bears in a different degree and, as a result, the responsibility for the violation of their divine Founder's last commandment about the unity and love between them, which was that «all may be one»<sup>1</sup>. Because, they who have sinned, by breaking the bonds of Christian unity and love, have the sacred obligation, knowing the truth which liberates and being conscious of their great sin toward the unity of the Church, to work together sincerely and humbly for the re-establishment and reunion of the divided Church.

On the other hand, it was not possible for the two sister Churches to lose the comforting hope of the possibility for their reunion. For this reason almost immediately after the schism of the eleventh century they began making somewhat significant

1. John 17, 21.

and friendly efforts at reunion<sup>1</sup>, which, however, were fruitless. Because, union of the two Churches was not pursued sincerely, and on equal terms and on the basis of the teaching of the Holy Bible and the ancient Church, but Rome sought chiefly by various means to extort the unconditional subjugation and enslavement of the Orthodox Churches to the Papacy by imposing the sovereign papal primacy over them<sup>2</sup>. So that, that which became the cause of the outbreak of the schism is censured also as the chief cause for its perpetuation and for the failure of all friendly unionist attempts. Consequently, removal from the center of this great and important obstacle of unity, i. e. the tyrannical papal supremacy, this stone of scandal for divided Christianity, is able to lead to the reunion of the divided Churches. We believe that if the Popes of Rome wanted to return to the existing «pentarchy» of the Patriarchs<sup>3</sup> of the ancient Church and

---

1. See J. Karmiris, Unionist attempts and relations of the Churches, article in «Religious Encyclopaedia», (Greek) vol. III p. 106 seq. Also, The Division of the Church and unionist efforts» by the same author, p. 7 seq. In fact, the Orthodox Catholic Church from the time of Saint Photius has in no way ceased admonishing the Latins to abandon their heterodox teachings and innovations and to return to the unity of the Church and to her dogmas, which were transmitted from antiquity, but they, however, according to the Patriarch of Constantinople Joseph, «did not hear, were not taught, did not accept the reminder of the offences; yet from all the land came forth the voice of them who admonished them by discourses, by letters, by ecclesiastical and synodical tomes, by many and different charters, which were confirmed by the synodical decisions of Patriarchs, hierarchs, monastics and Kings, whose eagerness aimed at nothing else but to correct them and turn them back to piety; but they did not accept, did not hear, were not convinced, did not perceive, did not understand». (A. Demetrakopoulos, op. cit. p. 131).

2. For this reason it is necessary that «non-Roman Catholic Christians continue to pray in order that the Church of Rome be persuaded to acquire a broader and deeper conception of Christian unity» and the way of its attainment. (W. Visser t'Hooft, in «Ecclesia» 27 (1950) 322).

3. See Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 93 seq. The peacemaker Patriarch of Antioch, Petter III, who was characterized by M. Jugie (op. cit. p. 219. 232) as «unionist» (?), was in favor of the ecclesiastical pentarchy during the time of the schism, as he writes in the well-known letter to the Metropolitan of Gradenza: «By divine grace five patriarchs were ordained to be in all the world, one of Rome, one of Constantinople, one of Alexandria, one of Antioch and one of Jerusalem. Yet, not even each of these is properly called patriarch, but abusively. The body of man is led by one head, and in it there are many parts, all ordered by five senses only. These are, sight, scent, hearing, taste

to recognise «the five-peaked power of the Church» which the venerable Church Tradition, including the general Synods in Constantinople of 869/70 and 879/80—when the papal legates also agreed—has handed down<sup>1</sup>, the Orthodox Catholic Church will continue firmly on the one hand to recognize the old *primatus honoris* or *ordinis* of the bishop of Rome as really *primus inter pares*<sup>2</sup>, on the other hand to reject as she always did in the past the *primatus potestatis* or *jurisdictionis*, which was unknown in ecclesiastical antiquity and was contrived in the West after the seven Oecumenical Synods. Thus, would the necessary and favourable presupposition and the good interecclesiastical climate be created for the beginning of unionist conversations<sup>3</sup>. «The just cutting off of the Pope of Rome from the Church did not destroy the canonical and good order», according to the correct teaching of Theodore Balsamon<sup>4</sup>.

During these unionist conversations the entire question of the union of the Orthodox and the Roman Church must be put on a new basis. As we stressed at another time, «from the standpoint of an Orthodox the meeting and union of the two Catholic Churches is possible only on the grounds of the ancient and united Church of the seven Oecumenical Synods of the eight first centuries and upon equal terms. Both have to oust every posterior element which was unknown and is irreconcilable with the ancient and common ecclesiastical tradition. The Roman Church particularly has to renounce all her later innovations in faith, worship and ecclesiastical administration which are opposed to the

---

and touch. The body again of Christ, the Church, I say, of the faithful, which is joined by different parts like nations and ordered by five senses of the aforesaid great thrones, is led by one head, Christ himself. As there is no other sense than the five, in this way will no other patriarch be accepted the above five patriarchs. At any rate, under these five thrones, being as senses in the body of Christ, are all the parts, namely all the peoples of the nations and the local bishoprics throughout the land ordered and divinely conducted, as in one head, in Christ the true God, joined by one Orthodox faith and led by him» (C. Will, op. cit. p. 211/2).

1. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 152 seq. See also A. Demetrakopoulos, op. cit. p. 174.

2. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. XI seq.

3. See «Reply of a certain Orthodox» etc. p. 65/6. Chrys Papadopoulos, The presuppositions of union, in «Ecclesia» 4 (1926) 2 o/1.

4. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit. p. 543.

Holy Bible, to the decisions of the Oecumenical Synods and in general to the genuine Orthodox Tradition of the ancient, united and undivided Church<sup>1</sup>. Above all, both Churches must seek true dogmatic and internal unity, full unity in the faith, to include all the fundamental truths of divine Revelation and especially those concerning the head and the infallibility of the Church and to exclude only the liturgical and administrative differences and peculiarities of each which are not connected with dogma. According to Photius, «whenever that which is violated is not the faith, nor is a fall from the common and catholic decree, because other customs and laws are kept by others, he who knows how to judge rightly should not think that they who keep these fall into injustices, or that they who do not accept them violate the law»<sup>2</sup>.

Personally we believe that under these presuppositions and conditions our own Orthodox Catholic Church of the East would not deny co-operating sincerely with the Roman in order to adjust by «*oconomia*» the existing differences and to re—establish the harmony, love and unity between the two sister Churches, so that the last Hierarchical prayer to the Heavenly Father of the divine Founder, and unique Leader and Governor of the Church may be realized: that again «they may be one»<sup>3</sup>.

*Translated by Z. Xintaras.*

---

1. J. Karmiris, *The Orthodox Catholic Church and her relation with the heterodox Councils and the «World Council of Churches»*, Athens 1949, p. 23/4 (in Greek). See: Encyclical letter of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church to the Orthodox everywhere, Constantinople 1848, § 17 p. 37 seq.—Answer of the Oecumenical Patriarch Gregory VI to the papal invitation to the Vatican Council, in «*Evangelical Herald*» 1 (1869) 223 seq. (both in Greek).—Answer of the great Church of Constantinople to the papal encyclical on union, Oxford 1896, by E. Metallinos.

2. Photius' letter to Pope Nicholas I, by J. Valettas, *op. cit.* p. 156.

3. An Orthodox theologian who believes in the possibility of the reunion of the two Catholic Churches is able to repeat the words of Balsamon: «And yet, as the ivy of an oak tree I want to maintain concord with the Pope of Rome, and for his separation I tear my heart to pieces, and daily I eagerly expect the good return» (*op. cit.* p. 547).