

THE SCHISM OF THE ROMAN CHURCH *

BY

JOHN N. KARMIRIS

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS

I

Among the opponents and adversaries of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East, the Papacy very early took its place. By the word Papacy we mean the tendency of the bishops of Rome, which is foreign to the genuine spirit of Christianity, towards absolute concentration of all the powers and properties of the Church—even up to the point of infallibility—in one ruler and the exercise by him of tyrannical government and sovereignty over the whole Church of Christ. In addition, the term implies all the accompanying innovations of the bishops of Rome in administration, worship and faith of the Church; moreover, it means the appropriation by the Papacy of political, namely worldly power. This tendency appeared early in the ancient Church, but because she was entangled in hard struggles against heretics and other enemies, internal and external, she did not hasten to suppress it in its genesis. The fact that it was expressed in the West, on the other hand, offered suitable ground for its growth for various reasons, but above all because of its distance from the Greek East, which was then the center of all ecclesiastical, political, and intellectual movements, and because at that time the peoples of the West were uncivilized. In addition, the fact that there existed only one apostolic throne in the West, that of Rome, gave this tendency ground for development. It was natural for Rome to become a great ecclesiastical center, as

* Address, delivered at the auditorium of the University of Athens the 30th of January 1950, commemorating the holiday of the three Hierarchs, Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, which holiday is also honored in Greece as Greek Education Day. In the foreword, which is omitted here, the speaker spoke about the relations of the work of the three ancient Hierarchs to that of the two byzantine Hierarchs Photius and Cerularius, Patriarchs of Constantinople when the schism of the Roman Church from the ancient, united and undivided Church was completed.

it already had become a political one¹. The Eastern Church, in which the great dogmatical and ecclesiastical struggles were taking place at this time that as a result gave to Christianity its definite and permanent form, was not touched immediately by the absolute papal ambitions. For this reason, she did not react effectively in time against the pursuits of the bishops of Rome, which in the beginning were put forward in the East in the form of a simple claim to honorary primacy. In this way, the Papacy found the opportunity to impose itself on the entire Western Church and to strengthen its position during the first eight centuries. When it thought itself sufficiently strong, it attempted to extend its sovereignty even over the Eastern Church during the latter half of the ninth century, taking advantage on the one hand of her weakness due to her subjugation by Mohammedanism and of the decline of the three ancient Patriarchates of the East—Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem; on the other hand, of its political emancipation from the byzantine emperors and its alliances with the Frankish rulers of the West, through the aid of whom the Papacy had already obtained political power. The theory of the two swords and the papal primacy was thus shaped².

1. See also B. Stefanides, *Church History*, Athens 1948, p. 261 seq. (in Greek).

2. Very characteristic is the event that to justify all this and particularly to support the papal primacy of jurisdiction and the other arrogant claims of the Papacy the two known fictitious fabrications called «Donatio Constantini» and the «Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals» were forged in the West from the middle of the eighth century to about the middle of the ninth. Because their forgery remained unperceived for a very long time, they caused a complete revolution in the ecclesiastical form of government which was held from the first centuries of Christianity. Because, the administrative, legislative and judicial powers of the Pope of Rome were enlarged and completed by the addition of worldly power. For further details see Nectarius Kephalas, Metropolitan of Pentapolis, *Historical study of the causes of the schism, its perpetuation and the possibility or impossibility of the union of the two Churches Eastern and Western*, Athens 1911 vol. I, pp. 185—200 (in Greek). J. Döllinger (Janus), *Der Pöpst und das Concil*, Leipzig 1869, p. p. 101 seq. Ph. Vafeides, *The primacy of the Pope of Rome developing in the history of the Church*, Salonika 1929, pp. 114, 131 seq. (in Greek). B. Stefanides, op. cit., p. 274 seq. Such myth-making and forgeries were customarily made by the Latins, and even the great scholastic theologian and philosopher Thomas Aquinas was influenced by them. See J. Karmiris, *Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae*, Athens 1935, p. 33/4 (in Greek).

In this manner, there was somehow created in the Church a new degree in the priesthood, that of the Pope, who being considered as «episcopus episcoporum», and «episcopus universalis» and source of the priesthood, centralizes the highest ecclesiastical and worldly power and stands above all the hierarchs and patriarchs and even over the Œcumenical Synods; the Pope is the visible head and ruler of the whole Church and the vicar of Christ on earth, having the «plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam» whenever he speaks «ex cathedra» and defines the teaching which ought to be observed by the whole Church in faith and morals, «ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit», as the Vatican Synod dogmatized in the past century¹. So in this way, the ancient simple honorary primacy of the bishop of Rome was perverted and changed into a primacy of jurisdiction that was even completed and crowned with infallibility. Of course, these fabrications of the Latins, which are contrary to the letter and to the spirit of the Holy Scriptures and Holy Tradition, were able to find reception only in the West and not in the Greek Orthodox East which was the first teacher of Christianity and Civilization. For this reason, it is obvious that as soon as this monarchy and absolutism of the Pope, thus developed and enforced in the Western Church, would attempt to spread out over the independent and free Eastern Church, it would inevitably lead to conflict and schism of the two Churches, the responsibility resting with the Roman Church.

Moreover, the Papacy was not content with changing the organization of the Church alone, but ventured also to introduce many dogmatical and liturgical innovations that were unknown in the ancient Church. Thus, she innovated in the celebration of the Sacraments of Baptism, Chrism and Holy Eucharist even up to the point of touching the dogmatical teachings of the ancient Church. But that which clashed more against the dogmatical conscience of the Orthodox was the addition of the «filioque» clause to the Creed, which in form was anti-canonical and in substance erroneous. This clause contains the new latin teaching of the procession of the Holy Spirit «and from the Son», which was characterized by Photius as an «heretical belief», «atheistic opi-

1. H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, Freiburgi 1911, ed. 11, p. 487.490.

nion» and «blasphemy against the Spirit, or rather against the whole Trinity» and the «apex of evils»¹. Peter of Antioch, writing to Cerularius, characterized it as «an evil and of all evils the worst»². Because, it meant the forgery of the sacred symbol of the Church and a change in the most fundamental Christian dogma about the Holy Trinity, which the first two Œcumenical Councils had formulated, which the great Fathers of the Church had theologically and philosophically examined and fortified and which the five succeeding Œcumenical and other ecclesiastical Synods had recognized and validated. On this point, the Third Œcumenical Synod decreed that «it is not permitted to anyone to pronounce another faith, by writing against that which was defined by the holy Fathers, who convened at Nicaea under the guidance of the Holy Spirit»³. Its president, Cyril of Alexandria, added that to no one is it permitted to «change one word of the text, not even one syllable»⁴. This was accepted by the earlier Popes, of whom Leo III in 810 in order to protect the Creed from alteration ordered it to be written on two silver plates in Greek and Latin without the illegitimate addition and set it up in the Church of the Apostle Peter in Rome⁵. Consequently, this new Latin belief of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son also, which by the Orthodox was considered anti-canonical and arbitrary as well as scripturally, historico-dogmatically, ecclesiastically and logically unacceptable, naturally contributed a great deal to the division between the Eastern Church adhering steadfastly to the teaching of the Œcumenical Synods and the Western Church with its inclination to innovate in matters of faith⁶.

1. J. Valletas, Letters of Photius, the most-wise and saintly Patriarch of Constantinople, London 1864, pp. 171, 175, 177, 191/2 (in Greek).

2 Letter to Michael Cerularius, in Migne P.G. 120, 804.

3. Canon 7. in Mansi, Concil. 4, 136. G. Rhalles and M. Potles, The Constitution of the sacred Canons, Athens 1852, vol. II p. 200 (in Greek). See also Mansi 7, 117. 11, 640.

4. Mansi, Concil. 5, 308/9.

5 For this reason he noted: «haec (Leo) pro amore et cautela orthodoxae fidei fecit», and Baronius observed that Leo III «indelebili monumentum erigendum putavit, quo posteris innotesceret, in sacro symbolo nihil esse addendum» (op. cit., vol 9. p. 481 seq.). See also A. Palmieri, Filioque, article in A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique, vol 5 p. 2316/7. C. Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, Freiburg i. B. 1877, vol. 3 p. 753 seq.

6. Because, as B. Stefanides rightly observes: «the teaching about the filioque clause, officially introduced into the Bulgarian Church, ceased to be a

Besides, intellectual and ecclesiastical differences, which appeared many centuries earlier between the Greeks and Romans, and the racial and political differences existing among them had gradually prepared an ecclesiastical schism. These differences had their beginning and roots in the transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire by Constantine the Great to Constantinople. We are able to discern differences arising even before this, in the occupation of Greece by the Romans and much earlier in the establishment of the first Greek colonies on Italian and Gallic soil. All these, together with the forementioned theory of papal primacy, we consider as the principal, real and deeper causes of the ecclesiastical schism between East and West while, on the contrary, the events and the protagonists of the schism in the ninth and eleventh century were only the immediate and lesser occasion for it. The schism would have been realized sooner or later inasmuch as it depended upon persons not imbued deeply with the Christian spirit of love. It is obvious that the causes and pretenses of the schism should not be confused, as is often done.

In fact, we must seek the first, principal and deeper causes and roots of the schism in the intellectual and ecclesiastical differences between the Greeks and the Latins on the one hand and in their theological tendencies on the other. For example, the Greek Fathers were distinguished for their theoretical and philosophical mind; the Latin for their practical and organizing spirit. This difference existed from antiquity, as confirmed by the differences existing between the Alexandrian theologians and Tertullian who represented the West. From the time of Origen to Photius this difference pervaded all theological thought, resulting in the severance of the Christian East from the West. This severance was intensified by the totally peculiar and almost independent development of each in the field of theological speculation, ecclesiastical organization and divine worship. It was accompanied by the partial or total lack of understanding on the part

theological opinion in the relations between the Western and Eastern Church; it now appeared as an ecclesiastical dogma. For this reason did Photius first attack this as being heretical precisely at this time» (op. cit., p. 326). But even earlier in 807/8 the orthodox monks of Jerusalem under the leadership of the monk John characterized the Frankish monks as heretics, because they had recited the sacred symbol of Nicaea—Constantinople in Bethlehem with the addition of the «filioque». See J. Hergenröther, op. cit., vol. I p. 696 seq. C. Hefele, op. cit., vol. 3 p. 750; A. Palmieri, ante p. 2315.

of both, by the love for power and leadership and by the rivalry of the bishops of Rome and Constantinople «for the thrones». Thus, the first disagreement between the East and the West occurred with the decisions of the Second (381) and particularly the Fourth (451) Œcumenical Councils which bestowed equal privileges to the Patriarch of Constantinople with «the bishop of Rome, for Constantinople becoming new Rome. ., (the Fathers) rightly deciding that the city which was honored for royalty and senate, should enjoy equal rights with the older royal Rome, and be magnified in church affairs like Rome, being the second after her...and to the older Rome did the Fathers reasonably give privileges because she was the ruling city»¹. But more significant was the first real schism between the East and the West which lasted thirty-five years (484—519) and which was caused by Zeno's «Henotikon», issued with the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople Acacius². The smaller schisms caused by the persecution of John Chrysostom (406—407)³ and Maximus the Confessor (649)⁴ and others of smaller significance are overlooked.

Furthermore, deeper and more official became the antithesis

1. See Rhalles and Potles, *op. cit.*, vol. II p. 173, 281. With the 28th Canon of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod «the primary rights of honor of Constantinople were equal to those of Rome». But amongst equal honorary rights, those chronologically older come first. (See 16th meeting of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod, Mansi 7, 450, Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* 2, 543). The rights of the Pope of Rome were no longer superior in themselves, but only as being the more ancient. The East recognized these ancient primary rights of honor and for this reason called the bishop of Rome «proto-throne». (B. Stefanides, *op. cit.*, p. 267). Against the 28th Canon the Pope Leo I protested. See E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, Tübingen 1930, vol. I p. 527 seq.

2. The Pope Felix without any right invited imperatively to Rome the Patriarch of Constantinople Acacius in order to apologize. Because of his refusal, the Pope deposed him and crossed out his name from the diptychs. It is understood that the Eastern Church, recognizing no such jurisdiction of the Pope, paid no attention to his anti-canonical action. Acacius, however, repaying in equal measure, ordered the name of the Pope to be crossed out from the diptychs. In this way, the first serious schism between the two Churches broke out. The responsibility rests with Felix, although it is called the «Acacian» schism. His example was followed by his successors Gelasius I, Anastasius II, Symmachus and Hormisdas at whose time the schism was lifted. See also Nectarius Kephalas, Metropolitan of Pentapolis; *op. cit.*, p. 147 seq. E. Caspar, *op. cit.* vol. II p. 10 seq.

3. See B. Stefanides, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

4. *Ibid.* p. 223.

and dissension between the Eastern and Western Church on account of the Canons 36, 38, 13, 55 and 56 of the Quini-seximum Council (Trullanum) in 691 by which the primary rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople were again recognized and the general obligatory celibacy of the Clergy and the fast of the Latins during the Saturdays of Lent were condemned¹. Contributing also to the antithesis was the decision of the Lateran Council of 769 against the synod of 754 called by Constantine V during the Image controversy². This antithesis continued until the end of the Image controversy.

In addition to the intellectual, theological and ecclesiastical differences, it is also necessary to add the racial national, and political antitheses and antipathies which existed before Christ between the Greeks and Romans and later between the Christian Emperors of Byzantium and the Popes of Rome. And, between the ancient Greeks and Romans, because of their mutual tyrannical conquests and subjections and the conflict of their great national and economic interests, it was natural for a permanent enmity to develop. This was intensified by significant differences in respect to culture, spirit, language, national, religious and social character, life, manner and customs etc. But, this dissension continued after Christ when the capital was transferred to Byzantium. Since then, the bishops of Rome maintained an unfriendly disposition toward Byzantium which was dawning as

1. See Rhalles and Potles, op. cit., vol. II pp. 333, 387, 392, 434, 436. Likewise the canons 67 and 82 about the edibility of blood-containing animals and the representation of Christ as a lamb (ibid. pp. 462 and 492) seem to refer to the Latin practices, as do the canons 52 and 57 about the celebration of the Liturgy of the Pre-Sanctified during the Lenten period, excepting Saturday, Sunday and Annunciation Day, as well as that «there is no need to offer honey and milk to the altars» (ibid. pp. 427 and 437). See also E. Caspar, op. cit., II p. 632 seq. M. Jugie characterizes the above canons as «la première offensive contre la primauté romaine», inasmuch as the Fathers of the Synod «attaquent plusieurs points de la discipline de l'Église romaine et les proscrirent sous peine d'excommunication ou de déposition». (Le schisme byzantin, p. 25,26).

2. See also Nicetas chartophylax of Nicaeus, For what reasons and when did the Roman Church break away from the Church of Constantinople, Migne P. G. 120, 712—720. G. Kremos, History of the Schism of the two Churches Greek and Roman, Athens 1905, vol. I pp. 128 seq., 218 seq., 259 seq., 283 seq., 409 seq., 447 seq., 493 seq. B. Stefanides, op. cit., p. 2,6 seq. M. Jugie, op. cit. p. 9.

an ecclesiastical as well as political center, and on the other hand they began to try to invest themselves with and consolidate the double authority of their predecessors, pontifices maximi, as well as that of the emperors of pagan Rome in order to exercise both ecclesiastical and political authority. They hoped to continue under the new cloak of papo—caesarism the old caesarean imperialism and totalitarianism. To this end, they contrived the theory of the so-called papal supremacy.

This theory, however, inevitably caused conflict not only with the Patriarchs of the East, but also with the emperors of Byzantium. And in fact, the Byzantine emperors bore heavily the loss of their sovereignty over central Italy, which was subjected during the 8th century by the papal state established by the Franks. They resented, as well, the political maneuvers of the Popes, conditioned each time by the advent of powerful rulers in the West. Similarly, the Popes also resented both the political and ecclesiastical subjection of southern Italy, Sicily and Eastern Illyricum by Byzantium. Besides, the Popes sought to emancipate themselves fully from the Byzantine court in order to effect more easily their ecclesiastico-political projects; towards this end, already from the middle of the 8th century they had placed themselves under the protection of the Franks who had recently appeared and whose rulers Pepin and Charlemagne they had crowned emperors. In this way, they contributed to the establishment of the western empire, limiting the authority of the Byzantine emperors to the East, which later was even threatened by the Christian West¹. Through such political maneuvers the Popes sought chiefly to put an end to their dependence and relations with the lawful Roman emperor in Byzantium and to invest themselves with political power by provoking and accepting the so-called papal state in Italy as a gift² of the Frankish rulers. Henceforth, the Popes bear two swords, that is, exercise two powers, priestly and royal, ecclesiastical and political. And in order to strengthen these, they fabricated the fictitious «Gift of Constantine» and the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals³. So, already for one

1. See also G. Kremos, *op. cit.*, pp. 475/6.

2. See B. Stefanides, *op. cit.*, p. 317/8

3. About these see p. 402 footnote 2. Concerning their forgery, B. Stefanides *op. cit.*, p. 274 observes that «no other forgery in the history of the world was accomplished with so much skill and no other had greater results. The

century before Photius, the Popes for the sake of their own ecclesiastico-political ambitions and pursuits had created first the political schism of the West from the East. The ecclesiastical schism followed as a necessary and inevitable consequence with the Popes taking the lead¹.

II

Such were the relations between the two Churches when in about the middle of the ninth century their leadership fell into the hands of the two eminently powerful hierarchs, the Pope of Rome Nicholas I on the one hand and the Patriarch Photius of Constantinople on the other. Nicholas, a man fond of power, most despotic and overcome by the idea of the absolutism of the papal supremacy and the ecumenicity of the Church of Rome, sought to impose and extend his jurisdiction in all directions, considering this as the chief purpose of his papal rule. Regarding himself as a despot of the entire universe, he began an ecclesiastical and political struggle against patriarchs and kings. In fact, he principally after the Popes Leo I and Gelasius I succeeded in defending the theory of supremacy and giving it a definite form. He succeeded in raising this and the papal power to an hitherto unprecedented degree².

forgeries mentioned are simple fabrications of the imagination...». See also F. Heiler, *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus*, München 1941, p. 235 seq., 243 seq.

1. See Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *The primacy of the bishop of Rome*, Athens 1930, p. 127 seq. A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, München 1865, vol. I p. 146 seq. Nectarius of Pentapolis, op. pp. cit. 199-200.

2. Because «keiner jener Päpste hat den römischen Primatsanspruch «in so stolzer und überragender Sprache» und mit so «formaler Vollendung und Präzision» ausgesprochen wie Nikolaus I.» (F. Heiler (Perels), op. cit., p. 240). Hence «durch Nikolaus I wurde das römische Papsttum tatsächlich zum Weltimperium, zur «pontificalen Theokratie». Nicholas «totius mundi imperatorem se fecit», as if he were «imperator-pontifex» and «geistlicher imperator» and «dominus orbis terrarum» (ibid. pp. 239, 240, 242). And the latin analyst Abbot. Reginus even noticed that Nicholas «post beatum Gregorium usque in praesens nullus in Romana urbe illi videtur aequi parandus; regibus ac tyrannis imperavit, eisque ac si Dominus orbis terrarum auctoritate praefuit». (J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 43). F. Dvornik writes that Nicholas «is without doubt one of the greatest Popes of the early Middle Ages, and the increase of papal authority throughout the following centuries is for ever connected with the acts of that great Pope whose writings on the sublimity

Photius, adorned with superior talents, which are rarely gifted by nature to man, and marked out on account of these as the wisest man of his times and the greatest defender of Orthodoxy against the Papacy, opposed the Pope as the invincible and unrivalled guardian of the integrity and purity of Orthodoxy and the independence and rights of his Church¹.

The clash between these two great hierarchs was inevitable, as soon as the first would attempt to extend his sovereignty over the Eastern Church. Unfortunately, this did not delay due to the historical consequences of the Church's evolution in the imme-

of the institution of the papacy had an unprecedented influence over the canonists and theologians of the Western Church during the Middle Ages... He succeeded in bringing the whole Western hierarchy under absolute obedience to him and he crushed all tendencies towards independence in the powerful Frankish Church. It is not surprising that he intended to handle the affairs of the Eastern Church in the same way». (The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion?, ante p. 24). See the writings of Orthodox writers about Nicholas I: Nektarius of Pentapolis, op. cit., p. 204/5. S. Œconomou, The Amphilochia of Photius, Athens 1858, p. XX seq. (in Greek). J. Vallettas, op. cit., p. 42 seq. G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 271 seq. Ph. Vafeides, op. cit., p. 118 seq. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit., p. 137 seq.

1. Photius was highly praised by Constantine Œconomou in this manner: «Photius, the great name and miracle of his age and those ages after him; with the works of whom all libraries are full, and all pages of Church History; far-famed for his race, wealth, offices and indeed genius, wisdom, virtue, and piety...(in him) you see the harmonious abode of education, particularly the most sacred temple of Theology, and the clear-voiced mouth of Orthodoxy developing and performing the all-holy mystical truths of piety in highly favoured and revealing word and phrase; Photius the comrade in the choir of the great Church Fathers and among the Saints glorified etc». (The Septuagint Translators of the Old Testament, Athens 1849, vol. IV, p. 752 seq. in Greek). See also the «Amphilochia» of Photius, p. 3). The editor of the history of the Florentine Synod, R. Creighton, writes in his prologue about Photius: «Qu; propriis oculis, et non alienis in rerum momenta introspicent, mecum fatebuntur spero, illustri Photio doctiorem in omni genere literarum, prudentiorem in rebus gerendis, omnis juris divini humanique peritiorem, nunquam sedisse in quovis solio, vel Romae Papam vel Constantinopoli Patriarcham». (Vera historia unionis non verae inter Graecos et Latinos. . p. 34). Likewise, F. Heiler characterizes Photius as «bewundernswerten, vielseitigen und ungeheuer gelehrten» (Urkirche und Ostkirche, München 1937, p. 135) and M. Jugie as «illustre professeur et savant homme» (op. cit. p. 105). F. Dvornik writes: «Since the Renaissance philosophers and philologists have venerated him as the genius who among others was instrumental in transmitting to later generations through the Byzantine period classical Greek and Hellenistic culture». (The Photian Schism. History and Legend. Cambridge 1948, p. 1).

diately preceding centuries. In fact, Nicholas, strengthened by his successes in the West after imposing himself in the ecclesiastical and political field, was eager to enforce the genuinely roman politics of ecclesiastical imperialism, which was inherited from ancient Rome, even over the Orthodox East.

This was particularly necessary because the papal supremacy, established in the West with the aid of Pepin and Charlemagne, had to get recognition from the four remaining eastern Patriarchates of the Church Pentarchy especially from the Patriarch of Constantinople in order to insure itself. Since this recognition was peacefully unattainable, forceful intervention was necessary, and for the successful imposition of the primacy in the East, proper exploitation was needed. The favourable opportunity Nicholas thought that he had found in the dispute in Constantinople between Photius and Ignatius. The disagreement was due to the arbitrary interference of the Byzantine Court, as well as to the christianization of Bulgaria by Byzantium and her subjection to the Patriarchate of Constantinople at the time of Photius. Both reasons were obviously of an ecclesiastico-political nature and lacked the intention of expansion, which was characteristic of Nicholas' aims. In themselves they had nothing which was anti-canonical and they gave no right to the bishop of Rome to intervene. Nevertheless, together with a few new dogmatic latin teachings, they served as the formal pretext for the outbreak of the ecclesiastical schism whose inner causes, however, are found in the system of the Papacy and in the course of its development, as we have seen.

In the first place, today it has been historically ascertained under what conditions the Patriarch of Constantinople, Ignatius, was deposed in 857¹. He was forced to resign chiefly for politi-

1. Modern scientific research has shown that Ignatius was not dismissed arbitrarily and anti-canonically, but having been first coerced and then convinced, finally submitted his resignation in order to prevent worse complications and hardships in the Church. This resignation was recognized as canonical by the Church of Constantinople. See F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 39 seq. and especially p. 48: «Having examined all the important accounts of Ignatius' attitude after his internment, we may then conclude with confidence that Ignatius was not deposed by force, but that he abdicated to forestall worse complications. His abdication was made at the request of the new regime, it is true, but it was acknowledged as valid and canonical by all the members of the higher clergy gathered in Constantinople, including Igna-

cal reasons and without any interference on the part of Photius; also, it is known how the most-learned professor in the University of Constantinople and protoasekretis Photius was unwillingly¹ elected to the vacant throne canonically and by the unanimous vote of clergy and laity². He was, in fact, canonically recognized in the beginning by Ignatius and his followers as the canonical

tius' staunchest supporters. Ignatius himself invited his followers to accept the situation and to proceed to elect the new Patriarch». Likewise, p. 53: «This consummation was due to Ignatius' wisdom in resigning and thus sacrificing his personal interests to those of the Church and to the new Patriarch's conciliatory spirit and readiness to make concessions». See also F. Dvornik, *Le premier Schisme de Photios*, in *Bulletin de l'Institut archéologique bulgare*, Sofia 1935, vol. IX, and G. Kremos, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 136 seq.

1. The same Patriarch Photius writes: «when recently my predecessor had lost the dignity of serving as patriarch and when a shepherd was in demand agreeable to all and able to join together the disjointed members of the Church and to calm the agitation (for there were manifold agitations against the Church) oh, the generosity towards me! when the Emperor and the college of Priests attack my weakness and mediocrity, forcing me to take on the yoke of the prelate. With tears and with supplications and with difficulty conceding, I earnestly entreat that the vote be given to others (but how am I to relate what followed?), they do not yield even for a short time. While I delay the undertaking and they resign not from exercising force, at last the will of the majority prevails. The more I resisted, the more their pressure increased. Already an end was brought about by those who had cast their vote and the priests and hierarchs who had displayed the form of the Cross. What need was there to delay for those assembled there, I being overcome with tears? I do not know, either by the providence of God, or for the reproof of my sins they charge me with the yoke of a prelate. In one thing I discovered small consolation: that, unity of mind and feeling being implanted in their hearts, those who were at a variance among themselves were brought together and former concord was graciously given». J. Valettas, *op. cit.*, p. 145/6. See *ibid.* p. 136/7, 148 seq., 495.

2. See F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, p. 48 seq. and especially p. 50: «The synod presented to the government, besides an Ignatian and an anti-Ignatian, a neutral candidate, the protoasekretis Photius, the very man whom the Emperor and Bardas had had in mind from the beginning. The choice, besides giving the government some satisfaction, rallied all the bishops present, except five, of whom Metrophanes, and no doubt Stylianos, were the most refractory. Why did most of the Ignatian bishops rally to Photius? First, because he was a new man: though a sympathizer with the Moderate party, he evidently was not numbered among its most outspoken members. His orthodoxy was above suspicion, since he had been persecuted by the iconoclasts; he was moreover related to Theodora». Similarly, p. 52: «The fact that bishops of the Ignatian party took part in Photius' consecration is generally omitted by the Ignatians». See G. Kremos, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 148 seq.

Patriarch¹. It is also known that the Synod which convened in Constantinople in 861, «proto-deutera»,² unanimously approved Photius' election as canonical. In this synod official representatives of the Pope Nicholas took part, voting in favor of Photius and condemning Ignatius³.

In spite of this, Nicholas, thinking that the opportunity had come in presenting before the Easterners his absolute supremacy and imposing it over them by all possible means, wrote repeated letters to the Emperor Michael III, to the Patriarchs and Bishops of the East and «ad omnes fideles» and to the «most-learned mister Photius»—not recognizing him as bishop—in which on the basis of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals he presents himself as the absolute sovereign of the Church and her highest judge, and therefore, the judge in the dispute between Photius and Ignatius. As such, he annulled in 862 the acts of the Church synods which convened in Constantinople and declared Photius a layman and Ignatius the only canonical Patriarch of Constantinople. The reason for this, according to him, was the patriarchal change, which was made without his knowledge and consent («sine romani pontificis consultu»)⁴. Besides, he called together

1. F. Dvornik writes that: «Ignatius was not arbitrarily deposed by Michael III, but that he himself presented his resignation upon the Emperor's invitation, and that Photius was not appointed by the Emperor, but elected by a special local Council of the Church of Constantinople in accordance with the statutes of Eastern Canon Law. He was recognized as lawful Patriarch by all the bishops, amongst them even the warmest supporters of Ignatius, and by Ignatius himself». (The Eastern Churches Quarterly 3 (1939) 410). Elsewhere he writes: «...For two months the new Patriarch was recognized as legitimate successor by the whole Byzantine Church, and even by Ignatius. We can find absolute evidence for this fact in the documents of the Ignatian party, hitherto misinterpreted by all scholars who have studied them». (The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion? ante p. 22.) On page 23 he writes about Ignatius' change in attitude towards Photius: «Ignatius was not responsible for these troubles and that his prestige and personality had been misused by some fanatics who were posing as his admirers. On this, as on other occasions, Ignatius did not show enough comprehension of the real situation and let things take their course».

2. B. Stefanides, A new interpretation of the name of the «proto-deutera» synod of 861, in «Ecclesia» 24 (1947) 132 seq.

3. See G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 197 seq. F. Dvornik, The Photian Schism, p. 78 seq.

4. See Mansi, Concil. 15, 168 seq. Migne P. L. 119, 785/94. G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 285 seq.

a latin synod in Rome in 863 which likewise deposed and anathematized Photius and those ordained by him, and declared Ignatius the canonical Patriarch and reinstated him and the Ignatian bishops to their thrones¹. Getting no attention and answer from Constantinople, he continued the same violent polemics against Photius; for example, his responsive letter to the emperor Michael in 865² and his other letters in 866 to the same Michael, to Bardas, to the Empresses Theodora and Eudoxia, to the members of the Senate, to the Patriarchs, Photius and Ignatius, to the remaining Patriarchs and Bishops of the East³ and to the Clergy of Constantinople⁴.

The Pope based this arbitrary and anti-canonical intervention in a foreign and independent Church on the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and on the pitiful misinterpretation of the 9th Ca-

1. Mansi, Concil. 15, 178 seq., Migne P. L. 119, 926/62. F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 97/8. G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 297 seq. On page 300 he concludes: «In this manner the papal synod through its decisions officially declared the schism between the Pope of Rome Nicholas and the Patriarch Photius and the Emperor of Constantinople, which is a prelude to the official schism between the two Churches, Greek and Roman». Ibid. p. 307. It is understood that the unlawful and anti-canonical decision of the latin synod was by no means taken into consideration at Constantinople; on the contrary, the Emperor Michael expressly rejected it with a polemical letter to Nicholas I which was lost but whose contents are able to be inferred from the Pope's answer to it. See Mansi, Concil. 15, 187 seq. and G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 301 seq.

2. Ibid. p. 187 seq. See also F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 105 seq. Noteworthy is his observation (p. 105) that the present «letter was destined to be one of the most important documents in the evolution of the Papacy».

3. According to Nicetas Paphlagonos, «Nicholas... to the Patriarchs of the East ...sent this judgement», thus obviously, «he first made a rent in the seamless garment of the Saviour»... (S. Aristarchus, Sermons and Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantinople 1901, pp. 31-36, in Greek).

4. Mansi, Concil. 15, 162 seq., 216 seq. In these arrogant letters the Church of Constantinople was slandered and the haughty papal claims rudely stated to the Easterners. For example we read in Mansi, Concil. 15, 234: «Verumtamen quid opus est hinc multa proseguere, cum hodieque penes Ecclesiam CPolitana impietas ipsa vigeat, praevaricatio regnet, schismata multiplicentur». And generally «in his attitude towards Michael III, Nicholas showed that he regarded all kings and emperors as accountable to him for their actions and thus subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. In this sense at least he may be said to have contributed materially to the formulation of a papal potestas directa in temporal matters ratione peccati». (T. G. Jalland, The Church and the Papacy, London 1944, p. 383).

non of the Fourth Œcumenical Council, which even his apologist Cardinal Hergenröther acknowledges that it was «interpreted not in the sense that its writers, the Fathers of the Synod of Chalcedon, had given it»¹, but arbitrarily for his own benefit. Hence he contended that his so called privileges gave him superiority and power «super omnem terram, id est super omnem Ecclesiam»². The truth, however, is that the Pope had no right to intervene, because according to the canons of the Œcumenical Synods beginning with the 4th canon of the First Œcumenical Synod³, the bishops are elected, established and judged by the bishops of the local province or ecclesiastical district, as had in fact been done in the case of Photius⁴.

It is obvious that Nicholas, acting against the canons of the Church and indeed after the lapse of many years following the canonical election of Photius, aimed to extend his power over the eastern bishops and especially over the Patriarch of Constantinople, who was considered in Rome as a dangerous opponent, and to subjugate in this way the Eastern Church. This precisely was the first cause of the outbreak of the ecclesiastical schism, the Pope of Rome Nicholas being chiefly responsible.

But the same arbitrary Pope Nicholas gave almost simultaneously yet another cause for the outbreak of the schism, arising from his ecclesiastico-political ambitions. It was the arbitrary intervention in another jurisdiction, namely in the Bulgarian Church, which shortly before was founded by Byzantium in its own territory and brought under the spiritual leadership of the Patriar-

1. J. Hergenröther, op. cit., vol. I. p. 568, n. 92. See also Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit., p. 141 seq.

2. F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 107.

3. Rhalles and Potles, op. cit., vol. II, p. 122.

4. F. Dvornik also accepts the fact that «never did a Patriarch ask a Pope in his synodal letter for confirmation of his election. The election of the Patriarch and bishops was regarded as a matter concerning the internal affairs of the Eastern Church and the Emperor. The Eastern Church was always very jealous in defence of its absolute independence in disciplinary matters... We must not judge the matter from our modern point of view, but from the point of view of the Byzantines in the ninth century... His objection (the Pope Nicholas') to the elevation of Photius, that he was a simple layman when elevated, is not very grave». (The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion? ante p. 24). Concerning the consecration of Photius see all that he writes to the Pope Nicholas, in J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 151 seq.

chate of Constantinople¹. In order to subject this newly established Church and bring it under their influence, this Pope and his successors conducted violent struggles, contributing in this way materially to the final outbreak of the schism. Because, the Patriarchs and especially the Byzantine Emperors opposed them in equal measure².

As it is known, while Nicholas was engaged in extending and imposing his so-called sovereign rights over the Eastern Church through his polemics against Photius, the latter on the contrary was engaged in christianizing Bulgaria and organizing the Church and State on a christian basis. This is indicated in the letter of the Patriarch Photius «to Michael, ruler of Bulgaria»³. But Nicholas, parallel to his open attack against the

1. F. Dvornik points out that «canonically, the Byzantine claim was legitimate, since Bulgaria included only a small portion of Macedonia which had been under Roman jurisdiction, and included a great part of Thrace which had always been under the jurisdiction of Constantinople» (op. cit., p. 153, n. 1). Principally «they who resided in Constantinople disapproved of the intervention as conflicting with the 28th canon of the Fourth Œcumenical Council in Chalcedon (451), which confirmed the rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople over the Thracian province and those parts which belonged to him but which were at the moment in the hands of barbarians. (This was the eastern portion of Bulgaria, while the western, outside of Thracian jurisdiction, was in eastern Illyria, over which the Popes had claim, although Leo III, Isaurus, in 732/3 had subjected it to the Patriarchate of Constantinople). Besides, they (the Byzantines) feared that this church intervention was the prelude of a political intervention on the part of the West.» (B. Stefanides, op. cit., p. 325).

2. It is to be noted that previously Nicholas in a letter to the Emperor had asked to give back to him Eastern Illyricum where the above mentioned portion of Bulgaria was located (that is, almost the entire Balkan peninsula except Thrace), together with southern Italy, including the patrimonia of Calabria and Sicily, and the right to consecrate bishops of Syracuse. See *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, Epistle 6 p. 438. Because the bearers of this letter delegates to the «proto-deutera» synod were unsuccessful, Nicholas refused to confirm the decisions of that Synod. The Pope's continuous campaign against Photius purposed the subjection of the Byzantine Church and especially of Eastern Illyricum with Bulgaria, because, it seems, he had believed the false assurance of Ignatianus Theognostos that, if Ignatius returned to the throne, he would cede Bulgaria to the Pope! See also F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 101.

3. J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 200/48. The Bulgarian ruler, Bogoris, (Michael after his baptism, September 865) as well as the Bulgarian people were guided in the Christian faith by Photius, who for this reason in the above-mentioned letter addresses him «my beloved son», «my philochrist and

Church of Constantinople and her chief leader Photius, indirectly was undermining her by sending into Bulgaria anticononically his bishops, Formosus and Paul, later Donatus, Marinus, Dominicus, Leopardus and Grimoaldus and many other latin clergymen, who were applying themselves to the task of latinizing orthodox Bulgaria and the neighboring Slavic countries by the introduction of latin dogmas and traditions¹. This was done at the expense of the Greek Church whose Clergy was driven out and whose orthodox traditions were assailed and slandered².

In this manner, while Photius was patiently receiving repeated attacks and condemnations from Rome, avoiding to answer and retaliate, suddenly he was astonished to learn that «impious and abominable men, appearing from darkness (because they were offspring of the western lands), had fallen upon the newly established and organized nation like a thunderbolt or an earthquake or a great hail storm, or in more familiar terms, as though a wild boar had destroyed it, having first divided the beloved and newly-planted vineyard of the Lord. Their audacity was so great that it was accomplished, one might almost say, by tooth and nail, that is, by the practices of infamous activity and the corruption of dogma. Unscrupulously they corrupted and led them away from the correct and pure dogma and the blameless faith of the Christians»³.

spiritual son», «a good statue of my sufferings», «the noble and genuine offspring of my spiritual pangs» etc., or he exhorts him «do not therefore falsify our hopes, which your tendency to do good and your readiness to listen give rise to, nor make vain the pains and struggles, which we have suffered for your salvation», etc. (ibid.). See also G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 308 seq.

1. See also A. Pichler, op. cit., vol. I, p. 194/5. Even in the legislation they displaced the Justinian Code and introduced the collection of laws of the Lombards. (F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 114).

2. With Nicholas and his legates to Bulgaria, the Pope John VIII undertook to slander the Orthodox Greeks, writing to Boris Michael that «quotidie novis et variis disciplinis atque dogmatibus confunduntur». (Mansi, Concil. 17, 119). And elsewhere: «Tristamur et ingemiscimus, verentes et pertimescentes, ne, si forte Graecos secuti fueritis, cum illi in diversas haereses et schismata solito more ceciderint, vos quoque cum ipsis in erroris profunda ruatis... Nam te, fili, Mosaicis rogo verbis: «Interroga patrem tuum, et annuntiabit tibi, seniores tuos, et dicent tibi», si aliquando Graeci, sine hac vel illa haeresi fuerint» (ibid. p. 62).

3. J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 168. Of particular importance is the fact that the occupation of Bulgaria by the Popes played a significant role in the out-

Precisely this last point, namely the corruption and the forgery of Orthodox dogmas and traditions became the third cause for the outbreak of the ecclesiastical schism. Because the papal legates introduced new heterodox teachings in Bulgaria, the By-

break of the schism, as we have seen, and in the evolution of the events. This forced the Popes Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII and their successors to define and change their position many times against Photius and Ignatius. On this issue F. Dvornik writes: «Pope Hadrian had acknowledged Ignatius as the legitimate Patriarch on condition that he should undertake nothing contrary to Roman interests in Bulgaria; that, should he be daring enough to do so, he would be severed from communion with Rome, and therefore be excommunicated. In no other sense could these words of John VIII be explained. We therefore have here indisputable evidence that the Bulgarian issue played a leading part in all dealings with Photius by Nicholas, since his successor makes his recognition of Ignatius conditional on the latter's attitude towards Roman interests in Bulgaria. This condition was laid down in the letter which the legates handed to Ignatius at the time of the conference that met after the Ignatian Council to settle Bulgaria's fate; and the legates were not to produce the letter except in the urgent case of Roman interests being actually at stake. This helps us to explain the enigmatic passage in the Pope's letter to Domagoi, referring to Ignatius as having been repeatedly excommunicated as a result of these offences. If Ignatius' recognition by Hadrian had been made to depend on his attitude towards Bulgaria, and if the Patriarch had been threatened with excommunication if ever he dared to trespass on Roman rights in Bulgaria, then John could treat Ignatius as excommunicated, as soon as it became clear that Ignatius had failed to observe the condition. Yet, on the other hand, because John VIII did not wish to close the door upon a possible settlement, he put off passing public sentence on Ignatius as long as there remained the least hope of the Patriarch acknowledging his fault. He must therefore have twice appealed to him before the last summons, the only one attested by a papal letter. It is worded in very resolute terms: Ignatius will be excommunicated, if he does not recall the Greek priests from Bulgaria within thirty days. In another letter to the Greek clergy of the same country, the Pope confirmed the sentence of excommunication once pronounced against them by Hadrian. But should the bishops and priests not quit Bulgarian territory within a month, they would all be suspended and excommunicated» (op. cit., p. 156/7). See also G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate 451—1204*, London 1947, p. 126 seq. J. Valettas rightly observes: «For Bulgaria Photius suffered, for Bulgaria Ignatius was disliked, for Bulgaria the Council which in all ways served the papal arrogance was declared useless, for Bulgaria the Pope John became the friend of Photius, putting on the foxskin when the lion's skin was insufficient...all the coherence of the past events showed nothing but this: the papal greed alone, which was the source and beginning of the trouble and the schism later» (op. cit., p. 71). It must be noticed here that the christianization of Bulgaria by Byzantium was completed in the year 864; the

zantines there were aroused by the unfamiliar innovations. The latin clergy stirred up the neophyte Christian Bulgarians by declaring certain of their sacraments invalid because they had been performed by the married Greek clergy, whose marriage they criticized in a Manichean way. They also imposed the obligatory latin celibacy of the clergy and ordered the separation of the already married clergy. They also considered invalid the Sacrament of Holy Chrism as being performed by priests and not bishops as in the West, «the Chrism of the priests is useless and its celebration is futile since they act as impostors». Hence, they repeated a Sacrament which dogmatically is performed only once. They also changed the customs of fasting according to the latin practice, consecrated anew the Churches etc. The worst of all was the introduction of the «filioque» clause into the Creed, which was characterized by the scandalized Orthodox as heresy. This innovation especially aroused the Orthodox, and Photius denounced it in an encyclical to all the Orthodox Patriarchs and to the entire eastern world as introducing two principles in the monarchic Trinity and leading to the acceptance of two Gods, since the monarchy is dissolved. He further stressed that such «a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, moreso against the Holy Trinity, even if nothing more is dared than this, is sufficient to put ten thousand of them under anathema». He calls it altogether an «atheistic opinion»¹.

arrival of the latin clergy was made towards the end of the year 866 and their expulsion in the beginning of the year 870, as a result of the Synod of Constantinople in 869/70: «Bulgarorum patriam, quam ex Graecorum potestate dudum fuisse et Graecos sacerdotes habuisse comperimus, sanctae Ecclesiae CPolitanae, a qua per paganismum recesserat, nunc per Christianismum restitui judicamus». (Anastasio Bibliothecari, *Historia de vitis Romanorum Pontificum*, 637. Migne P.L. 128, 1393). In general see G. Konidaris, *The Greek Church as a civilizing force in the Peninsular of Aimos*, Athens 1948 p. 41 seq. (in Greek).

1. Photius, Encyclical letter to the eastern hierarchic thrones, in J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 165 seq. In this are enumerated the more important innovations of the Latins and their differences with the Orthodox at that time. Also see J. Karmiris, *The symbolical texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, Alexandria 1945 pp. 41/3. (Reprint from the «Church Pharos» 1946). G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, p. 331. The uprising of the Orthodox at the innovations in the faith (filioque) was such that Photius was forced during the last eight years of his life to write a letter to the Metropolitan of Aquileia (J. Valettas, op. cit., p. 181 seq.) and to prepare his *Treatise on the «Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit»*. (Migne P. G. 102, 280 seq).

These were the three most serious and direct causes precipitating the ecclesiastical schism, whose chief reason and source was the monarchic papal primacy, with the Pope Nicholas I as the spearhead¹. The great Photius, having found himself before the continuous unjust attacks of Rome, in the midst of an anti-latin and oppressive atmosphere and facing the general uprising, decided that it was time to defend himself. When the acts of the Pope and the Latins were made known in Constantinople, that they were being practiced at the expense of the Orthodox faith and tradition, the independence and self-sufficiency of the Eastern Church and her leader Photius, a general agitation prevailed. The demonstrative and unanimous opinion, decision and claim of all, especially of the rulers, was that an end should be put to the evil. Contributing materially to this agitation were the nine fore-mentioned letters of the Pope Nicholas, which were written in an arrogant and harsh tone and attacked the Church of Constantinople. Moreover, different accusations were sent from the West to Photius concerning the tyrannical behavior of the Pope Nicholas. About these Photius writes: «a certain synodical letter and other letters from different sources came forth from there full of tragedy and great lamentation»².

Under the pressure then of popular opinion and that of the Emperor, which was caused by the loss of Bulgaria, the able champion of Orthodoxy, Photius, who «had captured the hearts of the whole Empire and the whole Byzantine Church»³, having suffered «a serious wound inwardly as one who sees the contents of his stomach being torn and broken to pieces by reptiles and wild beasts», and who had suffered «toils and pains for their (Bulgarians) regeneration and perfection»⁴, decided to react ec-

1. In fact the primacy of the Pope about «the middle of the ninth century received its more perfect development on account of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. The Pope of Rome Nicholas I was the first who sought to enforce these decrees, and for this reason did the schism begin with him. Particularly «by the intervention of the Pope of Rome Nicholas in the Bulgarian Church, the papal supremacy came out of its theoretical and indefinite form, which it had maintained until then, and received a practical and definite form which was dangerous to the independence of the Eastern Church». (B. Stefanides, op. cit., p. 317, 326).

2. Photius, Encyclical Letter etc., ante p. 179.

3. F. Dvornik, The Photian Schism. p. 201.

4. Photius, op. cit., p. 175.

clesiastically against the extension of Nicholas' sovereignty. His aim was to censure Nicholas for forging the Orthodox faith, for violating ancient traditions and for seeking to latinize Bulgaria and other countries, not even excepting Greece. Towards this end, Photius issued his famous encyclical in the year 866¹ with the approval of the resident synod of Constantinople², entitled «to the hierarchal thrones of the East»³, in which the heterodox teachings and anti-canonical acts of Rome and her Pope Nicholas I are denounced with force rarely expressed and with orthodox zeal⁴.

This Synod met during July-August of the following year in Constantinople under the presidency of Photius and in the presence of the Church delegates from the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, numerous bishops and clergymen, as well as the Emperor Michael, the co-emperor Basil Macedon and many councillors, patricians and other officers⁵ and condemned the forenamed latin teachings and innovations.

1. S. Aristarchus, *op. cit.*, p. 48-49, 51, 54-57. On the basis of the facts given here, we accept 866 and not 867 as the year of the writing of the Encyclical of Photius, which date is set by J. Valettas (*op. cit.*, p. 166), A. Pichler (*op. cit.*, p. 185), M. Jugie (*Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, vol. I, Paris 1926, p. 107, 130), Chrys. Papadopoulos (*op. cit.*, pp. 146, 172) and others.

2. S. Aristarchus, *op. cit.*, p. 48-49.

3. See J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 36 seq. It is here classified among the symbolical texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church.

4. Although Nicholas did not know what was occurring at Constantinople, he «was no less alarmed: it seems as if he had never realized before how vital to the Byzantines the Bulgarian problem was, and never understood the Greek reaction to his success in Bulgaria. But he really did take fright, fearing a rupture between Rome and Byzantium that was more than dangerous, one that might easily shift to dogmatic issues. This is why he gave such a cry of alarm in his letters (to Hincmar etc.) and tried to mobilize all the spiritual forces in his Church before the great blow that he feared should fall». (F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 119). Others but particularly Aeneas of Paris and Rattramnus from Corbie answered to the cry and invitation of Nicholas with two treatises «Against the Greeks» (Migne P. L. 121, 223-340 and 686-762), as well as synods which convened in France and Germany. See G. Every, *op. cit.*, p. 128, and J. Valettas, *op. cit.*, p. 51/2.

5. The Acts of this great synod, which bears about one thousand signatures (B. Stefanides, *op. cit.*, p. 325/6), were carried to Rome and burned by the Latins for obvious reasons in the same way that the Acts of the Synods in Constantinople in August 858, May 861 and June 866 were destroyed. (See S. Aristarchus, *op. cit.*, p. 148, 151).

It also proclaimed that the Pope Nicholas be deposed, anathematized and excommunicated¹, as well as those in agreement with him, especially the papal legates in Bulgaria who were introducing into the Orthodox East the latin innovations denounced in the well-known encyclical of Photius.

As the Church historian and Archbishop of Athens Chrysostom Papadopoulos noticed, «in the person of Nicholas the papal primacy, unheard of in the Eastern Church, was denounced and anathematized. According to this theory of papal primacy, the canonical order and independence of the patriarchal thrones, as defined by the Œcumenical Councils, was overthrown. In addition, the bishop of Rome sought to become absolute ruler of the entire Church, judging all and being judged by none, enforcing upon the Church not only his own wishes in administrative issues, but even his own innovations and heterodox teachings»². Professor A. D. Kyriakos also writes: «In this Synod the Eastern Church claimed her own rights and by the deposition of the Pope who had asked to subject her, she expressed her autonomy and independence»³.

In this manner, then, through the exchange of personal anathemas between the Pope Nicholas and the Patriarch Photius, through the decisions of the latin synod of 863 in Rome and of the Orthodox synods of 867 in Constantinople and in general on account of the arbitrary interventions of the Pope, the first disastrous ecclesiastical schism of great proportion broke out. By this the seamless garment of the Saviour was torn asunder and the Church of Christ was divided: the Eastern composed of the four

1. F. Dvornik believes that «the Council of 867 was not aimed at the Western Church as such. The anathemas and condemnations hurled by the Eastern Fathers against some western customs were only directed against the Roman missionaries of Bulgaria for the purpose of impressing Boris and his Boyars; in fact, Photius' encyclical, I insist, only mentioned the «so-called» bishops preaching in Bulgaria» (op. cit., p. 122).

2. Chrys. Papadopoulos, op. cit., p. 147.

3. A. D. Kyriakos, *Studies on Photius*, Athens 1887, p. 108. (in Greek). K. Paparregopoulos also observes that «Photius was obliged to fight that which the Greek Nation from the beginning and until this day repels and is unable to do otherwise, is, that the sovereign claim of the hierarch of Rome; first, because it is opposed to the fundamental principles of the Christian faith and secondly, because no nation is considered obliged to submit to foreign domination either political or ecclesiastical». (*Histoty of the Greek Nation*, Athens 1887, vol. III, p. 747. in Greek).

ancient Patriarchates and the Western under the Patriarchate of Rome.

Exactly at this point the question is justifiably raised by all: Who then is the true father and the one responsible for the schism?

On the basis of what we have already written one is able to conclude, we think, that the deepest cause of that grievous event was the Papacy as a system in general and especially its attempts to expand and even impose its power and sovereignty and latin dogmas and traditions over the Orthodox East. The true father, first-cause and perpetrator of the schism and the first who expressed completely the antithesis between East and West, was the Pope Nicholas I. He was the aggressor, while Photius became the defender. The latter was forced ten years later to return the earlier anathematizations of Rome and to censure Nicholas for intervening in foreign administrative issues and for the proposed innovations¹. Consequently, they who ascribe the responsibility of the schism to Photius calling him «father of the schism», do so unjustly. It was not the «Photian schism»², but «the schism of the

1. See also K. Paparregopoulos, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 323/4. Here it is noticed that the position of Nicholas, Hadrian and their successors against Photius bears witness to the fact that Rome had decided beforehand to extend the papal supremacy through all possible means to include even the East, when an opportunity would be given. Thus, Photius appears as the pitiful victim who was forced to resist and to defend the independence of the Greek Church and Nation, after having first fallen into the net thrown by Rome for prey to attract the eastern world.

2. As it is known, Photius was made a subject of controversy and has been treated by writers according to their Church affiliation. However, F. Dvornik rightly observes that: «few names in the history of Christianity have inspired feelings so conflicting as that of the Greek Patriarch Photius. Saint and hero in the eyes of the Christian East, he is branded by the Christian West as the man who unbolted the safeguards of unity and let loose the disruptive forces of dissent and schism. Whilst the East invokes his name as one that carries weight with God, the West still quotes it as the symbol of pride and lust for ecclesiastical domination; hailed by all who ever claimed a larger share for nationalism in the life of the Church and a closer association between man and God, it is reprobated by others as the badge of disruption and an element destructive of Christian universality» (*op. cit.*, p 1). Undeniably however, the life and activity and especially the position of Photius against the Papacy was distorted and misconstrued as that of no other ancient churchman by the prejudiced historians of the West, who did not examine the sources of all his contemporaries, the ecclesiastical synods and even the papal legates, but instead based their views one-sidedly on the evi-

Roman Church»¹.

We do not consider Photius infallible; we admit that he was destined to make certain mistakes in the terrible ecclesiastico-political confusion and conflict of the two worlds. But, taking into consideration the condition that he was in suffering unjust attacks, he was obliged—either with or without the synod of 867—to defend the independence and rights and dogmas of his Church. He was forced to repel the Papacy's deviation from the canonical

dence of untrustworthy enemies of Photius like Nicetas of Paphlagonia (Life of Ignatius, Mansi, Concil. 16, 209 seq.), Metrophanes of Smyrna (letter to the patrician Manuel, *ibid.* 413 seq.), Stylianos of Neo-Caesarea (letter to the Pope Stephen, *ibid.*, p. 425 seq.), Theognostos (libellus against Ignatius, *ibid.*, p. 293 seq. Migne P. G. 105, 856 seq.), Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Praej. ad concil. VIII oecum. ejusdem vita Nicolai et Hadriani II, Mansi 16, 1 seq. Migne P. L. 128, 1357 seq.), or on the so-called «anti-Photian collection» (Mansi 16, 409 seq. F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 216 seq.) and others repeating the accusations against Photius without testing their validity. They, «revolving around one anchor point whenever there was anything to be written about Photius, set up a ridiculous dream of great nonsense, compiling these diligently and adding their own, laboriously copying the work of each of other, and, as if convinced, attempted to convince others that Photius and not the anti-Christian papal haughtiness was responsible for the great schism of Christ's Church». (J. Valettas, *op. cit.*, p. 2. See also K. Oeconomos, On the Septuagint Translators of the Old Testament, Athens 1849, vol. IV, p. 753/4, in Greek). But now the English historian Bury has pointed out that: «the story (about Photius) is based on one-sided sources defending the viewpoint of the Ignatian party and extremely hostile towards Photius». (Eastern Churches Quarterly 3 (1939) 410), and the Czech F. Dvornik observes that: «on the literary and scholastic side, Photius has always ranked fairly high amongst those scholars who have studied his writings; in this field his name always commanded respect, as his contemporaries, friend and foe alike, unanimously testified. Scholars familiar with his literary work were not inclined to believe all the stories brought up against him by his opponents; they were true to the scholar's instinct which prompted them to feel that a man who had spent his best days amongst books, in the company of the best representatives of the classical period and in daily contact with many devoted disciples, was not likely to descend to such meanness and petty ambition as were imputed to him by his enemies; and it was a right instinct which led them to honour a scholar who has been prominent in transmitting Hellenistic culture to posterity. At the same time, the firm conviction which prevailed among the simple orthodox that their Church could not be wrong in crowning its leader with the halo of sanctity for setting an example of Christian virtue was bound to find its justification» (*op. cit.*, p. 432).

1. See also H. Alivisatos, On the Nature of the Church from an Orthodox point of view, in «Theologia» Athens, 21 (1950) 34. 38 (in Greek).

track, since this deviation was contrary to the whole historical past of Christ's Church.

Indubitably, the wise and keen-sighted Photius had foreseen and with his resistance had averted in the Eastern Church what had taken place in the West i. e. the arbitrary conversion of the ancient synodical and democratic form of Church government to a monarchy. He checked the introduction of new dogmas and traditions into the Eastern Church as for example, the theory of papal primacy, the «filioque» clause, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, the supererogatory meritorious deeds of Christ and the Saints, the doctrine of superior works, the indulgences, the fire of purgatory, the innovations in the Sacraments and in the worship of the Church, as well as the known abuses of the latin Middle Ages. All these innovations aroused the people of the West and eventually precipitated the two newer schisms within the bosom of the Western Church: the schism of Protestant world that of the Old Catholics. The Greek people of Byzantium, who were holding the sceptre of civilization in the ninth century, did nothing more than that which the cultured people of the West did centuries later as a result of the papal abuses¹.

We must not forget that Photius acted as the representative and bearer of the will of his Church and Nation, whose rights were violated and whose autonomy and independence were threatened. He was, therefore, compelled to struggle against and frustrate the papal ambitions in order to save Orthodoxy and Hellenism from subjection and latinization². As Kyriakos writes, «Photius having done this became the savior of the Eastern Church from the dreadful danger of the Papacy» and for this reason «the Eastern Church and the Greek Nation in particular owe their perpetual gratitude to the great Photius for his struggles against the Papacy»³.

To enslave the unsubdued and free Greek Church Nicholas and his successors sought to overthrow her synodical administrative system inherited from the Apostles (based upon the equa-

1. «Photius is stated to have inspired Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon and other famous reformers in launching their campaigns against the Papacy and its authority». (F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 1).

2. See also Nektarius, Kephalas, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 208.

3. A. D. Kyriakos, *op. cit.*, p. 94, 106. See also G. Kremos, *op. cit.*, II, 2-4

lity and brotherhood of all bishops) and to impose a centralized and monarchic system unknown earlier in the Church and based upon the subjection of all bishops, synods and local churches to the bishop of Rome. Thus, they sought to centralize all power and authority and to invest themselves almost with divine privileges and attributes. In the future the Pope was not satisfied with considering himself, as until then, *primus inter pares*, but wanted to be recognized *primus super omnes* and as absolute and infallible monarch of the whole Church. Precisely from this anti-canonical and downhill trend did Photius try to restrain Nicholas, without desiring the schism.

That Photius did not desire the schism and did not provoke it, and consequently should not be criticized as responsible for the division of the Churches¹, is proved by the fact that for ten years he tolerated patiently the papal intervention in a foreign administration and the anti-canonical decisions and actions of Nicholas practised at his expense. Even the Synod of 867 in Constantinople might not have been called, if the danger of losing Bulgaria politically and ecclesiastically had not existed and if the Emperor, the government and the people had not exercised strong pressure over him. This is shown also from the indisputable fact that even after the outbreak of the schism, Photius did nothing to enlarge it, make it permanent or change it from a simple personal antithesis and exchange of personal anathematizations to an official denunciation of the two Churches, which occurred 1054; on the contrary, he succeeded within a short time² in reconciling and lifting the schism by calling the Synod of 879/80 in Constantinople which restored community between Rome and Constantinople. This was done with the participation and agreement of the representatives of the Roman Church.

1. Recently D. J. Doens correctly stated that «Photius s'était montré vis-à-vis de Rome plus conciliant à certains égards que saint Ignace». (*Irenikon* 22 (1949) 434/5).

2. According to the Roman catholic theologian F. Mercenier «toute l'affaire photienne se ramène à une querelle fort vive entre Photius et Nicolas I et à un schisme de quelques mois (fin de 866 à septembre ou octobre 867)». (P. Dumont—F. Mercenier—C. Lialine, *Qu'est-ce que l'Orthodoxie? Vues catholiques*. Paris 1945, p. 71). F. Dvornik notes that the schism «separated East and West for six years only». (*Eastern Churches Quarterly* 3 (1939) 414).

Because of this, the Byzantines called it the «unifying synod», in which a great peace was made between the Western Church and the other Patriarchates»¹. The Pope at that time, John VIII, recognized Photius and ratified the decisions of that Synod². «The researches initiated by A. Lapôtre and completed by V. Grumel and F. Dvornik have proved that the settlement of 879/80 between Photius and Pope John VIII was accepted not only by the Church of Constantinople, but by the greater part of the Church of Rome. This settlement regulated relations between East and West in the tenth century, and remained authoritative in the West until the end of the eleventh»³.

As it is known, in the great Synod of 879/80, which by many is considered as the true eighth Œcumenical⁴, Photius was justified and recognized as the canonical Patriarch, and the decisions against him of the latin Synods in Rome (863) and Constantinople (869/70) were invalidated⁵.

1. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, p. 457. Rhalles and Potles, op. cit., vol. I, p. 392/3.

2. F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 205 seq.

3. G. Evêry, op. cit., p. 153.

4. The Acts in Mansi, Concil. 17, 373—524. On this Synod see Chrys. Papadopoulos as an Orthodox writer, op. cit., p. 155 seq., and F. Dvornik, op. cit., pp. 159 seq., 383 seq., 418 seq., as a Roman catholic. The same Synod was self-named «œcumenical» in many places, especially in the canons (Rhalles and Potles, op. cit., II, 705 seq.). Theodore Balsamon (ibid), the Patriarch Efthymius and the metropolitan Neilos of Rhodes and others called it œcumenical also (ibid I, 392. F. Dvornik, op. cit., p. 457). Officially however, the Church did not recognize this Synod as such.

5. This general Synod officially and unanimously annulled the unjust decisions of the two latin Synods against Photius—as well as the synods themselves, which as regards time and place appeared as two, but in reality were only one—and what is more, this annulment was made by the letters of the Pope John VIII as well as the mouths of his legates and all the fathers of the Synod declaring: «May the synod called against the most-saintly Patriarch Photius in Rome and Constantinople at the time of Hadrian be henceforth ostracized, invalid, uncertain and unclassified with other holy Synods» (Mansi, Concil. 17, 401, 416, 489, 492, 508 seq.). In conformity with this decision, the Orthodox Church ignored completely the later Synod of 869/70 (see also J. Hergenrôther, op. cit., II, 510) and put it in the same class with the robber synod of 449 in Ephesus and the similar one of 1438/9 in Ferrara-Florence. But Rome retracted and for obvious reasons officially declared it as the eighth œcumenical. F. Dvornik proves that this Synod was characterized as œcumenical for the first time about the end of the 11th century (op. cit., p. 309 seq.). He fur-

Besides this, the unlawful addition of the «filioque» clause to the Creed¹ and the theory of papal supremacy in jurisdiction and power over the whole Church², which chiefly caused the clash
 ther states that this was forgotten and only during the 16th century does Baronius mention it again. Later latin writers reiterate the same up to the Hergenrother, Hefele and our contemporaries. See F. Dvornik, *L'œcuménicité du huitième concile (869/70)*, in *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, vol. 24 (1938). Elsewhere he writes: «We must not forget that the council of 869/70, called the eighth œcumencal, was in many ways a failure for the Papacy. Only thirteen bishops were present at the beginning, and the so-called «libelli» were unpopular...» (The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion?, ante p. 30).

1. All the participants of the Synod, including the papal legates, accepted the sacred symbol unchanged and unforged, «deducting nothing, adding nothing, altering nothing, forging nothing; because deduction and addition introduces criticism of things uncriticized and inexcusable insult against the fathers, when some heresy is not stirred by the artifices of temptation, and altering the words of the Fathers with forged words is more serious than the former». Therefore the Synod pronounced anathema anyone who «in spurious words or additions or deductions would dare to forge the antiquity of this sacred and venerable word». (Mansi, *Concil.* 17, 516). On page 520: «if anyone becomes audacious enough to dare to write another symbol besides this one or to add, subtract, pronounce or write another word, may he be censured and rejected from every Christian confession...». See also what is said in the treatises of the Patriarch Eftymius and the metropolitan Neilos of Rhodes about the Synods, in F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 457, where this Synod is called «unifying», during which a great peace was made between the Western Church and the Patriarchates, the Westerners plainly confessing that in the same manner as you do we read and believe, the symbol which is the holy of the faith without any addition to it and that we anathematize anyone who adds or omits etc». It is unnecessary to repeat that the fathers of this Synod, as well as those of the Synod of 867 in Constantinople and Photius himself in 866 in his encyclical did nothing more than Pope Leo III in 810 (see above p. 403, and F. Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 49/50) and all the preceding orthodox Popes did. On the other hand, even after Nicholas I the addition of the filioque was unacceptable in Rome during the whole of the 9th and 10th century. It was introduced by Benedict VIII in 1014 perhaps under the pressure of the Emperor of Germany Henry II. «Cependant, même après l'adoption du Filioque par Rome, quelques Églises continuèrent à chanter le symbole sans ce mot. Un texte d'Alexandre de Halès atteste qu'en 1240, à Paris, on ne chantait pas encore le filioque au symbole.» (A. Palmieri, *Filioque*, ante vol. V, p. 2317). All this shows the right that Photius had in fighting the addition and the reason why the latin Synod in Constantinople in 869/70 against him did not venture to condemn him as an heretic for this. Indirectly and silently it recognized that Photius' teaching about the procession of the Holy Spirit was orthodox.

2. See also Chrys. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 162 seq. Even the latin Synod

between Nicholas and Photius, were condemned. Thus, Photius was released by this Synod of all responsibility for the conflict. It is especially noteworthy that the Byzantines characterized this reconciliation as a union of the Churches. The Patriarch of Constantinople Michael of Anchialus (1169—1177)¹ testifies to this, as well as Nicetas Chartophylax of Nicaea who writes: «Photius after much clamor and confusion and without further meddling having again united with the Romans, likewise was there union of the Churches»². This «union» became more real later particularly at the time of the Patriarch Antonius II (893—895)³, and especially from 880 to the time of Cerularius.

of 869/70 in Constantinople did not recognize the papal primacy based on the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the «Gift of Constantine», at least in the measure that the papal legates had hoped for. See *ibid.*, p. 152 seq. The Synod of 879/80, following the practice of the ancient Œcumenical Synods, recognized the honorary pre-eminence of the bishop of Rome in the Patriarchal pentarchy, «changing none of the rights belonging to the most-holy throne of the Church of the Romans, or to her chairman neither now nor in the hereafter», according to her first canon. For indeed «what the Pope Nicholas I and his successors claimed was an innovation, that is, arbitrarily to acquit clergymen of another Church who were condemned by her, or to convict others by intervening in her internal questions». The «rights belonging to him» were nothing else but the rights honorarily given to the bishop of Rome (see the exegesis of Zonaras, in Rhalles and Potles, *The Constitution of the Sacred Canons*, II, 706, P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, p. 136, 557), which were defined by the 6th canon of the first Œcumenical Council, the 3rd of the 2nd Œcumenical, the 28th of the 4th Œcumenical, the 36th of the Quini-seximum. All innovations then in the privileges of the bishop of Rome were prohibited by the above provisions just as every change of honorary primacy to administrative supremacy was. By this provision the Patriarch of Constantinople was made equal to the Patriarch of Rome and consequently any excess of the latter was prohibited». (*Ibid.*, p. 164/5).

1. See Biz. *Vremennik* 14 (1908) 356.

2. Migne P. G. 120, 717. For this reason the Byzantines called this Synod of 879/80 «unifying» (F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 384, 385, 457). The Latins of the Middle Ages did not give great importance to the schism and even ignored the so-called «second schism». (F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 279 seq. The same writer, *L'affaire de Photios dans la littérature Latine du Moyen-Age*, in *Annales de l'Institut Kondakov* 10 (1938) 69 seq.)

3. See K. Amantos, *History of the Byzantine State*, Athens 1947, vol. II, p. 227 (in Greek). For this reason in the year 899 the papal legates at Constantinople took their earlier position on the protocol of the Byzantine Court, as the Kletorologion of Philotheus p. 155 testifies «They, who arrived from Rome: during the time of Leo the pious despot for the union of the Churches, as for example Nicholas and the cardinal John, were honored above all the classes of

«During this interval our own leaders showed great tolerance in their relation with Rome»¹, and in reality the schism was lifted or rather changed into a political and cultural one². In this the Pope John IX was very instrumental because he recognized the Patriarchs of Constantinople Ignatius, Photius, Stephen I and Antonius II as canonical and condemned all who did not³. Consequently, after the Synod of 879/80 no «second schism» existed between Photius and Rome, as Roman catholic writers above all asserted, ignorant of the real facts or who out of pure prejudice and fanaticism had based their views upon sources⁴, «which today are considered as purposeful fabrications of the Ignatian party»⁵. Modern unbiased scientific research⁶ has arrived at the conclusion that the so called «second schism» of Photius is one «historical mystification»⁷ and belongs to the «realm of legend»⁸, inasmuch as no other condemnation against Photius was repeated by the succeeding Popes John VIII, Marinus, Stephen V and Formozos⁹. F. Dvornik further points out «that

magistrates». (Migne P. G. 112, 1341. 1353/6). In general the relations between the two Churches until 1053 are characterized on the whole as tolerable and good enough. See A. Michel, *Bestand eine Trennung der Griechischen und der Römischen Kirche schon vor Kerullariös?* in *Historische Jahrbuch* 1922, p. 1—11. L. Bréchier, *Le schisme oriental du XIe siècle*, Paris 1899, p. 2. Of the same author, *Avant le schisme du XIe siècle. Les relations normales entre Rome et les Églises d' Orient*, in *La documentation catholique* 19 (1928) 387 seq. E. Amann, Michel Cérulaire, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, vol. x, p. 1702.

1. A. D. Kyriakos, *Church History*, Athens 1898, vol. II, p. 26 (in Greek).

2. See also G. Every, *op. cit.*, p. 145 seq.

3. Mansi, *Concil.* 16, 457. M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin*, p. 133.

4. Mansi, *Concil.* 16, 445 seq.

5. B. Stefanides, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

6. A. Lapôte, *Le pape Jean VIII*, Paris 1895. E. Amann, *Jean VIII*, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, vol. 8, p. 601 seq. H. Böhmer, *Johannes VIII*, in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 9, p. 260. E. Kattenbusch, *Photius*, *ibid.* vol. 15, p. 384. H. Schubert, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter*, 1921, p. 438.

7. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, p. 202 seq.—*Le second Schisme de Photios—Une Mystification historique*, in «*Byzantion*» 8 (1933) 42 seq.

8. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, p. 236: «There is only one possible conclusion: Photius' second schism, assumed so far to have been particularly fatal to the friendly relations between the two Churches, belongs to the realm of legend».

9. *Ibid.*, p. 215 seq. Even the Pope Stephen V, «who was always believed to be Photius, particularly venomous enemy», nevertheless, «did not break with Photius, but like his predecessors continued to treat him as the

the person of Photius, the great Patriarch and Father of the Eastern Church, has for centuries been treated by the whole of the West with unmerited scorn and contempt»¹. He is led, as a result of his long and detailed study, to the conclusion that «on the basis of History, Photius can and must be justified. He further states that «we shall be free once more to recognize in Photius a great Churchman, a learned humanist and a genuine Christian, generous enough to forgive his enemies and to take the first step towards reconciliation»². Accordingly, Photius, who for cen-

legitimate Patriarch», and «will in fact champion his cause on the occasion of his second deposition by the Emperor» (p. 236). In addition, from research into the latin literature of the 9th to the 12th century (ibid., p. 279 seq.) the author concludes that: «the view held, at that period at any rate, of the Photian case was not the same as the view current in the modern period; Photius' litigation with the Papacy occupied a very restricted place in the writings of the time; above all, to our great surprise, absolutely nothing was known of what to-day goes by the name of the second schism of Photius; whereas against this, the Patriarch's rehabilitation by John VIII was common knowledge» (p. 308). For details about the so-called second schism see also V. Grumel, *Y eut-il un second schisme de Photius?* in *Rev. Sciences philos. et théol.* 32 (1933) 432 seq. F. Dölger, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 34 (1934) 214/5. K. Amantos, *op. cit.*, p. 32 seq.

1. Ibid., p. 432.

2. Ibid., p. 432. We deem it relevant to quote here the summary of the chief deductions of F. Dvornik's studies and research about Photius, which is taken from the «Report of the proceedings at the Church unity octave, held at Blackfriars, Oxford», Oxford 1942, and entitled: *The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion*, p. 20/1: «Fortunately, in recent years, new light has been thrown on the history of the unfortunate Patriarch. Let us recapitulate only those discoveries which have been so far accepted by the scientific world. First of all, it has been proved that the second Photian schism never existed. The Patriarch Photius was duly and sincerely reconciled with Pope John VIII, and the Council of 879-880 officially sanctioned this reconciliation. Photius was never re-excommunicated by the Pope. On the contrary, when he was deposed by the Emperor Leo VI for political reasons, the Pope, Stephen VI, rose in his defence, and only entered into relations with his successor, the emperor's young brother Stephen, when the emperor sent him the copy of Photius' free resignation of the patriarchal see. Then when Photius died he was in communion with the Church of Rome. It has also been established that the Church of Rome was well aware of this reconciliation and that, to the end of the eleventh century, the papal Chancellery officially recognised only seven oecumenical councils, thus refusing to accept the so-called eighth council which publicly condemned Photius in 869-870. The Roman Curia has not forgotten that the decisions of this council were cancelled in 879-880 when Photius was reconciled with Rome, that this decision was confirmed by John VIII, and

tures was misinterpreted and slandered by fanatic heterodox theologians and historians, was not the «father of the schism», but rather the pioneer and apostle of the reconciliation and union of the two Churches, whose unity was troubled by Rome. Such a recognition on the part of the heterodox, even if it is not complete, constitutes the triumphant restoration and justification of the great

that it was never afterwards revoked by the Papacy. The council which condemned Photius and whose decision concerning the Patriarch were cancelled ten years later by another synod approved by the Pope, has never since been counted amongst the oecumenical councils in the Eastern Church. Nor can any official decision of the Western Church be found ordering this council to be counted again amongst the oecumenical councils. This synod owes the undeserved honour of being counted as the eighth oecumenical council to a singular mistake on the part of Roman canonists of the eleventh century, who found the Acts of this council in the Lateran archives and were delighted to read amongst them a decision forbidding the laity to interfere with the election of bishops. They were so delighted with this discovery that they not only forgot that this synod had been cancelled, but promoted it to be one of the greatest councils of Christianity. Naturally, when this happened the whole history of the Patriarch Photius was bound to be misunderstood. A Photian legend was born in Western Christianity, a legend supported by the Acts of an oecumenical council, and which had accordingly to be believed without hesitation. This legend developed during the Middle Ages, and was codified by the first modern Church historian, Cardinal Baronius, in the seventeenth century. These are the new discoveries concerning the history of the Patriarch Photius which have been so far in some degree accepted by the specialists. These new views are naturally destroying all that the Middle Ages built up. If we look at the history of «the Father of the Schism» from this point of view, then naturally the imposing building which Cardinal Baronius erected in the seventeenth century and Cardinal Hergenröther so magnificently renovated in the nineteenth is cracking and collapsing before our eyes. The history of the great Greek has to be rewritten».

1. Although as Orthodox theologians we find difficulty in understanding how in the system of the Papacy the expressed hope of F. Dvornik is able to be realized, nevertheless as Christians we have no difficulty in sharing his wish and hope that «this new light shed upon historical differences will ultimately influence beneficently relations between the separated East and West and contribute to dissipate the many misunderstandings between the two Churches, thus paving the way to Reunion» (The Eastern Churches Quarterly 3 (1939) 415), and in any case «why could not Photius, canonized by the Eastern Church in the tenth century, when East and West were united and canonisations were not reserved to the Popes, be regarded, not as the Father of all Schism, but as the future Patron of Reunion?» (Report of the proceedings at the Church unity octave, p. 31).

Orthodox Patriarch Photius¹ in History, coming one and more

1. Lastly it must be added that the Orthodox Catholic Church, recognizing the great work of Photius on behalf of the Church and Orthodoxy in general, declared him a Saint and celebrates his memory on the 6th of February. The Church honors him as «the champion of Orthodoxy, the defender of the Orthodox, the pillar and foundation of the Church, the organ of Grace, the chosen vessel, the godly-voiced lyre of the Spirit, the spirited orator, the wisest hierarch, the teacher of the universe, brilliant in word and dogmas, the trumpet clearly declaring the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, as the descendant of thunder had theologized, the firmest opponent of heresies, the criticizer of the error of heresy, the divine defender of Orthodoxy, the deposer of the haughtiness of heresy, the refuter of the addition to the Creed, most-holy Father, great Photius, Photologos and Photonymus etc». See «Service of our Father and equal-to-the Apostles Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople», written by Constantine Typaldos, metropolitan of Stavroupolis, and edited in 1848 and 1891. See also A. Papadopoulos Kerameus, *The Patriarch Photius as a holy Father of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 8 (1889) 647/71, Chrys. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 180/1. M. Jugie, *Le culte de Photius dans l'Église Byzantine*, in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 3 (1922/3) 109 seq. F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 388. It is worth noting that in Athens during the last few decades the Holy Synod of Greece officially celebrates the memory of Saint Photius at the monastery of Penteli, which is located near the city. Likewise, the Synodical which is read on the Sunday of Orthodoxy contains the following anathematization: «Everything written or said against the saintly Patriarchs Germanos, Tarasius, Niceforos, Methodius, Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, Antonius and Nicholas, anathema», and «the memory of Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, Antonius and Nicholas, eternal». (Triodion, edition M. Saliberos, Athens 1930, p. 146). See also Michael Cerularius, *Homily*, Migne P. G. 120, 729, 732, and «Tome of Unity», in Rhalles and Potles, *op. cit.*, vol. V, p. 9. Chrys. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 180/1. G. Kremos, *op. cit.*, II, 416. F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 434. But, as we have seen on p. 409 and 423 ante, many others judged Photius similarly, as for example K. Paparregopoulos who writes: Photius was a superb man. During the interval between the first Constantine, who was the cause for the establishment of the eastern state and the last Constantine who fell on the battlements of Constantinople, the state falling with him,—in the period of one thousand years, no other name shone brighter in the historical firmament than that of Photius. He, standing between the two Constantines of whom one represents the beginning and the other the end of medieval Hellenism, contributed more than anyone else in shaping that Hellenism» (*op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 727). And G. Kremos observes that the «Church and the entire Greek nation justly places Photius amongst the first of the great personages who fought the triumphant battle for the sake of the pan-Hellenic, its faith and existence» (*op. cit.*, II, p. 4). He speaks of him as the «most brilliant Byzantine hierophant of the Church, the great theologian, the most profound philosopher, the new Aristotle of our medieval history, the good-speaking orator, the beautifully-singing melodist, the most-learned philologist, the experi-

millenium after his justification by the general Council of 879/80.

enced teacher of law, the highest pride of the most dignified arch-sacrificer of the Orthodox Church, may whose glory be imperishable» (ibid., p. 419). According to S. Zambelios, Photius is «the apex of the 9th century, the renown contender of Neo-Hellenic nationality, whose glory fills the History, Literature and Theology of the Medieval Ages», from whom begins «the obvious formation of the neo-Hellenic peculiarity, being the indirect result of the schism» (op. cit., pp. 454, 463). For other criticisms of Photius see J. Valettas, op. cit., pp. 99—122, and G. Kremos, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 84—85, 145—148, 409—420. See also G. Every, op. cit., p. 118/9 and K. Bonis, Byzantine Theology, Athens 1948, p. 8 seq., and of the same author, Friendship in general and according to the great Photius, Athens 1938, p. 24 seq., 52 seq. (both in Greek). Significant is the fact that even the Pope John VIII called Photius «a man eminent in the orthodox faith, and renowned for modesty of life and exact citizenship... and proclaimed different from all in wisdom and prudence concerning the divine and human, and concerning the practical virtue and diligence of other things, a worker of the divine commandments having no cause for shame». (A. P. Kerameus, Small works of Photius, Petroupolis 1892, p. 147/8, in Greek). Lastly, his own vicars confessed that «non esse similem ei (Photio).. commisaratione ac largitione in pauperes, neque benignitate et humilitate». (J. Harduini, Acta conciliorum, Parisiis 1715, vol. VI, p. 339).
