



East–West Schism

This is an old revision of this page, as edited by Shellwood (talk | contribs) at 12:42, 11 July 2018 (*Reverted edits by 103.86.130.127 (talk): unexplained content removal (HG) (3.4.3)*). The present address (URL) is a permanent link to this revision, which may differ significantly from the current revision.

The **East–West Schism**, also called the **Great Schism** and the **Schism of 1054**, was the break of communion between what are now the Catholic Church and Eastern Orthodox churches, which has lasted since the 11th century.^[1] The Schism was the culmination of theological and political differences between the Christian East and West which had developed over the preceding centuries, and marked the first time since the Edict of Milan that there was more than one body considered by secular authorities to constitute the Christian Church.

Outline

A succession of ecclesiastical differences and theological disputes between the Greek East and Latin West pre-dated the formal rupture that occurred in 1054.^{[2][3][4]} Prominent among these were the issues of the source of the Holy Spirit, whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used in the Eucharist,^[a] the Bishop of Rome's claim to universal jurisdiction, and the place of the See of Constantinople in relation to the Pentarchy.^[8]

In 1053, the first step was taken in the process which led to formal schism: the Greek churches in southern Italy were forced either to close or to conform to Latin practices.^{[9][10][11]} In retaliation, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Michael I Cerularius ordered the closure of all Latin churches in Constantinople. In 1054, the papal legate sent by Leo IX travelled to Constantinople for purposes that included refusing to Cerularius the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch" and insisting that he recognize the Pope's claim to be the head of all the churches.^[2] The main purpose of the papal legation was to seek help from the Byzantine Emperor in view of the Norman conquest of southern Italy and to deal with recent attacks by Leo of Ohrid against the use of unleavened bread and other Western customs,^[12] attacks that had the support of Cerularius. Historian Axel Bayer says the legation was sent in response to two letters, one from the Emperor seeking assistance in arranging a common military campaign by the eastern and western empires against the Normans, and the other from Cerularius.^[13] On the refusal of Cerularius to accept the demand, the leader of the legation, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, O.S.B., excommunicated him, and in return Cerularius excommunicated Humbert and the other legates.^[2] This was only the first act in a centuries-long process that eventually became a complete schism.^[14]

The validity of the Western legates' act is doubtful, since pope Leo had died and Cerularius' excommunication applied only to the legates personally.^[2] Still, the Church split along doctrinal, theological, linguistic, political, and geographical lines, and the fundamental breach has never been healed, with each side sometimes accusing the other of having fallen into heresy and of having

initiated the division. The Crusades, the Massacre of the Latins in 1182, the West's retaliation in the Sacking of Thessalonica in 1185, the capture and Siege of Constantinople in 1204, and the imposition of Latin patriarchs made reconciliation more difficult.^[2] Establishing Latin hierarchies in the Crusader states meant that there were two rival claimants to each of the patriarchal sees of Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, making the existence of schism clear.^[15] Several attempts at reconciliation did not bear fruit. In 1965, Pope Paul VI and the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras I nullified the anathemas of 1054,^[2] although this nullification of measures taken against a few individuals was essentially a goodwill gesture and did not constitute any sort of reunion.^[16] Contacts between the two sides continue: every year a delegation from each joins in the other's celebration of its patronal feast, Saints Peter and Paul (29 June) for Rome and Saint Andrew (30 November) for Constantinople, and there have been a number of visits by the head of each to the other. The efforts of the Ecumenical Patriarchs towards reconciliation with the Catholic Church have often been the target of sharp criticism from some fellow Orthodox.^[17]

History

The schism between the Western and Eastern Mediterranean Christians resulted from a variety of political, cultural and theological factors which transpired over centuries.^[18] Historians regard the mutual excommunications of 1054 as the terminal event.^[19] It is difficult to agree on an exact date for the event where the start of the schism was apparent.^[20] It may have started as early as the^[21] Quartodeciman controversy at the time of Victor of Rome (c. 180). Orthodox apologists point to this incident as an example of claims by Rome to papal primacy and its rejection by Eastern Churches.

Sporadic schisms in the common unions took place under Pope Damasus I in the 4th and 5th centuries.^{[22][23][24]} Disputes about theological and other questions led to schisms between the Churches in Rome and Constantinople for 37 years from 482 to 519 (the Acacian Schism). Most sources agree that the separation between East and West is clearly evident by the Photian schism for 13 years from 866–879.^[25]

Centres of Christianity

Apart from Rome in the West, "many major Churches of the East claim to have been founded by the apostles: Antioch by Peter and Paul, Alexandria by Mark, Constantinople by Andrew, Cyprus by Barnabas, Ethiopia by Matthew, India by Thomas, Edessa in eastern Syria by Thaddeus, Armenia by Bartholomew, Georgia by Simon the Zealot."^[26] Famous also are the seven churches of Asia (the Roman province of Asia), mentioned in the opening chapters of the Book of Revelation.

Claims of the See of Rome

While the church at Rome claimed a special authority over the other churches, the extant documents of that era yield "no clear-cut claims to, or recognition, of papal primacy."^{[27][28]}

Towards the end of the 2nd century, Victor, the Bishop of Rome, attempted to resolve the Quartodeciman controversy. The question was whether to celebrate Easter concurrently with the Jewish Passover, as Christians in the Roman province of Asia did, or to wait until the following Sunday, as was unanimously decreed by synods held in other Eastern provinces, such as those of

Palestine and Pontus, the acts of which were still extant at the time of Eusebius, and in Rome.^{[29][30]} The pope attempted to excommunicate the churches in Asia, which refused to accept the observance on Sunday. Other bishops rebuked him for doing so.^[31] Laurent Cleenewerck comments:

Victor obviously claimed superior authority, probably from St. Peter, and decided – or at least "attempted" to excommunicate a whole group of Churches because they followed a different tradition and refused to conform. One could therefore argue that the Great schism started with Victor, continued with Stephen and remained underground until the ninth century! But the question is this: even if Victor was not acting wisely, did he not have the power to "cut off whole Churches"? This is what Roman Catholics argue with the implication that such an excommunication would be ontologically meaningful and put someone "outside the Catholic Church". Yet, we do not see bishops "pleading" but indeed "sharply rebuking" and "admonishing" Victor. Ultimately this is why his letters of excommunication came to no effect. Nevertheless it is possible to read in Eusebius' account the possibility that St. Irenaeus recognized that Victor could indeed "cut off whole Churches" and that such excommunication would have been ontologically meaningful. ... In the end, it took some patience and an Ecumenical Council to achieve what Victor could not achieve by his threat to excommunicate.^[32]

Despite Victor's failure to carry out his intent to excommunicate the Asian churches, many Catholic apologists point to this episode as evidence of papal primacy and authority in the early Church, citing the fact that none of the bishops challenged his right to excommunicate but rather questioned the wisdom and charity of his action.^[32]

The opinion of the Bishop of Rome was often sought, especially when the patriarchs of the Eastern Mediterranean were locked in fractious dispute. However, the Bishop of Rome's opinion was by no means accepted automatically. The bishops of Rome never obviously belonged to either the Antiochian or the Alexandrian schools of theology, and usually managed to steer a middle course between whatever extremes were being propounded by theologians of either school. Because Rome was remote from the centres of Christianity in the eastern Mediterranean, it was frequently hoped its bishop would be more impartial. For instance, in 431, Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, appealed to Pope Celestine I, as well as the other patriarchs, charging Constantinople Patriarch Nestorius with heresy, which was dealt with at the Council of Ephesus.

In 342, Pope Julius I wrote: "The custom has been for word to be written first to us [in the case of bishops under accusation, and notably in apostolic churches], and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place".^[33]

In 382 a synod in Rome protested against the raising of Constantinople to a position above that of Alexandria, and spoke of Rome as "the apostolic see".^[34] Pope Siricius (384–399) claimed for papal decretals the same binding force as decisions of synods, Pope Innocent I (401–417) said that all major judicial cases should be reserved for the see of Rome, and Pope Boniface I (418–422) declared that the church of Rome stands to "the churches throughout the world as the head to its members" and that bishops everywhere, while holding the one same episcopal office, must "recognise those to whom, for the sake of ecclesiastical discipline, they should be subject".^[35] Celestine I (r. 422–432) considered that the condemnation of Nestorius by his own Roman synod in 430 was sufficient, but consented to the general council as "of benefit in manifesting the faith".^[36] Pope Leo I and his successors rejected canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, as a result of which it was not officially recorded even in the East until the 6th century.^{[37][38]} The Acacian schism (484–519), when, "for the

first time, West lines up against East in a clear-cut fashion",^[39] ended with acceptance of a declaration insisted on by Pope Hormisdas (514–523) that "I hope I shall remain in communion with the apostolic see in which is found the whole, true, and perfect stability of the Christian religion".^{[40][41][42]} Earlier, in 494, Pope Gelasius I (492–496) wrote to Byzantine Emperor Anastasius, distinguishing the power of civil rulers from that of the bishops (called "priests" in the document), with the latter supreme in religious matters; he ended his letter with: "And if it is fitting that the hearts of the faithful should submit to all priests in general who properly administer divine affairs, how much the more is obedience due to the bishop of that see which the Most High ordained to be above all others, and which is consequently dutifully honoured by the devotion of the whole Church."^[43] Pope Nicholas I (858–867) made it clear that he believed the power of the papacy extended "over all the earth, that is, over every church".^{[44][45]}

Claims of the See of Constantinople

In 330, Emperor Constantine moved the imperial capital to Byzantium, a strategically located city on the Bosphorus. He renamed the capital *Nova Roma* ("New Rome"), but the city would become known as Constantinople.^[46] The centre of gravity in the empire was fully recognised to have completely shifted to the eastern Mediterranean. Rome lost the Senate to Constantinople and lost its status and gravitas as imperial capital.^[47]

The bishop of Byzantium was under the authority of the metropolitan of Heraclea when in 330 Roman Emperor Constantine I moved his residence to this town, which, rebuilt on a larger scale, became known as Constantinople.^[48] Thereafter, the bishop's connection with the imperial court meant that he was able to free himself from ecclesiastical dependency on Heraclea and in little more than half a century to obtain recognition of next-after-Rome ranking from the First Council of Constantinople (381), held in the new capital. No Western bishop took part in this council, and the Latin Church recognized it as ecumenical only in the mid-6th century.^[49] It decreed: "The Bishop of Constantinople, however, shall have the prerogative of honour after the Bishop of Rome; because Constantinople is New Rome",^[50] thus raising it above the sees of Alexandria and Antioch. This has been described as sowing the seed for the ecclesiastical rivalry between Constantinople and Rome that was a factor leading to the schism between East and West.^{[51][52]} The website of the Orthodox Church in America says that the Bishop of Byzantium was elevated to Patriarch already in the time of Constantine.^[53]



Hagia Sophia, cathedral of Constantinople at the time of the schism

Disunion in the Roman Empire contributed to disunion in the Church. Theodosius the Great, who in 380 established Nicene Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire (see Edict of Thessalonica), was the last Emperor to rule over a united Roman Empire. Following the death of Theodosius in 395, the Empire was divided for the final time into western and eastern halves. In the 4th century, the Roman emperor (reigning in Constantinople) started to control the Church in his territory.^[54]

The patriarchs of Constantinople often tried to adopt an imperious position over the other patriarchs, provoking their resistance. For example, in 431 Patriarch Cyril, of Alexandria, impeached for heresy, Patriarch Nestorius, of Constantinople.^{[55][55]}

Alexandria's objections to Constantinople's promotion, which led to a constant struggle between the two sees in the first half of the 5th century,^[56] were supported by Rome, which proposed the theory that the most important sees were the three Petrine ones, of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria,^[57] with Rome in first place.^[49]

However, the power of the patriarch of Constantinople continued to grow.^[58] Eastern Orthodox state that the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon (451)^[59] explicitly proclaimed the equality of the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople,^{[60][61]} and that it established the highest court of ecclesiastical appeal in Constantinople.^[59] The patriarch of the imperial capital succeeded in his efforts^[62] to become the leading bishop in the Byzantine Empire: he "headed a vast curia and other bishops who resided in Constantinople constituted a permanent synod, which became the real governing body of the church".^[63]

Patriarch John IV of Constantinople, who died in 595, assumed the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch".^[37]

The idea that with the transfer of the imperial capital from Rome to Constantinople, primacy in the Church was also transferred, is found in undeveloped form as early as John Philoponus (c. 490 – c. 570). It was enunciated in its most advanced form by Photios I of Constantinople (c. 810 – c. 893). Constantinople, as the seat of the ruler of the empire and therefore of the world, was the highest among the patriarchates and, like the emperor, had the right to govern them.^[64]

Council of Nicaea (325)

After the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great legalized Christianity (with the Edict of Milan), he summoned the First Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325. The bishops at the council confirmed the position of the metropolitan sees of Rome and Alexandria as having authority outside their own province, and also the existing privileges of the churches in Antioch and the other provinces.^[65] These sees were later called Patriarchates. These were given an order of precedence: Rome, as capital of the empire was naturally given first place, then came Alexandria and Antioch. In a separate canon the Council also approved the special honor given to Jerusalem over other sees subject to the same metropolitan.^[66]

First Council of Constantinople (381)

Roman dominate Emperor Theodosius I convened the second ecumenical council (Constantinople I) at the imperial capital city in 381. The council elevated the see of Constantinople, to a position ahead of the other chief metropolitan sees, except that of Rome thus raising it above the sees of Alexandria and Antioch.^[b]

This action has been described as sowing the seed for the ecclesiastical rivalry between Constantinople and Rome which was ultimately a factor leading to the schism between East and West.^{[68][69][c]} It demarcated the territory within the praetorian prefecture of the East into five canonical territories corresponding to the five civil dioceses: Diocese of Egypt (metropolis in Alexandria), Diocese of the East (metropolis in Antioch), Diocese of Asia (Metropolis of Ephesus), Diocese of Pontus (metropolis in Caesarea Cappadociae), and Diocese of Thrace



Icon depicting the Emperor Constantine (centre) and the bishops of the First Council of Nicaea (325) holding the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381

(metropolis in Heraclea, later under Constantinople);^{[49][71]} The council mentioned the churches in the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, it decreed that the synod of each province should manage the ecclesiastical affairs of that province alone, except for the privileges already recognized for sees of Alexandria and Antioch.^[71]

No Western bishops attended the council and no legate of the bishop of Rome was present.^[72] The Latin Church recognized the council as ecumenical about 150 years later,^[72] in the mid-6th century.^{[49][70]}

Chalcedon (451)

Rome's Tome of Leo (449) was highly regarded, and formed the basis for the Council of Chalcedon formulation. But it was not universally accepted and was even called "impious" and "blasphemous" by those who condemned the council that approved and accepted it.^[73] The next ecumenical council corrected a possible imbalance in Pope Leo's presentation. Although the Bishop of Rome was well respected even at this early date, the East holds that the concept of the primacy of the Roman See and Papal Infallibility were only developed much later.

The disputed^{[37][74]} canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, confirming the authority already held by Constantinople, granted its archbishop jurisdiction over Pontus and Thrace.^[75]

The council also ratified an agreement between Antioch and Jerusalem, whereby Jerusalem held jurisdiction over three provinces,^[76] numbering it among the five great sees.^[77] As thus interpreted, there were now five patriarchs presiding over the Church within the Byzantine Empire, in the following order of precedence: the Patriarch of Rome, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Patriarch of Antioch and the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

Although Leo I, whose delegates were absent when this resolution was passed, recognized the council as ecumenical and confirmed its doctrinal decrees, he rejected its canon 28 on the ground that it contravened the sixth canon of Nicaea and infringed the rights of Alexandria and Antioch.^{[49][78]} However, by that time Constantinople, the permanent residence of the emperor, had in reality enormous influence, and had it not been for the opposition of Rome, its bishop could easily have been given first place among all the bishops.^[49]

This canon would remain a constant source of friction between East and West, until the mutual excommunications of 1054 made it irrelevant in that regard;^[79] but controversy about its applicability to the authority of the patriarchate of Constantinople still continues.^[80]

The same disputed canon also recognized an authority of Constantinople over bishops of dioceses "among the barbarians", which has been variously interpreted as referring either to all areas outside the Byzantine Empire or only to those in the vicinity of Pontus, Asia and Thrace or to non-Greeks within the empire.^[37]

Canon 9 of the Council also declared: "If a bishop or clergyman should have a difference with the metropolitan of the province, let him have recourse to the Exarch of the Diocese, or to the throne of the Imperial City of Constantinople, and there let it be tried." This has been interpreted as conferring on the see of Constantinople a greater privilege than what any council ever gave Rome,^[81] or as of much lesser significance than that.^{[82][83]}

After the Council of Chalcedon (451), the position of the Patriarchate of Alexandria was weakened by a division in which the great majority of its Christian population followed the form of Christianity that its opponents called Monophysitism.^[49]

Separation of the West from the Roman Empire

In 476, when the last emperor of the western part of the Roman Empire was deposed and the western imperial insignia were sent to Constantinople, there was once again a single Roman Emperor. However, he had little power in the West, which was ruled almost entirely by various Germanic tribes. In the opinion of Randall R. Cloud, the permanent separation of the Greek East from the Latin West was "the fundamental reason for the estrangement that soon followed between the Greek and the Latin Christians".^[84]

The dominant language of the West was Latin, while that of the East was Greek. Soon after the fall of the West to invaders, the number of individuals who spoke both languages dwindled, and communication between East and West grew much more difficult. With linguistic unity gone, cultural unity began to crumble as well. The two halves of the Church were naturally divided along similar lines; they developed different rites and had different approaches to religious doctrines. Although the schism was still centuries away, its outlines were already perceptible.^[85]

In the areas under his control, Justinian I established caesaropapism as the constitution of the Church in a scheme according to which the emperor "had the right and duty of regulating by his laws the minutest detail of worship and discipline, and also of dictating the theological opinions to be held in the Church".^[86] According to the *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*, this caesaropapism was "a source of contention between Rome and Constantinople that led to the schism of 1054".^[87] Explicit approval of the emperor in Constantinople was required for consecration of bishops within the empire. During the period called the Byzantine Papacy, this applied to the bishops of Rome, most of whom were of Greek or Syrian origin. Resentment in the West against the Byzantine emperor's governance of the Church is shown as far back as the 6th century, when "the tolerance of the Arian Gothic king was preferred to the caesaropapist claims of Constantinople".^[88] The origins of the distinct attitudes in West and East are sometimes traced back even to Augustine of Hippo, who "saw the relationship between church and state as one of tension between the 'city of God' and the 'city of the world'", and Eusebius, who "saw the state as the protector of the church and the emperor as God's vicar on earth".^[89]

Decline of three patriarchates

By 661, Muslim Arabs had taken over the territories assigned to the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, which thereafter were never more than partially and temporarily recovered. In 732, Emperor Leo III the Isaurian, in revenge for the opposition of Pope Gregory III to the emperor's iconoclast policies, transferred Sicily, Calabria and Illyria from the patriarchate of Rome (whose jurisdiction until then extended as far east as Thessalonica) to that of Constantinople.^[90] The Constantinople patriarchate, after expanding eastward at the time of the Council of Chalcedon to take in Pontus and the Roman province of Asia, which at that time were still under the emperor's control, thus expanded equally to the west, and was practically coextensive with the Byzantine Empire.

Council in Trullo (Quinisext, 692)

The West's rejection of the Quinisext Council of 692 led to pressure from the Eastern Empire on the West to reject many Latin customs as non-Orthodox. The Latin practices that had got the attention of the other Patriarchates and that had been condemned by this Council included the practice of celebrating Mass on weekdays in Lent (rather than having Pre-Sanctified Liturgies);^[91] fasting on Saturdays throughout the year;^[92] omitting the "Alleluia" in Lent; depicting Christ as a lamb;^[93] using unleavened bread.^[94] Larger disputes were revealed regarding Eastern and Western attitudes toward celibacy for priests and deacons, with the Council affirming the right of married men to become priests (though forbidding priests to marry and forbidding bishops to live with their wives)^{[95][96]} and prescribing deposition for anyone who attempted to separate a clergyman other than a bishop from his wife, or for any cleric other than a bishop who dismissed his wife.^[97]

Pope Sergius I, who was of Syrian ancestry, rejected the council.^[98] Emperor Justinian II ordered his arrest.^[99] This was thwarted.^{[100][101]}

In 694, in Visigothic Spain, the council was ratified by the Eighteenth Council of Toledo at the urging of the king, Wittiza.^[102] Fruela I of Asturias reversed the decision of Toledo sometime during his reign (757–768).^[102]

Papal supremacy and Pentarchy

The primary causes of the schism were disputes over conflicting claims of jurisdiction, in particular over papal authority—Pope Leo IX claimed he held authority over the four Eastern patriarchs— and over the insertion of the Filioque clause into the Nicene Creed by the Western patriarch in 1014.^[103] Eastern Orthodox today state that Council of Chalcedon canon 28 explicitly proclaimed the equality of the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople and that it established the highest court of ecclesiastical appeal in Constantinople.^[104] Council of Ephesus canon 7 declared:

It is unlawful for any man to bring forward, or to write, or to compose a different (ἐτέραν) Faith as a rival to that established by the holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Ghost in Nicæa. But those who shall dare to compose a different faith, or to introduce or offer it to persons desiring to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed, if they be bishops or clergymen; bishops from the episcopate and clergymen from the clergy; and if they be laymen, they shall be anathematized^[105]

Eastern Orthodox today state that this canon of the Council of Ephesus explicitly prohibited modification of the Nicene Creed drawn up by the first Ecumenical Council in 325, the wording of which, it is claimed, but not the substance, had been modified by the second Ecumenical Council, making additions such as "who proceeds from the Father".

Eastern Orthodox argue that First Council of Ephesus canon 7 explicitly prohibited modification of the Nicene Creed by any man (not by ecumenical church council) drawn up by the first Ecumenical Council in 325.^[106] In reality, the Council made no exception for an ecumenical council or any other body of bishops,^[107] and the Greeks participating in the Council of Florence emphatically denied that even an ecumenical council had the power to add anything to the creed.^[108] The creed quoted in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus of 431 (the third ecumenical council) is that of the first ecumenical council, that of Nicaea (325), without the modifications that the second ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 381, is understood to have made to it, such as the addition of "who proceeds from

the Father".^{[109][110]} Eastern Orthodox theologians state this change of the wording of the churches' original creed, was done to address various teachings outside of the church in specific the Macedonius I of Constantinople teaching which the council claimed was a distortion of the church's teaching on the Holy Spirit. This was not a change of the orthodoxy of the churches' original creed.^[111] Thus the word *ἐτέραν* in the seventh canon of the later Council of Ephesus is understood as meaning "different" or "contradictory" and not "another" in the sense of mere explanatory additions to the already existing creed.^[108] Some scholars hold that the additions attributed to the First Council of Constantinople were adopted only with the 451 Council of Chalcedon, 20 years after that of Ephesus,^{[112][113]} and even that the Council of Ephesus, in which Alexandrian influence was dominant, was by this canon excluding the Constantinopolitan Creed, which eventually annexed the name and fame of the creed adopted at Nicaea.^[114]

Other points of conflict

Many other issues increased tensions.

Theological

- The iconoclast policy enforced by a series of decrees of Emperor Leo III the Isaurian in 726–729 was resisted in the West, giving rise to friction that ended in 787, when the Second Council of Nicaea reaffirmed that images are to be venerated, but not worshipped. The Libri Carolini, commissioned by Charlemagne criticized what a faulty translation gave as the council's decision, but their objections were rebutted by Pope Adrian I.
- The Western Church's insertion of *Filioque* into its Latin version of the Nicene Creed (accepted in Rome in 1014) was objected to as done without holding a council or obtaining consent from the Eastern Churches.^[115]
- In the East, Patriarch Photios I of Constantinople responded to the practice of certain Frankish monks in Jerusalem who attempted to impose the practice of the *Filioque* on their Eastern brothers.^[116]

Jurisdictional

- Disputes in the Balkans, Southern Italy, and Sicily over whether Rome or Constantinople had ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Governance

- The Byzantine Empire was a theocracy, the Emperor was the supreme authority in both church and state.^{[117][118][119][120]} "The king is not God among men but the Viceroy of God. He is not the logos incarnate but is in a special relation with the logos. He has been specially appointed and is continually inspired by God, the friend of God, the interpreter of the Word of God. His eyes look upward, to receive the messages of God. He must be surrounded with the reverence and glory that befits God's earthly copy; and he will 'frame his earthly government according to the pattern of the divine original, finding strength in its conformity with the monarchy of God'."^[121]
- In the East, endorsement of Caesaropapism, subordination of the church to the religious claims of the dominant political order, was most fully evident in the Byzantine Empire at the end of the first millennium,^[122] while in the West, where the decline of imperial authority left the Church relatively independent,^{[123][124][125][126]} there was growth of the power of the Papacy.
- As a result of the Muslim conquests of the territories of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, only two rival powerful centres of ecclesiastical authority, Constantinople and

Rome, remained.^[127] Until this happened, Rome often tried to act as a neutral mediator in disputes among the Eastern Patriarchies

Canonical

- Certain liturgical practices in the West that the East believed represented illegitimate innovation: the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, for example (see azymite).
- Celibacy among Western priests (both monastic and parish), as opposed to the Eastern discipline whereby parish priests could be married men. However, the Latin church has always had some priests who were legally married. They have been a small minority since the 12th century.

In Eastern Christendom, the teaching of papal supremacy is said to be based on the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals,^[128] documents attributed to early popes but actually forged, probably in the second quarter of the 9th century, with the aim of defending the position of bishops against metropolitans and secular authorities. The Orthodox East contests the teaching that Peter was the Patriarch of Rome, a title that the West too does not give him. Early sources such as St. Irenaeus can be interpreted as describing Pope Linus as the first bishop of Rome and Pope Cletus the second. The *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* states: "In the late 2nd or early 3rd cent. the tradition identified Peter as the first bishop of Rome. This was a natural development once the monarchical episcopate, i.e. government of the local church by a single bishop, as distinct from a group of presbyter bishops, finally emerged in Rome in the mid-2nd cent. The earlier tradition, however, which placed Peter and Paul in a class apart as the pioneers who together established the Roman church and its ministry, was never lost sight of."^[129] St. Peter was according to tradition bishop of Antioch at one point, and was then succeeded by Evodius and Ignatius. The Eastern Orthodox do not hold the primacy of the Pope of Rome over the Eastern church; they teach that the Pope of Rome is the first among equals. The first seven Ecumenical Councils were held in the East and called by the Eastern Emperors, Roman pontiffs never presided over any of them.^[130]

Filioque and primacy issues (867–879)

Three councils were held, two by Constantinople, one by Rome.^[131] Rome attempted to replace a seated Patriarch with one amenable to the Filioque dispute. The Orthodox responded by denouncing the replacement and excommunicating the pope convening the Roman council, denouncing the pope's attempt to control affairs outside the purview of Rome, and denouncing the addition of Filioque as a heresy. Each church recognizes its own council(s) as legitimate and does not recognize the other's council(s).^{[132][133][134][135][136][137]}

Mutual excommunication of 1054

In 1053 Leo of Ohrid, at the instigation, according to J. B. Bury, of Patriarch Michael Cerularius of Constantinople,^[138] wrote to Bishop John of Trani a letter, intended for all the Latin bishops, including the pope, in which he attacked Western practices such as using unleavened bread for the Eucharist, and fasting rules that differed from those in Constantinople, while Cerularius himself closed all Latin churches in Constantinople.

In response, Leo IX wrote the letter *In terra pax* of 2 September 1053,^[139] addressed to Cerularius and Leo of Ohrid, in which he speaks at length of the privileges granted through Saint Peter to the see of Rome. In one of the 41 sections of his letter he also speaks of privileges granted by the emperors,



Changes in extent of the Empire ruled from Constantinople.

476 End of the Western Empire; 550 Conquests of Justinian I; 717

Accession of Leo the Isaurian; 867 Accession of Basil I; 1025 Death of

Basil II; 1095 Eve of the First Crusade; 1170 Under Manuel I; 1270 Under

Michael VIII Palaiologos; 1400 Before the fall of Constantinople

quoting from the *Donation of Constantine* document, which he believed to be genuine (section 20).^[140] Some scholars say that this letter was never actually dispatched, but was set aside, and that the papal reply actually sent was the softer but still harsh letter *Scripta tuae* of January 1054.^[141]

The advance of the Norman conquest of southern Italy constituted a threat to the possessions of both the Byzantine Empire and the papacy, each of which sought the support of the other. Accordingly, conciliatory letters, the texts of which have not

been preserved, were written to the pope by the emperor and Cerularius. In his January 1054 reply to the emperor, *Quantas gratias*,^[142] Leo IX asks for his assistance against the Normans and complains of what the pope saw as Caerularius's arrogance. In his reply to Caerularius,^[143] he upbraided the patriarch for trying to subject the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to himself and for adopting the title of Ecumenical Patriarch, and insisted on the primacy of the see of Rome.^[140]

These two letters were entrusted to a delegation of three legates headed by the undiplomatic Humbert of Silva Candida. They were given friendship and support by the emperor but were spurned by the patriarch. Finally, on 16 July 1054, three months after Pope Leo's death in April 1054 and nine months before the next pope took office,^[141] they laid on the altar of Hagia Sophia, which was prepared for celebration of the Divine Liturgy, a bull of excommunication of Cerularius and his supporters. At a synod held on 20 July 1054, Cerularius in turn excommunicated the legates.^{[140][147]} In reality, only Michael may have been excommunicated along with his then-living adherents.^[d]

At the time of the excommunications, many contemporary historians, including Byzantine chroniclers, did not consider the event significant.^{[149][150][151][152]}

Efforts were made in subsequent centuries by emperors, popes and patriarchs to heal the rift between the churches. However, a number of factors and historical events worked to widen the separation over time.^[153]

East and West since 1054

"Even after 1054 friendly relations between East and West continued. The two parts of Christendom were not yet conscious of a great gulf of separation between them. ... The dispute remained



Division between the Eastern and Western Churches^{[144][145]}



The religious distribution in 1054^[146]

something of which ordinary Christians in East and West were largely unaware".^[154]

There was no single event that marked the breakdown. Rather, the two churches slid into and out of schism over a period of several centuries, punctuated with temporary reconciliations.

Sectarian tensions in the Byzantine Empire in the 11th-12th centuries

Starting from the late 11th century, dependency of Byzantine Empire on the naval forces of Republic of Venice and, to a lesser extent, Republic of Genoa and Republic of Pisa led to predominance of Roman Catholic merchants in Byzantium (they were getting major trading concessions starting from 1080s), subsequently causing economic and social upheaval. Together with the perceived arrogance of the Italians, it fueled popular resentment amongst the middle and lower classes both in the countryside and in the cities.^[155]

By the second half of the 12th century practically uncontrollable rivalry between competitors from different city states made it to Italians raiding quarters of other Italians in the capital, and retaliatory draconian measures by the Byzantine authorities led to subsequent deterioration of inter-religious relations in the city.

When in 1182 regency of empress mother Maria of Antioch, an ethnical French notorious for the favoritism shown to Latin merchants and the big aristocratic land-owners, was deposed by Andronikos I Komnenos on the wake of popular support, the new emperor allowed mobs to massacre hated foreigners. Henceforth Byzantine foreign policy was invariably perceived as sinister and anti-Latin in the West.^[156]

Fourth Crusade (1204) and other military conflicts

During the Fourth Crusade Latin crusaders and Venetian merchants sacked Constantinople itself, looting The Church of Holy Wisdom and various other Orthodox Holy sites,^[157] and converting them to Latin Catholic worship. The Norman Crusaders also destroyed the Imperial Library of Constantinople.^{[158][159][160]} Various holy artifacts from these Orthodox holy places were taken to the West. The crusaders also appointed a Latin Patriarch of Constantinople.^[157] This event and the final treaty established the Latin Empire of the East and the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople (with various other Crusader states). Later some religious artifacts were sold in Europe to finance or fund the Latin Empire in Byzantium as can be seen, when Emperor Baldwin II of Constantinople sold the relic of the Crown of Thorns while in France trying to raise new funds to maintain his hold on Byzantium.^[161] The Latin Empire was terminated in 1261 by Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos. This attack on the heart of the Byzantine Empire is seen as a factor that led to its conquest by Ottoman Muslims.

In northern Europe, the Teutonic Knights, after their successes in the northern crusades,^[162] attempted to conquer the Orthodox Russian Republics of Pskov and Novgorod, an enterprise endorsed by Pope Gregory IX.^[162] One of the major defeats they suffered was the Battle of the Ice in

1242. Catholic Sweden also undertook several campaigns against Orthodox Novgorod. There were also conflicts between Catholic Poland and Orthodox Russia. Such conflicts solidified the schism between East and West.

Second Council of Lyon (1272)

The Second Council of Lyon was convoked to act on a pledge by Michael VIII to reunite the Eastern church with the West.^[163] Wishing to end the Great Schism that divided Rome and Constantinople, Gregory X had sent an embassy to Michael VIII, who had reconquered Constantinople, putting an end to the remnants of the Latin Empire in the East, and he asked Latin despots in the East to curb their ambitions.

On 29 June (Feast of Saints Peter and Paul patronal feast of Popes), Gregory X celebrated a Mass in St John's Church, where both sides took part. The council declared that the Roman church possessed "the supreme and full primacy and authority over the universal Catholic Church."

The union effected was "a sham and a political gambit", a fiction maintained by the emperor to prevent westerners from recovering the city of Constantinople, which they had lost just over a decade before, in 1261.^{[164][165][166]} It was fiercely opposed by clergy and people^{[167][168]} and never put into effect,^[169] in spite of a sustained campaign by Patriarch John XI of Constantinople (John Bekkos), a convert to the cause of union, to defend the union intellectually, and vigorous and brutal repression of opponents by Michael.^{[167][170]} In 1278 Pope Nicholas III, learning of the fictitious character of Greek conformity,^[166] sent legates to Constantinople, demanding the personal submission of every Orthodox cleric and adoption of the *Filioque*,^[171] as already the Greek delegates at Lyon had been required to recite the Creed with the inclusion of *Filioque* and to repeat it two more times.^[172] Emperor Michael's attempts to resolve the schism ended when Pope Martin IV, seeing that the union was only a sham, excommunicated Michael VIII 1281 in support of Charles of Anjou's attempts to mount a new campaign to retake the Eastern Roman provinces lost to Michael.^{[167][173][174][175][176][177][178][179]} Michael VIII's son and successor Andronicus II repudiated the union, and Bekkos was forced to abdicate, being eventually exiled and imprisoned until his death in 1297.

Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439)

In the 15th century, the eastern emperor John VIII Palaiologos, pressed hard by the Ottoman Turks, was keen to ally himself with the West, and to do so he arranged with Pope Eugene IV for discussions about reunion to be held again, this time at the Council of Ferrara-Florence. After several long discussions, the emperor managed to convince the Eastern representatives to accept the Western doctrines of *Filioque*, Purgatory and the supremacy of the Papacy. On 6 June 1439 an agreement was signed by all the Eastern bishops present but one, Mark of Ephesus, who held that Rome continued in both heresy and schism. It seemed that the Great Schism had been ended. However, upon their return, the Eastern bishops found their agreement with the West broadly rejected by the populace and by civil authorities (with the notable exception of the Emperors of the East who remained committed to union until the Fall of Constantinople two decades later). The union signed at Florence has never been accepted by the Eastern churches.

Fall of Constantinople (1453) and thereafter

In May 1453, the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire fell to the invading Ottoman Empire. But Orthodox Christianity was already entrenched in Russia, whose political and de facto religious centre had shifted from Kiev to Moscow. The Russian Church, a part of the Church of Constantinople until the mid-15th century, was granted full independence (autocephaly) and elevated to the rank of Patriarchate in 1589. The Russian political and ecclesiastical elite came to view Moscow as the Third Rome, a legitimate heir to Constantinople and Byzantium.^[180]

Under Ottoman rule, the Orthodox Church acquired the status of an autonomous millet, specifically the Rum Millet. The Ecumenical Patriarch became the ruler (millet başı) of all the Orthodox Christian subjects of the empire, including non-Greeks. Upon conquering Constantinople, Mehmed II assumed the legal function of the Byzantine Emperors and appointed Patriarch Gennadius II. The sultans enhanced the temporal powers of the Greek orthodox hierarchy that came to be politically beholden solely to the Ottoman sultan and, along with other Ottoman Greek nobles, came to run the Balkan Orthodox domains of the Ottoman Empire. As a result, the entire Orthodox communion of the Balkans and the Near East became isolated from the rest of Christendom. For the next four hundred years, it would be confined within the Islamic world, with which it had little in common religiously or culturally.

In Russia, the anti-Catholic sentiments came to be entrenched by the Polish intervention during the Time of Troubles in the early 17th century, which was seen as an attempt to convert Moscow to Roman Catholicism. The modern Russian national holiday, Unity Day, was established on the day of church celebration in honour of the Our Lady of Kazan icon, which is believed to have miraculously saved Moscow from outright Polish conquest in 1612. Patriarch Hermogenes of Moscow was martyred by the Poles and their supporters during this period (see also Polish–Lithuanian–Muscovite Commonwealth).^{[181][182]}

First Vatican Council (1870)

The doctrine of papal primacy was further developed at the First Vatican Council, which declared that "in the disposition of God the Roman church holds the preeminence of ordinary power over all the other churches". This council also affirmed the dogma of papal infallibility, declaring that the infallibility of the Christian community extends to the pope himself, when he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the whole Church. These new dogma, as well as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception promulgated in *Ineffabilis Deus* a few years prior, are unequivocally rejected by the Eastern Church as heretical.^[183]

Nullification of mutual anathemas (1965)

A major event of the Second Vatican Council (Vatican II), was the issuance by Pope Paul and Orthodox Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople of the Catholic–Orthodox Joint Declaration of 1965. At the same time, they lifted the mutual excommunications dating from the 11th century.^[184] The act did not result in restoration of communion.

Eastern Catholic Churches

The Eastern Catholic Churches, historically referred to as "uniate" by the Orthodox, consider themselves to have reconciled the East and West Schism by having accepted the primacy of the Bishop of Rome while retaining some of the canonical rules and liturgical practices in line with the Eastern

tradition such as the Byzantine Rite that is prevalent in the Orthodox Churches. Some Eastern Orthodox charge that joining in this unity comes at the expense of ignoring critical doctrinal differences and past atrocities.

There have been periodic conflicts between the Orthodox and Eastern Catholics in Ukraine and Belarus, then under Polish rule,^[185] and later also in Transylvania (see the Romanian Greek Catholic Church United with Rome). Pressure and government-sponsored reprisals were used against Eastern Catholic Churches such as the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in the Russian Empire and later in the USSR.^[186] Since the late 1980s, the Moscow Patriarchate (the Russian Orthodox Church) has criticised the methods of restoration of the "uniate" church structures in Ukraine as well as what it called Catholic proselytism in Russia.^[187]

In 1993, a report written by the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church during its 7th plenary session at Balamand School of Theology in Lebanon stated:^{[188][e]} "Because of the way in which Catholics and Orthodox once again consider each other in their relationship to the mystery of the Church and discover each other once again as Sister Churches, this form of 'missionary apostolate' described above, and which has been called 'uniatism', can no longer be accepted either as a method to be followed nor as a model of the unity our Churches are seeking". At the same time, the document inter alia stated:

- Concerning the Oriental Catholic Churches, it is clear that they, as part of the Catholic Communion, have the right to exist and to act in answer to the spiritual needs of their faithful.
- The Oriental Catholic Churches who have desired to re-establish full communion with the See of Rome and have remained faithful to it, have the rights and obligations which are connected with this communion. The principles determining their attitude towards Orthodox Churches are those which have been stated by the Second Vatican Council and have been put into practice by the Popes who have clarified the practical consequences flowing from these principles in various documents published since then. These Churches, then, should be inserted, on both local and universal levels, into the dialogue of love, in mutual respect and reciprocal trust found once again, and enter into the theological dialogue, with all its practical implications.

In February 2016, Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC), had a meeting in Cuba and signed a joint declaration that stated inter alia: "It is our hope that our meeting may also contribute to reconciliation wherever tensions exist between Greek Catholics and Orthodox. It is today clear that the past method of 'uniatism', understood as the union of one community to the other, separating it from its Church, is not the way to re-establish unity. Nonetheless, the ecclesial communities which emerged in these historical circumstances have the right to exist and to undertake all that is necessary to meet the spiritual needs of their faithful, while seeking to live in peace with their neighbours. Orthodox and Greek Catholics are in need of reconciliation and of mutually acceptable forms of co-existence."^{[189][190][191]} Meanwhile, in the interview published on the eve of the meeting in Cuba, Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev, the chairman of the Department of External Church Relations and a permanent member of the Holy Synod of the ROC, said that tensions between the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the ROC's Ukrainian Orthodox Church had been recently

heightened mainly due to the conflict in Ukraine.^[192] The declaration was sharply criticised by Sviatoslav Shevchuk, the Primate of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, who said that his flock felt "betrayed" by the Vatican.^{[193][194][195]}

Recent efforts at reconciliation

Joint Theological Commission

Inspired by the spirit of Vatican II that adopted the *Unitatis Redintegratio* decree on ecumenism in 1964 as well as the change of heart toward Ecumenism on the part of the Moscow Patriarchate that had occurred in 1961, the Vatican and 14 universally recognised autocephalous Orthodox Churches established the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church that first met in Rhodes in 1980 and is an ongoing endeavour.

Other moves toward reconciliation

On a number of occasions, Pope John Paul II recited the Nicene Creed with patriarchs of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Greek according to the original text.^[196] Both he and his successor, Pope Benedict XVI, have recited the Nicene Creed jointly with Patriarchs Demetrius I and Bartholomew I in Greek without the *Filioque* clause, "according to the usage of the Byzantine Churches".^{[197][198]} This accords with the Roman Catholic Church's practice of including the clause when reciting the Creed in Latin,^[199] but not when reciting it in Greek.^[200]

In June 1995, Patriarch Bartholomew I, of Constantinople, visited Vatican City for the first time, and joined in the historic inter-religious day of prayer for peace at Assisi. John Paul II and Bartholomew I explicitly stated their mutual "desire to relegate the excommunications of the past to oblivion and to set out on the way to re-establishing full communion".^[201]

In May 1999, John Paul II was the first pope since the Great Schism to visit an Eastern Orthodox country: Romania. Upon greeting John Paul II, the Romanian Patriarch Teoctist stated: "The second millennium of Christian history began with a painful wounding of the unity of the Church; the end of this millennium has seen a real commitment to restoring Christian unity." John Paul II visited other heavily Orthodox areas such as Ukraine, despite lack of welcome at times, and he said that healing the divisions between Western and Eastern Christianity was one of his fondest wishes.

In June 2004, Bartholomew I's visit to Rome for the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul (29 June) afforded him the opportunity for another personal meeting with John Paul II, for conversations with the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and for taking part in the celebration for the feast day in St. Peter's Basilica.

The Patriarch's partial participation in the Eucharistic liturgy at which the Pope presided followed the program of the past visits of Patriarch Dimitrios (1987) and Patriarch Bartholomew I himself: full participation in the Liturgy of the Word, joint proclamation by the Pope and by the Patriarch of the profession of faith according to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in Greek and as the conclusion,

the final Blessing imparted by both the Pope and the Patriarch at the Altar of the Confessio.^[202] The Patriarch did not fully participate in the Liturgy of the Eucharist involving the consecration and distribution of the Eucharist itself.^{[203][204]}

Prospects for reconciliation

Despite efforts on the part of Catholic Popes and Orthodox Patriarchs to heal the schism, only limited progress towards reconciliation has been made over the last half century. One stumbling block is the fact that the Orthodox and the Catholics have different perceptions of the nature of the divide. The official Catholic teaching is that the Orthodox are schismatic, meaning that there is nothing heretical about their theology, only their unwillingness to accept the supremacy of the Pope which is presented in Catholic teaching as chiefly an ecclesiological issue, not so much a theological one. The Orthodox object to the Catholic doctrines of Purgatory, Substitutionary atonement, the Immaculate Conception, and papal supremacy, among others, as heretical doctrines.^[205] With respect to Primacy of the Pope, the two churches agree that the Pope, as Bishop of Rome, has primacy although they continue to have different interpretations of what that primacy entails.

The Roman Catholic Church's attitude was expressed by John Paul II in the image of the Church "breathing with her two lungs".^{[206][207][208]} He meant that there should be a combination of the more rational, juridical, organization-minded "Latin" temperament with the intuitive, mystical and contemplative spirit found in the East.^[209]

In the Orthodox view, the Bishop of Rome (i.e. the Pope) would have universal primacy in a reunited Christendom, as *primus inter pares* without power of jurisdiction.^[210]

Ecclesiological reconciliation

The Eastern Orthodox insist that the primacy is largely one of honor, the Pope being "first among equals" *primus inter pares*. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, insists on the doctrine of Supremacy. It is widely understood that, if there is to be reconciliation, both sides will have to compromise on this doctrine. Although some commentators have proposed ways in which such compromise can be achieved, there is no official indication that such compromise is being contemplated.

In his book *Principles of Catholic Theology*, Pope Benedict XVI (then Cardinal Ratzinger) assessed the range of "possibilities that are open to Christian ecumenism." He characterized the "maximum demand" of the West as the recognition by the East of and submission to the "primacy of the bishop of Rome in the full scope of the definition of 1870..." The "maximum demand" of the East was described as a declaration by the West of the 1870 doctrine of papal primacy as erroneous along with the "removal of the Filioque from the Creed and including the Marian dogmas of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." Ratzinger asserted that "(n)one of the maximum solutions offers any real hope of unity."^[211] Ratzinger wrote that, "Rome must not require more from the East than had been formulated and what was lived in the first millenium." He concluded that "Reunion could take place in this context if, on the one hand, the East would cease to oppose as heretical the developments that took place in the West in the second millennium and would accept the Catholic Church as legitimate and orthodox in the form she had acquired in the course of that development, while on the other hand, the West would recognize the Church of the East as orthodox in the form she has always had."^[212]

The declaration of Ravenna in 2007 re-asserted the belief that the bishop of Rome is indeed the *protos*, although future discussions are to be held on the concrete ecclesiological exercise of papal primacy.

Theological reconciliation

Some scholars such as Jeffrey Finch assert that "the future of East–West rapprochement appears to be overcoming the modern polemics of neo-scholasticism and neo-Palamism".^[213]

These doctrinal issues center around the Orthodox perception that the Catholic theologians lack the actual experience of God called *theoria* and thereby fail to understand the importance of the heart as a noetic or intuitive faculty. It is what they consider to be the Catholic Church's reliance on pagan metaphysical philosophy and rational methods such as scholasticism rather than on intuitive experience of God (*theoria*) that causes Orthodox to consider the Catholic Church heretical. Other points of doctrinal difference include a difference regarding human nature as well as a difference regarding original sin, purgatory, and the nature of Hell.

One point of theological difference is embodied in the dispute regarding the inclusion of the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed. In the view of the Roman Catholic Church, what it calls the legitimate complementarity of the expressions "from the Father" and "from the Father and the Son" does not, provided it does not become rigid, affect the identity of faith in the reality of the same mystery confessed.^[214] The Orthodox, on the other hand, view inclusion of the phrase to be almost heretical (see also the Trinity section).

More importantly, the Orthodox see the Filioque as just the tip of the iceberg and really just a symptom of a much more deeply rooted problem of theology, one so deeply rooted that they consider it to be heretical and even, by some characterizations, an inability to "see God" and know God. This heresy is allegedly rooted in Frankish paganism, Arianism, Platonist and Aristotelian philosophy and Thomist rational and objective Scholasticism. In opposition to what they characterize as pagan, heretical and "godless" foundations, the Orthodox rely on an intuitive and mystical knowledge and vision of God (*theoria*) based on hesychasm and noesis. Catholics accept as valid the Eastern Orthodox intuitive and mystical understanding of God and consider it complementary to the rational Western reflection.^{[209][215]}

Sacraments

Most Orthodox Churches through economy do not require baptism in the Orthodox Church for one who has been previously baptized in the Roman Catholic Church. Most Orthodox jurisdictions, based on that same principle of economy, allow a sacramental marriage between an Orthodox Christian and some non-Orthodox Christians. The Catholic Church allows its clergy to administer the sacraments of Penance, the Eucharist and Anointing of the Sick to members of the Eastern Orthodox Church, if these spontaneously ask for the sacraments and are properly disposed.^[216] It also allows Catholics who cannot approach a Catholic minister to receive these three sacraments from clergy of the Eastern Orthodox Church, whenever necessity requires or a genuine spiritual advantage commends it, and provided the danger of error or indifferentism is avoided.^[216] Catholic canon law allows marriage between a Catholic and an Orthodox.^[217] The Orthodox Church will only administer the sacraments to Christians who aren't Orthodox if there is an emergency.

The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches authorizes the local Catholic bishop to permit a Catholic priest, of whatever rite, to bless the marriage of Orthodox faithful who being unable without great difficulty to approach a priest of their own Church, ask for this spontaneously.^[218] In exceptional circumstances Catholics may, in the absence of an authorized priest, marry before witnesses. If a priest who is not authorized for the celebration of the marriage is available, he should be called in, although the marriage is valid even without his presence.^[219] The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches specifies that, in those exceptional circumstances, even a "non-Catholic" priest (and so not necessarily one belonging to an Eastern Church) may be called in.^[220]

Criticism of reconciliation efforts

The efforts of Orthodox patriarchs towards reconciliation with the Catholic Church has been strongly criticized by some elements of Eastern Orthodoxy, such as the Metropolitan of Kalavryta, Greece, in November 2008.^{[221][222]}

In 2010, Patriarch Bartholomew I issued an encyclical lauding the ongoing dialogue between the Orthodox Church and other Christian churches and criticizing those who are "unacceptably fanatical" in challenging such dialogue. The encyclical lamented that the dialogues between the two churches were being criticized in "an unacceptably fanatical way" by some who claim to be defenders of Orthodoxy despite the fact that these dialogues are being conducted "with the mutual agreement and participation of all local Orthodox Churches". The Patriarch warned that "such opponents raise themselves above episcopal synods and risk creating schisms". He further accused some critics of distorting reality to "deceive and arouse the faithful" and of depicting theological dialogue not as a pan-Orthodox effort, but an effort of the Ecumenical Patriarchate alone. As an example, he pointed to "false rumors that union between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches is imminent" claiming that the disseminators of such rumors were fully aware that "the differences discussed in these theological dialogues remain numerous and require lengthy debate". The Patriarch re-emphasized that "union is not decided by theological commissions but by Church Synods".^[223]

Differences underlying the schism

Jaroslav Pelikan emphasizes that "while the East–West schism stemmed largely from political and ecclesiastical discord, this discord also reflected basic theological differences". Pelikan further argues that the antagonists in the 11th century inappropriately exaggerated their theological differences whereas modern historians tend to minimize them. Pelikan asserts that the documents from that era evidence the "depths of intellectual alienation that had developed between the two sections of Christendom." While the two sides were technically more guilty of schism than heresy, they often charged each other with allegations of heresy. Pelikan describes much of the dispute as dealing with "regional differences in usages and customs" some of which were adiaphorus (i.e. neither right nor wrong). However, he goes on to say that while it was easy in principle to accept the existence of adiaphora, it was difficult in actual practice to distinguish customs which were innocuously adiaphoric from those that had doctrinal implications.^[224]

Ecclesiological disputes

Philip Sherrard, an Orthodox theologian asserts that the underlying cause of the East–West schism was and continues to be "the clash of these two fundamentally irreconcilable ecclesiologies." Roger Haight characterizes the question of episcopal authority in the Church as "acute" with the "relative

standings of Rome and Constantinople a recurrent source of tension." Haight characterizes the difference in ecclesiologies as "the contrast between a pope with universal jurisdiction and a combination of patriarchal superstructure with an episcopal and synodal communion ecclesiology analogous to that found in Cyprian."^[19]

However, Nicholas Afansiev has criticized both the Catholic and Orthodox churches for "subscribing to the universal ecclesiology of St. Cyprian of Carthage according to which only one true and universal church can exist."^[225]

Types of ecclesiologies

There are several different ecclesiologies: "communion ecclesiology", "eucharistic ecclesiology", "baptismal ecclesiology", "trinitarian ecclesiology", "kerygmatic theology".^[226] Other ecclesiologies are the "hierarchical-institutional" and the "organic-mystical",^[227] and the "congregationalist".^[228]

Ecclesiological structure

The Eastern Churches maintained the idea that every local city-church with its bishop, presbyters, deacons and people celebrating the Eucharist constituted the whole Church. In this view called Eucharistic ecclesiology (or more recently holographic ecclesiology), every bishop is Saint Peter's successor in his church ("the Church") and the churches form what Eusebius called a common union of churches. This implied that all bishops were ontologically equal, although functionally particular bishops could be granted special privileges by other bishops and serve as metropolitans, archbishops or patriarchs. Within the Roman Empire, from the time of Constantine to the final extinction of the empire in 1453, universal ecclesiology, rather than eucharistic, "became the operative principle".^{[229][230]} The view prevailed that, "when the Roman Empire became Christian the perfect world order willed by God had been achieved: one universal empire was sovereign, and coterminous with it was the one universal church".^[231] Early on, the ecclesiology of the Roman Church was universal in nature, with the idea that the Church was a worldwide organism with a divinely (not functionally) appointed center: the Church/Bishop of Rome. These two views are still present in modern Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism and can be seen as foundational causes for the schisms and Great Schism between East and West.

"The Orthodox Church does not accept the doctrine of Papal authority set forth in the Vatican Council of 1870, and taught today in the Roman Catholic Church."^[232] The Orthodox Church has always maintained the original position of collegiality of the bishops resulting in the structure of the church being closer to a confederacy.^[233] The Orthodox have synods where the highest authorities in each Church community are brought together, but unlike Roman Catholicism no central individual or figure has the absolute and infallible last word on church doctrine. In practice, this has sometimes led to divisions among Greek, Russian, Bulgarian and Ukrainian Orthodox churches, as no central authority can serve as a rallying point for various internal disputes.

Early on, the ecclesiology of the Roman Church was universal in nature, with the idea that the Church was a worldwide organism with a divinely (not functionally) appointed center: the Church/Bishop of Rome. Vatican II re-asserted the importance of collegiality to a degree that appears satisfying to most if not all ecclesial parties. Starting from the second half of the 20th century, eucharistic ecclesiology is upheld by Roman Catholic theologians. Henri de Lubac wrote: "The Church, like the Eucharist, is a mystery of unity – the same mystery, and one with inexhaustible riches. Both are the body of Christ – the same body."^[234] Joseph Ratzinger called eucharistic ecclesiology "the real core of Vatican II's

teaching on the cross".^[227] According to Ratzinger, the one church of God exists in no other way than in the various individual local congregations.^[235] In these the Eucharist is celebrated in union with the Church everywhere.^[236] Eucharistic ecclesiology led Vatican II to "affirm the theological significance of the local church. If each celebration of the Eucharist is a matter not only of Christ's sacramental presence on the altar, but also of his ecclesial presence in the gathered community, then each eucharistic local church must be more than a subset of the universal church; it must be the body of Christ 'in that place'."^[237]

Papal primacy

The ecclesiological dimension of the East–West schism revolves around the authority of bishops within their dioceses^[238] and the lines of authority between bishops of different dioceses. It is common for Catholics to insist on the primacy of Roman and papal authority based on patristic writings and conciliar documents.^[239]

Papal privilege and authority

The Roman Catholic Church's current official teachings about papal privilege and power that are unacceptable to the Eastern Orthodox churches are the dogma of the pope's infallibility when speaking officially "from the chair of Peter (*ex cathedra Petri*)" on matters of faith and morals to be held by the whole Church, so that such definitions are irreformable "of themselves, and not by the consent of the Church" (*ex sese et non ex consensu ecclesiae*)^[240] and have a binding character for all (Catholic) Christians in the world; the pope's direct episcopal jurisdiction over all (Catholic) Christians in the world; the pope's authority to appoint (and so also to depose) the bishops of all (Catholic) Christian churches except in the territory of a patriarchate;^[241] and the affirmation that the legitimacy and authority of all (Catholic) Christian bishops in the world derive from their union with the Roman see and its bishop, the Supreme Pontiff, the unique Successor of Peter and Vicar of Christ on earth.

Principal among the ecclesiastical issues that separate the two churches is the meaning of papal primacy within any future unified church. The Orthodox insist that it should be a "primacy of honor", as in the ancient church, and not a "primacy of authority",^[242] whereas the Catholics see the pontiff's role as requiring for its exercise power and authority the exact form of which is open to discussion with other Christians.^[243]

According to Orthodox belief, the test of catholicity is adherence to the authority of *Scripture* and then by the *Holy Tradition* of the church. It is not defined by adherence to any particular See. It is the position of the Orthodox Church that it has never accepted the pope as *de jure* leader of the entire church. All bishops are equal 'as Peter' therefore every church under every bishop (consecrated in apostolic succession) is fully complete (the original meaning of *catholic*).

Referring to Ignatius of Antioch^[244] Carlton says

Contrary to popular opinion, the word catholic does not mean "universal"; it means "whole, complete, lacking nothing." ...Thus, to confess the Church to be catholic is to say that She possesses the fullness of the Christian faith. To say, however, that Orthodox and Rome constitute two lungs of the same Church is to deny that either Church separately is

catholic in any meaningful sense of the term. This is not only contrary to the teaching of Orthodoxy, it is flatly contrary to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, which considered itself truly catholic^[245]

The church is in the image of the Trinity^[246] and reflects the reality of the incarnation.

The body of Christ must always be equal with itself... The local church which manifests the body of Christ cannot be subsumed into any larger organisation or collectivity which makes it more catholic and more in unity, for the simple reason that the principle of total catholicity and total unity is already intrinsic to it.^[247]

Any changes to the understanding of the church would reflect a change in the understanding of the Trinity.

Theological issues

From the perspective of the Catholic Church, the ecclesiological issues are the central issue which is why they characterize the split between the two churches as a schism. In their view, the Eastern Orthodox are very close to them in theology and the Catholic Church does not consider the Orthodox beliefs to be heretical. However, from the perspective of Orthodox theologians, there are theological issues that run much deeper than just the theology around the primacy and/or supremacy of the Pope. In fact, unlike the Catholics, who do not generally consider the Orthodox heretical and speak instead about the Eastern "schism",^[148] some prominent Orthodox theologians do consider the Catholic Church to be heretical on fundamental doctrinal issues of theology, such as the *Filioque*. These issues have a long history as can be seen in the 11th-century works of Orthodox theologian and Saint Nikitas Stithatos.

In the Roman Catholic Church too, some writers can be found who speak pejoratively of the Eastern Orthodox Church and its theology, but these writers are marginal.^[248] The official view of the Catholic Church is that expressed in the decree *Unitatis redintegratio* of Vatican II:

In the study of revelation East and West have followed different methods, and have developed differently their understanding and confession of God's truth. It is hardly surprising, then, if from time to time one tradition has come nearer to a full appreciation of some aspects of a mystery of revelation than the other, or has expressed it to better advantage. In such cases, these various theological expressions are to be considered often as mutually complementary rather than conflicting. Where the authentic theological traditions of the Eastern Church are concerned, we must recognize the admirable way in which they have their roots in Holy Scripture, and how they are nurtured and given expression in the life of the liturgy. They derive their strength too from the living tradition of the apostles and from the works of the Fathers and spiritual writers of the Eastern Churches. Thus they promote the right ordering of Christian life and, indeed, pave the way to a full vision of Christian truth.^[249]

Although the Western churches do not consider the Eastern and Western understanding of the Trinity to be radically different, Eastern theologians such as John S. Romanides and Michael Pomazansky argue that the *Filioque* clause is symptomatic of a fatal flaw in the Western understanding, which they attribute to the influence of Augustine and, by extension, to that of Thomas Aquinas.^{[250][251][252][253][254]}

Filioque, Latin for "and (from) the Son", was added in Western Christianity to the Latin text of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, which also varies from the original Greek text in having the additional phrase *Deum de Deo* (God from God)^{[255][256]} and in using the singular "I believe" (Latin, *Credo*, Greek Πιστεύω) instead of the original "We believe" (Greek Πιστεύομεν),^[256] which Oriental Orthodoxy preserves.^[257] The Assyrian Church of the East, which is in communion neither with the Eastern Orthodox Church nor with Oriental Orthodoxy also uses "We believe".^[258] *Filioque* states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, a doctrine accepted by the Catholic Church,^[259] by Anglicanism^[260] and by Protestant churches in general.^[261] Christians of these groups generally include it when reciting the Nicene Creed. Nonetheless, these groups recognize that *Filioque* is not part of the original text established at the First Council of Constantinople in 381^[262] and they do not demand that others too should use it when saying the Creed.^[263] Indeed, the Roman Catholic Church does not add the phrase corresponding to *Filioque* (καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ) to the Greek text of the Creed, even in the liturgy for Latin Rite Catholics.^[264]

At the 879–880 Council of Constantinople the Eastern Orthodox Church anathematized the "Filioque" phrase, "as a novelty and augmentation of the Creed", and in their 1848 encyclical the Eastern Patriarchs spoke of it as a heresy.^[265] It was qualified as such by some of the Eastern Orthodox Church's saints, including Photios I of Constantinople, Mark of Ephesus, Gregory Palamas, who have been called the Three Pillars of Orthodoxy.

The Eastern church believes by the Western church inserting the *Filioque* unilaterally (without consulting or holding council with the East) into the Creed that the Western church broke communion with the East.^[115]

Orthodox theologians such as Vladimir Lossky criticize the focus of Western theology of God in 'God in uncreated essence' as misguided, which he alleges is a modalistic and therefore a speculative expression of God that is indicative of the Sabellian heresy.^[266] Orthodox theologian Michael Pomazansky argues that, in order for the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son in the Creed, there would have to be two sources in the deity (double procession), whereas in the one God there can only be one source of divinity, which is the Father hypostasis of the Trinity, not God's essence per se.^[267] In contrast, Bishop Kallistos Ware suggests that the problem is more in the area of semantics than of basic doctrinal differences.^[268]

Experience of God (Theoria) vs. Scholasticism

Lossky, a noted modern Eastern Orthodox theologian, argues the difference in East and West is due to the Roman Catholic Church's use of pagan metaphysical philosophy (and scholasticism) rather than actual experience of God called *theoria*, to validate the theological dogmas of Roman Catholic Christianity. For this reason, Lossky argues that Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics have become "different men".^[269] Other Eastern Orthodox theologians such as Romanides.^[270] and Metropolitan

Hierotheos of Nafpaktos have made similar pronouncements.^[271] According to the Orthodox teachings, *theoria* can be achieved through ascetic practices like hesychasm (see St John Climacus), which was condemned as a heresy by Barlaam of Seminara.

The heart reconciled with the mind higher than reason alone

Orthodox theologians charge that, in contrast to Orthodox theology, western theology is based on philosophical discourse which reduces humanity and nature to cold mechanical concepts.^{[272][273]} Orthodox theologians argue that the mind (reason, rationality) is the focus of Western theology, whereas in Eastern theology, the mind must be put in the heart, so they are united into what is called nous, this unity as heart is the focus of Eastern Orthodox Christianity^[274] involving the unceasing Prayer of the heart.^[275]

Theological consequences of the division East and West

In Orthodox theology, in the Eastern ascetic traditions one of the goals of ascetic practice is to obtain sobriety of consciousness, awakeness (nepsis). For humankind this is reached in the healing of whole person called the soul, heart. When a person's heart is reconciled with their mind, this is referred to as a healing of the nous or the "eye, focus of the heart or soul".^{[276][277]} Part of this process is the healing and or reconciliation of humankind's reason being called *logos* or *dianoia* with the heart, soul.^[278] While mankind's spirit and body are energies vivified by the soul, Orthodoxy teaches man's sin, suffering, sorrow is caused by his heart and mind being a duality and in conflict.^[279] According to Orthodox theology, lack of noetic understanding (sickness) can be neither circumvented nor satisfied by rational or discursive thought (i.e. systematization),^[276] and denying the needs of the human heart (a more Western expression would be the needs of the soul) causes various negative or destructive manifestations such as addiction, atheism and evil thoughts etc.^{[280][281]} A cleaned, healed or restored Nous creates the condition of sobriety or nepsis of the mind.

Uncreated light

Orthodox theologians assert that the theological division of East and West culminated into a direct theological conflict known as the Hesychasm controversy during several councils at Constantinople New Rome, between the years 1341–1351. They argue that this controversy highlighted the sharp contrast between what is embraced by the Roman Catholic Church as proper (or orthodox) theological dogma and how theology is validated and what is considered valid theology by the Eastern Orthodox. The essence of the disagreement is that in the East a person cannot be a genuine true theologian, or teach knowledge of God, without having experienced God, as is defined as the vision of God (*theoria*). At the heart of the issue was the teaching of the Essence-Energies distinctions (which states that while creation can never know God's uncreated essence, it can know his uncreated energies) by Gregory Palamas.

Original sin, free will and the Immaculate Conception

Augustine's doctrine of original sin

The Eastern Orthodox do not accept Augustine's teaching of original sin. His interpretation of ancestral sin is rejected in the East as well. Nor is Augustine's teaching accepted in its totality in the West.^[282] The Roman Catholic Church rejects traducianism and affirms creationism. Its teaching on original sin is largely based on but not identical with that of Augustine, and is opposed to the interpretation of Augustine advanced by Martin Luther and John Calvin. Its teaching departs from Augustine's ideas in some respects.^{[282][283]} The Eastern Church makes no use at all of Augustine. Another Orthodox view is expressed by Christos Yannaras, who described Augustine as "the fount of every distortion and alteration in the Church's truth in the West".^[284]

Church teachings on original sin

What the Eastern Orthodox accepts is that ancestral sin corrupted their existence (their bodies and environment) that each person is born into and thus we are born into a corrupted existence (by the ancestral sin of Adam and Eve)^[285] and that "original sin is hereditary. It did not remain only Adam and Eve's. As life passes from them to all of their descendants, so does original sin. All of us participate in original sin because we are all descended from the same forefather, Adam."^[286] And the teaching of the Eastern Orthodox Church is that, as a result of Adam's sin, "hereditary sin flowed to his posterity; so that everyone who is born after the flesh bears this burden, and experiences the fruits of it in this present world."^[287]

Similarly, what the Catholic Church holds is that the sin of Adam that we inherit, and for the remission of which even babies who have no personal sin are baptized,^[288] is called "sin" only in an analogical sense, since it is not an act committed like the personal sin of Adam and Eve, but a fallen state contracted by the transmission of a human nature deprived of original holiness and justice.^[289]

Both East and West^[289] hold that each person is not called to atone for the actual sin committed by Adam and Eve.

According to the Western Church, "original sin does not have the character of a personal fault in any of Adam's descendants",^[289] and the Eastern Church teaches that "by these fruits and this burden we do not understand [actual] sin".^[287] The Orthodox and the Catholics^[290] believe that people inherit only the spiritual sickness (in which all suffer and sin) of Adam and Eve, caused by their ancestral sin (what has flowed to them), a sickness leaving them weakened in their powers, subject to ignorance, suffering and the domination of death, and inclined to sin.^[290]

Immaculate Conception rejected by the East

The Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which claims that God protected the Virgin Mary from original sin through no merit of her own,^{[291][292]} was dogmatically defined by Pope Pius IX in 1854. Instead, Orthodox theology proclaims that Mary was chosen to bear Christ, having first found favor of God by her purity and obedience.^{[293][294][295][296][297][298]}

Sin, Purgatory and Hell

Purgatory

Another point of theological contention between the western and eastern churches is the doctrine of purgatory (as it was shown at the Second Council of Lyons and the Council of Ferrara–Florence).^[299] It was developed in time in western theology, according to which, "all who die in God's grace and friendship, but still imperfectly purified, are indeed assured of their eternal salvation; but after death they undergo purification, so as to achieve the holiness necessary to enter the joy of heaven."^[300] However, some eastern theologians, while agreeing that there is beyond death a state in which believers continue to be perfected and led to full divinization, consider that it is a state not of punishment but of growth;^[301] hold that suffering cannot purify sin, since they have a different view of sin and consider suffering as a result of a spiritual sickness.^[302] Western theology usually considers sin not only as a sickness that weakens and impedes, but also as something that merits punishment.^[303]

The Eastern Orthodox Church holds that "there is a state beyond death where believers continue to be perfected and led to full divinization".^[301] Although some Orthodox have described this intermediate state as *purgatory*, others distinguish it from aspects associated with it in the West: at the Council of Ferrara–Florence, the Orthodox Bishop Mark of Ephesus argued that there are in it no purifying fires.^[304]

Damnation

The traditional Orthodox teaching is that "those who reject Christ will face punishment. According to the Confession of Dositheus, persons go immediately to joy in Christ or to the torments of punishment".^[301]

In Orthodox doctrine there is no place without God. In eternity there is no hiding from God. In Catholic theology, God is present everywhere not only by his power but in himself.^[305] Hell is a state of self-selected separation from God.

Eastern theology considers the desire to sin to be the result of a spiritual sickness (caused by Adam and Eve's pride), which needs to be cured.^[306] One such theologian gives his interpretation of Western theology as follows: "According to the holy Fathers of the Church, there is not an uncreated Paradise and a created Hell, as the Franco–Latin tradition teaches".^[307] The eastern Church believes that hell or eternal damnation and heaven exist and are the same place, which is being with God, and that the very same divine love (God's uncreated energies) which is a source of bliss and consolation for the righteous (because they love God, His love is heaven for them) is also a source of torment (or a "Lake of Fire") for sinners (because they don't love God, they will feel His love this way).^{[308][309][310][311]} The Western Church speaks of heaven^[312] and hell^[313] as states of existence rather than as places, while in Eastern Orthodoxy there is no hell per se, there is damnation or punishment in eternity for the rejection of God's grace.

Notes

- a. A late 11th-century pamphlet, *Against the Franks*,^[5] falsely attributed to Photios I of Constantinople, lists this as second point, right after the Filioque.^{[6][7]}
- b. Following the establishment of Constantinople (the ancient city of Byzantium) as the state capital of the Roman Empire in the early part of the 4th century, a series of significant ecclesiastical events saw the status of the Bishop of New Rome (as Constantinople was then called) elevated to its current position and privilege.^[67]

- c. Constantinople I canon 3: "The Bishop of Constantinople, however, shall have the prerogative of honor after the Bishop of Rome; because Constantinople is New Rome."^[70]
- d. "[...] the Roman legates excommunicated him [...] But [...] there was no [...] general excommunication of the Byzantine Church, still less of all the East. The legates carefully provided against that in their Bull. [...] They excommunicated Caerularius, Leo of Achrida, and their adherents. [...] The real tragedy is that gradually all the other Eastern patriarchs took sides with Caerularius, [...] and chose [...] to share his schism. [...] The emperor (not **Constantine IX**, but his successor) was on the side of his patriarch and they had learned too well to consider the emperor as their over-lord in spiritual matters too. [...] it was the usurped authority of Constantinople, the Erastianism of the East that turned a personal quarrel into a great schism."^[148]
- e. The report contains unofficial suggestions of the commission, "until the competent organs of the Catholic Church and of the Orthodox Churches express their judgement in regard to it."^[188]



References

1. "Great Schism", *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (article), Oxford University Press, 2005, ISBN 978-0-19-280290-3
2. Cross, FL, ed. (2005). "Great Schism (1)". *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (article). New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-280290-9.
3. D'Agostino, MG (2008), *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054). Studio dei testi latini nella controversia greco-romana nel periodo pregregoriano* [*The primacy of the Roman see in Leo IX (1049–54). Study of the Latin texts in the Greek-Roman controversy in the pre-Gregorian period*], Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo
4. Bayer, Axel (2002), *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (in German), Köln-Weimar-Wien
5. *Sydney Palatiano* (http://loki.stockton.edu/~papadema/Sydney_Palatianos.pdf) (PDF), Stockton
6. Hergenröther, J (1869), *Monumenta Graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentiam* (in Latin), Regensburg, pp. 62–71
7. Beck, Hans-Georg (1982), *Byzantinisches Lesebuch* (in German), München, pp. 245–47
8. Lembke, Martin (Spring 2010), *Meetings with the World's Religions* (lecture), Lund University: Centre for Theology and Religious Studies
9. Dragani, Anthony (2007). *Adrian Fortescue and the Eastern Christian Churches* (https://books.google.com/books/about/Adrian_Fortescue_and_the_Eastern_Christi.html?id=sU1WvgAACAAJ). Gorgias. p. 44. ISBN 978-1-59333345-4. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
10. Bihlmeyer, Karl; Tüchle, Hermann (1967). *Church History: The Middle Ages* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=JqgNAQAAMAAJ>). Newman Press. p. 102. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
11. Bury, John Bagnell (1923). *The Cambridge Medieval Histories* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=9IH36S8ooC&pg=PT1522>). Vol. 4. Plantagenet Publishing. p. 267. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
12. *Siecienski 2010*, pp. 113.
13. Bayer, Axel (2004), *Spaltung der Christenheit* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=LYD7XoGwafAC&pg=PA80>) (in German), Böhlau, p. 80, ISBN 978-3-41214204-9
14. *Runciman 1955*.
15. *Nichols 2010*, p. 281.

16. The absence of full communion between the churches is mentioned explicitly even in the permission that canon 844 §3 of the Code of Canon Law (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0017/_P2S.HTM) accords for the administering by Catholic ministers of the sacraments of penance, the Eucharist and anointing of the sick to spontaneously requesting members of eastern churches such as the Eastern Orthodox Church (as also the Oriental Orthodox churches and the Church of the East) and of western churches such as the Old Catholic Church.
17. "Eastern Churches Journal". 8 (Issues 1–2). Society of Saint John Chrysostom. 2001: 149.
{{cite journal}}: ; |number= has extra text (help)
18. Granfield, Patrick; Phan, Peter C. (1 November 2000). *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=2knW3blxlYgC&pg=PA37>) Liturgical Press. p. 37. ISBN 978-0-8146-5931-1. Retrieved 26 October 2012. "(t)he divergence of the Eastern and Western churches, leading ultimately to the East–West Schism, was a process of many centuries, influenced by a host of political, cultural and theological factors"
19. Haight, Roger D. (16 September 2004). *Christian Community in History Volume 1: Historical Ecclesiology* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=EDzSaqXK-aEC&pg=PA289>). Continuum International Publishing Group. p. 289. ISBN 978-0-8264-1630-8. Retrieved 26 October 2012. "The [East–West Schism] should not be understood to have occurred in the mutual excommunications [of 1054] ... only one factor in a much longer and larger story involving cultural, political and theological factors"
20. Schadé, Johannes P. (30 December 2006). *Encyclopedia of World Religions* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=XRkfKdho-5cC&pg=PT805>). Foreign Media Group. p. 805. ISBN 978-1-60136-000-7. Retrieved 28 October 2012.
21. Cleenewerck, Laurent *His Broken Body: Understanding and Healing the Schism between the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches*. Washington, DC: EUC Press (2008) pp. 145–155.
22. Soloviev, V.S.; Wozniuk, Vladimir (1 July 2009). *Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V. S. Soloviev on Christianity and Judaism* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=ftjKBRToMygC&pg=PA14>). SUNY Press. p. 14. ISBN 978-0-7914-7536-2. Retrieved 9 November 2012.
23. Makrides, Vasilios N. (1 September 2009). *Hellenic Temples and Christian Churches: A Concise History of the Religious Cultures of Greece from Antiquity to the Present* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=kKOY5NsefkC&pg=PA68>). NYU Press. p. 68. ISBN 978-0-8147-9568-2. Retrieved 9 November 2012.
24. Nichols 2010, pp. 227–272.
25. See Patriarch Photios I of Constantinople
26. John Binns, *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches* (https://books.google.com/books?id=MOA5vfSI3dwC&pg=PA144&dq=Binns+%22many+major+Churches%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=0h52UtPrLauw7Ab8h4GYDw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Binns%20%22many%20major%20Churches%22&f=false), Cambridge University Press, UK, 2002, p. 144.
27. Kling, David W. (20 April 2005). *The Bible in History: How the Texts Have Shaped the Times* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=61g19QTJk5UC&pg=PA61>). Oxford University Press. p. 61. ISBN 978-0-19-988096-6. Retrieved 31 October 2012. "Obviously, the church at Rome, given the dual presence of the apostles Peter and Paul, claimed a special authority. In the first three centuries, church leaders and thinkers throughout the empire increasingly recognized Rome as a center of Christianity. At the same time, the literary evidence yields no clear-cut claims to, or recognition of, papal primacy."
28. "Roman Presidency and Christian Unity in our Time" (<http://www.orthodoxytoday.org/articles6/HopkoPope.php>). Orthodoxytoday.org. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
29. "Eusebius, "Church History", chapter 23" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.iii.x.xxiv.html>). Ccel.org. 13 July 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.

30. "An Orthodox Christian Historical Timeline" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120723192152/http://www.orthodoxanswers.org/history>). Orthodox Answers. Archived from the original (<http://www.orthodoxanswers.org/history>) on 23 July 2012. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
31. "Eusebius, "Church History", chapter 24" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.iii.x.xxv.html>). Ccel.org. 13 July 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
32. Cleenewerck, Laurent (2007). *His Broken Body: Understanding and Healing the Schism Between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches* (https://books.google.com/books?id=oeKOUb6OcG4C&pg=PA156&dq=Cleenewerck+ontologically+meaningful&hl=en&sa=X&ei=oUR2UpiXE8PE7Ab8i4GgAQ&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Cleenewerck%20ontologically%20meaningful&f=false). Euclid University Press. p. 155-page156. ISBN 978-0-615-18361-9. Retrieved 28 October 2012.
33. Nichols 2010, p. 199. This was also decreed by the Council of Sardica, which declared Saint Athanasius to be the lawful bishop of Alexandria (Council of Sardica, canons 3-5 (<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3815.htm>)).
34. Nichols 2010, p. 202.
35. Nichols 2010, p. 203.
36. Nichols (2010), p. 203. The First Council of Ephesus in 431 stated that it condemned Nestorius "compelled thereto by the canons and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow-servant Coelestine, the Roman bishop" (Decree of the Council against Nestorius (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.xi.html>)).
37. George C. Michalopoulos (11 September 2009). "Canon 28 and Eastern Papalism: Cause or Effect?" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20130110112941/http://www.aoiusa.org/canon-28-and-eastern-papalism-cause-or-effect/>). Aoiusa.org. Archived from the original (<http://www.aoiusa.org/canon-28-and-eastern-papalism-cause-or-effect/>) on 10 January 2013. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
38. Nichols 2010, p. 208.
39. Nichols 2010, pp. 209–210.
40. Nichols (2010), p. 210
41. Whitehead, Kenneth D. (2000). *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=5V1xelf69XAC&pg=PT244>). Ignatius Press. p. 244. ISBN 978-0-89870802-8.
42. Ayer Jr., Joseph Cullen (2008). *A Source Book for Ancient Church History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=fM9y0Db-88wC&pg=PT315>). Mundus Publishing. p. 537.
43. "Gelasius I on Spiritual and Temporal Power" (<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/gelasius1.asp>). Fordham.edu. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
44. Bishop Kallistos Ware, *The Great Schism* (<http://www.stpaulsirvine.org/html/TheGreatSchism.htm>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20100412093028/http://www.stpaulsirvine.org/html/TheGreatSchism.htm>) 12 April 2010 at the Wayback Machine
45. Mark Galli, "The Great Divorce" (<http://www.ctlibrary.com/ch/1997/issue54/54h010.html>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110914171457/http://www.ctlibrary.com/ch/1997/issue54/54h010.html>) 14 September 2011 at the Wayback Machine. Ctlibrary.com (1997-04-01). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
46. Rautman, Marcus Louis (2006). *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=hs3iEyVRHKsC&pg=PR17>). Greenwood Publishing Group. p. 17. ISBN 978-0-313-32437-6. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
47. See also [Fall of Rome](#)
48. Ware, Kallistos, "Byzantium: The Church of the Seven Councils", *Orthodox Church* (http://www.fatheralexander.org/booklets/english/history_timothy_ware_1.htm), Father Alexander

49. Galavotti, Enrico. "L'idea di pentarchia nella cristianità" (<http://www.homolaicus.com/storia/medioevo/pentarchia/pentarchia.htm>) [The idea of pentarchy in Christianity]. *homolaicus.com* (in Italian). Enrico Galavotti. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
50. Schaff, Philip (ed.), *Canon 3* (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.ix.viii.iv.html>), The Christian classics ethereal library
51. Geanakoplos, Deno John (1989), *Constantinople and the West* (https://books.google.com/books?id=_6PYWPWWhrUC&pg=PA172), University of Wisconsin Press, p. 172, ISBN 978-0-29911884-6
52. Baker, Robert Andrew; Landers, John M (2005), *A Summary of Christian History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=MQvCL1STfaAC&pg=PA110>), B&H, p. 110, ISBN 978-0-80543288-6
53. *St Metrophanes the first Patriarch of Constantinople* (<http://www.oca.org/FSLivesAllSaints.asp?SID=4&M=6&D=4>), OCA, "Saint Metrophanes, Patriarch of Constantinople, was a contemporary of St Constantine the Great (306–337). His father, Dometius, was a brother of the Roman emperor Probus (276–282). Seeing the falseness of the pagan religion, Dometius came to believe in Christ. During a time of terrible persecution of Christians at Rome, St Dometius set off to Byzantium with two of his sons, Probus and Metrophanes. They were instructed in the law of the Lord by Bishop Titus, a man of holy life. Seeing the ardent desire of Dometius to labor for the Lord, St Titus ordained him presbyter. After the death of Titus first Dometius (272–303) was elevated to the bishop's throne, and thereafter his sons, Probus (303–315) and in 316 St Metrophanes. The emperor Constantine once came to Byzantium, and was delighted by the beauty and comfortable setting of the city. And having seen the holiness of life and sagacity of St Metrophanes, the emperor took him back to Rome. Soon Constantine the Great transferred the capital from Rome to Byzantium and he brought St Metrophanes there. The First Ecumenical Council was convened in 325 to resolve the Arian heresy. Constantine the Great had the holy Fathers of the Council bestow upon St Metrophanes the title of Patriarch. Thus, the saint became the first Patriarch of Constantinople."
54. Binns, John (2002), *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches*, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 162–64
55. McGuckin, John (2004), *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*, NY: SVS Press, p. 173
56. "Klaus Schatz: Primat und Reichskirchliche Strukturen im 5. – 9. Jahrhundert" (<http://www.sankt-georgen.de/leseraum/schatz2-2.html>) (in German). Sankt Georgen. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
57. Gailardetz, Richard; et al. (2003). Manion, Gerard (ed.). *Readings in Church Authority: Gifts and Challenges for Contemporary Catholicism* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=aezGH7vcWMEC&pg=PA211&dq=%22THREE+Petrine+sees%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=PLm8UNrcDo-u8QSMkoCAAg&ved=0CDAQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false>). Ashgate Publishing. p. 211. ISBN 0-7546-0530-2.
58. *History* (<https://web.archive.org/web/20100510123826/http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/history>), The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, archived from the original (<http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/history>) on 10 May 2010, "Following the establishment of Constantinople (the ancient city of Byzantium) as the state capital of the Roman Empire in the early part of the fourth century, a series of significant ecclesiastical events saw the status of the Bishop of New Rome (as Constantinople was then called) elevated to its current position and privilege"
{{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
59. Schaff, Philip, ed. (1 June 2005), *The Seven Ecumenical Councils* (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xi.xviii.xxviii.html>), The Christian Classics Ethereal Library, NPNF2-14, retrieved 2 June 2012

60. Romanides, John, *Romanity* (http://www.romanity.org/htm/rom.16.en.romanity_romania_roumeli.01.htm), "There are no primacies nor primates according to Roman Orthodox Canon Law, but only bishops with "Seniority of Honor" since all bishops are doctrinally equal. The Franco-Latin and Protestant translations of "Seniority of honor" by "primacy of honor" is theirs, not ours"
61. *Council of Chalcedon, 451* (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120526130238/http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/studies-themes/251-council-of-chalcedon-451-resource-materials>) (resource materials), Monachos, 28 May 2012, archived from the original (<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/studies-themes/251-council-of-chalcedon-451-resource-materials>) on 26 May 2012, retrieved 2 June 2012 {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
62. Bunson, Matthew (2009), *Encyclopedia of the Roman Empire* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=T5tic2VunRoC&pg=PA115>), Infobase Publishing, p. 115, ISBN 978-1-43811027-1
63. Schadé, Johannes P (2006), "8", *Encyclopedia of World Religions* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=XRkfKdho-5cC>), Foreign Media, ISBN 978-1-60136000-7
64. Anastos, Milton V (2001). "Aspects of the Mind of Byzantium (Political Theory, Theology, and Ecclesiastical Relations with the See of Rome)" (http://www.myriobiblos.gr/texts/english/milton1_21.html). Variorum Collected Studies. Ashgate Publications. ISBN 0-86078-840-7. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
65. "Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis prevail, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these, since the like is customary for the Bishop of Rome also. Likewise in Antioch and the other provinces, let the Churches retain their privileges" (First Ecumenical Council, Canon VI (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.vii.vi.viii.html>)).
66. "Since custom and ancient tradition have prevailed that the Bishop of Ælia [i.e., Jerusalem] should be honoured, let him, saving its due dignity to the Metropolis, have the next place of honour" (First Ecumenical Council, Canon VII (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.vii.vi.x.html>))
67. "History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20100510123826/http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/history>). *patriarchate.org*. Istanbul: The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Archived from the original (<http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/history>) on 10 May 2010. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
68. Geanakoplos, Deno John (1989). *Constantinople and the West: essays on the late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman churches* (https://books.google.com/books?id=_6PYWPWWhrUC&pg=PA172). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. p. 172. ISBN 978-0-29911884-6. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
69. Baker, Robert A.; Landers, John M. (2005). *A summary of Christian history* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=MQvCL1STfaAC&pg=PA110>). Nashville: Broadman & Holman. p. 110. ISBN 978-0-80543288-6. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
70. Council of Constantinople I, c. 3 (NPNF2 14:  178–179.).
71. Council of Constantinople I, c. 2 (NPNF2 14:  176–177.).
72. Collier, Theodore F. (1911). "Constantinople, Councils of" (https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/1911_Encyclop%C3%A6dia_Britannica/Constantinople,_Councils_of). In Chisholm, Hugh (ed.). *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. 7 (11th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
73. "The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, vol. II" (<https://archive.org/download/p2selectletterss02seveuoft/p2selectletterss02seveuoft.pdf>) (PDF). p. 254. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
74. Articles on moral / morality Orthodox Christian perspective. "Patriarch Alexis of Moscow and All Russia – A Letter To The Ecumenical Patriarch Concerning The Situation Of The Diaspora" (<http://www.orthodoxytoday.org/articles-2009/Alexis-A-Letter-To-The-Ecumenical-Patriarch-Concerning-The-Situation-Of-The-Diaspora.php>).

75. "Canon XXVIII" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xi.xviii.xxviii.html>). Fourth Ecumenical Council. "[T]he Fathers rightly granted privileges to the throne of old Rome, because it was the royal city. And the One Hundred and Fifty most religious Bishops [i.e., the Second Ecumenical Council], actuated by the same consideration, gave equal privileges (ἴσα πρεσβεῖα) to the most holy throne of New Rome, justly judging that the city which is honored with the Sovereignty and the Senate, and enjoys equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be magnified as she is, and rank next after her; so that, in the Pontic, the Asian, and the Thracian dioceses, the metropolitans only and such bishops also of the Dioceses aforesaid as are among the barbarians, should be ordained by the aforesaid most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople."
76. Fourth Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Jurisdiction of Jerusalem and Antioch (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xi.xv.html>)
77. Ware, Bishop Kallistos (1963). *The Orthodox Church*. London: Penguin Books,. p. 34. ISBN 0-14-020592-6.
78. Collier, Theodore Freylinghuysen (1911). "Chalcedon, Council of" (https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/1911_Encyclop%C3%A6dia_Britannica/Chalcedon,_Council_of). In Chisholm, Hugh (ed.). *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. 5 (11th ed.). Cambridge University Press. p. 803.
79. McGuckin, John Anthony (18 October 2010). *The Orthodox Church: An Introduction to its History, Doctrine, and Spiritual Culture* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=KLIFmipXcoC&pg=PA32>). John Wiley & Sons. pp. 32, 137. ISBN 978-1-4443-3731-0. Retrieved 9 November 2012.
80. McGuckin (2010), p. 137.
81. Johnson, quoted by Schaff
82. Hefele, quoted by Schaff
83. "Canon 9 and Notes" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xi.xviii.ix.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
84. Randall R. Cloud (2007). *"Aristotle's Journey to Europe"* (https://books.google.com/books?id=O7lOF7szdHkC&pg=PA222&dq=Cloud+%22East-West+Schism%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=4Lf1UPeGCpOlhQe79oAo&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Cloud%20%22East-West%20Schism%22&f=false). ProQuest. p. 222. ISBN 978-0-54929226-5. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
85. "Orthodox Church in the Philippines - East–West Schism 01" (<https://archive.is/20120905202235/http://www.orthodox.org.ph/content/view/211/50/>). Orthodox.org.ph. Archived from the original (<http://www.orthodox.org.ph/content/view/211/50/>) on 5 September 2012. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
86. Ayer, John Cullen, ed. (1913). *A Source Book for Ancient Church History* (https://books.google.com/books?id=fM9y0Db-88wC&pg=PT325&dq=Ayer+%22minutest+detail%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=vM81UoDiFcWL7AbN1oHQAaw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Ayer%20%22minutest%20detail%22&f=false). Mundus Publishing (2008 reprint).
87. McKim, Donald K. (1996). *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=UJ9PYdzKf90C&pg=PA35>). Westminster John Knox Press. p. 35. ISBN 978-0-66425511-4.
88. Wolfram, Herwig (1990). *History of the Goths* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=xsQxcJvaLjAC&pg=PA328>). University of California Press. p. 328. ISBN 978-0-52006983-1.
89. Volz, Carl (2011). *The Medieval Church* (https://books.google.com/books?id=U_g1S4pyyOIC&pg=PT73). Abingdon Press. p. 73. ISBN 978-1-42672477-0.
90. "Encyclopædia Britannica: "Leo III"" (<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/336200/Leo-III>). Britannica.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
91. "Canon LII" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.liii.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.

92. "Canon LV" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.lvi.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
93. "Canon LXXXII" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.lxxxiii.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
94. "Canon XI" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.xii.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
95. "NPNF2-14. The Seven Ecumenical Councils" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.vi.html>).
96. "Canon XII" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.xiii.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
97. "NPNF2-14. The Seven Ecumenical Councils" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xiv.iii.xiv.html>).
98. Ekonomou, Andrew J. (2007). *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes* (https://books.google.com/books?id=zomZk6DbFTIC&pg=PA222&dq=Ekonomou+%22captive+in+matters+of+religion%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Gw2cUI-xKsOzhAeNoIBo&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Ekonomou%20%22captive%20in%20matters%20of%20religion%22&f=false). New York City: Lexington Books. p. 222. ISBN 978-0-73911977-8. "to die rather than consent to erroneous novelties ... [would not be] its captive in matters of religion"
99. Ekonomou (2007), p. 223.
100. Ekonomou (2007), p. 224.
101. Ullmann, Walter (2003). *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=UdB64ytwmaQC&pg=PA64>). Routledge. p. 64. ISBN 978-0-41530227-2. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
102. Collins, 19.
103. Aristides Papadakis, *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy*, Face Press, NY, 1994, p. 14.)
104. Hartmann, Wilfried; Pennington, Kenneth (2012). *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=BwnCVYHf5VAC&pg=PA63>). Catholic University of America Press. p. 63. ISBN 978-0813216799.
105. (Extracts from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3810.htm>)). The creed quoted in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (the Third Ecumenical Council) is that of the first Ecumenical Council, not the creed as modified by the second Ecumenical Council, and so does not have additions such as "who proceeds from the Father" (*ibidem*).
106. NPNF2-14. The Seven Ecumenical Councils – Christian Classics Ethereal Library (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.ix.i.html>). Ccel.org (2005-06-01). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
107. The seventh canon of the Council of Ephesus (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.xvi.x.html>) declared: "It is unlawful for any man to bring forward, or to write, or to compose a different (ἐτέραν) Faith as a rival to that established by the holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Ghost in Nicæa. But those who shall dare to compose a different faith, or to introduce or offer it to persons desiring to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed, if they be bishops or clergymen; bishops from the episcopate and clergymen from the clergy; and if they be laymen, they shall be anathematized."
108. "Excursus on the words πίστιν ἐτέραν" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.xvi.xi.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
109. (Extracts from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3810.htm>))

110. Council of Ephesus, 431: Definition of the faith at Nicaea (<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/34-patrtexts/152-ephesus-definition-nicaea>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120418215517/http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/34-patrtexts/152-ephesus-definition-nicaea>) 18 April 2012 at the [Wayback Machine](#)
111. "However, the chief of the heretics who distorted the apostolic teaching concerning the Holy Spirit was Macedonius, who occupied the cathedra of Constantinople as archbishop in the 4th century and found followers for himself among former Arians and Semi-Arians. He called the Holy Spirit a creation of the Son, and a servant of the Father and the Son. Accusers of his heresy were Fathers of the Church like Sts. Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, Athanasius the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Amphilocius, Diodores of Tarsus, and others, who wrote works against the heretics. The false teaching of Macedonius was refuted first in a series of local councils and finally at the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381. In preserving Orthodoxy, the Second Ecumenical Council completed the Nicæan Symbol of Faith with these words: "And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son is equally worshiped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets," as well as those articles of the Creed which follow this in the Nicæan-Constantinopolitan Symbol of Faith." Orthodox Dogmatic Theology: A Concise Exposition Protopresbyter Michael Pomazansky St Herman of Alaska Brotherhood press 1994 (ISBN 0-938635-69-7) [1] (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0824/_P17.HTM)
112. J.N.D. Kelly, *"Early Christian Creeds"* (Continuum International 2006 ISBN 978-0-82649216-6), chapter X (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Titk-TEYqD4C&pg=PA296>). Books.google.ie. 14 November 2006. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
113. Leith, John Haddon (1982). *Creeds of the Churches* (https://books.google.com/books?id=saFgJRjaPwcC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=Constantinopolitan&f=false). Westminster John Knox Press. p. 31. ISBN 978-0-80420526-9. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
114. Hussey, Joan Mervyn. *The Cambridge Medieval History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Zus8AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA177>). Vol. 8. CUP Archive. p. 177. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
115. Quoting Aleksey Khomyakov on the Filioque and economy of the Eastern Churches and Roman Catholicism pg 87 History of Russian Philosophy by N. O. Lossky ISBN 978-0-8236-8074-0
116. The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism By Richard McBrien, Harold Attridge pp. 529–530 (<https://books.google.com/books?id=WINfJC6RveAC&pg=PA529>) ISBN 978-0-06-065338-5.
117. Herrin, Judith (2013). *Margins and Metropolis* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=iKIR4xyOmKUC&pg=PA11>). Princeton University Press. p. 11. ISBN 978-0-69115301-8.
118. VanVoorst, Jenny Fretland (2012). "The Byzantine Empire" (<https://books.google.com/books?id=RyOoBQiCm88C&pg=PA14>). Capstone. p. 14. ISBN 978-0-75654565-9.
119. Steffoff, Rebecca (2007). *Monarchy* (https://books.google.com/books?id=3_HhJcQhhoYC&pg=PA62). Marshall Cavendish. p. 62. ISBN 978-0-76142630-1.
120. Dawson, Christopher (2008). *The Formation of Christendom* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=wS78LsGaZpkC&pg=PA140>). Ignatius Press. p. 140. ISBN 978-1-58617239-8.
121. Steven Runciman. The Byzantine Theocracy. Cambridge University Press, 1977.
122. *Church and State in the Byzantine Empire* (https://www.webcitation.org/5kwQzUrYB?url=http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761573998/Church_and_State.html). Archived from the original (https://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761573998/Church_and_State.html#p3) on 31 October 2009. {{cite encyclopedia}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)

123. *Church and State in Western Europe* (https://www.webcitation.org/5kwQzydzE?url=http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761573998/Church_and_State.html). Archived from the original (https://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761573998/Church_and_State.html#p4) on 31 October 2009. {{cite encyclopedia}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
124. John C. Dwyer, *Church History* (Paulist Press 1998 ISBN 978-0-8091-3830-2), p. 118.
125. Matthew Bunson, *Encyclopedia of the Roman Empire* (Facts on File 2002 ISBN 978-0-8160-4562-4), pp. 115–116.
126. Deno John Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West* (University of Wisconsin Press 1989 ISBN 978-0-299-11884-6), p. 226.
127. "During the decade following the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632, his followers captured three of the five 'patriarchates' of the early church — Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem — leaving only Rome and Constantinople, located at opposite ends of the Mediterranean and, eventually, also at opposite ends of the Schism of 1054" (*Encyclopædia Britannica* (<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/507284/Roman-Catholicism/257669>)).
128. "orthodoxresearchinstitute.org" (http://www.orthodoxresearchinstitute.org/articles/dogmatics/krehel_orthodox_catholic_faith.htm#_ednref21).
129. J. N. D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, 2005, page 6
130. The Orthodox attitude to the papacy is expressed by a 12th-century writer, *Nicetas*, Archbishop of Nicomedia

My dearest brother, we do not deny to the Roman Church the primacy amongst the five sister Patriarchates; and we recognize her right to the most honorable seat at an Ecumenical Council. But she has separated herself from us by her own deeds, when through pride she assumed a monarchy which does not belong to her office... How shall we accept decrees from her that have been issued without consulting us and even without our knowledge? If the Roman Pontiff, seated on the lofty throne of his glory, wishes to thunder at us and, so to speak, hurl his mandates at us from on high, and if he wishes to judge us and even to rule us and our Churches, not by taking counsel with us but at his own arbitrary pleasure, what kind of brotherhood, or even what kind of parenthood can this be? We should be the slaves, not the sons, of such a Church, and the Roman See would not be the pious mother of sons but a hard and imperious mistress of slaves (Quoted in S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p. 116). Orthodox Church by Bishop *Kallistos Ware* Part I: History. ISBN 978-0-14-014656-1.

131. "Eighth Ecumenical Council: Constantinople IV (869)", *The Catholic encyclopædia* (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04423f.htm>), New advent, "The Fourth General Council of Constantinople, under Pope Adrian II and Emperor Basil numbering 102 bishops, 3 papal legates, and 4 patriarchs, consigned to the flames the Acts of an irregular council (conciliabulum) brought together by Photius against Pope Nicholas and Ignatius the legitimate Patriarch of Constantinople; it condemned Photius who had unlawfully seized the patriarchal dignity. The Photian Schism, however, triumphed in the Greek Church, and no other general council took place in the East"
132. Fortescue, A, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, pp. 147–48
133. Louth, Andrew, *Greek East and Latin West*, p. 171
134. Tougher, S, *The Reign of Leo VI*, p. 69
135. *Siecienski* 2010, pp. 103.
136. *Fortescue*, pp. 147–48.

137. Vauchez, André; Dobson, Richard Barrie; Walford, Adrian; Lapidge, Michael (1 April 2001), *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=om4olQhrE84C&pg=PA1016>), vol. 2 (1 ed.), Routledge, ISBN 978-1-57958-282-1
138. Bury, J. B. *The Cambridge Medieval History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=9IH36S8ooC&pg=PT1404>). Vol. 4. Plantagenet Publishing. p. 200.
139. The text is available in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 143, coll. 744–769 (<https://archive.org/stream/patrologiaecurs86unkngoog#page/n375/mode/2up>)
140. Kidd, B. J. (2013). "Churches of Eastern Christendom" (<https://books.google.com/books?id=tc5FAAAQBAJ>). Routledge. pp. 208–213. ISBN 9781136212789.
141. Setton, Kenneth Meyer, ed. (1969). *A History of the Crusades* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=RfO1J6hjcdgC&pg=PA210>). Wisconsin University Press. pp. 209–210. ISBN 9780299048341.
142. "Patrologiae cursus completus: sive bibliotheca universalis, integra uniformis, commoda, oeconomica ..." (<https://archive.org/stream/patrologiaecurs86unkngoog#page/n375/mode/2up>)
143. Letter *Scripta tuae* in PL 143 coll. 773–777 (<https://archive.org/stream/patrologiaecurs86unkngoog#page/n389/mode/2up>)
144. "Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Holy Land" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20130610034842/http://rbedrosian.com/Maps/ahgh66b.htm>). Rbedrosian.com. Archived from the original (<http://rbedrosian.com/Maps/ahgh66b.htm>) on 10 June 2013. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
145. "home.comcast.net" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20130213233630/http://home.comcast.net/~DiazStudents/MiddleAgesChurchMap1.jpg>). Archived from the original (<http://home.comcast.net/~DiazStudents/MiddleAgesChurchMap1.jpg>) on 13 February 2013. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
146. Dragan Bruić (2005). "Vodič kroz svet Vizantije (Guide to the Byzantine World)" (<http://www.cartileonline.eu/carte/1025738/dragan-brujia-vodia-kroz-svet-vizantijeDragan>). Beograd. p. 51.
147. Previt -Orton, C. W. (1975), *Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=RXU5AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA276>), vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, p. 276, ISBN 9780521099769
148. Fortescue 1912.
149. Binns, John (2002). *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches*. Cambridge University Press. p. 203. ISBN 978-0-521-66738-8.
150. Dvornik, Francis (January–March 1945). "News" (<https://www.google.com/search?tbm=bks&tbo=1&q=archdale+king+intercommunion&btnG=>). *Church History and Christian Reunion; Eastern Churches Quarterly*. pp. 29–30. "In spite of what happened in 1054, the faithful of both church remained long unaware of any change in their relations and acts of intercommunion were so numerous that 1054 as the date of the schism becomes inadmissible."
151. King, Archdale (2007). "The Rites of Eastern Christendom". 1. Gorgias Press: 6. ISBN 978-1-59333-391-1.
152. Kallistos, Bishop (2001). *The Great Schism* (<https://web.archive.org/web/20100412093028/http://www.stpaulsirvine.org/html/TheGreatSchism.htm>). New York City. p. 67. ISBN 0-06-621330-4. Archived from the original (<http://www.stpaulsirvine.org/html/TheGreatSchism.htm>) on 12 April 2010. "Even after 1054 friendly relations between East and West continued. The two parts of Christendom were not yet conscious of a great gulf of separation between them. ... The dispute remained something of which ordinary Christians in the East and West were largely unaware" {{cite book}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
153. *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Pnxfhi4mQC&pg=PA596>). Oxford University Press. 2008. p. 596. ISBN 978-0-19-925246-6.
154. Bishop Kallistos (Ware), *op. cit.*, p. 67.

155. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the Middle Ages: 950-1250* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=1lhKYifENTMC>). Cambridge University Press. 1986. pp. 506–508. ISBN 978-0-521-26645-1.
156. J. Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, 112
157. During the Crusades the schism was deepened by the brutal atrocities of the French and Venetian soldiers in the pillage of Constantinople (1204), the establishment of a Latin empire, and the appointment by the pope of Latin bishops in Greek sees.³¹⁸ Although this artificial empire lasted only half a century (1204–1261), it left a legacy of burning hatred in the memories of horrible desecrations and innumerable insults and outrages, which the East had to endure from the Western barbarians. Churches and monasteries were robbed and desecrated, the Greek service mocked, the clergy persecuted, and every law of decency set at defiance. In Constantinople "a prostitute was seated on the throne of the patriarch; and that daughter of Belial, as she is styled, sung and danced in the church to ridicule the hymns and processions of the Orientals." Even Pope Innocent III. accuses the pilgrims that they spared in their lust neither age nor sex, nor religious profession, and that they committed fornication, adultery, and incest in open day (in oculis omnium), "abandoning matrons and virgins dedicated to God to the lewdness of grooms." And yet this great pope insulted the Eastern church by the establishment of a Latin hierarchy on the ruins of the Byzantine empire.[2] (http://www.ccel.org/s/schaff/history/4_ch05.htm)
158. *The Crusades: A History of One of the Most Epic Military Campaigns of All Time – Jonathan Howard – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=YWEUg5pMqJYC&pg=PT21&dq=Crusaders+Burn+the+Library+of+constantinople&hl=en&sa=X&ei=15sjUc3JJYqk8QSj8YCYQBQ&ved=0CEAQ6AEwAw>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
159. *The Library: An Illustrated History – Stuart A P Murray – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=FCP9kHegLOcC&pg=PA53&dq=Crusaders+Burn+the+Library+of+constantinople&hl=en&sa=X&ei=15sjUc3JJYqk8QSj8YCYQBQ&ved=0CEUQ6AEwBA#v=onepage&q=Crusaders%20Burn%20the%20Library%20of%20constantinople&f=false>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
160. *The Great Betrayal: The Great Siege of Constantinople – Ernle Bradford – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=qkS916lwXScC&pg=PT3&dq=Crusaders+Burn+the+Library+of+constantinople&hl=en&sa=X&ei=15sjUc3JJYqk8QSj8YCYQBQ&ved=0CFEQ6AEwBg>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
161. Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations By Donald M. Nicol pg 169 [3] (https://books.google.com/books?id=rymlUITIYdwC&pg=PA169&lpg=PA169&dq=Emperor+Baldwin+II++Crown+of+thorns&source=bl&ots=xV12LcHBQ-&sig=jzygYi9_i8Fn5vGj3GU368s3zQ&hl=en&sa=X&ei=WH0mUYXBMZKy9gTA9YAI&ved=0CEEQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=Emperor%20Baldwin%20II%20%20Crown%20of%20thorns&f=false)
162. Christiansen, Erik (1997). *The Northern Crusades*. London: Penguin Books. p. 287. ISBN 0-14-026653-4.
163. Wetterau, Bruce. World history. New York: Henry Holt and company. 1994.
164. Nicol, Donald M. (1996). *The Byzantine Lady* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=PThFM3RS3h0C&pg=PA38>). Cambridge University Press. p. 38. ISBN 978-0-52157623-9.
165. Previté-Orton, Charles William (1975). *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=7L88AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA735>). Cambridge University Press. p. 735. ISBN 978-0-52109977-6.
166. Nicol, Donald M. (1993). *The Last Centuries of Byzantium* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=y2d6OHLqwEsC&pg=PA63>). Cambridge University Press. p. 63. ISBN 9780521439916. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
167. Nicol, Donald M. (1993). *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=y2d6OHLqwEsC&pg=PA79>). p. 79. ISBN 9780521439916. Retrieved 23 February 2013.

168. Prévité-Orton, Charles W. (1975). *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=53I5AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA735>). Cambridge University Press. p. 735. ISBN 9780521099776. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
169. Threadgold, Daniel W. (1973). *Russia 1472–1917* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Fg04AAAIAAJ&pg=PA2>). Cambridge University Press. p. 2. ISBN 9780521097253. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
170. "Schaff, "History of the Christian Church", vol. VI, §18" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/hcc6.iii.iii.vi.i.html>). Ccel.org. 1 June 2005. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
171. Siecienski 2010, pp. 140.
172. Siecienski 2010, pp. 137.
173. *Papal Genealogy: The Families And Descendants Of The Popes – George L. Williams – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=-mq7ctwMNdoC&pg=PA37&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tIYiUeyRHla09QSn74C4BA&ved=0CGcQ6AEwCTgK#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
174. *Dogma Evolution & Papal Fallacies – Imma Penn – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=9MBnbFg-jJgC&pg=PA134&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tIYiUeyRHla09QSn74C4BA&ved=0CDwQ6AEwAjgK#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false>). Books.google.com. 30 May 2007. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
175. *History of the Church: Volume 3: The Revolt Against The Church: Aquinas To ... – Philip Hughes – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=L2nvpmOLdLwC&pg=PA29&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tIYiUeyRHla09QSn74C4BA&ved=0CE0Q6AEwBTgK#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
176. *OSV's Encyclopedia of Catholic History – Matthew Bunson, Monsignor Timothy M Dolan – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=dWpO1--eMrYC&pg=PA24&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tIYiUeyRHla09QSn74C4BA&ved=0CDUQ6AEwATgK#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
177. *Councils and Assemblies: Papers Read at the Eighth Summer Meeting and the ... – Ecclesiastical History Society, G. J. Cuming, Derek Baker – Google Books* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=QfM8AAAAIAAJ&pg=PA136&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=tIYiUeyRHla09QSn74C4BA&ved=0CC0Q6AEwADgK#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false>). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
178. *Pocket Dictionary of Popes - Michael J. Walsh - Google Books* (https://books.google.com/books?id=vWP_K-IZCB0C&pg=PA107&dq=Pope+Martin+excommunicated+Emperor+Michael&hl=en&sa=X&ei=kVYiUbzVEYeu9AThy4HgDg&ved=0CFsQ6AEwCA#v=onepage&q=Pope%20Martin%20excommunicated%20Emperor%20Michael&f=false). Books.google.com. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
179. "Catholic Encyclopedia: Pope Martin Iv" (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09724a.htm>). Newadvent.org. 1 October 1910. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
180. Nicol, Donald MacGillivray, Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453, Cambridge University Press, Second Edition, 1993, p. 72
181. Thornton, Robinson (1854). "Nikon, sixth Patriarch of Moscow". *Lives of eminent Russian prelates* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=xIBAAAAQAAJ&pg=PA3>). London: Joseph Masters. p. 3. OCLC 721101635 (<https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/721101635>).

182. Mouravieff, Andreï Nikolaevich (1842). *A history of the Church of Russia* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=FwxKAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA165>). Translated by Blackmore, Richard White. Oxford: John Henry Parker. p. 166. OCLC 555807778 (<https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/555807778>). OL 7187765M (<https://openlibrary.org/books/OL7187765M>). "He endured to the end and was accounted worthy of the crown of martyrdom: inflexible alike to prayers and threats, he was starved to death in prison, to be a pledge of deliverance to his country."
183. Encyclical of the Eastern Patriarchs of 1848
184. "Joint Declaration" (https://web.archive.org/web/20140208192705/http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_common-declaration_en.html). Vatican.va. 7 December 1965. Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_common-declaration_en.html) on 8 February 2014. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
185. Dimitry Pospelovsky (1998). *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia* (https://books.google.com/books?id=2cP0wc_E6yEC&pg=PA96). St Vladimir's Seminary Press. pp. 96–. ISBN 978-0-88141-179-9. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
186. The Ukrainian Greek Catholics: A Historical Survey (<http://web.archive.loc.gov/all/20050420013442/http://www.risu.org.ua/eng/major.religions/greek.catholic/historical.survey/>). Risu.org.ua. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
187. "Современное состояние отношений между Русской Православной и Римско-Католической Церквями: официальный взгляд, Алексей Дикарев" (<https://mospat.ru/ru/2010/02/16/news13315/>) (in Russian). The official web site of the Moscow Patriarchate. 16 February 2010. "К сожалению, двусторонние отношения между нашими Церквями на российской и вообще постсоветской территории трудно назвать нормальными. Здесь ситуация является, пожалуй, наиболее сложной. Московский Патриархат продолжает выражать свою озабоченность политикой Греко-Католической Церкви на Украине и отдельными случаями католического прозелитизма в России. Несомненно, современная ситуация больше не является столь критичной, как еще 10 лет назад, и конфликт перестал носить столь острый характер. Однако до сих пор вышеуказанные проблемы не нашли удовлетворительного решения. Даже если между православными и греко-католиками на Украине больше не происходит кровавых столкновений, характерных для начала 90-х г.г., тем не менее конфликт продолжает оставаться неурегулированным. На Западной Украине православные, большинство которых принадлежит к Московскому Патриархату, ощущают себя ущемляемым в правах меньшинством."
188. Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church (24 June 1993). Written at Balamand, LB. *Uniatism, method of union of the past, and the present search for full communion* (https://web.archive.org/web/20031223144638/http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19930624_lebanon_en.html). 7th plenary session, June 17–24, 1993. Vatican City. Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19930624_lebanon_en.html) on 23 December 2003. {{cite conference}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
189. "Unity call as Pope Francis holds historic talks with Russian Orthodox Patriarch" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20160213110712/http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-35565085>). *bbc.co.uk*. BBC. 12 February 2016. Archived from the original (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-35565085>) on 13 February 2016. Retrieved 13 February 2016. {{cite news}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)

190. "Historic encounter between the Pope and Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia: Orthodox and Catholics are brothers, not competitors" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20160213144411/http://visnews-en.blogspot.com/2016/02/historic-encounter-between-pope-and.html>). *visnews-en.blogspot.com*. Vatican City: Vatican Information Service. 13 February 2016. Archived from the original (<http://visnews-en.blogspot.com/2016/02/historic-encounter-between-pope-and.html>) on 13 February 2016. Retrieved 13 February 2016. {{cite news}}: Unknown parameter |dead-url= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help) Includes full text of the Joint Declaration.
191. "Совместное заявление Папы Римского Франциска и Патриарха Московского и всея Руси Кирилла" (<https://mospat.ru/ru/2016/02/13/news128178/>). The official web site of the Moscow Patriarchate. 13 February 2016. "§25. Надеемся, что наша встреча внесет вклад в примирение там, где существуют трения между греко-католиками и православными. Сегодня очевидно, что метод "униатизма" прежних веков, предполагающий приведение одной общины в единство с другой путем ее отрыва от своей Церкви, не является путем к восстановлению единства. В то же время, церковные общины, которые появились в результате исторических обстоятельств, имеют право существовать и предпринимать все необходимое для удовлетворения духовных нужд своих верных, стремясь к миру с соседями. Православные и греко-католики нуждаются в примирении и нахождении взаимоприемлемых форм сосуществования." Template:Ru icon
192. "'Противоречия полностью не преодолены': Глава церковного МИДа митрополит Иларион об отношениях между Московским патриархатом и Ватиканом" (<http://kommersant.ru/doc/2913683>). *Kommersant*. 11 February 2016. "Во-первых, не преодолены вероучительные разногласия. Однако целью встречи и не является обсуждение вероучительных вопросов. Во-вторых, не преодолены те разногласия практического характера, которые омрачают жизнь наших церквей. Я имею в виду прежде всего проблему украинской унии. Разгром униатами трех епархий Московского патриархата в Западной Украине на рубеже 1980–90-х годов, перенос центра Украинской греко-католической церкви из Львова в Киев, настойчивое желание этой церкви присвоить себе статус патриархата, распространение миссии УГКЦ на традиционно православные земли Восточной и Южной Украины, поддержка униатами раскольников — все эти факторы лишь усугубили проблему. Положение еще ухудшилось в результате событий последнего времени на Украине, в которых представители УГКЦ принимали самое непосредственное участие, выступая с антироссийскими и русофобскими лозунгами." Template:Ru icon
193. "Ukrainian Greek Catholics 'betrayed' by pope-patriarch meeting" (<http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/Default.aspx?pageID=238&nid=95183>). *AFP*. *Hürriyet Daily News*. 13 February 2016. " "Today, a lot of believers spoke to me and said they feel betrayed by Vatican," Major Archbishop Svyatoslav Shevchuk said in an interview published late Feb. 13."
194. "His Beatitude Sviatoslav disappointed in Joint Declaration; laments Vatican's "weaker team" – Catholic World Report – Global Church news and views" (http://www.catholicworldreport.com/Blog/4577/his_beatitude_sviatoslav_disappointed_in_joint_declaration_laments_vaticans_weaker_team.aspx).
195. "Украинские греко-католики чувствуют себя преданными Ватиканом" (<http://newsru.com/religy/15feb2016/shevchuk.html>). *NEWSru*. 15 February 2016. Template:Ru icon
196. Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation, 25 October 2003 (<http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/dialogue-with-others/ecumenical/orthodox/filioque-church-dividing-issue-english.cfmAgreed>). Retrieved 17 October 2012. Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20130311221040/http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/dialogue-with-others/ecumenical/orthodox/filioque-church-dividing-issue-english.cfmAgreed>) 11 March 2013 at the Wayback Machine

197. Office of Papal Liturgical Celebrations, Presentation of the Celebration (Solemnity of the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, 29 June 2004) (http://www.vatican.va/news_services/liturgy/2004/documents/ns_lit_doc_20040629_rite_en.html), accessed 15 October 2017
198. Video recording of joint recitation (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_MFg8FBOHDg), Youtube.com, retrieved 2 June 2012
199. Missale Romanum 2002 (Roman Missal in Latin), p. 513
200. Ρωμαϊκό Λειτουργικό 2006 (Roman Missal in Greek), vol. 1, p. 347
201. Common Declaration (<http://www.ewtn.com/library/PAPALDOC/BARTHDEC.HTM>). Ewtn.com (1995-06-29). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
202. Report on Catholic-Orthodox Relations (<http://www.ewtn.com/library/Theology/CATORT04.HTM>). Ewtn.com. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
203. Presentation of the Celebration (http://www.vatican.va/news_services/liturgy/2004/documents/ns_lit_doc_20040629_rite_en.html). Vatican.va (2004-06-29). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
204. Common Declaration (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2004/july/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20040701_jp-ii-bartholomew-i_en.html). Vatican.va. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
205. Vatican Insider (<http://vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/world-news/detail/articolo/ortodossi-ortodoxa-orthodox-francesco-francisco-francis-33491/>), "Two Orthodox bishops accuse the Pope of heresy" 04-15-14
206. "I, myself, have often spoken of the 'two lungs' – the East and the West – without which Europe could not breathe. There will be no peaceful Europe in the future, nor one whose civilization will shine forth, without this osmosis and this sharing of values which are different yet complementary. It is on this 'humus' that the Europeans are called to build up their common house" (John Paul II 22 December 1989)
207. Ut unum sint (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25051995_ut-unum-sint_en.htmlEncyclical), 54
208. Constitution "Sacri Canones" (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_19901018_sacri-canones_it.htmlApostolic). Vatican.va (1930-04-02). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
209. of Pope John Paul II (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/apr/02/guardianobituaries.catholicismObituary>). Guardian (2005-04-02). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
210. Emmanuel Clapsis. "Papal primacy" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20080617082301/http://www.goarch.org/en/ourfaith/articles/article8523.asp>). Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. Archived from the original (<http://www.goarch.org/en/ourfaith/articles/article8523.asp>) on 17 June 2008. Retrieved 16 October 2008. "The regional primacy can be conceived not as power or jurisdiction but only as an expression of the unity and unanimity of all the bishops, and consequently of all the churches, of an area. We must understand the universal primacy of the Roman Church similarly. Based on Christian Tradition, it is possible to affirm the validity of the church of Rome's claims of universal primacy. [...] Orthodoxy does not reject Roman primacy as such, but simply a particular way of understanding that primacy. Within a reintegrated Christendom the bishop of Rome will be considered *primus inter pares* serving the unity of God's Church in love. He cannot be accepted as set up over the Church as a ruler whose *diakonia* is conceived through legalistic categories of power of jurisdiction."
211. Cleenewerck, Laurent (1 January 2008). *His Broken Body: Understanding and Healing the Schism Between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=oeKOUb6OcG4C&pg=PA120>). Euclid University Press. p. 120. ISBN 978-0-615-18361-9. Retrieved 27 October 2012.

212. Ratzinger, Joseph; Boeve, Lieven; Mannion, Gerard (8 July 2010). *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=pEaxgHIMQbcC&pg=PA162>). Continuum International Publishing Group. p. 162. ISBN 978-0-567-03214-0. Retrieved 27 October 2012.
213. Michael J. Christensen; Jeffery A. Wittung (31 January 2007). *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=DgtUoMqm594C&pg=PA244>). Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Press. p. 244. ISBN 978-0-8386-4111-8. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
214. of the Catholic Church, 248 (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P17.HTM#XTCatechism). Vatican.va. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
215. Aidan Nichols, "A Catholic View of Orthodoxy" in *New Blackfriars*, volume 77, No. 905, June 1996 (<http://www.christendom-awake.org/pages/anichols/orthodox.html>)
216. "PRINCIPLES AND NORMS ON ECUMENISM" (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/general-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19930325_directory_en.html).
217. "CCEO: text – IntraText CT" (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG1199/_PML.HTM).
218. "Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches", canon 833 (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG1199/_PN5.HTM). Intratext.com (2007-05-04). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
219. "Code of Canon Law: text – IntraText CT" (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0017/_P3Z.HTM).
220. "Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches", canon 832 (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG1199/_PN4.HTM). Intratext.com (2007-05-04). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
221. The Metropolitan's own blog (<http://www.mkka.blogspot.com/>). Mkka.blogspot.com. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
222. Ο Πάπας, ο Πατριάρχης και η...ένωση των εκκλησιών (https://web.archive.org/web/20090317064414/http://www.romfea.gr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1932). romfea.gr
223. "Patriarch of Constantinople's new encyclical defends Catholic-Orthodox dialogue" (http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/patriarch_of_constantinoples_new_encyclical_defends_catholic-orthodox_dialogue/). Catholic News Agency. 20 February 2010. Retrieved 27 January 2011.
224. Pelikan, Jaroslav (15 July 1977). *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Volume 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Lr3ebL4iwcC&pg=PA170>). University of Chicago Press. pp. 170–171. ISBN 978-0-226-65373-0. Retrieved 26 October 2012.
225. Doyle, Dennis; Bazzell, Pascal D.; Furry, Timothy J. (1 September 2012). *Ecclesiology and Exclusion: Boundaries of Being and Belonging in Postmodern Times* (https://books.google.com/books?id=K_lvImfHGHYC&pg=PA311). Orbis Books. p. 311. ISBN 978-1-57075-982-6. Retrieved 27 October 2012.
226. Millet, L. (2010). *By What Authority?* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=bV4RUW6Unn4C&pg=PA43>). Mercer University Press. pp. 43–44. ISBN 978-0-88146201-2. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
227. Volf, Miroslav (1998). *After Our Likeness* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=J-s7xzugXqkC&pg=PA42>). Eerdmans. p. 42. ISBN 978-0-80284440-8. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
228. Volf (1998), p. 44.
229. Cleenewerck (2008), p. 107; cf. pp. 108, 209; cf.
230. Ferencz, Nicholas (2006). *American Orthodoxy and Parish Congregationalism* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Uh4VnseTNZkC&pg=PA21>). Gorgias Press. pp. 21–22. ISBN 978-159333195-5.
231. Schadé, Johannes P. (2006). "8". *Encyclopedia of World Religions* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=XRkfKdho-5cC&pg=PT154>). Foreign Media Group. ISBN 978-1-60136000-7. Retrieved 23 February 2013.

232. Ware, Kallistos. *The Orthodox Church* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=f7D-5Q-Q19MC&pg=PA27>). p. 27.
233. Lossky, Nikolai. *History of Russian Philosophy*. p. 87. ISBN 978-0-8236-8074-0. "The legal formalism and logical rationalism of the Roman Catholic Church have their roots in the Roman State. These features developed in it more strongly than ever when the Western Church without consent of the Eastern introduced into the Nicene Creed the filioque clause. Such arbitrary change of the creed is an expression of pride and lack of love for one's brethren in the faith. "In order not to be regarded as a schism by the Church, Romanism was forced to ascribe to the bishop of Rome absolute infallibility." In this way Catholicism broke away from the Church as a whole and became an organization based upon external authority. Its unity is similar to the unity of the state: it is not super-rational but rationalistic and legally formal. Rationalism has led to the doctrine of the works of supererogation, established a balance of duties and merits between God and man, weighing in the scales sins and prayers, trespasses and deeds of expiation; it adopted the idea of transferring one person's debts or credits to another and legalized the exchange of assumed merits; in short, it introduced into the sanctuary of faith the mechanism of a banking house"
234. McPartlan, Paul (2000). *Sacrament of Salvation* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=tSiha9BMxEQC&pg=PR15>). Continuum International. p. xv. ISBN 978-0-56729299-5. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
235. Volf (1998), p. 43.
236. Ratzinger, "Theological Notes", quoted in Garuti, Adriano (2004). *The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome and Ecumenical Dialogue* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=nFcTKX3P8nwC&pg=PA66>). Ignatius Press. p. 66. ISBN 978-0-89870879-0.
237. Gaillardetz, Richard R. (2006). *The Church in the Making* (https://books.google.com/books?id=_iFSYQskQPUC&pg=PA46). Paulist Press. p. 46. ISBN 978-0-80914276-7. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
238. Cleenewerck, Laurent (1 January 2008). *His Broken Body: Understanding and Healing the Schism Between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=oeKOub6OcG4C&pg=PA155>). Euclid University Press. p. 22. ISBN 978-0-615-18361-9. Retrieved 28 October 2012. "It is my contention in this book, not as a pioneer but as a follower of the great proponents of Eucharistic theology, that the catholic Church is fundamentally the local Eucharistic assembly, gathered around its bishop. Thus, the "Church of God which is at Ephesus or Corinth' is the "whole Church" and the "catholic Church."
239. Shaw, Russell B. (2000). *Papal Primacy in the Third Millennium* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=fgJE4JweJBkC&pg=PA40>). Our Sunday Visitor Publishing. p. 40. ISBN 978-0-87973-555-5. Retrieved 26 October 2012.
240. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ, chapter 4" (<http://www.ewtn.com/library/COUNCILS/V1.htm#6>).
241. "Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, canon 181" (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG1199/_P51.HTM).

242. Ware, Kallistos (1995). *The Orthodox Church London*. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press. ISBN 978-0-913836-58-3. "as can be seen in the words of 12th century Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia: "My dearest brother, we do not deny to the Roman Church the primacy among the five sister patriarchates and we recognize her right to the most honorable seat at the Ecumenical Council. But she has separated herself from us by her own deeds when through pride she assumed a monarchy which does not belong to her office... How shall we accept decrees from her that have been issued without consulting us and even without our knowledge? If the Roman pontiff seated on the lofty throne of his glory wished to thunder at us and, so to speak, hurl his mandates at us from on high and if he wishes to judge us and even to rule us and our churches, not by taking counsel with us but at his own arbitrary pleasure what kind of brotherhood, or even what kind of parenthood can this be? We should be the slaves not the sons, of such a church and the Roman see would not be the pious mother of sons but a hard and imperious mistress of slaves."
243. In 1995, John Paul II wrote: "With the power and the authority without which such an office would be illusory, the Bishop of Rome must ensure the communion of all the Churches." He invited "Church leaders and their theologians to examine with me in a patient and fraternal dialogue on this subject, a dialogue in which, leaving useless controversies behind, we could listen to one another, keeping before us only the will of Christ for his Church and allowing ourselves to be deeply moved by his plea 'that they may all be one ... so that the world may believe that you have sent me' (Encyclical *Ut unum sint* (http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0221/_PT.HTM) section 96). The Ravenna document (<http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/14/130.aspx#2>) of 13 October 2007 is one response to this invitation."Archived copy" (https://web.archive.org/web/20081226130223/http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0221/_PT.HTM). Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0221/_PT.HTM) on 26 December 2008. Retrieved 2008-12-23. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
244. "VIII. Let Nothing Be Done Without the Bishop", *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*
245. Carlton, C (1999), *The Truth: What Every Roman Catholic Should know about the Orthodox Church*, Salisbury, MA: Regina Orthodox Press, p. 22
246. Lossky, V (2002). *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimirs Seminary Press. p. 176.
247. Sherrard, P (1978). *Church, Papacy and Schism: A Theological Enquiry*. Limni, Greece: Denise Harvey Publisher. p. 15.
248. An example is Guimarães, Atila Sinke, *Curiosities from the 'Orthodox' Arena* (<http://www.traditioninaction.org/HotTopics/b004bht.htm>), Tradition in action
249. II Vatican council, *Unitatis Redintegratio* (https://web.archive.org/web/20130306113628/http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html), Rome, IT: The Vatican, n. 17, archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html) on 6 March 2013 {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
250. Pomazansky, Michael. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0824/_P14.HTM). "The ancient Orthodox teaching of the personal attributes of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit was distorted in the Latin Church by the creation of a teaching of the procession, outside of time and from all eternity, of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son — the Filioque. The idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son originated in certain expressions of Blessed Augustine. It became established in the West as obligatory in the ninth century, and when Latin missionaries came to the Bulgarians in the middle of the ninth century, the Filioque was in their Symbol of Faith."

251. Romanides, John S. "Part I: Augustine's Teachings Which Were Condemned As Those of Barlaam the Calabrian by the Ninth Ecumenical Council of 1351" (http://www.romanity.org/htm/rom.18.en.augustine_unknowingly_rejects_the_doctrine.01.htm). "Augustine unknowingly rejects the doctrine of the ecumenical councils concerning the Old Testament Lord of glory incarnate and his Vatican and Protestant followers do the same"
252. Romanides, John S. "Filioque" (https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html&date=2009-10-25+23:19:24). Archived from the original (http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html) on 25 October 2009. "The pretext of the Filioque controversy was the Frankish acceptance of Augustine as the key to understanding the theology of the First and Second Ecumenical Synods." {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
253. Romanides, John S. "Filioque" (https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html&date=2009-10-25+23:19:24). Archived from the original (http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html) on 25 October 2009. "During the ensuing centuries long course of the controversy, the Franks not only forced the Patristic tradition into an Augustinian mold, but they confused Augustine's Trinitarian terminology with that of the Father's of the First and Second Ecumenical Synods. This is nowhere so evident as in the Latin handling of Maximos the Confessor's description, composed in 650, of the West Roman Orthodox Filioque at the Council of Florence (1438–42). The East Romans hesitated to present Maximos' letter to Marinos about this West Roman Orthodox Filioque because the letter did not survive in its complete form." {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
254. Romanides, John S. *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine — Part 2. Empirical Theology versus Speculative Theology -Empirical Theology* (http://www.romanity.org/htm/rom.03.en.franks_romans_feudalism_and_doctrine.02.htm). "A basic characteristic of the Frankish scholastic method, mislead by Augustinian Platonism and Thomistic Aristotelianism, had been its naïve confidence in the objective existence of things rationally speculated about. By following Augustine, the Franks substituted the patristic concern for spiritual observation, (which they had found firmly established in Gaul when they first conquered the area) with a fascination for metaphysics. They did not suspect that such speculations had foundations neither in created nor in spiritual reality."
255. Bindley, Thomas Herbert (1980). *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=3IAOAAAQAAJ&pg=PA78>). Greenwood Press, a division of Congressional Information Service. p. 78. ISBN 0-313-22197-9. Retrieved 3 December 2016.
256. Schaff (13 July 2005). "Creeds of Christendom" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds1.iv.iii.html>). Ccel.org. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
257. Nicene Creed (<http://www.armenianchurchlibrary.com/files/creed.pdf>) (Armenian Apostolic Church); The Coptic Orthodox Church: Our Creed (<http://www.saintmaryhouston.org/index.php?q=content/about-us>) (Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria); Nicene Creed (<http://www.ninesaintsethiopianorthodoxmonastery.org/id18.html>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110126005944/http://www.ninesaintsethiopianorthodoxmonastery.org/id18.html>) 26 January 2011 at the Wayback Machine (Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church); The Nicene Creed (<http://www.stmarysnova.org/documents/church-mission>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120623001926/http://www.stmarysnova.org/documents/church-mission>) 23 June 2012 at the Wayback Machine (Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church); The Nicene Creed (<http://sor.cua.edu/Liturgy/Common/NiceneCreed.html>) (Syriac Orthodox Church).
258. Creed of Nicaea (<http://assyrianchurch.org.au/about-us/faith/creed-of-nicaea>) (Assyrian Church of the East)

259. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (<https://web.archive.org/web/20081225180911/http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p1s2c1p2.htm>). pp. 246–248. Archived from the original (<http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p1s2c1p2.htm>) on 25 December 2008. {{cite book}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
260. "Article 5 of the Thirty-Nine Articles" (<http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/39articles.html>).
261. Lutheranism (Book of Concord (<http://www.bookofconcord.org/creeds.html>), The Nicene Creed and the Filioque: A Lutheran Approach (<http://www.angelfire.com/ny4/djw/lutherantheology.filioque.html>), Presbyterianism (Union Presbyterian Church (<http://www.unionpresbyterian.com/Creeds/NiceneCreed.dsp>), Presbyterian Church of Aotearoa New Zealand (<http://www.presbyterian.org.nz/3368.0.html>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20090206021635/http://www.presbyterian.org.nz/3368.0.html>) 6 February 2009 at the Wayback Machine, Reformed Presbyterian Church (<http://saintandrewsrpcga.org/nicene.html>); Methodism (United Methodist Hymnal (<http://gbgm-umc.org/UMW/BIBLE/ncreed.html>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20080511203721/http://www.bookofconcord.org/creeds.html>) 11 May 2008 at the Wayback Machine
262. "Catechism of the Catholic Church, 247" (https://web.archive.org/web/20130303003725/http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P17.HTM). Vatican.va. Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P17.HTM) on 3 March 2013. Retrieved 23 February 2013. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
263. The Holy See encourages Eastern Catholics who had included *Filioque* in languages such as Syriac to remove it: "Though it is quite true to say that the Spirit proceeds from both the 'Father and the Son', the Eastern Church, encouraged by the Holy See, has asked us to return to the original form of the Creed" (Q & A on the Reformed Chaldean Mass (http://www.kaldu.org/14_Reformed_ChaldeanMass/QA_NewMass.html)). Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20090102212208/http://www.kaldu.org/14_Reformed_ChaldeanMass/QA_NewMass.html) 2 January 2009 at the Wayback Machine
264. Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity: The Greek and the Latin Traditions regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit (https://web.archive.org/web/20091026205632/http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/vatican_clar_images.html) (scanned image of the English translation on *L'Osservatore Romano* of 20 September 1995); also text with Greek letters transliterated (<https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Atrium/8410/filioque.html&date=2009-10-25+05:54:33>) and text omitting two sentences at the start of the paragraph that it presents as beginning with "The Western tradition expresses first ..." (<http://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/PCCUFILQ.HTM>)
265. Encyclical of the Eastern Patriarchs, 1848 A Reply to the Epistle of Pope Pius IX, "to the Easterns" (<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1848orthodoxencyclical.html>). Fordham.edu. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
266. Lossky, Vladimir (1997). *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. SVS Press. ISBN 0-913836-31-1.
267. Pomazansky, Michael. "On the procession of the Holy Spirit" (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0824/_P14.HTM). "Oneness of Essence, and it is absolutely essential to distinguish this from another dogma, the dogma of the begetting and the procession, in which, as the Holy Fathers express it, is shown the Cause of the existence of the Son and the Spirit. All of the Eastern Fathers acknowledge that the Father is monos aitios, the sole Cause" of the Son and the Spirit. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology"
268. "The Filioque controversy which has separated us for so many centuries is more than a mere technicality, but it is not insoluble. Qualifying the firm position taken when I wrote The Orthodox Church twenty years ago, I now believe, after further study, that the problem is more in the area of semantics than in any basic doctrinal differences." (Bishop Kallistos Ware, Diakonia, quoted from Elias Zoghby's A Voice from the Byzantine East, p. 43).

269. In the Introduction p. 21 "We have become different men" The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, by Vladimir Lossky, SVS Press, 1997. (ISBN 0-913836-31-1) James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1991. (ISBN 0-227-67919-9)
270. Romanides, John S. "Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine — Part 2. Empirical Theology versus Speculative Theology -Empirical Theology" (http://www.romanity.org/htm/rom.03.en.franks_romans_feudalism_and_doctrine.02.htm). "A basic characteristic of the Frankish scholastic method, misled by Augustinian Platonism and Thomistic Aristotelianism, had been its naïve confidence in the objective existence of things rationally speculated about. By following Augustine, the Franks substituted the patristic concern for spiritual observation, (which they had found firmly established in Gaul when they first conquered the area) with a fascination for metaphysics. They did not suspect that such speculations had foundations neither in created nor in spiritual reality. No one would today accept as true what is not empirically observable, or at least verifiable by inference, from an attested effect. So it is with patristic theology. Dialectical speculation about God and the Incarnation as such are rejected. Only those things which can be tested by the experience of the grace of God in the heart are to be accepted. "Be not carried about by divers and strange teachings. For it is good that the heart be confirmed by grace," a passage from Hebrews 13.9, quoted by the Fathers to this effect."
271. Metropolitan Hierotheos of Nafpaktos. "Knowledge of God according to St. Gregory Palamas" (https://web.archive.org/web/20090105041142/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.06.htm). Archived from the original (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.06.htm#2k) on 5 January 2009. "As I have indicated, Barlaam insisted that knowledge of God depends not on vision of God but on one's understanding. He said that we can acquire knowledge of God through philosophy, and therefore he considered the prophets and apostles who saw the uncreated light, to be below the philosophers. He called the uncreated light sensory, created, and "inferior to our understanding". However, St. Gregory Palamas, a bearer of the Tradition and a man of revelation, supported the opposite view. In his theology he presented the teaching of the Church that uncreated light, that is, the vision of God, is not simply a symbolic vision, nor sensory and created, nor inferior to understanding, but it is deification. Through deification man is deemed worthy of seeing God. And this deification is not an abstract state, but a union of man with God. That is to say, the man who beholds the uncreated light sees it because he is united with God. He sees it with his inner eyes, and also with his bodily eyes, which, however, have been altered by God's action. Consequently theoria is union with God. And this union is knowledge of God. At this time one is granted knowledge of God, which is above human knowledge and above the senses." {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
272. Pomazansky, Michael. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology: A Concise Exposition Protopresbyter Appendices New currents in Russian philosophico-theological thought Philosophy and Theology* (http://www.intratext.com/IXT/ENG0824/_P2N.HTM).
273. "Roman Catholicism rationalizes even the sacrament of the Eucharist: it interprets spiritual action as purely material and debases the sacrament to such an extent that it becomes in its view a kind of atomistic miracle. The Orthodox Church has no metaphysical theory of Transsubstantiation, and there is no need of such a theory. Christ is the Lord of the elements and it is in His power to do so that 'every thing, without in the least changing its physical substance' could become His Body. Christ's Body in the Eucharist is not physical flesh." History of Russian Philosophy by Nikolai Lossky ISBN 978-0-8236-8074-0 p. 87.
274. " "The Relationship between Prayer and Theology" from the official website of "The American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese" " (<https://web.archive.org/web/2007101114120/http://www.acrod.org/sn/sn4a.shtml>). Web.archive.org. Archived from the original (<http://www.acrod.org/sn/sn4a.shtml>) on 11 October 2007. Retrieved 23 February 2013.
275. Romanides: "the unceasing prayer in the hearts which repairs the short-circuit between the heart and the brain."

276. Neptic Monasticism (http://www.greekorthodoxchurch.org/neptic_monasticism.html). Greekorthodoxchurch.org. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
277. Metropolitan Hierotheos Vlachos (1 January 2005). *Orthodox Psychotherapy CHAPTER III* (http://web.archive.org/web/20090106070353/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.03.htm). Birth of Theotokos Monastery, Greece. ISBN 978-960-7070-27-2. Archived from the original (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.03.htm) on 6 January 2009. {{cite book}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
278. "What is the Human Nous?" (<http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/phronema/patristic-theology-romanides-chapter-1-what-is-the-human-nous.aspx>).
279. "as the Trinitarian God is Nous, Word and Spirit, so the soul too has nous, word and spirit." (but in humans' case they "are not hypostases") Metropolitan Hierotheos Vlachos (2005), *Orthodox Psychotherapy* (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.03.htm#in) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20090225105941/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b02.en.orthodox_psychotherapy.03.htm#in) 25 February 2009 at the Wayback Machine, Tr. Esther E. Cunningham Williams (Birth of Theotokos Monastery, Greece), ISBN 978-960-7070-27-2
280. "JESUS CHRIST – THE LIFE OF THE WORLD" (http://romanity.org/htm/rom.19.en.jesus_christ_the_life_of_the_world.01.htm#s3), John S. Romanides
281. "THE ILLNESS AND CURE OF THE SOUL" (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b05.en.the_illness_and_cure_of_the_soul.02.htm#Fall) Metropolitan Hierotheos of Nafpaktos Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20090326044427/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b05.en.the_illness_and_cure_of_the_soul.02.htm#Fall) 26 March 2009 at the Wayback Machine
282. "Augustine claims that all humans have sinned in Adam. The Council, however, interprets Rom. 5:12 as saying that, 'By one man sin entered the world, and by sin death, and thus to all men [death] passed, in which all have sinned.' In other words all sin because of the spiritual death which each one suffers by not being in communion with the glory of God": Romanides
283. Ancestral Versus Original Sin: An Overview with Implications for Psychotherapy (http://www.stmaryorthodoxchurch.org/orthodoxy/articles/ancestral_versus_original_sin) by V. Rev. Antony Hughes, M.Div St. Mary Antiochian Orthodox Church, Cambridge, Massachusetts
284. (The Freedom of Morality, p. 151n. Christos Yannaras).
285. The Ancestral Sin John S. Romanides George S. Gabriel, translator (<http://store.holycrossbookstore.com/970730314.html>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110712214225/http://store.holycrossbookstore.com/970730314.html>) 12 July 2011 at the Wayback Machine. Store.holycrossbookstore.com. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
286. Original Sin And Its Consequences (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110726122920/http://www.gocanada.org/catechism/catorsin.htm>). Metropolitan Archbishop Sotirios, *Orthodox Catechism: Basic Teachings of the Orthodox Faith*
287. Confession of Dositheus, Decree 6 (<http://www.crivoice.org/creeddositheus.html>). Crivoice.org (2011-11-11). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
288. "Catechism of the Catholic Church, 403" (https://web.archive.org/web/20120904224955/http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM). vatican.va. Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM) on 4 September 2012. Retrieved 22 June 2014. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
289. "Catechism of the Catholic Church, 404" (https://web.archive.org/web/20120904224955/http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM). vatican.va. Archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM) on 4 September 2012. Retrieved 22 June 2014. {{cite web}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
290. Catechism of the Catholic Church, 418 (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20120904224955/http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P1C.HTM) 4 September 2012 at the Wayback Machine. Vatican.va. Retrieved 2 June 2012.

291. Trigilio, John; Brighenti, Kenneth (2013). *Catholicism for Dummies* (https://books.google.com/books?id=uWJhrY-s2iYC&dq=%22immaculate+conception%22+%22didn%27t+earn%22&source=gb_s_navlinks_s) (2 ed.). John Wiley & Sons. p. e-book. ISBN 9781118596678. Retrieved 26 January 2015.
292. Macquarrie, John (2001). *Mary for All Christians* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Tk3GcuRO43MC&pg=PA75>). A&C Black. p. 75. ISBN 9780567087515. Retrieved 26 January 2015.
293. Ware, Kallistos. *The Orthodox Way* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=HG8c-IUZIDEC&pg=PA77>). p. 77. ISBN 978-0-913836-58-3.
294. [4] (http://www.ocf.org/OrthodoxPage/reading/ortho_cath.html) "from "the first instant of her conception, the Blessed Virgin Mary was, by a most singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, and in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, preserved from all stain of Original Sin. It is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful" (from the "Bull Ineffabilis Deus")." WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORTHODOXY AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM? By Father Michael Azkoul.
295. [5] (<http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/inquirers/theotokos.aspx>) "However, we do believe that the Virgin Mary is an image, as St. Maximos the Confessor says, of the Christian goal of becoming Christ-like, of "theosis". Just as the Theotokos gave birth to Christ in a bodily way, so we must, St. Maximos tells us, give birth to Christ in an unbodily or spiritual way. In so doing, we imitate her practical spiritual life, including the purity and humility by which she formed her free will into perfect obedience to the Will of God.", "we cannot lose sight of the importance of free will in the development and expression of her rich personality." An Orthodox View of the Virgin Mary.
296. "The Patriarchal Encyclical of 1895" (http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/encyc_1895.aspx). Orthodoxinfo.com. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
297. Luke 1:30–31 (<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke+1:30-31&version=nkjv>)
298. *Orthodox Study Bible*, St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology, 2008, p. 1363, "Mary is the most blessed !@#\$\$%^&* who has ever lived because of her complete willingness to receive God's grace."
299. Thomas P. Rausch; Catherine E. Clifford (1 February 2003). *Catholicism in the Third Millennium* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=o4jG7X95mMQC&pg=PA200>). Liturgical Press. pp. 200–. ISBN 978-0-8146-5899-4. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
300. Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1030 (<http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p123a12.htm#II>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20090220001723/http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p123a12.htm#III>) 20 February 2009 at the [Wayback Machine](#)
301. Campbell, Ted A. (1996). *Christian Confessions: a Historical Introduction*. Westminster John Knox Press. p. 54. ISBN 0-664-25650-3.
302. What Are The Differences Between Orthodoxy And Roman Catholicism? By Father Michael Azkoul (http://www.ocf.org/OrthodoxPage/reading/ortho_cath.html). Ocf.org. Retrieved 2 June 2012.
303. "Venial sin weakens charity; it manifests a disordered affection for created goods; it impedes the soul's progress in the exercise of the virtues and the practice of the moral good; it merits temporal punishment." Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1863 (<http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p3s1c1a8.htm>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20090220174131/http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p3s1c1a8.htm>) 20 February 2009 at the [Wayback Machine](#)
304. Life After Death (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b24.en.life_after_death.05.htm#pu2) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20090219210756/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b24.en.life_after_death.05.htm#pu2) 19 February 2009 at the [Wayback Machine](#) by Metropolitan Hierotheos.
305. Catholic Encyclopedia: "The Nature and Attributes of God" (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06612a.htm>). Newadvent.org (1909-09-01). Retrieved 2 June 2012.

306. "Human nature, according to St Symeon, needs a physician who can heal it from its corruptibility, and this physician is Jesus Christ Himself." *An Online Orthodox Catechism* (<http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/10/1.aspx#24>). Orthodoxeurope.org (2003-09-24). Retrieved 2 June 2012.
307. "Εκδόσεις Ιεράς Μονής Γενεθλίου της Θεοτόκου (Πελαγίας)" (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b24.en.life_after_death.07.htm).
308. *An Online Orthodox Catechism* (<http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/10/1.aspx#53>), Orthodox Europe, 24 September 2003, retrieved 2 June 2012
309. Romanides, John, *Filioque* (https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html&date=2009-10-25+23:19:24), archived from the original (http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/romanides_filioque.html) on 25 October 2009, "the biblical concept of heaven and hell also becomes distorted, since the eternal fires of hell and the outer darkness become creatures also whereas, they are the uncreated glory of God as seen by those who refuse to love." {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
310. Hierotheos, *Life After Death* (https://web.archive.org/web/20090201132350/http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b24.en.life_after_death.07.htm), archived from the original (http://www.pelagia.org/htm/b24.en.life_after_death.07.htm#par2) on 1 February 2009 {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)
311. Lossky, V (January 1976), *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=dxqvWwPSCSwC#PPA234,M1>), p. 234, ISBN 978-0-913836-31-6, "Hell is not so much a place where God imprisons man as a place where man, by misusing his free will, chooses to imprison himself. And even in hell the wicked are not deprived of the love of God, but by their own choice they experience as suffering what the saints experience as joy. 'The love of God will be an intolerable torment for those who have not acquired it within themselves"
312. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P2M.HTM), Rome, IT: The Vatican, 1024, retrieved 2 June 2012
313. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (https://web.archive.org/web/20120609122435/http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P2O.HTM), Rome, IT: The Vatican, 1033, archived from the original (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P2O.HTM) on 9 June 2012, retrieved 2 June 2012 {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help)

Bibliography

- Henry Chadwick. *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church: From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- One or more of the preceding sentences incorporates text from a publication now in the public domain: Fortescue, Adrian (1912). "The Eastern Schism". In Herbermann, Charles (ed.). *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 13. New York: Robert Appleton Company. {{cite encyclopedia}}: Invalid |ref=harv (help)
- Joseph P. Farrell. *God, History, & Dialectic: The Theological Foundations of the Two Europes and Their Cultural Consequences* (<http://dialectic.wordpress.com/ghd/>). Bound edition 1997. Electronic edition 2008.
- Chrysostom Frank. *Orthodox-Catholic Relations: An Orthodox Reflection* (<http://www.unitypublishing.com/Newsletter/OrthodoxCatholic.htm>). 1998
- Nichols, Aidan (2010). *Rome and the Eastern Churches: a study in schism* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=Hje62q52XNsC>). Ignatius Press. ISBN 978-1-58617282-4. {{cite book}}: Invalid |ref=harv (help)
- John Romanides, *The Cure of the Neurobiological Sickness of Religion, the Hellenic Civilization of the Roman Empire, Charlemagne's Lie of 794 and His Lie Today* (<http://romanity.org/htm/rom.0>)

[2.en.the_cure_of_the_neurobiological_sickness_of_rel.03.htm](#))

- Runciman, Steven (1955), *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Eastern_schism.html?id=8NUNAQAAIAAJ).
- Siecienski, Anthony Edward (2010). *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (<https://books.google.com/books?id=auT8VbgOe48C>). Oxford University Press. {{cite book}}: Invalid |ref=harv (help)
- Taft, Robert F (2010), *Perceptions and Realities in Orthodox-Catholic Relations Today* (<http://www.fordham.edu/images/theology/orthodoxy/orthodoxy%20in%20america%20taft.pdf>) (PDF), Fordham.
- Sherrard, Philip (2009). *Church, Papacy and Schism• A Theological Enquiry*. Denis Harvey Publisher. ISBN 978-960-7120-24-3.
- Eugene Webb. *In Search of The Triune God: The Christian Paths of East and West*. University of Missouri Press, 2014.

External links

- Ware, Bp. Kallistos, *Byzantium: The Great Schism* (http://www.fatheralexander.org/booklets/english/history_timothy_ware_1.htm#n4), Father Alexander.
- Encyclopædia Britannica: *Schism of 1054* (<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/587056/Schism-of-1054>)
- Joint Catholic-Orthodox Declaration of Pope Paul VI and Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I, 7 December 1965 (https://web.archive.org/web/20140208192705/http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_common-declaration_en.html)
- BBC Radio 4 round table: *In Our Time: Schism* (16 October 2003) (https://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/history/inourtime/inourtime_20031016.shtml) (audio)
- *East–West Schism* (<https://archive.is/20120905202235/http://www.orthodox.org.ph/content/view/211/50/>), Orthodox Church in the Philippines, archived from the original (<http://www.orthodox.org.ph/content/view/211/50/>) on 5 September 2012 {{citation}}: Unknown parameter |deadurl= ignored (|url-status= suggested) (help).
- *The Great Schism* (<http://www.orthodoxinfo.com/general/greatschism.aspx>), Orthodox SCOBA.

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=East–West_Schism&oldid=849801215"

▪