The Mother Church in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Tradition

Hegumen Dionisy (Shlyonov), Abbot of the St. Andrew's Stavropegial Monastery, Head of the Postgraduate School of the Moscow Theological Academy, Professor of the Moscow Theological Academy

Advocates of the primacy of authority, when speaking of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, very frequently employ the expression "Mother Church." This expression is not merely an elegant turn of phrase: it conveys the very essence of the new doctrine of the primacy of authority. The Constantinopolitan Patriarchate is the Mother Church in relation to its daughters, that is, according to the interpretation of its supporters, to all the autocephalous Churches established outside the ancient patriarchates of the Pentarchy (and the closely related Orthodox Church of Cyprus). Those Churches that are unable to make a straightforward choice in favor of conciliar ecclesiology have found themselves in a difficult position, being compelled to accommodate both sides, as, for example, the Churches of Jerusalem and Albania have done.[1] In one of his recent interviews, Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople stated that the Ukrainian ecclesiastical question had been resolved by him single-handedly once and for all and required neither conciliar discussion nor approval.[2] The Church of Constantinople, as the Mother Church, supposedly possesses the right independently to grant autocephaly to other Churches—its daughters. Even after the granting of autocephaly, the maternal-filial relationship is expected to remain intact. The Church of Constantinople will continue to be the senior and responsible Church, possessing not only precedence but also a certain measure of authority—and indeed a rather considerable measure of authority—over its daughter Church. The Constantinopolitan Patriarchate likewise reserves for itself the right to intervene in geopolitical affairs, expressing the viewpoint of those who lay claim to primacy in that sphere as well. Thus, quite recently, the Holy Synod of Constantinople called for the return fr om Russia of what its statement described as "forcibly transferred" Ukrainian children, without taking into account the actual state of affairs.[3]

To what extent does such an interpretation of primacy correspond to actual historical practice and the Byzantine tradition? Did the Byzantine tradition possess a special conception of a Mother Church standing above all the other Churches? From what century did the Church of Constantinople begin to regard itself as the foremost Church in the Orthodox East and, moreover, throughout the entire world? The present article seeks to answer these questions.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a Russian author wrote of the Church as the “common mother”:

> “…Only the Orthodox Greek Eastern Church is the true Church <…>. Therefore, one must highly esteem the Church as the common mother of us all; one must draw as near to her as possible and actively maintain one’s bond and living communion with the Church…”[4]

It is evident that by this he understood the entire Greek Eastern Church, namely, the totality of the Local Churches, with the exception of the fallen Roman Church and the Protestants. This would seem to be the only possible interpretation, and it is difficult to imagine any other.

Earlier, St. Meletios Pegas taught concerning the “Eastern Church” (Greek: ἡ Ἀνατολικὴ Ἐκκλησία) as the first to receive the Divine Light and to transmit it to others, evidently understanding by the Eastern Church the ancient Local Churches of the Christian East, namely, those of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria.[5] Thus, both in the historical past and in the comparatively recent past, the Eastern Church was understood not as one particular Local Church, but as the totality of the Local Churches, excluding the Western Roman Church.

However, after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the subjugation of Byzantium to the Ottoman Porte, or the Turkish Ottoman Empire, the Church of Constantinople—which, from the seventh century onward, had occupied an exceptional position in the Christian East (following the Arab conquest of the other three eastern patriarchates)—gradually came to perceive itself no longer as a “particular” Church alongside the others, but as the “common,” “ecumenical,” “catholic,” and unique Church. This sense of exclusivity became even more pronounced after 1517, when the Ottoman Turks conquered Egypt, Syria, and Palestine together with the three ancient patriarchates, all of which were united within the single “Roman Nation” (Turkish: Rum Millet).[6] Subsequently, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Church of Constantinople began to refer to itself as the Mother, or the “Common Mother,” in relation to the other Local Churches. At the same time, a radical reinterpretation took place concerning the relationship of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate with the ancient apostolic Churches of the East.

According to the acts of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, the Patriarch of Constantinople during that period could, in practice, almost single-handedly elevate worthy candidates to patriarchal thrones,[7] and, conversely, depose unworthy incumbents,[8] thereby effectively exercising the right of supreme judicial authority over the primates of Churches who, at least in theory, were entirely his equals. This appears all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the other Local Churches were likewise of

apostolic origin and, indeed, more ancient than Constantinople itself (namely, the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, as well as the Church of Cyprus and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem).

In comparison with the ancient Churches, the Russian Orthodox Church occupied a more advantageous political position, being the Church of an independent imperial state. Thus, in the address to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church (1723),[9] each of the three Eastern Patriarchs signed himself: "your fervent intercessor and brother in Christ" (Greek: εὐχέτης διάπυρος καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν).[10] The Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, which possessed a strong sense of its own special greatness but remained within the Ottoman Porte, was obliged to "humble itself" and to treat the Russian Church with respect—not so much as a daughter, but rather as an equal, and indeed as a Church surpassing itself, since it enjoyed the special protection of the sole Tsar of an independent state in the Orthodox East.[11]

The Eastern Church

The expression "Eastern Church," or "Greek Eastern Church," could bear a dual meaning. In the Russian Empire, as has already been noted, it denoted the Orthodox Church as a whole, comprising the entirety of the Eastern Local Churches. In the Western tradition, the expression "Eastern Church" (Latin: Orientalis Ecclesia) began to be used as early as Blessed Augustine, who wrote that "the Western and Eastern Church of Christ <…> feared <…> the profane babbling" (cf. 1 Tim. 6:20) of the Pelagians.[12] In Byzantium, this expression—most likely under the influence of the Western tradition that had by then become established[13]—came into use from the fourteenth century onward, as is evident from the Life of St. Philotheos Kokkinos.[14] John Eugenikos (fifteenth century) wrote of the "fellowship of the primates of the Eastern Church,"[15] evidently referring not merely to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but to the entire body of the Eastern Churches. "Our entire Eastern Orthodox Church, namely, those who occupy the four patriarchal thrones, together with all the bishops dependent upon them, and those honored with autonomy…"[16]—such is John Eugenikos' conception of the fullness of the Eastern Church. St. Gennadios Scholarios, the first Patriarch of the period of Ottoman rule, likewise referred in one of his letters, written before his patriarchate, to the "Patriarchs <…> of the Eastern Church,"[17] thereby regarding the Eastern Church as the common brotherly family of all the Local Churches of his time. He also called the Eastern Church "mother."[18]

St. Meletios Pegas[19] wrote:

> "…the doctrine of the Eastern Church is the doctrine of the catholic faith…"[20]

evidently understanding the Eastern Church to be the catholic Church.

> "…And the Eastern Church remained the true body of that same Church (namely, the catholic and apostolic Church) …"[21]

> "We solemnly commemorate and visit our mother, the Eastern Church of the Orthodox…"[22]

> "…This the Eastern Church preserves, this she teaches, this she hands down, accepting neither addition nor subtraction…"[23]

According to St. Meletios Pegas, the Eastern Church also bears other epithets: "Greek"[24] or "ancient."[25] This makes it possible to define its precise composition: it consists of the Eastern Patriarchates and the Church of Cyprus, all of which were situated within the territory of the Ottoman Porte, as "the most deeply rooted trunk of the catholic Church."[26] At the same time, the Eastern Church is exceedingly diverse in its national composition and customs.[27]

Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem thought in essentially the same way: the Eastern Church consisted of the four Patriarchates, among which Constantinople held the first place in honor.[28]

The expression Eastern Church, in contrast to the Roman Catholic Church, referred to the Orthodox East as distinguished from the Catholic West. Since it was the Patriarchate of Constantinople that was the principal participant in the controversy, it was above all perceived as the Eastern Church by its Western opponents or by the Uniates, as, for example, George of Trebizond, who wrote:

> "She alone, after the schism, constitutes the whole Eastern Church…"[29]

Moreover, Roman Catholics referred to their Western Church as the "mother" and to the Eastern Church as the "daughter,"[30] something that obviously could not be accepted in the Orthodox East. Likewise, according to the testimony of Dositheos of Jerusalem, the Latins called the Roman Church the

head and the Eastern Church the body,[31] which therefore was obliged to obey her. The members of the Eastern Church themselves, however, in the fervor of zealotry, regarded the Pope of Rome as the Antichrist and the dragon.[32]

In the second half of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the concept of a single Eastern Church began to develop along two different lines. On the one hand, Anastasios Gordios, who understood the Eastern Church as apostolic and catholic,[33] wrote:

> "And it was as though a certain translation of the Eastern Church of the three Patriarchates had taken place, from the East to the northern regions of Great Russia. There she remains, and she desires to be [that is, she shall remain.—D. Sh.] Orthodox, by the grace of her Bridegroom and Beloved, Christ our God, until the end of this present age."[34]

Thus, Anastasios Gordios identified the Eastern Church with the Russian Orthodox Church, as the Church of an independent state governed by a Tsar.

On the other hand, from the standpoint of the Church of Constantinople, especially from the eighteenth century onward, the Eastern Church was identified precisely with the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which exercised leadership over the other Churches. The established epithet "the Great Church"[35] underscored the exceptional grandeur of Constantinople and of the Patriarchal Church located there. According to the ideology of the proponents of the primacy of the Church of Constantinople, by the second half of the nineteenth century the "Great Church" bore a special responsibility before the "whole Church,"[36] effectively acting as its head. The existence of the Permanent Synod, whose members included the other Patriarchs and primates of the Orthodox East, reinforced this conception as something indisputable. The privileges granted to the Patriarchate of Constantinople by Mehmed the Conqueror[37] and a series of international treaties[38] subsequently came to serve as a kind of juridical foundation for the alleged leading role of the Church of Constantinople in world Orthodoxy. Paradoxically, the founder of Islam—regarded by the Greeks themselves either as the Antichrist or as his forerunner[39]—stood at the origin of the new type of privileges that the Patriarchate of Constantinople came to enjoy, particularly after the fall of Constantinople.

In the nineteenth century, Neophytos Doukas understood the "Eastern Church" to mean the "Great Church" of Constantinople,[40] yet even apart from such an explicit identification, the Patriarch of Constantinople was regarded as its true head on the basis of Ottoman legislation concerning privileges,

although without sufficient canonical grounds for such a claim.

The Mother Church

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in world Orthodoxy, it is useful to examine the expression “Mother Church” in the patristic and Byzantine tradition. Unlike the expression “Eastern Church,” the comparison of the Church to a mother is of much greater antiquity. Nevertheless, these two expressions and their historical development have much in common. During the period when the expression “Eastern Church” first appeared and became firmly established in Byzantium, the expression “Mother Church” came to be applied first to the Eastern Church as a whole, understood as the totality of the four Eastern Patriarchates, and later to the Patriarchate of Constantinople alone as the foremost among them. In the context of anti-Latin polemics, in which the Greeks categorically rejected the exclusive right of the Roman Church to call itself the Mother Church, Constantinople's appropriation of this epithet for itself constitutes an evident step along the rather lengthy path of unilateralism upon which the Church of Constantinople had already embarked and which, during the past century, it has pursued with even greater intensity. The epithet “mother” is closely related in meaning to the epithet “head,”[41] which, when appropriated by a single person claiming universal ecclesiastical supremacy, becomes one of the instruments of an institution of primacy that is contrary to the conciliar ecclesiology of the Orthodox Church.

The Ancient Patristic Period

The early Christian thinker Origen left the following statement:

> “Our mother is the Church, whom God the Father, through the Holy Spirit, has appointed as His companion, for through herself she continually bears sons and daughters unto Him.”[42]

According to the same author, God the Father and the Mother Church likewise rejoice over those who have been instructed in the knowledge and wisdom of God.[43] The term “Father” in Trinitarian theology gave rise to the corresponding ecclesiological concept of the Mother Church.[44]

In addition to God the Father, Christ the Savior was also called Father, being mystically correlated with the Mother Church.[45]

The Life of Cyrus and John states that for St. Cyrus the Unmercenary, God is Father and the Church is

Mother:

> “In his spiritual birth he had God as his Father, who regenerated him by water and the Spirit; and the Orthodox Church as his mother.”[46]

These ancient interpretations—the images of the Church—proceed directly from her relationship to the Triune God and exclude any conception of the Mother Church other than in the most universal sense. No Local Church can claim a special closeness to God or a unique comparison with Him.

The imagery of the Mother Church was also employed apart from any direct analogy with the First or Second Person of the Holy Trinity. According to Eusebius of Caesarea, the “Heavenly Church” is the “mother of the holy men who dwell upon the earth.”[47]

The Three Holy Hierarchs

Alongside the universal conception of the Mother Church, St. Gregory the Theologian was the first to formulate several expressions referring to the Mother Church in relation to a particular diocesan Church. Thus, he wrote of the Church of Caesarea as “our mother Church,”[48] just as St. Basil wrote of the Church of Nicopolis: “Do not seek to justify yourselves before your mother, the Church of Nicopolis.”[49] At the same time, St. Gregory praised the departed St. Basil as one who “offers himself as a gift to the Mother Church,”[50] evidently understanding by the Church the Universal Church as a whole.

St. Basil himself defended the “Church—the Mother of all,” evidently meaning the Universal Church, against those possessed by the spirit of pride and self-exaltation.[51] According to his ascetical theology, she is likewise the mother of virgins dedicated to God.[52] Particularly noteworthy is St. Basil’s expression “the common mother”:

> “Once again, as you know, the devil displayed his own madness against us <…>. Once again the common mother [that is, the Church.—D. Sh.] was victorious…”[53]

This epithet of the Church—“the common mother”—became widespread in the centuries that followed,

including within the terminology of the doctrine of the primacy of authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In patristic literature, however, it referred exclusively to the Universal Church as the family of the Local Churches.

St. John Chrysostom wrote of the “Church, the common mother of us all,” as the one who daily edifies and instructs.[54] “...In the bosom of the Church, the common mother of us all...” Christians who have chosen the path of virtue rejoice, whereas those who reject that path sigh and grieve.[55] In the spiritual legacy of St. John Chrysostom, the conception of the Church as the “common mother” becomes a kind of leitmotif,[56] one that corresponds with remarkable precision to the universal and catholic character of the Church.

> “The Church is the mother of her own children, both receiving them and extending her bosom even to strangers.”[57]

The Church is our mother, just as the Heavenly Jerusalem according to Holy Scripture:

> “...But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is the mother of us all” (Gal. 4:26).[58]

St. John Chrysostom likewise interprets the Old Testament prophecy concerning the barren woman (cf. Ps. 113:9 LXX) as referring to the Church:

> “...She was barren, but became the mother of many children.”[59]

He also compares Ruth to the Church: Ruth became “the mother of kings,” just as the Church.[60]

Among the three Cappadocian Fathers, St. John Chrysostom emerges as the most systematic teacher of ecclesiology. Employing a contemplative and exegetical method, he unfolds the image of the Mother Church, the “common mother of all,” as one founded upon Old Testament types and individual verses of the New Testament. Within such a typology, there is no place for any particular Local Church, for no Local Church would have dared to appropriate exclusively to itself and to its own prerogatives the Old Testament prophecies. It is characteristic that, unlike St. Gregory the Theologian and St. Basil the Great, St. John Chrysostom says nothing of the Mother Church in a particular or local sense, but always

has in mind the Universal Church—that is, the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

St. Cyril of Alexandria writes of the Church as the ark of salvation:

> "...having fled to the Church as to a certain mother..."[61]

The Church is the mother of the assembly both of the Gentiles and of the Jews,[62] or the Church from the Jews became the mother of the Church from the Gentiles.[63] The Church is the "mother of the faithful,"[64] also called the "holy mother."[65] A distinctive theme in the spiritual legacy of St. Cyril is his teaching concerning the heavenly spiritual Church, which—like Zion—is called "mother."[66]

> "The Heavenly Church" is the "mother of the saints."[67]

> "The Church from the Gentiles" is the "mother of the holy and the good."[68]

The emphasis that the Church as mother gives birth specifically to saints is fundamental. In her mercy, the Church is the mother of all: of the saints, of those striving after holiness, and even of sinners who still have hope of repentance. Yet the true and lofty goal of every Christian's life is to become a saint, to attain holiness. The Church, being herself holy and spotless, makes possible this spiritual birth—or, more precisely, rebirth—from an ordinary human being into a saint who has received the gracious gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The Church that gives birth to saints is herself, by definition, holy. St. Cyril of Alexandria writes of the Church as the holy mother:

> "(The saints), in great peace, are the children of the Church, our mother, established in righteousness."[69]

> "...For a remnant is preserved; therefore there is a certain small portion for the heirs upon the holy mountain, that is, in the Church. And if, indeed, anyone should call the heavenly city, which

is in heaven, the Church, the mother and nourisher of the saints, she is called by them the holy mountain, and in her they desire to receive a share of the inheritance...”[70]

Thus, in every instance wh ere St. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of the Mother Church, he has in view the Universal Church, holy, catholic, and spotless. Only once does he refer to the Church from the Jews as the mother of the Church from the Gentiles, and this in no way implies any superiority of the former over the latter.

Philo of Carpasia, commenting on the verse from the Song of Songs, “...tell him that I am wounded with love” (Song 5:8), writes of the Church as a martyr crucified for her children—the martyrs:

> “This holy Church, the good mother, speaks boldly in her children, in the holy martyrs through whom she was crucified, and says to the apostles and prophets: ‘Tell him that I am wounded with love’ (Song 5:8).”[71]

Among subsequent patristic and Byzantine authors, this image of the Universal Mother Church remained a constant leitmotif, although this, of course, did not preclude the designation of one or another particular Local Church as a mother.[72] The monk Euthymios Zigabenos interpreted the words “they have gone astray from their mother's womb” (Ps. 57:4 LXX) to mean that the “mother's womb” is the Mother Church:

> “...They have gone astray from their mother's womb... From the Church; for she is the mother and the womb of those adopted by God, regenerating them through holy baptism.”[73]

The “Church of the faithful” is the “new mother,” standing in relation to the synagogue just as the New Testament stands in relation to the Old. Thus, St. Euthymios Zigabenos wrote:

> “Hagar signifies the Old Testament (for she gave birth much earlier to her son Ishmael), while Sarah signifies the New (for her son Isaac was born later). The former is the earlier mother, as is the synagogue of the Jews; the latter is the new mother, as is the Church of the faithful. Therefore, from the former came the old people, and from the latter the new.”[74]

Blessed Theophylact of Bulgaria writes of the Mother Church in an ascetical context. Just as a child prefers his poorest mother to a queen, so too the ascetic prefers the Mother Church, who teaches virtue, to every pleasure:

> “Thus also the man who lives according to virtue prefers nothing to his Mother, namely the Church, not even pleasure reigning over many.”[75]

According to the theological teaching of St. Eustathios of Thessalonica, the Church is the light-bearing mother of “children filled with light.”[76] In his Eighth Homily, St. Gregory Palamas wrote:

> “Therefore our spiritual and common mother and nourisher, the Church of Christ, today <…> proclaims”

the saints, as well as the councils and the dogmas of the faith.[77]

In this instance, he was speaking of the Universal Church, whose action might indeed be exercised through the Patriarchate of Constantinople, though this in no way implied its exclusive position among the other Local Churches.

Likewise, the associate of St. Gregory, St. Philotheos Kokkinos, wrote of the Apostolic Church as the “common mother and nourisher”:

> “This confession I confess with all my heart, having received it from my childhood from the common mother and nourisher of the faithful, the Apostolic Church...”[78]

St. Gennadios Scholarios called the “Eastern Church” “our mother,” evidently in contrast to the “Roman Church.”[79]

St. Meletios Pegas exhorted:

> “Therefore be reconciled with one another and be at peace, being children of one Father—God, children of one Mother—the Church of the Orthodox, brethren of one Christ, united in one Spirit;

and become partakers not of curses and excommunications but of prayers and blessings."[80]

The Alexandrian hierarch wrote of the one Mother Church, whose unity proceeds from the divine unity. The Mother Church is conciliar, not one possessing earthly supremacy. For him, just as for St. Gennadios, the Eastern Church is "our mother"[81] or "the mother of all the Churches."[82],[83] The latter designation is most likely intended as a response to the Roman Church's assertion that she herself is the mother of the Churches. In reality, the Roman Church has fallen away from the Mother Church,[84] by which the totality of the Eastern Churches is naturally understood. Following the theological tradition of St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Meletios declares that the Church is the "mother of those who are enrolled in heaven."[85] According to St. Meletios, the "Universal Church, the mother of all," heals everyone and exercises spiritual care for everyone.[86] Yet he also called the Great Church, that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, a mother—but only for those who belonged to its own jurisdiction.[87]

Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, in his polemic not only against Western primacy but, to some extent, against Eastern primacy as well, wrote of the Church of Jerusalem as the "mother of the Churches."[88] The entire Universal Church is the "holy mother of Christians."[89] The identification of the Universal Church with the Roman Church as the mother is an error,[90] first committed by Emperor Phocas (according to Pope Hadrian's account),[91] namely, the same emperor who called her the mother of all the Churches. All five Patriarchs are ecumenical, together constituting the one Mother Church.[92]

St. Nikodemos the Hagiorite, deeply imbued with patristic theology, wrote of the "one Church <...> the sole Mother of Christians..."[93] In the same work he also calls the Church the universal mother.[94]

The Great Church

In a document of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the first third of the fourteenth century, one of the earliest references appears to the Great Church as mother.[95]

In his Testament, Joseph Bryennios (fifteenth century) bequeathed all his books to "the Most Holy Great Church and Mother of the Churches, Hagia Sophia of Constantinople..." for his perpetual commemoration.[96]

After the fall of Constantinople and the granting of special privileges to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, there appear instances in which it is called the “common mother,” as, for example, in the Historical Book of Dorotheos of Monemvasia. The inhabitants of the city of Patras called upon the Patriarch of Constantinople to take measures against Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Nauplion:

> “…We appeal to Your All-Holiness and to your divine and holy Synod, that, by the mercies of God, you should no longer allow him to exercise the episcopal office over us, because he desires utterly to separate and alienate us from the Catholic Great Church, the common mother.”[97]

> “As the Church, our Mother, One and Holy, prays.”[98]

Patriarch Kallinikos III of Constantinople calls the Church One and Holy, just as in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. Most likely, he is thereby beginning to refer to the Patriarchate of Constantinople itself in these terms, identifying it with the Universal Church.

Proclaiming his devotion to the ideals of the Kollyvades, St. Nikodemos the Hagiorite wrote that he “submits himself to our common mother, the Great Church of Christ.”[99] Here, the Patriarchate of Constantinople is evidently intended, since for St. Nikodemos, as a monk of Mount Athos, it was the immediate head of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. However, as has already been shown above, St. Nikodemos far more frequently wrote of the Universal Mother Church, by which he understood the one Church manifested in all the Local Churches.

In a letter to a certain metropolitan, Patriarch Gregory V of Constantinople refers to the “holy Church of Christ,” that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as the “common mother.” He exhorts the metropolitan himself to ecclesiastical discipline and obedience to the “invincible kingdom,” that is, most likely, to submission to the Ottoman Empire.[100]

Neophytos Doukas (nineteenth century), commenting on the establishment of the independent Church of Greece without the consent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, wrote that the Greeks had dared “to separate the Church from her mother and nourisher…”[101] Evidently, in this instance he understood the Patriarchate of Constantinople to be the mother. Likewise, Ioannis Makriyannis refers—in relation to the Church of Greece—to the “Great Church of Christ” as “our mother,”[102] that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

In his abdication from the patriarchal throne[103] (24 May 1861), Patriarch Kallinikos of Alexandria called the “Holy Church of Christ,” that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, “the mother of all the pious.”[104]

In the report of the commission on the Bulgarian question (21 February 1864), the Great Church was called the “loving mother.”[105]

In the encyclical of the former Patriarch Anthimos of Constantinople, dated 15 June 1867, the Church of Constantinople is designated the “common mother.”[106]

At the Council of 1872, Patriarch Sophronios IV of Alexandria spoke of the apparent benevolence of the “Mother Church” toward the Bulgarian people.[107]

From the foregoing survey it is evident that the majority of references to the Mother Church in relation to the Church of Constantinople are connected with its actual ecclesiastical-administrative and jurisdictional rights and responsibilities. The nineteenth century was marked by two Great and Holy Councils concerning the Orthodox Churches of Greece and Bulgaria. It was on the eve of these Councils, or subsequently in the course of the developments that followed them, that conceptions of the Mother Church were brought to the forefront. Yet in neither case did this Mother Church receive governing authority over these Churches. Shortly after its establishment, the Orthodox Church of Greece adopted an entirely independent statute, while the Bulgarian Orthodox Church followed a distinctive historical path—from complete rejection to subsequent recognition under entirely different ecclesiastical and political circumstances.

The “Local Church” and the “National Church”

The explanatory conclusion of the Council of Constantinople of 12 September 1872 set forth the rationale for condemning the founders and members of the Bulgarian Exarchate on the charge of the heresy of phyletism (ethnophyletism). The central idea of this document is that all Churches are “local,” that is, they are limited by specific territorial boundaries. It was implicitly assumed that the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as the “Church exercising authority over the nations” (Greek: ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐθνάρχουσα),[108] constituted a unique exception and might therefore possess considerably broader boundaries. This ecclesiology was subsequently developed much further by various Phanariot theologians, including the contemporary leading canonist of Constantinople, Metropolitan Gregory (Papathomas) of Peristeri.[109]

It is evident that such a sovereign Church is especially suited to be designated by titles such as

“mother,” “head,” and other similar appellations.

On 12 September 1872, several days before the condemnation of the Bulgarians—and, in their person, of the other Slavic peoples as well—a key distinction was formulated: “local Church” (Greek: τοπικὴ ἐκκλησία) versus “national Church” (Greek: ἐθνικὴ ἐκκλησία). A Local Church may exist even within a multi-ethnic population, but it must not extend beyond its territorial boundaries. In other words, the national principle was condemned both within the Church of Constantinople (that is, within its own jurisdiction) and outside it (beyond its own jurisdiction). In the former case, the intention was to prevent the restoration of an independent Bulgarian Church; in the latter, to exclude any possibility whatsoever of ecclesiastical independence for the Bulgarian—or, more broadly, the Slavic—diaspora.

In order to substantiate this theory, however, it was necessary to provide a proper interpretation of the Apostle Paul's expression “all the Churches of the Gentiles/nations” (Greek: πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν) (Rom. 16:4). According to the authors of the memorandum, the expression “Churches of the Gentiles” does not refer to national Churches but is employed in contrast to the Church from the Jews.[110] “It is clear that these Churches consisted of Gentiles, but not of one tribe and one language.”[111]

In rejecting the national principle within the Church, particular emphasis was placed upon the multinational or supranational character of the Church—despite the fact that the Patriarchate of Constantinople itself was, in reality, Greek in its national character. This distorted situation gave rise to the following consequences:

1. The Patriarchate of Constantinople implicitly identified the Greek national principle with the universal principle.
2. The national principle in other Churches came either to be rejected or to be contrasted with the universal principle as something either improper or tolerated only out of necessity.
3. The condemnation of the national Bulgarian Church as phyletist or ethnophyletist became a precedent for strengthening the dominance of Constantinople in the contemporary period.
4. The ecclesiology of primacy came to be reflected ever more strongly, in particular, in the image of the mother, who always remains the mother of those Local Churches to which she has granted autocephaly. Such a status implicitly underscores her supposed infallibility: a mother is, by default, regarded as more perfect than her sons or daughters. Within this framework, it becomes easier to regard the Church of Constantinople as apostolic, the most ancient, and infallible. The Patriarchate of Constantinople came to consider itself the principal Church among all the Local Churches, bearing responsibility for all of them with corresponding authority. This applied not only to the ancient apostolic Churches that were then situated within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, but also to all the other Local Churches.
5. The ecclesiology of Constantinople at the end of the nineteenth century became the foundation of the contemporary “new ecclesiology” of primacy.

As a modern illustration of this approach adopted by Constantinople, one may cite the words of

Patriarch Bartholomew from his address to the Ukrainian people (delivered in 2008 and published in 2018):

> "As the Mother Church of the Orthodox peoples has never identified herself with a single Orthodox people, but has always willingly supported the historical destinies of all Orthodox peoples…"[112]

Of course, this approach was not implemented in its full measure from the very beginning, and the Bulgarian Exarchate itself was not blameless in deed, word, or intention. Yet now, a century and a half later, this approach has led to schism…

The Providential Role of the Patriarchate of Constantinople

As a consequence of the Patriarch of Constantinople becoming the ethnarch within the Ottoman Empire, statements began to appear in the acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople concerning the special providential role of Constantinople and its care for the other Patriarchates. Thus, for example, on 30 October 1850, on the occasion of the return to Orthodoxy of the Syrian and Egyptian Roman Catholic Melkites, a Great Council was convened in Constantinople with the participation of the other Eastern Patriarchs. In the Patriarch of Constantinople's letter to the Melkites, it is stated that "it is out of the joy of our soul and in accordance with the duty of our ecclesiastical care and protection that we do this for your encouragement and edification…"[113] Although the letter is signed by four Patriarchs, the leading role of the Patriarch of Constantinople is evident. It is to him, in accordance with the Turkish privileges, that "care" (Greek: πρόνοια) and "protection" (Greek: προστασία) belong in a preeminent sense.

In 1813, Patriarch Cyril of Constantinople appointed a new Patriarch of Antioch. The corresponding patriarchal letter spoke of the "care" (Greek: κηδεμονία) exercised by the Patriarch of Constantinople for "the other patriarchal apostolic thrones."[114]

At first glance, these terms appear to emphasize the humility of the first in honor—that is, of one who humbly serves the other Patriarchs. In reality, however, "care" and "providence" are terms that describe Divine Providence or, in other words, God's care for the world.[115] Thus, into the very affirmation of service is introduced the idea of the superiority of the one who serves over those whom he serves.

Nevertheless, at that time, in the nineteenth century, such formulations could still be regarded as justified and sufficiently precise. They reflected the actual superiority of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as ethnarch, over the other primates who belonged to the Eastern Church within the territory of the Ottoman Empire. The omission of the Russian Orthodox Church is particularly noteworthy: situated within an independent state, it was in fact less dependent upon Constantinople than the other Eastern Patriarchates and itself exercised “care” and “providence” toward them.

Presidency at Councils

On 1 May 1930, at the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, under the presidency of Patriarch Photios II, the Church of Constantinople was proclaimed the “presiding” Church at the forthcoming Preconciliar Conference.[116] During the period of Ottoman rule, the Patriarch of Constantinople presided over local Councils in his capacity as Patriarch-ethnarch. After the end of the period of Ottoman rule, however, his supposed “right” to preside still required confirmation.

The term “presiding” (Greek: προκαθήμενος, from προκάθημαι—“to preside”) is of ancient origin. According to patristic theology, it is Christ the Savior who presides in the Church.[117] In the twelfth century, in a Novella of Emperor Manuel Komnenos, the term “presiding” was applied specifically to the Great Church of Constantinople, that is, to the Patriarchate of Constantinople,[118] in view of its actual greatness during that period. Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, however, described such expressions (together with the words “head” and “presidency”) as merely “honorific praises,” not implying that the Patriarch of Constantinople stood above the canons.[119] It is evident that even during the period of Ottoman rule, the term “presidency” could be understood in two opposite senses—either as referring solely to honor or as referring to honor together with authority.

In the subsequent period, its meaning became even more ambiguous. In 1948, Metropolitan Germanos of Enna published a work defending the rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople in response to earlier articles by the Russian canonist S. V. Troitsky.[120] According to Metropolitan Germanos, a Pan-Orthodox Council cannot be convened by anyone other than the Ecumenical Patriarch. But how does Metropolitan Germanos justify this assertion? One of his principal arguments is that Canon 9 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council granted the Patriarch of Constantinople authority “outside his own boundaries and within the boundaries of the other Orthodox Autocephalous Churches as well.”[121] And since “the canons are immutable,” the ancient canonical privileges of Constantinople, he argues, remain in force today.

The question of presidency thus proved to be profoundly interconnected with judicial privileges. Yet the

actual meaning of Canons 9 and 17 of Chalcedon, as well as of the other canons dealing with the same subject,[122] presents an altogether different picture: the Patriarch of Constantinople was a judge within the limits of his own jurisdiction, and no more than that.

The Contemporary Church of Constantinople

At the present time, the expression “Mother Church” is regarded by proponents of the theory of the primacy of authority as an exclusive designation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. At the ordination of the Romanian deacon Marius Tsața[123] and at the consecration of the metochion church in Athens, the Patriarch of Constantinople referred to his own Local Church as the “Mother Church.”[124] This is no coincidence.

One of the metropolitans of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Andrew (“Metropolitan of the Forty Churches”), emphasized in a solemn sermon that the Universal Church is the guarantor and guardian of unity, as are her “First Ones” (Greek: Πρῶτοι). The “Great Church” is identified with the “Mother Church,” which—especially after the Council of Chalcedon—has carried out and continues to carry out the universal mission.[125]

On 2 February 2020, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew received at his residence in the Phanar a group of professors and students from the Grevena Theological School.[126] Among other things, he told them:

> “The most important thing is that our new archbishops will in a special way unite our Christians who are there, in those distant lands, with the sacred center that is here—with our Ecumenical Patriarchate, which, as I said earlier, is the heart of Orthodoxy and the spiritual womb of our race. The Patriarchate possesses exceptional value for us Greek Orthodox, but also for all Orthodox Christians, who relate themselves to what takes place here. The newest Orthodox Autocephalous Churches likewise received from here their autocephaly, their very existence, if you will. Unfortunately, there are also ungrateful children; there are those who have failed to give thanks and who do not appreciate what they have received from Constantinople: baptism, culture, the Cyrillic alphabet, and everything else they have taken from here. The Mother Church in Constantinople sacrificially emptied herself, made herself empty, in order to give these things to others. And, as our people say, from some we have not even heard a word of thanks. In any event, the Mother Church, because she truly is a mother, continues to love everyone. She has never been a stepmother, as one metropolitan of the Church of Greece accused her of being. She was, she is, and she always will remain a true mother.”[127]

The idea of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the Mother Church is accompanied by three assertions: first, that the Mother Church endures sufferings and empties herself for the sake of her children; second, that she has the right to demand obedience from them always, even after they have separated from her; and third, that the Mother Church is prepared to serve not only her obedient but also her disobedient children. It should be noted, however, that for Constantinople the demand for obedience is an absolute and unquestionable principle, whereas the service rendered by the Mother Church to her children remains, in practice, a very serious question. Behind these attractive assertions one can readily discern a purposeful rhetoric aimed at establishing highly rigid and categorical mechanisms of authority.

On 6 December 2023, during the Divine Liturgy in the Basilica of St. Nicholas in Myra of Lycia (Turkish: Demre), Patriarch Bartholomew declared with exceptional determination:

> “From here, from Asia Minor, we proclaim in every direction that the true and only Mother Church is the Great Church of Constantinople. She alone bears the inheritance of Jesus’ sacrifice on the Cross for all humanity, having given birth to numerous Churches from Bulgaria to Ukraine. This declaration is not a modern invention in ecclesiology, but an experiential truth and a heritage inherited from the Fathers of the Ecumenical and Local Councils.”[128]

Unfortunately, such an appropriation of motherhood as an exclusive primacy does not correspond to the patristic and conciliar tradition of the Church. The present emphasis of the Church of Constantinople upon its being the Mother typologically repeats the similarly confident position once adopted by the Church of Rome[129]—the very position that was categorically rejected in the Orthodox East, including by the Church of Constantinople itself. Proceeding from the Church's tradition, one may speak only of the Universal Church as the common Mother, whereas no Local Church, including that of Constantinople, can lay exclusive claim to this role. For the members of any given Local Church, however, that Church is indeed their mother, just as its primate is the head of his own jurisdiction, but not of the entire Universal Church.

Thus, as the Mother Church, the Patriarchate of Constantinople lays claim to the following:

- the exclusive right of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction;
- the exclusive right to preside over pan-Orthodox conferences and councils;
- the exclusive right to grant autocephaly;
- the obligation to care for all of its children, both within and beyond its own jurisdiction, and to exercise “exceptional responsibility” (Greek: ἐξαιρετικήν εὐθύνην) toward them.[130]

In reality, however, every primate possesses analogous, though limited, rights within the boundaries of his own jurisdiction and, beyond those boundaries, only in conciliar agreement with the other primates.

As is evident from the acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, its “matriarchal” rights during the period of Ottoman rule concerned primarily the independent Eastern Patriarchates, whereas the Russian Church, by virtue of Russia's political independence, enjoyed even greater ecclesiastical independence than Constantinople itself.

The autocephalies granted by the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the twentieth century after the Russian Revolution of 1917 were, to a considerable extent, the result of Russia's political weakening. At the same time, however, the Patriarchate of Constantinople itself lost the situational primacy that it had possessed during the Ottoman period following the abolition of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the primacy of Constantinople, even within the Ottoman Empire, was to a great extent conditional in character, since it lacked clear canonical foundations; and from the 1920s onward it became entirely exaggerated and no longer corresponded to reality.

At the present time, the proclamation of a universal Mother Church (in the person of the Church of Constantinople) together with a universal ecclesiastical head (in the person of its Patriarch) constitutes the greatest challenge to the conciliar structure of the Church. The catastrophic consequences of this new stage of Constantinople's unilateral activity are evident in the schism within world Orthodoxy, a schism that continues to deepen in one way or another but that can be overcome through a striving for truth rather than through formulations concerning primacy and/or other default scenarios.

Conclusion

From the earliest times, the Holy Fathers and Christian writers referred to the Church as “mother.” All the theological meanings of this metaphor are related to the universal conception of the one Universal Church, which is the dominant and determinative understanding. The motherhood of the Church corresponds to the Fatherhood of God; it is an exalted image emphasizing the Church's providential care for the world and for the faithful. The children of the Mother Church are the saints and those who strive for holiness. The expression “common mother,” introduced into ecclesiastical usage by St. John Chrysostom with reference to the Church, emphasizes the Church's unique ministry as “the Church of all the faithful.”

The relative rarity with which the Mother Church is identified with a particular Local Church (at one or another level of ecclesiastical administration) serves only to underscore more clearly the enduring and eternal theological significance of the concept of the Mother Church.

Beginning in the fourteenth century, both the expression “Eastern Church” and the designation of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia—that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople—as “mother” came into use.

The Eastern Church denotes all the Eastern Patriarchates together, constituting the Mother Church in the absolute sense. The Great Church itself (that of Constantinople) was called mother only in a relative sense, namely, in relation to those within its own jurisdiction.

After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, however, over the course of the following centuries the Eastern Church came to be perceived less as a union of Patriarchates equal in honor than as a single Church under the leadership of the Patriarch of Constantinople as ethnarch. His distinctive leading role is evident from the acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The epithet “mother,” attached to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, came to be understood as a kyriarchal epithet, emphasizing its plenary authority and its special position among the other Local Churches.

In the course of this transformation of realities and concepts, the Church of Constantinople came to employ the epithet “the Great Mother Church” as one manifestation of its aspiration to primacy by analogy with the Church of Rome. Although theologians of the Church of Constantinople refused to recognize Rome's claim to a unique motherhood as an expression of primacy, they subsequently, in essence, accepted the primacy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople—a primacy that was first secured by privileges granted by the Turkish rulers and later came to hang, as it were, entirely in the air.

In conclusion, we may summarize that the contemporary rhetoric of Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople and his associates concerning the Mother Church does not reflect the canonical tradition but rather expresses only their own ambitions and aspiration to primacy, through which the unity of world Orthodoxy is being undermined.

SOURCES

Anastasius Sinaïta. Viae dux // Anastasius Sinaïtae viae dux / ed. K.-H. Uthemann. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981. (CCSG; vol. 8). P. 3–320.

Augustinus Hipponensis. Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum // PL. T. 44. Col. 609–638.

Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 41. Βασίλειος πρὸς Ἰουλιανόν // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957. P. 96–98.

Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 169. Γρηγορίῳ Βασίλειος // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1961. P. 104–106.

Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 227. Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Κολωνίᾳ κληρικούς 1 // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 3. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966. P. 29–32.

Basilius Caesariensis. Quod rebus mundanis adhaerendum non sit // PG. T. 31. Col. 540–564.

Benedictus Nursiae. Regula cum commentariis // PL. T. 66. Col. 215D–932D.

Bernardus Claraevallensis. Epistula 221. Petri Venerabilis ad Bernardum abbatem // PL. T. 182. Col. 398B–417A.

Callinicus III Patriarcha. Narratio brevis // Καλλινίκου γ′ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Τὰ κατὰ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐξορίαν ἐπισυμβάντα καὶ ἔμμετροι ἐπιστολαί / ἔκδ. Ἀ. Τσελίκας. Ἀθήνα: Μορφωτικὸ Ἵδρυμα Ἐθνικῆς Τραπέζης, 2004. Σ. 79–269, 271–429.

Collatio quarta. Novellae constitutiones annorum 1057–1204 // Νεαραὶ καὶ Χρυσόβουλλα τῶν μετὰ τὸν Ἰουστινιανὸν Βυζαντινῶν Ἀυτοκρατόρων / ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos (post C. E. Zacharia von Lingenthal). Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1962. (Jus Graecoromanum; Bd. 1). S. 275–480.

Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Commentarius in xii prophetas minores // Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in xii prophetas / ed. P. E. Pusey. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1868. [Brussels: Culture et Civilization, r1965]. P. 1–626.

Cyrillus Alexandrenus. De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate // PG. T. 68. Col. 132–1125.

Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Expositio in Psalmos // PG. T. 69. Col. 717–1273.

Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Glaphyra in Pentateuchum // PG. T. 69. Col. 9–677.

Cyrillus Alexandrenus.Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam // PG. T. 70. Col. 9–1449.

[Doropheus Monembasiae]. Liber historicus (versio altera) (e cod. Mich. Ann Arbor. 215) // Ζαχαριάδου Ἐ. Ἀ. Ἡ πατριαρχεία τοῦ Διονυσίου Β′ σὲ μία παραλλαγὴ τοῦ Ψευδο-Δωροθέου // Θησαυρίσματα. 1962. Τ. 1. Σ. 144–155.

Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 3–4 // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων, ἄλλως καλουμένη Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου / ἔκδ. Ἐ. Δεληδέμος. Τ. 2. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικός Οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982. Σ. 3–492.

Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 5–6 // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων, ἄλλως καλουμένη Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου / ἔκδ. Ἐ. Δεληδέμος. Τ. 3. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικός Οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982. Σ. 9–452.

Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 7–8 // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων, ἄλλως καλουμένη Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου / ἔκδ. Ἐ. Δεληδέμος. Τ. 4. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικός Οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1983. Σ. 9–477.

Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 9–10 // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων, ἄλλως καλουμένη Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου / ἔκδ. Ἐ. Δεληδέμος. Τ. 5. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικός Οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1983. Σ. 9–681.

Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 11 // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Ἱστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Πατριαρχευσάντων, ἄλλως καλουμένη Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου / ἔκδ. Ἐ. Δεληδέμος. Τ. 6. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς οἶκος Β. Ρηγοπούλου, 1983. Σ. 9–83.

Eusebius. Commentaria in Psalmos // PG. T. 23. Col. 66–1396; T. 24. Col. 9–76.

Eustaphius Thessalonicensis. Exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem // Eustathii Thessalonicensis exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem / ed. P. Cesaretti, S. Ronchey. Göttingen: De Gruyter, 2014. (Supplementa Byzantina; vol. 10). P. 7–264.

Euthymius Zigabenus. Commentarius in Pauli epistulam ad Galatas // Euthymii Zigabeni Commentarius in XIV Epistolas Sancti Pauli et VII catholicas / ed. N. Kalogeras. Vol. 1. Athenis: Typis fratrum Perri, 1887. P. 496–560.

Euthymius Zigabenus. Commentarius in Psalterium // PG. T. 128. Col. 41–1325.

Gennadius Scholarius. De verbis patrum Latinorum de processu Spiritus Sancti // Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios / éd. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Siderides. Vol. 3. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930. P. 49–63.

Gennadius Scholarius. Epistulae Georgii Scholarii (ante 1450) // Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios / éd. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Siderides. Vol. 4. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1935. P. 398–473.

Georgius Trapezuntius. De processione spiritus sancti et de una, sancta, catholica Ecclesia // PG. T.

161. Col. 829–868.

Gregorius Nazianzenus. Epistula 44. Εὐσεβίῳ Σαμοσάτων // Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres / éd. P. Gallay. Vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964. P. 56–57.

Gregorius Nazianzenus. Epistula 50. Τῷ Αὐτῷ [Βασιλείῳ] // Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres / éd. P. Gallay. Vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964. P. 64–66.

Gregorius Nazianzenus. Funebris oratio in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi (orat. 43) // Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée / éd. F. Boulenger. Paris: Picard, 1908. P. 58–230.

Gregorius Palamas. Homilia 8. Περὶ πιστέως. Ἐν ᾗ καὶ τῆς κατ᾽ εὐσέβειαν ὁμολογίας ἔκθεσις // Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα / ἔκδ. Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Τ. 9. Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατερικαὶ Ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς, 1985. (Ἕλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τ. 72). Σ. 211–229.

Gregorius V Patriarcha. Epistulae Synodales // Ἀλεκσούδης Ἀ. Δύο ἐγκύκλια ἔγγραφα Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ε′ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως // Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας. 1892. Τ. 4. Σ. 269–275.

Gregorius VII. Registrum (1085): Epistola XXIX. Ad Judices Sardiniae (a. 1073) // PL. T. 148. Col. 311D–312C.

Joannes Chrysostomus. Ad populum Antiochenum (homiliae 1–21) // PG. T. 49. Col. 15–222.

Joannes Chrysostomus. Ad illuminandos catecheses 1–2 (series prima et secunda) // PG. T. 49. Col. 223–240.

Joannes Chrysostomus. De baptismo Christi // PG. T. 49. Col. 363–372.

Joannes Chrysostomus. De sancto hieromartyre Phoca // PG. T. 50. Col. 699–706.

Joannes Chrysostomus. Non esse desperandum // PG. T. 51. Col. 363–372.

Joannes Chrysostomus. Expositiones in Psalmos // PG. T. 55. Col. 39–498.

Joannes Chrysostomus. In Matthaeum (homiliae 1–90) // PG. T. 57. Col. 13–472.

Joannes Eugenicus. Antirrheticus adversus decretum Concilii Florentini // Rossidou-Koutsou E. John Eugenikos' Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Nicosia: Research Centre of Kykkos Monastery, 2006. P. 3–153.

Joannes Macrygiannes. Acta et epistulae // Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ἰωάννου Μακρυγιάννη / ἔκδ. J. Vlachogiannis. Vol. I. Athens: S. K. Vlastos, 1907. (Ἀρχεῖα τῆς Νεωτέρας Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας, τ. 2). Σ. 1–469.

Josephus Bryennius. Epistulae 30. Διάταξις Ἰωσὴφ μοναχοῦ Βρυεννίου (1421) // Τομαδάκης Ν. Ἐκ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἐπιστολογραφίας. Ἰωσὴφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου Ἐπιστολαὶ Λ′ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν Γ′ // Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν. 1983–1986. Τ. 46. Σ. 283–362.

Leo I. De haeresi et historia Eutychiana // PL. T. 55. 1095C–1324B.

Maximus Confessor. Ambigua ad Joannem 10 // On Difficulties in the Church Fathers: The Ambigua / ed. N. Constas. Vol. 1. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 2014. (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library). P. 150–344.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 137. Τοῖς ἐν Μικρᾷ Ῥωσίᾳ // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 167–178.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 175. Τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ καὶ Ὀρθοδοξοτάτῳ ἄρχοντι Κνέζῃ Ἀδάμῳ Βασιλείου Βισκοβέτσικῃ, καὶ τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ Κνέζῃ Κυριακῷ Ῥουζίνσκῃ μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἀρχόντων, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, τῆς ἱερᾶς τάξεως, καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς καταστάσεως· υἱοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις, χάριν... // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 207–208.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 6. Μαξίμῳ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 23–24.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 9. Μαξίμῳ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 27–33.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 10. Τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι ἀδελφοῖς καὶ συλλειτουργοῖς, τῷ τε Πανιερωτάτῳ Γαβριὴλ Φιλαδελφείας καὶ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων Μαξίμῳ τῷ Μαργουνίῳ χάριν, ἔλεος // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of

Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 34–36.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 31. Ἰὼβ Πατριάρχῃ Ῥωσίας, καὶ Μοσκόβου, καὶ τῶν ὑπερβορείων μερῶν. L. 34–37 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 65–66.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 62. Ἱερεμίᾳ τῷ Οἰκουμενικῷ // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 87.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 215. Κυρίλλῳ Ἱερομονάχῳ // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). 17–365. P. 270–272.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 241. Εἰς Σαυρομάτας // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 288–289.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 257. Τῷ Πανιερωτάτῳ Φιλαδελφείας κὺρ Γαβριήλ, ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτῳ, χάριν, ἔλεος παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 302–316.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 258. Κυριακῷ Φωτεινῷ ἰατρῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἐν Ἐγγοσταλδιανίῳ Ἀκαδημίᾳ λαμπροτάτῳ· χάριν, ἔλεος, καὶ εἰρήνην παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 317–325.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 270. Τοῖς ἁπανταχοῦ Ὀρθοδόξοις καὶ εὐσεβέσι Χριστιανοῖς, τοῖς τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ καταλόγου καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς τάξεως, τοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις· χάριν, ἔλεος, καὶ εἰρήνην παρὰ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. L. 31–34 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 333–334.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 272. Τοῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Γαληνοτάτην Ἀρχὴν τῶν Ὑψηλοτάτων Πολωνῶν εὑρισκομένοις Ὀρθοδόξοις Χριστιανοῖς τοῖς τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ καταλόγου καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς τάξεως, ἄρχουσί τε μεγαλοπρεπεστάτοις καὶ ἀρχομένοις, καὶ ἁπαξάπαντι τῷ χριστωνύμῳ πληρώματι, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ περιποθήτοις, χάριν, ἔλεος... // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 335–336.

Meletius Pegas. Epistula 316. Τοῖς μεγαλοπρεπεστάτοις Ἄρχουσιν, Ἀνδρέᾳ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Ζακοροβάσκιε τοῖς ὀρθοδοξοτάτοις, καὶ ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις υἱέσι // Methodios. Letters of

Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.]: [S. n.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; t. 52–57). P. 363–364.

Meletius Pegas. Oratio ad Silvestrum patriarcham (edita a Dositheo patriacha) // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Τόμος Χαρᾶς / ἔκδ. Κ. Σιαμάκης. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικός Οἶκος Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1985. Σ. 460–551.

Neophytus Ducas. Epistula 1196. Θεοδωρήτνῳ // Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς τινὰς ἐν διαφόροις περιστάσεσι ὑπὸ Νεοφύτου Δούκα εἰς τόμους δύο ὡς ἀκολουθία τῶν κατὰ τὸ 1839 προεκδεδομένων. Τ. 1. Αἴγινα: Τυπογραφεῖο Ἀνδρέου Κορομηλᾶ, 1844. Σ. 147–148.

Neophytus Ducas. Epistula 1495. Θεοδωρήτῳ // Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς τινὰς ἐν διαφόροις περιστάσεσι ὑπὸ Νεοφύτου Δούκα εἰς τόμους δύο ὡς ἀκολουθία τῶν κατὰ τὸ 1839 προεκδεδομένων. Τ. 2. Ἀθῆναι: Τυπογραφεῖο Ἀνδρέου Κορομηλᾶ, 1844. Σ. 175–183.

Nicodemus Hagiorita. Confessio fidei // Paschos P. B. Ἐν ἀσκήσει καὶ μαρτυρίῳ. Ἀθήνα: Ἁρμός, 1996. (Ὑμναγιολογικὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέτες, τ. 3). Σ. 105–181.

Nicodemus Hagiorita. De Carthaginensi concilio locali (Concilium 11) // Ἀγαπίου ἱερομονάχου και Νικοδήμου μοναχοῦ Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησίας / ἔκδ. ἀρχιμ. Δορόθεος. Ἀθήνα: Ἐκδόσεις Παπαδημητρίου, 121998. Σ. 462–542.

Origenes. Expositio in Proverbia (fragmenta e catenis) // PG. T. 17. Col. 161–252.

Petrus Argivus. Encomium ad sanctos Anargyros Cosmam et Damianum // Κυριακόπουλος Κ. Τ. Ἁγίου Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου Ἄργους βίος καὶ λόγοι. Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μητροπόλεως Ἀργολίδος, 1976. Σ. 82–108.

Philotheus Coccinus. Confessio fidei // Arambatzes C. Ἡ Ὁμολογία πίστης τοῦ Πατριάρχη Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Φιλοθέου Κοκκίνου // Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Νέα Σειρά. 2000. Τ. 10. Σ. 23–41.

Phipo Carpasianus. Enarratio in canticum canticorum // PG. T. 40. Col. 28–153.

Physiologus (redactio secunda quae vocatur Byzantina) // Physiologus / ed. F. Sbordone. Rome: Dante Alighieri-Albrighi, Segati, 1936. [Hildesheim: Olms, r1976]. P. 149–256.

Registrum patriarchatus Constantinopolitani (1315–1331) // Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel, Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315–1331 / hrsg. H. Hunger, O. Kresten. Bd. 1. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981. (CFHB SV; Bd. 19/1). S. 100–614.

Sugerius S. Dionysii. Epistula LX. Ejusdem ad eumdem et viromandensem comitem // PL. T. 186. Col. 1379C–1380B.

Sylvester Syropulus. Historiae // Laurent V. Les «Mémoires» du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439). Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1971. P. 100–574.

Theodorus Lascaris. Epistula 90. Ad Manuelem patriarcham I // Theodori Ducae Lascaris Epistulae CCXVII / ed. N. Festa. Florence: Istituto di studi superiori pratici e di perfezionamento, 1898. (Pubblicazioni del R. Istituto di studi superiori pratici e di perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di filosofia e lettere; vol. 29). P. 117–119.

Theophylactus. Enarrationes in evangelia // PG. 123. Col. 140–1348.

Vita et miracula sanctorum Cyri et Joannis (BHG 469) // PG. T. 87.3. Col. 3677–3689.

Vita sancti patriarchae Philothei // Δεντάκης Β. Λ. Βίος καὶ ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοθέου (Κοκκίνου) πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1353–1354 καὶ 1364–1376) τοῦ θεολόγου. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: [Χ. ἔ.], 1971. (Ἡσυχαστικαὶ καὶ Φιλοσοφικαὶ Μελέται, τ. 9). Σ. 63–93.

Γερμανός, Μητροπολίτης Αίνου. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον και η αρμοδιότης αυτού πρός σύγκλησιν πανορθοδόξων Συνόδων. Κοινοφελές Ίδρυμα της Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Ιεραπύτνης και Σητείας Παναγιά η Ακρωτηριανή, 2014.

Ἔγγραφα πατριαρχικὰ καὶ συνοδικὰ περὶ τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ ζητήματος (1852–1873) / ἔκδ. Μ. Ἰ. Γεδεών. Κωνσταντινούπολις: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1908.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν τῷ Πατριαρχικῷ Ναῷ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου μεγαλομάρτυρος Γεωργίου τοῦ Τροπαιοφόρου περὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ βουλγαρικοῦ ζητήματος συγκροτηθείσης ἐν ἔτει σωτηρίῳ ,αωοβ΄ κατὰ μῆνα Αὔγουστον καὶ Σεπτέμβριον. Κωνσταντινούπολις: [Τυπογραφεῖον Ἰ. Ἀ. Βρεττοῦ καὶ Σ.], [1872].

FOLLOWING SOURCES

Дионисий (Шлёнов), игум. Выражение «ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς…» 28-го правила Халкидона и его интерпретации // Мировое Православие: первенство и соборность в свете православного вероучения. Материалы международной конференции Синодальной библейско-богословской комиссии Русской Православной Церкви. Москва, 16–17 сентября 2021 года / под ред. митр. Илариона (Алфеева). Москва, 2023. С. 136–181.

Дионисий (Шлёнов), игум. Кто является главой Церкви? К вопросу о теории первенства // БВ. 2023. № 1 (48). С. 127–168.

Троицкий С. В. О границах распространения права власти Константинопольской Патриархии на «диаспору» // ЖМП. 1947. № 11. С. 34–45.

Ю. Б. Церковь // Наставления и утешения святой веры христианской / ред. свящ. С. В. Петровский; изд. Свято-Андреевского на Афоне русского общежительного скита. Кн. 12. Одесса: Типо-хромолит. Е. И. Фесенко, 1905. С. 1093.

Bartholomew: We Proclaim in Every Direction that Constantinople is the Genuine, The Only Mother Church. (Dec 11, 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://orthodoxtimes.com/ecumenical-patriarch-we-proclaim-in-every-direction-that-constantinople-is...** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Ανακοινωθέν για τις εργασίες της Αγίας και Ιεράς Συνόδου (4 Οκτωβρίου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/10/04/anakoinothen-gia-ergasies-agias-kai-ieras-synodou-4-10-2...** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Ανδρέας (Νανάκης), αρχιμ. Εκκλησία εθνάρχουσα και εθνική. Μέσα από τη σύναξη των πρεσβυτέρων και τον ιερό σύνδεσμο της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος (1870–1922). Θεσσαλονίκη: Βάνιας, ^{2}2007.

Ανδριόπουλος Π. Α. Το «Φως Φαναρίου» απαντά στην Εκκλησία της Αλβανίας (7 Οκτωβρίου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/10/07/to-fos-fanariou-apanta-stin-ekklisia-tis-alvanias**/ (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Βαλάκου-Θεοδωρούδη Μ. Το νομικό περίγραμμα του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου στο πλαίσιο της διεθνούς κοινότητας. Θεσσαλονίκη: Σάκκουλα, 2001.

Βαρθολομαῖος (Χρήστος) Ἰατρίδης, ἀρχιμανδρίτης. Διευνὲς συμβατικὸ δίκαιο καὶ Οἰκουμενικὸ

Πατριαρχεῖο. [Διδακτορικὴ διατριβή]. Κομοτινή, 2019.

Καριωτόγλου Α. Ισλάμ και χριστιανική χρησμολογία. Από τον μύθο στην πραγματικότητα. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αρμός, 2000.

Ο Πατριάρχης δέχθηκε τον Αρχιεπίσκοπο Αυστραλίας Μακάριο (2/06/2020). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **http://fanarion.blogspot.com/2020/02/blog-post_6.html** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: «Δεν θα συγκαλέσουμε Σύνοδο Προκαθημένων για το Ουκρανικό» (4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/09/04/ecum-patr-den-tha-syglithei-synodos-prokathimenwn-gia-to...** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: «Δεν μας συγκινούν νέαι εκκλησιολογίαι» (18 Μαΐου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/05/18/ecum-patr-den-mas-sygkinoun-oi-nees-ekklisiologies/** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Οικουμενικός πατριάρχης: η μήτηρ Εκκλησία όχι μόνο δικαιούται αλλά υποχρεούται να θεραπεύει το σχίσμα στη Ουκρανία (25 Σεπτεμβρίου 2018). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2018/09/25/blog-post_25-33/** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: Παραμένομεν, επιμένομεν και υπομένομεν (11 Ιουνίου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/06/11/ta-onomastiria-tou-ecum-patr-11-june-2023/** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Ομιλία Μητροπολίτου Σαράντα Εκκλησιών Ανδρέου κατά την Κυριακή της Σαμαρείτιδος (14 Μαΐου 2023). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/05/18/omilia-mitropolitou-40ekklisiwn-andreou-tin-kyriaki-sama...** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Ομιλία της Α. Θ. Παναγιότητος του Οικουμενικού Πατριάρχου κ. κ. Βαρθολομαίου προς τον Ουκρανικόν λαόν (26 Ἰουλίου 2008). [Электронный ресурс]. URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2018/09/25/blog-post_25-33** (дата обращения 23.12.2023).

Παπαθωμᾶς Γ. Δ., ἀρχιμ. Κανονικὰ ἔμμορφα (Δοκίμια κανονικῆς οἰκονομίας, ΙΙ). Κατερίνη: Επέκταση, 2015. (Νομοκανονικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, τ. 29).

Abbreviations

CCSG

CFHB SV — Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Vindobonensis. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975–. Bd. 12/1–3–.

BHG

PL

PG

БВ

Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον = Μητροπολίτης Αίνου Γερμανός. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον και η αρμοδιότης αυτού πρός σύγκλησιν πανορθοδόξων Συνόδων. Κοινοφελές Ίδρυμα της Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Ιεραπύτνης και Σητείας Παναγιά η Ακρωτηριανή, 2014.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου [1872] = Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν τῷ Πατριαρχικῷ Ναῷ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου μεγαλομάρτυρος Γεωργίου τοῦ Τροπαιοφόρου περὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ βουλγαρικοῦ ζητήματος συγκροτηθείσης ἐν ἔτει σωτηρίῳ ,αωοβ΄ κατὰ μῆνα Αὔγουστον καὶ Σεπτέμβριον. Κωνσταντινούπολις: [Τυπογραφεῖον Ἰ. Ἀ. Βρεττοῦ καὶ Σ.], [1872].

NOTES

[1] See one of the most recent publications by P. Andriopoulos: Ανδριόπουλος Π. Α. Το «Φως Φαναρίου» απαντά στην Εκκλησία της Αλβανίας (7 Οκτωβρίου 2023). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/10/07/to-fos-fanariou-apanta-stin-ekklisia-tis-alvanias/**

[2] Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: «Δεν θα συγκαλέσουμε Σύνοδο Προκαθημένων για το Ουκρανικό» (4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2023). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/09/04/ecum-patr-den-tha-syglithei-synodos-prokathimenwn-gia-to...**

[3] “Also, the Holy and Sacred Synod expressed a wish and an exhortation that thousands of children from Ukraine, who had been forcibly transferred to the Russian Federation, should return as quickly as possible to their homeland and homes.” See: URL:

https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/10/04/anakoinothen-gia-ergasies-agias-kai-ieras-synodou-4-10-2...

[4] Thus wrote an author writing under the pseudonym Y. B. in 1905. See:: Ю. Б. Церковь // Наставления и утешения святой веры христианской. 1905. Кн. 12. С. 1093.

[5] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 215. Κυρίλλῳ Ἱερομονάχῳ. L. 54–59 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⌜1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 272.

[6] Цит. по: Βαλάκου-Θεοδωρούδη Μ. Το νομικό περίγραμμα του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου στο πλαίσιο της διεθνούς κοινότητας. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2001. Σ. 195.

[7] “In 1813, the Ecumenical Patriarch Cyril of Constantinople elected a new Patriarch of Antioch. At the beginning of the corresponding letter there is an assertion of the special rights of the Great Church, that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople. See:: Κώδιξ Θ. 323 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 166–167.

[8] For example, in 1759 the Ecumenical Patriarch Seraphim II, with the consent of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, deposed the former Patriarch of Antioch Cyril. See: Κώδιξ A.M.66 411 // Germanos, Metropolitan. The Ecumenical Patriarchate. pp. 142–145. [Act of deposition]. In the act the derogatory expression “Evil Cyril” (Greek: “Κακο-Κύριλλος”) is used. The impious hierarchs are condemned by the “Holy Church and the Holy Synod”: in effect, the Patriarchate of Constantinople is identified with the entire Church.

[9] Κώδιξ A.M.49, σελ. 227 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 194–195. [Address to the Synod of the Russian Church]. The Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah III, together with Athanasius of Antioch and Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, sent a request to the Russian Synod (1723) to express, together with the Eastern Church, its opinion on the Anglican confession of faith.

[10] Κώδιξ A.M.49, σελ. 227 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 195. [Address to the Synod of the Russian Church]].

[11] This reverence of the East toward the grand-princely and tsarist Russia can be expressed in the words of St. Meletius Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria: “What, says [the Latin. — H. D.], has the Eastern Church lost its kingdom, O deceit! But, first, this did not happen today or yesterday; secondly, the Orthodox faith is also rich in kingdoms; for there is also the most powerful Orthodox Tsar of Muscovy, and your authority, most illustrious Prince Basil...” See: Meletius Pegas. Epistula 137. Τοῖς ἐν Μικρᾷ Ῥωσίᾳ. Il. 288–292 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.],

r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). p. 175.

And the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus noted that the Latin-minded Paisius Ligarides, after visiting “reigning Muscovy,” became a defender of the entire Eastern Church. See: Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 11, 11, 7 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Vol. 6. p. 83:9–11.

[12] Augustinus Hipponensis. Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum 4, 8, 20 // PL. 44. Col. 623:10–32. Leo I. De haeresi et historia Eutychiana 7, 1 // PL. 55. Col. 1145C:2–7.

[13] In the 12th century, the expression “Eastern Church” began to be regularly used by Western authors, often with a polemical attitude toward the Orthodox East. See, for example: Suger of Saint-Denis. Epistula LX. Ejusdem ad eumdem et viromandensem comitem // PL. 186. col. 1379D:4–8. English translation: “Let it be made known to you, we do not doubt, that the Eastern Church is being laid waste by daily persecutions from the Saracens and unbelievers…”

[14] In the description of the Union of Lyon and its consequences, reference is made to a division within the Eastern Church—those for and those against the union. See:: Vita sancti patriarchae Philothei 9 // Δεντάκης Β. Λ. Βίος καὶ ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοθέου (Κοκκίνου) πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1353–1354 καὶ 1364–1376) τοῦ θεολόγου. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1971. (Ἡσυχαστικαὶ καὶ Φιλοσοφικαὶ Μελέται 9). Σ. 70:2–8.

[15] Joannes Eugenicus. Antirrheticus adversus decretum Concilii Florentini 6 // Rossidou-Koutsou E. John Eugenikos’ Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Nicosia, 2006. P. 25:2–3.

[16] Joannes Eugenicus. Antirrheticus adversus decretum Concilii Florentini 29 // Rossidou-Koutsou E. John Eugenikos’ Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence. P. 136:13.

[17] См.: Gennadius Scholarius. Epistulae Georgii Scholarii (ante 1450) 5 // Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios / éd. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Siderides. Vol. 4. Paris, 1935. P. 414:32–35.

[18] См.: Gennadius Scholarius. De verbis patrum Latinorum de processu Spiritus Sancti // Jugie M., Petit L., Siderides X. A. Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios. Vol. 3. Paris, 1930. P. 63:13–18.

[19] For the sake of fairness, it should be noted that St. Meletius Pegas referred to the Eastern Church as the “Mother of Churches” — historically. See: Meletius Pegas. Epistula 241. Εἰς Σαυρομάτας. ll. 5–11 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], r1976.

(Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). p. 288.

The Eastern Church is the “Mother of all Churches” since the times of the Gospel. See: Meletius Pegas. Epistula 257. Τῷ Πανιερωτάτῳ Φιλαδελφείας κὺρ Γαβριήλ, ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτῳ, χάριν, ἔλεος παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ll. 445–450 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], r1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). p. 314.

[20] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 9. Μαξίμῳ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων. L. 201–202 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ʳ1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 33: «φρόνημα τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς οὐ Ἐκκλησίας, φρόνημα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Καθολικῆς…».

[21] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 10. Τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι ἀδελφοῖς καὶ συλλειτουργοῖς, τῷ τε Πανιερωτάτῳ Γαβριὴλ Φιλαδελφείας καὶ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων Μαξίμῳ τῷ Μαργουνίῳ χάριν, ἔλεος. L. 42–43 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ʳ1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 35.

[22] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 31. Ἰωβ Πατριάρχῃ Ῥωσίας, καὶ Μοσκόβου, καὶ τῶν ὑπερβορείων μερῶν. L. 34–37 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ʳ 1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 66.

[23] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 175. Τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ καὶ Ὀρθοδοξοτάτῳ ἄρχοντι Κνέζῃ Ἀδάμῳ Βασιλείου Βισκοβέτσικῃ, καὶ τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ Κνέζῃ Κυριακῷ Ῥουζίνσκῃ μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἀρχόντων, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, τῆς ἱερᾶς τάξεως, καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς καταστάσεως· υἱοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις, χάριν... L. 17–18 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ʳ1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 207.

[24] Cp.: Bernardus Claraevallensis. Epistula 221. Petri Venerabilis ad Bernardum abbatem 9 // PL. 182. Col. 403D:2–6. English translation: “We also are witnesses of our time. We see that the Roman Church and the entire Latin world offer to God the salvific sacrifice of unleavened bread; whereas the Greek Church and most of the East and the barbarian Christian peoples offer the sacrifice — as it is said about them — on leavened bread.”

[25] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 258. Κυριακῷ Φωτεινῷ ἰατρῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἐν Ἐγγοσταλδιανίῳ Ἀκαδημίᾳ λαμπροτάτῳ· χάριν, ἔλεος, καὶ εἰρήνην παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. L. 180–184 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ʳ1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 322.

[26] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 270. Τοῖς ἁπανταχοῦ Ὀρθοδόξοις καὶ εὐσεβέσι Χριστιανοῖς, τοῖς τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ καταλόγου καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς τάξεως, τοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις· χάριν, ἔλεος, καὶ εἰρήνην παρὰ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ. L. 31–34 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⌜1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 334.

[27] Meletius Pegas. Oratio ad Silvestrum patriarcham (edita a Dositheo patriacha) // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Τόμος Χαρᾶς / ἔκδ. Κ. Σιαμάκης. Θεσσαλονίκη, 1985. Σ. 544:8–13. English translation: "…Among Western Christians there is preserved neither the idea of the Church nor that of the Roman Church. And as for the Eastern Church, who would not be astonished, given such a diversity of peoples, languages, customs, and regions, at its distinctive features, when everything pertaining to the Church remains unchanged among all, and nothing of what belongs to the past is replaced by what follows?"

[28] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 10, 3 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 6. Σ. 263:3–9. English translation: "…but it is fitting in every way that those who seek the Catholic Church of the Orthodox in this world should resort to it and be united with it, and be nourished in its bosom; such is the Eastern Church, established like upon four pillars upon the patriarchal thrones, among which Constantinople occupies the highest place—not distinguished by pride, nor by arbitrariness, nor by worldly imaginings, but by the ancient order of ecclesiastical good order…"

[29] Georgius Trapezuntius. De processione spiritus sancti et de una, sancta, catholica Ecclesia // PG. 161. Col. 856:13–14.

[30] См.: Sylvester Syropulus. Historiae 2, 13 // Laurent V. Les «Mémoires» du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439). Paris, 1971. P. 114:5–6.Translation: "…in other words, that the Roman Church is the mother, and the Eastern Church is the daughter; and the daughter must remain with the mother."

[31] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 3, 9 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 2. Σ. 42:12–18. Translation: "…so that the Pope and all bishops subject to him, who are also called the Western Church, are supposedly referred to by the Holy Fathers as the head, whereas the Fathers in Constantinople, who are called the Eastern Church, are by them referred to as the body. From this it is clear that the Western Church is a many-headed hydra, for how can such be one head?"

[32] См.: Anastasius Gordius. Περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ Λατείνων 57:33–40. Translation: "…and moreover, he is called and named Antichrist, and enemy of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and anti-God, and rival of the holy apostles and fathers and of all the Ecumenical Holy Councils, persecutor of the Eastern Orthodox Church, betrayer and enemy of Christians in the East. All these traits the Pope has acquired

through his own deeds. Therefore he will become an heir of the lake of fire together with the ancient serpent, whom he has come to imitate in perfect apostasy and rebellion."

[33] Anastasius Gordius. Περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ Λατείνων 81:29–30. Translation: "…and on this basis we think and speak, and especially does the Eastern Catholic and Apostolic Church reflect on the Holy Spirit." The expression "Eastern Catholic Church" became established in the 18th century; see in the "Confession of Faith" by St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite: Nicodemus Hagiorita. Confessio fidei 1 // Paschos P. B. Ἐν ἀσκήσει καὶ μαρτυρίῳ. Athens, 1996. (Ὑμναγιολογικὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέτες 3). p. 107:11–12.

[34] Anastasius Gordius. Περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ Λατείνων 44:67–73.

[35] See, for example: Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου [1872]. p. 7. Russian translation: "The Great Church, in a spirit of meekness and with maternal love, endeavoured to persuade the leaders of the movement [i.e., the Bulgarian Exarchate — H. D.]."

[36] Ibid. p. 8. English translation: "The Great Church considered that upon it lay the greatest responsibility before the face of the whole Church."

[37] For more details on the privileges, see: Valakou-Theodoroudi M. The legal framework of the Ecumenical Patriarchate within the context of the international community. Thessaloniki, 2001. pp. 193–216.

[38] For more details on international treaties, see: Bartholomaios (Christos) Iatridis, Archimandrite. International treaty law and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. [Doctoral dissertation]. Komotini, 2019; Valakou-Theodoroudi M. The legal framework of the Ecumenical Patriarchate within the context of the international community. pp. 150–155.

[39] Anastasius Gordius. Περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ Λατείνων 46:56–61. Anastasius Gordius prayed: "...for a thousand years the Eastern Church has been in danger from the Antichrist Muhammad, and it appears that there is no hope of freedom for us in the present age. But may it be, O Lord, at least in the future, and may we not fail in either of the two, neither in the present nor in that which is to come (Ἀλλὰ γένοιτο, Κύριε, κἂν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, καὶ μὴν ἀστοχήσωμεν καὶ τῶν δύο, καὶ τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης)."

See also: Kariotoglou A. Islam and Christian divination. From myth to reality. Thessaloniki, 2000. p. 53: "I am astonished how the impious Turks, being such, were allowed by God to remain against us, who love and revere Him." Russian translation: "I am astonished how, when the Turks are impious, God has

turned away from us, who love and revere Him.”

[40] See.: Neophytus Ducas. Epistula 1495. Θεοδωρήτῳ. L.1–7 // Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς τινὰς ἐν διαφόροις περιστάσεσι ὑπὸ Νεοφύτου Δούκα εἰς τόμους δύο ὡς ἀκολουθία τῶν κατὰ τὸ 1839 προεκδεδομένων. Τ. 2. Ἀθῆναι, 1844. Σ. 175–176.

[41] See: Дионисий (Шленов), игум. Кто является главой Церкви? К вопросу о теории первенства // БВ. 2023. № 1 (48). С. 127–168.

[42] Origenes. Expositio in Proverbia (fragmenta e catenis) // PG. 17. Col. 201:17–23.

[43] See: Origenes. Expositio in Proverbia (fragmenta e catenis) // PG. 17. Col. 201:23–28.

[44] This theological imagery was also used in late Byzantine theology. See: Petrus Argivus. Encomium ad sanctos Anargyros Cosmam et Damianum 3:90–94 // Κυριακόπουλος Κ. Τ. Ἁγίου Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου Ἄργους βίος καὶ λόγοι. Ἀθῆναι, 1976. Σ. 86.. Eng. transl.: “The God of all is the First and true Father, and the Church is Mother; the righteous who have pleased God from eternity—patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and all who have lived piously and blamelessly—are fellow citizens, friends, and co-workers, brothers, friends, and relatives…”

[45] As in the Byzantine literary monument Physiologus, in the chapter “On the Viper,” it is said that “[the Jews] … killed the father, that is, Christ, and killed the mother, that is, the Church.” This saying, especially its second part, can be understood as referring to the persecutions of the early Christian community. See: Physiologus (redactio secunda quae vocatur Byzantina) 22:11–13 // Physiologus / ed. F. Sbordone. Rome, 1936 [Hildesheim, reprint 1976]. p. 236: “καθὼς καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πατρολῷοι καὶ μητρολῷοι ἐγένοντο· ἀπέκτειναν τὸν πατέρα, τουτέστι τὸν Χριστόν, ἀπέκτειναν τὴν μητέρα, τουτέστι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.”

[46] Vita et miracula sanctorum Cyri et Joannis (BHG 469) // PG. 87.3. Col. 3677:22–25.

[47] Eusebius. Commentaria in Psalmos // PG. 23. Col. 401:39–43.

[48] Gregorius Nazianzenus. Epistula 44. Εὐσεβίῳ Σαμοσάτων 4:1 // Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres / éd. P. Gallay. Vol. 1. Paris, 1964. P. 57. См. также: Gregorius Nazianzenus. Epistula 50. Τῷ Αὐτῷ [Βασιλείῳ] 5:1–4 // Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres / éd. P. Gallay. Vol. 1. Paris, 1964. P. 65.

[49] Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 227. Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Κολωνίᾳ κληρικούς 1:25–26 // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 3. Paris, 1966. P. 30.

[50] Gregorius Nazianzenus. Funebris oratio in laudem Basilii Magni Caesareae in Cappadocia episcopi (orat. 43) 31, 5:1–4 // Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée / éd. F. Boulenger. Paris, 1908. P. 126.

[51] Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 41. Βασίλειος πρὸς Ἰουλιανόν 1:8–14 // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 1. Paris, 1957. P. 96–97.

[52] Basilius Caesariensis. Epistula 169. Γρηγορίῳ Βασίλειος 1:45–46 // Saint Basile. Lettres / éd. Y. Courtonne. Vol. 2. Paris, 1961. P. 105.

[53] Basilius Caesariensis. Quod rebus mundanis adhaerendum non sit // PG. 31. Col. 556:38–43.

[54] Joannes Chrysostomus. Ad populum Antiochenum (homiliae 1–21) 6, 1 // PG. 49. Col. 81:41–46.

[55] Joannes Chrysostomus. Ad illuminandos catecheses 1–2 (series prima et secunda) 1, 1 // PG. 49. Col. 224:14–19.

[56] See also: Joannes Chrysostomus. De baptismo Christi // PG. 49. Col. 363:40 — 364:2.

[57] Joannes Chrysostomus. De sancto hieromartyre Phoca // PG. 50. Col. 702:49–52.

[58] Joannes Chrysostomus. Non esse desperandum // PG. 51. Col. 368:17–21.

[59] Joannes Chrysostomus. Expositiones in Psalmos // PG. 55. Col. 304:11–18.

[60] Joannes Chrysostomus. In Matthaeum (homiliae 1–90) 3, 4 // PG. 57. Col. 36:10–14.

[61] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Commentarius in xii prophetas minores // Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in xii prophetas / ed. P. E. Pusey. Vol. 2. Oxford, 1868. [Brussels, ⌜1965]. Vol. 2. P. 327:8–11.

[62] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate // PG. 68. Col. 817:18–23.

[63] Cyrillus Alexandrenus.Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam // PG. 70. Col. 1337:51–54.

[64] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Glaphyra in Pentateuchum // PG. 69. Col. 221:30–33.

[65] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Glaphyra in Pentateuchum // PG. 69. Col. 324:27–31.

[66] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Expositio in Psalmos // PG. 69. Col. 1128:3–4.

[67] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Expositio in Psalmos // PG. 69. Col. 1208:53 — 1209:2.

[68] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam // PG. 70. Col. 1196:14–19.

[69] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam // PG. 70. Col. 1212:35–39.

[70] Cyrillus Alexandrenus. Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam // PG. 70. Col. 1396:13–20.

[71] Phipo Carpasianus. Enarratio in canticum canticorum // PG. 40. Col. 105:47 — 108:2.

[72] The Emperor Theodore Laskaris referred to the Patriarchate of Constantinople as “the divine Mother Church of Christ,” without implying any opposition to other Churches in this designation. See: Theodorus Lascaris. Epistula 90. Ad Manuelem patriarcham I:1–6 // Theodori Ducae Lascaris Epistulae CCXVII / ed. N. Festa. Florence: Istituto di studi superiori pratici e di perfezionamento, 1898. (Pubblicazioni del R. Istituto di studi superiori pratici e di perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di filosofia e lettere; 29). p. 117.

[73] Euthymius Zigabenus. Commentarius in Psalterium // PG. 128. Col. 600:15–18.

[74] Euthymius Zigabenus. Commentarius in Pauli epistulam ad Galatas 4, 24:9–14 // Euthymii Zigabeni Commentarius in XIV Epistolas Sancti Pauli et VII catholicas / ed. N. Kalogeras. Vol. 1. Athens, 1887. P. 540–541.

[75] See: Theophylactus. Enarrationes in evangelia 2 // PG. 123. Col. 597:29–34.

[76] Eustaphius Thessalonicensis. Exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem 1, 131:1–5 // Eustathii Thessalonicensis exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem / ed. P. Cesaretti, S. Ronchey. Göttingen, 2014. (Supplementa Byzantina; 10). P. 147.

[77] Gregorius Palamas. Homilia 8. Περὶ πιστέως. Ἐν ᾗ καὶ τῆς κατ᾽ εὐσέβειαν ὁμολογίας ἔκθεσις 6:1–5 // Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα / ἔκδ. Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Τ. 9. Θεσσαλονίκη, 1985. (Ἕλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας 72). Σ. 218.

[78] Philotheus Coccinus. Confessio fidei. L. 4421–444 // Arambatzes C. Ἡ Ὁμολογία πίστης τοῦ

Πατριάρχη Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Φιλοθέου Κοκκίνου // Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Νέα Σειρά. 2000. Τ. 10. Σ. 23–41.

[79] Gennadius Scholarius. De verbis patrum Latinorum de processu Spiritus Sancti // Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios / éd. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Siderides. Vol. 3. Paris, 1930. P. 63:13–18.

[80] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 6. Μαξίμῳ τῷ Θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυθήρων. L. 35–38 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 24.

[81] См.: Meletius Pegas. Epistula 31. Ἰωὴβ Πατριάρχῃ Ῥωσίας, καὶ Μοσκόβου, καὶ τῶν ὑπερβορείων μερῶν. L. 34–37 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 66; Meletius Pegas. Epistula 316. Τοῖς μεγαλοπρεπεστάτοις Ἄρχουσιν, Ἀνδρέᾳ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Ζακοροβάσκιε τοῖς ὀρθοδοξοτάτοις, καὶ ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτοις υἱέσι. L. 13–17 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 364.

[82] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 241. Εἰς Σαυρομάτας. L. 6–9 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 288.

[83] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 257. Τῷ Πανιερωτάτῳ Φιλαδελφείας κὺρ Γαβριήλ, ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποθήτῳ, χάριν, ἔλεος παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. L. 445–451 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 314.

[84] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 272. Τοῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Γαληνοτάτην Ἀρχὴν τῶν Ὑψηλοτάτων Πολωνῶν εὑρισκομένοις Ὀρθοδόξοις Χριστιανοῖς τοῖς τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ καταλόγου καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς τάξεως, ἄρχουσί τε μεγαλοπρεπεστάτοις καὶ ἀρχομένοις, καὶ ἁπαξάπαντι τῷ χριστωνύμῳ πληρώματι, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ περιποθήτοις, χάριν, ἔλεος... L. 20–25 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 335.

[85] Meletius Pegas. Oratio ad Silvestrum patriarcham (edita a Dositheo patriacha) // Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων Τόμος Χαρᾶς. Σ. 462:2–6.

[86] Ibid. Σ. 542:31–34.

[87] Meletius Pegas. Epistula 62. Ἱερεμίᾳ τῷ Οἰκουμενικῷ. L. 5–7 // Methodios. Letters of Meletius Pegas, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria. [S. l.], ⸢1976. (Ekklesiastikos Pharos; 52–57). P. 87.

[88] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 4, 11 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 2. Σ. 480:1–4.

[89] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 7, 9 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 4. Σ. 19:9–12.

[90] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 7, 9 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 4. Σ. 22:18–21.

[91] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 7, 9 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 4. Σ. 25:3–8.

[92] Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 10, 2, 6 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 5. Σ. 259–260.

[93] Nicodemus Hagiorita. De Carthaginensi concilio locali (Concilium 11). Canon 66:14–15 // Ἀγαπίου ἱερομονάχου και Νικοδήμου μοναχοῦ Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησίας / ἔκδ. ἀρχιμ. Δορόθεος. Ἀθήνα, [12]1998. Σ. 495.

[94] Nicodemus Hagiorita. De Carthaginensi concilio locali (Concilium 11). Canon 66:18–20 // Ἀγαπίου ἱερομονάχου και Νικοδήμου μοναχοῦ Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησίας Σ. 495: «…τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς καθολικῆς μητρός…»

[95] See: Registrum patriarchatus Constantinopolitani (1315–1331) Doc. 4:11–12 // CFHB SV. 19/1. S. 128. Cp.: Ibid. 4:19–20.

[96] See: Josephus Bryennius. Epistulae 30. Διάταξις Ἰωσὴφ μοναχοῦ Βρυεννίου (1421). L. 13–31 // Τομαδάκης Ν. Ἐκ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἐπιστολογραφίας. Ἰωσὴφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου Ἐπιστολαὶ Λ′ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν Γ′ // Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν. 1983–1986. Τ. 46. Σ. 283–362.

[97] [Doropheus Monembasiae]. Liber historicus (versio altera) (e cod. Mich. Ann Arbor. 215) L. 228–232 // Ζαχαριάδου Ἐ. Ἀ. Ἡ πατριαρχεία τοῦ Διονυσίου Β′ σὲ μία παραλλαγὴ τοῦ Ψευδο-Δωροθέου // Θησαυρίσματα. 1962. Τ. 1. Σ. 144–155.

[98] Callinicus III Patriarcha. Narratio brevis 3, 21:2961–2964 // Καλλινίκου γ′ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Τὰ κατὰ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐξορίαν ἐπισυμβάντα καὶ ἔμμετροι ἐπιστολαί / ἔκδ. Ἀ. Τσελίκας. Ἀθήνα, 2004. Σ. 79–269, 271–429.

[99] Nicodemus Hagiorita. Confessio fidei 3 // Paschos P. B. Ἐν ἀσκήσει καὶ μαρτυρίῳ. Ἀθήνα, 1996. (Ὑμναγιολογικὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέτες 3). Σ. 142:3–16.

[100] Gregorius V Patriarcha. Epistulae Synodales Doc. 1:1–42 // Ἀλεκσούδης Ἀ. Δύο ἐγκύκλια ἔγγραφα Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ε′ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως //Δελτίον Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας. 1892 Τ. 4. Σ. 269–275.

[101] Neophytus Ducas. Epistulae (a. 1839–1844). Epistula 1196. Θεοδωρήτνῳ. L.1–8 // Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς τινὰς ἐν διαφόροις περιστάσεσι ὑπὸ Νεοφύτου Δούκα εἰς τόμους δύο ὡς ἀκολουθία τῶν κατὰ τὸ 1839 προεκδεδομένων. Τ. 1. Ἀθῆναι, 1844. Σ. 147–148.

[102] Joannes Macrygiannes. Acta et epistulae. Doc. 302:7–10 // Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ἰωάννου Μακρυγιάννη / ἔκδ. J. Vlachogiannis. Vol. I. Athens, 1907. (Ἀρχεῖα τῆς Νεωτέρας Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας 2). Σ. 1–469.

[103] Κώδιξ ΚΒ. 404 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 179–180.

[104] Ibid. Σ. 179.

[105] Ἔγγραφα πατριαρχικὰ καὶ συνοδικὰ περὶ τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ ζητήματος (1852–1873) / ἔκδ. Μ. Ἰ. Γεδεών. Κωνσταντινούπολις, 1908. Σ. 42.

[106] Ibid. Σ. 187.

[107] Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου [1872]. Σ. 60. Translation: “...the Mother Church, knowing the former piety...”

[108] See: Ανδρέας (Νανάκης), αρχιμ. Εκκλησία εθνάρχουσα και εθνική. Μέσα από τη σύναξη των πρεσβυτέρων και τον ιερό σύνδεσμο της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος (1870–1922). Θεσσαλονίκη, ^{2} 2007. Σ. 11, 32–33.

[109] See, for instance: Παπαθωμᾶς Γ. Δ., ἀρχιμ. Κανονικὰ ἔμμορφα (Δοκίμια κανονικῆς οἰκονομίας, II). Κατερίνη, 2015. (Νομοκανονικὴ βιβλιοθήκη 29).

[110] Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλης Συνόδου [1872]. Σ. 60, 44.

[111] Ibid. Σ. 44.

[112] Οικουμενικός πατριάρχης: η μήτηρ Εκκλησία όχι μόνο δικαιούται αλλά υποχρεούται να θεραπεύει το σχίσμα στη Ουκρανία (25 Σεπτεμβρίου 2018). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2018/09/25/blog-post_25-33/**

[113] See: Κώδιξ ΛΓ. 244 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 173–177.

[114] Κώδιξ Θ. 323 // Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 166–167.

[115] See, for instance: Maximus Confessor. Ambigua ad Joannem 10, 100:18–31 // On Difficulties in the Church Fathers: The Ambigua / ed. N. Constas. Vol. 1. Cambridge (Mass.), 2014. (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library). P. 310.

[116] See: Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 188. Со ссылкой на: Ὀρθοδοξία. 1930. № 5. Σ. 198. Translation: "...The Church of Constantinople, as the presiding Church, will convene them so that all together they may reach a decision on major ecclesiastical issues which have occupied worldwide Orthodoxy for such a long time."

[117] See: Anastasius Sinaïta. Viae dux 8, 1:3–6 // CCSG. 8. P. 114.

[118] See: Collatio quarta. Novellae constitutiones annorum 1057–1204. Novella 56, 1. L. 29–50 // Jus Graecoromanum. 1. S. 376–377.

[119] See: Dositheus. Historia patriarcharum Hierosolymitanorum 5, 2 // Δωδεκάβιβλος Δοσιθέου. Τ. 3. Σ. 178:30 — 179:12.

[120] More in detail: Троицкий С. В. О границах распространения права власти Константинопольской Патриархии на «диаспору» // ЖМП. 1947. № 11. С. 34–45.

[121] Γερμανος, μητρ. Το Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχείον. Σ. 31.

[122] See: Дионисий (Шленов), игум. Выражение «ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς…» 28-го правила Халкидона и его интерпретации // Мировое Православие: первенство и соборность в свете православного вероучения. Материалы международной конференции Синодальной библейско-богословской комиссии Русской Православной Церкви. Москва, 16–17 сентября 2021 года / под ред. митр. Илариона (Алфеева). Москва, 2023. Р. 136–181.

[123] «…διότι εὐλογεῖ ἡ Μήτηρ Ἐκκλησία τά ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς τιμηθέντα διακεκριμένα τέκνα της…» См.:

Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: «Δεν μας συγκινούν νέαι εκκλησιολογίαι» (18 Μαΐου 2023). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/05/18/ecum-patr-den-mas-sygkinoun-oi-nees-ekklisiologies/**

[124] Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης: Παραμένομεν, επιμένομεν και υπομένομεν (11 Ιουνίου 2023). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/06/11/ta-onomastiria-tou-ecum-patr-11-june-2023/**

[125] Ομιλία Μητροπολίτου Σαράντα Εκκλησιών Ανδρέου κατά την Κυριακή της Σαμαρείτιδος (18 Μαΐου 2023). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2023/05/18/omilia-mitropolitou-40ekklisiwn-andreou-tin-kyriaki-sama...**

[126] Also present at the meeting were Archbishop Makarios of Australia and his auxiliary bishops.

[127] Ο Πατριάρχης δέχθηκε τον Αρχιεπίσκοπο Αυστραλίας Μακάριο (2/06/2020). URL: **http://fanarion.blogspot.com/2020/02/blog-post_6.html**

[128] Bartholomew: We Proclaim in Every Direction that Constantinople is the Genuine, The Only Mother Church. (Dec 11, 2023). URL: **https://orthodoxtimes.com/ecumenical-patriarch-we-proclaim-in-every-direction-that-constantinople-is...**

[129] For example, Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand (1073) wrote: “Be it known to you and to all who honor Christ that the Roman Church is [our] common mother [for] all Christians.” See: Gregorius VII. Registrum (1085): Epistola XXIX. Ad Judices Sardiniae (a. 1073) // PL. 148. Col. 312A:1–2.

For comparison, St. Benedict of Nursia referred to the entire universal Church, and not just a part of it, as “mother.” Benedictus Nursiae. Regula cum commentariis (547): Commentarius // PL. 66. Col. 468A:7–12.

[130] See, for example: Ecumenical Patriarch: The Mother Church not only has the right but is obliged to heal the schism in Ukraine (25 September 2018). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2018/09/25/blog-post_25-33/**.

See also the speech of Patriarch Bartholomew addressed to the Ukrainian people in 2008: Speech of His All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew to the Ukrainian people (26 July 2008). URL: **https://fosfanariou.gr/index.php/2018/09/25/blog-post_25-33/**.

Source: https://mospat.ru/en/authors-analytics/91555/