

On the Status of Uncondemned Heretics*

INTRODUCTORY THOUGHTS

The present paper deals in brief with two fundamental deviations in ecclesiology, and was originally written in May 1997, in a more extensive form, which was intended to address other subjects as well.

The ensuing ecclesiological views, as summary expressions of our Church's ecclesiological self-understanding, are the natural outgrowth of this earlier article, "The 'Lawful' Character of the Sacred Struggle Against Ecumenism" (and its first and second theses, especially), and are presented for the following two primary reasons:

1) They constitute a well-intentioned effort, by way of a thorough clarification of their ecclesiological identity, at a balanced contribution to the intra-Orthodox dialogue among the [various groups of] Old Calendarist anti-ecumenists, with the goal of reconciliation, unity, and the recovery of their substantially compromised synodal authority.

2) They aid in an understanding of our own Church's critical stand towards the grievous fragmentation within the Old Calendar movement and the yet more grievous in-fighting between the ever-multiplying factions of bishops, which is essentially the result of the incorrect and incoherent ecclesiological grounding of the anti-ecumenist struggle, with all of the tragic consequences on the theological, pastoral, and spiritual level.

In particular, let us draw the attention of the Faithful to the fact that they will see, here, no hyperbole in the minute, precise, and detailed explanation that we have undertaken of the extremely thorny issue of the ecclesiological identity of heretics who have not yet been brought to trial.

In questions of such seriousness, all superficialities, simplifications, and unfounded opinions have an adverse effect on the basic characteristics of Patristic theology, since—"not content with the teachings and precepts of the Divine Fathers"—such opinions come to constitute "warfare against the Fathers" and "warfare against God," according to St. Theodore the Studite.¹

Far from any such inadmissible generalizations and simplifications, and in a typically painstaking and, at times, somewhat detailed way, St. Basil the Great, for example, dealt with the distinction between heretics, schismatics, and unlawful congregations;² the Second and Sixth Holy Œcumenical Synods dealt with the variety of ways of receiving those outside the Church;³ the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod dealt with the possibility of the incorporation, in general, of

formerly heretical clergy into the Orthodox clergy;⁴ and St. Theodore the Studite dealt with all of the foregoing questions together; indeed, he admonished his disciple Arsenios, who had a penchant for uninformed generalizations.⁵

There has always been a temptation in the Church to resort to generalities and to the over-simplification of theological issues, which has led to extreme views and positions, and which derived chiefly from those who were unpardonably ignorant of how the Holy Fathers “handled particular circumstances, and [of] what their goals were,” as St. Tarasios says,⁶ and, in this ignorance of theirs, “have not yet read the words of the Fathers, and if they have read them, have done so cursorily, not circumspectly,” to quote from the pronouncements of the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod.⁷

Notes

1. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, cols. 1064D and 1484D.
2. First Canon.
3. Seventh Canon of the Second Synod and the Ninety-Fifth Canon of the Sixth Synod.
4. Mansi, Vol. XII, cols. 1015E-1050E; *Πρακτικὰ τῶν Ἁγίων καὶ Οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων* [Proceedings of the Holy Œcumenical Synods], ed. Spyridon Melias (Holy Mountain: Kalyve of the Venerable Forerunner Publications, 1981), Vol. II, pp. 731b-741a (First Session).
5. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1052D.
6. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1050C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 741a.
7. Mansi, Vol. XIII, col. 248C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 843a.

THESIS I

“It has been argued that the ecumenists, and, more generally, the ecumenist Churches, have already fallen away from the Body of the Church entirely, that is, they are branches that are automatically cut off from the Vine, and this, indeed, can be demonstrated from the fact that we do not have Mysteriological (Sacramental) communion with them.”

RESPONSE

A. Basic principles

1. Those who commune with heretics: the Synodal proclamation

a. First and foremost, it is not correct, or even just, that a local Church should be characterized and regarded as ecumenist *in toto*, simply because a number of Her clergy—and sometimes a small number, at that—are actually ecumenists: *they* are certainly not to be equated with the local Church.

b. The local Orthodox Churches today are fundamentally anti-ec-

umenist; the inertia of the silent majority does not in any way imply agreement with, or endorsement of, ecumenist activities and teachings.

c. It should not be forgotten that no local Church has proclaimed *synodally* that the primary dogma of the ecclesiological heresy of ecumenism is a teaching of the Orthodox Church that must be believed and that is necessary for salvation; and neither has this ever been proclaimed in a pan-Orthodox manner.

d. The aforementioned views, concerning the need to avoid indiscriminate generalizations, if one is to have a reliable understanding of the true ecclesiological identity of our ecumenist brothers who are caught up in innovation and heresy, but have not yet been brought to trial, are grounded in the Fathers and are strongly upheld by St. Theodore the Studite, as follows:

- St. Theodore, in his detailed analysis of the extremely intricate question of “whether one should receive communion from the Presbyter of a Bishop who is himself Orthodox,”¹ but out of fear “commemorates his own Metropolitan” [see note 1], who is a heretic, ultimately makes the following declaration: “If the Metropolitan falls into heresy, it is not the case that all of those who are in direct or indirect communion with him are regarded automatically and without distinction as heretics,” despite, of course, the fact that by this stand of theirs “they bring upon themselves the fearful charge of remaining silent.”²

- In explaining subsequently, and at length, that Moechianism [the specific ill to which he addresses himself] is “a most grievous heresy,” he invokes as his main argument the fact that this dogma was proclaimed synodally and was confirmed by an anathema: the Moechians “proclaimed [their transgressions] synodally,” “taught their transgressions synodally as dogma,” “and placed those who opposed their dogma under anathema....”³

2. *The twofold character of the Church*

a. Next, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the following basic ecclesiological principle: the Theanthropic body of the Church, since it possesses a Theandric structure, is, on the one hand, a community (a spiritual relationship according to Grace and the communion of the Faithful with each other and with the Holy Trinity—we are united with the Father in the Holy Spirit through the Savior), and, on the other hand, and at the same time, an institution (an historical and concrete organization, the visible Body of Christ), corresponding to the unconfused and indivisible union of the Divine and human natures in the one Person and the one Hypostasis of our Savior Jesus Christ.

b. The inward and invisible reality of the Divinely-preserved Church, defined as a communion transcending nature and comprehension, is founded as much on Her Divine Head, Christ, as on Her

Divine Soul, the Holy Spirit.

- “We have communion one with another”; “and our communion is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ”;⁴ “the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.”⁵

- Christ “is the Head of the Body, the Church”;⁶ He constitutes the corner stone,⁷ the foundation,⁸ and the center that holds the entire organism together.⁹

- In the Divine Edifice of the Church, according to St. John Chrysostomos, “it is Christ Who binds the whole together”; “Whether you speak of the roof, or of the walls, or of any other part whatsoever, He it is Who supports the whole.”¹⁰

- The Holy Spirit dwells in the Body of Christ and constitutes its life-giving, sanctifying, and unifying, or cohesive, principle: “What the soul is in the human body,” says St. Augustine, “the Holy Spirit is in the whole Church,”¹¹ and for this reason, according to the Divine Chrysostomos, “we are always able to celebrate Pentecost.”¹²

- Finally, the “New Life” of Grace “is bestowed” on the members of the Church, according to St. Basil the Great, “by God (the Father), through Christ, in the Holy Spirit,”¹³ and because of this, in the Church, “the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit alike hallow, quicken, enlighten, comfort, and do all such things.”¹⁴

c. The outward, empirical, and visible character of the earthly Theandric community of the Church is underscored primarily by Her preëminently historical dimension, according to which the eschatological “People of God,” the new and true “Israel of God,”¹⁵ are on a path towards the “Eighth Day,” “the unceasing day which knows no evening and no successor, that age which does not end or grow old,”¹⁶ and secondarily by the variety of Her images and names, which, incidentally, offer only a descriptive and symbolic definition of this organism of Divine Grace (“metaphorically,” “as in an image” [St. John Chrysostomos]¹⁷).

- “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people,” “which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God, which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.”¹⁸

- The Holy Prophets, the Lord, and the Divine Apostles compared the Church to and described Her as a “glorious Mountain of the Lord” and a “House of God,”¹⁹ a “Kingdom,”²⁰ a “Flock,”²¹ a “Building,”²² a “Vineyard,”²³ a “Vine,”²⁴ a “Temple,”²⁵ a “City,”²⁶ a “Tower,”²⁷ a “Tabernacle,”²⁸ “Husbandry,”²⁹ an “Ark,”³⁰ a “House,”³¹ and, indeed, the Divine Paul saw Her chiefly as a “Body,”³² that is, a living organism.

d. Consequently, and on the basis of the foregoing very condensed remarks, a member of the Church (whether as a person or as a community) has, at the same time, a twofold relationship to Her: he com-

munes with the Holy Trinity (the “Communion of Deification” [St. Gregory Palamas]³³) and he belongs liturgically to the organized, earthly body of Christians, as a “member” of the Body (Apostle Paul³⁴).

B. Practical Consequences

1. Exclusion from communion

a. The members of the Body can be ailing, that is, they can be in error regarding the Orthodox Faith, and in this way their spiritual communion with the God-Man can be ruptured; in spite of this, even as ailing members, they are not dead; they continue to belong institutionally to the Body, which is precisely what happens with a healthy human body, in which there can also exist unhealthy cells, or with a tree in bloom, which may also have sickly branches.

- St. Gregory of Sinai gives us a very vivid description of this twofold condition of the ailing member: the Spirit of Christ “prevails” in His Body, even over the members that are “ailing and [cannot] partake of [life],” which, because of “unbelief,” have become “inactive,” “unenlightened,” “sluggish,” and “incapable of participating in the Grace of Christ.”³⁵

- The word of the Lord to Nicodemus, “he that believeth not is condemned already,”³⁶ contributes substantially to a deeper understanding of this truth: he who teaches false doctrine “is condemned already” (“for to be outside of the light, this alone is a very great punishment”³⁷ [a rupture in spiritual communion]), but his full (and institutional) condemnation will be registered in the future, because “everyone who sins is immediately condemned by the nature of the sin; but subsequently by the verdict of the magistrate.”³⁸

- The distinction between healthy and ailing, “good wheat” and tares, good and rotten fish, which can co-exist and “grow together” in the same “field” and the same “net” of the Church, is strikingly emphasized in the relevant parables of the Lord;³⁹ the healthy and ailing will be separated decisively either through a “synodal decision” by the Church,⁴⁰ or at the time of “the harvest,” i.e., “at the end of the world,” by the Lord.⁴¹

2. Exclusion from the Body

a. The mortification of ailing members, through their decisive alienation from the Body, occurs in two ways:

b. *Through schism.* In this case, those who are in error regarding the Orthodox Faith, who are “alienated in matters concerning the Faith itself,” according to St. Basil,⁴² sever, by themselves, their institutional connection with the healthy Body of the Church.

- As this Revealer of heavenly things (*Οὐρανοφάντωρ*) says, in “apostatizing”⁴³ and “withdrawing from the Church”⁴⁴ “through schism” [see note 43], such individuals are, and should be considered

to be, decisively and “entirely cut off” [see note 42], since, indeed, they organize themselves, in unlawful congregations, into their own separate community, as was done, for example, by the extreme faction of the Arians, the Anomœans, who were for this reason characterized by the same Saint as “manifestly broken off from the body of the Church.”⁴⁵

- In line with this, schismatics and heretics are considered literally and in actuality to be “those who have estranged themselves from the Church,”⁴⁶ who cease any longer even to be ailing members of the Church, since, prior to their synodal judgment, “they have broken away from the body of the Church,”⁴⁷ according to the canonists Aristenos and Zonaras.

- Those who have in this way been “broken off” [see note 44] and split off from the institutional unity of the Body are moribund “immediately”⁴⁸ and certainly do not have saving Mysteries, according to St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite.

c. *Through a synodal verdict.* Ailing, but not “broken-off,” members are subject to synodal judgment; this judgment is necessary and the competent ecclesiastical bodies are ordered to implement it, as, moreover, the Holy Apostle Paul exhorts the Corinthians, that one who has sinned terribly “might be taken away from among you” (thrown out of the Church, “cut off” [St. Theophylact]⁴⁹), assembling, according to Theodoret of Kyros, “a tribunal full of fear; for he first gathered everyone in the name of the Lord, and then presented himself through the Grace of the Spirit, showing the Master Himself to be the presider”;⁵⁰ “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan...”⁵¹

- In this way, for example, the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod, in its *Ὁροϛ*, decrees the following: “We order that those who dare to think or teach differently, or, in accordance with the abominable heretics, to overthrow the Traditions of the Church and devise some innovation..., if they are Bishops or clergy, should be deposed, and if monastics or laymen, should be excommunicated.”⁵²

- It is obvious that if such individuals were reckoned to be *automatically* cut off from the healthy Body and mortified, there would be no need for deposition or excommunication, since the Church does not judge those outside of Herself:⁵³ “I have no concern with those outside, says (St. Paul)”; “therefore, it is superfluous to apply the ordinances of God to those outside Christ’s fold; for whatever the law says, it says to those under the law,” as St. Theophylact says.⁵⁴

- It is significant, furthermore, that the Second Holy Œcumenical Synod makes the following clarification: “By heretics we mean [on the one hand] those who have previously been excised from the Church, and [on the other hand] those who have recently been anath-

ematized by us,”⁵⁵ which certainly indicates that the excision of earlier heretics and the anathematization of recent ones requires a synodal verdict.

- Likewise, St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite makes the telling comment that those liable to deposition or excommunication are “subject, on earth, to deposition and excommunication or anathematization, and, in the hereafter, to Divine retribution,” because “unless it is actually put into effect by a Synod (‘of living [that is, *presiding*] Bishops’), the imperative force of Canons [and of the *ᾠδος* of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod] remains unexecuted and does not act of itself, either immediately or before a decision.”⁵⁶

- It should be noted that the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod, after condemning the Iconoclasts, declared the following: “And we cast the inventors of the innovating babble far away from the precincts of the Church”;⁵⁷ that is, their “rejection” was carried out properly by the Holy Synod in the wake of a decisive judgment and, indeed, after sixty entire years had elapsed since the manifestation of the heresy.

- The same Holy Synod, referring, in its *ᾠδος*, to the Third Holy Œcumenical Synod, affirms that “the Synod in Ephesus” “expelled the impious Nestorios and his followers from the Church,”⁵⁸ which clearly demonstrates that the exclusion of a heretic is not accomplished automatically, but constitutes an act of “expulsion” (a driving out, a forcible casting out), requiring a competent body, that is, a Synod.

- Indeed, in this *ᾠδος* of the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod there is a similar reference to the Fourth Œcumenical Synod, and in this way the uniformity of the Synodal tradition is borne out: the Synod in Chalcedon proclaimed the two perfect natures of the Savior, “driving out of the divine fold” the “blasphemers Eutyches and Dioscoros.”⁵⁹

- Finally, the holy Patriarch Nicephoros of Constantinople, writing to Pope Leo III of Rome, informs him that “we [the Fathers of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod] have cast out of the Church” the Iconoclast Bishops “who occupied their Episcopal thrones in defiance of God,”⁶⁰ which underscores very sharply, on the one hand, the ecclesiological content of the act of “casting out” by a competent Synod, and, on the other hand, the fact that, until the institutional “casting out” and “expulsion” from the Church of the Hierarchs who taught false doctrine, such Hierarchs were regarded as “occupying Episcopal thrones.”

- Needless to say, we recall the very severe admonition of our Savior, according to which if the ailing member of the Christian community should “neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican”:⁶¹ that is, not *automatically* or at the

same time as the transgression is committed, *but after a specific procedure has been followed*; transgression is denounced by “the Church,” that is, “the Leaders of the Church.”⁶² She looks into each case judicially through a competent body, in line with the authority given to Her;⁶³ in the event that someone persists unrepentant, then—according to Zigabenos—“let him be deprived of communion with you, as one incurable.”⁶⁴

- In particular, we note that the Lord, through the provision of such authority (“ye shall bind” and “ye shall loose” are in the plural [see note 63]) to the Holy Apostles and their successors, the Hierarchs, assembling in a synodal tribunal, on the one hand excluded once and for all partial, arbitrary opinions and individual verdicts of guilt in the Church, exhorting the healthy member only to “tell it unto the Church” [see note 61], and on the other hand confirmed the full, exclusive, and sovereign spiritual jurisdiction of the synodal body, saying, in essence, the following, according to Zigabenos: “Whatever you decide on earth, God will validate it in Heaven, whether you cut those who are incurable off from the Church or later receive back those who repent.”⁶⁵

d. Additionally, if the “diseased” but not “excised” part of the Church is out of communion with the “healthy part” (the distinction between “diseased” and “healthy” is made by St. Basil the Great and St. Theodore the Studite⁶⁶), which should certainly be “walled off” from the former, this does not at all entail that the “diseased” part has already fallen away from the Body, because in that case it would not be characterized as “diseased,” but as “mortified”; mortification, however, will come about through a “synodal decision,”⁶⁷ that is, a “final decision.”⁶⁸

- Moreover, the need for a decisive judgment and “excision” of unfruitful branches (St. Cyril of Alexandria writes: “awaiting the suitable time for excisions”⁶⁹) is suggested very clearly by the relevant Parable: the Father, as “husbandman,” at a definite moment and after a due process of inquiry, “taketh away every branch that beareth not fruit” and “casteth it out.”⁷⁰

- The holy hymnographer of the First Holy Œcumenical Synod defines very clearly the meaning of “disease”—and indeed of the “incurable” disease—in the image of the act of “expelling” heretics from the Body: “The divine shepherds” “cast out” “the prowling and destructive wolves,” “driving far off with the sling of the Spirit those who had incurred a fall that leadeth unto death and were afflicted with an illness that could not be cured.”⁷¹

- It should be noted that the natural ramification of the ecclesiological distinction between “healthy” and “diseased” members is that it introduces, without forcing the issue, the notion of schismatics and heretics of a “potential” and “actual” (i.e., “under judgment” or “al-

ready judged”), and constitutes the best interpretation of the self-understanding of the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod, which, on the one hand, made it clear that the Church was at that time “at variance,” “in division,” “in discord,” and “at odds,”^{71a} while the Synod had convened “for the union and harmony of the Church,”⁷² “for the union of the Holy Catholic Church of God,”⁷³ “that what was sundered might be united,”⁷⁴ and was praying that the peace of God “might unite what was separated and heal the chronic wound,”⁷⁵ and on the other hand, glorified “God Who had united what had been estranged.”⁷⁶

- If the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod had believed in the *automatic* exclusion of heretics, it would never have stated, through St. Tarasios, that it regarded the Church of Christ as “divided, split, and broken, Her members moving this way and that,”⁷⁷ but, on the contrary it would have thanked God for the repentance and return of the heretics and their re-enrollment in the never-divided Body of Christ.

- Indeed, in delving still more deeply into this burning question and interpreting the ecclesiological position of the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod, we observe that this Synod, having condemned every heresiarch who had already “perished in this [heresy of Iconoclasm],”⁷⁸ and especially those who “successively” presided over “the throne of Constantinople” [see note 78], as well as other Bishops who were ringleaders in the heresy, as “having perished irretrievably,”⁷⁹ did so in the awareness that they belonged to the portion “of the earlier heretics in the Catholic Church” [see note 79], according to St. Tarasios, when, that is, they were still institutionally united with the Body (they presided over thrones and were heretics *in* the Church); if they had really been cut off and excluded automatically, why would they have undergone such judgment and condemnation, when they had no life in them?

- Finally, when the Holy Œcumenical Synods summoned Nestorios of Constantinople (the Third Synod in Ephesus⁸⁰) and Dioscoros of Alexandria (the Fourth Synod in Chalcedon⁸¹) three times to appear for judgment, they acknowledge that the heresiarchs in question still occupied their Sees, up to that time, from which they spoke and acted in the name of, and on behalf of, the Orthodox Church.

C. Conclusions

1. In conclusion, let us summarize the foregoing as follows:

- a. One who is heretically-minded, but is not “completely broken off,” is still a member of the Body, though an ailing one.

- b. When we break communion with this ailing member, we have the following goals in view:

- that we should not become sick ourselves (lest his illness be transmitted to us);
- that we should make the other members of the Body aware that

they ought to do likewise—that is, that they should break communion, so as not to become diseased or polluted themselves;

- that we should aid in the repentance and cure of the ailing member, so as to avoid the worsening of his illness and his final excision from the Body;

- that we should contribute, finally, to the convocation of a competent synodal body, which would take the following measures to prevent the disease from spreading to the entire Body (“as one hastens to check a plague before it spreads to the entire Body of the Church” [St. Theophylact]⁸²—lest the healthy members, who stand firm in their good confession, be ruined by the soul-destroying disease” [St. Nicephoros of Constantinople]⁸³): *excision of the member*—if he does not repent; *the proclamation of “sound doctrine”*⁸⁴—the remedy for the disease; and the *exhortation of the Orthodox* to live, as St. Ignatios of Antioch says, “only on Christian fare, and to refrain from strange food, which is heresy.”⁸⁵

THESIS II

“It has also been asserted that the Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Holy Synod in Constantinople, under St. Photios the Great (861), in characterizing the Bishops who preached heresies that had previously been condemned as ‘pseudo-bishops’ and ‘pseudo-teachers,’ opened up a new era in a certain way, giving us the right to consider such Bishops, henceforth, as *automatically* deposed, ‘prior to a synodal decision,’ and no longer as being Bishops.”

RESPONSE

A

This interpretation is totally arbitrary and subjective, since the Holy Synod of 861, in passing the Fifteenth Canon, did not introduce anything new or unknown in the life of the Church, let alone in order to destroy age-old canonical order.

B

The Fifteenth Canon is included organically in the correct interpretation of the Thirty-first Canon of the Holy Apostles, which the First-Second Synod undertook by way of four *ad hoc* Canons (Twelve, Thirteen, Fourteen, and Fifteen), with a view towards uniting the Orthodox after the cessation of the Iconoclastic controversy.

C

The incorrect interpretation of the Thirty-first Apostolic Canon during that period had given rise to misunderstandings and to schisms and unlawful congregations that were unjustified, since the ecclesiastical authority was not openly and publicly preaching a known heresy,

the only case in which “walling off” can be justified “prior to a synodal decision.”

D

That is to say, “walling off” from a heretical Shepherd “for reasons of doctrine”⁸⁶ is regarded as an obvious and familiar course of action that has always been pursued and does not carry with it any penalties, but which, on the contrary, invites honors and commendations.

• Moreover, an almost identical idea had been formulated over two hundred years before by St. Sophronios of Jerusalem (†637), a fellow-struggler of St. Maximos the Confessor against Monothelism:

“If any should separate themselves from someone, not on the pretext of an offense, but on account of a heresy that has been condemned by a Synod or by the Holy Fathers, they are worthy of honor and approbation, for they are the Orthodox.”⁸⁷

E

The characterization of a Shepherd as a “pseudo-bishop” “prior to a synodal decision” is heuristic or diagnostic in nature (the doctor ascertains the disease) and not final and juridical or condemnatory (the doctor diagnoses the incurability of the ailing member and reaches a firm decision to amputate it).

1. We will recall that before the Third Holy Œcumenical Synod, St. Cyril called the heresiarch Nestorios “the Most Reverend Bishop Nestorios,” and at the same time characterized him diagnostically as a “wolf.”⁸⁸

2. For precisely this reason, the Third Holy Œcumenical Synod can call Nestorios “Most Reverend” and “Lord”⁸⁹ before his synodal condemnation, but after his sentencing can characterize him as “most impious.”⁹⁰

F

If the First-Second Holy Synod had, by its Fifteenth Canon, decreed the *automatic* exclusion and deposition of one who teaches heresy, then this local Synod would have been claiming a supra-Œcumenical authority, since it would have decided on something completely at odds with the holy Tradition of the Church up until 861; likewise, it would have come into direct conflict with the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod (which had gathered almost seventy-four years previously), which, in its *ᾠδος*, designated deposition and excommunication as punishments for heretics and innovators; these are imposed, in any case, by each successive Synod of “living,” that is, “presiding Bishops,” according to St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite.⁹¹

☩

* Source: *Orthodox Tradition*, Vol. XVIII, No. 2 (2001), pp. 2-15.

Notes

1. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1089A.
2. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1076C.
3. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1072B; col. 1041C.
4. I St. John 1:7, 3.
5. II Corinthians 13:13.
6. Colossians 1:18; Ephesians 1:22, 4:15.
7. Ephesians 2:20; I St. Peter 2:6-7.
8. I Corinthians 3:11.
9. Cf. Ephesians 4:16.
10. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXII, col. 44.
11. *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. XXXVIII, col. 1231.
12. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. L, col. 454.
13. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXIX, col. 664C.
14. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 693A.
15. Galatians 6:16.
16. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 192AB.
17. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LV, col. 199.
18. I St. Peter 2:9-10.
19. Isaiah 2:2-3; Micah 4:1-2.
20. St. Luke 19:11-27 (St. Matthew 13:24ff, 31ff, 47ff; St. Luke 18:29ff).
21. St. Matthew 26:31; St. John 10:1-16.
22. St. Matthew 16:18; I Corinthians 3:9; Ephesians 2:21.
23. St. Matthew 21:33-41.
24. St. John 15:1-6.
25. I Corinthians 3:16; II Corinthians 6:16; Ephesians 2:21.
26. Revelation 21:2; Hebrews 12:22.
27. St. Matthew 21:33.
28. Acts 15:16; Hebrews 8:2, 9:11.
29. I Corinthians 3:9.
30. I St. Peter 3:20-21.
31. I St. Timothy 3:15; Hebrews 3:6.
32. I Corinthians 12:27; Ephesians 1:23; Colossians 1:18.
33. *Συγγράμματα* [Writings], ed. P.K. Chrestou (Thessaloniki: 1962), Vol. I, p. 149.
34. I Corinthians 12:12ff.
35. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CL, col. 1293BC.
36. St. John 3:18.
37. St. Theophylact, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIII, col. 1213C.
38. Zigabenos, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIX, col. 1173A.
39. St. Matthew 13:24-30, 47-50.
40. Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Synod.
41. St. Matthew 13:30, 49.

42. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 665A. [On first reading, it may seem strange that the author should discuss the subject of heresy under the heading of schism. After all, St. Basil the Great makes a very important distinction, in his First Canon, between heretics, who are “alienated in matters concerning the Faith itself,” and schismatics, who have “separated for certain ecclesiastical reasons and questions capable of mutual solution.” However, the main point at issue in this section of the article is not this canonical distinction, but rather, the manner in which one may end up being decisively excluded from the Body of the Church. Heresy and schism constitute two different ways of being separated from the Church. Prior to the Second Œcumenical Synod of 381, the Anomœans (or Eunomians) comprised the extreme faction of Neo-Arians, who actually cut themselves off from the Church, through schism, by forming their own ecclesiastical community, whereas the more moderate Arians, namely the Homœans and the Homœousians (or Semi-Arians), still considered themselves to belong to the Body of the Church and were, therefore, potential rather than actual heretics—Trans.]

43. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 668B.
44. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 669A.
45. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, col. 976CD.
46. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXXVIII, col. 585D.
47. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXXVIII, col. 584B.
48. *Πηδάλιον* [The Rudder], p. 589, n.
49. I Corinthians 5:2; *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIV, col. 621C.
50. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXXXII, col. 261CD.
51. I Corinthians 5:4-5.
52. Mansi, Vol. XIII, col. 380B; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 874b (Seventh Session).
53. Cf. I Corinthians 5:12-13.
54. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIV, col. 628AB.
55. Second Holy Œcumenical Synod, Sixth Canon.
56. *Πηδάλιον*, pp. 4-5, n. 2 and xxxix, n. 3, § 10.
57. Mansi, Vol. XIII, col. 404C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 880a (Seventh Session).
58. Mansi, Vol. XIII, col. 377A; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 873b.
59. *Ibid.*
60. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. C, col. 193C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 914a.
61. St. Matthew 18:17.
62. Zigabenos, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIX, col. 505C.
63. St. Matthew 18:18.
64. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIX, col. 505B.
65. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIX, col. 505D.
66. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, cols. 425B, 428A, 432C, 460B, 476C, 481A, 481C, 526C, 753C, 901BC, 908B, 937CD-940A; Vol. XCIX, col. 1288A.
67. Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Synod.
68. Balsamon, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXXVII, col. 1068D.
69. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXXVII, cols. 124D-125A.
70. St. John 15:1-11.
71. *Πεντηκοστήριον*, Sunday of the Holy 318 Fathers, third Sticheron at the Praises.

- 71a. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1003D; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 728b. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1130B; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 762a/ Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1154C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 768b.
72. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1118E; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 758b.
73. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1126B; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 760b.
74. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1126D; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 761a.
75. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1127A; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 761a.
76. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1011C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 730b. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 987B; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 724. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1006D; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 728b.
77. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCVIII, col. 1440BC; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 895b.
78. Mansi, Vol. XIII, col. 400AB; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 878b-879a.
79. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCVIII, col. 1440BC; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 895b.
80. Mansi, Vol. IV, cols. 1129, 1212; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. I, pp. 469b-471ab, 490a.
81. Mansi, Vol. VI, cols. 1045-1093; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. I, pp. 115-130.
82. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CXXIV, col. 621C.
83. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. C, col. 612A.
84. St. Titus 2:1.
85. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. V, col. 680A.
86. Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1042C; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. II, p. 739a (First Session).
87. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXXXVII.3, cols. 3369D-3372A.
88. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXXVII, cols. 124B and 125B.
89. Mansi, Vol. IV, cols. 1180, 1181; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. I, p. 482ab.
90. Mansi, Vol. IV, col. 1212; *Πρακτικά*, Vol. I, p. 490a.
91. *Πηδάλιον*, p. xxxix, n. 3, §10.