

Translator's introductory note: As one can determine by a cursory survey of the pseudo-scholarly entries in Internet sources concerning the condemnation of the Papal or Gregorian Calendar by the Orthodox Church, two camps have emerged in this debate: 1) those who believe that three separate Church synods have once and for all condemned and anathematized believers who accept the Gregorian (or New) Calendar; and 2) those who, accepting this ecumenical innovation and violation of Holy Tradition as valid, dismiss the Orthodox disapprobation of the New Calendar as a myth or as something based on forged documents.

The Acting President of the Holy Synod in Resistance, Bishop Cyprian of Oreoi, a wholly remarkable student of the Patristic witness, discusses these two views with scholarly skill and precision, exposing the misinterpretations that, on the one hand, have risen on account of certain documents condemning the New Calendar that are, in fact, unreliable and forgeries; and, on the other hand, rejecting, in presenting the genuine historical record, self-serving claims that the calendar innovation has never in actuality been officially condemned by the Orthodox Church.

This paper constitutes a study of singular importance in demonstrating that both those on the extreme right and left, with regard to this important subject, are wrong in their thinking and conclusions about the calendar innovation. Both base themselves on false presuppositions and poor knowledge and faulty assessments of the historical record.

The “Sigillion”* of 1583 Against “the Calendar Innovation of the Latins”: Myth or Reality?

A Study by Bishop Cyprian of Oreoi
Acting President
of the Holy Synod in Resistance

- A. The Threefold Synodal Repudiation of the New Calendar
- B. The Tomoi of the Synodal Repudiations
- C. The Athonite Transcriptions of Monk Iakovos
- D. A Fruitless Conflict
- E. Appendix

Phyle, Attica
May 13, 2011 (Old Style)

* *Translator's note:* Throughout this document, we have used the standard English transliteration of the Greek “σιγγίλιον,” which is alternatively spelled “σιγγίλλιον” or “σιγίλιον.” This standard transliteration corresponds to the first alternative spelling, which better reflects its etymology. The word is of Latin origin, derived from “sigillum,” or a “seal,” and was used in Byzantine times to refer to documents (especially ecclesiastical documents) bearing an official seal.

A. The Threefold Synodal Repudiation of the New Calendar

1. Pope Gregory XIII (1502-1585) reformed the Church Calendar and introduced the eponymous “Gregorian Calendar” on October 5, 1582, which was thereby reckoned as October 15.

2. Subsequently, Pope Gregory besought Oecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II (Tranos) of Constantinople (1536-1595), by way of three special delegations, to accept the New Calendar.

3. Patriarch Jeremiah repudiated the “Latin Calendar” and repeatedly condemned it, both through epistles and through Synodal decisions, in 1583, 1587, and 1593.

4.a. “In 1583, during the reign of Patriarch Jeremiah, a Synod of Metropolitans was convened in Constantinople, with Patriarch Sylvester of Alexandria also in attendance. This Synod condemned the innovation in the Calendar introduced by Gregory of Rome and refused to comply with the request of the Latins that they accept it.”¹

b. “Jeremiah convoked a Synod in Constantinople in 1583, in which Sylvester of Alexandria also took part. This Synod issued a *Tomos* against the Gregorian Calendar, thereby condemning the Papal innovation. Furthermore, when the opportunity presented itself, Meletios Pegas (1549-1601), in his capacity as Chancellor or Dean (*Πρωτοσύγκελλος*) of the Church of Alexandria and at the urging of Patriarch Sylvester, launched an attack on the Papal fiat by composing a special study, which he entitled “Another *Tomos*, the Alexandrian,” in order to distinguish it from the aforementioned *Tomos* of Constantinople.”²

c. “Therefore, the Eastern Fathers, having convened a Synod in Constantinople [in 1583], when the so-called correction of the date of Pascha devised by the Roman Church was first proclaimed, resolved to uphold the Tradition of the Fathers in every way possible. The illustrious former Patriarch of Alexandria, Sylvester, was in residence in Constantinople, having left me in charge of the Patriarchal Throne. After returning from there, he asked me to write something about this issue. I had previously sent word to Rome, proving that it was correct to celebrate Pascha according to the rule (*Κανόνιον*) of the Fathers and beseeching them not to increase the disagreements between the Churches. Since they had written back from Rome, maintaining that they had not been injudicious in their deliberations concerning Pascha, and since the Elder [Patriarch Sylvester] had requested from me a written statement on this subject, I naturally obeyed and wrote the ‘Alexandrian *Tomos*,’ which

¹ Metropolitan Meletios of Athens, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία* [Church history], §9 (Vienna: 1784), Vol. III, p. 402; Athanasios Comnenos Hypselantes, *Τὰ Μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωσιν* [The aftermath of the fall of Constantinople] (Constantinople: 1870), pp. 111-112.

² Archimandrite Christodoulos Paraskevaïdes, *Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς* [Meletios Pegas] (Athens: 1971), p. 88.

was so named to distinguish it from the Synodal *Tomos* composed in Constantinople on the same subject.”³

5. In “the year of salvation 1587...a second Synod was held in Constantinople, in the presence of the Œcumenical Patriarch Jeremiah, Meletios Pegas of Alexandria [representing Patriarch Sylvester], and Patriarch Sophronios [IV] of Jerusalem, and those present synodally rejected the correction of the date of Holy Pascha made by Pope Gregory XIII as parlous, unnecessary, and the cause of many scandals to all Christian nations.”⁴

6.a. “On February 12, 1593...a permanent [Holy and Great, ‘Plenary’] Synod was convened [in Constantinople] in the Church of ‘Our Most Holy Lady *Theotokos* and Ever-Virgin Mary, the *Pammakaristos*, also named *Paramythias*.” Present at this Synod, apart from the Œcumenical Patriarch [Jeremiah II], were Patriarchs Meletios of Alexandria, who also represented Patriarch Joachim [VI] of Antioch, and Sophronios of Jerusalem, as well as “Hierarchs from every diocese of the Eastern Orthodox Church,” in order to confirm the Autocephaly of the Russian Church. The decisions of this Synod were published in a “Synodal Act,” which included “a rejection of the New Calendar, that is, the innovation of the Latins concerning Pascha.”⁵

b. This Holy and Sacred Great Synod “subsequently promulgated Canons pertaining to Church order,” the eighth of which mentions the wish of the Hierarchs that “what was decided by the Holy Fathers regarding the Holy and salvific Pascha should remain unshaken”—“what was decided” being the First Canon of the Synod of Antioch (341), which the Synod of 1593 repeated verbatim.⁶

c. Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, in the *Paralipomena* of Book XI of the *Δωδεκάβιβλος* (ch. 11, §18), repeats in summary form that the “Plenary” Synod in Constantinople in 1593 decided “that Pascha should occur as determined by the First Synod and that the calendar concocted by the Latins should be anathematized.”⁷

B. The *Tomoi* of the Synodal Repudiations

1. *Tomoi*, that is, Synodal documents by which serious ecclesiastical matters are resolved and in which the acts and decisions of a Synod are set forth, are not extant for the Holy Synods of 1583, 1587, and 1593. The only *Tomos* that survives is the aforementioned “Alexandrian *Tomos* Concerning the *Paschalion*,” which was composed, though in the manner of a refutation,

³ Meletios Pegas, “Epistle XXIII,” *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος*, Vol. LIII, No. 4 (1971), p. 611.

⁴ Hypselantes, *Τὰ Μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωσιν*, p. 113; Dositheos of Jerusalem, *Δωδεκάβιβλος* (Bucharest: 1715), p. 1169.

⁵ Paraskevaïdes, *Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς*, pp. 113ff.; Dositheos of Jerusalem, *Τόμος Ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων* [Tome of love against the Latins] ([Iasi]: 1698), pp. 541-547.

⁶ Paraskevaïdes, *Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς*, pp. 113ff.

⁷ *Δωδεκάβιβλος* (Thessalonike: Ekdoseis Bas. Regopoulou, 1983), Vol. VI, p. 232.

by “His Beatitude, His All-Holiness, Pope Meletios of Alexandria, concerning Pascha.”⁸

2. Nevertheless, the extant documents of the Synods of 1583 and 1593 can be regarded in a broad sense as *Tomoi* of these Synods: vis-à-vis the Synod of 1593, the “Synodal Act,”⁹ and vis-à-vis the Synod of 1583, the joint Epistle of Patriarchs Jeremiah II of Constantinople and Sylvester of Alexandria to the Armenians, dated November 20, 1583, since “this epistle was written in the wake of the Synod that was convened that year in Constantinople, which [Synod] condemned the Gregorian Calendar primarily because, according to the latter, it may happen that we will celebrate together with the Jews, contrary to the Synod of Nicæa.”¹⁰

3. This theory, that the joint Epistle of Jeremiah and Sylvester to the Armenians can be regarded as the *Tomos* of the Synod of 1583, is corroborated by the fact that it is characterized as the publication of a “Synodal decision” and “as an official act of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East,” and also by the fact that in other sources “it contains, in addition to the signatures of Jeremiah and Sylvester, those of Joachim of Antioch and Gabriel of Ohrid.”¹¹

C. The Athonite Transcriptions of Monk Iakovos

1. In 1858, an Athonite monk, Father Iakovos of New Skete, transcribed various documents, from among the aforementioned, concerning the repudiation and condemnation of the Gregorian Calendar, which are to be found in Codex No. 258 of the library of Kavsokalyvia. It was from this codex that Codex No. 722 of the Monastery of St. Panteleimon was compiled.¹²

⁸ Émile Legrand (ed.), *Lettres de Mélétius Pigas* [Letters of Meletios Pegas] (*Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire*, Vol. IX; Paris: J. Maisonneuve, 1902), pp. 138-155; there also exist two more recent editions, published in Greece in 1924 and 1984.

⁹ See, above, Part A, §6a.

¹⁰ Metropolitan Philaret Bapheides of Didymoteichon, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία* [Church history] (Constantinople: 1912), Vol. III, Pt. 1, p. 125; for the joint Epistle, see *Τόμος Ἀγάπης*, pp. 538-540.

¹¹ Archimandrite Germanos Karavangeles, *Ἐπιστημονικὴ διατριβὴ περὶ τῆς ἐορτῆς τοῦ Πάσχα* [Scientific dissertation on the Feast of Pascha] (Constantinople: 1894), p. 121; Archimandrite Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, “Τὸ Γρηγοριανὸν ἡμερολόγιον ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ, μέρος Β΄” [The Gregorian Calendar in the East: Part II], *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Κήρυξ*, No. 147 (April 14, 1918), pp. 172, 173, and n.1.

¹² Evlogios Kourilas Lavriotes, *Κατάλογος τῶν Κωδίκων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Σκήτης τῶν Κανσοκαλυβίων καὶ τῶν Καλυβῶν Αὐτῆς* [Catalogue of the codices of the Holy Skete of Kavsokalyvia and its Kalyvai] (n.p.: 1930), pp. 129-130, Codex 258: “A most sacred and soul-profiting book containing...assembled from ancient manuscripts...and translated into...simple diction...through the effort and zeal, and at the expense, of Monk Iakovos...in the year 1858 on Mount Athos.”

Note: The codex herein cited as No. 722 of the Monastery of St. Panteleimon is probably the source of the Russian translation entitled “*Sigillion* of the Local Synod of Constantinople in 1583,” which was published in the official periodical of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, *Church News* [Belgrade], Nos. 15-16 (1924), p. 18.

2. The original texts compiled by Father Iakovos and the items deriving from him in these codices constitute a patently arbitrary admixture of disparate documents of different dates, into which, moreover, alterations and additions have also been introduced, to the point that one wonders what ultimately was the intention of Father Iakovos, who doctored, distorted, and falsified them.

3. This truly deplorable farrago put together by Father Iakovos, which is fancifully characterized as a “Patriarchal and Synodal *Sigillion*” “accompanied by sanctions and anathemas,” has been used in self-serving ways since 1924, and has appeared in many versions,¹³ each worse than the other. The form of it that has finally prevailed bears a title unattested in the original texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: “*Sigillion* of the Patriarchal formulation of an Encyclical to Orthodox Christians throughout the world not to accept the modernistic *Paschalion* or calendar of the innovated *Menologion*, but to abide by what was well formulated once and for all by the three hundred and eighteen (318) Holy God-bearing Fathers of the Holy First Œcumenical Synod, under pain of sanction and anathema.”¹⁴

4. In the aforementioned Athonite codices the following three texts, which have no relation to each other and in which, as we have said, alterations and additions have been introduced, were mixed and spliced together:

a. the joint Epistle of Patriarchs Jeremiah and Sylvester to the Armenians, dated November 20, 1583;¹⁵

b. the “Synodal Act” of 1593;¹⁶

c. the *Tomos* of Cyril Loukaris (1570-1638), Patriarch of Alexandria, issued in Târgoviște, Moldo-Wallachia, in 1616.¹⁷

5. In the predominant version of the *Sigillion* there are five blatant alterations and additions arbitrarily imported by the compiler.

a. The title: a pure invention of the compiler.

b. The date: this document was allegedly composed on November 20, 1583, which is actually the date of the joint Epistle of Patriarchs Jeremiah and Sylvester, whereas the text presented in the *Sigillion* was composed in 1616.

• Metropolitan Anthony (formerly) of Kiev, an eminent Hierarch and First Hierarch of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, “believed in the authenticity of that notorious forgery, the ‘*Sigillion*’ of Jeremiah, which was shown to him on the Holy Mountain” (Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens, *Ἡ Διόρθωσις τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ Ἡμερολογίου ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος* [The correction of the Julian Calendar in the Church of Greece] [Athens: 1933], p. 35).

¹³ Evlogios Kourilas Lavriotes, *Κατάλογος*, p. 130, Codex 258: “And the proceedings of the Synod [of 1593], in particular, have been published in an extremely distorted form by fanatical zealots.” [!]

¹⁴ For the full text, see Gregorios Evstratiades, *Ἡ πραγματικὴ ἀλήθεια περὶ τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ Ἡμερολογίου* [The real truth about the Church Calendar] (Athens: 1929), pp. 119-122.

¹⁵ See, above, Part B, §2.

¹⁶ See, above, Part A, §6a.

¹⁷ *Τόμος Ἀγάπης*, pp. 552-554.

c. The signatures: Patriarchs Jeremiah (†1595) and Sylvester (†1590) were no longer alive in 1616, and Patriarch Sophronios had already abdicated by 1608.

d. The text: it belongs to Loukaris (1616) and not to the Synod of 1583, and its content is not only entirely unrelated to the calendar question, but is also appallingly garbled.

e. The anathema: whereas in Loukaris' text, there are six anathemas, pertaining to Roman Catholic teachings, the compiler has added to the *Sigillion* a seventh anathema concerning all who follow the “newly invented *Paschalion* and the New *Menologion* of the atheist astronomers of the Pope [*sic*].”¹⁸

6. The argument that the content of the two aforementioned Athonite codices is—supposedly—confirmed by a manuscript codex from Sinai, from which the *Sigillion* was published in Romania by Archimandrite Porfiry Ouspensky, who visited Sinai in 1850, is without foundation, since, on the basis of our Romanian sources, it is evident that Father Porfiry published in translation only the “Alexandrian *Tomos*” of Meletios Pegas and his epistle to Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich of Russia, dated September 12, 1594.¹⁹

D. A Fruitless Conflict

1. In the wake of the calendar innovation in 1924—the first step towards implementing the plan for rapprochement between divided Christians, in conformity with the ecumenist 1920 Encyclical of the Patriarchate of Constantinople—the so-called *Sigillion* of 1583 has proved to be a “rock of offense” between ecumenists and anti-ecumenists, between innovators and anti-innovationists, who expend their energies in a fruitless conflict, thereby willy-nilly shifting attention to an almost insignificant issue.

2. The putative *Sigillion* of 1583 essentially has nothing to offer to the sacred cause of resistance against the ecclesiological heresy of ecumenism. Indeed, even if it were genuine, it would not take effect automatically and instantaneously, expelling the innovators from the Church forthwith, since an anathema, in order to take effect, requires a special Synodal judgment on the basis of Orthodox Church order.²⁰

¹⁸ It is noteworthy that the seventh anathema of the *Sigillion* is also missing from the text of the Latins who attempted to refute the *Tomos* of Loukaris. See *Ἀποδοκιμασία καὶ Κατάκρισις...καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἀναθεματισμῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ Κυρίλλου [Λουκάρεως] πάλαι ἐκφωνηθέντων* [Disproof and condemnation...and repudiation of the anathemas pronounced long ago by Cyril (Loukaris)] (Rome: 1671).

¹⁹ See Evstratiades, *Ἡ πραγματικὴ ἀλήθεια*, pp. 208-209; Bishop Melchizedek, “The Orthodox Church and the Calendar” [in Romanian], *Romanian Orthodox Church*, Vol. V (1880-1881), pp. 561-604; Meletios Pegas, “Epistle XXIII,” *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος*, Vol. LIII, No. 4 (1971), p. 611.

²⁰ See A.D. Delembases, *Πάσχα Κυρίου* [The Lord's Pascha] (Athens: 1985), pp. 793-795.

3. One way or another, Orthodox resistance and walling-off do not depend on the contrived *Sigillion* of 1583, nor even on the Synodal decisions of the sixteenth century, for, although these deserve our respect and give us guidance, they do not pertain directly to the contemporary form of the calendar question: in 1924, the innovation of Pope Gregory XIII was partially implemented, while the Orthodox *Paschalion* remained intact.

4. This partial acceptance of the Gregorian Calendar demands a new and specific assessment of the issue by a Pan-Orthodox Synod, as the Confessor-Hierarch Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina (†1955) very astutely maintained. He very severely condemned the view that, supposedly, “it is unnecessary and superfluous to convene a Pan-Orthodox Synod or a major local Synod for the authoritative and definitive condemnation of the calendar innovation...since the Pan-Orthodox Synods of 1583, 1587, and 1593 condemned the Gregorian Calendar”; the innovation of 1924, which applied “the Gregorian Calendar only to the fixed Feasts and not to Pascha, which was the main reason why the Gregorian Calendar was condemned as conflicting with the Seventh Apostolic Canon, is an issue that appears for the first time in the history of the Orthodox Church. Consequently, the convocation of a Pan-Orthodox Synod is not only not superfluous...but is actually required for the canonical and authoritative adjudication of this issue.”²¹

† Bishop Cyprian of Oreoi,
Acting President

Phyle, Attica
May 13, 2011 (Old Style)
Holy Martyr Glykeria

* The present condensed piece, in order to focus attention primarily on the issue of the *Sigillion*, does not include a full bibliography on the subject.

E. Appendix (the *Sigillion* and *Tomos* compared)

1. The contrived [essentially forged—Trans.] *Sigillion**

Sigillion of the Patriarchal formulation of an Encyclical to Orthodox Christians throughout the world not to accept the modernistic *Paschalion* or calendar of the innovative *Menologion*, but to abide by what was well formulated once and for all by the three hundred and eighteen (318) Holy God-bearing Fathers of the Holy First Œcumenical Synod, under pain of sanction and anathema.

²¹ “Επιστολή πρώην Φλωρίνης [πρὸς Ἐπίσκοπον Κυκλάδων Γερμανόν]” [An Epistle of the (Metropolitan) of Phlorina (to Bishop Germanos of the Cyclades)], in *Resistance or Exclusion? The Alternative Ecclesiological Approaches of Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Florina and Bishop Matthew of Vresthene*, tr. Hieromonk Patapios (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2000), pp. 58-59.

To all the genuine Christian children of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Eastern Church of Christ in Târgoviște and throughout the world: Grace, peace, and mercy from God Almighty.

No small tempest overtook that ancient Ark, when, violently buffeted by waves, it was borne upon the waters, and had not the Lord God remembered Noah and seen fit to still the water, there would have been no hope of salvation for it at all. Thus also with regard to the New Ark of our Church, since misbelievers have launched an implacable war against us, we have decided to leave behind the present *Tomos* against them, so that by means of what is written herein you may be able to defend your Orthodoxy more securely against such men. However, lest our composition be burdensome to simpler people, we have decided to frame the issue in the vernacular, wording it as follows:

In the vernacular

From old Rome there have come certain persons who learned there to think as the Latins do. What is bad about this is how, from being born and bred Romans [Ῥωμαῖοι, i.e., Greeks] of Roumele, they not only have changed their faith, but even wage war upon the Orthodox and true dogmas of the Eastern Church which Christ, the Divine Apostles, and the Holy Synods of the Holy Fathers have handed down to us. Hence, cutting off these persons as rotten members, we decree:

(1) Whoever does not confess with heart and mouth that he is a child of the Eastern Church baptized in the Orthodox manner, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, essentially and hypostatically, as Christ says in the Gospel, but temporally from the Father and the Son, let such a person be outside our Church and let him be anathematized.

(2) Whoever does not confess that at the Mystery of Holy Communion the laity, too, must partake of both kinds, of the Precious Body and Blood, but instead says that it is sufficient to partake only of the Body, only of the Flesh, because therein is also the Blood, when as a matter of fact Christ said and administered each separately, and they who fail to observe these matters, let such persons be anathematized.

(3) Whoever says that our Lord Jesus Christ at the Mystical Supper had unleavened bread (made without yeast), as did the Hebrews, and not leavened bread, that is, bread raised with yeast, let him depart far away from us and let him be anathema, as one holding Jewish views and as bringing the doctrines of Apollinarios and of the Armenians into our Church, on which account let him be doubly anathema.

(4) Whoever says that our Christ and God, when He comes to judge, will not come to judge souls together with bodies, but instead will come to sentence only bodies, let him be anathema.

(5) Whoever says that the souls of Christians who have repented while in the world but have failed to perform their penitential rule of prayer [κανόνα], go to the purgatorial fire when they die, where there is flame and punishment,

and are purified, which is a pagan Greek myth, and those who, like Origen, think that Hell is not everlasting, and thereby afford an occasion of license to commit sin, let him and all such persons be anathema.

(6) Whoever says that the Pope is the head of the Church, and not Christ, and that he has authority to admit persons to Paradise by his letters [of indulgence] and can forgive as many sins as a person may commit who pays money to receive indulgences (certificates of forgiveness) from him, let such a person be anathema.

(7) Whoever does not follow the customs of the Church, as the Seven Holy Œcumenical Synods have decreed, and Holy Pascha, and the *Menologion*, which they rightly made it a law that we should follow, and wishes to follow the newly invented *Paschalion* and the New *Menologion* of the atheist astronomers of the Pope, and opposes all of these things and wishes to overthrow and destroy the dogmas and customs of the Church that have been handed down by our Fathers, let him be anathema and let him be put out of the Church of Christ and out of the assembly of the faithful.

(8) As for you pious and Orthodox Christians, remain faithful in what you have been taught and have been born and brought up in, and when the time calls for it and the need arises, let your very blood be shed in order to safeguard the Faith handed down by our Fathers and your confession; and beware of such persons as the aforementioned, in order that our Lord Jesus Christ may help you, and at the same time may the prayer of us, your humble servants, be with all of you. Amen.

In the year of the God-Man 1583, in the Twelfth Indiction, November 20.

Jeremiah of Constantinople
Sylvester of Alexandria
Sophronios of Jerusalem
And the rest of the Hierarchs present at the Synod

* Evstratiades, Ἡ πραγματικὴ ἀλήθεια, pp. 119-22.

2. The Tomos of Cyril Loukaris, Patriarch of Alexandria, in Târgoviște, Moldavia, 1616*

Cyril, by the mercy of God
Pope and Patriarch of the great city of Alexandria
and Judge of the inhabited earth

To all the Orthodox Christians in Târgoviște, both those listed among the clergy and those belonging to the laity, genuine children of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Eastern Church of Christ, who rightly abhor and reject, for the sake of Evangelical truth, every empty utterance and addition of both the heretics and the Latins who insidiously wage war against our Orthodox Faith:

Grace, peace, and mercy from God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ, our Savior.

No small tempest overtook that ancient Ark, when, violently buffeted and tossed by waves, it was borne upon the waters, with the floodgates sending down furious showers of rain by Divine permission and, as it were, menacing those in the Ark, and there was no hope for those enclosed therein of finding deliverance, had not God remembered Noah the steersman and seen fit to still the water. These things, I believe, were a foreshadowing of the woes that even now beset the New Ark, that is, our Church. We do not expect these woes to desist, unless God should lay to rest and subdue these evil torrents, which destroy simpler souls. For, envying the profound peace of the Church in this city, they have launched an implacable war against us and have continued to disturb the tranquility that exists here. Being minded, therefore, to leave behind the present *Tomos* against them, so that it might be a panoply for all of you and so that by means of what is written herein you may be able to defend your Orthodoxy more securely against such men, we deemed it meet, lest our composition be burdensome to simpler people, to put the entire issue before you in the vernacular, wording it as follows:

From old Rome there have come certain persons who learned there to think as the Latins do. What is bad about this is how, from being born and bred Romans [Ῥωμαῖοι, i.e., Greeks] of Roumele—whose parents, I can aver, have never even seen a Westerner—and by going to Rome, they not only have changed their faith, but even wage war upon the true and Orthodox dogmas of the Eastern Church which Christ, the Divine and sacred Disciples of the Savior, and the Synods of the Holy Fathers have handed down to us. Therefore, since we are going to depart from here, we enjoin you, of your charity, to stand firm in your piety and in your Orthodoxy. And as for such Latinizers and corrupters of your consciences, let them not have so much as a hearing from you, but reject them as heretics and enemies of your salvation, whenever they speak to you against these things that we write here below. No, you should think in their manner.

First, whoever does not confess with heart and mouth, and indeed, whoever calls himself a Roman [Ῥωμαῖος, i.e., a Greek] and a child of the Eastern Church, and is baptized in the Greek Christian manner, as we are, and then does not confess that the All-Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, essentially and hypostatically, and that He proceeds from the Father and the Son temporally: whoever does not confess thus, but says that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, let him be outside our Church, let him not have any communion with us, and let him be anathema.

Secondly, whoever does not confess that at the Mystery of Communion the laity, too, must partake of the precious and immaculate Body and Blood, but instead says that they should commune only of the immaculate Body and not of the Blood as well, let him be outside the Church and let him be anathema. And in addition to this, whoever says that it is sufficient to partake only of the Flesh, because therein is also the Blood, whereas Christ said and administered

each separately, and fails to observe these matters, let such persons be anathema.

Thirdly, whoever says that our Lord Jesus Christ at the Mystical Supper had unleavened bread, like the Jews, and not leavened bread, that is, bread raised by yeast, let him depart far away from us and let him be anathema, as one holding Jewish views and as bringing the doctrines of Apollinarios and of the Armenians into our Church, on which account let him be doubly anathema.

Fourthly, whoever says that our Lord Jesus Christ, when He comes to judge, will not come for the sake of souls, but will come to sentence bodies, let him be anathema.

Fifthly, whoever says that the souls of Christians who have repented while in this world but have failed to perform their penitential rule of prayer [κινόνα], when they are parted from their bodies, go to the purgatorial fire, where there is flame, torment, and punishment, which is a pagan Greek myth, let him be anathema, since they give Christians license to sin.

Sixthly, whoever says that the Pope of Rome is the head of the Church, and not Christ, let him be anathema.

Whoever opposes these precepts in order to overthrow and destroy them, let him be anathema.

As for you, my Christians, I beseech you, for the Lord's sake and for the sake of what is profitable for your souls, to beware of these wolves, whoever they may be, and to read this *Tomos* frequently in Church, so that you may be familiar with the points on which such men are going to war against you. Throughout their lives they have not learned anything other than to oppose us Orthodox Christians, in order that destruction and ill-treatment might be inflicted on our nation by Latins. Let us not listen to them, but let us stand firm as far away as possible. Beseech God that you not enter into temptation on account of the Faith. However, when there is great need, it is a sweet thing for a man to shed his blood for the sake of piety. But in so great a matter, God will not allow it, so that your enemies may prove wholly insignificant and, by the Grace of Christ, ignorant and blind. Yet, guard yourselves and beware of such men. May our Lord Jesus Christ help you, bless you, and grant you a peaceful state, and at the same time may the prayer of your humble servant be with all of you. Amen.

* Dositheos, Τόμος Ἀγάπης, pp. 552-554.