

man's nature, his salvation and the extension of the Church its great concern.

From 330 A.D., when the seat of empire was removed from Rome by Constantine to Byzantium, which was afterwards called Constantinople, in honor of the Emperor, there was a continually increasing tendency to disruption between the east and the west. This founding of new Rome led to a jealousy which with other causes finally resulted in separation.

Dr. Schaff sums up under three heads the reasons for the ultimate schism ; (1) "the politico-ecclesiastical rivalry of the patriarch of Constantinople backed by the Byzantine empire and the bishop of Rome in connection with the new German empire," (2) "growing centralization and overbearing conduct of the Latin Church," (3) "the stationary character of the Greek and the progressive character of the Latin during the middle ages."

The history of the movement is in outline as follows: One of the first indications of the future schism is found in 594 A.D. when Gregory the Great objected to the title "Episcopus Ecumenicus," being assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople. (Patriarch was a name originally given to all bishops but afterwards restricted to the presiding bishops of the great imperial dioceses and still later to the five greatest of these, viz., Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.) The title was ratified by two councils of the Church and for a time the storm passed.

The first serious conflict was in the last half of the seventh century when a controversy arose between the east and the west on the subject of *Mono-*

*thelism* (the belief that though there were two natures in Christ, the human and the Divine, there was but one will, which was Divine.) Although the Eastern Church did not unite in supporting Monothelism nor all the Western in condemning it, yet the line of separation was clearly enough marked, to show that the edge of the wedge was entered which would result in splitting the Church into two rival factions.

A little later another cause for dissection arose, known as the *Iconoclastic* controversy. In 724 the emperor Leo issued an edict against the veneration of sacred images. This edict was resented by the Western Church, indeed so far did Gregory III, bishop of Rome go, that he called a council of bishops and condemned Iconoclasm and Iconoclasts, though he was careful enough not to mention the emperor by name. The emperor retaliated by transferring Greece and Illyricum, which up to this time had been under the jurisdiction of Rome, to the jurisdiction of the Byzantine patriarchate, confiscating at the same time certain revenues of the Roman Church. About twenty years later the new emperor, Constantius V, convened a council at which the worship of images was condemned. The Roman bishop refused to appear at this council, and those who did attend were mere creatures of the emperor. Leo IV, the son and successor of Constantius, was more tolerant, and his wife, who seems to have been an ardent advocate of image worship, after his death issued a decree of toleration. In 786 a council was convened first at Constantinople and afterwards at Nicea at which veneration (*proskunesis*) of images