

**The Image of the Constantinople Patriarch Michael I Cerularius
on the Pages of 'Palinode' by Zakharia Kopystenskiy**

In the middle of the XIth century Christianity as a single religious doctrine split into two parts – Orthodox and Catholic. This schism has not been overcome till the present day, and the rivalry between churches is preserved. These events took place in the time when Michael I Cerularius (1043 – 1058) was Byzantine Patriarch, and his opponent was the Pope Leo IX (1049 – 1054).

Michael I Cerularius's personality is mainly interesting for church historians. All researchers who have turned their attention to this range of problems can be divided into three groups. We consider those who accused the Constantinople Patriarch of the schism of the Christian church to be the first group. The second group is the Pope, and those who believed that the schism was connected not so much with personalities as with global reasons belong to the third group. We attribute, for example, Syvastiyan Sabol and his work 'Catholicism and Orthodoxy' to the first group. The researcher gives quite a negative reference to Michael I Cerularius and leads a reader to the thought that it was Michael I Cerularius who started the struggle with Rome that led to the church split. A similar standpoint in describing the image of Michael I Cerularius belongs to one more researcher, I. Nagayevskiy. A famous contemporary researcher I. Shevchenko mentioned among other things in his essay which was devoted to religious polemical literature that all the problems of the religious schism and the following arguments have their roots in the Byzantine Empire and are connected with patriarchs Photios (IX century), Michael I Cerularius (XI century), Mark of Ephesus (XV century).

An opposite point of view as for the culprits of the schism belongs, mainly, to the supporters of Orthodoxy. For example, these are pre-revolutionary church history researchers of the end of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century O. Lebedyev and M. Posnov; a famous researcher and a church figure O. Men' who believes that although

the Constantinople Patriarch was ambitious, he was at the same time ready to make concessions for the sake of keeping the church unity during the conflict; a contemporary researcher O. Dvorkin, an archbishop Ihor Isichenko.

As for the third group of researchers, it is possible to attribute S. Golovaschenko who considered canonical-administrative factor to be the main cause of the Oecumenical orthodox church schism, because Constantinople patriarchs and popes were engaged in a constant struggle for the power and authority in the church to it. The religious argument and the seizure of territories in order to strengthen the possessions are the main reasons for the church schism in 1054, as V. Balukh thinks. The author considers Michael I Cerularius to be a great, peaceful person. The researcher describes Rome ambassadors as schism begetters.

Now let us pay our attention to that part of *Palinode* by Zakhariya Kopystenskiy in which the matter is Michael I Cerularius.

In the first article Zakhariya Kopystenskiy analyses Michael I Cerularius's letter to the Antiochene patriarch Peter III (1053 – 1076). The poetic manner of the first article indicates clearly that the author unambiguously tried to create a positive image of the Constantinople Patriarch and his milieu, and a negative image of the Pope and his legates.

In the second article the author tells about Michael I Cerularius's relations with Tsargrad/ Constantinopolitan emperor Isaac I Comnenus (1057 – 1059). These events took place already after the church schism and concern the Constantinople Patriarch's last years of life. Zakhariya Kopystenskiy depicts a positive image of Michael I Cerularius, while Isaac I Comnenus appears to be a negative figure.

The next, the third article, concerns again the Constantinople Patriarch's letter to the Antiochene Patriarch Peter III. In this case the author tries to show Michael I Cerularius's politeness and respect to the Pope. At the same time the Pope is described in the negative light.

In the fourth article it is told, on the one hand, about mutual damnations of Michael I Cerularius by the Roman ambassadors and, on the other hand, about Michael I Cerularius' damnation of the Roman ambassadors and the Pope. The actions of the Pope's ambassadors are criticized as well. At the same time the Constantinople Patriarch's actions are justified.

The fifth article concerns the letters which Peter Antiochene wrote to Michael I Cerularius, the Pope Leo IX and Dominic, Venetian archbishop. The polemicist asserts that the letters addressed to the Constantinople Patriarch were forged, especially in those parts which were devoted to the adherence to the Latin rite. Michael I Cerularius's image is not analyzed. However, the author depicts the patriarch's rivals – the popes – in the negative light. In general, the contents of the article are based on contrasting the monks from the Eastern Church with the monks from the Western Church, and the liking for the first ones is not concealed.

In the last, sixth article, Zakhariya Kopystenskiy tries to prove the rightfulness of Michael I Cerularius's action once again grounding his reasons by the words of the Antiochene patriarch Peter.

All in all, we can definitely assert that a completely positive image of the Constantinople Patriarch is depicted to the readers of *Palinode*. Zakhariya Kopystenskiy, using versatile theoretical and historical materials, tries to prove that the reasons for the schism of the Christian world are concealed in the apostasy of the Roman church representatives.