

THE TOUCHSTONE

Alexandre Kalomiros

A few words, written with love and pain of heart,
concerning the heresy of our times
and true Orthodoxy

*Commissioned by and written under the auspices
of the Holy Convent of the Annuncia-
tion of the Theotokos
Oinussai, Chios
1976*

The Holy Orthodox Church in North America

BOSTON

Edited English Edition, 1999

The Holy Orthodox Church in North America
850 South Street
Roslindale, Massachusetts 02131-2448
Printed in the United States of America



THE TOUCHSTONE

Preface

Our age is that age of apostasy to which Saint Paul makes reference in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. I know that the prudent, the sober-minded, and the knowledgeable will smile with magnanimous condescension at my assertion. Knowledgeable people simply do not proffer such adventurous opinions, particularly when they are in reference to apocalyptic matters. Since I do not consider myself prudent, I lend ear to what our Lord says: Now learn a parable of the fig tree: When its branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors (Matt. 24:32–33). I draw my conclusions, therefore, on the basis of the Lord's ordinance, since I see all these things.

Before the advent of our amazingly wondrous age, the Orthodox believed in Orthodoxy, the heretics in their heresy, the atheists in their atheism, and the one attempted to convince the other that he was in possession of the truth. People, that is, believed in truth and labored on its behalf, even those who were ignorant of the Truth. The terrible apostasy of our era is not due to the fact that the world is filled with heretics and atheists. All things being equal, they cannot but strengthen the faith of the pious, no matter how many they may be. Our contemporary apostasy is due to the fact that people today have ceased believing in the truth; they have ceased believing in the existence of truth and that it is worth struggling for. Heretics who believe in their heresy have become a rare species. Strange as it may seem, even the ideological atheists, who have some conviction in their type of atheism, are somewhat of a blessing in our era. People today have lost every conviction. All things to them are relative, doubtful, indefinite. Little exists for them that merits fighting for. Little appears worthy of their support except the pleasures of this fleeting life.

In such a world, an atheist and a heretic of conviction are living islets in an ocean of death, because such conviction witnesses to a zeal for the truth, which, no matter how bereft of understanding, dark, or impassioned it may be, has not burned all the bridges connecting a soul with God, Who, even if they do not know and accept it, is Himself the Truth.

People in our age, therefore, do not believe in anything but in their own pleasurable pastimes. But, in order to have pleasurable pastimes, the peaceful co-existence and cooperation of all peoples is absolutely essential in order to insure the procurement of material goods. In order for this to be realized, all boundaries must fall. Religions, ideologies, and nations must unite. Every cause of war, battle, and counter-opinion must cease to exist. The policy of Co-existence, the ideas of a United States of Europe, Masonic syncretism,¹ the Ecumenical Movement, the hope for a world-wide state, are expressions of man's inordinate thirst for undisturbed pleasurable living.

Ecumenism² teaches that the truth is nowhere to be found. It is the assassination of the hope that has lived in the heart of man from time immemorial. It is the rejection of Truth and its supplantation with man-made truths. These man-made truths, of necessity, must make concessions, one to another, for the common good. Ecumenism is the last and most perfect trap that the devil has set for mankind and his most terrible, underhanded attack against the Church of Christ. It is that poison which paralyzes the soul and renders it incapable of believing, of seeing the light, incapable even of thirsting for the truth. It darkens the mind of the Orthodox Christian and affects him, so that instead of loving the sick and laboring to cure the illness, he ends up loving the very sickness; instead of loving the heretic, he ends up loving his heresy.

¹ Syncretism: the attempted union or reconciliation of diverse or opposite tenets or practices, especially in philosophy or religion; the system or principles of a school founded in the seventeenth century by George Calixtus, who aimed at harmonizing the sects of Protestants and ultimately all Christian bodies.

² Ecumenism is the offspring of the Ecumenical Movement; it is expressed in uniting various religions in common prayers and rituals despite doctrinal differences. It is regarded by many, including the author of this present work, as synonymous with syncretism.

If the Salt Should Lose Its Savour

The target of pan-religious syncretism, which is otherwise known as Ecumenism, is the Orthodox Church because she is the Church of Christ, the hope and the salt of the world. The devil well knows that if the salt should lose its savour all mankind will decompose, and this precisely is the purpose of the one who was a murderer from the beginning (John 8:44).

Constantinople opened the back door to Ecumenism in the year 1919. The Anglican or Episcopalian Church, which had organized the Ecumenical Movement, sent a deputation in that year to the Orthodox Churches, inviting them to send representatives to the Faith and Order assembly of the Ecumenical Movement, which was to convene in Geneva in August of the following year. At that time, Dorotheus of Prusa was the *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Throne. At a meeting of the Patriarchal Synod on January 10, 1919, he stated, "I think it is more than time that the Orthodox Church also think seriously about the subject of the union of the individual Christian churches." The Synod was pleased to accept the suggestion of the *locum tenens* and proceeded to form committees, whose task it was to study the various ways this union might take place. In one year, by January, 1920, the historic Encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the Churches of Christ Wheresoever They Might Be was ready, and dispatched to all corners of the world. It elicited a universally enthusiastic response. Protestants of every denomination applauded the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the Ecumenical Patriarchate has ever since preened itself for this encyclical which proves it to have been a pioneer in the Ecumenical Movement.

According to this encyclical, the union of the churches would become a reality with the gradual erasure of differences between the individual churches. As a first step, the encyclical suggested:

1. The adoption by all the Churches of one single calendar for the common celebration of the great Christian feasts (holy days),
2. The exchange of fraternal letters,
3. Fraternal contact between the representatives of the Churches,

4. Establishment of relations among the divinity schools and exchange of documents and periodicals of each church.
5. Student exchange,
6. The convocation of pan-Christian assemblies,
7. An objective, historic examination of doctrinal differences,
8. Mutual respect of practices and customs of the various churches.
9. Mutual sharing of houses of prayer and cemeteries, for the burial of adherents of other confessions.
10. Implementation of common rules regarding mixed marriages, and
11. Mutual support in the realm of religious edification, philanthropy, etc.

A bishop who held the throne of Constantinople had not visited the West for centuries. The last to make such a visit was Patriarch Joseph who took part in the false Synod of Florence in 1439. (At that time only Saint Mark of Ephesus refused to sign the union of the Orthodox Catholic Churches with the Papacy.) That Patriarch had an inglorious end. Nonetheless, after so many centuries, it was he whom Dorotheus wished to emulate. Royalty, lords, and various officials received Dorotheus in England with great pomp. He was unable, however, to be present at the great ceremony prepared in his honor. He also died in the West far from his throne.³ The conquest of Constantinople by Ecumenism, however, was a veritable fact. In a short time, the succeeding Patriarch of Constantinople, Meletius Metaxakis, recognized Anglican orders. A new wave of enthusiasm spread throughout the Protestant world. The English press reported, "The first step toward total outward union has been completed. The Orthodox will henceforth be able to receive the sacraments and other religious ministrations from the hands of the Anglican clergy." At the same time, common prayer with those in heresy commenced, and Anglicans began administering their sacraments to the Orthodox.

The Church of Greece was soon to join the Ecumenical Patriarchate in its Ecumenism. Chrysostom, the Archbishop of Athens,

³ Metropolitan Dorotheus died suddenly in London on March 6, 1921, only a short time after he had presented an episcopal *Panagia* to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

preached the dialogue of love many years before Patriarch Athenagoras. This is what he said at his enthronement: For the purpose of such cooperation and mutual help, doctrinal unity, unfortunately difficult to achieve, is not a necessary presupposition, since the bond of Christian love suffices, which, after all, can smooth the road toward union.

The heresy of Ecumenism, therefore, in the form that it has taken today, did not appear with the advent of Athenagoras, as some would believe. It made its way into Orthodoxy during the time of Dorotheus, Meletius Metaxakis, and Chrysostom Papadopoulos, when the Greek peoples were suffering martyrdoms at the hands of the Moslem Turks in Asia Minor. The first official announcement of this heresy in Orthodox lands took place in 1920 with the Encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate To the Churches of Christ Wheresoever They Might Be. The first overt symptom of the illness, however, appeared in 1924. It was the application and implementation of the first suggestion of the 1920 Encyclical, that is, the adoption by all the churches of one single calendar for the common celebration of the great Christian feasts, by which the liturgical or festal union of the churches was accomplished.

New-Calendarism Equals Ecumenism

The new-calendarists⁵ contend that they corrected the calendar purely for astronomical reasons. They said that it was embarrassing to follow an antiquated, inaccurate calendar. Very well. The Church, however, is certainly not concerned with the astronomical accuracy of the calendar, but only with the liturgical and festal union and order of the local churches. Even so, let us suppose that those people truly labored on behalf of scientific accuracy.

⁴ See Karimiris, John, *The Doctrinal and Symbolic Documents of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, second. ed., (Groaz:1968), vol. II, pp. 957–960. (In Greek.) For the full text in English, see *The Struggle Against Ecumenism*, Holy Orthodox Church in North America, Boston, 1998, pp. 177-181.

⁵ New-Calendarists: those who follow the errant calendar change according to the 1920 encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, despite the fact that the Pan-Orthodox Councils of 1583, 1587, 1593, and many subsequent Orthodox Councils condemned the new calendar and pronounced an anathema upon those that would adopt it.

Why then did they not correct the calendar according to the scientific data available in the twentieth century? Rather, they implemented an equally inaccurate calendar dating from the sixteenth century, the calendar of Pope Gregory. Why did they not implement the one which Peter Dragich had carefully computed and which was submitted to the so-called Pan-Orthodox meeting of Constantinople in 1923? Simply because the real reason was not a scientific correction of the calendar, which would have been a completely useless undertaking from an ecclesiastical point of view. The real purpose of the calendar change was to effect a festal union of the Churches, which could be actualized only with the Orthodox adoption of the Gregorian calendar of the Papists and Protestants, so that all would have the same festal calendar, and so that the first stage of Ecumenism—the union of the so-called Christian Churches—could begin.

It is not, therefore, out of some kind of pathological love for thirteen lost days that the traditional Orthodox Christians broke ecclesiastical communion with the innovating church, but rather in order that they might remain Orthodox. New Calendarism equals Ecumenism, equals a rejection of the Truth, a rejection of the One, Holy Church, a rejection of Holy Tradition, a rejection of the continual presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church. The new-calendarists declared the festal order of the Church Fathers to be in error; they overturned the festal relation between the Paschal cycle and immovable feasts; they abolished fasts; they changed immovable feasts to movable ones (for example, the feast of Saint George);⁶ they destroyed the festal harmony and unity of the Church of Greece with the other Orthodox Churches which did not change the festal calendar. They did all this in order to concelebrate with the heretical denominations of the West. They preferred to keep festival even though the rest of their brethren labored in fasting. What happened to the decisions of the Councils of 1583, of 1587, and of 1593, which repeatedly had excommunicated all

⁶ According to the traditional church calendar, the earliest the feast of Saint George can fall is Holy and Great Saturday or Holy Pascha. In this instance, it is transferred to New (Bright) Monday. According to the new calendar, however, Saint George's feast will often fall well within the period of Great Lent, and because the hymns in his Service are intertwined with paschal themes, this necessitates transferring the Saint's feast for up to two weeks.

those who would accept the Gregorian changes? They acted as if those Councils were unknown to them, or rather, they impudently ignored them.

We labor, therefore, to remain Orthodox in the face of the contemporary heresy of Ecumenism, which has corroded everything in the State Church of Greece. Do not ever believe those who would wish to deceive you with the usual lie proffered the naive. They will tell you: Of what concern is it to you if the Patriarch is a heretic, and if the Archbishops and Metropolitans commemorate him? The Patriarch is not our leader, but Christ. We know our hearts and our faith. We are Orthodox. Let the Patriarch declare whatever heresy he wishes. Let the Archbishops commemorate whom they will. They will have to answer for their souls and we for ours. Besides, we are sheep and it isn't our place to speak out. This is the concern of the shepherds. Jesus, our Saviour, the Christ, has said that no one can come unto the Father except through the Son. Similarly, no one can approach the Son except through the Church. A Christian cannot exist as an individual, but only as a member of the Body of Christ, the Church. And the Church is there only where the Truth is confessed. Where Ecumenism—that is, error—is confessed, there is neither Church nor Christ. And do not think that this is the case only when Ecumenism is preached from the pulpit—though even this occurs frequently enough. In the Church we confess our faith through the name of the bishop whom we commemorate. The Orthodox commemorate Orthodox bishops, Arians commemorate Arian bishops, Monophysites commemorate Monophysite bishops, Iconoclasts commemorate Iconoclast bishops, Uniates commemorate Uniate bishops, and Ecumenists commemorate Ecumenist bishops.⁸ It is possible for all things to appear Orthodox in the Church; however, the bishop who is commemorated by the priest will reveal to us where we truly are. In a Uniate church,⁹ all things appear to be

⁷ See: Calendar, *The Great Hellenic Encyclopedia*, Pyrsos edition, Vol. 12, p. 274, and Vol. 15, *Councils of Constantinople*, p. 642. (In Greek.)

⁸ Arians, Monophysites, Iconoclasts, etc., are followers of ancient heresies condemned by the Orthodox Church of Christ in its Seven Ecumenical Councils.

⁹ Uniate Church: a surreptitious religious movement established by the Roman Catholic Church primarily in order to bring about the union (*unia*) of the Orthodox people with Rome. This is attempted by infiltrating Orthodox countries with

Orthodox. Indeed, it is possible that the hair and beard of the priest there may be longer and fuller than those of the Orthodox. Also, the chant may be a great deal more liturgical and traditional, and the icons more austere than in some Orthodox Churches. The Creed itself in such a church may be recited without the *Filioque* insertion.¹⁰ But the priest there commemorates a Uniate bishop, who in turn commemorates the Pope of Rome. Thus all the appearances of Orthodoxy are for naught.

You may say that it matters little to you whom the priest commemorates since you believe in your heart that you are Orthodox. Would you, then, stay in a Uniate church to receive Holy Communion? But you do remain in a new-calendarist church. Everything there appears Orthodox. Your priest may even have long hair and a beard, and perhaps they have not yet sent you a Progressive preacher. But which bishop does that priest commemorate? And that bishop, which Patriarchs and Archbishops and Synods does he commemorate aloud or in the diptychs?¹¹ Does he commemorate Demetrius, the Patriarch of Constantinople? And Demetrius whom does he have inscribed in the diptychs and whom does he commemorate at every Liturgy? Is it not his Older brother, as he calls the Pope of Rome, Paul VI,¹² on every occasion? Why then flee from the Uniates, since either one way or the other you are commemorating the Pope? The tragedy of our times is precisely that Orthodox Christians have been united to Rome without being aware that this has already taken place.

clerics who dress and worship as the Orthodox do. It is noteworthy that many Uniates also use the old calendar.

¹⁰ *Filioque*: a heretical doctrine, officially adopted by the papacy in the ninth century and introduced into the Creed, creating a distortion in the Orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity. *Filioque* is a Latin word meaning "and the Son." Contrary to the Holy Scriptures and Church Tradition, the addition to the Creed states that God the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

¹¹ Diptychs: Originally a double-leaved tablet, but now registers, upon which the names of *bona fide* bishops of the Orthodox Christian Church are inscribed, and from which they are commemorated during the Divine Services. Erasure from these registers constitutes a grave act signifying that the once registered person is no longer considered to be a bishop of the Church. On the other hand, inclusion in the diptychs signifies that the individual whose name is included is a *bona fide*, canonical Orthodox bishop of the Church.

¹² As of this writing, the present Pope, John Paul II, is the one commemorated by the bishops of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. See also *The Struggle Against Ecumenism, op. cit.*, p. 318.

The Small Flock

We are sheep, but we are reason-endowed sheep; therefore, we have a right to speak. As for shepherds, the Good Shepherd has forewarned us that many of them are robbers and thieves who do not enter by the gate. The rational sheep follow the good shepherd or they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of strangers (John 10:4–5).

Ecumenism is the voice of strangers. Ecumenist shepherds, as much as they wish to appear to be Orthodox in order to deceive, are in reality wolves in sheep's clothing, working the destruction of the sheep (cf. Matt. 7:15, Acts 20:29). The sheep of Christ recognized with whom they were dealing and removed themselves far from the false shepherds in obedience to the ordinance of Christ, the Apostles, and the Fathers. And the camp of the wolf-like shepherds derisively called them old-calendarists, as the Christians derisively were called Nazarenes in another age. This people who knoweth not the law! But they forgot that the weak things of the world, and the despised hath God chosen to confound the wise (cf. I Cor. 1:27). The Orthodox, the true Orthodox, were always the small flock, always derided, always persecuted. But the Lord said, Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom (Luke 12:32). What were the first Christians in the eyes of the Hebrews who did not believe, that is, for the vast majority? What were they in the eyes of the heathen who boasted of their worldly wisdom? Ask your conscience and it will respond: They were like the old-calendarists of today.

A Member of the World Council of Churches

The matter is quite simple: The State Church of Greece is part of the worldwide ecumenist forces. It is a member of the World Council of Churches. In the recent past, an official delegation of its hierarchs visited Sicily and repeatedly concelebrated with Roman Catholics, thereby causing great joy to the Latins in attendance. In the new-calendar religious press, one will find many references concerning participation of the State Church of Greece in ecumenical activities during these latter years. The official periodical

of the State Church of Greece, *Ecclesia*, is an ecumenist publication. Hierarchs of the Church of Greece, accompanied by Uniate clergy, are openly depicted in photos as they engage in religious ceremonies. But even if all this were absent, even if the Church of Greece did not belong to the Ecumenical Movement as a whole, even if all her hierarchs were Orthodox in conviction, just the fact that they are in communion with Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrius, after so many of his public syncretistic pronouncements, is enough to render them deniers of the Faith.

With a great voice, Saint John Chrysostom declared that not only heretics, but also they who hold communion with them are enemies of God.¹³

Concerning the faith, the heretics were totally shipwrecked; and as for the others, even if their reason did not founder, nonetheless, because of their communion with heresy, they too were destroyed.¹⁴

Consequently, things are very clear for those who wish to remain Orthodox: they must sever all communion with the false shepherds, and must take on the reproach of the Old-calendarists. Here, however, is the stumbling-block that makes things difficult, because it is difficult to face not only the derision or the silent scorn of the world, but that also of the Brethren in Christ.

The Bait of Pietism

In our days, the days of false prophets and false teachers, Greece has been inundated with spiritual people who know how to say beautiful and true things about the life of prayer and spiritual struggle; but when anyone asks them about matters pertaining to the Faith, they say that such things adversely affect the spiritual life and Christians ought not to be occupied with them. It is as if the grace of God could exist without an Orthodox understanding. Since these people do not struggle for the Faith, they do not offend anyone, and they are on good terms with everyone. The majority say good things about them, and even call them saints. Nevertheless they work great evil upon innocent and well-disposed souls

¹³ St. Theodore the Studite, *Letter to Abbot Theophilus*, PG 99, 1049.

¹⁴ St. Theodore the Studite, *To the Patriarch of Jerusalem*, PG 99, 1164.

by convincing them to close their eyes and to unquestioningly follow the Patriarch and the Church. They are the most effective allies of Ecumenism. This terrible heresy could never take root without them, because they disarm precisely those who could be the most vital combatants for Orthodoxy. This is what Saint Isidore of Pelusium says about them:

Just as the fishermen hide the hook with bait and covertly hook the fish, similarly, the crafty allies of the heresies cover their evil teachings and corrupt understanding with pietism and hook the more simple, bringing them to spiritual death.¹⁵

Lest They Should Be Put Out of the Synagogue

When Christ was on earth, many of the Jewish leaders had recognized who He was, but they did not proclaim it because they dreaded facing the consequences of this confession. Here is what the Holy Scriptures say concerning them: Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on Him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God (John 12:42–43). Today, we see the same thing happening. Many of the leaders of the New Israel of Orthodoxy understand thoroughly what is taking place. They understand that universal syncretism has officially displaced Orthodoxy, but they do not admit it (many times not even to themselves) in order that they may not lose worldly goods—the respect of men, followers, positions, salaries—which they preserve by a policy of submission with or without protest on their part. These leaders of the New Israel are in some instances hierarchs, in others priests and laymen—university professors, instructors of religious brotherhoods, etc.—who are overwhelmed with fear that they might be put out of the synagogue. Thus, they deny Christ in deed by remaining faithful to the high priests who crucified Him and crucify Him.

¹⁵ *Letter to Timothy the Reader*, PG, 78, 252C.

A Stone Instead of Bread

Their teachings have two fundamental characteristics:

1. The introduction of a new type of ecclesiology foreign to Orthodoxy, according to which it is possible for a Christian to profess a faith other than that of his bishop.

2. The attack against the Old-calendar Church by lawful or unlawful means.

Some people have the ability to make black appear white, and white black. This is one of the characteristics of wisdom according to the world. But God hath chosen the foolish of the world who have the ability to detect this wisdom and to know that this wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic (James 3:15). It is a cold wisdom, dry, glued to the letter of the law, legalistic, prideful, cerebral. It is a wisdom that cannot sustain anyone, that cannot bring the peace of Christ to the heart, but that can bring only turmoil and confusion. And turmoil and confusion are, after all, the only deliberate intention of these people. They write things simply to sow doubt, turmoil, and confusion in wavering souls that are weak, and bereft of doctrinal and spiritual foundations.

Woe to you, ye blind guides who give stones to those who ask bread of you; to you that see the wolf coming, and lead the sheep to his mouth. You do have a form of godliness. No one would deny this; however: Behold, as for those who have a form of godliness (cf. II Timothy 3:5), their mentality and understanding resemble that of the world. Indeed, you think like men of the world in order to preserve order and discipline. Above all else, obedience to authority! As for the Truth, What is truth? A few protests are an acceptable substitute for truth. But as for discipline? Woe, if discipline should crumble! Truly, what difference is there between such a mentality and that of the Jesuits? Is there any difference between such an ecclesiology and that of the Latins?

Professing to be Wise, They Became Foolish

The religion of Christ is a simple matter, the late Photius Kottoglou would say, it is simplicity itself. Despite this, however, men make of it a complicated system like all their other sinful systems.

The struggle of the traditional Orthodox Christians is as clear as the water in a mountain spring. They struggle to preserve Orthodoxy inviolate just as they received it from the Fathers and the Apostles. But just look at how many shrouds and coils, and with how many laws and canons their eloquent enemies have entangled the Church of Christ. So much so, that they themselves, without knowing how it happened, finally come to absolute agnosticism, which, in its most naked form, is the denial of faith.

One of them writes: "I will be asked if Athenagoras is an Orthodox Patriarch in the eyes of God. Is God awaiting a synodal decision in order to determine if he has fallen away from the Orthodox Faith?" And here is his answer to this timely question: "We are not Cherubim and Seraphim, with the capacity of searching the archives of Heaven to see who has been inscribed and who has been erased. Which of us could say with absolute certainty and sureness that God has decided this way or that concerning this or that priest or bishop?" Indeed, if we do not have the ability to distinguish between truth and error, between Orthodoxy and heresy, then on what is our Faith based? Why do we believe in Christ and not in Buddha? Why do we follow Athanasius and not Arius? Why do we follow the Seventh Ecumenical Council, which condemned the Iconoclasts, and not that other "Seventh Ecumenical Council" which condemned the Orthodox? Woe to the Orthodox, if during the iconoclastic period they had awaited a synodal decision in order to learn what is written "on the archives of Heaven." Whom did that latter Council condemn? The Orthodox! Woe to us, if our fathers had reasoned like the present-day enemies of the traditional Orthodox Christians! The Apostle Paul wrote concerning these people, that they "became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Romans 1:21–22).

The Authority

On the one side stand they and "the whole of the Orthodox Church throughout the world." On the other side stand a few "old-calendarists." The ones who preserve the truth appear as individuals few, indeed, in number. These same few individuals are forced

to confront not individuals but whole churches. How can this situation be explained?

Yet even if they who preserve the truth are few, could this be used as an argument against them? Better one that doth the will of God rather than ten thousands of transgressors (Sirach 16:3). One shall pursue thousands, and two shall rout tens of thousands (cf. Deuteronomy 32:30). Even if there be very few that abide in Orthodoxy and godliness, they are the Church; the authority and protection of the ecclesiastical ordinances rests with them even if they should suffer exceedingly on behalf of piety. Our Lord has told us: Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom (Luke 12:32). They, however, say: Fear the little flock and flee far from it.

The papal mentality of these people has become widespread. According to this mentality, Christians are divided into officers and soldiers. However, it is not the saints, the dwelling-places of the All-Holy Spirit, who are the officers, but rather the hierarchs. In keeping with this mentality, it is inconceivable that a holy layman, monk, or priest would stand up to a hierarch who tramples upon the traditions of the Fathers. That which took place throughout the entire history of the Church is now condemned by the enemies of the traditional Orthodox Christians. The Church and for these people, the Church is the hierarchy would say to a saint who would dare to rebuke her, Who are you, sir? Are you a higher authority than I? I judge. I decide. I have the authority, not you. But these are words that are heard in Latin dominions. They were never heard in the Orthodox Catholic Church, save only from the Latin-minded. The Holy Spirit is the authority in the Church, and not the hierarchy. Whoever has the Holy Spirit has the authority, even if he be the lowliest garbage man. He can put a thousand hierarchs in their place. No one can question him, but he can question everyone.¹⁶ If the hierarchs excommunicate that man, their excommunication descends on their own heads, because whosoever cuts off the Holy Spirit cuts himself off from Life. In

¹⁶ Since the Church is catholic in all her parts, each one of her members not only the clergy but also each layman is called to confess and to defend the truth of tradition, opposing even the bishops should they fall into heresy. Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 1976), p. 16.

Orthodoxy, the significance lies not in agreeing with the hierarchs, but in agreeing or disagreeing with the organs of the Holy Spirit, the holy Fathers.

The Abyss of Papism

“This, my brother, they write, is Orthodox ecclesiology—that is, that the hierarchs possess all authority. But for individuals—that is to say, individual clergy or laymen—to rise and denounce the bishops whom the Universal Church accepts, that is clearly Protestantism.”

For one to write such things means that he must be ignorant of both Protestantism and Orthodoxy. Protestantism is not a refusal to recognize the authority of the Church. It is a refusal to acknowledge that the Holy Spirit illumines and guides the Church. On the other hand, when the Orthodox speak of the Orthodox Catholic Church, they do not mean only her bishops or the contemporary Orthodox Church throughout the world. The Catholic Church is not only the Church militant, but the Church triumphant as well. When any members of the contemporary Official Orthodox Church throughout the world act in opposition to the triumphant Church of the Fathers, then those individuals who rise up against them in order to remain in communion of Faith with the Church of the Apostles and Fathers are not Protestants; on the contrary, they are the only members of the Church militant. They do not perpetrate schism by not following the contemporary hierarchs who tread their own individual paths; rather, they constitute the Church, because they alone are one body with the Apostolic, Catholic Church of Christ.

Does one have to study theology in order to forget these things?

When another heretic, Nestorius, occupied the throne of Constantinople centuries ago, those who ceased to commemorate him, were they not simple priests and laymen, that is, individuals? How much time elapsed before the Church throughout the world became aware of what was happening in Constantinople and excommunicated Nestorius? In that interval, the priests and laymen who had ceased commemorating Nestorius were excommunicated by the Legal Archbishop of Constantinople. Now these individuals, did they or did they not act well by ceasing to com-

memorate their Archbishop? Who indeed was guilty of creating schism—the individuals who remained faithful to the Catholic Church, or those priests and laymen who followed their heretical Archbishop in order to prevent schism? Truly, how easily appearances deceive! It is for this reason that the Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Council of AD 867 emphasizes: “. . . they have not fragmented the Church’s unity with schism, but from schisms and divisions have they earnestly sought to deliver the Church.”

Some people fleeing from Protestantism fall into the abyss of Papism. The Pope accepts the Uniates with a creed different from the one professed by the Latins. His only concern is that they commemorate him. They may believe as they wish so long as they are subject to him. This is exactly what the Right from within advocates say!¹⁷ This is the way they argue: “We simply mean that we should not break away from them—the hierarchs—that we should not sever ourselves from canonical dependence upon them. As for the other matters, we will disagree, we will protest, we will stand in opposition. Subjection, accordingly, is fundamental, while the Faith is secondary; it is the other matters.” What fault, indeed, could the Papists find with such an ecclesiology? Here is the *Filioque* in all its glory. The Holy Spirit takes a second, subordinate place in His relationship to the Son, and becomes dependent on Him! The mystical economia of the Holy Spirit is inferior to the sacramental economia of the Son; and since it is inferior, it slowly loses every reason for existence! Thus, in Papism, the mystical life has disappeared, even as a concept. Actual contact with God does not exist for the Roman Catholic, even in theory. Everything is determined by reason and by ecclesiastical submission to the clergy. Thus agreement in the Faith is not considered indispensable.

Hence, we arrive at the strange ecclesiology of the new-calendarists, according to which it is not at all unnatural for a bishop who has revealed himself to be a devotee of extreme syncretism to demand that a monk, who belongs to his diocese but believes dif-

¹⁷ Contrary to the Orthodox Church’s historical and canonical procedure, clerics who have abandoned their apostatizing bishops have been severely criticized in our days because they have not remained with their errant bishops, fighting their former bishop’s heresies from within. The Right from within mentality is due to an erroneous understanding of the role of the bishop, and of the relationship between a believer and his bishop. Concerning the Church’s teaching in this matter, see *A List of Texts*, at the end of this book.

ferently, be obliged to follow and commemorate him as his own bishop. Two different faiths, two different confessions, but one bishop. That which may be seen in the political life of the nation, where many different religions may exist but where there is but one national government, is now transposed to the spiritual level. Many religions, but only one authority. Can these people tell us how their ecclesiology differs from reprehensible syncretism?

What is Heresy?

A godly wrath is provoked in the reader upon his realizing that, although the new-calendar writers understand very well the heresy that is presently assaulting Orthodoxy (forced as they are to admit that "Patriarch Athenagoras, and those who think as he does, have proved themselves to be secular and followers of reprehensible syncretism"), they attempt to present the issue as an insignificant infringement of the canons. They labor diligently to establish that the whole issue is not a matter of Faith, but simply a matter of canons, "which have been continuously violated for the whole of the Church's history." "Today you see various anti-Orthodox declarations, movements, and joint prayer with heretics, etc., on the part of Patriarch Athenagoras and Iakovos of America, and you are outraged. You do well. I too am enraged and shaken by the shameless violation of the holy canons. But, my brother, these things have not happened only in our days."

They know very well that the problem is not the joint prayers with heretics and the like, but that of corrosive syncretism, which circulates like the most deadly poison in the veins of mankind, and which has even permeated "official" Orthodoxy. "I surmise and believe," writes one of them, "that Patriarch Athenagoras, and the above mentioned Patriarchs, Archbishops, Metropolitans, Bishops, etc., are profoundly guilty in the eyes of the Church for their high-handed violations of the holy canons . . . and his [Athenagoras'] antic juggling with the Faith." "In other words, do not fear, O Christians, the whole issue is merely one concerning the violation of canons. As for the Faith, it is not a question of falling into heresy, but simply a matter of jugglery!" "But," he writes, "if the Patriarch proceeds further, if he advances toward "Unions," then you will

see . . . In other words, it appears the Patriarch has not yet gone far enough, as long as official union has not been effected.

Do you see the smoke screen they send up in order to hide the truth? All those who have not as yet understood what is happening around them think that the whole issue is the union of the Papists and the Orthodox, just as it was at Ferrara and Florence. The aims of the unionists, however, are not confined to the union of two churches. The unionists are syncretists. *They are not interested in amalgamation, but in co-existence.* They are not about to pursue a union such as the naive imagine. They are satisfied so long as the idea that *All of us are brothers* is firmly established in the minds of men, that *We are all the same*, that *We do not have essential differences*, and that *All of us are travelling toward God, each in his own way.*

This Masonic motif is the quintessence of syncretism. Today, this thinking is being cultivated among so-called Christians. Tomorrow, it will be preached to the monotheistic religions (Judaism, Islam, etc.). After that it will become the creed of the whole world, without exterior changes of any consequence taking place in the various religions.

However, when such a thought takes root in the mind of man, faith in Christ straightway departs from his soul. For those who would quaff the poison of syncretism, Christ is a great mystic, a great philosopher, a great moral teacher, perhaps even a god, but under no circumstances *the* God. He is a way, but not *the* Way. He is a truth, but not *the* Truth. He is a light, but not *the* Light. Orthodoxy is a path, but not *the* Path. Other paths exist that are equally good. A homogenization of religions is not about to take place. Let everyone hold to his own way. All that is required is that he not be a fanatic; that he not think that Orthodoxy is the only religion that exists in the world and none else; that he not think that only Orthodox bishops are bishops, and that heretics are nothing; that he no longer think that only in Christ can one know God, and that so many millions of Hebrews, Moslems, Buddhists, etc., are far from God.

This is the heresy that we are struggling with, and not some sort of union that has not as yet taken place. This heresy is the denial of Christ and His Holy Church. This heresy has engulfed every acre of Greece, and has become a way of thinking and living for

the Greeks. In spite of this, these teachers, in full cognizance of the situation, lull their spiritual children with such inane statements as the following: *Of the Patriarch proceeds further, if he advances toward Union, then you will see . . . But such Unions are not about to happen, hence their naive disciples will never see.* The very clever apologists of new-calendarism know this fact full well.

The Head and the Body

A heretical bishop ceases to be a bishop, he loses his priesthood, he is out of the Church. As many as follow him by commemorating him do not follow a bishop, but a man who has fallen away from hierarchical grace. How is it possible for his flock not to fall away also? From whence do the presbyters receive the commission of the priesthood? Is a fallen hierarch able to give the Body and Blood of Christ to his flock? The Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Council clearly states that a heretical bishop is no bishop, but a false bishop, that is, a false priest. His liturgies are false liturgies: his ordinations are false ordinations; his chrism is not Holy Chrism, and all of his Mysteries are devoid of sanctifying content. But in the Church, which is one Body, no one stands by himself. A priest is dependent on his bishop. The priest always concelebrates with his bishop, the bishop that he commemorates, even if the bishop happens to be elsewhere. People, priests, and bishop comprise one Body. When the head of a body dies, the whole body dies. For example, the fathers on the Holy Mountain¹⁸ who commemorate Demetrius have him as their head. But as they themselves confess, Demetrius is a follower of arrant syncretism, a preacher and devotee of the most deceitful and dangerous heresy which has ever assaulted the Church. As a heretic (read *apostate*, since syncretism is apostasy *par excellence*), Demetrius is dead to Christ. The Holy Mountain fathers who commemorate Demetrius, therefore, have a dead head. Who has ever seen a body live with a dead head?¹⁹

¹⁸ The Holy Mountain (also known as Mount Athos) is a monastic community on the Halkidiki peninsula in northern Greece.

¹⁹ Even if we were to assume that the head were not *dead*, would it be any better if, let us say, the head were dying, or confused, or indifferent to the Faith of Christ?

The Fifteenth Canon

When they realize that they cannot silence the Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Council of Constantinople, they skillfully send up a smoke screen. They do not cite the text of the canon, but they paraphrase it, pretending not to see or make reference to the most important phrase, which is the key to the canon: *Ὁ . . . for not bishops, but false bishops have they condemned.* Passing over this phrase in silence, they legalistically attempt to establish that the canon is discretionary and not obligatory. That is to say, it does not demand that the clergy cease commemorating their heresy-teaching bishop before his condemnation, but only that they have the *right* to cease commemorating him. In other words, he who ceases to commemorate does well, and he who does not, but continues in communion with the heretical hierarch, also does well. *Six of one; half dozen of another.*

Let us accept that this indeed is what the canon actually says: *If any clergyman cuts himself off from such a bishop before synodical clarification, he in no wise acts illegally, and he is not subject to censure, but rather he is worthy of praise.* Very well. If they accept this, then why do they hinder the monks of the Holy Mountain from ceasing the commemoration of Demetrius and becoming thereby worthy of praise? In what would the monks of the Holy Mountain be erring, if they ceased commemorating Demetrius, and instead of him, they commemorated *Every diocese of the Orthodox*? Would they or would they not be worthy of honor? These teachers themselves admit that they would be. Why, then do they prevent the monks from ceasing the commemoration? Why do they threaten them by saying that they are perpetrating schism if they cease to commemorate the Ecumenical Patriarch?

Let us see, however, whether or not the Fifteenth Canon is in actual fact optional. Here is the text of the canon:

But as for those who on account of some heresy condemned by the Holy Councils or Fathers, sever themselves from communion with their president, that is, because he publicly preaches heresy and with bared head teaches it in the Church, such persons as these not only are not subject to canonical penalty for

walling themselves off from communion with the so-called Bishop before synodal clarification, but [on the contrary] they shall be deemed worthy of due honor among the Orthodox. For not Bishops, but false bishops and false teachers have they condemned, and they have not fragmented the Church's unity with schism, but from schisms and divisions have they earnestly sought to deliver the Church.

After reading the above text, who can contend that one who does not cease commemorating a heretical bishop, but continues to be in communion with him, does equally well? Who would dare to maintain that one who follows a false bishop does well? Who would maintain that one who concelebrates with a false bishop imparts the Body and Blood of Christ to the faithful? Who would maintain that one ordained by a false bishop is truly a priest? One would have to be a syncretist, an ecumenist, and a denier of the Orthodox Faith to uphold such things. Knowing that your bishop is not a bishop, will you continue to commemorate him as though he were a bishop? Is this not a mockery of God? Knowing that your bishop does not have the grace of the priesthood and cannot celebrate the Mysteries, will you continue to commemorate him when you celebrate the Mysteries? Is the Fifteenth Canon, therefore, optional?

Who Perpetrates Schism?

The defenders of new-calendarism have well understood the obligatory significance of the Fifteenth Canon; consequently, they seek to gloss over the phrase: *Not bishops, but false bishops have they condemned.* All their arguments are, in essence, opposed to the Fifteenth Canon, and are in support of views that are diametrically contrary. For these people, a bishop is a false bishop only when he has been condemned by a Council. According to this view, it is not God but a Council which withdraws grace. As the canon would have it, however, a heretical bishop falls from grace the moment he begins publicly preaching his heresy. *He is a false bishop even before synodal clarification.*

The defenders of new-calendarism and Ecumenism label as Protestantizers and schismatics those who would dare to stop commemorating and sever communion with a heretical bishop. The

canon, however, emphasizes that they have not fragmented the Church's unity with schism, but from schisms and divisions have they earnestly sought to deliver the Church. How is it possible for a Christian not to feel obliged to rescue the Church from the schisms provoked by bishops who teach other than what the Church teaches? Because of their un-Orthodox teachings, these hierarchs—even if they are numbered in the thousands—tear themselves away from the Church of Christ, from the Church of the Apostles and of the Fathers. Since those who separate themselves from such bishops are usually few in number, it appears as if *they* are the ones who are perpetrating the schism. With this in mind, the canon emphatically speaks to every generation of Christians down through the ages and points out that appearances ought not to deceive them. The ones who remain faithful to the heretical hierarchs are the ones who perpetrate schism. They are the ones who separate themselves from the Church of the Apostles and the Fathers. The few who separate themselves from such hierarchs in reality preserve the Church from schism. Is the Fifteenth Canon obligatory or not?

If another cleric does not do this—that is, does not cease commemorating and communicating with a heretical bishop—but continues to commemorate the bishop without adopting his teachings, and awaits synodal clarification and judgment, on nowise, say these writers, is he judged by the canon. Let us be reasonable! Since he who ceases commemorating and communicating preserves the Church from schism, does not the one who persists in remaining with the schismatics come under the judgment of the canon?

But let us marvel at another of their sophisms: Never, say they, has a cleric been punished, nor even placed under ban, because he did not hasten to separate himself immediately from a heretical bishop, but rather awaited until his condemnation by a council. True, but how is it possible for a cleric to be punished by the Church when he is found to be outside the Church? If he should persist in remaining with his bishop after his bishop has been condemned by a council, what further can the Church do to him that she has not already done? The Church has condemned him also along with his bishop. On the other hand, should he delay and repent only after a synodal condemnation of his bishop

and wishes to return to the Church, how is it possible for the Church to accept him with bans and punishment? The Church was taught by the Lord to receive prodigals in the same manner as the parable teaches. The Church seeks to save souls, and not to drive them further away.

Councils and False Councils

Woe to the believer who sits and waits for a synodal judgment. When, indeed, is the convocation of a council going to be possible? And should a council be convoked some day, what sort of council will it be? Will it be a true council, or will it be a *Robber Council*? When the Orthodox priests of Constantinople ceased to commemorate their bishop, Nestorius, did they await the judgment of a council? Fortunately, no. A council was indeed convoked in Constantinople. What, however, was its judgment? It justified Nestorius and anathematized the Orthodox! The Third Ecumenical Council had to be convoked in order to restore things to their proper place. In other instances, however, the Orthodox had to endure for a long time under *Synodal Censure*. Fortunately, they were not of that mentality which attributes to councils of bishops that infallibility which belongs solely to the Church.

Inanities

One day Patriarch Athenagoras will die, and then who knows? Perhaps a conservative and prudent man will succeed him. If so, then there will be an end to the hysteria for unity and to the papist delirium. If, however, we have created schisms, how will we be able to heal the wounds of the Church? They suppose and unashamedly proclaim that the pious Orthodox Christians comprise a mob of unbridled fanaticism. When we kindle the fanaticism of the masses, they say, it will be impossible to enforce order afterward.

O haughty men! The masses which you disdain are not irrational, but rational sheep. If a truly Orthodox Patriarch should ever arise in Constantinople, those masses which you today call schismatic will be the first to fall at his feet and to kiss his hand. Would that such a miracle take place! For when we look at mat-

ters with human reason, we perceive that it is totally unrealistic for us to expect the return of an Orthodox Patriarch to Constantinople. Who of the hierarchs of the Phanar²⁰ is Orthodox? Which one of them is not an ecumenist? Who of them is not an innovator and worldly-minded? And of the priests under the Patriarchate, who of them ever protested against Ecumenism and syncretism? This Orthodox Patriarch whom they expect, where is he going to come from? Who is going to elect him, and who will enthrone him? Who elected Athenagoras? Was it the Orthodox, or was it International Masonry, through Truman? Who elected and enthroned Iakovos, the Archbishop of America, whom the hierarchs of the Phanar had voted down? Who pulls the strings in the puppet show that is played between the Bosphorus, Europe, and America? Certainly not the Orthodox Christians. Knowing all these things, how can we expect to see an Orthodox Patriarch in Constantinople? Awaiting such a miracle is like tempting God.

The Hireling Church

Some say that the Church of Greece follows Athenagoras. No! This is the worst possible slander. In no wise, my friends, does she agree with his brazen ventures.

So declared a new-calendar writer once in a diatribe against the traditional Orthodox. Let us see, however, to what degree this statement holds true.

When Athenagoras had completed the betrayal of Orthodoxy, after having officially declared the Church in error, and had lifted the anti-Papal anathema of nine centuries duration, and after he met with the Pope in Constantinople, and again in Rome, Athenagoras sent to the Synod of the Church of Greece all the documents concerning the betrayal. Here is the response of the Synod of the Church of Greece:

At the meeting of the Holy Synod, the chronicle sent by the Ecumenical Patriarchate was read, which narrated the October twenty-sixth to twenty-eighth visitation of His Holiness the Pope of Rome, as also were copies of the addresses and talks

²⁰ The quarter in Constantinople where the Ecumenical Patriarchate is located.

exchanged at that time between them and among other officials of the Roman Church . . .

After reading and studying them, the Holy Synod verified with special satisfaction that the visit and new meeting of the leaders of the two Churches—the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox—came about with the blessing of God, in accordance with the fervent prayer and anticipation of the Holy Synod and the pious body of the Church . . .

From the official announcement published after the meeting, the Holy Synod especially noted that the two leaders recognize that a true dialogue of love—upon which all the relations between them and between their Churches should be based—must be rooted in total faithfulness to the one Lord Jesus Christ and in a mutual respect for their different traditions, and that the dialogue of love between these Churches must bring forth fruits of unselfish cooperation, common effort on the pastoral, social, and spiritual plane with mutual respect for the fidelity of Christians of both traditions toward our particular Churches . . .

In consideration of the foregoing, the Holy Synod expressed its joy over the favorable results of the visit of the Ecumenical Patriarch, His All-Holiness Athenagoras, as well as her heartfelt desire that the dialogue inaugurated in love and mutual respect and on equal terms between the Churches may speedily come to a favorable conclusion, to the glory of our Holy Church and her divine Founder.

This text was made public on the seventh of November, 1967, and I transcribe it here just as it was published in the newspaper *Macedonia*.

Is it, therefore, a slander to say that the Church of Greece follows Athenagoras? Did any of the stalwart hierarchs protest this decision? Did any of them disclaim any responsibility? No, not one. The State Church of Greece, through her synod, assured the Greek people that she was especially satisfied with Athenagoras' betrayals and his syncretistic message. Moreover, she officially sealed this confession of hers on the one hand by accepting Holy Chrism blessed by the heresiarch Athenagoras, bringing it to Athens, causing the hapless Greek people to venerate it, and afterward, anointing their newly-baptized children with it. On the other hand, she again sealed her confession by the various concelebrations with

the implausible Iakovos of America in her own cathedral in Athens, and by concelebrations in various places throughout Greece with the new Patriarch of Alexandria, who has made so syncretistic and ecumenistic a profession of faith that Athenagoras himself would have envied it.

The Church of Greece, therefore, proclaimed that there should exist mutual respect between the Orthodox and the Papist traditions. Here, in all its glory, is syncretism. The Orthodox should respect the heresies of the Latins. Is there, then, much difference between this respect and the respect Orthodox should have toward other religions, firstly toward the monotheistic ones, the Jews, the Moslems, and then toward the polytheistic ones? The Church of Greece not only proclaims her fervent agreement with Athenagoras, but with a loud voice she preaches his same heresy: syncretism. Her agreement with Athenagoras is not merely a timid, passive agreement, but an active agreement, a parallel course, as her primate promised when he met with Athenagoras in Constantinople. The daily press understood quite well the significance of these various statements and actions of the Church of Greece. Here is what the newspaper *Eleftheros Kosmos* wrote on the tenth of September, 1969:

Yesterday, the Holy Synod of Greece, in an official communique expressed her deep sympathy to the Moslem world because of the burning of Al-Aksa Mosque in Jerusalem. In the same communique, the Holy Synod prays for the speedy achievement of peace in the world, and for the brotherhood of all the people of earth. The expression of the Orthodox Church's sympathy, and particularly that of Greece toward another faith, is, as Patriarch Athenagoras announced two years ago, a mark of the new striving toward closer relations and dialogue between our own and other faiths. As is known, a meeting between Moslem and Christian representatives of the two churches [*sic*] will soon take place on Crete.

Masonic syncretism is being cultivated by the Church of Greece with the same zeal and care as that shown by the World Council of Churches (of which she is, after all, an organic member) and by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It is not simply a question of cooperation for the union of the so-called churches, for Ecumenism is not

limited to the so-called Christians, but pursues the co-existence of all religions, the concord and reconciliation of everything false, and the conforming of the Church to this end.

What Need is There for Christ?

Characteristic of the syncretistic course of the State Church of Greece is the stand of some of her Metropolitans. For example, the May 9, 1969 issue of the newspaper *Macedonia* shows Metropolitan Leonidas blessing a Jewish banquet. The picture was taken at the banquet of the Greco-Israeli League which the Metropolitan attended. The same newspaper in its April 25, 1969 issue printed a photograph of the same Metropolitan at the Jewish cemetery of Thessalonica during a Jewish memorial service for the victims of Nazi brutality. In an appended article the paper writes:

Leonidas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, in offering a prayer for the victims of Nazi brutality said, "The Greek Orthodox Church, which I here now represent, prays to the Most High that He grant rest to the souls of the Greek Jews . . ."

Here is the syncretistic teaching of the Church of Greece in all its glory. Since God grants rest to the souls of Jews who refused to believe in Christ, what reason is there for one to be Christian? What need is there for Baptism? What need is there for the Mysteries? Indeed, what need is there for Christ? Christ is but one of the many ways which lead toward that vague "Higher Being," which everyone finds it easier to believe in, since everyone understands "it" according to his own preference. Judaism is another way equally good. Mohammedanism also. All religions are good and sure paths. Masonic syncretism has finally been preached publicly and unabashedly from official lips of the State Church and on official occasions.

Let no one naively think that these pronouncements and actions spring from the light-mindedness or thoughtlessness of one individual only who, "as bad luck would have it," happened to be Metropolitan of Thessalonica. Metropolitan Leonidas clearly announced that it was not simply he alone as an individual who prayed for the repose of the souls of the Jews (who deny Christ),

but the whole Greek Church which he was representing at that time. The truth of this is substantiated by the fact that the Church of Greece in no wise denied that Metropolitan Leonidas was representing her at that official occasion when men from all over the world were present; in no way did she protest his statements which were published in the international press. Not even as individuals did any of the Metropolitans of Greece protest.

In past ages, a similar action would have raised a storm: the Metropolitan would have been unable to remain even for a second on his throne for the wrath of the people and also of the other shepherds, who would have sent him hastily to the monastery where he made his vows, to weep for his sins, and to come to his spiritual senses. Today, however, all who preach that the deniers of Christ can be saved equally as well as the confessors of Christ not only hear no protests, but rather receive congratulations.

They Correct the Church

It is not only Athenagoras who is an exponent of extreme syncretism, as the above-mentioned writer of the new-calendar study would like to convince us. The whole Church of Greece is of the same persuasion and officially proclaims it. How is it possible for the Church of Greece not to agree and not to feel special satisfaction with Athenagoras' acts and preachings? For to all those black-robed clergy, whether their passport be Turkish or Greek, Christianity is not the Truth, but *a* truth, one among many others. The Church of Christ is not the infallible and holy Body of the Lord, but a community of people which errs and is in need of correction. Hence, we observe changes continuously taking place in the Church without any protest. It is not only Athenagoras who corrected the Church with the lifting of the anathema. The bishops and priests of the State Church of Greece correct the Church every day in other areas. That profound hymn of the Supplicatory Canon to the Theotokos: "Speechless be the lips of the impious who refuse to reverence thy revered icon . . ." has, under the domes of the ecumenist new-calendar church, been changed to: "Eloquent are the lips of the pious who reverence . . ." For these gentlemen, the patristic hymnology is uncouth and barbarous. This type of hymnology is especially incongruous in an ecumenis-

tic church. What could the Brethren in Christ say to the Protestants should the latter ever hear such expressions, lacking as they are in ecumenistic love?

But the Church is not being corrected in her hymnody only. She is being corrected even in the use of New Testament texts. In many churches, when the Mystery of marriage is served, the phrase “. . . and let the wife see that she reverence her husband” (Ephesians 5:33) has been systematically dropped of late, as being inconsistent with the feminist views of our times, and the appointed Biblical text is read in a truncated form. A prominent Greek theologian has gone so far as to suggest “the review and correction of certain of our liturgical texts, particularly those of Great and Holy Week, which offend the reputation and dignity of the Jewish people and nation.”²¹ As for the abbreviation of the Liturgy, the up-to-date appearance of the clergy, the introduction of four-part harmony and organs, and a plethora of other details, what are they but a correction of the Sacred Tradition of the Holy Church of Christ? The calendar change was also just another correction.

Colleagues

That which is hidden under the cover of these seemingly insignificant corrections is terrifying. That which is hidden is no less than a complete denial of Christianity. For these people, Christianity is not something both Divine and human. It is something purely human. For them the Church is not the Body of the God-man Christ. In the depths of their souls, they do not believe that Christ is the God-man. If they truly believed that He is, they would never dare to correct His Body, the Church. Nor do they truly believe in the Holy Spirit or in His guiding and enlightening presence in the Church. From this twofold disbelief, whether conscious or unconscious, springs the denial of the authority of the Holy Fathers, which may be seen in the State Church of Greece in these latter times.

The Fathers of the Church are being studied more than ever before, but this should not fool anyone. Our unlettered forefathers under the Turkish yoke may not have had the ability to study the patristic texts—however, they had absolute confidence in their

²¹ See *Orthodoxos Skepsis*, January 16, 1960, pp. 5–8.

authority. And if they erred unwittingly, they did so believing that the Fathers thus taught.

Today on the other hand, most of those who study the Fathers do so with an irreverent, proud, and critical disposition. For them, the Fathers are nothing more than their colleagues in theology. They see no reason why the Fathers should be respected any more than any one of their other colleagues. Sanctity no longer has any meaning. Only moral integrity, which has no spiritual, but only a social purpose, has any meaning for today's Christians. The Church of Greece, indeed, has attained great success in that realm. In her, pharisaism has developed into a science. The worst violations of the sacred canons are made on the pretext of purifying morals.

Although a hypocritical sensitivity prevails in the matter of morals, a boundless tolerance is shown in matters of faith. This is so because matters of faith relate to eternal life—something hereafter, intangible, and essentially of no interest to these people who have lost their faith—while moral matters relate to this city which, though it may not be abiding, the people who have no hope wish to make more abiding, in order to find some placebo for the futility of their existence. Morality is the mainstay of society. Holiness, however, is a departure from the world and the systems of the world, and for this reason society looks inimically upon it. Holiness denies the world which lieth in wickedness. It is something totally different from moral integrity. Moral integrity looks to the present age, but holiness is indifferent to it in this vain age of corruption, and looks to the future age of incorruption. From this fact, a sundering antithesis results between ethics and holiness, an antithesis which is completely ignored by the moralistic conduct and teaching of the State Church.

The State Church is essentially nothing more than a tool in the hands of Caesar. All look upon her as a means to preserve law and order, as a power which lends greater authority to the laws than the sword alone could give. Thus, paradoxically, we see the greatest atheists, and people most indifferent to religion, supporting the Church so long as through her they have the power to subjugate the masses.

Toward a Worldly Kingdom

When one studies carefully the labors of the religious organizations that have sprung up in the midst of the State Church of Greece these last years, he will observe that these organizations have as their goal "a Christian Greece" and not the Kingdom of Heaven. Behind these apparent Christian goals there lurks a worldly expediency which is not even perceptible to the majority of the members. Their thirst for numbers, power, and supremacy, together with the disdain which their most devoted members have toward monasticism, and their involvement in the world, speak eloquently of the change in spiritual orientation of the flock of the "official Church." The faithful in that church have gradually been orientated toward a worldly kingdom of Christ of a millennial type, or more accurately, of a Jewish type. They have begun to long for and to struggle for a utopia which they label "the dominion of God," or "Christian democracy," or "Christian civilization." The phrase "Christian civilization," or more commonly "Helleno-Christian civilization," is perpetually on their lips.

However, true Christians "have here no abiding city, but seek the one to come" (Hebrews 13:14). This search for "an abiding city here" on the part of the elect faithful of the new-calendar church and by the faithful of the religious organizations is a result of a protracted spiritual poisoning of the faithful. Even though it has not affected many external characteristics of Orthodoxy, it has, in reality, corroded her very foundations. It is exceptionally difficult to find a person in the State Church who, in one way or another, has not become subject to this corrosion. Those who are left feel unsettled and alienated; they become objects of derision and are described as "old-calendarists." Thus the derision reveals the truth that there exists a deep difference of mentality, views, and faith between what in the past was Orthodoxy and what exists today in the new-calendar church.

The question, "Is the State Church of Greece following Athenagoras or not?" is long out of date. Both Athenagoras and the official Church of Greece suffer equally from the same illness. They are two parallel branches of the same plant, only Athenagoras was the riper of the two fruits.

Confession Made Publicly On the Churches

The supporters of new-calendarism persist: Ask the bishops of the Greek Church in writing if they are of one mind with the Patriarch and you will be informed . . . We should not forget that although amenities and affability [shown by members of the new calendar episcopate toward Athenagoras and those of like mind with him] are always publicized and thus become known by reason of misguided courtesy, other actions which criticize and censure [Athenagoras and his colleagues] remain unknown.

It is not a matter of remaining unknown. They know very well that that which is important and subject to consideration in the Church is not one's private opinion, but his confession of faith. That which a bishop secretly believes is a matter of indifference to the Church. What is of significance is that which he preaches publicly, with bared head, On the Churches. This is why the canons dictate that only when a heretical bishop preaches his heresy publicly are we to break off communion with him. When he keeps his heresy to himself, when he does not teach his heresy, and refrains from communicating with heretics openly, the Church considers him to be Orthodox, his priesthood remains intact and his Mysteries are valid. However, when a bishop publicly preaches heresy, or communicates openly with those in heresy, when he publicly denies Christ and His Church, notwithstanding what he may feel in his heart, or what he may privately say to some one or another, the Church considers him to be an apostate and a denier of Christ. He is outside the fold of the Church; his priesthood is forfeited and his Mysteries are bereft of sanctifying grace.²²

²² When new calendarists seek to dismiss the un-Orthodox statements made by their bishops, they often say that these pronouncements are only private opinions, and do not reflect the teaching of their church. But when such private opinions are pronounced publicly, they are no longer private, but public or, in the language of the holy canons, bare-headed. In addition, and more importantly, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and all those church bodies in communion with it, officially removed itself from the Orthodox Church when it lifted the anathemas against the papacy in 1965 and commenced commemorating the name of the Roman pontiff and all the confessions of the East and West in the diptychs in 1968, as though the Pope were a *bona fide* bishop of the Church, and as though all the confessions were Orthodox. These are not private acts or opinions, but official, synodal decrees, solemnly proclaimed. These decisions are all the more incriminating when one considers that Roman Catholicism has not abandoned or repented of any of its earlier errors, but has added even more, such

The Church is not a private and merely individual matter. The priesthood and the episcopacy are not individual and private matters, but Mysteries given by the Church and in the Church. God will judge the denier as a person, but he cannot be a priest or hierarch of the Church when he denies the Church which gave him his priesthood, and officially and openly deserts to the camp of the deniers. Those who publicly denied Christ in order to avoid punishment at the hands of temporal rulers have always been considered by the Church as estranged from her, even though it was known by all that, within their hearts, they had never denied Christ or His Church. How then can she not consider as estranged from her those who, without the threat of martyrdom, publicly deny the Faith and betray Christ?

Therefore, we have no need of any private letter, or of any private assurance from the bishops of the official Church of Greece who follow the Patriarch of Constantinople by commemorating him. Publicly, *Òn the Churches,* *Ó*with bared head, *Ó*at the most solemn moment of the Liturgy, they declare themselves to be followers of the syncretistic Patriarch. Of what value are their private assurances? Of what value are any *Ó*actions which criticize and censure, *Ó*when they remain unknown? Officially, publicly, *Òn the Churches,* *Ó*all the hierarchs of the State Church agree with the Phanar and follow it.

Those bishops and priests who say in their private conversations that they disagree with Demetrius prove nothing else but that they lack sobriety and straightforwardness. How is it possible that the deception and subterfuge of these clergymen be considered proof of their Orthodoxy? And how can a spiritual father *Ñ* who bears such great responsibility for the youth he shepherds *Ñ* call such two-facedness and opportunism *Ó*courtesy, *Ó*or even *Ó*misguided courtesy? *Ó*And, in their studies, have not these erudite Archimandrites ever chanced to come across what Saint Basil the Great had to say about such hierarchs? *Ó*As for all those who pretend to confess the sound Orthodox Faith, but are in communion with

as the doctrines of the immaculate conception and papal infallibility. See also the booklet *Sister ChurchesÑ Five Hundred Years After Florence*, Boston, 1994.

Concerning the matter of sanctifying grace in the sacraments of those who preach heresy, see Appendices K, L, M, N, and O in *The Struggle Against Ecumenism, op. cit.*, pp. 255-279.

those who hold a different opinion, if they are forewarned and still remain stubborn, you must not only not be in communion with them, but you must not even call them brethren.²³

Have Any of the Rulers . . .

All the teachers of the Church, all the Councils, and all the Divine Scriptures, exhort us to flee those who uphold other doctrines and to separate from communion with them, says Saint Mark of Ephesus.²⁴ With a great voice, Saint John Chrysostom declared that not only heretics, but also they who hold communion with them are enemies of God, writes Saint Theodore the Studite to the abbot Theophilus.²⁵ The entire written and unwritten Tradition of the Church, all the Saints and the Apostles in the Holy Scriptures condemn the hierarchs of the State Church of Greece who are in communion with the apostate Patriarch and those of like mind.

Yet how many of today's Orthodox Christians have the courage to flee from those whose faith differs from that of the Church from all ages past and to withdraw from communion with them? Few, indeed. How small has that little flock, Christ's flock, always been! And what weak clay and earthen vessels are they who are left in the modern world to witness to the Truth: the unlettered mob with its passions, divisions, and narrow-mindedness, who knoweth not the law! Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in Him, ask the scribes of the new-calendarists. But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed (John 7:49).

Has any theologian become an Old-calendarist? Has any university professor become an Old-calendarist? Have any one of the so-called irreproachable bishops become Old-calendarists? No, none of the wise and the powerful of this age has followed the unlettered mob of the Old-calendarists those few Galileans who shout "Now listen to this" that supposedly the Church of Greece agrees with Athenagoras and Demetrius, and who sound the alarm as Noah once did for the animals to enter into their ark.

²³ *Patr. Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 303.

²⁴ *Confession of Faith*, XIII, 304.

²⁵ PG 99, 1049.

Look around you and see how quietly people behave; how calmly they go to be baptized and married in the large churches, and with what compunction they apply the chrism of that *most reprehensible syncretist, Athenagoras.* Look at what a great multitude they are, and how prominent: priests, bishops, scientists, rulers, Scribes, Pharisees, Teachers of the Law. Can it be that they all know nothing and that only the unlettered *Old-calendarists* understand what is happening?

The unlettered *Old-calendarists* may not know anything, but one thing they do know: they are in agreement with the New Martyrs, the Confessors, the Fathers, the Anchorites, the ancient Martyrs, the Apostles. It does not matter to them if they are few, because the real Christians were always few in number. They do not care if they are weak, because the Apostles were also weak. It does not bother them that they are unlettered, because Christ also was unlettered. They are anxious about one thing alone: how they may remain faithful to Orthodoxy, how they may remain in the Church, how they may run into the Ark. To the teachers of the new-calendarists who calm their followers with references to the *multitudes of the Church throughout the world,* the Orthodox Christians answer with the words of Saint Theodore the Studite, *One who is well-pleasing to God is to be preferred over myriads who are invested with presumption.*⁶ *It is your prerogative to prefer the drowned multitude to Noah who was saved; but as for me, allow me to run to the Ark along with the few.*⁷

Strugglers in Behalf of Orthodoxy

The crude and conscious distortion of the truth by the defenders of the new calendar reveals their insincerity and demagogic purpose. Here is what they say about the traditional Orthodox Christians: *They departed from the Church of Greece and established the Church of the True Orthodox Christians because the calendar change violated the Sacred Canons . . . They only established the Church of the True Orthodox Christians [T.O.C.] out of a desire to defend the Sacred Canons . . . The Church of the T.O.C.*

²⁶ PG 99, 1081C.

²⁷ PG 99, 1084A.

was established as a means . . . a means of strictly observing the Sacred Canons.

A more crafty calumny of the struggle of the traditional Orthodox Christians could not have been devised. It is crafty because at first glance it appears true and accurate. Indeed, the calendar change did in fact violate the Sacred Canons and, as was natural, the traditional Orthodox Christians were not remiss in underscoring this. The slander consists in presenting the old-calendarists as struggling like Don Quixote with as they write "exactness" as their banner. This is indeed an infernal slander which aims at and has the power to debase the struggle of the traditional Christians in the world's eyes to the low levels of a naive and unrealistic struggle carried on by a fanatic element.

However, the Orthodox Christians are not struggling to establish a bias for ecclesiastical exactness at the expense of ecclesiastical *economia*. It never was an issue of exactness and *economia*. The Orthodox Christians were struggling in behalf of Orthodoxy. The change of the festal calendar was not merely a trampling of the canons. It was the beginning of the demolition of Orthodoxy's walls—a destruction whose preparations go back to the time of Theoklitos Pharmakides.²⁸ If the strugglers for Orthodoxy have been called "old-calendarists" this is due to the fact that the enemies of Orthodoxy decided to begin her overthrow with the introduction of the Papal festal calendar. If they had started with something else, the form of the struggle and the designation of Orthodoxy's strugglers, who today are called "old-calendarists" would have been different.

The enemies of Orthodoxy pretend that they do not understand the meaning of the struggle of the traditional Orthodox Christians. They drown the vastness of Christianity, they say, in thirteen drops of water. The thirteen days of the calendar are, for them, a frightful difference of faith, a matter of salvation, a dogma of the Church. This distortion is a classic display of impotence in the presence of truth. The Orthodox Christians never strove for thirteen days or for calendars. It was rather the new-calendarists who

²⁸ Secretary to the Holy Synod of Greece from 1833–1839 and again from 1844–1850. Pharmakides was notorious for his espousal of the precepts of the Western Enlightenment and his opposition to Church tradition and canonical order.

resorted to the excuse of astronomical accuracy. The Orthodox Christians of Greece in 1924 saw the liturgical harmony of the Church of Christ throughout the world being overthrown a harmony that had reigned for sixteen whole centuries. They saw disdain toward the traditions of the Church; they saw the syncretistic flirting with the heretical denominations of the West; they understood that this was the real reason for the introduction of the Papal calendar. And worst of all, they saw the hidden denial of the infallibility of the decisions of the Church, which finally surfaced in all its glory in 1965 with the raising of the anathemas against the Papacy. In other words, they comprehended that the vessel of the Greek Church had foundered and had begun to ship water.

The calendar change was the first axe blow on the trunk of the Church, whose felling had been long in planning. One would have to be blind not to see or understand that those who dealt the first axe-blow would not stop, but would proceed. Their purpose was not the first axe-blow, but the felling of the tree. As many as were pious understood this fact very well, and we now see that they were right.

The Attenuation of Orthodoxy

The Orthodox Christians, therefore, did not leave the State Church because they did not know what ecclesiastical *economia* was. They left in order to remain Orthodox. The State Church of Greece had inaugurated a program of divesting itself of Orthodoxy. Remaining in her would have been not merely a silent assent to the crime perpetrated against the Faith, but in actuality a question of salvation. Behind all of the actions there hid a subversive disdain of the Church Fathers, which we have seen so tangibly revealed in the bosom of the various religious organizations here in Greece.

When the Fathers conformed the festal calendar and the hymnody of the Church to the calendar of Julius Caesar the astronomers, they knew full well that with the passage of time there would be a time loss. The Fathers were not concerned with astronomical accuracy. The Fathers way of thinking is radically different from the worldly and thoroughly man-pleasing mentality of the bishops of the Greek Church in our own days. This dif-

ference in way of thinking is the foremost and gravest danger for the souls of the faithful. It is an invisible poison which spreads more and more densely into the blood of the faithful, and moreover renders them incapable of absorbing spiritual oxygen, if ever they should find themselves in the pure air of Orthodoxy. The pulpit, the catechisms, the religious organizations, the theological schools, the publications, the brotherhoods of dedicated Christians—all bear a stamp of secularization that is reminiscent of the plight of western religion. The few exceptions constitute jarring discords, lumps in the pudding, foreign bodies that must be rejected. Therefore, is withdrawal from such a Church a matter of salvation, or is it not?

Why are the patristic books so hard to find? Why have not the religious organizations, with their tremendous resources, published the Fathers? Why does not the Church pressure the government into teaching the patristic texts in the schools? The answer is simple: It is because the Fathers are no longer loved. They honor them with their lips, but hate them with their hearts. In the Church of Greece, they do not wish to believe and to live as the Fathers believed and lived. No! The change in the festal calendar was not a simple and isolated act, it was not the chance inspiration of some archbishop; it was the first eruption of a volcano that had been rumbling for some time—an eruption which presaged the other eruptions that followed, and of which we are witnesses. This is how the Orthodox Christians saw the calendar issue, and the times have shown that what they saw was true.

Legalistic Rationalism

The other Orthodox Churches, say the apologists of new-calendarism, even though they maintain the old calendar, have had, and continue to have unbroken canonical relations with the Church of Greece. Why have the old-calendarists of Greece acted differently? And having acted thus, have they not placed themselves outside of the Orthodox Catholic Church? Which local Orthodox Church of those who maintain the old calendar has ever had canonical relations with the old-calendarists in Greece? The Church of Jerusalem? That of Russia? That of Serbia? That of Bulgaria? Not one. All the churches, from the very start, have carried

on relations only with the Church of Greece. If, because of the calendar change, the Church of Greece became automatically (that is without the proscription of the other Churches) schismatics, then all the local Orthodox Churches are schismatic also, since they are in communion with a schismatic Church. Ó

With a few changes we can transfer the above paragraph to another time and write it as follows: ÓWhen Nestorius first taught heresy in Constantinople, the other Orthodox Churches, even though they kept the Orthodox Faith, continued to maintain unbroken canonical relations with the Church of Constantinople and with Nestorius. Why did the few priests and laymen of Constantinople act differently? Why did they cease commemorating their Archbishop, and why did they publicly denounce him? By this act did they not place themselves outside of the Orthodox Catholic Church? Especially since the excommunication issued by their Archbishop (with whom all the Patriarchs and Bishops of the world were in communion) had descended on their heads? Which local Church of those that maintained the Orthodox Faith unscathed had canonical relations with the true Orthodox Christians of Constantinople? The Church of Jerusalem? That of Antioch? That of Rome? That of Alexandria? Not one. All the Churches maintained relations only with the Official Church of Constantinople and Patriarch Nestorius. If, because of the heresy of her Archbishop, the Church of Constantinople became automatically heretical, (that is, without proscription by the other Churches, which came later), then all the local Orthodox Churches became heretical, since they were in communion with a heretical Church . . . ! Ó

Behold where dry, unorthodox, and legalistic reasoning leads. In fact, neither the genuine and pure Orthodox Christians of Constantinople who had been excommunicated by Nestorius were ever outside the Church, nor did the other local Churches ever become heretical, since they had never agreed with Nestorius. However, Nestorius's heresy had not yet become widely known. Rumors were circulating, but things had only been substantiated or clarified for the residents of Constantinople because they had personally heard Nestorius's preaching. For them, to continue in communion with Nestorius would have been tantamount to true heresy. The others were justified in remaining in communion until they could ascer-

tain the facts of the matter. In such instances, communion is broken with a heretic little by little by the surrounding Churches, according to their measure of awareness of their neighbor's heresy. The cessation of commemoration and communion always begins within the very Church where the heresy has spawned. A space of time intervenes until the other Churches perceive the heresy, and an even greater span of time lapses before councils convene and excommunications are pronounced.

The same thing happened with the Orthodox Christians in Greece. The innovation took place within the bosom of the Greek Church, and therefore it was natural that the Greek Christians should be the first to break relations with the innovators. The other Churches, of course, delayed in reacting, or they reacted not at all. This happened because most of them, deep down, held the same syncretistic views as the State Church of Greece. The others, the genuinely Orthodox—the Catacomb Church of Russia and the Russian Church in the diaspora—were experiencing such evident trials that they could not perceive what had exactly happened in Greece, nor could they react.²⁹

Awaiting Synodal Clarification

The Orthodox do not await the Church's pronouncement of anathema in order to withdraw from heretics. All who become aware of contagion, withdraw without waiting for the order to be given to them by the health authorities. Circumstances may prevent such an order from ever being given, or of it being given too late. Those infected with cholera are thus infected whether the physicians know it or not, or whether they declare it or not. They who are near will be the first to comprehend the gravity of the contagion, and they must be the first to leave since they are in greater danger than all the rest. Heresy is heresy whether it has

²⁹ *Trans. Note:* Unfortunately, after the repose of Metropolitan Philaret of blessed memory in 1985, the Russian Church in exile did not remain faithful to its original course of Orthodox confession. Many responsible commentaries on this change of course are found in the letters written to various bishops of the Russian Church in exile by numerous clergy who left that jurisdiction. Especially significant are the letters written by Fr. Seraphim Johnson, Fr. Michael Azkoul, Fr. Victor Melehov, and the clergy of the French Mission. See also *The Struggle Against Ecumenism, op. cit.*

been anathematized or not. Woe to those who remain in communion with it, while awaiting synodal clarification.

The first symptom of the heresy of Ecumenism in Greece appeared in 1924 with the overturn of the calendar. As many as were alert understood that they were dealing with cholera and they retreated without awaiting further developments. Today they are criticized. It is said they should have waited until their neighbors had also discerned the disease in their house. Their neighbors are still waiting there and are holding back all those who are gullible enough to obey them. They say they await the physicians. Can it be that no one has been found to inform them that the physicians from whom they await a diagnosis are the *first* to have been infected?

A Controller of Grace

A new-calendarist writes, "It is alleged today that since the Church of Greece is in communion with Patriarch Athenagoras it has become heretical. If so, she became so today. Perhaps she became so even yesterday, or a year ago, or two years ago, or even three years ago. However, five years ago or ten years ago she was not. And especially thirty years ago she was not. Therefore, thirty years ago the Church of Greece, being Orthodox, deposed the two hierarchs in question (meaning Chrysostom, the Bishop of Florina, and Germanos, the Bishop of Demetrias, who returned to the old calendar and denounced the calendar innovation) along with all those ordained by them. Therefore, this decree of hers, since it was done in years past, is effectual and valid for us. The present acts of the Church of Greece, which is now heretical— I speak hypothetically, of course—are not valid, and those deposed by her are not deposed. Those, however, who were deposed by the Church of Greece twenty or thirty years ago are deposed, most assuredly deposed."

So Chrysostom and Germanos were deposed? But who deposed them, and why? They were deposed by those who had overturned the Orthodox liturgical tradition, by those who despised the Fathers in order to befriend the heretical denominations of the West. And why were they deposed? Because they did not wish to follow the innovators and despisers in their headlong fall.

Really now, do these people truly believe that God is a servant of the hierarchs? That He is obliged to remove His grace from just and Orthodox people at the bishops' behest? Indeed, they do preach this because their ecclesiology is not Orthodox, but Papal. The hierarchy, for them, is the controller of God's grace. As long as the hierarchy does not oppose Athenagoras, God cannot withdraw His grace from him.

The Orthodox, however, do not view matters legalistically, but ontologically. Heresy is darkness. Darkness cannot exist together with the light of God's grace. The heretic is a heretic because he has driven God far from himself; it means that he has willingly shut himself up inside a dark tower of ignorance where no ray of the divine light can penetrate. More than any other sin, heresy estranges men from God. Through heresy, a man severs himself from God whether a council excommunicates him or not. Heretics are ontologically, not legalistically, cut off from the Church. They are separated because they are in heresy, and not because the Church has decided to cut them off. The heretic—that is, he who preaches heresy and anyone who knowingly follows one who preaches heresy—is, in either case, in opposition to the Church. He who is in opposition to the Church cannot have the Blood of Christ, which cleanses from all sins. The presupposition for this cleansing to take place is that one should abide in the truth. God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all, writes the beloved Disciple of the Lord. If we say we have communion with Him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not act in truth. But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have communion one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin. (I John 1:5–7). Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son (II John 1:9). The presupposition for people to have the grace of God is for them to have the truth, because, as Saint Symeon the New Theologian says: Truth is nothing else than the grace of Christ.³⁰

The separation of the heretic from the Church, therefore, has no relation with the decisions of a council of the hierarchy. The Orthodox Council is the surgeon which amputates the rotten

³⁰ Homily Twenty-Two.

member from the Body of the Church. It is not the Council, however, that put the member to death. The member was dead before the Council decided to excise it.

Truly, the hierarchs have authority to excommunicate, but to excommunicate only those who have already died spiritually. No matter how many excommunications, anathemas, depositions may be showered on an Orthodox and just man, even from Orthodox hierarchs, he remains alive and unshaken within the Church of Christ, reproving others, yet being reproved by no man. If, contrary to the intention of God, a hierarch issues an excommunication, the judgment of God does not follow to fulfill this decree. says Saint Maximus the Confessor, who knew something about such excommunications. Saint Dionysius the Areopagite writes:

Thus, the hierarchs, as expounders of the divine statutes, also have powers to excommunicate—not that the All-wise Divine Principal, so to speak, servilely obeys their irrational impulses—but being prophetically moved by the Supreme initiating Spirit, they excommunicate, as is due, those who have been judged by God.³¹

A very expressive cartoon was published on the front page of the periodical *The Christian Spark* (January, 1961, No. 33). The cartoon depicts a bishop with black crows coming out of his mouth. The crows, flying about and not finding a place to roost, return and settle on the bishop's head. At that time, Panteleimon, the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, had excommunicated nine members of the organization of the then Archimandrite Augustine Kantiotis. Under the headline the following words appear: "As birds and sparrows fly, so a curse uttered in vain shall not come upon a man" (Proverbs 26:2). As a caption to the above cartoon were the words, "Unjust curses and anathemas, as the people say, do not take hold, even if they are cleverly interwoven with Biblical texts. According to the Scriptures, they resemble the black, hungry birds with hooked claws, which fly about in the air, but finally return to roost on the head of him who so foolishly released them." The text in the publication finishes with a brief reference to Church History, where one can find many examples of unjust excommunica-

³¹ *Concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, Chap. 7.

tions and depositions of pious, Orthodox people by impassioned or uninformed bishops.

The erudite new-calendarist writer, whom we quoted at the beginning, knows all this. He knows that an unjust deposition, even if it should be enacted by Orthodox bishops, is without validity. God is not a servant of the bishops so that He has to remove the grace of ordination from priests and bishops who are completely Orthodox and righteous, just because other bishops ordered Him to do so. How is it possible for anyone to imagine that God would punish His servants because they are obedient to His holy will rather than to that of transgressing bishops? Nonetheless, the learned mentors of the new-calendarists employ this argument, knowing that it is without content, solely to impress their readers.

The Un-orthodox Depose the Orthodox

Thirty years ago the Church of Greece, being Orthodox, deposed . . . Here is a point that should be examined. If, indeed, an unjust excommunication and an unjust deposition are invalid when they are enacted by Orthodox bishops, what happens when they are enacted by hierarchs who are inimical to Orthodoxy? By bishops who have come under the anathemas of Pan-Orthodox Councils? By bishops who are laboring for the fulfillment of the goals of accursed Ecumenism? By bishops who are advocating the heresy of heresies—Ecumenistic Syncretism? Now wait a minute, they will say to us, Ecumenism is a heresy that appeared just recently. Ten years ago it did not exist, and this is true even more so thirty or more years ago when all the old-calendar clergy and laity were excommunicated and anathematized by the Church of Greece . . . Indeed, all who think like this are in error, grave error.

What was the purpose of the calendar change? The change of calendar for the cycle of fixed feasts, as well as the projected change of the Paschal calendar (Paschalion), had as its fundamental aim the establishment of a common festal calendar with the Western denominations. It was the first step toward the much-bruited Union of the churches. The calendar change was the first official act of syncretism in our land. The new-calendarists attempt to present the traditional Christians' adherence to the

Orthodox festal calendar as a peculiarity, as an understandable eccentricity which, however, cannot justify the traditional Christians' reverence of communion with the innovating State Church. This, in general, was the tactic of the new-calendarists: to make the issue for which the traditional Orthodox Christians were struggling appear to be, in all ways, ridiculous and insignificant. The defenders of new-calendarism attempt to present the change of the Orthodox festal calendar and the heresy of Ecumenism as if the two were completely unrelated subjects. Nevertheless, from the very start, the traditional Orthodox Christians cried that it was the Faith that was in danger. The struggle of the traditional Orthodox Christians was not a struggle of narrow-minded fanatics against a perfected and more accurate calendar, as the new-calendarists wished to make it appear. It was the struggle of Orthodoxy against a new heresy—a treacherous and camouflaged heresy which was not then known by its real name. The overthrow of the Orthodox festal calendar was the first organized attack of Ecumenism against Orthodoxy in Greece.

When one studies the history and the decisions of that un-Orthodox Council of Constantinople which convened under the presidency of the Mason-Patriarch of Constantinople, Meletius Metaxakis, one recognizes Ecumenism in all its glory, just as we know it today.³² At that Council, in May of 1923, the change of the festal calendar and of the Paschalion were not the only decisions. The following decisions were also made: the abolition of the rason and its replacement with the suit and clerical collar of the

³² Meletius Metaxakis had a very active and far-ranging ecclesiastical career. He began his episcopal activities as Metropolitan of Kition of Cyprus (1910–1918), then became Metropolitan of Athens (1918–1920), then Ecumenical Patriarch (as Meletius IV, 1921–1923), and finally Patriarch of Alexandria (as Meletius II, 1926–1935). Although removed from his position as Metropolitan of Athens, he came to America in February of 1921, still acting as the head of the Church of Greece, and established the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. Elected Ecumenical Patriarch in 1921, he remained in that position until he was removed forcibly by the faithful in 1923. An ardent ecumenist, he was largely responsible for the uncanonical adoption of the Gregorian calendar for use in church and the recognition of Anglican orders, which are but two of the several un-Orthodox practices and teachings he espoused and promoted. Finally, according to Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain, who was present as an archdeacon and eye-witness, Metaxakis was given a full Masonic funeral upon his death in Alexandria in 1935. For more information on this individual, see *The Struggle Against Ecumenism*, *op. cit.*

heterodox clergy; the shearing of the hair and beards of the Orthodox clergy so that they would completely resemble the clergy of the Protestants, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics; the abolition of the fasts, again, in accordance with heterodox practices; the abolition of monasticism, or its transformation into organizations with a social or educational mission, again, according to the example of the non-Orthodox West. At that time, sporadic ecumenical contacts and dialogues had already taken place and there was systematic propaganda urging the recognition of Anglican Orders, and of all non-Orthodox baptisms. A review of the Church's canons as well as a new definition of the official confession of the Orthodox Faith were also discussed.

Thirty years ago, therefore, the Church of Greece, being anti-Orthodox and not Orthodox, deposed and excommunicated the traditional Orthodox clergy and laity. However, in reply, the old-calendarists addressed her with the following words of Saint Mark of Ephesus:

The Councils condemned those not in submission to the Church, who maintained some opinion contradictory to that of the Church and who preached and labored to propagate it. For this reason, the Councils called them heretics, and they condemned first the heresy, then its adherents. I do not preach my own opinion, nor have I innovated, nor do I maintain some strange and base-born doctrine, but I keep myself in that pure belief, which the Church received and preserves from Christ our Saviour . . . How can I be condemned with the judgment with which the heretics were condemned? First, the faith that I profess must be condemned. If this faith be pious and correctly professed, why am I worthy of condemnation?³³

The Insolent Mindlessness of the Pernicious

Does not this excommunication of the Orthodox by the innovating State Church remind one of that old excommunication of the Orthodox Church by the Papists in 1054? They too condemned the Orthodox because they did not submit to the Church that

³³ *Apomnenoneumata*, Sylvester Syropoulos, X, 15–16.

is, to the Pope and his cardinals. They also called the Orthodox rebels against ecclesiastical authority, and also had the secular power on their side. The Papists were also innovators and suffered from a chronic and progressively worsening illness as regards the Faith.

Furthermore, does not this excommunication remind one of that other excommunication levelled against the Orthodox by the three hundred and forty Iconoclast bishops that met in an Œcumenical Council in AD 754? At that time, the Orthodox did not disobey a mere seventy bishops, as did the contemporary traditional Orthodox Christians, but three hundred and forty bishops gathered in an official Œcumenical Council. This Council also condemned the Orthodox then as fanatics, and said that they paid inordinate attention to insignificant matters, as icons supposedly were, and that they perpetuated schisms in the Church by not commemorating and communicating with the innovating bishops. At that time also, some of the erudite among them made proposals to the Orthodox: ŒDo you wish to venerate icons? We will not hinder you, as long as you hang them a little higher. One thing alone do we ask, that you commemorate the bishops of the Official Church, and then I too will put icons in the Church where I serve; because, even in my diocese, there are many who are nostalgic for this custom of having icons which is so meaningful but they certainly do not want to create schism in the Church.Œ

How easily we forget history; or rather, we read it without making the effort to put ourselves in the place of those people which history writes about.

So the Orthodox Christians have been excommunicated by the Ecumenists, who were so full of love that they did not wish to celebrate their feasts alone, but together with the heretical denominations of the West. What joy and glory there is laid up for those new confessors of the Faith whom the Lord blesses: ŒBlessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of manŒ sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for behold, your reward is great in the Heavens: for in like manner did their fathers unto the ProphetsŒ (Luke 6:22–23).

Saint Photius the Great writes:

Of old the anathema was fearful and something to be avoided when it was imposed by the preachers of piety upon those who were guilty of impiety. But ever since the daring and insolent mindlessness of the pernicious—contrary to every divine and human law and contrary to every way of thinking, both Greek and barbarian—became so insanely arrogant as to turn the anathema, which they deserved, back on the proponents of Orthodoxy, and as they bickered, in their barbarian frenzy, to accomplish their ecclesiastical transgression, then that fearful and last extremity of all penalties became degraded into a myth and a joke, or rather it became even desirable to the pious. Certainly, it is not the utterly presumptuous opinion of the enemies of truth that makes penalties—especially ecclesiastical penalties—fearful, but rather the culpability of those who are condemned; for guiltlessness changes their punishments into a mockery, and turns their condemnations back upon them, and results in undefiled crowns and immortal glory, rather than condemnation, for him who is castigated by them. Therefore, all the pious and holy prefer to be reviled myriads of times by those who are alienated from Christ rather than, with splendid acclamations, to have communion with their Christ-hating and God-hating villainies.³⁴

He continues in another place:

For a long span of time, every heretical council and every assembly of the Iconoclasts anathematized us (and not only us, but our father and our uncle also—men who were confessors of Christ and the lustre of the hierarchy); but by anathematizing us, they caused that we be raised, though unwilling, to the archiepiscopal throne. Therefore let those who, together with the former, have irrationally strayed from the Master's commandments and have thrown wide open the gate of all iniquity, anathematize us even now so that they may raise us, though faltering, from earth to the Heavenly Kingdom.³⁵

³⁴ *Letter to Ignatius, Metropolitan of Claudiopolis*, PG 102, 833 A–C.

³⁵ *Letter Sixty-four to Gregory, the deacon and archivist*, PG 102, 877 B–C.

For Where Two or Three are Gathered Together

The priesthood of the old-calendarists, write our enemies, is derived from Chrysostom, the former Bishop of Florina, and Germanos, former Bishop of Demetrias. However, until 1935, for a whole eleven years from the time of the change of the calendar, these bishops were in schism, that is, they were in the State Church of Greece. Therefore, both of the above-mentioned bishops were bereft of grace.

One must marvel here at the legalistic mentality in all its glory. How cut and dried are all things for these persons! How rationalistic are all their solutions! How mechanical is their comprehension of the Church! Certainly, they continue, when a schismatic or heretical clergyman returns to Orthodoxy, he is oftentimes accepted without ordination, but only by the simple decision of a council or a synod of a local church. Fine, agreed. This must happen, however, through a council or a local synod. By which synodal decision were the consequences of the schism lifted from them? Which local synod or council re-instated the two aforementioned bishops?

Does it not occur to these individuals that even if it should be granted that after the introduction of the Papal calendar all the official churches died spiritually—a supposition that breathes rationalism to the *n*th degree—all those who remain faithful to Orthodoxy are the ones who constitute the Church, the Councils, the hierarchy, even if there be not one clergyman in their midst. Even if very few remain in Orthodoxy and piety, they are in the Church, says Saint Nicephorus the Confessor, and the authority and the protection of the ecclesiastical institution resides in them.³⁶ Also, Saint Theodore the Studite writes to the abbot Theophilus, Let us not raise a stumbling-block for the Church of God which, according to the teaching of the Saints, is made up of even three Orthodox, so that we may not be condemned according to the Lord's verdict.³⁷ The Lord, Who said, Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of

³⁶ PG 100, 844D.

³⁷ PG 99, 1049C.

them (Matt. 18:20), is indeed much greater than any Council. He can restore to the hierarchy all those bishops who have fallen and then repented. These are very simple and well-known things to the Orthodox, but very difficult to understand for rationalists possessing a Papal ecclesiology.

Since 1920!

The disease from which the new-calendarists are suffering is the worst heresy that the Church ever faced. It is a condition which one can label with many names: Ecumenism, Syncretism, Agnosticism, Religious indifference, Secularism. The toxin that has poisoned the new-calendarists is the spirit of this world. Some of the symptoms of their disease: their celebrating feasts with the heretical denominations of the West, their anti-monastic spirit, their refusal to recognize the authority of the Church Fathers (whose authority is masterfully being torpedoed in their theological schools), the social gospel, the secular mode of attire of the clergy, the official concord with the preaching and works of Athenagoras, Demetrius, and the essential acceptance of them by all, the dissemination of the ecumenistic message and its extension to a pan-religious level. Such actions are synodically being committed, as well as by individual bishops, and are tolerated by the rest.

Like the Latins during the time of Saint Photius, the new-calendarists of our days are laboring under a host of evils. The sickness of the West was chronic, but assuredly lethal. Death in the West came little by little; the poison of rationalism seeped little by little into the cells of that member of the Church of Christ. Who can tell exactly when the sickness began in the West? Searching, one can go back to Augustine and possibly earlier. Who can say when the West was completely dead? As many as have a Papal mentality will answer that the West died spiritually as soon as the Council of Constantinople excommunicated the Papacy in 1054. But even they would yet hesitate. Could it be, they would say, that death came then, or perhaps when the letters of the rest of the Patriarchates arrived, concurring with Constantinople's excommunication? And when did those letters arrive? or when did the other Patriarchates arrive at the decision? Profound com-

plications! In any case, one way or another, since they place the death of the West after Constantinople's act of excommunication, they acknowledge that before that excommunication the Church of the Latins was a living Church. But, if the Church of Rome, which was first in honor, was a living Church before her being excommunicated by the Council of Constantinople, then this means that as a living Church, and as the foremost see at that, Rome excommunicated the Orthodox Church first and had by her pre-emptive excommunication and anathema rendered the Orthodox Church lifeless before the latter could take steps to excommunicate the heretical West! Therefore, today the Church of Christ is the heretical Church of the Pope!!! Here is where we end up if we use the ecclesiology of the new-calendar apologists.

What happened to the Christianity of the West is the same thing that is happening to the new-calendarists of our time. The West was sick for centuries, and no one can say exactly when she died spiritually. The new-calendarists were sick for decades, and no one can say exactly when they died sacramentally and spiritually. It may have been that Theoklitos Pharmakides³⁸ was the first germ. The sickness, however, began in 1920 with the circulation of the first official heretical confession of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate—the Encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the Churches of Christ Wheresoever They Might Be. It was the first time an Orthodox Patriarchate overturned the article of the Symbol of Faith on One . . . Church and officially proclaimed belief in many Churches. For the first time, an Orthodox Patriarchate confessed publicly, and in a most official manner, that the Church of Christ is not One, is not the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, the one known by the name Orthodox, but that all the heresies which exist on the face of the earth are also the Churches of Christ. What was most reprehensible, however, was that the local Orthodox Churches accepted this heretical confession of the ecumenists of Constantinople without any protest or disavowal. This was the beginning of the Ecumenist heresy, and this beginning was in 1920.

No one protested for four years, not even those who subsequently remained with the traditional ecclesiastical calendar. This

³⁸ See footnote 28.

reveals just how rationalistic are they who use years and days, hours and seconds, to calculate the instant when the grace of God departed from the new-calendarists. The Church of the new-calendarists, they say, became schismatic with the calendar change and, therefore, completely lost the grace of the Mysteries at that very moment in 1924. However, the Church of Greece, and all the other Orthodox Churches, had accepted since 1920 the heresy of Ecumenism without protest. But can we speak of schism when it is really a matter of heresy? The calendar change was simply an implementation of a decision which already had been accepted in 1920.

The 1920 Encyclical stated clearly: On our opinion, such a friendship and kindly disposition towards each other [that is, between the Church and the various denominations] can be shown and demonstrated in the following ways: 1) through the adoption of one single calendar for the common celebration of the great Christian feasts by all the Churches. This proposition, therefore, was accepted in 1920. Only the implementation was delayed four years, and that is what awakened the Orthodox. The Orthodox became aware of the heresy of Ecumenism little by little as it advanced and became more apparent. And the responsibility of the new-calendarists increased right along with this growing awareness until the mutual lifting of the anathemas in December of 1965 left them with no excuse.

How much time did the seed of the Latin heresy need before it became the horrible tree we see today? Not only that, but how much time did it take for the schism between East and West to take place? The historians write, Thus, the schism of the West from the Eastern Church, which began during Photius's time, was completed during the patriarchate of Michael Cerularius in 1054. In other words, it needed two whole centuries to become complete. Even so, the Western Church was potentially heretical long before Saint Photius. But even during Saint Photius's time, and possibly after, there were instances of sobriety, there were in the West men with discernment. When did the West completely die? Who can say? But what is the importance of knowing? The West was sick; it was a ship whose hull was breached and was taking on water and sinking. Woe to him who sees that the ship he is on is sink-

ing, yet he remains complacent and does not hasten to board a lifeboat.

Today, in the new-calendarists, the seed of heresy has blossomed and has become a plant which is apparent even to the least informed. Not one of them can profess ignorance. All the new-calendarists today know that they are members of a heretical Church.

That the Orthodox Church tolerated both the Pope and his false teachings entire centuries before 1054, before the final proscription of Rome, as the new-calendarist apologists write, does not mean in the least that the West was not sick unto death for all that time. Nor does it mean that death came exactly at the moment of the official interdict. The official proscription was the death certificate. A death certificate does not cause death. For that matter, the issuance of the certificate may be much delayed, or it may never be issued.

No one should be scandalized, therefore, on hearing us say, on the one hand, that the new-calendarists are in heresy, and on the other, that we accept that the grace of the Mysteries was still with them in the beginning but that it was lost little by little as the sickness advanced, and as they sank ever more deeply into heresy. Neither should they consider the arguments of the traditional Orthodox Christians as contradictory, when in 1937 the traditional Orthodox Christians accepted the existence of grace in the new-calendar church, and then later in 1950, after perceiving the new-calendarists to be savage and unyielding persecutors of the Church of Christ, they repudiated it. Did not the same thing happen during the Council that took place during the Patriarchate of Saint Photius in 867? That Council of Constantinople excommunicated the Pope and all those in communion with him. And in 879, at another Council of the Orthodox Church in the Church of the Holy Wisdom, were not the decisions of 867 ratified? In spite of this, there are many indications that the Orthodox, even after these events, continued to recognize islets of grace in the West for quite a while.³⁹

³⁹ When the calendar change first took place, the traditional Orthodox Christians correctly perceived that there were several bishops in the new-calendar Synod of Greece who sympathized with them and supported them from the very beginning as well as new-calendar bishops who viciously persecuted them. The

Discernment is Essential

The Mysteries of the Church and whatever relates to the grace of God are not subject to our reason and understanding. Let us not delve into them with our proud, rationalistic intellect and presume to comprehend the judgments of God, which are inaccessible to men and angels. Heresy is a refusal to accept the illuminating grace of God; it is a willful blindness, that is, a condition that is irreconcilable with the presence of the All-holy Spirit. There are neither grace, nor Mysteries with those in heresy, because for one to come to be in heresy means that one has driven God's uncreated energies far from oneself. If God's uncreated energies were with him, he would not be in heresy. That one is in heresy, is proof that one does not have the Holy Spirit, and without the Holy Spirit how can we speak of Mysteries?

However, just as there are degrees of holiness, so also are there degrees of sin, so also are there degrees of heresy. Heresy is, of course, the gravest of all mortal sins precisely because it estranges a person from the Church. Nevertheless we should be extremely careful not to rationalistically categorize matters, forcing them into the pigeonholes of our limited and sinful comprehension. It is possible for one to publicly preach a horrendous heresy without his really being a heretic, because he preaches heresy out of ignorance; but as soon as it is pointed out to him that he is in error, and that what he says is not the belief of the Church, he retracts his words. A person can be in communion with those in heresy without knowing that they are heretics. The same action can at one time constitute heresy and at another time be a missionary act. When the Judaizers circumcised the Gentile Christians their act constituted heresy, because they considered circumcision necessary for salvation, and thus were returning to the slavery of the law from which Christ has redeemed us. Nevertheless, Saint Paul,

bishops who sympathized with them were not just any bishops: Metropolitan Germanos of Demetrias was second in seniority to Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos (who introduced the new calendar), and Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina was one of the most respected and erudite bishops in the Church of Greece. For eleven years these and other bishops supported and sympathized with the true Orthodox, hoping that the State Church would correct itself. When they lost all hope of correction, three bishops finally broke communion with the State Church. Other bishops would have left with them, but they feared persecution.

who fought this heresy with all the strength of his soul, did not hesitate to circumcise certain of his disciples himself in order that he not cause scandal and the Gospel thereby suffer loss.

No matter how rationalistic a man may be, he is obliged to admit that if one person commits the same sin as another, this does not mean that, no matter what, he also bears the same liability. It is possible for the same act under certain circumstances to be a sin, and under other circumstances to be a virtue. For one to strike another is considered by all people to be a sin; however, when Christ struck the money-changers in the Temple, was this a sin? All will concur that lying is a sin. However, when that ascetic of the desert, who is told of in the *Gerontikon*, spoke lies to the robbers in order to save the man whom the robbers were pursuing, did he sin? Discretion is the chief of virtues, the rudder of the life in Christ.

The introduction of the new festal calendar is a heresy *because it is the first act of Ecumenism*, and no rational person can doubt that Ecumenism is a heresy. By itself, however, entering into communion with heretics is not sufficient to make one equally responsible with them. One must also be aware that they are heretics. When they deceive you and represent themselves as Orthodox, when they provoke confusion and agitation in the Church, then your responsibility is mitigated. Can we possibly say that those good Levites in 1924, who continued to commemorate their bishops even after the festal calendar change, were equally responsible with the innovating ecumenists? The new-calendarists of today know that they are in communion with *Ó*prehensible syncretism, *Ó*as some of their own writers call it. Earlier, however, many priests had not comprehended this. Certainly, not all of the priests of the Church of Greece were good Levites; there were many who were very guileful; they knew what goal was being pursued and they gladly approved of it. We would perpetrate a great injustice, however, if we were to say that all of them were guileful, and that all of them were aware.

One might say that an evil is always an evil, regardless if one knows it or not. This is true. We should not forget, however, what is recorded by the Evangelist Luke: *Ó*He that knoweth shall be beaten with many stripes and he that knoweth not shall be beaten with few stripes *Ó*(cf. Luke 12:47–48). Let us not forget that Elder about

whom we read in the *Gerontikon* who used to worship in a church of the Arians, but, because he was simple, he had not comprehended that they were heretics. God did not become disturbed because of him, but toward the end of his life He helped him to learn the truth and to come to the Orthodox. By what right, therefore, do we become more kingly than the King, and condemn those whom God does not condemn?

Categorization

It is, therefore, very rationalistic for us to say that the Church of Greece was instantaneously deprived of grace with the change of the calendar in 1924. These are categorizations that satisfy the narrow human mind and give simplistic, but untrue, solutions to our problems. If God operated just as the rationalists think, the Church would have been deprived of grace even from the first centuries. We encounter so many upheavals in the Church's history that it is impossible for anyone with the limited human mind to find a beginning or an end, or a clear answer.

Let them say what they will. Metropolitan Chrysostom of Florina had not been deprived of grace, and because he had never essentially concurred with the heresy, he had no need of anyone to restore to him the grace of hierarchical office, which he had supposedly lost. As soon as he discovered with certainty what the modernists had done to the Church of Greece, he ceased from every communion with them. The ones who need to have their priesthood restored are they who today are in communion with the heresy of Ecumenism, with full knowledge of what that heresy is. They are the ones who are essentially, truly, and consciously in communion with reprehensible syncretism. God sees the essence of matters and not the letter of the law. Nonetheless, even for them and for those like them, there exists the *economia* of the Church. If they should ever become humble, cease their argumentations and repent (a matter for which we all ardently pray), the Church will not need to re-ordain them, just as oftentimes when, applying *economia*, she does not baptize heretics even though they have no true baptism. The Church of Christ, which is wherever the Orthodox Faith and Confession is, and not where the most mitres are, has the power, even without external forms and rites, to restore

the grace of the priesthood that was lost as soon as the sickness, which repulsed grace, is cured.

The Remnant of Grace

The pharisaism of the defenders of new-calendarism, however, reaches its apogee when it concerns itself with the ordination of the contemporary traditional Orthodox bishops. The agreement of all ecumenistic bishops with the Masonic syncretism of Ecumenism does not bother them; nor does the fact that most of the new-calendar bishops today are simoniacs and adulterer-bishops.⁴⁰ Even the question of transferring one bishop from one diocese to another, which at other times unsettled them, does not appear to impress them any longer. One matter alone appears completely unacceptable to them— that the Old-calendar bishop (Akakios) was ordained by two bishops. They rend their clothes and shout, “What further need have we of witnesses?” (Matt. 26:65); the consecration of a bishop by two bishops is uncanonical! “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cumin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith . . . ye blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow a camel!” (Matt. 23:23–24).

By using the same method and by applying exactness, one can prove that all the bishops of Greece are uncanonical. The new-calendarists violate both the Faith and the canons, and are the last who have the right to speak about the violation of the canons. People who consecrate bishops despite the fact that the laypeople in the church are shouting “Unworthy!” and while those standing outside are scornfully hooting both the consecrators and consecrated, must have much effrontery in order to judge the consecrations of the traditional Orthodox.

The consecration of the True Orthodox Bishops of Greece, they continue, was performed outside of jurisdictional bound-

⁴⁰ Adulterers in the sense that they have taken dioceses belonging to other bishops.

⁴¹ The consecration of a bishop by two bishops is not uncanonical, provided there is synodal approval for it. The First Canon of the Holy Apostles, adopted and ratified by subsequent Ecumenical Councils, is explicit: “Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops (provided as later Councils stipulated that the local Synod of Bishops has accepted and approved of the consecration).”

aries, since it was performed by bishops of America, an action that is prohibited by the canons. The Holy Synod of the Church of Greece, they write, is prohibited from consecrating a bishop or another clergyman for the Church of Cyprus, or of Crete, Serbia, Bulgaria, etc. We agree that this is indeed prohibited when the Churches of Crete, of Cyprus, of Serbia, of Bulgaria, etc., are *Orthodox* in all things. If, however, it were supposed that the Church of Cyprus had become heretical, would it continue to be prohibited by the canons for the Church of Greece to consecrate one or two bishops for the few remaining Orthodox of Cyprus? Would it not be criminal negligence if she did not perform such consecrations? When Byzantium sent bishops to Russia as pastors, were these bishops considered as extra-jurisdictional bishops? If the festal calendar had not been changed in Greece; if the State Church of Greece had not taken the road of Ecumenism; if she had remained truly Orthodox, then, indeed, the consecration of Greek bishops by the Russian hierarchy in America, would have to be considered extra-jurisdictional, and therefore, uncanonical. Now, however, not only are they not uncanonical, not only can they not be considered extra-jurisdictional, but to the contrary they are salutary. In this manner was the remnant of grace the chosen people of the Old-calendarists preserved in Greece. Like Israel of old, in spite of all their provincialism and failings, they serve as a bridge of truth upon which all who still worship God in our land will tread in order to cross the raging torrent of the present trial of Ecumenism.

The Distortion of History

The new-calendarists have not even respected history, and their impiety reached the point of slandering the Church by saying that . . . for whole centuries the Church tolerated the Pope and his misbeliefs. Here is what one of them has written:

Let it not be forgotten that the Primacy of the Pope and the *Filioque* did not first appear in 1054 when Rome was proscribed, or in 1053 or 1052. For whole centuries these things were taught in the West. The Church, however, using *economia*, tolerated both the Pope and his errors. Yes. Photius the Great himself not only tolerated the erring Pope, commemorating him in

the diptychs for a long while, but he also wrote in 885 concerning Pope John VIII, who had died three years previously, "Therefore, this John, valorous of mind, valorous also in piety . . . This most gracious Bishop of Rome . . ." (*Mystagogia*, ch. 89). Oh! If only certain contemporary Super-zealots and Super-Orthodox lived at that time! They would not have hesitated, on the basis of the above courteous expressions, to revile that holy man to his face and to smear him as a traitor.

No one is about to doubt that the errors of Papism appeared long before 1054. But that which is the shameless and cunning lie is that the Church tolerated the errors. One cannot believe what one reads! The great Photius, the protagonist in the condemnation of Papism, the primary cause for the expulsion of the erring Latins from the Church, is represented as tolerating heresy!!!

This new-calendar enemy of Orthodoxy is exploiting here the erroneous notion that is very widely disseminated: that the Schism supposedly began in 1054. However, the Council that condemned Papism and the errors of the West, the official Council with representatives from all the Patriarchates, was not convoked in Constantinople during the patriarchate of Cerularius in 1054, but during that of Photius in 867.

Indeed, writes Professor and Academician Balanos, "During the autumn of 867 a Council convened in Constantinople with representatives of the Patriarchs in attendance. This Council anathematized Pope Nicholas and the Papal envoys that had travelled to Bulgaria . . . Thus, the schism between the two Churches became final."⁴² And in the same article he writes, "The name of Photius was immortalized principally because it was inextricably connected with the events surrounding the schism of the Churches."

The Schism, therefore, did not become final in 1054, but in 867, that is, just when the various errors which up to that time were merely tendencies and debatable theological subjects of the Western world took definite shape in the person of Pope Nicholas I. The Church never tolerated heretical Papism for any space of time, but struck at its source as soon as it reared its horrible head.

⁴² See Photius the First, *Great Hellenic Encyclopedia*.

Heretical Papism once and for all was condemned during the patriarchate of Photius, and that condemnation never was raised, nor could it possibly ever be raised. There have only been renewals and confirmations of that anathema imposed during Photius's time. If there were periods of reconciliation with Rome after 867, this is not due to the Church's toleration of heresy, but to the fact that Rome at times retracted its errors and the Pope appeared, as formerly, with the visage of an Orthodox bishop.

This is exactly what happened when Pope John VIII ascended the throne of Rome in 872. We have incontestable proof that John, as well as Leo III, was Orthodox all his life. We writes Saint Nectarius, Metropolitan of Pentapolis.⁴³ We have four indelible proofs that John VIII was Orthodox and a guardian of the holy Creed of the Nicean Fathers, that is, of the common heritage of Christians, and rivalled Leo III, who is among the blessed.⁴⁴ The intransigent Latins hated this Pope so much for his Orthodoxy that they slandered him as being effeminate, and from this, the myth of Pope Joan was fabricated.⁴⁵

Indeed this Pope of Rome, John VIII, sent three legates to Constantinople as his representatives at the Ecumenical Council of 879, and he ratified the decisions made under that Council. That Council which convened under the presidency of Photius anathematized anyone who would dare to add anything to the Symbol of Faith, and, therefore, anathematized all those Latins who advocated the *Filioque* heresy, that is, the enemies of Photius and John. Besides this, this Council, along with the legates of Pope John, not only made Photius equal to the Pope, but in the acclamations placed Photius first and the Pope second. When Procopius, the Bishop of Caesarea referred to Saint Photius and exclaimed, Truly, such a man is he to whom has fallen the charge of the whole world! the legates of the Pope not only did not protest, but confirmed the statement saying, And we who dwell in the ends of the earth hearken unto this. In other words, they accepted Photius as higher than their own Pope. Thus, the heresy of Papal

⁴³ St. Nectarius of Pentapolis, *An Historic Study Concerning the Causes of the Schism*, Vol. 1, p. 290.

⁴⁴ See the 1863 *Encyclical of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church*, pp. 96–108, 296.

⁴⁵ See John the VIII, Pope of Rome, *Great Hellenic Encyclopedia*.

Supremacy, as much as the heresy of the *Filioque*, were condemned by the Council, and Pope John ratified the decisions of the Council.

Therefore, since Pope John officially condemned the false teachings of the Latins through the Council of 879, the condemnation of heretical Papism by the Council of 867 could not possibly be applied to him. John was not a heretic as was his predecessor Nicholas; rather, he upheld the Orthodox Confession of Faith. Where, then, is the toleration of heresy that the erudite new-calendarist apologist ascribes to Photius and the Church?

He deliberately mutilates Saint Photius's text in his reference to Pope John VIII. If he had cited it *in toto*, it would have appeared quite clear that Saint Photius did not write of John in glowing terms for reasons of worldly courtesy, while at the same time covering up his false teachings, as the writer wishes to convince his readers. Saint Photius sincerely considered John to be a brave combatant for Orthodoxy and his ally in the fight in behalf of truth. Here is the text without the omissions:

My John I call him mine, for in other things also and more than the others, he has befriended our views; therefore, this, our John, valorous of mind, valorous in piety, valorous also in hating and suppressing every injustice and impiety . . . this most gracious bishop of Rome . . .⁴⁶

Who can harbor any doubts any longer concerning the bad faith of this noted and chief apologist of new-calendarism? He excised the whole phrase: ". . . valorous also in hating and suppressing every injustice and impiety," in order to manufacture his proof that Saint Photius supposedly acclaimed John and called him "pious" in spite of the fact that he knew about his supposed false teachings. Reading Saint Photius's words without the omitted phrase, one becomes indignant and asks how the Church and History could call "Great" a man who, for the sake of a worldly courtesy, would forget all that he had said and wrote in the past against the false teachings of Papism and would refer to the impious and heretical Pope of Rome as "valorous," "pious," and "most gracious." Nonetheless, this enemy of Orthodoxy tells us, "Do not be troubled, the Church has always acted in this manner when using

⁴⁶ *Mystagogia*, ch. 89.

economia—They that are indignant over this kind of hypocrisy are Super-zealots and Super-Orthodox.⁴⁷

But in spite of all that the apologist of new-calendarism says in order to lower Saint Photius the Great to the abysmal level of his own new-calendar bishop friends, the text that he desired to mutilate exists and cries out. Saint Photius the Great praises John for his hatred of impiety and for his ability to put down heresy; these things were well known to all the Saint's contemporaries.

Where, then, is the toleration of false teaching on the part of the Church and of Saint Photius? The Orthodoxy of Pope John generated such a great upheaval in his heretical Latin environment that, for centuries, this Pope was the focus for the hatred of the defenders of heretical Papism. You can understand how much humiliation this Council caused the arrogance and haughtiness of the Papacy, and what a mortal blow it dealt to heresy. Consider the anxiety, the quandary, the contradictions among the defenders of the Papal faction—who affirm with an oath that the epistle of Pope John to Saint Photius is no less than a forgery . . . while others discover the peak of ungodliness in John's action because he became of one opinion with the schismatics. Furthermore, they affirm that he enacted everything of his own accord, and because he was unmanly and effeminate in mind; and because he feared the Greeks (from whom there was nothing to be feared at the time), he was defeated by Saint Photius. Wherefore, they renamed him Joan instead of John, and from this the report of a Pope Joan was spread abroad among the Papists.⁴⁷

Saint Photius never tolerated heresy.

Tolerance Never Existed

Perhaps our unabashed new-calendar writer will answer that the heresy of Papism existed long before Saint Photius, and the Church, by employing *economia*, was tolerant.

Indeed, it is known that many scholars have recognized the seeds of the *Filioque* heresy in Augustine, the great teacher of the Westerners. Already during the fourth and fifth centuries, Latin theologians discussed this tenet. The *Filioque* first appeared in

⁴⁷ Elias Tantalides, *Refutations of Papism*, Vol. 2, Append. 30, p. 243.

Spain, principally at the Councils of Toledo in 547 and 589. Although it sprang from Orthodox motives, it was a rationalistic extrapolation which appeared during the theological battle against Arianism. From Spain, the *Filioque* found its way into the local confessions of the Frankish nation a little after 767. It began to take on dangerous dimensions in the hands of Charlemagne's theologians, but always remained a theological opinion (*theologoumenon*) without any official status whatsoever. When Charlemagne asked Pope Leo III (+816) to add the *Filioque* to the Symbol of Faith, the Pope summarily rejected the addition and, in the Church of Saint Peter, placed two silver plaques which had the Symbol of Faith inscribed in Greek and Latin without the *Filioque*.⁴⁸

As for the primacy of the Pope, this developed with the passage of time as a reaction to the progressive waning of Rome's significance. It reached full development toward the mid-ninth century with the appearance of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals.⁴⁹ Pope Nicholas I of Rome, who was anathematized by Saint Photius, was the first who sought to enforce these false decretals. As Professor Basil Stephanides of the University of Athens writes in his *Church History*, "Rome's struggle for world rulership already had begun with Nicholas I (858–867). According to his contemporaries: 'Nicholas made himself emperor of the whole world.' Thus, it is easy to understand why the schism began during his time."⁵⁰

When Nicholas attempted to place the Church of Bulgaria under his authority, the Roman Church had not added the *Filioque* addition to her creed. Nonetheless, Nicholas officially introduced the *Filioque* teaching into the Bulgarian Church. As Stephanides writes:

The teaching concerning the *Filioque*, having been introduced

⁴⁸ In their writings, both St. Maximus the Confessor and St. Photius the Great explain that the *Filioque* could be understood in an Orthodox manner (in the sense of the Holy Spirit's mission to the world). Subsequent Latin scholastics, however, rejected this interpretation.

⁴⁹ Pseudo-Isidorian decretals: a collection of documents, forged sometime between the years 775 and 785 and first used by Pope Adrian of Rome. These documents, used in the subsequent centuries by the Papacy to support its claims, alleged that the Roman Church, and the Pope in particular, held "in perpetuity" all the provinces, cities, castles, etc., in the West. That is to say, the Popes claimed not only spiritual authority over the entire Church, but also secular rights of private ownership over vast portions of the Roman Empire. See *The Papacy*, by Abb Guett e, p. 258 ff, for a complete history of these documents.

officially into the Bulgarian Church, ceased being a matter of theological opinion (*theologoumenon*) in the relations between the Western and Eastern Church; rather, it now appeared as an ecclesiastical dogma. Because of this Photius was the first to combat this teaching as heretical. Through Nicholas of Rome intervention in the Bulgarian Church, the Papal Primacy finally developed from the theoretical and indefinite form which it had maintained up to this point, and took an applied and definite form.⁵⁰

One clearly sees, therefore, that the Church never tolerated the Pope and his false teachings. As soon as the false teaching which hitherto had been circulating as a theological opinion (*theologoumenon*) took on a specific, dogmatic form during the pontificate of Nicholas I, the Church struck it down with an anathema in the Council of 867. When, in turn, Pope John VIII repudiated the false teachings of Rome, Saint Photius had no reason to refrain from restoring relations with a Church whose primate he saw abhorring and overthrowing every injustice and impiety.

Not Even in the Diptychs

Heretical Papism was condemned as soon as it officially appeared. That condemnation was never raised, nor will it ever be possible to raise the condemnation of heretical Papism. Papism was condemned once and for all in 867. In 879 the relations between the Orthodox Church and Rome were restored, but not with *Papal Rome*. The Church's relations were restored with Orthodox Rome. Orthodoxy did not retreat; the Pope changed. The heretical Pope died and an Orthodox Pope was elected. John VIII denounced the errors of Nicholas I, and endorsed that condemnation through his representatives at the Council of 879. Never was there any *economia* toward heresy. There was only Rome's bounding from heresy to Orthodoxy, and back again, which caused the Church to be at times friendly and at times inimical toward her until 1054, when Rome definitely settled into error.

In essence, the aforementioned apologist of new-calendarism did nothing other than repeat the arguments of Athenagoras, who

⁵⁰ Stephanides, *Church History*, p. 354.

stated that before 1054 there was communion between East and West despite the dogmatic differences. Nevertheless, it is well known that not only was there no communion before 1054, but also that not even in the diptychs did the name of the Pope appear. In 906, more than a century before 1054, Nicholas the Mystic, Patriarch of Constantinople, noted in his *Epistles* (No. 53 and 54) to Rome⁵¹ Pope John X that the name of the Pope was not to be found in the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople. In other words, twenty years after the Orthodox Pope John VIII, the name of the Pope was already struck from the diptychs.

But if anyone wishes to gauge even better the extent of the historical dishonesty of these men, and wishes to see the nature of this much-touted toleration of the Orthodox Church toward heretical Papism, let him read the anathema that Cardinal Humbert and the other Papal emissaries left on the Holy Table of the Church of the Holy Wisdom on that Saturday in July of 1054. What was included among the reasons for hurling that anathema? The Orthodox, according to the Papal representatives, were worthy of excommunication because, among other things: They re-baptize the Latins, considering only their own mysteries [sacraments] as being valid, and they allow their hair and beard to grow and do not accept into communion clergy who do otherwise.⁵¹

Epilogue

The more time passes, by so much the more are they who willfully remain blind left without excuse. The Church of Christ always was the small, the ignored, the persecuted flock, impoverished, without worldly glory and wisdom according to the world. Not many wise men, not many prudent, but the foolish things of the world, and the despised, hath God chosen to confound the wise (cf. I Cor. 1:26–27). The wisdom of the wise and prudent of this age has served only to bring them to self-conceit, that self-conceit which disdains the few who remain, preserving the truth.

This separation into new-calendarists and traditional Orthodox Christians is a deliverance of the Church. The majority who have the spirit of the world will remain new-calendarists, thus cleans-

⁵¹ Stephanides, *Church History*, p. 378.

ing the Church of Christ of all those who are Christians because they happen to be born in a Christian land. The few who have the spirit of the Fishermen will take refuge in the Church of Christ. In our days we have become witnesses of a historic event: the true Church of Christ in Greece, in Russia, in the whole world, is escaping from the suffocating embrace of the world which has always been at enmity with God. Freed from the clutches of authorities and powers which, in these last centuries, had proffered her a tyrannical friendship, she emerges covered with blood, wounded, bearing the reproach of Christ and His marks on her Body, yet eternally alive and militant. The world, however, having shaken off the theocratic authority of the distant past, threw off as well its mask and pretence of Christianity, and runs with a frenzied pace down the road to utmost apostasy. The world will gather into its embrace all those who, deep down, are its own, even if they bear the name Orthodox Christian whether they be laymen, monks, deacons, priests or bishops and will slowly assimilate them with a diabolic methodicalness.

There are many with the spirit of the world even among the traditional Orthodox Christians. When they discover that they have lost the comfort of this world's embrace, they will cease being Orthodox, and will return to their own vomit. And many new-calendarists, who today are suffocating under the majestic domes of their secularized Church, will find their way back to the hum-



ble, poor, scorned Church of the Fishermen. Re-alignments will take place. The Church, however, will remain what she always was, until the terrible and glorious day of the Lord.

A LIST OF TEXTS

Comparing the basic positions of the New Calendarists with those of the Church Fathers

Motivated by that which is right, the mind finds the truth; but motivated by some passion, it will reject it.

Saint Thalassius of Africa, *Philokalia*, I, 1:58

—1—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

“The 15th Canon of the First-Second Council . . . is optional and not obligatory. That is, as regards a bishop who teaches heresy, [the Canon] does not absolutely require the clergy to stop commemorating him before his condemnation, but it only gives them the power to do so. If . . . without embracing the bishop’s teachings, a clergyman continues to commemorate him while awaiting a Synodal decision, when he is in no way condemned by the Canon.”

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

All the teachers of the Church, all the Councils, and all the Divine Scriptures, exhort us to flee those who uphold other doctrines and to separate from communion with them.

Confession of Faith, XIII, 304

Saint Mark of Ephesus

With a great voice, Saint John Chrysostom declared that not

only heretics, but also they who hold communion with them are enemies of God.

Letter to the Abbot Theophilus

Saint Theodore the Studite (PG 99, 1049)

Keep yourselves from soul-corrupting heresy, whose communion is alienation from Christ.

Saint Theodore the Studite (PG 99, 1216)

Concerning the Faith, the heretics were totally shipwrecked; but as for the others, even if in their thinking they did not founder, nonetheless, because of their communion with heresy, they too were destroyed with the others.

Letter to the Patriarch of Jerusalem

Saint Theodore the Studite (PG 99, 1164)

You told me that you feared to tell your presbyter not to commemorate the heresiarch; . . . I will not presume to say anything about this to you for the present, except that the communion is defiled simply by commemorating him, even if he who is commemorating is Orthodox.

Ibid.

For if simply saying "Hail" (II John, 10–11) is the same as partaking of another's evil deeds, how much more so is the blatant commemoration in the very presence of the divine and dread Mysteries? For if He that is present before us is the Truth Himself, how is it reasonable to suppose that He will accept *this great lie*, that is, that this man should be esteemed as an Orthodox patriarch among the other Orthodox patriarchs? At the time when the dread Mysteries are being celebrated, shall we play the part of an actor on the stage? And how shall the soul of an Orthodox Christian endure these things and not straightway refrain from communion with the commemorators, and esteem them to be men that make sordid gain of divine things? For from the beginning, the Orthodox Church of God has accepted that the mention of the hierarch's name within the sanctuary meant *complete communion with him*. For it is written in the exposition of the Divine Liturgy that the celebrant commemorates the name of the bishop, thereby demonstrating submission to a superior, and that he is a communicant

with him, and his follower in the Faith and in the divine Mysteries.

. . . And God signified this very thing, saying, *Ó*he priests have violated My law and have profaned My holy things *Ó* (Ezekiel 22:26). How? Because *Ó*hey have put no difference between the holy and the profane, *Ó*but have esteemed all things as common. However, should we do this by way of *Óconomia* *Ó* But how can such an *Óconomia*, *Ó*which profanes things divine and drives the Holy Spirit from them, be acceptable according to what God has said, since it causes the faithful to lose their adoption [as children of God] and cuts them off from the forgiveness of their sins? Can there, indeed, be any *economia* more harmful than this? . . .

From the Letter of the Athonite Fathers to Emperor Michael Paleologus, against John Beccos, who was Patriarch of Constantinople at that time, and who had not yet been deposed by a Council.

Author *Ó*Note: As is known, these Fathers of the Holy Mountain signed this Letter a little later with the blood of their martyrdom.

—2—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

*Ó*this, my brother, is the Orthodox Church *Ó*ecclesiology. As for the rest, that is, that *individuals* *Ñ* clergy and laypeople *Ñ* should arise and denounce bishops, whom the Orthodox Catholic Church accepts *Ñ* this is pure Protestantism. *Ó*

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

When Saint Hypatius understood what opinions Nestorius held, immediately, in the Church of the Apostles, he erased his name from the diptychs, so that it should no longer be pronounced at the Oblation. [*This was before Nestorius* *Ó*condemnation by the Third Ecumenical Council.]

When the most pious Bishop Eulalius learned of this, he was anxious about the outcome of the affair. And seeing that it had been noised abroad, Nestorius also ordered him to reprimand Hypatius. For Nestorius was still powerful in the city. Bishop Eulalius spoke thus to Hypatius: *Ó*Why have you erased his name with-

out understanding what the consequences would be? Ó Saint Hypatius replied: ÓFrom the time that I learned that he said unrighteous things about the Lord, I have no longer been in communion with him and I do not commemorate his name; for he is not a bishop. ÓThen the bishop, in anger, said: ÓBe off with you! Make amends for what you have done, for I shall take measures against you. ÓSaint Hypatius replied: ÓDo as you wish. As for me, I have decided to suffer anything, and it is with this in mind that I have done this. Ó

From the *Life of Saint Hypatius*
(*Sources Chrétiennes*, No.177, pp. 210–214)

As history has demonstrated, Saint MaximusÑ who was only a simple monk and not even ordainedÑ and his two disciples were the ones who were Orthodox, and all those illustrious, famous and influential Patriarchs and Metropolitans against whom the Saint had written were the ones who were in heresy. When the Sixth Ecumenical Council was finally convened, among those condemned for heresy were four Patriarchs of Constantinople, one Pope of Rome, one Patriarch of Alexandria, two Patriarchs of Antioch, and a multitude of other Metropolitans, Archbishops and Bishops. During all those years, that one simple monk was right, and all those notable bishops were wrong.

From the Epilogue of *The Life of Our Holy Father Maximus the Confessor*^o

How then does Paul say, ÓObey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselvesÓ (Heb. 13:17) After having said before, ÓWhose faith follow, considering the end of their lifeÓ(Heb. 13:7), he then said, ÓObey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves. Ó

What then (you say), when he is wicked, should we obey?

Wicked? In what sense? If indeed in regard to matters of the Faith, flee and avoid him; not only if he be a man, but even if he be an angel come down from Heaven; but if in regard to his life, be not overly-curious.

^o Fr. Christopher Birchall, trans., *The Life of Our Holy Father Maximus the Confessor* (Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1982), pp. 53–69.

—3—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

How great will our responsibility be if we undermine the judgment of the Church, since we think we know the judgment of God. Is it not infinitely preferable, and more humble, and safer, to follow the decisions of the Church? My brother, it is the uttermost delusion for us to be of the opinion that we know for certain what is God's choice. Woe, a thousand times woe, unto the Church, if individuals, and especially laypeople, declare revolutions of this sort.

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be anathema.

Galatians 1:8–9

I shall judge the bishop and the layperson. The sheep are rational and not irrational, so that no layman may ever say that, I am a sheep, and not a shepherd, and I give no account of myself, but the shepherd shall see to it, and he alone shall pay the penalty for me. For even as the sheep that follows not the good shepherd shall fall to the wolves unto its own destruction, so too it is evident that the sheep that follows the evil shepherd shall acquire death; for he shall utterly devour it. Therefore, it is required that we flee from destructive shepherds.

Apostolic Constitutions, 10:19 (PG 1, 633)

As we walk the unerring and life-bringing path, let us pluck out the eye that scandalizes us—not the physical eye, but the noetic one. For example, if a bishop or presbyter—who are the eyes of the Church—conduct themselves in an evil manner and scandalize the people, they must be plucked out. For it is more profitable to gath-

er without them in a house of prayer, than to be cast together with them into the gehenna of fire together with Annas and Caiaphas.

Saint Athanasius the Great (PG 26, 1257 C)

We forbid all the clergy who adhere to the Orthodox and Ecumenical Council in any way to submit to the bishops who have already apostatized or shall hereafter apostatize.

Third Canon of the Third Ecumenical Council

Ever rekindle this faith within yourselves and keep yourselves unblemished and undefiled, by neither having communion with the aforementioned [Nestorius], nor attending to him as though he were a teacher, so long as he remains a wolf and not a shepherd . . . We are in communion with those clergymen or laypeople that have separated themselves from him or who have been deposed by him on account of the right Faith, because we do not endorse his unjust sentence; rather, we praise those who have suffered, and we say to them, **B**lessed are ye if ye are reviled for the Lord's sake; for the Spirit and the might of God rest upon you.

A Letter of Saint Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, to the Clergy and People of Constantinople before the convocation of the Third Ecumenical Council, which condemned Nestorius (Mansi IV, 1096)

I adjure all the people in Cyprus who are true children of the Catholic Church to flee as fast as their feet can carry them from those priests who have fallen and submitted to the Latins; neither assemble in church with them, nor receive any blessing from their hands. For it is better for you to pray to God in your homes alone than to gather together in churches with the Latin-minded.

Germanos II, Patriarch of Constantinople
(PG 140, 620 A)

Among us, neither Patriarchs nor Councils were ever able to introduce innovations, because the defender of Religion is the very Body of the Church—that is, the people themselves—which desire to have their Religion eternally unchanged and identical to that of their Fathers.

Reply of the Orthodox Patriarchs of the East to Pius IX,
issued in 1848

Not only if one possesses rank or knowledge is one obliged to strive to speak and to teach the doctrines of Orthodoxy, but even if one be a disciple in rank, one is obliged to speak the truth boldly and openly.

Letter Two (Book Two) to Monastics
Saint Theodore the Studite (PG 99, 1120 B)

—4—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

“Since the Church has not deposed them (our heretical bishops), we must not renounce them, nor cease commemorating them.”

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

He that saith not “Anathema” to those in heresy, let him be anathema.

Seventh Ecumenical Council

Is the shepherd a heretic? Then he is a wolf! You must flee from him; do not be deceived to approach him even if he appears gentle and tame. Flee from communion and conversation with him even as you would flee from a poisonous snake.

Homily Fifteen, 10,
Saint Photius the Great

—5—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

“However, until this takes place—that is, their condemnation by the Church—the bishop or the priest who has fallen into heresy continues, by a certain divine *economia*, to impart divine grace.”

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

Grace and truth came by Jesus. They have forsaken the truth, in

which the author of Proverbs boasts, saying, "My throat shall meditate truth" having embraced falsehood to themselves, it is clear that they have fallen away from grace.

Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council

—6—

The Position of the New-Calendarists:

"Was Nestorius within the Church during the whole time before he was anathematized [by the Third Ecumenical Council]?" asks K. triumphantly. Yes, he was! That is to say, he was an acting Bishop of the Church of Christ. If he wasn't for you, yet he was for Saint Cyril, and for the Council of the Church of Alexandria, and for the Third Ecumenical Council itself! Have you ever read the famous letters written by the divine Cyril to Nestorius, and which were sent to him after he had proclaimed his heresy? Do you see how he addresses the already heretical Nestorius? "O the most pious and God-fearing concelebrant Nestorius." What more do you want? . . . The [Third Ecumenical] Council judged his teaching to be heretical and condemned him *in absentia*: "Weeping many times [say the Council Fathers in regard to their decree of condemnation], we have proceeded to this severe decision against him: accordingly, Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who was blasphemed by him, has decreed through this most holy Council that Nestorius is alien to the episcopal rank and to every priestly assembly." Did you hear that, K.? Was or was not Nestorius an acting bishop until his condemnation by the Third Ecumenical Council?"

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

Let this, our decision, be plain: that if you do not preach the same doctrine concerning Christ our God as that embraced by the Church of the Romans, and of the Alexandrians, and of all the Catholic Church, which also the great Church of the Constantinopolitans so excellently embraced until you, and if within ten days—counting from the day of this notice—you do not openly and by a written confession reject this infidel innovation, which seeks to separate that which the Holy Scripture has united, you shall be cast out from the entire Catholic Church.

A Letter of Pope Celestine I of Rome to the heretical Patriarch Nestorius of Constantinople, written in the name of the Local Council of Rome, which condemned Nestorius before the convocation of the Third Ecumenical Council

We make our protest to you in this third letter, and counsel you to refrain from such wicked and perverse doctrines, which you believe and teach, and that you choose the right Faith . . . Otherwise, unless Your Reverence does so by the time set in the letters sent to you by our concelebrant, the most righteous and God-fearing bishop of Rome, Celestine, know that you will have no portion with us, nor place or speech among the priests and bishops of God.

Saint Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius, in the name of the Council of Alexandria, which condemned Nestorius before the convocation of the Third Ecumenical Council (Mansi, IV, 1081)

Note: As we see, Nestorius had been cast out of the Church before the Third Ecumenical Council had been convoked. But perhaps some will say: ÓVery well, he was cast out before the Third Ecumenical Council, but it was a Council that did it.Ó However, since he had been cast out of the Church and had Óno place or speech among the priests and bishops of God,Ó why was the Third Ecumenical Council called and why did it condemn him again? Did the Fathers believe that their previous synodal decision had not Óaken effectÓ If it is the decision of a Council, and not the fact that one is consciously preaching heresy, that removes divine grace from a person, then which Council removed the grace of the priesthood from Nestorius? The Council of Alexandria? The Council of Rome? The Third Ecumenical Council? When, in the final analysis, was Nestorius cut off from the Church? However, it is not a Council that removes grace. God does not take orders from men. The Council simply confirms that grace has departed, and it proclaims this fact through its decree. Let us not forget that when Saint Cyril wrote to the clergy and people of Constantinople, as we read above, he referred to Nestorius as Óa wolfÓ even before the Council; and again, as we saw above, long before the decree of any Council, long before Cyril or Celestine of Rome had even learned or become concerned over this matter, Saint Hypatius, a priest

under Constantinople's jurisdiction, stopped commemorating his patriarch, Nestorius. And when his timid superior, the Bishop Eulalius, remonstrated with him, that most holy minister answered, "From the time that I learned that he said unrighteous things—that is, heretical teachings—about my Lord, he is no longer a bishop, and I am no longer in communion with him, nor do I commemorate his name in the Liturgy." What a difference between the priests of that time and our contemporary archimandrites!

—7—

The Position of the New Calendarists:

Ⓐ continuous and unceasing war against the Patriarch's actions: YES. Schisms: NO! Ⓐ

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

This is indeed peace, when that which is ailing is cut away, when that which is seditious is separated.

Homily Thirty-Five on the Gospel of Saint Matthew
Saint John Chrysostom

Put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

I Corinthians 5:13

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not according to the tradition which he received from us.

II Thessalonians 3:6

I am convinced that the further I depart from him [the Patriarch] and from those like him [the Latin-minded], the closer do I draw near God and all the faithful and the holy Fathers; and the more I am separated from them, by so much more am I united to the truth and the holy Fathers.

Saint Mark of Ephesus (PG 160, 536 C)

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance

against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household.

Matthew 10:34–36

It is good to be at peace with all, but [only] when they are of one mind with us as regards piety; for peace with that which is just and proper is a most excellent and profitable possession; but when it is with that which is evil or enslaving, then it is most disgraceful, and of all things the most shameful and harmful. For there is an evil concord and a good discord; *there is a good severance, and an evil concurrence*. And if friendship become a cause of perdition for some, then hatred becomes a virtue for them. Better is division for dispassion's sake than concord effected for the passions's sake.

Joseph Bryennius, the teacher of Saint Mark Eugenius

Better is a praiseworthy war than a peace that separates us from God.

Saint Gregory the Theologian



The Position of the New Calendarists:

A whole army of pious bishops and presbyters in the Orthodox Catholic Church preserve the truth, love the authentic Faith, cleave steadfastly to the traditions of the Fathers, become deeply grieved over the stunts and the presumptuous acts of certain leaders of the Church, but—using *economia*—they bear with them, sparing the Church's peace.

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

Any servant who kept his peace and did nothing in order to prevent thieves from breaking into his master's house to rob it, but allowed them to take everything secretly and to leave, would be condemned by his master as being a treacherous thief like them, even if he had done nothing to assist them.

Homily Seventy-Eight

Saint Symeon the New Theologian

Even if one should give away all his possessions in the world,

and yet be in communion with heresy, he cannot be a friend of God, but is rather an enemy.

Saint Theodore the Studite
(PG 99, 1205)

Submit not yourselves to monastics, nor to presbyters, who teach lawless things and evilly propound them. And why do I say only monastics or presbyters? Follow not even after bishops who guilefully exhort you to do and say and believe things that are not profitable. What pious man will keep silence, or who will remain altogether at peace? *For silence means consent.* Oftentimes war is known to be praiseworthy, and a battle proves to be better than a peace that harms the soul. For it is better to separate ourselves from them who do not believe aright than to follow them in evil concord, and by our union with them separate ourselves from God.

Saint Meletius the Confessor

For when the [unbelievers and heretics], though established in a lie, use every means to conceal the shamefulness of their opinions, while we, the servants of the truth, cannot even open our mouths, how can they help condemning the great weakness of our doctrine? How can they help suspecting our religion to be fraud and folly? How shall they not blaspheme Christ as a deceiver, and a cheat . . . ? And we are to blame for this blasphemy, because we do not desire to be wakeful in arguments for piety, but deem these things superfluous, and care only for the things of earth.

Homily Seventeen on the Gospel of Saint John
Saint John Chrysostom

Any one who is able to speak the truth and does not do so shall be condemned by God.

Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 82
Saint Justin the Philosopher

It is a commandment of the Lord that we should not be silent when the Faith is in peril. So, when it is a matter of the Faith, one cannot say, "What am I? A priest, a ruler, a soldier, a farmer, a poor man? I have no say or concern in this matter." Alas! the stones shall cry out, and you remain silent and unconcerned?

The Position of the New Calendarists:

Œhe beloved Old Calendarists left (the official State Church) so they might not give up something of small consequence . . . Œ

The Reply of the Church Fathers:

The fact that we do not become indignant over small matters is the cause of all our calamities; and because slight errors escape fitting correction, greater ones creep in. As in a body, a neglect of wounds generates fever, infection and death; so in the soul, slight evils overlooked open the door to graver ones . . . But if a proper rebuke had at first been given to those who attempted to depart from the divine sayings and change some small matter, such a pestilence would not have been generated, nor such a storm have seized upon the Church; for he that overturns even that which is minor in the sound Faith, will cause ruin in all.

Homily One on the Epistle to the Galatians
Saint John Chrysostom

The sixteenth century gave birth to four great beasts: the heresy of Luther, the heresy of Calvin, the heresy of the Jesuits, and the heresy of the new calendar. The heresies of Luther and Calvin were refuted by [such and such] . . . As for the heresy of the new calendar, this was condemned by a decision of the great Ecumenical Council that met in Constantinople in 1593.

Confession of the Orthodox Faith, p. 4
Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem