



## FROM THE FATHERS

“WHEN WE ARE humbled and shattered, - and keep in mind Christ’s humiliation, - what anger, wrath and bitterness can take possession of us! But when forgetfulness of the life-creating truths is accompanied by the sister vices of laziness and ignorance, then these three oppressive and deep-seated passions of the soul, hard to discover and correct, overlay and darken us with a terrible futility. They prepare the way for the rest of the evil passions to become active and nest in the soul, stifling its sense of awe, making it neglect what is good, providing easy access and free scope for every passion.”

VEN. MARK THE ASCETIC, FIFTH CENTURY.

“THE MIND of the idler cannot occupy itself with any other thoughts than of food and eating, until it find somewhere or other companionship in a man or woman of equal lukewarmness, and gets involved in their affairs and private business, and so becomes, step by step, caught to such a degree in a net of harmful occupations, that, as though enveloped in a serpent’s coils, the man can never free himself.”

VEN. JOHN CASSIAN THE ROMAN, + 435 A.D.

“BE DILIGENT and avoid idleness. For as diligence is pleasing to God, so idleness, on the contrary, as a source of every evil, is a sin very offensive to God.”

SAINT TIKHON OF ZADONSK, + 1783 A.D.

*During the forty-day paschal period this year, **Metropolitan Chrysostomos** is to be glorified by the **Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of Greece** under the Presidency of His Eminence, **Archbishop Kallinikos of Athens**, and so in this issue we present this tribute to the holy confessor for our readers.*

# **Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina:**

## **An Heroic Confessor of the Faith and Restorer of Hallowed Traditions**

† *His Grace, Bishop Klemes (Clement) of Gardikion*

EVEN as ecumenism charges forth in all of its forms, pronouncements, and manifestations—indeed, precisely at the outset of a potentially decisive meeting of the concessionary theological dialogue between Orthodox and Roman Catholics<sup>1</sup> in Vienna, Austria<sup>2</sup>—we commemorate at the Liturgy three anniversaries of a leading figure in contemporary Orthodoxy: the 55th anniversary of the repose in the Lord of Metropolitan Chrysostomos (Kabourides) of Phlorina, the 75th anniversary of the initiation of his struggle as a Confessor for the Traditions of the Holy Fathers, and the 140th anniversary of his birth in Madytos, Eastern Thrace. [These anniversaries fell in 2010, when Bishop Klemes gave his address- ed.]

Our celebration is not untimely, and his multifarious messages are not unrelated to the tragic realities of the Church today.

From history, we are aware that, even as far back as Apostolic times, the “mystery of iniquity”<sup>3</sup> has been active and at work, be it openly or in hidden manner. Its ulterior purpose is to impede and, if possible, to thwart the mystery of salvation within the mystery of the one and unique Church of Christ, and in particular by adulterating the Truth of the Faith through heresies. The aim of the “mystery of iniquity” is to bring about the spread and domination of “apostasy,”<sup>4</sup> which, at its apogee, will beget and disclose “the man of sin..., the son of perdition,”<sup>5</sup>

to wit, the Antichrist, for the final tribulation of the Church prior to the Second and glorious Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.



The great heresy of Papism, which was cut away from the Church in the eleventh century, has unleashed, as is well known, an uncontrollable torrent of innovations and false teachings. One of these was the concoction, in the sixteenth century, of the so-called Gregorian Calendar, which was condemned by three Pan-Orthodox Synods in Constantinople, in 1583, 1587, and 1593. Since then, the persistence of the Latins in foisting their calendar innovation on the Orthodox Church has been looked upon as Papal intrigue and was categorically rejected by Orthodoxy up until the beginning of the twentieth century.<sup>6</sup>

In 1920, the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople “To the Churches of Christ Everywhere” proclaimed the ecclesiological heresy of ecumenism in the midst of the Orthodox Church, proposing as a first practical measure for rapprochement with the heterodox a common calendar for the joint celebration of the Christian Feasts.

The ecumenist Congress of 1923 in Constantinople, under Patriarch Meletios (Metaxakes), a Freemason, decided on the calendar innovation, with the intention of also changing the Paschalion, along with a series of ecclesiastical reforms, so as to abrogate and trample upon the Sacred Canons and the Tradition of the Church.

In 1924, the Œcumenical Patriarchate unilaterally resolved, after exerting suitable pressure on Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens, to impose the calendar innovation on just a few of the local Orthodox Churches. The Church was divided and sundered into innovationists and anti-innovationists, with regard to the issue of the Calendar. A “small flock” in our country [Greece—Trans.], which increased daily, initially without Hierarchs, resisted in a self-sacrificial manner this pro-heretical imposition, which lacked any ecclesiastical, canonical, or pastoral foundation, being based solely on worldly and pseudo-scientific arguments.

The innovationist Church in Greece, which dubbed the New Calendar the “revised Julian Calendar,” even though it will coincide with the Gregorian Calendar until 2800, had no inkling of the “grave confu-

sion”<sup>7</sup> that this reform had introduced into the life of the Church or of the “reaction”<sup>8</sup> of the God-loving flock. Thus, the “intervention of the civil authorities”<sup>9</sup> proved necessary for the “implementation” of the calendar innovation, which is for this reason, too, contemptible and rejectable.

The “unfortunate repercussions”<sup>10</sup> of the innovation were palpable. A fair number of the faithful refused to accept it and formed the “Greek Religious Community of True Orthodox Christians.”



There was a difference of opinion within the Hierarchy of the innovationist Church over the issue of the Calendar. Many traditionalist Hierarchs reacted against the innovation and strove for the restoration of the traditional Church Calendar. One Hierarch among them offered a very judicious observation, which touched on the heart of the matter. To be precise, Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina<sup>11</sup> said at the Tenth Session of the Hierarchy, on 27<sup>th</sup> June, 1929:

In submitting a memorandum on this subject, I implore you to take into consideration the fact that the Calendar ought to be examined primarily from the standpoint of the difference with the Catholics (Papists), against whom the Old Calendar constitutes a bulwark for Orthodox Christians. This has great significance for our nation and will have momentous consequences, the responsibility for which I am unable to bear.<sup>12</sup>

In truth, the Church Calendar is a “bulwark” against the machinations of heretics, and has from of old been regarded as such in the Orthodox world, until the Shepherds themselves decided to demolish it, thereby putting the Divine Vineyard in jeopardy.

Later on, the same Confessor-Hierarch, now as the former Metropolitan of Phlorina and leader of the anti-innovationist Old Calendarists, wrote elegantly that the Holy Fathers, in order to safeguard the Orthodox Church from the false teaching of the West,

raised in the form of ramparts and bastions the bulwarks of the Canons and Synodal decrees.... One of these ramparts of Orthodoxy is the Church Calendar, which separates Orthodox Churches from the heretical ones in the celebration of the Feasts and the observance of the fasts, and thus provides the simpler among the faithful with a perceptible conception of the ecclesiastical difference between the Orthodox Christian and the heretic or heterodox Christian.<sup>13</sup>

However, since this “rampart” was demolished, the ecumenist divagation of the innovationists was thenceforth to be expected, as we see it unfolding today!



The calendar innovation did not come about for the sake of astronomical and chronometric accuracy, as its defenders maintained and continue to maintain, even though they are well aware that the Church never posited such a criterion. Rather, it came about, as Meletios Metaxakes admitted, for the sake of rapprochement with the heterodox and to make an “impression on the civilized world through this” rapprochement!<sup>14</sup>

These anti-Orthodox motivations—again, according to the great innovator, Patriarch Meletios—aim also at the inevitable adjustment of the Paschalion to the New Calendar.<sup>15</sup>

The issue of the common celebration of Pascha according to the New Calendar as it *already* occurs in the Church of Finland, or according to some other putative calendrical reckoning of more recent provenance, frequently recurs in ecumenical circles. It is, moreover, no secret that the Orthodox ecumenists have a deep desire and longing for this, since it is here that their calendar innovation of necessity ends up.

Just a few days ago, the ecumenist Patriarch Irinej of Serbia, during his visit to Austria, stated (September 14, 2010 [New Style]), *inter alia*, at an ecumenical get-together with the Roman Catholics, that the common celebration of Pascha with the Catholics “is a matter of great necessity.”<sup>16</sup>

As may easily be inferred from the examples cited above, we cannot separate the calendar issue from the panheresy of ecumenism or, by implication, from the apostasy which is paving the way for the pan-religion of the Antichrist and is sorely putting the members of the Church to the test.



Metropolitan Chrysostomos, who retired from the See of Phlorina in 1932, knew well that we Orthodox “are not of them who draw

back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.”<sup>17</sup> For this reason, with “faith,” “confidence,”<sup>18</sup> and “patience”<sup>19</sup> as his sole provisions, he unyieldingly did the Will of God in order to reap the good fruits of his vocational vows, and also in order to check the incursion of pro-heretical forces into the Church, hence providing solid ground for an Orthodox witness of resistance and a refuge for the children of the persecuted Church at a time when apostasy was in the ascendant.

Thus, in May of 1935, together with Metropolitans Germanos of Demetrias and Chrysostomos of Zakynthos, he took the step of walling himself off from the innovationists and assumed the pastoral care of the anti-innovationist community of the Church.

We scarcely need to emphasize that this act of Confession required heroism of soul.

In their “Statement of Abjuration” to the Hierarchy of the New Calendar Church, the three Confessor-Hierarchs invoked the following serious reasons for their action:

—the unilateral and uncanonical introduction of the Gregorian Calendar into the Church, contrary to the traditions of the seven Œcumenical Synods and the age-old practice of the Orthodox Church;

—the rupture of the unity of the Orthodox Church and the division of the Christians through the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar, without the consent of all the Orthodox Churches;

—the contravention of the Divine and Sacred Canons, which govern Divine worship, and in addition, the violation of the Fast of the Holy Apostles;

—the rupture of the unity of the Orthodox Church in the celebration of the Feasts and division among Christians, which pertains indirectly to the dogma of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of the Symbol of Faith;

—the instigation of scandal, division, and recrimination among Christians and the rejection of concord, love, and solidarity.

For these reasons, they were of the opinion that the ruling Hierarchy of the Church of Greece had cut itself off, according to the Sacred

Canons, from the wholeness of the Orthodox Church and had rendered itself in essence schismatic, with the proviso that they (the resisting Metropolitans) were struggling for the return of the Traditional Church Calendar and the restoration of Orthodoxy and the peace of the Church and the nation.<sup>20</sup>



This persistence on the part of Metropolitan Chrysostomos in confessing the Faith—both then, at that critical juncture, and also later on, until his death—was characteristic of him and unshakable. He never lost the opportunity to proclaim that:

We have boldly and courageously unfurled not the banner of rebellion against Orthodoxy and of division among Christians as have they [the innovators Meletios Metaxakes and Chrysostomos Papadopoulos], but the glorious and honourable standard of the union of disunited Orthodoxy and of the pacification of the Church on the basis of hallowed Traditions and the Divine and Sacred Canons.<sup>21</sup>

He believed that we resisters have full canonical justification for temporarily severing ecclesiastical communion with the Hierarchy of the New Calendar Church, prior to a Synodal verdict, and for “forming our own religious community provisionally,”<sup>22</sup> until there is an authoritative and final resolution of the calendar question by a Pan-Orthodox Synod.

The purpose of his action, far removed from any personal motivation, was to reunite all of the Orthodox Churches, which had become separated through the unilateral alteration of the Festal Calendar, in the celebration of the Christian Feasts and the simultaneous observance of the fasts.<sup>23</sup>



Given these few but wholly pithy points, how can there be any validity in the accusation of schism and disobedience against Metropolitan Chrysostomos as regards the Church of Greece, and how can the decision to depose him, based as it is on this erroneous line of thought, be considered valid?

Schism occurs when one refuses to obey a lawful and canonical ecclesiastical authority and displays insubordination towards it,<sup>24</sup> and

certainly not when one withholds obedience and subordination from an ecclesiastical authority that has introduced innovations and which one has disavowed for reasons of faith and righteousness.<sup>25</sup>

Metropolitan Chrysostomos did not disavow the Hierarchy of the innovationist Church of Greece out of a desire for leadership or out of self-seeking, but for ecclesiastical and canonical reasons, which pertained not only to the Sacred Canons concerning Divine worship, but also to the very unity of the One Church.<sup>26</sup>

There had been no rebellion against the canonical ecclesiastical authority, the Confessor-Hierarch affirmed, nor against the Orthodox Church of Greece *per se*, but a rupture of ecclesiastical communion with the ruling Synod, since it had deviated, through the calendar reform—according to a strict Orthodox understanding of the matter—from the Canons and Traditions of the Church, and since he could not brook any complicity in this deviation and rupture in the unity of the Orthodox Church in the celebration of the Christian Feasts.<sup>27</sup>



In spite of this, the innovationist Hierarchy proceeded hastily on 1<sup>st</sup> / 14<sup>th</sup> June, 1935, to sentence the three Hierarchs to deposition and monastic house arrest.<sup>28</sup>

This false and unjust deposition falls flat, since it was based on the alleged insubordination and rebellion of the accused. But it is also invalid for the reason that the members of the Synodal tribunal were themselves subject to trial and in contest against the Hierarchs who had walled themselves off; since the innovationists had no right to sit in judgment on the anti-innovationists who had disavowed them; the decision included the unheard-of penalty of house arrest; and the proper order for summoning a Hierarch to stand trial was not observed.<sup>29</sup>

Though at least the vast majority of the anti-innovationist flock had accepted the Confessor-Hierarch, who had been persecuted in this way as their Shepherd, he was twice exiled by the authorities, at the instigation of the innovationists, as a malefactor (1935, 1951), frequently hauled before law courts on charges of allegedly usurping authority, humiliated, despised, treated unjustly, and slandered,—though without losing his sense of purpose, his vision & hope, or his boldness as a Confessor.





Certain ill-disposed persons, both then and now, have raised, and do raise, the question as to why the Confessor-Hierarch did not hasten to align himself with the Old Calendarist flock from the outset, but waited for eleven whole years (1924-1935), maintaining communion with those whom he later denounced as innovationists.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos himself declared, from the place of his first exile—the Holy Monastery of St. Dionysios of Olympos—in 1935, that although, along with other Hierarchs, he had not endorsed the calendar innovation, he bore with it out of ecclesiastical *oikonomia*<sup>30</sup> and out of concern lest he create a schism, in the hope that, after suitable enlightenment, the Hierarchy would reintroduce the Orthodox Festal Calendar. However, despite his efforts and the measures that he took, the majority of the Hierarchy, under the influence of the innovationist Archbishop, stubbornly and obstinately persisted in the innovation. Since peaceful means had been exhausted, he thenceforth disavowed the ruling Synod. Furthermore, he only gradually became aware of the gravity of the issue, having not originally been fully enlightened about it. In fact, he had confidence in assurances—primarily those of the innovationist Archbishop—that this issue had no bearing on the Faith or Divine worship, and that all of the local Orthodox Churches would adopt the New Calendar at the suggestion and urging of the Œcumenical Patriarchate.<sup>31</sup>

In the meantime, division among the Orthodox continued to exist and became wider. And the innovationist Hierarchy, like an “inhuman and hard-hearted stepmother,” persecuted her Orthodox children for their adherence to Church Tradition, while the Old Calendarist community veered towards extremes because it lacked leaders with ecclesiastical authority.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, Metropolitan Chrysostomos was led little by little, along with his original fellow-strugglers, to assume the pastoral care of the anti-innovationists, “moved by the hope that the Hierarchy, compelled by the invincible force of the truth and of Orthodoxy, and avoiding the creation of what would henceforth become a formal schism, would see fit to reintroduce the traditional Festal Calendar for the union of the Orthodox Greek people.”<sup>33</sup>



The steadfast tenacity, the virtuous way of life, and the indefatigable activity of the Confessor-Hierarch Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina, in spite of the vicissitudes and difficulties of those times and circumstances, and in spite of reversals, persecutions, and machinations, imprinted his personality on the conscience of the Old Calendarist Orthodox community, and more widely, too, as its unquestioned leader.

Nevertheless, the tergiversations of his fellow Bishops were a grave disappointment for him and caused him great and unbearable distress. In the course of the struggle, he remained the sole Hierarch, whereas at the beginning (1935), the three Metropolitans had consecrated four other Bishops.<sup>34</sup> Some of them retreated to the New Calendar Church out of fear and instability, while others split off and became marginalized owing to their lack of a healthy ecclesiology.

Already in 1937, Bishops Germanos of the Cyclades and Matthew of Bresthene had denounced Metropolitan Chrysostomos for not teaching aright the word of Truth, since he had begun to issue clarifications about what the characterization of the innovationists as “schismatics” and indeed, “deprived of the Grace of the All-Holy Spirit” might mean in ecclesiological terms.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos insisted that such issues were a matter of personal opinion and denoted something that applied “potentially” and not “in actuality.” The innovationists were declared to be such, but in order for this to hold good in truth and in actual fact, they would have to be judged and condemned by a lawful ecclesiastical authority; that is, by a recognized Autocephalous Orthodox Church, or more clearly and more fully by a Pan-Orthodox Synod of the entire Church.<sup>35</sup>

The faction of clergy and laity which had broken ecclesiastical communion with the ruling Hierarchy did not constitute a distinct Church, but “belong[s] canonically to the same one and undivided Church, as an unsullied and integral part of her.”<sup>36</sup>

The Confessor-Hierarch emphasized that the original resisters had set out on their struggle for the sake of restoring the traditional Calendar to the Church, and not in order to make permanent or perpetuate a division in the Church.<sup>37</sup>

It is plain that he did not have any sense that the “Religious Community” under him or the provisional Holy Synod were the Church in Greece, to the exclusion of all others.



Even when, on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 1950, he signed an Encyclical<sup>38</sup> that stated that the innovationists were deprived of Mysteriological (Sacramental) Grace, that retracted the terms “potentially” and “in actuality,” and that said that those coming from the New Calendar Church should be rechrismated, he did not indicate to anyone, at a broader level, that he had truly changed his ecclesiology and, in general, his ecclesiological thinking and beliefs.<sup>39</sup> That Encyclical, with the three discordant points mentioned above, was patently unionist, aimed at unifying the fragmented adherents of the Old Calendar, and displayed *oikonomia* and diplomacy in view of coming woes.<sup>40</sup> The Metropolitan himself did not enforce it and stated, in fact, that he signed it in self-defense.<sup>41</sup>

Moreover, in this Encyclical he does not express the slightest remorse or regret as “culprit” for the schism of the Matthewites, who broke away precisely because Metropolitan Chrysostomos did not accept the ideas contained in this document!

It is also well known that Metropolitan Chrysostomos never explicitly declared, concerning the innovationists or the anti-innovationists who seceded from him at various times, that they had “fallen away from the Church,” nor did he ever judge anyone for his ecclesiastical outlook. Finally, if he had the sense that he alone was the authentic personification of the entire Church, how is it that he left her orphaned? He ought, as the saying goes, to have moved heaven and earth to ensure his succession. However, the audacious act of the Consecration of Bishops by a single Bishop was committed by his ideological adversary, Matthew of Bresthene, who was consistent in his extremist ecclesiology as, supposedly, the sole remaining Orthodox Bishop! Metropolitan Chrysostomos never had such a belief or sensibility, as can be demonstrated with perfect clarity by a simple comparison of the two men on this issue.<sup>42</sup>



The correct ecclesiological outlook of the Confessor-Hierarch and the steadfastness of his principles are worthy of admiration and

emulation. He waged a truly theological struggle against both the innovationists and the erroneous ecclesiology of the anti-innovationists.<sup>43</sup> He constantly faced smear campaigns, polemics, and attacks from both sides, such that the saying of the Apostle applies to him: “Without were fightings, within were fears.”<sup>44</sup> Under pressure, he made concessions to the impetuosity of the anti-innovationists for the sake of agreement on more fundamental and less contentious issues,<sup>45</sup> something that arguably has a Patristic basis.<sup>46</sup>

His contribution, in our view, is incalculable, and the message that he sends to us from eternity, where he enjoys rest from his labours, is abundantly clear:

That we should remain Orthodox in deed and word in all matters and that we should at all costs avoid communion with those who deviate: there are no small points in matters of Faith; the preservation of Tradition as a treasure involves the crown of incorruption; maintaining a judicious course between extremes is a laborious tightrope walk, in that it draws fire upon itself from both sides; it is worth enduring and dying, even if one is abandoned for the sake of the Truth!

The Apostolic exhortation, “Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle,”<sup>47</sup> does not lead to a scleroris and ossification in our spiritual life and journey, but to a spiritual rebaptism in the waters of piety. Only by living in the Holy Spirit can we resist the “mystery of iniquity”<sup>48</sup> and avoid falling into the “apostasy”<sup>49</sup> of the heresy of ecumenism. Let all who have censured, and do censure, the anti-innovationists in word and in writing understand that the maintenance of living Tradition entails obedience, humility, and love for God, the Church, and the truly spiritual Fathers and Saints. Only within this blessed state do we elicit the gift of God “through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.”<sup>50</sup> Only through this God-pleasing attitude do we receive “the love of the truth”<sup>51</sup> and are we not abandoned to the acceptance of “strong delusion, that [we] should believe a lie”<sup>52</sup> and the unrighteousness of heresy and iniquity.



Even though ecumenism, especially since 1965, has advanced and developed rapidly, in our view the guiding ecclesiological principles of the Confessor-Hierarch Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina have

not lost their force, validity, or value. His discrete stand; in general, his entire spirit, and his unitive vision express our outlook and move us.

The sacred legacy of this holy Confessor and Hierarch, as we have come to know it in the faith, confession, activity, and return [to the Old Calendar] of His Eminence, Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, First Hierarch of the Holy Synod in Resistance, and as we encounter it in the Holy Hierarchs who are our brethren, inspires us to maintain it with self-sacrifice to the end, so that we do not fall from “our own steadfastness,”<sup>53</sup> but rather preserve it intact and spread it, to the glory of God and salvation in the Church. Amen!

*Fili, Attica*  
*7<sup>th</sup> / 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2010*  
*Holy Martyr Sozon*  
*Commemoration of the repose in the Lord of the*  
*Confessor-Hierarch Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina*

1. His Grace has in mind, here, the numerous compromises made by the Orthodox participants in this ongoing dialogue. For example, having originally insisted on the exclusion of Uniates from any of the deliberations of the dialogue, the Orthodox have now acquiesced to the presence of Uniate clergy. Thus, at the Seventh Meeting of the Dialogue in 1993, in Balamand, Lebanon, almost one third of the Roman Catholic participants in the dialogue were Uniates—*Trans*.

2. The Twelfth Meeting of the Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue Between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church—*Trans*.

3. 2 Thes. 2:7.    4. 2 Thes. 2:3.    5. 2 Thes. 2:3.

6. It is striking that Metropolitan Chrysostomos, in his essay “To the Greek Orthodox Intellectuals,” which he wrote in the wake of his return to the Old Calendar in 1935, summarizing the attitude of the Orthodox Church to the Papal calendar innovation, addressed the innovationist Archbishop Chrysostomos (Papadopoulos) with the following series of questions:

“(I) Why did the six remaining Œcumenical Synods, after the First Œcumenical Synod, which determined that the Feast of Pascha should be celebrated on the first Sunday after the full moon of Spring, on the basis of the equinox of the Julian Calendar, not undertake to correct this supposed error in the Julian Calendar, given that the Fathers were aware of its inaccuracy?

“(II) Why is it that thereafter, when the Pope attempted to impose the Gregorian Calendar on the Orthodox Church, the Fathers condemned it (at the Synods of 1585 [sic; 1583, 1587] and 1593), during the reign of Œcumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II, characterizing it as an innovation of the Elder Rome, as a universal scandal and as a high-handed violation of the Divine and Sacred Canons...?

“(IV) Why, under Œcumenical Patriarch Joachim III, did the Orthodox Churches, with the Œcumenical Patriarchate at the forefront, reject the Gregorian Calendar as un-Or-

thodox and uncanonical?” (Elias Angelopoulos and Dionysios Batistatos, *Metropolitan Chrysostomos Kabourides of Phlorina: Struggler for Orthodoxy and the Nation* [Athens: 1981], pp. 60-61).

7. Nikolaos Zacharopoulos [Professor Emeritus at the University of Thessalonica], “The Orthodox Church in Greece During the Twentieth Century” in *History of Orthodoxy*, Vol. VII, “The Orthodox Churches in the Twentieth Century” (Athens: Ekdoseis Road, 2009), p. 210.      8. *Ibid.*      9. *Ibid.*      10. *Ibid.*

11. Earlier of Imbros and Tenedos and subsequently of Pelagonia (now Bitola in the Republic of Macedonia)—*Trans.*

12. Archimandrite Theokletos Strangas, “History of the Church of Greece From Reliable Sources (1817-1967)” (Athens: 1971), Vol. III, p. 1648.

13. “Memorandum in defence of the restoration of the Traditional Church Calendar” [1945], in Angelopoulos and Batistatos, Μητροπολίτης πρ. Φλωρίνης Χρυσόστομος Καβουρίδης, p. 157. Further on in this document, the Confessor-Hierarch emphasizes the following essential aspects of the issue: “The question of the Church Calendar is not one of times and dates for our Church, but a matter of unity and a concerted line of defence of Orthodoxy against heresy and false belief, as represented by the Western Church, which is aiming by all means and at all costs to demolish one after another the ramparts of the Eastern Church, in order ultimately to profane the precious pearl of Orthodoxy” (*ibid.*, p. 158).

14. *Ibid.*, p. 126. On the issue of rapprochement between East and West, the Confessor-Hierarch writes elsewhere: “To be sure, rapprochement between the two Christian worlds of the East and the West in the celebration of Christian Feasts is desired by all and is a matter of great moral value and significance. However, it must be pursued and attained in the service of Christian truth and for the glory of the God-Man Jesus Christ. Were such to be the case, the moral interests of the entire Christian world would truly be served in the right Faith. But when this rapprochement springs from materialistic and worldly interests and motives and is undertaken at the expense of Orthodoxy and to the diminution of the glory of Christ, then personal interests, and especially ecclesiastical ambitions and desires, are served, to the detriment of the idea of the Church and of the prestige of Orthodoxy in general. Her soul consists of the traditions and the God-inspired and unerring documents of the Apostolic Constitutions and the decisions of the Seven Holy and Œcumenical Synods, the distortion of which diminishes the Divinely wrought and inviolable authority of the Divine essence of the Church of Christ. Thus, all harm done to Orthodoxy and every diminution thereof becomes the harm and diminution of the Divinity of Christ, from Whom there shines the sublime and Divine character and the deeper and Divine meaning of the Christian religion” (“Refutation of the ‘Censure’ of Archbishop Chrysostomos Papadopoulos,” in *The Complete Works of (Metropolitan) Chrysostomos of Phlorina* [n.p.: Ekdosis Hieras Mones Hagiou Nikodemou Hellenikou Gortynias, 1997], Vol. I, pp. 260-261).      15. *Ibid.*

16. “Patriarch Irinej of Serbia Seeks the Reconciliation of the Two Churches,” [http://www.romfea.gr/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=5835:eirhnaio&catid=13](http://www.romfea.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5835:eirhnaio&catid=13).      17. Heb. 10:39.      18. Heb. 10:35.      19. Heb. 10:36.

20. “The Church Calendar as a Criterion of Orthodoxy,” in *Απαντα πρ. Φλωρίνης Χρυσόστομου*, Vol. I, pp. 130-131.      21. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

22. See note 30 in the article “The Inspirers and Ringleaders of the Calendar Innovation: ‘These Two Luthers of the Orthodox Church,’” in *Ορθόδοξος Ενστασις και Μαρτυρία*,

Vol. II, No. 17 (Oct.-Dec. 1989), p. 77; <http://hsir.info/p/ib>.

23. “Υπόμνημα πολογητικόν,” p. 155.

24. See Protopresbyter Evangelos Mantzouneas, “Ecclesiastical Penal Law” (Athens: 1979), p. 168.

25. See Canon XXXI of the Holy Apostles and Canon XV of the First-Second Synod.

26. “Υπόμνημα πολογητικόν,” p. 149.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

28. Strangas, Εκκλησίας Ελλάδος Ιστορία, Vol. III, p. 2043.

29. “Υπόμνημα πολογητικόν,” pp. 151-152.

30. “Proclamation of Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Phlorina for the Enlightenment of Orthodox Greeks,” in Angelopoulos and Batistatos, Μητροπολίτης πρ. Φλωρίνης Χρυσόστομος Καβουρίδης, p. 69.

31. “Υπόμνημα πολογητικόν,” p. 146.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

33. *Ibid.*

34. A fact indicative of the sensitive and exceedingly meticulous ecclesiological and canonical conscience of the Confessor-Hierarch is that ten years later, in 1945, he characterized the Episcopal Consecrations as “hasty,” “fraught with peril,” and “precipitous,” while he called the original ecclesiastical organization of the Hierarchs who had assumed pastoral oversight of the anti-innovationists a “Hierarchical Council” and not a Holy Synod! (See “Υπόμνημα πολογητικόν,” p. 136.)

35. See his “Pastoral Encyclical of 1st June, 1944,” translated into English in *Resistance or Exclusion? The Alternative Ecclesiological Approaches of Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Florina and Bishop Matthew of Vresthene*, tr. Hieromonk Patapios (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2000), pp. 63-82; see also <http://hsir.info/p/p>. The original Greek is found in Απαντα πρ. Φλωρίνης Χρυσόστομου, Vol. II, pp. 13-28; see also <http://hsir.info/p/w>.

36. “A Clarification by Metropolitan Chrysostomos of His Pastoral Encyclical (18th January, 1945)], translated into English in *Resistance or Exclusion?*, p. 124; see also <http://hsir.info/p/bx>. The original Greek is found at <http://hsir.info/p/u6>.

37. “[An Epistle of the Erstwhile (Metropolitan) of Phlorina (to Bishop Germanos of the Cyclades)],” in Angelopoulos and Batistatos, Μητροπολίτης πρ. Φλωρίνης Χρυσόστομος Καβουρίδης, p. 83. [This text is translated into English in *Resistance or Exclusion?*, pp. 54-62—*Trans.*] In this wonderful epistle, which is ecclesiological in nature, Metropolitan Chrysostomos deals, *inter alia*, with the question of the meaning of the condemnations pronounced against the calendar innovation in the sixteenth century. There are some, even to this day, who, motivated by an extremely simplistic, and also naïve and limited, understanding of the matter, opine that on the basis of those resolutions the contemporary calendar innovation has been condemned in advance and that therefore a fresh condemnation of it is not required. The Confessor-Hierarch provides the following incontrovertible elucidation:

“Likewise, Your Grace, you dissemble and utter outright falsehoods when you assert that it is unnecessary and superfluous to convene a Pan-Orthodox Synod or a major local Synod for the authoritative and definitive condemnation of the calendar innovation by the Archbishop, since the Pan-Orthodox Synods of 1583, 1587, and 1593 condemned the Gregorian Calendar.

“And this is so, because you know fully well that the aforementioned Synods condemned the Gregorian Calendar, but that this condemnation concerns the Latins, who implemented this calendar in its entirety, whereas the Archbishop adopted half of it, applying it to the fixed Feasts and retaining the Old Calendar for Pascha and the move-

able Feasts, precisely in order to bypass the obstacle of this condemnation.

“In view of this, the innovation of the Archbishop in applying the Gregorian Calendar only to the fixed Feasts and not to Pascha, which was the main reason why the Gregorian Calendar was condemned as conflicting with the Seventh Apostolic Canon, is an issue that appears for the first time in the history of the Orthodox Church.

“Consequently, the convocation of a Pan-Orthodox Synod is not only not superfluous, as Your Grace declares *ex cathedra*, like another Pope, but is actually required for the canonical and authoritative adjudication of this issue” (*Resistance or Exclusion?*, pp. 58-59).

38. See Φωνη της Ορθοδοξίας, No. 86 (12th June, 1950).

39. The same applies also to circular memoranda on this subject published from time to time by certain persons, and letters, instructions, etc. of the Confessor-Hierarch, chiefly to the clergy serving under him, in which one can find similar ideas and statements.

40. For a clear summary of these “woes,” that is, the terrible persecution visited on the Old Calendarists under Archbishop Spyridon, see Archbishop Chrysostomos, Bishop Ambrose, and Bishop Auxentios, *The Old Calendar Orthodox Church of Greece*, 5th ed. (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2009), pp. 22-24—*Trans.*

41. A.D. Delembases, *The Lord’s Pascha* (Athens: 1985), pp. 807-808.

42. Let us remember what the Confessor-Hierarch wrote to Bishop Germanos of the Cyclades in the aforementioned Epistle of 1937 on the issue of the Matthewite view concerning the sole remaining Orthodox Hierarchs:

“If you take this step, Your Grace, you will put an end to the life and the age-old history of the Orthodox Church, since you are proclaiming all of the Orthodox Churches as a whole to be heretical, thereby falsifying the declaration of the Lord to His Disciples when He said: ‘Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.’

“You see, Your Grace, to what absurdities and to what an abysmal precipice this reckless and populist policy leads you; for you not only defile the sanctity of our struggle, to serve which we elevated you to the vantage point and honour of a Bishop, but you also annul the meaning and substance of the universal Orthodox Church” (*Resistance or Exclusion?*, p. 59). 43. Delembases, p. 807. 44. 2 Cor. 7:5.

45. It should, of course, be emphasized that in the end this condescension remained ineffectual and failed in its purpose, save that it facilitated the return of just a small group of Matthewite clergy and monastics. Yet, in a certain way it darkened the radiant witness of the Confessor-Hierarch and provided a strong argument for the harsh persecution that ensued under the innovationist Archbishop Spyridon (Blachos).

46. See, for example, “Epistle CXIII, “To the Presbyters in Tarsus” by St. Basil the Great, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXXII, cols. 525B-528A.

47. 2 Thes. 2:15. 48. 2 Thes. 2:7. 49. 2 Thes. 2:3. 50. 2 Thes. 2:13.

51. 2 Thes. 2:10. 52. 2 Thes. 2:11 53. Cf. 2 Peter 3:17.



“WHENEVER a man reads the Divine books, the demons fear.”

FROM THE PARADISE OF THE FATHERS



# Teaching on the Divine Services of the Orthodox Church

BY ARCHPRIEST ALEXANDER RUDAKOV

PUBLISHED IN 1890 IN SAINT PETERSBURG

*Note: In what follows we have substantially expanded on  
Fr Alexander's original text to make things clearer for  
contemporary readers.*

**§ 79. Particularities of the Services for the Feast of Pentecost.** This feast is called Pentecost from the Greek word for fifty, because the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles took place on the fiftieth day after the Resurrection of Christ. The present feast includes two particular celebrations, that to the glory of the Most Holy Trinity, and that to the glory of the Holy Spirit, Who visibly descended upon the Apostles and sealed the new and everlasting covenant of God with man. The first day of the feast itself, the Sunday, is consecrated primarily to the glory of the Holy Trinity, and this day is often colloquially referred to as **Trinity**. The second day of the feast, the Monday, more particularly celebrates the Most Holy Spirit, and is called **Holy Spirit Day**.

The liturgical celebration of the descent of the Holy Spirit begins, as is usual, at Vespers, chanted on the Sunday evening. [Sometimes, for convenience sake, this service is chanted earlier in the day or even at the end of the Sunday Liturgy, so that as many people as possible may receive the blessing - *transl.*] During this service, three compunctionate prayers are read, while all those participating prostrate themselves on the ground. These prayers were composed by Saint Basil the Great, and in them we confess our sins before the Heavenly Father, and for the sake of His Son, we beseech remembrance in His Kingdom. We also ask the Lord Jesus Christ to grant us the grace of the Divine Spirit, for

our enlightenment and the confirmation of our souls, and finally we pray for our fathers and brethren who have fallen asleep, that the Lord grant them rest in a place of light, a place of green pasture and of peace.

On the ancient feast of Pentecost, the Jews had the custom of decorating their dwelling places and synagogues with branches of trees and with flowers. This they did recalling that the Law was given to their forebears on the mountain, which was covered with greenery and flowers. [As we think of Sinai as a barren desert, this may seem improbable, but Fr Alexander's assertion is backed up by the Jewish Encyclopedia on this point - *transl.*] The first Christians were, of course, Jewish, and they continued this tradition, handing it on to the Christian Church. This custom has been continued to this day in the Orthodox Church, although now it has a different significance. The decorating of our churches and homes with greenery and flowers at this time signifies, first of all, the life-giving and edifying power of the Spirit, and secondly, it is an offering to Him of the first-fruits of Spring, a promise and sign of the new life.

*N.B. Pentecost, this year, falls on 6th June (19th on the civil calendar), but we have continued this teaching with this paragraph, so that our readers may be prepared for the festival.*

*.... to be continued.*



AN ELDER SAID: “The reason why we do not make progress and are not aware of our real spiritual condition is that we do not have patience in the work that we begin, but wish to acquire virtue without effort. We are changeable and also move around easily, going from place to place without difficulty, because we think it is possible to find some place where the devil does not exist.”

FROM “THE EVERGETINOS”

# THE COMING MONTH

IN MAY we continue the paschal celebration and also celebrate the **Great Feast of the Saviour's Ascension** (27th May / 9th June). The late **Archbishop Andrew of Rockland** has some words on this feast which are particularly comforting, especially in our increasingly troubled times. He says: "And here today, while parting from the disciples and ascending into heaven, He blessed them. And what happened? There was a parting. Now parting always brings sadness, but they left in joy. Why? Well, because before them were revealed the ways of life, which were no longer self-reliant, but were with the Grace of God. They knew that they too would go into eternity, to Christ. And while living in this earthly life, which is so bound up with the storms of life, the path they were going would be quiet and peaceful for them, because the Grace of the Holy Spirit is breathed into the priesthood, forgiving and absolving. And what does the Apostle say in this regard? Here is what he says: 'For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, Who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness ... covetousness, which is idolatry' (Col. 3:3-5). In other words, you go ahead but around you pass all these waves: impurity, anger, fury, slander. Your heart is tossed from one side to the other. Yet you are joyful. Around you is the Hand of the Lord, the Grace of the Holy Spirit which guides and comforts you, giving light, freeing you from darkness and anguish." Such is one cause of our joy on this feast, another is that in this feast, we see one of our kind, a Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, seated on the Throne of the Most High, our hope made manifest.



“WHEN you find unchanging peace on your way, then fear; because you are far from the right path by which the righteous go with suffering feet.”

SAINT IGNATIUS OF THE CAUCASUS, + 1867 A.D.,  
QUOTING THE VEN ISAAC THE SYRIAN.

# POINTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE

*"I SPOKE with XXX and she gave me the gospel book & told me: don't read through it page by page but open it and what you're thinking about you will find and when I first opened it the first thing I saw was a gospel on 'believing' and I came close to tears. I sat just now on my bed and thinking how hard I'm finding fasting so I got the book of gospels and opened it and the page that opened was 'on fasting'... So I closed the book after reading about fasting and crossed myself, opened it again and it was a gospel on 'caring for yourself...'" - L.C., Essex*

BE EXTREMELY CAREFUL about the method of reading the Scriptures which XXX suggested to you. The Scriptures are not an oracle, such as the pagan Greeks used to consult. On the occasions you mention when her method seemed to help, it may have been for several reasons. Either because you are new, the Saviour showed you a special mercy (I hope), or maybe you were predisposed to see it work in that way, or (and I hope not) the evil spirits "helped" you in that way to gain your confidence for this entirely un-Orthodox way of approaching the Scriptures, so that you would rely on it and thus fall into superstition. There are very rare occasions when people are desperate, when our Saviour grants a blessing through this way, but it is not something to be expected.

The proper way to read Scripture is to read a little each day having first prayed that you be given understanding. A good rule is to at least read the appointed portions which we list in our calendar insert for every day - which is why we put them there. They have been selected from ages past by God-enlightened Fathers and appointed to be read in that way because those Fathers understood what we need for our spiritual nourishment. And in that way you are praying with the rest of the Orthodox world, uniting yourself to them in that one respect. Also you need to read back-up material so that you can understand the Scriptures as the Church does, not by private interpretation. Where we have them in English, St Theophylact of Ochrid's commentaries are perhaps the best help in this regard. We have them available at the back of our church.

# NEWS from the communities in England of the Church of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of Greece

## ***SAINT EDWARD'S SPRING FEAST***

JUST before the Vigil for St Edward's feast, we received a visit from **Hieromonk Evloghie** from our Sister Church in Romania. He was brought to Brookwood by **Catalin Muraru**, but unfortunately they were unable to stay for the Vigil itself. However a goodly number of people did attend, many of them from other jurisdictions. On the feast day itself, Thursday, 18th / 31st March, we celebrated the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, and again, this year, more people than usual attended, which was uplifting. Afterwards we shared breakfast together.

## ***THE ANNUNCIATION, THREE BISHOPS & THREE ARCHIMANDRITES***

MEMBERS of the Saint Edward Brotherhood met **His Grace, Bishop Ambrose**, on his arrival in this country at Gatwick on 24th April / 6th March, and took him to the Convent, where the Vigil for the **Great Feast of the Annunciation**, the community's dedication festival, was chanted. **Fr Borislav Popov** joined the Bishop and the Brotherhood clergy in this celebration and for the Divine Liturgy the next day. After both services, **Mother Vikentia** and her sisters invited the participants to festal meals. After taking his leave of the faithful there, Bishop Ambrose

came to Brookwood, where he stayed until the following Sunday. He was present at our celebration of the Presanctified Liturgy on the **Synaxis of the Archangel Gabriel**, and that evening chanted the Akathist service for us, as Fr Alexis was indisposed. On the Saturday, he attended the services for the Soul Sabbath. On that day **Bishop Sofronie of Suceava**, who had arrived in England on the Friday evening, celebrated the Mystery of Holy Unction at the Convent for the Romanian Faithful. On the Sunday, Saint John of the Ladder, both Bishops celebrated the Divine Liturgy at Brookwood and were joined by **Bishop Evloghie of Sibiu**, the three hierarchs concelebrating together. During the Matins service, before the Divine Liturgy, **Archimandrite Daniel (Toyne)**, a clergyman formerly of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, was received into our Diocese and back into Traditionalist Orthodoxy by *cheirothesia*, Bishop Ambrose reading the prayer for him and completing his vesting. Fr Daniel then joined us in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. We were also joined by **Archimandrite Seraphim** and **Father Deacon Nicolae** from Romania, and thus had three Bishops and three Archimandrites serving together, with Fr Borislav, assisted by Fr Nicolae and our Fr Sabbas as deacons. During the Liturgy, Bishop Ambrose preached a sermon in English, and then Bishop Evloghie preached in Romanian, explaining the significance of the sequence of the Sunday commemorations during Great Lent. At the end, Bishop Ambrose gave a further short address, introducing Fr Archimandrite Daniel to our people. Fr Daniel had been baptized by **Metropolitan Cyprian the Elder** at Fili about 38 years ago, and on returning to England was a parishioner at the old Russian Orthodox Church Abroad Cathedral at Emperor's Gate, Kensington. His work took him to Singapore, where there was only a church of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, for which after some years he was ordained, and built up the mission there, travelling to Pakistan and other countries in South East Asia, doing missionary work. He is now resident in Germany, and will be there until his retirement from his teaching post, by which he supports himself. His Grace pointed out that by now joining

our diocese, he is returning home. Though staying in Germany, Fr Daniel will be returning as often as possible to England to help our communities here. About 200 people attended the celebration on this Sunday, and we are thankful that again **Catalin Tamasanu** provided us with a sound system, so that the sermons could be heard by all. We are also thankful that the weather was fine, so that the many people whom we could not accommodate within the old Mortuary hall, could eat outside. While they did so, the three Bishops and our new Archimandrite were able to mingle among them and speak to them. Fr Borislav then kindly drove Fr Daniel to Heathrow to catch his flight, and **Vasileos Cancanteras** drove Bishop Ambrose back to the priest's house attached to the Convent in London, where he stayed before returning to Greece.

## ***MORTUARY RESTORATION FUND***

SINCE our last issue, for this fund we have received **£4,224.63** from our readers and parishioners towards this work. God bless you all for your ready response. Donations may be sent to the Brotherhood or paid directly into our **King Edward Orthodox Trust Co Ltd** Building Fund account, number 00089278, at the **CAF Bank Ltd**, sort code 40-52-40.

The monies collected are for re-roofing the **Old Mortuary building** and attending to various essential structural matters. The work is now due to begin about the time that you will receive this magazine, and will necessitate our closing down the Mortuary Building for about twelve weeks. During that time, we will have only coffee and a snack after the Sunday Liturgies. And in general we will have to re-arrange our life around the work for the duration. We ask you to bear with any inconvenience, and to generously give to the fund itself - to help us pay for the restoration!

## A NEW ICON

THE SISTERS of the **Convent of Saint Philothei, Villberga, Sweden**, have painted an icon of **Saint Glicherie of Romania, St Sophronius of Jerusalem and Saint Blaise of Sebaste** for our church. We commissioned this icon in thanksgiving for the help, support and love that the Romanian faithful who have joined us have shown us. St Glicherie was of course a confessor and guide of the Traditionalist Orthodox in that country, during the various persecutions they suffered in the twentieth century; St Sophronius is the name saint of Bishop Sofronie, who so often visits our communities here, and St Blaise, the name saint of Metropolitan Vlasie, the president of the Synod of Bishops of the Old Calendarist Church in Romania.

\* \* \* \* \*

## PRACTICAL TIP

BEWARE of becoming an "**Internet Orthodox**"! There are many excellent articles on the internet now about the Orthodox Church and her teachings, news of developments, sermons, pictures and reports of events. There are, of course, also many things which profess to be Orthodox, - oftentimes claiming to be more Orthodox than the Orthodox! - but which are extremely harmful and do not manifest the love of Christ in any way. These naturally should be avoided. However, even with the positive things, one has to be extremely careful. There seems to be a growing tendency, for even quite committed people, to listen to recordings of chants, watch videos of services, read homilies, have prayers read on tape, etc, but as it were as a pastime. These things can be helpful for people who are housebound or infirm, but they are **no substitute** for saying your prayers before your icons at home, for attentive and prayerful spiritual reading, for setting about correcting yourselves, and for attending and participating in the Divine services in church. Orthodoxy is not a hobby; it is a way of life. Live it to the fullest!