

Bishop Klemes of Gardikion GOC (K): Refutation of New Calendar Denigrators



Bishop Klemes of Gardikion was born in Drama, in Eastern Macedonia, Greece, in the year 1966. He is the author of numerous erudite and instructive theological articles and studies of spiritual and historical content. He was Consecrated a Bishop on October 7, 2007 (Church [Old] Calendar), and immediately assumed the position of Secretary of the Holy Synod in Resistance.

Refutation of an “Encyclical Sermon” by a Hierarchy of the New Calendar Orthodox Church of Greece and a Wily Denigrator of Anti-Ecumenists and “Old Calendarists” Who Have Walled Themselves Off From His Church

by His Grace, Bishop Klemes of Gardikion,
Secretary of the Holy Synod, Church of the
True Orthodox Christians of Greece

[TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK ORIGINAL
BY THE ST. GREGORY PALAMAS MONASTERY]

1. The Divine injunction of the Holy Apostle Paul, “Speak ye truth,”¹ ever retains its timeliness and significance, especially when Divine Truth is distorted by those who are supposed to be its teachers, guardians, and defenders!

An assault on the truth and on those who, with God’s help, are its followers, was recently mounted by a Metropolitan of the New Calendar Church of Greece by way of a printed “Encyclical Sermon” for the Sunday of All Saints (June 15, 2014, New Style), which was earlier posted on the Internet.²

This Bishop, who has the reputation of being a traditionalist, wrote the text in question, as he avers, by way of a “response to certain letters and messages,” entitling it “Let Us Attend, That We May Offer the Confession of Faith in Humility and With a Correct Ecclesiology.” The title is truly fine and laudable, as is the beginning of his printed sermon. Its ensuing contents and its ending, however, are not merely disheartening but (as has already been correctly observed³) constitute a misleading, arbitrary, and tedious distortion, falsification, misinterpretation, violation, and degradation

of the canonical and Patristic Tradition of the Orthodox Church.

Since this challenge has been issued publicly, we cannot remain indifferent and cannot fail to teach aright the word of Truth, not of course in order to lecture its author, who is now advanced in years and is, indeed, an university professor emeritus,⁴ but in order to set forth a public correction of this unacceptable misrepresentation of the truth and to protect those of our brethren who may be unfamiliar with, or ignorant of, the issues from being enticed into the error of our wily deprecator.

2. This intemperate attack by our denigrator on truth-loving anti-ecumenists and on genuine Orthodox Christians who follow the traditional Church Calendar is an old chestnut. At least twenty-five years ago, when he was still a Hierokeryx⁵ in [the then municipality] of Mandra [an outer suburb of Athens], Attica, he launched a “campaign” against the “Old Calendarists,” who, in fidelity to their principles, refrain from communing with his innovationist New Calendar Church, and whom he, for this reason, regards as being supposedly “outside the Church.”

We assure him that we are not out of communion with the Church of Christ, the Church of the Firstborn in the Heavens,⁶ the Church of the Saints, the Righteous, and the Confessors of our Faith, and also of those of like mind on the earth, but are totally out of communion with all who have diverged from the straight path, created a schism, and suffered a dreadful fall into the apostatic heresy—and panheresy, to boot—of ecumenism. It makes no difference to us whether those who have fallen and those, like

our accuser, who commune with them “cut us off” from their Church.

It is well known that when one lives and experiences the truth of the Church in an organic fashion,⁷ with constancy, love, and humility, and also by preserving what has been handed down, without additions or subtractions, he becomes a vessel of Divine Grace and is united with the Church of the Firstborn as an authentic member of the Body of Christ, even if a sentence of condemnation should be pronounced against him by unworthy representatives of the Hierarchy, who may have Apostolic Succession, but who are in error with regard to the Faith. The Divine Chrysostomos, as St. Gregory Palamas explains, “was cut off from the Church and condemned to banishment”⁸ in accordance with the unjust deposition imposed on him synodally by the partisans of Theophilus of Alexandria, and it is precisely for this reason that he did not abide by it or take the least account of it! For unjust condemnations are reckoned as “persecutions”⁹ and furnish a greater abundance of Divine Grace and benediction.¹⁰

In his earlier invectives against us, our deprecator was even more incautious and fell into additional tragic errors, which he is careful not to repeat. Back then, for example, he maintained that it is of no importance which calendar one follows, since this has nothing to do with ecclesiastical Tradition, and that it suffices to be “united with the Church,” that is, with Her administration. As well, yet more tragically, he wrote that ecumenism is nothing other than “simple fellowship and a display of

etiquette,”
innocent “courtesies” and “polite meetings”; that it is innocent “dialogue, in
order
show up the delusion” of the heretics!¹¹

We do not know whether these views of his, which were leniently
characterized
as completely groundless, represented what he consciously believed or were a
deliberate
distortion of reality, for the sake of serving his own interests.

3. It is gratifying that he now at least acknowledges that the calendar was
“wrongly changed” and that ecumenism is patently and unequivocally a
“panheresy.”

In the “Encyclical Sermon” under review he admits, inter alia: “I see that the
boundaries which our Fathers set are being violated.”

This certainly constitutes some progress. We would not, however, describe it as
signi
ficant. Our denigrator leaves us no room for encouragement, because he
hastens to
tone matters down by incessantly harping on “violations of the Sacred
Canons,”¹²
as though the panheresy of ecumenism resided solely in violations of the
Sacred
Canons (!), and also because the root of the problem remains the same: rather
than
turning with all his might against this panheresy, which manifestly deprives
those
implicated in it of eternal salvation, and making sure to distance himself from
it—for
whether he likes it or not, he is implicated in it through his Mysteriological
(Sacramental)
communion with the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and, in general, those
concelebrants
of his who are exponents thereof—he instead defends his reprehensible

communion with heresy and turns with vehemence and animosity on the “Old Calendarists”!

They, in his opinion, “did what was wrong”! They, he affirms with bombast and Papal absolutism, “are not a Church, and their Mysteries are invalid”! They, he concludes dauntlessly, “have not a leg to stand on,” and for this reason he is an adversary of their stand and their praxis.

For him, as a putative “proper confessor,” it is sufficient to express his confession candidly, “both orally and in writing,” and simply to “protest” when he sees violations of the Sacred Canons, albeit—as he resolutely assures us—from “within the Church, . . . commemorating our Holy Synod and our OEcumenical Patriarch,” id est, the ringleader of the panheresy of ecumenism!

The author’s patently erroneous and contradictory conclusions are founded on the mistaken viewpoint that he posits as the basis of his arguments and which is related to his conception of the unity of the Church.

4. Our deprecator declares simplistically, at least in the text under consideration, that the unity of the Church is expressed by commemoration of the Bishop: “Through commemoration there exists unity in the entire Church. . . . If I, your Bishop [he is instructing his flock], cease to commemorate the Holy Synod, I cut myself off from the Church.” And all who follow him in this are thereby automatically “outside the Church.”

This position, when things are well and functioning in an Orthodox manner, validly constitutes part of the truth, but not the whole truth. When things are not in

order, that is, when heresy is preached in the Church, as has been occurring for many decades with regard to the panheresy of ecumenism, then our denigrator's position constitutes clear deviation and an entrapment in the impasse of heretical dissoluteness, giving priority to the administrative structure of the Church and overlooking the most essential, primary, and cardinal issue, namely, the Faith and Confession of the Church.

This position, in any event, entails the hallmark of centralized and absolutist Papist ecclesiology, in which everything hinges on communion with, and a relationship of dependence on, a see purportedly infallible solely by virtue of the station and rank of the occupant of that see; that is, the Pope. This occurs precisely when Grace is made subordinate to the institution, to history, and to a place: when the Church is rendered supposedly subject to Peter and not Peter to the Church!

This mentality has, unfortunately, mutated into the neo-Papal outlook and conduct of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the last century, and it is amazing how it has influenced, and influences, even people who in theory do not appear to espouse the neo-Papal and domineering aspirations and pretensions of the Phanar and who desire to be free, in other respects, from the Babylonian captivity of Western theological absolutism and scholasticism.

5. Let us see, however, with God's help, how matters stand from an Orthodox point of view:

Inasmuch as the Church of Christ is “the pillar and ground of the truth,”¹³ communion with Her is assessed not on the basis of communion with the prime Patriarchal see, that of Rome or of Constantinople, but on the basis of communion with the Truth. As St. Gregory Palamas summarizes this point, “Those who belong to the Church of Christ belong to the Truth; and those who do not belong to the Truth do not belong to the Church of Christ either.”¹⁴ This is because the Church of Christ is founded and built upon the confession of the correct and saving faith of Truth.¹⁵ The unity of the Church has precisely the common confession of the Faith as its wellspring and foundation. Consequently, the unity of the Church is safeguarded and protected when and where there exist unity of Faith and abidance in the Traditions of the Church. The genuine children of the Church readily obey “Apostolic and Patristic teachings and ecclesiastical Traditions,”¹⁶ and for this reason “if anyone [whoever he may be] annuls any ecclesiastical Tradition, written or unwritten, let him be anathema!”¹⁷

Hence, without unity in the dogmas of the Faith, and without respect for, and observance of, the Church’s Traditions, any kind of unity in the Church is inconceivable, according to the Apostolic and Patristic understanding of the entire Orthodox Catholic Church.

St. John Chrysostomos says, for example: “When we all believe alike, then there is unity. . . . For this is unity of faith, when we are all one. . . , [when] we show that we all have one faith.”¹⁸

In the “one body” of the Church there should without fail exist “one spirit,” that is, concord and unanimity in Faith and Tradition, since it is also possible for the following to occur: “That there be one body, yet not one spirit; as, for instance, if some [member of it] were to be a friend also of heretics”!¹⁹

See how the Divine Chrysostomos touches on this sensitive point: “friendship” with heretics sunders the unity of Faith, and therefore of the Church, since the latter is not safeguarded simply and solely through the maintenance of administrative unity. Ensurance of the unity of Faith and of the Church entails a dearth of “friendship” and “fellowship” with heretics, since the latter destroy it. For this reason the “anathema” of the Apostle Paul falls like a thunderbolt against even the very slightest heterodox teaching!²⁰

Only, then, when there is unanimity in the Faith and the Tradition of the Church is there communion in the Mysteries, something which is expressed liturgically by commemoration in the Divine Services of the Church. Commemoration does not constitute unity, but expresses unity when it truly exists; otherwise, “we are playacting”²¹ with Divine things by commemorating those with whom we do not have oneness of mind in the Faith or in Tradition, unto our condemnation both on earth and in Heaven! We think this quite evident even to the conscience of a small child!

6. In the meantime, no one is exempt from the danger of falling away from the Truth and, as such, no one is exempt from the impossibility of being

commemorated
[in the services], neither the successors of the Apostles, the Bishops, nor
Patriarchs,
nor historic thrones and sees. Not few are the instances in the history of the
Church when a Pope or Patriarch preached heresy and caused agitation in the
Church,
being cut off therefrom even through anathema.

“If” Hierarchs “are faithful to Tradition and act in accord with the whole
Church. . . then they abide in the Truth [and are therefore commemorated—
AUTHOR’S
NOTE]. But if they abandon Orthodoxy, then they lose not only their teaching
authority,
but their very status as Christians, and their anathemas [which they unleash
against
all who disavow them—AUTHOR’S NOTE] have no value. Not Bishops only,
but whole
local Churches may stray from the path of truth,”²² becoming excluded from
communion
and commemoration, even “prior to a Synodal verdict,” as having succumbed
to heresy and to being cut off from the Truth.

Those who commemorate such Hierarchs and Churches as Orthodox do not
preserve the unity of the Church but destroy it; and those who do not
commemorate
them do not destroy the unity of the Church but serve, uphold, and
save it.²³

Thus has Orthodoxy been “preserved” until today, and thus will it be
“preserved,”
not through the concoction of newfangled ideas, which propose the “uniate”
path
and a solution familiar to history, that is, unconditional communion with
Bishops, a
see, or sees that have fallen into heresy, and this for the sake of maintaining a
vener

of external, structural unity. This does not constitute a preservation of the unity of the Faith, for it is devoid of Truth. We have such examples in history, which are to be avoided and not imitated!

7. Now that we demonstrated, albeit briefly, that the conception of the unity of the Church advocated by the author of this “Sunday Encyclical Sermon” rests on a wholly erroneous base, we can easily infer the erroneousness of all of his other ideas and views.

If ecumenism is a panheresy, and if it is preached, applied, and put forth on a continuous basis, in an expanded form, methodically and steadfastly, by every means and in every way by the powers-that-be and administrations of all of the local official Orthodox Churches, which participate in it and have sustained the multifarious and contagious corruption that it spawns, having been caught and strangled in its tentacles—the Patriarchate of Constantinople, senior among the Patriarchal thrones, being assuredly at the forefront—then what stand do Orthodox Confessors take in the face of this phenomenon? Do they exhaust themselves simply by protesting about violations of the Canons? And do they maintain uninterrupted their communion with the prime movers of this heresy?

Indeed not. We speak in terms of heresy and panheresy and regard ecumenism as misbelief and not as a mere violation of the Canons. We also desire to bring to mind, here, some essential truths before we further respond to our foregoing

questions.

The 1920 Proclamation of the Church of Constantinople viewed the heterodox heretics as “members of the Church” and heterodox communities as “Churches of Christ,” through the acknowledgment of a supposed common Baptism as a unifying factor. It is also well known that a “uniform calendar” for the purpose of concelebration was proposed in order to realize the objectives of this unionist program.

The Orthodox ecumenists did not make unity and identity in Faith the basis for their unwarranted transgressions, but a new principle: coöperation with the heterodox “churches” on practical issues and concelebration with them, despite the nonexistence of dogmatic agreement, so as to pave the way for an anomalous [future] form of unity, though, in essential action, to experience such by anticipation.

Thus did they commence their unfaltering “common journey with the rest of the Christian world” and multifarious syncretistic “fellowship” and coöperation therewith, towards a putative joint witness and ministry to the world.

The so-called “Pan-Orthodox Congress of Constantinople” in 1923, under the Masonic Patriarch Meletios Metaxakes, mooted a series of inadmissible innovations and modernizations, and also the “revised Julian Calendar,” for the sake of conforming the Church to the demands of this world of corruption, of setting Tradition aside, of rewarding the West for its rebelliousness, and “for the service of pan-Christian unity” and “the restoration anew of the unity of Christians, at least on this point.”²⁴

Thus, since the calendar was regarded as a tool for the promotion of the ecumenist

vision, the ecclesiological character of the calendar innovation, which was finally implemented in a dictatorial manner in 1924 [in Greece], ninety years ago, is plain and incontrovertible. It is precisely this innovation that prepared the ground and dug the foundations for a revision of the entire order and life of the Orthodox Church.

The rest of the story is familiar: participation and inclusion, from 1948 onwards, in the panheretical alliance of the World Council of Churches, where the slogan “unity in diversity” holds sway in practical experience; the Lifting of the Anathemas with the Papists in 1965; the expansion of the interfaith movement in 1971; the Synodal endorsement by Constantinople of the thoroughly heretical “Thyateira Confession” in 1975; the signing of a union agreement with the Non-Chalcedonians in 1991; the Balamand agreement on full mutual recognition with the Papists, in 1993; recognition of baptism between Constantinople and the Evangelical Church of Germany, with a prohibition of any rebaptism, in 2004; joint prayers, joint declarations, joint consultations, joint endeavors, etc., which now occur and are disseminated on an almost daily basis!

None of these events comes under the rubric of simple canonical violations; rather, they constitute the “overturning of all things.”²⁵ Prominent Orthodox ecumenists proclaim openly and frankly that, supposedly, no Christian Church can any longer act, speak, or even think, reflect, and make decisions in isolation, that “the syndrome of the unique way” must be abandoned,²⁶ that withdrawal from the World Council of

Churches is considered “an inconceivable proposition,”²⁷ and that their ecumenical unionist course is deemed, and is, “irreversible.”²⁸

8. In the face of this unprecedented apostasy—we repeat yet again—what is the proper stand? Is it the case that all who refrain from communion with those with whom they do not associate forfeit their unity with the Church, are deprived of Grace, and are inspired by the Evil One?

The Orthodox Faith and Tradition say otherwise, for the opinions of all persons on these subjects, whoever they may be, are submitted to the crucible of Holy Scripture and of Patristic and Synodal doctrine and practice. No view or opinion whatsoever is accepted when it is not based on Orthodox teaching and, in general, on its spirit and principles. According to St. Maximos the Confessor, every [theological] statement that is not Patristic is heretical.²⁹

We know, therefore, that “agreement” and “union” with and “love” for heretics at the expense of the Truth of the Faith and of piety are characterized as “betrayal.”³⁰

For this reason, the Fathers, to a man, command us to abhor “assemblies with heretics.”³¹

The conclusion is obvious: the Orthodox ecumenists have effected a clear break and rupture with Tradition and they “are cut off from the Church of the Saints who dwell in Heaven,”³² and for this reason are, and are proclaimed, “excommunicate,” as being “estranged from God,”³³ on account of the disturbance provoked by

their
innovations.

Confessions of Faith are not made painlessly, from a position of safety, or without actual consequences. Spiritual and Mysteriological rapprochement with those whom one may denounce theoretically as heretics or persons inclined toward heresy means separation from the Saints, whereas separation from such persons means rapprochement and union with God, the Truth, and the Holy Fathers of the Church.³⁴

For it behooves us to avoid communion with those whose outlook we abhor.³⁵ Such is the clear and limpid Orthodox teaching and stand on this vital issue.

9. The teaching of our deprecator, that those who are walled off are inspired by the Evil One, is blasphemous, while his insistence on the possibility of communion with heretics or persons inclined toward heresy, under the illusion that we can cleave in this way to an Orthodox Confession, is completely anti-Patristic and therefore deluded.

One of those who follow the practice of our denigrator candidly writes, in spite of the fact that he does not put his own writings into practice with any consistency: “Let the pro-Papists, the Latin-minded, the ecumenist Bishops, spiritual Fathers, Priests, and theologians maintain communion with heretics; we prefer communion to be with the Saints. The two cannot coexist”³⁶!

The “Old Calendarists” have not done anything wrong, but have, from the outset, followed their Orthodox sensitivities, as genuine and responsible members of the Church, being justified, moreover, by the fearful continuation of apostasy and

ongoing
events.

As children of obedience, they have hearkened to the President of the Seventh OEcumenical Synod, St. Tarasios, who exclaims: “We do not move the boundaries set by our Fathers; rather, being instructed by the Apostles, let us hold fast to the Traditions that we have received.”³⁷

The “Old Calendarists” have abided in the things that they have learned and been assured of,³⁸ knowing—and putting this into practice—that no one can disturb even so much as a syllable, without falling under the penalties of the Holy Fathers and being disavowed and excised from the Body of the Church,³⁹ since “Neither Patriarchs nor Synods could ever have introduced novelties amongst us, because the protector of religion is the very Body of the Church, that is, the people themselves, who desire their religious faith to remain perpetually unchanged and of the same kind as that of their Fathers.”⁴⁰

Innovations are considered an instigation of the Devil and are not accepted, even if proposed by Angels from Heaven. Therefore, those of us who reject ecumenism and the calendar innovation have not provoked a schism, but have separated ourselves for dogmatic reasons from those who publicly preach misbeliefs and heresies, walling ourselves off by Divine assistance for reasons of soteriological necessity. We find schism in the instance of a separation which is “groundless” and “unjustifiable,” on the pretext of “matters capable of resolution” or [personal] transgressions on the part of Hierarchs. But ecumenism is not a matter capable of resolution

or merely a violation of Canons, but the most appalling syncretism, the worst panheresy, an “unheard-of betrayal”⁴¹ of the Faith.

All who wall themselves off therefrom are doing what is salutary and are worthy of the “honor due to Orthodox Christians.”⁴²

The fact that the Old Calendarists have organized themselves as a Church arose from the very course of events. The increasing abandonment of the position of the Church on the part of the innovators has been rightfully covered by those who have been by nature and adoption bonafide members of the Church, with reference, of course, to Her Synodal conscience.

For this reason, we would remind our denigrator that he is suffering from dreadful spiritual blindness, and also from a tragic ignorance of the “ways” of uncreated Grace, which he is unable to recognize precisely where it truly exists, where it is experienced palpably and unquestionably, resting content, as he does, in communion with those who recognize Grace precisely where it truly does not exist!

10. These tragic results, however, are, unfortunately, only to be expected from persons like our deprecator, who, a few years ago, signed a much-trumpeted “Confession of Faith Against Ecumenism,”⁴³ but then hastened to withdraw his signature (!), seeking forgiveness and leniency from Bartholomew of Constantinople, the standard-bearer of the Orthodox ecumenists, imploring him, no less, to come to his diocese in order to “bless” his flock! What consistency and honesty can one expect from persons of such instability, pusillanimity, and culpability? How is “much” to be

entrusted to him who cannot bear “a little”? And how is he to be regarded as a teacher in these matters, he who gave in as soon as he had ventured to take a step that was a little more firm and decisive?

Indeed, at some point in his “Encyclical Sermon” he mentions that it is probable that he might face “persecution”! But others have been, and are, persecuted: the true and reliable Confessors, not those theoretical Confessors who are in communion with heretics and yet fancy themselves to be Confessors! As for the cheap and painless stand that our denigrator has chosen and propagates, not only do the heretics and the powerful of this world not deem such vexatious and threatening, but it actually aids and abets them, since it serves their interests to maintain communion with those who may have a somewhat more traditionalist attitude and viewpoint, under the illusion that they are simultaneously doing their confessional duty, and thus all of whom are, and remain, complacent in their delusion!

Our denigrator and those like him suppose that they are “obligated” to follow the policy of the Hierarchs of the innovating official Orthodox Churches, inasmuch as they all tolerate the deviations and transgressions of ecumenism, so as to avoid “Protestantizing”; and yet, they state, on the other hand, that they will not cease “protesting”! In this way they demonstrate yet again the tragic dimension of their parlous ignorance and, more generally, their confusion and inconsistency.

The decisions even of major Synods possess binding and obligatory authority only when they are identical with the Truth that wells forth from the Spirit of Truth. Only then does the plenitude of the Church accept them and the conscience of the Church endorse them. These decisions are not valid in any other instance, nor is it possible to appeal to some obligation to follow those who “tolerate” the persistent violation, for almost a century, of the Rule of Faith and the Mind of the Church!

The stand put forth by our deprecator is catastrophic, and, by Divine Grace, genuine Confessors will never follow it. For this erroneous stand obligates our denigrator and those with him, by way of their reprehensible communion with the ecumenists, truly to participate in the heretical ecumenical movement, to belong to the World Council of Churches, with all that this entails, to pray together with all manner of heretics and adherents of other religions, to regard the heterodox as “Sister Churches,” to accept the baptism of heretics, to serve the world together with them, to offer a common witness of faith, etc.⁴⁴

As to why this solution of communion with the Orthodox ecumenists, which produces such catastrophic results, leading to their engulfment by the abyss of eternal perdition, is preferable for our deprecator, it is explicable only by the false dilemma which he poses to himself and others: he is afraid that, if he undertakes to wall himself off, he will succumb to a deadly transgression and will become “guilty of schism

from the Church,” and, in the face of this possibility, he would prefer to “go and drown himself”!

Praying for his spiritual recovery and healing, we leave him to Divine Forbearance, emphasizing that the Godly solution to the terrible confusion of our denigrator and whoever is like him is the espousal of our position, in deed and in word, as in fact this is set forth in our ecclesiological document, “The True Orthodox Church and the Heresy of Ecumenism: Dogmatic and Canonical Issues,” so that we might journey together in Truth and Love, expressing likewise the fervent wish that, unto the end, our Lord not deprive us of the Grace of the true and consistent Confession of Him.
Amen!

Phyle, Attica
Sunday of the Holy Athonite Fathers
June 9/22, 2014

Notes

1. Ephesians 4:25.
2. This is a reference to Metropolitan Jeremias (Phountas) of Gortys and Megalopolis and to a document posted on various religious websites, such as “Αποτεΐχιση,” which contains a forceful critique of his views: “Ο Μητρ. Γόρτυνος παραποιεῖ σεβέστατα τὴν παράδοση τῆς Ἐκκλησίας γιὰ νὰ ῥέσει στὸν αἵρεσιάρχη” [The Metropolitan of Gortys most impiously adulterates the Tradition of the Church in order to please a Heresiarch], <http://>

apotixisi.blog

spot.com/2014/06/blog-post_5619.html (accessed June 25, 2014).

3. See note 2.

4. Metropolitan Jeremias (1941-), who was consecrated to the Episcopacy in 2006, was, until his recent retirement, also a Professor of Biblical Studies at the university of Athens—TRANS.

5. Ἱεροκῆρυξ, a term denoting an individual with a theological education, usually a clergyman, but in some cases a layman, who is given the responsibility of preaching homilies in a particular diocese—TRANS.

6. Hebrews 12:23.

7. Rev. John S. Romanides, “Orthodox Ecclesiology According to Alexis Khomiakov (1804-1860),” *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. II, No. 1 (Easter [Pascha] 1956), pp. 62-63.

8. “To the Most Reverend Among Nuns Xene,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CL, col. 1045C. See also Georgios Mantzarides, Παλαμικά [Palamite studies] (Thessalonike: Ekdosis P. Pournara, 1983), pp. 196-197.

9. See St. Maximos the Confessor, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XC, col. 128D.

10. Cf. St. John Chrysostomos, *On the Priesthood*, Bk. III, ch. 11, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XLVIII, col. 648.

11. “Reply to the Magazine Thymiamia: The Panheresy of Ecumenism and False Depositions,” in Patrick G. Barker [now Archimandrite Patapios], *A Study of the Ecclesiology of Resistance:*

The Writings of Metropolitans Cyprian of Oropos and Fili, Chrysostomos of Florina, and

Cyril of Kazan (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1994), pp. 69-70.

12. Seven times, to be precise—TRANS.

13. I St. Timothy 3:15.

14. “Refutation of the Letter of Patriarch Ignatios of Antioch,” §3, in Panagiotes K. Chrestou (ed.), *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα* [The works of Gregory Palmas], Vol. II (Thessalonike: 1966), p. 627.

15. St. John Chrysostomos, “Homily XXI on St. John,” §1, *Patrologia Græca*,

- Vol. LIX, col. 128; St. Maximos the Confessor, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XC, col. 93D; Hieromonk Atanasije Jevtić, Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν Χρυσόστομον [The ecclesiology of the Apostle Paul according to St. John Chrysostomos] (Athens: Ekdoseis “Gregore,” 1984), pp. 163-164.
16. Seventh OEcumenical Synod, Session VI, in J.D. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. XIII, col. 208C.
17. Seventh OEcumenical Synod, Session VII, in *ibid.*, col. 400C.
18. “Homily XI on Ephesians,” §3, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXII, col. 83.
19. *Ibid.*, §1, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXII, col. 79.
20. Galatians 1:8-9. See also Jevtić, Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου, pp. 180, 181.
21. See the letter of the Athonite Fathers to the Latin-minded Emperor Michael Palaiologos (thirteenth century), in Kallistos Blastos Hagioireites, Δοκίμιον Ἱστορικὸν περὶ τοῦ Σχίσματος τῆς Δυτικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πρὸ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς [Historical essay concerning the schism of the Western Church from the Orthodox Eastern Church] (Athens: Typois Paraskeva Leone, 1896), p. 108.
22. John Meyendorff, *A Study of [Saint] Gregory Palamas* (London: The Faith Press, 1964), pp. 179-180.
23. Canon XV of the First-Second Synod (“A Contribution to the Theology of Orthodox Resistance and Walling-Off,” <http://hsir.org/p/r44> (accessed June 28, 2014)).
24. Dionysios M. Batistatos (ed.), Πρακτικὰ καὶ Ἀποφάσεις τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Πανορθοδόξου Συνεδρίου (10 Μαΐου-8 Ἰουνίου 1923) [Proceedings and Decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Congress in Constantinople (10 May-8 June 1923)] (Athens: 1982), pp. 6, 14.
25. St. Theodore the Studite, “Epistle I.34,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1025C.
26. Stylianos Tsompanides, “Ἡ Ὁρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία καὶ τὸ Παγκόσμιο Συμβούλιο Ἐκκλησιῶν. Μία ‘κοινωνία’ μοιβαίου ἐμπλουτισμοῦ στὸ δρόμο τῶν ναζητήσεων” [The Orthodox Church and the World Council

of Churches: A “fellowship” of mutual enrichment on the path of searching], in Ἱστορία τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας [History of Orthodoxy], Vol. VIII (n.p: Ekdoseis ROAD, n.d. [actual place and date of publication: Athens, 2009]), p. 306.

27. Θεοδορομία (January-March 2009), pp. 63-74.

28. A statement of the ecumenist Metropolitan Emmanuel of France at a service of joint prayer with Roman Catholics held at the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris on May 21, 2014, in anticipation of the meeting between Patriarch Bartholomew and Pope Francis in

Jerusalem: “Ὁρθόδοξοι καὶ Καθολικοὶ ἐνώθησαν ἐπὶ τὴν Παναγία τῶν Παρισίων!!! Κι ὅμως

οἱ Ποιμένες μας συνεχίζουν νὰ τοὺς Μνημονεύουν!” [Orthodox and Catholics are “united”

at Notre Dame de Paris!!! And yet, our Shepherds continue to commemorate them!], http://paterikiparadosi.blogspot.com/2014/05/blog-post_1206.html (accessed June 28, 2014).

29. See Charalambos Soteropoulos, Θέματα δογματικῆς θεολογίας καὶ πνευματικῆς ζωῆς κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Ὁμολογητοῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Ὁμολογητοῦ [Issues in dogmatic theology and spiritual life according to the teaching of Maximos the Confessor] (Athens: 2003), pp. 15-16, which contains references to the relevant works of St. Maximos.

- It is worth noting, here, that our denigrator gives expression, in his “Encyclical Sermon,” to a novel definition of heresy, unknown in Patristic literature, to wit, that heresy is “the truth taken to extremes”! However, the Truth, in and of itself, does not admit of being thus “taken,” but only of corruption, adulteration, or addition and subtraction. The purpose of our denigrator’s view, we suppose, is to mislead: those who observe and apply the Divine Will to matters of the Faith, severing communion with heretics, are allegedly led to “extremes,” whereas those who maintain their reprehensible communion with those denounced for heresy and content themselves merely with “protests,” are supposedly following the middle way. On this point, though, St. Mark of Ephesus offers clear and illuminating comments: “Never have ecclesiastical affairs been corrected through middle ways. There is no mean between truth and falsehood; but just as one who has departed from the light is of necessity in darkness, so also we would truly say that he who diverges

even slightly from the truth is henceforth subject to falsehood. Although it is possible to speak of a middle state between light and darkness—that which is called twilight—one could not even conceive of a mean between truth and falsehood, however hard he might strive to do so” (“Epistle from Mark of Ephesus to George Scholarios,” §2, in Louis Petit [ed.], “Documents Relatifs au Concile de Florence” [Documents pertaining to the Council of Florence], No. XVI, *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. XVII [Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1923], p. 461).

30. Jevtić, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου*, p. 182.

31. St. John Chrysostomos, “Homily on the Verse ‘The Son Doeth Nothing of Himself, But What He Seeth the Father Do,’” §7, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LVI, col. 256. See also Jevtić, *Ἡ*

Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου, p. 323, n. 332.

32. Protopresbyter Theodoros Zeses, “Ἀνησυχητικὲς Ἐξελίξεις. Νέα νοίγματα στὸ Βατικανὸ καὶ στοὺς Προτεστάντες. Φανάρι καὶ Ἀθήνα ντίπαλοι καὶ συνοδοιπόροι” [Disquieting developments. New overtures toward the Vatican and Protestantism. The Phanar and Athens are rivals and fellow-travellers], *Θεοδορομία* (April-June 2003), pp. 284, 285, 286.

33. St. Theodore the Studite, “Epistle I.36,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1033D.

34. St. Mark of Ephesus, “Apologia uttered Impromptu at the Time of His Death,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CLX, col. 536CD.

35. St. Athanasios the Great, “Epistle to Monks,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXVI, col. 1188BC; see also “St. Athanasios the Great: Teacher of Orthodox Walling-Off,” <http://hsir.org/p/5p7> (accessed June 28, 2014).

36. Protopresbyter Theodoros Zeses, “Κινδυνεύει τώρα σοβαρὰ ἡ Ὀρθοδοξία” [Orthodoxy is now in serious danger], *Θεοδορομία* (January-March 2007), p. 103.

37. Seventh OEcumenical Synod, Session IV, in J.D. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. XIII, col. 4C; cf. II Thessalonians 2:15.

38. Cf. II St. Timothy 3:14.

39. Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem.

40. “Reply of the Orthodox Patriarchs of the East to Pope Pius IX [1848],” §17, in Ioannes Karmires, *Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* [The Dogmatic and Credal Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church], 2nd ed. (Graz: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, 1968), p. 920 [1000].
41. St. Justin (Popović) of Čelije, “Orthodoxy and Ecumenism: An Orthodox Appraisal and Testimony,” in “‘The Greatest Snare of the Enemy’: The World Council of Churches: The World Hodgepodge of Heresies,” <http://hsir.org/p/n6> (accessed June 28, 2014).
42. Canon XV of the First-Second Synod (“A Contribution to the Theology of Orthodox Resistance and Walling-Off,” <http://hsir.org/p/r44> (accessed June 28, 2014).
43. Θεοδορομία (April-June 2009), pp. 176-202; <http://www.impantokratoros.gr/FA9AF77F.en.aspx> (accessed June 28, 2014).
44. Metropolitan Cyprian of Oropos and Phyle (†), “‘Schism’ or ‘Walling-Off’? The Calendar Question and the Heresy of Ecumenism,” §H (The “Old Calendarist unia”), <http://hsir.org/p/57c> (accessed June 28, 2014).

Source: <http://www.hsir.org/index-en.html>