

The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW, DEVOTED TO THE STUDY
OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. I

MARCH, 1950

PUBLISHED FOR

The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

BY

THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

7 TUFTON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1

2/6 per copy. 10/- per year post free.

Editorial Committee

THE REV. DERWAS J. CHITTY	THE REV. ERIC THORNTON
THE REV. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS,	PRINCE DIMITRI OBOLENSKY,
D.D.	D. PHIL.
THE REV. EDWARD EVERY	H.E. MR. ALEXANDER A. PALLIS

Editor: THE REV. AUSTIN OAKLEY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ENVOI—His Grace the Metropolitan of Thyatira, Germanos ...	1
The Right Reverend, the Right Honourable, The Lord Bishop of London	1
His Grace the Orthodox Archbishop of the Americas, Michael	2
EDITORIAL	4
THE YEARS BETWEEN—Derwas J. Chitty	6
ECCLESIA EXTRA ECCLESIAM—E. Every	16
THE EVANGELISTIC WORK OF THE CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH—Professor P. I. Bratsiotis (<i>to be concluded</i>)	21

THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. 1

MARCH 1950

ENVOI

8 Dawson Place, W. 2.

January 26th, 1950.

REVEREND AND DEAR MR. OAKLEY,

I have learnt with pleasure of the revival of *The Christian East* under the ægis of the Anglican and Eastern Churches' Association and under your enlightened direction. This news brings back to me memories which go back to the time when I had the good fortune to set foot in this country (1922), and when I was first honoured with the title of Orthodox President of the Association. *The Christian East* was not only a periodical for the publication of important theological and ecclesiastical articles, but also gave a quarterly picture of the theological and ecclesiastical activity in each of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Without minimizing the value of other publications that have appeared since the pause in the publication of *The Christian East*, I make bold to say that none of them has made up for its temporary eclipse. I greet therefore its reappearance with particular thankfulness, and pray from my heart that it may find a wide circulation in the English and Orthodox Christian world, as well as collaborators in the various Orthodox Churches, who appreciating the work of the Association will enrich its columns with interesting information. There are many means by which our Association seeks to fulfil its principal object, which is to facilitate the work of mutual understanding and unity between the Anglican and the Orthodox Church. But nobody will deny that *The Christian East*, in the future as in the past, will be the most important means for the gaining of knowledge and understanding of the problems which surround the blessed work of union. May God's blessing and strengthening from above be with you in your praiseworthy and God-pleasing effort.

Yours sincerely,

✠ GERMANOS,

Archbishop of Thyatira.

IT is good news indeed that *The Christian East* is to start publication again. It was a most valuable organ of enlightenment in the old days, and many owe to it their first introduction to a knowledge of Eastern Christendom.

That knowledge has spread considerably in the recent past. The life of the Eastern Churches is no longer a *terra incognita* to Anglicans. We confidently expect that the new series of the old magazine will carry still further the good work. May God's richest blessing rest upon it.

✠ WM: LONDON.

THE following letter has been received from Michael, formerly Metropolitan of Corinth, now Greek Orthodox Archbishop of the Americas and Exarch of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in the United States. It was written when he was still Metropolitan of Corinth.

We have heard with great pleasure that *The Christian East* is to be published again. The lack of it was very much felt. It is true that the void which it left was in some ways filled by the Eastern Churches *Broadsheet* which has for some time been edited by one who has a profound knowledge of the Orthodox Church and is an enthusiastic Anglican cleric, the Reverend Austin Oakley. To him we all, and particularly we Greek Orthodox, owe much. For through the *Broadsheet*, which though small in size was always significant and important in its contents, the Christians of the Church of England who subscribed to it were informed of the condition in which almost all the Churches of the East find themselves, and especially about the Church and the general condition of Greece at the present time. By means of the columns of his most sympathetic *Broadsheet*, the Reverend Austin Oakley lost no opportunity of making known to the English public the distresses and catastrophes which Communism has let loose all over the northern part of Greece, more particularly against the Church and her venerable ministers and against the beloved young children. And, while this little periodical performed these very valuable services relating to the present condition of the countries of the Orthodox East, it also did and does take care to publish comprehensive and essential articles dealing with the relationships between the two Churches which are friends of each other, the Anglican and the Orthodox. Thus, thanks to this periodical the spiritual bridge of a kind whereby Anglicans and Orthodox communicate with one another was not altogether broken down. It was a species of "air lift" which was due to the initiative of its zealous editor, and served the mutual relations between us with extraordinary and truly wonderful success. We Greek Orthodox will always be grateful to the Reverend Austin Oakley. He knows the Greek Orthodox Church, as few Anglicans know her, through the long years of his residence in Constantinople; and he makes use of his knowledge thus acquired in wonderful manner in advancing the mutual acquaintance and mutual respect of our two Churches, the Anglican and the Orthodox. But now *The Christian East* comes on to the scene once more and it will continue to perform the services which it performed in the past, concerning the question of the mutual *rapprochement* of our Churches, of which the more distant aim is their union.

We Greek Orthodox are often misunderstood, even by our Anglican friends, when in great conferences, like that at Amsterdam, we maintain a cautious attitude. Happily, however, there are many Anglicans who respect this attitude of the Orthodox as it should be respected. I shall

never forget the joy and deep thankfulness which most of the Anglicans in the Conferences of Lausanne (1927) and Edinburgh (1937) experienced after the declaration which the Orthodox delegates made at these conferences, whereby they clarified the attitude of the "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic" Orthodox Church, to the different Churches and confessions participating by their delegates. We Greek Orthodox look towards Anglicanism in a different way from the way in which we look to the many different denominations of continental Protestantism. Even as long ago as the days of Jeremias Transos, Patriarch of Constantinople in the sixteenth century, the Greek Orthodox were extremely cautious in their attitude to continental Protestantism. That great Greek Patriarch, in the discussions which he held with the Protestants, showed what a great chasm divides Protestantism from Orthodoxy. Jeremias and the Greek theologians of his circle were most kindly disposed towards a sincere mutual understanding which might end in union, if it were possible. But unfortunately the goodwill and kind intentions of the Orthodox met with an obstacle in the erroneous opinions of the Protestants, which they could in no way be persuaded to give up. Many of them, erroneously, identified many characteristics of the Orthodox Church with the corresponding characteristics of the Roman Catholic Church, from which they had broken away a few decades previously. Fear and trembling overcame them at the idea that it might be possible for them to accept once again the "superstitions" of Rome. And thus, on account of their ignorance of the Orthodox Church (an ignorance resulting from lack of contact, on account of geographical distance and the wretched condition of the Orthodox East under the Turkish yoke which made journeys to Constantinople difficult and sometimes impossible) the *rapprochement* of the first leaders of Protestantism with Orthodoxy failed. Since, the chasm has widened. The Orthodox Church has ever since remained solidly attached to the unshakable rock of scripture interpreted by the saving light of tradition. But Protestantism, unfortunately, being based on scripture interpreted subjectively and individualistically, deprived also of the safe guidance of sacred tradition, has departed more and more from the teaching of the One and Undivided Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils of the first eight centuries, which teaching is the content of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

But the same did not happen with reference to the relationships which we, the Orthodox, have had with the Church of England. These relationships date from the beginning of the seventeenth century (1611), in the days of the Patriarch Cyril Lukar, and have always been relationships of sincere friendship, inspired by mutual trust and goodwill. But apart from having this basis, which is so useful and especially precious in matters of mutual understanding having union for their more distant object, the Church of England has preserved the episcopal rank; this has the greatest significance for us Orthodox, for we are persuaded that, in this way, through the episcopal rank, the Apostolic Succession has been preserved in the Church of England. Thus things make progress in the relationships of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. A proper ground of mutual comprehension exists. There is hope, God working with us, of the union at which we aim.

The writer of these lines had the good fortune to live in London for ten years and to know the Church of England in her depths with her life and her work. What is noted above is my personal and individual conviction, which conviction, however, was and is, I am sure, that of all the Orthodox theologians, clerical and lay, who have been in contact with Anglican theologians and clerics. In the discussions we have had in recent years, we have made progress to a significant extent in our mutual approach, as Anglicans and Orthodox. The last official contact, aiming at reunion between Anglicans and Orthodox, was that made at Lambeth in 1931 and at Bucharest in 1936. Then an almost full agreement was reached about the most important question of holy tradition. A most serious basis of reunion was laid down. In addition to this, the Anglicans, through the mouth of the ever-to-be-remembered Bishop Headlam, to whose soul may "the God of spirits and of all flesh" grant rest in the land of the living, declared amid the applause of the Orthodox that they understand the eternal procession and the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit as the Orthodox do, and that consequently the Filioque does not have for the Anglicans the significance and the meaning which it has for the Roman Catholics. This was another most important gain. We here see the reason why the contacts between Anglican and Orthodox theologians and clerics ought to be continued. The question of reunion does not make progress when conferences like that of Amsterdam are called together. On the contrary it recedes and is impeded. This the Anglicans should understand as well as the Orthodox; then they will not attempt what is naturally and human impossible. We Anglicans and Orthodox ought to revive our theological discussions. The significant agreement achieved in them in the past should encourage us. We should diligently cultivate our relationships which, as Orthodox Patriarchs and Archbishops and Bishops of both Churches have said in the past, have now left the sphere of merely friendship and entered that of fraternity. May the re-publication of *The Christian East*, with the Saviour's help, press forward the question of the further mutual approach of the two Churches, to the achievement and realisation of the last prayer concerning unity of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

✠ MICHAEL

(formerly) Metropolitan of Corinth.

EDITORIAL

THE resuscitation of *The Christian East* after a period of eleven years calls for some comment in an Editorial introduction. It is, in the first place, a quarterly Review devoted to the study of the Eastern Churches. Yet, in the light of the Anglican and Eastern Churches' Association's declared aims, this study is not purely objective and academic, but an aspect of the prayer and work for reunion, and "the promotion (to quote our Constitution) of mutual knowledge, sympathy and intercourse between the Churches." The "Review of Events" that appears in the first issue of this new series makes it clear that what has happened during the catastrophic

upheaval of Europe and the Near and Middle East in the recent world war, as well as after it, has not only deeply affected our problems, but in several directions gone some way to clarify them.

Once again a rampart has been built up between us in Western Europe and the western world, and the countries of Eastern Europe under the domination of Soviet Communism. While there are parallels between the isolation of Orthodoxy that resulted from the conquest of the Balkans and the area of the old Roman Empire by the Moslem Turkish power in the sixteenth century—an isolation which continued for four hundred years—new factors have now arisen. Of these the most arresting is the fact that the new enemy is openly aiming at the destruction of Christianity. Looking back on the former isolation, it is permissible to see in it the hidden blessings that arose from the shutting away of Orthodoxy from the violent changes, religious, moral, social and economic that in their decadence have brought western Europe to its present sorry state. What good will be brought about, what mutation of evil into good, in the present situation, is still hidden from us. It is sufficient to believe that as other formidable tyrannies have decayed and fallen away, so the present enslavement is also transient when opposed to the deathless power of Christ in His Church.

But another factor of a different character has become clear. The long and patient and always delicate task of forging and maintaining mutual relations between *ecclesia anglicana* and Orthodoxy has resulted in the removal of many barriers, by personal contacts and friendships, by discussion and conference. In the modern atmosphere bred of the intense desire of Christians to realize an exterior unity, both Anglicans and Orthodox have led the way. From the foundation of the Anglican and Eastern Churches' Association in 1864, the guiding principle has been expressed that the basis of unity is the threefold foundation of Apostolic Faith, Order and Worship. For us this still stands, in the face of the modern tendency either to belittle or to fail to understand the deadly effects of both heresy and schism. It is not too much to say that could the threefold strand of Apostolic Faith, Order and Worship be shown unequivocally to exist between us, corporate unity would be realizable forthwith, and the tradition of the two Communions be merged and integrated to our great spiritual enrichment. This is of course a simplification of the general pattern of reunion, since the Anglican Communion has pressing commitments elsewhere in Christendom and also nearer at home. But we repeat that we believe the principle referred to stands and is basic.

The Anglican sense of isolation following the rejection of our advances to Rome in the nineties of the last century, led us to pursue a similar policy of securing the recognition of the validity of our Orders by the Orthodox. Since there seemed little hope of Orthodoxy being able to speak with one voice through a pan-Orthodox Synod, this recognition was worked for *seriatim* and with a measure of success. But the policy, based theologically on a mainly Latin conception of what constitutes the validity of Orders, while leading to careful and scholarly study of our origins by the Orthodox and a recognition of our place in historic Christendom, has tended on the whole to confuse the issue. Neither we nor the Orthodox can look to the

absorption of one Communion into the other as the resolution of our problems, but rather to a mutual recognition of a spiritual identity in faith and dogma. For the realization of that end we make bold to work, without any minimizing of the difficulties before us.

THE YEARS BETWEEN, 1938-50

THE last appearance of *The Christian East* was in a double number for January-June, 1938. A Rip van Winkel, falling asleep at that time and waking up with our reappearance in March, 1950, would indeed find it hard to believe he was in the same world. It is important for us, in our fresh start, to call to mind both some of the contrasts between the old and the new, and some of the links which make the continuity between them.

In those days, the European world stretching to the Dniester, the Pripet marshes, and Lake Ladoga, seemed for the most part strangely ready to forget the power that lay beyond her Eastern borders. Austria had been swallowed up in the Anschluss in March, and Munich was brewing for the autumn. Even so, England at least was slow to realize the extent of the Nazi threat to European peace and order and justice. A string of prosperous little states lay along the Eastern shores of the Baltic—preserving uniquely, at Valamo and Petseri and elsewhere, the life of old Orthodox Russia. Poland was occupied with the desire to polonize her eastern and south-eastern provinces.¹ Both she and Hungary were to prove only too ready to accept from Germany their share in the spoils of Czechoslovakia.

Of more purely Orthodox countries, Rumania, spread out to include Transylvania and the Bukovina, Bessarabia and the Dobrudja, was conscious of having the largest autocephalous Orthodox Church outside the enigmatical Russia, and showed signs of aspiring to the position of a "Fourth Rome." Her scholars took a prominent part in the first pan-Orthodox Congress of theologians in Athens in 1936, and a second Congress was planned to be held in Bucharest in 1939.² Her Church was in the happiest relations with our own. A most successful exchange of students had begun and seemed likely to become a regular practice. Theological discussions with a strong Anglican delegation in Bucharest in 1935 had led to a declaration by the Rumanian Holy Synod of acceptance of the validity of Anglican Orders, subject to the ratification by the Church of England of the statements in regard to sacramental doctrine agreed upon by the Bucharest Conference; and the Convocations of Canterbury and York had declared (with no dissentients except for six members of the Lower House of Canterbury) their approval of these statements as "a legitimate interpretation of the Faith of the Church as held by the Anglican Communion"—a resolution vitiated, for stable and effective results, by an

¹ An article in our last number on "Latin Poland and its Orthodox Minority" makes grim reading. But the Uniates suffered from this policy as well as the Orthodox.

² The Congress projected a common theological journal for which the Metropolitan Visarion Puiu of the Bukovina (who gave generously to this end) was requested to undertake the financial responsibility. A glowing account of this prelate, from an Anglican student at his seminary at Cernauti, is given in *The Christian East* for January-July, 1937, which also gives his portrait for frontispiece.

equivocal character which is clearer in English than it might be in translation.³

Jugoslavia was under the Stoyadinovič dictatorship, which had recently concluded its concordat with the Vatican in the face of violent Serbian opposition. The Patriarch Gavriilo had just been elected—his portrait forms the frontispiece of our last number. His efforts to come to some agreement with the government over the Concordat brought about, in spite of his earlier record, a breach between him and the more uncompromising Serbian patriots, headed by Bishops Nicolai (Velimirovič) of Zhitcha and Irenaeus of Dalmatia—a breach which was only healed in August, 1940, after the fall of Stoyadinovič. The old friendship between the Serbian and Anglican Churches continued. But traditional Serbian regard for Russian Orthodoxy forbade any synodal decisions of the Serbian Church in regard to our Orders, etc., until the Russian Church should be free to speak.

The Bulgarian Church continued in its old anomalous position of being in communion with some Orthodox Churches, in schism from Constantinople and others. Her primate, the Metropolitan Stefan, and her theologians had taken part, along with other Orthodox representatives, in the conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937. Politically, Bulgaria's ambitions frustrated the hopes of strong Balkan solidarity implicit in the Balkan Pact entered into by her four neighbours.

Greece was under the Metaxas dictatorship. Chrysostomos was still Archbishop of Athens—a scholar of wide learning in the tradition of Meletios. Our last number gives a portrait of Professor Alivizatos, who had just received a doctorate at Oxford. It also publishes a lecture on the Church of England given in Athens by Bishop Parsons, then of Southwark, later of Hereford, which approximates to the type of exposé required for presenting the facts of our Church to the Orthodox. In a general way the dictatorship did not seem to impede the life of the Church. The Athens professors were wisely putting a brake on any tendency to hasty pronouncements on validity of orders, etc., of the type sometimes desired in England.

At the eastern end of the Mediterranean, Cyprus was still denied the possibility of electing an Archbishop, and the only Bishop in the island, the Metropolitan Leontios of Paphos, was on uneasy terms with the government. Of the Arabophone Patriarchate of Antioch at home we heard little, but Syrian Orthodox were not without importance in America, and in Egypt the influential Orthodox community of Syrian merchants continued to press for a larger part in the affairs of the Patriarchate of Alexandria—a pressure which had caused some delay in the authorization by the government of the election of the Patriarch Nicolas—an old friend of our Church, and a valued participant in the Cairo "Fellowship of Unity."

In Jerusalem, where violent "Arab" activity against the growing Zionist threat was at its height, the mandatory government, failing to reconcile the rival claims of the Greek hierarchy and the Arabophone populace of the Orthodox Church, was still refusing to ratify the canonical

³ Even so, these decisions were deemed sufficient to authorize generous acts of economy towards Anglicans in Bucharest long after the outbreak of war.

election, three years before, of the Patriarch Timotheos. On the staff of the Anglican bishopric, Canon Bridgeman, the American chaplain, was carrying on valuable liaison with the Orthodox as well as with the Armenians; while, in varied spheres of prayer and work, the contribution to mutual understanding of at least four independent Anglican ladies⁴ deserves not to be forgotten. The ending of the mandate was not yet seriously envisaged.

* * * * *

We awake to find almost the whole world of Eastern Europe become satellite to that Russian power which we had, before, so largely left out of account—the Baltic states swallowed up, save for a shorn Finland still bravely independent; Poland and Czechoslovakia diminished and subservient; Hungary equally under the yoke; Rumania robbed of vast territories and at the mercy of the Soviet; Bulgaria, gone Communist, apparently content to play the jackal to the Russians as she had done to the Germans in 1941; Jugoslavia also under a Communist government, though moved perhaps into a kind of penumbra by her break with the Cominform. Only Greece remains heroically free, though in tragic plight, of all the Orthodox Balkan lands. Turkey, still harbouring the Ecumenical Patriarchate, looks fearfully to the North, wondering how long she will be able to retain the peace which she, alone among the Near-Eastern lands, has managed to preserve, if in a somewhat ambiguous fashion, through the last decade. The independence which has come to Syria and the Lebanon seems, in Syria at least, to have brought little settlement. The growing assertiveness of Egyptian nationalism makes for some uneasiness in the Christian minorities. Palestine is split precariously in two, and her Christian peoples have shared in the dreadful sufferings of their Muslim compatriots. Shells have violated the sanctity of the Holy Places, and at the Zion Gate a barred frontier stops the way between the Cenaculum and the Holy Sepulchre.

* * * * *

The year of false peace after Munich saw the death, within a few months, of the Patriarchs Miron of Rumania and Nicolas of Alexandria, and the Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens. When the Metropolitan Damaskenos of Corinth was elected to Athens by a majority of one, the Greek High Court, on appeal, quashed the election, and Chrysanthos of Trebizond was elected under an altered statute passed by the Metaxas government. Damaskenos, refusing to withdraw, was relegated to the monastery of Phaneromene in Salamis, where he remained until the German occupation. During the spring Archbishop Lang of Canterbury visited both Athens and the Ecumenical Patriarch—a visit unique in history. An Anglican theological delegation came to Athens in the summer to confer with Greek theologians; and this was followed by the publication in Greece of a group of papers by Athens professors on the question of the validity of Anglican Orders.

When the storm broke in the autumn, Eastern Poland was seized by

⁴ I refer to Miss Carey at Ain Karim; Miss Alexander on the Mount of Olives; Miss Butlin and Miss Joseph in Transjordan.

Russia, and the three smaller Baltic states first occupied, then merged in the U.S.S.R. After a gallant resistance Finland was forced to yield wide frontier areas, including the monastic island of Valamo. When Rumania surrendered to the Axis in the summer of 1940, Russia possessed herself not only of Bessarabia, but also of the more purely Rumanian territory of the Bukovina. In Western Poland the Germans at first appear to have removed the Metropolitan Dionysi and subjected the Orthodox Church to a German bishop of the émigré-Russian "Karlovtsi" Synod. But before the end of 1940 Dionysi and his Church appear to have been reinstated as the "Ukrainian" Orthodox Church—a pointer to the policy which was to reveal itself when the Germans invaded Russia. Nevertheless, Dionysi remained at the head of the Polish Orthodox Church after the war, and it was some years before he gave place to a prelate prepared to seek and receive from Moscow the autocephality which Dionysi had assumed some twenty years before.

The other Balkan countries were still at peace. The Serbian Church was strengthened by the reconciliation between the Patriarch and Bishop Nicolas in August. Earlier in the year a conference of Bulgarian and Serbian bishops in Sofia had seemed to augur well for future co-operation.

In the autumn Italy attacked Greece. It was the sinking of the cruiser *Helle* at Tenos during the festival of the Dormition that heralded this onslaught. And stories of the protection of the Mother of God fill the record of the heroic winter campaign in Albania. April, 1941, saw the German overrunning of Jugoslavia and of Greece, and June the invasion of Russia.

Bulgaria, with no protest from her Church, seized the lands she coveted from her neighbours. In the regions taken from Greece, even the Greek inscriptions on the ikons in churches were replaced by Slavonic. When the tide turned she changed to Communism and Russian friendship, but fortunately did not thereby retain her ill-gotten gains. Paradoxically, it was then, in November, 1945, that the schism was healed between her Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Since then, Communism has been fastened more firmly on the country. The old Exarch Stefan has resigned. The Church has been separated from the State, while the new law on religions seems intended to ensure that she should remain its tool.

Rumania went in with the Germans to occupy not only the Bukovina, and Bessarabia, but even Odessa. And the new territories of Transdnistria were absorbed into the organization of the Rumanian Church. Now again, defeated and crippled, she has conformed to the Soviet. And on the visit of the Russian Patriarch in 1947 it was made clear that the Church, like the State, was to turn away from the West. After the death of the Patriarch Nicodem in February, 1948, Justinian Marina was elected Patriarch—a man of forty whose violently anti-Western and pro-Russian views may be one reason why he had been a country priest until the year before. The old Western friendships of the Church were repudiated. Some of our friends have taken refuge in this country or in France. Hundreds of other priests are reported in prison.⁵ The important Uniate body has been

⁵ It is however fair to state that some of those whom we knew as friends before the War have conformed to the régime.

officially absorbed into the Orthodox Church—a method which we might expect to ensure its continued separation, and in protest against which many Orthodox are themselves reported to have faced imprisonment. Justinian appears to have assumed dictatorial powers over the Church.

We turn with relief to Yugoslavia and to Greece. The Patriarch Gavrilo played a leading part in that moment of glory when, true to the traditions of Kossovo, his country, knowing that she would be defeated and overrun, refused to sign away her soul. Among many noble things of those years that action stands out unique in its unmixed and unsullied idealism.⁶ The years that followed saw the attempts by Croatian ustashi forcibly to “convert” Serb Orthodox to the Roman obedience—attempts which were nobly and vigorously discountenanced by the Roman Catholic authorities; the base acceptance by a Russian Bishop Hermogen of the headship of an ephemeral “autocephalous Croatian Orthodox Church” set up against the Serbs; the fine and tragic efforts of Mihaelović and his chetniks to hold their integrity, and act in the best interests of their people, against attacks from two sides—from the Germans and from the Communists; and the imprisonment and sufferings of the Church leaders who had inspired the Serbian stand. When the war was over it began to become apparent that we had betrayed our friends. A Communist régime was installed with a show of gradualness and “free elections.” The young King remained in exile. The Patriarch Gavrilo, released from Dachau, did not immediately return home. Visiting England in the autumn of 1945 for the baptism of the Crown Prince, he was quite outspoken in public about the condition of his country. At last, true Serb, he went back with his eyes open to resume his leadership. May our prayers be with him! Meanwhile, in this country and in America, are the thousands of those who, for having stood by us, cannot return to their families. Bishops Nicolai of Zhitcha and Ireney of Dalmatia share their exile.

When German force overran Greece the Archbishop Chrysanthos, whom perhaps the Germans expected to be friendly—he had studied in their country—proved bravely intractable, refusing to administer the oath to the puppet government. The vexed question of his election was raised again, and he was suspended. Damaskenos, emerging from his prison, was re-elected by the synod to the throne which he believed to have been his by right since 1938. But any hopes the Germans may have had of support from him were soon dashed. A born leader, and quite fearless, he stood out as a legendary champion of his suffering people in the face of German and Bulgar oppression, and of the famine which carried off a tenth of the population in the first year of the occupation. In 1944, when the rapture of October was followed so quickly by the tragedy of December, he seemed the only possible choice for regent. But in fact, in this he was an embodiment of the position held by the Church in the life of the Greek nation,

⁶ It was on the arrival of this news that I first realized the respect which the Orthodox Church commanded in the Royal Navy, which had had more opportunity than most of our countrymen for seeing her at home. “It was that Church man that did it,” says our ageing and normally blasphemous Senior Engineer. “Greek Orthodox. They’re the cream, they are.”

where Church and people are one, in the old Byzantine manner, to a degree perhaps unequalled elsewhere in the modern world.

Damaskenos died last May, still well under sixty. His rival Chrysanthos followed him in the autumn, a week after being officially recognized as “ex-Archbishop of Athens,” and was likewise granted a State funeral. So the Church which recognizes both Ignatius and Photius as saints can honour the memory of these two brave men, happy to leave to God the judgment in the issue that lay between them. Meanwhile the experiences of the War years have intensified the life of the Church. To some of us, arriving in the newly-liberated Athens in October, 1944, it seemed as if, for the first time in our life, we were in a Christian city. And this is no static Christianity, but a dynamic evangelism, seeking to permeate every level of life.⁷

In Cyprus, after an interregnum of twelve years, the Metropolitan Leontios was elected to the Archbishopric in July, 1947. He died the next month at the age of 51. His successor, Makarios, had been in exile since the troubles of 1931. Relations with the government continue to be conditioned by the close connexion of the Church with the movement for union with Greece. At the same time the healthy developments in the life of the Greek Church are reflected in the island.

In the Eastern patriarchates we should note a growing tendency to mutual consultation and concerted action; the growth of a vigorous movement among Orthodox youth in the Patriarchate of Antioch; and certain signs of a *rapprochement* (with origins, perhaps, quite a long way back) between the Copts and the Greeks in Egypt. In Palestine the Patriarch Timotheos has for years been a sick man; the racial problem and the division of the country leave the Church in dire straits.

What of Russia?

In June, 1940, the “staggered” five-day week was abandoned and Sunday restored. When the Germans invaded the country in 1941 the godless government, having failed in 23 years to kill the Church, found it necessary to accept her support, which was patriotically given. A new policy began. A theological seminary and publication of religious books and periodicals was permitted. The convening of a synod for the election of a Patriarch was allowed, and in September, 1943, the Metropolitan Sergius was elected. The Archbishop of York visited Moscow at that time. The new Patriarch died the following May, and in February, 1945, his successor, Alexis, was enthroned, having been elected unanimously by open ballot in the presence of the Metropolitan Germanos—who was given the precedence due to the representative of the Œcumenical Patriarch—the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, the Catholicos of Georgia, the acting head of the Serbian Church (the Patriarch was still in captivity), and others. Alexis had earned a high reputation as Metropolitan of Leningrad during the siege of that city.

The Patriarch Alexis subsequently visited the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem in person, while in the summer of 1945 the Metropolitan Nicolas of Krutits led delegations to this country and to France—the first of their kind in history—which caused a great stir of emotion among the

⁷ See Professor Bratsiotès’ article.

Russian émigrés, and brought about the reconciliation to Moscow of the Metropolitan Evlogie and those of his jurisdiction (as well as of the Archbishop Seraphim who had represented the Karlovtsi Synod in Paris)—though on Evlogie's death the majority of his followers in France sought once more the jurisdiction of Constantinople, and received Archbishop Vladimir as Exarch. Meanwhile, in spite of ugly accusations of collaborationism during the War, the "Karlovtsi" Synod, under its old head the Metropolitan Anastasy,⁸ re-established itself in Munich under American protection, claiming as of old the right to speak independently as the only free voice of the Russian Church. It has the support of a considerable element of the Russian emigration in most countries. So the tragic three-fold division continues unhealed.

In the summer of 1948—at the same time as the Lambeth Conference—celebrations were held in Moscow to mark the quincentenary of Russian autocephality, and a conference of a quasi-pan-Orthodox character took place which made important pronouncements on Ecumenical matters. Almost all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches were represented at the celebrations, at which the Armenian Catholicos was also present. But the representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and of the Church of Greece did not take part in the conference.

Churches in Russia are reported full, the congregations including young people, and the services are said to be executed in scrupulously traditional manner, and followed more devoutly and patiently than of old—the crowd remaining after three hours' worship for a sermon lasting an hour. Other observers tell of the crowds of indigent folk at the church gates receiving from the poor faithful the support they cannot get from a State which has discarded them as useless.

No one will suppose that Communism in Russia has ceased to be anti-religious. If greater freedom is now permitted to the Church we assume that this is a change of tactics, not of fundamental policy, and a return to harsher tactics is always possible. Moreover there is the ever-present danger that the official Church should compromise too far and become a mere tool of the State. The deplorable enforcement by the State of the absorption of the Ukrainian Uniates into the Orthodox Church might seem to support such a fear. Those who hold that the godless government can only be overthrown by force from outside point to the evidence that, until their behaviour wrecked their chances and cemented the peoples against them, the German invaders were hailed as deliverers up and down Russia and the Ukraine, and a widespread plan to overthrow the régime had strong chances of success. They claim to know of a secret underground Orthodox Church in Russia which would survive if the official Church were suppressed. But it is not made clear whether this underground Church actually rejects the official Church—clearly it could not openly seek to be countenanced by it. Criticism of the official Church seems commonly to come from Roman Catholic sources, or from other elements which see no

possible solution but war. And their attacks are often mixed up either with gross ignorance or with serious distortion of facts. Thus a recent book, *Through God's Underground*—valuable in much of its evidence—would almost seem to suppose that the official Church was suddenly created, as it were out of nothing, in 1941; and it speaks of the "Living Church" schism of the early 'twenties as having been "headed by a priest named Sergius" (the future patriarch), who returned to Orthodoxy within a year. Actually Sergius, who was never *leader* of the Living Church, had been consecrated *bishop* in 1901. And his successor, Alexis, was also a bishop under the Tsar, having been consecrated in 1913. Sergius (who was not to be despised as a theologian—he had been Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg under the Tsar)—had in fact, in spite of his lapse into schism, succeeded legitimately to the leadership of the Russian Church in 1927, nominated thereto by Peter who had been nominated by Tikhon before his death in 1925. He had followed consistently ever since then that policy (inherited from Tikhon) of refusal of political opposition, which may in the end prove to have saved the organized Church in Russia, and which made it possible in 1941 for the godless government to begin to come to terms with it. It has a strong claim to be the policy normally followed by the Orthodox Church throughout all ages and countries in the face of anti-Christian governments. If the Church is unprotected from becoming a hive of informers and secret agents, the same accusation has been made against the Church under the Tsars. If we bewail the suppression of the Uniates we must remember that for years, even in Ruthenia, strong inner forces had been moving to reunite them to the Orthodox⁹—though we suspect that the use of force will tend rather to perpetuate the separation. If we may deplore, in the declarations of the Moscow Conference of 1948, something of a negative, sectionalist tendency to be anti-Roman and anti-Capitalist, we can believe them at least to be genuine expressions of opinion on the information available within Russia. And others besides the Russians may dread the alliance of religion, against Communism, with a capitalist materialism which may be no less atheist, though its atheism be veiled. Have we not yet learnt the fallacy of supposing that those who are against our enemies are on our side? We cannot judge from outside Russia, or from inside the present time, whether and in what respects the official Church has or has not gone too far in adjusting itself to the State. Meanwhile it would seem right to be guided by the cautious but real recognition accorded to the official Church of Russia by other autocephalous Orthodox Churches. A voice was recently raised in Alexandria (that of the Archimandrite Parthenios, lately a student in this country), to point out that the Roman crusade against Communism is not the Orthodox way of resistance. Is there not another, slower but truer, way to which Russian, Serbian and Greek history alike would seem to point the Orthodox Church?

"Trust not for freedom to the Franks."

⁸ Whatever be thought of his policy, those of us who have known, honoured and loved the Metropolitan Anastasy in the past, would not easily lose our faith in his person.

—D.J.C.

⁹ See an article by Fr. Savva Struve—"Orthodoxy in Subcarpathian Russia"—in *The Christian East* for April, 1935.

Russia was saved from the Tartars, not by the Poles, but by her own princes.

* * * * *

The Moscow Conference brings us round again to the question of oecumenical relationships. Here we need see no Communist dictation in the refusal to take part in the World Council of Churches. Apart from Russia there had been, ever since 1937, strong criticism in Greece, Serbia and elsewhere, of tendencies to amalgamate "Faith and Order" with "Life and Work" in ways which might threaten the rightful primacy of "Faith and Order." This hesitancy or refusal to take part in the movement as at present constituted may well have salutary results. Incidentally, those Orthodox who do take part are all the more on their mettle to be sure of taking a clear Orthodox line themselves. It is to be noted that the Moscow declaration does not denounce the Ecumenical Movement in itself, but its actual manifestations—its tendency to a negative anti-papalism, and to the creation of a non-dogmatic "Ecumenical Church" on a "practical" basis.

The declaration on Anglican Orders typifies a vast change in conditions since the decisions of the Rumanian Synod in 1936. And we cannot help feeling that the newer state of our relationships is healthier. A declaration which was read at first sight as a rejection of the validity of our orders proves on closer examination to contain an affirmation that the facts of our history would justify "economic recognition" by a pan-Orthodox Synod, provided only that the Anglican Church as a whole gave clear dogmatic assurances, especially on the question of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Surely any catholic-minded Anglican must welcome such a challenge: and to receive such encouragement from a conference so free from political bias in our favour, is worth a great deal more than the kind of recognition—also dependent upon synodical ratification by the Church of England (which was never given unequivocally) of certain dogmatic statements—which we received in Bucharest when political conditions were all in favour of a *rapprochement*. It was just the cold douche we needed. (And yet, in spite of it, we note that the Archbishop of Canterbury's congratulatory letter on the Quincentenary was printed in the journal of the Moscow Patriarchate along with those of the heads of the Orthodox Churches.) If it slows down the tempo of official relationships, official action on the Anglican side may seem to have the same tendency. The Lambeth Conference of 1948 did not implement or follow up as might have been hoped the results of the valuable discussions with the strong Orthodox delegation led by Meletios of Alexandria to the Conference of 1930, and the subsequent Joint Commission of 1931, or of the subsequent local meetings in Bucharest and Athens. The much weaker Orthodox delegation in 1948 was not invited to any comparable discussions—though there was a recommendation that a new joint commission be set up. But in other ways, we believe that the Anglican Church in her ordinary members has become much more aware of the Orthodox Church than she used to be, and even of the possibility that, in dogma and spirituality, there may be things of primary importance which the Orthodox have to teach us. The Confer-

ences of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius have made a real contribution in this since the War. They have been far more concerned with real dogmatic issues than they used to be in the old days before the War, although the number of scholars taking part has been comparatively few. This dogmatic tendency has been encouraged from the Roman Catholic side by the work of Dom Bede Winslow and others in the *Eastern Churches' Quarterly*, and in conferences at Blackfriars in Oxford wherein Anglicans as well as Orthodox and Roman Catholics have taken leading parts.

Meanwhile, the growing scholarly interest in Byzantium on the continent of Europe and in America in the last thirty years has begun to have its repercussions even in England to make scholarship more aware of the East Christian world from many sides other than the narrowly ecclesiastical. Also, in Greece and elsewhere, far more ordinary Englishmen than ever before have had practical contact with Orthodox peoples at home.

Even the normal peace-time spreading of Orthodox peoples has begun to establish more clearly the oecumenical character of their Church. The Russians and missions in China and Japan become native Orthodox Churches. The Patriarchate of Alexandria unveils its claim to the jurisdiction of all Africa with a Bishop of Johannesburg, or the conversion of native families in Tanganyika. The many Orthodox national Churches in America begin to recognize the necessity for one American Orthodox Church. And the interplay between the Old World and the New becomes apparent as the Greek Archbishop Athenagoras from America becomes Ecumenical Patriarch, and our old friend Michael Constantinides is called from Corinth to succeed him in America (our prayers are with them both). In our own country the Greeks and Cypriotes have increased to require a second church in London. And the War and its aftermath have brought a vast and varied increase in the numbers of Orthodox through the influx of "European Voluntary Workers" and other refugees—Serbs, Ukrainians, Poles, Rumanians, etc. Were there but enough Orthodox priests to care properly for these it should soon be possible for us, if we used our opportunity aright, to make Orthodoxy and Orthodox worship known to a great proportion of our countrymen. Few as are the Orthodox clergy with us for this great task, it was still a remarkable sign of the times when, at the Festival of the Anglican and Eastern Churches' Association in Southwark Cathedral last November, the Orthodox Requiem was sung in their own liturgical languages by clergy of seven distinct Orthodox local Churches—Greek, Russian, Rumanian, Serbian, Polish, Lithuanian, Estonian.

Time is telling, too. In France and England the Russian émigrés have been settled with us now for a generation and their children are growing up as English- or French-speaking Orthodox. Others of Western origin are drawn by divers paths to the Orthodox Church, and the need for a Western Orthodoxy becomes a practical issue. The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom begins to be heard in English and in French. And in Paris a Western Orthodox Rite advances beyond its first tentative steps.

And in contrast therewith, his influence all the stronger for being in no

way spectacular, our Orthodox President, the Metropolitan of Thyatira, Germanos, builds, with his 28 years among us, his exarchate into a national institution.¹⁰

DERWAS J. CHITTY.

ECCLESIA EXTRA ECCLESIAM

IN connection with the pronouncements of the Moscow Conference and certain recent statements of Eastern Orthodox theologians in all parts of the Orthodox world, about Orthodox participation in the Ecumenical Movement and about the Orthodox doctrine of the Church, an important question has frequently been asked. Do the Orthodox regard as Churches of Christ, in any sense, the Churches now actually separated from their communion or not visibly in communion with them?

The following remarks of the late Frank Gavin, an American Episcopalian theologian, on the Eastern Orthodox position, have recently been quoted with approval by the professor of dogmatic theology in the university of Athens, John Karmiris. "In summary we may state, (a) that the Orthodox Church claims to be the whole and only Catholic Church; (b) that as such she claims infallibility; (c) that she can recognize no unity of doctrine save on the basis of the acceptance of the whole of her teaching; (d) that she cannot admit the existence of any 'members' or 'branches' of the Church, since it is constituted of herself alone, nor the validity of any sacraments save her own. Consequently her ideal of unity is . . . a return of all heretical or schismatic bodies to the one Church." Gavin quotes from the Greek theologian Androustos: "As the Orthodox Church constitutes the true Church of Christ, any 'Church' outside her cannot be a true or equal member of the true Church, and if reunion should take place between Orthodoxy and these Churches, it would not constitute a re-establishment of the broken and destroyed unity of the Church, but only a return to the true form of Christianity." Gavin concludes that the Orthodox theory is "perfectly lucid, consistent, and utterly inelastic."

But there are certain reasons for doubting whether this is really a completely satisfactory statement of the Orthodox position. In the following numbered paragraphs, I attempt to summarize the ideas on the subject of the "Ecclesia extra ecclesiam," which Orthodox theologians whom I know and those whose works I have read have recently drawn to my attention.

1. There are certainly some Orthodox theologians who completely and entirely reject any idea of an "Ecclesia extra ecclesiam." The late Metropolitan Antony of Kiev among the Russians, the late Professor Dyovouniotes among the Greeks and other Orthodox writers have held, quite uncompromisingly, that all non-Orthodox sacraments are merely outward signs. According to this view the Roman Catholic receives no more sacramental

grace than the Moslem or the Buddhist. If the Roman Catholic priest is received into the Orthodox Communion without receiving baptism from the Orthodox and is at once allowed to act as an Orthodox priest without receiving ordination from the Orthodox, this is only if the Orthodox bishop who receives him into the Orthodox Church decides accordingly in his particular individual case. In such instances of reception without reordination the first Orthodox sacrament received by the convert must be regarded by the Orthodox Church and by him as the efficient sign of his reception of the sacramental grace of baptism, confirmation, and holy orders, in one moment. As the bishop lays his hands on the head of the convert in absolution, the external part of the sacraments which he received in heresy or schism is vitalized and made effective for the first time, if these sacraments are being recognized by the Orthodox Church, in his particular case. In another instance, a Roman Catholic priest, who is to be an Orthodox priest, may be baptized in the Orthodox manner on his conversion, confirmed immediately and, in due course, ordained deacon and priest. The difference in mode of procedure is a purely external one, according to the theologians whom we are considering here.

2. But this view has been criticized. For example, the late Patriarch Sergius of Moscow regarded it as inadequate. He compared the situation of the non-Orthodox to the canonical situation of the penitents, who are organically related to the Church but not communicants. It is not his view that they receive the full grace of Christian initiation in the sacramental sense. But he seems to think that, when the Orthodox Church has treated a convert as already baptized, she has implicitly told him to think that, before being Orthodox, he was already, in some real sense, a Christian, and that some analogous meaning must belong to the reception of a cleric without reordination.¹ This appears, in the light of historical facts, to imply that the Orthodox can, in one context, regard the Roman Communion as not a Church at all, while, in another context, they regard the same Roman Communion as being, in some real sense, a Church. This is strange; but it may be comprehensible, if the concrete circumstances are considered. For example, in the Levant, at least at certain times, the Roman Communion appears to the Orthodox as a proselytizing agency working against them. A group of families becomes Uniate and their children are baptized by Latin or Uniate priests; when, as often happens, the families return to Orthodoxy, the children baptized in the Roman Communion receive Orthodox baptism. It is not incomprehensible that the Roman baptism of the children should be treated as an expression of their parents' desertion of the Church of their fathers and therefore not recognized as a sacrament. It was in conditions in which this was common, and during the fight against proselytism, that the practice of treating Western baptism as wholly in-existent arose, although the alleged necessity of triple immersion was often the pretext. In a different context, where the converts from the Latin confession were of Western origin, the Latin Church's baptism could appear in a different light. It is true that the inconsistencies of Orthodox practice, from individual case to individual

¹⁰ Space, and the shape of this article, have made inevitable some very large omissions, particularly in regard to events in England and France. But certain names at least of those closely connected with our work, who have passed from our sight, in addition to those already mentioned, cannot be left unremembered—Archbishops Cosmo Lang and William Temple; two Anglican presidents of the A. & E.C.A., Bishop Hicks and Bishop de Labilliere; Athelstan Riley, our Chairman for many years; and, among the Paris Russians, Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, and (martyrs of the concentration camps) Fr. Dmitri Klepinin and Mother Mary. *Αιωνία η μνήμη αὐτῶν.*

¹ See E. R. Hardy: *Orthodox statements on Anglican Orders.*

case, can seem arbitrary. But it may be suggested that, from the Orthodox standpoint, something depends upon whether the reception of the non-Orthodox sacraments was a move away from Orthodoxy or a move in the direction of Orthodoxy (e.g. from heathenism or Judaism).

3. The opinion of Professor Dyovouniotes, the Greek theologian, in his book on the sacraments² was that the Orthodox Church should always rebaptize, or rather baptize in the Orthodox way, all converts from Christian bodies which have no episcopate claiming the apostolic succession. He contended that baptism depends on ordination, not only because the minister of baptism ought to be the priest, except in extreme necessity, but also because baptism must imply admission to the other sacraments. However, the Greeks do not always give Orthodox baptism to converts from the Protestant confessions; their practice seems to vary from individual to individual. The Slav Churches, in modern times, have made it their general practice to receive Lutherans and Calvinists into the Orthodox Church simply by confirmation. This may possibly have become the use of the Slavs at a time in which the Protestants were still regarded as irregular Roman Catholics, as Rome recognizes Protestant baptisms and regards all validly baptized Protestants as members of the Roman Church. But it is possible to treat the Orthodox recognition of Protestant baptisms as an indication that, when the Protestant Confessions believe in the Holy Trinity and have a conception of baptism sufficiently close to the Orthodox conception, these Confessions are, in some sense, imperfect and unequal parts of the Church. Thus the baptisms of bodies which do not hold the doctrine of the Trinity and those of bodies which do not regard baptism as being obligatory are not recognized by the Orthodox.

4. It has been suggested to me, in conversation only, by an Orthodox theologian, that the "High Church Lutheran" groups, and other groups which, although not having the apostolic succession, *de facto*, desire it, because they are returning to the Catholic ideas of the Communion of Saints, the Tradition of the Church, and the supreme importance of the sacraments, are much nearer to Orthodoxy than Anglican groups which, although, *de facto*, having the succession, do not regard it as theologically important. While it is unlikely that any "High Church Lutherans" or similar people, without a claim to the historical succession, would ever desire to become Orthodox priests without receiving episcopal ordination, and it was not suggested that this would be possible, it was suggested that Lutherans might be able, after a corporate reunion of a group of them with the Orthodox, to regard their past life, especially in their movement towards Orthodoxy, as Catholic life in some "proleptic" or "incipient" sense. This depends upon the Orthodox evaluation of the continental Reformation. The Orthodox Councils of the seventeenth century seem to have regarded the Reformation as a movement which carried the West farther from Orthodoxy than it was before. Many Orthodox theologians now take that view, about both the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. But there may be another way of regarding the matter. Catholicizing movements are regarded with favour and interest in the

² Τὰ μυστήρια (1913).

Orthodox world in so far as they bring back the thoughts of the period of the undivided Church.

5. The Eastern Orthodox have repeatedly asked the Roman Catholics whether they will negotiate for reunion on equal terms, not assuming, for the purposes of the conversations, that either Church is heretical, but seeking to discover by the historical method which of the two Churches has made dogmatic innovations since their separation. At least one nineteenth century Patriarch of Constantinople offered, in an encyclical letter, to alter any Eastern Orthodox doctrine or practice if he could be convinced that it was alien to the faith of the ancient Church. It has repeatedly been stated that, if Rome were ready to cease to regard as *de fide* the doctrines defined in the West since the separation, except for those which the East can accept as dogmas, the Eastern Orthodox would negotiate with Rome, on that basis, and would not require from the Roman Catholics any submission to the East and renunciation of their past existence. There is evidence of this in the history of the negotiations between the Old Catholics and the Orthodox. No Eastern Orthodox General Council declared the Latin Communion, as such, to be anathema. The Byzantine condemnations were directed against particular Popes and particular papal pronouncements and, at a later period, against certain Western doctrines being introduced into Eastern Orthodox communities. The schism is a fact and, in actual practice, the Latins and other Westerns have been treated as schismatics or even as heretics; but the door is left open for future negotiations from the Eastern standpoint, even if, from the Western standpoint, it has been closed by the Vatican decrees.

6. There is no Church belonging to the Orthodox Communion which claims territorial jurisdiction in Western Europe at the present time. Some years ago some of the Russian emigree bishops wished to enthrone bishops with such titles as "Bishop of Berlin." The late Patriarch Sergius, then Locum-Tenens of the throne of Moscow, protested. He made it part of the ground of his protest that it was at least inexpedient and possibly uncanonical for a particular Orthodox Eastern Church to set up, on a territorial basis, a diocese in the ancient territory of the Patriarchs of Rome. He held that the Orthodox of all jurisdictions in Western Europe are *metochia*; that means that they are, as it were, "extra-territorial colonies" of Churches elsewhere. The canonists of the Phanar do not seem to deny this, for they claim that all Orthodox bishops in Western Europe belong to the category of missionary bishops without definite limits to their dioceses.³ The Exarchs of the Œcumenical throne in Western Europe do not treat the Exarchate of another Patriarchate as schismatic; they do not claim to be the only bishops of all Orthodox in the territorial limits of their spheres of mission. In any Orthodox country they would certainly regard as schismatic any one claiming to be Orthodox who was not under the Orthodox bishop of the place. But the Western European controversy between the Phanar and other Patriarchates is not pushed to the extreme point of definite territorial claims. On the other hand, in the new countries, where

³ Over these bishops the Patriarch of Constantinople claims jurisdiction. His claim is contested by other Orthodox Churches.

there was no Christianity before 1054, the Orthodox bishops, of all jurisdictions, have no hesitation in assuming territorial titles and making territorial claims. This reserved policy of the Orthodox in Western Europe may be ascribed, in part at least, to the idea that the historic Churches of France, Italy, Spain, etc., although in schism from the Orthodox Church and although deformed in their doctrinal tradition, still have a certain existence as a continuation of the life of the original Orthodox Church in the West.

If the Old Catholics were fully reunited with the Eastern Orthodox, or if the French people in Paris becoming Orthodox were numerous enough to have a bishop of their own, or even if the Orthodox of all nationalities who live (more or less permanently) in France were to agree that they wanted to be organized as an Orthodox Church of France on a territorial basis, a new situation would arise. It is not at all out of the question that, in that event, the Eastern Orthodox authorities would recognize a Western Orthodox Church as a territorial sister Church, with jurisdiction over all Orthodox Christians in her local territory and with a claim to be the revival of the Church of Holland, or France, or Germany, as it was before the separation of East and West. This would be the reunion of part of the West with the East and could involve the condemnation of the part of the West which rejected the union. But, until something of that kind happens, the Eastern attitude to Romanism contains a certain element of the undecided or "apophatic."

7. Reunion between Churches which believe in the Communion of Saints would not be merely reunion between Christians in the present generation; it would also involve the faithful departed. If neither of the Churches involved is to renounce her past history (except in respect of sins and errors) then the question inevitably arises whether those who died before the union are to be prayed for as faithful Catholics and whether the saints who lived and died during the period of the separation are to be venerated and invoked after the union. The Orthodox living in France at present, where there is a vigorous Orthodox religious life, are developing a strong sense of veneration for the French saints. This is not confined to Orthodox people of French birth; it extends to Orthodox of Eastern origin who have made France their adopted country. While it is chiefly concerned with French saints of the period before 1054, it is not entirely limited to the saints of that period. Some of the Orthodox in France, regarding themselves as forerunners of a French Church united with Orthodoxy, have a sense of continuity with the spiritual currents in French Catholicism which were close to Orthodoxy, in their ethos, during the whole period of the separation of East and West. They wish to regard some of the French saints after 1054 as saints of the future Orthodox Western Church and heirs of the saints of the undivided Church in the West. They feel that certain Roman Catholic saints, who were associated with polemics against the Byzantine Church and with the growth of the papal claims, cannot possibly be recognized in this way; but they seem to be ready to recognize other saints who died during the separation. This points forward to a conception of Church history not entirely excluding the separated West from the conception of the Orthodox Catholic Church.

8. Dogmatic agreement cannot be limited to the points explicitly mentioned in the Creed. It must include everything which members of the Church are obliged to regard as revealed truth. The Eastern Orthodox would not be able to agree to the idea that Papal Infallibility should continue to be taught as *de fide* in Latin Churches, on condition that it was not imposed on the Eastern Churches and the English, an idea which some Anglicans have proposed. Similarly the Eastern Orthodox could not agree to the Thirty-nine Articles as an obligatory standard in England, even although not to be imposed elsewhere, unless they were first convinced that the doctrine which those who subscribe to the Articles are obliged to believe is an essentially sound and acceptable doctrine. They insist on the idea that the obligatory dogmas must be the same in all parts of one communion. But the absolute claim to truth, thus made for certain essential doctrines, which are believed to be implied in the preaching and life of the primitive church and of the whole Church before the separation, differs in kind from the claim of Rome that the local Church of a particular city, as it now is in divided Christendom and as it now teaches, is the divinely-appointed centre of unity. It is not proposed that Western Christians should accept a doctrine solely because it is now taught in the Orthodox East. It is not suggested that any particular national or local Church is infallible. The Eastern Orthodox doctrine of the "infallibility" of the Church is a very subtle doctrine and is easily misunderstood by Protestants and Anglicans. It means that past decisions now recognized or to be recognized generally as decisions of the Church Universal were in fact true. But it does not mean that if on some future occasion the bishops of the Orthodox communion all over the world meet in council and come to an agreement, their decision will necessarily be true *ipso facto*. It is practically impossible that they would ever be literally unanimous on any important issue and the Orthodox admit that the minority of the bishops may, at any particular time, be right in opposition to the majority which may be wrong. Only through a long process, in which the Orthodox and all in communion with them accept the doctrinal decisions of a council, could a council of the future have the authority of the General Councils of the undivided Church. Thus the Orthodox claim to "infallibility" is not a claim to impose specifically "Eastern" or "Byzantine" doctrines upon the Western Churches and other bodies separated from the Orthodox.

E. EVERY.

THE EVANGELISTIC WORK OF THE CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH¹

by P. I. BRATSIOTIS

I. SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. The evangelistic work united with the prophetic office of Christ, the exercise of which He has entrusted to the Church, has ever constituted in the consciousness of the Orthodox Church one of her basic obligations, as

¹ Published by special permission of the study department of the World Council of Churches.

it constitutes His principal work. Although this obligation has not always been executed with the same intensity in the Orthodox Church, it has never been entirely laid aside.

Responsibility for evangelism falls upon the bishops, the shepherds or pastors of the Church, in the first place, according to the Orthodox way of thinking; but it has always been regarded as the duty of the Orthodox laity as well, for the idea found in the Bible concerning the Royal Priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 9), the idea of the General Priesthood of all believers, taught by the Church Fathers, has always been preserved, and remains lively in the consciousness of the Orthodox Church, as her past history and present life show. It is thus that we should interpret the existence in the Orthodox Church of simple (i.e. not-ordained) monks or lay preachers and lay theologians in general which sometimes seems rather paradoxical to Western Christians. It was well known in the Orthodox Church in ancient times and has continued all through the centuries until to-day. It is sufficient to allude to Justin the philosopher and martyr, to Origen (although later ordained), to Lactantius, to Maximus the Confessor, Photios (before his ordination), Michael Psellos, George the Scholar (before ordination), many emperors, Nikon the Penitent, and so many other unknown and well-known Byzantine monks engaged in home and foreign missions; these belong to the ancient and Byzantine periods. In the period of Turkish rule we can mention the names of Pachomios Rousanos (obit. 1553), S. Kosmas of Aitolos (obit. 1779) and others. On the basis of the liveliness of the idea of the General Priesthood, in the consciousness of the Orthodox Church, the active participation of the lay element, and especially their initiative in evangelistic work can be explained.

2. The spoken kerygma remains the principal method of evangelistic action in the Orthodox Church in accordance with the sacred example of our Lord and His apostles. But, side by side with it, use is made of the written word, which was used by the apostles themselves also. The sacred Naos remains the centre of the evangelistic activity where the faithful are concerned; the Divine Liturgy is so in a special way; but that does not imply neglect of the task of seeking and attracting those who are more or less alienated from divine worship and those who are religiously indifferent or entirely uninstructed, by work in other places, especially in markets and public streets and squares. It is to be noted that the work of foreign missions which was actively developed by the Byzantine Church in Europe, Asia, and Africa, as the conversion to Christianity of the Ethiopians, the Slavs, the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, and other formerly uncivilized peoples testifies, was necessarily laid aside in the Church under Turkish rule on account of the extremely difficult conditions under which the enslaved Christian peoples had to live; it was not neglected in the Russian Church, which could dispose of such abundant material, spiritual and political means for the execution of such a purpose.

3. But even after the liberation of the Balkan peoples from their age-long slavery, with the end of Turkish rule, it was not only foreign missionary work which could not yet be redeveloped by the Orthodox autocephalous Churches in the Balkans. Even home missionary work operated insuffi-

ciently for several decades, although the cultural and social conditions in which the liberated peoples found themselves made the need of evangelism all the more imperative. This need was particularly related to the dangers which result from the insufficient correlation of Christian education with intellectual education among the liberated peoples and, even more, from the rapid introduction from the West of Western culture combined with materialistic, anti-Christian, and subversive dogmas, which were disseminated in a variety of ways by half-educated Greek "scientists," who had the reputation of an "education in Europe," and also by means of translations.

4. To meet these dangers, and to proceed to the broad and efficient development of evangelistic work, the Church needs, before everything else, educated and able clergy, capable of enlightening the people by their speech and example and forming the Christian consciousness which is indispensable to the growth of the lay mission. But although immediately on the liberation of the Balkan peoples universities and theological faculties and ecclesiastical seminaries were founded for the purpose of obtaining an adequate number of such clergy, many and various obstacles, which will not be set out in this essay, have impeded this. Thus the evangelistic work of the bishops and pastors of the Church has been limited to two things; on the one hand there has always been the activity of the clergy in performing rites and carrying out the impressive and most didactic worship of the Orthodox Church; on the other hand there has been the kerygma of the bishops and of a few specially appointed clerical preachers on the bishoprics, combined with the hearing of confessions by experienced spiritual fathers.

5. By the grace of God it happened that, at least in Greece, from the liberation of the country onwards, private initiative came to the assistance of the evangelistic attempts of the pastors of the Church and became a valuable aid to them. Through private initiative important religious movements developed and these have given, and continue to give, extremely valuable services to the Church and to the country generally. They have contributed greatly to the Christian regeneration of the people and have supplied the needed basis for the revival of the Church and clergy from all points of view.

II. THE PRINCIPAL EVANGELISTIC MOVEMENTS IN THE GREEK CHURCH SINCE THE TIME OF THE LIBERATION OF GREECE FROM TURKEY

6. The personalities of the first religious leaders in Greece in this period were inspired by theocratic ideas; there was something in them which, from some points of view, reminds one of the Old Testament prophets, and their activity was noted for its uncompromisingness and aggressiveness, which extended as far as the making of attacks upon the constituted authorities of both the State and the Church, and therefore provoked the persecution of the leaders in question. There stand out in the nineteenth century history of the Greek Church two such personalities. Kosmas Flamiatos (obit. 1850) and Apostolos Makrakes (obit. 1905). From this point onwards we shall be mainly concerned with the movement led by

Makrakes and with the movements which followed after it, as we consider that movement to have been more important and effective than all previous movements.

7. *Apostolos Makrakes* was born in the little island of Siphnos in the Cyclades, but moved when a child to Constantinople, where he studied in the school called "The Great National School" (of the Greeks); there he received a good philosophical and literary and religious education. All his life he remained a layman; he began work in Constantinople as a school-master. By meditation on the Bible and the works of the Greek Fathers, and by the study of the condition of the Greek Church and Greek society in his day, he reached the conclusion that only through regeneration in Christ and through return to the way of life of the primitive Christians could the Church and the Greek nation be restored, and that it was through Orthodoxy and the Greek nation that humanity was to be restored. In 1858 he had already published an essay with the characteristic title of "The Revelation of the Hidden Treasure"; by this treasure he meant Christ and the Gospel. He followed this up with the publication of several similar books in which there appeared, with growing intensity, his clear personal conviction that he was to play an important part in the work of general re-creation which he had in mind. This conviction of Makrakes was strengthened by a dream which he had seen. In 1862 he went to Paris as the tutor of the children of a Greek banker; there he had a chance to study modern philosophy, especially French philosophy. He there published three philosophical studies, in which he attacked the misguided ways of the French, and attempted to oppose to them a Christian philosophy. He afterwards came to Athens, and, in the square in front of the university, he made three speeches about the Republic of Plato, which produced a deep impression upon the vast audience, including some university professors. From Athens he returned to Constantinople where he published his "Treatise on the Nature and Fundamental Law of the Church of Christ" (1864) in which he attacked the non-Orthodox Churches and exhorted the Orthodox to return to the Christian life. But as he failed to find a suitable field of action in Constantinople he came back to Athens where he settled down and undertook a remarkable work, in teaching, being a missionary, and writing books, and where he gathered around him not a few warm supporters and untiring colleagues, some of whom were clergy and some laymen.

8. One very important innovation then introduced by Makrakes was the preaching of the Gospel in public places other than the churches, and especially the practice of preaching in the most central public squares in Athens and of other cities and villages of Greece. He repeatedly made journeys from place to place over most of the country. But apart from these journeys he had a permanent home and a centre for his teaching in Athens in the form of the "School," which he founded, calling it "The Philosophical and Educational School of the Word" (*Logos*). There he taught the interpretation of the Scriptures, and also philosophical and educational subjects,² in lectures attended by many fanatical hearers of his

² The philosophical works of Makrakes have recently been translated into English and published in America, where they have had a good reception, even in some non-Orthodox circles.

words, who regarded Makrakes as the God-sent teacher. The fruit of his teaching activity was a series of philosophical and education books (i.e. books on the theory of education) as well as several commentaries on books of the Bible (the Psalms, the Song of Songs, the Gospels, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse). From 1868 onwards Makrakes published a religious periodical entitled *The Word (Logos)*, which was recommended to the Greek people in an encyclical letter by the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece.

9. Generally speaking, in the first years of his activity Makrakes enjoyed the respect of the hierarchy and the clergy of the Church of Greece until he began to make attacks upon higher clergy who were misbehaving themselves, and also to expound dogmatic ideas diverging from the Orthodox teaching. After that the reaction of the bishops of the Church against him began; eventually it went so far that certain teachings of his were condemned as false teachings ("Kakodoxies"). Many factors in the situation combined to remove from him many of those who worked with him and in many ways to damage his work; besides the condemnation of his teachings there was his over-imaginative, over-nationalistic, and even egoistic interpretation of some passages of the Apocalypse (especially xi. 3), his intervention in politics and the wildness of his polemics against the Freemasons, and also the University, which he called "the Pan-skotisterion" (the abode of universal darkness), and every one who disagreed with him, including some of his former colleagues. This occasioned his prosecution.

10. But, in spite of all that, there were undoubtedly remarkable results of the activity of Makrakes. From this time onwards the breath of living spirituality began to blow in the Greek Church, combined with a tendency to impart new life to her forms and to bring her back to her old vigour and brightness. Enthusiasm for the study of the Bible was also strengthened, and the ancient Church practice of the frequent reception of Holy Communion was revived. The written and spoken kerygma of the divine word began to spread and to be demanded by the people. The idea of the Lay Apostolate was significantly strengthened. A goodly number of untiring and enthusiastic workers for the Gospel were enlisted and were trained under the inspiration of that fiery teacher to keep the torch which he lit alight and to continue and make fruitful, even under a separate banner from his, the work which, until he breathed his last, he continued as vigorously as ever, unaffected by any reactions or even by the repeated non-fulfilment of his extravagant and vain hopes and by the separation from him of the more spiritually-minded of his colleagues.

11. In spite of the extremisms of Makrakes, his many mistakes, and the condemnation of certain points of his teaching by the Church, he never lacked the reverence of both the clergy and laity, so that his funeral took place in the cathedral church of Athens on December 25th, 1905. After his death his movement was carried on by those of his colleagues who had stayed with him after the rest separated from him, particularly S. Philaretos, M. Charitos, General Leivadas, etc. It remained within the Church, but as an "ecclesiola in ecclesia," and in the course of time it has become very small, while simultaneously other movements, related to it by belonging for

the most part to the same genealogical tree, have grown strong and have come to dominate the scene. However, it ought to be admitted that the movement of Makrakes was the starting point and fountain head of most of the more important religious movements in Greece.

12. Among the principal movements worth mentioning is the one brought into being in connection with the religious association named *Anaplasis*, founded in 1887 by Constantin Dialesma (obit. 1922), who had formerly been in relations of close co-operation with Makrakes and was the head of a secondary school (a Lycee), and a layman, aided by another layman, Michael Galanos, who was a lawyer; the purpose of the association was "the Christian renewal of Greek society and the maintenance of the Church," and it was placed under the honorary presidency of Constantine, then the Crown Prince and later the King of the Hellenes, while under the regular presidency of the celebrated teacher of law, John Skaltsounes (obit. 1905). It gathered into its ranks both the more sober-minded elements in the movement of Makrakes and also others among the best clergy and laymen, and so brought into being an important and fruitful religious movement. The *Anaplasis* carried out evangelistic work by publications, such as the periodical of the same name, and many other instructive and defensive (or apologetic) publications, among which we ought to mention particularly the issue of paraphrases of books of the Holy Bible and works of S. John Chrysostom, which was begun but unfortunately was never finished; on the other hand it organized morning and evening sermons, not only in the churches, but also in special halls for that purpose, in Athens and Piraeus, and also in the provinces, which were visited under its auspices by enthusiastic clergy and laity. Of these the most important were the Archimandrite Panaretos Douligeris (obit. m. 1942) and Michael Galanos, who was twice elected a Member of Parliament and who continued until this year to preach in the Church of S. George, in the centre of Athens, at the age of 87 (obit. 1948).

13. From this movement concerned with the association called "Anaplasis" proceeded two other important movements led by two inspired members of the parochial (or married) clergy. The first was that of George Makres, the parish priest of S. Basil's Church in the Piraeus, whose special task was to approach young people and to impart to them his love for the Bible; his methods were Catechetical Schools (or Sunday Schools) and Bible Study Circles, and he inspired a good number of men, now both clergy and laity, who play an important part in present-day evangelism. For some years he published a religious periodical called *Anamorphosis*, which was noted for its spirituality and served the movement well. The movement continued after the death of Fr. George which took place in 1943.³

14. The movement founded by the enthusiastic parish priest of S. Catherine's Church in Athens, Fr. Mark Tsaktanis, also emerged from the "Anaplasis" movement and proved more permanent. Fr. Mark with

³ No. 43 of the Church Magazine *Enoria* (The Parish) in 1948 was dedicated to the memory of this distinguished priest, and there articles about him by outstanding clergy and laity were published.

the co-operation of others, among whom Chrysostom Papadopoulos, then a university teacher but later Archbishop of Athens, was included, made his parish church the centre of an important movement among young people, which later spread to the suburbs of Athens and to some other parts of Greece. He founded the oldest of the Catechetical Schools now functioning and multiplying in Athens, and also the first associations of young men and young women; he edited the periodical *Kaine Ktisis*, and developed the study of the Scriptures in Bible Study Circles. After his premature death in 1924, Fr. Angelos Nesiotes, the brother of Fr. Mark's wife, who is parish priest of the Church of the "Life-Giving Fountain," in the centre of Athens, assumed the task of continuing, extending and systematizing Fr. Mark's work. Its centre was transferred to his parish, and the movement now ranks next after "Zoc," for the intensity and breadth of its work. Like Fr. Mark, Fr. Angelos has been a daring innovator in some departments of evangelism; for example he has introduced sermons in factories, and expeditions into the country-side for purposes of religious training and in order to spread the Gospel, he has organized summer camps combined with religious education, he has paid great attention to the more lively participation of young men and young women in the liturgical life of the Church, and he has developed the use of Church music and religious songs. Owing to the efforts of this untiring priest about 200 branches of the "Orthodox Christian Unions," founded by Fr. Mark (for adults and young people of both sexes) exist and function in Athens, the Piraeus and the surrounding places, as well as 350 Catechetical Schools (for the most part these are girls' schools) with 45,000 children. The movement led by Fr. Angelos has at its disposal three buildings for evangelistic work and one piece of pine-wooded property in Ekate, a summer resort near Athens, where it holds summer camps. It also directs a special publishing house, in which *Kaine Ktisis* and *Paidike Chara* (the children's paper) are published, as well as various theological and educational books. The circulation of *Paidike Chara* is 24,000.

15. Three years ago a student organization was founded within the framework of the movement of Fr. Angelos, with the title of "The Student Christian Association" (*Omilos*), under the guidance of a professor of the university, having as the basis of its spiritual work the common study of the Bible. This Association co-operates with the World Student Christian Federation and was represented by two delegates in the World Conference of Christian Youth at Oslo in 1947. Through scholarships of the Œcumenical Institute in Geneva members of our Association and the Unions of Father Angelos Nesiotes attended various courses at the Institute during the recent years, and coming back to Greece they offered their valuable service for a more complete and effective organization of Evangelism in our country. A special Co-ordination Committee, composed of the Leaders of the Orthodox Unions and Student Association, was formed to pursue the co-ordination of the action of the above organizations.

16. Three other clergy who, as parish priests in Athens, have in recent years made their churches into centres of significant evangelistic work, came from the movement of Fr. Mark and Fr. Angelos. These are the two

brothers, the Archimandrites *Timothy* and *Titus Matthaïakes*, and their nephew, Fr. *Stephen Matakoulis*. The brothers publish the periodical *Lychnia*, and Fr. Stephen published, as his parish periodical, the magazine *Elpis*. But these are not the only parish priests who work with zeal in the field of evangelism. There are others whose number increases daily.

17. We allude, for example's sake, to the names of the Archimandrites Gervase Paraskevopoulos and Damaskenos Asemakopoulos and the married priest Thomas Papagiannopoulos, who have developed an important evangelistic work, especially among young people, the first in Patras, the second in New Nicæa near Piræus (a new city inhabited by refugees from Asia Minor) and the third at first in Patras but later in Athens, where he died in 1947. Here mention should be made of the "Synaxis of the Presbyters," a movement which first emerged as early as 1870 in Athens under that name, and which consisted of the married parish priests of Athens and the Piræus, banded together in order to help in the religious and moral improvement of the people through sermons and catechetical schools. This movement has unfortunately not produced the results that might have been expected from it, although it has been supported by distinguished members of Athenian society and particularly by some university professors; it has been confronted by misunderstanding on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, and even more impeded by the lack of a sufficient vital force and a directing personality.

18. The most important of all the movements which have, up to now, appeared in the whole Greek Church (and, if I am not mistaken, in the rest of the Orthodox Church as well) in our times, from the points of view of breadth, intensity, systematic organization and lasting results, is the movement named the "Zoe" movement, founded in 1907 by the Archimandrite *Eusebios Matthopoulos*, who died in 1929.⁴ He was born in 1846 in a village in Arcadia, and belonged to a pious family; he became a monk in the great and historic monastery of the Megaspelaion in the Peloponnesus, under the patronage of his uncle, Ignatios Lampropoulos, a man of great spirituality and great virtue and vigorous missionary zeal, and a friend of Makrakes. Eusebios later moved to Athens, where he began to study in the philosophical school of the university, and joined Makrakes' "circle," becoming one of the best and most beloved disciples and colleagues of Makrakes. He was ordained priest and became the chaplain and confessor of the circle. He was condemned by the Holy Synod, together with the other "Makrakist" clergy, to exile in a monastery, and he remained in exile for three years, during which, by religious meditation, self-examination and self-control, he started to prepare for a new spiritual campaign, with methods different from and both gentler and more truly evangelical than those of his fanatical teacher. After his return from exile he petitioned, together with others among the clergy who had been condemned, for the Church's pardon, and having separated from Makrakes he began, in co-operation with his uncle, Hierotheos Metropoulos, who was later to be Archbishop of Patras, although then he was merely a preacher, his own

⁴ *Eusebios Matthopoulos*, by Seraphim Papakostas (English translation published by the S.P.C.K. in 1936).

evangelistic activity, not only in Athens and the Piræus, but also in many other parts of Greece, which he repeatedly visited to preach and to hear confessions. His kerygma was noted for its biblical and practical character; being simple, lively, and aiming at the edification of the faithful, it made a deep impression, stabbing the souls of men, not only upon simple people, but also upon his educated hearers, all the more because it was the reflection of a life which was holy and perfectly devoted to God.

19. Many times he refused promotion in the priestly office, and his one and only ambition was to contribute successfully to the spiritual regeneration in Christ of the Greek people. In 1907 he decided to accomplish a long cherished plan of his by the foundation in Athens, for that purpose, of a missionary brotherhood of young theologians living a common life with him in the city, which when suitably trained and led should undertake the gradual, gentle and pacific spiritual reform of the Greek people on the basis of Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition, and with the blessing of the Church authorities.

20. The original core of the brotherhood consisted of the young theologians, Dionysios Farazoules (d. 1920), P. Trembelas, now a professor in the university, and D. Panagiotopoulos; to these after a short time there were added the brothers Ignatios Koliopoulos the theologian and John Koliopoulos the lawyer. The brotherhood now numbers about 75 members living a communal life of whom about 25 are clergy and the rest are laymen. Most of the laymen are theologians, but there are some whose degrees are in other sciences. The brotherhood purposes to form the characters of its members into Christian personalities, in accordance with the spirit of the Orthodox Church, and thereby to attain the regeneration of the Greek people in Christ. As means to this great end it uses Catechetical Teaching, the written and spoken kerygma, and the sacrament of confession, all these efforts being centred around frequent Holy Communion. The spoken kerygma is cultivated with great intensity by 50 or more preachers, whose activity extends to the whole of Greece, and to places outside Greece, such as the Dodekanese (before their liberation) and Egypt and Cyprus. It is noteworthy that the successor of the founder in the leadership of the brotherhood, Fr. Seraphim Papakostas, has for 25 years been the preacher of the cathedral church in Athens. With the same zeal the brotherhood cultivates the practice of the sacrament of confession by training members as confessors.

21. Side by side with the spoken kerygma, the written word is cultivated with the same intensity. The brotherhood disposes of its own printing press and publishing house and its own bookshop. From 1911 onwards the chief organ of the brotherhood, the periodical *Zoe*, has circulated without a break; it is issued weekly and is an edifying periodical, now having about 110,000 regular subscribers, scattered in all parts of the world where there are Greeks. Apart from this periodical, other theological and religious books are regularly published, including two series of commentaries on the books of the New Testament, one of a rather more practical character by the founder of *Zoe*, Fr. Evsevios, and the other, of a more theological character, by Professor P. Trembelas. The chief book by Fr. Evsevios, *The*

Destiny of Man, has had eight editions in 35 years. The numerous books of the present leader of the brotherhood, Fr. Seraphim, have a comparable circulation. From 1929 onwards the brotherhood assumed the tasks of a Bible Society, by publishing in the "original" Greek, the texts of the Greek Bible; the Septuagint text of the Old Testament was published twice in 1929 and 1939, and the New Testament was published three times; the third edition in 1939 was in 100,000 copies. In 1926 the brotherhood, in the execution of its programme, turned its attention to young children, and then gradually extended the work done among them to adolescents, aiming mainly at their Christian education through Catechetical Schools or Sunday Schools. For this purpose the brotherhood now employs about 150 male and female catechists, at whose disposal there are special "aids" (or lesson-plans) devised by members of the brotherhood. According to the last statistics there are now functioning in Greece and Cyprus, in the church buildings, 622 catechetical schools (lower, middle, higher, and for working boys and girls) with 90,000 pupils. Members of the brotherhood who are endowed with musical talents have composed some fine religious songs for the pupils of the catechetical schools and for the Christian young people generally, which are being spread far and wide and are sung even in the State schools. In very recent years the brotherhood has turned its attention also to the students in the universities and the other higher educational institutions, and to young people who are already at work; this part of the youth of the country is being provided with special Christian organizations in Athens, Salonika, and other large centres of population. It is also in very recent years that the *School of Higher Education* is functioning under the care of the brotherhood; in this school members of the brotherhood and of the Christian Union of Scientific Men, which co-operates with it, are teaching.

22. The following organizations, consisting of the spiritual children of the brotherhood, should be regarded as the result of these efforts:—

(i) The women's sisterhood, named "Eusebeia," recently founded and having aims similar to those of the corresponding men's brotherhood, "Zoe." "Evseveia," founded a few years ago, has undertaken among other tasks the organization of catechetical schools for girls and young women and the publication of a children's periodical called *The Child's Life*, which, although it has hardly circulated for two years, has a circulation of about 50,000 copies. The same sisterhood provides for the training of some of its members as specialized nurses, and also for the similar training of other women with similar ideas of life. It is preparing for the foundation of a special company of nursing sisters for the care of the sick.

(ii) The association for home missions, named *The Apostle Paul*, consisting of people belonging to the wider circle of the spiritual children of "Zoe." This association was founded in 1926 on the initiative of the founder of "Zoe," with the object of contributing to the spread of the Gospel and the Christian education of the people. The association has a centre in a building in a central position in Athens, No. 14 Karoutsis Street, and there the members worship together in a special chapel and find room in the building for these sister organizations.

(iii) *The Christian Student Union*, founded in 1933, when it was called *The Academic Social League*, and now numbering more than 1,000 members in Athens and Salonika. This association worked with great zeal during the Germano-Italian occupation. Since the country was liberated it has sub-divided itself into teams which have undertaken a missionary campaign in many parts of Greece with many successes.

(iv) *The Pan-Hellenic Association of Christian Parents*, founded in 1935, and having branches in the provinces of Greece. Of this the object is to assist in the work of the Christian upbringing of Greek children and in all efforts to protect them from anti-Christian influences and from temptations to sin. This objective is pursued by regular lectures to parents, by support for catechetical schools, and by the organization of summer camps for children, with a Christian atmosphere.

(v) *The Christian Union of Scientific Men*. This union, founded in 1935, contains representatives of all the branches of learning. Its organ is the periodical called *Aktines*, which has now a circulation of 40,000 and is published by a Christian publishing company named "Damascos." The same publishing company issues the literary works of the members of the Union and of other literary men of the same turn of mind. About the beginning of 1947 the Union published a Manifesto of the Christian Men of Science, which had a circulation of 100,000 copies or more. There the fallacies of unbelieving research and of negative theories in various departments of science were demonstrated, with special reference to the realities of the Greek situation. Furthermore the harmony which has been established between modern science and religion, especially the Christian religion, was shown, as well as the beneficial influence of Christianity in the growth of civilization. This manifesto made a deep impression upon the educated public in Greece. It also circulated in foreign countries in translation and found a favourable reception not only in the church press of other confessions, but also in the foreign scientific world wherever it is Christian.

23. Apart from these movements of an evangelistic character, which have been started by clergy and laity together in the Church of Greece, the following *Lay Movements* should be mentioned. Above all we ought to call to remembrance the evangelistic efforts of the pious Queen Olga, who was of Russian birth (obit. 1926). She was not satisfied with the task of bringing up her own children in the fear and nurture of the Lord and with the initiative she had in the foundation of proper hospitals. She also cared for the arrangements for sermons and for the hearing of confessions in these institutions and the publication of edifying tracts. She took steps for the preparation of a new translation of the Gospels into Modern Greek. The movement which came into existence in connexion with the religious association called "The Three Hierarchs" is also worth mentioning. The association was founded in 1905 by a pious merchant named P. Varybobiotes and has its own periodical, organizes regular lectures in its own building, and publishes edifying books, combining this task with philanthropic work. Here mention should be made of the *Christian Social Union*, founded by a professor of the university in 1932, and comprising well-known men of science, industrialists, merchants, and civil servants of high

rank, as well as distinguished politicians of all political parties. This Union consists of two departments, one of which works in the sphere of Sociology, studying social problems, under the direction of the writer of this study from the point of view of the light given by the Gospel, while the other department working under the direction of Ar. Kouzes, a professor of medicine, is active in the philanthropic field, organizing Night Schools for working-class young people and having founded the *Greek Anti-Cancer Institute*, which is the only one in the Near East. This organization made preparations for the first Pan-Hellenic Conference of Practical Christianity last November, although it was postponed owing to the critical conditions of the country.

24. Another purely lay evangelistic movement which is very interesting is the *Christian Corner*, founded in Athens by Mme. Chrysanthe Makrykostas, a chemist who had studied in London, the daughter of a distinguished Athenian surgeon. Distinguished personalities such as the Minister of Transport, Mr. P. Hadjipanos, and the General Director of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Mr. Ar. Pappas, are numbered among those who have gathered themselves around her and co-operate with her. This movement, which is for the most part composed of people of the upper classes, is supported by university professors of theology and higher clergy. Its evangelistic meetings take place once a week in the great hall of the School of Law in the university of Athens, and also in centres in the housing estates around Athens, and they are regularly attended by many people. This movement was first regarded by some higher clergy as suspect of Protestantism, but now receives the recognition and support of the ecclesiastical authorities, as one operating, with great and fruitful zeal, within the framework of the teaching of the Orthodox Church. It is characteristic of the missionary zeal of this movement and of the confidence which the Church and the people have in it that the "Christian Corner" arranges "missionary journeys," with the blessing of the Church. Thus a year ago it went to Patras, the capital of the Peloponnesos, where a great crowd, headed by the Metropolitan of Patras, attended the organized evangelistic lectures. In May this year (1948) the "Christian Corner" undertook a new "missionary journey" to Navpaktos at the request of the Metropolitan of Navpaktos himself. In addition to the above activities, the same organization is developing a vital evangelistic activity in hospitals, and especially among the lepers of the anti-leprosy station outside Athens, combining with this a provision for their cure through the most modern drugs, sent to the "Christian Corner" by specialized philanthropic organizations concerned with lepers in America.

To be concluded.