



The Orthodox Informer

“For it is a commandment of the Lord not to be silent at a time when the Faith is in jeopardy. Speak, Scripture says, and hold not thy peace.... For this reason, I, the wretched one, fearing the Tribunal, also speak.”

(St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1321)

■ The advancing course of the syncretistic axis of the Vatican, Athens, and the Phanar



Dossier

A. Vatican-Phanar

B. Vatican-Athens

“The foundations of the Faith have been undermined for decades by the panheresy of ecumenism.”

(*Protopresbyter Theodoros Zeses*, *Orthodoxos Typos*, No. 1665 [17 Nov. 2006], p. 1)

“Who is able to suffer these things without sighing? What is incontrovertible has become a matter of doubt.”

(St. Basil the Great, “On the Holy Spirit,” § 70)

THE RECENT occurrences at the Phanar (29-30 November 2006) and the Vatican (14-16 December 2006), involving *ecumenists* from the East and the West, have demonstrated, in the clearest and most forceful possible way, that the panheresy of *ecumenism* has deeply corroded the Orthodox self-awareness of those Shepherds who have embraced the *syncretistic vision* of the anti-Patristic *Encyclical of 1920*, the very foundation and basis of the contemporary *inter-Christian and interfaith movement*.

This corrosion has long been leading these Shepherds “far from the way of the Holy Fathers” (Father Theodoros Zeses, *O. T.*, No. 1670 [22 December 2006], p. 1), since their thoughts, words, and actions run entirely contrary to the **Patristic bequeathal**, which is most lucid in its exhortation to us:



Phanar, 30 November 2006



Vatican, 14 December 2006

“And may you have no communion with the schismatics, and by no means with the heretics”; “for you know how I, too, have turned away from them”; “rather, you should take care to unite yourselves firstly with the Lord and then with the Saints, so that they, also, might receive you as friends and acquaintances in the eternal abodes.””

(St. Anthony the Great, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXVI, col. 969C-972A)

The recent advancement and reinforcement of the *syncretistic axis* of the Vatican, Athens, and the Phanar are finally awakening the volcano of *anti-ecumenism*, and hopeful developments are soon to be expected from the standpoint of *Orthodox resistance* and *walling-off*, especially on the part of the *New Calendarist anti-ecumenists*, for the rallying, at long last, of the truly Orthodox.

In conclusion, all of these things fully justify the stance of the Orthodox *anti-ecumenists*, *following the Calendar of the Fathers*, who have, since 1924, walled themselves off from the ecumenists, resisting the panheresy of syncretism in a God-pleasing manner.

♦ **A series** of texts on the subject, which we will be publishing, demonstrates this *awakening*, the truly Patristic character of which may it preserve to the end,

“for the union and harmony of the Church”; “that the divisions among the Churches might be banished and the bond of peace might join us all together”; “and that we might drive the inventors of vain discourses of innovation far from the precinct of the Church.”

(Seventh Œcumenical Synod, Mansi, Vol. XII, col. 1118E, 1003D; Vol. XIII, col. 404C)

Text A11

Second Open Letter from Athonite Fathers to the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain of Athos *

With a notification
to the Œcumenical Patriarchate

*Criticisms of the Sacred Community's flaccid attitude
towards the colossal apostasy from the Faith*

Holy Abbots and Holy Fathers, *Evlogeite*:

WE feel the need, in this *Second Letter*,** to speak out a second time and to express our most profound sorrow over the two recent *Statements* by the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain, one of which was addressed to the ecclesiastical press and the other to the daily press and the mass media.

A priori, we regard these two *Statements* as having been made in order to reassure and deceive those of us who are disquieted by, and reacting against, the anti-Orthodox and heretical steps taken in our times by Œcumenical Patriarch Bartholomew.

* * *

IN THE first place, the Sacred Community's *Statement* is questionable and inane.

• It is *questionable*, on the one hand, because, though it should have been addressed to the two ringleaders of the panheresy of ecumenism, i.e., Patriarch Bartholomew and Archbishop Christodoulos, it is addressed to the media, as if the media were responsible for the impropriety in question.

Moreover, the cowardice of the Sacred Community in censuring the instigators of the crime—those, that is, who, as bad representatives of the Church, betray the Faith—, is also here revealed. It has turned to the media, theoretically and painlessly proclaiming its

Orthodoxy, which is, of course, doubtful from an Orthodox point of view, for the reasons that we will set forth below.

Note that we, who also sent the *first Open Letter*, have not, as yet, received any response.

• This *Statement* is also *inane*, on the other hand, because the Sacred Community has made such statements and confessions in the past—such as the one dated 9/22 April 1980, which you cite in the *Statement* to the ecclesiastical press—, without, to be sure, producing any substantial result.

Such being the case, we cannot perceive any other purpose in the *Statements*, other than that of quietening us and creating an impression.

* * *

NOW THEN, we wish, by way of confession, to relate to you what was not to our liking about these two Statements, and what actions, in our opinion, it would be advisable for the Sacred Community to take under the present circumstances.

1. So as to praise the Œcumenical Patriarch, but not having found him to have put forth any struggle on behalf of the Faith, or any kind of confession that would produce results, or to have walked, at least to some degree, in the footsteps of the Fathers, you refer to his defence of the rights of the Patriarchate, his support of Orthodox Churches, and his promotion of the message of the Orthodox Church to the world.

All of these things—forgive us—are pious loquacities.

And as for the promotion of the Orthodox message to the world, we believe that what you state is deception and falsehood. Unless, of course, you consider joint prayers and ceremonies with heretics, the recognition of the mysteries of heretics, and even ecological concern for the environment to be a promotion of the Orthodox message.

2. You then state that you live the mystery of the Church and preserve your dogmatic conscience as the apple of your eye. At this point, you invoke the struggles of the Confessors for the Faith, and especially the Athonite Saint, Gregory Palamas, and the Athonite Monk-Martyrs, who were put to death by the Latin-minded Patriarch John Bekkos.

Holy Fathers, it is, at this point, a matter of wonder how you can live the mystery of the Church while commemorating a heretical Patriarch, and how you invoke the Holy Fathers who contested under Bekkos, which Fathers were put to death precisely because they did not commemorate or recognize Patriarch John Bekkos, who had fallen into Papism.

The great St. Gregory Palamas, also an Athonite, does not recognize as belonging to the Church of Christ one who does not possess the truth and does not confess it in word and deed, may he be a monk, Abbot, Bishop, or Patriarch:

“For those who are of the Church of Christ are of the truth; and those who are not of the truth are not of the Church of Christ, and all the more do they deceive themselves by calling themselves and one another **holy shepherds and chief shepherds**. For we have been taught that Christianity is characterized not by persons, but by the truth and exactitude of Faith” (E. Π. E., Vol. III, p. 608).

- How, then, is it possible for the Patriarch to belong to the true Orthodox Church—he, who recently performed this *theatrical act* with the Pope, on the Feast Day of the Holy Apostle Andrew, in Constantinople, and who regards our forefathers, who created the schism with the Papists, as having been deluded? Because the Patriarch has stated:

“...Our forefathers, who bequeathed the split to us, were hapless victims of the serpent, the author of evil, and are already in the hands of God, the Just Judge. We beseech God’s mercy on their behalf, but we ought, before God, to redress their errors.” (*Episkepsis*, No. 563 [30 November 1998], p. 6)

- How is he, who participates in the WCC and, in short, is a champion and pioneer of the heresy of ecumenism, Orthodox?

- We must also note that your phrase, “*We preserve our dogmatic conscience as the apple of our eye*,” is not sound, because the dogmatic conscience of each person, or of many as a whole, may depart from the truth, even if, as you say, it is edified by Orthodox Patristic texts; this is something that frequently occurs.

You should have said that “we preserve the dogmatic conscience

of the Orthodox Church as the apple of our eye,” which is, of course, expressed by Holy Scriptures, the Holy Synods, and the Holy Fathers.

3. You state that:

“we fear to keep silent whenever an issue arises that concerns the legacy of the Fathers.”



We must, again, raise an objection here.

At least in the last few years, when the Sacred Community speaks and when it keeps silent, it all amounts to one and the same thing. Because when it speaks, it speaks without taking risks, in a lukewarm and impersonal manner, with obsequious submission to persons, and not simply with respect for institutions. It primarily speaks with the rigid criterion that it not fall in the estimation of the ecclesiastical and political rulers and the mighty of the world, in such a way that there may be no consequences for what it says.

In a word, it shoots with blank cartridges, rather like the fireworks that are heard at New Year’s, which create an external effect, but which no one fears.

Needless to say, the Holy Fathers did not speak in such a manner, nor did they thus defend the truths of the Faith.

4. You also state that:

“The Pope was received as if he were the canonical Bishop of Rome.”

We think that, on this point, Patriarch Bartholomew is more honest than the Sacred Community, because he acted in accordance with that which he believes about the Pope, during the highly ceremonial Divine Liturgy, before the eyes of the whole world.

He addresses the Pope as his beloved brother in Christ, recog-

nizes the validity of his mysteries, considers those who protected us from the Papal heresy to be hapless victims of the Devil, placed the Pope on a high throne during the Divine Liturgy of the Patronal Feast, etc.

What else, holy Fathers, did he need to do to consider him to be the canonical Bishop of Rome?

- The problem, however, is a different one, and herein lies the lack of sincerity on the part of the Sacred Community.

That is, the Faith of the Patriarch is shared, in essence, by all of those who commemorate him, in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Fathers and the Tradition of the Church.

We remind you of the words of the Athonite Monk-Martyrs—whom you say that you particularly revere and honor—, who point out to the Latin-minded Emperor Michael VIII:

“For the Orthodox Church of God, from of old, considers the commemoration of the name of the Bishop in the sanctuary to be **perfect communion** with him. For it is written in the explanation of the Divine Liturgy that the celebrant commemorates the name of his Bishop, showing both his submission to his superior and that he is a participant with, and successor to, him in the Faith and the Divine Mysteries.”

From the foregoing confession of the Athonite Monk-Martyrs and from the entire liturgical tradition of the Church, it becomes clear that, in matters of Faith, the Sacred Community identifies itself with the Patriarch with regard to the Pope, the World Council of Churches, ecumenism, etc.

By extension, Fathers, in making this lukewarm protest to the mass media, you are attempting to extinguish the conflagration of heresy with a watering-can.

5. Further on in the Statement, you assert that the Troparia chanted to the Pope were not composed by an Athonite monk. You affirm this, of course, so as to deny the information given by the media.

We must, here again, stress the following points.

Everyone saw on television that the representative of the Patri-

archate, the Great Protopresbyter Dr. Georgios Tsetses, was present during the live broadcast of the events, explaining and commenting on what was taking place. Thus, if this were a matter of misinformation on the part of the media, the Priest in question should have corrected it and been the first to issue a denial, since he is considered to be knowledgeable about everything that goes on at the Patriarchate.

Moreover, how is the Sacred Community so sure that the Troparia were not composed by an Athonite monk, since it is apparent from the Community's comments that it is speaking conjecturally:

*"We take the opportunity to inform the pious Christians that the composer [of the Troparia] is not, **and could not be**, an Athonite monk."*

- Clearly apparent here, again, is the Sacred Community's cowardice in censuring its superiors, such that the truth might be revealed; that is, that the composer be named and the denials not be necessary.

This is, however, surprising, Fathers: How is it that you were so offended by the matter of the composer of the *Troparia*, reckoning it an insult to the Holy Mountain that the composer should be an Athonite monk, but you were not offended by the contents of the *Troparia*, and that honors due to a Saint were rendered to the Pope? For *Troparia* are only chanted to Saints, never to the living, even should they be in all things Orthodox and holy.

How, then, do you judge the Patriarch's addressing the Pope with the exclamation "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," which refers to Christ? And how do you judge the *Troparia* that were sung to him?

"The city of Constantinople, the lampstand of the First-called, celebrateth this radiant Feast, receiving the Primate of the venerable Roman Church, the See of the Chief Disciple. With a disposition of brotherly love, and from the heart let us pray joyously: Abide in us, O Comforter, leading us to Thy truth, that we might glorify Thee in unison, with one mouth and one heart"

and

“The all-honorable vessel of Orthodoxy now taketh delight in receiving the venerable Shepherd and Primate from the West; and it rejoiceth, offering an auspicious sacrifice of praise, piously beseeching Christ: Safeguard Thy world by Thy power, preserving it in harmony, as Thou art Supremely Good.”

Is this just a simple matter of verbal irregularity, or do these words demonstrate the depth of the Patriarch’s corrosion and the steamrolling of everything in Orthodoxy?

We, the signatories, personally believe the latter. Our view is strengthened by the fact that all of these things were said at such a sacred moment, under the eyes of the entire world, to the greatest enemy of Orthodoxy throughout the ages: to him who has warred against Orthodoxy for ten centuries; to him who, by means of the Unia, has latinized countless multitudes of Orthodox; to him who has aspired to become God on earth.

- Members of the Sacred Community, are you content with issuing a denial over the matter of the composer of the *Troparia*, without realizing—and yet saying that you live the mystery of the Church—that we, the Orthodox, *in unanimity* chanted these *Troparia* to the Pope and, through the Patriarch, exclaimed “blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord”; and we exchanged the kiss of peace with him, whom St. Kosmas of Aitolia said that we must curse as an antichrist and cause of evil; and we chanted the *Polychronion* to him, that he might have many years in which to fulfill his plans for world domination; and, finally, we permitted him to bless the Christian *pleroma*, that he might show his authority over it, and we, our complete submission to him who cometh in



“his own name”?

It should be noted, here, that the *Troparia* in question had been published by the press before the Patronal Feast at which they were chanted (see *Βήμα Κυριακής* [Bema Kyriakes], 26 November 2006); this demonstrates, on the one hand, the Patriarch’s desire and zeal to tread the path of apostasy; and, on the other hand, that rudimentary standards of decency and restraint have now vanished, in such a way that the most unlawful things, which lead to the Antichrist, are promoted with the greatest of ease.

- And something else, before we finish dealing with hymnological stunts and verbal courtesies:

The Sacred Community surely knows that during the Patriarch’s visit to the Monastery of Karakallou, a few days before the *theater* of the Patronal Feast in Constantinople, the monastery Fathers chanted *Megalynaria* to their grand visitor that were especially composed in his honor, evidently by an Athonite monk. We would like to learn how your dogmatic conscience—which you preserve as the apple of your eye, as you say—judges this event.

6. It is true that, in the places where you touch on Papal errors and deviations, you speak with the mouth of truth. Any believer could relate these things, and unfortunately many others, about the wretched state and fall of Papism.

What is incomprehensible is this: How can the hobnobbing among Orthodox and Papists at an ecclesiastical and liturgical level be justified, as also the acquiescence with those who have fallen away and apostatized from the body of Christ?

The words of St. John Chrysostomos on the subject are revealing:

“He who reconciles with the enemies of the king cannot be a friend of the king, and is not even granted his life, but goes to perdition with the enemies.”

- At this point, we must also note, with regret, the words of the Sacred Community, which we believe show the whole intention of the *Statement*:

“In addition [the things that the Patriarch and Archbishop are doing] impel certain of the faithful and pious Orthodox—who

are disquieted by all the inopportune things that are happening, which go against the Sacred Canons—to cut themselves off from the body of the Church, thereby creating new schisms”!

Really, Fathers, how can cutting oneself off from a heretically-minded Bishop, Metropolitan, or Patriarch be understood as cutting oneself off from the body of the Church and creating new schisms?

If you reckon this cutting off as such, then we must stress to you that your dogmatic conscience is suffering from the Papal disease.

You must also—if, of course, you believe the foregoing—disavow a multitude of Saints and Confessors, who cut themselves off from heretical Bishops and Patriarchs, and you must especially disavow those Athonite Monk-Martyrs who cut themselves off from the Latin-minded Patriarch John Bekkos; that is, those whom you confess in your *Statement* that you honor and revere.

And, of course, you must disavow all of those who, in recent times, ceased commemorating Patriarch Athenagoras, on account of the notorious *Lifting of the Anathemas*.

You must also strike out two Sacred Canons from the *Pedalion*: the Thirty-first Apostolic Canon and the Fifteenth Canon of the First-Second Synod under St. Photios.

So, then, according to New Age theology—which, to be sure, differs in nothing from Papal theology—in order not to be cut off from the Church and not to create new schisms, we must submit ourselves to heretics and commemorate John Bekkos, Athenagoras, Bartholomew, Christodoulos, and so on and so forth.

If, Fathers, this were a teaching of the Church, then the Church would be anthropocentric and it would not have truth as its criterion, but rather the opinion of the Bishop, as is the case in Papism. Then the struggles unto blood of the Fathers for the Faith would not be necessary, since this Faith would be expressed by the mouth of the *Proestos*, to whom all must submit themselves.

Finally, if this theology existed, then Orthodoxy would long have ceased to exist, since it would have been banished by the errors of the Bishops and the relaxed vigilance of the Orthodox.

- By everything you say in your *Statement*, it is obvious that you fully justify the attitude of the Sacred Community towards the persecuted Fathers of the Monastery of Esphigmenou.

Truly, how can your dogmatic conscience permit you to side with the persecutors, when you know that these Fathers ceased commemorating and broke off ecclesiastical communion with the heretically-minded Patriarch for reasons of Faith?

- It is, moreover, a fact that since the Holy Mountain has been included in European programs and you draw on economic packages from Europe and have European leanings, you are unable to utter a word of Orthodox protest and resistance, but instead you will always grovel and submit yourselves to your patrons.

It is lamentable that, in order to repair and restore our monasteries, we have abandoned their Protectress, the *Panagia*, and have scurried to the sinful and easy money of Europe, demolishing the boundaries set by the Holy Fathers.

We all know, however, that no one gives anything without demanding something in return. And the Holy Mountain is already paying for its lack of faith in God and its attachment to European plans.

7. Towards the end of your *Statement*, among other things, you proclaim the following:

“So long as the aim of dialogue with the heterodox is to inform them about the Orthodox Faith, such that, having become receptive to Divine illumination and their eyes having been opened, they return to the Orthodox Faith, this dialogue is not reprehensible.

It is equally lamentable, Fathers, that, although dialogue with the heterodox has been conducted for nearly forty years now, you have still not understood its aim. And if *you* have not understood it, what can we expect from the simple Christian laity?

Have you perhaps not realized that, for so many years, the Papists, on the one hand, have not budged an inch from their errors, while we, on the other hand, daily yield to, and are suffocated by, the tight embrace of the Papal beast?

Have you not understood that the only thing that dialogues with the heterodox have achieved is the division among the Orthodox—just as was once the case with the [Synods of] Florence and Fer-

rara—into unionists and anti-unionists, or more precisely, into the Orthodox and the Latin-minded?



• You state in the end that

“...they may give the impression that our Orthodox Church recognizes Roman Catholics as a complete Church and the Pope as the canonical Bishop of Rome.”

Just what do you mean by the term “complete Church”?

Perhaps that is to say that we recognize Papists as a Church, but not as a complete Church? As for us, we know that Rome was a Church before the Schism, but after the Schism it fell and is no longer a Church.

We believe that your phrases “complete Church” and “canonical Bishop of Rome” usher in *new demons*.

8. In conclusion, you state that:

“By the Grace of God, the Holy Mountain remains faithful to the Faith of the Holy Apostles and the Holy Fathers.”

We believe that, after everything that has been said, in order for the Holy Mountain to remain faithful to the Holy Apostles and the Holy Fathers, it must distance itself from the current Patriarch, who thinks and acts heretically.

And the way indicated by the Fathers in this circumstance is to cease commemoration. But as you remain united in the commemoration of the current Patriarch, it is nonsense to maintain that you are struggling for the Faith of the Holy Apostles and the Holy Fathers.

* * *

WE WOULD like, in what follows, to set forth advisable actions that, in our opinion, the Sacred Community should have taken, that its stance might truly be one of Confession and in accordance with Patristic Tradition.

a) The Sacred Community should long ago have rigorously censured the Patriarch, who is floundering in the Faith, as we are all,

through ecclesiastical unity, a party to his actions.

For, in accordance with the confession of the Saints whom you revere and invoke in your *Statement*, the Athonite Monk-Martyrs who contested under Bekkos,

“This is why the greater sins enter in, because the smaller have not been given the necessary correction; and just as the bodies of those who ignore their wounds give rise to fever, decay, and death, so it is also with souls. Those who ignore small things usher in the greater; for if those who endeavored to bypass Divine laws and alter something small had been given the necessary correction from the outset, this plague would not have been born, and such a great tempest would not have overcome the Church; **for he that overturns even the slightest part of the healthy Faith contaminates everything.**”

The evil began with the heretical *Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of 1920*; was continued with the *calendar change*; was aggravated by entry into the Babylon of the *World Council of Churches*; degenerated into a cancerous growth with the *Lifting of the Anathemas*; was transformed, by means of the *theological dialogue*, into a *theater of shadows*; became gangrenous with the *recognition of the heretical Mysteries of the Monophysites, in Chambésy, in 1990*; of the Papists, in Balamand, in 1993; and, recently, of the Lutherans, in Constantinople; and finally led up to grandiose *liturgical jamborees* of heretical leaders, so that the submission of Orthodoxy to the principles of the *New Age* might be officially demonstrated.

• **Spiritual death comes about thereby; that is, all of those who take part, actively or tacitly, in the planned apostasy that leads to the Antichrist, are cut off from the age-old body of the Church.**

b) Next, since the Œcumenical Patriarchate has continued in its spiritual fall, the Sacred Community should have long ago ecclesiastically distanced itself from it by ceasing commemoration, in such a way that it would be in security and in unbroken communion with the age-old Church, just as those who contested under Bekkos acted, and, more recently, the majority of Athonite **Fathers under**

Patriarch Athenagoras, who ceased commemorating him on account of the *Lifting of the Anathemas*.

c) The Holy Mountain should not have fallen into the trap of European economic subsidizations, so that, on the one hand, its monks might live in poverty and simplicity, and, on the other hand, so that they might be able to speak freely, boldly censuring wrongdoings within and without the Church.

• **This economic enslavement of the Holy Mountain is the *coup de grâce* in its dogmatic fall.**

d) The entire Holy Mountain should be unified in its opposition to heresy, lest it become an object of ridicule and scandal in the eyes of the world, because of the divisions and infighting among the monks.

e) We, the signatories, believe that you, the members of the Sacred Community, have been given an opportunity, by reason of the provocative theatrical performance that took place during the past Patronal Feast at the Phanar, to awaken and to desist from the inertia that you have hitherto displayed. But we were disappointed once again, when we read the lukewarm and inane Statements, which were evidently made to reassure the monks who are disquieted over the course of the Holy Mountain.

• We already made it clear to you in our first *Letter* that, if you make no effort to follow the way of the Holy Apostles, the Holy Fathers, and the Œcumenical Synods, we will do what is pleasing to God and not what is pleasant.

• We notify you that, if you do not give a fittingly Orthodox reply to the Patriarch, who is deviating from, and abrogating, the Sacred Canons, we will consider whether we should be in ecclesiastical communion with the Sacred Community and the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

Hopeful that this letter will contribute towards a reconsideration of your ecclesiastical and dogmatic positions with regard to the ecumenists and, finally, towards your alignment with the Holy Fathers, we remain in expectation.

* * *

Since a collection of signatures from the entire Holy Mountain is not feasible, the first signatures follow by way of illustration. We believe that those confessing Orthodoxy add their signatures.

The signatories:

Elder Hilarion, Monk, Xerokalyvo Platani, Monastery of Docheiariou

Gabriel, Monk, of the Koutloumoussiou Kellion of St. Christodoulos

Elder Meletios, Monk, Nativity of the Theotokos

Elder Nikodemos, Monk, Kellion of St. Nektarios, Kapsala, Monastery of Stavroniketa

Dositheos, Monk, Kouloumoussiou Kathisma (Leivadi)

Elder Savvas, Kellion of the Holy Archangels (of Savvas), Monastery of Hilarandar

Elder Isaac, Kellion of the Nativity of the Theotokos, Monastery of Stavroniketa

Elder Vlasios, Monk, Xerokalyvo Viglas, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Elder Isaiab, Monk, Kellion of the Nativity of the Theotokos, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Georgios, Monk, Kellion of the Dormition of the Theotokos

Elder Kosmas, Monk, Kalyve of St. Demetrios, Skete of St. Anna, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Markellos, Monk, Kalyve of St. Demetrios, Skete of St. Anna, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Athanasios, Monk, Kalyve of St. Demetrios, Skete of St. Anna, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Elder Spyridon, Monk, Kellion of St. Nicholas, Monastery of Koutloumoussiou

Elder Onouphrios, Monk, Kellion of the Dormition of the Theotokos, Karyes

Parthenios, Monk, Kellion of St. Anthony, Skete of St. Anna, Monastery of the Great Lavra

Elder Nicholas, Monk, Kellion of St. Nicholas, Karyes

Elder Antonios, Monk, Kellion of the Dormition of the Theotokos, Monastery of Pantokrator

Elder Pavlos, Monk, Kellion of the Holy Apostles, Xenophontine Skete

Christophoros, Monk, Kellion of the Holy Apostles, Xenophontine Skete

* * *

Archimandrite Kyrillos, Abbot of the Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Evstratios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Arsenios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Nektarios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Ignatios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Raphael, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Michael, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Mardarios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

Antonios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki
Tychon, Hieromonk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki
Pachomios, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki
Lukas, Monk, Hesychasterion of Pantokrator, Melissochori, Thessaloniki

* * *

Archimandrite Euthymios, Ambelakia, Larisa
Archimandrite Emmanouel Kalyvas, Preacher for the Archdiocese of Athens
Nikolaos I. Soteropoulos, Theogian and Philologist
Ioannes Kornarakes, Professor Emeritus at the University of Athens

* * *

Editorial note by Orthodoxos Typos: *While Orthodoxos Typos was going to press, three monks requested that their signatures be withdrawn, because they subsequently found the document to be harsh on the points regarding the Monastery of Esphigmenou, the allocations by the European Union, and the danger of schism. Orthodoxos Typos withdrew them, despite the fact that it had the document for weeks and was waiting for the “green light” to publish it. One of the monks that withdrew his signature was one of the two leading lights in the movement for the collection of signatures. The names were withdrawn on the morning of 21 March.*



(*) **Sources:** *Orthodoxos Typos*, No. 1682 (23 March 2007) pp. 1 and 5. *Publication lay-out ours.*

(**) See the First Open Letter: [*In an Open Letter to the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain, Monks Call for a Cessation of the Commemoration of the Ecumenical Patriarch*](#), *Orthodoxos Typos*, No. 1671 (5 January 2007), pp. 1 and 5; *Stylos Orthodoxias*, No. 74 (December 2006), pp. 12-13.