

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 Græca*, Vol. xcix, col. 1321)

“Walling-Off from the Ecumenists Is a Matter of Urgency Envisaged by the Holy Fathers”

*By His Grace, Bishop Cyprian of Oreoi,
Acting President of the Holy Synod in Resistance*

At the Holy Synod of Bishops of the official innovationist (New Calendar) Church of Greece a year ago (October 2009), Metropolitan Hierotheos of Naupaktos and Hagios Blasios delivered a noteworthy address entitled: “The Synodal Functioning of the Hierarchy, of the Standing Holy Synod, and of the Synodal Secretariats.”¹

In the section “Problems of Bureaucracy,” His Eminence asserts that “the issues chosen for examination at the Synod of Bishops ought to be consistent with the issues discussed by the Synod of the Holy Apostles² and by local and Ecumenical Synods, that is, theological and canonical issues that pertain to faith and order, to dogma, to canonical structure, and to the character of the members of the Church,” expressing the

¹ The address was posted on October 20, 2009 on the website Amen.gr: <http://www.amen.gr/index.php?mod=news&op=article&aid=788>.

² See Acts 15:6-35.

opinion of many Hierarchs: “that at meetings of the Synod of Bishops... academic issues are raised, mostly for the sake of having something to talk about.”

In support of his opinion, so distressing to us, Metropolitan Hierotheos cites the following example: “Why is it that at practically every Synod meeting there is a report on financial matters—which as such is necessary, since there ought to be transparency and good management in this regard—while at the same time no information is given to the Hierarchy by the relevant Synodal commission about inter-Orthodox and inter-Christian affairs? What is important for the Church? Financial matters, or the various inter-Orthodox, inter-Christian, and inter-faith dialogues, in which the faith and life of the local Church ought to be expressed?”

His Eminence continues: “In my opinion, our Synodal system of government is not functioning properly when inter-Christian and inter-Orthodox statements are signed without the knowledge of the members of the Hierarchy and without a Synodal resolution.”

* * *

The adulteration of the Synodal system of Church government by the Hierarchy of the innovationist, ecumenist New Calendar Church has been quite apparent—as one may indeed ascertain “in several and various ways”³—since the founding of the modern Greek state, but nowhere more so than with regard to the inter-Christian and interfaith movement, that is, the ecumenical movement (1920–).

In October of 2009, this very Hierarchy displayed, by common admission, its inability to confront head-on the ecclesiological heresy proclaimed by Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Messenia, which he submitted to the Synod in writing, to the effect that “the Church of Christ was

³ Hebrews 1:1.

one and undivided before the Schism, but is today divided, since we are in schism, as confirmed by paragraph 41 of the Ravenna Statement.”⁴

Would it, one wonders, have been so difficult for the Synod of Bishops to declare what is perfectly self-evident, to wit, that “by virtue of this ecclesiological statement” of the Metropolitan of Messenia “the dogmatic truth of the Church is fundamentally altered” and that this “statement” constitutes a “grave ecclesiological blunder”?⁵

In any event, the catholic conscience of the Church places “a legitimate and timely question” before the ecumenists: “With what sense of the Orthodox Church’s self-understanding do her representatives approach bilateral theological dialogue? ...Does our Orthodox Church approach it through her representatives as the ‘ONE, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,’ or as a divided Church that seeks its ontological unity in a union with heterodox who have at different times broken away from her?”⁶

* * *

The adulteration of the Synodal polity of the Church by the ecumenist Hierarchy of the Church of Greece, or, more precisely, their forfeiture of Apostolic, Patristic, and Synodal Tradition, is even more evident in our gloomy days, in which, as someone has very correctly written, “The ecumenists have become utterly audacious and their impieties glaring and brazen; they are no longer surreptitious.”⁷

For,

⁴ “Βόμβα’ κατά τοῦ Μεσσηνιαῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Καθηγητοῦ κ. Δ. Τσελεγγίδη” [A “bomb” hurled against the Metropolitan of Messenia by Prof. Demetrios Tselengides], *Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, No. 1841 (July 23, 2010), pp. 1, 7; see also “Απάντηση του καθηγητή Δ. Τσελεγγίδη στὸ Μητροπολίτη Μεσσηνιαῖς Χρυσόστομο Σαββάτο” [Response of Prof. D. Tselengides to Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Messenia], http://www.impantokratoros.gr/tselegidis_apanthsh_messhnias.print.el.aspx.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Panagiotēs Semates, “Οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι Ἐνώπιον Ἐνῶπιω πρὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τοῦ Οἰκουμενισμοῦ – Ἡ Ὁμολογία τῶν Ἁγίων Πατέρων καὶ τὸ καθῆκον τῶν συγχρόνων Ἐπισκόπων” [Bish-

whereas the Holy Synod has dealt with hundreds of cases of newfangled ‘heresies,’ and has published lists which include the most insignificant heretical groups (many of which number just a few dozens of adherents), concerning the major heresy of ecumenism, in the bosom of which are clergy of all degrees in the Church hierarchy, there prevails the ‘deafening silence of a tomb’.... However, when questions of finance and taxation are raised (as happened two weeks ago), an extraordinary Synod of Bishops is convoked in a flash. Is the Faith of Christ, therefore, a lower priority and the pressing and lingering problem of the heresy of ecumenism a matter of no importance, while property and money have a higher priority?⁸

* * *

In March of 2010, a lengthy article by the well-known theologian Panagiotēs Semates saw the light of publication. This article bears the striking title, “Walling-Off from the Ecumenists Is a Matter of Urgency Envisaged by the Holy Fathers,” with the following explanatory byline: “A Response to Articles and Comments on Suspending Commemoration and Walling-Off.”⁹

This anti-ecumenist theologian presumably supports Orthodox walling-off, as is evident from the conclusion of his article, which is, however, not phrased with sufficient care and contains inexact references to the “schismatic ranks of the Old Calendarists”:

The Priest who ceases to commemorate his Bishop (with all that this entails) and the believer who walls himself off from such a Bishop, following the Fathers, are safeguarding themselves from the pollution of heresy. For this reason, among others, the Fathers (observing the words of Christ Himself, Who does not wish for any concession in matters of Faith) were so strict towards heretics and those who commune ecclesiastically with heretics, since

ops in the face of the heresy of ecumenism: The Confession of the Holy Fathers and the duty of Bishops in our day], *Κοσμάς Φλαμιᾶτος*, No. 1 (March-April 2010), pp. 23-26.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ See the website “Apoteichise,” March 23, 2010: <http://apotixisi.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2010-03-27T00:43:45%3A00%2B02%3A00&max-results=5>.

such communion has a direct bearing on our salvation and on preserving the Faith undefiled.¹⁰

Professor P. Semates, indirectly underscoring—though uncommonly emphatically—the dolorous truth that the adulteration of the Synodal system by the ecumenist Hierarchy of the State Church is an indisputable reality, and one with soteriological repercussions for us (“Today, however, things have changed radically”), concludes:

No human power, it appears, is capable of halting the escalation of ecumenism. The heretical opinions spouted a few months ago by the Metropolitan of Messenia at the Synod of Bishops (October 2009) are still fresh in our minds; apart from the protest by the Metropolitan of Peiræus [Seraphim—*Trans.*], there was no other official reaction.... Indeed, the Bishops ultimately entrust the Metropolitan in question to represent us in dialogues with heretics, whose very ideas he advocated and promoted at the Synod!¹¹

* * *

The New Calendarist anti-ecumenists are waiting in vain for a reaction from the Synod against ecumenism: first, because they are committed to ecumenism by virtue of pan-Orthodox Synodal consultations based on the ecumenist Patriarchal Encyclical of 1920; and secondly, because they are unable, or not eager, to confront this panheresy in the person of its ringleaders.

Just recently, Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople, while extolling the personality of the not-very-Orthodox Patriarch Athenagoras († July 7, 1972 [New Style]) at his annual Memorial Service at Kontoskali, in Constantinople (Church of St. Kyriake, July 7, 2010 [New Style]), proclaimed for the umpteenth time the heresy of the “invisible unity” between Orthodox and heretics, which is founded, as is well known, on ecumenical “Baptismal theology”.¹²

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² See our article “Participation in the ‘World Council of Churches’ as an Ecclesiological Heresy,” at http://www.synodinresistance.org/Theology_en/E3a2026PSE-Airesis.pdf.

“The Church is one and unique and united before the Triune God, in the Name of Whom all of her members are baptized, thereby obtaining their justification, regardless of the Confession to which they belong, united with Christ and with each other in a single body, which cannot be divided into a plurality of bodies,”¹³ and the work of the World Council of Churches is “to call the Churches to the goal of visible unity” (“Constitution” [of the WCC], III.1).¹⁴

Patriarch Bartholomew, the chief Orthodox representative of the heresy of ecumenism, reiterated that “The Church which Christ founded, the Church of the Symbol of Faith, has never ceased to be one. We Christians are divided and want to return to the visible unity of the Church. For this reason we struggle and fervently support the Theological Dialogue between Rome and Orthodoxy.”¹⁵

* * *

The New Calendarist anti-ecumenists, if they want to be consistent with the catholic conscience of the Church, must finally surmount their dilemmas and, unimpeded by the multifarious weaknesses of the Old Calendarists, strike a fundamental blow against the heresy of ecumenism by walling themselves off in an Orthodox manner.

See also Bishop Klemes of Gardikion, “The Ecumenist Heresy of the ‘Invisible Unity’ of the Church,” Presentation at the Fourteenth Convocation for Orthodox Awareness” (Sunday of Orthodoxy, Athens, February 27, 2006), http://www.synodinresistance.org/Annals_en/E2a1079KyrOrtho6-keimena.pdf.

¹³ Ioannes N. Karmires, *Δογματικῆς Τιμῆμα Ε’—Ἡ Ὁρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησιολογία* [Dogmatic Theology, Part v: Orthodox Ecclesiology] (Athens: 1973), p. 241.

¹⁴ Basileios T. Stavrides and Evangelia A. Barella, *Ἱστορία τῆς Οἰκουμενικῆς Κινήσεως* [History of the Ecumenical Movement] (Vol. XLVII in *Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων*; Thessalonica: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1996), p. 370; Great Protopresbyter Georgios Tsetses, *Οἰκουμενικὰ Ἀνάλεκτα – Συμβολὴ στὴν Ἱστορία τοῦ Παγκοσμίου Συμβουλίου Ἐκκλησιῶν* [Ecumenical Gleanings: A Contribution to the History of the World Council of Churches] (Katerine: Ekdoseis “Tertios,” 1987), p. 114.

¹⁵ “Πατριάρχης Βαρθολομαῖος: Ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία δὲν φοβᾶται τὸ Διάλογο” [Patriarch Bartholomew: Orthodoxy Does Not Fear Dialogue], <http://www.amen.gr/index.php?mod=news&op=article&aid=2807>.

They have delayed longer than they should have; their responsibility before God is incalculable; and their dilatoriness is contributing to the consolidation and reinforcement of ecumenism, which, “ever spawns innovations”¹⁶ and assaults the immune system of the Body of the Church, and indeed, its most vital organ: to wit its Patristic conciliarity.

August 19, 2010 (Old Style)
Holy Martyr Andrew the Commander
Afterfeast of the Dormition of the Theotokos



¹⁶ St. John Chrysostomos, “Homily v on II St. Timothy,” *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXII, col. 626.