

MONOGRAPHIC SUPPLEMENT SERIES
NUMBER V

CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS

**ORTHODOX TRADITION
AND MODERNISM**

**Translated from the Greek by
Patrick G. Barker**



**CENTER FOR TRADITIONALIST
ORTHODOX STUDIES**

Etna, California 96027

1992

From the Greek original, published in Athens
by "Orthodoxos Typos" Editions, 1971.

A Monographic Supplement to
Orthodox Tradition (ISSN 0742-4019)
Copyright 1992 by
Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies

About the Author

Professor Constantine Cavarnos, a distinguished contemporary philosopher, Byzantinist, and Orthodox thinker, received his education at Harvard University. Twice a Fulbright scholar and a former Sheldon Traveling Fellow in Philosophy at Harvard, Dr. Cavarnos has taught at a number of American colleges and universities and is now President of the Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. His countless books and articles on Orthodox spirituality form an indispensable body of materials for the sober student of the Orthodox Church, its history, and its ethos. He has been an advisor to the Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, from which he holds the Licentiate in Orthodox Theological Studies *honoris causa*, since its inception.

The Translator

Patrick G. Barker completed his B.A. (honors) degree at Cambridge University, an M.A. degree at the Pennsylvania State University, the M.A. and M.L.S. degrees at the University of Pittsburgh, and the Licentiate in Orthodox Theological Studies at the Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, where he is now a research associate. Mr. Barker is at present a post-graduate student at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley.

PREFACE TO THE GREEK EDITION
(1971)

"Orthodoxos Typos" Editions takes joy in delivering to the public a lecture by Mr. Constantine Cavarinos, a Professor of Philosophy in the U.S.A., "Orthodox Tradition and Modernism," which was delivered in the auditorium of the Archaeological Society of Athens on May 27, 1970, under the aegis of the Panhellenic Orthodox Union.

We have here a study of instructional character and of great value, because it constitutes a responsible view, through which misconceived modernism is condemned. It is condemned on the basis of the Fathers and of Orthodox theologians, since it aims at the annihilation of Sacred Tradition, whereby the Orthodox Church would be rendered powerless and would degenerate into a simple, feeble and despiritualized worldly form.

In this study, the essence and importance of Tradition are stressed, the so-called "Ecumenical Movement" is denounced as a dreadful hodgepodge of innovations and heresies, a frightful syncretism which aims to overthrow the entire Divine edifice that is called the Orthodox Christian Church, and to erect in its place the new Tower of Babel. Moreover, in this study an admirable interpretation, a content of genuine Orthodox spirituality, is given to the idea of modernization.

Let it be noted, finally, as proof of the value of the published lecture, that Constantine Cavarinos was born in Boston, America, and was trained, educated and lives in the West; in spite of this, however, "he is *par excellence* a representative of the ardent intellectual, who takes a clear position in the face of the problems of the Greek people.... He openly defends the Hellenic-Christian tradition, hurling thunderbolts at the architects of the de-Hellenization of Orthodoxy." He has taught at various universities in America and today, as a *savant*, he constitutes not just a precious asset of Panhellenic merit, but is also a most

fervent advocate of Orthodox Tradition.

Let it be noted that Dr. Cavarnos deals briefly with the topic of Ecumenism, because two weeks earlier there was a lecture by Mr. Constantine Mouratidis, Professor at the University of Athens, in which from the same rostrum of the Archaeological Society the topic was developed in very great detail.

In delivering such a study to the public, then, we have confidence that we are contributing positively to the defense of the Orthodox conscience of our people.

ORTHODOX TRADITION AND MODERNISM¹

I

Introduction

*Most Reverend Metropolitans,
Very Reverend Archimandrites,
Reverend Fathers,
Ladies and Gentlemen:*

Great ignorance and confusion exists today among the Orthodox as to what exactly is this thing that is called Tradition, what is the relation of the Orthodox Church to it, and what is that of the heterodox, and whether it is possible for the Orthodox Church to remain faithful to Tradition and at the same time to be "modernized." A result of this ignorance and confusion is the confusion and disturbance which exist among the Orthodox, the disregard and disdain for Tradition on the part of many, and the projection of mistaken, dangerous and subversive views. It is urgent, then, that this topic be studied very attentively. Only when this happens, and the correct answers are given and passed on, will it be possible for mutual understanding, unanimity and peace to come about among the Orthodox, and for the great danger, which Orthodoxy faces today from all kinds of plotters against her, to be put off.

For one to deal adequately with such an important and broad topic, he must write a book of many pages. In my address tonight I shall simply sketch the most important points of the topic, and I shall give examples, so that as far as possible what I will say in general about Tradition and about modernism may be more comprehensible and useful. To be precise, I shall explain *what*

¹A lecture at the auditorium of the "Archaeological Society" of Athens, which was organized by the "Panhellenic Orthodox Union" and delivered on May 27, 1970.

Sacred Tradition is, what its validity is, what has been the relation of the Orthodox Church to it, and what the relation of the heterodox, and also what the relation is between Tradition and the Synods, on the one hand, and the Fathers of the Church, on the other. After this, I shall deal in general with the question of the "modernization" of the Church, and I shall speak specifically about various attempts which have been made, from the eighteenth century and thereafter, to "modernize" her. I shall conclude by formulating some thoughts on a true and desirable modernization of the Church, and the true presentation of Orthodoxy in the contemporary world.

My sources for this study will be chiefly Holy Scripture, the writings of the Greek Fathers, and also of Greek saints, theologians and other learned men of the more recent period.

II

What Sacred Tradition Is

In order to understand what Sacred Tradition is, right from the beginning we must distinguish it from the various kinds of *human* traditions. *Sacred* Tradition originates from God, it is a Divine revelation, whereas human traditions originate from mankind, are products of the human mind. Christ Himself explicitly distinguishes these two kinds of tradition, the Divine and the human, when He disapproves of the Scribes and Pharisees, because they disregard the Divine Tradition, the Divine Teaching, while they observe human traditions, saying: "Ye leave the commandments of God, and hold fast the tradition of men" [St. Mark 7:8]. And the Apostle Paul clearly distinguishes these two kinds of tradition, when he advises the Colossians, saying: "See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental spirits of the universe, and not according to Christ" [Colossians 2:8]; also when he says to the Thessalonians: "Now we command you, brethren, ...that ye keep away from any brother

who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that ye received from us" [2 Thessalonians 3:6]. From these passages, as also from others, the distinction between Sacred Tradition and human tradition is clear, as is the placing of Sacred Tradition on an incomparably higher level than human tradition. They put forward Sacred Tradition as a Divine and consequently sure guide to our life, while on the contrary they demote human tradition. They proclaim that we should always observe Sacred Tradition, whereas we should break human tradition, which is composed of human teachings and customs, whenever it is opposed to Sacred Tradition. In saying that Sacred Tradition is a Divine revelation, I mean that it was given to men by God, whether directly, by the God-man, or indirectly, through the Prophets and the Apostles. The incomparable superiority of Sacred Tradition is due to its revelatory character.

Its revelatory, Divine character is evident in the Old Testament from phrases like the following: "Thus saith the Lord;" "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying." In the New Testament this character is conspicuous, not only in the Gospels, where the God-man speaks, but also in the Apocalypse of John, which begins with the words, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him," and in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, particularly those of St. Paul. He frequently stresses that what he is teaching is not his own, nor of the wise of this world, but teaching from God. For example, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle Paul says: "Yet we speak wisdom...not that of this age nor of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to perish; but we speak wisdom of God that is in a mystery and hidden...which God has revealed to us through His Spirit" [1 Corinthians 2:6-7,10].

That which distinguishes Christianity from the various and countless systems which the human intellect has devised—religious, philosophical, ethical and social systems, etc.—is precisely its revelatory character.

The term "Tradition" is used by the Fathers and other

ecclesiastical writers in a *broader* sense to indicate the *written* Divine word, namely the Old Testament and the New Testament, and also the *unwritten* Divine word of the Apostolic preaching, which is not written in Holy Scripture, but was preserved in the Church and was written in the Proceedings of the Synods and in the books of the God-bearing Fathers.² In a *narrower* sense, the term "Tradition" indicates *only the unwritten* Divine word of the Apostolic preaching. The Apostle Paul uses the term "Tradition" in the broad sense, when he writes to the Thessalonians: "Brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter" [2 Thessalonians 2:15]. Before the canon of the New Testament was formed, the Fathers and Teachers of the Church called Tradition the written *and* the unwritten Divine word (cf. Nectarios Kephalas, *op. cit.*, p. 32). Since the time that the canon of the New Testament was formed, the term "Tradition" is usually employed in the narrower sense, to designate the unwritten Divine word of the Apostolic preaching (*ibid.*, p. 33).

According to the broader sense of the term, the relation between Holy Scripture and Tradition is that of part to whole (*ibid.*, p. 34). The two parts of Tradition, the written and the unwritten word, are considered by the Œcumenical Synods and the Holy Fathers to be of *equal authority*. "The sacred Synods," writes St. Nectarios of Pentapolis, "in their deliberations, draw not only from the sacred Scriptures, but also from sacred Tradition as from a pure spring" (*ibid.*, p. 83). He makes a similar observation about the Fathers: "The holy Fathers," he says, "regard this sacred Tradition as a pure spring, as also they regard the spring of the Holy Scriptures, from which we draw the life-begetting and salvific streams that provide eternal life, and that is why they ascribe *the same authority* to both written and unwritten Tradition" (*ibid.*, p. 33).

²Cf. St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite, *Pedalion* (Athens, 1957), p. 649, and St. Nectarios (Kephalas), Metropolitan of Pentapolis, *Two Studies: I Concerning the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church; II Concerning Holy Tradition* (Athens, 1913), pp. 32-33.

I shall mention two of the most important passages that confirm this observation: one from St. Basil the Great and one from St. John Chrysostom. St. Basil says: "Of the dogmas and proclamations preserved in the Church, some we possess from written teaching, while others we have received in secret from the Tradition of the Apostles; these both *have the same validity* for true religion. And no one will gainsay these points, at least if he is even moderately versed in ecclesiastical institutions" (*Concerning the Holy Spirit* 27; PG 32:188A). The Divine Chrysostom says: "They (namely the Apostles) have not handed down everything in writing, but have also delivered many things in unwritten form. The former and the latter are equally trustworthy, and so we also consider the [unwritten] Tradition of the Church to be trustworthy. It is Tradition—seek no further" (*On 2 Thessalonians*, Homily 4; PG 62:488).

The following words of St. John the Theologian, at the end of his Gospel, bear especial witness to the existence of a rich Apostolic Tradition: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written" [St. John 21:25]. Another clear testimony of the rich unwritten Tradition is the *Apostolic Canons* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

Many passages of the Fathers inform us of the *content* of the unwritten Apostolic Tradition. One of the most important is found in St. Basil the Great's *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, chapter 27. Here he mentions the following, apart from other examples of this Tradition: (1) that we make the sign of the Cross; (2) that we look to the East when we pray; (3) that we do not kneel in our prayers on Sunday and throughout Pentecost; (4) that each person is baptized with three immersions and emersions; (5) the renunciation of Satan and his angels in Baptism; (6) the confession of faith in Father, Son and Holy Spirit, word for word in this way; (7) the words which the priest utters at the change of the bread

and the wine of the Divine Eucharist (PG 32:188-189, 192-193). Regarding the latter, I observe that St. Dionysios the Areopagite in his book *Concerning the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* also stresses that the secret prayers, which sanctify and accomplish the Divine Mysteries, are part of the unwritten Tradition. "It is not permitted to interpret in writing the consecrating invocations or their mystical meaning, or to bring out from secrecy to the public the powers worked by God in them; but as our Sacred Tradition holds, when you have learned them thoroughly by secret instructions...you will be uplifted by the illumination which is originative of perfection toward the highest knowledge of them" (7; PG 3:565C). In his defense of the holy icons, St. John of Damascus observes that it is Apostolic Tradition that we make icons of Jesus Christ and the Saints and that we venerate them by way of honoring them. And he gives as other examples of the unwritten traditions of the holy Apostles the veneration of the Cross and our practice of turning to the East when we pray. He adds that "the Apostles have handed down very many things to us unwritten" (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* IV.16; PG 94: 1172C-1173B; cf. 1304-1305). Among other examples of the unwritten traditions which the Fathers give are the fast on Wednesday and Friday, the composition of the services and especially of the Divine Liturgy, the manner of celebrating the holy Mysteries (cf., e.g., *The Complete Works of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessaloniki* [Athens, 1882], pp. 33-34; St. Nectarios, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 83), and our practice of doing memorial services for those who have died while faithful members of the Church (cf. St. Nectarios, *Study Concerning the Immortality of the Soul* [Athens, 1901], pp. 113-137).

III

Tradition and Orthodoxy

The Orthodox Church has been *the only faithful keeper of Tradition*. The Protestants deny the unwritten sacred Tradition;

they accept only the written Tradition, Holy Scripture. The rejection of the unwritten Tradition on their part is a superficial and disastrous act. It is superficial because it disregards the fact that Holy Scripture, which the Protestants generally accept as Divinely-inspired, is a product of *oral* Tradition, since the writings which constitute Holy Scripture were handed down in the Church only around the end of the Apostolic period. In order to be consistent, they ought to discard Holy Scripture also as a Divine revelation. Some Protestants *have* done this and have ceased to be Christians except in name. The denial of the unwritten Tradition on the part of Protestantism was something ruinous, because it was the rejection of a treasury which is most necessary for salvation (cf. St. Nectarios, *Two Studies*, pp. 71-72).

Only the Orthodox Church, as I said, remained a faithful observer of Tradition and preserved the sacred Deposit [cf. 2 Timothy 1:14 and 1 Timothy 6:20] as the Apostles handed it down, not distorting it with subtractions and additions. This loyalty to Tradition has been underscored by the Holy Fathers, by distinguished Orthodox theologians of the recent period, and also by heterodox theologians. The following observations of Basil Ioannidis and Georges Florovsky are characteristic of Orthodox theologians. "The Orthodox Church," says Ioannidis, who was a professor at the Universities of Thessaloniki and Athens, "possesses full and unaltered the teaching and the tradition of the one, ancient and undivided Church.... She has not altered anything of what she has received" (*Ekklesia*, June 1954, p. 201). Father Florovsky, a leading Russian theologian of the Diaspora, writes: "From the first moment the Church has proclaimed that her faith remains the same throughout the ages. And this identity, this similarity of the faith, from the Apostolic times until our own days, without doubt constitutes a most conspicuous sign and a very strong indication of Orthodoxy" (*Orthodoxos Typos*, December 1964, p. 3). Important also are the admissions which distinguished heterodox theologians make regarding the traditional character of the Orthodox Church. I shall mention two

examples. The Protestant E. Seeberg, Professor at the University of Berlin, says: "The Orthodox Church is the one Church, the Catholic Church, the Apostolic Church. She has remained faithful to the Apostolic teaching and the Apostolic canons, and through uninterrupted succession has preserved undiminished the connection to the Apostles" (*The Nostalgia for Orthodoxy* [Athens: "Zoe" Brotherhood, 1965], p. 37). The Roman Catholic theologian Julius Tyciak writes: "For the Eastern Church Tradition is everything. She wants to be the Church of Tradition, the Church of the ancient times" (*ibid.*, p. 73).

IV

Tradition, Synods, and Fathers

The Synods not only made wide use of the Apostolic Tradition, but also stressed its value and took measures for its preservation. They preserved and proclaimed it in their definitions. Likewise, the holy Fathers contended vigorously, both with the spoken word and with the written word, for the preservation and predominance of the Apostolic Tradition without additions or subtractions. A fair number of them contended through the Synods. The following words of St. Athanasios the Great are characteristic of the line which the Fathers deliberately and persistently followed: "I have taught according to the Apostolic faith handed down to us by the Fathers, devising nothing outside it" (*Epistle to Serapion* 33; *PG* 26:605C).

The amazing concord which exists in the teaching of the Greek Fathers is due to the fact that they completely assimilated Sacred Tradition and followed the line of transmitting it without modernizations, without external inventions.

Eugenios Voulgaris, the eminent eighteenth-century theologian, underscores the concord of the Fathers most vividly when he says: "The Fathers and the teachers of our Church agree on all the dogmas, are unanimous on all, and differ on none, but

form a harmonious melody in the Church as from many voices, precisely because the Truth is one, and discord never enters into it. Where there is the illumination and operation of the Holy Spirit, there is concord" (*Epistle to Orthodox Christians*, third edition [Athens, 1969], p. 18).

It is to the Synods, then, and to the holy Fathers that we owe the preservation and guarding of Sacred Tradition, which the Lord gave, and the Apostles proclaimed, and upon which the Orthodox Church is founded (cf. St. Nectarios, *op. cit.*, p. 94, *The Œcumenical Synods of the Church of Christ* [Athens, 1892], p. 10, and Spyridon S. Bilalis, *Orthodoxy and Papism* [Athens, 1969], vol. 1, p. 45).

V

About Modernism

The Orthodox always regarded the unchanging persistence of the Orthodox Church in Sacred Tradition as her boast. On the contrary, the heterodox—with exceptions, especially in recent times—regarded this persistence as a sign of decline, as a sign of deficiency in her inner life. In particular, the Protestants hurled the reproof that the Orthodox Church is "dead" and likened her to a "petrified mummy." This demonstrates the ignorance which the heterodox customarily have about the true essence of Christianity, and shows to what degree they confuse the revealed faith with the different *worldly* systems, with the different *human* contrivances and creations. Since in the *crafts* and the *sciences* there is a continuous development and perfection, they think that the same thing ought to happen in the Christian religion, that here too there should be a continuous revision, change, and replacement of the old by the new—in a word, "modernization." Looking at Christianity rationalistically, they misunderstand its revelatory character and demote it to the level of the systems which the mind of man has formed on the basis of reason and the observations of the five senses.

This error is not as new as some would think. It was known to Eugenios Voulgaris and Adamantios Koraës. These two Great Teachers of the Hellenes, who were far from being "backward provincials," condemned it wisely and vigorously. "The faith does not alter with the times," wrote Voulgaris in 1756, "it does not deteriorate from circumstances, it does not grow old, but remains always the same, both old and new. Why do these new theologians (the Papists) dare to change what cannot be changed? We know that the dogmas of the faith are more dubious the newer they are, and more genuine and certain the older they are, just as the farther away waters are from their sources the more dirty and turbid they are, and the closer they are to their sources the purer they are" (*op. cit.*, p. 17). Koraës observed in 1820: "(Our) religion, which is above reason, does not resemble the rational sciences or arts. (These) sciences and arts, the work of the human mind, are perfected with the progress of time, insofar as its rational power is perfected by philosophy. Religion, the work of God, is, on the contrary, corrupted, insofar as it is separated in time from its first proclamation, if its leaders do not take care to guard it intact, as a deposit entrusted to them by its Author" (*Advice of Three Bishops* [London, 1820], pp. xv-xvi). Later on, another Teacher of the Nation, Neophytos Doukas, placed similar emphasis on the Divine provenance of the Orthodox faith, and excluded innovations, saying: "The things of the Church taught and enacted by the Divine Apostles, and by the Holy Fathers gathered together in the [seven] Synods, since they were illuminated by the All-holy Spirit, are unalterable; no one can add or subtract anything from them, or transform them... Just as the Divine Legislator dictated them many centuries ago, so they should remain unchanged unto all ages" (*Speech to the Deputies and Senators on Behalf of the Ecclesiastical Parliamentary Bill* [Athens, 1845], pp. 8, 15).

The immobility of death did not accompany the strict observance of Tradition on the part of the Orthodox Church, as the heterodox and some nominally Orthodox maintain, but on the

contrary, it was accompanied by the vibrancy of the life in Christ. The history of the Eastern Church bears witness to this, as much before the Schism as after, up to our days. Numerous serious students of her, such as Voulgaris and John Brownlie, have proclaimed this. In a letter of his to the French Jansenist Leclerc, in which he speaks about the miracles and also about the martyrs and other saints of the Orthodox Church from the time of the Schism up to his days, Voulgaris stresses that Orthodoxy has shown forth countless saints, equal to the ancients, and that throughout this whole period she possessed the bounty of miracles unceasingly, so that, as he says, "Our Church is continuously glorified and made wondrous by God, no less after the Schism than before it, and up to our times" (*Epistle of Eugenios Voulgaris to Pierre Leclerc*, first edition, by Andreas Koromelas [Athens, 1844], p. 68). Brownlie, a distinguished Anglican hymnologist, in his book *Hymns of the Holy Eastern Church*, makes the following important observations: "They tell us that the Greek Church is a dead Church, without missionary zeal. But how can a Church be characterized as not missionary, which stretched out her hands to the Far East, giving the blessing of the Gospel to the Tatars and the Indians; in a southerly direction, putting up the Cross in Arabia, Persia and Egypt; and in a northerly direction, spreading the light to the ends of Siberia? How can a Church be called dead, which engaged in hand-to-hand combat with idolatry, not only in the first centuries, but also in the last six centuries, under the abominable superstition of the Turks, preserving her faith in Christ throughout this interval? No Church offered so many martyrs to the Christian faith.... If under the persistent, ceaseless persecution—not for generations, but for centuries—a Church can maintain her Faith and preserve her witness, then the term 'dead' cannot be applied to her" (John Brownlie, *Hymns of the Holy Eastern Church* [Paisley, 1902], pp. 18-19).

Let us not be worried, then, when we hear our most beloved Orthodoxy being characterized as dead because she maintains the

sacred Deposit unaltered through the centuries. The reality loudly belies the assertion that she is dead, and demonstrates completely the opposite—that she is full of life.

If strict perseverance in Tradition does not entail the deadening of the Church, but on the contrary is absolutely necessary for the preservation and fruitfulness of the life of the Church, as much again the disregard for and even partial abandonment of Tradition entails the slackening of her life and her gradual decomposition. The most persuasive witness to this is borne by the history of the Western Church, which introduced one novelty and "modernization" after the other, chiefly from the time of the Schism and after. This Schism of the Western Church from the Eastern Orthodox Church was a result of Western innovations. And the very revolution of the Protestants, which split the Western Church into warring parties, was a result of the downfall of the Western Church, a downfall which occurred as a consequence of her distortion of Sacred Tradition. Nevertheless, the introduction of innovations continued. At the end of the nineteenth century, for example, there appeared in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church the movement of "Modernism" or Modernization, which set as its goal the renovation of Christian teaching by adapting it to contemporary worldly thought. The representatives of this movement inflicted one damage after another on Christian doctrine, and thought that in this way they would revivify their Church. But the result of this spurious Christianity of discarding truths of the Faith and making "adaptations" was that large numbers of persons left the churches and became complete unbelievers (cf. P. Melitis, *Let the Way be Cleared* [Athens, 1957], p. 28).

Protestantism, having denied the unwritten Tradition, was quickly divided into different confessions, and they again into others, and so on, so that there exist today countless Protestant confessional groups, called "Churches," a result of the different innovations and adaptations to each "contemporary spirit."

The important lessons of the history of the Eastern Church, on

the one hand, and of the Western Church, on the other hand, unfortunately have not been learned and assimilated by all the Orthodox of the last two centuries. A large number of contemporary Orthodox, not only lay people but also clergymen, are ignorant of them, even clergymen who hold high offices. From the eighteenth century and thereafter, then, different innovations have been introduced into Orthodox churches—innovations in iconography, in music, in the attire and appearance of the clergy, etc.

VI

Modernism In Iconography

In the first place, innovations were introduced into iconography and music. This occurred in Russia in the eighteenth century. At that time in Russia, innovative icons began to be produced, with models taken from Roman Catholic paintings of the Italian Renaissance, and polyphony or heterophony, called four-part harmony (tetraphony), began to be used in Russian churches, in imitation of the innovative ecclesiastical music of the West. These innovations spread gradually also among the Greeks, from the Revolution of 1821 and after, when Greece, having been freed politically from Turkey, began to be enslaved spiritually to Europe. The solemn, spiritual, hieratic style of Byzantine iconography was almost entirely abandoned in Russia, and afterwards in Greece, as also in other Orthodox countries, and the innovative, ostentatious, worldly iconography of the Western Church prevailed until recently. The new iconography is not only unrelated to the Orthodox faith, but is actually contrary to it, since its expression is carnal, not spiritual. To have icons and to venerate them by way of honoring them is an Apostolic tradition, which we ought to revere and observe. But we should keep in mind that this tradition speaks not merely about icons, but about *holy* icons, that is, about icons which impart the fragrance of sanctity, which raise us up to holy prototypes. The modernistic

icons cannot be called holy, except by an improper use of language. Consequently, it is an infringement of Apostolic Tradition to use them. On the contrary, icons of Byzantine style are faithful in the highest degree to the spirit of Tradition, as is certified by the acknowledgment of Herbert Read, a famous English aesthete and art critic, and of many other distinguished students of Byzantine art. Read says: "Byzantine painting is the highest form of religious painting that Christianity has known" (*The Meaning of Art* [New York, 1951], p. 117).

Fortunately, the deviation from the iconographic tradition has largely ceased, not only in Greece, but also elsewhere. And we see icons of the Orthodox iconographic tradition known as Byzantine being introduced everywhere, and innovative icons being replaced. Traditional Orthodox iconography, with its spiritual beauty, has commanded respect to such a point that Byzantine icons are sought-after throughout the world, even by non-Orthodox.

VII Modernism In Music

(1) The Introduction of Four-part Harmony

Four-part harmony, which the Russians took from the Western Church, was introduced in certain Greek churches in the nineteenth century. The first to introduce it in a Greek church were the Greeks of Vienna. In 1844, these people officially abolished Byzantine chanting and introduced four-part harmony into the two Greek Orthodox churches of Vienna. Afterwards, four-part harmony was introduced in Pest, Baden, Alexandria, Athens, and elsewhere. It is the music used in the Divine Liturgy in almost all the New Calendarist Greek Orthodox churches in America.

The reason given by the Greek parishes of Vienna for the

introduction of four-part harmony are two: first, the music of the Church should be modernized, developed. "Today," they wrote to Patriarch Anthimos of Constantinople, "as is known to all, both arts and sciences make progress" (*Kivotos*, July 1952, p. 302). Secondly, four-part harmony would attract the people to the churches. "Seeing our church entirely devoid of listeners," they say, "because the music does not please them, we were compelled, in order to attract the people to the church..., etc." (*ibid.*). The supporters of four-part harmony repeat these same reasons up to this day.

As far as the first reason is concerned, it should be stressed that it is a great error to believe that the ecclesiastical arts, such as iconography and hymnody, which were formed and function with the synergy of God, should be changed according to the tastes and fashions which appear in worldly arts from time to time. The ecclesiastical liturgical arts should always remain such as to express the pure spirit of the Christian faith, avoiding everything that distorts this expression. In other words, they should be faithful to Tradition. Homophonic (one-part) chanting is in accordance with the practice of the ancient Church, and it is the only one which expresses the simple, humble and sober character of Christ and His teaching. Polyphony or tetraphony introduces an element of *complexity*, and also of *ostentation* and *lightness*. It replaces the *single* line of melody, which the traditional Byzantine music has, with *four* lines of melody, and thus *suppresses the meanings* of the hymns, whereas the simplicity of the melody of the Byzantine music transmits the meanings with clarity, and consequently presents them more vividly and intensely to the souls of the listeners. The Synodal Letter of the Patriarchate of Constantinople that was sent to the innovating Greeks of Vienna in 1846, and which *officially condemns* four-part harmony, says *inter alia* the following: "It is evident that the newly-appearing tetraphonic music, on account of its unspiritual melody, is unbecoming to ecclesiastical propriety, and consequently its introduction into the sacred services goes against

the sacred Canons of the Church, which has inherited the tradition of praising God in spiritual songs and contrite, decorous hymns, in the manner that they are in our ancient ecclesiastical music..." (*ibid.*, p. 303). It adds that the action of those who introduced four-part harmony in the churches of Vienna "renders them guilty of sinning with reference to the Canons and the holy Church of Christ, the common Mother of the pious, which in no way tolerates any change whatsoever in the ancient Christian traditions and order" (*ibid.*).

With regard to the second reason which the supporters of four-part harmony gave then and have been giving from that time—namely, that they introduced it in order to attract people to the churches, because the traditional homophonic music, the Byzantine, is no longer pleasing—, it is superfluous for me to try to refute it, since the use of four-part harmony is excluded in our churches, according to what I have just mentioned.

However, let us ask: Is it true that Byzantine music was not pleasing to Greeks in the nineteenth century? No, it is not true. Apart from other things that have been written in the past on behalf of Byzantine music and against four-part harmony by Patriarch Anthimos and his Synod (as we have seen), this is attested by the very musical Constantine Valiadis, Metropolitan of Mytilene, the notable and learned musician Constantine (not John) Sakellaridis, the distinguished historian, philologist and poet Demetrios Vernardakis, our greatest writer of short stories Alexander Papadiamantis, and the most important historian of Byzantine music, George I. Papadopoulos; in the twentieth century the leading iconographer and outstanding man of letters Photios Kontoglou, the renowned prose writer Stratis Myrivilis, the distinguished musicologist Simon Karas, and many others have testified to it. That Byzantine ecclesiastical music is very pleasing even to non-Greeks is demonstrated by the witness of many non-Greeks and especially by the works which internationally known musicologists like Tillyard and Wellesz have written in our days. Byzantine chant, then, is only not pleasing when it is not executed well, or when there is prejudice

against it, as there was formerly prejudice against Byzantine iconography. Bad execution would gradually cease if the Church were to take all the requisite measures, by elevating the office of the chanter in the awareness of the people, by establishing good schools for chanters, and by helping aspiring chanters in every way, so that they are perfectly equipped in the theory and execution of the superb traditional music—the Byzantine. Persistent enlightenment on the part of the Church and the education system would banish the prejudice against it.

(2) The Abolition of Antiphony

It should be noted that the innovation of four-part harmony entails another, the abolition of antiphony. Antiphony, two chanters, the left and the right, or two choirs chanting alternately, is a very ancient tradition of the Church. Four-part harmony abolishes this tradition, because in order for four-part music to be performed, at least four singers are needed, and for it to be executed with antiphony, as many others are needed; whereas Byzantine music can be executed antiphonally with only two chanters. In abolishing antiphony the modernistic music subjects the congregation to a tiresome monotony of continuously hearing the same voices from the same point in the church.

(3) The Organ

Another lamentable innovation is the introduction of the organ. The organ was introduced into certain Greek Orthodox churches in Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1926, it was introduced into churches on Corfu, and thereafter into Greek Orthodox churches in America. Recently, it is being introduced into certain churches in Athens.

The introduction of the organ takes place in imitation of the Roman Catholics and Protestants, and constitutes an innovation which the Holy Fathers explicitly prohibited and which is

contrary to the ordinances of the first Christians. Attentive study of the New Testament absolutely convinces us that the Apostolic Church did not use musical instruments. The Fathers, faithful guardians and unflinching interpreters of Tradition, explicitly excluded the use of musical instruments in the execution of ecclesiastical hymns, and also the accompaniment of hymnody with instruments, as incompatible with the sober, hieratic, spiritual character of the Christian religion, because they bring to mind the fallen world and the things of the world—parties, dances, laughter, disorderly shouting, and the like. As for the fact that musical instruments were used in worship in the time of the Old Testament, this is explained as a concession from God by reason of the Jews' "grossness of mind" and their inability to change from their ancient customs (cf. St. John Chrysostom *On Psalm 150*; PG 55:497-498). The use of musical instruments in Christian worship is excluded, because the preaching of the New Testament places Christians in a more favorable position, and there is consequently the demand that in every respect they become more spiritual than the people of the Old Testament. Consistent with the example and the spirit of the God-man and the Apostles, the Orthodox never used musical instruments in their churches until the middle of the last century, when the first—among the Orthodox—despisers of the sacred tradition of purely vocal music appeared.

It is worth noting that the instrument from which the organ originated was known to the Byzantines, but they used it in the Hippodrome and the Palace, never in the Church (cf., e.g., Manuel Gedeon, *Old Innovations in Our Sacred Music* [1931], p. 30).

VIII

Modernism In The Clergy

We come now to the topic of "modernism" in the clergy: the abolition of the *raison* (cassock), cutting the hair in the manner of

laymen, and shaving the beard. Like the other innovations which I have mentioned, so also these made their first appearance in the Western Church. Shorn and shaven "Orthodox" priests without *rasa* probably appeared for the first time in the Greek communities of Europe, and especially Vienna, and later in the United States, after the great stream of migration to the New World in the first two decades of the twentieth century. Now of late, considerable agitation is being produced even here in Greece by the innovators, who want the clergy to be "modernized" by cutting the hair, shaving the beard, and the rejection of the *rasa*. In particular, some clergymen here also have already cut their hair in a way that completely resembles the hairstyles of laymen.

(1) *The Abolition of the Rason*

With regard to the attempts which some are making today to abolish the *rasa* as the general everyday attire of clergymen, and to replace it by a jacket and pants, I have the following to say:

First of all, the *rasa* is useful for distinguishing the clergyman from the layman quite clearly, even from a great distance, and for reminding the clergyman and those who meet him that he is a minister of the Most High. St. Basil the Great explains this very beautifully in the following passage: "The distinctiveness in clothing, which announces each one of us in advance and bears witness to the profession of the life according to God, is useful.... Announcement through appearance is like a kind of pedagogy for the weaker, for keeping them away from base things even against their will. Just as, then, there is one distinctiveness in the clothing of a soldier, and another in that of a senator, and another in that of someone else, from which their offices, for the most part, are inferred, so also there is a certain distinctiveness of a Christian from his clothing that through its distinctive appropriateness maintains the propriety handed down from the Apostles" (*Long Rules*, Question 22; PG 31:980BC).

Although St. Basil is addressing himself to monks, these observations of his pertain to clergymen in general, and are in agreement with the twenty-seventh Canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Synod, which commands: "Let no one ranked among the clergy wear inappropriate clothing, either when living in the city or when walking in the street, but let him use the garments that have already been assigned to those ranked among the clergy" (*Pedalion*, p. 242).

With its dignified, hieratic appearance, the *rason* arouses respect in those who see the clergyman. And continually reminding him of his spiritual office, it makes him more attentive to his behavior—"it is a kind of pedagogy for keeping him from base things," as St. Basil observes. The pants and the jacket, on the contrary, do not proclaim anything special or any office at all, nor are they expressive of what is dignified and fitting for a priest, nor do they bring anything special to mind.

The English theologian Richard Littledale observed with great discernment the marvelous influence that the *rason* exercises, as much on the clergy as on the laity, as is evident from the following passage of his book *The Holy Eastern Church*, where he says: "With all the simplicity of their habits, there is a peculiar calmness and dignity in the appearance of the Greek priests which is very striking. They never forget their priestly capacity and responsibility, even as they never in any circumstance take off their cassocks. You always see them with their dark clothing, with the high cap (*kalymmavchion*) and the black veil (*epanokalymmavchon*), which from time immemorial have been their customary attire. They walk with an unworldly calm that appears even involuntarily to evoke the respect of all" (Richard Littledale, *The Holy Eastern Church* [London, 1870], p. 69).

The innovators or "modernizers," who want the *rason* to be abolished, disregard this very important spiritual, religious side of the question, and judge with supposedly aesthetic criteria. They say that they are disgusted by the ugliness of the *rason*. They want the *rason* to be abolished, then, because it is ugly—

according to their taste. Photios Kontoglou gives an excellent reply to this argument. First of all, he says, in ecclesiastical matters "there is no good taste according to worldly likes and dislikes. That is good and beautiful which is decorous and dignified, which befits the spiritual office of the priest. ...The attire and appearance of clergymen should indicate their spiritual office" (*Orthodoxos Typos*, August 10, 1969). Secondly, the *rason* conceals the incidental aesthetic deficiencies of the clergyman: the crooked feet, the long arms, the belly, the hump, etc. "They are all dressed with propriety and spiritual dignity" (*ibid.*).

(2) *Cutting the Hair*

With regard to the hair, the innovators, who want clergymen to cut their hair short, as laymen are accustomed to doing in our days, think that they have an unshakable argument for this in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 11, verse 14. This verse says: "Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair (*koma*), it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering?" They translate the verb *koma* as "lets his hair grow long." But this is only part of its meaning. *Koma* has the additional meaning "he adorns his hair." As for the length of the hair, we cannot deduce from this passage that *clergymen* ought to cut their hair in the contemporary fashion of laymen, leaving the nape of the neck bare. What it obviously condemns is men in general—not specifically clergymen—leaving their hair completely uncut, so that it falls low to the waist, as women formerly did, and adorning it. We find the meaning of the passage in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and in the interpretation which Zonaras gives to the ninety-sixth Canon of the Sixth Œcumenical Synod. The *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* say: "Do not give extra adornment to the natural beauty given to you by God, but diminish it humbly before men, in this way not giving undue care to your hair" (PG 1:564C). Zonaras says that the

ninety-sixth Canon of the Sixth Œcumenical Synod excommunicates those who do not cut their hair at all, but deliberately let it fall as far as the belt, like that of women, and also those who dye it, or tie it up with reeds to make it curly, or put on wigs (*Pedalion*, p. 306). For clergymen to let their hair grow long enough to cover the nape of the neck is not forbidden either by the passage of the Apostle which I mentioned, or by the *Apostolic Constitutions*, or by the canons. And it is in keeping with the oldest icons of Christ that are preserved, in which the God-man and the "Great High Priest," as the Apostle Paul calls Him [Hebrews 4:14], is depicted with hair falling down to His shoulders.

Let our clergymen, then, not listen to the innovators, who want them to be imitators of laymen and heterodox clergymen, but let them remain imitators of Christ, according to the exhortation of the Apostle, who says: "Be ye imitators of me, as I also am of Christ" [1 Corinthians 11:1].

(3) *Shaving the Beard*

The "modernizers," wanting to make the Orthodox in the image and likeness of the non-Orthodox, put forward as an argument against beards that they are ugly and unclean. They disregard the purely religious side of the question, which is essential. I shall speak, then, about this, and after that I shall reply to their argument, which is supposedly based on aesthetics and hygiene.

There are passages in the written Tradition—in the Old Testament to be precise—which forbid cutting the beard. The most authoritative is the following, from Leviticus. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying: 'Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, and say to them...they shall not shave the edges of their beards'" [21:1,5; cf. 19:27]. Here God, through the Prophet Moses, gives a command that priests should not cut their beards. In the New Testament, there is no reference to beards; but the *Apostolic*

Constitutions and very old icons testify that the tradition of clergymen's beards not being cut continued in the Apostolic times. The *Apostolic Constitutions* decree: "One must not destroy the hair of his beard, nor alter a man's face in violation of nature" (PG 1:565A-568A).

The importance of the beard from a spiritual, ecclesiastical perspective lies chiefly in the fact that it evokes respect. The Great Teacher of the Nation, the Equal-to-the-Apostles and Hieromartyr Cosmas Aitolos, understood this very well, as his teachings make clear. He says: "If there happens to be a man 30 years old who has let his beard grow, and one of 50, 60 or 100 years who shaves, make the one who has let his beard grow sit higher up than the one who shaves, as much in the church as at the table" (Augoustinos Kantiotis, *Saint Cosmas Aitolos* [Athens, 1959], p. 86).

But the innovators, as I said, disregarding these points, which are essential, take refuge in aesthetics and hygiene in order to condemn the beards of clergymen. From an aesthetic point of view, they say, beards are ugly and repulsive. However, this assertion does not hold water. No one can seriously maintain that the ancient Greeks were inferior in aesthetic sensibility. On the contrary, they are recognized throughout the world as devotees *par excellence* of the beautiful. Nonetheless, they wore beards, a fact which testifies that they did not regard beards as unsightly. Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Miltiades, Themistocles, Pericles, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and other distinguished ancient ancestors of ours are depicted with beards, like today's priests in Greece. Let us also note that the bearded philosophers Plato and Aristotle were the founders of aesthetics!

The beards of Orthodox clergymen are unsightly only to those who are biased against them, because they suffer from ignorance both in things of the Orthodox faith and in aesthetics. The guileless, pious lay people do not find beards ugly and do not detest those who wear beards. With respect, contrition, and love, lay men and lay women stoop and kiss the hands of bearded

clergymen and make the sign of the Cross before the icon of the bearded God-man, the bearded Prophets, Apostles, Monastic Saints and other Saints, and kiss them. Nor do beards repel children, even in a country like America, where a clergyman with a beard is a rare phenomenon. One of the most beloved personages for small children in America is Santa Claus, St. Nicholas, with his sumptuous, all-white beard, who (as their parents tell them) comes every year on Christmas Eve and brings them presents. Children rejoice to see likenesses of him, and especially living ones, namely men clothed in his characteristic (for them) apparel and large beard. How true are the words of the Lord: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven" [St. Matthew 18:3].

With regard to the argument from hygiene, that beards are unclean, it is enough for me to say that it shows an astounding superficiality. According to this argument, all the renowned ancient Greeks whom I mentioned must have had an unclean appearance, and likewise Christ, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the other Saints. What superficiality, what impiety, what blasphemy!³

³In the following excerpt from an article by the Blessed Elder Philotheos (Zervakos) of Paros we see an example of the Modernists' disdain for Holy Tradition [*Trans.*]:

"Now I come to you, the Priests of Greece and especially of Athens, and I beg you to hear me attentively. When 50 years ago—I do not remember precisely—Meletios Metaxakis of Kition...ascended to the Archiepiscopal throne of Athens, he summoned a clergy congress in a hall in the offices of the Metropolis. Almost all the priests of Athens came enthusiastically to hear his paternal counsels. Instead of telling them, as Christ told His disciples, 'Ye are the light of the world. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father Who is in heaven' [St. Matthew 5:14,16]—to be 'humble, merciful, meek, pure in heart, peacemakers, patient in afflictions, temptations, persecutions, accusations, and to rejoice when men persecute you, hate you and wrong you, to love God and every man, even your enemies, and to pray for them' [St. Matthew, chapter 5]—he gave them the following advice. Listen, so that you may shudder and weep. 'In Europe all the clergy shave, cut their hair, and go without *rasa*. We should imitate

IX

Other Kinds Of Modernism

Aside from the innovations about which I have spoken, and which are to be condemned, because they go against Sacred Tradition, and for other reasons, in recent years other attempts at unacceptable modernization have been made, such as de-Hellenization and Ecumenism.

(1) *De-Hellenization*

Many of the heterodox in the recent period assert that Christianity, as we understood it, has no more relation to the man of today. We need, they say, a Christianity that is to be based on new concepts and a new terminology. Until now Christianity has been based, they say, on concepts and terminology of ancient Greek philosophy; it must now be based on contemporary concepts and Greek terminology must be replaced by existential them, in case we should seem out of date and uncivilized.' Then almost all the priests, with one mouth, with boldness and confidence, said to him: 'Your Beatitude, we are Greek Orthodox; we will never become heretics, Protestants or Papists.' Then, as a politician, not as a pastor, he told them: 'I did not tell you to become Protestants and Papists. I told you that, because I am concerned for your health, since beards, uncut hair and *rasa* cause illness.' A fair number of priests replied to him: 'We are healthier than those who are shaven and woman-faced.' Having given up hope because his aim and his advice had proved vain and fruitless, he turned to a doctor, whom he had brought along to assist his purpose, and said to him, 'Doctor, talk to them, advise them, because they will not listen to me.' When he was called upon to speak, the doctor began to give them advice, but some of the priests did not allow him to, saying to the Metropolitan: 'Let the physician heal himself.' Others said to the doctor, 'Go and cure the sick who summon you. We are neither sick nor have we summoned you,' and in this way the clergy congress dissolved into a shaming of Meletios Metaxakis, the modernist, the innovator, the scorner of Patristic Traditions, and redounded to the glory of God, the boast of Orthodoxy, and the praise of the priests of Athens" (*Fourth Clarion Call to Salvation* [Thessaloniki: "Orthodoxos Kypseli" Editions, 1981], p. 36).

and scientific terms. A well-known Greek hierarch in America adopted this innovationist position and announced it in the American press [*New York Times*, September 25, 1967, p. 40: "Iakovos Urges New Religion Without Greek Ideas;" cf. also *Ethnikos Keryx* (New York), September 26, 1967, p. 1], creating great commotion among the Orthodox, and especially the Greeks.

In relation to this position, I have the following to say. First, it may pertain to Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, which have become almost completely secularized with their continual innovations and discarding what is eternal, revealed, Divine; but it is foreign to Orthodoxy, which has remained faithful to Tradition. Orthodox Christianity, with the same dogmas and the same terminology that she always had, with her fidelity to the Divine, has as much relevance to contemporary man as she had to the man of the first centuries and the man of subsequent periods. Many millions of pious people in the entire world find in Orthodoxy even today rest, hope, and supramundane joy. And many select souls from other confessions or from unbelief, lured by the light of truth, take refuge in Orthodoxy in our days.

Secondly, I note that the assertion that Christianity should be modernized in accordance with the worldly thought of our era was heard even in earlier times. As we saw previously, certain Western theologians set about "renewing" Christian teaching by harmonizing it with the thought of their time. The movement failed miserably and caused a great evil—it led many to complete unbelief.

Thirdly, the assertion that Christianity is *founded* on the views of the ancient Greek philosophers constitutes a great error, unless we mean by "Christianity" a philosophical-theological system, like that of Thomas Aquinas or some other rationalistic Western theologian. As I emphasized at the beginning of my address, true, Orthodox Christianity is not a work of men and is not based on human conceptions, on human inventions; it is a work of God, a Divine revelation. It took many *terms* from the

ancient philosophers, but assimilated them completely to the essence of the Gospel. These terms did not impede in the past, and do not impede us today, from comprehending this essence—on the contrary, they aid us. As in the past, so also today, the concepts and *terms* of ancient Greek philosophy assist theology, as well as every science, to express its special content.

Regarding the topic of the relationship between Orthodox Christianity and ancient Greek philosophy, it is proper and correct for us to follow, not the view of this or that heretic, but the view of our Saints. Since we are dealing with "modernism," let us hear what our greatest Saint of the recent period, Nectarios of Pentapolis, says:

"Greek philosophy. Two words denoting great and lofty notions. In them is encompassed the totality of scientific principles.... In them is acknowledged the depth of concepts, the subtlety of thoughts, their distinctness and clarity, their power and grace. Greek philosophy is the tutor of mankind, the guide toward true religion.... She taught the providence of God toward mankind, and through her sound theories led mankind to Christ.... Greek philosophy was born according to Divine providence on behalf of Christianity, so that it might work for the salvation of mankind.... (Greek) philosophy became a schoolmaster (*paidagogos*) leading to Christianity, in which was found the complete transcendence of the deficiencies of philosophy and the perfect satisfaction of the yearnings of man's heart.... Mankind was seeking Divine revelation, in order to learn the truth and be assured and persuaded; mankind was in need of a Divine teacher; philosophy lacked these. Mankind found them in Christianity, *toward Greek philosophy was guiding it*" (St. Nectarios Kephala, *Treasury of Sacred and Philosophical Sayings* [Athens, 1895-1896], vol. 2, pp. vi, xv, xvi).

Consistent with this conviction of his, St. Nectarios often uses sayings of the ancient Greek philosophers—Socrates, Plato and Aristotle—, most noticeably in his books *Treasury of Sacred and Philosophical Sayings* and *Know Thyself*, which are works that

exhort us to the Christian faith and life.

(2) *Ecumenism*

Contemporary "Ecumenism," like all the other innovations or modernizations about which I have spoken, is an invention of the heterodox. The supposed "Orthodox" who share the views of the Ecumenical Christian Movement are attempting to align the Orthodox Church with the views and dubious aims of this movement. In particular, it can be said that the attempts which are now taking place to replace Byzantine chant with four-part harmony, the introduction of the organ, the rejection of the *raison*, the clergy cutting their hair and shaving, and also de-Hellenization are being set in motion by the Ecumenists, who want to assimilate and align Orthodoxy with all the other so-called "Churches." The Ecumenical Movement aims at the union of the various "Churches," *with indifference about Tradition and the truth*. The "Orthodox" Ecumenists regard the Dogmas, the sacred Canons, and the totality of Tradition as insignificant matters, things that are not worth discussing, because it appears that deep down they do not believe that there is absolute truth, that there is Divine revelation. Likewise, the Ecumenists disregard the fact that there are not many Churches, in the strict sense of the word, to be "united." They disregard the fact that there is only *one* Church, as the Symbol of Faith (the Creed) says: "I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church;" and that this one Church is the Orthodox, because only she has remained a faithful keeper of Tradition. The attempt to align the Orthodox Church with such a movement does not benefit the Orthodox in any way. With the disdain that the "Orthodox" Ecumenists show for Tradition and the very provocative manner in which they trample on the sacred Canons, they scandalize the Orthodox people and cast many down into the abyss of unbelief and perdition.

Ecumenism is obviously not simply an innovation, but is a dreadful hodgepodge of innovations and heresies, a frightful

syncretism which aims to overthrow the entire Divine edifice that is called the Orthodox Christian Church and to erect in its place the new Tower of Babel.

EPILOGUE

All the forms of modernism about which I have spoken are incompatible with Sacred Tradition, and their foundations are unsound. They must, therefore, be rejected. However, there are forms of modernization that are completely in agreement with Tradition and indeed are commended by it. I shall give some examples.

(1) Let the entire written Tradition, namely the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament, be translated into the English language, which is today *par excellence* the international language. This would be a most valuable offering that duly qualified and sincere Orthodox theologians and scholars could make to the Orthodox and also to the heterodox of America and other places, who know the English language but not the Greek. Now they use translations which are full of inaccuracies and errors.

(2) Let the Apostolic and Synodal Canons and also the definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Synods be translated from the original Greek into English, so that they may become more widely known in an Orthodox version.

(3) Let the works of the Fathers be translated into the contemporary purist Greek and let Patristic texts be introduced into all Greek schools, so that they may become the property of the entire Greek people.

(4) Let there be more use of radio stations for the transmission of Byzantine music, which is the sweetest voice of Orthodoxy. Especially here in Greece, where Orthodoxy is the official religion of the nation, why is Byzantine chant not heard every day, since religion ought to be a daily affair and not only one of the weekend?

(5) Let other contemporary means be used for bringing Sacred Tradition, written and unwritten, to people's awareness, as much as is possible, so that it might become a living experience that is

manifested in all the actions of the clergy and the laity.

When modernizations of such a kind come about and the bad innovations, which I subjected to criticism, are rejected, then the choicest fruits of Tradition will begin to be manifested—new choirs of God-bearing Fathers, lights of the world, of inspired Missionaries who will radiate holiness, and of Confessors who will support the Faith steadfastly, without compromises and condescensions before rulers and nations, and who will be ready to testify about it. The existence of such personalities will, in and of itself, constitute the best modernization of the Orthodox Church. Orthodoxy needs such personalities more than anything else. They, with the co-operation of God, will preserve, spread and glorify her throughout the world.

In closing, I say to the innovators: do not change things that are in good order, creating disturbances and schisms within the Orthodox Church. And heed the words of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod: "If anyone breaks any ecclesiastical tradition, written or unwritten, let him be anathema" (eighth Proceeding; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* [1960], vol. 3, p. 416). To the pious clergy and people I say: Impress in your memory and bring to mind daily the words of the Apostle Paul: "Brethren, stand firm and hold fast to the traditions which ye were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter" [2 Thessalonians 2:15]; "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that ye received from us" [2 Thessalonians 3:6]; and also these words of St. John of Damascus: "Brethren, let us stand on the rock of faith and the Tradition of the Church, not removing the landmarks which our holy Fathers set, nor giving any place to those who want to innovate and destroy the structure of the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of God" (*Concerning Images*, 3.41; PG 94:1356C).

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- Aeschylos, 29
- Anthimos, Patriarch of Constantinople, 21,22
- Aquinas, Thomas, 32
- Augoustinos Kantiotis, Metropolitan, 29
- Aristotle, 29,33
- Athanasios the Great, St., 14
- Basil the Great, St., 11,13,25,26
- Bilalis, Spyridon S., 15
- Brownlie, John, 17
- Cosmas Aitolos, St., 29
- Dionysios the Areopagite, St., 12
- Doukas, Neophytos, 16
- Eugenios Voulgaris, 14,16,17
- Euripides, 29
- Florovsky, Georges, 13
- Gedeon, Manuel, 24
- Hippocrates, 29
- Homer, 29
- Iakovos, Archbishop, 32
- Ioannidis, John, 13
- John Chrysostom, St., 11,24
- John of Damascus, St., 12,37
- John the Evangelist, St., 9

- Karas, Simon, 22
- Kontoglou, Photios, 22,27
- Koraës, Adamantios, 16
- Koromelas, Andreas, 17
- Leclerc, Pierre, 17
- Littledale, Richard, 26
- Meletios Metaxakis, Archbishop of Athens, 30 n. 3
- Melitis, P., 18
- Miltiades, 29
- Mouratidis, Constantine, 6
- Myrivilis, Stratis, 22
- Nectarios, Metropolitan of Pentapolis, St., 10,12,13,15,33
- Nicholas, St., 30
- Nicodemos the Hagiorite, St., 10 n. 2
- Papadiamantis, Alexander, 22
- Papadopoulos, George I., 22
- Pericles, 29
- Philotheos Zervakos, Elder, 30 n. 3
- Plato, 29,33
- Read, Herbert, 20
- Sakellaridis, Constantine, 22
- Seeberg, E., 14
- Socrates, 29,33
- Sophocles, 29

Symeon of Thessaloniki, St., 12

Themistocles, 29

Tillyard, H.J.W., 22

Tyciak, Julius, 14

Valiadis, Constantine, 22

Vernardakis, Demetrios, 22

Wellesz, Egon, 22

Zonaras, John, 27,28