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Preface to the English Edition

This book is a revised edition of a text published in Greek in 1992. Its title implies a contrast between the Orthodox or Eastern version of the Church and its Western counterpart. This contrast is not abstract or ideological, but is embodied in the history of a specific people at a particular time, the experience of the Greeks from the fourteenth century to the present day. Like any other metaphysical tradition, the Church cannot be described in static terms. It defines our mode of life, our culture.

In the early Christian centuries, Greek civilization provided the known world with its chief cultural paradigm. Reflection on the Church’s experience was expressed in the Greek language, a language highly developed through philosophy, poetry and drama to shed light on the meaning of existence, the world and history. The new meaning conveyed by the Church’s experience literally refashioned Greek culture, enabling it to flourish in a new form for another thousand years.

The name given to the Greek cultural embodiment of the Church in the first eight centuries or so was “Orthodoxy.” For it was Orthodoxy that guaranteed the primitive ecclesial experience, preserving it unchanged. But in the fifth and sixth centuries another version of the Church’s Gospel appeared. This was embodied in the new peoples who entered the western part of the Roman empire and settled in its territory. These peoples, who were culturally far less advanced than those they conquered, finally produced the first truly global
culture in human history. Today this culture, which we call “Western,” has prevailed everywhere.

In the present work the reader will find a necessarily brief and schematic account of the historical process by which Orthodoxy (the ecclesiastical culture of the Greek people) was swallowed up by the new global culture of the West. My aim is not to lament the past in a sentimental fashion, nor is it to resurrect the Greek experiential version of the Church in pursuit of a lost culture. But neither is it simply to present a historical survey.

What most concerns me is to study the consequences of the differences between “Orthodoxy” and the “West” in today’s world. We are faced with difficult problems. A vast number of publications discuss the threats which the mode of life common to us all in both East and West—our Western culture with all its astonishing achievements—presents to us.

In the following pages I try to contribute to this discussion. I attempt to identify the cultural consequences of some of the West’s deviations from the Greek embodiment of ecclesiastical experience, to trace these consequences in the social body of the historical transmitter of Orthodoxy, to study in Westernized modern Hellenism a cultural tragedy which is perhaps of general human interest, and to highlight the real spiritual problems that have been created by the Western “religionizing” of the Church.

Let me therefore make one thing absolutely clear. The critique of Western theology and tradition which I offer in this book does not contrast “Western” with something “right” which as an Orthodox I use to oppose something “wrong” outside myself. I am not attacking an external Western adversary. As a modern Greek, I myself embody both the thirst for what is “right” and the reality of what is “wrong”: a contradictory and alienated survival of ecclesiastical Orthodoxy in a society radically and unhappily Westernized.

My critical stance towards the West is self-criticism; it refers to my own wholly Western mode of life.

I am a Western person searching for answers to the problems tormenting Western people today. The threat to the environment, the assimilation of politics to business models, the yawning gulf between society and the state, the pursuit of ever-greater consumption, the loneliness and the weakness of social relations, the prevailing loveless sexuality—all these seem to go back to the theological differences that once provoked the “Schism” dividing Christendom into two. Today’s individualism and absolute utilitarianism appear to have theological origins.

The Westernization of modern Hellenism is a field in which one can study the dynamics of the global spread of Western culture. These dynamics are founded on the subjection of ecclesiastical life to the rules of natural religion’s individualistic demands: a revealing cultural tragedy.

Christos Yannaras

Athens
June 2005
Translators’ Note

The ideas at the core of this book were first set out by Christos Yannaras in two articles: “La théologie en Grèce aujourd’hui,” in *Istina* 2 (1971) 129-67, and “Theology in Present-Day Greece,” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 16 (1972) 195-214. These articles were incorporated into his *Orthodoxia kai Dysi — I Theologia stin Ellada smera* [Orthodoxy and the West: Theology in Greece Today], Athens, 1972. The entire work was rewritten and much enlarged twenty years later and published under a new title: *Orthodoxia kai Dysi sti neoteri Ellada* [Orthodoxy and the West in Modern Greece], Athens: Domos, 1992. This last work is the basis of the present translation.

The initial English version was made by Peter Chambers. Norman Russell has revised it and is responsible for the final text. Readers familiar with the 1992 Greek edition will notice a number of differences: the luxuriant prose of the Greek original has been pruned to adapt it to current English style; the notes have been updated, with an emphasis on material available in English; the polemical tone – though not the passion – of the original has been modified. These changes have been made in consultation with the author, who is anxious, as he explains in the Preface, that his work should be seen not as an attack on the Western religious tradition as such, but as an examination of how Greek Orthodox historically have approached their own ecclesiastical culture. In this respect the present volume represents a further stage in the evolution of the work.
I

The Historical Context

We usually begin the study of the history of "modern" Hellenism with the Fall of Constantinople (1453), the final act in the collapse of what we call "Byzantine" Hellenism, which marks the end of the "medieval" and the beginning of the "modern" period of Greek history.

From the point of view of the development of Greek culture, however, the starting-point of the "modern" period is not 1453 but 1354, when Demetrios Kydones, at the invitation of the Emperor John Kantakouzenos, translated into Greek the Summa contra Gentiles of Thomas Aquinas. Fired by an enthusiasm for the new "light" coming from the West, Kydones undertook to transmit it to his fellow Greeks.

This event marks the beginning of a new era for Hellenism, a new historical period in which the Greeks gradually transferred the focus of their attention from their own tradition and their own civilization to another vision and another ideal.

Hellenism was always at a crossroads of cultures marked by different scientific and philosophical ideas and concepts. From the start, Greeks were passionately interested in foreign traditions and accepted elements from other civilizations. Their distinctive talent was to assimilate what they borrowed, each foreign element enriching and renewing Greek self-awareness.

This capacity to assimilate seems enfeebled or lost during the era of Kydones' translations. The Greek way of life and the Greek vision no longer acculturated the borrowed
elements, which progressively eroded the cultural self-awareness of the Greeks, dissolving their sense of identity. Oppressed by the Ottoman Turks for four hundred years, and then gathered into a state with conventional boundaries after 1827, they now lived with their spirit and gaze turned towards the “luminaries” of the West.

Regardless of popular resistance and the opposition of a few intellectuals, Greeks increasingly misconceived, or were ignorant of, their cultural tradition. They were often indifferent to their Greekness or even contemptuous of it. Admiration for developing Western civilization prevailed, monopolizing the popular consciousness of “progress.” Greeks learned about their own cultural heritage from Western scholars, the “humanists” and European admirers of classical antiquity, without suspecting any misunderstandings or deliberate distortion.

The pivotal date of 1354 raises further questions. Is it appropriate to speak of Hellenism and Greek culture in the fourteenth century? Were the Byzantines, the inhabitants of the multi-ethnic Eastern Empire, really Greek?

We must summarize the great mass of historical material available to us schematically if we are to make sense of it today. We divide historical time into periods and distinguish between different civilizations or nationalities. Our present understanding of what constitutes a “civilization” or a “nationality” often shapes how we schematize the past, and we don’t use the same criteria as the period we are examining.

For many decades, Greek schoolchildren have been taught to separate their history into three broad periods: (i) ancient Greece – ranging from the proto-Helladic and proto-Minoan (2900 BC) up to the Roman occupation of metropolitan Greece (146 BC) or the closing of the last philosophical schools of Athens (AD 529); (ii) “Byzantine” or medieval Greece – from the founding of Constantinople (AD 325) to its fall in 1453; and (iii) modern Greece – from 1453 to the present.

This academic slicing-up of Greek history presupposes the unity of Hellenism through the ages, and more especially its ethnic homogeneity – a continuous biological succession through the generations from the most ancient times to the present.

When Fallmerayer, a minor nineteenth-century German historian, put the direct descent of contemporary Greeks from ancient Hellas in doubt, the resulting disturbance revealed a very profound confusion in the small modern Greek state. The neo-Hellenes could not define their own Hellenism. The “Byzantine” or medieval period occasioned the greatest scandal. In what sense were the multi-ethnic inhabitants of the Eastern Roman Empire Hellenes? Greek had been the dominant language, while philosophy and art had cherished and reworked the ancient Greek legacy. Certainly the “Byzantine” Church Fathers, some of whom had studied at Athens, worked within the same tradition as Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and the Neoplatonists and studied the same questions. But they also wrote orations “Against the Hellenes” because the word “Hellen” referred exclusively to pagans. The general population too must have been familiar with pagan Greek texts, Homer remaining the reading and writing primer for nearly a thousand years.

The problem of defining Hellenism remains unresolved in the small modern Greek state. Certain “progressive” intellectuals consider every admixture of Hellenism with Christianity demeaning, and persist in doubting the Byzantine Empire’s Hellenism. Some ideologically motivated Christian intellectuals prefer “Roman” and “Romanism” (Romiosyni) to “Hellene” and “Hellenism.” A modern Greek prime minister, later President of the Hellenic Republic, even went so far as to speak of the different oppressions which the Greeks
Orthodoxy and the West

had undergone: first under the Romans, then the Byzantines and later the Turks ...!

We cannot approach the relationship between Hellenism and the West in the modern period without resolving this enormous confusion. We need a proposition that defines Hellenism: we must see Greece fundamentally not as a place but as a mode of life.

Hellenism acquired geographical boundaries for the first time during the nineteenth century — a mere 160 years ago. The small Greek state’s boundaries after the 1821 revolution against the Turks left three quarters of the Ottoman Empire’s Greek-speaking population outside its territory.

Ancient Greece was not a unified state, nor did it have fixed boundaries. It was the “Hellenic cities” taken as a whole that constituted ancient Greece. These independent city-states stretched from Macedonia to Crete, from Ionia to Sicily and Southern Italy. They were considered “Hellenic” for their common Greek language, but also for their common way of life and culture. Although the term culture calls for extensive study, identification with a mode of life may serve as an initial definition.

Alexander the Great’s military rule united most Greek city-states in the fourth century BC for his ambitious campaign against the Persian Empire. He routed the Persians, leading his army as far as Bactria and India. His idea was to establish new Greek cities to propagate the Greek way of life throughout his vast conquests, from the southern shores of the Caspian Sea to Palestine, Babylonia, Egypt and the Indian Ocean — every corner of the then known world. The “great world” of the Hellenistic kingdoms that resulted was an explosive cultural expansion unequaled in history.

When Rome later conquered and unified many lands Hellenized by Alexander under its own administrative system, Greek civilization remained the common and unifying element of its empire. Paul the Apostle was a deeply conserv-

ative Jew whose texts indicate the extent, depth and quality of the Roman world’s Hellenization. Of all peoples, the Jews resisted Hellenization with the greatest energy, and at the cost of much blood. Paul belonged to the most conservative group, the Pharisees. But for all his conservatism, he used the national language and philosophical thought of the Greeks, and certain Greek authors, as dextrously as any contemporary Alexandrian or Athenian.

Even in the second century BC, the Latin aristocracy in Rome preferred Greek for social intercourse. When Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans in the first century AD, he never considered writing in Latin. Two hundred and fifty years later, Diocletian’s political and military genius discerned that historical development had shifted decisively to the Greek East, and as a result he spent most of his reign in Nicomedia. He anticipated Constantine the Great, who would transfer the empire’s center to a new Greek capital, New Rome, popularly known as Constantinople.

The Roman Empire, now centered on New Rome, embarked on a historical journey which would last one thousand years, and each phase would be astounding. Its cultural identity was neither purely Roman nor purely Greek. It was the Christian element that prevailed, faithfully adhering to the orthodox tradition of the early Church. The Roman Empire absorbed and transformed elements from both Rome and Greece, the legal and administration traditions of the one and the philosophy and art of the other. But at the center of its life was an ecclesiastical understanding of human existence, the world and history. Officially a Greek-speaking empire after the sixth century, and adopting the terms “Hellene” and “Hellenic” after the tenth, this rich cultural identity distinguished it from the civilization arising in the West following conquest by barbarian tribes and races.

Western and central Europe’s new inhabitants had subdued and weakened the Latin-speaking Romans, but aspired to
appropriate the name and historical continuity of the Roman Empire by the logic of geographical boundaries. They denied the name of Roman to the citizens of the Hellenized Eastern Empire. They derisively called them “Greeks,” and in the seventeenth century their historians invented the new words “Byzantine” and “Byzantium.” Byzantium, of course, certainly existed historically: the large town on the Bosphorus, founded as an ancient Greek colony, where Constantine built New Rome. Westerners went back to the former name as a substitute for New Rome, which they could then consign to oblivion. Until the period of Turkish rule, the name “Byzantium” would have been unintelligible to most Greek-speaking Romans — as strange as calling modern Greeks “Plakiotai” after the old name of the district below the Acropolis around which the present city of Athens was built. But the Westerners’ arbitrary invention has prevailed, and is well established now in common parlance and scientific history.

From the second century BC to the nineteenth AD, a succession of some seventeen barbarian invasions overran the lands where the ancient Greek cities had flourished. Successive waves of conquest harried the Greek-speaking inhabitants of regions from the Danube to Crete and from Southern Italy to the heartland of Asia Minor and Pontus. Settlements of foreign peoples brought inevitable intermarriage with indigenous Greeks. Claims to modern Greek racial homogeneity or “purity of blood” have little real basis; they are mostly romanticism.

General Makriyannis affirmed the historical paradox in his habitually colorful language: “From beginning to end, from ancient times to the present, all the beasts have struggled to consume us Hellenes, and they cannot; they eat away at us but there still remains some leaven.” This “leaven” was a relic of Greek cities and later “communities” that had survived conquest and intermarriage, ultimately preserving a particular Greek identity: a language, a mentality, a vision of the world and of life. All this was finally absorbed into ecclesiastical Orthodoxy.

Genealogical trees of successive families and names cannot reveal the “leaven” of a dynamic and perpetually renewed Hellenism. It shows itself in popular poetry, the people’s ethos, their way of building churches and decorating them with icons in even the most remote Greek mountain community; in the people’s music and clothing, dowry agreements and various trade association contracts. Under Turkish rule it was a way of life and expression of a common ecclesiastical faith (free from racial or ideological criteria) which distinguished the Orthodox Christian Greek from the Muslim Turk or heterodox “Frank”: it was the practice of fasting, celebrating church festivals and dancing at the panegyriki afterwards; it was the burning of the vigil lamp on the family icon stand; it was the baking and offering of bread for the Divine Liturgy; and the blessing of the waters and all creation every month.

When the Greeks gathered at Epidaurus for their first constitutional State National Assembly during the second year of the revolt against Turkish tyranny (1822), they had only their religious faith with which to define themselves and their particularity. Section B, paragraph 2 of the Epidaurus Constitution reads: “All those indigenous inhabitants of the State of Hellas who believe in Christ are Hellenes.”

Here is the real reason for defining Greece as a mode of life rather than a place.2
II

The Creation of the “West”

Let us return to Demetrios Kydones, the first Greek translator of Thomas Aquinas, whose work transformed the Greek people’s historical and cultural sensibility. I use the expression “cultural transformation” to mean a loss of confidence in one’s own culture combined with an exaggerated admiration for an alien culture. This is difficult to understand at a time when art and thought were enjoying a last brilliant renaissance in the Byzantine Empire.

Kydones’ translations of Aquinas’s works tried to assert their philosophical and theological superiority while a strong Greek philosophical tradition was still capable of refuting his rationalism. Kydones seems not to have understood what was going on around him. He did not appreciate the thought of Gregory Palamas, who was then writing in Thessalonica (their common birthplace), never valuing his significance for the history of philosophy, let alone his theological and spiritual importance. He seems oblivious to the achievements of Greek artists at Mistra, at Thessalonica and at Constantinople’s monastery of St. Savior in Chora.

The first Greek Thomists, or Latinizers, could not appreciate the blossoming of Greek thought and art in the fourteenth century, which synthesized ten centuries of tradition. They were contemporaries of Gregory Palamas yet preferred Thomas Aquinas, even though philosophy, painting, architecture, political and social institutions, and popular culture were all of the highest standard in the East.
News of social change in the West had reached Constantinople by 1400. From the mid-twelfth century to the mid-thirteenth century we can trace the origins of what we now call "totalitarianism." Authoritarian institutions and a single ideology dominated thought and daily social and personal life.

Westernizers admired scholasticism, transforming religious faith into an ideology consisting of a strictly determined world view and obligatory methodology. The Scholastics grounded truth in the syllogism and in the defense of theses by the systematic refutation of contrary statements.

This "technology of truth," based on intellectual dexterity and methodological effectiveness, measured every aspect of Western European life. The Summae articulated the Gothic structure of society, strengthening its authoritarian hierarchies. A syllogistic "system" balancing theses and antitheses, and excluding all doubt, refutation or risk, lay behind this Western culture.

This method controlled everything. Life and culture were polarized between an intellectual individualism and an authoritarian "objectivism," reversing the Greek terms. But the "common logos" of the Greeks habitually identified "what is true" (alétheuwin) with "what is participated" (to koinônein), verifying theory and practice against social and empirical reality.

The investiture controversy between the pope and the Holy Roman Emperor had seen the papacy's triumphant theocratic vision unite political, spiritual, legal and judicial authority (plenitudo potestatis) under the Roman pontiff's control. The Summa Theologicae (1266-72) of Thomas Aquinas introduced the principle of papal infallibility as incontestable. Earlier, in April 1233, Pope Gregory IX had instituted the Holy Office (or Inquisition) which tortured and executed thousands of opponents or suspected opponents of the prevailing ideology. And in 1252 Pope Innocent IV had issued a bull institutionalizing torture for heresy trials: a model for the way later totalitarian regimes have dealt with dissidents.

The Greek East also had direct experience of Western behavior. One hundred and fifty years before Demetrios Kydones was translating Aquinas's Summa contra Gentiles, the Fourth Crusade had achieved its real goal: sacking Constantinople (1204) and abolishing the Roman Empire in the Greek East.

The Christian Crusaders in Constantinople behaved worse than the Saracens at the capture of Jerusalem in the seventh century or the Ottoman Turks when they took the imperial capital in the fifteenth century. A modern Western historian writes:

The violence of the Western knights and soldiers, unleashing their inhibited envy and resentment against the perfidious Greeks, did more deliberate and lasting damage ... [L.] Just and avarice raged through the streets. The treasured monuments of antiquity, which Constantinople had sheltered for nine centuries, were overturned, carried off, or melted down. Private houses, monasteries and churches were emptied of their wealth. Chalices, stripped of their jewels, became drinking-cups; icons became gaming-boards and tables; and urns in their convents were raped and robbed. In St. Sophia the soldiers tore down the veil of the sanctuary and smashed the gold and silver carvings of the altar and the ambon. They piled their trophies on to mules and horses which slipped and fell on the marble pavement, leaving it running with their blood; and a prostitute sat on the Patriarch's throne singing bawdy French songs ... and the most horrifying account of all comes from the pen not of a Greek but of Innocent III, who was quick to condemn what he might have foreseen but had been powerless to prevent.

This brutality had not been forgotten in fourteenth-century Constantinople, but the empty pedestals of destroyed classical statues and the graves of the victims did not dampen the
enthusiasm of Demetrios Kydones and his circle for the new civilization in Western Europe.

Historical information was scarce. Ignorance, or lack of historical memory, would persist for centuries, while profound changes took place in the Greek consciousness through an uncritical admiration for the West. The Greeks seemed to be oblivious to the most basic historical facts: the comparative antiquity of their culture, whose achievements were already outstanding when European civilization was just starting.

The Eastern Roman Empire, the medieval Greek civilization of New Rome, had its first period of greatness while the western part of the empire was undergoing the barbarian invasions. Successive waves of invaders crossed the frontier and settled in imperial territory. They were the Germanic Franks and Goths, both Ostrogoths and Visigoths, the Mongolian Huns, succeeded by Germanic Burgundians, Vandals, Longobards, Angles and Saxons. Contemporary chroniclers describe the barbarians who conquered and divided up central, western and southwestern Europe most unflatteringly.

Later historians refer to “the great migration of peoples” from the late fourth to the sixth centuries. The word “vandalism” still evokes the violence of the period. Yet the Greek world was still productive. The great Cappadocians, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa continued the tradition of Plato and Aristotle. John Chrysostom composed his liturgy, and the homilies that remain models of Greek rhetoric. Then Hagia Sophia was built in Constantinople, Justinian compiled his legal code, and Romanos the Melodist wrote remarkable poetry. The mosaics at Thessalonica and Ravenna date from the same period, as do the encaustic icons of Mount Sinai.

The Eastern Roman Empire used diplomacy and missionaries to Christianize the barbarians, but indigenous Roman populations and the surviving Latin community in Rome did

most to convert the new Europeans. The barbarians were delighted to imitate and adopt the civilization of the Christian world. Greek missionaries, architects and artists reached the German forests and the north of the British Isles to help these peoples adapt to a new Christian civilization, although it is doubtful whether Greek art and philosophy could have meant much to them.

Germanic tribes first encountered Christianity through the Arian heresy which simplified the Holy Trinity to an easily grasped formula. Arian Greek prisoners had converted the Visigoths when they were still occupying the lands between the Danube and the Carpathians, and the Ostrogoths and Burgundians and later the Vandals of Spain took their Arianism from them.

Missionaries from Ionia, or the Asia Minor colonies of Marseilles and Lyons in Southern Gaul, brought orthodox Christianity to the Angles and Saxons in the British Isles. The same is true for the Franks: when they occupied Gaul at the end of the fifth century they adopted the faith of the native population, in their desire to emulate the culture of the peoples they ruled. Frankish conquests or intermarriage gradually converted the Germanic Arians to the orthodox faith.

But the “orthodoxy” of the Franks did not survive for more than a hundred years. The council of Toledo of 589 condemned Arianism but added the Filioque to the Creed, asserting that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father. To the orthodox they were simplifying and schematizing the Holy Trinity and by the arbitrary addition of the Filioque to the Creed marked off Western Christianity from the East.

A national form of Christianity assisted the Franks’ political ambitions, especially after 800 when Charles the Great (Charlemagne) became king. They were working towards
a unified Western Roman Empire bringing other European peoples and rulers under their control.

The idea of the empire recalled a single *ordo rerum*—an “order of things” (like the *pax Romana* or the later Roman *pax Christiana*). The empire perhaps was more a cultural entity than a formal state. No second empire could conceivably challenge the “Christian Oecumene” (the Christian *Imperium Romanum*) centered on New Rome or Constantinople.

Charlemagne perceived correctly that his ambition to found a new empire in the West required a new “order of things,” a cultural unity which had to break with the Roman world’s traditions. The Christian faith was still the obvious basis for civilized social life. A new kind of Christian belief and worship was needed to justify a second empire in the Christian world.

Charlemagne also had the good sense to gather the best available advisors at his court, including Alcuin the famous Anglo-Saxon scholar. It was perhaps from these advisors that Charlemagne acquired his ideological ideas and political ambitions.

Augustine’s theology was decisive, offering an ideal basis for a differentiated Western version of Christianity. A Westerner of exclusively Latin education, he neither spoke nor read Greek. He was universally respected in the Christian world for the brilliant example of his conversion. He was unfamiliar with early Christian theological debates, since he did not know the Greek texts or their philosophical background. His Christianitity was easier to understand and assimilate than the more complex Greek discussions.

The Franks had already drawn from Augustine their teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son. Charlemagne also borrowed from him the idea of a theocratic civilization (from his work *De Civitate Dei*) of an empire which imposed divine justice and routed the enemies of the Church.4

Frankish theologians derived from Augustine the presuppositions for a secularized “religionization” of the Christian life, emphasizing individual conviction against experiential participation in the Church as truth. Intellectuality and individualism afterwards always pervaded the Western religious tradition. A divine judge and his implacable justice would irrevocably predestine human beings to salvation or perdition. Humanity’s relationship with God is transformed into a metaphysics of exchange, in which God calculates guilt and man pays up.

This characteristic Western mutation was already present in the mentality of Tertullian and Ambrose of Milan, Augustine’s teachers. The elder Rome’s Latin hierarchy barely resisted the Carolingian theological innovation. Besides, Rome found in the person of Charlemagne an effective supporter of its ecclesiastical authority and autonomy.

Converted barbarian tribes accepted this version of the Christian life unhesitatingly, oblivious to any “canonical presuppositions” of ecclesiastical order. The Church of Rome no longer participated in imperial institutions which might have preserved church unity. To impose its authority meant assuming political powers and transforming itself into an autonomous political entity.

Charlemagne’s father, King Pepin II the Short, had offered political autonomy for the Church of Rome to Pope Stephen II. Just as the barbarian kings distributed their feudal lands among themselves, Pepin granted the duchy of Rome, the exarchate of Ravenna, and the Pentapolis to the pope, thus forming the first papal state (754). Charlemagne protected it from Lombards and granted it new territories. In return Pope Leo III crowned him emperor of the West (on Christmas day 800), recognizing him as the overlord of the papal state. Charlemagne’s theocratic ideas justifying his imperial power depended on the Church’s authority.
Despite these mutual concessions, the Church did not always officially accept the innovations the Franks had introduced into the Christian life. Leo III flatly refused to add the *Filioque* to the Creed. He had the original text engraved on silver panels in the Church of St. Peter to defend the Creed against Frankish misrepresentations. From 1009, the Franks controlled the succession to the papal throne and Latin orthodoxy dropped its resistance to the innovations devised at the court of Charlemagne, making it official doctrine. But even before 1009 the Latin Romans had been ambivalent. The historical circumstances that strengthened the Church of Rome only highlighted the changes in ecclesiastical sensibility that had become dominant.

By the ninth century Western Christianity had already changed its customs and external forms of ecclesiastical practice, which had been invented by the Franks, to make the particularity of Western Christianity, and therefore of the Western Roman Empire in relation to the Greek East, perceptible to the laity as a whole. The obligatory celibacy of the clergy, the celebration of the Eucharist with unleavened bread, the exclusion of the laity from communion from the chalice, the abolition of baptism by immersion and its replacement by sprinkling, the tonsure of the clergy and their shaven faces were some of the external changes which manifested differentiated the practice of Western Christianity from the early Christian tradition and its continuity in the Greek East.

These changes articulated a profound mutation in the Church’s proclamation of religious truth, and how it made sense of life and the world. For ordinary people these changes were only the external marks of the attempt to create a new world independent of the cultural legacy of the Greeks.

The descendants of the Germanic tribes resented the Greeks. The West produced at least ten treatises between 800 and 1300 entitled *Contra errores Graecorum* – “Against the errors of the Greeks.” All Greek culture was depicted as false. And certain Latin bishops of Rome shared in this enmity.

After New Rome became the capital of the Roman Empire, and especially after an equal “primacy of honor” with Rome was accorded to her by the 28th Canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, this rivalry became permanent. The popes started to claim jurisdiction over the whole Church, presuming to exercise control or intervene pastorally in other local churches. The consolidation of the German kingdoms strengthened the Roman Church, intensifying papal ambitions.

The myth grew up that the first bishop and founder of the Church of Rome was the Apostle Peter. Since Christ had given him primacy amongst the apostles, this primacy devolved upon his successor bishops of Rome – although Peter had also founded churches in other cities. One of history’s most skillful spurious documents, the famous Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, was fabricated in France in the mid-ninth century. The equally spurious Donation of Constantine was also very influential. These forged synodal canons assigned a higher rank to the clergy than that of the political authority and recognized the Roman pope as head of the clergy and therefore of the whole world (*caput totius orbis*). According to the Donation of Constantine, when Constantine the Great transferred the imperial capital to the Greek East, he granted the pope the administrative control of the Western Roman state with imperial authority and insignia: the purple robe, scarlet buskins, crown, scepter and the Lateran Palace.

These crass forgeries and political claims played a decisive role in the formation of medieval and modern Europe. But papal ambitions were more than personal aggrandizement. They were one of the ways in which the popes defended themselves and contested the imperial pretensions of the Frankish and later the German emperors. They needed to impose papal authority on bishops from the converted peoples.
who often behaved as if they held their sees as autonomous feudal fiefdoms.

The popes' growing involvement in the conflicts between feudal leaders must have altered and damaged their sense of the Church. When might was right in daily life, church pastors could hardly follow Christ's example of self-emptying after he denounced worldly power and authority. Greek patriarchs of the East were rarely examples of Christlike humility, but they never made their worldly pretensions into an institution. In the East, personal pursuit of power was seen as an aberration or personal sin, but in the West it became institutionalized in the canon law of the Roman Church.

The first pope to make the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals a legally obligatory code for the whole Church was Nicholas I (858-67). He tried to impose papal authority on all Western sees and secular rulers. He intervened in internal politics, using excommunication as a weapon against rulers who contested his jurisdiction. He proclaimed the emperor's authority itself to be a feudal gift from Peter's successor, the Roman pope, because only anointing and crowning by the pope gave validity to the imperial dignity. Thus Nicholas concentrated all ecclesiastical and political authority in his person - or, as contemporaries said, he regarded himself as the emperor of the whole world (Nicolaus totius mundi imperatorem se fecit.)

His limitless ambitions inspired him to intervene uncanonically even in the ecclesiastical provinces of the East (specifically in the Church of Bulgaria) and also to demand that he should be recognized as the highest court of appeal for the canonical disputes that had arisen as a result of the ordination of the Patriarch Photios. Constantinople resisted, and the clash between Old and New Rome became an open rift with mutual excommunications causing the first schism between Eastern and Western Christendom (867).

In the first rift the Greek East focused its criticism on the authoritarian demands of the papacy which undermined the catholicity of every local church. It also noted the other innovations of the Western Church without making these of central importance. About two hundred years later, when the Franks completely controlled the papal throne, they began to demand the imposition of their innovations - and particularly the addition of the Filioque to the Creed - as a canonical requirement of orthodoxy. The patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cerularios (1043-59), attempted to save the remaining Greek sees of Southern Italy from Frankish doctrines. His letter condemned papal innovations, appealing to apostolic and conciliar tradition. Leo IX riposted with an official delegation to Constantinople led by Cardinal Humbertus who on July 16, 1054 deposited a bull on the altar of Hagia Sophia excommunicating all of Eastern Christendom. The schism between the East and the West that had broken with the tradition and culture embodied historically in the Church's Gospel was confirmed.

Innovation in the Western Church became unstoppable. The transformation of life, to which the experience of the Eucharist calls us, was changed into an authoritarian ideology, into a secular auctoritas which subjected all thought and conscience to the papal Church.

Twenty years later, in his famous Dictatus, Pope Gregory VII (1073-85) claimed plenary authority for the papal throne. The pope is the absolute lord of the universal Church. He appoints and deposes bishops and metropolitans. He alone can call ecumenical councils. His legates are superior to bishops. He is lord of the world. His tiara bears imperial insignia. Princes must kiss his foot. He can depose emperors and release subjects from their oath of allegiance. Secular appointments are dependent on his office, like the moon receives its light from the sun. He enjoys the special protection of
St. Peter whose virtues guarantee the sanctification of each pope. The Roman Church has never erred nor will it ever err.  

This vision became the political program of all popes. Some were more successful than others but the crown belongs to Innocent III (1198-1216), who finally realized the papal dream of imposing the *plenitude potestatis* on the whole world.  

Innocent re-established papal authority in Rome, where the Latin aristocracy had been struggling to limit it. He regained control of Southern Italy. He excommunicated the German Emperor Otto IV and forced the German princes to accept the coronation of Frederick II, who was devoted to the papal throne. He obliged King John of England to assign his kingdom to God and the pope, to be given back to him as a papal fief on the payment of an annual tribute. The same obligations were imposed on Sancho I of Portugal and Peter II of Aragon. Hungary had already been the pope’s vassal since the tenth century. Finally, the Fourth Crusade extended Innocent’s power over the Roman Empire of the Greek East as the summit of his ambitions to dominate the world.  

III  

The Ecclesial Framework  

The increasing secularization of the Roman Church should surprise nobody. Regardless of the errors of pastors and princes, Western Christianity increasingly lost all sense of the ecclesial life characteristic of the early Christian communities which had been sustained by ecumenical councils up to 800.  

By 1354, when Demetrius Kydones was translating Thomas Aquinas, a different Christianity had already emerged in the West and been expressed in conciliar documents, papal decisions, and theological treatises. Kydones’ chief opponents, Gregory Palamas and Nilos Cabasilas, had already perceived and denounced the changes in the Western understanding of the Church, as had earlier ecclesiastics such as Photios the Great, Nicholas Mystikos, Sergios of Constantinople and Michael Keroularios. But in each period simply denouncing the changes could not carry conviction without appropriate criteria for judging their consequences.  

Gregory Palamas, archbishop of Thessalonica, perceived perhaps more clearly than his predecessors how the Western Church’s innovations were not just a new Christian heresy – a distortion of specific Christian doctrines – but a radical overturning of the doctrine of salvation proclaimed in the Gospels.  

The West’s innovations resulted in what we may call a “re-ligionized” version of the Church. Historically, Christianity was not a new religion but the proclamation of a new mode
of existence. It was a way of transforming human existence from a physical, mortal individuality to personal relation, a way for people to exist in a relation of love and communion with life as the members of a body which is the Church.

The sense of the Church primarily as a body in which we share in life and existence was lost in the West. With this change, Christianity became an individualistic “religion,” dominated by private convictions, the acquisition of individual merit, and the institutional control of faith and morals.

This mutation was more fundamental than any earlier heresy, none of which had changed the mode of Christian life so radically or so distorted the Christian Gospel. The Church’s teaching on the meaning of life offered a new beginning for humankind, a new mode of life that inaugurated the thousand-year culture of New Rome. The Western religious changes not only altered the Gospel but also rejected the Greek understanding of human life, resulting in the emergence of a different culture whose global influence still predominates.

The Gospel joyfully proclaims the good news that human beings can overcome death and transcend the limitations of their human nature. This proclamation was a “revelation.” Not in the sense of an unverified supernatural message about the existence of God and a transcendent world, but in the sense of a testimony from experience which “reveals” the capacity of human beings to overcome death.

The testimony from experience carries the conviction of a real encounter with a historical person at a particular time and place, Jesus Christ, who embodied the capacity of human beings to exist in the mode of God’s uncreated nature.

The Christian Church does not call human beings simply to accept intellectually and a priori that Christ was both man and God. It does not seek “faith” in the sense of individual intellectual assent to a supernatural datum. It sets out the testimony of the first “eyewitnesses” to God’s “epiphany” in the person of Christ, calling on human beings to share experientially in a mode of existence which verifies the original testimony. The message of the eyewitness, historically perpetuated by the Church, was expressed linguistically as a kerygmatic proclamation. The experience of the ecclesial body is not an illogical or irrational mysticism. The Church’s proclamation is a rational declaration and clarification of its experience, so that others can participate in it. But rational knowledge never replaces the immediacy of lived experience.

This is the basis of the apophaticism that is essential before we can receive the Church’s proclamation. Apophaticism is the denial that we can exhaust the truth in its expression, a denial that we can identify the knowledge of truth simply with an understanding of its declaratory logic. The Church’s proclamation links the revelation of God’s personal existence and of humanity’s personal capacities to the historical manifestation of Christ.

Religious mythologies often personified God naively, without a causal explanation. Philosophical search for a causal principle was irreconcilable with the irrationality of anthropomorphic representations of the divine. Philosophy never went beyond the abstract concept of an existentially undetermined “supreme being,” a logically necessary “first cause,” an unmoved “first mover.” These ideas remained as remote as imaginative myth. Ancient Greek philosophy developed a highly systematic theology governed by logic. Logic defined God’s existence as necessary, but his existence remained a theoretical hypothesis. God is empirically inaccessible, but must exist because logic demands a first cause. We conceive of this first cause as an abstract essence, as the sum of the attributes which the first cause must have to be truly divine.

According to the “principle of essence” this supreme being which we call God must be pure mind which is uncaused, immortal, infinite, almighty, all wise, immaterial and without passion. Of course such an idea cut off the essence of God
from the world and human reality: God created (and perhaps sustained) the world, but no rational construct could explain how the immaterial and infinite can emerge from the material and finite, or the immortal and incorruptible from the mortal and corruptible. That is why philosophical thought always left matter ontologically unexplained: either matter was eternal (self-existing as a second divinity) or God created it supernaturally.

According to the Church’s proclamation, the historical Person of Christ reveals the mode of divine existence. God’s essence remains unknowable and inaccessible. This inaccessible and incomprehensible essence is revealed by Christ as existing in a personal mode, as we do. The uncreated “nature” of God and the created nature of man have a mode of existence in common, and this mode constitutes the reality of personhood.

Personhood implies an existence with self-awareness and rationality, with the capacity for reference and relation, an existence with a uniqueness that goes beyond its essence and nature. Thus human existence is personal because it recapitulates all the attributes of the nature common to all human beings, while at the same time it “hypostasizes” (makes into existential reality) these common attributes in a mode which is unique, particular and unrepeatable. Human nature is capable of rational thought, judgment, imagination, will, creativity and love. But every human being expresses himself or herself, judges, imagines, wills, creates, and loves, in a mode different from everyone else. This means that our individual existence is expressed through our common human energies, while at the same time we “stand out” existentially, emerging from the general and universal, and existing free from the predetermined aspects of our natural species. This existential “standing-out” or “ek-stasy” is always revealed in the reality of interpersonal relations, is tied to the referentiality of human existence.

In Christ’s life on earth, the Church affirms an analogous (mutatis mutandis) personal “standing-out” of God, his existential freedom from his uncreated nature. We talk about God’s “nature” and “essence” analogously because human beings cannot verify their understanding of “uncreatedness” by experience. But we do have an experiential sense of the personal mode of existence of this uncreated “nature,” God’s personal “standing-out” from his own “nature,” his power to express his personal hypostasis and in the manner of the created energies of human nature. Free from any predetermined arising out of essence or nature, God hypostasizes in his Person (the Person of Christ) not only his own Being (the uncreated essence or nature) but also humanity’s created being. And by simultaneously hypostasizing the two natures in a single personal hypostasis, he kept the natural attributes of both without any necessity to realize these attributes existentially. That is why he can “suspend” or “empty himself” of the “glory” of his Godhead — “being conformed to the body of our humble nature” — just as he can shed the weight of our material being when walking on the waters of Lake Gennesaret. If that which hypostasizes Being is the Person, no necessity arising from nature or essence (divine or human) can limit personal freedom. The uncreated God can then exist in the mode of created humanity. And created humanity (insofar as its pastoral and existential capabilities are liberated from the necessities of its nature) can exist in the mode of uncreated divinity. It can overcome death.

This revelation underlies the Church’s good news. The cause and principle of existence is personal freedom alone. It is not nature, logic or any other necessity.

For the Church the historical Christ is God’s personal hypostasis, not in terms of a “natural” (or “supernatural”) individual self-sufficiency but as an existential reference to a second divine personal hypostasis. Christ is the Son and Word of God the Father — he does not exist for himself. He
does not seek existential autonomy. His existence witnesses to and manifests the Person of the Father. In the Church’s experience a third personal hypostasis makes this accessible: the Spirit of God, the Paraclete. The Spirit makes the Word’s witness effective, not simply as information about God the Father, but as a life-creating possibility, open to everyone willing to accept adoption, and realize with God the same living relationship which the Son has with the Father.

By manifesting himself as the Son of God, Christ reveals that Father is the name which most fully expresses the mode of God’s hypostasis, that which God really is. He is the begetting and life-giving principle initiating a relationship which hypostasizes being. For the Church the foundation of existence, the source and cause of being, is not a primary essence which then comes to exist in a personal mode, but is primarily a Person free from any necessity arising from essence or nature only because he loves, because he hypostasizes his Being, his essence, by eternally begetting the Son and causing the Holy Spirit to proceed.

The Person of God the Father precedes and defines his essence. Person is not predetermined by essence. Consequently, God is not obliged by his essence to be God: he is not subject to the necessity of his existence, but exists because he is the Father, the one who fully confirms his will to exist, begetting the Son and causing the Spirit to proceed. He exists because he loves, and love is only an expression of freedom. Unconstrained even by love, the Father (timelessly and lovingly) hypostasizes his Being in a Triad of Persons, constituting the logos mode of existence as a communion of personal freedom, a communion of love. The Church’s experience gives a single definition of God: that “God is love,” that what God is love, that God’s being is love, that the mode in which God exists is love.

The Church’s Gospel is summarized in this fundamental proposition/invitation. For humanity also to exist in the mode of God, the mode of freedom from any necessity of corruption or death, the mode of love, of self-transcendence. We are invited to conform to the mode of existence of the divine personal hypostases, no longer drawing our existence from nature – from our physical and psychological individuality, which is mortal and subject to corruption. We are invited to change our capacity for existence into the freedom of personal relation, into life as loving communion.

This proposition/invitation is not simply a moral exhortation. Such exhortations and our response to them cannot change our mortal mode of existence. However much we develop a morality of disinterested love, however many virtues we acquire, we will not cease being mortal, “because overcoming our own nature is an impossibility.” Certainly, human nature is endowed with a capacity for personal existence, a capacity for an existential disengagement or “ecstasy” from nature. But even this capacity is still bound to the limitations of the created, the ephemeral and the mortal.

According to the Church, for humanity to exist in the mode of the personal hypostases – to exist because it loves and in the measure in which it loves – it must be “born again.” This is not a symbolic mystical expression, but a vivid reminder of the mode which constitutes life. Every form of life is a “birth,” a gracious gift and mystery beyond causal explanations. Our participation in the true life of personal freedom from death is also a gracious gift.

The Church’s Gospel identifies our “charismatic” and “sacramental” rebirth with our incorporation into the “body” of a loving communion of persons, into the ecclesial body’s unity of life. “Body” means a mode of existence in which the “members” partake of life – existing only because of the life-giving unity of the whole body. Life is communion with the whole ecclesial body, not the possession of private virtues or qualities.
The sacrament of baptism brings us into the unity of life of the ecclesial body. In the water – the primordial womb of life – we “bury” our mere individuality and “rise” as personal beings communing with life, brought into the ecclesial mode of existence. The Church’s body receives us and gives us a personal name to acknowledge our uniqueness. The “body” acknowledges and loves us like Christ and the saints, transforming life into communion.

At the center of this communion is the eucharistic meal, which constitutes and realizes the Church. The members of the ecclesial body participate in life not symbolically or morally but in a practical way by receiving food – bread and wine, which mark out life’s rhythm. But the purpose of this food is no longer to sustain the life of the individual; it offers a comparable access to the life of the members of the ecclesial body, an interpersonal communion with life. Communion, which is simultaneously an “offering” of life to God, is Eucharist – in the mode of the Son’s offering of himself to the Father – for the life-giving love which brings immortality.

Thus the bread and the wine that sustain our earthly life are shared in “kenotically, that is to say, erotically” and are offered up to the Father. They are the realization of Christ’s mode of existence, the realization of God’s true life in the mode in which created being operates, the life of Christ, his body and blood.

I do not mean a magical “transubstantiation” of matter into supernatural power. I am speaking of a life free from the determination of essence or nature. I mean a real generative-dynamic transformation of the mode of existence, of incorporating humankind into the flesh of Christ, into the mode of divine existence operating “in the flesh.” This incorporation presupposes on the human side the same Christlike renunciation of the demand for individual existential self-sufficiency, the same willingness to offer up one’s existence to the loving communion of a brotherly “sharing a common food.”

The Eucharist perpetuates Christ’s sacrifice. Christ gives himself to the cross and death not to redeem some legal guilt of ours, or appease the wrath of an oppressive God who demands that his justice should be satisfied. Christ gives himself to death, “emptied” of every demand for self-sufficient existence, taking our failure upon himself and making it his own – with a passionate love that saves us from oblivion. And this acceptance of death is an act of offering and obedience and thanksgiving to the Father, whose own life-giving will is fulfilled by the Son’s sacrifice. Christ’s crucified flesh thus becomes the life and resurrection of “all flesh,” since this makes the Triadic love which brings life to created being effective.

The eucharistic body of the church is conformed to the crucified flesh of Christ’s obedience. To be conformed in this way does not call for individual virtues and merits but the offering up of our individual death, our existential failure and sin – an offering which implies our surrender to the passionate love of the Bridegroom “who raises the dead.” We do not seek a life which is self-sufficient but simply offer up the mode of our mortal existence as thanksgiving to him who makes the mortal immortal. By offering up death which is all we possess, we offer ourselves up to the freedom of personal relation with our brothers and sisters unhindered by the demands of nature. We transform life’s promise into the love which brings unity to the ecclesial body and life to its members.

Thus the Eucharist is the whole of our salvation, the whole truth and realization of the Church’s Gospel. Every local Eucharist, every particular celebration of the “memorial” of Christ’s sacrifice, is the realization and manifestation of the universal Church: the comprehensive renewal of the created and the vivification of the mortal. The Eucharist is the truth and completion of the Church, the transformation of the mode of human existence. Any institutional, administrative or organizational structures that are independent of the Eucharist betray our reliance on nature’s capabilities, our
imprisonment (even if a "religious" imprisonment) in natural self-sufficiency, in a death without hope.

The same is true of individual virtues, individual moral achievements and "good works." As a training in self-denial and self-offering, they are simply a preparation for the goal or telos of participation in the eucharistic body of ecclesial communion. Without this telos they are merely natural achievements, feeding illusions of self-sufficiency, that prevent us from renouncing nature and surrendering to grace.

Participation in the Gospel promise of incorruption and immortality requires our incorporation into the eucharistic community, the eucharistic mode of existence. The parable of the Publican and the Pharisee serves as a pointer to this mode of existence. The Pharisee is the model of a religious person who seeks salvation for himself in reliance on his own merits, his own moral achievements and his faithfulness to the Law. He fasts twice a week; he gives away a tenth of all he gains; he is not like other men – he justifies himself as a moral individual but nevertheless remains mortal, excluded from the life of loving self-renunciation and communion. By contrast the Publican is the model of an ecclesial person. He acknowledges his moral failings. His only hope is to surrender himself humbly to God's mercy and love. He does not consider himself worthy of salvation or possess anything meritorious for his redemption. If he has any hope of salvation it will only be because God loves him without limit and so he abandons himself to God's loving goodness. The Publican leads us to the eucharistic Kingdom. Similar parables are found throughout the Gospels. The thief, the prostitute, the prodigal – these markedly non-religious types, presented as guides to the realization of true life insofar as they embody repentance, a radical change of heart, an understanding of life as relational and of death as individual self-sufficiency.

IV

The Origins of the Rift

The previous chapter summarized the Church's Gospel – "Orthodoxy": literally, the correct (orthos) belief and experience (doxa) of the eucharistic body. By contrast, Western Christianity radically betrayed it.

A parallel doctrine gradually emerged, an undisguised distortion of the Gospel kerygma, driven by the "religionization" of the Church. The West rejected (or failed to understand) the priority of personhood, returning to the abstract conception of God as supreme essence. This conception entails an exclusively individualistic approach to divine truth which – as in all religions – is assessed by the standard of individual assent to dogmatic formulas and their concomitant moral demands. The Church became simply a mechanism for controlling individual fidelity to dogma and morality, a mediator between the individual and an experientially inaccessible divine Essence.

The West's inability to understand the priority of personhood (to move from the level of an individualistic conception of God to the level of personal participation in the ecclesial body) led Popes Victor, Zephyrinus and Calixtus, and especially the Roman theologian Sabellius, in around the year 200 towards a monarchical theology. They understood God as a monarchy, giving priority to the unity of the one divine Essence and reducing the Persons to "internal relations" within it. Thus they attributed the causal principle of existence and of life not to the freedom and otherness of per-
sonhood but to the necessity imposed by an initially given essence.

This was the basis of Augustine’s theology which Charlemagne made the Western Church’s official teaching. Augustine was declared “the greatest teacher of the Church after the apostles,” thereafter dominating the development of theological thought. The later scholastics borrowed from Augustine to construct an austere ideological system.

The priority of essence entails the priority of conceptual thought and therefore of the individual intellect over experience. God is not recognized primarily as personal intervention in history revealing the mode of divine existence, as personal experience of participation in this mode, in the way he is seen in the eucharistic unity of the ecclesial body. God becomes an object of individual understanding (objectum formaliter acceptum), which implies an abstract and impersonal ‘supreme being’ (supra ens) unrelated to experience and history.

The priority of essence presupposes a particular approach to epistemology. The experiential immediacy of relation is excluded. Knowledge becomes the coincidence of thought with the object of thought. It is restricted to individual intellectual conception.

In the West, by the end of the ninth century, logos came to acquire the sense of ratio, which no longer corresponded to the Greek logos, signifying manifestation, and therefore the referentiality that constitutes relation. Ratio is the individual’s capacity for rational thought (facultas rationis), the mind’s ability to know things by their essence (per se). This is because the human mind by definition is a microcosm of the divine intellect which contains the essences of all things as intellectual concepts.

If the concept corresponds to the object of thought (the aequatio rei et intellectus) and tells us how we know truth, individual comprehension of logical statements expressing truth suffices for human beings to know truth. Experiential participation, the dynamic immediacy of our relationship with what we know, becomes superfluous. The apophatic character of the expressions of truth, which the Church considered essential to an experiential knowledge of revelation, is discarded. Understanding how truth is formulated is all that guarantees knowledge of truth. The Church’s Gospel, or theology, was transformed into a rationalistic structure, an apodictic methodology, able to convince the individual intellect (modus argumentativus). It was turned into a sacred science (sacra scientia) which neglected experience and empirical evidence.

To identify what is real with the intellectual conception of its essence – to interpret existence only according to the logical structure of the essence – makes the distinction between essence and energies superfluous. There is no need to distinguish nature from its energies. But it is the energies which make the freedom and otherness of personal existence possible in relation to the common nature. The West rejected the distinction between essence and energies precisely because it denied the priority of personhood: the priority of the existential fact over the intellectually conceived essence. The West refused to recognize that essence or nature constitutes an existential fact only as personal hypostasis – only in the mode of an ek-static referentiality, an otherness and freedom with regard to the common nature.

From the earliest centuries Westerners tended to identify essence with hypostasis (the essentia with substantia), with the result that they took existence to mean logically predetermined onticity. They left no space for the energies really to exist, no space for the freedom of ek-static self-transcendence, because existence was understood only intellectually, not through the experience of relation, participation and communion. The mode in which existence is expressed, is reduced to the essential “attributes” of a logically predeter-
mined existential onticity. In particular, the West confuses God’s essence with his energy, regarding the energy as a property of the divine essence and interpreting the latter as “pure energy” (actus purus). This denies God’s personal existential ek-stasy, his power to act outside (ektos) his essence, and leaves the question of the ontological constitution of matter and the world unanswered: if matter results from God’s energy, and energy is identified with his essence, then even matter is part of God’s essence (which leads us to pantheism), or it belongs to another self-existent and eternal essence (a second divinity), or, emerging from the divine essence-energy, it constitutes an essence inferior to the divine essence (therefore entailing an emanation of the divine essence and two “qualities” of the divine essence, one “transcendent,” the other “immanent”).

Augustine’s simple solution, later adopted by the scholastics, sees matter as a reality without essence—a penitus nihil. Aquinas maintains that matter has no being (nullum esse habet). Thus only the ideas which shape matter and the laws which govern the material world have their ontological principle in God’s rational essence, his essence as Logos, even though matter is “essentially” non-existent. (This simple solution not only makes matter nonexistent, but also implies that every “eidetic” change in matter—decay and death—necessarily reflects God’s essence, since his essence embraces the definitive mode—eidos of existence of all sensible things.)

The nullity of matter leaves many questions unanswered. What does God’s incarnation in the person of Christ, the resurrection and “glory” of his material body mean in ontological terms? How does the material human being participate in the immortality and holiness which are essential properties of the Godhead alone? What does the materiality of the bread and wine of the Eucharist represent? To reply to such questions Western theologians are obliged to mix indeterminate “matter” with the concept of the “supernatural” (supernaturaliter), that is, the magical, which is beyond philosophical or religious interpretation.

If matter essentially doesn’t exist, it is inevitably devalued. The material, the bodily and the sensory are held in contempt for the sake of the spiritual and the immaterial. The West distrusted sensory experience and eroticism. This quasi-Manichaean sensibility imposed clerical celibacy, denied the chalice to the laity, and replaced communion bread with a transparent host with minimal resemblance to real food. Symbolic sprinkling replaced baptism by immersion.

The priority of essence over personhood—the priority of the rational definition of existence—is not a logical “error,” setting off countless intellectual debates. It has vital practical consequences for every aspect of human existence. To center life around the individual and his or her mental capacities traps us in our own intellectual limitations. It is a fear of the relation that leads to experiential knowledge, a fear of the freedom that relation presupposes. Individualism and intellectualism, which are the pivots of Western European life and culture, are historical products of a theology which denies the priority of personhood, of participation in relations and experiential knowledge, for the sake of the intellectual certainties of the individual and denies the ecclesial mode of existence for the sake of an individual “religious” certainty. Western theology turns God into an “object” subject to the individual’s comprehension. It conceives of him as Being defined by logical thought, by the rational conceptualization of his essence. The first twenty-five chapters of Thomas Aquinas’s Summa Theologiae or any Roman Catholic dogmatic handbook depict an intellectual being, subject to human logic, in place of the living God. What is missing is the experiential basis of the Christian Gospel, the approach to the truth of the personal Triadic God though participation in the ecclesial communion of persons. There is no union of
knowledge with the experience of relation, of relation with love, of love with freedom, of freedom with the realization and manifestation of personal otherness.

The Church witnesses to the divine personal hypostases from its experience of the historical Theophany. Western theology makes the hypostases concepts. It defines them intellectually according to essence: the Logos reveals the rationality – “logosness” – of God’s essence, the essence of God as Logos. The Spirit reveals the spirituality of God’s essence, the essence of God as Spirit. Thus the distinction of the Hypostases serves to manifest the priority of the essence, “the interior relations” of the essence. That is why the Spirit for Westerners proceeds “from the Father and the Son” (ex Patre Filioque). The common procession of the Spirit is a relation of the Father and the Son which logically ensures the unity of the one essence. The causal principle of the Spirit is this logical relation – the hypostasis itself of the Spirit is the relational link between the Father and the Son which guarantees the unity (and priority) of the divine essence. The rationality of the interior relations of the divine essence is the starting-point of existence – not the personal freedom of the Father’s love. Furthermore, the procession of the Spirit also from the Logos ensures the “essentially” logical (and, of course, supernatural) character of the Spirit’s activity in history – notably the rational character of the “spiritual” foundation of the Church.

By the same logic the distinction of the divine hypostases is subordinated to the attributes of the divine essence – the personal freedom of love and intense eros is not the mode of God’s hypostatic existence, not subject to prior definitions and “essential” necessities. Love is also this “essential” attribute of God whose manifestation is necessarily limited by other equally “essential” attributes, such as divine wisdom and justice.

Thus God’s “essential” wisdom obliges Western theology (from Augustine onwards) to decry God’s love and man’s freedom and teach the absolute predestination of every human being. Since God is all-wise by virtue of his essence, the generation of beings (and consequently the exercise of human freedom) is strictly tied to a universal concept or plan existing within the divine knowledge which absolutely predetermines every existence. And since not only knowledge but also will belong to God’s essence – and for that reason are also absolute – evil cannot be realized without divine consent. Consequently, we must accept that God predetermines how evil will be realized and by whom, just as he predetermines how good is realized. That is why Augustine even speaks of the fearful need of sinning (dura necessitas peccandi). Thus human salvation has its cause only in God’s choice, not in personal freedom; freedom cannot be a reality since the causal principle of reality is determined by the presuppositions which the priority of the essence imposes.

Accordingly, God’s “essential” justice also circumscribes the manifestation of his love and makes him a legislator, a judge, who punishes every transgression of his implaceable will. God’s relations with the world and humanity are set within the framework of this legalistic interpretation of the divine will. The order of the universe reflects a law laid down by God. So does the logic of history – a law which “essentially” excludes freedom and the unforeseen. Human beings accordingly are “justified” and “saved” only in the degree in which they individually obey the laws of morality laid down by God. Morality is God’s legally expressed will.

The West thus abandoned the Gospel understanding of “salvation” (making a human being “sound,” intact, as a hypostatic existence through participation in the ecclesial mode of loving existence and communion). The West returned to the commonplace religious concept of the legalistic justifi-
cation of the individual through his or her virtues, self-control and good works.

Augustine’s legalistic way of thinking supports “individual” justification in juridical categories acceptable to the Roman mentality, introducing into the relationship between humanity and God a concept which we can call “transactional metaphysics.”

This “transactional metaphysics” is based on Augustine’s assumption that human sin is a “debt” which must be “redeemed” for justification in the sight of God. Redemption is realized on two levels: theologically by Christ’s death on the cross, offered as a “ransom” for the settlement of the infinitely great “debt” of human sin and impiety towards God, and anthropologically by the “penalty” imposed on the sinner which must be paid if his sins are to be redeemed.

Anselm of Canterbury and Thomas Aquinas made this Augustinian teaching on the need for the “satisfaction” of a divine justice injured by human sin fundamental for Western theology. And the Council of Trent made it the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

But from the ninth century this “transactional metaphysics” had already entered into Western religious life. Religious texts present God as a “sadistic father” burning to satisfy his justice, and by logical extension delighted at the torture of sinners in hell. The role of the clergy, the organization of religious institutions, the practice of the sacraments, especially that of confession, and even art and forms of worship presuppose a relationship between man and God measured only by the logic of debt (poenae injunctae) and redemption (redemptio). Every human action is calculated as an addition to or reduction of the debt. Human life itself is measured by the logic of this transaction. There is also an “amassing of capital” in the practice of this transaction: this is the thesaurus meritorum sanctorum, the treasury of the merits of the saints, which is administered by the pope and may be used in place of financial compensation. Sinners bought indulgences which represented the “accumulated” merits of the good works of the saints: the merits of works in excess of the sum required by the justification of the saints.

Western Christianity distorted tradition without most of the faithful noticing. For only occasionally did the West openly alter the letter of the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils or the external forms of the sacraments and of worship. But it did alter the way in which the Gospel and the life of the Church were interpreted. Under the guise of “Church” and “Christianity” it hid what was precisely the opposite of the Church’s understanding of the mode of existence.

No other Christian heresy so effectively distorted the Christian Gospel. Perhaps this was because the West adopted the individual’s natural tendency to reduce this wonderful existential invitation to his own level, to “religionize” the Church’s inner life, to subject it to the demands of individual ideological certainty and psychological moral self-sufficiency. This natural tendency has always been a temptation for Christian consciences—ever since the time of the Judizers of the first Christian communities.

For the first time in history the natural human tendency to turn the Gospel into a “religion” was adopted and fully institutionalized. But it was also skilfully concealed under the cloak of an easily understandable individual piety and morality. To understand the radical transformation of the ecclesial mode of existence into an individualistic religiosity and morality we need the experience of existential change embodied in the ecclesial person, or at least an appreciation of the existential need for such a change. Without these requirements it is very difficult for the Western distortion of the Christian Gospel to be understood.

In recent centuries discontented Europeans have realized something was wrong but underestimated the extent of the problem. They turned against “dogma” which made faith
into a codified set of propositions, replacing experience by intellectualism. But they were unaware that the dogmatic formulas were the fruit of the denial of Christian apophaticism. This denial dissolved personal relations. Thus the truth becomes the "validity" of the formula. Consciences are subjected involuntarily and passively to the letter of the formulation and to the supremacy of an authoritative "cathedra" which exploits the formulations in an ideological manner. Dogmatism becomes the dominant ideology, using propaganda (historically first evidenced in the Propaganda Fidei) to dominate the masses and eliminate dissent. Europeans resented a religion which assumed secular powers and had become an autonomous state with ministries, diplomatic missions, banks, investments, police and censorship. But Europeans were unaware that the Roman Church's transformation into a secular state was a direct consequence of its denial of the Church's eucharistic character. This denial not only invalidates the mode of existence taught in the Gospels but also destroys human life as community. Bureaucratic and authoritarian structures dominated social life, and freedom was mortgaged to officialdom.

Europeans also resisted the pressure of feelings of guilt arising from transgressing the moral codes, which crippled them with the fear of sin and the denigration of the body, love and beauty. But they were unaware that their suffering was the result of the denial of personhood, of life as personal communion and relation, which diminished not only the Gospel's transformation of sin and death into a loving self-denial and faith, but also our power to attain to the full stature of human maturity implied by risk and freedom. The denial of personhood polarized the understanding of existence, dividing essence from individual onticity. It ignored the energies of the essence or nature that reveal personal otherness and freedom as manifested in beauty, love and poetry - the logos of personal uniqueness.

After the Schism, certain Greek Fathers saw clearly where these "innovations" of Western Christianity were leading. Centuries later Dostoevsky drew the same conclusions about the West: "Roman Catholicism is no longer Christianity"... Catholicism is a non-Christian faith ... The Catholicism of Rome is worse than atheism ... atheism teaches nothingness, but Catholicism goes further; it teaches a distorted Christ who is Christ's opposite. It proclaims the anti-Christ."

Dostoevsky is widely admired in the West, but most readers ignore this passage, regarding it as a typical piece of Russian hyperbole. They prefer to see this as an incidental criticism or "confessional" comparison. But it is the crux of Dostoevsky's analysis. He is making a positive point that sheds a relentless light on the Western distortions. His work as a whole attempts to set the Church's Christ against the distorted version of Christ prevalent in the West.

"That is where atheism comes from, from Catholicism. Atheism began in the first place with the Roman Catholics themselves: could they ever have taken themselves seriously? It took root through the abhorrence people felt for them... Rome has proclaimed a Christ who has fallen for Satan's third temptation ... It has proclaimed that Christ cannot reign without an earthly Kingdom. It is as if Catholicism had proclaimed the Antichrist, and that is what has destroyed the West. The pope has seized territory, sitting on an earthly throne and with a sword in his hand. Nothing has changed; there are only more lies, deceit, and fanaticism ... They have manipulated the people's honest, most just, most pure, most ardent feelings. They have betrayed everything for a worthless earthly power. Is not this teaching of the Antichrist? Atheism was inevitable after this... and socialism is the offspring and essence of Catholicism. Atheism, its brother, came from disappointment, usurping the lost moral authority of religion to save humanity, not through Christ but by force. Socialism is also freedom through force and union through blood and the sword... In the West there
is no Church at all, only clergy and magnificent church architecture. Denominations try to aspire to the virtues of the state that swallows them up. This is what I think has happened in the Lutheran countries. But in Rome the state replaced the Church a thousand years ago..."

Dostoevsky’s novels reflect the historical experience of his age, the experience of Western expansion into the Orthodox East. The most celebrated expression of this is in Ivan Karamazov’s fable, the “Grand Inquisitor,” which exposes the inner logic of the Western innovations.

Dostoevsky remains the best guide to the experiential differences between Orthodoxy and the West.

V

The First Greek Unionists

Demetrios Kydones’ fourteenth-century translations of Thomas Aquinas mark a dramatic turning point, initiating developments which exercised a decisive influence on the Greek people for centuries to come.

In 1364, having already translated the Summa contra Gentiles (known in Greek as Kata Hellēnōn) – and the Summa Theologiae as well as several minor works of Aquinas, Kydones formally became a Catholic. Pope Urban V wrote personally to congratulate him and encourage him in his faith. Kydones had long been a minister and personal friend to the Emperor John Kantakouzenos, and the influence which he exercised on Greek political life tended to help the Catholics. The Dominicans, who had founded a house in Pera, a suburb of Constantinople on the other side of the Golden Horn, frequented his home daily and encouraged the work of translation.

Demetrios’s brother Prochoros was a monk of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos. He too knew Latin and translated works of Augustine, Jerome, Boethius, and Thomas Aquinas into Greek. Strongly opposed to Gregory Palamas, he was condemned for his theological views by the Constantinopolitan Council of 1368.

Another monk, Maximos Planudes (late thirteenth - early fourteenth centuries) had already translated Augustine’s De Trinitate. Frequent contemporary references and numerous
manuscripts surviving on Mount Athos testify to the influence this translation had on Greek theologians.

At the end of the fourteenth century the Greek Latinizers found a leader in Manuel Kalekas (d. 1410). A Latinist and friend of Demetrios Kydones, he defended Western theology before finally converting to Catholicism, ending his days as a Dominican on Mytilene.

Andreas and Maximos Chrysobberges also belonged to the Kydones brothers’ circle. Becoming Catholics, they joined the Dominicans and studied in the West. They wrote works in Greek defending Catholic theses with scholastic arguments. The popes rewarded them with high ecclesiastical office.27

Bessarion (1402-1472), metropolitan of Nicaea, was also an admirer of the West before converting to Catholicism. He was born in Trebizond and received his education at Constantinople and at Mistra, where he studied under the celebrated Platonist George Gemistos Pliithon, whose culture and intelligence marked Bessarion’s outlook. As metropolitan of Nicaea he participated in the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1439), where, although a member of the Orthodox delegation, he took the Catholic side and advocated the submission of the Greek East to the papacy. On returning to his see, he attempted to enforce the Council’s decisions. But strong lay resistance forced him to leave Nicaea and settle in Italy, where Pope Eugenius IV appointed him cardinal, thereby rewarding him for his devotion to the West. In 1463, ten years after the fall of Constantinople, Pope Pius II made Bessarion Latin patriarch of Constantinople. A keen Thomist, he attacked Mark Eugenikos, the bishop of Ephesus, drawing most of his arguments from Demetrios Kydones. The Kydones brothers, Manuel Kalekas, the Chrysobberges brothers, and Cardinal Bessarion were the culmination of a Greek intellectual trend dating from the early fourteenth century.

This movement, that of the unionists, was not popular. It is difficult to say whether the movement indicates the first signs of a change in Greek Orthodox ecclesiastical consciousness, or whether it should be interpreted as loss of nerve in the face of the coming catastrophe. With its shrunken territory and military power, the empire was clearly dying. Most Greeks already lived under Ottoman rule. A two-thousand-year-old civilization, around which so many other cultures revolved, was facing destruction. The Greeks feared Ottoman conquest as a return to barbarism. Their only hope was enlisting military aid from the West, which in turn sought the East’s religious submission as a precondition for support.

The “unionist” movement was willing to accede to Western demands in order to save Greek culture and prevent: the enslavement of the Christian populations in the East. The anti-unionists considered the West a greater threat to Greek civilization than Turkish rule. They chose destruction rather than a false salvation, preferring to see “the Turkish turban triumphant rather than the Latin mitre.”

To support ecclesiastical union with the West implied more than a conscious personal choice. Historical considerations were set aside. In their admiration for the West, Westernizers ignored the differences between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism. This is true not only of scholars who converted to Catholicism, but also of others who accepted Western influences unconsciously, without being aware of the implications for the Greek Christian tradition. They abandoned their own ecclesiastical culture, denying the immediacy of Christian experience for the sake of syllogistic arguments drawn from Western scholasticism.

The main fourteenth-century opponents of St. Gregory Palamas exemplify this. The monk Barlaam of Calabria defended theological apophaticism and opposed scholasticism but nevertheless crossed over to Catholicism. The Bulgarian monk, Gregory Akindynos, started as a disciple of Palamas, but became his opponent and an enemy of hesychasm. The scholar Nikephoros Gregoras, Barlaam’s enemy and a critic
of Roman innovations, finally led the opposition to Palamas and the hesychasts.

These monks were neither ignorant nor seduced by naive admiration for the West. Well educated for the time, they understood the shortcomings of Western theology. Barlaam knew Latin and was familiar with scholastic works. A brilliant mathematician, he was one of the founders of modern algebra. His dialectical skill made him famous at the University of Constantinople and in Orthodox debates with Catholics. Akindynos was familiar with the works of Aquinas in translation and was steeped in the Greek Fathers. He was admired by contemporaries as a theologian. Nikephoros Gregoras was a pupil of the philosopher Theodore Metochites, the distinguished theological advisor of the Emperor Andronicos, and ran his own famous school in Constantinople.28

These three learned monks show how Western influence permeated Orthodox thinking. None of them was particularly attracted by the Roman Catholic version of the Christian faith. But their opposition to the West was based on Western theological presuppositions: on the correct reasoning of the individual intellect rather than on the priority of Christian experience and the living witness of the Church. The results are still being felt. They are characteristic of Westernized Orthodox scholars, persisting as a pedantic obedience to the letter of theological texts that encourages an individualistic approach to truth and its rationalistic verification. This intellectual version of Orthodoxy inevitably sometimes slips into violating the letter of the formula when this is required by the rules of correct syllogistic thought — as happened with Barlaam, Akindynos and Gregoras.

By contrast, for Gregory Palamas, as for every Orthodox exponent of the Christian faith, what has absolute priority is not words and names but the experience that confirms them.

If anyone agrees about the reality, we do not quibble about the words... For truth and piety, according to Gregory the Theologian, reside not in words but in things... My concern is not with words but with anyone who argues about the realities. Nor do I quibble about words or syllables but about the realities that are devoutly proclaimed by them.29

Personal understanding and rational analysis are part of our approach to the Church's Gospel. Palamas, brilliantly using Aristotelian logic, does not resort to an irrational "mysticism" to prove that experience is all-important. He was the last Hellenic thinker with an understanding of the apophatic character of Aristotelian logic, which emphasized the priority of experience, and subordinated "correct thinking" to "truly participating."

The hesychast controversy, accordingly, turns on the differences between Orthodoxy and the West, on the gulf between Christian ecclesial experience and the "religionization" of Western Christianity. Gregory Palamas differentiates between essence and energies. This distinction was denied by the Westernizers but it underlies the experiential character of knowledge, the possibility of the experiential knowledge of God through personal relationship with him. Ontology is grounded in experience, not in abstract thought. Palamas also emphasized the uncreated character of the divine energy, implying the experiential possibility of our participation in uncreated Godhead, the possibility of our participations through our bodily senses in the active grace of the Theophany, our sharing in a sensory way in the life of the Uncreated.

The fourteenth-century hesychast controversy contrasts Orthodoxy and the West as experience against abstract religious "conviction." Real historical experience underlies the Church's Gospel, manifesting God and conveying knowledge of him. The created communes with the Uncreated, humanity participating in incorruption, immortality and ex-
istemal fullness. The Church does not seek to “improve” the individual morally as its final goal, or to entrench its dogma. The Church seeks humanity’s “deifying participation” in the uncreated life of the Godhead that is offered as a gift of Grace. The West replaced this experiential goal with intellectual structures, metaphysical hypotheses, syllogistic arguments, and a legalistic transaction, turning Christian experience into ideological religiosity.

In the life and practice of the Church, if not on the level of theological formulation, the gulf seems unbridgeable: “For indeed truth for us is not in words but in things.”

VI

“Aristotelians” or “Scholastics”

Gregory Palamas and his supporters in his conflict with the Latinizers mark the last conscious resistance to the Western transformation of the Greek outlook. We should also recall the final phase of this resistance in the person of Mark Eugenikos (1392-1444), whose spiritual stature and theological acumen were instrumental in nullifying the decisions of the unionist council of Ferrara-Florence.

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the final dissolution of the Orthodox Greek empire ended the theological rivalry between Orthodoxy and the West. Certain Greek scholars still resisted Westernized Christianity. But most concentrated on criticizing external differences and the arbitrary alteration of doctrinal formulations. None seemed to suspect that the West had distorted the Christian Gospel by turning it into a religious system which undermined the whole nature of salvation.

Orthodoxy remained alive among the laity in their sense of the ecclesial body manifested in the social life of the Greek communities, their architecture and sacred art, their tradition of liturgical music, their everyday way of life. A study is needed of the Greek lay tradition which united Orthodoxy with daily life. The few Greek intellectuals who survived under the difficult conditions of Turkish rule were different. Even when defending Orthodoxy, they relied on their Western education and on Western religious thought, not on Orthodox lay experience.
During the Turkish period there were two schools of thought. From the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries the “Aristotelians” (or “scholastics,” as their opponents called them) were dominant. Enthusiastic students of Aristotle, they adopted the Western scholastic approach, especially that of Thomas Aquinas. In the eighteenth century they were succeeded by a second school, the “modernists” or “progressives,” who followed the European reaction against Aristotelianism shaped by the new empirical scientific method and the work of Copernicus (1533–92), Giordano Bruno (1548–92) and Galileo (1564–1642), which led to the establishment of the Enlightenment.

The Greek Aristotelians were flattered by Aristotle’s authority in the West, and believed that their Aristotelianism kept them faithful to the Greek cultural tradition. They ignored how scholasticism had transformed Aristotelian philosophy in the West. The “canonical” Western Aristotle obscured the vitality of Aristotelian thought in “Byzantine” thinkers such as the Cappadocians, Maximus the Confessor, Theodore of Rhaithu, John Damascene and Gregory Palamas. Even when refuting the Thomistic approach to Aristotle (chiefly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), Greek scholars were trapped within a Western Aristotelian perspective.

This is all-important. To speak of a radical distortion of Aristotelian philosophy in the West, and at the same time of a canonical version of Aristotelianism which accepted Aristotle’s methodology and understanding of reality unreservedly, seems contradictory, but is not.

The West received the whole Aristotelian corpus as a “canon” enshrining an infallible (or at least highly efficient) means of knowing reality, as if it were certain and definitive. But this version is opposed to Aristotle’s own approach in his treatises on the investigation of nature. This was also the way in which the “Byzantines” approached Aristotle.

In short, Aristotle’s method “of the philosophical sciences” clarifies experience without imposing a single empirical approach. According to Aristotle, his dialectical, apodictic method concerns the general principles of the sciences (the principles of “correct understanding”). Nothing can be said about “what is proper” to any particular science. Though of course he does not hesitate to go on to establish the “first principles” even of the particular sciences, having stated that he is relying only on the “reputable” opinions of his own time and society. For without validating these “reputable” opinions he is concerned to evaluate everyday experience correctly.

Aristotelian method and science aimed at investigating everyday experience with participation in that experience as a criterion of correctness. There is no imposition of immutable laws which exhaust our knowledge of reality. Yet experience is not an arbitrary subjective certainty. It is true only in accordance with correct reasoning. And ultimately correctness of reasoning is not simply a formal matter of methodology. It is confirmed by moral excellence, and moral excellence exists within a community: “the excellence of the citizen must therefore be relative to the constitution of which he is a member.”

Aristotelian methodology thus interrogates human experience without limiting its dynamic growth, or social evolution. Both the ancient Greek city-state and the early Christian community, could use the Aristotelian method to understand and share experience, judging its correctness as a social event, as “rational dissemination.”

The West was entirely unaware of this apophatic basis of the Aristotelian corpus. It identified the validity of the method with a single interpretation of it. It took what was “reputable” and “probable” to be certain and secure, making Aristotle’s epistemology a “scientific” ontology (a valid knowledge of things as they are in themselves). It icenti-
tified rational definitions with the reality of what was defined. It made reason autonomous and cut it off from experience, separating the individual’s intellectual certainty from social verification. It thus introduced a new approach to life based on intellectualism and individualism. In the West physics and metaphysics both became systematic theoretical “sciences” whose dogmatic demands narrowed the human experience of reality. For truth is obtained experientially and socially.

The Greek Aristotelians of the Turkish period seemed to have been oblivious to this Western distortion of Aristotle. Even the West’s “neo-Aristotelianism,” introduced into Greece in the seventeenth century, only questioned the “reputable” opinions of Aristotelian physics and ethics, because they conflicted with the “modern” scientific study of physics and ethics. Eventually the Modernists were to reject Aristotle entirely, seeking valid scientific truth instead in the mathematical and mechanistic interpretation of sensory reality.

With this approach, any reliance of the Greek Aristotelians on Orthodox teaching was also trapped in the faulty perspective of Western metaphysics – in an ontology separated from history and a faith cut off from experience, in the identification of the Church’s teaching with dogma that was accessible intellectually but not experientially. The “Aristotelians” may not have quibbled with the letter of the Church’s official formulations of doctrine, but they were cut off from the experience which the dogma signified. A religious attitude shrunk to an individualistic utilitarian moralism whose “transcendence” was purely abstract. The dominant personality of the years immediately after the fall of Constantinople was without doubt George Scholaris (1405-72). He ascended the patriarchal throne under the name of Gennadios, the first patriarch of the Turkish period, chosen by Mehmet II the Conqueror on account of his reputation as the leader of the Greek anti-unionists.

Scholarios was an anti-unionist for political reasons. Although considered a disciple of Mark Eugenikos, his sympathies were quite different. He had studied law and became Judge-General responsible for matters concerning the University. He taught grammar, rhetoric and philosophy at the school he founded at Constantinople. He was also the emperor’s general secretary and professor of theology at the Imperial Academy. His Latin was excellent and he appreciated Albert the Great and Gilbert de la Porée, but Thomas Aquinas was his favorite. He lectured on Aquinas and translated a long epitome of his works. He regards him as “wise and lacking nothing of human perfections regarding wisdom,” “an excellent exponent and epitomizer of Christian theology.”

As a layman at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, he keenly supported union with Rome. Later he joined the anti-unionists, but his theological views on the critical differences between East and West nevertheless combined Orthodox formulations with a Western understanding of them. His writings are typical of a theology which turns Christian experience into an autonomous religious system, substituting individualistic and intellectualist convictions for ecclesial experience. In his thinking and writing he expressed himself in the terms of Western thought: His “admiration and his general interest in Latin scholarship affected all his thinking and his methodology.” Although he was a Greek, he interpreted Aristotle via the Latin scholastics. He lived in Constantinople, Hellenism’s center, and accepted leadership and pastoral responsibility for the Greeks under Ottoman rule, but personally ignored the fundamental Greek spiritual tradition.

One of Scholarios’s contemporaries was George Trapezuntius (1395-1472). He sought refuge in Italy, where he taught at various universities. In 1437 he entered the papal service, and in 1443 was appointed apostolic secretary.
to the Holy See. He sent Mehmet II a treatise “On the truth of the Christian faith” which characteristically understands God as an intellectual “object” in the Western manner:

All bodies have length, breadth and depth and are constituted by them. Therefore the body is one, but if one of these three dimensions is lacking, it is nothing ... What can be clearer? Length is analogous to the Father, the surface to his Word, and depth to the Holy Spirit. The three, then, are one simple body.⁴⁰

Like Scholarios he was oblivious to the priority of the personal character of the divine hypostases, the priority of the historical experience of the ecclesial body, which alone confirms the existence of the Triadic God as immediacy of communion and relation.

Many Greek scholars fled to Italy after the fall of Constantinople. They became teachers of philosophy and Greek at the universities and schools, translating ancient Greek philosophers into Latin. Around 1500 the best known were Theodore of Gaza (1400-75), a professor at Ferrara and Rome, Andronikos Kallistos (d. 1486), who taught at Bologna, Rome, Florence, Paris and London, and Mark Mousouros (1470-1517), a professor at Padua, Venice, and Rome. During the sixteenth century their numbers increased. From 1572 to 1600 more than twenty Greek professors are known to have taught at Padua alone.⁴¹

Another group of Greek scholars taught at the Patriarchal Academy which Scholarios founded in Constantinople, as successor to his earlier Panditakatoreion, immediately after he became patriarch. The first head was Matthew Kamariotes (d. 1490), and professors included Hermodoros Lestarchos (1500-77), a learned physician and teacher who had studied at Rome and Ferrara and taught for many years in Chios, and Theodosios Zygomalas (1544-1614), who with John his father contributed to the correspondence of the Patriarch Jeremias II with the Lutheran theologians of Tübingen.

These names are simply representative examples of Greek scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, most of whom pursued a dual aim. They sought Western help, chiefly from Venice and the papacy, to liberate the Christian populations of the East from Turkish rule. They also pursued the controversy which began with Gemistos Plethon about the respective merits of Plato and Aristotle.

This conflict was about deciding whether Plato or Aristotle provided the best theoretical basis for the scientific rationalism developing in the West.⁴² The different Greek and Western approaches to the two greatest philosophers of antiquity were not mentioned or even suspected. Both sides took as their criterion: “How those who have made a genuine study of philosophical doctrines in the West judge such matters.”

The painful efforts of the Greek scholars to obtain military help from the West were touching but naive. The popes and Frankish leaders sought the forced Latinization of Greeks living in areas ruled by the Latins, while abandoning the Orthodox under Ottoman rule to wholesale conversion to Islam and loss of cultural identity.

The Greek scholars did not see that the West, particularly after the Renaissance, claimed to be the sole heir of ancient Greek culture, and was not prepared to abandon this claim for the sake of opponents who seemed condemned to historical oblivion.

The most telling example of papal policy in the Frankish East in the second half of the fifteenth century is provided by Crete ... A series of documents beginning from 1454 of the Venetian Council of Ten shows that any Orthodox cleric in Crete who dared to proclaim his faith was persecuted, while the twelve pro-Latin priests of the Cretan capital, Candace, were favored and given material support. According to a document of 1460, the latter by confusing and Latinizing the island and the whole city also forced the
others to adopt Latin opinions ....' The Venetian authorities also exiled, fined and imprisoned people .... The Orthodox were also persecuted in the Dodecanese, which had been governed by the Knights of St. John since the thirteenth century. This order depended directly on the pope, so Catholic decisions were particularly onerous there .... After the fall of Byzantium the Catholic Church continued its propaganda with the help of the civil authority in the Greek lands under Latin rule.43

The ordinary Greek lay people strongly resisted Latinization. Many contemporary documents record their resistance. It is worth mentioning Michael Apostoles (1422-80), a pro-Western philosopher and fervent disciple of Pletnon, who had so offended the people of Candace that he could not leave his house without their shouting abuse at him.44

VII

Western Propaganda

One aspect of papal policy in the years after the fall of Constantinople was the attempt to forcibly Latinize the Orthodox in territories under Frankish rule. Another aspect was an organized missionary endeavor aimed at Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, attempting to proselytize them under cover of caring for their religious needs.

This endeavor acquired a formal character after the beginning of the Reformation (1517). The papacy feared a rapprochement or even union between the Protestants and the Orthodox, which might have lent the Reformers the authority of the Greeks' fidelity to the Church's apostolic and patristic tradition.

The Society of Jesus was founded in 1540 to serve the work of the Counter-Reformation. Together with the Franciscans, who had long been working to restore "schismatic" Greeks to Roman obedience, the Jesuits soon arrived in the Greek-speaking areas of the Ottoman Empire.

The Greek College of Saint Athanasius was founded in Rome in 1577 with Jesuit help. Supervised by five cardinals, it offered higher education to young Greeks from the Ottoman Empire.

This noble gesture seems unrelated to the confessional rivalries of the time. The Greek College attracted students from the Greek communities of the Aegean islands which had already been converted to Catholicism. But the Jesuits also welcomed students from Orthodox families in the
Peloponnese, Crete, Cyprus, the Ionian islands, Epirus, Smyrna, Pontus and especially Constantinople. Most students were poor. Even if they did not covert, they took home a favorable image of Catholicism.

Before 1600 the Jesuits had founded an excellent school for Greek children in Constantinople (in Pera). Schools were also founded in Thessalonica, and Smyrna, and in 1645 in Athens. Popular opposition, however, forced the Athenian school to transfer to Chalcis.

The most striking papal achievement was the founding of a school in 1635 at Karyes in the heart of the monastic republic of Mount Athos for the education of Orthodox monks. The school was founded at the request of Ignatius, the hegoumenos of the Monastery of Vatopediou, who visited Rome in 1628 expressly to propose this project. The papal school offered a seven-year formation to Orthodox monks. In 1641, because of opposition from the Turkish authorities who viewed the Western presence on Mount Athos with great unease, the school was forced to move to Thessalonica. 55

Ordinary lay people under Turkish rule resisted Latin propaganda and Westernization rather more vigorously than their church leaders. The clergy seemed impressed especially by the cultivated, austere and spiritual Jesuits. The missionaries sent to the Greek-speaking areas were carefully selected. The organization of the mission was excellent, especially after 1622, when the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Propaganda) was founded.

But the admiration of the Greek clergy was not just the result of effective Western propaganda. There had been a deep confusion, if not an essential change, in Orthodox thinking with no Greek resistance to papal imperialism.

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century evidence suggests that the Orthodox were encouraged to take part in Catholic liturgies and vice versa, particularly in the Ionian and Aegean Islands. This implies that the Orthodox must have forgot-
Nevertheless Greek clergy rarely converted to Catholicism. Perhaps they feared lay anger and anger. The most striking successes of the Latin missionaries were the conversion of Metropolitan Iosaphat of Lacedaemonia in 1625, of three patriarchs of Ochrid between 1624-1628, of Metropolitan Meletios of Rhodes (1645-1651), of six bishops of the Cyclades in 1662, of the Monastery of St. John the Theologian of Patmos in 1681 and again in 1725, of some nuns of Santorini in 1710, of the abbot of Ieron on Mount Athos in 1726, of the abbot of a monastery on Hydra in 1727, and Metropolitan Kallimikos of Aegina, with many of his clergy, in 1727.49

These conversions and the general deference of the higher clergy to Roman Catholicism reflect the despair of educated Greeks during centuries of Turkish rule. Any experience of foreign occupation or dictatorship, however brief, always seems interminable. But Ottoman rule lasted four centuries. Greeks saw no hope of freedom for themselves or their children. The Greek nation seemed to be losing its cultural identity. It seemed destined for extinction. The missionaries at least offered Greeks access to the West, with all its impressive achievements, to set against their humiliations under the Turks.

VIII

Korydalleus and Korydallism

In 1622 Patriarch Cyril Loukaris of Constantinople entrusted the Patriarchal Academy to the Athenian Aristotelian philosopher, Theophilos Korydalleus, who directed it with absences until 1640, becoming the leader of the philosophical school which was to predominate for the next two hundred years. The scholar who most influenced Greek spiritual life in the Turkish period, “he was the most widely known of the interpreters and commentators, of Aristotle, whose dominance in the next two centuries is undeniable.”50

When he took over the Patriarchal Academy, Korydalleus’s reputation as an outstanding philosopher was already established. He was also well known as a former hieromonk who had renounced the monastic life. All were familiar with his metaphysical opinions, which bore no relation to the Church’s experience and went against the apostolic and patristic tradition. In his lectures he ridiculed the chief doctrines of Christian faith. But in spite of his opinions, he was restored to the clergy and in 1640 ordained metropolitan of Naupactos. Deposed again, he died in Athens in 1645.

Korydalleus was born in Athens in 1570. After receiving his early education there, he went to the College of St. Athanasius in Rome. He then studied philosophy and medicine in Padua, as a pupil of the famous Aristotelian, Cesare Cremonini. He taught at the Greek community school in Venice, and in Athens, Cephalonia and Zakynthos, before becoming head of the Patriarchal Academy.
Korydalleus "reorganized the Academy as a university on the Italian model with which he was familiar. He gave it a new spirit, marginalizing the theological aspect which had been predominant until then, and replacing it with a systematic study of philosophy based on the Aristotelian corpus and commentaries on it. He translated and commented on all the main texts. His works are mostly text books or collections of lecture notes ... No other seventeenth- or eighteenth-century Greek philosophical writer was so influential. His language was archaizing, but scholarly, clear and precise."  

Many writers refer to Korydalleus's spiritual influence during the Turkish period. According to K. Th. Dimaras:

For nearly two hundred years Korydallism was the basis of modern Hellenism's philosophical education. His works were considered a great improvement on the Byzantine handbooks which had preceded them. He was universally praised; his works filled every Greek library. Important scholars summarized them, commented on them, and translated them. But as Moisiodax observed, they are in the strictest scholastic tradition and ultimately hindered the development of learning in Greece.  

Although Korydalleus was greatly admired both by contemporaries and posterity, he also had many critics who had serious reservations about his teaching and attacked him for inhibiting the development of learning. Korydallism is regarded both as "the first real spiritual renaissance in Greece after the fall of Constantinople," and as "a brake on the influence of the new currents of European philosophy and science."  

Korydalleus was certainly an original Aristotelian scholar and a gifted teacher. His writing and teaching demanded a serious study of the ancient Greek texts. Wherever he taught he organized his courses on the Italian model, not only forming a circle of students around him, but also creating a new climate for the study of Aristotle. This new climate led to a renaissance of Greek education under the Turks. But as Josipos Moisiodax also said, Korydalleus belongs to the strictest Western tradition of medieval scholasticism. Which means that he uses Aristotelian logic not to arrive at a correct methodology that allows a dynamic participation in knowledge, but to define correct knowledge "objectively." He accepts the scholastic identification of truth with correct definition and logical proof. What is real is defined intellectually, by the coincidence of the object of thought with its definition: *Veritas est aequipatio rei et intellectus*. When the truth about reality is reduced to an intellectual idea and its correct definition, experience (sensory, personal, or social) is clearly excluded from the knowledge of truth. An intellectualism made absolute allows no room for the dynamics of experiential knowledge and experimental science. This is why many came to regard scholasticism, including "Korydallism," as a brake on the development of the experimental sciences and empirical philosophy.

Like his teacher, Cesare Cremonini, Theophilos Korydalleus belonged to the progressive school of Neo-Aristotelianism.  

The great advance marked by the Neo-Aristotelians was that finally they studied Aristotle in the original Greek, interpreting him with the help of the older Greek commentators, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius, Simplicius, and John Philoponus. For three hundred years the Westerners had been using poor twelfth- and thirteenth-century Latin translations of Aristotle from the Arabic, and had relied on Arabic commentators, especially Averroes. It was only when Greek refugees began to arrive in Italy that Mark Mousouros and his collaborators could begin the printing of the Greek text of Aristotle.

Neo-Aristotelianism thus improved the study of Aristotle but retained scholastic criteria for interpreting his works. Aristotelian studies still depended on *argumentatio*, the
grounding of the validity of knowledge on logical proof and
correct definition.

In the Turkish period Greek scholars were oblivious to the
difference between the Western and Greek conceptions of
knowledge and truth. Westerners considered an individual
mind sufficient (as a microcosm of the divine mind, the *fac-
ultas rationis*) for truth to be established definitively, pro-
vided the mind followed the rules of correct reasoning. But
for Greeks from Heraclitus to Gregory Palamas, knowledge
is guaranteed by the immediacy of our relation with what
exists and is real, since the relation sums up the many epist-
emological possibilities of an empirical approach to reality.
For the ancient Greeks relationship was a concept (or *logos*)
necessarily subject to the given rational necessity of cosmic
harmony and order (which neither gods or human beings
could transcend) – to the universal or common *logos*. The
Christian Greeks, however, experienced relation as the pres-
ervation of the dynamic indeterminacy of personal freedom
and otherness – the only given *logos* being the manifesta-
tion of a personal God and the human person in the specific ways
freedom works.

In these two phases of the Greek tradition, the verification
of the rational experience of personal relations is not rel-
egated to deontological formulations of the “correctness”
of reason, (formulations which are inevitably conventional,
utilitarian, or arbitrary). The verification is itself a dynamic
and undetermined fact of rational relations, that is to say, a
social fact, a result of participation, a coordination of indi-
vidual with social experience – when “all express the same
thought and each witnesses to it.” This coordination is the
aim not only of the methodology of definitions and logical
proofs, but also of the fundamental elements of linguistic ex-
pression (words, names, concepts). The signifiers of logical
discourse exhaust neither reality nor the knowledge of what
is signified. They are only symbols (*symbola*) which bring
together (*syn-ballous*) or coordinate individual experiences,
inviting them to an experiential participation in the common
*logos* of the experiences.56

The gulf is therefore unbridgeable. The Greeks identified
knowledge with experience, experience with the immediacy
of relation, and relation with the indeterminacy of freedom.
The Westerners were afraid of the freedom of relation, the
dynamic of indeterminacy, the risk of experience. They
needed individual certainties with objective assurances for
their psychological security. That is why they identified the
expression of the truth with the truth itself, and controlled
the correctness of the expressions by codified methods. They
obscured or even denied the real difference between signi-
plier and signified. They thought, for example, that they knew
God and believed in him when they understood the concept
of God and were intellectually convinced (by a correct *argu-
mentatio*) of the necessity of his existence.

The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Greek scholars were
oblivious to this fundamental difference between Greece and
the West. Whether they taught ancient Greek philosophy in
European universities, or, like Korydalleus and his disciples,
contributed to the renaissance of education at home, they
were simply perpetuating a distorted Greek tradition.

This progressive alienation of the Orthodox from the an-
cient Greek and patristic tradition of apophaticism, with its
emphasis on the precedence of experience, caused much con-
fusion. Philosophers and churchmen tried to remain faithful
to the letter of the Orthodox doctrine but were trapped within
their Western presuppositions. Their “Orthodoxy” differed
from Catholic and Protestant theology only in details. They
ignored the Church’s experience and had nothing to say
about the existential problem of life and death.

Steven Runciman writes characteristically:

Confronted by theologians who liked clarity and accuracy,
the Orthodox found that their traditional apophatic avoid-
ance of precision was out of date and harmful to themselves. The West did not share their spiritual modesty. It considered their answers dusty; it was hot for certainties. Among the Greek divines there were now many who had received their higher education in Italian or other Western universities; and this education predisposed them towards the Western attitude. In spite of the traditions of their Church they began to search for a more systematic and philosophical pattern. Their searching took forms that were all the more varied because of the lack of definitions in the past.  

And Timothy Ware concludes:

Promising Greek students, then, who wished to continue their early studies, had no choice but to go to the universities of Western Europe. Among the leading theologians of the Turkish period, a few were self-taught (for example, Dositheos, the great seventeenth century patriarch of Jerusalem), but the overwhelming majority had been trained in the West, under Protestant or Roman Catholic masters. Greeks went to Padua, to Pisa or Florence, to Halle, Paris, or even as far afield as Oxford; they went also to Rome, where in 1576 Pope Gregory XIII had founded the College of Saint Athanasius, especially intended for Greek students. This Western training, given under non-Orthodox auspices, inevitably influenced the way in which Greek theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries approached and interpreted their faith. However great their desire to remain loyal Orthodox, most of them looked at theology to a greater or lesser extent through Western spectacles. Naturally this tendency towards Westernization was not limited to those who had actually studied in the West, but also affected many who themselves had never left the Orthodox world. Conscious or unconscious, most Greek writers of the time adopted theological categories, terminology, and forms of argument foreign to the tradition of their own Church.

The Westernization of both scholars and ecclesiastics in Greece during the Turkish period must have influenced the laity but it is difficult to say how much. This influence spread through teachers educated in the West, who ran the surviving schools in the Greek areas, through the sermons and writings of the clergy, and above all through the publication of certain Western devotional books under the name of Orthodox authors, which circulated widely among the laity. One of these was The Salvation of Sinners, first printed in Venice in 1641, which became the preferred religious reading of ordinary Greeks in the Ottoman Empire. The author was supposedly Agapios Landos, but he had merely translated Heisterbach’s Latin work, Dialogus Miraculorum, into demotic Greek. Towards the end of the eighteenth century two more books circulated widely among the laity, Invisible Warfare and Spiritual Exercises by St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain, which were again translations with minor modifications. The first was a work of Lorenzo Scupoli and the second of the great founder of the Jesuits, Ignatius Loyola. The Westernization of the Greeks had vital consequences going beyond geographic and national boundaries. It was more than the alienation of a historic people from its roots, or of an ancient local ecclesiastical tradition from its cultural particularity, but affected the whole of human history. Failure, for example, to appreciate Aristotle’s apophaticism in its social dimensions (which is the basis of a democracy very different from the modern European version) is a loss for the whole of humanity. Distorting the Christian Gospel of salvation, and transforming ecclesiastical life into fruitless individualistic religiosity is an even greater loss. It altered the meaning of existence for everybody, depriving us of the experiential foretaste and hope of immortality.
IX

The “Confessions of Faith”

After 1517 the European Reformation inspired religious conflict in the West, which spilled over to the Greek East. The Greek regions subject to the Turks became a theater of Catholic-Protestant rivalry, each side seeking to win the alliance of the Orthodox against the other, by drawing the Orthodox population into its own religious program.

Against these intrigues and machinations, the Eastern patriarchates with their limited resources attempted spiritual resistance. The patriarchates kept their distance from both of the European confessions, in order to preserve their own Orthodox identity, while struggling with the difficulties of Turkish oppression.

But the Greeks’ Westernized mentality made resistance difficult; they already thought in their opponents’ terms. The rival Western confessions imposed their own categories and terms, so that the Orthodox had to defend their faith in the same manner as the Westerners: ideological certitude defended by appropriate syllogistic arguments. They identified religious experience with the intellectual formulations, “principles” and “dogmas,” all reduced to confessional statements. The rival confessions argued on the basis of abstract theoretical convictions without reference to ecclesial experience and the apophasic nature of the expression of this experience. Each Western “Confession of Faith” articulated an individualistic demand for religious certainties backed by
authoritarian institutions. That is why disputing these certainties became a conflict between institutions.

At first the Western influence seems barely discernible. The written formulations of the Orthodox faith still recalled the descriptive “definitions” of conciliar decisions, which referred back to the witness of the Gospel and the Fathers. This was the situation when the Patriarch Jeremias II first encountered Reformation theologians in 1573.

Earlier the German Hellenist, Philipp Melanchthon (Philip Schwarzerd, 1497-1560), one of Luther’s close collaborators, had written to Constantinople to arouse Orthodox interest in the Reformation, enclosing a translation of the Confession of Augsburg. But the patriarch at that time, Joasaph II, seems not to have replied.

A group of Tübingen theologians contacted his successor, Jeremias II. This approach was more carefully organized. The German Emperor Maximilian II sent a zealous Protestant as ambassador to Constantinople and appointed one of the Tübingen theologians as his chaplain. The chaplain delivered a letter to the patriarch from the famous philologist and theologian, Martin Crusius, as well as some published sermons of the Tübingen professor, Jacob Andrea. Two further letters from the Tübingen professors followed, the second of which contained another translation of the Confession of Augsburg.

In 1576, helped by the Constantinopolitan scholars John and Theodosios Zygomas and the metropolitans of the Standing Synod, Patriarch Jeremias II composed a reply to the Lutheran theologians in twenty-one chapters. He set out the Orthodox faith in detail, emphasizing his disagreements with the Protestant texts. A year later the Tübingen theologians tried to justify their differences from Orthodox theology. This elicited a second letter from Jeremias (1579) and after their second reply a third patriarchal letter (1581) which concluded that the dialogue was pointless. The Protestant professors were only interested in justifying their own theses, without regard for apostolic and patristic Tradition. Jeremias II’s replies seem impressive for that particular period. They maintain their distance from both the intellectualist arguments of the Latins and the comparable use the Protestants made of the Bible. Jeremias summarized patristic teaching with long extracts from the Fathers. He explains that for the Orthodox a Confession of Faith is only a “sign” and “defining boundary” of true piety – “the divine, most sacred and perfect sign of our piety at all times and in all places is the confession of all the Holy Fathers, the defining boundary of Christianity.” Jeremias’s use of the word “piety” (ensebeia) does not have the Pauline sense of “religion” (1 Tim 3:16) summarizing the event of salvation. It refers to the practice of the virtuous without suggesting participation in the eucharistic realization of authentic life. The Church’s faith is therefore admittedly experiential but in the sense of an individualistic “internalization” incompatible with any deviation from the traditional formulations of the faith. There is no other experiential aspect.

The same goes for many of the other articles of Jeremias’s replies. But for all their emphasis on individualism and their legalistic coloring, they do not exclude a use of language which evokes the ecclesial and existential experience of faith.

In the years following the patriarchate of Jeremias II, the confusion of the Orthodox in the face of the conflict between Catholics and Protestants became all the more evident. This confusion reflected the lack of an Orthodox self-awareness, and in consequence a lack of criteria with which to confront the Western warring parties.

The Orthodox favored Catholicism and Protestantism in turn, one party’s political pressure and missionary activity provoking an Orthodox rapprochement with the other.
Orthodoxy was at best understood as a “middle way” between the two rival confessions. The idea of Orthodoxy as a middle way reflected a radically Westernized theology and faith which was to prevail in Greece until the middle of the twentieth century. The idea of occupying the “middle ground” has nothing to do with victory over death or participation in authentic life. It merely balances two schematized formulations of doctrine.

This “middle way” between deficiency and superfluity was a rationalistic balancing act, an ideological position of no interest to the majority because an Orthodoxy of this kind bore no relation to the existential adventure of life and death. It was merely of academic interest.

An Orthodoxy which is a “middle way” cannot be more than a third “confession” alongside its competitors. The middle term evokes balance, not catholicity. The Church’s catholicity is an experience of existential fullness unrelated to theoretical moderation. It is the realization and manifestation of salvation, a life which is sound and whole.

Three of Jeremias II’s intellectual contemporaries articulated this “confessional” understanding of Orthodoxy, with its perplexity and confusion.

The first was the Cretan scholar Maximos Margounios (1549-1602). He was bishop of Kythera but lived in Venice because the Venetian authorities prevented him from traveling to Kythera to take up his pastoral duties. After studying at the University of Padua, and becoming famous for his Greek and Latin learning, he produced an important body of original works and translations from and into Greek. Best known for his vernacular homilies and translations into popular speech, his collected lives of the saints in unpretentious Greek circulated widely.

In the theological debates of the time Margounios proposed a conciliatory solution to the dispute between Orthodox and Catholics about the procession of the Holy Spirit. He wrote three books on this subject, but his “middle way” provoked opposition from both sides. He was denounced by Gabriel Severos as a papist, while the Vatican wanted him referred to the Holy Office. Finally the Venetian authorities saved him from the threat of the stake and the Synod of Constantinople acquitted him of heresy in 1594.

Gabriel Severos (1539-1638), Margounios’s childhood friend, became his fierce opponent. Although metropolitan of Philadelphia in Asia Minor, he lived in Venice for about forty years as ecclesiastical superior of the Greek community. He wrote defending Orthodoxy against Catholics and Protestants, but in the manner of Latin scholasticism. It is indicative that his writings were translated into Latin and used by Catholics against Reformation theologians.

A far more influential figure was Meletios Pegas (1550-1601). As patriarch of Alexandria, and for about two years locum tenens of Constantinople, he struggled energetically against the widespread papal propaganda that was provoking the Greek East. A charismatic figure from Crete with great administrative and pastoral abilities, he was a notable writer whose concerns and activities extended throughout the Orthodox world from Sinai to Poland and Russia. He studied at Padua and at Protestant Augsburg, having been exiled from Crete for his strong resistance to Catholic propaganda. His brief life was a ceaseless struggle for the Orthodox faith. He saw Catholicism as blighting the Orthodox East but did not realize that Protestantism posed a comparable threat. Against the Catholics he canvassed support from the ambassadors of the Protestant powers in Constantinople. He made no concessions about dogma. But his theology was Western in its mentality.

Four seventeenth-century Confessions mark the emergence of a “confessional” Orthodoxy which ignored the catholicity and experiential priority of the Eucharist. These are the Confessions of Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1525),
Cyril Loukaris (1629), Peter Mogila (1645), and Dositheos of Jerusalem (1672).

Written “confessions” had existed since apostolic times. There are confessional formulations in the New Testament itself. They appear again at greater length in the Apologists of the first three centuries. The classic form of the confession was the Creed formulated by the first two Ecumenical Councils, (Nicaea – Constantinople). This Creed was reproduced by the later Ecumenical Councils which added further clauses for clarification.

The salient point is that as a result of the Creed of Nicaea – Constantinople, the “confession of faith” was immediately incorporated into the Church’s liturgical practice, becoming an integral part of the Eucharist – when the Church assembles and manifests itself. There the Creed is a “Symbol of Faith,” functioning precisely as a symbol, uniting (symbolon) and coordinating particular personal experience in a shared manifestation of the truth of salvation.

Separating the “confession” from the shared eucharistic experience may turn it into an expression of intellectual “convictions,” adopted according to personal preference or for their usefulness in polemics.

The earliest Protestant Confessions (Confessio Augustana, 1530 – Formula Concordiae, 1577 – Confessio Tetrapolitana, 1530 – Confessio Gallicana, 1559 – Confessio Belgica, 1561 – Confessio Helvetica, 1536 and 1563, etc.) marginalized the Eucharist. The seventeenth-century Orthodox Confessions followed the same model. They sought to distinguish the Orthodox from the corresponding Catholic and Protestant theses. But the “symbolic” character of the Confessions was lost. Their style and tone hardly corresponds to the historical experience of the Eucharist, its role in the ascetic life, and its conciliar expression.

Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589-1639), patriarch of Alexandria, wrote his Confession as a young student at the University of Helmstedt in Germany. Patriarch Cyril Loukaris had sent him on a special mission to study the Protestant churches in preparation for dialogue and possible rapprochement between Protestants and the Orthodox.

Kritopoulos spent seven years in England and three in Switzerland and Germany visiting the leading Protestant centers. At Helmstedt the university professors were surprised to learn from Kritopoulos that the Orthodox Church had survived at all. So they requested a written statement of Orthodox faith and teaching. The “Confession of the Eastern Catholic and Apostolic Church” which he compiled for them was published in Helmstedt in 1601.

Kritopoulos’s Confession is more a theological treatise than a brief credal statement. He discusses at some length the points on which Catholics and Protestants differed – in theology as well as practice – from the tradition of the undivided Church. Often referring to the Church Fathers and Ecumenical Councils, he nevertheless accepts certain Protestant teachings such as the acknowledgment of three sacraments, the remaining four becoming “sacramental rites.”

Certainly Kritopoulos’s is the most Orthodox of the four seventeenth-century Confessions, even though his academic approach to theology and his understanding of the Church as a “religion” are often apparent. What he lacks is a fundamental reliance on the priority of experience: an awareness of the apophatic character of theological discourse, of the catholicity of every local Eucharist and of the experiential basis which assures a distinction between the essence and energies of God.

Nevertheless Kritopoulos’s Confession did not satisfy German Protestants, who wanted to use Orthodox arguments for their own purposes. Consequently, although they translated and circulated Cyril Loukaris’s Confession at once,
they ignored Kritopoulos’s for many years, publishing and commenting on other works less important than his.

Cyril Loukaris’s Confession was a great scandal to the seventeenth-century Orthodox. Though one of the most important personalities of the Turkish period, Cyril Loukaris (1572-1638) was controversial. Some recognize his great contribution to the national and ecclesiastical life of the period, a contribution sealed by his martyrdom. Others, without diminishing his stature, see him as a betrayer of the Orthodox faith specifically on account of his Confession.

Loukaris was born in Crete and studied at Venice and Padua. He was a pupil of Margounios and a cousin of Meletios Pegas, who ordained him and sent him as exarch to Poland, where Catholics were pressing the Orthodox to become Uniates. There he experienced Vatican propaganda at first hand. He escaped with his life to Alexandria, where he succeeded Meletios Pegas as patriarch. His talent and culture made him the leading figure of the Orthodox world. Corresponding with kings, rulers, and churchmen in Europe and the East, he frequently traveled to the main Orthodox centers, to coordinate a defense against the aggressive policies of the Roman Catholics.

Elected ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople in 1620, he was already known as a pro-Calvinist and anti-Catholic. This was a critical time in Europe. The Thirty Years War (1618-48) between Catholics and Protestants was raging, exporting its hatred and violence to the East. Jesuits and Capuchins were attempting to induce mass conversions to Catholicism, while Catholic powers and Protestant ambassadors were both applying pressure on the Sublime Porte.

As patriarch, Cyril Loukaris found himself at the center of this rivalry. He clearly favored the Protestants, seeking protection from England and Holland against Vatican intrigues. During the eighteen years of his patriarchy he was deposed and recalled five times.

The Catholic Church used all its religious and political influence to destroy this “son of darkness”: the Jesuits and Capuchins of Constantinople, the French and Austrian ambassadors, the newly constituted Propaganda Fidei, Pope Urban VIII himself and even Louis XIII and the powerful Cardinal Richelieu. Almost any means of attacking Loukaris were regarded as legitimate because the motive was “sacred”: these included threats and violence, bribing Turkish officials and pro-Catholic clergies in the circle of his successor Cyril Kontares, forging texts incriminating Loukaris, and claiming that the patriarch was inciting foreign powers against the Ottoman Empire. The Austrian Embassy planned Loukari’s assassination or his abduction to Italy and delivery to the Holy Inquisition. Eventually the Austrian ambassador and Kontares persuaded the Sublime Porte to eliminate the patriarch and he was strangled on June 27, 1638.

Loukaris had ambitious plans. He reorganized the Patriarchal Academy with Theophilos Korydalleus as director and established a Greek press in Constantinople to strengthen Greek education. He commissioned Maximos Kallipolites to translate the New Testament into the vernacular and edited the final text himself. “Every renewal movement the historian encounters in subsequent years was in some way initiated by Loukari.”

Loukaris embodies the drama of Hellenism under the Turks: a Hellenism struggling to save itself from extinction, having already lost its Greek identity. Loukari’s mentality and ideas were influenced by the West, and even his “conservative” opponents were equally Westernized. For centuries this false polarization was to dominate the Greek world. The “liberals” or “progressives” adopted a Protestant mentality, while the “conservatives” or “progressives” were clearly influenced by Catholicism.

Loukaris openly allied himself with the Calvinists for historical reasons, but it is obvious that he was also person-
ally attracted to Reformation doctrines. He fought to defend
Orthodoxy, about which he was sadly ignorant. He did not
understand what he was supposed to represent, or the great
gulf that separated the Orthodox tradition of the Christian
Gospel from its Protestant transformation into a “religion.”
Perhaps choosing Theophilos Korydallos to direct the
Patriarchal Academy, and collaborating with the Reformers
on publishing the New Testament (useful to the Protestant
missionaries for teaching an individualistic approach to the
“source” of the Christian faith, unrelated to ecclesial expe-
rience?) are indicative of a Westernization more spontane-
ous than that of his famous Confession. A Latin version
of Loukaris’s Confession was published under his name in
Geneva in 1629. It was reissued six times in the same year in
French and English. In 1633 a Greek version was also pub-
lished, based on Loukaris’s putative autograph. It is a typi-
cally Calvinist text without any attempt to follow “Orthodox”
forms. Research has failed to uncover the true author. Until
his death nine years later Loukaris remained silent. He nei-
ther repudiated nor adopted the Confession. Later three of
his letters came to light affirming his authorship and one re-
pudiating it, but none of them have been authenticated.
Karmiris provides a probable explanation:

The Confession was composed in Geneva by Calvinist
theologians working under Diodat and then adapted
and reshaped in a more Orthodox manner in Constantinople by
the Calvinist theologian Anthony Leger and the Patriarch
Cyril Loukaris himself. The patriarch claimed authorship
under Protestant pressure in view of the many dangers sur-
ronding him. The Calvinists submitted their draft of the
Confession to the patriarch and demanded his signature in
recompense for the great services they had rendered him.74

Loukaris’s Confession was immediately used for propa-
ganda by both Protestants and Catholics. Protestants urged the
Orthodox and Roman Catholics to identify the Reformation
with the Orthodox apostolic tradition, while Catholics tried
to attract the Orthodox to papism, which they claimed pre-
served the purity of the Christian faith. The campaign spread
to the Orthodox Slavs using the same arguments mingled
with anti-Hellenism.75

Immediately after Loukaris’s death six local Orthodox
councils condemned the controversial Confession and its
author: Constantinople in 1638, Constantinople and Jassy
in 1642, Constantinople in 1672, Jerusalem in 1672, and
Constantinople again in 1691. Each of these councils was
held in response to a new wave of propaganda and the con-
fused reaction of the Orthodox population disturbed by the
Confession.

Loukaris’s Confession aroused controversy in Russia. The
metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Mogila (1596-1647), composed
his own anti-Loukaris Confession from Latin sources using
Catholic teaching. Mogila submitted his Confession to the
provincial synod of Kiev, which delated it to the patriarchate
of Constantinople and to the Council of Jassy called in 1642
to condemn Loukaris.

The Council gave Mogila’s text to Meletios Syrigos (1586-
1663), a known anti-Calvinist, for correction.

Syrigos raised a number of objections to the Confession,
and when translating it into Greek introduced various
amendments. Most of his changes were actually stylistic.
He chose, for example, to eliminate certain scriptural quo-
tations used in the draft. It is true that in Mogila’s Con-
fession key Roman doctrines, including the primacy of the
pope, are repudiated. Nevertheless, much of the substance
and the whole of the style remain Roman, and not even
Syrigos’ editing at Jassy could alter that fact. It was not so
much the doctrine, but the manner of presentation that was,
so to speak, erroneous, particularly the choice of language
and the tendency to employ any and all Roman weapons
against the Protestants even when not consonant in full or
in part with Orthodox presuppositions. The impression is
created that Orthodoxy is no more than a purified or refined version of Roman Catholicism.90

Nevertheless, the Council of Jassy approved Peter Mogila’s Confession as amended by Meletios Syrigos, and in the following year (1643) the four Eastern patriarchs by a synodical act gave it official recognition as “A Confession of the Orthodox Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ.”

According to Karviri the Confession is not only Latin in style and tone, but also in specific differences from Orthodox teaching:91

It followed Latin scholastic models, especially the Roman Catechism and the catechism of the Jesuit, Peter Canisius, as a catechism for practical use rather than as a Confession of faith ... The Confession is closer to contemporary Latin writings than to the Greek Fathers, and the traditions and life as a whole of Orthodoxy ... It should be observed that Meletios Syrigos too, on account of his Latin education, conducted his theology, like Peter Mogila, chiefly from a Latin perspective.92

Georges Florovsky is even less circumspect in his description of Mogila. He was

an avid and resolute westernizer ... In dogma, he was privately, so to speak, already at one with the Holy See. He was quite ready to accept what he found in Roman books as traditional and “Orthodox.” That is why in theology and in worship Mogila could freely adopt Latin material ... It has been argued that Mogila sought to create an ‘occidental Orthodoxy,’ and thereby to disentangle Orthodoxy from its ‘obsolete’ oriental setting. The notion is plausible ... True, he found the Church in ruins and had to rebuild, but he built a foreign edifice on the ruins. He founded a Roman Catholic school in the Church, and for generations the Orthodox clergy was raised in a Roman Catholic spirit and taught theology in Latin. He “Romanized” the liturgies and thereby “Latinized” the mentality and psychology, the very soul of the Orthodox people. Mogila’s “internal toxin,” so to speak, was far more dangerous than the Unia. The Unia could be resisted, and had been resisted, especially when there were efforts to enforce it. But Mogila’s “crypto-Romanism” entered silently and imperceptibly, with almost no resistance.93

Thirty years after Mogila’s Confession, another anti-Loukarian Confession was published in the Greek East. It author was the patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos Notaras (1641-1707). Born in Arachova in the Peloponnese, he was the only seventeenth-century Greek ecclesiastical scholar who was not educated in the West. He studied the Church Fathers, wrote long books (Tomes katallages, Tomos agapes, Tomos charas) and was a fierce anti-Westerner. Known by his contemporaries as “a scourge of the Latins” he was regarded by the Capuchins of Jerusalem as “an extremely hostile enemy of the Latin Church.” He called the pope “a beast, a wolf, the abomination of desolation set up in a Holy Place, a corruptor of the Christian people and a persecutor of the Church of Christ.”

Yet Dositheos was another example of the involuntary alienation of Orthodox theologians in the modern period. This fanatical anti-Westerner and opponent of the Latins was deeply affected by their mentality and religious sensibility, as his Confession of 1672 makes clear.

Dositheos’s Confession was written against Loukaris, following its order so as to refute it point by point. Confirmed by the anti-Loukarian Synod of Jerusalem of 1672, it was used by the four Eastern patriarchs in 1723 as their basis for dialogue with the Anglican Nonjurors.94

This text is representative of the theological viewpoint which identifies Orthodoxy with faithfulness to the letter of its traditional formulations. Though even this formal fidelity is often violated in the Confession, where Dositheos betrays
Orthodoxy and the West

a Roman Catholic influence. More importantly, the text presupposes the individualistic and legalistic conceptions of virtue and salvation, the exclusion of the priority of experience for participation in the Church’s truth, the legalistic and “essentialist” understanding of this truth, the idealization of traditional forms cut off from the real understanding of life. All these are critical presuppositions which give Dositeos’s Confession a Western character.

The anti-Western patriarch wrote a Western text, a “religious” tract unrelated to the ascetic struggle and the Church’s eucharistic life. We cannot blame him. The Greeks were living through the darkest period of their history. But we must seek criteria which preserve the universal human hope of the Christian Gospel from its transformation into an ideology and “religious” conviction.

X

A Historical Quandary

By the eighteenth century Greek scholars were making sense of their world by reference to modern ideas from Europe rather than the conflict between Roman Catholics and Reformers.

Modernity challenged the long domination of religion in the West. This challenge undermined the Roman Catholic intellectualist approach to scientific method based on the scholastic interpretation of Aristotle, as well as ending reliance on Aristotelian “reputable opinions” in all scientific theory.

The Western European outlook had been changing fast. The discovery of America in 1492, and of the passage to the East Indies in 1498 opened up a new vision of the world: greater activity and wealth widened the horizons of European thought.

In 1543 Copernicus rejected the medieval geocentric cosmology for a spherical universe with the sun at its center. In 1632 Galileo confirmed his calculations. Giordano Bruno had already evoked an infinite universe with countless planetary systems in 1584, but was burnt at the stake by the Inquisition for his temerity.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) had opposed scholastic Aristotelianism with his Novum Organum, anticipating modern empiricism. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was an unapologetic materialist, while John Locke (1632-1704)
prepared the way for the Enlightenment’s individualist liberalism.

René Descartes (1596-1650) rethought scholastic intellectualism, proposing a mechanistic model of nature and human thought. Similarly Leibniz (1646-1716) sought to supersede metaphysical essence with mathematical functional laws.

Finally, Isaac Newton (1643-1727) established scientific causality to explain the physical world, consigning scholastic abstractions to the waste bin. Humanity was now confronted by a mechanistic universe unmediated by metaphysics. But God was still left beyond empirical knowledge where the scholastics had placed him – an abstract “transcendent” concept indifferent to human life. The essentialist ontology of the scholastics and their rejection of the distinction between essence and energies thus reached their logical conclusion.

Greek scholars studying in the West took modern ideas home with them. This transfer to the East took several decades and had limited success. Hellenism under Turkish domination proved incapable of either accepting or rejecting modern ideas.

“Korydalism” continued to dominate the Greek mind until the early eighteenth century. Their reliance on commenting on Aristotle and their one-sided intellectualism gave the Greeks the illusion that they were cultivating their own Greek tradition. They were oblivious to the Western origins of the ideas they propagated.

Theophilos Korydallos fell out with the patriarchate after Cyril Loukaris’s murder. In a sermon delivered on October 27, 1639, his pupil, Meletios Syrigos, on the patriarch’s instructions, denounced Korydallos as a Calvinist opposed to the Orthodox tradition. Everyone was aware that this official denunciation had been trumped up by Loukaris’s successor, Cyril II Kontares, and it convinced nobody. Korydalism could not be combated on this level.

A number of scholars continued Korydallos’s work, all relying on commentaries on Aristotle in spite of differences between themselves. The most celebrated were John Karyophylles, Sebastos Kyninetas, Ioannikios Markouras, George Souroudes, Gerasimos Vlachos, George Koresios, Nicholas Koursoulas, and Alexander Mavrokordatos. John Karyophylles (d. 1693) succeeded Korydallos at the Patriarchal Academy. He wrote a commentary on Aristotle’s Physics and some theological treatises. Although an Aristotelian, he did not accept that the distinction between substance and accidents could sustain the Roman Catholic teaching on transubstantiation. He was condemned for denying it by a Synod convoked in 1691 by the Patriarch Kontares. First borrowed from Thomas Aquinas by Gennadios Scholarios, the use of this term distinguished pro-Latinis from pro-Calvinists during the Loukaris controversies. Both sides accepted a Western intellectualist view of essence, oblivious to how Orthodox reliance on the priority of the mode of existence changes the way the problem should be approached.

George Koresios (1554-1641) was a Chiot physician and theologian who wrote commentaries on Aristotle’s Physics and polemical and theological treatises against the Latin, which relied on the letter of theological formulations but on Western lines. “Koresios bases his teaching on Aquinas, from whom he received all his theological ideas. For he followed the teaching of the Thomists, from whom he derived his scholastic theology.” Anti-Western ardor dressed up in the presuppositions of Western theology continues to the present day.

George Koresios studied at the great school that the Jesuits had founded in Chios in 1590. Of about two hundred pupils, eighty were Orthodox. The Jesuits enabled these young men to continue their studies at Italian universities or the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome.
Gerasimos Vlachos (1605/7-1685), metropolitan of Philadelphia, and “teacher of the sciences in both languages” (i.e., Greek and Latin) at the Greek school in Venice, was prominent in the Greek struggle against the Turks at Candace. A fiery preacher and serious classical Greek and patristic scholar, he wrote “paraphrases and questions” *On all the logical treatises of Aristotle, On Aristotle’s On the Soul*, etc. He published a *Thesaurus in Four Languages*, a lexicon of modern Greek, Latin, Italian, and French. He also wrote *A Definitive Harmony of All that is Compiled according to the Greek Philosophers* — in Greek and Latin: a concise philosophical lexicon containing theological and philosophical definitions. He collaborated with the scholarly French Abbé François Combes on his edition of Maximus the Confessor (Paris 1675); which was reprinted by Migne in the Patrologia Graeca in the nineteenth century. It includes a letter from Vlachos claiming possession of an autograph parchment codex of Maximus.90

Nevertheless, this great pastor and scholar was Westernized too. His theological discussions are typically rationalist. This is how he proves God’s existence:

If you wish to prove that God exists use the following cumulative argument: If God exists, providence exists; if providence exists, there is one who exercises providence; if there is one who exercises providence, all things are the object of providence; if things are the object of providence, they are subject to providence; if they are subject to providence, they know benevolence; if they know benevolence, will exists; if will exists, sovereignty exists; if sovereignty exists, justice and retribution and punishment exist; if these exist, hell and life exist; if hell and life exist, resurrection exists; if resurrection exists, so does judgment; therefore God exists.

Alexander Mavrokeordatos (1641-1709) a leader of the powerful Phanariote class of Constantinople, came from one of the oldest Phanariote families and was an important political figure in seventeenth-century Europe. He became Grand Dragoman (European Interpreter of the Sublime Porte) and later Exarhite (Minister of the Seals), while retaining his reputation as a distinguished teacher.

He studied at the Greek College in Rome and at the universities of Padua and Bologna, where he taught classical Greek and Thomist philosophy. On returning to Constantinople, he became professor of philosophy at the Patriarchal Academy. His parallel career as a diplomat was significant for Ottoman foreign policy and influenced the Sultan’s attitude toward his Greek subjects.

Mavrokeordatos wrote textbooks on grammar, rhetoric and Aristotelian logic. His most important works were his *Notions* and his *Handbook of Opinions and Notions on Ethics and Politics*, where he sets out his personal views on political philosophy, strongly influenced by natural justice principles.

Elias Miniates (1669-1714), bishop of Kephale and Kalavryta, is considered the most important ecclesiastical orator of the Turkish period.91 Born in Cephalonia, he studied in Venice. Although he was only forty-five when he died, he had gained considerable renown and remained famous throughout the Greek world for many generations. During the eighteenth century his *Didastes* went through ten editions and his anti-papal *Petra skandalon* five.

Miniates used a literary demotic Greek for preaching and writing. His "prose was adorned with all the decorative embellishments of Italian baroque ... It is rich in rhetorical figures: subjectio, rogetio, images, parables, visions, and dialogues ... It seeks not to persuade intellectually, but to move, charm, and enwrap ... he bases his teaching on moral problems, avoiding technicalities 'which do not inform but confuse'.993
His anti-papal treatise on the differences between Roman Catholicism and the undivided Orthodox Church concentrates almost entirely on the question of papal primacy. Most of his thought and teaching is Roman Catholic in sensibility. His sermons addressed to the laity contributed decisively to the Westernization of Greek piety. His Didaches were read aloud in monastic refectories and later became a basic text for preachers.

The laity thus gradually adopted Miniates' Western ideas, taking them for the Church's teaching. He relied on Latin legalistic moralism from Augustine, Anselm, and Aquinas for his juristic model of the relationship between man and God, and taught that human guilt was redeemed by good works and suffering after death. Although formally denying the papal teaching on purgatory, he adopted it, not as a place after death, but as a state in which repentant sinners who had not yet redeemed their guilt paid off the "canon" of their debt. His sermons on Christ's passion borrow Roman Catholic teaching on the satisfaction of divine justice through Christ's blood — an infinite transaction for the infinite magnitude of the offense done to God by human sin. Miniates' sermons are still part of the Holy Week services in the monasteries of Mount Athos.

Methodios Anthrakites (1660 to before 1749) was born in Ioannina and studied in Venice, where he served for some years as parish priest of the Greek church. On returning to Greece, he taught at the celebrated schools of Kastoria, Stiatista, and Ioannina. He was the first to challenge Korydalleus' Orthodoxy, not in a theoretical way, but in his teaching. He abandoned the commentaries on Aristotle for teaching mathematics, which had become fashionable in Europe, as had the philosophy of Descartes and Malebranche. For some unknown reason his pupil, the hieromonk Hierotheos Iverites, became his bitter enemy and used every means to destroy him as a heretic.

Despite "Confessions of faith" he was obliged to make to local bishops, Anthrakites was condemned by his persecutor, and in 1723 the Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople sentenced him to be stripped of his priesthood and teaching post. Anthrakites then traveled to Constantinople and sought a review of his case. During the retrial he was publicly humiliated and his lecture notebooks were burned in the courtyard of the patriarchate.

They gathered together books on logic and physics and Euclid and other mathematical works, and lit a fire in the courtyard of the church in three places, and threw them in on Sunday, and there was a huge crowd outside, sailors, cobbler, tailors, and they treated them as if they were the heresies of Arius or the Pneumatomachians, although they were books which everybody studies, which have nothing at all to do with the faith.

These accusations are difficult to judge. His surviving works (Introduction to Logic, Basic Logic, Christian Theories and Beneficial Advice, Spiritual Visitation, Shepherd of Rational Sheep) were written after his second trial and abjuration of error, which resulted in his restoration to the priesthood and his teaching post. These books therefore conformed to his repentance and the Synod's requirements.

In a letter to the notables of Ioannina, Anthrakites claimed that he had been accused "not as a bad Christian, or for any of the Church's doctrines, but because I pursue philosophy differently from the Aristotelians." And indeed the Synod condemned him on the following grounds:

What our pious forefathers received from above by ancient tradition and have taught and still teach concerning physics and the outer learning, (the teaching of peripatetic philosophy), and concerning theology (the sacred books of the divinely inspired Fathers and teachers of Christ's Church), he has rejected and condemned.
The same verdict accuses Anthrakites of pantheism, the identification of all that is with God’s essence, because he had denied any distinction between sensible and intellectual, between divine being and divine energies. It also accuses him of teaching an absolute intellectualism and extreme Cartesianism that denied knowledge through sensory experience: “Only the mind sees and hears, only the mind senses.” On this basis Anthrakites was held to ridicule and despise the Church’s ceremonies, believing only in the Holy Spirit’s direct illumination of every human mind and denying that faith depends on the judgments of the Fathers, “because we are not assed bound by them.” These ideas were supposed to have been inspired by the teaching of Miguel de Molinos, the founder of Quietism, the most important of the Roman Catholic pietistic movements.

From these unsubstantiated accusations it is difficult to say what precisely Anthrakites taught and why the Patriarchal Synod reacted against him so violently. Enlightened Greek progressives later exploited Anthrakites’ condemnation to prove that the Orthodox Church had its own “Holy Inquisition” and “purging fire,” showing “how effective the official Church’s repressive measures were in the early eighteenth century.” They concluded that “obscurantism,” opposition to progress, and the denial of free thought were endemic to Christianity. Therefore human society could evolve only if it freed itself from religion. The patriarchal reaction to Anthrakites strongly recalls the mentality and tactics of the Vatican. Anthrakites probably typified a modern Greek intellectualism, still common today, which admires “modern” ideas without being capable of assimilating them. But equally, the Westernized higher clergy of the Turkish period sometimes imitated Protestant methods or Vatican institutions. Anthrakites’ case anticipates the perplexity of the Orthodox patriarchates in the face of the flood of modern ideas in the late eighteenth century. With their sense of Orthodoxy diminished by doctrinal intellectualism and moral individualism, the Eastern patriarchates were reduced to imitating Vatican obscurantism. At Constantinople a sense of ecumenical primacy and the patriarch’s increased responsibilities as Ethnarch (Millet-basîl) of all the Orthodox in the Ottoman Empire led the patriarchate to imitate Vatican practice.

If the Church authorities in the East behaved like the Vatican, this never became institutionalized. No doubt even among the higher clergy people were equally sinners in East and West. But what makes the Western religious consciousness different from the Eastern is that, unlike the East, Western religious institutions were adapted to human weakness and sinfulness. Certain patriarchs were worldly with political ambitions, but they controlled no authoritarian institutions, made no claim of infallibility, and did not possess the trappings of temporal power. The East also saw ecclesial experience turn into ideology, but there was no institution like Propaganda Fidei. Heretics or dissidents were persecuted but there was nothing comparable to the Holy Inquisition, the Index of Prohibited Books, or the legalization of torture for heresy trials. That is why we can speak of abuses or decadence in Eastern Orthodoxy today, but not of the replacement of the reality of the Church by a secular “religiorized” version of the Church’s Gospel.

Apart from the burning of Anthrakites’ books, there are two further indications of Westernization in this period which should be noted. These are the introduction of titular bishops and indulgences.

The first sign is the diminishing of the episcopal office. A bishop should be a spiritual father responsible for the pastoral care of a specific episcopal see. Otherwise the episcopal office is diminished. Titular bishops are those who do not have a see but simply bear the title of an “ancient and once illustrious” extinct local church. Thus their role is purely ad-
ministrative, their episcopal status being simply a promotion
to the higher ranks of the patriarch’s staff.

Titular bishops probably arose from the Permanent Synod
of Constantinople, which was originally made up of bishops
temporarily resident at the capital. Such residence, that is,
the bishop’s abandoning of his basic role (presiding over the
local Eucharist and being the pastor of the ecclesial body)
was partly due to the difficulties created for many Christian
communities by the Turkish conquest. Often temporary resid-
ence became permanent, and administrative responsibili-
ties were assumed to assist the patriarch. Episcopal father-
hood was the pivot of Orthodox Church life. But bishops
were reduced to being administrators on the Vatican model,
mere representatives of a dominant ideology.

In the mid-seventeenth century the patriarch of
Constantinople and his synod formally decided to ordain
bishops “with the bare name of the see,” to reward individ-
ual clerics, thus establishing titular bishops in the East.99

This development continued to evolve. A new rank of titu-
lar bishop appeared in the nineteenth century, the titular met-
ropolitan without responsibility for a metropolis. Episcopi
titulares on the Vatican model were thus introduced into the
Orthodox world, on the same principles as those defined by
papal canon law: “They discharge a special duty entrusted to
them by the Apostolic See in its territory.”

The Eastern patriarchs were supported by permanent syn-
ods of titular metropolitan, archbishops and bishops or-
ganized into “committees” or “departments” with specific
administrative responsibilities on the model of the Roman
Curia. Bureaucracy replaced the synodical system of apo-
stolic and patristic tradition, excluding the active pastors of
the ecclesial body in the areas under the patriarch’s jurisdic-
tion from participation in the central pastoral responsibility
of the patriarchate and making them subject to its adminis-
trative departments.100

The other sign of Western influence was the granting of
indulgences.101 Like the original papal practice, indulgen-
ces in the East were written assurances of the remittance of
sins, granted individually to the faithful, which guaranteed
salvation, regardless of confession or participation in the
Eucharist. The patriarchs have the exclusive prerogative to
grant indulgences, not only for the living but also for the
dead. Even in the East they cost money.

The date of the first appearance of indulgences in Greek
Orthodoxy is not known. At any rate, their use seems to have
become general from the sixteenth century onwards. The last
printed indulgence recorded in Ph. Ilissos’s study dates from
1555. In the early eighteenth century Dosithios Notaras,
whose Confession we have already mentioned, wrote: “It is
a long custom and ancient tradition familiar to all, that the
most holy patriarchs give indulgences to the common body
of the Church.”102

Indulgences are officially recognized in the Confession of
faith of the Council of 1727, convoked in Constantinople
to counter a new wave of papal propaganda. The thirteenth
article of this Confession says:

The Eastern Church of Christ calls the authority to remit
sins, given in writing to the faithful, “certificates of for-
giveness” and the Latins call them ‘indulgences.’ Chris: is
acknowledged as having given the authority to issue such
certificates to the Holy Church and their use is a most sav-
ing recourse for the faithful. Indeed such certificates of for-
giveness are issued throughout the entire Catholic Church
by the four most holy patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexan-
dria, Antioch and Jerusalem.103

How did a council convoked to counter Latin propaganda
come to adopt one of the most controversial of papal insti-
tutions? The council’s Confession states: “To say that the
authority to issue these (indulgences) belongs exclusively to
the Roman Pope is an outright lie and one of the absurd innovations of the Latins."

Indulgences must have been a powerful means of papist proselytization. The missionaries promised potential converts that they could obtain written confirmation of their salvation, which was unavailable if they remained Orthodox. And since the theological education of the faithful was very limited, the solution was simple: the patriarchs would issue rival indulgences against Rome’s pretensions to an exclusive prerogative.

Historical explanation does not justify the institution or remove the scandal of this radical distortion of the Gospel. In 1838 another council held in Constantinople issued the encyclical Against the Latin Innovations, signed by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem (who were also proxies for the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch), which flatly condemned the papal invention of indulgences as a dreadful and unprecedented abuse, arising from the boldness and arrogance with which the bishops of Rome exploit the most holy and sacred and awesome aspects of the Christian faith as a means of making money, as a result of which they have opened and are still opening exchange banks.104

The official adoption of indulgences alongside their official condemnation indicates the confused state of the Church, rooted in a manifest ignorance not of abstract principles and doctrines but of the fundamental meaning that the Gospel gives to life. The condemnation of indulgences was based simply on moral grounds as "a means of making money," without any awareness of the aberration which the indulgences represented. Turning the relation between humanity and God into a legalistic exchange distorts the image of the Church’s "Bridegroom," the passionate lover of humanity, transforming it into the image of a sadistic God who demands a ransom to free humanity from the interminable torments of hell.

Indulgences are only one symptom of a Westernization which had penetrated deeply into the Church’s consciousness. The practice shows how common Orthodox awareness, even in the teaching of the patriarchs, had sunk to the level of mere religiosity: a legalistic scheme of salvation, a moralistic individualism totally contrary to the Church’s Gospel.

Iliou has noted how in April 1806 Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain wrote from Athos to Bishop Paisios of Sitagri, who was visiting Constantinople, to ask for an indulgence "of the Great Church of Christ," made out in the name of another monk called Nikodemos living on Athos.105 He assured the bishop that he would send the required money as soon as he was told the precise amount. Yet Nikodemos was the editor of the Philokalia, the translator of Symeon the New Theologian, the writer who reminded the Orthodox of Gregory Palamas and his teaching. In the Pedalion he declares that "those spiritual fathers who use religion as a source of income and deal with Christ commercially, seeking payment from the Christians they confess, should without exception, as Paul says, be discharged."106 Yet Nikodemos himself wished to buy an indulgence, "participating in a practice so widespread and ingrained in the daily practice of Orthodoxy that even to the experienced there seemed no alternative or any possibility of rejecting it."107 Without this letter it is difficult to understand Nikodemos’ reliance on the Anselmian and Thomist teaching "on the satisfaction of divine justice through the death of Christ on the cross,"108 or his use of the Roman Code of Canon Law in his Pedalion, or the legalistic and Western spirit that dominates his Exomologetaria. His request for an indulgence expresses in practical terms the legalistic understanding of theology and salvation that pervades his works.
The “Modernists” or “Progressives”

Greek spirituality reached its nadir in the eighteenth century. Three hundred years of occupation did not break the Greek spirit, but left it vulnerable. The education available in the few Greek schools in the Ottoman Empire took its inspiration from the West. Missionary propaganda destabilized ecclesiastical life. The national spiritual leaders – the higher clergy – were dominated by Western culture.

Until the eighteenth century, the impoverished Greeks retained their own spiritual tradition. Scholasticism and neo-Aristotelianism encouraged Greek scholars to imagine that Europeans valued their Greek inheritance. A Western education therefore still implied fidelity to the Greek tradition.

In the early eighteenth century the followers of Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Leibniz and Wolff made Greeks aware of a new scientific and social world-view taking shape in the West. They began to realize that their own “classical” inheritance had less and less in common with the new Europe. By 1800 the Enlightenment had questioned every traditional scientific, political and social concept, making Greeks aware of an antithesis between their own culture and the West.

Modern Greeks began to feel a sense of inferiority in relation to Western Europe. Deference towards the “luminaries” of the West, “the enlightened, civilized and brilliant occidental people,” was widespread. In contrast to Greece under Turkish rule, “where ignorance, superstition, credulity, and boorish manners prevailed,” the West seemed “the happiest,
most beautiful, and most developed region of the world."
This perception has marked the spiritual life of Greece to this
day. Lost between traditional and "modern" ideas, Vikentios
Damodos (1700-52) was a talented philosopher, theologian,
and lawyer, who abandoned traditional Korydallism, combi-
ing it with new European ideas and methods.108 Born in
Chavriata in Cephallenia, he studied at the Philangeteion, the
Greek community's school in Venice, and received a doctorate
in law from the University of Padua. On returning to his
homeland, he worked at first as a lawyer and later founded
a school at his birthplace which made him famous through-
out the Greek world. The curriculum included philosophy,
teology, rhetoric and ethics, taught in the common spoken
language which he also wrote.

He sought to reconcile traditional and modern philo-
sophy, writing The Logic of the Lesser and the Greater in
Peripatetic and Modern Philosophy, and A Brief Idea of
Logic by Modern Methods. Ethics and physics were fash-
ionable in Europe, and Damodos tried to reconcile old and
new ideas in A Modern Physiology in the Common Dialect,
in which Natural Bodies are Discussed, and A Synopsis of
Moral Philosophy.

Damodos was the first Orthadox to write a theological
Dogmatic.109 Of course Confessions, especially Metrophanes
Kritopoulos's, already existed as systematic expositions of
Orthodox doctrine on the model of Western dogmatic hand-
boks. Damodos' work was less opportunistitc than the
Confessions. It is much longer and more rigorously academic,
divided systematically into parts and chapters ("treatises").
It became the model for all later Orthodox handbooks, such
as Eugenios Voulgaris's Theologikon, Athanasios Parlos's
Eptome or Collection of the Divine Doctrines of the Faith
(1806), A. Moschopoulus's Epitome of Dogmatic and Moral
Theology (1857) and the modern dogmatic works of Zikos
Rosis (1903), Christos Androulos (1907), and Panayiotis
Trembelas (1959-63).

Damodos's Dogmaties and later handbooks of a similar
kind were an innovation in the Church's tradition because
they made doctrine autonomous, arranged as a theoretical
program isolated from ecclesial experience. They do not set
out the "boundaries" of ecclesial experience, as the decisions
of the ecumenical councils do, but list ideological principles
and values as obligatory beliefs to which all Christians must
subscribe even if they don't understand them. For according
to Damodos, "the doctrines of the faith transcend the human
mind, often causing considerable difficulties. Hence these
should not be subjected to human reasoning but demand be-
ief as revealed by God to the Church through the Scriptures
and the true apostolic tradition."110

This is theology in terms of ideology, as in the West.
Scripture and Tradition do not define the Church's historical
experience. God's revelation is not experienced historically;
it is a "supernatural" addition of knowledge inaccessible to
reason or immediate experience. Reason becomes an abso-
late and autonomous "signifier," though what is signified by
it remains inaccessible to human beings. Sentimental state-
ments are all we have left. Faith is no longer trust, hypo-
sizing hope, but becomes individualistic (i.e., intellectualist)
and sentimental abstractions. Christianity becomes an ide-
ology and the truth about a life that conquers death is reduced
to unintelligible dogma.

Vikentios Damodos was conscious of the Western-style
transformation of Orthodox theology. In his Dogmaties he
sought to differentiate himself from the Westerners and de-
nounce their errors, mentioning "false scholastic reasoning,
"the falsity of scholastic teaching," the "the most erroneous
and impious doctrines of the Lutherans and Calvinists." He
wanted to follow "the God-bearing Fathers, and be guided
by them." The only modern Greek theological writer who
unequivocally attributes heresies to Augustine, Damodos ascribes them to off-the-cuff remarks, rather than thought-out positions. He insisted on the distinction between God’s essence and energies which he regarded as the major difference between East and West.

Yet he remained trapped in the Western theological assumptions which dominated his age. His *Dogmatics* was based on the *Dogmatica Theologica* of the French Jesuit, Denys Petavius (1583-1652), or Petavius, as he was generally known.113 Certain of his theses were severely critical of Petavius, but Damodos retained his themes and analytical method. Even the title *Dogmatic Theology*, now established in Orthodox theological writing, comes from Petavius.113

Damodos also criticized Thomas Aquinas, but again his opposition did not challenge Aquinas’ presuppositions, or his method and intellectualism. Wanting to be as equally “scientific” as his opponents, he ends up just as scholastic and intellectualist. Modern Greek academic theology falls into the same trap.

The leading figure in eighteenth-century Greek intellectual life was Eugenios Voulgaris (1716-1806).114 The “famous Eugenios” was “the glory of the nation.” “The learned Makrarios called him thrice-great. He struggled eloquently to introduce Locke, Leibniz and Wolff to us and led young people hungry for knowledge in various Greek communities to the shrine of true wisdom.”115

Born in Corfu, he studied theology, philosophy and mathematics at Padua. He began his teaching at the Marontsaian School in Ioannina, at the School of Kozani, at the Athonias School of the Holy Mountain, and at the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople. His teaching, which was based on Descartes, Locke, Leibniz, Wolff and Voltaire, emphasizing mathematics and geometry, provoked opposition. After clashing with patriarchal officials in Constantinople, he fled via the Danubian principalities to Halle and Leipzig, where he published his books. Called in 1772 by Catherine the Great to St. Petersburg, he was appointed librarian and became one of the empress’s counselors. He was ordained archbishop of Slavonia and Cherson, attending to his pastoral duties until 1779, when he resigned in favor of his friend, Nikephoros Theotokis. He remained a member of the St. Petersburg Imperial Academy and died at the Monastery of Alexander Nevsky.

His output of translations and original work was considerable. He translated Locke, Voltaire, Genovesi, Du Hamel, Pourchot, Gravesande, and Wolff. His own works include: *Logic; Elements of Metaphysics, Treatise on a Good Death; Theological Compendium; Favorite Ideas of the Philosophers; On a Universal System; On Tides; A Plan for Religious Toleration; Godly Conversations, Orthodox Confession*, etc. Usually written in an archaizing language, the most important of them was his *Logic*, with its six hundred closely printed pages, which made him famous. “It became established for many years as the national textbook of philosophy.”116

Voulgaris was an enlightened European of wide culture who happened to be Greek. Nothing in his work suggests that he was conscious of the particularity of Greek culture except what concerned the dogmatic differences between East and West. Remaining faithful to Orthodox “dogma,” he accepted and expounded it according to the intellectualist assumptions of the Western theological tradition.

He always insisted that he was “eclectic,” but he remains Greece’s first and greatest Enlightenment figure. His eclecticism meant reconciling Aristotelianism, which had become unfashionable in Europe, with the new science, philosophy and social theory. His writings mention contemporary Western authors alongside ancient authorities. “A rationalist and admirer of empirical scientific research, he accepted experiment and mathematical reasoning as apodictic, but also
accepted the a priori ideas which divine Revelation offers ready-made to the human spirit.”117

He translated and admired Voltaire, “celebrated amongst us for his writings,” when he was synonymous with the rejection of metaphysics. His love for Voltaire led to Voulgaris’s invitation to Russia by Catherine, who was a known admirer and personal friend of the great French lumiére.

In his later years he rejected Voltaire’s free thinking and became conservative – but only as part of the conservative European reaction to Voltaire as befitted his advancing years. “As a young man he quarreled with conservatives, as an old man with progressives.”118 His successors, Josipos Moisiodax and Athanasios Psalidas, recognized his genius but expressed intense admiration for modern Enlightenment ideas. They judged Voulgaris’s later conservatism very severely. Later academic theologians would exploit his conservative concessions as a model of fidelity to Orthodox Tradition.

At home in salons and royal courts, his European tastes and sensibilities cut him off from his own people’s ecclesiastical life. Living next to the Orthodox chapel in Leipzig, he remarked ironically: “I am in danger of getting to like church services.” Dimaras said: “We think of him more as a free-thinking Catholic abbé than as an Athonite monk.”119 He was conscious of the Greeks’ sufferings under Turkish rule and campaigned for them particularly at St. Petersburg, where he petitioned the empress to help them.120

Nikephoros Theotokis (1731-1800) was a friend of Voulgaris.121 Churchman, science teacher, writer and philosopher, he helped introduce Western science to Greece.

Also born in Corfu, he studied physics and mathematics at the universities of Bologna and Padua. Afterwards he taught in Corfu and briefly at the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople and the Princely Academy of Jassy. He then went to Russia, where he succeeded Eugenios Voulgaris as archbishop of Astrakhan, finally dying in Moscow.

Theotokis was widely known for his book Kyriakodromion, on the Gospels and Epistles of the liturgical calendar. His three-volume Elements of Mathematics, his Geography and Elements of Modern Physics and a long unsigned refutation of Voltaire were also influential in the Greek world, the last work offering the most detailed presentation of Voltaire’s ideas available in Greek.

He avoided Voulgaris’s archaizing language but without adopting demotic Greek. Perhaps the first before Kcrais to present a formal theory of “katharevousa,” the purist form of Modern Greek, he defines it as “another dialect, not that of our forefathers, nor the everyday speech of the streets, but so far as possible a purified form.”122 “His language is simple, logical, and mathematical, testifying to a progressive and critical mind.”123 “Modern” and “progressive” ideas were thought to endanger Western intellectualism invested with the authority of Aristotle and religion. Theotokis trusted European scientific empiricism, mathematics and a Newtonian mechanics. A “progressive” who used purely Western criteria, he rejected conservative Roman Catholicism, though without refuting it. His opponents, who created so many difficulties for him, were Western-style “conservatives.” No eighteenth-century Greek realized that empirical science was more compatible with the experiential emphasis of Orthodox Church life than with Augustinian and Thomist intellectualism.

Later men of the Enlightenment, from Josipos Moisiodax to K. Th. Dimaras and E. Papanoutsos, would think of Nikephoros Theotokis as a conservative because he did not follow the Western model. His empirical science did not cut him off from religious tradition, and he never taught philosophy without reference to religion.

The Kyriakodromion remains an inspired religious text. Theotokis’s principal interest is moral, but his scriptural
knowledge and fidelity to Orthodox teaching give his homilies a character of their own. This is not the ecclesiastical character that goes with an insistence on the eucharistic realization of salvation, the doxological nature of ascesis, and the apophatic nature of theology. But these Orthodox elements are hard to evaluate critically and objectively. It is therefore difficult to distinguish the ecclesial character of Theotokis’s homilies from the Pietistic trends of certain aspects of contemporary Enlightenment thought.123

If Eugenios Voulgaris was "the apostle of the Greek Enlightenment,",124 his pupil Josipos Moisiodax (1725/30-1800) was more radical and systematic. Born in Chernavoda in northeastern Bulgaria, and a pupil of Voulgaris at the Athosias School, he was ordained deacon and went on to study at Padua, specializing in natural science and education. In 1765 he followed Theotokis as director of the Princely School of Jassy. He reformed the entire curriculum to eradicate the Aristotelianism which still dominated it. He began philosophy courses with mathematics, not logic, and concentrated on classical texts while excluding ecclesiastical authors. He taught in demotic Greek, following the ideas of Locke, Newton and Voltaire. His fierce anti-Aristotelianism provoked a conservative reaction in Jassy. As the conservatives imitated Roman Catholic scholasticism in the Thomist intellectualist tradition, they considered empirical science a danger to faith and morals. But if empiricism founds knowledge on immediate experience, it is nearer to the Orthodox tradition than is intellectualism. "They denied empirical science, which supports the experiential Orthodoxy of the Church Fathers."125 The conservatives often repeated: "Do not move ancient landmarks" – which became the maxim of the twentieth-century Old Calendarists. With both groups fear of the new inspired a faith in tradition that is psychologically reassuring.

Josipos Moisiodax eventually fell ill with consumption and became too weak to continue the struggle, resigning as director of the school. He traveled to Venice, Trieste, and later Vienna, devoting himself until his death in 1800 to writing. He wrote a Moral Philosophy (adapting Antonio Muratori), a Treatise on the Education of Children, or Pedagogy, which is mainly a translation from John Locke, a Theory of Geography, Notes on Physiology, and a long personal Apologia.

Modern Greek sympathizers with the Enlightenment present Moisiodax as an example of the "enlightened" scholar who suffered tragically from obscurantist opposition. Their analysis perpetuates the typical Western confrontation between philosophy and religion. This schematic approach has some basis in reality, but is artificial and arbitrary. The problems of the Turkish period were exacerbated because both modernists and conservatives were imitating foreign models. The Western Enlightenment was a polemical campaign against religion, anti-clerical if not always atheist. This reaction to the totalitarian character of "religiousized" Christianity in Europe took various and mutually contradictory forms, but was always opposed to the religious organization of society.126

In the Greek world the Enlightenment was promoted mainly by clerics. Social and cultural life was focused on the Church, preserving the unity of the Greek people and their resistance to conversion to Islam. But there was little autonomy. Certain ecclesiastical and social groups improvised resistance to science and new ideas, but this action was again a symptom of Westernization, imitating Western conservatism. Unlike the leaders of the Western Enlightenment, Moisiodax never made a definitive break with the Church. He did not even adopt their rigid separation of theology from philosophy. For him, theology and metaphysics helped prove God's existence and the value of morality.127
His contemporary Demetrios Katazis or Photiadis (1725/30-1807), was another Greek representative of the Enlightenment. Born and educated in Constantinople, he worked in the princely courts of Moldau-Wallachia, becoming Grand Logothete of Wallachia and being honored as “august patriarch of scholars.” Inspired by the French Encyclopedists, he advocated radical educational reform based on the simplified spoken language. He aspired to rational simplification of the written language with a phonetic rendering of demotic speech, as later promoted by Psycharis. He wrote in this strange and artificial language *A Proposal for the Romaic Tongue, An Educational Proposal for Roman and the Vlach Children, and A Plea for Training Teachers in Romaic*.

His educational ideas were derived from the French Enlightenment. He also wrote legal and philological studies on the art of jurisprudence, on modern Greek versification, and on ancient and modern Greek grammar. Two further books, *In Praise of the Philosopher and Know Thyself*, were inspired by the French Encyclopedists. For all his Western thought, style and approach, he insisted on Orthodox faith, devotion and morality. Rejecting Enlightenment atheism and anti-clericalism, he admired all the rest. He praises people who remain loyal to the Orthodox faith and sometimes seems alarmed at the effect of “Frankish books” on the young, writing *How the Young Can Benefit from Frankish and Turkish Books without Being Corrupted by Them*.

A writer who did follow the Enlightenment’s rejection of religion was Christodoulos Eustathiou Pamplexis (1733-1793). A pupil of Eugenios Voulgaris at the Athanas School, for most of his life he taught Greek children in Vienna. An insignificant compiler of books, “written in a dull archaizing language,” “he neither articulated nor inspired the spiritual rebellion of which he was supposedly the spokesman.”

He compiled an anthology of deism and anti-clericalism from the French Encyclopedists and Spinoza. According to Manuel Gedeon, his enemies denounced him to the patriarchate of Constantinople and Christodoulos was forced to defend himself by attacking his persecutors, impugning the clergy by writing against priests, bishops, ascetics, monks, and even the sacred apostles and holy Fathers. This led to his condemnation by the patriarchate three months after his death, granting him posthumous fame. Modern admirers of the Enlightenment see him as a victim of Church persecution.
Vigilance and Resistance

A new scholarly tradition took shape in the modern Greek world after the fall of Constantinople and in the subsequent centuries of Turkish domination. This intellectual approach used the Greek language but was not authentically Greek; it merely imitated and copied the Western break with the Greek ecclesiastical view of life. Whether conservative or progressive, the “great teachers of the Nation” brought European ideological conflicts to their enslaved country without adapting them to the Greek world’s cultural dynamics. Modern Hellenism acquired an imported scholarly tradition, oblivious to the Greek legacy, that disavowed its own ecclesiastical tradition.

Arguably, the Turkish period’s scholarly tradition was shaped without reference to popular tradition, which appears to have sustained, concretely and perhaps unconsciously, the Greek ecclesiastical mode of life as lived from day to day. Not theory but daily praxis preserved the Greek people’s identity, differentiating them from the Muslim Turk and the heterodox Frank. Daily life conformed to the Church calendar’s liturgical time – the fasts, feasts and their social expression in popular festivals. Ecclesiastical praxis informed contracts, partnerships, dowries, tradesmen’s guilds and any other legal transactions, inspiring popular church architecture and traditional iconography. It brought together ecclesiastical and popular music or dress. The “osmosis” of monastic asceticism and family morality united church and popular
piety in the habit of daily liturgical prayer, the family icon stand, the vigil lamp burning in every home, the bread offered for the Eucharist, and holy water.

These are not idealized images of an unchanging, flourishing popular culture, but the Greek people’s living tradition during those difficult centuries. A barbarous oppressor humiliated and degraded them; they suffered the unbearable pain of the devşirme (the seizure of Christian children to be brought up as Muslim Janissaries), heavy taxes, systematic and often forced conversion, fear and insecurity before the capricious Turk. But illiteracy, ignorance, superstition, prejudice and cultural barbarism were commonplace. Western missionaries imposed religious customs which alienated them from the Church’s ethos, as did popular versions of the ideas and practices of Westernized Greek scholars, or the contacts which resulted from shipping and trade with the West.

The popular tradition grew out of these contradictions and unfavorable circumstances. Moreover, the frequent presence of neomartyrs throughout most of the Greek world was decisive for preserving the Orthodox Church ethos. These farmers, small merchants, sailors or employees were mostly young. They refused conversion or renounced Islam after it had been forced on them, and as a warning to others were tortured and put to death. Immediately, the people acknowledged them as saints. The signs of their sanctity sustained and encouraged the faithful, as in the first centuries, as a measure and revelation of the Church’s Gospel. The martyrs’ witness confirmed the Church’s faith that life is not just biological survival; life is relationship with Christ. That is why, when the moment of decision came, they sacrificed mere survival for the sake of that relationship. The theology of martyrdom nurtured and preserved the Greek ecclesiastical ethos throughout the centuries of Turkish domination.130

Kosmas Aitolos (1714-1779) was the greatest of the neomartyrs, widely venerated as a saint even during the Enlightenment and formally canonized in 1961.131 But he was something more. The people called him Father Kosmas. During the Turkish period, he represented “the other side” to the Westernized scholarly tradition; the Greeks were growing alienated from their spiritual roots but his life symbolized awakening and resistance.

He was born in Apokoulo, in the mountains of eastern Trichonis in Aitolokarnania. After a local ecclesiastical education, he studied at the Athonias School on Mount Athos where Eugenios Voulgaris and other notable scholars taught him grammar, logic and rhetoric. He was tonsured as a monk at the Monastery of Philotheou, and ordained presbyter. By his own account he dedicated seventeen years to study and asceticism on Mount Athos.

Towards the end of 1760 he went to Constantinople to see Patriarch Seraphim II’s blessing and permission for a preaching mission to the Greek heartland, “because our nation has fallen into ignorance.” His missionary journeys continue almost uninterrupted for twenty years throughout mainland Greece, from Thrace to the northern Peloponnese. He also visited the Cyclades and the Ionian islands, but concentrated on Epirus and western Macedonia, encountering many people there who had changed their faith or abandoned the Greek language.

He would travel from village to village, staying two days in each, with a sermon the night he arrived, a second the next morning and a third that evening. In these three addresses he recapitulated the Church catechism’s basic truths briefly and elegantly, with simple examples to draw out the practical consequences of the Church’s teaching for daily living. Remarkably for the times, he linked theological truth with practical life, illuminating daily practice with his experience of revealed truth.
He was an extraordinary phenomenon, expressing the fundamental issues of Christian experience in simple but powerful language: the most important manifestation of the Church’s authentic spirit during the entire period of Turkish rule. Neither rationalistic nor moralistic, his word was a revelation of the Church’s Gospel: the flesh of life and the mode of true being.

His style and the vigor of his language were inimitable. His wide vocabulary preserved the clarity of popular idiom. His teaching constituted a systematic theology, and his practical exhortations were sharp and realistic. His speech was the palpable expression of his holiness and beyond critical evaluation; his tender concern and anguished love for the people he met prove he understood their sufferings. The Greek nation was sunk in ignorance and misery, but his passion revived a real sense of the true life, a foretaste of participation in the Kingdom, a consciousness of the privileged possession of truth, and an awareness that painful and wretched lives had noble antecedents.

Scholars have evaluated Kosmas Aitolos’s social and educational work: he founded ten Hellenic schools (where ancient Greek was taught) and two hundred elementary schools. His work was important in rescuing the Greek language and Greek self-awareness from Islamic influence in several critical regions. He strengthened the hope of the people in the future liberation of the Greek nation.

All this is well documented; only the historical roots of his extraordinary personality remain mysterious. His character was diametrically opposed to contemporary ideas, so what ecclesiastical environment, what schools and teachers could have formed him? How was he able to clothe the Triune God, the sacramental life of the Church, the ceaseless prayer of the heart, and God’s love for everyone with the clear immediacy of everyday life? How did he come to elucidate the Gospel’s message of salvation in a manner worthy of the greatest texts of the patristic tradition?

Kosmas Aitolos sealed his life with martyrdom. The Turks hanged him on August 24, 1779, outside Kalikontasi, near Berat, by the River Apso. Not just memories survived him; for more than a century Greeks from regions he had visited would regulate their lives by reference to his presence and word.

In the late eighteenth century, a new controversy in the monastic community of the Holy Mountain turned unexpectedly into a movement of spiritual regeneration. Certain important ecclesiastics came together to defend the theological profundities of Orthodox worship, and soon found themselves attempting to reawaken the subject Greek nation’s spiritual consciousness.

This was the Kollyvades movement, a complex issue with contradictions that provoked widely differing reactions. Were conservative zealots, servile to the Turk, spreading obscurantism? Or was a strong neo-patristic revival preparing a final flowering of a broader Greek culture? Was it a movement against Westernization and the alienation of Hellenism from its spiritual roots? Or did it exemplify Western Pietism’s penetration of Greek Orthodoxy?

“Kollyvades” began as a pejorative term for Athonite monks who disapproved of commemorating the departed on a Sunday with “kollyvd” — boiled wheat. The commemorations were always read after the Divine Liturgy on Saturday in the Athonite community’s monasteries and sketes. The Church’s most ancient custom was to celebrate Sunday as a paschal day of resurrection, which excluded the funerary memorial prayers for the departed.

In 1754 monks of the Skete of St. Anne transferred the commemorations from Saturday to Sunday for a practical reason: they wanted to visit the Saturday market in Karyes. Their ignorance about the sense and significance of worship
proved their theological superficiality, provoking opposition from simple monks who clearly possessed an alert ecclesiastical consciousness. A painful controversy ensued and arguments were exchanged by both sides. The Kollyvades insisted on the paschal character of the Lord’s Day, refusing to “bend the knee” on Sunday, and insisting on frequent holy communion.

The Church’s canons forbid kneeling on the Lord’s Day. They stipulate that “we offer the Eucharist on the Lord’s Day in a standing position,” because we are no longer slaves, subject to death, but conformed to the Lord’s resurrection. Insisting on “continuous holy communion” reflects a true understanding of the Church; only the Eucharist realizes and manifests the Church when the faithful receive communion “from the same bread and cup.”

The Kollyvades’ theses convey a vigilant theological awareness of the Church’s living priorities, which for that time was unusual. The opponents’ arguments were generally scholastic and lacking in theological content. Yet they prevailed, their proponents imposing their views on the patriarchate of Constantinople and procuring the condemnation of the Kollyvades by the Holy Synod. The leaders were exiled, excommunicated and deposed. Two Kollyvades monks of Mount Athos were even assassinated.

Most of the movement’s leaders had to abandon the Holy Mountain, many going to the Aegean islands: Chios, Ikaria, Paros, Hydra, etc. The most important Kollyvades center was in Skiathos, at the Monastery of the Annunciation founded by hieromonk Niphon in exile. Niphon’s personality and the monastery’s traditions strongly influenced two local authors: Papadiamantis and Moraitidis.

At the start, the Kollyvades’ leader was Neophytos Kausokalyvites (1713-1784). Having studied in Constantinople, Patmos and Ioannina, he became a monk in the Skete of Kausokalyvia on Mount Athos. He taught at the Athenias School, serving two terms as director. His influential treatise On Frequent Holy Communion of the Immaculate Mysteries (1766) intensified the controversy. Exiled from Mount Athos, he continued teaching in Chios, Adrianople, Brasov in Transylvania, and Bucharest, where he died.

Hieromonk Athanasios Parios (1721-1813) succeeded Neophytos as the movement’s leader.132 Born in Kostos on Paros, he studied in Smyrna, and then under Eugenios Voulgaris and Neophytos Kausokalyvites at the Athenias School. He taught in Thessalonica, broadening his studies with lessons in philosophy, rhetoric and physics from Nikotheos Theotokis in Corfu. After a brief stay in Mesolonghi, he returned to the Holy Mountain as director of the Athenias School, vigorously defending the Kollyvades. His opponents accused him of heresy and on June 9, 1776, he was condemned, defrocked and excommunicated by Sophronios II, patriarch of Constantinople, and his synod. He took refuge in Thessalonica, and ran the city’s grammar school. He defended himself before the Holy Synod of Constantinople during Gabriel IV’s patriarchate in 1781, when his excommunication was lifted and he was restored to the priesthood. He stayed in Thessalonica until 1786, collaborating with St. Nikolos of the Holy Mountain in publishing St. Gregory Palamas’s works, and then went to Chios, where he directed the grammar school until he died.

His work on rhetoric, grammar, philosophy and mathematics mostly remains unpublished. He translated the Neoplatonist A. Genovesi’s Elements of Mathematics, and collaborated with Makarios Notaras, bishop of Corinth, on a theological Epitome, a school theology textbook later translated into Romanian.

Athanasios Parios translated and published the Metaphysics of Genovesi, a man of the Enlightenment, while conscientiously and vigorously opposing modern Western ideas. His erudition and linguistic competence helped him understand
the tremendous changes taking place in Europe, where the Enlightenment was imposing an atheistic nihilism on the human conscience. He remained the Enlightenment’s implacable enemy when most Greek scholars, especially in the European diaspora, trusted the Enlightenment’s liberal ideas to regenerate Hellenism. Greeks of the Enlightenment considered Parios a symbol of obscurantism and reaction. The Church deposed and persecuted him, while his liberal opponents slandered him; he was a tragic figure at a time when neo-Hellenism was undergoing confusion and division. The enslaved Greek nation vacillated between pale imitations of Western conservatism and liberalism because it lacked cultural self-identity.

Parios was a personal enemy of Korais. He widely circulated a treatise in the form of a letter to denounce Korais’s theologically groundless view of fasting (1791). His *A Response to the Irrational Zeal of the Philosophers Coming from Europe* (1802) strongly attacked Westernized Greek scholars who aspired to lead their enslaved nation from abroad, free to choose their ideological preferences in safety. Korais’s equally vigorous response forced Parios to adopt provocatively conservative positions. He did not hesitate to condemn the modern ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau and the French Revolution, even defending the institution of monarchy. Against a secularized “social contract” and the implied atheism of liberal democracy, Athanasios Parios revered monarchy as the image of God, the guarantor of justice and the royal dignity to which holy baptism restores everyone.

Parios’s notorious *Paternal Teaching* brought his dispute with Korais to a head. Published in 1797 by the patriarchal press of Constantinople under the name of Patriarch Anthimos of Jerusalem, there is no doubt it was written by Athanasios Parios.¹² It challenged the followers of the Enlightenment with a rival political-social vision beyond mere ideology and religious belief. Against the new rationalistic nationalism and the secular state with its civic duties, Parios advocated a multi-ethnic empire whose political unity would be based on a shared culture.

With his colloquial and often naïve turn of phrase and conservative religious language, he vilified European political institutions as demonic and heretical, especially those that had originated from outside the Roman Empire and subsequent to the divisions caused by the Reformation. That the powerful Ottoman Empire had succeeded the Roman Empire in the East, so that “the holy and Orthodox faith was preserved unchanged,” he ascribed to God’s love.

The *Paternal Teaching* explicitly exhorted the Greeks to accept the Ottoman Empire’s authority without protest, and reject revolution and modern liberalism. The book was officially published by the patriarchate with the Sublime Porte’s agreement, so we do not know how far it reflected the author’s personal opinions.¹³ The text gave men of the Enlightenment a pretext for attacking the Church, condemning its obscurantism, conservatism and self-interested subservience to the oppressor.

Korais replied personally in 1798 with his *Fraternal Teaching to All the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire in Refutation of the Pseudonymous Paternal Teaching*, published in Constantinople under the name of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, a harshly polemical text denying that the *Paternal Teaching* expressed the Greek people’s feelings, and depicting its author as a mad and hypocritical cleric.

The crisis of rival hopes and opinions about Hellenism’s future inspired Korais’s sharp language. He and his Enlightenment followers had a clear goal and purpose: a national state on the European humanist model to revive political Hellenism within the geographical borders of ancient Greece. The modern state, inspired by European liberal models, would gain added brilliance from ancient Hellenic ancestry.
Parios, the patriarchate’s officials and the Phanariotes held to intuitive beliefs which lacked theoretical elaboration. They trusted to a traditional multi-ethnic empire and borrowed the language of European conservatism, with its terror of modern ideas and political liberalism. Historical realism lay behind their confused, intuitive opposition to Enlightenment romanticism. Only a traditional multi-ethnic empire could preserve Hellenism when Greeks were dispersed throughout the Ottoman Empire among its different ethnic populations. Hellenism was clearly identified with the Orthodox ecclesiastical tradition; it included Greek communities from mainland Greece to the deep interior of Asia Minor and Pontus, and from the trans-Danubian principalities to Cyprus and Egypt.

The humanists’ narrow “Helladic” state within the geographical borders of ancient Greece would have excluded the vast majority of Greeks, leaving them exposed to Turkish vengeance, forced conversion, and the eradication of their culture. To the Greeks’ traditional leadership the idea of a national state threatened the annihilation of Hellenism. But they had another fear. A Western-style state presupposed social transformation, with the common life organized around a rational and secular “social contract.” Natural rights and utilitarianism would undermine the social cohesion that historically had preserved Hellenism under the most adverse conditions.

The “conservative” leadership’s preference for the Ottoman Empire was not pro-Turkish, as Korais maintained, nor was it compliant towards slavery. It was based on a particular understanding of Hellenism and its ecumenical dimension that contrasted with the narrow nationalism and obsession with antiquity characteristic of those who followed the Enlightenment. Vilified as conservatives who craved to stay enslaved, the traditionalists were full of hope. Greeks were being appointed to key positions in the Ottoman Empire, particularly in foreign affairs and the administration of the trans-Danubian principalities. Trade and merchant shipping were largely in Greek hands. The Greek population’s admirable social organization and institutions in the rapidly growing cities left their Turkish fellow-citizens seemingly underdeveloped.

As a result, the officials of the patriarchate and the Phanariotes hoped for a gradual capture of the Ottoman Empire from within. The idea was probably discreetly promoted even amongst the Turks. Against modern nationalism, the traditional leadership supported the option of a united Eastern Empire, where dynasties succeeded one another as in Byzantium. Thus the period of Turkish occupation was the “dynasty of the Osmanis.” This idea circulated unofficially in the Phanar until around 1900. The controversy between Parios and Korais, between the Kollyvades and the Enlightenment was not simply a struggle between conservatives and progressives, as “enlightened” historiography tends to represent it. Here are two contrasting visions of Hellenism. Against the realism of Byzantine Catholicity’s mode, or culture, embodied in a Greek Orthodox Nation transcending racial boundaries, an imaginary racial Hellenism could draw an identity from antiquity by arbitrarily ignoring the Byzantine centuries.

The clash between the Kollyvades and the Enlightenment’s proponents at the turn of the nineteenth century was perhaps neo-Hellenism’s last chance to preserve its traditional identity. Of course, Korais’s opinions prevailed, not those of the Kollyvades. Wider Hellenism had begun its long agony, which after successive amputations continues painfully and inexorably to the present day.

makarios Notaras (1731-1805), metropolitan of Corinth, was a leader of the Kollyvades’ movement without being an Athonite monk. Descended from the noble Byzantine family of Notaras, he bore a name made illustrious by St.
Gerasimos (1509-1579) and the distinguished patriarchs of Jerusalem, Dositeos and Chrysanthos. After a brief stay at the Monastery of Mega Spelaton, where he had been tonsured as a monk, Makarios taught for six years in Corinth, where he had been born. In 1765, at the age of thirty-four, he was ordained metropolitan. His first concern was educating the young and the clergy, but he was soon actively involved in the Orloff revolt (1768-1774). After its suppression he fled in a Russian naval ship first to Zakynthos, where he befriended Nikephoros Theotokis, and later to Cephalonia and Hydra.

In Hydra Makarios met Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain, a turning point in both their lives. They compiled together the Philokalia of the Holy Neptic Fathers and published a second anthology of patristic aphorisms, collected by the eleventh-century monk Paul Evergetinos.138 Inspired by and even borrowing from the Roman Catholic Miguel de Molinos’ Breve tratado de la comunión cotidiana (Rome 1675), Makarios published the Anonymous Handbook Proving that Christians Ought to Receive Holy Communion More Frequently (Venice 1777). This work provoked new hostility on Mount Athos to the Kollyvades. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain reworked, completed and republished it six years later,139 but the book was again condemned by Patriarch Gabriel IV and Prokopios; nevertheless it continued to attract wide Christian readership.

Makarios then joined the other Kollyvades leader, Anthanasios Parios, in Chios. Their new collaboration produced the Epitome or Collection of the Dogmas of the Faith (Leipzig 1806), the New Leimonarion (Venice 1819), containing biographical sketches of the neomartyrs of the Turkish period, and the second edition of the Christian Apology (Leipzig 1800).

Makarios went to Mount Athos for the first time in 1777, handing Nikodemos the Philokalia manuscripts to check and compare with codices in the Athonite libraries. On the Holy Mountain Makarios experienced the bitterness of the Kollyvades controversy directly when he refused to perform a commemoration in the Monastery of Koutoumoussiou on a Sunday. Disillusioned, he abandoned Mount Athos and continued his wandering in Patmos, Hydra, Corinth and Smyrna, ending his days in a hermitage on the island of Chios.

In the context of his times, Makarios was an astonishing phenomenon. Europe was being transformed; a new world was being born amidst frenzied enthusiasm. Society, politics and ideology were changing radically; the speed of change excited the enslaved people of the East, arousing new hopes.

The French Revolution was central, but a lot happened just before or afterwards: Napoleon’s early triumph as “the Liberator,” the United States of America’s declaration of independence, the awakening of nationalism, the radical ideas of the Encyclopaedists, Voltaire’s iconoclastic language, Fichte’s criticism of all “revelation,” Kant’s reinvention of metaphysics and ethics, the founding by liberals of political science, the allure of revolutionary politics, impressive advances of science, and bold innovations in art. The impetus of social and cultural change in the West seemed unprecedented.

The Ottoman Empire’s oppressed rayahs were particularly excited by this. Educated Greeks following European developments tended to align themselves unreservedly with modernism’s ideas. We shall meet some of the personalities and their reactions in the next chapter.

But the Kollyvades dissented: a handful of humble, scholarly monks gathered around Makarios. Their inspired and fruitful opposition to the new European world reveals an astonishing historical perspicacity. They provided their enslaved nation with fundamental texts of spiritual and cultural self-awareness under very difficult conditions. Against mod-
ernism, they proposed to reawaken humanity to its essential, original needs, illuminated by the Church Fathers' ethos and experience.

They rapidly produced the first printed editions of Gregory Palamas, Symeon the New Theologian and Mark Eugenikos, in the original or in a more popular idiom. These works and writers had been completely forgotten for three and a half centuries, even amongst ecclesiastics. The Kollyvades themselves produced catechisms and apologetic works to sustain the Greeks' Christian resistance. They also composed biographies of neomartyrs to provide the faithful with recent examples of sacrificial self-denial.

The Kollyvades' greatest achievement was the Philokalia.²⁹² This anthology borrows from thirty-six Church Fathers and ascetics from the fourth to fifteenth centuries; all the texts suggest that a direct relationship of man with God, and a bodily perception of God through the purification of the mind by ceaseless mental prayer, are indeed possible.

The Kollyvades understood how the complex new European order was actively opposed to the religious oppression and obscurantism which had caused people to lose their faith. That is why they presented the Philokalia as a witness to the genuine experience of the Church. They focused on the central promises of the Church, on the ascetic goal of the monks and the laity, on palpable experience of the Gospel's revelation.

This is surprising. After three and a half centuries of rationalism and moralism by Greek scholars, imitations of Western "religionization," scholastic "Confessions" and inadvertent concessions to secularization, after three and a half centuries of patriarchs, schools and students alienated from their tradition, St. Makarios' revelatory judgment rescued from oblivion the Church's witness to the most essential issues of the Christian faith.

The Philokalia is not a collections of specialized "mystical" texts; it demonstrates what we seek when we participate in the Church. We are not interested in the validation of concepts or legal guarantees of ultimate justification. Human beings seek the love (philia) of the good and for beauty (kallos). Longing for the beauty of the Lord's Person is part of the personal relationship or communion that constitutes incorruptible, immortal, true life.

A personal relationship with Christ's Person, like true love, requires a persistent effort to let go of egocentricity and be freed of the natural selfish will. We actively seek this relationship by constant invocation of the beloved's name, coordinating mind and breathing to invoke his mercy and share his life.

Constant, loving invocation purifies the mind of its illusions, and the desires at the "heart" of man of sensual distractions, those appetites that endow the created with self-existence; it joins the "mind" with the "heart" in loving self-offering. Desire is personalized and the mind subordinated to the longed-for relationship.

Awareness of being physically alive, even the natural function of breathing, can be transformed into a desire for loving relationship, freeing humanity from the limitations of its created and mortal nature. Human beings know existence not just as nature but as a loving relationship which is also the true life of the Triune Deity.²⁹³

The Philokalia's publication in a tentative way constituted a challenge of one culture by another. Enthusiasts for "progress" aspired to an anthropocentric autonomy of mere biological existence; their intoxicating freedom was divorced from social responsibility, individuals' rights became an absolute, and they wanted to make life as efficient as a machine. But truth is more than usefulness. Communion and love are important, personal otherness has priority over individualism, life is not mere survival. Joy and hope can transcend death.
What common life did the Kolpavades want and the Philokalia imply? What kind of society, technology, politics, economics and culture? A different understanding of human existence and action cannot be reduced to a single program.

At a critical historical moment Hellenism followed the Enlightenment rather than the Kolpavades. Hellenism came to be organized as a national state, borrowing Europe's institutions, administration and ideologies, and losing its cultural identity and otherness in the process.

The Philokalia nevertheless exercised profound influence beyond the Greek world, like any true manifestation of the Greek spirit.

In 1793, eleven years after the first Greek edition of 1782, the Philokalia was published in Slavonic translation. The initiative came from the famous Ukrainian monk, Paisy Velichkowsky (1722-1794), abbot of Neamt Monastery in Moldavia, who had spent eighteen years as an ascetic on Mount Athos. He knew Makarios Notaras, who sent him a copy, and he supervised the translation into Slavonic by Neamt monks. It was immediately sent to St. Petersburg for publication, where Metropolitan Gabriel assembled a group of monks and professors of the Academy of Alexander Nevsky who knew Greek to polish the translation. The terminology and nuances of Byzantine ascetic literature were transposed for the first time into classical Russian.

The Slavonic translation of the Philokalia was decisive for the spiritual life of Russia. This dynamic revival of ascetic and Church-centered piety was known as the "Philokalian Renaissance"; from the mid-nineteenth century it sustained Russian Orthodoxy's spiritual tradition, which had been undermined by Peter the Great's reforms.

The center of the "Philokalian Renaissance" was the famous Optina Monastery, where Paisy Velichkowsky's students gathered, bringing with them from Neamt many more manuscript translations of the Greek Fathers. Ivan Kireevsky, a talented philosopher and author who had studied in Germany under Hegel and Schelling, supported the Optina monks, at once perceiving in the Philokalian texts an authentic sense of the Church and a philosophical position which alone could resist the challenge of European nihilism. They collaborated to publish a series of patristic texts in Slavonic: John Climacus's The Ladder, the Book of Barsanuphios and John, Theodore Studites' Catecheses, Isaac the Syrian's Ascetic Writings, etc.

Optina as a Philokalian center was the occasion for Kireevsky's friendship and collaboration with three other significant philosophers: Khomiakov, Aksakov and Samarine. These were the first Slavophiles, whose thought inspired such ferment in nineteenth-century Russia.

The Slavophile movement was complex and its adherents had very differing approaches, but a common orientation unites them. They resisted Western rationalism and its concomitant individualism, and revered the vital energy preserved in Orthodox Church Tradition and popular Russian piety. The spirit of European "populism," derived from Pushkin and Gogol's wonderful writings, influenced the Slavophiles as did the Philokalian Renaissance and monastic centers such as Optina.

Ecclesiastical currents such as those of the Philokalian Renaissance and Optina came to exercise a decisive influence on the Russian intelligentsia, later inspiring works by Tolstoy, Soloviev and especially Dostoyevsky. Tychen in The Possessed and the starets Zossima in The Brothers Karamazov are drawn from Dostoyevsky's personal experience of Optina.

But the full benefits of the Philokalian Renaissance were reaped only in the mid-twentieth century by Russian theologians of the post-revolutionary diaspora. For the first time since the fourteenth century, the Orthodox recovered their theological self-awareness and identity. This reawaken-
ing influenced all European theology, stimulating leading Roman Catholic theologians to study the Greek Fathers and Orthodox worship and art. The "neo-patrician" movement among Roman Catholics found encouragement in the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), but Vatican conservatives soon stifled it. Russian theologians were more influential in Greece, Romania and Serbia, initiating the "theological spring" of the sixties. One hundred and seventy years later, the Philokalian Renaissance thus returned to the territory of its creator, St. Makarios Notaras.

A second edition of the Philokalia was published in Greece in 1893 and a third in 1957 with frequent reprints. Fr. Dumitru Staniloae's Romanian translation began publication in 1946, and was completed in ten volumes by 1981, following the translator's persecution and imprisonment by the Communist regime. Faber and Faber published a two-volume English anthology in 1951, translated by E. Kadloubovsky and G. E. H. Palmer, and began publication of a six-volume complete text in 1979, edited by G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard and Kallistos Ware. Jean Guillard's French edition, Petite Philocalie de la prière de cœur, 1953, included a few texts, but his narrow interest in mystical techniques is obvious. A new edition of the entire text by the Abbaye de Bellefontaine appeared from 1979 to 1986, translated by the Orthodox French poet Jacques Touraille and edited by Protopresbyter Boris Bobrinskoy. Unfortunately, it fails to evoke the realism and robustness of the original, often slipping into pietistic sentimentalism. Finally we may note that an extensive literature has grown in response to European translations of the Philokalia.

Among the Kollyvades the best known and most prolific author was Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain (1749-1809). Born Nicholas Kallivoutzis on Naxos, he received there his elementary education at a time when the island was dominated by Jesuit missionaries. At the age of sixteen he went with his father to Smyrna and was enrolled at the "Evangelical School," where he studied for five years, impressing everybody with his achievements, especially of a classical Greek. He concentrated on school philosophy and theology, but also studied Italian and French, becoming interested in contemporary Western spirituality. The brevity of his studies did not permit him to encounter the positive sciences or new philosophy which were then in the ascendant.

The Russo-Turkish war sent him back to Naxos in 1770, where he became secretary to the metropolitan of Paronaxia and frequently met the Naxos Jesuits; perhaps he learned his Italian from them rather than in Smyrna. In Naxos too he met three monks in refuge from Mount Athos, who initiated him into the Kollyvades controversy and inspired him with enthusiasm for the monastic life.

With letters of introduction from the exiled monks, he traveled to Hydra to meet the Kollyvades' spiritual leader, Makarios Notaras. Their meeting changed young Nicholas's life, and the movement itself.

He then went to Mount Athos via Naxos, becoming a monk at the Monastery of Dionysiou in 1775. Two years later Makarios visited his ascetic retreat, giving him the manuscripts of the Philokalia, the Evergetinos and On Frequent Holy Communion to revise and edit. Makarios was then forty-seven and Nikodemos twenty-eight.

After this editing work, Nikodemos retired to live as a hermit in Kapsala and continued writing. He attempted to visit the elderly Paisii Velichkovsky in Moldavia, but a storm forced his ship to put in at Thasos. He then sailed to the island of Skyroula, near Euboea, remaining under obedience to the monk Arsenios, whom he had met in Naxos.

Returning to Mount Athos, Nikodemos continued his ascetic life as a hermit. He received a second visit from Makarios in 1784, and immediately afterwards Athanasios Parios invited him to Thessalonika to collaborate on publish-
ing the works of St. Gregory Palamas. He spent his last years on Mount Athos, writing and publishing feverishly until his death on July 14, 1809, at the age of sixty. The Ecumenical Patriarchate proclaimed him a saint of the Eastern Orthodox Church on May 31, 1955.

The mass of St. Nikodemos’ writings, alone or in collaboration with others, is immense. Twenty-eight titles are recorded.129 There are translations or editions of patristic texts (Gregory Palamas, Theophylact of Bulgaria’s Commentary on Saint Paul’s Epistles, Euthymios Zygabenos’s Commentary on the Psalms of David, various authors’ Commentary on the Catholic Epistles, Symeon the New Theologian’s complete works, the Life of Barsanuphios and John, the Philokalia, the Evergetinos, St. Meletios the Confessor’s Alphabetalphabietos, or Paradise.) There are also adaptations and translations of Western originals (Unseen Warfare, the Spiritual Exercises); pastoral works and codifications of the Church’s canons (Pediadion, Exomologetion); original works of moral edification (Handbook of Spiritual Counsel on the Guarding of the Five Senses, Christotheia of Christians). There are also works on saints’ lives (Neon Eklogion, Neon Martyrology and the Synaxaristes of the Twelve Months of the Year – a paraphrase of Maurice Diakonos’ work); the Confession of Faith, his Apology for the Mariological Theses of the Unseen Warfare, and a popularized version of Makarios Notaras’s On Frequent Holy Communion.

Podskalsky observes that Nikodemos’ works consist entirely of compilations, adaptations and paraphrases, without any theological works of his own.130 But Nikodemos wrote commentaries on the Church’s liturgical books: The Eortodromion, or Commentary on the Canons of the Dominical and Marian Feasts, the Nea Klimax, or Commentary on the Seventy-Five Ananathmoi of the Octoechos, and The Garden of Graces, or An Elegant Interpretation of the Nine Odes of the Tithologion. St. Nikodemos’ theological originality is obvious; he is

the theologian of ecclesiastical worship, drawing his main themes from the Liturgy.

The real problem is a different one: his work reveals open Westernization. He was brought up surrounded by Orthodox worship, studied patristic texts, especially Gregory Palamas, and had theological knowledge of the ascetic fathers, yet his writings and his pastoral ministry are based on a Western version of the Gospel.

It seems astonishing that Nikodemos translated and published two typically Roman Catholic manuals as “most edifying” works for Orthodox readers, without revealing the author or stating his confessional allegiance. One of these was Ignatius Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises, which Nikodemos translated from a later Italian edition with commentary by the Jesuit J. P. Pinamonti (1632-1703).131 The other was Unseen Warfare, also the work of a Roman Catholic cleric, Lorenzo Scupoli of the Theatine order.132

Nikodemos “beautified, corrected and embellished” both books “with various notes” without explaining why he had to do so. Many patristic passages, referring to asceticism and the prayer of the heart, were added in the footnotes as commentary. But the books remain Roman Catholic in their theology and language, with their rationalism, moralism and intense legalistic sense of guilt.

Both books, especially Unseen Warfare, were often reprinted. They circulated widely in the Greek world, becoming a kind of popular literature. Earlier The Salvation of Sinners by the monk Agapios Landos (c. 1600-1664/70), first published in 1641, had enjoyed popular success, and was considered the standard compilation of Orthodox monasticism for three centuries; it too was a faithful translation of a Roman Catholic handbook, Heisterbach’s Dialogus Miraculorum.134

These popular works benefited from an apparently Athonite provenance, which goes some way to explaining how
Western legalism and judicial casuistry quietly infiltrated even the popular piety of the Greek Orthodox during the last two hundred years of Turkish rule. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain published two books on canon law which contributed strongly to the alienation of popular piety from its traditional roots. The first was the Exomologetaria, a most edifying book containing brief instructions for spiritual fathers how to hear confessions with the help of the canons of St. John the Faster precisely explained; elegant advice to the repentant on how to confess properly; and an edifying homily on repentance (first edition, Venice 1794).

The pastoral strategy of the Exomologetaria is based, without any reservation, on the Roman Catholic approach to salvation: people are saved not in the measure in which they share through repentance and asceticism in the eucharistic realization of authentic life, but in the measure in which as individuals they achieve virtue and avoid sin. The Church, the sacraments and grace are only aids, even if indispensable ones, in this individualistic effort. The underlying logic for Nikodemos is that of a “metaphysics of exchange” between man and God – precisely as defined by Augustine and Anselm, and as enshrined as official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church by the Council of Trent. People stand guilty and alone before an implacable judge, who requires satisfaction for the offense done to his justice by human sin. God demands the punishment of the sinner, because “his impartial justice cannot be satisfied in any other way except that the very same body that has sinned should be punished.”

Sin is a “transgression of the law” which provokes an “infinite insult to God” and “renders the sinner hateful to him.” That is why “if you put mortal sin on one side of the scale, and put on the other side all the love of the angels, all the merits of the Queen of the Angels, the Theotokos, all the blood of the martyrs, all the tears and labors and fasting of the ascetics, in short, all the good works of the saints, all these together do not weigh as much as one mortal sin.”

Nothing can satisfy the wounded egoism of such a God but his own deliberate self-punishment for the sins of his creatures. “The only payment of this infinite debt of sin was the infinitely precious blood of a God, and only the Cross and the nails and the passion could balance the weight of sin.” In place of the Bridegroom of ecclesial experience, the ardent lover of the human soul, Nikodemos proposes a Frankish God, who “punishes sin” in his Son’s person with a particularly “harsh punishment” because “he was not satisfied to see his Son suffer a small torment to undo the sin, but a whole heap of torments.”

It was on this basis that Nikodemos built the Exomologetaria’s pastoral teaching. Like the Jesuit missionaries of the Greek islands, he understood confession as a judicial act of individual expiation. The penance imposed by the confessor was no benevolent healing for the sinner, but a ransom which must be paid by the penitent “to calm the great wrath which God feels against him.” This was the thinking behind Nikodemos’s purchase of the indulgence mentioned in the last chapter.

The same theological assumptions marked his second volume on canon law. This was the Pedalion (the Rudder, Leipzig 1800), a codified compilation of the canons of the ecumenical and local councils and of “various holy Fathers.” Each canon’s text is followed by an interpretation in the vulgar tongue, using older commentators (Zonaras, Balsamon, Aristenes, etc); a “concordance” then compares related canons critically, resolving any apparent contradictions. Nikodemos also comments on the canons he considers most important in lengthy footnotes.

We do not know whether Nikodemos was imitating contemporary European developments. At the time, Enlightenment positivism was inspiring codifications (Kodifikationsvära)
to remove contradictions from the legal system, attain the greatest possible judicial objectivity, and make knowledge of the laws available to every citizen. Nor do we know whether the codification of the canons of the Roman Catholic Church, the well-known *Corpus Juris Canonici* (1580), was his model.

Probably Nikodemos was inspired by the West’s theological approach, which used legalistic means for evaluating guilt and its consequences objectively. The *Pedalion* is constructed around this judicial emphasis on individual guilt, redemption and justification. The rarest and oddest sins are to be disciplined and punished according to compiled case-law. Individualistic “justification” is the reward: the more pleasurable the sin, the greater the punishment for its absolution.

Casuistry already existed in the canonical compilations of “various holy Fathers,” doubtless prompted by specific pastoral needs; the spiritual father requires detailed knowledge of human nature in revolt and the torment it causes. The place of the Eucharist in the theology and worship of the Church Fathers ensured that casuistry never became a system or legal code. The canons were never codified as juridical system, the “authority of philanthropy” always being given to the eucharistic community’s father, the bishop or presbyter. The penances imposed by the canons, usually a period of abstinence from the Eucharist, emphasized a cutting off and estrangement from the Feast of the Kingdom created by human sin, our failure to participate in the life of the Church.

Gerasimos III refused to approve publication of the *Pedalion* as patriarch, as he had earlier as metropolitan of Derkoi in the synod; he knew the canons were only an aid to the father confessor. Nikodemos had to wait for the next patriarch, Neophytos VII, to get his book approved.

The *Pedalion* imposed the Western juridical understanding of the sacrament of penance on Greek Orthodoxy. The ramifications of this were extensive, for the sacrament of repentance defines how we understand and live salvation, how we imagine God and our relationship with him. Church life and truth are alienated and “religionized” when repentance becomes a matter of legal and mental guilt, redemption and justification.

We may assume but cannot prove that the legalism of the *Exomologitarion* and the *Pedalion*, spreading rapidly through the pastoral life of the Greek Church, helped create broad social resistance to religion in Greece, what we know as “secularization.” Many people were cut off from Church life, which implied a settled indifference to metaphysical problems rather than atheism; this was the “religious fading” of the masses.

Patriarchal approval of Nikodemos’s canon law books, together with the lack of any theological resistance, imposed their pastoral theology as an official standard on the Church; no bishop or father confessor could challenge them without danger of censure. This pastoral approach, however, provoked opposition, contempt or indifference in the laity: one traumatic confession in the new judicial format might make people cut their ties with the Church.

The God of Augustine, Anselm and Nikodemos, with his fierce demands for justice, lacked human appeal. He seemed only a threat or source of anxiety to human beings. To keep their dignity and self-respect, and help overcome their mortality, people must reject or forget this God. Secular thinking is always anthropocentric, but it can suggest “a more divine understanding of God” than legalistic ideas and judicial transactions. People refuse to accept a God who gladly inflicts “a heap of torments” on his Son, and “with great wrath” considers life’s failures and tragic misadventures as
a debt, demanding a “ransom” to be paid through codified “penances.”

Nikodemos’s legalistic pastoral theology tends inevitably to moralism, transforming the Church’s Gospel into a codified deontology governing conduct. His *Chrestoetheta of Christians* (Venice, 1803), in particular, is typical of European eighteenth-century pietism.\(^{167}\)

The titles of its thirteen chapters are revealing: “Christians must not play instruments or dance or sing;” “Christians must not play games or dance or sing at their weddings;” “Christians must not adorn themselves, must not wear perfumes, must not use cosmetics, must not look with curiosity;” “Christians must not play cards, practice divination or engage in gambling, wrestling, shot put, races or other similar games, nor should they watch these and similar spectacles;” “Christians must not relate jokes or act the fool or laugh;” etc. etc.

All these prohibitions are justified primarily by sexual danger, but Nikodemos was not simply urging chastity on Christians. Like Western pietists, he condemned all social life, popular traditions and customs because they afforded sexual opportunities. He saw popular folk culture, songs, music, festivals and dances, the demotic traditions which today delight us with their spirituality, nobility and dignity imbued with the Church’s culture, as “a satanic cause of pollution.” Behind these expressions of cultural life he sees “hidden fornication and secret adulteries” because men dancing “hold a woman’s hand” and men singing “look with curiosity at a woman’s face.” So “musical instruments and dances are diabolical” and Nikodemos threatens Christians: “for such disorderly conduct not only will you be punished but your children yet unborn will not survive but die.”\(^{168}\)

This is a sect’s mentality, imposing a Manichaean dualism of “pure” and “impure” ways of life on people. The teachings and practices of European pietistic movements were strikingly similar.\(^{169}\) Only by reference to Kosmas Aitolos’s *Teachings* does Nikodemos’s *Chrestoethia* (good conduct) differ from the ecclesial community’s *Christoethia* (Christ-centered conduct); or by the standard of patristic texts such as the *Epistle to Diognetus* which rely on early Christian social teaching:

Christians are known to be in the world, but their religion remains invisible... They live in Greek or barbarian cities, as is everyone’s lot, following native customs in dress and diet and every aspect of life... They marry like everybody else. They obey the prescribed laws, and they exceed the laws in their private lives... They live on earth but their commonwealth is in heaven...\(^{170}\)

What I call the “West,” the “religionizing” of ecclesial reality, its transformation into self-centered moralism with legalistic presuppositions, is a spiritual failure not confined to Western Europe; it is exemplified by St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain. The West has shadowed the developing Christian conscience throughout the centuries up to contemporary Pietism and puritanism. In Western Europe, ecclesial reality was transformed in the way I have described and institutionalized without resistance; this transformation was also sometimes present in the East, as Nikodemos’s official recognition and canonization implies.
XIII

The Enlightenment

From Eugenios Voulgaris and Nikephoros Theotokis to Neophyto Vamvas and Theokletos Pharmakidis most Greek men of the European Enlightenment were clerics, as were their conservative and traditionalist opponents, who were just as Westernized. Modern Hellenism’s crisis of identity, or alienation from its roots, concerned its religious consciousness.

By 1800, Greek intellectual life was pervaded by Enlightenment attitudes. In this chapter I shall discuss some representative personalities.

The Athonite hieromonk Benjamin Lesbos (1759-1824) always aspired to be a secular teacher and writer. He was born in Plomari in Lesbos and studied at Pisa University and at the Paris École Polytechnique. He earned a living by teaching mathematics, physics and modern philosophy, mainly in the Academy of Kydonies, in Mytilene, Constantinople, Bucharest, Jassy, Smyrna and Hydra. He became a member of the Philiki Hetairia and was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Greek Provisional Government during the War of Independence.

An empiricist who borrowed heavily from Locke, Benjamin was familiar with Condillac, Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis and other men of the Enlightenment. He wrote Elements of Arithmetic, Elements of Euclid’s Geometry, and two unpublished works: Elements of Algebra and Elements of Trigonometry. He trusted in education and empirical sci-
ence to revive Greek national life by bringing enlightenment and progress.

His *Elements of Metaphysics* nevertheless covers psychology and the "first principles" of positivism, while his unpublished *Elements of Ethics* remains naturalistic in its approach, emphasizing individual rights.

His conservative Church opponents took Vatican opposition to science as a model. But his 1805 confession of faith to the patriarchate enabled him to continue teaching and writing.171

Stephanos Douugas (end of eighteenth century -1830) was a cleric born in Trnovo, where he was educated by the celebrated John Pezaro, and ordained deacon. In 1802 he went to Germany, and studied philosophy and mathematics at Halle, Göttingen and Jena. Schelling's philosophy lectures strongly influenced him. In 1809 he returned from Germany and took up the directorship of the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople. But his appointment lasted only a year. The hostility he encountered led him to accept an invitation from the Prince of Wallachia to teach at the Academy of Jassy, where he lectured on philosophy, physics, chemistry and mathematics for six years. He planned to found a university at Ambelakia in Thessaly, and began buying equipment for physics, chemistry and astronomy at his own expense from Europe, but the plan failed. In 1814 Dorotheos Voulismas, censor to the synod of the patriarchate of Constantinople, denounced Douugas for heresy over an unpublished physics book used in his teaching.172 In 1816 Douugas retired to a Moldavian monastery, *a metochion* of Vatopedi. He was immediately elected abbot and remained there until his death.

Only a handbook on arithmetic and algebra was published in his own lifetime. But manuscripts on scientific themes, and a treatise on aesthetics and ethics survive. Voulismas's charges against him suggest that his "physics" combined contemporary science with theology and Schelling's dialectics with Church dogmatics. For Douugas the Holy Spirit was the "synthesis" of the dialectic antithesis between Father and Son,173 which is typical of uncritical borrowing at the time from Western notions.

Athanasios Psallidas (1767-1829) was a layman born in Ioannina, who studied mathematics, science, and philosophy – especially Locke and Kant – at Poltava in the Ukraine, and then in Vienna for eight years. He returned to Ioannina, and taught for nine years at the Maroutaia School and fifteen at the Kaplanaich, which he had himself founded with funds provided by Zoe Kaplani. He taught mathematics, physics, geography, chemistry and the philosophy of Locke and Kant. He criticized teachers who knew nothing about modern ideas and Western luminaries. One such, his personal enemy, Kosmas Balanos, who was director of the Balaniana School, denounced him to Ali Pasha as an atheist and Voltairian, but in the ensuing controversy Psallidas prevailed. The outbreak of the revolution forced him to leave Ioannina in 1822 and transfer to Corfu, hoping for a post at the Ionian Academy, but his reputation as an advanced modernist hindered him. He became director of a middle school in Leucas, where he remained until he died.

As a young man in Vienna, he produced his two published works: *True Happiness, or the Basis of all Religion*, with his own Latin translation, and *Kalokinemata, or a Guide against Envy and Eugenios's (Voulgaris's) Logics*. His other works, mainly on philosophy, remain unpublished.

Only Psallidas's educational work makes him significant. He was a poor writer. His *True Happiness* was a compilation combining the Enlightenment's eudaemonicist values with a Kantian critique of reason and clumsy scholastic arguments. His *Kalokinemata* is worse, using scholastic logic to refute Voulgaris's teaching on the threefold source of knowledge.

Conservative hostility has ensured Psallidas the respect of modern Greek intellectuals, who regard him as a victim of
the Church’s bigotry and obscurantism, “and the intrigues of the conservatives, the anti-unionist leaders, and those satisfied with their rayah status.”

Adamantios Korais (1748-1833) was the figure who gave his name to the Greek Enlightenment. Korais and Koraism symbolize the “decanting” of modern European ideas into Greece and their effect on intellectual life.

What did the Enlightenment mean to eighteenth-century Greek intellectuals? The History of the Greek Nation (1775), a collective work bearing the authority of leading Greek establishment figures, gives a typical account:

In Europe Galileo had taught how the earth moves, Copernicus had proved how the earth is a planet in the solar system, Newton had described forces which sustain the universe. The French Enlightenment soon spread throughout Europe culminating with the Encyclopaedists and the French Revolution, which precipitated cataclysmic changes. The East remained in the Middle Ages; nothing had moved since Old Testament times. The new philosophers were changing how people understood the world, God and man. Rationalism was replacing religious conviction and threatening social and political structures ... The Greek East was just awakening but seemed lost ... The official Church, responsible to the Sultan for its flock, was in a panic. The patriarchate acted against the “atheist” French and the supporters of the “Gallic plague.”

This version of history belongs to Greek admirers of the Enlightenment, and derives from Korais’s interpretation of his age and his proposals for the development of modern Hellenism.

Korais was born in Smyrna. His father was a Chioite merchant and his mother an educated woman. He studied at the Smyrna Evangelical School and befriended the pastor of the Dutch consulate, Bernard Keun, while the Jesuits helped him study foreign languages.

At the age of twenty-three he went to Amsterdam to become a merchant. There he discovered music and other joys of life, especially philosophy, notably that of Francis Hemsterhuis. Dimaras called it his “awakening.” But he failed in business and in 1778 returned to Smyrna, stopping over in Leipzig, Vienna, Trieste and Venice.

In 1782 he left his homeland for good and spent the rest of his life in Europe. At thirty-four he began medical studies at Montpellier, supported financially by Makarios Notaras, the spiritual leader of the Kollyvades. It was also Makarios who helped him publish his first translation, the Orthodox Teaching of Metropolitan Platon of Moscow, who typified the religious Enlightenment and the influence of Lutheran Pietism in Russia. It was published in Leipzig in 1782, followed by two theological books: A Synopsis of Sacred History and Catechism (Venice 1783) and A Short Catechism (Venice 1783). Although both must have been composed during his stay in Smyrna, Makarios Notaras’s part in the publication is unknown. At Montpellier he was awarded a doctorate in medicine on the publication of two dissertations: Pyretologiae Synopsis (1786) and Medicus Hippocraticus (1787). In 1788 he settled in Paris, and for ten years translated German and English medical books into French to earn a living. Fifty years old in 1798, he showed his concern for Greece under Turkish rule with Fraternal Teaching, a polemical response to the anonymous Paternal Teaching. He also published political pamphlets in verse and prose: War Song (1800), Trumpet Call to War (1801), and What Should the Greeks Do in the Present Circumstances? (1805). Inspired by the French Revolution and placing his hopes in Napoleon Bonaparte, the peoples’ liberator, Korais called on the Greeks to rise against the Turks. Like Westerners, he refers to “Graikoi” rather than “Hellenes,” while trying to encourage pride in their ancestry and the glory of ancient
Greece, which he sought to reconcile with French liberalism:

Friends of freedom
With the French on our side
Who else do we need?
French and Greeks together
One in friendship
No more Greeks or French
But one Franco-Greek nation.  

Korais undertook the publication of classical Greek texts in two series: *Hellenic Library* and *Periherga*. His first publications were intended for schools (Hippocrates, Heliodorus, Aelian, Isocrates, Plutarch, Hierocles, Xenocrates, and Aesop’s Fables). When the War of Independence began, he concentrated on political thought: mainly Aristotle, Xenophon, Plato, Lycurgus, Plutarch, and Arrian. He provided these texts with extensive introductions and notes.

Korais had real talent, recognized by contemporary European Hellenists, although his textual changes often lacked scholarly justification. Obviously he was trying to make ancient texts accessible to his contemporary fellow Greeks to establish an unbroken tradition going back to classical times, as contemporary romanticism expected. He sought to confirm that the Greek heritage was compatible with Enlightenment principles. As a modern Greek intellectual, he set out to prove it, in a work written in French, *Mémoire sur l’état actuel de la civilisation dans la Grèce*, which he read to the Société des Observateurs de l’Homme in Paris on January 7, 1803.  

But he did not neglect theology. In 1820 he published *Counsel of Three Bishops sent in 1553 to Pope Julius II, Translated from the Latin and Enriched with an Introduction and Copious Notes*, and in 1831 *Hieratic Synedemos, Containing Paul the Apostle’s two Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, with Two Translations into the Vernacular* with an Extensive Commentary. In the introductions he advocates reform of the Orthodox Church, proposing an end to external ritual and dead forms, a shortening of the services and the fasts (fasting by the quantity, not the category of food), married bishops or the ordaining of unmarried men only after the age of sixty, and the gradual abolition “by persuasion” of monastic life.

He wrote an autobiography (1833), and five volumes of *Atakta* (corresponding to French *Mélanges*), issued posthumously. His letters were published later.

His influence was astonishingly wide, both with Philhellenes and his compatriots. His immense spiritual and ideological influence, however, should not hide his intellectual limitations. A “free thinker” without specialization, a failed doctor and amateur philologist, he never completed an original work but nevertheless remained to his contemporaries “the wise Korais.” Cut off from his homeland and people, detached from his culture and tradition, he established himself as the authentic spiritual expression of the Greek people. His opinions on education, religion, language and Greek politics were treated with reverence. His proposals and ideas “were quickly put into effect by numerous followers ... It is rightly said of these years that ’he made speeches as if giving orders, which could be heard three hundred leagues away.’”  

Manuel Gedeon notes “that none of Korais’s books received bad notices, no voices were raised against any of the wise doctor’s writings, and unfortunately any Greek books or newspapers that were unenthusiastic were disregarded or attacked by the *Logios Hermes*; I say ‘unfortunately’ because his admirers formed a mutual admiration society which claimed to monopolize wisdom, culture and concern for the common good, particularly the supervision of national education.”

Through ideological fashion, or (as Gedeon hints) European political influence, Korais acquired indisputable
authority. His name became an emblem of modern Greek culture. On the outbreak of the War of Independence, revolutionaries looked to Korais as their inspiration and guide.

A tower at Missolonghi was named after him. The 1827 National Assembly expressed the nation’s gratitude to him ("acclaiming him as Teacher of the Nation, a kind of pater patriae"). Many of his followers become fighters, teachers, and administrators in Greece.

In revolutionary Greece the "Koraists" were a political party influencing the military, political and educational elites. Their ideology was blinkered. Any objections were dismissed as due to the difficult historical circumstances and labelled "Phanariotism," partisanship, obscurantism, or conservatism. From the first, the modern Greek state was shaped by Korais’s ideas and led by his followers. Korais became the ideology of modern Hellenism, the ground of its cultural identity and self-awareness.

Korais was more than an external influence; he was a deliberate choice. The final stage in the historical process of modern Hellenism's cultural transformation, it concluded a process which began with Demetrios Kydones in the fourteenth century and led to the Westernization of Greek intellectuals during the Turkish period.

Korais was a typical example of radical estrangement from his Greek roots and the surviving popular culture. He was a European intellectual who was interested in the Enlightenment solely as ideology. His Greek origins brought him to prominence because they fitted in with the program of the Philhellenic humanists of the Enlightenment.

Korais selected classical texts to sustain contemporary political and social liberalism. The romantic project of a nation state gathered around the remnants of the Acropolis recalled the glory of ancient Greece and brought Enlightenment principles to the place of their supposed origin.

Korais’s Greek origins ensured him a star role in the realization of this European dream. Korais was indifferent to the historical reality of the Greek people and their popular culture, turning his own people and homeland into a utopian ideal.

This European spirit led Korais to propose a removal of cultural and national boundaries producing a common nation of “Franco-Greeks.” He concentrated on adapting the Greek people to this ideal. He regarded the language spoken by his contemporaries as unacceptable. For him the language of the people was “the vulgar tongue.” He even called the author of the Erotokritos “the Homer of vulgar philology.” He undertook (while in Paris) to invent a new “purified” language for the Greek people, the katharevousa in which any element inconsistent with classical forms was suppressed, so that modern Greeks might sound like the ancients’ direct descendants and heirs to the classical tradition, once freed from the “darkness” of the Byzantine “medieval” millennium and the four centuries of Turkish rule.

Korais’s later admirers, who all used demotic, as the left-wing intellectual fashion now demanded, tried to defend katharevousa as a “middle way” between Atticism and common speech, a more or less genuine demotic! This was nonsense. Even in his own time Solomos’s Dialogos attacked the linguistic politics of “the most wise Korais.”

The newly constituted Greek state did not follow Solomos. It adopted katharevousa as the official language, as part of Korais’s Hellenic ideal. The artificial katharevousa infected a bilingualism on Greece that became a considerable handicap for the nation. Against the spontaneous language of daily life, which had evolved continuously throughout the Byzantine and Turkish eras, the compulsory purified speech, imposed by Korais to impress Europeans with a living classical tradition, has dogged Hellenism for more than one hundred and fifty years.
Korais also attempted to reform Greek “religion” in accordance with his particular Enlightenment sensibilities. He is recognized as the leading Greek man of the Enlightenment, but was not a real scholar. Relying on Enlightenment commonplaces, he develops them according to his idiosyncratic opinions.192

“He draws his basic ideas from the Encyclopaedists, excluding materialists like D’Holbach or Diderot, but including occasional contributors such as Rousseau and Montesquieu.”193 What drew him most to the Enlightenment was a sense of national inferiority. He was a Greek anxious to be considered a “progressive European.” “When he witnessed the transfer of Voltaire’s bones to the Panthéon in 1791, he expressed the secret wish to be considered a Greek Voltaire”194.

Korais admired Voltaire for his hostility to “caloyer’s” and what they represented.195 Korais wanted the Greeks to keep an equal distance “both from the Scylla of unbelief and the Charybdis of superstition.”196 He recognized the Charybdis of superstition in the nation’s ecclesiastical tradition and its clergy – the “caloys’” whose generosity had permitted him to study. The Enlightenment’s deism, on the other hand, offered a form of religion appropriate for a “progressive European.”

Korais’s religious ideas broke with Orthodox Church experience, the ecclesiastical reality of life and transcendence of death. He wanted a religion which accorded with Enlightenment priorities. For Korais, “Christianity could only be justified if it was compatible with supreme Reason … In 1786 he was already seeking truth in Reason, which revealed religion might later simply endorse.”197

The role of reason focused religion on personal ethics and the deontological requirements of social life. “Thus Korais identified Christian love of one’s neighbor with political equality.”198 He was not interested in metaphysics or the problems of existence. Investigating the nature of reality with the help of the ancient Greek philosophers did not appeal to him. He “identified the ancient Greek spiritual inheritance, just as he did ‘sound’ Christianity, with Enlightenment rationalism, thus marginalizing Plato’s and Aristotle’s metaphysics.”199

In spite of his jejune religious views, Korais longed to regenerate and reorganize Greek ecclesiastical life, aspiring to set up an autocephalous Church in the new Greek state. This did not prevent Greek clerics and theologians subsequently regarding him as a “faithful son of the Orthodox Church,” “with a filial concern for strengthening the Church’s prestige.”200

Konstantinos Koumas (1777-1836) was an admirer of Korais and one of the most distinguished men of the Greek Enlightenment. He was a conciliatory writer, an educator whose translations introduced modern science into Greece. He founded and directed the Smyrna Philological Gymnasium while writing and translating a considerable body of work on mathematics, chemistry, geography, history, ancient Greek language, philosophy and the history of philosophy. He was not a strict materialist, and did not support Korais’s anticlericalism. He made rational sense of God and the absolute demands of reason, and supported Kant’s restriction of metaphysics to epistemology, which was new in Greece. His metaphysics denied all dogmatic principles and the examination of the limits of reason.

“Korais’s most complete disciple”201 was the Chiote hieromonk Neophytos Vamvas (1770-1855). He studied in Chios, Siphnos and Patmos, and from 1806 to 1815 in Paris, supervised and supported financially by Korais. He then taught in Chios, Cephalonia and Syros, became professor of philosophy at the Ionian Academy of Corfu, and eventually occupied the chair of philosophy at the newly founded University of Athens, where he became dean of the faculty and president of the university. He wrote Elements of Philosophical Ethics (Venice 1818), Elements of Philosophy (Athens 1838),
Handbook of Ethics (Athens 1853), Natural Theology and Christian Ethics (Alexandria 1893).

Vamvas embodied Korais's ideas on "enlightened" Christianity and the need to reform the Greek Orthodox Church. He openly maintained that reform implied Protestantism. He hoped the Protestant missionaries who were pouring into Greece at that time would purge his compatriots' faith of "dead forms" and "superstition." These missionaries considered Vamvas a man destined to be "a re-former of Greece." 202

Vamvas approved of the missionaries unreservedly, helping them found schools and attending their functions and religious services. He strongly supported the printing and circulating of Protestant books in Greece. 203 He encouraged Protestant proselytizing and his translation of the Bible into vernacular Greek realized their main aim. The British and Foreign Bible Society had first suggested this to Korais in 1808, when he had recommended Vamvas as translator.

Greek Protestant groups, including Jehovah's Witnesses, still use this translation today. Its production and publication is a complex story that reveals the sustained efforts all the Protestant denominations have made to proselytize the Orthodox. 204 Neophytos Vamvas greatly helped them, keenly supporting a Greek "Reformation."

For Protestant missionaries Vamvas's translation offered direct personal access to Scripture for each believer as the "source" of truth and salvation. In Protestantism the Bible (sola scriptura) has a validity independent of ecclesiastical life and the Church's Tradition. Access to truth and salvation is primarily an individual matter, a form of personal "illumination" unmediated by ecclesiastical experience. Protestantism was easily compatible with the Enlightenment: an individualistic liberalism, faith in the objectivity of truth guaranteed by reason, and hostility to the historical expression of Christianity.

The Orthodox insist on reading and hearing Scripture within the context of worship, showing their fidelity not to an individualistic intellectual approach, but to participating in the ecclesiastical life of the Church. We can understand Scripture when we share in it, in the mode of communion which constitutes the Church as a body, the mode of worship. As Scripture simply transcribes the earliest ecclesiastical experience, its witness merely states an ideal when it is cut off from the continued historical expression of this experience.

Vamvas, like the Protestants, insisted that the Old Testament should be translated directly from the Hebrew. The Church's theology had been based on the exegesis of the Septuagint, the only version used by the early Church. Protestants were less interested in the Church's experience and theology than in the text for itself, and with the original's philological authority as the guarantor of divine inspiration.

Protestant influence helped establish Old Testament exegesis from the original, and therefore the teaching of Hebrew, in the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens from its foundation in 1837.205 This Protestant influence survives to the present day in textual criticism of the Bible detached from the Church's ecclesiastical experience.

If Neophytos Vamvas was considered "Korais's most complete disciple," his most aggressive and intelligent Greek follower was Theokleitos Pharmakidis (1784-1860).206 Born in a village in Thessaly, he began his education in Larisa and was ordained deacon at the age of eighteen. He next studied in Constantinople, then for some years at the Patriarchal Academy, and subsequently went to live in the Danubian Principalities, where he was ordained priest (1811). From Bucharest he traveled widely in Central Europe and Italy. His experience of Russian occupation in the Danubian Principalities during the Russo-Turkish war left him hostile to Russia and Panslavism.
From about 1815 he edited *Logios Hermes* in Vienna with Konstantinos Kokkinakis (1781-1831). They used the periodical, which had first appeared, edited by Anthimos Gazis, in 1811, to spread Enlightenment ideas, particularly the personal views of Koraïs. Pharmakidis became known as the leading advocate of Koraïsism, often going further than Koraïs himself.

In 1819 Lord Guilford, the English Governor of the Ionian Isles, invited him to become Professor of Theology at the Ionian Academy, but only after he had made a systematic study of Protestant theology. He enrolled at Göttingen University in Germany, where he remained until the outbreak of the Greek revolution.

In July 1821 he returned to Greece and began publishing the first independent Greek newspaper, *Hellenic Clarion*, at Kalamata, with Demetrios Ypsilantis. He participated in the National Assembly of Epidaurus and became state inspector of schools and education.

Soon disillusioned, he went to Corfu, and taught “dogmatic theology according to the Russian Théophane Prokopovitch” (1681-1736), who had been appointed archbishop of Novgorod by Peter the Great to impose his religious reform and make the Russian Church more like Western Protestantism. “A typical hireling and adventurer,” Prokopovitch was influenced by German Pietism and Western scholasticism. He “openly despised the clergy, especially in Great Russia where he always felt a foreigner. He was a typical man of the ‘Enlightenment,’ who did not hide his contempt for ritual, miracles, asceticism and even the hierarchy.” Theokletos Pharmakidis could not have found a more like-minded guide.

After Kapodistrias was elected Governor of Greece, Pharmakidis returned to Nauplion to publish the *General Newspaper of Greece*. He soon criticized Kapodistrias, especially for what he considered his “pro-Russian” policies.

He was a school director in Aigina when the Governor was assassinated and King Otho came to power. Soon afterwards the Regent, Maurer, invited him to Athens to collaborate on the reform of the Greek Church. Pharmakidis assumed in Greece the role which Prokopovitch had played in Russia.

Pharmakidis and Maurer both favored, as had Koraïs, the creation of an autocephalous state Church, detached from the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, and subject to state authority. They also favored the dissolution of the monasteries, with their vital influence on lay piety. Finally, they advocated “modernized” theological training, together with a general religious education adapted to European models.

Their program was largely realized with Theokletos Pharmakidis as instigator of all three aspects of the reform. He planned and thought out the first charter of the autocephalous Church of Greece, and was secretary to the first Permanent Holy Synod. With the Protestant Maurer he initiated and coordinated the regency’s anti-monastic policy. Like Misael Apostolidis and Konstantinos Kontogonis, he was a founder member of the theological faculty of the University of Athens. After subsequent opposition he transferred to the faculty of philosophy as professor of Greek philosophy.

If Koraïs was the theoretician of the de-Hellenization and alienation of the modern Greek state, it was Pharmakidis who put his ideas into practice.

Theophilos Kairis (1784-1853) concludes this account of the leaders of the Greek Enlightenment. He was born on Andros and received his early education at the schools of Kydonies, Patmos, and Chios. He was ordained deacon at the age of eighteen, and went to Pisa, where he studied philosophy, mathematics, and physiology. He continued his studies in Paris, becoming there an enthusiastic disciple of Koraïs. In 1811 he returned to Greece, to become director of the Smyrna Evangelical School for a year before teaching at the
School of Kydonies. Active in the War of Independence, he saw action, was wounded, and sat in the National Assembly as a deputy for Andros. In 1834 he founded a war orphanage on Andros which soon evolved into a school and center for a new religion devised by him, which he called “Piety towards God” (Theosevismos). He created a wide circle of devoted followers through an aggressive campaign of proselytization, rejecting all attempts at mediation from his learned friends and even the Greek Church Synod. Pharmakidis signed the synodal decision which finally deposed him. He traveled to Paris and London, seeking followers amongst expatriate Greeks. Protected by Kolettis’s “French” Party he returned to Greece to propagate his religion, but after his political patron died, the Syros court condemned him for illegal proselytization. He died some months later in prison.

Kairis’s case has been treated by admirers of the Enlightenment as an example of Church intolerance and obscurantism. “His persecution for his ideas and death in jail,” made him a martyr for Greek religious liberalism and anticlericalism. But at the time of his condemnation the “official” Greek Church was dominated by men of the Enlightenment — a fact that is often ignored.

Kairis was spreading not political ideals but his personal religion of mystical moralism. “He had his own faith,” writes Dimaras, “his own revealed religion for which he devised a liturgy with its own hymns and prayers.” According to E. P. Papanoutsos,

an anonymous two volume work entitled Theosophia was published in London in 1852, a year before his death. The first volume contains prayers, and hymns for the ‘pious’, with an appendix entitled Pious Opinions and Exhortations, or Pious Readings; the second contains An Epitome of Pious Teaching and Morality with a supplement entitled On the Practice of Piety. This work is clearly the Bible and Liturgy of the new religion.
Independence and an Alien State

Greek independence from the Turks after four hundred years of servitude was the result of the living Christian faith of the people and was achieved, to a large extent, by the clergy. The sources, especially the memoirs of the revolutionaries themselves, make this abundantly clear.²⁴²

Social and economic factors were also important, but did not distract from political and religious aims. According to Makriyannis, the Greeks wanted “to live as human beings in their own country with their own religion.” The country’s national identity was defined by its religion. The ideological interpretations of the revolutionaries’ motives that have been fashionable for some time cannot overturn the evidence of the sources.

Enlightenment revolutionary ideas influenced Western-educated intellectuals, but not the peasants, merchants, sailors and their leaders who did the fighting. They fought in the name of the Orthodox faith which differentiated them nationally: Greekness was identified with Orthodoxy, which set them apart from the Muslim Turk and the heterodox “Frank.”

At the start of the war, people put their hopes for external aid in Orthodox Russia, as they had done for centuries, not in Europe. The clergy were their natural leaders. As a rule, a cleric would call on the people to rise “in the name of the faith and the motherland.” Monasteries often became supply
centers and command posts, or a haven for refugees and the wounded.

Bishops and priests together with the captains summoned the revolutionary war councils, and often fought in the front line. They acted as officials in the new local administration and participated in the first National Assemblies. There was Germanos of Old Patras, Theodoretos of Vresthenes, Isaías of Solonoi, Joseph of Androusa, Neophyto of Talanton, Prokopios of Kernike, Joseph of Rogoi, Gregory of Methone, Cyril of Corinth, Daniel of Tripolis, Dionysios of Reina, together with Gregory Dikaios-Papaphlesas and Athanasios Diakos. But there were countless others, many unknown. Maurer himself estimated that eighty bishops were killed during the revolution,215 as were hundreds of priests.216

But when the revolution spread and hopes began to grow for its success, the clergy and the captains began to be marginalized in the search for more effective political control. The new leaders were ambitious to organize the struggle and the new state. They included former primates, powerful shipowners, Phanariotes from the Danubian principalities and intellectuals from the European diaspora. They needed to impress Europeans with an image of a people rising against a barbarous tyranny and seeking their natural place amongst civilized nations. These Western criteria would dominate the new state.

From the start, the Greek state modeled its social and political institutions on the West. The dreams and ambitions of the fighters themselves became irrelevant. Respect for ancient social and political traditions seemed less important than the assertion that Greece was a modern European nation.

The imposition of a new perspective was neither easy nor painless. After 1824, the revolutionary leadership became divided. The old primates demanded a decentralized, traditional form of government, while the Westernizers would not give way on the idea of a strong centralized state.217

Within this basic division of outlook there were many other causes of disagreement: the factionalism of the captains, who were ignored by the politicians, the interests of the shipowners and powerful primates, and fierce local loyalties. Consequently, after the Turks had been driven from their strongholds in just two years, the revolution degenerated into bloody civil war. The Turks regained control of most areas, but for the next four years the Greeks had no concern for anything but their fratricidal conflicts.

It was the intervention of the European powers that ensured the liberation of some Greek lands as an independent state. Without them the revolution of 1821 would probably have suffered the same fate as the Orloff rebellion of 1768-74, or Alexander Ypsilantes’ invasion of Moldo-Wallachia in the spring of 1821.

The intervention of England, France and Russia was decided by the Treaty of London on July 6, 1827, on the initiative of the British foreign minister, George Canning. He proposed a compromise to the Greeks and the Turks: an autonomous Greek state subject to the Sultan, with the imposition of an armistice by the three powers. The Greeks accepted the proposal, but the Turks did not, and the allied fleets were ordered to cut off supplies to Ibrahim, the Viceroy of Egypt, whose well-organized force was crushing resistance in the Peloponnese. On October 2, 1827, the Turco-Egyptian fleet was totally destroyed at the battle of Navarino on the initiative of the English admiral, who decided to interpret his orders to cut off supplies to the Egyptians in a proactive manner. The battle of Navarino implemented de facto the Europeans’ provisions for an independent Greek state.

The European powers’ motives are obvious. The unexpected Greek successes in the first two years of the revolution, followed by Turkish atrocities such as the hanging of the patriarch, the murders of bishops and Phanariotes, or the massacres of Chios and Psara, aroused intense public sym-
pathy. The European educated classes, having had a classical education, were prone to romantic Philhellenism. Lord Byron’s participation and death in the struggle was decisively influential. Another motive was purely political. The Eastern Question projected an image of Turkey as “the sick man of Europe.” The Western powers sought to solve the Eastern Question without benefiting Russia. A third motive was the strategic importance of Greece for trade and shipping. Against the threatened disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, a small dependent state would safeguard the Powers’ interests.

The economic subordination of the emerging state to the European powers had been established long before Navarino. The first and second “Independence Loans” (1824 and 1825) were granted by the Europeans on such stringent terms that they ensured the total dependence of the Greeks on the West. Successive loans were supposedly granted to consolidate the first elements of a national economy, but in effect every new loan was used to settle the debts of the previous ones.

It is no coincidence that after each large loan the new state was declared bankrupt. The first bankruptcy in 1827 followed the drawing of the first two “Independence Loans.” The second in 1843 came after the loans made to King Otho. The third came three years after the loan of 1890. Then loans for settling the refugees after the Asia Minor catastrophe led to default in 1932.218

For years the economy was under foreign diplomatic tutelage, a unique phenomenon in international political history.219 Economic dependence was accompanied by political subservience, Western influence pervading all aspects of national life to a humiliating degree.220

After Western pressure, the four-year fratricidal war was concluded with the formation of three political parties: the “French party” of John Kolettis, the “English party” of Alexander Mavrokordatos, and the “Russian party” of Andreas Metaxas.221 Each furthered the interests of the Power which supported it. Parties defined by their dependence on foreign Powers have bedeviled Greek political life ever since. Their subsequent ideological differences were all imported from the West, perpetuating foreign dependence.

From the start, Greek autonomy was more apparent than real. The European powers were in charge. The new state’s institutions and political culture were Greek only in name; they had been fashioned for the different social circumstances of other peoples. To this day Greece is ruled in spite of state institutions, not through them.222

The Kapodistrian experiment was the only alternative to Western models, but it failed within three years. The time was not right. Too much depended on John Kapodistrias himself (1776-1831), a distinguished European figure at ease with courts, governments and palace officials.223 A man of great integrity and conscious of his Hellenism, he had already devoted his personal fortune to the national cause.

He was elected governor of Greece in May 1827 by the Third National Assembly of Troezen. Born in Corfu, he had studied medicine in Italy. When the Russians seized Corfu in 1803, they made him General Secretary of the Ionian Republic, a post he held until they returned the Ionian islands to French control. The tsar then invited him to join the Russian diplomatic service.

After a successful first posting to Vienna, he was appointed the tsar’s deputy foreign minister, and in this capacity played a central role in European politics. Kapodistrias was a distinguished diplomat, helping to prevent the dismemberment of France and establish Switzerland as a decentralized state based on separate cantons and direct democracy.

As Governor of Greece, Kapodistrias did not try to repeat the Swiss experiment under very different conditions. He preferred centralization regardless of Greek traditions and sensibilities, insisting on personally controlling every de-
partment in a desperate attempt to create an awareness of a unitary state and its institutions out of the warring factions and conflicting interests emerging from the civil war.

Inevitably he clashed with party leaders manipulated by the English and French, who considered him an ally of Russia and a potential danger to their hegemony. They encouraged the opposition to begin a series of local movements, which resulted in Hydra declaring itself independent under the Mavrokordatos party. When the Russian fleet crushed a rebellion in Poros at Kapodистrias’s instigation, the Powers planned his assassination.

Foreign participation in Kapodистrias’s murder is no longer in doubt. The leading conspirator was the French General Gérard, the administrator of Kapodистrias’s new regular army, helped by his aide-de-camp Lieutenant Antony Kalamogdaries and the French Colonel Pellion. To execute the plan they used Petroybe Mavromichales’ son and brother whom Kapodистrias had imprisoned for sedition. Kapodистrias was murdered outside the church of St. Spyridon at Nauplion as he arrived for the celebration of the Liturgy on Sunday, September 27, 1831.

His murder denied the Greeks any chance of benefiting from the freedom they had won at such cost. They were unready to take responsibility for themselves. This was the tragedy of modern Hellenism, too often identified with the Greek state.

By the winter of 1831-2 Greece was on the point of collapse. Every armed leader who could control a piece of territory set up his own government. His own men and the remnants of the regular army supported themselves by banditry. People were dying of starvation. The land had been left uncultivated for years and what food remained was pillaged by plundering bands. The cities were abandoned and famine threatened.

Whether the Greek state could continue to exist now depended entirely on the European powers. Nothing stood in the way of their instigating a protectorate. By a treaty signed on May 7, 1832, England, France and Russia guaranteed with Bavaria the “independence” of Greece and appointed Otto Wittelsbach, the second son of the philhellenic Ludwig of Bavaria, as monarch.

Bavarian domination would continue until 1862. The Bavarians undertook to realize what Kapodистrias had failed to achieve, to establish a state, organize institutions, and ensure that the Greeks conformed to European political and social norms. The state that emerged – the Greek state of today – was a creation of the Bavarians whose stamp still dominates public life.

Prince Otto Wittelsbach was sixteen when appointed monarch of “the Greek kingdom.” Born in 1815, he was a Roman Catholic, and originally destined for the priesthood. By agreement with the Powers, his father appointed a three-man regency to exercise authority until the king’s coming of age.

Besides the president, Count Joseph von Armannsparg, a former Bavarian foreign and finance minister, General Karl von Heideon was responsible for military and naval affairs, while Georg Ludwig von Maurer, a Göttingen law professor, looked after justice, education and the Church.

Armannsparg was a Roman Catholic but also a freemason. Heideon and Maurer, a pastor’s son, were both Protestants. The Roman Catholic diplomat Karl von Abel was secretary to the regency, and Armannsparg’s assistant.

Otho and the regents arrived in Nauplion on January 18, 1833, with 3,500 Bavarian soldiers and a flotilla of forty-three ships. On his way from Munich to Greece the young king had stopped in Rome to seek the pope’s blessing.

The Bavarians imposed an absolute monarchy “by the grace of God” with no constitution to safeguard basic political and human rights. The regency exercised all authority in the king’s name. It set up a government of Greek politicians from the English and French parties with purely execu-
tive responsibilities. Greeks connected in any way with the Russian party or Kapodistrias’s government were excluded.

The regency was arbitrary and authoritarian, treating the Greeks as semi-barbarians and imposing decisions by force of Bavarian arms. All opposition met with execution and imprisonment.

And those who have the authority seize them and deal with them according to their law. And they apply the knife which the enlightened men of Europe sent us, and they kill us savage Greeks. And so many people are killed and all the dungeons and prisons are full. And who are those who are killed and put in prison? All the fighters. All those who kept their faith for so many centuries under the Turks. And they caused them so much suffering but they endured it. And they liberated their country, those men with their religion.

Even this vivid description of Makriyannis barely evokes the Bavarian tyranny, which even imprisoned and condemned to death the hero of the War of Independence, Theodore Kolokotrones.

But the regents’ aim was to demonstrate their ability to set up a state with institutions and functions where previously chaos and anarchy had prevailed. Their organization and structure was based on the European model. The Bavarians were so contemptuous of things Greek that the Greek people’s needs went unmet. Korais’s most prominent disciples, who had strongly opposed Kapodistrias, instantly cooperated with the Bavarians and their project for a Westernized Greek state.

Administrative institutions, the army, education, the legal system, the urban environment and the Church were organized on a pattern derived from different societies with different needs.

The regency organized the state administration on the model of a centralized European monarchy. By the “Law on the structure and administration of the demes,” drawn up by Abel, the regency’s secretary, the country was divided into ten nomes and forty-two eparchies, with the dème as the principal administrative unit. Nomarchs and eparchs were appointed by the central government. The demarchs were elected, but only by “those who had the property qualification required by law,” not by “gatherings of the whole citizen body,” and were denied any freedom of action. The system abolished any rights the Greeks had acquired under Turkish rule. It imposed central authority on the regions, abolishing the previous system of national and local assemblies, and the administrative structures dating from the revolution.

The army was given a Western command structure with the imposition of Western military regulations. A national police force was instituted on the model of the French gendarmerie, to absorb the many irregulars left over from the dissolution of Kapodistrias’s regular forces. But they refused to serve in the new army or the gendarmerie, distrust ing the Bavarian administration and resenting Bavarians in the army. In 1835 there were as many Bavarians as Greeks in the army and the gendarmerie.

In education the formal divisions of primary, middle and higher were retained. Middle schools were organized into Hellenic Schools, imitating the German Lateinische Schule, and Gymnasia again on the German model. The curricula reflected Bavarian interest in cultivating a humanistic education in its original cradle as much as the primary need in Greece of “modern” studies. The University of Athens, founded in 1837, faithfully copied the structure and organization of the German universities.

Maurer’s legal expertise allowed him control of the justice system. Ignorant of customary Greek law and its Byzantine sources, he applied the Kantian “sovereignty of justice” theory, basing national unity on a unified legal code. The Greek Penal Code reproduced the Bavarian Penal Law of 1813, drafted by Feuerbach, and the Bavarian Code of Penal Procedure. Similarly, the Urban Code reproduced the
German Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, and the Code of Political Procedure borrowed from the relevant Bavarian statutes of 1825, 1827 and 1831. The regency’s urban planning was sheer romanticism. The Bavarians cherished Greece for its brilliant archaeological past. This remote past needed visual expression in the new state. It was as if the 2,400 years since the Golden Age of Pericles were an episode of decadence and barbarism, best forgotten.

On July 11, 1833, the capital was transferred from Nauplion to Athens. The Bavarians’ motives were obvious and were shared by romantic European Philhellenes and Greeks influenced by the Korais’s “enlightened” ideas.

Athens in 1833 was a village of brick-built houses centered round the ruins of the Acropolis with barely 4,000 inhabitants. King Ludwig of Bavaria sent the famous architect Leopold von Klenze to transform the impoverished village into an imposing capital. Klenze was famous for his extraordinary neoclassical buildings in Munich, notably the Propylaea.

Another German architect, Gustav Schaubert, together with Stamatios Klenthes, a Greek colleague who had studied with him in Berlin, had already prepared a grandiose urban plan for Athens. This was considered too expensive, and Klenze was asked to adapt it. But his adaptations were never implemented. Buildings were erected rapidly to house government officials, without reference to rudimentary urban planning. From the beginning the new capital was a failed city.

Klenze’s contribution was to demolish the Venetian and Turkish buildings on the Acropolis, clearing the site of later structures and reconstructing the Temple of Wingless Victory. The only new building he designed in Athens was the Roman Catholic church of St. Dionysios the Areopagite.

Once Athens was officially proclaimed the capital in December 1834, several neoclassical European architects submitted ambitious plans. Their decorative imitations of classical Greek styles and motifs embellished the otherwise undistinguished city. Friedrich von Gärtners designed the royal palace (1836-1842) after another German architect’s plans to build a palace on the Acropolis next to the Parthenon were rejected. Christian Hansen designed the University (1839), while his brother Theophil was responsible for the Observatory (1842-1846), the Eye Hospital (1847) and the Academy (1859-1885).

Neoclassicism became obligatory for Orthodox church architecture. Nothing in the capital was to be a reminder of the “dark” period of Byzantium, of which the Greeks were ashamed. To Theophil Hansen was assigned the construction of the cathedral, but his plans were later adapted by the Greek architect D. Zezios, and put into effect by the Frenchman Frédéric Boulanger. The German artist Seitz contributed naturalistic frescoes in the Western manner.

To fund the construction of the Athens cathedral, seventy-two Byzantine or later churches were demolished and the sites sold. Many of these churches were of great architectural merit with wonderful frescoes. The notable church of Kapnikarea was also destined for demolition but was saved because it attracted the attention of Ludwig of Bavaria when he visited Athens. He gave orders not to destroy the church but to create a square around it in Ermou Street.

An aversion to the Byzantine tradition was characteristic of the Bavarians and “enlightened” Greeks. At the opening ceremony of the neoclassical church of Agios Konstantinos in Omonia, the architect Lysander Kautanizoglou reviled the Byzantine style and tradition, advocating a return to classical Greek standards. He designed the churches of Agios Georgios Karytzes (1845) and Agia Irene in Aliolou Street (1846), as well as the Arsekeion (1846-1852), and the Metsovio Polytechnic (1862).

There was no opposition to the imposition of the neoclassical style on ecclesiastical buildings – just as there had been no opposition in Orthodox Russia decades earlier. The style
was purely decorative, with Renaissance domes, fake columns, and pseudo-metopes over the doors; it had no roots in the country’s Christian experience and was unrelated to worship. Classical Greek architecture had enshrined cosmic truth, while Byzantine architecture bore witness to the logos. Neoclassical eclecticism demanded no specific faith or experience and therefore could be used by architects of any denomination for the design of Orthodox churches. Thus Hansen and Boulanger designed the cathedral in the capital of Orthodox Greece. Ernst Ziller would be responsible for the church of Chrysospilaiotissa in Aiolou Street and the church of the Hatzikosta orphanage. Paul Abadie, the architect of the Sacré Coeur in Paris, was invited to build the church of Agios Loukas in Patissiou Street. And while foreigners designed Orthodox churches, the Greek Stamatios Kleanthes was the architect of the Gothic Anglican church in Philhellon Street.

These buildings set the style for a hundred years in provincial towns and villages: bogus neoclassicism. This non-theological decorative architecture was complemented with sentimental naturalist paintings whose iconography was drawn from Italian and Spanish religious art. The long theological tradition of Orthodox iconography was rejected. Orthodox Hellenism became so ignorant about the theology of icons that even monastic icon painters on Mount Athos abandoned Byzantine iconography; their “Russian style” was a second-hand version of Italian and Spanish originals.

The intervention of the Bavarians in the life of the Greek Church was not restricted to transforming ecclesiastical architecture and iconography. The radical alienation of ecclesiastical life, the turning of the Church into a religion, was undertaken systematically and forcibly. The root cause of this systematic alienation was the declaration of an autocephalous Greek Church.

**The Autocephaly of the Church of Greece**

The War of Independence raised a problem of canon law in those regions which had risen in revolt and were ecclesiastical provinces of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Patriarchal Synod chose and ordained their bishops, resolved differences between them, and sent holy oil for baptismal chrismation – a visible sign of the unity of the local church with the primatial see of New Rome.

At the beginning of the uprising the Patriarchate was obliged to denounce it and excommunicate the rebels to protect the several million Greek-speaking Orthodox of Constantinople, Asia Minor, the Balkans, and Pontus from reprisals. Most bishops of metropolitan Greece who escaped massacre by the Turks took a leading part in the rebellion and were duly denounced by their administrative and spiritual leadership, separating them canonically from the body of the Orthodox Church.

This was merely a diplomatic ruse, as the rebels hoped to spread rebellion throughout every Greek region, and in the minds of the lay fighters the Greeks’ national center was Constantinople and its Ecumenical Patriarchate. But as the revolt was limited to metropolitan Greece, where an independent national state was proclaimed, the ecclesiastical problem was left unresolved.

The new state defined itself not by ethnicity or a common language but by the Orthodox faith of its inhabitants. Before Otho’s reign, the constitutions of the National Assemblies at
Epidaurus, Astroi, and Troezen defined the Greek citizens of the new state as "all who believe in Christ."[236]

This formula included the Roman Catholic Greek minority on the Aegean islands, in spite of their opposition to the national struggle, and their appeals to the pope and the French government to be regarded as not participating in the revolution.[237]

The identification of Greek particularity with the Orthodox faith did not prevent the Greeks from emphasizing religious tolerance in their first constitutions while defining the "Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ" as the "prevailing religion of the Greek state." At the head of the constitution they invoked the Holy and Undivided Trinity, setting the communion of divine Persons as the principle of their own social cohesion.[238]

The 1827 National Assembly of Troezen chose provisionally "not an autocephalous system but self-administration by a three- or five-member Ecclesiastical Council." According to the clerical members of the National Assembly:

All of us, and especially the members of the clergy of the Eastern Church, have known no other mother besides the Great Church, and no other Lord except the Patriarch of Constantinople – the great Patriarch Gregory sacrificed himself a few years ago for our holy faith and for the Motherland – and therefore it is not up to us to cut ourselves away from the Church and desert it. The prelates who are in Greece, united in spirit, will govern the churches entrusted to us, without causing any schism or division in our spiritual and ecclesiastical community.[239]

This was Kapodistrias's policy. There were two aims: the Church in the new state should be autonomous, while linked spiritually with the Patriarchate of Constantinople by its consent and according to canon law. And that Church government should be protected from the state and never become subject to its political aims.

But Korais disagreed and so did many Greeks, particularly if they were under Western missionary influence. From the first victories of 1821, Korais wanted the Greeks to forswear ecclesiastical obedience to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, thereby preparing the ground for a religious reformation on the model of the Westernized Russian Church.

He wrote:

The clergy of liberated Greece should no longer recognize the Patriarch's ecclesiastical leadership since Constantinople is the polluted seat of a lawless tyrant. A Synod of priests[240] should be freely elected by clergy and laymen, in accordance with Early Church[241] practice and like the fellow-Orthodox Church of Russia. It is not fitting that the clergy of free and autonomous Greeks should obey a Patriarch chosen by a tyrant and obliged to show him reverence.[242]

Korais's definition of ecclesiastical unity is limited to politics. He confuse[s] the synodical system of the Orthodox Church with Protestant administration by "permanent councils."[243] He saw the Church as an institution dependent on secular authority like any other useful body. He sought a separate Greek Church as an institutionalized religion assimilated to the religious ideas of the Enlightenment.[244] His primary aim was to reform worship: "Liberated Greece ... has the right to convoke its own local synod of free clergy, choosing services to suit the Church in the new secular regime ... and teaching evangelical morality instead.[245]

A reformed "national Church" – subject to state officials, modernized and freed from liturgical "superstition" and outmoded monasticism – suited the Bavarian regency. As with everything else, their model for ecclesiastical affairs was Bavaria, where the Church and religious services were controlled by the secular authority.[246]

Regency policies accorded with Korais's ideas and were put into practice in collaboration with Maurer by Theokletos
Pharkakis. Pharmakidis was invited to Nauplion from Aigina, barely a month after the Bavarians arrived in Greece, and together with Maurer devised a charter for an autocephalous Greek Church. Later, each claimed exclusive authorship of this proposal.

On March 15, 1833, a seven-member advisory “Ecclesiastical Committee” was set up by royal decree. There were four laymen and three bishops, with Spyridon Trikoupis, the minister of ecclesiastical affairs, as chairman, and Theokleos Pharmakidis as secretary.

At its first meeting the committee “unanimously decided that the Church of the Kingdom of Greece, recognizing no spiritual leader or head apart from the Church’s founder, Jesus Christ, and recognizing as its secular leader the King of Greece, remains independent of any other Church.” This was an undisguised coup d’état. Regardless of the metropolitan Greek episcopal synod and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Bavarians and Koraists cut the metropolitan Greek Church away from the body of Eastern Orthodoxy, from its patrictic and Byzantine roots.648

The committee worked on until May 2, 1833, submitting a final report oblivious to the reality of the Church and the salvation it proclaims. It is naïve, ill-informed and uncannional.649 The report presents a tendentious interpretation of history, asserting that the primacy of Constantinople is morally tainted and historically unfounded. It introduces a federal conception of ecclesiastical unity, as if churches are absolutely autocephalous, with only their doctrines held in common. It proposes complete state control of the Church, the king appointing a “permanent synod” with absolute authority. It derides Orthodox monasticism, presenting it as decadent and disorganized. It ridicules the Greeks’ attachment to their forms of worship, fasting, resting on feast days, and honoring the saints. It ignores the lay religious life which did more to preserve Greek identity during the four hundred years of Turkish rule than all the efforts of the intellectuals. It laments the fact that “Greeks prefer death to breaking the most insignificant fast, and begging for food to working on a feast day.” The committee considered lay fidelity to popular culture to be a ridiculous superstition.

A royal decree of July 15, 1833, summoned all the bishops of metropolitan Greece, together with refugee bishops from Turkish-controlled areas, to Nauplion to ratify the proposals of the seven-member committee. Twenty-two bishops deliberated for eight hours, keeping no record of their discussions. Few of the bishops raised any objections. There must have been an underlying atmosphere of fear. Thirteen of the twenty-two bishops were refugees whose residence in the new Greek state depended on the good will of the regency.

On the same afternoon all the bishops ratified the committee’s proposals with very few reservations. Maurer and Pharmakidis had triumphed. The ecclesiastical charter drawn up by them in advance was published as a royal decree on July 23, 1833.

The charter proclaimed the Church of metropolitan Greece autocephalous, appointing the Roman Catholic king as its “administrative head” working through a five-member Holy Synod appointed by himself. Three members had to be bishops. At its discretion the government might appoint additional priests or laymen as counselors or assessors. The king chose a permanent secretary, the first being Theokleos Pharmakidis. The royal procurator represented the government and his presence was obligatory. All the Synod’s decisions, even those on theological matters, needed government approval.

The remaining articles of the ecclesiastical charter were borrowed word for word from the “1818 Bavarian Church Constitution, the Consistorium.”525 Maurer and Pharmakidis were not interested in ecclesiology or tradition, simply in legalizing state control. The Church, which until then had
led the nation, became a civil service department charged with serving "the spiritual needs of the people," strictly controlled by political leaders who could be of any faith.251 Unchanged throughout the Othonian period, the ecclesiastical charter of the Bavarians and Koraists lasted until 1923, when Plastiras's revolutionary government abolished it, but only for two years. In 1925 another revolutionary government, that of Theodore Pangalos, restored the Church constitution of 1833.252 The Bavarian period thus proved decisive for Orthodoxy in Greece.

The nominated members of the Holy Synod were sworn in on July 27, 1833, before the king. The government proclaimed a holiday and organized celebrations in the capital: church services, gun salutes and state banquets.

The Bavarians and the Koraists could now push for more radical reforms, starting with the monasteries, for they understood that monasticism sustained lay piety.

On August 19, 1833, less than a month after its institution, the Holy Synod proposed suppressing monasteries with fewer than three monks and confiscating their property to endow an ecclesiastical fund for clergy stipends and the maintenance of schools.

On September 25, 1833, a royal decree suppressed all monasteries with fewer than six monks, and dismissed all novices and all nuns under the age of forty from their monasteries. Lands, liturgical vessels, icons, books, furnishings and any other saleable goods were to be expropriated. The monks were responsible for the sale by auction of land and moveable property and the remittance of the proceeds to the Ecclesiastical Fund.

The new Greek state contained 545 monasteries for men and 18 for women. Their landed property had remained intact because the Turks considered monastic property "sacred" (vakuf). Many Greeks in the Turkish period gave their lands to monasteries in the expectation that they and their children would enjoy a lifetime tenancy.

The regency's success was rapid. Religious life suffered more than during the entire Turkish period. The nomarchs and eparchies entered the monasteries with their officials and armed police, drove out the monks and nuns, and began their plundering. In the sanctuary, they seized liturgical vessels, stripped the altar, and took the icons from the iconostasis and the walls. Together with the vestments, candelabra and liturgical books, they piled them up in the center of the church or in the narthex. They then began the separation of "useful" from "useless" objects. The "useful" were recorded in a register, the "useless" burned in the courtyard. Then the stalls were ripped out from the walls, and everything, "even the sticks of the old monks," was loaded into sacks and crates, with the pots and pans, the refectory table and anything of value from the cells. The church was locked and the monastery gates were chained up, leaving the monks outside lamenting their loss.253

The sum raised for the Ecclesiastical Fund was diserosy.254 Precious vessels were seized by officials and sold in the bazaars. Valuable icons and vestments were destroyed. Liturgical vessels became items for domestic use. The poet Panayiotis Soutsos wrote: "The thieving state official shamelessly gets drunk from the silver chalice."

Of the 563 monasteries in the new Greek state, 412 were dissolved. Only three women's monasteries survived, to which all the remaining nuns were compelled to go. Roman Catholic monasteries and monastic lands were not touched. Surviving Orthodox monasteries lost all autonomy. The local bishop undertook their "spiritual" responsibilities and the nomarch their "secular" (mainly economic) ones. The monasteries paid punitive local and national taxes.255

But there was resistance. At first the clergy did little, intimidated by Bavarian brutality. The Greeks knew how to cope
with the flexible if unpredictable Turkish administration. But they had never encountered a rationally organized bureaucracy controlling all aspects of life. What Makriyannis called “devious Bavarian policies” provoked fear.

Only two bishops actively resisted the proclamation of the autocephaly and publicly condemned Pharmakidis: Ioannikios of Rethymne and Gerasimos of Adrianople, who fled to Constantinople to escape arrest. The monk Prokopios Dendrinos, a teacher in the seminary at Poros, who took part in their resistance, was exiled. Dionysios Velentzas, a deacon who also condemned the autocephaly, was confined to Aigina. Neophytos Doukas was saved from arrest by his renown and great age.

The resistance of laypeople was more widespread. The autocephaly and the dissolution of the monasteries brought their resentment towards Bavarian rule to a head. Under foreign rule and a foreign king they had no rights and no political recourse.

The monasteries had been rallying points of the national struggle. The people fearing being isolated from the 80 per cent of Greeks who still lived in the Ottoman Empire and recognized the leadership of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. A revolutionary circular of 1834 stated: “they have insulted our churches and our religion, they have destroyed the houses of orphans; in a word, they have ruined us and are continuing to despoil us each day.” Makriyannis adds:

The enlightened men of Europe have brought an axe to cut down the wild Greeks ... The king of Bavaria should have cut down his regents and then cut off his own head. For His Majesty is our country’s grave-digger ... Have any of his fellow-Bavarians who have despoiled us ... who govern us like Helots ... spoken out? During the Turkocracy they didn’t touch a single stone of the old churches. And these deceivers have made common cause with polluted men,

Phanariots and the like, who polluted Europe and have ruined our monasteries and churches – they have left their filth in some and turned others into stables.

In this atmosphere of resentment, uprisings were inevitable. For twenty-five years after the proclamation of the autocephaly various popular uprisings always made reference to “the monasteries they have despoiled,” “the Luther-Calvinists who govern us,” “the Catholic king” who remains foreign to the people’s faith, the “Frankish Synod” which has usurped the place of the Orthodox patriarch.

Uprisings took place in Tinos in August 1833, and Mani in April 1834, which became so serious that Maurer and Abel were recalled to Bavaria. More uprisings followed: in Messenia and Arcadia (July 1834), Aitolokarabania (February 1836), Hydra and Spetsai (April 1838), Pyla of Messenia (August 1838), Mani again (April 1839), the island of Kalamai and Pyrgos of Eleia (October 1840), Akarnania (June 1844), Mani a third time (September 1845), Akarnania again (June 1847), Euboea (August 1847), Naupactus (August-October 1847), Patras (November 1847), Lamia (April 1848), Messenia, Corinth and Eleia (May 1848), and finally Papoulakos’s uprising in the southern Peloponnese (1852).

Whatever their motivation, popular anger at the way the Greek Church had been treated was always present. Often party and personal rivalries or Russian influence lurked behind explicit resentments about high-handed state intervention in Church affairs stirring up popular religious violence.

Matters of faith and tradition always pervaded popular uprisings in Otto’s reign, if only as a pretext. Secret societies defended Orthodoxy (“Phoenix,” “Philothoqos Society,” “Grand Brotherhood”). Local prophets and oracles had wide currency, spreading fear and millenarian hopes. Newspapers and broadsheets sustained mutual loathing between “mod-
Orthodoxy and the West

behavior. The missionaries used their Sunday schools, educational foundations, evening sermons, “painting classes,” and philanthropic organizations to swamp Greece with their Protestant propaganda. They set up printing presses in Syros and Smyrna, publishing books for children, young adults, parents and teachers, chiefly on moral themes, and also catechetical handbooks. In 1836, 45,000 Protestant translations were published.263 Children learned Protestant hymns in Sunday schools, not the hymns of Orthodox worship.

Resistance to the autocephaly, the dissolution of the monasteries, and Protestant missionary activity is embodied in three important figures of the period: the priest Konstantinos Oekonomos of the Oekonomoi, the monk Christophoros Panayiotopoulos or Papoulakos, and the layman Kosmas Philamiatos.

Konstantinos Oekonomos (1780-1857) is by common consent the most important nineteenth-century Greek churchman and theologian.264 The only person to criticize the Bavarian regime on an intellectual level, and an implacable opponent of Pharmakidis’s theological ideas, he symbolizes Greece’s ecclesiastical consciousness at that time.

He was born in Tsaritsani, a village in Thessaly. His father, a priest who held the office of oekonomos, or steward, of the diocese of Ellasson, supervised his early education. He then attended the celebrated school of Ambelakia, and acquired a good knowledge of French. He had no further education but was an impressive autodidact. At the age of twenty-one, already famous for his intellectual gifts, he was ordained as a married priest. He too was appointed oekonomos of the diocese of Ellasson and from then on began to sign himself Oekonomos of the Oekonomoi. He devoted himself to literature and translation: “His first works were literary but demonstrated his theological interests. He translated Fénelon’s Adventures of Telemachus into heroic verse, composed a tragedy, and took a strong interest in Romantic
French poetry,” while developing a reputation as a preacher in Thessaly.

In 1806 he was arrested by Ali Pasha for participating in Papa-Euthymios Vlachavas’s revolutionary movement, but bought his release. He fled to Serres and then to Thessalonica, where he pursued his theological and literary studies.

With Konstantinos Koumas, he was invited to Smyrna in 1809 to teach at the progressive “Literary Gymnasium.” He taught literature and rhetoric in Smyrna for ten years. At the time, he admired Korais for his views on language and his Enlightenment ideas, and corresponded with Pharmakidis in Vienna and Kairis in Kydonies. His published works included his *Rhetoric and Grammar* (a system of aesthetics) and a free translation of Molière’s *L’avare*, entitled *O Exintavelonis*.

His contact with Korais circles in Smyrna alerted Oekonomos to the dilemma facing Hellenism and made him aware of the rivalry between “progressives” and “conservatives.” He experienced the pressure exercised by the “Logios Hermes” circles, and recognized that “those who were attempting to detach the Greeks from their mother Church” were leading the nation towards a loss of their Hellenism. Teachers did not exist who could introduce him to the theology of ecclesial experience. But his spiritual and cultural attitudes had not been altered by enthusiasm for the “luminaries” of the West. Lay piety and the study of the Fathers were more important to him.

In 1819 he was called to Constantinople and appointed Megas Oekonomos and preacher of the Great Church of Christ. His renown for his rhetoric and spiritual insight increased as a result of his appointment at the Patriarchate. On the outbreak of the revolution, Turkish persecution forced him to flee to Odessa only a few days before the Patriarch Gregory V was hanged. The patriarch’s remains were brought to Odessa, where Oekonomos delivered a famous funeral oration. His Odessa sermons were later published in Berlin (1833). In 1822 the tsar invited him to St. Petersburg. Elected to the Academy of Sciences and the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, he became the tsar’s trusted advisor on Greek matters. He collaborated with John Kapocistrias on the founding of a theological academy in Greece, and in this connection obtained financial help from the Rizaros brothers, rich merchants who later also financed the ecclesiastical school in Athens named after them.

In 1833, in spite of being pressed by the tsar to remain in his service, he decided to return to liberated Greece. The tsar decorated him and honored him with a lifetime pension. On the return journey he stopped in Berlin, where he was appointed a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and decorated by the king of Prussia. He then traveled to Italy, where Pope Gregory XXI received him with great ceremony at the Vatican. When he finally reached Nauplion in October 1834, his great reputation had preceded him.

Oekonomos immediately denounced the autocephaly, calling the new Church constitution “a document modeled on the Protestant Consistoria” and the day on which the autocephaly was proclaimed “ill-fated and the source of all evil.” Pharmakidis reacted violently denouncing Oekonomos as a “Russian” and “an agent in the pay of Russia,” opposing Oekonomos’s theological arguments with Koraisitic nationalist ideas and denying the ecumenicity of the Patriarchate.

This clash resulted in personal enmity and an ideological dispute that lasted for more than twenty years. There was no common ground or room for compromise. Two parties formed around the protagonists: the “conservatives” around Oekonomos, and the “liberals” around Pharmakidis. The newspapers of the first party were the *Evangelical Trumpet, Savior and The Century*, that of the second, *Athena*. One of Pharmakidis’s allies was Neophytos Vamvas, whose translation of the Bible Oekonomos severely criticized.
This theological warfare was often conducted at a high intellectual level. The newspapers had a more acerbic style, engaging in political and personal attacks. Principal themes were the Church’s autocephaly, Vamvak’s translation of the Bible, Protestant missionary activities, Theophilos Kairis’s heresy and condemnation, and legal oaths.

During this time Othon come of age, ending the regency. The revolution of Makriyannis and Kallergis on September 3, 1843, gave the Greeks a constitution. The embassies of the great powers intrigued to establish control over national policies and the king proved unequal to his role. The missionaries continued their activities, with popular uprisings succeeding one another. The pope pressured Othon over the “rights” of Greek Roman Catholics. With all this activity the new Greek state was polarized between “conservatives” and “progressives,” “traditionalists” and “modernists,” Oekonomos and Pharmakidis.

This rivalry has left its mark on the spiritual life of modern Greece. Every problem was defined simply in terms of the “conservative” or “progressive” dichotomy. Oekonomos played into his opponents’ hands, his impeccably Orthodox opinions expressed in schematic Western terms. What was Orthodox tradition? What did it really contribute? What social structure did it presuppose? And how did Western “enlightenment” and “modernism” offer meaning to life? These were the real issues buried under schematic arguments, rhetorical tropes and dubious evidence.

Both sides had their points. Pharmakidis attacked the manifest corruption of the Phanar, the prevailing simony, the uncanonical and arbitrary action of the Patriarchal Synod and the patriarch’s political ambitions. He exposed theological inconsistencies in Constantinople’s universalist claims, and the blatant manipulation of the Church’s canons and Gospel exhortations to humility and sacrificial service.268

Oekonomos responded with the need for ecclesiastical unity, faithfulness to tradition, and hierarchical accord. He rejected the introduction of the “democratic” principles of the Enlightenment into ecclesiastical life, “federated” unity, and the subjection of the Church to the moral aims of the state.269 He was right, but his theological arguments did not go far enough; the Church is less interested in the morality of its leaders and their ideological consistency (for human sin is always with us) than in preserving the Church’s “boundaries,” not out of conservatism but to maintain authentic life and the universal human hope of victory over death.

Finally Oekonomos’s party seemed to prevail. After much intrigue and maneuvering, the Ecumenical Patriarchate by a synodal tome recognized the autocephaly on June 29, 1850, thus bringing the schism to an end. This tome legalized the Greek Church’s unilateral action, laying down certain preconditions. Some formal preconditions were honored, but none of the essential ones. By Law 201 of 1852 the Greek government, ignoring reference to the patriarchal tome, revised certain articles of the Pharmakidis-Maurer Church constitution without changing the Church’s subjection to the state.270 Oekonomos had won a Pyrrhic victory.

The monk Christophoros Panayiotopoulos (Papoulakos or Papoulakis) (c. 1770-1861) was born in the village of Arbona in the province of Kalavryta. A completely illiterate butcher or livestock dealer, he became a monk in later life. According to Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, he began his monastic career at the monastery of Mega Spelio.271 Already a monk by 1825, he lived in a small cell he had built near his village.272

He lived the eremitical life for more than twenty years, teaching himself to read and write and becoming familiar with liturgical texts and other ecclesiastical writings. He was nearly eighty when in 1847 he decided to undertake a preaching mission to the villages of Achaia, rapidly becom-
ing famous for his charismatic gifts. With his exceptional ability for popular preaching, people flocked to hear him. He spoke the simple language of the people and his love and sympathy for them carried conviction, his sermons relating to their lives and problems. Papoulakos embodied what he preached, possessing nothing but his monastic habit, and living on whatever the country people gave him, which he shared with the poorest.

He preached repentance and fidelity to Church tradition: fasting, prayer, keeping feast days, almsgiving. He castigated adultery, false witness, and stealing farm animals, which was rife in the western Peloponnese. His sermons elicited such contrition that even political officials admitted that a simple monk had accomplished what laws and police forces had failed to achieve. "The return of stolen property is the climax of his audience's conversion, after the eradication of malice, hatred, animal-theft and tree-felling."273

Moving as he did amongst the people and seeing the consequences of the Bavarian government's policies, his preaching turned to contemporary politics. He fiercely denounced the autocephaly and the abolition of ancient metropolitan sees, which left the people fatherless. He condemned the dissolution of the monasteries, foreign missionaries, and the non-Orthodox schools they had established and the exclusion of the sacred Scriptures (i.e., the Septuagint) from the schools.

Behind these acts Papoulakos saw a clear aim: "It is their purpose to ruin our religion." And he lists the guilty: the English who controlled the state with their loan; the foreigners, the "Luther-Calvinists," Bavarians and missionaries who were swamping Greece; Kairis, "who had lit the match;" Pharmacidis, "who had poured out the poison;" the Synod which had meekly accepted the foreigners' schemes and which Papoulakos calls "polluted, diabolical, sealed with Armannsperg's seal."274

Papoulakos's sermon repudiated the new Greek state as an alien form of government that had swept away traditions the Greeks had known for centuries. In repudiating state authority Papoulakos called on the people for specific action. He wanted them to refuse to swear in court because the Gospel forbids oath-taking and the Greeks prefer the law of the Gospel to Bavarian legislation. "This law of Christ was written down by the four evangelists, seven Ecumenical Councils, eleven local councils and eleven modern martyrs," who refused to take the oath, and were killed in consequence.275

He denounced the state clergy and state education – the universities were "schools of the devil." Finally he attacked the heterodox king himself. He urged priests not to commemorate Otho and Amalia in the Liturgy, since they were "of a different faith and Franks." Through a parliamentary deputy he petitioned the king:

We too have our faith, Your Majesty, and have had it for 1,830 years, that is, from 30 to 1852, when we lost our faith ... now Your Majesty has a priest and a faith of your own ... Be careful, Your Majesty, our heavenly King tells us to fight for our faith and country. We, your servants, seek this faith of ours, the bishoprics we used to have and the seats of our bishops, we want the same bishopry today in the same places ... and we don't want our bishops to be appointed by the Synod, we want our Holy Gospel to come out of the courtrooms because we are polluting it with oaths, we want public teachers appointed with the Oevateuch and Psalter and our apostles and the books written by our forefathers. We don't want teachers full of foreign learning, whether Greeks or not ... if you are a just king, give justice to your people who are crying out to you for their religion.

And he signs it "Christophoros preacher of Greece" or "Christophoros the Greek."276
Inflammatory language of this kind, reflecting popular feeling, aroused the masses and provoked the anger of the Synod and the government. Papoulakos was arrested three years into his mission while he was preaching in the province of Achaia. He was sent to Athens under police escort on January 7, 1851, but in the face of public protest the Synod declined to prosecute him and sent him for trial to the bishop of Kalavryta. He was acquitted on condition that he would confine his preaching to his own diocese.

Six months later a Lakonian police report shows Papoulakos traveling around Mistra, Kytheion, and the diocese of Oitylos. When he arrived at Kalamata, thousands flocked to hear him preach. They camped outside his lodgings all night and sought a piece of his habit as a relic. The authorities were in a quandary; the nomarch and the police referred to the government for instructions.

Papoulakos continued his tour in Triphylia and Kyparissia. The Synod sent a representative to summon him to Athens but he refused to go. Two months later he appeared in the Argolid, crossed over to the island of Spetsai, returned to the Peloponnese, traveled around Kythera and arrived at Monemvasia and Elaphonisos. On April 5, 1852, the Synod put a preaching ban on the monk Christophoros and the Interior Ministry insisted the nomarchs saw it implemented. Simultaneously the Synod sent preachers to the areas Papoulakos had visited “to reduce the effects of his teaching.” But the people ignored and repudiated them. On April 24, Otho signed a decree confining him to the monastery of Thera. Military detachments were sent to Lakonia and a warship patrolled the Gulf of Gytheion.

Nevertheless, Papoulakos moved to the Mani and continued his mission, accompanied by Bishop Makarios of Asini, many priests and a bodyguard of more than five hundred peasants. The government reinforced the police with a regiment of soldiers to bring about his arrest. This provoked huge demonstrations. About 5,000 peasants gathered at Mavrovouni with the clergy at their head to appeal to the government for the restoration of Orthodox ecclesiastical order as preached by Papoulakos.

Papoulakos continued to travel from village to village in the interior of the Mani. Otho appointed the police commandant of Athens nomarch extraordinary of Lakonia, and sent General Gennais Kolokotronis to the Mani with a staff of officers and the royal corvette Amalia. A company of soldiers and police was ordered to arrest Papoulakos in a village near Gytheion. The force arrived at night and at dawn found themselves surrounded by 2,000 Maniotes. The soldiers deserted and the officers escaped by sea.

Reinforcements were sent: regiments of cavalry, infantry, national guard and mountain artillery. The Mani was in full revolt and the rumors of Papoulakos’s imminent arrest led to uprisings in Arcadia, Spetsai, Kranidi, and even in Boeotia, where Christophoros had never preached. The government reacted violently, billeting military detachments in the monasteries of the Peloponnese, and arresting any monk found outside his monastery. Kosmas Philiasiotes was arrested and imprisoned in Patras. A search was ordered of Konstantinos Oekononos’s house in Athens.

Papoulakos moved about now only in the Mani, accompanied day and night by thousands of people. Many of these were armed and skirmished with military units. “Christophoros’s name has been identified with that of religion,” wrote the provincial governor of Oitylos.277 The struggle was “for faith and country” against the “persecutors of Orthodoxy, Luther-Calvinists who feed on the blood of the unhappy people.”

On May 27, Papoulakos announced he would preach in Kalamata. Troops were concentrated in the area, blocking the approaches to the city. Faced with the danger of bloodshed, Christophoros persuaded his followers to withdraw to
western Mani, which was inaccessible to cavalry. He was pursued by military units who fought his followers in many villages.

Eventually the authorities looked for someone to betray him. A priest called Vasilarios accepted 6,000 drachmas to pose as a friend and follower of Papoulakos and arrange a meeting with him at an isolated monastery. Papa-Vasilarios kept the rendezvous with a group of police officers, who arrested Papoulakos at dawn on June 21, 1852.

They brought him down by a mountain path to the royal cutter Mathilda and then with a strong military escort the steamship Otho brought the octogenarian monk to Piraeus. He was then incarcerated in the Rion prison, where he remained in isolation until January 22, 1854. He was to have been tried as a rebel by the criminal court of Athens, but the outbreak of the Crimean War forced Otho to grant him amnesty. The Synod removed him first to Thera and then to the Panachrantos monastery on Andros, where he died on January 18, 1861, after seven years of exile.

Another representative figure of the period, though of more limited influence, was Kosmas Phlamiatos (1786-1852). Born in Cephalonia in Poulata of Sami, he was the son of a priest and teacher. A teacher himself, he taught in many of Cephalonia’s villages.

Known for his learning and asceticism, he resisted the British regime in the Ionian islands, particularly the Protestant missionaries who were sustained by the British authorities. In 1836 the British administration attempted to win him over by offering him a professorship at the Ionian Academy, but he refused the post, provoking official displeasure. Four years later he was exiled to Kythera, charged with membership in the Philohellenic Society.

A year later he was preaching and writing in Patras, criticizing the Bavarian regime’s ecclesiastical policy. It is possible that the bloody uprising in Patras in December 1842, with the slogan: “Out with the Freemasons and atheism” was inspired by him.

Perhaps because of his experience in the Ionian islands, he regarded all of Greece’s troubles as rooted in British policies and freemasonry. Research is lacking to judge whether Masonic influence was as pervasive as in Russian ecclesiastical life. Reflecting popular feeling, Phlamiatos regarded the British as incomparably more destructive of Hellenism than the Turks.

His writing mixes Orthodox monastic spirituality with naïve politics. He insisted on the importance of asceticism, liturgical experience and spiritual guidance, but saw organized English conspiracies against Orthodoxy everywhere. Nevertheless, his observations on British policies are often extremely acute.

In 1852, after the Papoulakos uprising, Phlamiatos and 150 others, mostly monks, were arrested in Patras and imprisoned in the Rion. Soon afterwards he died in prison, only a few days after being tonsured as a monk. Rumor had it that the authorities had poisoned him.

Phlamiatos’s name is often linked with the Philohellenic Society. But the evidence for this is slight. The Philohellenic Society’s role has been very little researched, although clandestine actions were often attributed to it. Contemporary newspapers report that a secret organization called the Philohellenic Society had been uncovered in 1839, led by General Nikitas Stamateopoulos or Nikitaras (the legendary Tourkophagos ["Turk-eater"] of the battle of Dervenakia against Mahmoud Dramali), George Kapodistrias, the governor’s younger brother and the Cretan Nikolaos Renieris. The Society’s aim was to foment risings against the Turks in Epirus, Thessaly and Macedonia, and place an Orthodox king on the Greek throne. The ringleaders were arrested and tried on July 12, 1840, but acquitted, as the trial was intended to expose Russian embassy intrigues in Athens.
General Makriyannis’s reputation now overshadows that of his contemporaries (1797-1864). Well known as a War of Independence fighter, he had shown legendary courage against Ibrahim in the Peloponnesse and Kutahi on the Athenian Acropolis. He also led the uprising of September 3, 1843, which forced Otho to grant Greece a constitution.

Makriyannis’s fame would have rested there if his Memoirs had not come to light fifty years after his death. Without any formal education, he learned to read and write only in later life. He kept a journal recording events he had lived through from the Revolution until 1851, hiding the manuscript in his garden.

In 1907 John Vlachoyannis transcribed and published this manuscript, but the Memoirs attracted only limited attention amongst a narrow circle of intellectuals, chiefly historians. It was only in 1943 that the poet George Seferis aroused more general interest in Makriyannis, through a lecture he gave in Alexandria and Cairo asserting to general astonishment that “Makriyannis is the most important prose writer of modern Greek literature, not the greatest only because we have Papadiamantis.” His vigorous reading of extracts supported his analysis.

The Memoirs then went through several editions and were widely read and discussed. An illiterate fighter’s popular sensibility elucidated history like a revelation.

As a witness to factional in-fighting, his work became popular with the left, sustaining their interpretation of the War of Independence as a class struggle between peasant-soldiers and landowner (or Phanariote) politicians.

Makriyannis’s vigorous language has appealed to Marxists, who have dominated the interpretation of his Memoirs. But there is popular piety and genuine faith on every page, unselﬁshness and a refusal to compromise. In his views on society and the individual he was always faithful to traditional Orthodox practice.

In 1983 a second spiritual testimony by Makriyannis was published. This was his Notebook, recording his personal spiritual experiences and prayers, interspersed with daily events. This second manuscript could be described as an Orthodox saint’s autobiography or Synaxari. The revolutionary fighter, tough garrison commander, opponent of politicians and Othonian despotism, and famous general who was condemned to death and had spent years in jail, had led a discrete life of asceticism, prayer and charismatic tears, his experience of the vision of God recalling the greatest hesychasts of the neptic tradition. His unselﬁshness is evident:

I said on Holy Thursday and Good Friday I would on these two days do 3,300 prostrations day and night ... I have no other way of thanking God but by my sinful prayer, 1,300 prostrations morning and evening and 100 with the prayer-robe, and whatever I can manage before I go to work and when I come home to give thanks, sinner that I am.

Zisimos Lorentzatos says that The Notebook is permeated by the three characteristics we find in all his writings: sudden light, tears, and the impossibility of describing the indescribable ... Apart from the tears of compassion – which Patriarch Kallistos Xanthopoulos calls a sign of the spirit’s participation in noetic prayer and a desire, in the humility of poverty, for ceaselessly ﬂowing tears (On Prayer 31) – and the acknowledged impossibility of setting down what he attempts to describe – “and I cannot represent how the light troubled me and the terror and the tears of my eyes” (258); “how can I, my dear readers, describe this beauty and great light?” (251) – there are indications which enable us, I believe, to be almost certain (naturally, as far as possible) that Makriyannis in the last years of his life not only followed the difﬁcult path of noetic prayer, the “Pray without ceasing” – “Today, Friday, I struggled for many hours with sinful tears; on the other days I spend four hours, morning and evening, in prayer,
when I go out of the house, and when I return, and when I am about to eat” (252) — but was sometimes also granted, it seems, the union which is “the summit of desire” where the eternal light, ‘if it gazes at itself, it sees light, or if it gazes at that which it sees, again it sees light, or if it gazes at that which gives the vision, it sees light there too; and such is the union, where all things are one, so that the one who sees cannot distinguish either the means or the goal or the essence, but only that it is light and that he sees light which resembles nothing created.”

Makriyannis’s theology in the Memoirs or more especially in The Notebook did not interest progressive Greek intellectuals. When John Vlachoyannis showed the recently discovered manuscript to George Theotokas in 1941, he responded: “This is the work of a madman.” And Linos Polites in his preface to The Notebook says: “The religious mania of the aged Makriyannis is offensive to us today.” Most reactions were in the same vein. Even psychiatrists were sought to support the view that head wounds that Makriyannis had suffered had brought about a form of paranoia.

Makriyannis’s marginalized witness brings hope that the Church’s Gospel and its universal Greek embodiment survive and function invisibly like the buried “mustard seed.” As Makriyannis said: “It is our fate as Greeks always to be few. From beginning to end, from antiquity to this day, all the beasts fight to devour us but they cannot. They consume us but the leaven remains.”

XVI

The Theological Schools

The University of Athens was founded by royal decree on April 24, 1837, with faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy.

A theological faculty in a state university, outside Church supervision, was quite new in the Orthodox world. Theology was to be taught like any other subject, as in the Ionian Academy which had been set up by the British administration. The government consented to the autonomy of the Athenian faculty, and Church leaders did not express any reservations. It was based chiefly on the Protestant German model.

Contemporaries hardly appreciated the consequences. What was uppermost in people’s minds was the urgent need for theological training, most clerics being uneducated and barely able to read or write. Well-educated missionaries were active throughout the country and even clerics studied at their schools. There seemed no alternative to a European education for theological students.

The effect on Greek ecclesiastical consciousness was more insidious than the autocephaly, which had undermined Orthodox unity. Theology as an independent science transforms the experience of the Gospels, reducing salvation to an intellectual formula, a philological approach to the sources and an “objective” historicism.

In the Church’s tradition, theology conveyed the collective experience of the ecclesial body, a witness to participation in
salvation, with an immediate sense of true life beyond corruption and death. Theology could not be separated from the liturgical life of the eucharistic community, the experience of ascetic, and the writings of "eyewitnesses of the Word" who "not only learn but also experience the divine things", the true fathers of faith. Gregory of Nyssa contrasted theology with outer learning, which "is without live issue, always in labor but never giving birth."

Neither Church leaders nor theology professors asked themselves whether a faculty modeled on the German Protestant universities, with their curricula and "scientism," satisfied the Orthodox understanding of theology.

A second state theological faculty was founded at the University of Thessalonica in 1925 by government decree, although it did not become operational until 1941. An identical system was put in place with the same intellectualist curricula, but still nobody objected. Theological schools had been founded in Russia, Serbia, Romania and Paris with Western theological curricula and teaching programs. But they retained close links with the Church's pastoral administration and liturgical worship, unlike in Greece.

Greek state theological faculties were not bastions of liberalism and secularism. But the teachers perpetuated the division between conservatives and liberals. Conservatives followed mostly Roman Catholic models, while liberals preferred Protestant patterns. European models were always followed, the German having priority in the universities. As Timothy Ware remarks, in Greek academic theology of the last hundred years it is often easy to guess whether the German university at which the author studied was Protestant or Roman Catholic.

The radical Westernization of university theology in Greece has never allowed the question to be put whether theological studies could be organized in any way other than that imposed by a Western perspective. Western programs and teaching methods seemed to have a self-evident validity. The "Orthodoxy" of the teachers was merely formal and "confessional."

Orthodoxy in Greek universities always rested on the letter of doctrine. In spite of their German academic background, Greek university theologians considered themselves impeccably loyal to the formal expressions of Orthodox doctrine. They liked to represent "Orthodoxy" at ecumenical conferences and inter-church dialogues - as a "middle way" between the "extremes" of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, even when they officially represented the Orthodox patriarchates and national Churches.

But no ideological formula could explain the difference between the Church (Orthodoxy) and the religious confessions. What differentiates the Church is its denial of the confessional and ideological approach to dogma, its insistence on the primary important of the experience of the ecclesial body as expressed in the conciliar definitions, an insistence on the importance of asceticism, worship, and the eucharistic nature of authentic life.

Oblivious to the primary and essential characteristics of Orthodoxy, academic theologians accepted the inclusion of theology in the state universities as a subject like any other. Academic theologians in metropolitan Greece seemed unaware of the historical origins of the position they adopted: when and why theology appeared as a "science" independent of ecclesial experience; when and how a rationalist approach to faith arose in accordance with scientific evidence; when and why faith and theology were separated; or how theology became a science; analogies came to be sought between the "principles" of faith and scientific "values," God became an "object" of theological science, physical and metaphysical "certainties" began to be approached in the same way, the Gospels came to be subjected to textual criticism, and so on.
The first Athens professors of theology were Theokleitos Pharmakidis, his close collaborator Archimandrite Misael Apostolidis, and the layman Konstantinos Kontogonis. Pharmakidis never actually taught. Apostolidis began teaching dogmatics, ethics and Old Testament exegesis, but the burdens of ecclesiastical administration and his ordination as metropolitan of Athens soon made him resign. Thus from 1838 to 1852 the theological faculty of the University of Athens had only Konstantinos Kontogonis, who taught every subject singlehanded.

Konstantinos Kontogonis (1812-1878) shaped the character of the first university-level theological studies in Greece — and “created a modern Greek theological language.” Born and educated in Trieste, in 1830 he went to Germany to study theology and philosophy at the universities of Munich and Leipzig. Returning in 1836, he was appointed professor a year later. He wrote textbooks on patrology and the archaeology of Israel, an introduction to the Scriptures and an ecclesiastical history.

In 1852 a second professor was appointed, Damianos Liveropoulos, who taught for four years. He was succeeded by Archimandrite Dionysios Kleopas, who was succeeded in turn, a year later, by the priest Panayiotis Robotis. “Twenty years after its foundation the university’s theological faculty acquired a second permanent professor. A number of years were needed before two more professors were appointed and fifty years after the foundation of the faculty for the fifth and sixth professors to be added.”

Consequently, lack of teaching staff was reflected in the small number of students, since the faculty could not offer a substantial education. There were rarely more than five students and in many years only one or two. Most students soon abandoned their studies, with the result that there were only two graduates in twenty-five years.

Throughout the nineteenth century the theological faculty of the University of Athens hardly existed. From its foundation until 1904 there was only one academic year in which there were more than three graduates. “The people’s religious needs” were served by the Western missionaries “whom the government appointed as teachers of religion in the state schools.”

Only at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the faculty’s teaching staff was increased, did the number of students expand. Most of the hundred or so students who enrolled were sent home for two years after the great influx of refugees from Asia Minor in 1922. The faculty did not regain its numbers until the period of Greece’s rapid postwar urbanization.

A few more teachers and students and the opening of a second theological faculty in Thessalonica were insufficient to change the marginalized nature of Greek academic theology. For intellectuals of European sensibility, even in its Westernized form theology seemed old-fashioned and dogmatic. And lay piety, rooted in the living experience of Orthodox tradition, found imported German theology totally alien.

It was partly the university theologians’ fault. From the start they isolated themselves by cultivating a hermetic academic specialization, which interested neither intellectuals nor the Greek Church. Vital specialized research should not preclude wider intellectual interests or be cut off from the experience of the ecclesiial body and social life as a whole.

Greek academic theologians tended to evade real problems. Their theological works were written mainly to demonstrate technical skill in presenting neutral and uncontroversial themes in an “objective” manner. The writers’ prime motive was to establish professional competence. It sufficed to treat important aspects of the Church’s doctrine by presenting an annotated, thematically arranged catalogue of relevant pas-
sages, with long footnotes drawn from foreign secondary literature. Avoiding engagement with difficult problems helped secure an academic career.

To engage with real problems and debate spiritual issues requires a broad culture rarely seen in Greek academic theologians. In Greece an interest in theology has always carried with it a certain social stigma. The "enlightened" spiritual climate created by intellectuals and the inadequacy of the theologians themselves meant that city people derided theology. Religious studies seemed the last resort for less gifted children, chiefly peasants' sons, incapable of establishing themselves in the professions.

An academic career was the only way of improving their social status. They lacked broad culture but did little to acquire it, wishing only to overcome the social disadvantage of being a theologian. The supposed scientific validity of their research promised to improve their "social" status but merely increased their marginalization.

Most Greek university theologians were timid positivists. There were a few exceptions, mostly from sophisticated urban families (such as Demetrios Balanos, Hamilcar Alivizatos and Vasilis Stephanidis), who, in spite of their defensive attitude as "scientific" theologians, took a full part in social life and were at ease in intellectual circles.

University theology was cut off from the country's spiritual life and is now merely of specialist interest. It is not pursued with reference to the secular environment and people's thirst for truth, or even with reference to the ecclesial body and the needs and problems of believers.

This sterile academicism was imported from abroad and was cut off from social reality. Its public image continues to decline. In the preliminary examinations of the universities, candidates in theology usually gain the lowest grades. The professors offer students unimpressive teaching, and the sermons delivered by clerical and lay theologians in the churches rarely impress the public. Their stilted theological language cannot convey social interaction or collective experience.

The "language question" which divided Greece for over a hundred and fifty years -- the "katharevousa" versus "demotic" controversy -- never troubled the theologians, who followed the state-imposed "official" language, which until 1976 was a precondition for an academic career. When the government changed the rules, theologians dutifully adopted a language which was equally artificial.

Opposition to any linguistic straightjacket imposed from above -- the struggle for genuineness of expression -- begins when empirical truth and common experience need to be communicated. But empirical and social reality never seems to have impinged on Greek university theology. Theological language has remained tied to the formalization of Western science. Whether using the archaizing or the modified katharevousa, it insists on the "objectivity" and neutrality of a professional version of theology.

Greek theology was marooned beyond the reach of living language without becoming a true empirical science. It confined itself to a narrow circle which avoided spiritual matters of concern to the general public and questions debated by Greek intellectuals. The archaizing katharevousa remained dominant for decades until it was replaced by state "demotic," exemplifying theology's isolation from the country's traditions and the problems of the laity. Living linguistic expression is theology's vital need. It is through language that the fundamental difference between ecclesiastical theology and religious teaching or dogmatic ideology is revealed.

Theological language should always be apophatic. It should not claim to exhaust the truth in its expression. Words can only indicate the truth, they can never substitute it. By understanding the expression we do not necessarily recognize the truth, because truth is not simply intellectual like the
Platonic logos of beings. Truth in ecclesiastical theology is unrestricted by time, space, and the corruption of death: it is the persons and the energies of the persons, the otherness of the word or logos of what is brought about by the personal energy. And this truth can only be known in the experiential immediacy of relation.

Language signifies relation, invites relation, and serves relation, but cannot replace the universality of relation, the experiential knowledge which creates relation. Linguistic expression can therefore only mark the limits of truth; it is always relative and suggestive of truth, functioning through poetic images. It does not obey rules of methodology and formal logic. In the language of ecclesiastical theology, mutually contradictory concepts can lead to their transcendence. By accepting contradiction, humanity can participate in reality, not just its representation.

Apocalypticism differentiates Orthodoxy from the West in clear, striking language. The West denied the apocalypticism of theological expression, understanding truth as the “coincidence of meaning with the object of thought.” It identified the power of knowing truth with the individual’s capacity to understand concepts, with the capacity for correct thought. And it shaped a theological language utterly subject to this priority of individualistic intellectualism, which is the complete opposite of the Church’s way of expressing truth in apophatic language and images.

This did not come about by chance. Behind the denial of apophtic expression we may discern all the fundamental Western deviations from the Church’s Gospel. The denial of apocalypticism implies the rejection of the real nature of the Church, a falling away into an individualistic religiosity. The proclamation of salvation is no longer a call or invitation to change one’s mode of existence, to withdraw from individualism and participate in the communion of personal relations, in the authentic life of the eucharistic kingdom. The proclaimation of salvation in the language of individualistic intellectualism alienates it, turning it into a religious teaching which through the comprehension of individuals aims at an individualistic faith and an individualistic conformity to its moral requirements.

The denial of apophticism implies a reversal of the terms of Orthodox ontology, a reliance on the priority of the divine essence, which is accessible only intellectually, and not on the priority of the Person, who is known only in the experiential immediacy of relation and historical revelation. The denial of apophticism implies a rejection of the distinction between essence and the essence’s energies, a rejection of the creature’s participation in the grace of the energies of the Uncreated, in the Uncreated’s mode of existence. Without apophticism salvation only adds an inexplicable (created but “supernatural”) grace to existence, which cannot explain how life is released from the bounds of nature, how existence is drawn from the freedom of relation.

Briefly, a theological language without apophticism, such as is characteristic of novel Western doctrines, can overturn the Church’s Gospel. The language of individualistic intellectualism cannot express an empirical participation in the ecclesial reality of salvation. Apophtic language inculcates the Church from heresy and theology from ideology.

Greek university theology has almost entirely ignored the apophtic language of ecclesiastical tradition, not only the apophtic approach but even the word “apophticism.” It has swallowed positivism and its language without demur. Even in university publications the language adopted by Greek academic theology shows it to be thoroughly Westernized and alienated from its roots. Greek theologians respect the letter of dogma, but their language makes it abstract and formal. Such language separates truth from life, knowledge from experience and the Gospel’s revelation from the eucharistic fact of the Church. This betrayal
earning a doctorate at Leipzig, he taught at the Theological School of Halki, Greek gymnasia in Romania and Crete, and the Marasleion School in Athens. Appointed Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology at the University of Athens in 1912, he remained there, with absences for political reasons, until his death.


Androutsos's philosophical expertise, intelligence, and systematic mind were much admired and assured him a brilliant academic career. He was the first professor capable of attracting audiences to his lectures from other faculties. In spite of reservations about his philosophical work, he was revered as a theologian in official ecclesiastical circles. His formulations of doctrine were regarded as a criterion of Orthodoxy, and reference to his work was obligatory for any theological writing that wished to be taken seriously.

But his Western presuppositions were obvious. Even colleagues less learned than he about Orthodoxy accused him of "Western influences" for his use of non-Orthodox sources. But in fact his whole approach was Western-inspired. He had a legalistic, rationalist mind. He was distrustful of experience, uninterested in the truth of personhood, and denied the distinction between essence and energies. His *Dogmatics* is typical: the culmination of the unconscious process of the Westernization of Greek scholars that had begun in the fourteenth century.

of ecclesiastical theology turns the Gospel of salvation into a religion.\textsuperscript{311}

This applies to all Greek academic theologians, regardless of their teaching, research, or spiritual stature. There is no doubt that an unconscious Westernization prevails. Rare exceptions since the 1960s confirm the rule. Several able personalities stand out amidst obvious mediocrity, maintaining integrity when others have compromised. In the last 150 years these professors have honored their academic specialty and won general respect: Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, Gregorios Papamichael, Hamilcar Alivizatos and Georgios Soterios may be singled out as examples.

Academic promotions are rarely on merit. For decades an ambitious student attaches himself to a professor, whose authority provides contacts and financial support for postgraduate work. An academic "assistant" is often treated like a domestic servant for many years. When he finally becomes a professor, he puts younger men through the same humiliations.

Such professors and colleagues who had inherited tenure from their fathers often resisted the rise of ability and talent. Mediocrity was perpetuated and promotion on merit required an unusual combination of circumstances.

Professional prospects for graduates were extremely limited in the theological faculty and the only possibility of a rise in social status lay in an academic career. After the Second World War, graduate studies were open to more students, which increased professional rivalry. Being a professor meant less, and the academic level declined.

One of the most representative figures of Greek academic theology is Christos Androutsos (1869-1935), whose reputation as an authoritative theologian has dominated the second half of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{312} Born in Kios in Bithynia, he studied at the central seminary of Constantinople and then at the Theological School of Halki, graduating in 1892. After
Androutos’s *Dogmatics* makes no reference to the experience of the ecclesial body, and severs faith from the experience of salvation. For him, faith is “the feeling through which a person senses, as it were, and becomes cognizant of the presence of God in the natural and moral world” (p. 37).

This faith “supports the Christian knowledge of God,” which is summed up in the “subjective assimilation of doctrines,” with the proviso that “the assimilation of doctrines takes place through the intellect” (p. 17), “rational thought being their formal instrument of expression, assimilation, and justification” (p. 13). Solitary feeling, individualistic intellectualism – the bases of the Western overturning of the ecclesial fact of salvation – transform faith into an emotional conviction and knowledge into the reception of ideology.

The reception of ideology “is supported by the certainty provided by the authenticity of revelation” (p. 37). Emotional conviction precedes it as the reception of this authenticity: it assumes recognition “of the divine power of the supernatural revelation that transcends human understanding” (pp. 13, 19). Revelation as something “supernatural” and “transcending human understanding” is cut off from historical experience of the incarnate Word or the contemplative life of the saints. Revelation is defined as the “theoretical teachings of faith” (p. 2), which are dealt with comprehensively by the objective “sources” of valid authority: Scripture and Tradition. This “theoretical” truth is inaccessible to experience. Doctrinal truth is only susceptible to “clarification” through various arguments that demonstrate its rationality, or from a moral or practical point of view as appropriate and suitable for our use” (p. 19).

These examples are sufficient to prove that Androutos’s theological assumptions were those of Roman Catholic scholasticism. On every page scholasticism masquerades as “Orthodox” dogmatics: an intellectual “clarification” of faith (the classic *manifestatio* of scholasticism), an appeal to “supernatural authority” (necessary *auctoritas*), a reliance on rational proof (the scholastic *modus argumentativus*, or *probatio credendorum*).

Androutos’s fidelity to the intellectualism and individualism of scholasticism is even more evident in the layout of his *Dogmatics*. The chapter “On God” begins with intellectual clarification of the “object” of cognition, which is “God,” defined primarily as a concept, that is, as essence and existence determined by necessary properties and additional natural, rational and moral qualities. The threefold nature of God follows, borrowed from Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*, and concludes the chapter.

The threefold nature of God does not come first because Androutos, like Western dogmatic theologians, did not recognize that it is only God’s personal mode of existence which makes possible his revelation and the knowledge that human beings can have of him. He omits the fundamentally experiential conviction of Orthodox theology: the distinction between God’s essence and his energies. Experiential knowledge of the divine Persons is never mentioned. Knowledge of God’s essence, existence and properties is merely intellectual, derived from natural and biblical revelation.

Faith is subjected to reductive definitions: divine providence, the incarnation of the Word, the Church, the sacraments, and the Last Things are all presented as the ideological “content” of what is received intellectually and are analyzed in a severely syllogistic manner.

Rationalism leads Androutos to scholastic hermeneutics. He accepts Anselm’s juristic interpretation of Christ’s crucifixion, which presents the Gospel of salvation as a psychological complex of guilt, redemption and justification. Androutos finds in Anselm “elements either completely alien to the Church’s thinking or developed under the influence of foreign models,” but accepts that Anselm’s fun-
damental thought on the Lord’s death is shared by Holy Scripture and the Fathers.\textsuperscript{318}

Androuitos’s brilliant theological oeuvre may not be deep scholarship but displays coherent thought. This exceptionally intelligent man impressed and surprised the public, which had not encountered many gifted intellectuals.

Greek theological circles that consider themselves “conservative” seem unable to recognize outdated Western thought in Androuitos’s \textit{Dogmatics}. Modern Greek scholars show uncritical admiration for Western intellectualism. Rationalism is being questioned in the West,\textsuperscript{319} while naïve faith in the objective validity of intellectual proof still prevails in Greece.

Androuitos’s work acquired authority. That he was respected in Western Europe flattered Greek academia, but he borrowed much from scholastic handbooks, seeking to defend a “middle way” between Roman Catholic and Protestant points of view. Contemporaries lacked criteria to judge how alien this confessional “middle way” Orthodoxy is to the Church’s Gospel, the experience of the saints, the witness of worship, and the knowledge which bodily asceticism brings.

It is a meager concept that cannot elucidate the problems of existence or help people balanced on the knife-edge of life and death.

A more significant figure was Panayiotis Trembelas (1886-1977).\textsuperscript{320} Born in Hypsinda (Stenmita) of Gortynia, he studied at the theological faculty of Athens without undertaking any postgraduate work in Europe. Awarded a doctorate in theology in 1908, ten years later he was elected Extraordinary Professor of the History of Symbolics, though his appointment was never confirmed. Finally in 1939, during the dictatorship of John Metaxas, he was appointed Professor of Practical Theology, Catechetics, Liturgy and Ecclesiastical Rhetoric, a post he held until 1957, often also covering other fields, such as apologetics and canon law.

Panayiotis Trembelas belonged to a small group of theologians who in 1907, under the leadership of Archimandrite Eusebios Matheopoulos, founded the “Zoe” Brotherhood of Theologians. This small organization steadily developed into a mass extra-ecclesiastical movement which decisively influenced the faith and devotion of the laity. Trembelas devoted himself wholeheartedly to this movement and served it through his extensive preaching and writing. Unlike other “Zoe” leaders, alongside a naïve moralism, supposedly suited to the needs of the laity, he continued to pursue his academic theological work.

His 2,035 publications covered most aspects of academic theology.\textsuperscript{321} He wrote commentaries on all the books of the New Testament, with long extracts from patristic texts. He published critical editions of \textit{Three Liturgies} and the \textit{Small Euchologion} on the basis of the liturgical manuscripts preserved in the libraries of Athens. He wrote books on homiletics and catechetics. He systemically refuted materialism, nihilism, and historical criticism of the Gospels. He also published studies on dogmatics, symbolics, and canon law. He translated the New Testament into the vernacular. His three-volume \textit{Dogmatics} defended Christian doctrine with many patristic texts.

A “workaholic,” his literary output is unmatched. His energy was astonishing. Amidst dry academicism, Trembelas was a dynamic presence. Never a careerist like most of his university colleagues, he grappled with real problems and illuminated areas of vital theological interest. His written works possess a clarity and immediacy then unknown in academia.

Trembelas’s stature is sadly diminished by his entrapment in a Western theological outlook. He stands out from the spiritual environment of his time yet was also part of it. From his youth he was an active member of a movement seeking to bring about a “spiritual renewal” in Greece on the model
of Protestant pietism. He never questioned the movement’s compatibility with his own spiritual roots.

His vast output is steeped in pietistic moralism, accompanied by rationalistic apologetic. Whether commenting on Scripture or editing liturgical texts, he sought the individual “edification” of believers, sustaining a moralistic ideological “faith” with intellectual certainties and emotional convictions. Trembelas was totally unaware of the importance of participating in the reality of the Church, of the existential rather than legalistic character of sin, and of the Gospel’s re-orientation of life from nature to the grace of relationship.

As a young man he re-edited for “Zoe” a series of tendentious books which had been introduced into Greece by the Protestant missionaries in the nineteenth century. He was not troubled about their origin, being only concerned with the education of the faithful. The same motive inspired his translations of Protestant Sunday school texts for catechetical use by “Zoe.” His loyalty to the letter of Orthodox doctrine protected him and the movement from criticism which might have hindered their “missionary” work. For Trembelas, Orthodoxy was simply moral purity of life and the emotional convictions which sustained it, and every page he wrote proves it.

Trembelas borrowed patristic texts out of context to support ethical and pietistic individualism. For the first fifty years of “Zoe’s” activity he based his catechesis and preaching entirely on Scripture, in accordance with the Protestant principle of sola scriptura, while composing his New Testament commentaries. Trembelas bolstered the movement’s suspect Orthodoxy with passages from Scripture and the Fathers to support his pietistic approach. He followed the same procedure in his three-volume Dogmatics, thus inaugurating a new era of “neo-scholasticism” in Greece, in which an intellectualist argumentatio concerning “truths” is drawn from an appeal to the auctoritas of Scripture and the Fathers. This “neo-scholasticism” has continued to dominate Greek theology, disguising distortions of the Church’s Gospel with patristic references.

The frequent citation of patristic texts in Trembelas’s Dogmatics escapes the arid intellectualism characteristic of Androutos, and makes dogma less academic and more devout. But the final result is no better than any other “confessional” exposition. There is the same religious ideology analyzed according to the requirements of an intellectualist methodology. The work provoked strong protests from the Orthodox, while Roman Catholics undertook its translation and publication, since it seemed to suggest that few differences separated the two churches.

Trembelas regarded Androutos’s Dogmatics as unimpeachably Orthodox, and therefore retained his arrangement of subjects and his intellectualist methodology. For example, under the heading of “Fundamental Principles of Dogmatics” Trembelas begins with a chapter “On Religion” where he proves the superiority of monotheistic and especially “revealed” religions (Judaism and Christianity) with arguments on the undoubted authority of “supernatural” revelation. In the chapter on God he begins with “The Correct Concept of God” and follows it with “The Properties of God,” “The Attributes of God,” concluding with “The Doctrine of the Trinity.” There is no acknowledgment in this exposition of the profound difference separating the Church’s experience of God from any religious ideology.

This ideological religious approach, founded on the twin bases of intellectualism and pietism, is evident in every chapter of Trembelas’s Dogmatics. With his mechanistic version of divine grace, his juristic concept “of the satisfaction of divine justice by the death of Christ on the cross,” his equally juristic idea of confession and penance, he distorts the Church’s experience, expressing it in legalistic and ideological language.
In spite of the accumulated patristic references, the final result is a systematic confessional dogmatics on the scholastic model, foreign to the spirit and mentality of the Fathers. Tremblenas aspired to complete Androuitos's *Dogmatics*, "combining historical and analytical with systematic and synthetic methodologies," as did "Roman Catholic and most Protestant dogmatic handbooks." He simply uses the Fathers to provide a historical context for dogma: "the exposition of dogma includes its history."

Tremblenas's *Dogmatics* is an interesting construct: a non-Orthodox treatise compiled from Orthodox materials. The patristic references do not change the extra-ecclesiastical character of a work which seeks to differentiate Orthodoxy as a denomination from Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Appealing to the Fathers does not guarantee Orthodoxy, nor does appealing to Scripture. Selected patristic passages can be used to construct a scholastic dogmatics, or perhaps a heretical work. "To attribute a purely mechanical and infallible authority to the Fathers and a kind of patristic scholasticism to theology is in reality the most radical denial of the spirit of patristic theology."

Tremblenas chose patristic texts selectively to support his intellectualizing perspective. Transcending intellectual forms is never suggested as an approach to the experience of truth, where the word becomes Person, and knowledge vision. The distinction between God's essence and energies is not presented as the vital differences between the Church's experiential theology and any metaphysical ideology. Only half a page is devoted to this distinction, in the form of a footnote. St. Gregory Palamas is mentioned only three times in 1,750 pages, John Climacus once, and Isaac the Syrian or Symeon the New Theologian never at all.

Tremblenas's *Dogmatics* was published fifty years after Androuitos's, by which time the study of the Fathers and Orthodox theology had been transformed. At least Androuitos had been working at a time when the entire theological climate was shaped by the rationalistic demands of "natural theology," pietism and "emotional religion." All the instruments of study available to him pointed in this direction.

But fifty years later things had radically changed. In 1944 Vladimir Lossky's *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* had rediscovered the patristic presuppositions of theology, but Tremblenas totally ignored it. Florovsky's ecclesiological and Meyendorff's first Palamite studies had appeared, together with the pioneering articles of Lot-Borodine. And above all the postwar flowering of patristic studies had taken place, the unexpected turning of leading Roman Catholic theologians to the study of the Greek Fathers of the undivided Church, notably Daniilou, Dalmai, Congar, Bouyer, de Lubac, Balthasar and Ivanka. Existential philosophy inspired Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians to abandon intellectualism and moralism. It suffices to mention the names of Karl Barth, Karl Rahner, Paul Tillich and Rudolf Bultmann.

Tremblenas ignores all these astonishing developments, the dynamic revival of Orthodox self-awareness and the impact on European theology of the Russian diaspora after 1917. He appears unaware of the works of Bulgakov, Afanassieff, Uspensky, Berdiaev, Kyprian Kern, Zander and Zenkovsky. But these vigorous pioneers had opened Western eyes to the treasures of the Orthodox tradition. They actively recalled the apophatic character of dogma, the eucharistic constitution of the Church, the dynamic theology of icons and the richness of Philokalian spirituality. Europe and North America valued the contribution of the Russian diaspora. Centers and university chairs were founded for the study of Orthodox, Byzantium and the Greek Fathers. Western theologians published specialized journals and detailed studies. They discovered the art and theology of the icon, the "mystagog" of Orthodox worship, and the witness of Eastern monasticism.
It was within this historical context that Trembelas wrote his *Dogmatics*, ignoring these developments entirely. Every page makes reference to minor Western nineteenth-century theologians, such as Martensen and Van Oosterzee. He was completely unfamiliar with his contemporaries. And he refers to no Protestant theological work later than 1891. If Trembelas had been unable to discover the essentials of Orthodox theology in the patristic texts themselves, he could have gained valuable information from the relevant publications of his day.34

Two years before his death, his final work, *Mysticism-Apophaticism, Catachetical Theology*, reveals him still oblivious to the fundamentals of the Church’s theology. This book was written in opposition to the theological awakening which was beginning to be felt in Greece, the rediscovery of the essential elements of Orthodox self-awareness. Trembelas perceived that the first step in recovering this self-awareness, the rejection of intellectualism and moralism, threatened the missionary ideal to which he had dedicated his life and the theological ideas which his writings supported. He therefore went on the offensive.

The apophatic way of making theological statements is incompatible with intellectualism, as is the mystical experience of the ecclesial body with moralism. Trembelas therefore tries to prove that apophaticism “taken by itself and studied without any connection or direct link with catachetical theology leads, if not to atheism, at least to an extreme agnosticism,”33 while mysticism “becomes a source of delusion in Christian teaching because the individual forms the conviction that truths are revealed to him through visions that transcend the written divine revelation. Thus the Scriptures are depreciated and with them reason and even the firm conclusions of science.”35

In his polemic against apophaticism and mystical experience Trembelas set himself against not only theoretical argu-

ments but also the living example of saints who had guided the Church in experiencing the vision of God and expressing an apophatic theology. He bitterly attacked outstanding figures in the Church’s life, attributing Symeon the New Theologian’s experience of the vision of God “to frayed nerves … this is not unlikely when we are probably dealing with peculiar sensitivities deriving from nervous exhaustion in a context in which such experiences are expected to take place.”37 He suspects, moreover, that “some of Symeon’s expressions … suggest Messalian influence,”38 and that therefore the saint’s witness is not entirely free from heresy.

Trembelas was even more scathing about Dionysius the Areopagite. “It is impossible to rate someone highly who hides under a pseudonym as a Church Father … someone who through a fictitious name seeks to assume the authority of an apostolic Father … Apart from using Neoplatonic terminology deriving from Plotinus instead of Christian theological terms, Pseudo-Dionysius has nothing new to offer.”39 Trembelas unhesitatingly attributes to him “pantheistic tendencies,” and “Neoplatonic opinions.” He condemns him for “belonging to a strongly anti-Chalcedonian Monophysite environment,” and for saying in his apophatic teaching that “the Godhead is all but annihilated by the negation of every attribute and cognitive approach.”40

Trembelas also attacked the *Spiritual Homilies* of St. Macarius of Egypt. In his view these writings “present us with the image of a man who out of excessive enthusiasm has a high opinion of himself … a man in a morbid state,” who does not allow us “to assert that he is free from all delusion and not subject through inexperience to the temptation of pride, given that ecstasy and divine eros are both found outside Christianity (cf. fire-walkers, dervish dancers etc.).”41

When he comes to St. Maximus the Confessor, Trembelas does not dare to attack him directly. He begins simply by contending that, “misled by the pseudonymity of the author
of the Areopagical writings and believing that he was really the Areopagite converted by St. Paul in Athens, Maximus was seduced by Pseudo-Dionysius’s philosophical tendencies and mystical experience as set out systematically by him, and became his follower and commentator.” He believed Maximus was faithful to the rationalist demands of cataphatic theology and the practical aims of moralism after all, so that he is a reliable example confirming that only when supported by Orthodox dogma and Orthodox cataphatic theology can apophaticism be prevented from falling either into pantheism or into rationalistic agnosticism.

Even the supreme expression of the apophatic understanding of ecclesiastical experience, Maximus’s “use of the allegorical and analogical exegesis of biblical texts ... is undoubtedly used purely for purposes of edification,” that is, “for moral exegesis.” Maximus “appears as a confessor and teacher of the Orthodox faith even in moral teachings conveyed allegorically.”

Finally, Trembeslas even tries to ascribe a purely moral character to Gregory Palamas’s teaching “on the purification of the mind and its illumination through its participation in divine grace.” He does not dare to accuse Palamas of “nervous exhaustion,” or “a morbid sensitivity leading to a constant flow of tears” or “a patrician tendency to erotic and mystical arousal,” or whatever else he accused Symeon of, since the Palamite defense of the Hesychasts’ vision of God had been confirmed by three great Orthodox synods.

Trembeslas could not resist many cutting remarks about the “the naïve Hesychasts.” Nor did he refrain from accusing Gregory Palamas “of at times giving his teachings a more highly colored character than was necessary; or of expressing himself so obscurely that, lacking at first sight dogmatic precision, they were open to misunderstanding.”

He also accuses him of “taking the opposite direction to scholastic theology but falling into the same confusion,” and making “the simple essence of God composite.” He regarded Palamas’s chief fault as unaware that the Areopagical writings were pseudonymous, he treated them as apostolic in origin and accorded them a confidence, authority, and respect almost as great as that due to the divinely inspired writings of the apostles. That is why he followed Pseudo-Dionysius’s apophaticism precisely.

Trembeslas wanted to derive all Gregory Palamas’s teaching from Scripture, complete with moralistic pietism. For him, purification, spiritual vigilance, illumination, participation in the uncreated energies and the deification of humanity all refer to biblical teachings about the moral improvement of the individual and the acquisition of “virtues.”

Trembeslas clearly adhered to the Protestant principle of sola scriptura. Revelation for him was a demonstrably infallible and divinely inspired “source.” He had no experience of an approach to revelation which transcends religious individualism, subjective understanding and the emotional acceptance of an objective authority. He translates every category of personal relation, erotic self-transcendence, living communion and existential mutual coinherence into an individualistic moralism or intellectualism.

Thus Trembeslas’s interpretation of Palamite texts leads to the astonishing conclusion that “holiness and deification in the present life are attributes like depravity and hardness. They are changes of character, moral transformations.”

Deification, or theosis, the Church’s hope and Gospel, the witness of the arduous asceticism of the saints, the participation of the creature in the authentic life of the Uncreated are for Trembeslas no more than moral improvement of character. The transfer of existence from nature to relation, the sensible vision of the light of the personal presence of the divine – a direct experience of the Hesychast saints that is fundamental to Palamite theology and distinguishes it from
the religious ideology of the West – is for Tremelias intellectual knowledge and moral enlightenment. In his own words, “It is the permanent establishment in the soul of the knowledge of God by divine illumination that dispels moral darkness.” And this knowledge of God “is beyond reason, but never contrary to reason,” since “the mysteries pertaining to God transcend all comprehension and understanding but are never contrary to reason.”

Tremelias’s last book conveys a neo-pietism, drawing authority from frequent reference to patristic texts, which has flourished in Greece for decades.

But Tremelias lacks even formal criteria for analyzing patristic texts. He confuses apophaticism with scholasticism’s *theologia negativa,* erotic “ek-stasy” with the natural exaltation of dancing dervishes and fire-walkers, or identified the “mystical” experience of personal communion between created and Uncreated with an individualistic mysticism “which ties all the soul’s faculties to the emotions and sets the human mind to one side, completely stifling its ability to gain knowledge and crushing its inner life.”

My discussion of this work is critical of the ideas, not the man. Tremelias’s personal qualities were admirable. He was the product of his education and religious environment – a result of the alienation of Orthodox self-awareness in Greece created by the extra-ecclesiastical organizations.

---

**XVII**

**The Extra-Ecclesiastical Organizations**

Autonomous religious groups, outside the visible unity of the ecclesial body under the local bishop, first emerged in Greece in the late nineteenth century. Clerical and lay “zealots” – “without consulting any bishop” – embarked on a missionary enterprise to bring about the religious awakening of the people.

From its inception, this movement has always been controversial. The groups never described themselves as extra-ecclesiastical, claiming to be the most dynamic expression of the Church’s life. Therefore, before examining the historical roots of the movement, we must first assess its character and identity.

These “zealot” groups or “brotherhoods” were set up as secular “associations,” with rights guaranteed by state legislation under protection afforded constitutionally to free associations. Extra-ecclesiastical by definition, their missionary activity was outside the bishop’s jurisdiction. They refused to be integrated into institutions which express the unity of the ecclesial body. Secular status guaranteed their independence from the Church.

They benefited from state-guaranteed autonomy from the Church, supposedly to assist the Church to “Christianize” the people more effectively. They claimed to preach the Church’s truth, while refusing to participate in the Church by maintaining a relationship with the bishop of the ecclesial body and recognizing his fatherly role.
These groups organized themselves under civil legislation because they wanted to be independent of the local bishop’s control over their structure and activities. Not wanting to be regulated by the Church’s canons, they replaced the pastoral supervision of bishops and presbyters with presidents and administrative committees.

The secular associations nevertheless considered the expression “extra-ecclesiastical” highly offensive. This was because they had silently adopted a typically Protestant ecclesiology. Participation in the Church was not judged in terms of membership of the eucharistic body, or recognition of the bishop as head of the body, “as a type and in the place of Christ.” It was judged on the basis of individual faith and morality, the unity of the Church being seen in terms of ideological homogeneity. These organizations borrowed the Protestant ecclesiology of the “general priesthood of believers” (as distinct from the special priesthood of the clergy) to justify their independence from local episcopal control. They used biblical and patristic texts on the active role of the laity in the ecclesial body to justify the subordination of bishops and presbyters to the presidents and administrative councils of civil associations.

With the scholastic mentality of appealing to “authorities” to silence objections, they procured blessings and congratulatory letters from patriarchs and synods. For in the general climate of Westernization, there were always bishops and even synods and patriarchs prepared to praise extra-ecclesiastical organizations for their missionary work. Some bishops accepted group members as preachers and confessors in their dioceses, even though they took orders from elsewhere, only acknowledging the bishop incidentally.

This episcopal approval granted the groups legitimacy. They forgot that Orthodox bishops in the seventeenth century had welcomed Jesuit missionaries to their dioceses as preachers and confessors, or that Athonite monks had petitioned the Vatican for a school on Mount Athos to educate the Orthodox. The groups exploited the ignorance of the Church authorities.

There was of course some opposition. But this arose from an intuitive Orthodox unease rather than from clear theological criteria. Twice (in 1914 and 1923), after complaints from the clergy, the extra-ecclesiastical organization “Zoe” was delated to the Holy Synod for heresy. But on both occasions it was exonerated, since the Synod limited heresy to the fundamentals of Trinitarian and Christological theology, which the extra-ecclesiastical groups always avoided. They were only interested in dogma as a source of moralistic teaching, using it in the manner of the academic theology of the time. The dogmatic expression of the fundamentals of the Church’s experience, which the organizations distorted, was unfortunately unknown either to the bishops or to the “official” theology of the period.

There were some genuinely ecclesiastical objections, but very few. The first were made by Papadopoulos in his short stories The Didachos, The Makroktistina, The Aeuplanitos and his article The Makrakian Affair in Skiahos. He condemned Apostolos Makrakis’s “Logos School,” with its Protestant-style popular meetings, preaching and prayers, brilliantly portraying the bigoted religious hypocrites who flourished there, encouraged “by the many new creations of the various societies … resurrections, reformations, renaissances, revitalizations, and renewals, professing great improvements – because of all the professions in the country the one that rules the roost is the profession of religion.”

Later some criticisms were made by Photis Kontoglou of the religious associations, but that was all. The first episcopal protest against the unorthodoxy of these groups on the basis of clear ecclesiastical criteria had to wait until 1962, when Dionysios (Psarianos), metropolitan of Kozani, wrote:
The truth is simple. The Church is a body (soma) and the religious organizations are associations (somaitaia), that is, parasitic organisms on the body. And there is a further fact about the religious organizations: they are all without exception misled by an initially sincere zeal which ends up as fanaticism and intolerance against the Church itself ... In the "Plenary Meetings," the "Groups" and the "Circles," the belief is nurtured that there is nothing sound in the Church. Thus they succeed in influencing the thinking of the faithful. Their loyalty is not to the Church but to the religious organization to which they belong, which teaches them that they must set to work to put right the things that are wrong in the Church ... For all this organized effort no Church teaching is provided for the laity ... Their activities are pastorally unsupervised and ecclesiastically uncanonical. In their catechetical schools, Christian student unions, Christian professional associations, hostels and summer camps they give much vigorous teaching, but most of it outside the spirit, tradition, worship, and experience of the Church, which is the experience of the saints, the experience of obedience and self-denial.360

The first theological study of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations followed in 1966. This was a brief article by Apostolos Alexandridis, a civil engineer rather than a professional theologian.361 But it is based on sound ecclesiological criteria. Doctoral dissertations and other studies came later,362 but Alexandridis' article still remains an important theological analysis of what distinguishes the ecclesiastical body from the religious associations.

There are three basic reasons why extra-ecclesiastical organizations found Greece fertile territory.

The first was the low standard of the clergy, especially the episcopate, in post-revolutionary Greece. Ecclesiastical education was rudimentary. Traditional piety had been eroded by Western missionaries and the aggressive secularism of the state and the intelligentsia. The Church's subordination to the state, engineered by Pharmacides and the Bavarians, deprived the clergy of the national and social role they had played during the Turkish period, stripping them of all authority. The bishops had become civil servants, humbled by the arrogance of the government and unable to recover their essentially ecclesiastical apostolate. The politicians openly interfered with episcopal elections, with the result that simony was rife, ministers making large sums from the sale of sees.363 In these circumstances popular esteem for the clergy diminished, while many people sought more "authentic" and "spiritual" forms of religion outside the official Church. The appearance of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations responded to a real spiritual need.

The second reason for the rapid growth of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations was their close imitation of the methods of experienced Western missionaries, whom they openly admired.364 The laity were impressed by the flawless organization and effectiveness of these European-style missions, with their high moral standards highlighting the scandals and corruption of the Orthodox clergy. Many Greeks found their sophisticated European model attractive. Yet the organizations maintained their formal Orthodox identity, sparing their followers any problems of conscience.

The adoption of a Western-type systematic organization and activity inevitably brought with it the mentality, theology and teaching which formed it. It is difficult to determine whether the fundamental Westernization of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations arose from consciously accepting the Western version of the Church's Gospel, or simply from adaptation to the organizational methods of the missionaries. But the resultant theology was "naive," "simplistic" and "popularized," reminiscent of the pietistic offshoots of Protestantism and Catholicism.365 charged with intense moral fervor expressed in a private jargon.
The third reason for the rapid development of the extra-
ecclesiastical organizations in Greece was the migration of
rural populations to the cities. Urbanization in Greece came
about rapidly and without planning after the Second World
War. Many people became isolated from community life.
The social context and personal identity provided by the fa-
miliar environment of the village and the small parish was
lost.

The “official” Church failed to recognize the problem.
Parishes expanded out of all proportion. Attending church
no longer felt like participation in a eucharistic community.
Fellow worshipers were like strangers at a football game or
cinema.

To make up for the loss of community life, the extra-eccle-
siastical organizations set up “Bible study groups” (on
the Protestant Bibel Kreise model) in every neighborhood,
catechetical schools, and associations for parents, scientis-
tists, teachers and workers, which offered social integration
to rootless people. Pietistic good manners created a feeling
of belonging. The newcomers now considered themselves
properly urbanized, rejecting popular piety and traditional
forms of social life.

The first extra-ecclesiastical organization in Greece, called
the “Logos School,” was founded in September 1876 by
Apostolos Makrakis. Lessons for children were arranged,
and each evening the school functioned as a meeting place
for religious gatherings with philosophical lectures and ser-
mons.

Apostolos Makrakis (1831-1905) was perhaps the great-
est figure of his time. He was knowledgeable about pat-
ristic teaching, ancient Greek philosophy and modern
Western thought.366 “A man of deep faith, he studied the
Church Fathers and Greek philosophy and was familiar with
European thinkers, acquiring some remarkable insights into
Christian truth.”367

Makrakis was born in Siphnos and studied at Constantinople,
where he taught theology and philosophy at a secondary
school and wrote his first theological and philosophical
treatises. In 1862 he went to Paris as a private tutor for
two years, while studying European philosophy from Descartes
to Hegel, and writing three philosophical essays in French
which were later also published in Greek as a defense of
Christianity. He strongly criticized modern European phi-
losophy, particularly Descartes.368 He returned to Athens via
Constantinople in 1866 and began preaching evening ser-
mons in Omonoia Square, attracting large crowds for his
eloquence and originality. He attacked Masonic lodges and
was twice jailed for insulting the king.

Amongst his dedicated supporters were the archman-
drites Eusebios Matheopoulos, Zoe’s founder, and his uncle
Ierotheos Mitropoulos, later metropolitan of Patras. With
their collaboration Makrakis published a periodical called
Logos and later founded the “Logos School.”

In 1875 a simony scandal broke out, three clerics having
been elected to episcopal sees by bribing two government
ministers.

Makrakis and his colleagues denounced the fact in articles
and sermons and demanded the punishment of those re-
sponsible. After a public outcry, parliament was forced to refer
the matter to the courts. Both ministers received prison sen-
tences and the bishops were deposed. But the Synod neither
defrocked nor excommunicated the simoniacl bishops, and
this caused Makrakis to cease commemorating the met-
ropolitan of Athens in the Liturgy, and mount a bitter attack
on the Synod.

The intense public outcry provoked a violent reaction from
the government and the Synod. In 1878 the government
closed the Logos School and imprisoned Makrakis without
trial, while the Synod condemned seven Makrakisite clerics
to monastic exile. In 1883 all seven clerics recanted. In a
statement to the Synod they denounced Makrakis’s theological errors and his refusal to communicate with the hierarchy, the Synod having finally condemned the simoniacal bishops. The clerics who signed the statement were recalled from exile and reinstated by the Synod in 1884.

Makrakis found new collaborators for his political battles. He founded the religious associations “John the Baptist” (1877) and “John the Theologian” (1884), and the political associations “Constantine the Great” (1879) and “Plato” (1901). His political aim was the recovery of Constantinople and the restoration of the Byzantine Empire. He was four times an unsuccessful parliamentary candidate. He was repeatedly imprisoned, which intensified his opposition to the authorities.

He nevertheless found time to write a commentary on the entire New Testament, concentrating on the Book of Revelation. He also commented on the Psalms and published a number of polemical and apologetic tracts. From 1879 he began to show the first signs of mental illness. His political vision became eschatological and millennialist, based on the prophecies of “Agathangelos” and his own interpretations of Revelation. He saw Hellenism as a new Israel with himself as God’s chosen prophet destined to guide the nation in a worldwide mission and restore the kingdom of God on earth. He predicted earthquakes and extraordinary signs to vindicate his political delirium and role as leader.

This exceptionally gifted man thus sadly faded into oblivion. The Synod excommunicated him to silence him, invoking ludicrous theological arguments, such as his views on the tripartite composition of man. When he died, however, the Synod agreed to give him a church funeral. His religious associations still survive, maintained by a few devoted followers.

The most successful of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations was the “Zoe Brotherhood of Theologians.” Founded in 1907 by a few clerics and lay theologians, it became a broad religious movement for all social groups within forty years. Centrally controlled, with a wide regional network and many active and disciplined members, it developed an effective missionary strategy, decisively influencing ecclesiastical, political and social life, and becoming a model for subsequent groups.

Zoe grew out of the Logos School, founded by Makrakis’s collaborator, Archimandrite Eusebios Matthopoulos (1849-1929). Exiled over the simony affair, Matthopoulos distanced himself from Makrakis and his excesses.

Matthopoulos’s spiritual roots predisposed him to a zealot career. Born in the village of Trestiana of Gortynia, at the age of fourteen he became a novice under the hieromonk Ignatios Lambropoulos at the Mega Spelaion monastery. Ignatios Lambropoulos (1814-1869) was linked to the first nineteenth-century zealot groups. A close collaborator of Kosmas Phlamiatos, he had been imprisoned with him during the Papoulakos revolt and for the entire Othonian period was confined to the Mega Spelaion monastery. He later became an itinerant preacher and famous father confessor. An admirer of Makrakis, he gave hospitality to him at Mega Spelaion.

Eusebios Matthopoulos remained at the monastery for eight years until Ignatios’s death. At seventeen he became a monk and at twenty-one was ordained deacon. Two years later he settled in Athens, where he studied at the Varvakeion gymnasium and enrolled in the university’s faculty of philosophy, though he never graduated.

In Athens he joined Makrakis and dedicated himself to the work of the Logos School. In 1876 he was ordained and was appointed confessor to a small monastery harboring Makrakis’s sympathizers. After the simony scandal, his exile to the monastery of Palaioastritsa in Corfu, and his break with Makrakis, he traveled around country towns in Greece.
preaching and confessing from 1884 to 1906. He refused ecclesiastical prepayment and was supported by his family, retaining independence from the ecclesiastical administration but possessing the Synod’s formal authorization to preach.

In 1907 Matthopoulos gathered around him a small group of young theologians, students and other lay people whose piety he had witnessed during his travels, establishing with them a community called “Zoe.” As a civil association, it was safeguarded from episcopal interference. The most distinguished member of this group was Panayiotis Tremblas. Another member, the young archimandrite Dionysios Pharakoulis, acquired a reputation for preaching, and a little later the talented cleric Seraphim Papakostas also became prominent.

In keeping with its cenobitic character, the Brotherhood insisted on the three monastic virtues of chastity, poverty and obedience, but not within a monastic context. The purpose of these virtues was to ensure total dedication to the missionary work of the Brotherhood on the model of the Western religious orders. At first they envisaged operating as a school of preachers like the Logos School: “through a life of a particular kind of community training … members were to be formed in a Christian manner to equip them for the education of the people by teaching how to live a Christian life and being themselves examples of it.”

In 1911 the Brotherhood began to publish a small periodical entitled Zoe. From its contents the preaching character of the Brotherhood is apparent. Preaching was to be based on Scripture, but Scripture was used in the Protestant manner introduced into Greece by the missionaries. Protestant pietism provided the model. Scripture served simply as a source of teaching for moral improvement, while the sermon sought to inculcate ethical values in the individual. Morality was an end in itself. Doctrine, worship and the sacraments only served to reinforce the practice of individual virtues.

Virtues and sins were objectively defined according to legal prescriptions.

In 1915 Matthopoulos published his own book, The Destiny of Man. In the Zoe movement the book acquired biblical status, with many editions and huge sales throughout Greece. This popular manual of catechetics and ethics encouraged practical piety with little reference to Orthodox ecclesiastical experience and tradition, producing a secularized utilitarian moralism centered on the individual.

However sympathetically one approaches this book, it is impossible to discern the author’s Orthodox monastic background. His theological assumptions reflect a dry Protestant pietism and an extremely Calvinist understanding of the Church’s Gospel. The Gospel is transformed into a totalitarian ideology merely regulating individual conduct.

The concepts of “discipline,” “responsibility,” and “obligation” served to provide a purely legalistic ethical code. Piety demanded “Duties towards God,” “Duties towards one’s neighbor,” “Duties towards the family,” “Special duties,” “Duties toward ourselves.” The goal and justification of this system of duties is quite openly individual self-interest. “It is to our great advantage to acquire the virtue of faith.” “Those who act in accordance with the Lord’s words will surely benefit.” “By loving God, the Christian loves himself.” “By loving others, the Christian loves himself even more.” “He who does not love God and neighbor does great harm to himself.”

Besides a utilitarian theory of duties, the book insists on “justification by faith alone,” reproducing the Protestant sola fide: “Faith is called justifying because it frees man from all his sins and presents him justified before God on account of this faith and not through his own works.” Faith alone is sufficient. Participation in the ecclesiastical experience is never mentioned, since everything is judged by the criteria of individuality. Not even “good works” add anything to justifica-
tion by faith alone. They are needed to prevent a person from losing the status of justification, for “if he does not observe Christ’s law and commandments after justification, he falls away from it.”

The fear of backsliding and a Calvinist guilt pervade the book. Guilt is a threat, but also a duty: “A person should feel profound guilt before God for his sins.” Sin itself is defined legally: “Impiety and disobedience and contempt towards the almighty infinite God, whose law the sinner disregards and transgresses.” It is because sin transgresses the law that “Christ died on the cross in pain and terrible suffering so that in his person the world’s sin may be punished and the divine law, which humanity has disregarded and transgressed, may be satisfied.”

Christ’s divinity concerns Matthropoulos mainly because of the supernatural value it gives to the ransom offered for the satisfaction of divine justice. But it also concerns him because it endows the human moral example of Christ with authority, and consequently everything that Christ says is not the words of a mere man but the words of the God-Man. That is why “a person should be completely obedient to Christ’s words in all things.”

Discipline and obedience together with the imitation of Christ’s example as man sum up humanity’s destiny completely: “Humanity’s earthly destiny is to imitate Christ’s perfect moral character so far as possible... Our aim is to become like Christ who lived as a man and shared our life in this world.”

Where did Matthropoulos acquire this distortion of the Church’s Gospel? How did Protestant pietism come to influence a monk in Mega Spelaion and turn him into a typical Calvinist missionary such as we find revealed in the Destiny of Man? Who taught him and where did he acquire his theology?

The most obvious theory connects these ideas with the Logos School. But apart from the Logos School, Matthropoulos must also have drawn directly on Protestant sources: the Zoe Brotherhood had always published material brought into Greece by the Protestant missionaries, suggesting a close relationship between Matthropoulos and this foreign element. The matter is still debatable.

In December 1927, two years before his death, Matthropoulos appointed the archimandrite Seraphim Papakostas as his successor. Under its new leader, Zoe expanded beyond all expectations of its founder.

Seraphim Papakostas (1872-1954) was born in Phourna of Eurytania. He studied theology at the University of Athens and the allure of Androustos’s thought made him an enthusiastic student of his work. In 1920, while working at the Zoe offices, he was noticed by Eusebios Matthropoulos, who invited him to join the Brotherhood. The Archimandrite Dionysios Pharazoulos, the pride and hope of the Brotherhood, hac just died that year and Papakostas seemed a possible replacement. He was ordained deacon a few months later. In 1923 the archbishop of Athens, Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, appointed him a preacher at the cathedral church of the capital, a position he held for twenty-five years.

In addition to his responsibilities as superior of the Brotherhood and preacher at the cathedral, Papakostas was a prolific writer. He wrote three volumes of New Testament exegesis (The Lord’s Sermons on the Mount, The Parables of the Lord, The Miracles of the Lord), a biography of Eusebios Matthropoulos, a study entitled The Question of Conception, and a small book called Repentance, which was the most successful of Zoe’s publications, selling 200,000 copies by 1959. Papakostas’s books follow the same line as The Destiny of Man: legalistic moralism, spiritual self-interest centered on the individual, and a reliance on a guilt – ransom – justification scheme of salvation. Like Matthropoulos he wrote like a Protestant pietist. In his book The Question of Conception, Papakostas faithfully follows Anglican and
Roman Catholic opinion about contraception, presented as a quintessentially Orthodox view.\(^{386}\)

During the first twenty years of the Brotherhood, while Eusebios Matthropoulos was superior, its missionary work was confined to the preaching activities of the brothers. This meant sermons given during the Liturgy and in the afternoons, confession, publication and distribution of the periodical Zoe, and the publication and distribution of books, mainly translations of Protestant literature.

The first expansion of missionary activity took place in the winter of 1926-7 with the founding of the first seven catechetical schools for children, closely based on the structure and programs of English and French Protestant Sunday schools.\(^{387}\) A nine-year cycle of education was established on three levels (lower, middle and higher) with separate schools for boys, girls and working children. At the first two levels the lesson set questions on a Bible passage, drawing a moral conclusion. The higher class taught apologetic arguments for the defense of the faith, without reference to dogma, worship or ecclesiastical institutions. The lessons were enriched with religious songs, mostly from the Protestant Gebetsbuch. After each lesson pupils received a small icon printed by the Vatican press, illustrating the biblical narrative which had been discussed.

By 1936 Zoe had opened 300 catechetical schools with 35,000 pupils, and received the first prize at the International Protestant Conference on Sunday Schools in Oslo. By 1959 Zoe’s catechetical schools had reached 2,216, with 147,740 pupils, not counting 139 schools with 7,747 pupils in Cyprus.\(^{388}\)

With Seraphim Papakostas as superior of the Brotherhood, the catechetical schools became the basis for the growth of Zoe’s missionary network. Every school had a committee of devout parents who recorded children’s absences and made home visits, canvassing the work of the schools from house to house and recruiting new pupils. They also encouraged the parents to subscribe to the periodical Zoe and participate in activities.\(^{389}\)

The catechetical school committees were unified in 1935 as the Pan-Hellenic Union of Parents, “Christian Upbringing,” (GEWA). They set up clubs for the pupils and lecture halls for the parents in cities and country towns. Through the financial contributions of thousands of parents, many such facilities were established throughout Greece, including offices for the various activities of the movement and appropriate centers where members could make their confession away from church premises. By 1959 GEXA had 9,000 members and about 80,000 coworkers, with an enormous property portfolio. GEXA became the channel for the development of a network of “Friendly Circles,” which were the base of the Zoe movement. There were two divisions: “Circles for the study of the Zoe periodical” and a higher level “Circles for the study of sacred Scripture.” As a rule, these circles were made up of parents, with men and women in separate groups, who met weekly in private homes like catechetical classes for adults. At the lower level they would read an article from the periodical Zoe, and at the higher a passage from sacred Scripture. After discussing its meaning, and drawing a moral lesson, they sang Protestant hymns and concluded with long extempore prayer. The circle leaders received written instructions from the Brotherhood on the selection of texts and the direction the discussion should take. In large cities there were weekly seminars for the training of the leaders.

The “Friendly Circles” transformed Zoe’s missionary work into a mass movement. During the peak years of the movement there were “Friendly Circles” not just in every neighborhood but virtually in every block. Hundreds of thousands attended these circles. In some years all these people can-
vassed door to door for new subscribers to the Zoe periodical.
As a result there were over 170,000 subscribers by 1959.
In 1933 the Brotherhood established its first association of
Christian students, the “Academic Social Union,” which in
1945 was renamed the “Christian Student Union.” In 1959
it had 2,500 members. These were organized in “Friendly
Circle” cells, but also attended weekly seminars. The mem-
bers were extremely active in centers of higher education,
primarily with an apologetic agenda to defend the Christian
faith, and proved to be the only force capable of confronting
the well-organized communist movement in the universi-
ties.390
In 1938 a “pious Sisterhood” was founded on the model
of the Brotherhood, which undertook responsibility for the
women’s section of the movement. In 1946 the Sisterhood
began publishing a bi-weekly periodical called The Life of
the Child with a circulation by 1959 of 130,000.
In 1938 the Zoe movement acquired a dynamic staff of
young scientists who began publishing a new periodical
called Aktines (Rays). Their aim was to broaden the subject
matter of the periodical beyond sermons to cover science,
philosophy, social issues, literature and art. The inspira-
tion behind the periodical was a young law professor at the
University of Athens called Alexander Tsirianis and a poet
and Zoe theologian called Alexander Gkialas (G.Veritis).
The periodical was devoted almost entirely to apologetics
and in the post-war period had 40,000 subscribers.
In 1946 Aktines published A Declaration of Greek
Scientists, Writers and Artists, condemning the deliberately
contrived and artificial opposition between science and reli-
gion, and professing “reverence for Christian values” as the
only solution “for the spiritual and material regeneration of
the nation.” Coming just as the civil war was beginning, the
Declaration was commonly seen as a rallying call to anti-

communist intellectuals. It was signed by 220 of the best-
known members of the Greek intelligentsia.
That same year the “Christian Union of Scientists” was
founded. The Declaration was reprinted in a volume togeth-
er with an analysis of its ideas entitled A Proclamation of the
Christian Union of Scientists. An unprecedented campaign
to put the book into the hands of every educated Greek re-
sulted in sales of 150,000 copies.
The “Young Christian Workers’ Union,” also founded in
1946, aspired to unite blue and white collar workers and arti-
sans. The organization followed the Zoe pattern: Bible study
circles, leadership seminars, services in the Brotherhood’s
churches, confession, excursions, and winter camps. In
1959, the last year before Zoe split up, the Young Christian
Workers’ Union numbered 2,500 active members and 6,000
workers who participated in its activities.
In 1947 the Zoe movement extended its activities into
the field of education, founding an association called the
“Christian Union of Educators.” A periodical called Greek
Christian Education was published, covering the principles of
Christian pedagogics, and attracted 9,500 subscribers.
1,500 teachers belonged to the association. In 1957 another
association was added: “Greek Education,” which went on
to found a number of private schools. In 1959 a second sis-
terhood, “Elpis,” was started among women teachers already
devoted to Zoe’s missionary work.
In 1949 a sisterhood was organized as an “order” of ap-
proximately 500 nurses in the large hospitals of Athens. This
was the “Eunice Sisterhood,” which quickly became the
pride of the movement, impressing the public with their self-
ienial and devoted service in the hospitals. In the provinces
Zoe preachers vied with each other to recruit young women
to the celibate life of the missionary nurses, for they were the
showcase of Zoe’s work.391
During the civil war (1946-9), the authorities, particularly the palace, which directed political life in Greece, saw the Zoe movement as the best ideological counterweight to the communist uprising. Court circles and King Paul himself began working with Alexander Tsirintanis and Seraphim Papakostas, entrusting the Zoe movement with the "spiritual side of the anti-communist struggle." The association "Hellenic Light" was created to organize a nationwide campaign to raise the religious awareness of the Greek people through homilies, leadership seminars, military hospitals and "children-towns." They also published a huge number of pamphlets which had a wide circulation.392

During this period the Zoe movement reached the apogee of its social influence. It enjoyed direct state support and had an organization for propaganda purposes with an influence unprecedented in Greece. The Brotherhood possessed the most advanced printing plant in the country, whose mass-produced books and pamphlets were very profitable. The Zoe edition of the New Testament alone sold 650,000 copies by 1959.

Eusebius Matthopoulos's small group of zealous student preachers had now become an austerely organized community on the model of a Roman Catholic "secular institute." Its 175 members were selected for their extreme dedication and discipline. The Brotherhood headquarters at 189 Hippokratous Street in Athens controlled operations involving hundreds of thousands of people. Centralization and the supervision of each member were draconian. It is a known fact that Zoe confessors reported on the members' moral life.393

The astonishing development of the Zoe movement must be attributed in great part to the personality and vision of Seraphim Papakostas. But the transformation of the Brotherhood's preaching and catechetical work into a multifaceted movement with the social aim of bringing about a religious and cultural renewal in Greece must be attributed to Papakostas's encounter with Alexander Tsirintanis.

The collaboration between Papakostas and Tsirintanis united two leading groups with very different social identities. The Zoe Brotherhood was a group of provincial theologians whose outlook was anti-intellectual and devoted to the cultivation of a moralistic piety.394 They lacked wider interests and a broad culture.395

By contrast, Professor Tsirintanis was surrounded by colleagues with impressive academic credentials, extensive experience of studies in Europe, refined culture and social status. They included the archimandrite Hieronymos Kotsonis, professor at the University of Thessalonica and royal chaplain (who became archbishop of Athens in 1967 under the dictatorship of the colonels), the law professor George Rammos, the psychiatrist Aristos Aspiotis, the economist Theodore Mertikopoulos, who served several terms as a government minister, the physician and author Sophocles Hatzidakis, and other less known but equally able people. The two groups complemented each other perfectly, uniting elite leadership with a popular base. Initially, both groups sought a religious reform recalling the European Reformation: as a movement bringing about a rebirth of people and nation, uniting Christianity and culture (Kultur Christentum).396 Professor Tsirintanis often talked about "the centuries-old mistakes of Christianity which one must correct;" and the constant watchword of Zoe's preaching was "Early Christian authenticity." The basic aim of the Protestant missionaries since the seventeenth century of reform of the Greek Orthodox Church seemed to be approaching realization in the early 1950s through the Zoe movement.

For about a decade, Tsirintanis was the spiritus rector of the Zoe movement,397 redirecting Zoe's reforming piety towards social and cultural goals. The ideal of "Christian civilization" marginalized the catechetical work, and reli-
gious awakening was incorporated into a view of “cultural rebirth.”

Tsirtnitis saw the religious impulse as serving a cultural goal, like truth, justice and beauty. His wertlehre (value theory) provided a theoretical historical perspective for the extra-ecclesiastical organizations. Thus in the early postwar years a new program with the slogan “For a new Greece” aspired to create a new Greek reality based on “Christian culture.”

During the Cold War, Christian civilization was promoted as an ideological bulwark against “atheistic communism,” and the first “Christian Democrat” parties were formed. Beginning with the Civil War, the Zoe movement sustained in Greece demands for a new social and cultural order based on Christian values — “the only values surviving in our wrecked civilization.”

Zoe has perhaps been the most powerful ideological force in modern Greek history. Its many adherents were working to realize a vision of a new Greece: a Christian political party that would transform vision into reality. This was the secret hope of religious people throughout the country. The Acts of the 23rd Congress of the Zoe Brotherhood (1951) record:

By working together, the Christian organizations will become a considerable spiritual power. A power that will contribute to the healing of the country’s cultural life. The organizations will not be politicized. But the spiritual culture developing among the members of the organizations contributes towards restoring the health of the people’s political thinking.

It is no coincidence that during this period Zoe’s leaders and members referred to their efforts as “God’s work,” or simply as “the Work.” There is a close parallel here with the Roman Catholic organization Opus Dei.

Apparently, after the civil war the palace wanted to bring Tsirtnitis into politics, but Zoe strongly opposed this. In 1951 Seraphim Papakostas suffered a stroke, and Tsirtnitis’s work with Zoe entered a difficult phase. The spiritus rector of “the Work” gradually distanced himself from the movement and founded his own organization. In its journal Synetesis he frequently expressed bitterness at the lost opportunity for establishing Christianity in a dominant role: “We have missed the boat,” he said.

The collaboration between Papakostas and Tsirtnitis and the demands of the vastly extended “Work” quietly sidelined the old guard, Eusebios Mattheopulos’s first disciples, with their narrow preaching and catechizing. The resentment of these people, particularly of Panayiotis Trembelas, began to be felt as opposition to Papakostas within the Brotherhood. After Papakostas’s stroke, the opposition, because of their seniority, found themselves in charge of the Brotherhood and “the Work.” Tsirtnitis and his colleagues were gradually marginalized and the totalitarian character of the movement was intensified.

After Papakostas’s death in 1954, the “elders” concealed from the Brotherhood his spiritual testament appointing the young talented archimandrite Elias Mastroyanopoulos as his successor and Zoe’s superior. This was a great scandal to the Brothers who had sacrificed their own personal ambitions for the sake of “the Work.” Once the concealment became common knowledge, the Brotherhood split up. The “elders” (P. Trembelas, D. Panayiotopoulos and J. Kolipoulos) stubbornly clung to their authority over Zoe’s most conservative members. Against them the hard-line “Tsirtnitian” opposition favored Papakostas’s “innovations,” but were set aside by the new leadership.

Petty rivalries and personal ambitions lurked behind the struggle between “conservatives” and “progressives,” which quickly spread to the movement’s associations. Both parties endeavored to rally support, and the Tsirtnitiots in particular tried to involve outsiders in the community’s internal
affairs, since the leadership problem concerned “the Work” as a whole. Under pressure of increasing opposition, the “elders” pretended to give way and in February 1958 suggested a solution: the election of the “conservative” archimandrite George Dimopoulos as temporary superior.

Instead of easing the tension it sharpened the division, and the whole Zoe movement was torn apart. The Association of Scientists and Tsirintanis’s party decided to intervene in the community’s internal affairs. They wrote to the community demanding the publication and implementation of Papakostas’s will.44 Faced with this demand and the prospect of “the Work’s” destruction, the “elders” were forced to back down, and in July 1959 the archimandrite Elias Mastroymannopoulos was appointed Zoe’s superior.

In spite of the new superior’s efforts, the split within the organization proved insurmountable. The “elders” and their followers refused to cooperate with the new superior. Sixty members seceded from the community in April 1960, announcing the formation of new organizations: The Brotherhood of Theologians “O Sotir,” and The Union of Cooperative Christian Associations “St. Basil the Great.” Although strongly opposed to the Tsirintanians’ version of “the Work,” the founders of the new groups faithfully copied it.

In this way the extra-ecclesiastical Christian organizations (parents, scientists, students, workers, schoolchildren, teachers, nurses and sisterhoods) doubled in number, and the two parallel movements expended much time and effort haggling over property which had once belonged to the unified “Work” and winning over the followers of the opposite camp. The two brotherhoods, permanently at loggerheads, began litigation over financial issues. The leadership of this huge moralistic movement, which promised Greece a puritanical renaissance, now demonstrated its moral bankruptcy. It was exposed to public ridicule and pilloried in the press.

The vision of a Christian civilization and a New Greece collapsed under the weight of scandal and moral disgrace.

Within a few years most of Zoe’s members abandoned the community, seeking a more genuine Christian service. The new superior’s attempt to cultivate a climate of Church-centered spirituality contributed to the mass exodus. The fact was that the rediscovery of ecclesiastical and theological authenticity was incompatible with the fixed structures of Protestant piety. The awareness of this led to a constant loss of members.

The Brotherhood’s hardcore leadership reacted violently to the breakup. In 1965 Mastroymannopoulos was deposed and every effort was made to prevent further erosion of the Brotherhood on theological and ecclesiastical issues. But the die was cast, only a small number of Brothers remained in the community, and no new members were ever added. The movement’s associations resigned themselves to a purely formal existence.

In contrast to Zoe, the Sotir Brotherhood did not experience any erosion on ecclesiastical and theological grounds. It maintained its pietistic character, its centralized administrative structures, and its moral supervision and discipline of its members. It therefore was able to continue its evangelism, but in a lower key. Sotir’s social influence was limited from the beginning to a narrow circle of religious people. The close-knit nature of the movement gave it a claustrophobic atmosphere.

In the 1970s, when Greece experienced a revival of interest in the Fathers and Orthodox tradition, Sotir made a strategic move. It adopted a militantly anti-Western and anti-eccen- merical stance in defense of “Orthodoxy,” a strident demand that the Church’s canons should be observed. Thus the very people who had introduced Roman Catholic rationalism and Calvinist moralism into Greece now suddenly became the defenders of “genuine” Orthodoxy and tradition.
Even this maneuver was ineffective. Apart from the confusion it caused, the Sotir movement continued to shrink and become marginalized ecclesiastically and socially. Like the old Protestant sects, the more the movement declined, the more it clung to its own particular outlook.

Sotir was a schismatic copy of Zoe’s “Work.” Another adaptation of the same model was that of the cleric Augustinos Kantiotis, born in 1907. Kantiotis began his career as a member of the Zoe Brotherhood. His psychological peculiarities did not allow him to remain in the community. He left and followed a career as a preacher in provincial towns, borrowing from Zoe’s piety and moralism, but inveighing against the wickedness of the times. In contrast with Zoe, which sought the religious rebirth of individuals in order to achieve a moral renewal of society, Kantiotis wanted to bring about a moral renewal by “objective” means. He became well known all over Greece through organizing demonstrations, accompanied by his followers using slings and clubs to prevent female beauty contests by breaking the windows of hotels which were staging such “morally deviant events.”

Kantiotis’s aggressive preaching had no regard for persons, institutions or titles. In his homilies or his two-page Christian Spark, which he himself wrote and published, he vilified the bishops, the government, the palace and state officials. His followers compared him to John Chrysostom for his fearless outspokenness and indomitable courage. But the press used Kantiotis to ridicule the Church.

In 1959 Kantiotis set up his first organization, the Society of Theologians, “The Cross,” with a periodical of the same name. In 1966 the Society assumed the form of a brotherhood. Another brotherhood called “Saint Savvas” was created for non-theologians, a sisterhood named “Saint Irene” and other religious associations centered in various provincial towns soon followed. Student hostels, meeting halls and a central bookshop were also organized. Two further newspapers were launched: Church Struggle and Clarion of Orthodoxy.

In 1967 the Colonels asked Archbishop Hieronymos Kotsonis to ordain Kantiotis a bishop. He was appointed metropolitan of Florina, and the seat of his extra-ecclesiastical movement was transferred to his episcopal see. The combination of episcopal responsibility with an extra-ecclesiastical “mission” was unprecedented in the Greek Church.

In spite of the growth of his missionary movement on the Zoe pattern, Kantiotis’s work was identified almost entirely with his critical denunciations. His moralistic cant had no influence on educated people. In his view there were two “orders,” good and evil: on the one side Christ, virtue, law and the commandments, all presented schematically, and on the other side sin, especially carnal sin, depravity and impiety, each identified with institutions and personalities in Greek society.

The role of public prosecutor which Kantiotis assumed, primarily in the columns of his publications, had a marked influence on the ecclesiastical life of his time. For several decades Greek ecclesiastics and theologians took pains to avoid his attacks. They feared the unrestrained vituperation which he could heap on them with impunity. Never before had Greece known such spiritual terrorism – not even during the colonels’ dictatorship – as that which Kantiotis exercised within the Church.

Among other extra-ecclesiastical organizations founded at the time are the following:

The “Orthodox Christian Unions” (OXEN), established by the protopresbyter Angelos Nissiotis, were centered in the parish of Zoodochos Pigi in Athens, but they engaged in many catechetical activities beyond the parish with their own local associations of students, scientists, etc.

The “Christian Corner” was an Athenian women’s organization for the study of sacred Scripture.
The “Brotherhood of the Paraclete,” which followed the Zoe pattern, was a community of preachers and catechists who imposed a monastic routine on their members.

The “Chryssopigi Brotherhood” was founded by Kallinikos Karoussos, metropolitan of Piraeus from 1978. It functioned chiefly as a group for bringing together clergy, originally to promote their preferment to the episcopate, and subsequently to enlist their cooperation in pastoral work.

The “Pan-Hellenic Orthodox Union” is known mainly for its publication of the newspaper Orthodox Press. Of this organization only the deacon Markos Manolis is well-known. The chief officers of the newspaper have always kept out of the public eye. The newspaper expresses an amalgam of views of the known extra-eclesiastical organizations. The pietistic moralism of Zoe and Sotir, the violent denunciations of Kantiotes, the zealous external forms of confessional Orthodoxy (with its characteristic Westernized ideology) are combined with far-right politics. As the extra-eclesiastical organizations declined, this newspaper rallied the “conservative” religious public, providing an outlet for extremist views. Certain articles were frankly scurrilous. It also played a dubious political role in the ecclesiastical problem created in Cyprus by the military dictatorship’s deposition of Archbishop Makarios in 1973. It also bitterly attacked the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the monasticism of Mount Athos.

The religious organization “Christian Democracy,” founded by a primary school teacher and lawyer called Nicolas Psaroudakis, was more like a political party. Psaroudakis’s intention was to realize what Tsirintas had been forced to forego: the active involvement of the extra-eclesiastical zealots in politics. A naive pietist, he wanted to apply Gospel principles to political life. Christians were called upon to reject both atheist Marxism and virtually atheist capitalism by voting for Psaroudakis’s “Christian” party. Repeated electoral defeats turned the pietistic populism of the party into an obsession with security, seeing hostile “sinister powers” everywhere and secret conspiracies to undermine Orthodoxy. Only when the military dictatorship arrested Psaroudakis in 1973 and ejected him from the organization did he gain some social standing. In the pro-left climate after the Colonels’ departure, his organization lurches towards Christian socialism. Student groups then cooperated with him, and for a short while the only serious expression of his political efforts was in the universities. Finally, the socialist party, PASOK, had him elected a parliamentary deputy by including him on an honorary state list that did not require votes being cast for him.

His naive moralism, however, only caused amusement in parliament. Subsequently, after attempting to be re-elected on a right-wing party list, Psaroudakis was deposed by his colleagues and faded into obscurity. Christian Democracy continued to exist on the margins of political life.

The extra-eclesiastical organizations played a decisive role in the history of the alienation of modern Hellenism. This process began in the fourteenth century and continued during the period of Turkish rule and the first decades of the Greek state. Throughout this epoch the alienation of the Greeks was confined to the Westernized intellectuals. But the extra-eclesiastical organizations undermined popular piety, which had been Orthodoxy’s main strength.

The theological ignorance of the Church’s pastors, the influence of the missionaries, the susceptibility of the public to an alluring European piety and rapid urbanization all facilitated the work of the extra-eclesiastical organizations. These organizations were consequently a decisive catalyst for the alienation of the spiritual and cultural self-awareness of the people as a whole. They dealt a blow to Orthodoxy comparable to the trauma inflicted on Hellenism by the loss of Ionia, Cappadocia and Pontus in 1922.
The influence of these organizations was not confined to their own followers and readers of their publications. The entire clergy was influenced by their pietism and often copied their approach to preaching, confession and pastoral work. The organizations established a "religionized" ecclesiastical piety throughout Greece. They imposed an ideological and individualistic idea of faith, a moralistic and legalistic idea of salvation, so that participation in the Eucharist and the other sacraments rewarded personal merit.

The Protestant scholar Christoph Maczewski has asserted: "To a certain degree the Zoe movement may be described as an Orthodox Reformation – which nevertheless, unlike the Protestant Reformation, did not lead to a schism." In its genesis and orientation and in its effort to expand it corresponds in many ways to the sixteenth-century Reformation.

These correspondences may be grouped under three headings: (i) ecclesiological presuppositions, (ii) doctrinal teaching, and (iii) moral precepts.

(i) The Protestant Reformers and the extra-ecclesiastical organizations rejected a Church-centered mode of existence constituting "true life," and relied on religious individualism (in faith, morals, and missionary strategy) leading to "justification."

They also rejected the Church’s hierarchy. According to the Acts of the Zoe Congresses:

The priests are not in a position to enlighten the people, being preoccupied with liturgical matters at the expense of the work of teaching ... The people look to us for men who will exercise leadership to teach them Christian truth, and guide them in a Christian life ... The episcopate is distracted and absorbed in administrative duties. Its work to a great extent has become thoroughly bureaucratic ... Bishops easily become arrogant, angry and obstinate, and also tend to be avaricious, greedy, and gluttonous.

This contempt for the clergy and their morals emphasizes the moral superiority of the extra-ecclesiastical zealots:

The conduct of the clergy, which is not appropriate to their sacred calling and scandalizes the faithful, is one of the causes for the unbelief and sin prevalent in society ... Today we observe that the greatest improprieties of the clergy arise from their material interests and this is generally why they do not succeed ... The bishop cannot expect any good result from his work. Hierarchs with ability have not achieved anything of significance ... a man needs to be extremely conceited to think he can achieve anything worthwhile as a bishop ... Zoe, however, is in a position to act much more spiritually than many dioceses put together. ... The Church’s spiritual work, which is the highest and most effective part of its apostolate, we can control ourselves.

Like Protestants, they consider the Church to be the sum total of the piety of the individuals who constitute it. Salvation is seen as the individual’s appropriation of morality, rather than participation in the life-giving unity of the ecclesial body. What is ignored is the presence of the bishop. He constitutes the ecclesial body “as type (typos) and place (topos) of Christ,” and his sacramental exercise of spiritual fatherhood grafts the faithful onto the “new creation” of the Kingdom. The organizations were concerned solely with personal morality, transforming the “Church’s spiritual work” into the formation of moral character, which is why they boasted that they accomplished it more effectively than the bishops.

The Eucharist, worship, and the sacraments serve the same goal of forming individual moral character, regardless of incorporation into the body of the parish and diocese. The organizations celebrated the Eucharist on their own premises, where entry was controlled by showing a special card. Confessions were also heard in their own private offices. Since “the Church’s spiritual work” concerned personal
moral character, the organization's preachers proclaimed Christ outside the Church's body without license from the local bishop, and sometimes after an episcopal ban.\textsuperscript{416} (ii) The doctrinal teaching of the organizations corresponds closely to the classic theses of the Protestant Reformation – particularly those of the pietistic movements.\textsuperscript{417}

The Bible has an “objective” absolute authority (\textit{sola scriptura}) and is considered superior to the Church, which created the Bible by recording its experiences in it.\textsuperscript{418} The organizations therefore preached that the Bible replaced the responsibility of the bishops for building up the ecclesial body. They proclaimed it as a moral code superior to the Church’s witness. The moralism of their preaching replaced “dogmatic” truth, which “defines” the Church’s experience of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{419} The entire content of the Bible’s witness is restricted to a christocentric monism, “Christ alone” (\textit{solas Christus}), but only as a moral example.\textsuperscript{420}

The christocentric moralism of the organizations entailed other Protestant characteristics: intellectualism, moral eudemonism, a utilitarian understanding of virtue, the importance of apologetics and the cultural value of religion. These characteristics pervaded the organizations’ publications and their work in general. They were accompanied by the theological presuppositions that differentiated Western Christianity from the tradition of the undivided Church: a judicial understanding of the relations between humanity and God, a theory of the satisfaction of divine justice through Christ’s death on the cross, a legalistic view of the transmission of original sin, an interpretation of the general priesthood of believers that gave it an independent status, a disregard for the distinction between the essence and the energies of God, and a denial of Hesychasm and the neptic tradition.\textsuperscript{421}

These ideas, central to the teaching of the organizations, transposed the criteria of life – the possibility of salvation – from the ecclesial imitation of the life of the Trinity to a personal, legalistic justification. This transposition was enshrined in the organizations’ forms of extra-ecclesiastical piety, often culminating in opposition to the Church. The moral unworthiness of the clergy, and especially the bishops, was constantly emphasized.\textsuperscript{422} The organizations’ feeling of superiority over the Church was strengthened by their constant pursuit of the “higher objectives” of moral purity and missionary work.\textsuperscript{423} The identification of the organizations’ teaching with Protestant principles was also expressed in practice. The Zoe movement based its publishing on reprinting Protestant books introduced by the nineteenth-century British and American missionaries.\textsuperscript{424} They also adopted Protestant extempore prayer\textsuperscript{425} and imitated the Protestant “liturgy of the word” (\textit{Wortgottesdienst}) with Bible readings, Protestant hymns and spontaneous prayer.\textsuperscript{426} The organizations believed their worship was as valid as that of the Church, since the sacraments were seen only as a means to personal moral improvement.\textsuperscript{427}

Like Protestant Reformers, the organizations rejected Orthodox monasticism and created missionary brotherhoods.\textsuperscript{428} The Greek brotherhoods claimed to imitate the Roman Catholic religious orders, but in fact had more in common with Protestant pietism.

(iii) The Greek extra-ecclesiastical organizations created a type of religious person encountered in any Protestant pietistic sect. The sociological observations of the classic works on pietism by Max Weber, Werner Sombart and Martin Schmidt\textsuperscript{429} can equally be applied to members of the Greek pietistic movements.

First, there is the same emphasis on uniform external behavior: clothes, conversations and gestures should be “moral” and “modest.” The Brotherhood’s demands were specific:

There is no need for parting the hair. This should be simple and sober. Trousers should not have turn-ups in the modern way ...
The Extra-Ecclesiastical Organizations  

imprudent and inconsiderate words and a manner and overall appearance lacking decorum are serious obstacles to the Gospel worker ... In all things we should create a unified type ... an external conformity will reflect internal conformity ... Every deviation from the established way and every unauthorized innovation bears witness to pride or foolishness.  

The purpose of this uniformity of behavior is to manifest an interior morality and avoid the slightest suspicion of any lack of purity. The instructions to the members are very precise:

Those journeying should not enter bars, or accept drinks if offered. They should also refuse any refreshments offered in private homes ... It is unsafe and indecent to enter a woman's sick room. We must protect ourselves on every side both from the danger of sin and from the danger of misunderstanding ... we must strictly observe the principle of not visiting private homes. If this is unavoidable we should have some serious person with us. If anyone thinks that there are exceptional circumstances, he should ask the center in writing ... with the students we should not be effusive and emotional ... Satan lies in wait ... A unified behavior reflects the principles of the Brotherhood.  

This prudery was extended to all associations directed by the brotherhoods on the same grounds of protecting individual and collective morality and purity. Mingling the sexes was unthinkable; so was smoking, drinking, dancing and attending secular entertainments, including the theater and the cinema. There were no concessions even for young children:

If we allow children games, they should be good games, with the air of Christian truth about them and capable of offering particular lessons, but theatrical plays must be forbidden ... for there is a danger that children might be drawn to the acting profession ... and become accustomed to go-

ing to theaters where unsuitable plays are being performed ... Special attention should also be given to the question of the cinema ... It is a proven fact that the theater and the cinema have destroyed in our time whatever morality existed.  

This very detailed directive encouraged a Manichaeans distinction between good and evil in social life while simultaneously cultivating an individual and collective “super-ego.” The most important and demanding concern of every Pietistic Christian — in the Protestant tradition as well as in the Greek religious organizations — is to avoid “evil” and preserve personal moral integrity, to maintain an irrefutable outward appearance. Through daily self-examination, and recording successes in avoiding sin and performing good works, an emphasis on outward appearances replaced genuine self-knowledge and inhibited insight into reality. 

An inflated “super-ego” and Manichaeistic dualism lead to a sectarian awareness of purity, like the Cathars. The members of the Greek extra-ecclesiastical organizations considered themselves the remnant of the “elect,” the only authentic Christian presence. They categorized people, even those who participated actively in the Church’s life, simply by the criterion of whether they belonged to the Pietistic movement (“one of us” or “not one of us”). This categorization was also applied to the clergy, creating in the peak years of the organizations a real danger of schism in the Greek Church. Schism even threatened the episcopate. When the colonels took over in 1967, a group of bishops within the Pietistic movement called an “elite” synod and deposed those of their fellow-bishops whom they considered morally reprehensible. Later they themselves were deposed by their enraged opponents.  

If an open schism was finally avoided in the Greek Church, it was due partly to the decline of the Pietistic organizations, but mainly to the absence of any serious theological opposi-
tion to the extra-ecclesiastical zealots. Even the declared opponents of the organizations – archbishops, bishops and university theologians – opposed them intuitively rather than with clear ecclesiological and theological criteria. There was no religious awe that could be set against the moralistic authority and missionary activism of the organizations. Although a Westernized piety was finally proved to be one-sided, it became the universal practice in Greece, adopted by both the friends and the opponents of the organizations. The pastoral work of most of the metropolitans faithfully imitated the missionary methods of the pietistic zealots, each diocese becoming an independent pietistic movement, with halls for “pious assemblies,” and associations of scientists, student youth groups, Bible study circles, and a variety of propagandist publications. Extra-ecclesiastical Christianity (the separation of faith from ecclesial experience, and morality from participation in ecclesial asceticism) was vested in the appearance of ecclesiastical canonicity. The extra-ecclesiastical organizations have suffered decline and marginalization. But the reformation of the Greek Church which was their aim was actually achieved.

XVIII

Papadiamantis and His School

From Demetrios Kydones to Panayiotis Trembelas, and from the fourteenth-century pro-unionists to the extra-ecclesiastical organizations of the twentieth century, the history of modern Hellenism is one of a progressive alienation from its roots, a reckless, ultimately fruitless, Westernization. The de-Hellenization of the Greeks took place primarily on the religious level. The fading or loss of Orthodox ecclesial awareness was one of the most decisive factors in the transformation of self-identity. This was because Orthodox ecclesial awareness had preserved Hellenism not as a historical memory and source of intellectual pride but as something assimilated in the experience of the people that gave meaning to human existence and activities. Within the boundaries of Orthodox church life, Hellenism was a mode, not a place – activity, not ideology. That is, it was a “living and active culture.”

The consequences of the Greeks’ de-Hellenization or alienation – which did not lead to a consistent Westernization – may be seen in the history of the modern Greek state, with its malfunctioning and underdevelopment. This assumes the form of a real historical tragedy: endemic political divisions, civil war, gross government incompetence, economic dysfunction, a top-heavy and ineffective civil service, a feeble system of education, shortsighted diplomacy, an uncritical peddling of ideologies, a jejune nationalism and a provincial internationalism. The painful result was the steady
shrinking of Hellenism through expulsion of Greek populations from their ancient homelands and the constant hemorrhage of emigration, and also the frequent gambling with the survival of Hellenism as a state by a succession of military coups, dictatorships, and changes of regime, together with a blind dependence on foreign powers.

This sad state of affairs may be summed up in the statement that, although content to be de-Hellenized through accepting the Western model, the Greeks did not achieve a real assimilation but remained in a disorganized state of alienation. They made a great effort to bring about the total Westernization of political and social life but could not achieve it. It is as if in the psychology and makeup of the Greeks there is an unconscious resistance that prevents what is borrowed from the West from functioning properly. However hard they tried, it proved impossible for the Greeks to reproduce the intellectualism and systematic effectiveness of the Western model in their daily life – their economy, politics, education and social institutions. Greece is consequently dominated by secondhand institutions, structures and ideas which result in a steady weakening of the state through successive crises in every sector of social life, giving citizens the sense of a permanent impasse and encouraging a fatalistic attitude.

Consequently, the Greek state is slowly and inevitably killing Hellenism. But from time to time across the centuries a conscious Hellenic presence shines through, linking Gregory Palamas to the present day. The response of Patriarch Jeremias II to the Lutheran theologians, the patriotic character of the teachings of Kosmas Aitolos, the work of Makarios Notaras, and the “rough-hewn” writings of General Makriyannis are examples. This brings us to a high point of Greek Orthodox ecclesial self-awareness: the “saint of Greek literature,” Alexander Papadiamantakis.

Papadiamantakis (1851-1911) is the most important figure in modern Greek literature. He was not involved in the bitter conflicts over the language question, but distilled a three-thousand-year linguistic history in a narrative style of unique clarity. Under different cultural conditions Papadiamantakis’s language could have provided modern Greeks with an educational primer, as Homer did for the Byzantines.

Given the de-Hellenized consciousness of modern Greeks, Papadiamantakis’s work is generally considered an evocation of local customs. He has been regarded as a romantic chronicler of the last remnants of a traditional way of life, of a people poised between two worlds: the picturesque but dying rural life, and the urbanization that had not yet been consolidated. But this is like reading Dostoyevsky simply as a commentator on nineteenth-century Russian society.

Papadiamantakis was a humble man: “As for me, so long as I live and breathe and am in my right mind, I shall never cease praising and worshiping Christ, describing nature with love, and representing the true Greek way of life with affection.” But within the modest limitations he claims for himself, broad horizons open up. His dissection of the existential adventure of human life, his feel for its limitless dimensions, are embodied in the narrative and not confined to a particular period and society. The depths of passion revealed in the confession of the nun Agapia in the Merchants of the Nations is endowed with historical flesh from Greek life under Frankish rule. In the Fallen Dervish he makes Christ’s “yes” (nai) audible in the erotic note of the nai, a musical instrument that used to be played in the Athenian Theseion quarter at the end of the nineteenth century. The significance of these works is not just tied to the circumstances they describe.

Certainly, the vanishing world of Skiathos provided Papadiamantakis with his subject matter. In a different, even more Westernized environment, Dostoyevsky was working through the same themes, demonstrating what constituted authentic life by an analytical examination of its cenial
or absence, an examination of the perplexed world of the Possessed, or of Raskolnikov's Western-inspired rebellion, or of the Karamazovs' measureless passion for life.

Papadiamantis excels at telling stories that bring the kingdom of the Gospels to life, enabling us to experience it in the popular holiness of a still-surviving eucharistic community. Old island women who love the Church services and simple priests with the common faults of human nature, goatherds and sailors unaware of their own sanctity, drunkards and petty criminals of childlike innocence, are all justified and made resplendent within the eucharistic body which was then still a living reality.

In Papadiamantis's work, the eucharistic liturgy of the people becomes a universal cosmic liturgy, where the smallest aspects of nature's beauty function as an erotic discourse with the clarity of the stanzas of the Song of Songs: a song of the Bridegroom for the desired Bride, a beauty calling one to the immediacy of personal relationship.461 In the Dream on the Wave, Love in the Snow, Eros-Hero, Under the Royal Oak, The Rose-Colored Beaches, and in certain aspects of many other of his stories, Papadiamantis restores the idea of "salvation" to the existential balancing act of erotic love. He releases the Church's witness from a soul-killing subjection to intellectualism and moralism and reveals the vital life-giving importance of the erotic power of love.

Papadiamantis's unrivaled sensitivity in depicting the world's beauty fills his narratives. They are not just aesthetic description—the phenomenology of the pleasure afforded to the individual senses—but convey the narrator's personal understanding of the erotic call. This call is directed personally by the Uncreated to the only created being that expresses personal uniqueness, the only erotic subject of life-giving divine love, which is the human person. Papadiamantis is the most important and most authentic modern Greek theologian precisely because he alone rediscovered the basic presupposition of the Church's Gospel: that we know God by cultivating a relationship, not by understanding a concept. Our relationship with God becomes immediate and perceptible through the ascetic practice of the ecclesial community, through abandoning the imagined self-sufficiency of individual pleasure, so as to approach the beauty of nature as an active principle of God's erotic offering for the sake of the personal uniqueness of each human being.

Such an approach is already an active human response of grateful thanksgiving, a celebratory acceptance of divine eros, a participation in the festival of lovers. Papadiamantis paints this festival of thanksgiving, relying not on schematic ideas but on a realism which sees human effort as leading to failure as often as it is transformed into an immediacy of communion. There is no distinction between "sacred" and "profane" in Papadiamantis. Even the most "desacralized" aspects of human behavior have a place in the dialogue between love and freedom, passionate divine love for humanity, and humanity's pardonable inadequacy. Papadiamantis's language is enriched by frequent allusion to the psalms and the lives of the saints and the Church's rich hymnology. At the center of almost every story there is a priest, a country chapel and a liturgical service. Every aspect of life follows the rhythm of the Church's calendar, the ecclesiastical experience of time: "an ever-moving stasis" revolving round the axis of things hoped for made present. And space—Papadiamantis's Greek landscape—is also the setting of the people's erotic relationship with the Bridegroom, its God. A landscape filled with small churches, shrines, monastic cells, places of pilgrimage—sensible "signs" of a space where relationship becomes an immediacy of communion. Papadiamantis can only be compared to Dostoevsky for the power of his writing and the authenticity of his Orthodox witness. In the theological ignorance prevailing in the Orthodox Churches during the last few centuries, these two "secular"
authors are perhaps the only examples of writers who set down the criteria for distinguishing between Church and religion, heresy and Orthodoxy.

Both Dostoyevsky and Papadiamantis insist on the risk which a relationship with God involves. The risk confirms that this really is a personal relationship, an attainment of communion. Both refuse to substitute individual self-sufficiency for relationship. For individual self-sufficiency implies an accumulation of virtues, moral achievements and the acquisition of merit. That is why they affirm the courage of failure. The whole history of the Church is objectively one huge failure, but a failure which constitutes the Gospel of salvation. Dostoyevsky and Papadiamantis reveal with equal clarity the Church’s life-giving power which is always “perfected in weakness.” It is the power of transforming individual and collective failure into the faith and confidence of erotic self-offering to God, the Bridegroom and Lover of humankind. It is a power to transform mortal nature into an existential relationship, to transform death into life.

Naturally Papadiamantis was fiercely rejected both by academic theologians—especially D. S. Balanos—and moralistic Pietists especially the monk Theokleitos of Dionysiou. Like most “enlightened” Greek scholars they had no conception of Papadiamantis’s greatness. They approached him through their ideological prejudices and attacked him by arbitrarily condemning his most positive aspects. The chief representative of such an attitude is the literary historian K. Th. Dimaras.

This is understandable, because Papadiamantis does not fit into the standard categories of scientism, pietism, and Enlightenment thought. He is astringent; there are those who cannot endure him. He mercilessly unMASKS the clever men who imitate the worse aspects of the West. He demands a measure of understanding inaccessible to the immature, which is why such denigrations of Papadiamantis actually prove him to be a touchstone of authenticity.

Papadiamantis’s lead seems to have been followed by Photis Kontoglou (1897–1965), who made a rich contribution to Greek spiritual life as an author, iconographer, journalist and publisher.

Kontoglou arrived in Athens as a refugee from Ayvalik in the year of the Asia Minor catastrophe of 1922. He had previously spent five years in Spain and France (1914–19), where he had attracted attention for his talent as a painter. He also became well-known for his first prose work, Pedro Casas, which revealed a high literary talent.

He pursued both painting and writing with success. His first literary works were well received in Greece. They were written in a colorful demotic as oriental tales with exotic descriptions and paradoxical heroes, bringing a fresh approach to modern Greek prose. In his painting he used the style of Byzantine iconography to represent secular themes—painting portraits, landscapes, and mythological scenes in the style of church icons. To his fellow artists he revealed the purely artistic attractions preserved in Byzantine art.

In 1924 he published the periodical Philiki Hetaireia, “a journal of art and criticism,” in association with the architect Demetrios Pikionis, the writer and artist Stratis Doukas, and the poet Kostas Varnalis. Publication ceased after six issues, but the periodical inspired an aesthetic approach with a Greek focus in rapport with European literature and painting. (The same approach was followed in the 1930s by the periodical The Third Eye, published by Stratis Doukas, Demetrios Pikionis, Hatzikyriakos-Ghikas, Spyros Papaloukas and Socrates Karantinos, without Kontoglou’s involvement.)

From the late 1930s Kontoglou began to be inspired by popular religious tradition in both his art and his writing. He became a fervent champion of the popular aesthetic values enshrined in Greek Orthodoxy. They seemed to him primary
values. He dedicated himself chiefly to ecclesiastical iconography, imitating without reproducing the style of the post-Byzantine Cretan school, and concentrating on the technique rather than the theology of the icon. In his literary work he imitated the style of popular saints’ lives from the synaxaria, translating biblical and patristic texts into this mode. In articles and serialized publications he did his utmost to promote the popular picturesque side of traditional Orthodoxy.

In 1952, in association with Vasilios Moustakis, Kontoglou began editing a “monthly magazine of Orthodox teaching” called The Ark. The magazine survived for two years. Without declaring it as its aim, it tried to embody a rejection of the Westernized and Protestantized teaching of the extra-eclesiastical organizations, which were then at their zenith. Yet the Orthodox spirituality it presented was based on weak theological foundations. It tended towards romanticism and the preservation of customary piety, without the dynamism and creativity of living tradition. The Orthodoxy of The Ark was therefore incapable of addressing secular issues. Its nostalgia for the past offered nothing to the present.

Kontoglou nevertheless made an important contribution to the reawakening of Greek Orthodox self-awareness in the context of his times. His work was a catalyst, not only for intellectuals but also for the general public, for at least recovering a sense of the aesthetic value of the Byzantine ecclesiastical tradition. Before Kontoglou, Byzantine art — indeed the whole Byzantine heritage — was held in contempt in Greece. Until the middle of the twentieth century it was taken for granted that churches should be decorated in the Italian Renaissance style. Even on Mount Athos the monks painted religious pictures rather than icons. Thanks to Kontoglou’s work and passionate enthusiasm, the climate changed radically. It is true that in Europe generally there was a renewal of interest in Byzantine art which helped the reception of Kontoglou’s work in Greece, but this does not diminish his contribution.

Kontoglou was a teacher to many people, mostly transient students. But he was also influential among a narrower circle of artists and intellectuals. One of Kontoglou’s students was the painter Yiannis Tsarouchis, who made Byzantine aesthetics accessible to contemporary Greeks, while at the same time drawing attention to the natural hagiographical “innocence” in the work of popular painters such as Theophilos. The composer Simon Karras belonged to the same circle. He awakened Greeks to the value and significance of the Byzantine and popular musical tradition, performing the same task for music as Kontoglou had done for art. Argeliki Hatzinichali was a friend of Kontoglou, Tsarouchis, and Simon Karras. She began the first systematic research into Greek popular art, collecting and publishing a vast amount of material. Thanks to Kontoglou’s influence, established artists such as Spyros Papaloukas and Spyros Vasileiou studied Byzantine painting and undertook to decorate churches. Many well-known younger painters such as Rallis Kopsisis, Petros Vampoulis, Yiannis Terzis and Dinos Xynopoulos learned iconography in Kontoglou’s workshop. There were also other artists of the 1930s apart from iconographers who passed through Kontoglou’s workshop, such as the surrealist painter and poet Nikos Engeonopoulos.467

The architect Demetrios Pikionis (1887-1968) and the writer and painter Nikos Gabriel Pentzikis (1908-93) were also pioneers of the Greek awakening in the 1930s that was to bear fruit in the postwar period. The contribution each has made within his field has been the subject of special studies.468 With regard to what concerns us here, the relationship between Orthodoxy and the West, these two share a common approach: the rediscovery of Orthodoxy’s positive attitude to the material world, its reverence for matter, which the Church accepts as the created flesh of the uncreated Word.
The alienated “religionized” version of Church tradition had imposed even on the Greeks a “spiritualized” understanding of Orthodoxy, an identification of faith with abstract “convictions,” and piety with an equally abstract deontology. This extreme idealism reflected the popularized Platonic dualism that was a fundamental mark of Western Christianity. What is ideal and conceptual must be spiritual, and therefore nearer to God, who is Spirit, while what is material or physical must be unclean and evil at the opposite pole to the spiritual. What is ignored is the Church’s insistence on the definition of Chalcedon, on the identification of Orthodoxy with the veneration of icons, on the popular expression of Tradition that brings alive John Damascene’s words: “I shall not cease venerating the matter through which my salvation has been accomplished.”

Pikionis’s architecture vividly evokes Orthodoxy’s respect for matter, the humble study of how matter can embody the relationship of the creature with the uncreated Word who created it. “The most important thing in art is veneration or respect for matter,” Pikionis said, and he expressed this respect impressively in his buildings. His writings on architectural theory witness to his sensitive appreciation of traditional popular art, which has much to teach us about the personal logos of nature. Faith has priority over works. The work has its source in faith. And as a teacher—he was a professor at the Polytechnic and later an academician—Pikionis tried to initiate his students into a true understanding of art:

You must throw out whatever is false and superfluous within you. You must strip yourself boldly of all the false and deceptive clothing you have worn until now, and, cleansed and purified, plant your feet on the burning ground of reality. How empty you will find all those achievements which before flattered you with the fame and outward esteem they won you. How pallid—food for time which devours everything. And on the other hand how bright and luminous is the reality you have gained, however small. You will have no need to have your work noticed. It may remain unseen for ever, in the secret depths of your soul. What need is there for it to be noticed when God himself notices it? Does any mother need anyone to notice the love she has for her child?"530

Both by his writings and by his artistic works Pikionis made a striking contribution to awakening an ecclesial awareness in Greece at a time when a secondhand ideology prevailed. He was also a milestone in the development of modern Greek architecture, even though the ecclesiastical roots of his thought remain unacknowledged. Zisimos Lorenzatos testifies: “In the last years of his life Pikionis passed his nights with the neptic Fathers of the Philokalia, noting on numerous slips of paper the words and phrases whose meaning he needed to understand more deeply, or take upon his shoulders by applying to his own life.”531

Nikos Gabriel Pentzikis is particularly notable for his ecclesiastical realism in both his paintings and his writings. He was a “modernist,” adopting the anti-novel in the form of an interior monologue, a stream of associations with weak logical connections but with a coherent succession of personal experiences and intense symbolism. This form allowed Pentzikis to dwell on the experiential relationship with the particular, where the personal element of the relationship consciously transcends the aesthetic for the sake of the experiential immediacy of the symbolism.

By using such language Pentzikis rids his spiritual experience of any idealism. This purification enabled him to appropriate popular ecclesiastical experience in its material and practical expression: buildings, texts, icons and daily customs. He identifies the Greek Orthodox tradition with the material expressions of popular piety, the details of a popular faith insignificant to the “objective” observer.
For example, Greek church buildings for Pentzikis are not simply an aesthetic interpretation of theological symbolism. They express the relationship between the artist — and every believer — and the tangible reality of creation, which is ultimately a relationship with the Creator. Even the hymns are not simply a poetic expression of metaphysical truth but express a dense feeling of erotic experience of communion with the persons of Christ, the Theotokos and the saints. The physical sense of this communion is the central motif linking the chain of recollections in Pentzikis’s monologue.

It cannot of course be denied that this monologue gradually develops a sense of unrestrained delirious euphoria, with the result that mannerism takes over. Nevertheless, within this mannerist stream there are pages which reveal a rich personal experience.

George Theotokas (1906-66) novelist, essayist and playwright, was characteristic of his generation. A restless and liberal spirit, he represented in Greece the more progressive tendencies of Western Enlightenment and liberalism. But, uniquely among Greek intellectuals, he made a conscious effort to adapt Western borrowings to Greek conditions. His essay, Free Spirit, published in 1929, was regarded as a manifesto of the generation of the 1930s. It expressed Greece’s anxiety and obstinate determination to overcome the backwardness of secondhand and confused thinking, even though there were as yet no clear criteria for the Greeks’ spiritual self-awareness.

In the novels that followed we find the same unease, together with a traditional middle-class sense of moderation in the unstable social and political conditions of Greece at that time. Through his column in the Vima newspaper, Theotokas commented on public life for many years with a passionate love for his country in an effort “to save from the storm of factionalism, civil war and demagoguery, so far as possible, the rights of the spirit, common respect, a sense of justice and the potentiality for social progress in the future.”

In his last years Theotokas rediscovered Hellenism’s Orthodox Tradition. This is revealed by his last three books: A Journey to the Middle East and the Holy Mountain (1961), a play, At the Roadside (1963), and a novel, Infirm Travellers (1964). All three witness to a deep and assimilated knowledge of the theological care of the Church’s spirituality, patristic thought, Orthodox worship, monasticism and icons and the answers they give to the agonizing existential questions of modern humanity. Theotokas’s work has a dynamic power which even Kontoglou did not approach. It transcends romantic nostalgia for the traditional forms of piety or the charm of popular expressions of ecclesiastical life. Theotokas was the first even amongst academic theologians to speak to modern Greeks about the neptic tradition of Orthodoxy, the prayer of the heart and hesychast asceticism in contemporary language that responded to the thirst of people dissatisfied with today’s one-sided emphasis on “evolution” and “progress.”

In 1959 Theotokas wrote:

It is a great mistake to imagine that the Greek Christian spirit has been expressed definitively once and for all and sits in our libraries unchanged through the centuries. This spirit is a synthesis of many living elements that are always evolving in response to changing conditions. It is therefore something which every age has to struggle to re-adapt to its life and experience.

In his essays, “Return to the Sources, National Consciousness and Byzantium and Hellenism,” published in a volume entitled Spiritual Journey, Theotokas speaks so clearly about the vital issues of Hellenism and Orthodoxy that one wonders how he was able to arrive at such maturity alone and without a guide.
In the past, modern Greek intellectuals found provisional solutions to their spiritual problems. They adopted, without difficulty, the latest philosophical theory or literary and artistic trend prevailing in the great centers of Western Europe ... But now things have changed ... Today the West, and the outside world in general, no longer carries conviction ... On the one side lies the dark shadow of the totalitarian East. On the other, a cold wave of nihilism rolls in from the celebrated spiritual centers of the free Western world ... In such circumstances it is only natural for many thinking people to feel the need to go back to the living traditions of spirituality accumulated by Greek Christian wisdom ... Byzantium has bequeathed us a unique tradition of Christian wisdom and mystical experience which still lives in the monasteries and hermitages of the Holy Mountain but is ignored by most Greek intellectuals.454

In the awakening of thinking Greek people to the value and significance of Byzantium, a decisive contribution was made by a distinguished scholar, Basil N. Tatakis (1896-1986), Professor of Philosophy at the University of Thessalonica. Tatakis’s contribution to the study of Byzantine Hellenism’s philosophical significance was not confined to Greece. His *La philosophie byzantine* was published in Paris 1949 in E. Bréhier’s series *Histoire de la philosophie*.455 “The first synthetic work on this period, it was a landmark in the modern study of Byzantine philosophy.”456

Before Tatakis’s book, neither Western historians nor their Greek imitators recognized the existence of philosophical thought in the thousand-year history of the Hellenized Eastern Roman Empire. The Western opposition between philosophy and theology had been generally adopted by Greek scholars, who all took it for granted that Byzantium produced only theologians.457 Thus the history of ancient Greek philosophy came to an end with the Stoics and the Neoplatonists, to be taken up twelve centuries later by the West during the Renaissance. It was not until 1891 that the

great Krumbacher condescendingly acknowledged that the “Byzantine theologians” had preserved the manuscript tradition of the ancient Greek philosophical texts. And in 1895 Ludwig Stein rescued some scholiasts and commentators from oblivion – some of Byzantium’s less original thinkers: Michael Psellus, John Italos, Michael of Ephesus.458

Tatakis’s *Byzantine Philosophy* was the first systematic study of Greek philosophy in the Byzantine period. It showed that the creative philosophical work of classical antiquity did not come to an end with the Christianization of the Greeks. The discussion of philosophical problems in a systematic way continued in the patristic period, leading to important new developments in the history of philosophy.

Byzantine philosophy, [writes Tatakis,] is the Christian form of the same Hellenic thought, the great friend of contemplation. Even if this thought changed its dress and put on the Christian spirit, it remained the same Hellenic thought in every other respect. This is evident in its wonderful flexibility and penetration, in its systematic elaboration, in the same logic it employs, while developing a new theme ... this approach inspired the Greek East from the second century and continued throughout the Byzantine era.459

In 1952 Tatakis published a collection of studies in a volume entitled *Christian and Byzantine Philosophical Themes*, which analyze the general character as well as specific aspects of the philosophical writings of the Greek Fathers. This was followed in 1960 by *The Contribution of Cappadocia to Christian Thought*, a profound study of the work of the three great Cappadocian Fathers, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, besides that of other spiritual writers of the region. This book came as a surprise to Greek intellectuals. For the first time they saw a serious scholar and philosopher dealing with theological writers and presenting the richness of their thought. A comparison of Tatakis’s study with the works of contemporary patrologists
of the theology faculty (D. Balanos and K. Bonis) is sufficient to convince one of the superiority of the philosopher over the theologians both in scholarship and in personal interest in the subject.

Another book followed: Studies in Christian Philosophy (1967), in which Tatakis presents some overviews (on the anthropological teaching of the Fathers, the dialogue between the Christian and the Hellenic spirit, etc.) or clarifies methodological principles (on Gregory Palamas and the foreshadowing of contemporary philosophical thought in Byzantine philosophy, on Plotinus as a forerunner of Christian mysticism, etc.)

In 1969 Tatakis published in the celebrated Encyclopédie de la Pléiade and in the first volume of the Histoire de la Philosophie a condensed version of his first book on Byzantine philosophy, with extensive updating in the light of more recent research entitled La philosophie grecque patristique et byzantine.

Finally, in his studies in The History of Philosophy (1980), he collected five more issues on Byzantine philosophy, completing his earlier research on logic, epistemology, pedagogics, Socratic teaching, etc.

It should be added that while Tatakis approaches his sources in a strictly scholarly manner, he does not write with the cold objectivity of a detached observer. What is attractive in his work is that it is written in an accessible style (unlike the wooden katharevousa of most academics of the time) and guides the reader through patristic thought and experience with the ease of someone thoroughly familiar with his subject. Here in conclusion is a characteristic passage:

“Rationality” says Gregory Palamas, is truly “rational” when its organ is the “heart,” because the mind is “connected” — it is an expression of humanity’s composite nature. We have not paid enough attention to this very important patristic concept, which is opposed to seeing the mind in mechanical terms, because it holds that the rational faculty attains its fullness when it dwells in the heart. It is then that it expresses human personhood. These views are especially relevant today, when “rationality” prevails in almost everything and is emphasized as naked rationality alone ... In Palamas we do not have a mind that thinks, but a mind that finds itself “in unceasing prayer to God.” It is a mind full of heart that finds the way to God. The mind, he concludes, “contemplates divine light ... as a joyful sacred vision.” If one does not ascend to this height, if rationality is confined simply to the process of thinking, one can be a theological scholar but one cannot arrive at the vision of God.660

Another philosopher who had insight into the philosophical approach of the Greek Fathers was Konstantinos D. Georgoulis (1894-1968). He was an extreme conservative both on the language question and in politics, but was nevertheless an important figure in the history of philosophy. In 1949 he published a well-documented study entitled Greek Christian Philosophy in the “Hellas” volume of the Encyclopedic Lexicon Helios. In this article the whole of patristic literature is surveyed in a most lucid way, emphasizing the pivotal points of patristic thought. It was later included in a two-volume posthumous work, A History of Greek Philosophy (1975), which was the first Greek survey of philosophical history without a borrowed Western perspective.

The 1930s saw the awakening of Greek intellectuals and artists to their Greekness — the first signs of a rebellion against the established Westernization of Greek spiritual life. This awakening was mainly associated with aesthetic matters and the valuing of popular tradition. In this connection two forerunners of this later flowering of Greek self-awareness should be mentioned: Ion Dragoumis and Pericles Yiannopoulos, both of whom were romantic nationalists.

Immediately after the Second World War, however, this Greek awakening began to mature and become a discovery
of the genuine roots of Hellenic identity, a proposal for the meaning of existence. The long history of Hellenic identity was linked for the first time by modern Greek intellectuals with the experience of Orthodox ecclesiastical life, with worship and asceticism. The person who contributed most to this synthesis was the poet and critic Zisis Lorentzatos (1915-2004). “He is a unique writer, a central figure of modern Greek literature. Thanks to his work, a neglected aspect of our tradition has been raised into a hermeneutic principle, whether we accept it or not … He set down a testimony, pointed the way, and gave new life to ancient principles.”

It is not easy to categorize Lorentzatos’s work. He first attracted attention in 1947 with his book *Essay on Solomos*, which still remains the best critical work on the national poet. The book shows a deep appreciation of poetry and a broad knowledge of European literature in general, filled with insights drawn from his own struggle to express himself.

In 1950 he translated Ezra Pound’s *Cathay* poems and published them with an analytical introduction. It was a tour de force to render into Greek the beauty and metaphysical density of the Chinese poetry which Pound had assimilated. This was followed by a short travel book in 1951: *Rhodes Diary*, which conveys vivid scenes with a poetic sensitivity that does not fall into lyricism. A year later came a second critical study on André Gide’s *Theseus* (1952), in which he discusses many important aspects of European literature, and after that, in 1954, a brilliant translation of William Blake’s *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.

These brief, dense works of criticism prepared the way for Lorentzatos’s “manifesto,” a collection of poems entitled *Little Sandbank*, published in 1955. This is a masterpiece of modern Greek literature. Dense and expansive, full of metaphysical intimations, it may be compared to T. S. Eliot’s *Wasteland* or Saint-John Perse’s French poetry.

A central motif in Lorentzatos’s poetry is a “metaphysics-in-action” gathered from diverse cultures – Chinese, Aztec, Mexican, classical and later Greek – centered on a religious understanding of reality and its active expression in a useful form of art. Only the Western European branch was cut off from this single development of the good and the right, the beautiful and the experientially true. That is why it produces a useless art unrelated to human needs, or a philosophy “whose under-nourished works have not been fed with a little practical application for centuries.”

A year later, in 1956, Lorentzatos completely rejected his way of writing poetry, which he saw trapped in the Western fantasy of “art for art’s sake.” Writing to his friend, the poet George Seferis, he confessed:

> What I considered poetry is only a vapid distortion of its function – of the function of the poet – as established by two relatively limited and unimportant eras: the late classical period and the last five hundred years in Europe. All other creative eras and cultures go beyond the bounds of what is considered poetry today, or an aesthetic that exists for its own sake – an invention that suits these two delimited eras – and attain a normal condition, that is, one that creates normality in contrast to one that is exceptional or distorted. Peoples and politics, that is, cultures (traditional ones, apart from the two I have mentioned, which we can only call cultures in a manner of speaking) linked themselves to this normal condition through something higher or sacred, God for example, so that their lives did not self-destruct in the void – see modern “poetry” or “painting” – but derived meaning from this connection and transmitted such meaning to all its functions, which in these polities was an imitation of transcendent models – on earth as it is in heaven – an applied metaphysics, if you will, which made them “possesses la vérité dans une âme et un corps” (Baudelaire).

Six years of silence followed until 1961, when Lorentzatos published a short essay on Papadiamantis. In this text he sig-
naled a radical change of direction in his thinking. His central conviction remained the connection between art and the experiential metaphysical tradition, but it was now clear to him that if art is to be true, it must put down roots into the metaphysical tradition of the specific place and people which gave birth to the artist. Bringing together different traditions can shed light on unexpected aspects of convergence and similarity, but there is also the possibility of a syncretistic confusion that turns empirical traditions into mere ideologies.

In his essay on Papadianantis, Lorentzatos gives the first indication of his study of his own Orthodox tradition and its “practical” manifestations. The dead end of “art for art’s sake,” which Lorentzatos had analyzed in his translations and critical studies, insisting on the metaphysical emptiness of the West, is illuminated from the opposite point of view. Papadianantis and his work point to an escape from the impasse: “He embraces us immediately, us who have voluntarily disinherited ourselves from our tradition, as soon as we utter his name.”

The essay on Papadianantis was followed a year later by a study on Seferis entitled The Lost Center (1962). Although he had rejected literature as “art for art’s sake,” Lorentzatos continued to study the central spiritual issues of life—“the spiritual aspect is the only one that interests me”—dwelling on the art of writing but not touching on theoretical matters. In Papadianantis he explores the creative springs of art. In Seferis he charts the attempt of modern Greek poetry to reject imitation and find its own authentic voice. He concludes:

Our era does not lack worthy technicians or the linguistic means or anything else (I am thinking of Seferis’s humble concern for language). What is missing is a center or vision, and without this nothing can be accomplished. All things were made through this, and as the Gospel continues, without him was not anything made that was made.

From 1962 until his death, Lorentzatos continued to construct his spiritual witness with a series of masterly essays and studies. Always perceptive, he bases his critical analysis on a sense of reality and vitality nourished by the experience of Orthodox tradition. He published further critical studies, an anthology of Greek critical thought, a study of ancient criticism, and two analyses of modern philosophical works, sketches of several important figures in modern Greek spiritual life and of their European precursors, a small collection of haiku, and a travel book on the Aegean islands.

It is too early to assess the spiritual or even literary stature of Zisimos Lorentzatos. Indeed, the criteria for such an assessment do not yet exist in Greece. Faithful to Papadianantis’s example, he voluntarily withdrew from the marketplace. What he once wrote about Blake is applicable to himself: “He is alone, like Prometheus on the rock.” He is alone because he is unique. And he is like Prometheus because he shines out like a “living fire.”
XIX

The 1960s

If Papadiamantis and his school convey an unexpected sense of Orthodox sensibility at a time when religious thinking in Greece was thoroughly Westernized, the awakening of Greek theology in the 1960s was even more surprising. It recalls fourteenth-century Byzantium, when political decline was accompanied by a theological and artistic renaissance.

By 1960, academic theology and extra-ecclesiastical piety were losing their authority. Theology was becoming reintegrated with ecclesiastical life. New themes were being discussed: the eucharistic rather than institutional constitution of the Church, an experiential or apophatic approach to dogma, an existential rather than legalistic understanding of sin. New publications noted the Westernization of Greek theology and the Protestant character of the religious organizations, seeking a return to patristic criteria.

This new trend affected everyone, changing the whole character of theological debate. University theologians began to use forgotten terms like “theosis” and “nepsis,” and referred to Gregory Palamas, Maximus the Confessor, and the neptic Fathers. The climate of opinion was now against expressing theological ideas in rationalistic stereotypes.

Monasticism, too, experienced an impressive revival, particularly on Mount Athos. Increasing numbers of young men, graduates with no previous religious background, repopulated monasteries on the point of closing through lack of recruits. This influenced students and intellectuals, while
young pilgrims flocked to Mount Athos. Whenever monks from the Holy Mountain spoke at the universities, they lectured to packed audiences.

Most "official" church leaders and university theologians remained aloof. Trembelas was one of the first to attack the new sensibility publicly with his book Mysticism-Apophaticism, Catachetical Theology, while much later Professor Savvas Agouridis, in his article "Notes on Certain Contemporary Orthodox Theological Initiatives," argues that the 1960s' new perspectives merely imitated the mystical trends of Russian diaspora theologians, who "as a result of exile found themselves in abnormal circumstances and lost touch with contemporary reality." For him these "mystical" trends are marginal to Orthodox tradition, being an isolated sign of Neoplatonic influence on a small segment of Byzantine monasticism. He considered it "incomprehensible why this influence on a particular group of Byzantines should be raised to a criterion for evaluating the past and the future," maintaining that to relate this "Byzantine Neoplatonic ascetical theology" to the ontological problem and contemporary philosophical debate about it ends up as inadmissible speculation "on the internal relations of the Holy Trinity" - which has nothing to do with salvation or history - or as an unacceptable theologizing variant of Western existentialism and personalism.

Parallel to this polemical reaction, there were many clerics and lay theologians who wanted to adopt the new theological perspective but were perplexed. They realized the importance of studying the Fathers and learning from the monastic and ascetical tradition. They understood the centrality of the Eucharist and the local ecclesial body, and appreciated the iconography and hymnology of the Church. But long-established habits of mind precluded a real change of outlook. Their preaching, catechizing and pastoral work in general aspired to reject the discredited practices of extra-ecclesiastical pietism, but they often fell into a middle way: a neopietism which, although denouncing the "excess" of the associations, in reality gave new life to a legalistic moralism sustained by proof-texts from the Fathers and the Church's canons. Previously, psychological security and guidance had been sought from the organization in the person of the "elder." Now that the missionary activity of the associations, with its Protestant character unchanged, had been integrated into the structure of the parish and the diocese, the deference shown to the leaders of the extra-ecclesiastical movement was transferred to Athonites or other monks. In short, the external marks of Orthodoxy were superimposed on the piety characteristic of the organizations, which were to be respected "in spite of numerous past mistakes." This saved Orthodox consciences.

None of this could minimize the significance of the new theological movement. After six centuries of "Babylonian captivity" during the Turco-Ottoman and the subsequent free Greek state, the 1960s reawakening was an important change.

The leading figures of this change, coming as they do from different backgrounds, do not form a unified group. The fact that they all produced their work in this brief period is quite remarkable.

In 1957 a doctoral dissertation was published with the approval of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens in spite of objections from certain professors. Entitled The Ancestral Sin, its author was a young Greek-American priest, John Romanides.77

Romanides' ecclesial view of sin and the Fall, salvation and deification, broke with the Western juristic model. Using patristic texts that elucidate the experiential character of theological expressions, he established - for the first time in Greek - that the legalism of Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas, officially adopted by the Western Christian denom-
institutions, was not an isolated heresy but the root of successive misinterpretations of every Christian doctrine, radically distorting the Church’s Gospel. By contrast, the Orthodox Church’s version of sin and salvation presupposes and summarizes all the fundamental points of the Church’s theology and experience: the Trinitarian thought of the Cappadocians and Palamas, and the insistence of the Fathers from the beginning on the biblical version of God’s relationship to creation, on uncreated divine energy, on uncreated life-giving grace, on the importance of personal freedom in determining existence, and on the centrality of the ecclesial body as the foundation of the Orthodox understanding of salvation.

With humanity’s sin and salvation as the pivotal theme, Romanides succeeded in summarizing the whole of Orthodox dogma, emphasizing the deep gulf separating it from the intellectualist and juridical expressions of Western dogma. His book was a model of Orthodox dogmatic theology, a unified vision of the experience of revelation. 474

The Ancestral Sin, making direct references to Christos Androuatos, revealed the dependence of previous Greek academic theology on Western ideas. It was Trembelas who was least exposed, for his theology, along with the entire teaching of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations, had been based on the Western juridical model of soteriology, particularly on Anselm’s theory of “the satisfaction of divine justice through Christ’s death on the cross.” Both of the theological faculty’s two “organization” professors, P. Trembelas and P. Bratsiotis, reacted strongly against Romanides’ dissertation. The correspondence that followed between the author and the two professors, preserved in the faculty’s archives, merits publication.

Romanides came from the Orthodox diaspora in America, where he acquired a deep knowledge of Roman Catholic and Protestant theology. He based his study of patristic texts on Orthodox criteria hitherto ignored in Greece. He had studied under Fr. Georges Florovsky, and had worked with the Russian theologians of St. Vladimir’s Seminary in New York, who sought to detach Orthodox theology from its dependence on the West and were rediscovering the theology of St. Gregory Palamas. Nevertheless, this influence did not prevent him from criticizing certain aspects of Russian thought. 475

The Ancestral Sin remained Romanides’ only theological work in Greek. Elected Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Thessalonica, he changed the orientation of his interests and research. He turned to history, seeking to prove that modern Hellenism is a “Frankish” construct which destroyed the cultural unity of the “Romans” and “Romiosyni,” that is, the Latin- and Greek-speaking parts of the Orthodox Roman Empire viewed as a cultural whole. He develops these ideas in Romiosyni – Romaia – Romeli where he discusses the political and cultural origins of modern Greek alienation, through a vocabulary, method and style differing radically from that of The Ancestral Sin. 476 But for all its richness the work is too polemical. 477

After the second book’s publication, Romanides dwelt with increasing sharpness on the cultural contrasts between the Romans and the Teutonic Franks (Germans), the Latin Franks (French) and the Italo-Franks (Italians), and also between the “Romans” and the “Neo-Greeks – Graeculi – neo-Greekism.” His interpretation of the theological differences between Orthodoxy and the West follows his historical analysis, with its emphasis on intrigues and conspiracies.

Romanides’ interests led him into politics, standing as a parliamentary candidate for an extreme-right party. Before resigning his university chair in 1982, he taught a peculiar kind of neo-moralism, identifying the priesthood solely with a spiritual state leading to the vision of God, and disputing the ecclesiological validity of the contemporary Orthodox Church. Although a priest, he rarely celebrated the Liturgy.
Nevertheless, *The Ancestral Sin* remains a classic, a landmark in the theological revolution of the 1960s that set an unimpeachable standard of Orthodoxy.

In 1960 there appeared the first volume of a critical edition of *The Works of St. Gregory Palamas*, inspired by Panayiotis Christou, Professor of Patrology at the University of Thessalonica.478 Professor Christou had also pursued postgraduate theological studies in America and had firsthand knowledge “of the revived interest in mystical theology during the last few decades which had brought Palamas into prominence.”479 He was the first Greek university professor to be well-informed about the new interest of leading Roman Catholic theologians in the Greek Fathers, and was aware of the role of Russian Orthodox theologians of the diaspora in stimulating it. In this first volume of the works of Gregory Palamas, Christou was assisted by the Russian theologians John Meyendorff and Boris Bobrinskoy.

An extremely able teacher, Christou transformed the climate of theological studies in Thessalonica through this project. He gathered around him a group of talented students and graduates whom he involved in editorial work and initiated into the systematic study of Palamite theology. This group activity provided a real postgraduate theological education at a high level which produced doctoral dissertations and serious monographs, creating a particular theological mentality and promoting common theological criteria. Many of Christou’s young colleagues became teachers themselves in Thessalonica’s theological faculty. Thanks to Professor Christou, a “school” of theology was at last created in Greece and remains influential.

Panayiotis Christou clearly saw how the teaching of Gregory Palamas could renew Orthodox theological studies internationally. Palamas’s thought presupposes a vital Orthodox self-awareness, with a sense of the criteria that mark it off from the Western understanding of the Church. The Russian diaspora’s “school” of theology, like the corresponding Serbian “school” of Fr. Justin Popović and the Romanian “school” of Fr. Dumitru Staniloae, took on a neo-Palamite character. Christou’s publishing initiative was a pivotal point in theological education, responding to a conscious need for the renewal of the Orthodox presence in our time.

Christou also published monographs on particular theological problems in the Fathers, as well as general summaries of patristic thought. These works stimulated a significant Greek contribution to the development of patristic studies. Christou was the leading Greek patrologist of his time, the pioneer of patristic studies in the Greek universities. He still remains important.

Sadly, Christou’s university career was curtailed. He became involved in extreme-right politics and was appointed Minister of Education in the last phase of the military dictatorship (1973-74). With the change of regime he was dismissed from his university post, but continued to direct the Patriarchal Foundation for Patristic Studies at the Monastery of Vlatadon, publishing further works and supervising the conservation of the manuscripts and icons of Mount Athos.

In 1963 Christou’s student and collaborator in editing the works of Palamas, Georgios Mantzaridis, published his doctoral dissertation, *The Teaching of Gregory Palamas on Theosis*.480 This study is a milestone in the theological “shift” of the 1960s, not only for its subject matter but also because it was the model for a new style of theological writing in Greece. After many centuries in which intellectualist and moralistic approaches have prevailed, this work returns to a vital theological problem which is the goal of the Church’s Gospel: humanity’s participation in the mode of divine existence and life. Humanity is meant to draw its existence not from its created and mortal nature but from a personal relationship with the Father, a relationship which
is life-giving through the uncreated grace of divine love. In Mantzaridis’s thesis this relationship is not psychological or moral but a real sharing through the Spirit in Christ’s incorruptible flesh, in the mode of his anthropic existence, through the historical reality of the eucharistic body of the Church. Participation in ecclesial communion, as it actually exists, transforms death and corruption into a kenotic self-surrender to the Father’s love and restores in humanity the principle of divine triadic existence. Humanity is thus led to theosis.

Few Greek studies since have been able to approach the maturity of Mantzaridis’s theological writings. Doctoral dissertations subsequently began to concentrate on specific theological themes in individual Church Fathers.

Mantzaridis published other studies on Palamite theology which were later collected in a volume entitled *Palamika*. As Professor of Christian Ethics at Thessalonica, he transformed the legalistic character which this branch of theology had acquired through Ch. Androuotos, B. Antoniadis and their imitators. In Mantzaridis’s writings Christian ethics insists on theosis as humanity’s goal, and appeals to the witness of patristic experience for every subsidiary aspect of moral teaching. The morality of the ecclesial person is restored to its real existential dimensions of freedom from death. It is a morality revelatory of true life: Christian ethics is “a revelation of God.”

Mantzaridis is highly regarded internationally. The maturity of his theological vision and the importance of his writings place him in the front rank of modern Greek theology. 1965 saw the publication of a book by Nikos Nissiotis: *Prolegomena to Theological Epistemology* (on the incomprehensibility of God, yet the possibility of knowing him — an Orthodox critique of knowledge of God derived through philosophy, psychology and modern natural theology). In the same year the author was elected Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at the University of Athens.

Before his election or the publication of the book, Nikos Nissiotis (1926-86) was already a prominent theologian. He embodies a new type of thinking free from the provincialism and old-fashioned attitudes characteristic of Greek theology. He was in touch with all the new developments of his time, being well-informed about current trends in science, philosophy, art, psychology and politics. For a theologian, the breadth of his interests was unprecedented. He not only observed the rapid changes taking place in the world around him, but also participated in them. He spoke several languages and was widely traveled. His natural charm made him an attractive personality. An enthusiastic supporter of athletics, he became a vice-president of the International Olympic Committee and introduced basketball to Greece. His team became European champions.

Nissiotis’s 1956 doctoral dissertation, defended at the University of Athens, was *Existentialism and the Christian Faith*. This was the first time that a Greek confronted the problems raised by Kierkegaard, Jaspers, Heidegger and Sartre in the light of living Orthodox theological thought.

When Nissiotis was elected to his chair in Athens (with strong opposition from the sympathizers of the extra-ecclesiastical organizations), he had already been director of the Ecumenical Institute of postgraduate theological studies in Geneva (Bossey) for many years. He had broad experience of the ecumenical movement and inter-church dialogue and was internationally the best-known Greek theologian. More than simply his many-sided theological presence, it was his book on epistemology, in Greek *Prolegomena eis tin Theologikin Gnosioslogian*, that became a landmark in the theological transformation of Greece.

The basis of the work was a denial that God could be known as an object, and consequently a rejection of the cog-
nitive principles of apodictic rationalism, which scholastic theology had adopted and which entailed the absence of a personal relationship with God. In the ecclesial perspective, God is only the “knowing subject.” “He knows each of us individually as we exist in our specific personal hypostasis through our inner communion with God as reconstituted by Christ” (p.156). Our knowledge of God follows the pattern established by Paul’s insistence on God’s initiative: “But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God” (Gal 4:9). Any other path by “analogy” or “inductive reasoning” is anthropocentric, reducing God to a bare concept, a product of human reasoning.

The God of a rationalist ontology is “derived from the abstraction of every existent … the raising of abstract thought to the ultimate idea of Being … and so non-existent in his indeterminacy … which is theologically a monstrous fabrication” (pp. 96-101). The same is true of God as “supreme good,” “moral principle,” and “goal of every moral value,” for he is then “subject to human reasoning and action according to successive needs, an intelligible sign of the goal of thought without personal hypostasis.” That is why “atheism is the real though unexpressed last word of moralism” (pp. 89-93). But psychology’s God is also only derived from the working of the human psyche … The God of the collective unconscious is a generalization and abstraction … A vast object … a projection of human wishful thinking” (pp. 116-119).

In contrast to all these abstract inductive arguments,

the God of Christian thought exists out of love and in the flesh so that humanity can share in him and partake of his body and blood. Therefore it is only through his incarnate appearance and through creation in the flesh that humanity can be raised up, or rather, can participate in his flesh and recognize him as that in which humanity's fleshly hypostasis can communicate directly. Thus to “eat his flesh” (John 6:51-2), however scandalous and unacceptable it may appear to be, is the only way to know him and for this knowledge to be transformed into life in him, that is, into acting in his likeness (p. 76).

Nissiotis summarizes Orthodox experience in the certainty that the incarnation of the Word provides humanity with its only means of knowing God. But he is anxious to distance himself from a Western theological tendency at that time to replace a scholastic “natural theology” with an “absolutized Christology.” This kind of Christology implies that all: civilizing human activity, technological as well as spiritual, is the direct fruit of Christ’s incarnation – even if unconsciously or unintentionally. This was understood as a continuous evolution of history and social relationships “moving forwards in Christ” towards the omega point of universal fulfilment, “the union of nature and history with the human spirit in a cosmology recapitulating everything in the One Word” (pp. 195-209).

Nissiotis opposes this evolutionary determinism with the Orthodox teaching on the common energy of the persons of the Trinity, and the role of the Holy Spirit, who brings about “the recapitulation of all things in freedom through the salvation of persons” within the life of the Church. Orthodoxy’s balancing of christological and pneumatological perspectives in its account of God’s creation reveals “the constant triadic drive of creativity, conceived in eternity, realized in time, and perfected in history, always through God’s absolute initiative and humanity’s free and conscious cooperation, by virtue of salvation in Christ and through the Holy Spirit within the Church” (pp. 220-30). Thus the Church is revealed as a microcosm of all creation, the center which recreates creation “in the Holy Spirit,” the very energy of God’s essence, which irrigates “like rivers of great waters” a continuous creation. This liturgical and eucharistic insight into creation constitutes humanity’s participation through re-
pentance in the energy of the divine essence. It brings about a knowledge of God which is not simply an intellectual apprehension or psychological assurance, but life in abundance.

Nissiotis proposes knowledge of God as a challenging solution to modern people’s questions about the meaning of life. He not only discusses the philosophical issues raised by existentialism, personalism, and phenomenology, but addresses the meaninglessness of daily life, the society of uncommunicating individuals created by our secular culture. His Orthodox sensibility pervades his analysis of modern trends.

Nikos Nissiotis was not especially prolific, publishing only two more works in Greek: *Philosophy of Religion and Philosophical Theology* (1965) and *The Apologia of Hope* (1975). He was active in ecumenism, participating in conferences and inter-church dialogues, and contributing articles to international scholarly journals and collective volumes. He died prematurely in an accident in August 1986.

Another important doctoral dissertation of the 1960s was *The Unity of the Church in the Holy Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* by John Zizioulas, since 1986 metropolitan of Pergamon.

Zizioulas had also worked under Florovsky as a graduate student at Harvard. The book is a systematic theology but based on a thorough study of the early Christian sources. It analyzes the testimony of ecclesial experience in the early centuries to prove the priority of the Church’s eucharistic structure over its institutional form, identifying the Church’s eucharistic unity with its “canonical” unity.

A eucharistic structure and unity means that both derive from the Eucharist. For the Church has its origin in the coming together of the faithful for the eucharistic supper. The early Christian texts lead Zizioulas to identify the very definition of the Church with the eucharistic supper. In the Eucharist of every local community the Catholic Church is realized and manifested—the whole Christ, the catholic event of the new mode of existence that constitutes the Gospel’s salvation, humanity’s participation in immortality.

In contrast to the catholicity of the Eucharist, heresy is fragmentation: not an ideological difference, but the transferring of salvation to other means outside the complete and full mode of the Eucharist. That is why “faith and Orthodoxy are ecclesiological concepts: correct faith cannot constitute a self-sufficient mode of salvation.” It depends on the participation of the believer in the Catholic Church, in the catholic realization and unity of the body of Christ which is manifested in the local Eucharist. “Orthodoxy does not constitute the criterion of the Catholic Church; the Catholic Church is the criterion of Orthodoxy.”

And because the Church’s unity depends on the Eucharist and is completed by it—not in terms of ideological concord and organizational structure but principally in terms of a unified and catholic mode of existence—the hierarchical structure of the Church also derives from the Eucharist. It serves the requirements for the celebration of the Eucharist and ensures the priority of the existential fact of ecclesial unity.

Thus the “leader of the Eucharist” or the “president of the Eucharist” is a bishop, in Greek *episkopos*, literally one who oversees (*episkopein*) “by virtue of the position he holds in the eucharistic assembly.” Such an assembly represents the image of the heavenly Eucharist, as described in the Book of Revelation: “God is, above all, Episkopos upon the throne, before the altar on which is the lamb that was slain, and before whom is the multitude of the saved, and around the throne are the twenty-four elders.”

“Such from the beginning was the position which the bishop occupied as one who offered the divine Eucharist, and consequently the Church looked upon him as an image and type of God or Christ.” But the image implies more than that. The bishop is not simply a symbol of the presence of Christ,
nor is he simply the successor of Christ and the apostles in the legal sense of the transfer of privileges. The bishop functions within the ecclesial body like Christ. The "gift of the Holy Spirit" which he received at his ordination makes him capable (irrespective of whether he is worthy) of fulfilling the work of Christ himself present in the Church. It enables him to create the unity of the eucharistic body on the model of the unity and true life of the Holy Trinity.

Zizioulas's analysis of the sources provides convincing support for these fundamental truths which prevent the Church from being transformed into a religious institution with the characteristics of a secular organization. The most important aspect of this historical study is the systematic theological teleology which emerges from it, the systematic and historical aspects illuminating each other.

In his analysis of the early phases in the development of ecclesial life, Zizioulas responds to the central problems of ecclesiology, illuminating the Church's historical formation on the basis of its early documented experience. The genesis of the parish (enoria) – that is, the preservation of the Church's unity centered on the bishop in spite of its division into separate assemblies – the relationship of the catholicity of the local church to the Catholic Church throughout the world, the visible distinction of the Catholic Church in practice from the heresies and schisms – these are all themes characteristic of Zizioulas's approach.

This study provides a sound historical foundation for a systematic eucharistic ecclesiology. This expression, introduced by the Russian émigré theologians Florovsky, Schmemann and Aфанасьев, has been at the center of ecumenical theological interest in recent years. Zizioulas adopts the Russian approach but goes beyond it. He is particularly critical of Aфанасьев, who was influenced by Khomíakov. He notes that the Russian understanding of catholicity (sobornost) makes the concept of communion an autonomous "princi-

ple" of catholicity – autonomous in itself and with regard to the existential character of the fact of communion. On the ecclesiological level, such a perspective tends to minimize personal freedom and Church unity as a product of catholicity, that is, of Orthodoxy.

In his later writings Zizioulas moved on from the ecclesial mode of existence centered on the Eucharist to ontological problems. In his article "La continuité avec les origines apostoliques dans la conscience théologique des églises orthodoxes," he analyzes salvation historically and eschatologically, arguing that a combination of historical and eschatological approaches allows us to locate the Church's apostolic identity and unity throughout the centuries in the Eucharist. And in another article, "Vérité et communion: Fondements patristiques et implications existentielles de l'écclésiologie eucharistique," he studies the ontological presuppositions of eucharistic ecclesiology and their epistemological implications, analyzing the relationship between truth and person, person and history, history and salvation, and salvation and the Church in a patristic perspective.

It is characteristic of Zizioulas's theology that he maintains a dialogue with other Orthodox theologians, promoting a fertile discussion of real problems in the Orthodox world. Although his ecclesiological studies were inspired by the eucharistic ecclesiology of the Russians, his shift towards ontology, specifically the theology of personhood, reflects a Greek influence.

His reflections on ontological problems in Orthodox theology are summarized in his article "From Mask to Person: The Contribution of Patristic Theology to the Concept of Personhood," and are expanded in another study: "The Being of God and the Being of Man."

Zizioulas demonstrates briefly but persuasively that the concept of person as an ontological category (a category determining the mode of existence which constitutes an ex-
istential \textit{otherness}, that is, freedom from the need for existence to be determined by its \textit{nature} or \textit{essence}) “is generated historically as the Church attempts to express its faith in the triadic God in ontological terms.” In the Greco-Roman world the concept of existential otherness was unthinkable, since reality presupposed a given \textit{logos} which (as essence-form) determined the mode of existence of everything that was. This given \textit{logos} ensures the world’s rationality and order, “but in such a world it is impossible for freedom and the unexpected to arise.” Even God is determined by the \textit{logos} of his essence. He cannot be or act in a manner other than that which is required by his being part of the universe’s rationality. The “causal principle” of everything that exists is consequently necessity, not freedom.

The Church’s historical experience is different from this ancient Greek understanding of reality. In the historical person of Jesus Christ the Church knows God not to be predetermined by his essence, but to be capable of also existing in the \textit{logos}-mode of humanity’s essence, free from whatever necessarily limits human existence, such as mortality.

The Church therefore recognizes experientially in God a \textit{mode of existence} not subject to any predetermination or necessity. And in this mode it seeks the truth of personhood. Zizioulas uses patristic thought to show that the causal principle of what exists is embodied in the truth of personhood: God is the cause of Being, not as an impersonal essence or nature, but fundamentally as Person. God the Father “timelessly and lovingly,” that is, in absolute freedom, constitutes his essence (i.e., produces hypostases) by begetting the Son and causing the Spirit to proceed. His personal freedom determines the mode of existence of his essence. In the same freedom of love, the common energy of the three divine persons creates the world ex nihilo. The world’s rationality is a \textit{logos} revealing the person of the Creator, just as an artist’s or poet’s \textit{logos} is revealed in their work.

If God exists, he exists because the Father exists, that is, he who out of love freely begets the Son and brings forth the Spirit ... This means that God, as Father, not as substance, perpetually confirms through “being” his \textit{free} will to exist. And it is precisely his Trinitarian existence that constitutes this confirmation ... and the one divine substance is consequently the being of God only because it has these three modes of existence [fatherhood, sonship, and procession] which it owes not to the substance but to one person, the Father.

Zizioulas arrived at these theological conclusions through studying the Church’s eucharistic identity. This study is apparent in every aspect of his later theological writings. His eucharistic ecclesiology led him to reformulate theology as a whole on the basis of ecclesial experience, not speculative thought, in the way that Gregory Palamas clarified the distinction between essence and energies, or Maximus the Confessor the two wills in Christ.

Zizioulas’s theological synthesis is analogous to the syntheses that defined Orthodox self-awareness in the patristic age. No other theologian since Palamas has had a comparable impact on Orthodox thought.

After his doctorate Zizioulas worked at the World Council of Churches. He then became a professor of patristic theology, lecturing in patristic thought first at Edinburgh, then at Glasgow, and finally at Kings College London. Since 1984 he has also been a professor at Thessalonica. In 1986 he was ordained bishop directly from the lay state with the title Metropolitan of Pergamon. During these years he has contributed significantly to the ecumenical movement, chiefly as a representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The first doctoral dissertation on his thought was published in Canada in 1989.

The crisis which affected the Zoe Brotherhood and its associations in the 1950s has already been mentioned. The
cultivated archimandrite Elias Mastroyanopoulos, who was elected superior at that time, was uneasy about the direction theology was taking.

Mastroyanopoulos, perhaps involuntarily, played an important role in the theological shift of the 1960s. A spiritual product of extra-ecclesiastical pietism, he nevertheless maintained a theological outlook very different from that of the pietistic associations. This was so marked that he seemed a "foreign body" in the organization. When he assumed the leadership of Zoe's "Work," he tried to deal with the many problems afflicting the organization by a bold initiative. He attempted to raise the movement from its flat moralistic spirituality and awaken in the younger members of the Brotherhood an interest in Orthodox patristic thought and the liturgical tradition.

This initiative produced impressive results with regard to the reawakening of the younger men, but was disastrous for the movement as a whole. As soon as Zoe's young theologians rediscovered an Orthodox approach, they abandoned the Protestant structures and practices of the organization to seek more Orthodox forms of spiritual life.

Within two years the Brotherhood lost its younger members, dozens leaving to pursue postgraduate theological studies. Many of them entered the clergy or became monks on Mount Athos or elsewhere. The impressive shift towards theology and monasticism which created a new outlook in Zoe circles was accompanied by a bold criticism of the organization's Protestant and extra-ecclesiastical character. Core members reacted vigorously, deposing Mastroyanopoulos and withdrawing his publications from the movement's bookshops.

But within three years Mastroyanopoulos' theological rebellion became the catalyst of the theological shift of the 1960s. One of his closest colleagues and mentors, though entirely outside the Zoe movement, was his childhood friend Demetrios Koutroubis, an exceptionally gifted man of unusual theological formation who had returned to Greece a few years previously after an eventful spiritual journey.

In April 1960, the month in which the conservative faction broke away from Zoe and founded Sotir, Koutroubis, encouraged by Mastroyanopoulos, published an article entitled "The Revelance of Gregory Palamas" in Aktines, a periodical of Western (Tsirianian) sensibility. This was followed a month later by "Gregory Palamas and Two Modern Problems," about anthropology and atheism. Both articles were inspired by John Meyendorff's Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas and St. Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe.

Two months later Koutroubis published a third article in the same periodical, "A Lay Teacher of the Spiritual Life: Nicholas Cabasillas," in which he introduced Myrra Lot-Borodine's Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au 14e siècle, Nicolas Cabasillas. Koutroubis emphasized the relevance of Palamas and Cabasillas to the religious difficulties confronting the modern Western world. He also drew attention to the renewal of Orthodox thought through the books of Meyendorff, Lot-Borodine, Florovsky, and Vladimir Lossky, and also to the new Roman Catholic and Anglican interest in patristic theology in scholars such as Henri de Lubac, Louis Bouyer, and E. L. Mascall. These theologians opened up new theological horizons for Greek readers, who until then had been limited to pietistic moralism and dry academic theology.

Similar articles followed in the periodical Anaplastis before we come in 1962 to the publication of a book by the Zoe Brotherhood which marks an important stage in the change of Greece's theological thinking. This book was Theology – Truth and Life, with passages from the great émigré Russian theologians Florovsky, Lossky, Schmemann and Meyendorff, and the Serbian Justin Popovic, all translated
by Koutroubis. Rarely has a theological book had so great an impact as a basic introduction to a new language, new problems, and new criteria for approaching ecclesial truth. Florovsky's book in particular, *Ways of Russian Theology*, analyzed the Westernization of Russian Orthodoxy, stimulating awareness of the equivalent alienation of Orthodox thought and life in Greece.

A year later, in 1963, Zoe published two more anthologies of translations by Koutroubis: *Our Liturgy*, three studies on Orthodox eucharistic theology by Elias Mastroymannopoulos, Alexander Schmemann and Olivier Clément, and *Monasticism and the Modern World*, which included important texts by Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant scholars on early Christian ascetic spirituality.

These three books were followed in 1964 by a best-seller which did much to promote the Mastroyanopoulos-Koutroubis program and also contributed to the neopalamite flowering at the University of Thessalonica. This was Vladimir Lossky's *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, one of the most influential Orthodox books of the twentieth century. It was translated by Presbytera Stella K. Plevrakis and published in Thessalonica with an introduction by Professor Antonios-Aimillos Tachiaos.

Parallel to these publications, Mastroynopoulos and Koutroubis founded a series of annual theological seminars called "Ephesus," in Athens and Thessalonica. Participants included Zoe theologians, postgraduates who had studied abroad, professors from the theological faculties, and some bishops. Running from 1960 to 1964, these seminars reintroduced Greek theologians to the Orthodox patristic and liturgical tradition and informed them of the broader revival of Orthodox studies in Europe and America. The presence of Russian émigrés, such as Fr. John Meyendorff and Mme. Behr-Sigel, brought Greek theologians for the first time into direct contact with pioneers of the dialogue between Orthodoxy and the modern West.

During this period Mastroynopoulos had entrusted Koutroubis with supervising postgraduate studies of the younger Zoe theologians, and teaching them foreign languages. Koutroubis's influence in these seminars was considerable, never criticizing the Brotherhood explicitly but nevertheless shedding a revealing light on the vital difference between the Church's outlook and piety and that of the organizations. Koutroubis's little house in Vouliameni became the center of the theological "rebellion" which dissolved Zoe and shaped the theological shift of the 1960s in Greece.

The overthrow of Mastroynopoulos and prevention of any collaboration between Zoe and Koutroubis broke the "rebellion." Almost all the younger members had by now left the organization, enabling the minority that remained easily to reaffirm its Pietism.

The "rebellion," however, continued to produce results. The theological conferences were held for a further six years without the involvement of the associations. The decision to continue them was taken by a small group of theologians who had returned from postgraduate studies abroad, led by Professor Savvas Agouridis. The venue each summer was a different Greek metropolitan see where the bishop had expressed an interest in this theological movement. By being held in different provincial cities, the conference attracted local clerics and theology teachers, university professors and postgraduate students. The issues discussed by the permanent members of the conferences thus influenced the provinces. The metropolises of Thessalonica, Kozani, Phthiotis, Eleia, and Selinos and Kissamos in Crete hosted the conferences.

A group of former Zoe members gathered round Demetrios Koutroubis and in 1964 began to publish a quarterly journal called *Synoro (Frontier)*. The group brought together theolo-
gians, artists and scientists who shared a common interest in the study of the Orthodox tradition and its relevance to contemporary problems. As its title suggested, the journal’s aim was to break down the frontiers between theology, art and philosophy in addressing the problems of society. Each issue had a theme such as Orthodox and modern art, Orthodox Marxism, Orthodoxy and nationalism, Orthodoxy and modern atheism, Orthodoxy in a changing world, Orthodoxy and politics. The word “Orthodoxy,” which had hitherto evoked academia or superstitious ritualism, lost is pejorative meaning. Linking Orthodoxy with the problems of modern life was something new.

With its mature sense of ecclesial authenticity, Synoro won new readers for theology, making the Russian diaspora theologians Lossky, Uspensky, Evdokimov, Bulgakov, Schmemann and Zander, and their followers Clément, Ware and Sherrard generally known to the Greek public. Greek thinkers and artists like George Theotokas, Takis Papasotiris, Nikos Karouzos and Alekos Kontopoulo also contributed creatively to the contemporary debate on the relevance of Orthodoxy.

After twelve issues the editorial group suspended publication on April 24, 1967, as a result of the military dictatorship’s suppression of free speech. But from 1970, as part of a build-up of publications against the dictatorship, the same group began to publish a series of eight books also entitled Synoro.

Demetrios Koutroubis was the inspiration behind both the journal and the later series. He remained the theoretician and organizer, supervising publication and writing pseudonymously. The editorial board learned under his tutelage how to construct a fresh theological approach without breaking with centuries of ecclesial experience and tradition. Even after suspension, the “Synoro group” met every fortnight, with Demetrios Koutroubis in the chair.

Demetrios Koutroubis (1921-83) was born in Athens, where he studied medicine during the German occupation.

In the last year of his studies a serious illness aroused his interest in metaphysical questions. Applying himself to the study of whatever religious books were then available, he found they did not answer his questions. Then a chance event changed his life. He met some Jesuits whose theological culture greatly impressed him. He believed he could find the answers he was looking for in the spiritual tradition that these men represented. He was also attracted by the Roman Catholic forms of worship.

At the end of the war Koutroubis traveled to France, where he became acquainted with some of the great names in Roman Catholic theology. On his return to Greece, after a painful interior struggle he decided to enter the Jesuit order. He joined them as a novice in 1946 and a month later began studying philosophy at Heythrop College near Oxford. In September 1948 he first visited the great Jesuit center at Lyons, where he remained for a year attending philosophy classes at the Collège de Mongré. There he formed a close friendship with Henri de Lubac and the group of Roman Catholic scholars around him engaged in pioneering studies on the Eastern Orthodox tradition and the Greek Fathers.

In 1950 Koutroubis was sent to Beirut to teach philosophy at St. Joseph’s University. But by now a new struggle was taking place within him. His study of Greek patristic theology began to convince him of the authenticity of his “maternal” faith. His friendship with Fr. Lev Gillet, a convert to Orthodoxy, strengthened a decision to return to the Church which he had abandoned in ignorance. After difficulties with his colleagues in Beirut, and after accusations of being pro-British, he left the order in May 1952. His departure was recorded in the Jesuit register as a “request to leave.”

After traveling to Jerusalem, Rome and England, he returned to Greece in 1954 for good. He fulfilled the formal
requirements for reinstatement in the Orthodox Church and settled with his mother in a small house in Vouliagmeni. It was there, five years later, that his old fellow student Elias Mastroynannopoulos found him living in straightened circumstances, giving English and French lessons while spending his nights studying Orthodox sources.

His discreet collaboration with Mastroynannopoulos and his participation in the Symevo venture caused him to be widely known in Greece. The news of his conversion and his rare personal gifts brought him into contact with many seekers of ecclesial authenticity. A multitude of people, both Greeks and foreigners from all walks of life, came to visit him at his house in Vouliagmeni. He had a unique gift of drawing people out, "un vrai socrate chrétien chez qui l'intelligence c'est faite bonté," according to Gabriel Matzneff. He led people to think and express themselves in ways in which they would not have considered themselves capable. According to his Times obituary of March 7, 1983, he had the gift of a unique ability to recognize the capabilities of others and draw out what was good in them, while at the same time encouraging them to find and follow the vocation which best suited them.

In 1978 ill health forced him to seek medical treatment in England. His condition did not improve, and from May 1981 he settled there, spending long periods in the hospital. Increasingly introspective and solitary, he refused to return to Greece. England, he said, was the place that had hurt him least. Finally, he died peacefully in a small village in Norfolk on March 2, 1983.

He left a feeling that his life was meant to be like that, fleeting and discreet. His friends regarded him as a unique person who stayed quietly on the margins of Greek life, fulfilling his mission discreetly before leaving virtually unnoticed. In a brief time he contributed unintentionally to the breakup of Zoe, and opened many people's eyes to the richness of the Orthodox tradition. His influence was considerable.

In the winter of 1966 three young theologians who had made an early break with Zoe settled in the Skete of Iveron on Mount Athos near the Elder Paisios, an experienced hesychast. All three had been disciples of Koutoubis. Having spent some years in graduate studies in France, they were already distinguished theologians.

Two of them, Vasileios Goutikakis and Gregory Hatzimanooul, were clerics. The third, a layman called Panayiots Nellas, accompanied them to study ascetic spirituality. The presence of these three theologians on the Holy Mountain provoked a certain amount of surprise. For decades the monastic life on Mount Athos had been despised by academic theologians and the religious associations as a refuge for illiterates, or as a museum preserving treasures of purely antiquarian interest. It had never occurred to theologians and postgraduates to pursue their spiritual aspirations on Mount Athos.

The strict divide in Greece between theology and monastic asceticism had brought Athonite monasticism into progressive decline. In the 1960s it seemed to be heading for extinction. Venerable monasteries were on the point of closing for lack of monks. The handful of elderly men there were barely sufficient to preserve the treasures of the Holy Mountain. The "idiomorphic" system of most monasteries, which had originally been designed to encourage a more austere asceticism, had degenerated into indiscipline. Monks lived together but led their own private lives, maintaining a monastic identity only through observing a few external rules. Worship in most monasteries was an incomprehensible ritual simply preserving an outward fidelity to the "typicon" while zealotism was gradually changing faith into a fanatical ideology.

In such an atmosphere the presence of three educated young men justifiably caused surprise. They had come to Mount
Athos not to renew it or modernize it, but with a clear intention to submit to its spiritual tradition and learn from it. For the Holy Mountain still hid holy ascetics "who do not study divine things but experience them."

Nellas left after a few months, but the clerics settled on Athos permanently. After four years at the Skete of Iveron, the Holy Community asked them and their elder to take over the Monastery of Stavronikita, which was on the point of closing through lack of monks. The small "company" settled in the monastery, initiating an extraordinary development. Within a few years the Coenobium of Stavronikita, with Archimandrite Vasileios as its abbot, was full to capacity. Stavronikita became a pilgrimage center, especially for students. For the first time the Athonite community saw on their cobbled streets and footpaths young people of all backgrounds, secular in appearance and dress yet fully mature in their spiritual aspirations and eager to experience the authenticity of the Church in the life of the Holy Mountain. Young men dissatisfied with modern secular life found guidance and encouragement to cope with the confusion of modern times.

Before long the Stavronikita experiment began to be imitated. A dynamic company of young monks settled in the Monastery of Simonopetra under the young Archimandrite Aimilianos Vaphiades. A second community went to the Monastery of Gregoriou, led by the equally young Archimandrite George Kapsanis. From 1975 onwards, the number of new "companies" settling in the monasteries rapidly transformed the population structure of the Holy Mountain. This unexpected rebirth of Athonite monasticism has been one of the most significant events in Greek Church life for centuries.698

The stream of pilgrims to Mount Athos has continued, bringing young people into contact with monastic life. Visitors returning from the Holy Mountain wanted to read theological books, patristic texts and liturgical works. This development led to a publishing boom. Whole series of patristic works appeared on the market, together with translations of modern Orthodox literature, besides many publications of the Athonite monasteries themselves. There was also a renewed interest in hagiography and Byzantine music. Young Athonite abbots attracted large audiences whenever they spoke in universities.

The Archimandrite Vasileios Gontikakis, who was abbot of Stavronikita for twenty years and since 1990 has been abbot of Iveron, is generally recognized as the most representative spokesman of the monastic renewal on Athos. His books (Hymn of Entry, Abba Isaac the Syrian, The Parable of the Prodigal, Theological Commentary on the Iconography of the Monastery of Stavronikita) have been translated and reprinted many times.699 They are written in a theological style totally new in Greece, reflecting the immediacy of real experience. Archimandrite Vasileios speaks directly to modern people without any deliberate "modernism." Neither does he turn life into ideology. If John Zizioulas is the outstanding theologian of our time, Vasileios Gontikakis is the great witness to "Philokalian" spirituality.

The brief period which Panayiotis Nellas (1936-86) spent on Mount Athos experiencing Athonite ascetism marks the beginning of his fruitful contribution to the "shift" in Greek theology. From his early days with Koutoubis and his studies in France his main interest had been Nicholas Cabasilas. After a series of articles on this great fourteenth-century lay mystic, he published his doctoral dissertation: The Teaching of Nicholas Cabasilas on Justification. At the same time he edited a series of patristic texts ("To the Sources") with introductions and commentaries which contributed greatly to an understanding of patristic theology. The first volume was three homilies of Nicholas Cabasilas on the Theotokos, which he edited personally. The second volume was a collec-
tive enterprise with four homilies on the Theotokos by John Damascene. The third volume was Maximus the Confessor’s *Mystagogia*, and the fourth the same father’s *Ambigua*.

In 1979 Nellas published a mature study on Orthodox ecclesiastical anthropology entitled *Zoon Theoumenon*. This book was a commercial success and was translated into English. In 1982 he began a new venture the publication of a theological quarterly called *Synaxis*. The title expresses the publication’s intention: to gather and coordinate the various scattered theological and spiritual discussions into a dialogue and study of the Greek Orthodox tradition. *Synaxis* achieved that goal. In its pages people with different viewpoints entered into dialogue with each other – Athonite monks, university theologians of various tendencies, left-wing intellectuals, artists like Yiannis Tsarouchis and Andreas Phocas, research scientists, young teachers of religion in schools, as well as Orthodox of other nationalities. By avoiding controversy, *Synaxis*’s impact was limited, but this ironic approach did at least bring together people with different views and interests.

In the Spring of 1986 Panayiotis Nellas died suddenly, but the work he began with *Synaxis* was continued by his friends and colleagues.

The so-called “administering” church in Greece and in the Greek diaspora worldwide was unaffected by the new theological aspirations of the 1960s. But there were a few bishops who sympathized with the attempt to recover an Orthodox ecclesial self-awareness and identity. Among these were two outstanding personalities.

The first was Dionysios Pearsanos, metropolitan of Kozani. Coming from a clerical family that had produced a succession of priests since the eighteenth century, he began in early youth to study the fathers, liturgy, and ecclesiastical music. Even before the 1960s the metropolitan of Kozani’s sermons were an exception to the general rule. In 1957 he started publishing a pamphlet called *Oikodomi* which gave a weekly sermon to his diocese. These sermons are marked by clear criteria distinguishing Orthodox experience from the religious ideals of a Westernized piety. In these pamphlets Dionysios condemned the extra-ecclesiastical character of the religious brotherhoods and associations as early as 1962 in language reflecting a Church-centered theology. After 1965 he became closely associated with the theologians who were organizing summer conferences in the first fertile period of the search for Orthodox self-awareness. He was always present at these gatherings with a willingness to learn. As metropolitan of Kozani he was certainly the best theologian in the Greek hierarchy. Avoiding ecclesiastical politics and episcopal intrigues, he was a pastor of his flock rather than a secular leader. He was a candidate for the archbishopric of Athens in 1973, but his fellow bishops rejected him for a man who, though influential in secular terms, deepened the Greek Church’s problems.

The other impressive theological bishop during these years was Stylianos Harkianakis, first metropolitan of Miletapolis and a lecturer at the University of Thessalonica, and later archbishop of Australia. As a young graduate of Halki, he was influenced by the Westernized theology of Christos Androussos, as is apparent in his doctoral dissertation *On the Infallibility of the Church in Orthodox Theology*. But his period in Thessalonica as *hegoumenos* of the Patriarchal Monastery of Vlatadon, and the links he cultivated there with Mount Athos and church-centered scholars and artists in Thessalonica, influenced him deeply. In his 1969 inaugural lecture, “The Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Church,” his ecclesiological criteria are extremely clear. He rejects a legal model of the Church in contrast to the re-orientation of Roman Catholic ecclesiology in this most important document of the Second Vatican Council (1962-65).
After this study, in papers presented at conferences and later as Orthodox Chairman in the official dialogue with the Roman Catholics, Harkianakis’s theological contribution is a mature and consistent witness to the Orthodox view of the Church’s catholicity.

Elected archbishop of Australia in 1975, he became responsible for Orthodox emigrants plagued by chronic problems of schism, uncanonical actions, political divisions and Pietistic factions. He began the tremendous work of reorganizing the Church in Australia in a consistent and uncompromising way, ignoring the attacks of various interest groups. After fifteen years the archdiocese has been transformed. There are active parishes everywhere, a dedicated clergy, a multitude of beautiful churches, dynamic youth organizations, a huge philanthropic work, publications and a perceptible Orthodox presence in the universities and public life. And in 1986 Archbishop Stylianos founded in Sydney the first Orthodox theological school in the southern hemisphere, named after St. Andrew.

The Archdiocese of Australia embodies the first attempt to restore Orthodox priorities to the pastoral and administrative aspects of a local church. Each year during Lent, Archbishop Stylianos brings over spiritual fathers from Mount Athos to hear confessions. This bond with the Holy Mountain has enriched ecclesiastical life in Australia. And this is only one example of the practical search for authenticity. The entire physiognomy of Greek Orthodoxy in Australia, centered on worship and parish life, preserves a remarkable fidelity to traditional ecclesiastical piety, unlike America, where the Greek Church seems to have lost its cultural and theological identity.

These critical remarks are not meant to asportion blame but merely to give a sketch of some of the personalities. The historical journey of Greek Orthodoxy, with the Scylla of alienating Westernization on the one side and the Charybdis of empty formalism on the other, is not a matter of abstract theory but is about people. And in the “physiognomy” of the Greek Church in Australia we can recognize the theological presence of Stylianos Harkianakis, especially in a sense of ecclesiastical authenticity that is incompatible with the marks of authoritarian spirituality and personal power. The archbishop has published ten collections of his poems. He does not shrink from exposure, making his personal sensitivity and pain public. He communicates a life which is fully human and without pretense, just as he communicates grace in his liturgical role.

* * *

It is time to take stock. Is the revival of the 1960s just another bout of introspection in Orthodox history, where no revival has endured? The full manifestation of the Gospel’s truth can only be expected as an eschatological event. By objective standards the history of the Church’s life through the centuries has been one of weakness, privations, misinterpretation, exploitation, alienation and ultimately failure. From time to time this failure is highlighted by some revelatory experience which encourages us to return to the teaching of the Gospel. The reality of the resurrection is always an unexpected light in the experience of the cross; the pain of the cross acquires meaning only in the surprise of the resurrection.

The sense of Orthodox ecclesial authenticity, which has come to the fore again after centuries of alienation and oblivion, continues to have an effect on Greek spiritual life despite a great deal of confusion and disorientation. The Western alienation of the Church’s Gospel remains a constant temptation to reduce ecclesial reality to mere religion. We naturally crave objective certainties and guarantees of salvation. We seek the psychological comfort of self-sufficiency and
authority. That is why the final banishment of the Western alienation of the Gospel is only an eschatological exception. Until then our criteria are limited and the ecclesiastical authenticity of our Orthodoxy is partial.

At the time of writing, a wave of “neo-pietism” seems to be replacing the older pietism of the extra-eclesiastical organizations in Greece. The signs are abundantly clear.

On the pastoral level bishops are increasingly adopting the missionary methods of the pietistic zealots. Episcopal jurisdiction only serves as an ecclesiastical screen. In reality this movement has a Protestant character, with typical forms of pietistic missionizing and ideological propaganda, sometimes enriched with modern advertising methods such as radio broadcasts and mass meetings in stadiums.

On the same neo-pietistic pastoral level there has also been a tendency to treat the Church’s canons or monastic obedience in a highly legalistic way. This juridical understanding is coming to replace the totalitarian emphasis on obedience of the moralistic movements. Orthodoxy is increasingly understood as scrupulous observance of “canonical” rules, the canons being used as an objective standard for evaluating personal fidelity to Orthodoxy.

Even the astonishing revival of monasticism on Mount Athos seems to be slipping into a zealous conservatism. On the pretext of anxiety to preserve Orthodoxy from heresy, monks are taking upon themselves the role of the Church’s policemen and prosecutors. The role takes over, and the monk is no longer a penitent crucified “on behalf of the body of Christ, which is the Church,” but is the bearer of an authority sustained by the secular power. He claims the right to fulminate at patriarchates, archbishops, bishops, or anybody else, accusing them of heresy, betrayal, and making concessions on matters of faith.

Thus the garment of mourning assumed through a consciousness of sin, a garment of freedom from the need for personal assertion and personal authority, is transformed into the clothing of conventional authority, and the peace of spiritual withdrawal is turned into a place for making ex cathedra pronouncements. Certainly, Orthodoxy has always recognized monasticism as the guardian of the Church’s faith. But it is a tragic sign of alienation when this guardianship is understood in terms of a papal Defensor Fidei, instead of as a lifelong ascetic effort to live out the authenticity of the faith as the Church teaches.

From another point of view, a large number of religiously inclined laypeople are encouraging the monks, without realizing it, to preen themselves on their “authority.” These are the people who once found psychological comfort in the totalitarian discipline of the extra-eclesiastical organizations and have now found a substitute for the organizations’ guidance in the objective authority of the counselors of some “elder.” Priests in the cities, without any personal experience of monastic life, have become self-styled “elders,” changing the struggle to attain freedom — which is what ascetical obedience means — into a disciplining of laypeople afraid of responsibility, into a spiritual direction that extends to the details of private life.

On a theological level, these neo-pietistic tendencies — whether conscious or not — find expression in certain ideas which try to make ecclesial experience objective and measurable. For example, the mystical and ineffable experience of “the vision of God” has been proposed as a reliable way of demonstrating the validity of the priesthood and as an essential element of “apostolic succession.” This position, which has been drawn from certain ideas of John Romanides (as noted above), throws doubt indirectly on the ecclesiastical authenticity of the Orthodox ecclesiastical body as it exists today. Among some theologians it has become a useful methodological tool for judging theological authenticity, even to the
point of classifying theologians according to three grades: "the purified," "the enlightened" and "the defiled."

It is characteristic that all these schemes follow a scholastic procedure. They seek support by citing a host of patristic texts, just as the scholastics founded their arguments on the authority of passages from Aristotle or the Bible. These theological theses and their accompanying patristic texts may refer to the importance of experience, but in fact rely on rationalist methods of scholastic argument.

Another example of neo-pietistic tendencies in theology is the systematic querying of any problem to do with ontology, which was one of the chief concerns of the 1960s. What is chiefly doubted is the ontological content of the concept of personhood when it refers to the human subject. It is held that since God is a Triad of Persons, only a saint, who has attended likeness to God, can be described as a personal existence.

Behind this view lies an understandable fear that the ecclesial experience of "person" might be confused with the secular "personalistic" sense of the term. Probably an attempt is also being made to emphasize the dynamic content of the word (as opposed to its static definition), the indivisible unity of "in the image" and "according to the likeness." But apart from the questions about human identity which it leaves unanswered, attributing personal hypostasis to the saints alone risks transforming the free dynamic of holiness into a mechanical support for a codified set of steps on a moralistic ladder.

These two examples simply suggest how easy it is to slip from the theological realism of ecclesial experience into schematic conceptualizations and moralistic aims. This easy transition perhaps explains the frequency with which Orthodoxy is appealed to in Greece, but in a context in which Orthodoxy has been turned into a religion, which is not immediately recognized as a symptom of deep-seated Westernization.

No one can claim that the theological "shift" of the 1960s released the Greek Church from its Babylonian captivity to a Western-style view of faith as a religion. A few signposts were set up pointing in the right direction. This is a cause for thanksgiving, an unexpected gift. But the gift refers to the continuity of the Greek witness to evangelical authenticity, without identifying this continuity with the historical survival of the present form of the Greek state and Greek culture.

The Greek state institutionally and culturally has remained totally uninfluenced by the theological and ecclesiastical debates of the last few decades. The educational system suffers from outdated "modernist" notions and gives Greeks neither a sense of their own culture, nor even a basic education. The decline of linguistic teaching in particular is cutting off more and more younger people from the source of their cultural continuity and identity.

The so-called "official" Church seems sunk in a stupor. Episcopal office is the subject of power struggles and intrigues. The majority of the clergy are committed to the professionalization of their functions. The seminaries are in a lamentable state of decline. The Greek Church has become socially marginalized, without influence on public life.

Unlike Thessalonica, Athens University theologians do not challenge Westernization. Standards have declined and the more obvious this becomes, the more prevalent is the psychological compensation of a disheartening self-sufficiency and short-sighted withdrawal. At least the academic theologians of the generation of Androuotos, Balanos and Alivizatos had been very influential. Contemporary academic theology, particularly in Athens, is essentially marginalized by its one-dimensional professionalism. It does not participate in the country's intellectual life.
Marked by these signs of cultural decline, Greece, once an Orthodox nation, has entered the European Union. The cycle which started in 1354 with Demetrios Kydones seems to be coming to a close with Greece becoming absorbed into Europe – the final triumph of the pro-unionists. European unification is inevitable and not necessarily a bad thing, safeguarding the geographical boundaries of the Greek state. But the real boundaries of Hellenic existence, its self-awareness and identity, have crumbled and collapsed.

Only the signposts remain, pointing to the real Hellenism, the historical embodiment of the Church’s Gospel. These signposts are the surprising exceptions to the story of decline now reaching the end of its cycle: Patriarch Jeremias II, Kosmas Aitolos, Makarios Notaras, General Makriyanis, Alexander Papadiamantis, and those who contributed to the remarkable Hellenic revival at the end of the second Christian millennium.
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Already in the Report of the Ecclesiastical Committee of 1833 we find the view expressed that “the Bishop of Constantinople ... has assumed the universal title of Ecumenical, a word of no significance.” For the Konstantinopoli there is no such thing as an ecumenism in the Orthodox Church. The word “confession” has acquired its meaning. Hellenism was transformed into a provincial nationalism and Orthodoxy into a religious “confession.” “With the trend of the modern world the nationalism began to dominate the ecumenicity,” as Runciman concisely puts it (1968, 379).
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Science may be defied as complete confidence in the infinite possibilities of scientific theory and practice.

Waren (1964) 15–16. Cf. Macall (1958) 62–63: “Greek theology for the last few centuries has very largely been based upon Latin scholasticism, often of a very decadent type, with slight modifications about the Papacy, the episcopacy and the Filioque, and has more recently shown a readiness to accept somewhat excessively and uncritically the Biblical theories of German liberal Protestantism.” Balanos notes in 1931 that of the thirty-one members of the Athenian theological faculty, twenty-seven had pursued post-graduate studies in Germany and four in Russia, though of the latter two had also gone on to complete their studies in England (1931, 159).
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lustruous professor of Athens University's theological faculty since its foundation and one of the most distinguished theologians of the contemporary Orthodox world. K. D. Georgoulis in his article on Androuotos in the Helios Encyclopedia (1948, ii.798) declares: "Who can see in Androuotos the most authentic representative of Greek Orthodox's philosophical spirit?" and this judgment is reproduced by G. Möckel in his entry on Androuotos in the RGG I, 370. Similar praise is bestowed by Chrysostomos Konstantinidis, Metropolitan of Myra and Professor of Dogmatic Theology (1972, 25) and Megas Phanaros (1973, 75).

E.g. Balanos (1907) 4; Bratsiotis in his article on Androuotos in the Ithiki kat thrisektiki Enthylopidea (ii.740). Among modern academics only Phanaros has ventured any criticism. He accuses him of a "manifest dependence on the Protestant theologian Wilhelm Herrmann" and observes that his references are confined to the Bible, philosophers, and Protestant theologians: "[H]e completely ignores the historic tradition." He then adds: "[T]his observation is of course external and formal, but nevertheless it does indicate the inner tendencies of his works" (1973, 74-75).

Compare the statements on pp. 12, 13, 16-17 on the appropriation of truth by human reason with the corresponding scholastic theses set out by M.-D. Chenu in his excellent study of scientific theology in the thirteenth century (1969).

John Romanides observes that Androuotos, following Western thought, confuses the essence and energies of God. When he speaks of the divine essence's relation with the world it is therefore not clear how he avoids pantheism (1989, 47, 48, 53).

For a fuller discussion of this point see Yannaras (1984).

On Trembelas, with a good bibliography, see Spiteris (1992) 227-41.


Florovsky warns of the futility of simply knowing patristic texts and being able to cite them: "[T]he return to the fathers must not be solely intellectual or historical, it must be a return in spirit and prayer, a living and creative self-restoration to the fullness of the Church in the entirety of sacred tradition" (1979, xvii).

A French translation was made by Père Pierre Dumont of the Monastery of Chevetogne and published by Chevetogne and Descée de Brouwer in 1966-68.

Trembelas (1959-61) ii.58.

salvation. And a doctrinally spineless piety which regards theosis as an
improvement of character is naturally to be rejected. ... If this were the
Church's Theology, she would not have produced God-revealing Fathers
and Confessors but cold scientific researchers and debaters of the present
age. And if this were the spirituality of our Tradition, she would not have
created the nectic Fathers as 'gods by grace' and 'lamps of discernment'
but morbid conventionalists, victims of psychological delusions."

The Extra-Ecclesiastical Organizations

336 See Trembelas (1957) for a typical example of this Protestant-type
ecclesiology and manipulation of biblical and patristic texts. See Dia-
mantopoulos (1988) for an even more naïve example of ignorance of the
ecclesiological fundamentals of the gospel's salvation.

338 See Papakostas (1948) 68; Yioultsis (1975) 169ff. The charges were
(1) that Zoe has a heretical tendency manifested in arrogance, (2) that it
seeks to introduce innovations into the divine Eucharist, (3) that it aboli-
ishes the sacrament of confession, and (4) that by its teaching it pushes
its members into irreconcilable celibacy.


340 See Okodomi, the weekly published sermon of the Metropolitan of
Servia and Kozani, year 4 (1962) fol. 34, 37.

341 Alexanderidis (1966), published in Synodo, the periodical founded by
Koutoubris's circle.

342 For the relevant literature, see the bibliographies in Yioultsis (1975);

343 See Papakostas (1948) 21–23.

344 Evidence of their admiration is contained in the Praktika Synodikon
Adelphothitos Theologon 1 ZOI, which were printed annually for private
circulation. For example: "One can only admire the great self-denial and
self-sacrifice of the members of the religious orders and their life-long
obedience to their superiors" (Praktika 13 [1936] 555–56); "Our Broth-
erhood is developing into a monastic order and consequently all of us,
especially the clerics, should regulate our conduct like members of an
order. In the Western orders the members are 'sold hides' in popular par-
lance. They belong neither to themselves, nor to the Christian commu-
nity, but to their order. They depend on their order absolutely and work
as its representatives" (Praktika 12 [1935] 510–11).

345 See Schmidt (1972) 14.
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385 The misleading nature of Papakostas’s book has been demonstrated by Stavropoulos (1977). Papakostas’s insidious influence even extended to the official publications of the hierarchy. A Church of Greece encyclical of October 1937 borrowed Papakostas’s heterodox theses verbatim.
278 The Praktika of 1946 state: “We should be acquainted with every student or child in the group or working person who belongs to our movement. We should know well the material we have in our hands. And for this we need cooperation. The youth movement leaders should be in touch with the young people’s spiritual director and with others of the Brotherhood who happen to come into contact with them” (215). There is much anecdotal evidence of members after confessing their faults to their spiritual director being called in the next day by the head of the local association and being informed of their expulsion.
277 See Praktika 7 (1930) 239–40, where it is claimed that university theological studies are of minimal value for preaching and practical work and that the many theologians who have pursued higher studies are not necessarily religiously inclined.
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395 See Praktika 12 (1935) 479, where it is noted that the desire to pursue higher studies is often a motive for leaving the Brotherhood. Such thoughts undermine confidence in the Brotherhood’s outlook.
394 See Tsirintanis (1951).
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Papadiamantis and His School

For a good overview in English see Cogg (1992). See also the following works in Greek: Mouzelis (1978); Babanais and Soulis (1976); Aignadis (1975); Tsoukalas (1977); Phakiotis (1978); Simopoulos (1990).

His best known work, Ι Photonissa [The Murderess], has been translated into English (trans. Peter Levi [London 1983]). A volume of short stories is also available in English: Tales from a Greek Island, trans. Elizabeth Constantinides (Baltimore, 1987).


See Kamberidis (1990) 137–52.

Balanos says: “His religious attitude was purely one of worship of form together with a mystical tendency and perhaps an unconscious pantheistic coloring.” See his whole article on Papadiamantis in the special issue of the periodical Nea Estia for Christmas 1941.

Theokletos of Dionysiou castigates him at length for his supposed hedonism and attachment to carnal passions (1986, 34, 80, 45, 70).

Dimaras designates his style, which he says “appeals to people not accustomed to writing of good quality” and regards his religious attitude as decadent and obscurantist (1968, 381–84).

See the essays in the commemorative volume Mmimi Kontoglou (Athens: Asit, 1975).
come to be seen as marking an important stage in the development of Greek poetry after Sferris.

The 1960s

472 Published in Athens in 1957, it was reissued by Dornos in 1989. There is an English translation by G. Gabriel, Ridgewood: Zephyr, 2002.
474 See Romanides (1956).
475 Romanides (1975).
479 An English translation (by L. Sherrard) titled The Deification of Man: St. Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition was published in 1984 by St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press in their Modern Greek Theologians series.
481 See Mantzaridis (1967), (1979), (1983), (1986), and (1988) on the ethical and spiritual life as participation in God.
483 There is a good exposition of his theology in Spiteris (1992) 323–61.
484 2nd ed. 1985.
485 Athens, 1965; 2nd ed. 1986; page references are to this edition.
486 The Apology of Hope was an offprint from Theologia. For a full bibliography of Nissiotis’s books and articles see Spiteris (1992) 323–25.
489 Irenikon 50 (1977b) 451–510.
490 Published originally in Greek in the festschrift for Metropolitan Meliton (Zizioulas, 1977c) and in English (trans. N. Russell) in Zizioulas’s Being as Communion (1985) 27–65.
493 Meyendorff (1959a); English trans. 1964.
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