

Anglican Orders and Orthodox Politics

by BRYN GEFFERT

This essay examines the political and religious impetus behind Patriarch Meletios Metaxakis's recognition of Anglican orders in 1922. The furore surrounding recognition, the events that led up to it and the fall-out that followed shed light on the many difficulties faced by religious leaders in the post-war Orthodox world, difficulties that led to fierce jockeying among Orthodox clerics as they tried to establish themselves in relation to their coreligionists and to the larger Christian world. The controversy also offers insight into the problems inherent when a 'comprehensive' Church such as the Church of England enters into discussions with a more uniformly dogmatic confession such as Orthodoxy.

I can say that one of the most important events of the century at the beginning of which we find ourselves is just the work of the union of both Churches, the Holy Anglican and the Greek Orthodox. We can really congratulate ourselves that this question has arisen in our days in a more vivid manner. Let us hope that through our efforts it may in our days come to a happy issue: Archbishop Meletios¹

It is regrettable and disastrous that ecclesiastical diplomats in common with other politicians should frequently bow themselves down in worship of policy rather than of principle, of expedience rather than of justice and right, in their actions and pronouncements: editorial, *Orthodox Catholic Review*²

In the early 1920s a significant number of catholic-minded members of the Church of England believed that the reunion of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches lay in the not-too-distant future. John Douglas, the crusading, grecophilic vicar of St Luke's in Camberwell (when not off trotting about the Balkans), typified such Anglo-Catholic optimism. In 1920 Douglas founded a journal, *The Christian East*, to both promote and chronicle this ambitious scheme. Mostly sober and didactic, although occasionally preening and bombastic, *The Christian East* emerged as the most complete source in the English-speaking world for information about Orthodoxy, and the leading cheerleader for efforts towards reunion. Its third issue, in 1920,

CE = *The Christian East*; CQR = *Church Quarterly Review*; ECU = *English Church Union*; JFSASS = *Journal of the Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius*; TV = *Tserkovnyia vedomosti*

¹ Meletios, archbishop of Athens, 'Letter from his grace the archbishop of Athens', CE i/3 (1920), 9.

² 'Consistency and Orthodox policy', *Orthodox Catholic Review* i/2 (1927), 49.

proudly printed a congratulatory letter from Meletios, the Orthodox archbishop of Athens, endorsing *The Christian East's* conviction that the union of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches might soon be a reality. 'I am sure', wrote Meletios, that *The Christian East* 'will help a great deal to the great purpose of union.'³

Throughout the nineteenth century Anglican and Orthodox theologians had discussed thoroughly the myriad issues that separated their two confessions.⁴ Anglicans examined Orthodox practices such as prayers for the dead, prayers to the saints and the veneration of the Mother of God. The Orthodox, in turn, examined and fretted over the Protestant tone of the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles, the incorporation of the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed⁵ and the adoption of a slew of doctrines never endorsed by the first seven ecumenical councils.

The 1910s and the 1920s were a time of burgeoning ecumenical optimism. Planning for the great pan-Christian Faith and Order conference (finally held in Lausanne in 1927) began in the years leading up to the war. Just before the outbreak of war the American Episcopal Church was attempting to arrange meetings with Orthodox hierarchs in Constantinople and Jerusalem. The great Russian Orthodox synod of 1917 announced that it welcomed overtures from Anglicans.⁶ Many leaders in the student Christian movements that blossomed before and after the war promoted contacts with the Orthodox. The Ecumenical Patriarch gave his blessing to the World Student Christian Federation's 1911 meeting in Constantinople, and student Christian movements sprang up soon thereafter in Romania, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece. (The Russian Student Christian Movement joined the Federation in 1913.)⁷

The post-war ecumenical movement was fuelled by a fierce determination to unite Christianity in ways that would foster joint efforts in the mission field and prevent the horrors of the Great War from ever occurring again. Many came to see ecumenical ventures as a means rectifying the 'sins of

³ Meletios, 'Letter from his grace', 9.

⁴ See Josef Altholz, 'Anglican-Orthodox relations in the nineteenth century', *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* xviii-xix (2002-3), 1-14; LeRoy Boerneke, 'The dawn of the ecumenical age: Anglican, Old Catholic, and Orthodox reunion negotiations of the 1870's', unpubl. PhD diss. Minnesota 1977; Bryn Geffert, 'Anglicans and Orthodox between the wars', unpubl. PhD diss. Minnesota 2003, ch. i.

⁵ The *filioque* is an addition (first appearing at the Third Council of Toledo in 589) to the original language of the Nicene Creed. The addition causes the Creed to assert that the Holy Spirit 'proceeds from the father and the son [*filioque*]'. The *filioque* was a constant source of contention between Orthodox and western theologians during the nineteenth century.

⁶ James Cunningham, *A vanquished hope: the movement for church renewal in Russia, 1905-1906*, Crestwood 1981, 202-3.

⁷ Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill, *A history of the ecumenical movement, 1517-1948*, Philadelphia 1968, 603.

egoism' and the 'insufficiency of love'⁸ on display during and after the war, a way to restore the 'brotherhood of man'⁹ and allow Christianity to present 'a united front against the [secular] subversive elements' of the post-war world.¹⁰ Contacts between Anglicans and Orthodox intensified as Russian exiles streamed into western Europe, and members of the Balkan Orthodox Churches sought Britain's financial and political support in the political and religious chaos following the war. Serbian Orthodox came to know British life well as displaced Serbian students studied in English universities during the war.¹¹ Anglicans distributed thousands of dollars to Russian *émigrés* through the Russian Clergy and Church Aid Fund.¹² Hamilcar Alivizatos, a theology professor at the University of Athens who returned in 1920 from meetings with Anglicans in New York, Oxford and London, was optimistic that points of contention between the two confessions could be resolved. The 'Anglicans place an Orthodox interpretation on the *Filioque*', he enthused upon his return.¹³ Discussions at Oxford demonstrated 'no essential difference' between Orthodox and Anglican interpretations of baptism and confirmation. And the conference in London convinced him that the Church of England makes use of icons 'on the lines of the Seventh Œcumenical Synod. They deviate in nothing from this line':¹⁴

The religiousness of the flock of [the Anglican Church], their perseverance and piety in prayer, the splendour of their worship, the sacred pictures and sacred feelings, the affection toward the Church and her sacred mission in society, the existence of monastic orders of both sections ... have persuaded me that the Anglican Church stands very near, and much nearer than any other, to our own Church, and that truly no serious obstacle exists to prevent intercommunion and union between the two Churches.¹⁵

In January of 1920 – the same year as *The Christian East* began publication – the Ecumenical Patriarchate issued possibly the most famous encyclical from Constantinople in the twentieth century, *Unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be*. This constituted an ardent plea for cooperation with other

⁸ Stefan Tsankov, 'Tserkovnoe edinstvo v sovremennom mirie', in *Khristianskoe vozsoedinenie: ekumenicheskaia problema v pravoslavnom soznanii*, Paris 1933, 125.

⁹ Thomas Pulvertaft, 'Lambeth 1920 and after', *The Churchman* xliii/3 (1929), 174.

¹⁰ Archbishop Germanos, 'Call to unity', in Constantin Patelos (ed.), *The Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement: documents and statements, 1902–1975*, Geneva 1978, 133.

¹¹ J. H. Greig, 'Some notes on the position in Serbia', *CE* v/4 (1924), 145–50. See also 'Serbs in Oxford: a slavonic service in Christ Church', *Church Times*, 14 Feb. 1919, 142.

¹² Donald Davis, 'British aid to Russian churchmen, 1919–39', *Sobornost* i (1980), 42–56. See also Mitropolit Evlogii, *Put' moi zhizni: vospominaniia mitropolita Evlogiia (Georgievskogo), izlozhennye po ego rasskazam T. Manukhinoi*, Moscow 1994; Marc Raeff, *Russia abroad: a cultural history of the Russian emigration, 1919–1939*, New York 1990.

¹³ Hamilcar Alivizatos, 'Aspirations towards union', *CE* i/3 (1920), 126.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 127.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 128.

confessions in the face of doctrinal differences.¹⁶ While it stopped short of calling for any kind of formal reunion, it proposed some specific steps towards *rapprochement*: the serious study of doctrinal differences, formal relationships between theological schools of different faiths (including student exchanges), pan-Christian conferences and the shared use of chapels and cemeteries in foreign lands.¹⁷

That same year the Ecumenical Patriarchate gladly accepted the archbishop of Canterbury's invitation to send a delegation to the Lambeth Conference (the decennial gathering of Anglican bishops) of 1920. Both Constantinople and Lambeth felt a new urgency for contact after the war. The archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, had established the Church of England's 'Council on Eastern Churches' in 1919 to deal both with increasing demands from the Orthodox Churches for political assistance, as well as growing interest among Orthodox theologians in theological dialogue.¹⁸ Davidson and his advisers knew well that Constantinople's new interest in the Anglican Church grew out of its need for allies during its fighting and negotiations with Turkey following the war. (Britain was determined to prevent the expulsion of the patriarchate, one of the early goals of the new, adamantly secular Turkish state.) A year earlier Dorotheos, *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, wrote to Davidson, pleading with 'our sister Church in England' for help against the Turks.¹⁹ G. K. A. Bell, Davidson's secretary, considered that Constantinople's decision to attend the 1920 Lambeth Conference was politically motivated. Indeed, the Orthodox seized every opportunity to hobnob with important officials in Britain, particularly the archbishop of Canterbury, who, in Bell's words, was 'conceived to possess a very great influence ... as primate of the national church'.²⁰ The process of peace negotiations between Allies and Turks, Bell argued, 'made the whole difference' in strengthening links between Orthodox and Anglicans.

The patriarchate organised a delegation of four members to attend Lambeth: Philaret Vapheidis (the metropolitan of Didymoteichon), Pan-teleimon Komnenos (a professor of theology at Halki) and two Orthodox

¹⁶ 'Our Church is of [the] opinion that a closer intercourse with each other and a mutual understanding between the several Christian Churches is not prevented by the doctrinal differences existing between them': 'Unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* i/1 (1954), 58–61.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Lambeth welcomed the formation of the council as a step that would 'help greatly to forward the cause of reunion with the Orthodox Church'.

¹⁹ 'There can be only one safeguard for us', wrote Dorotheos: 'it is the dislodgement of the Sultan from Constantinople.' Such lobbying had a significant influence on Davidson. On 17 December 1919 he delivered a polemical account of Turkish atrocities in the House of Lords, and argued that all Christians should be set free from Turkish dominion: G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson: archbishop of Canterbury*, New York 1935, 1089.

²⁰ Ibid. 1088.

priests working among the Orthodox community in England – Constantine Pagonis of London, and Constantine Callinicos of Manchester.

Arriving in London, the Orthodox could not have known they were about to witness the most ecumenical of all Lambeth conferences to date. The archbishop of York and his ‘Committee on Reunion’ – apparently inspired by the Russian Orthodox Synod of 1917,²¹ which called for a permanent commission within the new Russian Orthodox Synod to co-ordinate relations with the Anglican Church – urged the conference to issue an encyclical addressed to ‘All Christian People’, which would speak of the ‘imperative necessity’ of Christian unity.²² Most of the bishops at Lambeth were enthusiastic for the idea, and the final language proclaimed that ‘We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is his Body.’ An air of excitement gripped the conference as it endorsed the statement:²³ ‘The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited catholic church.’²⁴

But the Orthodox delegation did not find an Anglican Church united in doctrinal matters, or even in agreement about the best means for pursuing *rapprochement* with other confessions. Earlier that year prominent Protestants and evangelicals in the Church of England, together with contingents from England’s other Protestant Churches (the ‘Free Churches’ or ‘Nonconformist Churches’), had issued the ‘Mansfield Statement’, a decidedly Protestant proposal for intercommunion with other denominations. The signatories declared themselves equally part of the ‘one Church of Christ’, and insisted that ‘the efficacy of their ministrations is verified in the history of the Church’.²⁵ The statement called for the interchange of pulpits and ‘mutual admission to the Lord’s Table’, all proposals which were anathema to the Orthodox.

The Mansfield Statement also proved entirely alien to Anglo-Catholics, the wing of the Church most interested in discussions with the Orthodox. Bishop Gore, a leading Anglo-Catholic intellectual, believed that it would ‘rend the Church of England in two’.²⁶ The *Church Times*, the leading Anglo-Catholic newspaper, complained that such efforts ‘seem to be deliberately

²¹ For an account of the synod see James Cunningham, *The gates of hell: the great sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1917–1918*, Minneapolis 2002.

²² ‘Report on relations to and reunion with episcopal Churches’, in *The Lambeth conferences, 1867–1948: the reports of the 1920, 1930, and 1948 conferences, with selected resolutions from the conferences of 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897, and 1903*, London 1948, 129.

²³ J. G. Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, London 1949, 268.

²⁴ ‘Report on relations’, 120.

²⁵ ‘Christian reunion: strange manifesto from Oxford’, *Church Times*, 27 Feb. 1920, 229.

²⁶ ‘English church union: our relations with nonconformists’, *ibid.* 19 Mar. 1920, 307.

plunging us into anarchy' much like 'Lenin has done in the Russian State'.²⁷ The Anglo-Catholic English Church Union (ECU), upset about the implications of the statement for the status of the episcopate (which, it believed, the Anglican Church had – like the Orthodox – preserved inviolate since the time of Peter), condemned the statement.²⁸ So did the *Church Times*:

We cannot admit that the Church and the sects are 'equally as corporate groups, within the one Church of Christ' ... Some have parted with the Creeds, all have lost the Apostolic Succession and deny its necessity. The baptism with which they are baptised is not in their view regeneration.²⁹

The clauses on intercommunion and the interchange of pulpits appeared to violate the spirit – if not precisely the letter – of the 1888 Lambeth Quadrilateral,³⁰ a statement asserting *inter alia* the validity of the Anglican episcopate. Anglo-Catholics came to the 1920 Lambeth Congress prepared to defend the Quadrilateral's statement on Anglican orders. (The English Roman Catholic press watched the spat over the Mansfield Statement with detached amusement, *The Tablet* happily observing in an editorial that 'A clear parting of the ways between Catholic and Protestant is all for the good.'³¹)

Anglican proponents of intercommunion with the Orthodox rightly feared the impression Mansfield would make upon the Orthodox. It 'would be disastrous if one considers [the statement] in connection with the problems of reunion with Rome and the East', wrote a Serbian editorialist. 'The Mansfield Manifesto will be a new serious obstacle to many who are active Eastern workers on behalf of reunion with the Anglican Church. It may darken their vision and restrain their activity.'³² The statement, he complained, gave Orthodox theologians the *prima facie* impression that Anglicans could receive holy communion at the hands of non-episcopally

²⁷ 'Loading the dice', *ibid.* 18 June 1920, 605.

²⁸ 'Communion with schismatics', *The Churchman* xxxiv/173 (1920), 235.

²⁹ 'A disavowal', *Church Times*, 27 Feb. 1920, 217.

³⁰ Adopted at the 1888 Lambeth Conference, the Lambeth Quadrilateral took the form of a four-point doctrinal minimum that would, the bishops agreed, undergird all discussions on reunion. It recognised: (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God; (2) The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith; (3) The two sacraments – baptism and the supper of the Lord – ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him; (4) The historic episcopate, locally adopted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of other nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church. The fourth point was particularly controversial, and interpreted in quite different ways by Catholic and Protestant parties within the Anglican Church.

³¹ 'Communicatio in concione', *The Tablet*, 13 Mar. 1920, 351.

³² 'The Mansfield resolutions', *CE* i/1 (1920), 85.

ordained ministers, and that they regarded non-episcopal bodies as residing within the One Church.³³

At Lambeth excitement about reunion channelled itself in sharply contrasting directions. Some bishops looked towards the Free Churches, and others towards Rome and the east. The bishop of Durham demanded that the conference ‘acknowledge frankly the validity of Presbyterian Orders and Sacraments’, a demand that horrified the bishop of Zanzibar, who wanted the Church of England to move along a Catholic vector and seek out like-minded confessions.³⁴

To the delight of the Anglo-Catholics, the bishops again asserted the importance of the Lambeth Quadrilateral as a basis for unity. The episcopate, they declared, is ‘the one means of providing such a ministry’. It ‘is now and will prove to be in the future the best means for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church’.³⁵ Yet they were careful, as the bishop of Durham pointed out, to refrain from questioning the spiritual reality of ministries that do not possess an episcopate. Still, the reaffirmation of the Quadrilateral represented a triumph of sorts for the Anglo-Catholic party, particularly given the direction reunion seemed to be heading with the Mansfield Statement. Protestant Anglicans acknowledged a Catholic drift at Lambeth. *The Churchman* pointed out that whereas the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 called for an episcopate ‘locally adapted in the methods of administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called into the Unity of His Church’ (an explicitly inclusive conception of the episcopate), the 1920 conference went further, terming the episcopate ‘the one’ means of providing such a ministry.³⁶ (The English Roman Catholic press also pounced on this change in emphasis.³⁷) Some Protestant Anglicans accepted the change warily,³⁸ or tried to interpret the new language in a light incompatible with Anglo-Catholic (or Orthodox) doctrine. The Anglican evangelical clergyman, Thomas Pulvertaft, for instance, declared: ‘We are convinced that the Conference did not mean to question the validity of the ministry or the grace of the Sacraments of non-Episcopalians ... it casts no slur upon the validity of the Communion in these Churches.’³⁹ W. B. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, seemed

³³ Ibid. ³⁴ Roger Lloyd, *The Church of England, 1900–1965*, London 1966, 407.

³⁵ J. E. C. Wellington, *The English Church*, London 1926, 129.

³⁶ ‘Essentials of unity’, *The Churchman* xxxiv/177 (1920), 467.

³⁷ ‘[T]he removal of the “historic Episcopate” from its rank as one of the conditions *de iure* in the quadrilateral, and reducing it to a place in a supplementary plea that, *de facto*, is not at all the same thing’: ‘The Lambeth conference and reunion’, *The Tablet*, 21 Aug. 1920, 238.

³⁸ Or least as long as the episcopate is to be viewed, in Bishop Waller’s words, as a ‘bond of unity’ rather than a ‘papacy or a prelatical order’: ‘Lambeth and episcopacy’, *The Churchman* xxxiv/178 (1920), 525.

³⁹ Thomas J. Pulvertaft, ‘The sixth Lambeth conference’, *ibid.* 538.

to agree: '[the Lambeth appeal] involves the recognition of other ministries than the episcopal'.⁴⁰

Those elements most sympathetic to the Orthodox Church were disappointed by Lambeth. The English Church Union fretted that the conference had missed an opportunity to demand that the Nicene Creed 'be interpreted by the dogmatic decisions and the tradition of the whole Church', that confirmation and absolution be recognised as sacraments and that the sacraments of baptism and holy communion be defined more carefully (seeing as there was 'nothing' in the resolutions as worded to prevent 'Zwinglian errors'). Finally, it insisted that the Church of England recognise ordination as 'a sacramental means of conferring the grace of Holy Orders, and not merely the appointment to a ministerial position'.⁴¹

For the Orthodox, the above discussions demonstrated that neither Anglo-Catholics nor Protestants held full sway in the Anglican Church. Lambeth made it clear that episcopacy was important to discussions of reunion, but, as the ECU had noted, episcopal and other sacramental questions had been answered either unsatisfactorily for some parties, or left unanswered altogether. Questions about the exchange of pulpits and intercommunion – questions that would be crucial to later Orthodox–Anglican contacts – were addressed in the most vague manner possible⁴² and led to wildly conflicting interpretations.⁴³ So, although Lambeth had announced its support for reunion, Orthodox observers (and most other observers, for that matter) found Lambeth's terms of intercommunion nebulous. The Committee on Reunion recognised how tricky the matter had become: bend to satisfy one faction, and you risk offending another. Negotiations with one group might produce agreements that hurt negotiations with another.⁴⁴

As Lambeth worked through these questions, the Orthodox delegation was entertained in lavish fashion,⁴⁵ but its official contacts were limited to seven meetings with the Church of England's Council on Eastern Churches. These meetings did little to persuade the delegation that any sort of reunion with the Anglican Church would be coming soon. Instead, the delegation

⁴⁰ W. B. Selbie, 'The Free Churches and the Lambeth appeal', *Constructive Quarterly* ix (1921), 648.

⁴¹ 'The Lambeth conference: report of the theological committee of the E.C.U.', *Church Times*, 10 Dec. 1920, 589.

⁴² 'Report on relations', 40–1.

⁴³ Protestants in the Church of England were relieved that Lambeth refused to forbid pulpit exchanges, while Anglo-Catholics took solace that 'this privilege is very strictly limited' and 'a purely provisional arrangement': 'The report on reunion', *Church Times*, 20 Aug. 1920, 177.

⁴⁴ 'Report on relations', 127.

⁴⁵ Athelstan Riley and Lord Salisbury held official lunches for the delegation, as did the Lord Mayor of London.

found the variety of opinion within the Church of England rather shocking. The delegation's final report stressed the Anglicans'

essentially different conception of the idea of the Church and the members who compose it. The idea of the Church among them ... is much wider than ours. While with us the true member of the Church who continues in organic union with the whole, must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the holy Sacraments, and believe in lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles, in the English Church men differing from each other in faith, not in things indifferent and non-essential, constitute one undivided whole.⁴⁶

While expressing gratitude for the hospitality it received in England, the delegation's report was mostly pessimistic, critical and sometimes didactically reproachful. The Orthodox Church, it informed the Anglicans, 'does not accept those who do not belong to it as forming a part of the Church in the true and proper sense of the word'.⁴⁷ We cannot accept the validity of Anglican baptism either '*simpliciter* or by "*economy*"'.⁴⁸ Anglican definitions of the eucharist are vague; the Church of England must define the eucharist as 'a Sacrifice and Propitiation'.⁴⁹ The Church of England 'should formulate definitely the number of the Sacraments'.⁵⁰ The Church of England's use of the Athanasian Creed is troublesome: 'we should prefer that the Church of England ... would limit itself to [the Nicene] Creed only'.⁵¹

The Thirty-Nine Articles in particular offended the Orthodox. Their Anglican hosts offered countless explanations as to why – although problematic – the articles should pose no obstacle to reunion.⁵² The bishop of Gloucester, for instance, assured the Orthodox that the Thirty-Nine Articles 'have much less force than the Prayer-Book and the Catechism' and in 'some sections of the Anglican Church they are not used at all'. 'We do not ask that another Church which desires to enter into relations with us should accept them. They were written in the sixteenth century, for the confuting of heresies. Many of them are already obsolete.'⁵³ But such explanations failed to impress the delegation, and succeeded only in infuriating Protestant Anglicans who got wind of the assertions.⁵⁴ The delegation's

⁴⁶ 'Report of the delegation of the patriarchate sent to the conference at Lambeth, 1920', *CE* iii/1 (1922), 7.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 11. It did add, however, that 'our Church had not yet, like the Western Church, made a public pronouncement regarding the possibility of the salvation of Christians outside its bosom'. ⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 8. ⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 9. ⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 10. ⁵¹ *Ibid.* 11.

⁵² 'In answer [to our concerns]', wrote the Orthodox, 'we were given certain explanations such as the following: "The aim of Elizabeth and her counselors was to find a means to the reconciliation of those Catholic and Protestant tendencies."' The articles 'did not impose new Faith, but were composed to put an end to disputes. They were therefore articles of reunion': *ibid.* 12. ⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ 'Happily', wrote *The Churchman*, 'the revision scheme failed': W. Guy Johnson, 'The Orthodox churches and the Anglican communion', *The Churchman* li/4 (1937), 201–2.

report dismissed attempts to explain away the Articles' place in Anglican doctrine with the impatient and testy suggestion that 'we thought it would not be offensive to propose their general abolition'.⁵⁵ (Despite this recommendation, the delegation remained pessimistic about the chances of such an action.⁵⁶)

The delegation's report did conclude on a positive note ('we trust that we may advance steadily towards the goal of final union'), but it offered no suggestion on how to proceed, proposing only that both sides trust 'that the Almighty hand of God will, with time, remove the obstacles and bring to its fulfillment a work which will constitute a blessing to the Christian world'.⁵⁷ The only significant outcome was an agreement to form a joint Anglican–Orthodox doctrinal commission to explore questions of doctrine in greater detail.⁵⁸

But despite these setbacks, Anglican advocates of reunion with the Orthodox did not despair. Although disappointed by the delegation's report, they took solace in the promise of a doctrinal commission. Always looking on the bright side, the *Church Times* noted, 'So far as the deputation was concerned no objections had been raised as to the validity of Anglican Orders.'⁵⁹ Still, the *Church Times* conceded that all was not well. '[W]hen they saw among us what they called "High Church" and "Low Church" they saw something that they did not understand, and asked what the Anglican Church meant by union.'⁶⁰

The Roman Catholic Press in Britain – always wary of Anglican–Orthodox dialogue and always quick to interpret such contact in the most pessimistic light – correctly argued that the Lambeth resolutions could

⁵⁵ 'Report of the delegation', 12.

⁵⁶ 'As long as in England no separation between Church and State is made ... it appears in fact that only a revision of these Articles will perhaps be possible': *ibid.* 13.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 19. Panteleimon Comnenos tried to put a positive spin on the discussions in a letter to the *Church Times*, in which he spoke of 'the exceptionally friendly attitude of [the Church of England] towards ours, and the exceptional good feeling of the chivalrous English nation towards Greeks in General'. The letter had muted political overtones, and seems – at least in part – an attempt to flatter the British into remembering their obligations to the Greek state: 'The question of union with the Church of England', *Church Times*, 3 Dec. 1920, 562.

⁵⁸ The Orthodox delegation included representatives from all but the Russian Orthodox Churches. Not everybody welcomed the formation of this commission. Cosmo Lang, the archbishop of York, viewed the proceedings with some trepidation. Worried about the reaction of evangelicals in his fold, he refused to allow the commission to touch upon the authority of Holy Scripture: Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, 362.

⁵⁹ 'The Lambeth conference and the eastern churches', *Church Times*, 5 Nov. 1920, 453.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* The *Church Times* had not at this point written off the possibility of pursuing unity with both the Free Churches and the Orthodox. It urged that 'probably the wisest course to pursue will be to continue negotiations with the East and do all that can be done there, while leaving the door open for Protestants': 'Some nonconformist critics', *Church Times*, 27 Aug. 1920, 199.

not satisfy the Catholic mind (be it Anglo-Catholic or Orthodox). Under the Lambeth statements of unity, it observed, a clergyman ‘may believe that Baptism is a sacrament of regeneration, while another believes that it is merely a ceremony of initiation – the one may believe that the Eucharist is the true and substantial and adorable Body and Blood of Christ, and the other that it is merely a grace-giving ordinance in which bread and wine are blessed in remembrance of Christ’s passion’:

The whole foundation and fibre of the scheme is essentially Protestant ... its notion of ‘the Church of Christ’ is Protestant. Its whole notion of ‘unity’ and ‘Reunion’, based on a dead or documentary rule, with no provision for a living interpreting authority commanding the submission of all its decisions, is Protestant.⁶¹

In the Orthodox report, crowed the *The Tablet*, ‘There is not a trace of compromise on any point of the Orthodox faith. Indeed in some questions the Delegates seem almost unnecessarily unbending.’⁶² ‘No idea of softening [the teaching of the Orthodox Church] or of meeting anyone half-way in any dogma, occurs as even possible to them.’⁶³

Relations between Anglicans and Orthodox seemed at a standstill. And then, suddenly, Panteleimon Komnenos, a delegate to the Lambeth Conference, published a treatise on the possibility of recognising Anglican ordinations,⁶⁴ a recognition that Anglicans and Orthodox alike believed constituted a major step towards reunion. The article began with a bang:

The present short study aims at convincing every impartial reader that the reserved attitude of our Church towards Anglican Orders is altogether unjust, and that any notion of the absolute or conditional reordination of those of the clergy of that Church who may accede to Orthodoxy is even more so.⁶⁵

Komnenos argued forcefully that Anglicans had preserved the apostolic succession of ordination, and expressed his hope that such a finding would be a step towards the union of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. Yet the statement was hardly the ringing endorsement that some like John Douglas desired. The Orthodox may accept Anglican ordinations, Komnenos argued, but ‘through economy’ (i.e. by setting aside canonical requirements in extraordinary circumstances), and because the Orthodox Church has ‘at other times accepted the ordination of heretics’.⁶⁶

⁶¹ ‘What does Lambeth mean?’, *The Tablet*, 28 Aug. 1920, 270.

⁶² ‘The Orthodox delegates to Lambeth’, *ibid.* 5 Aug. 1922, 165.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 166. A subsequent article sought to prove that the Orthodox position on transubstantiation was essentially that of the Roman Catholic Church, and thus a major impediment to reunion with the Church of England: [?] Moyes, ‘The great eastern Church and transubstantiation’, *ibid.* 7 Oct. 1922, 453–55.

⁶⁴ Panteleimon Komnenos, ‘Anglican ordinations’, *CE* ii/3 (1921), 107–16, repr. in E. R. Hardy (ed.), *Orthodox statements on Anglican orders*, New York 1946.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 37.

⁶⁶ Arians would be an example of this.

It does not follow, of course, that the Orthodox would be justified in resorting to the Anglican clergy in order to be baptised, to be chrismated, to receive divine Communion, etc., in the same way that they do not so in regard to Roman Catholics and Armenians, whose Priesthood and by consequence whose other sacramental administrations the Orthodox Church recognizes.⁶⁷

And Komnenos was careful to emphasise that ‘full dogmatic agreement and union will of necessity require time’.⁶⁸

Still, unlike many others in the Orthodox world, Komnenos saw some room for unilateral action to push matters forward. He advised the Ecumenical Patriarch that Constantinople could accept Anglican ordinations ‘of our own initiative and responsibility’ without the immediate consent of other Orthodox Churches. Little did he or Douglas suspect how much trouble this last piece of advice would cause the Ecumenical Patriarch during the next two years.

In the meantime, Archbishop Davidson had asked the Eastern Churches Committee to draw up ‘terms of intercommunion’, or a statement of doctrine that could be used in negotiations within an Anglican–Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission. The terms of intercommunion tried to solve a number of vexing doctrinal issues through obfuscation. In retrospect, it appears that the terms set as its main goal the avoidance of providing offence to anyone. On the question of the *filioque*, for example, it suggested that ‘both forms of expression may be rightly used, and that they are intended to express the same faith’.⁶⁹ On the sacraments it waffled: ‘The number of sacraments has never been authoritatively fixed whether by tradition from the Apostles or any decision of an Oecumenical Council ... We recognise that the two sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are pre-eminent above the rest.’⁷⁰ ‘But we agree further that the title sacrament may be used of other rites and ceremonies in which there is an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace.’⁷¹ On the eucharist the terms noted that no ecumenical council ever touched on the manner of the presence of Christ in the elements, and suggested only that ‘We agree that this is a divine Mystery which transcends human understanding’ and that the doctrine of the eucharist taught in liturgies of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches ‘is adequate and sufficient.’⁷² On icons it proposed that ‘each Church may have liberty to preserve its own distinctive customs’ but warned that we should ‘take care that the homage we owe to God be not transferred to holy

⁶⁷ Komnenos, ‘Anglican ordinations’, 48.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 49.

⁶⁹ ‘Terms of intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church’, in *Documents on Christian unity: a selection from the first and second series, 1920–30*, ed. G. K. A. Bell, New York 1955, 25. ‘Since the added words are used in an orthodox sense, it is lawful for any Church which has received the Creed as containing these words to continue to recite it in the Services of the Church’ (p. 26).

⁷⁰ Ibid. 28.

⁷¹ Ibid. 29.

⁷² Ibid. 30.

images nor false miracles be ascribed to them'. In short, it avoided hard answers to difficult questions.

The wishy-washy nature of the terms is explained by their attempt to satisfy two very different constituencies.⁷³ Arthur Headlam, the bishop of Gloucester and primary author of the terms, recalled: 'I was drawing them up at the same time as we were carrying on negotiations with the Non-conformists at Lambeth, and, both in our relations with the Nonconformist and in relation to the Orthodox, I always had both sides of our purpose in my mind.'⁷⁴ Yet the terms still managed to offend, and Headlam felt compelled even ten years later to reassure Anglicans that they offered nothing inconsistent with Anglican doctrine: 'I am quite convinced that nothing has been said in relation to the Orthodox which could not be accepted by any loyal member of the Church of England.'⁷⁵

John Douglas was growing frustrated, and in 1921 published some observations about doctrinal divisions and began outlining negotiating approaches and language that might be acceptable to the Orthodox.⁷⁶ Nikolai Glubokovskii, a Russian *émigré* and professor at the University of Sofia, gave Douglas's book a positive review, praising his efforts to understand Orthodoxy 'correctly'.⁷⁷ Douglas 'carefully endeavours to avoid Western misunderstandings, and to initiate his readers into the real interpretation of Eastern Orthodoxy in its actual spirit and power'.⁷⁸ Upset over Headlam's earlier suggestions that the Nicene Creed might be a sufficient basis for Anglican–Orthodox unity, Glubokovskii welcomed Douglas's call for unity through a mutually acceptable 'firm basis of dogma'.

Glubokovskii and Douglas agreed that doctrinal differences within the Church of England posed impediments to doctrinal agreement between Anglicans and Orthodox (although Douglas was more confident than Glubokovskii of overcoming the differences). But Glubokovskii did not share Douglas's hope that private cases of intercommunion might be employed as a means of moving the two Churches closer together. These cases, Glubokovskii insisted, 'were and always will be nothing more than exceptions which in no way create a new rule – namely, that there cannot be any Church intercommunion without a uniting of the Churches. Such cases, therefore, render this unity more distant and difficult rather than nearer

⁷³ The terms did gain the attention of the Karlovatskii Synod, which printed them in its journal without any comment other than Archbishop Gore's *caveat* that they should be considered 'neither official nor final', coupled with his assurance that they 'express the general understanding of the Anglican Church': 'Osnovy vzaimoobshcheniia', *TV* no. 23–4 (1925), 21–5.

⁷⁴ A. C. Headlam, 'Lambeth and reunion', *CQR* ccxxii (1931), 214. ⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 216.

⁷⁶ J. A. Douglas, *The relations of the Anglican Churches with the eastern Orthodox, especially in regard to Anglican orders*, London 1921.

⁷⁷ Nikolai Glubokovskii, 'Eastern Orthodoxy and Anglicanism', *CE* iii/1 (1922), 21.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 23.

and easier'.⁷⁹ Still, Glubokovskii did affirm one of Douglas's prime beliefs – namely, that full reunion can occur only through full dogmatic agreement. Glubokovskii and Douglas shared a commitment to finding dogmatic formulas that would be acceptable to both sides, and that fudged nothing.

Douglas understood better than anybody the problems inherent in the 'Terms of Intercommunion' formulated by the Eastern Churches Committee. Written with the Free Churches in mind, they fell far short of Orthodox expectations. So, in 1922, Douglas took matters into his own hands. Inspired by conversations with Professor Komnenos back in 1920, Douglas – without any official authorisation from Lambeth or the archbishop of Canterbury – approached the ECU about producing an Anglican statement of faith, which, he hoped, the Orthodox could accept. Such a move, of course, was breathtaking in its audacity. But the ECU agreed, and its Theological and Liturgical Committee produced a 'Declaration of Faith', addressed to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and translated into Greek, Russian and other languages.

The declaration was Catholic to the core, taking Orthodox-friendly positions on the importance of patristic writings, the role of the ecumenical councils, the sacraments (particularly the eucharist) and the veneration of saints.⁸⁰ Most notably, however, it included the following: 'We account the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part.' Major Anglo-Catholic figures signed the statement, including Douglas, Bishop Gore and H. J. Fynes-Clinton. In time the declaration garnered 3,715 signatories. The patriarch of Constantinople placed some stock in it, as did Archbishop Aleksandr in North America.

Upon learning of the declaration, *The Tablet* could barely contain its excitement over the furore it knew would soon follow in England. 'We have no hesitation in prophesying that considerably more than half of the clergymen of the Establishment, and most of the Bishops, would abstain *on the ground that they simply do not believe the articles of the Declaration*, and they know it to be false as a description of the belief of the English Church.'⁸¹ As predicted, the declaration caused a firestorm of protest. Bishop Henson

⁷⁹ Ibid. 27.

⁸⁰ The 'one saving faith' 'of the undivided Church of Christ' is found not only in the Holy Scriptures, but has been 'handed on by the Holy Fathers in their writings and by the tradition of the Church' and 'reaffirmed and safeguarded by Ecumenical Councils'. An ecumenical council is 'the supreme tribunal of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church' and 'the dogmatic decrees of the Councils which have been accepted as Ecumenical by the whole Church are incontrovertible and binding on all Christians': 'The English Church and the Eastern Orthodox Churches (an *entente cordiale*)', *Church Times*, 26 May 1922, 543. See also 'Declaration of faith', in *Documents on Christian unity, 1920–4*, ed. G. K. A. Bell, Oxford 1924, 90–2.

⁸¹ 'Anglicans and the Orthodox Churches', *The Tablet*, 3 June 1922, 697.

of Durham delivered a speech in Westminster Abbey in which he decried the relegation of the Thirty-Nine Articles to a place of 'secondary importance'.⁸² He later published an attack on the declaration, asserting that this was

not only destitute of any authority but it conflicts sharply with the official doctrinal standards of the Church of England ... The Synod of Constantinople was deliberately misled by the Anglo-Catholic statement of doctrine. The whole spirit and drift of that statement are quite out of harmony with the English formularies.⁸³

Arthur Headlam, sometime-friend of the Orthodox, decided that 'this Declaration of Faith is inconsistent with the ordinary teaching of the English Church. It will be definitely repudiated by the vast majority of worshippers in the Church of England ... and would make the great majority of our fellow countrymen seriously distrustful of the National Church'.⁸⁴ If, Headlam continued, the declaration is an attempt to present the Church of England 'in the clothes of the Eastern Church, as one Greek friend of mine said, "It is worse than that sort of things our people write"'.⁸⁵ For,

a society like the English Church Union and a body of clergy such as those who have signed this document to approach the Œcumenical Patriarch independently in this formal way violates, as it seems to me, all the corporate principles of Catholicism. It may be right enough for individuals or groups of individuals to prepare the ground for reunion by discussing points of controversy privately, but public action by a section of the Church like this seems to me indefensible in itself and not likely to create a favourable impression on the Orthodox Church.⁸⁶

Douglas's good intentions appeared to have blown up in his face.

However difficult work towards reunion seemed at times, Anglican advocates could always take solace in knowing that they had a sympathetic ear in Constantinople. No Orthodox cleric was more eager than Meletios Metaxakis, former archbishop of Athens, to embrace the Anglican Church. Archbishop Davidson's secretary described Meletios as a 'tall vigorous man of forty-seven with bright eyes, a beard streaked with grey, and possessed of a strong voice', and a 'great champion of the Reunion of Christendom'.⁸⁷

⁸² One correspondent to the *Church Times* was willing to accept this diminution of the Thirty-Nine Articles. But while conceding that some articles were problematic, he assured his readers that 'the rest are most important': Douglas Maclean, 'The "Declaration of faith"', *Church Times*, 2 June 1922, 565.

⁸³ *Edinburgh Review* (Apr. 1923), quoted in Pulvertaft, 'Lambeth 1920 and after', 176–7.

⁸⁴ A. C. Headlam, 'Reunion with the Eastern Church', *Church Times*, 14 July 1922, 42. Headlam had authored another, more conservative document: Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1005.

⁸⁵ Headlam, 'Reunion with the Eastern Church', 42.

⁸⁶ 'I think it is important to emphasise this fact, as at the head of the signatures comes the name of Bishop Gore who is Chairman of the Committee for negotiation on behalf of the Church as a whole with the Eastern Church. It is therefore necessary to say that this document has never been before that Committee or received any support from it': *ibid.*

⁸⁷ Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 44.

He was no stranger to Britain, having visited in 1918 when he dined with the archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace and addressed a meeting at Westminster Central Hall.

The story of Meletios's assumption to the patriarchal throne in Constantinople is complex, but important to understanding his relations with the Anglican Church. The patriarchal throne had been vacant since 1918, as the patriarchate's status hung in the balance while the Orthodox world waited for a post-war treaty between Greece and Turkey. By early 1922 no treaty had yet emerged, and Greeks in Constantinople were growing impatient to fill the vacant seat. But here Greek politics intruded. Greeks in Constantinople and Greeks in Greece agreed on the need to maintain the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but they divided along political lines when it came to choosing a candidate.

Greeks in Constantinople generally supported Premier Venizelos, the anti-monarchist who assumed power in Greece after the abdication of King Constantine I in 1917. Arriving in Athens in 1917, Venizelos ousted most of the synod of the Greek Orthodox Church, a move that placed him at odds with the Church in Greece for the rest of his life. (Support among Venizelists for administrative and liturgical reforms within the Greek Church also hurt their cause with the more conservative bishops.) Venizelos lost and assumed power several times during the next few years, purging royalists and church hierarchs each time he returned.⁸⁸ The Greek Church, which supported Constantine, pronounced an anathema on Venizelos when, during the war, he set up a rival government in Thessaloniki.⁸⁹

Meletios placed himself squarely in the pro-Venizelos camp, and thus became a recipient of the royalists' and conservative prelates' ire. Meletios's candidacy for the patriarchal throne in Constantinople and his affiliation with Venizelos threatened the growing pretensions of the new archbishop of Athens, whose own position in the Orthodox world had begun to obscure that of the Ecumenical Patriarch.⁹⁰ The Gournis government in Greece, worried that Meletios would win the election, wrote to the Phanar through the Greek high commissioner asking it to postpone the election. When the Phanar refused, Athens intimated that the metropolitans of Thrace and Macedonia would not be allowed to cross the frontier to

⁸⁸ For a short history see Theofanis G. Stavrou, 'The Orthodox Church of Greece', in Pedro Ramet (ed.), *Eastern Christianity and politics in the twentieth century*, Durham 1988, 183–207.

⁸⁹ *The Christian East*, generally supportive of Meletios, called the anathema 'an undisguised attempt to use religion as a political lever': 'Athens letter', *CE* v/2 (1924), 87.

⁹⁰ It also plunged the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States into chaos. Supporters of Meletios in the USA refused to obey the royalist archbishop of Athens. Churches and dioceses divided over allegiances to royalists and Venizelists: Demetrios Constantelos, *Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church: its faith, history, and practice*, New York 1982, 139–42.

vote.⁹¹ But the election proceeded anyway, with Meletios emerging battered but victorious. Anti-Venizelists in Athens immediately challenged the election of their former metropolitan, pointing out that seven leading bishops had withdrawn from the election at the last minute. The anti-Venizelist candidate was Chrysanthos of Trebizond.⁹²

Here the Church of England enters the picture. Both Meletios and Chrysanthos visited the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, to seek his support and endorsement for their candidacies.⁹³ Davidson recalled that Meletios assured him that

one of his first duties as Patriarch would be to promote in every possible manner friendliness with the Anglican Church and to recognise our position. He did not actually speak of the validity of our Orders, but I understood him to imply it. I ought to add that exactly the same argument is being used by Chrysanthos of Trebizond, though he has not used it to me ... I discount this assurance on both sides. I think it rather significant of the sort of way in which these ecclesiastics mix up policy and principle in their declarations and procedure.⁹⁴

Davidson and a few other Anglicans realised the danger of supporting either Meletios or Chrysanthos, knowing that an endorsement would alienate either the Greek population in Constantinople or the Church in Greece.⁹⁵

Meletios, then, was in a bind. The Greek government would not give him passage to Constantinople, as he was not the preferred Greek candidate. The Turks also refused him entry, not wanting any patriarch at all in Constantinople. Meletios petitioned Lloyd George for assistance but got nowhere.⁹⁶ Davidson refused to intervene. So, without the support of the British government or the Church of England, Meletios accepted a lift from a French gunboat, which on 10 February 1922 sailed around the Golden Horn and into Constantinople's harbour. The crowds that greeted him were ecstatic.⁹⁷ He was crowned Meletios IV, the most ecumenical, vigorous and controversial Ecumenical Patriarch of the twentieth century.

Meletios's frustrations in Britain did not inhibit his attempts to draw closer to the Church of England. In fact, they seem to have made him all the more determined to cultivate ties. His major move in this direction came on 22 July 1922, when he and his synod in Constantinople issued a declaration on the validity of Anglican orders. Six days later he addressed a letter to the

⁹¹ The Anglican chaplain of the Memorial Church in Constantinople reported, 'Naturally the [Constantinople] Synod and the Mixed Council are extremely angry at this unwarrantable interference by Civil Governments, and are determined to assert their independence': R. F. Borough, 'Constantinople letter', *CE* ii/4 (1921), 199–200.

⁹² Duncan van Dusen, 'Some relations between the Anglican and eastern Orthodox Churches', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* xxviii/1 (1959), 48.

⁹³ Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1095.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 1096.

⁹⁶ van Dusen, 'Some relations', 46–9.

⁹⁷ R. F. Borough, 'Constantinople letter', *CE* iii/3 (1922), 140.

archbishop of Canterbury, informing Davidson of the decision.⁹⁸ A combination of factors best explains this move, which at the time was considered momentous by Anglican advocates of reunion. Genuine ecumenical concern certainly played a role: Meletios was committed to the reunion of Christendom, and truly believed in the importance of a united Church of Christ. He had read Komnenos's article and found it compelling.⁹⁹ (According to Douglas, Komnenos urged Meletios to issue the statement on ordinations.¹⁰⁰) Bell believed that Douglas's controversial declaration earlier that year had assuaged Meletios's concerns about Anglican church doctrine.¹⁰¹ (It is unclear how much knowledge Meletios had of the uproar that Douglas's statement had caused back in England.) Meletios also felt, as we have seen, a strong need to ingratiate himself with the Anglican Church, both to enhance his position in relation to Chrysanthos and the royalists, as well as (he hoped) to stay in the centre of the British government's good graces in the face of the Turkish threat.¹⁰² The Treaty of Lausanne guaranteeing the security of the Ecumenical Patriarch would not be signed until 1923.

Douglas was elated by Meletios's recognition of Anglican orders. It represented a major departure from the attitudes of some of Meletios's predecessors.¹⁰³ Equally exciting was Meletios's portrayal of the decision as a first step towards further achievements, or, in his words, 'profitable in regard to the whole question of union'.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, most Orthodox believed that the recognition of a given confession's orders was a necessary first condition for further efforts towards reunion.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁸ The statement concluded that the ordination of Archbishop Matthew Parker was valid, that subsequent Anglican ordinations were valid and that 'Orthodox theologians who have scientifically examined the question have almost unanimously come to the same conclusions': 'The encyclical of the Oecumenical Patriarch, Meletios, to the heads of all Orthodox autocephalous Churches', *Orthodox statements on Anglican orders*, 2–5 at p. 4.

⁹⁹ In his letter informing Davidson of the decision, Meletios listed Orthodox theologians who had declared that they accepted Anglican orders as valid: Meletios IV, 'Letter of the Oecumenical Patriarch to the archbishop of Canterbury [16 February 1923]', in *Documents on church unity: from the first and second series*, 35–6. Bell argues that Meletios was influenced by Komnenos's study.

¹⁰⁰ J. A. Douglas, 'The purport of the recent Orthodox delegation', *CE* xi/3 (1930), 105.

¹⁰¹ Although many argued against sending it to Constantinople, Douglas's declaration nevertheless reached Meletios: Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1106.

¹⁰² 'Lambeth and the east: interchange of important messages', *Church Times*, 29 Dec. 1922, 683.

¹⁰³ See, for example, Joachim III, patriarch of Constantinople, 'Patriarchal and synodal encyclical of 1902', in *The Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement*, 30.

¹⁰⁴ Meletios, 'Translation of letter of his holiness, the patriarch of Constantinople, to his grace the archbishop of Canterbury, in re Anglican ordinations', *CE* iii/3 (1922), 112.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, Georges Florovskii, 'The sacrament of pentecost: a Russian view of apostolic succession', *JFSASS* xxiii (1934), 29, 34. Sergii Bulgakov identified unity in apostolic succession as one of the three unities to which Churches should strive (the other two being

Yet Douglas's excitement was tempered from the outset by concern that the Ecumenical Patriarch's unilateral move could cause division in the Orthodox world,¹⁰⁶ despite Meletios's insistence that this move required the approval of the other Orthodox Churches.¹⁰⁷ The Anglican chaplain in Constantinople had warned a year earlier that – given the bitter contest for the patriarchate – ‘any action towards reunion taken by a new patriarch and his synod is likely to be disavowed by the Church of Athens if relations remain strained’.

His worries proved prescient. In the eight years following Meletios's recognition, only two of the ten autocephalous Orthodox Churches endorsed it, convinced that he had erred in not consulting them before his decision. Most of the Churches failed to respond to Meletios's letter at all. The Romanian Church waited two years to reply, and then, on 10 January 1925, Patriarch Miron Christea told Constantinople that his synod could not agree with the recognition until the Anglican Church proved that it viewed the Church as a visible society, and that the Anglican conception of a sacrament was equivalent to the Orthodox conception of the sacrament as a *mysterion*.¹⁰⁸ Metropolitan Photios of Alexandria – a dyed-in-the-wool royalist and rabid anti-Venizelist – consistently opposed Meletios and refused to endorse his decision on Anglican orders. Photios regarded Meletios's election in 1921 as invalid and thus insisted that ‘any private opinions of Meletios ... did not represent the Orthodox Church as a whole’.¹⁰⁹ The Serbs and the Bulgarians, to nobody's surprise, refused to take any action without the Russian Church, which had become largely impotent after the Bolshevik revolution. Douglas attributed Serbia's refusal to lobbying by Metropolitan Antonii, whose Karlovatskii Synod (a conservative branch of the Russian Church in exile that frequently feuded with more cosmopolitan Russian Orthodox in western Europe) resided in Serbia, and who was set on removing Meletios from Constantinople.¹¹⁰ *Émigré* Russians in western Europe (of whom there were still only a few) uttered nary a word about

unity in faith and unity in sacramental life): ‘One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church’, *JFSASS* xii (1931), 18.

¹⁰⁶ J. A. Douglas, ‘Editorial’, *CE* ii/3 (1921), 105. See also Douglas, ‘Purport’, 101.

¹⁰⁷ Meletios, ‘Translation of letter’, 112. In his report to the other Orthodox Churches, Meletios claimed that he made his announcement ‘in order that opportunity might be given them also to express their opinion, so that through the decisions of the parts the mind of the whole Orthodox world on this important question might be known’: ‘The encyclical of the Oecumenical Patriarch’, 5.

¹⁰⁸ J. A. Douglas, ‘The limits of agreements reached by the Orthodox delegates to the Lambeth conference’, *CE* xi/4 (1930–1), 178.

¹⁰⁹ Stuart Mews, ‘Anglican intervention in the election of an Orthodox patriarch, 1925–6’, in Derek Baker (ed.), *The Orthodox Churches and the west* (Studies in Church History xiii, 1976), 293–307 at p. 296.

¹¹⁰ J. A. Douglas, ‘The Oecumenical Patriarchate’, *CE* iv/4 (1923), 189.

the announcement. Conservative Russian Orthodox, especially those in the Karlovatskii Synod, opposed the move, and would later cite it as one of the many reasons why they would never place themselves under the Ecumenical Patriarch, despite their certainty that their own patriarchate in Russia was enslaved by the Soviet state.

The fierce reaction by the Karlovchane followed a confrontation with Meletios earlier that year, when he recognised the Soviet-supported 'Living Church' in Russia (a dubious body formed to supplant the Russian patriarchate) and thus alienated himself from almost all *émigré* Orthodox Russians.¹¹¹ Even the Metropolitan of Athens – no great friend of Russians in exile – condemned the Living Church¹¹² and publicly expressed sympathy for Antonii's stance.¹¹³

But what really set Meletios against the Karlovchane and a number of autocephalous Churches were reforms implemented at a pan-Orthodox Congress he convened the following year, 1923. Some history is in order here, not because the Anglican Church had any particular interest in the reform of the Orthodox church calendar (although the few Anglicans who followed the issue supported it), but because the reform ultimately undermined Meletios's standing in the Orthodox world, and thus throttled his ability to move Orthodoxy as a whole closer to the Church of England. Meletios's recognition of Anglican orders came to be seen as part of a package of 'un-soborny' or non-catholic action, and a dangerous flirtation with westernisation and modernism. The two actions – recognition of Anglican orders and reform of the Orthodox calendar – seemed to conservative Orthodox clerics and theologians two aspects of a false world view.

Meletios convened the pan-Orthodox conference with the aim of changing the Orthodox calendar (the Julian) to conform with the Gregorian calendar

¹¹¹ The Karlovatskii Synod termed the Living Church's Sobor a 'false Sobor' full of 'false bishops': Mitropolit Antonii, 'Otzyv Vysokopreosviashchennieishago Mitropolita Antoniiia o Moskovskom soborishche', *TV* no. 9–10 (1923), 10–11. It pleaded with the patriarch not to send a representative to the Living Church's Sobor, and thus 'increase Church discord within Russia': 'Po voprosu o vozmozhnosti uchastiia Vselenskago Patriarkhata v sozyvaemom v Moskve lzhe-soborie', *TV* no. 7–8 (1923), 3. Antonii's disciple, Nikon, went so far as to claim that Meletios was under the influence of the Soviets: *Zhizneopisanie blazhennieishago Antoniiia, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galitskago*, New York 1956–69, x. 40. Paul Anderson of the YMCA, a great friend of Russian Orthodox *émigrés*, termed the recognition of the Living Church hasty and ill advised, and 'the chief cause of the failure of this attempt at advancing Church unity': *People, Church, and state in modern Russia*, New York 1944, 182.

¹¹² 'The Greek Orthodox Church can have no intercourse with the false Sobor calling itself the Living Church': Mitropolit Athinskii Khrisostom, 'Mitropolita Athinskago i ekzarka Ellandskago Khrisostoma – ob otmoshenii k Moskovskomu lzhe-soboru, osudivshemu Sv. Patriarkha Tikhona', *TV* no. 15–16 (1923), 5.

¹¹³ Idem, 'Gramota Mitropolita Athinskago i ekzarka Ellandskago Khrisostoma', *ibid.* no. 13–14 (1923), 2.

used in the west. The conference also took up the contentious question of second marriages for widowed priests.¹¹⁴ Representatives from only five of the nine autocephalous Orthodox churches attended – Constantinople, Cyprus, Greece, Serbia and Romania – immediately opening the congress to charges of unrepresentative decision-making. Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Russia did not send representatives. Aleksandr, the Russian bishop of North America, attended without authorisation from the Russian Church; Metropolitan Antonii refused to represent the Karlovatskii Synod, which recalled its representative soon after the congress began its deliberations.¹¹⁵ (Antonii's biographer and disciple, Nikon, credits Antonii with persuading 'several' of the other Orthodox Churches not to attend.¹¹⁶) Bulgaria, in schism with Constantinople over the issue of whether it constituted an autocephalous Church, also failed to attend.

When the congress agreed (without Serbia's consent) to replace the old Julian calendar with the New Julian calendar, it emphasised that its decision would be valid only if those Churches that had not sent representatives to the congress were to adopt it. Such assurances, however, did little to assuage the anger of the absent Churches. Jerusalem,¹¹⁷ Antioch¹¹⁸ and Alexandria refused outright to accept the reformed calendar. Patriarch Photius of Alexandria declared that the calendar had the 'smell of heresy and schism', and alleged that Anglicans had inspired it.¹¹⁹ Patriarch Gregory IV of Antioch characterised the calendar reform as 'pointless, uncanonical and harmful'. Gregory conveyed Photius' condemnation to Antonii with the note, 'You can clearly ascertain the opinion of the Eastern patriarchs with regard to the questions raised by the meeting at Constantinople.'¹²⁰ The Karlovchane adhered rigidly to the old calendar, as did the Serbs.¹²¹

¹¹⁴ A representative to the Serbian metropolitan presented a report that asked the congress to 'condescend to the feebleness of the widowed clergy' and allow them, through economy, to marry after the death of a spouse. A representative for the Karlovatskii Synod (before withdrawing from the Congress) termed such a move an 'indulgence' (*poslablenie*), an 'abnormality' and a 'wavering [*kolebanie*] of one of the main bases of the canonical organization of the Church'. The Karlovatskii Synod later voted to 'reject completely' any such indulgence: 'Po voprosu o utorobrachiі dukhovenstvo', *ibid.* no. 13–14 (1923), 10.

¹¹⁵ 'Ob otozvanii predstavitelei Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi iz Konstantinopol'skoi Mezhdupravoslavnoi Komissii', *ibid.* no. 19–20 (1923), 6. ¹¹⁶ Nikon, *Žiznneopisanie*, x. 36.

¹¹⁷ Quoted in Photius, bishop of Triaditsa, 'The 70th anniversary of the pan-Orthodox congress in Constantinople: a major step on the path towards apostasy', in *The Orthodox Church calendar*, Jordanville 1996, 21. See also 'The Orthodox reformed calendar', *CE* x/1 (1929), 35.

¹¹⁸ Patriarch Antiokiiskii Grigorii, 'Kopiiia telegrammu Sviatieishago Patriarkha Antiokhiiskago, ot 10-go oktiabria 1923 goda, na imia Vysokopreosviashchennichishago Mitropolita Antoniiia', *TV* no. 19–20 (1923), 2.

¹¹⁹ Mews, 'Anglican intervention', 296.

¹²⁰ Photius, '70th anniversary', 25.

¹²¹ *The Christian East* attributed Serbia's refusal to the strength of Antonii's influence in Serbia: 'The Orthodox reformed calendar', 35.

Despite the official affirmation of the Greek Church, a number of Greeks joined the Karlovchane in portraying the calendar reform as an attempt by Meletios to move their Church – the One, True, Christian Church, untainted by western errors – closer to the heretical west.¹²² Some opposition to the reform stemmed from popular superstitions about tampering with days dedicated to the saints.¹²³ (Romania witnessed riots when in 1929 its synod eventually adopted a new means of determining the date for Easter.¹²⁴) And a number of opponents resisted any sort of change in principle as incompatible with Orthodoxy's emphasis on tradition.¹²⁵ But the most common complaint centred on the perceived attempt by one Church – Constantinople – to make substantive changes without the participation of all others. As the metropolitan of Kassandria wrote:

What right does that upstart [Meletios] have to create a Pan-Orthodox Congress without consulting the Metropolitans of the ecumenical Throne? ... What law or canon gives the representative of one local Church the right to change the decisions of all the Eastern Patriarchs concerning the question of the calendar and Paschalia, which was finalised by the illustrious Patriarchs Joachim III of Constantinople, Meletius Pigas of Alexandria, Joachim of Antioch and Sophronius of Jerusalem?¹²⁶

John Douglas supported Meletios's reforms,¹²⁷ hoping that they would move Orthodoxy into closer contact with the west and the Church of England. He thus observed the resultant furore closely and nervously. He put his finger on the problem when he noted that the proceedings at Constantinople represented an attempt by the Phanar to 'indicate its historic claim to be the active centre of Orthodoxy'.¹²⁸ Not all Orthodox Churches were ready to concede such a position to Meletios or to Constantinople. Antonii was furious about the reform,¹²⁹ as are his followers to this day: they portray it, and *rapprochement* with Anglicans, as all of one piece, a single package 'poisoned by ideas growing out of Protestant ecumenism',¹³⁰ modernism and westernism,¹³¹ and a willingness to consort

¹²² A number of Orthodox in the Greek constituent assembly submitted a protest that termed the reform a 'Popish or Protestant heresy': 'Petitsiia Obshchestva Pravoslavnykh vysokochtimomu Uchreditel'nomu Sobraniu Gretsii otnositel'no unichtozheniia nastunivshago v Tserkvi raskola', *TV* no. 1–2 (1925), 10–12.

¹²³ W. A. Wigram, 'Present-day problems of the Orthodox Church', *CE* vii/4 (1926), 165.

¹²⁴ 'The new style calendar of Rumania', *The Times*, 26 Jan. 1929, 11.

¹²⁵ 'Petitsiia Obshchestva', 11.

¹²⁶ Photius, '70th anniversary', 19.

¹²⁷ 'Pan-Orthodox conference in Constantinople', *CE* iv/4 (1923), 168. ¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 166.

¹²⁹ Mitropolit Antonii, 'Skorbnoe poslanie sviatiashemu; blazhennieishemu arkhiepiskopu Konstantinopolia – novago Rima; Vselenskomu Patriarkhu Kir-Kir Konstantinu VI', *TV* no. 11–12 (1925), 2.

¹³⁰ Photius, '70th anniversary', 6. He also complains of 'ecumenical expansiveness'.

¹³¹ *The Christian Century* appeared to confirm every such fear when it printed an article on the reforms, which it entitled, 'Eastern Churches try western ways': 'the weakness that

with heretics¹³² (traits supposedly personified by Hamilcar Alivizatos, an advocate of *rapprochement* with the Church of England and the calendar reform alike). Antonii was suspicious of canonical reform in general,¹³³ but he was especially outraged by this action since it looked like an attempt to institute a major change in the life of the Church without convening an ecumenical council.¹³⁴ The fact that such a council was out of the question given Turkey's refusal to host a major body of Christian hierarchs in no way lessened Antonii's anger. How dare Meletios institute a change in which the Russian Orthodox Church, now under the heel of the Bolsheviks, could not play an active part.

Antonii also feared any action that seemed to raise the standing of the Ecumenical Patriarch, a man who – to his mind – represented the triumph of pan-Christian unity over imperialistic Orthodoxy.¹³⁵ Antonii advocated Russia's historic interests in the Balkans: any attempt by the Ecumenical Patriarch to lead other Orthodox Churches towards reform could be viewed as an attempt to supplant Russia's traditionally strong influence in this region. And a resurgent Ecumenical Patriarchate had repercussions for the status of Antonii's own synod: its canonical authority and ability to win allegiance from members of the Russian Orthodox Church in exile were already in doubt.¹³⁶ Meletios and Antonii were both vying for the mantle of the deposed Russian patriarch, Tikhon, and the pan-Orthodox Congress of 1923 became a symbol for the post-war conflict over who represented the Russian Orthodox in exile.¹³⁷

Antonii had become convinced that Meletios, as part of his pan-Christian project, wished to gain control of Russian church dioceses in Poland and

followed the war, and the dread of the Roman Catholic invasion, are leading many of the strongest ecclesiastics in the eastern churches to say, mostly in private, but sometimes in public, that they want to add to their own noble Christian heritage the good things in western church life': Henry Strong Huntington, 'Eastern Churches try western ways', *Christian Century* xliv (1927), 301.

¹³² Here the current Russian Orthodox Church Abroad becomes even more conservative than its members at the time: Photius, '70th anniversary', 10.

¹³³ Ibid. 25. See also Sergii Chetverikov, 'Sliduet-li pravoslavnym prinimat Grigorianskii kalendar, kogda legko i prosto mozžno ispraviti Iulianskii s tochnost'iu, v 26 raz prevyshaiushchei tochnost Grigorianskago kalendara?', *TV* no. 1–2 (1925), 9–10.

¹³⁴ 'Po povodu postanovlenii mezhdupravoslavnoi komissii v Konstantinople', *ibid.* no. 17–18 (1923), 5.

¹³⁵ Antonii called for a patriarch in Constantinople who would prove to be a successor to the 'great' ecumenical prelates of antiquity and reestablish the Byzantine empire: Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, x. 39, 46. Convinced that Constantinople was not up to the task, he turned his attention to Jerusalem, hoping that it would pick up the mantle: *ibid.* iv. 164.

¹³⁶ The synod's journal nervously noted the inclusion of Archbishop Aleksandr, stationed in South America, who attended as a representative of the Russian Church without the authorisation of the Karlovchane: 'Po povodu postanovlenii mezhdupravoslavnoi komissii', 5.

¹³⁷ The synod had the difficult task of explaining Tikhon's own interest in calendar reform: *ibid.*

Finland,¹³⁸ making the Ecumenical Patriarchate the primary Orthodox force in Europe.¹³⁹ Antonii was furious when Meletios appointed a Finn as a bishop in the newly autonomous Finnish Church – a region that Russian imperialists insisted fell within the purview of the Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁴⁰ Meletios did not help matters with his statements about the rights and responsibilities of the Ecumenical Patriarchate: citing the canons of Chalcedon (451), he claimed that all Orthodox outside the territorial jurisdiction of a given autocephalous Church (all Russian *émigrés*, for example) were dependent upon the ecumenical throne. Finally, Antonii seems to have feared that the hubbub over the calendar reform would divert attention from the sufferings of the Orthodox Church in Russia.¹⁴¹

The Karlovatskii Synod's attitude towards the Ecumenical Patriarchate was complex. On the one hand, it appealed to Christians around the world to come to the aid of the patriarchate and preserve it from the Turks,¹⁴² insisting, rather disingenuously, that 'The Russian Church from earliest times has become accustomed to turn to the Ecumenical Patriarchate for the explanation of religious-ecclesiastical questions.'¹⁴³ On the other hand, the Karlovatskii Synod's publications vilified Meletios, portraying his reforms, his *rapprochement* with the western Churches and his involvement in the ecumenical movement as nothing more than an attempt to increase the prestige of Constantinople on the world stage. Citing the extensive travels of Metropolitan Germanos (Constantinople's representative in London), as well as correspondence between Germanos and the archbishop of Canterbury, the *Tserkovnyiia vedomosti* (the Karlovatskii Synod's journal) concluded that Germanos 'has pretensions to power over all Orthodox Churches in West and Central Europe'. England's involvement with the Ecumenical Patriarch, argued the *Vedomosti*, is an attempt to take from Russia its 'right of advantage' and 'protection of Near-Eastern Christian peoples'.¹⁴⁴ 'The projects of the English regarding the Ecumenical Patriarch

¹³⁸ Antonii, 'Skorbnoe poslanie sviatiashemu', 1; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, x. 40.

¹³⁹ An article by E. Makharoblidze, a regular and often bombastic polemicist for the Karlovchane, argued that Russia's efforts on behalf of Constantinople during the Great War should increase Russia's influence in the region: 'Polozhenie Vselenskago Patriarkha i Patriarkhii', *TV* no. 19–20 (1923), 14.

¹⁴⁰ Douglas observed that Antonii and his followers viewed such action as 'not only anti-canonical, but it cuts at their national feeling': 'The Oecumenical Patriarchate', 189.

¹⁴¹ It is terrible to risk a schism over this issue, he wrote, at a time when we are suffering persecution 'from the enemies of Christ': 'Po povodu postanovlenii mezhdupravoslavnoi komissii', 5.

¹⁴² Mitropolit Antonii, 'Obrashchenie Arkhiereiskago Sinoda k Lozannskoi konferentsii s protestom protiv udaleniia Vselenskoii Patriarshei katedru iz Konstantinopolia', *TV* no. 1–2 (1923), 2.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Makharoblidze, 'Polozhenie Vselenskago Patriarkha', 14.

deprive Russia [of its rights in the region] and completely liquidate its influence and significance.’

English and Anglicans, to the mind of the Karlovchane, became synonymous with support for Meletios.¹⁴⁵ The Karlovatskii journal repeated with suspicion the Ecumenical Patriarch’s statements from London that Constantinople wished to strengthen ties between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches, ‘which God clearly leads to union’.¹⁴⁶ Such statements suggested to the Karlovchane an attempt by Meletios to ingratiate himself with Lambeth in order to win control of Orthodox Churches in England, as well as an attempt to win ‘episcopal jurisdiction for governance of Orthodox’ in central and western Europe.¹⁴⁷

Back in England, *The Times* pushed (albeit carefully) for Anglican representation at the pan-Orthodox Congress that the Karlovchane considered heretical.¹⁴⁸ And when the congress convened, Bishop Gore was there, presenting Meletios with a petition from 5,000 Anglican priests assuring him that no impediment could prevent union with the Orthodox. One can imagine the Karlovatskii mind at work as Gore – who, after Davidson, was probably the most famous bishop in the Anglican Church – expressed his joy at being present at this congress.¹⁴⁹ ‘For us, living in the West’, wrote Gore, ‘it would be a source of great spiritual satisfaction to have the possibility of celebrating together [with the Orthodox] the major Christian feasts.’¹⁵⁰ Here was proof enough that Meletios – the unilateral reformer and westerniser – was in cahoots with the Anglicans.

This was the context in which most Orthodox Churches declined to endorse the recognition of Anglican orders. Jerusalem and Cyprus were the only ones to do so within the next five years.¹⁵¹ *The Christian East*, always optimistic, celebrated Jerusalem’s recognition (passed on 12 March 1923), hoping it would be the first in a series. But the Jerusalem patriarch’s decision, much like that of Meletios, elicited a strong backlash and accusations of political manoeuvring.

¹⁴⁵ In his indictment of the calendar reform Photius notes that those who organised the Pan-Orthodox Congress of 1923 ‘maintained close ties with Protestants in America and England’.

¹⁴⁶ ‘Ukaz Vrem. Arkh. Sinoda po voprosu otnoshenii zapadno-evropeiskikh rus. pravosl. tserkvei k ekzarkhu Vselen. Patriarkha v Z. Evropeie’, *TV* no. 16–17 (1922), 2.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. In response, the synod published an *ukaz* affirming that the Russian Orthodox Church in western Europe was subordinate to Evlogii, who was still on relatively good terms with the Karlovchane.

¹⁴⁸ ‘A year of church councils’, *The Times*, 25 June 1923, 13.

¹⁴⁹ Photius notes with contempt that Meletios asked Gore ‘to inform the Archbishop of Canterbury that we are well disposed to accept the New Calendar which you in the West have decided upon’: Photius, ‘70th anniversary’, 20–1.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. 20.

¹⁵¹ The text of letters from the patriarchs of Jerusalem and the patriarch of Cyprus may be found in *Orthodox statements on Anglican orders*, at pp. 6–7 and 8–9 respectively.

The patriarchate of Jerusalem was just as troubled as the patriarchate of Constantinople. Deep divisions separated its laity and parish priests (mostly indigenous Arabs) from the Greek monks who controlled the Jerusalem synod from their headquarters at the convent of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre. The brotherhood elected the patriarch and all members of the synod, excluding the Arab laity from administrative matters. Russia had long provided economic assistance to the Jerusalem patriarchate, both because of Russia's political interests in the region and because of its wish to aid the thousands of Russian pilgrims to the Holy Land. But the Great War bankrupted Russia, Russia lost its Orthodox tsar and Jerusalem lost its main source of income. By the end of the war the Jerusalem patriarchate was in debt to the tune of £500,000.¹⁵² Desperate, the Greeks in the patriarchate applied to Greece for assistance, and Venizelos responded generously.

In the middle of this mess sat Patriarch Damianos, a figure nearly as controversial as Meletios, and equally at odds with the Greek Orthodox Church in Athens. As the war drew to a close and British forces approached Jerusalem, retreating Turks abducted Damianos and held him in Damascus while the Greeks and the British debated his fate. The Greek consul general blamed Damianos for the financial chaos in his patriarchate. The British – who soon occupied Jerusalem – agreed. Both Greece and Britain refused to allow Damianos to return to Jerusalem. The Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre – now without patriarch or outside funding – turned all responsibility for the patriarchate's finances over to the Greek government.

This action did not sit at all well with the British. While unhappy with Damianos's fiscal record, the British were even more unhappy to see the patriarchate within their new mandate under the fiscal control of another state. London worried about the Greek government's support for the Brotherhood, and suspected a political motive behind Greece's loans – namely an attempt by Greece to secure its influence over Jerusalem and cement the Brotherhood's Hellenic sympathies.¹⁵³

Britain therefore allowed Damianos to return in 1919, as General Allenby, the British overseer of the occupied territory of Jerusalem, grew concerned about escalating tensions between the Greek synod and the Arab laity, and as the Arab laity expressed its unhappiness about Jerusalem's increased reliance on Greece. Damianos now seemed more acceptable to the British. He was less committed to the Greek national cause than was the *locum tenens* during his absence, and Britain hoped that he might become a conciliatory figure.

He did not. Instead, the Brotherhood complained loudly about his refusal to grant the Greek minority its accustomed power over the Arab majority.

¹⁵² Daphne Tsimhoni, 'The Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem during the formative years of the British mandate in Palestine', *Asian and African Studies* xii/1 (1978), 85.

¹⁵³ Ibid. 90.

In 1921 the British high commissioner for Palestine established a commission to examine the whole state of affairs in Jerusalem, and took the patriarchate into receivership. (By this time relations between Damianos and the Jerusalem bishops had soured to such an extent that the bishops severed all ties with him.¹⁵⁴) The commission issued a report extremely critical of Greek-minority control. During the investigation Archbishop Randall Davidson found himself being lobbied by Greeks and Arabs to support their positions.¹⁵⁵ As in the controversy in Constantinople, he worked mostly to keep himself above the conflict.

The parallels between Jerusalem and Constantinople are pronounced. Jerusalem, like Constantinople, found itself with a patriarch distrusted by Greece and threatened with financial ruin. And just like the patriarch of Constantinople, the patriarch of Jerusalem appealed to Britain for political and religious assistance, and for help in settling a dispute between local ethnic groups. Both controversies received heavy coverage in the British press,¹⁵⁶ and both created in the mind of many English a view of Eastern Orthodoxy as a chaotic religion – a tar-baby that one touched at one's own risk.¹⁵⁷ This 'crowd of greedy, dishonest Greeks and rioting Arabs', wrote *The Tablet*, now have 'honourable English gentlemen' as their judges. 'Rarely has the moral superiority of civilised Europe emerged so triumphantly.'¹⁵⁸

Given these parallels, it is no surprise that when Damianos recognised Anglican orders in 1923, the same charges levelled against Meletios fell upon him, namely, that he granted recognition largely to win political and financial support from Britain. *The Orthodox Catholic Review*¹⁵⁹ reminded its readers that in 1907 Patriarch Damianos had declared the impossibility of examining Anglican orders without examining Anglican doctrine and

¹⁵⁴ J. B. Barron, 'The Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem', *The Nineteenth Century and After* xcv (1925), 284.

¹⁵⁵ Tsimhoni, 'The Greek Orthodox patriarchate', 107.

¹⁵⁶ *The Times* followed the controversy avidly, and printed many letters to the editor. See, for example, 'The Haifa Orthodox congress', 20 July 1923, 11, and 'The patriarchate of Jerusalem', 28 July 1923, 8.

¹⁵⁷ Few journals would join *The Christian East* in arguing for greater British involvement in Jerusalem's religious politics: 'The deadlock at Jerusalem', *CE* xvii/1–2 (1937), 2–4. An article in *Blackfriars* remarked that such chaos tended to make the British public see a 'tendency to disunion', among the Eastern Churches': Donald Atwater, 'The Orthodox of Jerusalem', *Blackfriars* xiii (1932), 71. *The Tablet* chortled 'Once again the Orthodox Church exposes to the world the deplorable result of having no final authority over her members': 'The quarrel at Jerusalem', *The Tablet*, 22 Apr. 1922. The *Church Quarterly Review* sided with the Arab laity over the Greeks: Philip Usher, 'Recent tendencies in the eastern Orthodox Church', *CQR* no. 207 (1927), 12–13.

¹⁵⁸ 'The quarrel at Jerusalem', 498.

¹⁵⁹ This was the official journal of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, founded by conservative Russian Orthodox bishops in the United States.

practice as a whole, or without bringing the question before all Orthodox churches. Observing Damianos's about-face of 1923, the *Review* wrote

Doubtless the exigencies of the Jerusalem Patriarchate in 1923 dictated a policy calculated to secure support and protection from the Anglicans and the British Imperial Rulers of Palestine; whereas the unlimited support of Russian and Russian Pilgrims in 1907 left the Jerusalem Patriarchate free to speak the truth frankly and maintain true Orthodox principles boldly without consulting financial or political expediency. But such treacherous and unworthy sale of Orthodox principles and honour, such barter of the Body and Blood of Christ and petty pawning of the Communion and Fellowship of His Holy Church as this implies, should be far from loyal leaders of Orthodoxy. Such considerations are more fitting for the successors of Simon Magus and Judas.¹⁶⁰

A month later the *Review* termed the recognition of Anglican orders by Damianos and Meletios 'the buying of English favor with seeming concession of [the] Holy Church to the Protestant State Church of England' and 'a fishing for Orthodox alliance and "advantages in the Eastern Mediterranean"' for Imperial Britain – What a scandal and shame to the Holy Church!¹⁶¹ Such literature made clear the fears among Russian Orthodox about British influence in a region Russia considered its own:

If the British Crown, already head of the Protestant State Church of England, can, through the High Commissioner of its Palestinian Mandate from the League of Nations, arbitrarily revise the constitution of the Orthodox Catholic Patriarchate may we not look forward to an alien Protestant control of the Patriarchate by the British Government? Is it not to be expected that the next step will be the appointment of the Orthodox Patriarch and Bishops by a Jewish or Baptist British High Commissioner just as Anglican Bishops and Archbishops are appointed by religiously nondescript Prime Ministers or their under-Secretaries?¹⁶²

The Tablet portrayed the recognition as a *quid pro quo*: 'The Church [of Jerusalem] got protection; the Anglicans received recognition.'¹⁶³

Antonii, despairing over the refusal of the now-communist Russia to provide funds to Jerusalem, feared a Jerusalem patriarchate independent of Russian influence and reliant on Britain to judge its disputes and keep it fiscally solvent. Nationalists like Antonii could not tolerate the idea of one of the four original patriarchates being under British receivership. Jerusalem also earned Antonii's ire for its decision to recognise the Living Church in Russia, a move that destroyed any credibility it had with Russian Orthodox émigrés.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ 'Consistency and Orthodox policy', 51.

¹⁶¹ 'News, notes, and comment', *Orthodox Catholic Review* i/3 (1927), 142. ¹⁶² *Ibid.* 141.

¹⁶³ Godric Kean, 'The Orthodox recognition of Anglican orders', *The Tablet*, 6 Aug. 1927.

¹⁶⁴ The *Viestnik Russkago khristianskago studencheskago dvizheniia* (*The Herald of the Russian Christian Student Movement*) noted with dismay the 'happiness and celebration' with which the letter was received by authorities in the USSR: 'Obnovlencheskaia tserkov', *VRKSD* no. 2 (1926), 23.

The recognition of Anglican orders by Jerusalem and Constantinople, an event cheered by Anglican advocates of reunion, made the entire enterprise suspect in many corners of the Orthodox world, and raised qualms among Anglicans about the fractious easterners. Anglicans found that their greatest Orthodox advocate for reunion – a man determined to reform the Orthodox Church (however minimally) – was repugnant to large swathes of Orthodoxy, particularly to the Karlovatskii Synod, the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and the Churches of Greece and Serbia.

The turmoil following recognition of Anglican orders made Anglicans vulnerable to accusations that *rapprochement* with the Ecumenical Patriarchate was due to Venizelist intrigue.¹⁶⁵ Yet some English insisted on putting a positive spin on the situation. In 1927 the *Church Quarterly Review* was still praising Meletios's 'vigorous movement of practical reform designed to enable Orthodoxy to adapt itself to the rapidly changing conditions of the Near East'.¹⁶⁶ Athelstan Riley observed that 'Whatever view is taken of the "reforms" of Meletios the gratitude of all who work for Christian unity is due to that able prelate who realised the changed conditions of Christendom brought about by the Great War and took the first step to establish the *entente* which now exists between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches'.¹⁶⁷ But those close to the question of Anglo-Orthodox *rapprochement* knew that they were dealing with a powder keg. *The Times* called the question of the calendar 'vexed'.¹⁶⁸ And although *The Christian East* supported Meletios to the end, it also gave ample coverage to the turmoil he had caused. *The Church Times*, another supporter of Meletios, was forced to concede that 'it was generally felt in the East that the independent action of Meletios IV formed a dangerous precedent'.¹⁶⁹ Douglas, reflecting on the whole affair a few years later, noted that the Orthodox world 'has been rocked by the conflict regarding the former Ecumenical Patriarch', and reflected, 'In light of his popularity in London and his closeness to the upper spheres of the Anglican church, there is a sense that he supported and inspired us'.¹⁷⁰ Travelling in the east in 1930 Douglas reported that resentment over Meletios's actions 'was still an impediment' to further recognition of Anglican orders.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ John Douglas addressed just such accusations levelled by Michel d'Herbigny in *The Christian East*. Lloyd George had supported Venizelos, as did most progressives in the British parliament: Leon Tretjakewitsch, *Bishop Michel d'Herbigny, S.J., and Russia: a pre-ecumenical approach to Christian unity*, Würzburg 1990, 184–7. ¹⁶⁶ Usher, 'Recent tendencies', 13.

¹⁶⁷ Athelstan Riley, 'Anglican and Orthodox', *CQR* ci (1925–6), 128.

¹⁶⁸ 'Reforming the calendar', *The Times*, 10 May 1923, 13.

¹⁶⁹ 'An oecumenical council in Jerusalem: will it meet next year?', *Church Times*, 7 Aug. 1925, 149.

¹⁷⁰ J. A. Douglas, 'Anglikanskoe i Pravoslavnoe priblizhenie k vozsoedineniiu', *TV* no. 23–4 (1925), 16. ¹⁷¹ van Dusen, 'Some relations', 53.

Archbishop Davidson was careful not to play up Meletios's recognition, or even to act as if he welcomed the announcement.¹⁷² He did announce the receipt of Meletios's letter to convocation on 16 February 1923, but he emphasised that recognition would not lead to intercommunion, and that it would have to be accepted by all Orthodox Churches or approved by a general synod before it would be ecumenically binding.¹⁷³ Referring to the letter at a later sitting of convocation, Davidson noted his regret that 'politics and ecclesiastical matters were often intimately related'.¹⁷⁴

The status of Meletios in the whole affair of Anglican relations became moot for a few years after 1923. The Turks by this time had had quite enough of his advocacy on behalf of his loyal Greek flock in Constantinople. The British were determined to save the Phanar in negotiations at Lausanne, but they began to view the controversial Meletios as a player who might be expendable in their larger attempt to preserve the patriarchate.¹⁷⁵ In the end, Britain won from Turkey the preservation of the patriarchate, but it did not intervene when Turkey forced Meletios out of the Phanar. Meletios, stripped of his title, departed for Mount Athos. A correspondent for *The Times* reported that 'His All-Holiness, in declining to make any statement to journalists, merely said that he was broken physically and mentally, and had left Constantinople in order not to make the position of the Greeks there still more difficult'.¹⁷⁶ Anglican advocates of reunion with the Orthodox watched their champion depart, knowing that parts of the Orthodox world now regarded *rapprochement* with the Church of England as little more than political chicanery and opportunism.

Hopes for the reunification of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches were mired from the outset in political intrigues, both real and imagined. The hysterical accusations levelled against Meletios and Damianos by the Karlovchane had just enough basis in reality to frighten Orthodox and Anglican observers alike. There is no doubting the sincerity of Meletios's desire to see the Christian world restored – a desire spurred by Orthodoxy's almost messianic conception of Christianity as inherently incompatible with division of any kind. But neither is there any doubt that Meletios was hopelessly entangled in the byzantine (literally and figuratively) politics of the Balkans and the Near East, so that it became nearly impossible for his Orthodox brethren and many Anglican observers to discern where religion ended and politics began. Political divisions within Anglicanism – between

¹⁷² Bell, *Randall Davidson*, 1108.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁴ From a summary provided by a correspondent for *The Times*: 'Soviet war on religion: bishops' protest', *The Times*, 2 May 1923, 9.

¹⁷⁵ Matthew Spinka, 'Post-war eastern Orthodox Churches', *Church History* iv (1935), 104–5.

¹⁷⁶ 'Mgr. Meletios IV at Mytilene', *The Times*, 13 July 1923, 11.

evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics, and within Orthodoxy, between inward-looking nationalists and more cosmopolitan ecumenists – coupled with the political feuds engendered by Britain's imperialistic pretensions – led many in both confessions to doubt the sincerity of those who argued most forcefully for reunion.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the theologians and religious scholars who rose to prominence through the formal and informal meetings of Anglicans and Orthodox that continued into the 1930s (figures such as Sergii Bulgakov, Georges Florovskii, Hamilcar Alivizatos, Anton Kartashev, Nikolai Zernov and Vasilii Zenkovskii) tried mightily to focus discussions on theology and spirituality rather than on politics. But ecumenism is inherently a political endeavour: attempts at reunion are, if nothing else, attempts to reconcile division caused by competing interests.

Meletios was now gone. But the Orthodox world continued to splinter, the Russian Church dissolved into factions, and High Church and Low Church elements within the Church of England continued to feud. Advocates of Anglican–Orthodox reunion soldiered on. The nobility of the cause ensured that optimism remained. But so did the intractable divisions.