**IS THE PAPACY A CHURCH?**

**by Alexander Kalomiros**

***“We have cut the Latins off from us for no other reason than that they are not only schismatics, but also heretics. For this reason it is wholly improper to unite with them.”***– St. Mark Evgenikos of Ephesus (1392-1444)

The Latins, who deep down are conscious of the lie in which they live, have felt of old the necessity to teach that their differences from the Orthodox Church are insignificant. This is but a means of quieting the struggling conscience of their faithful who continually uncover in Orthodox Tradition and life new magnitudes and depths which they lack.

They teach, therefore, that our only difference is insubordination, and that the dogmatic differences are only misunderstandings because of incomplete formulations. They fashioned the *Unia*, in which, without asking for any other immediate change in their faith and life, they accept Easterners if only they submit to the Pope. They believe that this peaceful assault is the best means of paralyzing every resistance.

This cunning policy of theirs has diabolical psychological insight. They know that if they can convince their own people that nothing essential separates them from us, they keep them forever; and if they succeed in convincing us that those things which separate us are unimportant, they have gained us also, for the feeble human soul always stands in awe before worldly power and great numbers, and it desires to have them as allies.

The victims of this propaganda of the Latins are for the most part ordained or lay theologians, who, having studied in a rationalistic, Westernized environment and having also the desire to succeed in a world of compromises which does not allow the absolute and the truth, have been disseminating for years now these self-same Papal ideas. With frequent repetition one can succeed eventually in making the most monstrous lie appear to be natural. Thus, most of our people who even up to yesterday, after an experience of centuries regarded Westerners as the worst defilement of their religion and fatherland, today are in danger of becoming accustomed to the idea that the wolves in sheep’s clothing of Papism are in reality unjustly treated by us and are misunderstood brothers in Christ.

Here is what our Papophiles maintain: “The Western Church,” they say, “is not only a church in name but in reality, preserving in spite of the Schism and of dogmatic and other kinds of deviations the *charisma* of the priesthood and of the Mysteries.”

They base this contention of theirs on the following arguments:

1. The Western Church has preserved the Apostolic Succession in her ordinations.
2. The Orthodox Church accepts the baptism of the Roman Church, since She does not rebaptize repentant Papists who come to Her. This means, they say, that our Church recognizes the mysteries of the Papal Church and her ordinations.
3. There does not exist, they say, a clear decision of an Orthodox Council which characterizes the Western Church as heretical and therefore alien to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ.
4. In the older official documents of patriarchs which were addressed to the Pope, the Western Church is called “Church,” and this means that actually she is recognized as being essentially in the Church by the patriarchs who wrote to her.

Let us see, therefore, how sound their arguments are, and what the actual position of the Orthodox Church is on this question, in order that the irresponsible opinions which have been abounding lately may cease.

Can it be that the Papists really have preserved Apostolic Succession in their ordinations?

In speaking of Apostolic Succession it is not sufficient that we prove a continuous and unbroken chain of ordinations which reaches to the Apostles. The Church of Christ does not hang from the letter of the law. If those who ordained did not have the right Faith, their ordination is invalid, and we can speak neither of Apostolic Succession nor of priesthood. The laying of hands upon the ordinand by a true bishop transmits the grace of the All-holy Spirit. Does the Holy Spirit, however, abide where falsehood is? Where heresy is?

Here is what the Great Basil says, writing to Nikopolitas: “I will never number with the true priests of Christ him who was ordained and received the oversight of a flock from the profane hands of heretics, unto the overthrow of the Orthodox Faith.”

The 68th Canon of the Holy Apostles states; “If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon accepts a second ordination from anyone, let both him and the one who ordained him be deposed; unless, indeed it be established that he had his ordination from heretics. For those who have been baptized or ordained by such persons cannot possibly be either of the faithful or of the clergy.” Only if one has been ordained by heretics does the canon permit a second ordination, for the ordination of heretics is, in reality, as if it had never happened.

What value, then, does a merely ritualistic Apostolic Succession have from whence the Holy Spirit has departed?

Their second argument to prove that the Papacy is a genuine Church is always cited by the Papophiles as the greatest proof of their theory. “Inasmuch as our Church,” they say, “does not rebaptize Papists who desire to become Orthodox, this means that their baptism and therefore their priesthood and their other mysteries are real and valid.”

What great superficiality, however, is revealed by this conclusion! If this reasoning is true, then we must accept that neither the Arians nor the Macedonians were heretics, since the Church accepted for a time their baptism also. But away with such blasphemy! The baptism of heretics and schismatics is not Baptism. It holds the place of Baptism only when afterwards by economy the Church validates it. “One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism” teaches the Apostle Paul (Eph. 4:5). And the Council of Carthage, approved by the Sixth Ecumenical Council, explains: “For if the Catholic Church be one and the true Baptism be one, how can that of the heretics and schismatics be a true Baptism at a time when they are not in the Catholic Church but have been cut off from it by heresy? But if the baptism of heretics and schismatics be true and the Baptism of the Orthodox Catholic Church also be true, then there is not one Baptism as St. Paul proclaims, but two, which is most absurd.

Also, St. Basil the Great in his canons does not accept the baptism of schismatics: “Nevertheless, it seemed best to the ancient authorities – those I mean, who form the party of Cyprian and our own Firmilian – to class them all under one head, including Cathari and Encratites and Aquarians and Apotactites; because the beginning, true enough, of the separation resulted through a schism; however, those who seceded from the Church no longer had the grace of the Holy Spirit upon them, for the impartation thereof ceased when the continuity was interrupted. For although the ones who were the first to depart had been ordained by the Fathers and with the imposition of their hands they had obtained the gift of the Spirit, yet after breaking away they became common men and had no authority either to baptize or to ordain, nor could they impart the grace of the Holy Spirit to others, after they themselves had forfeited it. Wherefore they bade that those baptized by them should be regarded as being baptized by common men, and that when they came to join the Church, they should have to be repurified by the true Baptism of the Church” (1st Canon of St. Basil). Further on in the same text of St. basil the thought of the Fathers is shown forth clearly, for they affirm that the baptism not only of heretics but even of schismatics is invalid – that is, without grace and sanctification. However, for reasons of economy they permit that it be confirmed afterwards upon the admittance of the schismatics into the Church. St. Basil, therefore, writes: “Inasmuch, however, as it has appeared reasonable to some of those in the regions of Asia that their (schismatic) baptism be accepted as an economy to the many, let it be accepted.”

From the above, it is clearly obvious that the Fathers consider the baptism of heretics and schismatics to be non-existent. When they decide in certain circumstances not to repeat it, they are not, of course, changing their mind. They are making an act of economy in which the external and empty baptism of the schismatic or heretic obtains, upon his entrance into the Church, content: sanctifying power and grace which he, a man who until then had been outside of the Church, had never received.

If then, St. Basil the Great says such things for schismatics, “those who on account of ecclesiastical causes and remedial questions have developed a quarrel amongst themselves,” as he defines them, let everyone consider how much more so these hold true for heretics, “who have broken entirely and have become alienated from the Faith itself” (1st Canon of St. Basil), and indeed for those heretics who are not burdened with only one heresy, but with a multitude of frightful and unnamable heresies, as are the Papists.

St. John Chrysostom also says: “Let not the systems of the heretics fool you, O hearer; for they have a baptism, but not enlightenment; and so they are baptized according to the body, but as for the soul, they are not enlightened” (Homily on “In the beginning was the Word”). And St. Leo: “No heretic confers sanctification through the mysteries” (Epistle to Nicetas). And St. Ambrose: “The baptism of the impious does not sanctify” (Concerning the Catechumens).

But, someone may yet wonder, if it be true that heretics do not have Baptism, then why did the Church in the Second and Sixth Ecumenical Councils accept the baptism of certain heretics such as the Arians and Macedonians?

Here is how St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain answers this problem: “In order to have an easily understood solution to this perplexity, it is necessary to know beforehand that two kinds of government and correction are observed in the Church. One kind is called ‘Exactness’ (*Akribeia*), and the other kind is called ‘Economy’ and ‘Condescension’ (*Oikonomia* and *Synkatabasis*). With these the Stewards (*Oikonomoi*) of the Spirit administer the salvation of souls, at times with one, at times with the other. So the Holy Apostles in their aforesaid canons, and all the Saints who have been mentioned, employed Exactness; and for this reason they reject the baptism of heretics completely; while, on the other hand, the two Ecumenical Councils employed Economy and accepted the baptism of Arians and of Macedonians and of others, but refused to recognize that of the Eunomians and of still others … Those heretics whose baptism they accepted also rigorously observed the form and the matter of the Baptism of the Orthodox and were willing to be baptized in accordance with the form of the Catholic Church. Those heretics, on the other hand, whose baptism they had refused t recognize, had counterfeited the ceremony of Baptism and had corrupted the rite, or the mode of the kind, or (in the terminology of the Latins) species, and the same may be said of the invocations, or that of the matter, and the same may be said of the immersions and emersions, with reference to Roman Catholics and Protestants” (Second footnote to the 46th Canon of the 85 Apostolic Canons).

We must well understand that when the Church for reasons of economy accepts the baptism of heretics and schismatics, it does not mean that She accepts that their baptism was a real one from the beginning. She merely accepts that the form of the baptism need not be repeated so long as the form resembled that of Orthodox Baptism. This form (triple immersion in the name of the Holy Trinity, etc.) does not sanctify the heretic except only at the moment when, repentant, he is accepted into the Orthodox Church by the Holy Chrism. Then and only then, by the sanctifying grace of the Church, is value given to that baptismal form which that man had at some time received and which was till then a dead form.

We see, therefore, that even though our Church occasionally accepts repentant Papists without baptizing them, this practice does not mean at all that She accepts the priesthood of the Papal Church and its mysteries as being a true Church. We know very well, and all the Latins confess it, that our Church in the beginning always baptized repentant Papists. We have the witness of the Papal Council in the Lateran at Rome in 1215, which reports in its fourth canon that the Easterners would never liturgize where a Westerner had previously liturgized if they had not first blessed water there for purification, and that they would rebaptize those coming into the Eastern Church as if they had no Baptism. Therefore, if then, when the Papists had far fewer heresies, the Church rebaptized them, how much more so should it be done now when the Latins have added error upon error? “Therefore,” writes St. Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain, “since until then, according to the witness of those self-same enemies [i.e., the Latins], the Easterners had been baptizing them, it is evident that for a great economy they used later the method of Chrismation … So the need of economy having passed, exactness and the Apostolic Canons must have their place.”

“The baptism of the Latins,” writes St. Nikodemos, “is one which is falsely called Baptism, and for this reason it is not acceptable by reason of exactness for they are heretics.” Further on he explains that neither by reason of economy is it permitted to be accepted, for the Latins do not even preserve the form of Baptism intact, inasmuch as “they do not perform the three immersions and emersions in accordance with the Apostolic Tradition. Therefore, the Latins are unbaptized,” concludes the Saint. And further on – as if he lived in our days! – he adds: “I know what the unhired defenders of the Latin pseudo-baptism say. They argue that our Church became accustomed at times to accepting converts from the Latins with Chrism, and there is, in fact, some formulation to e found in which the terms are specified under which we will take them in. With regard to this, we simply and justly reply thus: It is enough that you admit that She received them with Chrism. Therefore, they are heretics. For why the Chrism if they were not heretics?” The unhired (or hired) defenders of the Latin deception, says the Saint, gave it to be understood that since the Church became accustomed to accepting Latins with the Holy Chrism, without rebaptizing them, this signifies that She does not consider them as heretics and as completely alien to the Church. But, answers the Saint, to whom does the Church give the Chrism? Does She not give it to those who lack the Holy Spirit? Is not the Chrism “The Seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit”? Therefore, would She have ever chrismated them if She did not consider them as lacking the Holy Spirit, that is, as alien to the Church? The fact, therefore, that She chrismates them is the most manifest proof that She considers them heretics. Besides, it is Chrism, that gift of the Holy Spirit, which makes operative the previously dead Latin “baptism,” and which the Church only permitted by economy not to be repeated.

“That the Latins,” he continues, “are heretics, there is no need of our producing any proof in this matter. The very fact that we have felt so much aversion for them for so many centuries is a plain proof that we loathe them as heretics, in the same way, that is to say, as we do the Arians or Sabellians or the Spirit-defying Macedonians. If, however, anyone should like to apprehend their heresies from books, he will find them all in the writings of the most holy Patriarch of Jerusalem, Lord Dositheos, the Scourge of Popes, together with their most wise refutations. Nevertheless, one can also obtain sufficient information from the booklet of the wise Meniates entitled *A Rock of Scandal.* Enough was said concerning them by St. mark of Ephesus in Florence (at the 25th Assembly), who boldly spoke thus: “We have cut the Latins off from us for no other reason than that they are not only schismatics, but also heretics. For this reason it is wholly improper to unite with them.’ And Sylvester, the Grand Ecclesiarch, said: ‘The difference of the Latins is heresy, and as such did those before us hold it to be’ (Section 9, Chapter 5). So, it being admitted that Latins are heretics of long standing, the immediate conclusion from this is that they are unbaptized, according to St. Basil the Great, cited above, and of the Saints preceding him, Cyprian and Firmilian. Because, having become common men as a result of their being cut off from the Orthodox Church, they no longer have with them the grace of the Holy Spirit with which Orthodox priests accomplish the Mysteries.”

We have seen, therefore, that according to the mind of the Fathers, schismatics and heretics have of themselves withdrawn from the life-creating and illuminating grace of the Holy Spirit, and so that which many call “Church” is in reality nothing but a dead body which, although it preserves the external marks of the Church, has lost its life. It would be stupid and blasphemous to consider that Papists, who are guilty of the worst schism that the history of the Church has ever known and of a whole system of heresies, have valid Mysteries and priesthood. The fact that the Orthodox Church of late does not rebaptize them when they repent and return to Her does not signify, as we have seen, recognition of the mysteries of the Papal “Church” and its ordinations, but signifies a conveying of life and grace to a dead form which would have remained forever a meaningless social rite if the person involved had not repented and been accepted by the real Church of Christ.

Is there any need for us to say any more to prove that the Papacy is nothing but a prodigious organization of heretics, without the truth, without Mysteries, without Divine Grace; that it is not a Church, but an organized worldly system with a religious veneer and, as other heresies, completely alien to the Church of Christ? But we shall continue and answer, with the help of God, the other two arguments of the unhired defenders of the Latin falsity.

The Latinophiles produce two other arguments in order to prove that the Papacy did not cease being a real Church. First, they say that inasmuch as Orthodoxy never convened a council in order to excommunicate the Papists, we have no right whatsoever to consider them as being cut off from the Church. Second, they maintain that since in the official correspondence with Rome various Patriarchs name the Papacy the Western or Latin Church, or the Church of Rome, we must conclude that those Patriarchs consider the Latin heresy as being essentially a real Church.

Really, one is astounded with the willful boldness of these men! What really happened in 1054? It is true that Orthodoxy did not excommunicate the Papacy. The haughty Papacy, however, excommunicated Orthodoxy. What more do the Papophiles want? What other official act could be stronger than that? What else could open a wider chasm between the Church and Papism? The Latins kicked the Church, but they kicked against goads. The theatrical scene with the Papal delegates in the sanctuary of Agia Sophia was the officialization, the confirmation, of the cutting off of the Latins from the Church of Christ. Is any other official act necessary? No one expelled Judas from the choir of the Twelve. He left by himself. No one excommunicated him. He excommunicated himself.

The Orthodox Church, say the Papophiles, never summoned a council to decide whether or not the Latins had been cut off from the Church. What nonsense! Which orthodox ever doubted that the Papacy had been cut off from the Church? Whoever doubted it was not Orthodox. For after the official act of the Latin Church, there exist only two possibilities. Either the Papacy is really the Church of Christ, whereupon the Orthodox would be in reality anti-Orthodox and schismatics [as the Papists profess]; or the Orthodox are the real Church, whereupon the Latins as heretics and schismatics have been cut off from the Church. What middle way and compromise is possible? The Church is one. Therefore, one of these two has ceased being the Church. Each Christian had nothing to do but to examine his conscience and choose. Whoever remained Orthodox automatically renounced Papism.

Councils meet with questions and dissensions arise concerning a certain matter. However, in the entire history of the Orthodox Church from the Schism and after, there never arose a discussion or division of opinion concerning Papism. Even the participants in the false council of Florence were conscious that they had committed treachery. The Masses of the Latins were considered not only as empty of content but were considered as being a profanation – just as much as rites of black magic; and for this reason, as we have seen, when an Orthodox was to liturgize where a Latin had celebrated Mass, he first had a service of sanctification in order to cleanse the place. Not one repentant Latin was accepted by the Church without Baptism. Who at any time protested against these things in the Orthodox Church? But why should anyone protest? It was a common conviction of all that the Papacy was not a Church. Where then is found the need for summoning a council? What would the council discuss? Something which was already decided by existing conditions? Something about which not one Orthodox had, nor was it possible to have, a real doubt? The Latins were alien to the Orthodox Church, alien to its emotions, alien to its mentality, alien to its dogmas, alien to its religious life. How then could they consider them a Church? That would be tantamount to accepting that there was not one Church, as they confessed in the Symbol of the Faith, the Creed, but two!

Although no council was summoned to discuss whether the Papacy is or is not a Church, nevertheless many councils were convened in order to discuss situations which every so often Papism created among the Orthodox. In the official documents and decisions of those councils, every man of good faith can clearly see what Orthodoxy believed concerning the Papacy. These documents settle things so well that they leave no margin of doubt even for the most disbelieving.

In the limited space of this article, however, only one official document is sufficient in order to fully demonstrate to the reader what the Orthodox Church has officially declared concerning Papism.

In 1583, the Pope of Rome, Gregory XIII, who changed the Julian calendar, repeatedly pressured the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremias II, who was called the Illustrious, to follow him in the calendar innovation. The Patriarch repeatedly refused with letters, and finally in the same year he convened a council in Constantinople at which, besides himself, were present the Patriarch of Alexandria, Sylvester, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronios, and many other bishops. This council issued a *Sigillion* which was sent to all the regional Orthodox churches and which enumerates the principle heresies of the Papacy [at that time] and anathematizes (that is proclaims as being out of the Church) all those who profess them. Here is the entire text of the *Sigillion*:

**To all the genuine Christian children of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ of the East in Trigovyst and in all places, be grace and peace and mercy from Almighty God.**

**Not a little distress took possession of that Ark of old, when, storm-tossed, it was borne upon the waters; and if the Lord God, remembering Noah, had not in His good will calmed the water, there would have been no hope of salvation in it. In a like manner with the new Ark of our Church, the heretics have raised up a relentless war against us, and we have deemed it well to leave behind the present tome against them so that with the things written in it you may be able more surely to defend your Orthodoxy. But in order that the document may not be burdensome to simple people, we have decided to set forth the entire subject to you in simple speech as follows:**

**From old Rome have come certain persons who learned there to think like Latins; and the bad thing is that from being Byzantines born and bred in our own parts, they not only have changed their faith, but they also battle the Orthodox and true dogmas of the Eastern Church which Christ Himself and the divine Apostles and the Holy Councils of the Holy Fathers delivered to us. Whereupon, having cut them off as rotten members, we order:**

**I) Whosoever does not confess with heart and mouth that he is a child of the Eastern Church baptized in an Orthodox manner, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father, essentially and hypostatically, as Christ says in the Gospel, although He proceeds from the Father and the Son in time, let such a one be out of our Church and let him be anathematized.**

**II) Whosoever does not confess that in the Mystery of Holy Communion laymen should commune from two kinds both of the precious Body and Blood, but says that it is enough to receive only the Body, for the Blood is also there, even though Christ has spoken and has given each one separately, and they do not keep it, let such be anathematized.**

**III) Whosoever says that our Lord Jesus Christ at the Mystical Last Supper used unleavened bread as do the Hebrews and not leavened bread, that is, raised bread, let him be far from us and under the anathema as one who thinks like a Jew and as one who introduces the doctrine of Apollinaris and of the Armenians into our Church, on which account let him be anathematized a second time.**

**IV) Whosoever says that when our Christ and God comes to judge the souls together with the bodies, but comes in order to decide only for the body, anathema to him.**

**V) Whosoever says that when they die the souls of the Christians who repented in this life but did not do their penance go to purgatory – which is a Greek myth – where fire and torment purify them, and they think that there is no eternal torment, as did Origen, and give cause by this to sin freely, let such a one have the anathema.**

**VI) Whosoever says that the Pope is head of the Church and not Christ, and that he has authority to admit into Paradise with his letters, and can forgive as many sins as will be committed by one who with money receives an indulgence from him, let such a one have the anathema.**

**VII) Whosoever does not follow the customs of the Church which the seven Holy Ecumenical Councils have decreed, and the Holy Pascha and calendar which they enacted well for us to follow, but wants to follow the newly-invented Paschalion and the new calendar of the atheist astronomers of the Pope; and opposing them, wishes to overthrow and destroy the doctrines and customs of the Church which we have inherited from our Fathers, let any such have the anathema and let him be outside of the Church and the Assembly of the Faithful.**

**VIII) We exhort all pious and Orthodox Christians: remain in those things which you learned and in which you were born and bred, and when the times and circumstances call for it, shed your very blood in order both to keep the Faith given us by our Fathers and to keep your confession. Beware of such people and take care, that our Lord Jesus Christ help you. May the blessing of our humility be with you all. Amen.**

**The 1,583rd year from the birth of the God-man, Indiction 12, November 20th.**

**+JEREMIAS of Constantinople**

**+SYLVESTER of Alexandria**

**+SOPHRONIOS of Jerusalem**

**And the rest of the bishops of the Synod who were present**

This *Sigillion* is found in manuscript Codex 772, in the sacred Monastery of St. Panteleimon, on the Holy Mountain, and manuscript Codex No. 285 of the cell “The Akathist Hymn” of the Sacred Skete of Kafsokalyvia, on the Holy mountain. It was first published in 1881, in the periodical “The Roumanian Orthodox Church” in Bucharest (12th issue), by the Russian Archimandrite Porphyrios Uspensky, who copied it from a manuscript codex of the great library of Mount Sinai.

Is a clearer or more eloquent condemnation of Papism needed than this one? Certainly not. Nonetheless, modern Greek “Christians” and “theologians” within themselves will scorn it, as they have scorned so many other Patristic declarations.

From all that has been written up to now, the answer to the fourth argument of the Papophiles naturally follows. Truly, in many official documents the Papacy is called the Latin or Western Church (although the attempt of the writers of these documents to use more frequently the words “the Westerners,” “the Latins,” and “the West,” is obvious). It is, however, unforgiveable superficially for one to attribute dogmatic content to such designations which are necessary for communication with people, since these names have prevailed in history, and they have been abolished, among others, for reasons of politeness. Even the greatest warriors against the Papacy happened many times to call it the Western or Latin Church, although it is known that they regarded it as anything but a Church.

But if we finally accept that when a heresy is officially called a Church this signifies also a dogmatic recognition in it of the sanctifying power and grace of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, then we must by all means accept that the so-called Protestant Church is a Church, inasmuch as it is called so officially. The same holds for the Church of the Seventh-Day Adventists, the Pentecostal church, etc. But, then, if all heretics constitute the Church of Christ, to what purpose are the struggles of Orthodoxy? Then all the Fathers, Martyrs, and Confessors were the most miserable of men! Worst of all were those monks of the Holy Mountain Athos during the reigns of Michael Palaeologos and John Palaeologos, some twenty-six whom were burned alive (at the Sacred Monastery of Zographou), others were butchered (Skete of Karyes), others were drowned in the sea (at the Sacred Monastery of Vatopedi and the Sacred Monastery of Iviron), others were hanged at Gallows Hill, and others were made captives and died as slaves from ill treatment, solely because they did not want to accept the union with the Latins which the Emperor Michael Palaeologos had commanded together with a worthy predecessor of Athenagoras [Spyrou], the Patriarch Beccos.

Truly, for modern “Orthodox theologians” these Martyrs of the Faith were nothing but miserable, lamentable, fanatical, narrow-minded, and retarded beings, men who had not tasted the savor of love for our “brother” heretics, men who lived in the “night of yesterday,” from which the partners and fellow-travelers of the “Cardinals of the Phanar” are trying to lead us.

Let it be so, however. Christians were always “unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness.” This is their insignia and distinguishing mark. Such will they remain until the end, subjected to the persecution and mockery of the world. The world is nothing but a masquerade where everyone portrays a role, having his face covered. Many portray the good Christian, others the priest, others the bishop, others the patriarch, others the theologian, and others the preacher. All these the world tolerates with great ease because they are acting, because they too are masqueraders. Woe to him, however, who will dare to appear with an uncovered face. Woe to him ho will not be masquerading, but will in all reality be a Christian, and especially woe to him when he begins calling everyone by their real name.

***TYPOS,* June-July, 1965, Athens, Greece**