

The Proposal of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem for the Expedited Convening of a Great Local or even Ecumenical Council in 1924

By Ioannis N. Ladas*

Introduction

The Ecumenical Patriarchate, after the acceptance of the “decision” of the Pan-Orthodox Conference (1923)¹, that is, the official beginning of the pre-synodic period, which led to the convocation of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church 93 years later, in order not to find itself “unprepared and faced with great and unsurmountable difficulties of all kinds, the anticipated ‘great Council’”, considered it necessary to be prepared systematically and “with much and concentrated deliberation”². Therefore, it constituted a special Committee on the convocation of the “great Council”, under the presidentship of Metropolitan of Cyzicus Kallinikos (1855-1934). At the same time, the Ecumenical Patriarch Meletios IV (1871-1935), with the Patriarchal Letters under protocol no. 3124 and of June 25, 1923, informed the individual Orthodox Churches that he accepted with pleasure the proposal forwarded by the Metropolitan

* Ioannis N. Ladas holds a PhD on Philosophy from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and a second one on Theology from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

1. See: Io. Ladas, «Διορθόδοξη συνεννόηση καὶ συνεργασία: Ἐπέτειος ἑκατονταετηρίδος ἀπὸ τῆ σύγκληση τοῦ Πανορθόδοξου Συνεδρίου καὶ τὴν ἀπόφαση συγκλήσεως Συνόδου τῶν Ὁρθόδοξων Ἐκκλησιῶν», *Δωδεκάνησος/Dodekanisos* 31 (2023), pp. 489-519.

2. Report of the Metropolitan of Nubia Nikolaos without protocol no. and of January 14, 1927: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

of Transylvania Nikolaos (1882-1955), for a solemn celebration of the 1600th anniversary of the convocation of the First Ecumenical Council and took the initiative to celebrate this event worthily by the entire Orthodox Church, not only locally but with the convocation of a Pan-Orthodox Council in 1925, “with the aim of resolving all the issues that concern the Orthodox Church at present”³.

Nevertheless, the Patriarchs Photios of Alexandria (1853-1925), Gregory IV of Antioch (1859-1928) and Damianos of Jerusalem (1848-1931) considered imperative the expedited convocation of the Council and asked the Ecumenical Patriarch to take the relevant actions with the purpose of gathering the Orthodox Churches for the same purpose a year earlier, that is in 1924. Given the 100th anniversary of the proposal of the Patriarchs of the East for the expedited convention of a Great Local or Ecumenical Council in 1924, in this article we attempt to examine on the one hand the historical context and the reasons that made it imperative to convene a Council of the Orthodox Churches and, on the other hand the conditions under which the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church (2016) entered history.

1. The History of the Proposal

The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, who had not participated in the Pan-Orthodox Conference, asked the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory VII (1850-1924) “as being *primus inter pares* to convene all the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches to an Ecumenical Council or a Great Local” (ἵνα, ὡς ἔχων τὰ πρεσβεία, συγκαλέσῃ ἀπάσας τὰς

3. «Ἱ. Σύνοδος», *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια/Ekklesiastiki Alitheia* 43 (14 July 1923), p. 256; Patriarchal Letters to Their Beatitudes and Their Eminences Presidents of the Holy Orthodox Churches, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Servia, Cyprus, Greece and Rumania under protocol no. 3124 and of June 25, 1923, *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια/Ekklesiastiki Alitheia* 43 (30 June 1923), pp. 229-231; Session of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of July 9, 1923: ΚΔΠΣ Β' 70, p. 455, §3; *Πρακτικά καὶ Ἀποφάσεις τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Πανορθοδόξου Συνεδρίου (10 Μαΐου-8 Ἰουνίου 1923)/Proceedings and Decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Congress in Constantinople (May 10-June 8 1923)*, Patriarchiko Typographeio, Constantinople 1923, p. 221.

Αὐτοκεφάλους Ὁρθοδόξους Ἐκκλησίας εἰς Σύνοδον Οἰκουμενικὴν ἢ Μεγάλην Τοπικὴν»⁴ in the year 1924, to examine dogmatic, liturgical and canonical issues, including the calendar and the Paschal⁵. They also suggested all the leaders of the non-Orthodox Churches around the world to be invited to the Council, as they wished to have a discussion on the union of all Christian Churches⁶.

The three Patriarchs addressed the Ecumenical Patriarchate with the aim to demonstrate “to everyone that, despite the recent adventures of the Genos and the Church, the honor to the Church of Constantinople is preserved” («τοῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι, παρὰ τὰς ἐσχάτους περιπετείας τοῦ τε Γένους καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διασώζεται ἡ πρὸς τὴν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἐκκλησίαν τιμή»)⁷. As the place of the convocation of the Council, they indicated “the Holy City of Jerusalem”, “from where the law and salvation” («ὀπόθεν ὁ νόμος καὶ ἡ σωτηρία»). In fact, they secured the permission of the Palestinian Government, which declared that the Council could be convened in Jerusalem on the condition that it did not interfere in political or pilgrim issues of an international nature⁸. As the time they indicated the feast of Pentecost, “When the Holy Spirit descended” («ὅτε τὸ πνεῦμα κατήλθε τὸ ἅγιον»)⁹. However, in the case that the time for the convocation of the Council was not enough, the Council could take place even later, according to the judgement of the Ecumenical Patriarch, but in any case, until the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy and Life-giving Cross¹⁰.

4. «Διὰ τὴν σύγκλησιν τῆς Συνόδου», *Πάνταϊνος/Pantainos* 16 (April 5, 1924), p. 226.

5. «Ἐκκλησία Ἀλεξανδρείας», *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* B', 48 (April 26, 1924), pp. 431-432.

6. «Διατί θέλομεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταϊνος/Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), pp. 253-254.

7. Document from Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouri) under protocol no. 248 and of May 6, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

8. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem (Venetatos) to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 377 and of October 20, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

9. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 374 and of March 20, 1924: Chief Secretariat Archive of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

10. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 372 and of March 26, 1924: Chief Secretariat

The initiative to expedite the convocation of the Council belonged to Photios¹¹, Patriarch of Alexandria, while according to some information his actions met with the objections of the Patriarch of Antioch, who initially refused to sign the joint Letter, which was consequently signed “with discontent” by the Patriarch of Jerusalem¹².

The Patriarch of Alexandria did not propose the See of the Alexandrian throne as the place of convocation of the Council due to lack of hospitality means. In fact, he advanced Jerusalem, because on the one hand, he reckoned that in this way “the issue would be postponed to the Greek Calends” and on the other hand, he hoped that the decisions of the Council would not be influenced by the objections of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Moreover, he seems to have wished the examination –on the spot– of the dangers that the Holy Land would go through from the reform of the ecclesiastical calendar¹³.

Of course, according to Patriarch Photios, the first who suggested the idea of the convocation of a Council were the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril II (1859-1933), who “designated” Jerusalem as the place, and Patriarch of Serbia Demetrios (1846-1930), who “next to the holy city Jerusalem he named Constantinople, and Alexandria and Nyssa in Serbia”. In addition, “among the first was the Greek Government” («πρὸς τῇ ἀγίᾳ Πόλει Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν

Archive of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

11. «Πανορθόδοξος Σύνοδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (March 1, 1924), p. 159. According to information, Patriarch Photios of Alexandria had a fervent desire to convene the Synod, in order to “annihilate” the decisions of Patriarch Meletios, whom he considered a “stallion” of the Ecumenical Throne. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 328 and of September 13, 1923: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive - Β΄ Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59, p. 1.

12. Document from the Consul General of Beirut under protocol no. 415 and of June 15, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive - Β΄ Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 414 and of November 13, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive - Β΄ Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59.

13. Document from the Consul General of Alexandria to the Minister of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 13 and of March 21, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

καὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν ἐν Σερβίᾳ Νύσσα προσονομάσας»¹⁴). In addition, “among the first was the Greek Government”, which, again according to the Alexandrian religious leader, immediately proposed that “the Council be convened in Alexandria”¹⁴.

Patriarch Photios sent Metropolitan Christophoros of Leontopolis (1876-1967), later Patriarch of Alexandria to Jerusalem and Damascus, to consult with the other Patriarchs on the convocation of the Council in 1924. Metropolitan Christophoros arrived at the See of the Church of Sion on March 22 and carried the Letter under protocol no. 374 to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory, already signed by the Patriarch of Alexandria.

In Jerusalem, after the signing of this letter, it was approved –in a synodical conference– to send a second letter to the Ecumenical Patriarch, in which among other things, the issues that should be studied and examined together in the Council were quoted. The second letter was signed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the representative of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Metropolitan Christophoros of Leontopolis. Subsequently, Metropolitan Christophoros accompanied by Archbishop Aristarchos of Diocaesarea (1879-1937), representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, went to Damascus to meet with the Patriarch of Antioch and deliver the relevant letters to him¹⁵. After been signed also by the Patriarch of Antioch, both were posted to the Ecumenical Patriarchate¹⁶.

The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, therefore, “according to the existing practice in the most Holy Church of God” with

14. See about it: Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouri) under protocol no. 248 and of May 6, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

15. «Ὁ μητροπολίτης Λεοντοπόλεως κ. Χριστοφόρος ἐν Δαμασκῷ», *Πάνταινος/ Pantainos* 16 (29 Μαρτίου 1924), p. 210.

16. See about it: Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouri) under protocol no. 248 and of May 6, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1; Archim. Theoklitos Stragas, *Ἐκκλησίας Ἑλλάδος Ἱστορία ἐκ πηγῶν ἀψευδῶν, 1817-1967*, vol. Β', Typografeio Papa-dogianni, Athens 1970, p. 1377; Bartholomaios Archontonis, *Metr. of Philadelphia*, «Προσπάθειαι συγκροτήσεως Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου πρὸ πεντηκονταετίας», in: *Τιμητικὸ Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν μητροπολίτη Κίτρους Βαρνάβα ἐπὶ τῇ 25ετηρίδι τῆς ἀρχιερατείας του*, Athens 1980, pp. 83-92.

the Letter under protocol no. 374 and of March 20, 1924 demanded that the Ecumenical Patriarch “convene” a Great Local or /and an Ecumenical Council in the same year. They noted, at the same time, that “God forbid, if he is unwilling, or unable, according to this fraternal recommendation, to provide the appropriate acceptance and execution”, this duty to the entire Church would necessarily be performed by “them themselves”. For this reason, they pointed out that they waiting with desire and expectation for the immediate positive response of the Ecumenical Patriarch, along with the invitation to participate in the Council¹⁷.

Likewise, on March 26, 1924, they sent the other joint Letter under protocol no. 372, by which they asked the Ecumenical Patriarch after the decision to convene the “Holy Council” by him and the Holy and Sacred Synod around him: 1. to announce to them telegraphically the acceptance of their proposal “in whole and in parts”; 2. to send at the same time telegrams to all the Presidents of the Orthodox Churches in which he would announce to them that “since It has the seniority in the Eastern Orthodox Church“ that he was inviting them “according to the proposal of the Most Holy Patriarchs of the East, approved also by It” to participate in “a Great Local or Ecumenical Council in Jerusalem that will be convened on the appointed day of the Pentecost”; 3. to send a note in time to the Patriarchs of the East, as well as to the other Primates, in which he would explain “the way of acceptance by It of the proposal for the convocation of a Council” of the three Patriarchs and any other useful detail; 4. to declare in the invitation Letters to the Presidents of the Churches that, in order to participate personally or by representatives in the Council, it would be good for them to be accompanied “with more than one distinguished in their environment for the zeal and the knowledge of our piety Bishops”, including any other cleric or laity, who was distinguished “for the Theological education and the knowledge of the secular and canonical law”¹⁸.

17. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 374 and of March 20, op.cit., pp. 3-4.

18. Op.cit.

Also the Patriarchs of the East, because they wished the issue of the union of all Christians to be discussed at the Council, decided that the Ecumenical Patriarch should have notified “the heads of the various foreign Christian Communities” “in time” “by telegrams and Letters” about the Council to be held in Jerusalem” and invited them to come “to this Council in order to study the way and the definite achievement of their union with the Orthodox Eastern Church”. It was also considered useful to ask the Heads of the Orthodox Churches who were in free countries to invite one or more representatives of their Governments to attend the Council “so that the decisions taken by it Council would not come up against the just claims of these Orthodox Countries”¹⁹.

For reasons of historical memory, it should be noted, that the Metropolitan Antonios Chapovitski of Kiev (1863-1936) also participated in the discussions on the holding of the Great Local or Ecumenical Council, who also visited Jerusalem, Alexandria and Damascus²⁰.

2. Reasons for Expedited Convocation

The Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Alexandria during the session of January 11, 1924, excluded any modification or alteration of the calendar, thus depending any arrangement, reform, addition or removal to the calendar on the decisions of a future Great or Ecumenical Council²¹. In fact, the Patriarch of Alexandria announced his decision to the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs through the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo. Patriarch Photios considered it “very urgent” through him to inform the Greek Government so that it can contribute “from its part” for the convocation of the “necessary Great or Ecumenical Council”, without which “none of the ecclesiastical issues under study can be promoted [...]

19. Op.cit.

20. See about it: Archim. Theoklitos Stragas, *Ἐκκλησίας Ἑλλάδος Ἱστορία...*, op.cit., p. 1377; Bartholomaios Archontonis, Metr. of Philadelphia, «Προσπάθειαι συγκροτήσεως Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου πρὸ πεντηκονταετίας», op.cit., pp. 83-92.

21. Decisions of the Holy Council of the Patriarchate of Alexandra of January 11, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

or regulated”. He expressed also a desire to receive an answer as soon as possible²².

However, the Church of Greece, at the proposal of the Metropolitan of Athens at the Holy Synod of the Hierarchy, which was unanimously accepted, decided to settle the calendar issue definitely by adding 13 days to the Julian ecclesiastical calendar, without changing the Paschal and the church calendar²³. Later, on January 24, 1924 for the well-known reasons, also the Church of Constantinople²⁴, “appreciating [the] urgency of the issue”, suggested the assimilation of the ecclesiastical with the political calendar, by adding thirteen days to the tenth day of March of 1924²⁵. The Patriarchate of Alexandria decided then to keep “unaltered” the calendar and to stick to the “things determined before”²⁶, referring any “alteration” of it to the only one competent to decide “Council of the Churches of the same denomination of East Great or Ecumenical”²⁷.

22. Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouri) under protocol no. 31 and of January 12, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

23. Letter of Chrysostomos Metropolitan of Ephesus, Patriarchal Representative in Athens to the Ecumenical Patriarchate under protocol no. 1914 and of April 23, 1923: ΚΔΠΙΣ Β' 70, p. 195, §3.

24. ΚΔΠΙΣ Β' 71, pp. 23-4, §1.

25. The Ecumenical Patriarchate sent the following telegram: “After the introduction of a political calendar by the Orthodox, there is great confusion about the ecclesiastical calendar. The Church of Constantinople, appreciating the urgency of the issue, proposes the assimilation of ecclesiastical and political calendar, by adding thirteen days to the tenth of the following March, Paschal remains intact. Therefore, next Easter will be celebrated in accordance with what is in force. Hoping that your Beatitude will agree with this proposed partial arrangement, please respond by telegraph”: Telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory to the Patriarch Photios of Alexandria under no. 623 and of January 25, 1924, *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (January 26, 1924), pp. 56-57.

26. The Patriarch of Alexandria communicated this decision to the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem as well as to the Archbishop of Cyprus.

27. It should be noted that Mount Athos, with the exception of the Holy Monastery of Vatopedi, did not accept the new calendar. In fact, some monks, due to the change in the calendar, stopped commemorating the name of the Ecumenical Patriarch. However, the Holy Community assured the Ecumenical Patriarchate of the restoration of canonical order and the commemoration of his name in all the monasteries, declaring that the entire Holy Mountain, except for the Holy Monastery of Vatopedi, decided to stick to the old calendar until the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, which was to decide on the issue with prestige and authenticity. Letter of the Holy Community of Mount Athos

The Holy Synod of the Alexandrian Throne, taking into consideration that the duty of the Church is to guide “the chosen people to the truth” asked the Ecumenical Patriarchate to postpone the decision until the convocation of a Pan-Orthodox Synod²⁸. At the same time, a proposal was made to convene a Great Local Council in Alexandria, “to validate” the decision, before the 10th of March²⁹. Likewise, Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem rejected the assimilation of the ecclesiastical and political calendar, mainly due to the status quo of the Most Holy Shrines³⁰.

to the Ecumenical Patriarch under protocol no. 2773 and of September 10/23 1926: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1. The Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate examined this letter at its session on November 27, 1926, and decided to send a committee consisting of the Metropolitans of Didymoteichon Philaretos (1850-1933), of Maroneia Anthimos (1870-1938) and of Zichna Alexander (1878-1958) as exarchs to the Holy Mount for appropriate admonition and exhortation pursuing the smoothing and settlement of the calendar issue that had arisen. Finally, only Metropolitan Anthimos of Maroneia went to Mount Athos as Patriarchal Exarch. Report of the Synodal Committee for the study of the issue of the Calendar under Protocol n. no. and of November 22, 1926, p. 5: ΥΔΙΑ, Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1. Document from the Ecumenical Patriarch to the Consul General in Constantinople under protocol no. 182 and of February 9, 1927: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

28. Telegram from Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 148 and of March 7, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1; Document from the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (Antonios Stachturis) under protocol no. 151 and of March 8, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1; Telegram from Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to Archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos of March 8, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

29. Telegram of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory no. 109 and of February 17, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1. Telegram of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Archbishop of Athens no. 108 and of February 17, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

30. Response of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Damianos to the protocol no. 623 and of January 25, 1925: ΥΔΙΑ, Άρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1. Telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under Protocol 1924, Πάνταινος/*Pantainos* 16 (January 26, 1924), p. 57.

The Patriarchate of the East therefore considered that there was no reason, to justify or impose “this haste” and rejected as “unjustifiable, useless and harmful” the “hurry to identify the two calendars”³¹.

The Patriarch of Alexandria, having in mind the Letters of the Churches of Serbia (proposal for the convocation of an Ecumenical Council) and Romania (postponement until October), insisted on the previous synodical decisions and rejected any addition or reform of the calendar before the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, the “only competent to discuss it” of which he suggested the “urgent”³². As it was stressed in the joint letter, “The Most Holy Churches of the East” that is, the Apostolic and Patriarchal Thrones of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, highlighted, wished and requested that “no reform be dared, nor that any change be approved, nor that anything be innovated: without a Council”. Therefore, they addressed the Ecumenical Patriarch and requested “in the love of Christ” that everything that had been approved in Constantinople and Athens be considered together in a Council³³.

From the above it becomes clear that the telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch on the identification of calendars, along with the need for coalition of the Orthodox Churches against the “common enemies”³⁴, provided impetus for the realization of the proposal. The official body of the Alexandrian Throne, however, also noted and the following reasons in order to prove the necessity of expedited convocation of a Great Local or /and Ecumenical Council:

“We want” the Council, was stressed, because: a. on this occasion we will return to the synodical system of administration of the Church, which was established during the peak of the Church’s History; b. to relieve

31. Document of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the General Consul of Alexandria (Peter Kaphabelis) under protocol no. 123 and of February 24, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/ Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

32. Response of the Patriarch Photios to no. 623 and of January 25, 1925; Telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory no. 28 and from January 15, 1924, *Πάνταινος/ Pantainos* 16 (26 January 1924), p. 57.

33. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 374 and of March 20, 1924, op.cit., pp. 1-2.

34. «Διὰ τὴν θέλωμεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταινος/ Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), p. 255.

the local Churches of the pressure of the state, to which their Christians belong as citizens; c. in order to give the local Churches a synodical decision on every issue “under study and, action”, on which they can rely in order to resist any pressures of the state in which they belong; d. to discuss “so many and so many” issues, other than the calendar issue, that arose after the VII Ecumenical Council and remain unsolved or roughly settled³⁵; e. for the Bishops of the Orthodox Church “we must get to know each other” and communicate in such a way that we may become more zealots for the Church and benefit “being deficient from the virtues and ecclesiastical wealth in general, of those who flourish among us”³⁶.

3. The Suggested Topics for Examination

The Patriarchs of the East proposed that the Council should study, examine together and make decisions “in the Holy Spirit” on issues of dogmatic, canonical and ritual nature³⁷. Although no Schedule of the Synod Proceedings of the proposed Council had been drawn up, in the joint letter they asked the Ecumenical Patriarch to indicate in the Invitation Letters to the Heads of the Churches as issues to be discussed “except for the calendar and the Paschal Canon”, and: a. the lifting of the Bulgarian schism; b. the finding of a way to restore the Uniates to the Orthodox Church; c. the pursuit of the union with the Orthodox Church of the Ecclesiastical Communities of Catholic, Anglican, Old-catholic, Protestant, Abyssinian, Armenian, Coptic and any other offshoot Monophysite, Nestorian, Monothelite and of Protestantism; d. the revision of all the canonical provisions, that had been drafted by Patriarchs and Patriarchal Synods from the Seventh Ecumenical Council onwards; e. the issue of fast (“what fasts should exist in the Church and how should the faithful should perform them”); f. the revision of the holy Services, of the Liturgical, the Typicon and the ecclesiastical poetry

35. «Διατί θέλομεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), pp. 252-253.

36. Op.cit.

37. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 372 and of March 26, 1924, op.cit., p. 1.

and music; g. the revision of the acknowledged symbolic books and their ratification; h. the issue of the monastic life; i. the issue of the second marriage of widowed priests, together with the issue of marriage after ordination and the marriage of Bishops; j. the issue of impediments to marriage due to kinship and divorce and k. the issue of the validity of Anglican ordinations³⁸.

The three Patriarchs, in addition to the issues that were mentioned by name in the joint letter, also proposed the examination of any other issue, that needed “pan-ecclesiastical conference, discussion and a decision in the Holy Spirit”³⁹. In the official bodies of these Churches, mainly in the journal *Pantainos*, the official body of the Alexandrian Church, but also individually by certain Metropolitans and Professors the need to examine the following issues was also stressed⁴⁰: 1. The “faster imposition of ecclesiastical order and peace of conscience through synodical prestige in the Orthodox Church in America”; 2. “the prevailing ecclesiastical anarchy and disorder in Russia”⁴¹; 3. the fight against or possible the disappearance of racial tendencies within the Orthodox Churches; 4. the establishment of a more concentrated system in the administration of the Orthodox Church; 5. the development of interest among all the local Churches; 6. the ratification of the proceedings of the Eighth Ecumenical Council; 7. the revision of all the canons, which had been drawn up by the Councils and the Fathers of the Church and had been ratified by the Ecumenical Councils; 8. the repeal of certain canons, which due to “timely reasons” could not be applied; 9. the drafting of other canons, that would be useful for the religious conditions of the time; 10. the determination of the Mysteries and their number; 11. the determination of the status of the Holy Land; 12. the financial mutual support of all the Orthodox Churches; 13. the establishment of a Tamieio for the publication and translation of all scientific theological work;

38. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 372 and of March 26, 1924, op.cit., pp. 2-3.

39. Op.cit.

40. «Διατί θέλομεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), p. 255.

41. «Ἐκκλησία Ἀλεξανδρείας - Οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (July 19, 1924), p. 479.

14. the catechism of the orthodox people (Sunday schools, magazines, newspapers, sermons); 15. the compilation of a classic comprehensible apologetic writing and its wide spread to the people and the clergy; 16. the establishment of missions; 17. the establishment of a permanent delegation of the local Holy Churches in order to resolve the urgent issues; 18. the establishment of an asylum for the retired (without pastoral duties) bishops and finally; 19. the establishment of Theological Schools, which would be supported by all the Churches⁴².

4. The Stance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate

The Committee on the issue of convening a Great Local or Ecumenical Council studied the proposal of the three Patriarchs of the East and considered that the Church of Constantinople, by accepting the resolution of the Pan-Orthodox Congress and announcing it to the other Churches, was committed and there was “no sufficient” reason to impose the expedited convocation of a Great Local or Ecumenical Council. In fact, the Committee proposed that all the issues that were to concern the Synod should be carefully determined and announced to all Autocephalous Churches⁴³.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not accept the proposal of the Bishops of the ancient Patriarchates for the expedited convening of the Council in 1924, both for canonical reasons and due to objective difficulties. Consequently, it continued to work on the basis of the earlier decision to convene the Synod of the Orthodox Churches the following year, that is, in 1925.

The Ecumenical Patriarch pointed out that the “timely situations” made it very “difficult”, “if not impossible”, to convene the Council both for the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and (perhaps) for the other local Churches. In

42. Letter of the synodical Metropolitan to the Patriarch of Alexandria of February 17, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1. «Οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος – Συζητητέα θέματα», Πάνταινος/Pantainos 16 (December 6, 1924), pp. 817-818.

43. Report (2) of the Ecumenical Council Committee under protocol no. 1454 and of May 14, 1924: ΚΔΠΙΣ Β' 71, pp. 260-1, §3.

addition, he believed that “essentially there was no reason to expedite the convening of this Council”⁴⁴. In a letter to the Archbishop of Cyprus, he noted that the convocation of a Council was “not at all imperative” and that the issue of the calendar “was not susceptible of the slightest postponement” and “the further postponement could not be seriously justified”⁴⁵. Moreover, the Church of Cyprus, although it had not been officially invited (until May 15, 1924) it would refuse to participate in the Council proposed by the three Patriarchs of the East⁴⁶, judging that although the convocation of a Pan-Orthodox Council was an imperative, “but meaning that” it would be convened by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which would determine “in advance” the program of its work⁴⁷. Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens moved in the same line, who replied to the Patriarch of Alexandria that the Church of Greece had accepted the proposal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to convene a Council next year in Jerusalem⁴⁸. In the same way, the Greek Ministry of Foreign affairs expressed the view that it was impossible to expedite the convening of the Council⁴⁹.

Epilogue

The decision of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to refuse the proposal of the Patriarchs of the East for the expedited convening of a Great

44. Letter of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory to the Archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos under protocol no. 2114 and of June 3, 1924, *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* B, 6 (July 5, 1924), pp. 41-42; «Οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (July 12, 1924), pp. 471-472.

45. «Ἐκκλησία Ἑλλάδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 12, 1924), pp. 246-247.

46. Document of the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril to the Deputy Consul (Themistocleus) under protocol no. and of May 14, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1; Document of the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril under protocol no. and of May 14, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

47. Document of the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril under protocol no. and of May 14, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

48. «Ἐκκλησία Ἑλλάδος», *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* B, 7 (July 12, 1924), p. 53.

49. «Διατί θέλομεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), pp. 254-255.

Local or Ecumenical Council in 1924, both for canonical reasons and for reasons of objective difficulties, provoked considerable reactions. The Alexandrian Church expressed the fear that the Ecumenical Patriarchate could postpone indefinitely both the proposal of the Pan-Orthodox Congress (1923) to convene an Ecumenical Council in 1925 and the proposal of the three Patriarchs to convene a Synod in 1924⁵⁰. On the contrary, according to the *Times*, the Patriarch of Antioch, after the refusal of the Ecumenical Patriarch revised the proposal for the expedited convening of the Synod, as he considered its cancellation necessary, as a consequence of the abstention of the Ecumenical Patriarchate⁵¹. On the basis of some information, the Patriarch of Antioch was “led and carried” in this matter by the Patriarch of Alexandria through some well-off Syrian Orthodox of Egypt on whom he was financially dependent⁵².

On the other hand, Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem in October 1924, invited the Patriarch of Alexandria to Jerusalem in order to discuss on ecclesiastical issues. As the official body of the Patriarchate of Alexandria notes, the two Patriarchs had daily meetings and “considered it necessary to convene a Great Local or Ecumenical Council, in order to prevent further fall as much as possible”. During the meetings, they decided to send a special memorandum to the Patriarch of Constantinople, confirming Jerusalem as the place of convocation of the Council and “all the ecclesiastical issues that need to be studied and settled from the calendar and Paschal to the most desirable union of the Churches” as issues that needed to be discussed⁵³.

In a publication of the official body of the Alexandrian Church, it was attempted the deconstruction of the arguments of the Ecumenic Throne as follows: 1. “The timely situations”, that made it very difficult to convene an Ecumenical Council: The question was posed whether these circumstances really existed, and if they did, why were they not

50. «Ἐκκλησία Ἀντιοχείας», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (May 10, 1924), pp. 310-311.

51. «Σύγκλησις Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (November 29, 1924), p. 805.

52. Document of the Consul General in Beirut (Liatis) under protocol no. 566 and of May 19, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

53. «Ἐκκλησία Ἀλεξανδρείας», *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* B, 26 (November 22, 1924), p. 198.

exposed? In addition, the writer wondered if these were things that should not be made public. Also in this argument, the three Patriarchates put forward the fact that they had secured the permission of Palestine, stressing that at that time there were means of transport, that the earlier fathers did not have, who rushed to participate in the Ecumenical and Local Councils, as they considered their participation as their most important episcopal duty⁵⁴. 2. «“Perhaps for other sister Churches”: How did the Ecumenical Patriarchate know that the transition might also become difficult for other Churches, posing the question: If indeed there were difficulties in convening the Council, would these difficulties be removed “by magic” next year by all the Churches at the same time?⁵⁵. 3. Decision of the Pan-Orthodox Congress to convene a Pan-Orthodox Council in 1925”: The editor wondered whether the fact that it was decided by the Pan-Orthodox Congress and coincided with the 1600th anniversary was more important than the opinion of the three Patriarchs of the East about the necessity of convening the Council? “Is it entitled”, continued, “a Congress to the greatest respect, as the Pan-Orthodox [...], for the Church of Constantinople, than the opinion of the three Patriarchates of the East?”⁵⁶. 4. “There is essentially no reason to hasten this Council”: The argument was characterized as untrue, as the issues that were proposed for discussion were urgent and had to be resolved definitely⁵⁷. 5. “It was not at all imperative” and 6. “the issue of the calendar can no longer be postponed in the slightest”: These two points are ironically commented on in the magazine *Pantainos* and it is characteristically mentioned: “Do not ask to know”. “These in Constantinople and Athens” “with momentum they are thinking, and deciding arbitrarily, for other reasons, but also because they lack any even sophistic, excuse”⁵⁸.

54. «Διατί θέλομεν τὴν Σύνοδον», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 19, 1924), pp. 254-255.

55. «Οἰκουμενικὴ Σύνοδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (July 12, 1924), pp. 471-473.

56. Op.cit., p. 473.

57. Op.cit.

58. «Ἐκκλησία Ἑλλάδος», *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (April 12, 1924), p. 247.

However, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, before acting, weighs the situations in the light of the well-meaning interest of the Orthodox Church. Therefore, although the realization of the Council was indeed imperative, the “situations” led to its convocation 93 years later⁵⁹. Indicative of the situation that intervened between the acceptance of the decision of the Pan-Orthodox Congress until 1925, when the Council was to be convened, was that, apart from the resignation of the Ecumenical Patriarch Meletios IV, the pan-Orthodox celebration of the 1600th anniversary of the convocation of the First Christian Ecumenical Council nor the timely celebration of the event locally by the Church of Constantinople, was possible. “Unfortunately” the Ecumenical Patriarchate as Patriarch Basil points out “was not able due to the irregularity at the time, to do what suited it for the common celebration by all the Orthodox, but not on its own, at the right time to celebrate this great event”. After his election Basil III (1840-1929), celebrated a festive Patriarchal and Synodical Liturgy with all the Hierarchs visiting Constantinople, on the occasion of the anniversary⁶⁰.

After the election of the 85-year-old Basil III, the Ecumenical Patriarchate continued to live under very difficult conditions. Both the Patriarch himself, and the bishops of the Throne found it difficult to move away from Constantinople. In addition, the Church of Russia was in a chaotic situation, the Church of Bulgaria was outside canonical ecclesiastical communication, and the competent in Greece considered the time of the convocation of the Council inappropriate and constantly put up obstacles. Of course, the numerical insufficiency of erudite theologians and educated/polyglot senior clerics must be taken into account⁶¹.

59. For the preparation and the procedures for convening of the Holy and Great Council see Io. Ladas, *Άγία και Μεγάλη Σύνοδος της Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας 2016. Προετοιμασία – Διαδικασίες*, Papazisis & Hiera Theologiki Scholi tis Chalkis Publications, Athens 2025.

60. Letter of the Ecumenical Patriarch Basil to the Archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos under Protocol no. and of July 21, 1925, *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* Γ', 35 (August 29, 1925), pp. 273-274.

61. Io. Ladas, *Άγία και Μεγάλη Σύνοδος της Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας 2016. Προετοιμασία – Διαδικασίες*, *op.cit.*, p. 20.

Although the meeting of the Orthodox Churches in 1925, as it had been decided, was not possible, there were pleasant developments in the areas of inter-Orthodox and inter-Christian relations. Indicatively the following are mentioned: 1. the visit of a patriarchal delegation to the Churches of Poland and Romania (1925); 2. the elevation of the Church of Romania to a Patriarchate (1925); 3. the visit of Dionysios of Warsaw and Myron of Romania to the Ecumenical Patriarchate (1927); 4. the efforts made to reconcile the divided sections of the Church of Russia; 5. the semi-official recognition of the ecclesiastical status of the Church of Georgia; 6. the appointment of patriarchal representatives in Moscow (Archim. Basil Dimopoulos), in Bucharest (Archim. Timothy Evagelinidis) and in Warsaw (Tracheias Alexander)⁶².

In any case, despite the fact that the proposal of the Patriarchs of the East took place after the official beginning of the pre-synodic period-while, the convocation of the Council was planned to take place a year later and, in the midst, a turbulent situation for the Orthodox Church-it shows the deepest need of the Orthodox Churches to meet for this reason and to take decisions jointly.

Archival Sources

1. Response of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to no. 623 and of January 25, 1925; Telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory no. 28 and of January 15, 1924, *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (January 26, 1924), p. 57.
2. Response of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Damianos to the protocol no. 623 and of January 25, 1925: *ΥΔΙΑ, Αρχείο Κεντρικής Υπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive* 1927/62.2.1.
3. Letter of Chrysostomos Metropolitan of Ephesus, Patriarchal Representative in Athens to the Ecumenical Patriarchate under protocol no. 1914 and of April 23, 1923: *ΚΔΠΙΣ Β' 70*, p. 195, §3.
4. Letter of the Ecumenical Patriarch Basil to the Archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos under Protocol no. and of July 21, 1925, *Εκκλησία/Ecclesia* Γ, 35 (August 29, 1925), pp. 273-274.

62. V. Stavridis, *Οί Οικουμενικοί Πατριάρχαι: 1860-Σήμερα. Ιστορία και Κείμενα*, Kyriakidis Publications, Thessaloniki ²2004, pp. 551-2.

5. Letter of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory to the Archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos under protocol no. 2114 and of June 3, 1924, *Ἐκκλησία/Ecclesia* B, 6 (July 5, 1924), pp. 41-2.
6. Document of the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril to the Deputy Consul (Themistocleus) under protocol no. and of May 14, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
7. Document of the Archbishop of Cyprus Cyril under protocol no. and from May 14, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
8. Document of the General Consul of Alexandria to the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios under protocol no. 1068 and of February 23, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
9. Document from the Consul General of Alexandria to the Ministry of Foreign under protocol no. 13 and of March 21, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
10. Document from the Consul General of Beirut under protocol no. 415 and of June 15, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive - Β' Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59.
11. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 414 and of November 13, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive - Β' Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59.
12. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem (Venetatos) to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 377 and of October 20, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
13. Document from the Consul General of Jerusalem (Venetatos) to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under protocol no. 328 and of September 13, 1923: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive - Β' Πολιτική/Political (1923-1925) /B/ 35B/59, p. 1.
14. Document of the Consul General in Beirut (Liatis) under protocol no. 566 and from May 19, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
15. Document from the Ecumenical Patriarch to the Consul General in Constantinople under protocol no. 182 and of February 9, 1927: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
16. Document of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the General Consul of Alexandria (Peter Kaphabelis) under protocol no. 123 and of February 24, 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
17. Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouris) under protocol no.248 and of May 6, 1924: 1924: ὙΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.

18. Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouris) under protocol no. 248 and of May 6, 1924: 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
19. Document of Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouris) under protocol no. 31 and of January 12, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
20. Document from the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ambassador of Greece in Cairo (A. Saktouris) under protocol no. 151 and of March 8, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
21. Report of the Metropolitan of Nubia Nikolaos without protocol no. and of January 14, 1927: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
22. Report of the Synodal Committee for the study of the issue of the Calendar under Protocol no. and of November 22, 1926, p. 5: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
23. Report of the Committee on the convening of the Ecumenical Council without protocol no. and from November 24, 1924, to the First General Report of the Commissariat of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Ecumenical Council dated May 14, 1925: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1926/38.3.
24. Report (2) of the Ecumenical Council Committee protocol no. 1454 and from 14th May, 1924: ΚΔΠΙΣ Β' 71, pp. 260-1, §3.
25. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory protocol no. 374 and of March 20, 1924: /Chief Secretariat Archive of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.
26. Joint Letter of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 372 and of March 26, 1924: /Chief Secretariat Archive of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.
27. Patriarchal Letters to Their Beatitudes and Their Eminences Presidents of the Holy Orthodox Churches, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Serbia, Cyprus, Greece and Romania under protocol no. 3124 and of June 25, 1923, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια/Ekklesiastiki Alitheia* 43 (30 June 1923), pp. 229-231.
28. *Πρακτικὰ καὶ Ἀποφάσεις τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Πανορθοδόξου Συνεδρίου (10 Μαΐου-8 Ἰουνίου 1923)/Proceedings and decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Congress in Constantinople (May 10-June 8 1923)*, Patriarchiko Typographeio, Constantinople 1923.
29. Telegram of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory to the Patriarch Photios of Alexandria no. 623 and of January 25, 1924, *Πάνταινος/Pantainos* 16 (January 26, 1924), pp. 56-57.

30. Telegram from Patriarch Photios of Alexandria to the Archbishop Chrysostomos of Athens under protocol no. and of March 8, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
31. Telegram of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Archbishop of Athens no. 108 and of February 17, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
32. Telegram of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 109 and from February 17, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.
33. Telegram of the Patriarch of Alexandria Photios to the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory under protocol no. 148 and from March 7, 1924: ΥΔΙΑ, Ἀρχεῖο Κεντρικῆς Ὑπηρεσίας/Central Service Archive 1927/62.2.1.