

HISTORICAL REFLECTIONS on the Constitutions of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, 1922-1982



by James Steve Counelis*

INTRODUCTION:

The sixtieth anniversary of the organizational establishment of the American Archdiocese is an event to celebrate joyfully. And given the fact that the constitutional structure of this church was changed in 1977, it is an apt opportunity to reflect historically on the constitutional structure of this church. Also, it is an appropriate opportunity to reflect upon practical Orthodox ecclesiology in the American legal milieu. For purposes of this discussion, the church structures in Canada and Latin America will be excluded, each requiring a separate study.

Within the American political doctrine of the separation of church and state, the formation and operation of churches is a private matter for people to group themselves under the legal structure of a non-profit corporate body. Under this American legal structure, the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America was incorporated under New York statute in 1921.¹ This corporate charter and the uniform parish by-laws made thereunder constitute one part of the legal structure of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. A second element in the archdiocesan constitutional structure is, collectively, the several archdiocesan constitutions granted by the Ecumenical Throne. These constitutions are of 1922,² 1927,³ 1931,⁴ and 1977,⁵ the last being the current document under which this Archdiocese operates. The third of these constitutional elements in the structure of the American Archdiocese are the over 450 independent, separate parish church corporations, which govern directly all parochial

resources and provide direct parochial services to the members of the parishes.⁶ But before this structure of documents can be reviewed with profit, the nature and principles of American constitutionalism and Orthodox Christian ecclesiology require delineation.

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM:

Professor of History Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago gave the 1932 Anson G. Phelps Lectures at New York University. This lecture series was titled, "The Foundations of American Constitutionalism." In these justly famous lectures, McLaughlin characterized American constitutionalism by five institutionalized ideas: (1) the social compact; (2) representation; (3) the constitutional convention; (4) the reign of law; (5) federalism.⁷ From these notions have risen the democratic expectations of American Orthodox Christians for an ecclesial structure that comports with the American constitutional experience.

The American Orthodox Christian buttresses these democratic notions theologically when he construes the church as the Eucharistic Community of right believers⁸ and as a royal priesthood or holy nation,⁹ wherein all persons are equal before the footstool of God.¹⁰ For the American Orthodox Christian, the Apostolic

* Dr. James Steve Counelis is Professor of Education in the School of Education of the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117. He is also Archon Chartularius of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and New Rome.

Council of Jerusalem, documented in the Book of Acts, is the model of the collegium of saints on earth who gather to elect their deacons and other clergy, who gather to make useful rules for church governance, and who gather to decide in the presence of the Holy Spirit the teachings or *dogmata* of the Church.¹¹ The ecclesiological concerns of laymen in the United States are not unique, for Cotsonis documents the same concerns among laymen of the Church of Greece.¹² In a significant way the Puritan Divines of New England and American Orthodox Christians meet in the twentieth century.

ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN ECCLESIOLOGY:

Orthodox Christian ecclesiology is discussed usually in one of two contexts. The one context is in Eucharistic theology; the other is in canon law. In the first context, the Church is construed theologically as the praying Eucharistic community, wherein the whole spiritual edifice of the Church is constructed and Orthodox Christian anthropology finds its finest expression.¹³ The context of canon law construes the Church as a legal body within the cultural framework of Roman law as it evolved in the Christian Byzantine East. From within this framework, the canon law is the one half of the Byzantine code that has survived to this day.¹⁴ Unfortunately, Eucharistic theology and its theology of man has not been instructive in the formation and implementation of the canon law.

The 1921 articles of incorporation contain the following language on the purposes of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America:

To edify the religious and moral life of the Greek Orthodox Christians in North and South America on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, the rules and canons of the Holy Apostles and the seven Ecumenical Councils of the ancient undivided church as they are or shall be actually interpreted by the Great Church of Christ in Constantinople and to exercise governing authority over and to maintain advisory relations with Greek Orthodox Churches throughout North and South America and to maintain spiritual and advisory relations with synods and other governing authorities of the said church located elsewhere.¹⁵

The reference to Holy Writ, canons of the church councils and the Ecumenical Throne's jurisdictional competence to interpret these

sources placed an hierarchical and undemocratic system of church governance within the purview and control of American law. Byzantine monarchy and its caesaropapistic pretensions are part of the model of Orthodox Christian church governance. The model of the Orthodox bishop in canon law is that of the emperor-bishop—a caesaropapistic notion that has been reversed for churchmen by modern historical experience into "ethnarch" or "head of nation." Canon law defines dioceses as fiefs and benefices. Canon law regulates clerical and lay statuses within the church, especially episcopal status and relations among bishops, synods, and churches. Canon law defines and regulates a bishop's religious, administrative, legislative, and juridical functions. Canon law defines the clergy as a guild; and a synod of bishops as government. And canon law defines the substance of theological creed, *viz.*, the issues which define "right believers" or "orthodox" from "other believers" or "heterodox," whatever their type.

But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a consecrated nation, a people set apart to sing the praises of God who call you out of the darkness into his wonderful light.

—I PETER 2:9

Without the practical restraint of the Emperor and Roman law or the restraint of current civil governments of nation-states, canon law defines the church hierarchically in absolute terms with the bishop as absolute monarch.

In her history, the Orthodox Church has had to be flexible and to adapt to a wide range of political, social and economic systems. In the United States, America's democratic ethos does not tolerate extreme arbitrary behavior of anyone, clergy or no. Indeed, American democratic expectations are that there is accountability for everyone's behavior in this world, regardless of status. In particular, there is a restraining effect upon gross absolutism because American civil law guarantees to every church member his or her say and vote. And in the American version of the Greek Orthodox Church, lay participation in the control over real estate and fiscal resources has an added restraining effect upon arbitrary clerical behavior of whatever type. There is the further fact that several Orthodox bishops have been brought into civil courts, the effect being to reduce arbitrary episcopal behavior over time.¹⁶

There is a creative tension in the American Archdiocese between the American democratic ethos and Byzantine ecclesial autocracy. Out of this creative tension, this writer believes that a new mode of episcopal service is evolving within American Orthodox Christian church life. It is a model of episcopal service that is built upon the theological anthropology of the Church. The traditional Orthodox episcopal model of emperor-bishop is being replaced by the ideal of Christ as rabbi and *kathegetes*. This mode of episcopal service is more American and Orthodox than Greek Orthodox as evidenced by the church's historical practice in modern times.¹⁷

CONTINUING CONSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

A document-by-document comparison of the four constitutions of this American Archdiocese reveals five continuing constitutional characteristics, each of which is found in the current 1977 church constitution.

The first structural characteristic of the American Archdiocese is the fact that it is an international rather than a national church. In name and operations, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America comprehends Canadian, Latin American and United States parishes and diocesan structures.¹⁸ The practical degree to which the Chancellory's administration has been effective over the years in serving multinational parochial needs requires study. But the presence of parishes throughout the western hemisphere requires at least parochial clergy for these established communities.

The establishment of an hierarchical ecclesial structure with an archbishop for the whole archdiocese, bishops for dioceses, and priests for parish churches is the second continuing constitutional characteristic.¹⁹ Also, this hierarchical principle extends above the American Archdiocese to that of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Each of the four constitutions explicitly states the superior jurisdiction of the Great Church of Christ over the American Church.²⁰

The third continuing constitutional characteristic is the autonomous status of the American Archdiocese. The appointment of all bishops, the approval of all churchwide legislation, and the direct control over all theological, inter-religious and inter-church

relations are all current prerogatives of the Ecumenical Throne.²¹ For the most part, the practical matters of internal governance and policy are not subject to detailed scrutiny and control by the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

CHART NO. 1:

ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHS SINCE 1923*

Gregory VII	1923
Constantine VI	1924-1925
Basil III	1925-1929
Photius II	1929-1936
Benjamin I	1936-1946
Maximus V	1946-1948
Athenagoras I	1948-1972
Demetrios I	1972-present

* Basil K. Stephanides, *Ekklesiastiki Istoria: Ap'Archis Mechri Simeron [Church History: From the Beginning until Today]* (Greek text; Athens: Starr Publishers—A. E. Papademetriou, 1948), p. 739.

Lay representation in some form at all levels of church governance is the fourth characteristic that continues across all four constitutions. Church congresses, diocesan assemblies, councils of all varieties and levels, and parish trustees are the typical organs for lay participation along with the lower clergy.²² With the exceptions of parish church boards of trustees, the parish clergy participate as equals.

The last characteristic is the mention and support of specific archdiocesan institutions for education and philanthropy. In particular, a theological school or seminary is mentioned in all four constitutional documents.²³

All five of these continuing constitutional characteristics of the American Archdiocese, embodied in the 1977 constitution also, are important to recognize. They represent the historical common denominator of requisite ecclesial institutions that fit a hybrid American Orthodox Church at this time. But a document-by-document review of these four archdiocesan constitutions reveals some other facts of importance.

PROGRESSIVE CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS:

Three important constitutional developments over the 1922-1982 period can be construed

to be progressive. The first of these is the increased scope of Orthodox Christians under the jurisdiction of the American Archdiocese. In the 1922 and 1927 constitutions, only Greek-speaking Orthodox were considered to be within archdiocesan purview.²⁴ The 1931 constitution broadens the archdiocesan jurisdiction to other Orthodox Christians who are not Greek-speaking.²⁵ The 1977 constitution reads: "The Archdiocese of North and South America serves all Orthodox living in the western hemisphere."²⁶ Such an umbrella statement is most progressive when contrasted to the 1922 and 1927 constitutions.

All baptized in Christ, you have all clothed yourselves in Christ; and there are no more distinctions between Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female, but all of you are one in Christ Jesus.

—GALATIANS 3:27-28

When all four constitutions are examined side-by-side, the second progressive development is the rising level of generality of goals. The 1922 constitution contained only one goal, *viz.*, the cultivation and improvement of the religious and ethical life of Greek-speaking Orthodox.²⁷ In 1927, the teaching and maintenance of the Orthodox Christian faith and the teaching of the "prototype language of the Gospel," *viz.*, Greek, were added.²⁸ However, the 1977 constitution states the archdiocese's purposes in the following:

The purpose of the Archdiocese is to administer the life of the church in the Americas according to the Eastern Orthodox faith and tradition, sanctifying the faithful through the divine liturgy and the holy sacraments and edifying the religious and ethical life of the faithful in accordance with the holy scriptures, the decrees and canons of the holy apostles and the seven ecumenical councils of the Ancient Undivided Church, as interpreted by the practice of the Great Church of Christ in Constantinople. As to its ecumenical activities, both inter-christian and inter-religious, the Archdiocese shall follow the position and guidelines established by the Ecumenical Patriarchate.²⁹

Certainly, the raising of the purposes of the American Church to a higher level of generality is progressive, to say nothing of including ecumenical activities within archdiocesan concerns.

The third progressive constitutional development is the return to a synodical structure with a decentralized form of canonical dioceses and bishops. The constitutions of 1922 and 1927 provided synods;³⁰ but the constitution of 1931 provided for a single canonical archbishop, quite monarchical in power and type.³¹ With the 1977 constitution, the movement toward decentralization was accomplished.³² This canonical pattern provided an overall solution to the problem of greater lay and lower clergy participation in the governance of a hierarchical church. It is in this sense of greater participation in the decision-making of an hierarchical church that the synodical form of church governance can be construed to be progressive.

CONSTITUTIONAL RETROGRESSIONS:

From the viewpoint of American Orthodox Christians, a document-by-document review of the four constitutions reveals that two retrogressions have occurred. These retrogressions are: (1) the participation and approval of the archdiocesan constitution by laymen and lower clergy; (2) the method of selecting bishops.

The constitution of 1922 was developed and approved by the 2nd Clergy-Laity Congress in 1922.³³ This constitution was intended to be temporary, a document to be revised in two years. The revision did not occur until 1927.³⁴ And it was approved at a general meeting in the then Cathedral of St. Basil in Chicago. As to the monarchical constitution of 1931, it is a well known fact that it was imposed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek Government.³⁵ And as for the 1977 constitution, it was never presented at a referendum at any Clergy-Laity Congress, though a small committee of bishops, lower clergy and laymen participated in its construction. It appears that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was more Christian and more trusting in the past than in the present.

The method of selecting bishops has also regressed since the 1922 and 1927 constitutions. In these two earlier constitutions, the Clergy-Laity Congress had the opportunity to submit the names of three clergymen for transmission to the American Synod of Bishops. They, in turn, would nominate one of the three, sending that candidate's name on to

Constantinople. The Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate would accept the decision of the American Synod and would elect that candidate to episcopal office.²⁶ No such process is available in the 1977 constitution; and certainly nothing is said in the 1931 constitution. In the 1977 constitution there is a vaguely worded reference to the American Synod of Bishops consulting with the Archdiocesan Council, on which laymen and lower clergy are present. However, the Ecumenical Patriarchate reserves the right to name bishops to American dioceses.²⁷ Obviously, the ancient tradition of the local diocese selecting its own bishop and proclaiming him "Axios," is dead. There is no doubt that the 1922 and 1927 constitutions were superior to the 1977 constitution in both the constitutional procedures and the method of selecting bishops.

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM AND THE ARCHDIOCESAN CONSTITUTION OF 1977:

For the American Archdiocese, it is in the parish church that the fullest meaning and most direct application of American constitutional principles are found. Certainly, the acts of a group of religious faithful coming together to form a parish church and incorporate it illustrates the social compact characteristic of McLaughlin's understanding of American constitutionalism. Certainly, the election of boards of trustees and the general assembly meetings of the church corporation constitute the institutionalization of representation in the best sense of the word and practice. And the creation of on-going corporate by-laws under state law through specific procedures for the church corporation to follow illustrates the basic ideas of constitutional convention and the reign of law. However, there is little doubt that the concept of federalism is not an applicable principle for a single parish church, lest two or more parish churches come together under some confederal or federal arrangement. McLaughlin's principles project our understanding of the Orthodox parish church of this Archdiocese to be by nature an American constitutional structure.

At the level of the Archdiocese, however, McLaughlin's principles of American constitutionalism are not fully present. The

original 1921 incorporation of the Archdiocese resulted from a meeting; and the constitutions of 1922 and 1927 were ratified by congresses. These actions of laymen and clergy reflected the principle of social compact and partially the notion of the constitutional convention. But the 1931 and 1977 constitutions were installed in specific and bald denial of American constitutional notions—

indeed, contrary to American Orthodox Christians' democratic expectations. Though it is true that the enactment of uniform parish by-laws is still a function of the Clergy-Laity Congress (even though they are approved by Constantinople), this is so because the reign of law through New York corporate statutes can not be shut down totally by ecclesial behavior that is Byzantine and autocratic. It appears that American civil law has a higher regard for the dignity and integrity of religious people than does an official church whose theological anthropology espouses the same principles.

Representation at the Clergy-Laity Congresses and Diocesan Assemblies is probably the one constitutional characteristic that still obtains. But this, too, is the result of the reign of law where American corporate law guarantees each church member a say and a representative vote.

The principle of federalism is seen operating in the pragmatic relations of the several Orthodox parish corporations to the American Archdiocese. Through the assignment of clergy and the application of the Uniform Parish By-Laws, a type of confederal structure obtains, though this structure is being eroded over time by a gradual amending process of these by-laws.

*He loves us and has washed away
our sins with his blood, and made us
a line of kings, priests to serve his
God and Father.*

—REVELATIONS 1:6

The degree to which the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America conforms to American principles of constitutionalism rests upon the determined vigilance of American Orthodox Christians to see to the application of the reign of law in all ecclesial affairs. And more precisely, the power of the Congresses and Assemblies of the Church to frame and pass resolutions is theologically important. The Church in assembly and prayer theologizes, proclaiming the "Good News"

through current concerns and issues of society and polity, through the application of theology to ecclesial order and affairs, through the defense of the Church against her internal and external enemies, and through the advocacy and practice of the theological pedagogy for *agape*. Indeed, every Congress and Assembly of the American Church should conclude its sessions with the apostolic formula, "It is good to the Holy Spirit and to Us."

CONCLUSIONS:

Through the sixty years of the constitutional elaboration of the American Orthodox Church, the American Archdiocese has a straight development. There is no doubt that the American Archdiocese represents one of the adaptive forms of the Orthodox Church through her nineteen centuries of history. And it should not come as a surprise that the American Orthodox ecclesial structure will take longer than sixty years fully to be indigenized. This writer believes that the development of an operative democratic church within the title of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America is inevitable, though he may not live to see it. Further, this democratization will occur only when the American Church takes seriously the theological anthropology of the Church and sees that that anthropology becomes the

structural basis of a Christ-like church—a Christ-like ecclesiology in living practice. The true ecclesial independence of the American Orthodox Church rests in the achievement of a Christ-like ecclesiology, for creativity, wisdom and piety will be her gifts. The Church is one priesthood of believers, clergy and lay, with one Head—the Christ.¹¹

At the 1892-1893 Columbian Exposition, the World Parliament of Religions met in Chicago simultaneously. The Church of Greece was represented by the Most Reverend Dionysios Latas, Archbishop of Zante (1835-1894).¹² To the knowledge of this writer he was the first Greek Orthodox prelate to visit the United States. At this international meeting, Archbishop Dionysios made a brief presentation on the Church. He closed that presentation with this wonderful historic prayer:

Almighty King, High Omnipotent God, look upon humankind; enlighten us that we may know Thy will, Thy ways, Thy Holy Truths; bless Thy Holy Truths; bless Thy Holy Church. Bless this country. Magnify the renown people of the United States of America, which in its greatness and happiness invited us to this place from the remotest parts of the earth, and gave us a place of honor in this Columbian Year to witness with them the evidences of their great progress, and the wonderful achievement of the human mind.¹³

Prophetic prayer! Amen.

CHART NO. 2

THE GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA: THE GREEK HIERARCHS, 1918-1982*

ARCHBISHOPS AND OTHER ARCHDIOCESAN LEADERS:

Alexander [Surname: Demoglou],
Titular Bishop of Rodostolos and Synodical Exarch,
1918-1922,
Archbishop, 1922-1930.
Damaskinos [Surname: Papandeou],
Metropolitan of Corinth and Patriarchal Exarch
to the American Archdiocese,
May 1930-February 1931.
Kallistos [Surname: Papageorgakopoulos],
Bishop of San Francisco and Locum Tenens,
February 1931.
Athenagoras [Surname: Spyrou],
Archbishop, 1931-1948.
Timothy [Surname: Evangelinides], Archbishop, 1948.

Elected Archbishop but died prior to
enthronement and service in the American
Archdiocese.

Athenagoras [Surname: Cavadas],
Bishop of Boston and Locum Tenens,
January/March 1949.
Germanos [Surname: Polyzoides],
Titular Bishop of Nyssa and Locum Tenens,
March/October 1949.
Michael [Surname: Constantinides],
Archbishop, 1949-1958.
Germanos [Surname: Polyzoides],
Titular Bishop of Nyssa and Locum Tenens,
July 1958/April 1959.
Iakovos [Surname: Coucouzis],
Archbishop, 1959-present.

BISHOPS: 1922-1929:

Philaretos [Surname: Ioannides],
Bishop of Chicago, 1923-1930.
Joachim [Surname: Alexopoulos],
Bishop of Boston, 1923-1930.
Kallistos [Surname: Papageorgakopoulos],
Bishop of San Francisco, 1927-1940.

BISHOPS: 1930-1939:

Athenagoras [Surname: Cavadas],
Bishop of Boston, 1938-1949.

BISHOPS: 1940-1949:

Germanos [Surname: Polyzoides],
Titular Bishop of Nyssa, 1941-1963,
Titular Metropolitan of Hierapolis, 1963-1972.
Eirinaios (Irenaeus) [Surname: Tsourounakis],
Bishop of San Francisco, 1941-1944.
Gerasimos [Surname: Elias],
Bishop of Chicago, 1943-1954.

BISHOPS: 1950-1959:

Athenagoras [Surname: Kokkinakis],
Titular Bishop of Elaia, 1950-1964.
Ezekiel [Surname: Tsoukalas],
Titular Bishop of Nazianzus, 1950-1958.
Demetrius [Surname: Makris],
Titular Bishop of Olympus, 1951-1975.
Eirinaios (Irenaeus) [Surname: Kassimatis],
Titular Bishop of Abydos, 1951-1975.
Germanos [Surname: Liamadis],
Titular Bishop of Constantia, 1955-1962.
Polyefkto [Surname: Finfinis],
Titular Bishop of Tropalon, 1955-1963.

BISHOPS: 1960-1969:

Silas [Surname: Koskinas],
Titular Bishop of Amphipolis, 1960-1979,
Bishop of New Jersey, 1979-1980,
Metropolitan of New Jersey, 1980-present.
Theodosios [Surname: Sideris],
Titular Bishop of Ancona, 1960-1974.
Meletios [Surname: Tripodakis],
Titular Bishop of Christianoupolis, 1960-1979.
Aimilianos [Surname: Lalouisis],
Titular Bishop of Harioupolis, 1960-1974.
Timothy [Surname: Halofitis],
Titular Bishop of Rodostolos, 1962-1977.

Gerasimos [Surname: Papadopoulos],
Titular Bishop of Abydos, 1962-1977.

Germanos [Surname: Psalidakis],
Titular Bishop of Synadon, 1962-1968.

Meletios [Surname: Diacandreas],
Titular Bishop of Aristeia, 1964-1968.

Iakovos [Surname: Pilidis],
Titular Bishop of Catania, 1967-1977.

Iakovos [Surname: Garmatis],
Titular Bishop of Apameia, 1969-1979,
Bishop of Chicago, 1979-present.

BISHOPS: 1970-1979:

Paul [Surname: de Ballester],
Titular Bishop of Nazianzus, 1970-1976.

John [Surname: Kallos],
Titular Bishop of Thermon, 1971-1979,
Bishop of Charlotte, 1979-1980,
Bishop of Atlanta, 1980-present.

Philotheos, [Surname: Karamitsos],
Titular Bishop of Meloa, 1971-present.

Timothy [Surname: Negropontis],
Titular Bishop of Pamphilos, 1974-1979,
Bishop of Detroit, 1979-present.

Sotirios [Surname: Athanasoulas],
Titular Bishop of Constantia, 1974-1979,
Bishop of Toronto, 1979-present.

Anthimos [Surname: Draconakis],
Titular Bishop of Christoupolis, 1977-1979,
Bishop of Boston, 1979-present.

Anthony [Surname: Gergiannakis],
Titular Bishop of Amisos, 1978-1979,
Bishop of San Francisco, 1979-present.

Maximos [Surname: Aghiorgouassis],
Titular Bishop of Dioclea, 1978-1979,
Bishop of Pittsburgh, 1979-present.

Gennadios [Surname: Chrysoulakis],
Bishop of Buenos Aires, 1979-present.

BISHOPS: 1980-present:

Kallistos [Surname: Samaras],
Titular Bishop of Zelon, 1980-present.

* For each archbishop and bishop listed above, the inclusive dates represent, solely, the time period of episcopal service in the American Archdiocese. Additionally, the episcopates of the Carpatho-Russians and the Ukrainian Orthodox who are under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the American Archdiocese are not listed in this chart.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Certificate of Incorporation of [the] Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, 17 September 1921, (Certified True Copy, County Clerk and Clerk of the Superior Court, New York County, New York, File No. 7650). This text is also in: Basil T. Zoustis, *The Greeks in America and Their Work* (Greek text; New York: D. C. Divry, 1954), pp. 133-135.

² Constitution of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, 11 August 1922, Certified True Copy/Greek Text, from *Patriarchikos Kodix: Synodikon Tomon kai Sigillion, anef Chronologia*, Tome 979, pp. 1-11, The Archives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and New Rome, Istanbul, Turkey.

³ Constitution of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, [12-14 October 1927], *Ibid.*, pp. 97-111.

⁴ Constitution of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, 10 January 1931, Certified True Copy/Greek text, The Archives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and New Rome, Istanbul, Turkey.

⁵ *Charter of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America*, 29 November 1977 (Brookline, MA.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1978).

⁶ For a complete listing of archdiocesan institutions and parishes, see: Dimitri Gemelos and Reverend Kosmas Karavellas (eds.), *Year Book 1982* (New York, NY: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, 1982).

⁷ Andrew C. McLaughlin, *The Foundations of American Constitutionalism* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1932).

⁸ John D. Zizioulas, "The Eucharistic Community and the Catholicity of the Church," in John Meyendorff and Joseph McLelland (eds.), *The New Man: An Orthodox and Reformed Dialogue* (New Brunswick, NJ: Agora Books/Standard Press, 1973), pp. 107-131.

⁹ I Pet. 2:9-10.

¹⁰ Gal. 3:26, 28; Col. 3:11; Rev. 1:6.

¹¹ Acts 1:23-26; 6:1-7; 15:1-31.

¹² Jerome I. Cotsonis, *The Place of the Laity within the Ecclesial Organism according to the Canon Law of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (Greek text; Athens, 1956), pp. 15-17. See also, Athenagoras Kokkinakis, *Parents and Priests as Servants of Redemption* (New York, NY: Morehouse-Gorham Company, 1958), Chs. XXI - XXII.

¹³ Zizioulas, *op. cit.* See also: (1) Alexander Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, translated by A.E. Moorhouse (London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1966); (2) Alexander Schmemann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973).

¹⁴ For an overview of canon law sources, see: John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and*

Doctrinal Themes (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 1974), Ch. VI. For an English translation of the traditional *Pedalion of Agapius and Nicodemus*, see: D. Cummings (trans.), *The Rudder . . .* (Chicago, IL: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957). For English translation of Byzantine civil and canon law, see: (1) Clyde Pharr (trans. and ed.), *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmundian Constitutions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1952); (2) Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (2nd Series; Reprint ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), Vol. XIV (*The Seven Ecumenical Councils*); (3) S. P. Scott (trans. and ed.), *The Civil Law . . .* (Cincinnati, Ohio: The Central Trust Company, 1932), Vols. XII-XVII.

¹⁵ 1921 Articles of Incorporation, *op. cit.*, Pgh. 5.

¹⁶ During the 1920's Venizelist-Royalist controversy over American church control, the American civil courts were used often to control arbitrary episcopal behavior regardless of political persuasion. Also for local control issues, civil suits and injunctive relief had been sought to control clerical behavior. To the knowledge of this writer, no systematic study of this matter has been made for any of the ethnic Orthodox Churches. For a sample, see, John Papas (ed. and publisher), *Greek Church in the Courts* (Printed booklet; Stanford, Conn.: n.d., [1945?]). This does not mean, however, that court cases involving the Orthodox Church have not made their imprint upon American case law involving religious societies. In a rapid review of encyclopaedic articles, titled, "Religious Societies" in *Corpus Juris Secundum* (1952) and *American Jurisprudence* (1973), some 28 cases were readily identifiable by title in the footnotes of these articles. Most of these cases involved The Russian Orthodox Church. The most significant case seems to be one ruled upon by the United States Supreme Court, viz., *Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral of the Russian Orthodox Church*, 344 U.S. 94, 97 L.Ed. 120, 73 S. Ct. 143. For the Greek Archdiocese under Archbishop Athenagoras, some legal problems are described in: George Papaioannou, *From Mars Hill to Manhattan . . .* (Minneapolis, MN: Light and Life Publishing Company, 1976), pp. 98-121; and some of the legal documentation is found in Papas, *supra*.

¹⁷ James Steve Councilis, "Polis and Ecclesia: Toward an American Orthodox Church," *Diakonia*, Vol. VII, No. 4 (1972), pp. 310-325. Also, see: (1) Charles A. Frazee, *The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece, 1821-1852* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1969); (2) L. S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453* (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958); (3) Mario Rinvoluci, *Anatomy of a Church: Greek Orthodoxy Today* (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 1966).

¹⁸ 1922 Const., art. 1, 4; 1927 Const., art. 1, 4; 1931 Const., art. 1; 1977 Const., art. 1, 4.

¹⁹ 1922 Const., art. 4, 8, 9; 1927 Const., art. 4, 7, 9; 1931 Const., art. 6; 1977 Const., art. 5, 7, 8, 9.

²⁰ 1922 Const., art. 2, 3; 1927 Const., art. 2a, 3; 1931 Const., art. 3; 1977 Const., art. 2, 3.

²¹ 1977 Const., art. 2, 11, 13, 14.

²² 1922 Const., art. 12, 13; 1927 Const., art. 13, 14; 1977 Const., art. 12.

²³ 1922 Const., art. 24; 1927 Const., art. 23; 1931 Const., art. 12, 13, 14; 1977 Const., art. 18, 19.

²⁴ 1922 Const., art. 2; 1927 Const., art. 2.

²⁵ 1931 Const., art. 2

²⁶ 1977 Const., art. 1.

²⁷ 1922 Const., art. 2.

²⁸ 1927 Const., art. 2.

²⁹ 1977 Const., art. 2.

³⁰ 1922 Const., art. 7; 1927 Const., art. 7.

³¹ 1931 Const., art. 6.

³² 1977 Const., art. 6.

³³ Zoustis, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

³⁴ 1927 Const., art. 28.

³⁵ The Most Reverend Damaskinos, Metropolitan of Corinth and Patriarchal Exarch, Encyclical of May 20, 1930 (?), Zoustis, *op. cit.*, pp. 195-201; The Most Reverend Damaskinos, Metropolitan of Corinth and Patriarchal Exarch, Encyclical of December 30, 1930, (Original text copy distributed to parishes in writer's Library.). Also, Mr. Paul Manolis, having amassed Greek Government documentation for this period, is preparing an historical study for publication.

³⁶ 1922 Const., art. 16-19; 1927 Const., art. 18-20.

³⁷ 1977 Const., art. 13-14.

³⁸ I Pet. 2:9-10; Col. 1:18.

³⁹ Basil Atesi, *Brief Episcopal History of the Church of Greece from 1833 until Today* (Greek text; Athens, A. T. Pountza, 1948), Vol. I, pp. 122-123.

⁴⁰ The Most Reverend Dionysios Latas (Archbishop of Zante), "The Greek Church," [Address given on September 13, 1893], in John H. Barrows (ed.), *The World's Parliament of Religions . . . The Columbian Exposition of 1893* (Chicago, IL.: The Parliament Publishing Company, 1893), Vol. I, pp. 114, 352-359. An illustration depicting Archbishop Dionysios appears on p. 357.