

NOTE AND DOCUMENT

*European Approaches
of the Bulgarian Church:
the Case of the Lambeth Conference
in London, 1930*

by MARIA LITINA

Centre for History and Palaeography,
National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, Athens

E-mail: maria.litina@miet.gr

This article examines the role of the networks and protagonists involved in securing the Bulgarian Church's participation in the seventh Lambeth Conference in London (1930) in their attempt to end the schism between the Bulgarian Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople dating from 1872, and to secure a new place for the Bulgarians in the wider ecclesial and political landscape. New evidence, contained in unpublished documents in the Lambeth Palace Archives in London, enables a better understanding of the various connections at work behind the scene, including how the Church of England perceived and responded to complex issues within their own ecumenical strategy and the wider context of British foreign policy.

As is well known, the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate in May 1872, which gave rise to the autocephalous Church of Bulgaria and resulted in schism with the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, preceded and laid the foundation stone for the

LPL = Lambeth Palace Library; LC = Lambeth Conference, 1930; ODNB = *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

This is a revised version of a paper delivered at the 11th Congress of South-East European Studies in Sofia (31 August–4 September 2015). I would like to express my deep thanks to Lambeth Palace Library, in particular the Librarian and Archivist Giles Mandelbrote and the former Archivist Clare Brown, for their kind permission and help in consulting the LPL Archives and photographing documents cited in this study. My profound thanks are offered to the anonymous reviewers and to Professor Andrew Chandler (University of Chichester) for his invaluable advice and help in the final version of the article.

establishment of the Bulgarian kingdom. Thus, the ecclesiastical history of Bulgaria is interlinked with the political history of the country, while the role of the Bulgarian Church in the political life of the country and its involvement in state diplomacy has often been instrumental in shaping political developments from the mid-nineteenth century onwards.¹

As a result of the Balkan Wars and the First World War, Bulgaria found itself needing to build its presence in the world and to forge relations with other countries and communions beyond the Balkans. Even before the Bulgarian defeat in the Second Balkan War (1913), Bulgarian Catholic and Orthodox clergymen had initiated approaches for union with the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches respectively, in an attempt to protect the Bulgarian population in Greek- and Serbian-occupied Macedonian regions from becoming Hellenised or Serbianised. The vision of union with the Anglican Church was attractive mainly for political reasons, as this would avoid the spiritual and ecclesiastical subjugation of the Bulgarian people to Rome,² while the Anglican Communion at large was considered more progressive and more willing to preserve the identity of the Bulgarian Church. On this basis, union with the Anglican Church was publicly proposed during the First Assembly of the newly founded Bulgarian nationalistic organisation, the ‘National Union’ (Националния съюз), which took place in Sofia on 6 October 1913.³ At the same time, in close co-operation with the state, the Bulgarian Church pursued a policy of strengthening its international position in Europe in light of its schism with the head of the Orthodox Churches, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Despite a number of attempts to heal the schism, the official rift between the two Churches had remained unsolved since 1872.⁴

A golden opportunity for the Bulgarian Church to promote its European position among the Orthodox Churches, and also its views on the schism, came with the seventh Lambeth Conference of the bishops of the Anglican Church, which took place in 1930.⁵ Such an occasion offered Bulgarians the chance to promote their national, European and international

¹ See in general Zhelev Dimitrov, ‘Bulgarian Christianity’, in K. Parry (ed.), *The Blackwell companion to Eastern Christianity*, Malden, MA–Oxford–Chichester 2010, 47–72.

² S. Eldarov, *Католицизм в България (1878–1989)* [*The Catholics in Bulgaria (1878–1989)*], Sofia 2002, 114–17.

³ Z. Lefterov, ‘Англиканската църква, източното православие и България (xix–средата на xx в.)’, Част първа [‘The Anglican Church, Eastern Orthodoxy and Bulgaria (xix–mid-xx c.)’ First part], *Historical Review* v–vi (2014), 142–5.

⁴ See G. Konidares, *Ἡ ἄρσις τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ Σχισματος ἐν τῷ πλαίσιῳ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ* [*The lifting of the Bulgarian schism in the context of the universal Orthodoxy of Hellenism*], Athens 1971.

⁵ See R. C. D. Jasper, *Arthur Cayley Headlam: life and letters of a bishop*, London–New York 1960, 222–5. More important is B. Geffert, *Eastern Orthodox and Anglicans: diplomacy, theology and the politics of interwar ecumenism*, South Bend, IN 2010, esp. pp. 184–200.

presence both ecclesiastically and politically. In particular, it would advance ongoing negotiations between the Bulgarian Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which were by then taking place with the mediation of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The political context, which had brought new possibilities of *rapprochement* among the Balkan states, also appeared to favour efforts to end the schism.

Papers in the Lambeth Palace Archives in London shed further light on the networks and protagonists involved in securing the participation of the Bulgarian Church in the Lambeth Conference. While much is simply ecclesiastical, the archives also highlight the significance of politics in the efforts to end the Bulgarian schism and to secure a new place in the wider Church and in the political landscape. Through these papers we are able to understand the various connections at work beneath the surface, many of which represented national interests, and to understand how those at work in the Church of England perceived these complex issues and placed them within their own ecumenical strategy, not least in the context of British foreign policy.

By 1930 the Lambeth Conferences had become an important institution in the history of the Anglican Communion. Rather than serving as a governing body of the Anglican Church, the conferences functioned as consultative assemblies of bishops convened by the archbishop of Canterbury, gathering together all autonomous national and regional Churches of the Anglican Communion around the world to discuss and express views on central issues of the times. The conferences possessed, uniquely, a moral and spiritual authority across the communion and to a large extent they influenced ecclesiastical policy. The first five conferences (1867, 1878, 1888, 1897, 1908) had focused on internal issues including liturgical, organisational and administrative matters. Over time the agenda was enriched with issues concerning the relations of the Anglican Communion with other Churches, such as the Eastern, the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches and the Old Catholics, while also discussing doctrinal and social issues of the times. In 1920 the sixth Lambeth Conference became widely known for its 'Appeal to all Christian People'. This provided a quite new basis for discussions of church union and inspired a serious response from Christians outside the Roman Catholic Church. The seventh Lambeth Conference looked to affirm and develop this vision, discussing Christian unity worldwide, the life and witness of the Christian community, and the organisation and structure of the Anglican Communion itself.⁶

It was as a part of this ambitious discussion about the unity of the Christian Churches in 1930 that a conference was now organised

⁶ LPL, LC, 153, fos 393–425, 426–38.

between a special committee of Anglican bishops and a delegation from the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The conference met in four sessions at Lambeth Palace between 15 and 18 July 1930. Fourteen Anglican bishops attended, led by Arthur Cayley Headlam, the bishop of Gloucester, while the Eastern Orthodox Churches were led by the Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletios (1926–35), former Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (1921–3). The Orthodox delegation consisted of one representative appointed by each autocephalous Orthodox Church, including the Metropolitan of Thyateira and Exarch of Eastern and Northern Europe, Germanos Strenopoulos (1922–51), representing the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Photios II (1929–35), and also representatives of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, the Churches of Cyprus, Greece, Serbia, Poland and the Patriarchate of Romania.⁷ The Church of Bulgaria was, as a key figure in the drama observed, only received at ‘the eleventh hour’.⁸ It was represented by Bishop Paisios of Znepole.

The story of this late arrival was significant. A month earlier (8–23 June 1930), the preliminary committee of Orthodox Churches had met at the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos to prepare for the coming pre-Synod of the Orthodox Churches, initiated by Photios II. The committee discussed a number of important theological and ecclesiastical issues,⁹ among them the cultivation of relations with non-Orthodox Churches which did not proselytise. This included the Anglican Church.¹⁰ No specific mention of the ending of the schism between the Bulgarian Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate was made in the final agenda for the pre-Synod, but the preliminary committee did consider the issue with some seriousness during its discussions. The Serbian Church now insisted that a representative of the Bulgarian Church should be present, suggesting that this matter ought to be resolved before the Synod.¹¹ This stance clearly reflected the pro-Bulgarian position of Serbia in this particular period, a position which aimed at a *rapprochement* and union between Serbs and Bulgarians.

⁷ Ibid. fo. 426. For a photograph of the archbishop of Canterbury with the Orthodox Delegation and its attendant Anglican chaplains at Lambeth Palace, taken on 8 July 1930, see <http://anglicanhistory.org/orthodoxy/del_1930.html>, accessed 4 Nov. 2021.

⁸ See below.

⁹ See Konidares, *Η ἄρσις τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ Σχίσματος*, 59–86; M. Litina, ‘Опити за вдигане на българската схизма (1932–1935 г.)’, *Трети конгрес по българистика*, 23–26 май 2013 г., *Софийският университет "Св. Климент Охридски"* [‘Attempts to lift the Bulgarian schism (1932–1935)’, *Third International Congress of Bulgarian Studies*, 23–26 May 2013, *University of Sofia «St Kliment Ohridski»*], Sofia 2014, 271–81.

¹⁰ *Πρακτικά τῆς Προκαταρκτικῆς Ἐπιτροπῆς τῶν Ἁγίων Ὁρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς συνελθούσης ἐν τῇ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει Ἱερᾷ Μεγίστῃ Μονῇ Βατοπεδίου (8–23 Ἰουνίου 1930)* [Acts of the preliminary committee of the Holy Orthodox Churches held in the Grand Monastery of Vatopedi on the Holy Mountain (8–23 June 1930)], Constantinople 1930, 144.

¹¹ Ibid. 71–2.

A subcommittee was now appointed to discuss this subject, under the title 'the Bulgarian Schism and the way of its lifting as soon as possible for the restoration of the unity in the Orthodox Church'. Far from lingering in the background, the question was now 'considered as urgent'. The Ecumenical Patriarchate had expressed its wish for the Church of Bulgaria to be represented at the pre-Synod. It also added, significantly, that it would not object to the mediation of one or more Orthodox Churches for the accomplishment of the union of the Bulgarian Church with the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹² The members of the subcommittee unanimously decided to follow the suggestion of the bishop of Ohrid, Nikolaj Velimirovic, not to place this proposal among the items for discussion in the agenda but simply forward it to the Ecumenical Patriarch for his consideration. Photios II, who spoke Bulgarian, had served as Patriarchal Exarch from 1906 to 1914 in Philippoupolis, the city in which his uncle was Metropolitan, and was committed to healing the schism. He accepted the proposal and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem was now appointed as the official mediator between the two sides. If this initiative failed, it was agreed that the Ecumenical Patriarchate should raise the question of the Bulgarian schism, as stipulated by the subcommittee, in the pre-Synod.¹³ But the pre-Synod, on which so many hopes rested, did not take place. It proved impossible to secure representation from the Russian Churches. If the schism were to be healed, there would have to be another mediator and another vehicle.

While this was going on, the representation of the Bulgarian Church and its relations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate became an important point of discussion during the organising of the Lambeth Conference. The authorities of the Church of England had invited the Ecumenical Patriarchate to send a list of those who would attend and represent the Orthodox Churches. They made no stipulations: this was considered an internal affair of the Patriarchate as head of the Orthodox world. Because of the schism, Patriarch Photios did not include a Bulgarian representation among the Orthodox Delegation.¹⁴ This provoked disappointment at Lambeth Palace. The two figures most responsible for advising Archbishop Lang in matters concerning the Orthodox Churches were Mervyn Haigh, at this time private secretary to the archbishop of Canterbury (1924–31),¹⁵ and the energetic Canon John Douglas (1868–1956), vicar of St Luke's, Camberwell, who over many years had come to play a major role in Anglican-Orthodox relations.¹⁶

The correspondence between Haigh and Douglas and other members of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches reveals that copious efforts were

¹² Ibid. 131–3. ¹³ Ibid. 133–4. ¹⁴ See LPL, LC, 153, fos 70–1, 72–4.

¹⁵ See G. C. Watson, 'Haigh, Mervyn George (1887–1962)', *ODNB*.

¹⁶ See E. Every, 'Canon John Albert Douglas, RIP', *Sobornost* 3rd ser. xxi (1957), 496–8.

made to secure as great a representation of Orthodoxy as possible at the Lambeth Conference while seeking to balance the various claims of the Orthodox Churches, which they now held in view, and avoiding giving offence to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which still considered the Bulgarian Church as schismatic. In this sensitive matter the Anglican Church turned to the archbishop of Thyateira, Germanos Strenopoulos, for advice and assistance.¹⁷ It was decided that the archbishop of Canterbury would now extend a personal invitation to the Bulgarian Church to send a representative who would attend the conference but not officially as a member of the Orthodox delegation. On 21 May 1930, Douglas had set this suggestion down in a confidential letter to Germanos:

Of course, I fully understand the difficulty in regard to the Bulgars. If the Ecumenical Patriarch felt unable to invite them, I should be glad to have a *clin d'oeille* from you as to whether it would be an indiscretion for them to be invited direct from London. I can well imagine that it will be an indiscretion and I only ask you this confidentially.¹⁸

If this appeared satisfactory, there were still points of awkwardness to negotiate. Before the Lambeth Conference a great service would take place, on 12 July 1930, at St Paul's Cathedral in the presence of 310 Anglican bishops and delegates of all Churches participating in the conference. In a letter to Douglas of 29 May 1930, Haigh made clear that Archbishop Lang was very cautious about extending an invitation to representatives of the Eastern Churches to the service, not least because such an invitation should be sent by the dean and chapter of St Paul's. Haigh added that Lang was 'strongly of opinion that to invite Serbians, Rumanians and Bulgarians to St. Paul's and not the others would do more harm than good, nor can he believe that it would be at all pleasant to have to get rid of the Bulgarian[s] from England before the Orthodox Delegation takes place'.¹⁹ It is still not known whether this invitation was ever sent by the dean, W. R. Inge, and chapter of St Paul's.²⁰ What is clear is that none of this was proving easy. In a letter to a canon of St Paul's, William Wigram, Douglas complained about 'the endless complexities of the Delegation', adding that 'the Bulgars have not been invited'.²¹

A week later, on 5 June 1930, Douglas sent a new report to Haigh concerning the problems which might be anticipated either by not inviting representatives of the Bulgarian, Serbian and Romanian Orthodox

¹⁷ On Germanos see V. T. Istavridis, 'The work of Germanos Strenopoulos in the field of inter-Orthodox and inter-Christian relations', *Ecumenical Review* xi/3 (1951), 291–9.

¹⁸ John Douglas to Germanos Strenopoulos, 21 May 1930, LPL, LC, 153, fo. 334.

¹⁹ Mervyn Haigh to Douglas, 29 May 1930, *ibid.* fo. 124.

²⁰ See M. Grimley, 'Inge, William Ralph (1860–1954)', *ODNB*.

²¹ Douglas to William Wigram, 30 May 1930, LPL, LC, 153, fo. 515.

Churches or by directly inviting them without the prior consent of the Ecumenical Patriarch. He stated:

I am profoundly anxious as to the possibility of the Bulgarians being hurt by receiving no invitation at all. They will not be offended with the Church of England but they will be offended with the Ecumenical Patriarch for not having told the Archbishop that he himself could not invite them and that if he desired their presence, they should receive an independent invitation. Soreness over that omission will, I anticipate, chill the Bulgarian Church authorities' present wish to end the schism with Constantinople and may have its repercussion not on Bulgarian friendship to England and the Anglican Church but in Bulgarian and Greek national sentiments.

'If it is so', Douglas concluded, 'none here is to blame. The fault lies with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. But the possibility is very real and is there.'²² In the notes that he attached to his report, Douglas added an important detail concerning the individual who mediated on behalf of the Bulgarian Church: 'Sir Edward Boyle, the Bishop of Guilford's brother and Chairman of the Near East Association and no mean expert has just rung me up to say that the Bulgar legation [referring to the Bulgarian Embassy] is greatly perturbed at "no Bulgars".'²³

The intervention of Sir Edward Boyle added a new layer to the story. Boyle was one of the main protagonists in promoting British interests in the Balkans. He was no less active in advancing Bulgarian, Serbian and Albanian interests in parliament and in British society at large, work for which he earned official recognition by the respective governments. Director of Richard Thomas & Company, he was the secretary of the Balkan Committee and had been its president since 1925.²⁴ Boyle's role in the discussions at Lambeth Palace grew more insistent in a number of letters, reports and memoranda there. As Douglas wrote:

Sir Edward Boyle labored at me but I said that my function is to do my job and not to think for my superiors. But of course Edward Boyle is right. The Bulgars will be very savage with the Greeks and the effect in Balkan politics will be to stop the ecclesiastical rapprochement between the Greeks and the Bulgars and possibly even that between the Serbs and the Greeks. As I have ventured to urge, the Ecumenical Patriarch has no recognized function to act as a foreign office for the Autocephalous Churches.

In the end, Douglas undertook to discuss the matter with the Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletios, who as former Patriarch of Constantinople had initiated a *rapprochement* with the Bulgarian Church in 1922.²⁵

²² Douglas to Haigh, 5 June 1930, *ibid.* fos 161–4 at fo. 163. ²³ *Ibid.* fo. 160.

²⁴ See C. E. A. Bedwell (rev. C. Pease-Watkin), 'Boyle, Sir Edward, first baronet (1848–1909)', *ODNB*. ²⁵ LPL, LC, 153, fo. 160.

Douglas did agree with Boyle. In another letter, to Haigh, he praised him for his knowledge of the Balkans and its problems, and especially Bulgaria. Douglas hoped that the invitation would not go through the Ecumenical Patriarchate again.²⁶ Haigh concurred, adding ‘perhaps we ought after all to invite one representative at this last moment’. He expressed his concern about the difficult situation which they now faced: ‘I am not at all sure that the Archbishop of Canterbury will consent to run even the risk of annoying the Ecumenical Patriarch in order to remove discontent for which the Ecumenical Patriarch and not *he* is responsible.’²⁷ The following day Douglas reported to Haigh that Meletios had now replied to their invitation, indicating his readiness to create a climate of trust with the Bulgarian Church during the Lambeth Conference in order to facilitate the healing of a schism which clearly had wider political implications in the Balkans.²⁸ According to Douglas, Meletios himself now suggested that it was better to ask the Bulgarians not to be members of the delegation but attend as an independent Church like the Armenians. Meletios would be pleased to meet them at functions, like dinners, which would enable them to fraternise informally. Douglas added that the Bulgar legation was very supportive in conveying an invitation to the Bulgarian Church. Moreover, Douglas suggested that Archbishop Lang should now write without delay, first to the Bulgarian ambassador Pantso Hadjimishev, ‘stating that he was forwarding an invitation to the Bulgarian Holy Synod to send a representative to give fraternal greetings to the Lambeth Conference and should ask him to convey that invitation by telegram’; and, secondly, to the acting president of the Holy Synod of Bulgaria, ‘formally inviting the Church of Bulgaria to send a representative to pay a fraternal visit to the Lambeth Conference and to be his guest’.²⁹

Photios’s approved list of members of the Orthodox delegation was received by Lambeth Palace on 26 June 1930. As was to be expected, no mention was made of the Bulgarian Church.³⁰ The archbishop’s letter of invitation to the Bulgarian Church was dispatched on 30 June 1930.³¹ The same day Boyle sent a letter of appreciation to Haigh on account of the part he had played in this: ‘It was a very courageous as well as a wise and just step to put matters right at the eleventh hour.’³² A positive response from the acting president of the Holy Synod of Bulgaria, the Metropolitan of Vidin, Neophite, was received by Lambeth Palace on 3 July 1930.³³ Neophite had already prepared the way with a letter of

²⁶ Douglas to Haigh, 27 June 1930, *ibid.* fo. 165.

²⁷ Haigh to Douglas, 27 June 1930, *ibid.* fo. 166.

²⁸ Douglas to Haigh, 28 June 1930, *ibid.* fos 167–70.

²⁹ *Ibid.* fos 168–9.

³⁰ Oecumenical Patriarchate’s answer to archbishop of Canterbury, 26 June 1930, *ibid.* fos 335–7.

³¹ Edward Boyle to Haigh, 30 June 1930, *ibid.* fos 174–5.

³² *Ibid.* fo. 174.

³³ Telegram, *ibid.* fo. 175.

congratulations that he had sent to the Ecumenical Patriarch (on 14 March 1930), in which he referred ‘to the restoration of unity and love among sister Churches of the Orthodox Communion’.³⁴ At the same time, Haigh sent a letter to Boyle’s brother, John Greig, bishop of Guildford, explaining that ‘the decision to invite the Delegation in the way in which it was invited was by no means lightly taken. It was the subject of consideration and discussion for weeks’, and that ‘The Archbishop was very disappointed that the Ecumenical Patriarch had not asked a representative from Bulgaria but felt that he could not go behind that decision until he had consulted Meletios as head of the official Delegation.’³⁵ Boyle expressed his own concern about this:

I note you say the Archbishop wishes to encourage the idea that he can deal with and through the Ecumenical Patriarch. Personally I ventured to doubt whether with all these national Churches grown up to a vigorous maturity, this is to-day possible. It is most certainly impossible in regard to the Bulgarian Church, which is regarded by the Patriarch as in schism. I note that the Archbishop was disappointed that the Ecumenical Patriarch had not asked a representative from Bulgaria, but there was certainly never the least chance that he would do so.³⁶

Haigh in turn expressed his deep appreciation for ‘having been one among those who would not let the Bulgarian question sleep’.³⁷

Bishop Paisios was appointed as representative of the Bulgarian Church.³⁸ He arrived in London sometime between 3 and 6 July. Douglas had prepared an intricate calendar of engagements, which was sent to Paisios on 7 July 1930. At the end of his letter, he added, carefully, ‘in each case, one of our chaplains will accompany you in all arrangements. I venture to ask that since other official events may be arranged you would not make other engagements without consulting me’.³⁹ On the Bulgarian side, the official journal of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, *Tsarkoven Vestnik*, gave a full report on the visit, alleging efforts by the Greek Orthodox Church to prevent Bishop Paisios from taking part in the Lambeth Conference. It also emphasised the support which the archbishop of Canterbury and others had given to the Bulgarian bishop to attend as an equal member among the other representatives in the Orthodox delegation.⁴⁰

³⁴ Konidares, *Η ἄρσις τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ Σχίσματος*, 64 n. 4.

³⁵ Haigh to John Greig, bishop of Guildford, 30 June 1930, LPL, LC, 153, fos 171–3.

³⁶ Boyle to Haigh, 1 July 1930, *ibid.* fos 176–7.

³⁷ Haigh to Boyle, 2 July 1930, *ibid.* fo. 178.

³⁸ *Ibid.* fo. 172.

³⁹ Douglas to Bishop Paisios, 7 July 1930, *ibid.* fo. 516.

⁴⁰ Anon., ‘Дописки: Православни и англикани на Ламбетската конференция’ [‘Notes: Orthodox and Anglicans in the Lambeth Conference’], *Tsarkoven Vestnik* xxxi/31 (19 July 1930), 345–6.

The investment of hope in informal encounters was not in vain. An opportunity to break the ice between the representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Bishop Paisios arose two days before the official opening of the Lambeth Conference, when Patriarch Meletios officiated at the holy liturgy in the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of St Sophia in London.⁴¹ This was followed by lunch in honour of the representatives of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. Paisios was present. In a speech addressed to his guests, Meletios expressed his high esteem for Paisios and made specific mention of the Bulgarian schism, an ‘exceptionally sad incident’, which he hoped would find its definite solution.⁴² Three days later, on 16 July 1930, a dinner in honour of the Orthodox delegation to the Lambeth Conference was hosted at the Athenaeum Club by the influential canon of Westminster, Athelstan Riley.⁴³ The presence of the Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian ministers among the guests is indicative of the wider aims of the Anglicans to advance not only ecclesiastical but political relations too. This time it is not clear whether Paisios was also present.

The new *rapprochement* between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Church was announced in an article published anonymously in *The Times* on 26 July 1930 under the title ‘The Bulgarian schism: new hope of reunion’. In a letter to Haigh dated the same day, Douglas commented on the article, pointing out the political reasons for the schism and the complexities of the possible arrangements agreed at the Lambeth Conference. But Douglas now described the outcome of this as a ‘sad one’: ‘the Greek Churches are to give authority to the Bulgar Church, the Bulgars are to recognise that Greek Macedonia and Thrace belong ecclesiastically to the Greek Churches’.⁴⁴ A few weeks after the Lambeth Conference, on 9 August 1930, the Ecumenical Patriarch Photios II officially invited the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Damianos I (1897–1931), ‘to accept the proposed brotherly mediation of the Church of Jerusalem for the healing of the Bulgarian Schism’.⁴⁵

The story of the Bulgarian invitation clearly shows how an individual Orthodox Church was seen to be an integral part of that wider Orthodox world, which Anglicans now sought to encounter on their own terms. Because of this insistence, the authorities of the Church of England had come to play a beneficial part in inter-Orthodox relations, fostering a new atmosphere and even facilitating official discussions between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Bulgarian Church. When the

⁴¹ Anon., ‘Из печата: Патриарх Мелетий за схизмата’ [‘In press: Patriarch Meletios on the schism’], *Tsarkoven Vestnik* xxxi/31 (2 Aug. 1930), 359–60. ⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Cutting from *The Times*, 17 July 1930, LPL, LC, 153, fo. 297.

⁴⁴ John Douglas papers, LPL, A.1, fos 111–12.

⁴⁵ Konidares, *Ἡ ἄρσις τοῦ Βουλγαρικοῦ Σχίσματος*, 62–3.

Bulgarian Church might have been left in an ecclesial *cul-de-sac* it now found itself moving within a new pattern of interweaving inter-Orthodox, ecumenical and international relationships. Yet national interests, ecclesial and political, still defined and determined much. In 1930 Canon Douglas, for all his efforts, found himself a disappointed man. The eventual ending of the Bulgarian schism would have to wait until after the Second World War.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Ibid. 114–32; Zhelev Dimitrov, ‘Bulgarian Christianity’, 63–5.