

**SEVEN CRITERIA
FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION
OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH:
THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERPRETATIVE SYSTEM
BASED ON THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF VATICAN II
AND VERIFIED AGAINST THE WORK OF
THE KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP**

by Yuriy Sakvuk

Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Theology,
Saint Paul University,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. (Th) / D.Th.
in the Eastern Christian Studies

Written under the guidance of
Prof. Andriy Chirovsky, Director,
Prof. Peter Galadza and Prof. John Gibaut, Committee Members

Ottawa, Canada
23 March 2011

© Yuriy Sakvuk, Ottawa, Canada, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

ABSTRACT 5
ABBREVIATIONS 10
ALA-LC TRANSLITERATION SCHEME FOR THE UKRAINIAN SCRIPT 15
INTRODUCTION 16
I. THE CLARIFICATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH’S ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION, AND THE RENEWED APPRECIATION FOR ECCLESIAL PARTICULARITY ELABORATED IN SEVERAL DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II 49
I.1. The Documents of Vatican II as a Unified Body of Doctrine Concerned Primarily with the Catholic Church’s Ecclesial Identity and Vocation 49
I.2. A Review of Three Conciliar Documents of Central Import for a Theology of the Particular Church 59
I.2.1. <i>Lumen Gentium</i> : History and Significance 60
I.2.2. <i>Unitatis Redintegratio</i> : History and Significance 74
I.2.3. <i>Orientalium Ecclesiarum</i> : History and Significance 92
I.3. Vatican II’s Ecclesiological Shifts with Regard to Ecclesial Particularity: From the Uniformity of “Universalistic Ecclesiology” to the Development of the Concept of “Unity in Diversity” and the Understanding of the Church as a “Communion” of Particular Churches 104
II. THE SEARCH FOR A PROPER SYSTEM OF EVALUATION OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH’S ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION 128
II.1. The Question of an Ecclesial Identity <i>Per Se</i> , Peculiarities of an Ecclesial Identity and the Vocation of a Particular Church; and a Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at Their Systematic Analysis 128

II.1.1. Reflections on an Ecclesial Identity <i>Per Se</i> in the Context of the Possibility of Its Organic Development and Its Inter-Connectedness with the Concept of Ecclesial Mission 128
II.1.2. Specificities of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of the Particular Churches of the Catholic Communion and the Special Role of the Eastern Catholic Churches 134
II.1.3. Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at the Systematic Analysis of an Ecclesial Identity in General 143
II.1.4. Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at a Systematic Analysis of a Particular Church's Ecclesial Identity and Vocation Specifically as an Introduction to the Interpretive System Proposed in This Thesis 152
 II.2. An Interpretive System Composed of Seven Ecclesiological Criteria for an Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Particular Church	 163
II.2.1. <i>Ad Fontes</i> and <i>Aggiornamento</i> : A Return to Authentic Traditional Roots and the Need for Proper and Organic Ecclesiastical Development 163
II.2.2. Theological Pluralism and Particular Theology 173
II.2.3. Particular Ways of Liturgical Worship 186
II.2.4. Particular Ecclesiastical Legislation 192
II.2.5. Particular Spiritual Patrimony 202
II.2.6. Preservation of and Contribution to the Existing Communion 207
II.2.7. Work towards Inter-Confessional Rapprochement and Universal Integration 212
 II.3. The Question of the Adequacy of an Interpretive System for the Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Particular Church Composed of Seven Criteria Delineated from the Documents of the Second Vatican Council	 232
II.3.1. Methodological Evaluation of the System 232
II.3.2. Theological Evaluation of the System 243
 III. VERIFICATION OF THE SEVEN-POINT SYSTEM VIA ITS PRACTICAL APPLICATION TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE VISION OF THE ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION OF THE KYIVAN CATHOLIC CHURCH EMANATING FROM THE PAPERS OF THE KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP	 254
III.1. The Question of the Particular Possibility of Applying an Interpretive System to the Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Concrete Particular Church of the Catholic Communion 254

III.2. An Assessment of the Vision of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church as Expressed in the Papers of the Kyivan Church Study Group by Means of the Use of an Interpretative System Composed of Seven Criteria Delineated from the Documents of the Second Vatican Council 266
III.2.1. A Return to Authentic Traditional Roots and the Need for Proper and Organic Ecclesiastical Development in the Kyivan Catholic Church 266
III.2.2. Theological Pluralism and the Particular Theology of the Kyivan Catholic Church 281
III.2.3. Liturgical Latinization and Particular Ways of Liturgical Worship in the Kyivan Catholic Church 294
III.2.4. The Kyivan Catholic Church and the Question of Particular Ecclesiastical Legislation 306
III.2.5. The Kyivan Catholic Church and Her Particular Spiritual Patrimony 336
III.2.6. Mutual Benefits Arising from the Preservation of the Full and Visible Communion of the Kyivan Catholic Church with the Church of Rome 344
III.2.7. The Kyivan Catholic Church and Her Role in the Contemporary Rapprochement Between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches 355
III.3. Some Concluding Reflections on the Legacy of the Kyivan Church Study Group as One that Reveals the Potential for the Catholic Church of Kyiv to Construct Her Ecclesial Identity and Vocation According to Seven Criteria of the Interpretative System Developed Here 386
CONCLUSION 397
BIBLIOGRAPHY 408

ABSTRACT

State of the Problem:

Since the publication of the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, the emphases of the ecclesiology of the Catholic Church have changed. Among other things, the Eastern Catholic Churches, which were once considered inferior to the *ritus praestantior* (more excellent rite) of the Roman Church, are now recognized as Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, with their own liturgical traditions, theology, and disciplines. But because of years of subordination to the Roman Apostolic See, these Churches need a way to assess their ecclesial identity and vocation. These were, and are, compromised by various degrees of inappropriate latinization. Assessing this identity and vocation will be a step towards introducing general reforms in accord with the decrees of Vatican II and later instructions. According to my analysis of the decrees of Vatican II, the Latin Particular Church of the Catholic communion also needs to assess her ecclesial identity and vocation so that she can continue to effectively implement reforms in her own life.

The dissertation aims to do three things:

First, it provides a survey of the historical and theological background of the Council; the Council's principal tasks and major ecclesiological documents concerned with the ecclesial identity and vocation of a Particular Church; and the general reshaping of Catholic ecclesiology in the light of documents of the Council.

Second, using pertinent documents of the Council and the reflections of Catholic theologians, it presents an original interpretative system for evaluating the ecclesial identity and vocation of any given Particular Church of the Catholic communion (Eastern or Western) through the use of seven interdependent criteria. These are

1. A return to the authentic traditional roots of a particular tradition and the need for proper and organic reform within a given Particular Church;
2. Restoration and development of a particular theology;
3. Restoration and development of particular ways of liturgical worship;
4. Restoration and development of particular ecclesiastical legislation;
5. Restoration and development of a particular spiritual patrimony;
6. Preservation of and contribution to the already existing communion of the Particular Churches;
7. Work towards inter-confessional rapprochement, inter-religious dialogue and universal integration.

Third, it will demonstrate how the interpretative system composed of seven criteria delineated from the documents of Vatican II can be verified by its practical application to the assessment of the concrete vision of the ecclesial identity and vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church as it was presented and explained by the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox members of the ecumenical body known as the Kyivan Church Study Group.

Methods:

The first part of the dissertation (chapter I) is largely descriptive and synthetic in method, describing the history and significance of major ecclesiological documents concerned with the ecclesial identity and vocation of a Particular Church. In particular, *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, are the focus. The teachings in these documents reshaped Catholic ecclesiology and serve as a firm foundation for the elaboration of seven criteria of my original interpretative system that emanates from the letter and spirit of Vatican II.

The second part (chapter 2) considers the question of an ecclesial identity and vocation *per se*, and especially that of a Particular Church. It then briefly analyzes previous attempts at a systematic analysis of these questions, and creatively proposes the above-mentioned interpretative system with seven criteria for assessing of the present ecclesial development of a given Particular Church of the Catholic communion. It also considers the adequacy of the system and gives both a methodological and theological evaluation of the latter.

The third part (chapter 3) employs the tools of the practical hermeneutical method and proposes a “case study,” evaluating the ecclesiological discussions that took place among Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs and theologians in the course of the seven theological consultations of the Kyivan Church Study Group. These discussions managed to reveal the potential for the Kyivan Catholic Church to construct her ecclesial identity and vocation according to seven criteria of my interpretative system.

Main Points and General Conclusions:

In this dissertation, I propose an original system in light of which both Eastern and Western Particular Churches of the Catholic communion can evaluate their ecclesial identities and vocations. With that information they will be able to proceed to the implementation of needed reforms. Such a system and the corresponding reforms are necessary for the Eastern Catholic Churches because, in the course of several centuries of renewed communion with Rome, they lost much of their liturgical, theologico-spiritual, and disciplinary tradition due to a desire to emulate Roman Church. This system will help each of these Churches return to their authentic roots, restore and develop their particular

theologies, ways of liturgical worship, ecclesiastical legislation and particular spiritual patrimony. Just as importantly, the system calls for balance so that these reforms preserve and contribute to the already existing communion of the Particular Churches and advance the union of all Churches. The system will also help the Latin Particular Church of the Catholic communion in its ongoing efforts at reform. This will also assist in ecumenical efforts.

An important difference of my system, as opposed to those that I have considered in my survey, is that it is designed specifically with Vatican II's ecclesiology of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, both Western and Eastern, in mind. Also, my system's balance among the notions of return to authentic traditions, concerns of already existing communion and possibilities for future rapprochement is key. I propose that all seven points are of equal value, and must be kept in balance in order to be effective.

Such a system will allow each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, Western and Eastern, to assess their own ecclesial identity and vocation and then reform themselves, especially so that each is better prepared to serve in the quest for Church unity. This then will assist in the general ecumenical efforts of the Catholic Church with regard to the Eastern Orthodox and the Western non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities. This will also better prepare the Catholic Particular Churches to take up the task of carrying on the "new evangelization." For the Eastern Catholic Churches this is of special importance. Note also that prior to Vatican II they were not allowed to be involved in missionary efforts. The Latin Particular Church is, of course, also very concerned about how best to effectively conduct the "new evangelization." In the current thesis I have already made a first attempt at practical application of my interpretative system to the

evaluation of one specific vision of the contemporary ecclesial development of the Particular Catholic Church of Kyiv as it was presented by the members of the Kyivan Church Study Group. I hope that, inspired by the unique contribution of this dissertation, other scholars will be able to use my system so as to assess many other aspects of the lived ecclesial experience of the Kyivan Catholic Church as well as the ecclesial identities and vocations of the other Particular Churches of the Catholic communion.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following unified list includes biblical and patristic sources; the documents of Vatican II as well as their schemata; other Church documents; the names of Vatican II Commissions and other ecclesiastical organizations, as well as the titles of periodicals.

- AA - *Apostolicam Actuositatem*: Vatican II's Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (18 November 1965).
- AAS - *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*: Official organ of the Roman Holy See and of the Vatican City State that contains the lists of Roman appointments and all principal public documents issued by the popes (Vatican City: Vatican Polygot Press, 1909-).
- AFER - *African Ecclesiastical Review* (Eldoret, Kenya: AMECEA Pastoral Institute, 1959-).
- AG - *Ad Gentes*: Vatican II's Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity (7 December 1965).
- AP1 - *Annuario Pontificio* (Pontifical Yearbook): the annual directory of the Roman Apostolic See.
- AP2 - *Aeterni Patris*: Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter on the Restoration of Christian Philosophy (4 August 1879).
- APC1 - Ante-Preparatory Commission (established on 17 May 1959 by Pope John XXIII in order to gather recommendations from the bishops, superior generals, Roman decasteries, and Catholic universities, so as to prepare an agenda for the coming Council).
- APC2 - *Ad Petri Cathedram*: John XXIII's Encyclical Letter on Truth, Unity and Peace in a Spirit of Charity (29 June 1959).
- AUP - *Aeternus Unigeniti Pater*: First schema of the future Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (drafted by a sub-commission of the Theological Preparatory Commission, *De Doctrina Fidei et Morum* by the time of the conciliar discussion that took place from 1 to 6 December 1962).
- CC - *Cum Compertum*: Monitum (Instruction) of the Holy Office (now Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) on the Ecumenical Movement (5 June 1948).
- CCEO - *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*: The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches (18 October 1990).
- CD - *Christus Dominus*: Vatican II's Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church (28 October 1965).
- CIC83 - *Codex Iuris Canonici* (25 January 1983).
- CIC17 - *Codex Iuris Canonici* (27 May 1917).
- CN - *Communio Notio*: Letter of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion (28 May 1992).
- CPC - Central Preparatory Commission of the Second Vatican Council (established on 5 June 1960).
- CS - *Cleri Sanctitati*: Pope Pius XII's Motu proprio (2 June 1957).
- DA - *Doctoris Angelici*: Pope Pius X's Motu proprio (29 June 1914).

- DAS - *Divino Afflante Spiritu*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on Promoting Biblical Studies (30 September 1943).
- DDFM - *De Doctrina Fidei et Morum*: Sub-commission of the Vatican II's Theological Preparatory Commission (established on 27 October 1960 in order to compose the first schema of the future conciliar Dogmatic Constitution on the Church).
- DE - *De Ecclesia*: Shortened form from the official Latin title of the Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* — *Constitutio dogmatica de ecclesia*. The term *De Ecclesia* is frequently used as a provisional title of any major document concerning theology of the Church promulgated by any Council (for example, Vatican I's *Pastor Aeternus* or Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium*). *De Ecclesia* was also the official name of one of the sub-commissions of the Preparatory Theological Commission of Vatican II (established in February, 1963).
- DEC - *De Unione Christianorum*: 10 articles derived from the schema *De Ecclesiae Unitate* that constituted the basis for the second part of the future Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* (added to the schema *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* by Cardinal Amleto Cicognani on 29 March 1963).
- DEO - *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus*: Schema of the future Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* (drafted by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches and discussed by the council fathers from 15 to 20 October 1964).
- DEOC - *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus Catholicis*: Title of the last schema of the future Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* (promulgated with a two month *vacatio legis* on 21 November 1964).
- DEU - *De Ecclesiae Unitate - Ut omnes unum sint*: One of three schemas initially intended to become the basis for the future conciliar *Decree on Ecumenism* that was drafted by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches and was later incorporated into Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* (composed between summer 1960 and winter 1961 and discussed by the council fathers from 25 to 31 November 1962).
- DH - *Dignitatis Humanae*: Vatican II's Declaration on Religious Freedom (7 December 1965).
- DI - *Dominus Iesus*: Declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church (6 August 2000).
- DIM - *Divinum Illud Munus*: Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter on the Holy Spirit (9 May 1897).
- DO - *De Oecumenismo*: Shortened form from the official Latin title of the Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* — *Decretum de oecumenismo*.
- DV - *Dei Verbum*: Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation (18 November 1965).
- EC - *Ecclesia Catholica*: Monitum of the Holy Office (20 December 1949).

- EM - *Euntes in Mundum*: Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter on the Celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of the Kyivan Rus' (25 January 1988).
- EP - *Etsi Pastoralis*: Pope Benedict XIV's Apostolic Constitution on Italo-Greeks (26 May 1742).
- ES - *Ea Semper*: Pope Pius X's Decree regulating Greco-Catholic life in the United States of America (14 June 1907).
- FD - *Fidei Donum*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on the Present Condition of the Catholic Missions, Especially in Africa (21 April, 1957).
- GE - *Gravissimam Educationis*: Vatican II's Declaration on Christian Education (28 October 1965).
- GS - *Gaudium et Spes*: Vatican II's Pastoral Constitution on Church in the Modern World (7 December 1965).
- HG - *Humani Generis*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter Concerning Some False Opinions Threatening to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine (12 August 1950).
- HS - *Humanae Salutis*: Pope John XXIII's Apostolic Constitution Announcing the Second Vatican Council (25 December 1961).
- IM - *Inter Mirifica*: Vatican II's Decree on the Instruments of Social Communications (4 December 1963).
- IS - *Instructio Super Aliquibus Ritibus Graecorum*: Pope Clement VIII's Preverbis (30 August 1595).
- KCSG - Kyivan Church Study Group (8 August 1992 – 20 April 1996): The unofficial ecumenical body consisting of hierarchs and theologians from the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.
- LG - *Lumen Gentium*: Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (21 November 1964).
- LU - *Lugduni in Urbe*: Pope Paul VI's Letter to Johannes Cardinal Willebrands (5 October 1974).
- MA - *Mortalium Animos*: Pope Pius XI's Encyclical Letter on Religious Unity (6 January 1928).
- MC - *Mystici Corporis Christi*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on the Mystical Body of Christ (29 June 1943).
- MD - *Mediator Dei*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on the Sacred Liturgy (20 November 1947).
- ME - *Mysterium Ecclesiae*: Declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Defence of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church (24 June 1973).
- NA - *Nostra Aetate*: Vatican II's Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to the Non-Christian Religions (28 October 1965).
- NRSV - *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard* (first published in 1989).
- OD - *Orientalium Dignitas*: Pope Leo XII's Apostolic Letter on the Churches of the East (30 November 1894).
- OL - *Orientalium Lumen*: Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter to mark the centenary of *Orientalium Dignitas* of Pope Leo XIII (2 May 1995).
- OO - *Orientalium Omnes*: Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on the Three

- Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reunion of the Ruthenian Church with the Apostolic See (23 December 1945).
- OR - *L'Osservatore Romano*: Vatican's newspaper that covers all the Pope's public activities and prints official documents after being released (Vatican City, 1961-).
- OT - *Optatam Totius*: Vatican II's Decree on Priestly Formation (28 October 1965).
- PA - *Pastor Aeternus*: Vatican I's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ declaring the infallible character of the papal *ex cathedra* pronouncements (18 July 1870).
- PAL - *Postquam Apostolicis Litteris*: Pope Pius XII's Motu proprio (9 February 1952).
- PC - *Perfectae Caritatis*: Vatican II's Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of the Religious Life (28 October 1965).
- PCEC - Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches (established on 5 June 1960).
- PG1 - Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed., *Patrologia Graeca // Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*: An edited collection of writings by the Christian Church Fathers and various secular writers, in the ancient *koine* or medieval variants of the Greek language (contains 161 volumes, published in 1857-1866).
- PG2 - *Praeclara Gratulationis*: Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter in the Reunion of Christendom (20 June 1894).
- PL - Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed., *Patrologia Latina // Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*: An edited collection of the writings of the Latin Church Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, in Latin (contains 217 volumes, published in 1844-1855).
- PO - *Presbyterorum Ordinis*: Vatican II's Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (7 December 1965).
- PS - *Postquam Sanctissimus*: Sacred Congregation of Studies's Decree of Approval of Some Theses Contained in the Doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas and Proposed to the Teachers of Philosophy (27 July 1914).
- QCM - *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore*: Pope Pius IX's Encyclical Letter on (10 August 1863)
- QP - *Quanti Pensieri*: Pope Paul VI's Homily at the Vatican Basilica Dedicated to the First Anniversary of the Closing of the Second Vatican Council (8 December 1966).
- SC1 - *Satis Cognitum*: Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter on the Unity of the Church (29 June 1896).
- SC2 - *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (4 December 1963).
- SC3 - *Sacri Canones*: Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Constitution for the Promulgation of the New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches (18 October 1990).
- SC4 - *Sister Churches*: Note of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the Expression "Sister Churches" (30 June 2000).
- SCD - *Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus*, 4 vol. (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis, 1962-1963).

- SD - *Studiorum Duce*m: Pope Pius XI's Encyclical Letter on Saint Thomas Aquinas (June 29 1923).
- SDDE - *Schema Decreti de Oecumenismo*: Schema of the future Vatican II's Decree on Ecumenism (drafted by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity on 22 April 1963 and discussed by the council fathers from 18 November to 2 December 1963).
- SDL - *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*: John Paul II's Apostolic Constitution for the Promulgation of the New Code of Canon Law (25 January 1983).
- SDM - *Superno Dei Nutu*: Pope John XXIII's Motu proprio establishing the preparatory commissions and secretariats for the Second Vatican Council (5 June 1960).
- SE - *Syllabus Errorum*: Document issued by the Roman Holy See under Pope Pius IX condemning all major errors of the modern world (8 December 1864).
- SF - *Salvete Fratres*: Pope Paul VI's Discourse on the Opening of the Second Session of the Second Vatican Council (29 September 1963).
- SL - *Sacrae Laudis*: Pope John XXIII's Apostolic Exhortation Asking for Prayer for the Approaching Council (6 January 1962).
- SPCU - Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (established by Pope John XXIII on 5 June 1960 as one of the preparatory commissions for the Council)
- SSPX - Society of Saint Pius X: International Priestly Society founded by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre on 1 November 1970.
- SVS - Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press
- TPS1 - *The Pope Speaks*: Bimonthly journal of recent papal letters, addresses, and other major Church documents translated into English (Washington D.C., 1954-).
- TPC2 - Theological Preparatory Commission of the Second Vatican Council (established on 5 June 1960).
- UCAF - Ukrainian Christian Academic Fellowship: Ukrainian ecumenical organization established on 11 March 2005 with the aim to restore the activity of the Kyivan Church Study Group and to promote the ecumenical movement in Ukraine.
- UR - *Unitatis Redintegratio*: Vatican II's Decree on Ecumenism (21 November 1964).
- US - *Unam Sanctam*: Pope Boniface VIII's Bull On the Unity and Power of the Church (18 November 1302).
- UUS - *Ut Unum Sint*: Pope John Paul II's Encyclical Letter On Commitment to Ecumenism (25 April 1995).
- WCC - World Council of Churches: International Christian ecumenical organization founded on a merger of the Faith and Order and Life and Work Movements that took place on 23 August 1948 in Amsterdam. Subsequent mergers were with the International Missionary Council in 1961 and the World Council of Christian Education in 1971. The organization is currently based in Geneva, Switzerland.

ALA-LC
The American Library Association and the Library of Congress
Romanization Table
Transliteration Scheme for the Ukrainian Script

Vernacular	Romanization	Vernacular	Romanization
Upper case letters		Lower case letters	
А	A	а	A
Б	B	б	b
В	V	в	v
Г	H	г	h
Ґ	G	ґ	g
Д	D	д	d
Е	E	е	e
Є	Ie	є	ie
Ж	Zh	ж	zh
З	Z	з	z
И	Y	и	y
І	I	і	i
Ї	İ	ї	i
Й	İ	й	i
К	K	к	k
Л	L	л	l
М	M	м	m
Н	N	н	n
О	O	о	o
П	P	п	p
Р	R	р	r
С	S	с	s
Т	T	т	t
У	U	у	u
Ф	F	ф	f
Х	Kh	х	kh
Ц	Ts	ц	ts
Ч	Ch	ч	ch
Ш	Sh	ш	sh
Щ	Shch	щ	shch
Ь	‘ (soft sign)	ь	‘ (soft sign)
Ю	Iu	ю	iu
Я	Ia	я	ia

INTRODUCTION

In his book *The Church*, one of the most prominent Catholic theologians of modern times, Hans Küng, underlined that authentic work towards inter-confessional rapprochement, as well as any attempt directed towards better realization of the Church's inner ecclesial nature and mission, should always “start in one's own Church, but with the other Churches in mind.”¹ In line with this insight, I believe that it is not really possible for a member of a given communion of Churches (Catholic, for instance) to become fully conscious of his or her genuine Catholic identity without an adequate understanding of the ecclesial identity and vocation² of his or her own Particular Church (Latin, Melkite, Coptic, Maronite, Chaldean, and so on).³

¹ Hans KÜNG, *The Church*, trans. by Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden (London: Burns and Oates, 1967), p. 287.

² In the same way as the Second Vatican Council, which was thoroughly dedicated to the clarification of the “ecclesial nature” and “ecclesial mission” of the Catholic Church, never formally defined the above-mentioned terms in a concise manner, I also find it difficult to present an all-encompassing definition of this study's often used concepts of a Particular Church's “ecclesial identity” and “ecclesial vocation” that fully correspond to the just indicated concepts of Vatican II. For that reason, I found it appropriate to reserve as many as two separate sub-chapters of the present study that will be focused precisely on the explanation of a number of various aspects and dimensions that are essential for constructing the very notion of an “ecclesial identity” *per se* in its inter-connection with the concept of “ecclesial vocation” especially when they are applied to the ecclesiastical life of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion (see subsections II.1.1. and II.1.2.). The “ecclesial identity and vocation” that derives its roots from the identity and vocation of Christ is an overly complex reality that simultaneously incorporates in itself the divine and human as well as static and dynamic elements that allow it to speak about past, present, and future identities. For the time being, it will be enough to designate the “ecclesial identity and vocation” of a Particular Church as her own self-understanding and the ability to incarnate this self-understanding into her own lived ecclesiastical experience. In the subsequent pages of this dissertation, I am going to explain that in order to come closer to a clearer response to the questions: “who you are” and “who you are for others,” which are the most fundamental for ecclesial identity and vocation, a Particular Church of the Catholic communion would have to rediscover the origins of her own ecclesiastical Tradition. This would entail developing her own approaches to theology, spirituality, liturgy, and legislation in such a way that it will allow her to find her own place in the inter-ecclesiastical relations that are ultimately directed towards re-integration of the entire world into the Kingdom of God.

³ By the term “Particular Church” I understand a Church of the Catholic communion with her own traditional roots, theology, liturgy, legislative system, spirituality, as well as with her own hierarchical structure headed by a Patriarch, Major Archbishop or Metropolitan. The new Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches designated “Particular Church” by the new term, *Ecclesia sui iuris* (CCEO c. 27), which has been translated into English in a number of different ways, e.g. “Autonomous Church” (John FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance: According to the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* (New

The present dissertation is devoted to the search for a Particular Church's identity and mission, more specifically to elaborating criteria for determining whether a Particular Church is developing its identity and mission in a way consonant with the most recent teaching of the Catholic Church. Once these criteria have been presented, I then turn to a specific moment in the life of one Church, that is, my own Kyivan Catholic Church (that "moment" being the Kyivan Church Study Group) in order to apply – as a system – the aforementioned criteria to its proceedings. Consequently, my dissertation almost equally treats the general principles shared by all of the Catholic Particular Churches as well as the problematic of my own Church. The latter is undergoing a significant process of maturation in ecclesial consciousness,⁴ and it is this exciting process that has inspired me to undertake the work at hand.

The last two decades became perhaps the most important turning point in the entire history of the Kyivan Catholic Church.⁵ In 1989, after forty-three years of suppression and

York: Saint Maron Publications, 1992), pp. 140-143) or "Church of her own legal standing" (Ivan ŽUŽEK, "The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris in the Revision of Canon Law," in Rene LATOURELLE, ed., *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, vol. 3 (New York: Paulist Press, 1988-1989), pp. 288-304). Nevertheless, the newer terms seem to be too limited, restricting the rich heritage of the various Churches of the Catholic communion to only one facet of their ecclesial nature, namely their juridical structure (FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 149). Therefore, for the purposes of my further analysis of an authentic Particular Catholic Church's identity and mission built on the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council, I am going to hold to the older term, "Particular Church," which was quite extensively employed by the documents of Vatican II and seems to be more accurate in designating the multidimensionality of the ecclesial nature and mission of any of the Churches of the Catholic communion (John FARIS, *The Communion of Catholic Churches: Terminology and Ecclesiology* (Brooklyn N.Y.: Diocese of Saint Maron, 1985), pp. 13-100). For further explanation of the terms *Ecclesia Particularis*, *Ecclesia Localis*, *Ritus*, *Ecclesia ritualis sui iuris* and *Ecclesia sui iuris*, see sections I.4.4. and II.2.4. of this thesis.

⁴ In the past the name of Ukraine's capital was transliterated as *Kiev*. This form became customary for English usage and corresponds to the Church-Slavonic and contemporary Russian spelling. However, in my dissertation I am going to hold to the transliteration that corresponds with the official language of the country in which the city is located today. This is the official transliteration used by the Ukrainian government and, hence, the most logical choice. This is also the official policy of *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*. See Andriy CHIROVSKY, "The Liberating Character of the Truth," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 7.

⁵ In the first few centuries after its establishment in 988, the Kyivan Church defined herself as *the Kievan Metropolitanate*. Consequently, her early primates used the title *Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'* (Andrei

severe persecution, this, the largest Eastern Church of the Catholic Communion, emerged from the underground and initiated the process of her⁶ gradual decriminalization and legalization.⁷ From the moment she emerged from the catacombs, the Catholic Church of Kyiv recovered most, though not all, of her previously confiscated properties.⁸ After the triumphal homecoming in 1991 of her Primate, His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal (Lubachivsky), from Rome to his flock in L'viv (Ukraine), the Kyivan Catholic Church managed to rebuild her basic structures. She convoked several Church Councils and Synods of bishops, created new eparchies and exarchates, reorganized Patriarchal, Metropolitan and Eparchial commissions and administrations, established thousands of parishes and dozens of monasteries, reopened and founded the Church's own mass media, printing

PLIGUZOV, "On the Title 'Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'," in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15 (1991), pp. 340-353). Byzantine sources generally referred to Constantinople's Northern ecclesiastical province using the term *Rus' Metropolis* (John MEYENDORFF, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 75). After the Florentine Union the Kyivan Church found herself in a state of partition into the so-called *Northern and Southern Metropolitanate*, or *Russia Superior* and *Russia Inferior* following the flow of the Dnipro river. The Southern Metropolitanates that resided in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth took on the nomenclature *Metropolitan of Kiev, Halych and all Rus'*. In 1807 (two centuries after the Union of Brest), Pope Pius VII re-established the *Metropolitanate of Halych* granting her primates a new title, *Metropolitan of Halych, Archbishop of L'viv, and Bishop of Kamianets'-Podil'sk* (Athanasius VELKY, ed., *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1955), pp. 315-18). In 1774, the Habsburg emperors Maria Teresa and Joseph II began to use the term *Griechisch-Katholisch* in designating the "united" Ruthenians. Consequently, the title of the Church has been changed into *the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church*. Recently, the journal *Logos* and many scholars have rendered this in English as *Greco-Catholic Church*, because in the Ukrainian language the term appears as *Українська Греко-Католицька Церква* [Ukrains'ka Hreko-Katolyts'ka Tserkva], not *Українська Грецька Католицька Церква* [Ukrains'ka Hrets'ka Katolyts'ka Tserkva]. In Kyivan Catholic communities outside Ukraine the Church's name was shortened to *the Ukrainian Catholic Church* (Andriy CHIROVSKY, "A Note on Terminology," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 7). Despite the fact that this title reflects an understanding of the Church as an ethnic branch of Catholicism, its usage remains official up to the present day (Andriy CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 112-113). Nevertheless, for centuries many members of this Church still maintained a Kyivo-Galician consciousness and a self-understanding as being the Church of Kyiv (Ibid., p. 92).

⁶ In my thesis I am going to use the older form of referring to the Church as "she" and "her" instead of the modern "it" or "its" in order to underline that the Church is a living reality and, therefore, is better referred to in personal rather than neuter terms.

⁷ Bohdan BOCIURKIW, "The Re-Emergence of the Eastern Catholic Church in Ukraine," in *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), pp. 14-18.

⁸ Serge KELEHER, "Out of the Catacombs: The Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine," in *Religion in Communist Lands* 19 (Wint. 1991), pp. 251-255.

houses, charitable organizations, lay movements, and so on. Within just a few years, the Catholic Church of Kyiv reopened her old institutions of secondary and higher theological education and continues to establish new ones.

Probably the most significant achievement of the Church's process of revival was the re-establishment of the Greco-Catholic Theological Academy of L'viv in its new ecumenically oriented incarnation as the L'viv Theological Academy. In 2002 this Academy was transformed into the Ukrainian Catholic University, the first such institution in the history of the Kyivan Catholic Church.

At present, the Kyivan Catholic Church is attempting to delineate the basic principles of Eastern Catholic theology,⁹ prepares herself for the promulgation of her own particular Canon Law, and is making her first steps towards participation in ecumenical dialogue with the Orthodox Churches.¹⁰ A few years ago her current Head, His Beatitude Lubomyr Cardinal (Husar), transferred his administration to Kyiv, the capital of the Ukrainian state and the cradle of its Christian Tradition.¹¹ In the nearest future he expects the official recognition of his Patriarchal dignity and consequent elevation of his Church to the level of a Patriarchate.

It is difficult not to be impressed by the accomplishments that were attained by the Kyivan Catholic Church in the last decade of the twentieth century. However, along with her great successes, the Church has also faced serious difficulties and questions regarding her ecclesial self-identification.¹² Since there is no all-embracing and wide-ranging

⁹ Several articles on this subject have been published in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 13-107.

¹⁰ Ihor SHABAN, "Ekleziolohichni priorityty Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs'koi Tserkvy [Ecclesiological Priorities of the Kyivan Church Study Group]," in *Kovcheh* 3 (2001), p. 448.

¹¹ Mykhaïlo DYMYD, Petro DIDULA, "Patriarshyï Sobor i proholoshennia Patriarkhatu [The Patriarchal Council and Proclamation of the Patriarchate]," in *Patriarkhat* 4 (2002), pp. 12-13.

¹² CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," pp. 119-123.

agreement on criteria for an assessment of ecclesial development within the Kyivan Catholic Church, she finds herself in a state of ecclesiological confusion. Despite the fact that her hierarchy at the most recent synods and conferences has formulated a certain ecclesiological vision regarding the Church's identity and vocation, the Kyivan Catholic Church remains divided into several camps with their own (often conflicting) perspectives regarding her canonical status, ecclesiology, liturgy and spirituality.¹³

These divisions, as might be expected, derive in part from the fact that the history of the Kyivan Catholic Church has often been used and abused towards various ends. Thus, a large number of contemporary Kyivan Catholic historians and theologians are still struggling with problems related to the necessity of establishing a firm balance between ecclesial and national identity, between canonical particularity and political independence and so forth.¹⁴

As noted above, for almost half of the twentieth century the Kyivan Catholic Church was hampered in her ecclesial development owing to harsh persecutions by the militantly atheistic Soviet regime. Consequently, many of the astounding changes that transpired after 1989 occurred spontaneously, without any far-reaching plan, without seeking any *ressourcement* in the early roots of Kyivan Christianity, and without a clear understanding of an authentic vocation of the Church in the present-day world.

Hostile to Catholicism in general, and to Eastern Catholic Churches in particular, Soviet authorities, starting in 1946, continuously forced Kyivan Catholic clergy and faithful

¹³ Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, "Rozdumy odnoho myriany na nad problemoiu ekumenizmu [Reflections of a Layman on the Problem of Ecumenism]," in Zenoviy ANTONIUK and Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Znaky Chasu* [The Signs of the Time] (Kyiv: Sfera, 1999), pp. 495-501.

¹⁴ Sophia SENYK, "The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church Today: Universal Values Versus Nationalist Doctrines," in *Religion, State and Society* 30:4 (2002), pp. 317-332.

into “reunification” with the Russian Orthodox Church. Not surprisingly then, in the course of her revival, the Kyivan *Catholic* Church did not pay enough attention to the concerns of the emerging Kyivan *Orthodox* Churches. So far, she has also been confused with regards to a clear understanding of her own place in the larger context of the contemporary dialogue among the divided parts of the Christian world.¹⁵

The whole process of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s legalization, and especially her recovery of previously confiscated properties, provoked harsh conflicts with the Russian Orthodox Church¹⁶ and became one of the main pretexts for the contemporary Catholic-Orthodox controversy over the issue of “uniatism.”¹⁷ Some Orthodox theologians and

¹⁵ Nataliia KOCHAN, “Chy Mozlyvyi Pravoslavno-Katolyts’kyi Dialoh v Ukraïni v Realiakh 90-kh Rokiv? [Is Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue Possible in the Realities of the Nineties of the 20th Century in Ukraine?]” in ANTONIUK and MARYNOVYCH, *Znaky Chasu*, p. 479.

¹⁶ Dimitriy POSPIELOVSKY, “The Eastern Rite Catholics and the Orthodox in Today’s Ukraine,” *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), pp. 19-21.

¹⁷ Theodore ZISSIS, “Uniatism: A Problem in the Dialogue Between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics,” in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 35 (Spr. 1990), pp. 21-31. Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos explains the term “uniatism” as a “fraudulent union deceiving the simple people, whereby one who unites himself with the Latin Church, accepts the primacy of the Pope and the entire doctrine of the Latin Church on the one hand, but on the other preserves his own liturgical order and some of his own usages and customs according to the Jesuit axiom ‘unité dans la foi, variété dans les rites’ (unity in faith, diversity in the rites) in order that those united be assimilated into the Latin Church gradually and not abruptly” (Chrysostom PAPADOPOULOS, *Nature and Character of Uniatism* (Athens, 1928), p. 18 [in Greek], cited in Gennadios LIMOURIS, *Aide Mémoire on “Uniatism:” A Concise Historical-Theological Study* [Provisional Text—Not for Publication] (Geneva: World Council of Churches, July 1992), pp. 3-4). The founding director of the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, Fr. Andriy Chirovsky and the former President of the Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchal Society (USA), Roma Hayda explicate “uniatism” as an “ill-defined term that has been used to describe everything from a self-romanizing attitude on the part of Eastern Catholics to ecclesiological approaches by which one Church proselytizes members of another” (Andriy CHIROVSKY, ROMA HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group: An Ecumenical Dialogue Team for Our Times,” in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 72:37 (2004), p. 9. The article was first published in *Patriarchate* 5 (384), 2004). The Freising Statement of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches designates “uniatism” as indicating the “effort which aims to bring about the unity of the Church by separating from the Orthodox Church communities Orthodox faithful without taking into account that, according to ecclesiology, the Orthodox Church is a sister-Church which itself offers the means of grace and salvation” (sec. 6, par. b. The full text of the Freising Statement, in English translation, appears in *One in Christ* 26 (1990), pp. 362-365). The Freising statement fails to acknowledge that the Orthodox have engaged in the same sort of soteriological exclusivism.

Church leaders question the very existence of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Consequently, they await the day when these Churches will simply disappear.¹⁸

These realities, as well as many other external and internal factors, compel the Kyivan Catholic Church to redefine her status within the Catholic Church, to find her own place in the ecumenical movement, to rediscover her authentic historical roots in Kyivan Christianity, and to clarify her ecclesial identity through her own approaches to theology, spirituality, liturgy and canonical tradition. From this perspective, the search of the Kyivan Catholic Church for her identity is a quest that demands careful ecclesiological clarification and a serious theological reevaluation. In order to delineate her future development and in order to find her genuine place in the ecumenical dialogue, the Kyivan Catholic Church needs to come to a clear understanding of her ecclesial role and vocation.

At this point we must emphasize the following: a certain amount of what has just been said about one specific Particular Church of the Catholic communion, the Kyivan Catholic Church, is equally applicable to many other Eastern Catholic Churches. In the course of their history, many of these Churches of the Catholic communion were subordinated to various powerful Christian centers, each with their own ecclesiological models. After the reunification of these Churches with the Roman Apostolic See, they became, on the one hand, deprived, for the most part, of the opportunity to develop their own ecclesiological thinking.¹⁹ On the other hand, in certain historical periods – owing to socio-economic and political factors – these Churches were simply not up to the task of demonstrating any creativity. Consequently, adequate criteria for the expression of their

¹⁸ Myroslaw TATARYN, “Russian Orthodox Attitudes Towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church,” in *Religion in Communist Lands* 17 (Wint. 1989), pp. 313-331.

¹⁹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 84.

ecclesial identities as Churches within the communion of Catholic Churches were not well elaborated and remain to this day rather ambiguous.

With regard to her ecclesial self-identification, even the Latin Church, which was formed in entirely different historical circumstances, has also faced a number of ecclesiological challenges. It was not easy for this Church, which for many centuries identified herself with the Church of Christ,²⁰ to adopt her new ecclesiological self-perception as one of many Churches of the Catholic communion, sharing absolutely equal rights and dignity with the rest of the Catholic Churches (*OE* 2-6, 10).²¹ At the same time, certain Latin Catholics were not really prepared to give up their previous ecclesiology based on soteriological exclusivism²² and a highly defensive ecclesial mentality²³ hostile both to internal changes²⁴ and to external dialogue across very definite ecclesiastical boundaries.²⁵ Vatican II's stress on the understanding of the Church as a mystery (*LG* 3, 5, 8; *SC* 2), the people of God (*LG* 9, 11-13, 16-17), a sacrament (*LG* 1, 9, 48; *SC* 5; *AG* 1-5; *GS* 3-9) and

²⁰ Joseph RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 1966), p. 69 and Avery DULLES, *The Dimensions of the Church: A Postconciliar Reflection* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1967), p. 31.

²¹ John MADEY, *Ecumenism, Ecumenical Movement and Eastern Churches* (Kottayam, India: Oriental Institute of Religious Studies Publications, 1987) p. 15 and Clemente RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo: la 3a sessione del Concilio Ecumenico* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1965), p. 139.

²² Christian soteriological exclusivism (best expressed by the famous patristic formula *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*) is the belief that "there is salvation only for Christians." ("Exclusivism," in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, at <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/197844/exclusivism#tab=active~checked%2Citems~checked&title=exclusivism%20--%20Britannica%20Online%20Encyclopedia>, accessed on 5 July 2008). Catholic soteriological exclusivism is based on the theological viewpoint according to which the faith of other religions and even of other Christian denominations does not lead to eternal life.

²³ Hans KÜNG, *The Living Church: Reflections on the Second Vatican Council* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1963), pp. 400-401.

²⁴ Clement PUJOL, "The Care and Organization of Particular Churches (Second Vatican Council, Decree 'Orientalium Ecclesiarum' n. 4)," in Jacob VELLIAN, ed., *The Malabar Church: Symposium in Honour of Rev. Placid Podipara C.M.I.* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970), p. 215.

²⁵ Alan SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge: Why Just "Being Catholic" Isn't Enough Anymore* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Publications, 1991), p. 203.

communion (*LG* 23; *UR* 4, 17; *OE* 3, 5)²⁶ encouraged the entire Catholic Church to reform her ecclesial life,²⁷ to change her previous apologetic attitude towards other Christian Churches,²⁸ and to open herself to the contemporary world.²⁹ Yet, many Latin as well as Eastern Catholic hierarchs and theologians regarded this change of emphasis in Catholic ecclesiology as a threat to the ecclesial integrity of their respective Churches and an obvious sign of dangerous “modernism” that put at risk all the important values of traditional Catholicism.³⁰

In spite of discreet signs of progress, it would not be an exaggeration to say that up to the present moment most of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, including the Latin Church,³¹ have not yet achieved sufficient clarity with regard to the basic principles of their further development and ecclesial orientation, especially as regards ecclesial identity and vocation.³² Therefore, I propose in this dissertation to search for an answer to these fundamental questions: What are adequate criteria for an assessment of a Particular Catholic Church’s ecclesial identity; Where can these criteria be found; and What

²⁶ Avery DULLES, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), p. 27 and Nikos NISSIOTIS, “The Main Ecclesiological Problem of the Second Vatican Council and the Position of the Non-Roman Churches Facing It,” in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 2:1 (1965), p. 34.

²⁷ Hans KÜNG, *The Council and Reunion*, trans. by Cecily Hastings (London: Sheed and Ward, 1962), pp. 50-51 and DULLES, *The Dimensions*, pp. 28-30.

²⁸ Giuseppe ALBERIGO, “The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II,” in Leonard SWIDLER and PIET FRANSEN, eds., *Authority in the Church, and the Schillebeeckx Case* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), p. 129.

²⁹ Gregory BAUM, “The Self-Understanding of the Roman Catholic Church at Vatican II,” in George JOHNSTON and Wolfgang ROTH, eds., *The Church in the Modern World: Essays in Honour of James Sutherland Thomson* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967), p. 86.

³⁰ George TAVARD, “Vatican II, Understood and Misunderstood,” in *One in Christ* 27:3 (1991), p. 220.

³¹ Meletius WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” in William MCDONALD, editor-in-chief, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 12 (New York, Saint Louis, San Francisco, Toronto, London, Sydney: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), p. 515.

³² Andriy CHIROVSKY, “Orthodox in Communion with Rome: The Antinomic Character of Eastern Catholic Theology,” in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), p. 78.

is their theological significance for the contemporary development of all of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion?

The criteria indicating the authenticity of the Church's ecclesial nature and mission, though "visible from a distance," "cannot be read with objective impartiality as though they were street numbers."³³ Consequently, the task of delineating these criteria, the choice of which, of course, has to be theologically grounded, is not going to be easy.³⁴

This explains why, before moving to the second chapter, where I actually treat the principles directed towards the clarification of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity and vocation, I need to devote some attention to the ecclesiological context of the Second Vatican Council.³⁵ Context, as is frequently noted, *is text*. Thus, if the overview of the history and theological shifts of the Second Vatican Council presented in the first chapter of this thesis at first seem less relevant to the present project, one should keep in mind that for someone of my generation – and background – Vatican II is not recent history. In my case in particular, many of my Ukrainian seminary professors had not read all of the conciliar documents until the early 1990s! Besides, even in the West, those under 35 do not have the same instinctive sense of the Council as those who are older. Consequently, demonstrating that I have actually attained a sufficient understanding of the Council's history and overall ecclesiology is not, I believe, irrelevant.

The search for adequate criteria for the assessment of the ecclesial identity of the Catholic Particular Churches in documents almost fifty years old may also require some explanation. Note, however, that most of the Council's decisions and ecclesiological

³³ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 265.

³⁴ Robert SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1985), p. 118.

³⁵ Robert SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997), p. 64.

guiding principles, especially regarding the Eastern Catholic Churches, were not adequately addressed by the Roman Curia after the Council and not fully put into practice by most of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion themselves.

If we turn our attention to the implementation of the decisions of Vatican II in the life of one of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, the Catholic Church of Kyiv, we notice at least two contrasting tendencies. On the one hand, in the first years following the Second Vatican Council it seemed that the ecclesiological transformations introduced by the conciliar documents would cause significant and immediate changes in the life of the Kyivan Catholic Church. Many of the Kyivan Catholic hierarchs and theologians welcomed the promulgation of the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*, which clearly emphasized that all the Churches of the Catholic Communion “enjoy equal dignity” and are bound by the same “duty to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules.”³⁶ Also, the appreciation of the Council for a distinctive Eastern Catholic worldview and praxis, as well as its clear emphasis on the importance of particularity in the Church, raised new expectations among Kyivan Catholics for a definitive resolution of the issue of a Kyivan-Galician Patriarchate,³⁷ an idea that had been discussed with a great deal of vigor in previous centuries.³⁸ On the other hand, one of the greatest problems with regard to reception of the Second Vatican Council in the Kyivan Catholic Church was caused by an overemphasis upon national and political factors in the Church. Such factors were entirely out of place in the context of the contemporary Catholic

³⁶ *OE* 5, in Norman TANNER, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), p. 902.

³⁷ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 116.

³⁸ Jean MADEY, *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien: Vers la Perfection de l'État Juridique Actuel* (Rome: Opera Theologicae Societatis Scientificaе Ucrainorum, 1971), pp. 81-92.

ecclesiology introduced by the conciliar documents.³⁹ Many of the members of the Kyivan Catholic Church, including some hierarchs and theologians, unfortunately, did not fully comprehend the spirit of the Council and concentrated their thinking inordinately on narrow questions of authority in the Church. Consequently, for quite a long period of time after the Council, a great many of the broader ecclesiological themes raised by the documents of Vatican II were simply overlooked.

In the West the majority of Kyivan Catholics were involved in internal discords over issues related to politics and nationalism.⁴⁰ In the Church's motherland, her clergy and faithful were harshly persecuted and victimized by the Soviet government for a quarter-century after the Council.⁴¹ Thus only after the legalization of the Greco-Catholic Church in Ukraine did the question of a clear understanding of her ecclesial identity and vocation become an issue of primary importance.⁴² And as noted above, a struggle continues between several camps in the Kyivan Catholic Church that so far have failed to come to an agreement on the basic principles of the Church's ecclesial development.⁴³

At this point we should note that, in addition to the Vatican II decrees, principles well-suited to the adequate assessment of a particular ecclesial identity can also be found in the decisions of local Church councils or synods of bishops of a given Particular Church. However, if we are searching for an interpretive system composed of a certain number of criteria that can be equally applied to any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, including the Latin Church, then we are compelled to look to documents

³⁹ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 118.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 118.

⁴¹ Peter GALADZA, "The Reception of the Second Vatican Council by Greco-Catholics in Ukraine," in *Communio: International Catholic Review* 27:2 (2000), pp. 324-329.

⁴² CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 84.

⁴³ MARYNOVYCH, "Rozdumy odnoho myrianyna," p. 495.

composed by the representatives of all of these Churches.⁴⁴ The last time that all of the Catholic bishops – speaking on behalf of their respective Particular Churches – gathered together was at Vatican II. This gathering became a “Council of the Church about the Church.”⁴⁵ Therefore, its documents is naturally the best place to look for the most relevant criteria testing the state of contemporary ecclesial development taking place in different Particular Churches of the one and the same Catholic communion of Churches.

With regards to the comprehensiveness of the Council, Karl Rahner and Hans Küng, wrote that it became the “first really all-encompassing ecumenical Church assembly,”⁴⁶ which clearly manifested that

all the Churches have a right to be represented with their particularities that have to be integrated in the Catholic Church as a whole. The Council represents biblical koinonia that does not consist merely of a centralist orientation of everyone toward a visible organization center, but is above all a brotherly communion with each other. The Council has also to take under consideration concerns of even those who do not participate in a council, not without the fault of the Catholic Church.⁴⁷

Of course, non-Catholic observers might certainly pose many questions regarding the ecumenicity of Vatican II.⁴⁸ However, the apparent openness of the Council towards all Christian Churches and ecclesial communities seems to demonstrate that the council fathers representing the entire Catholic Church were “led by the Spirit” in the hope that their

⁴⁴ Hans KÜNG, *Structures of the Church* (New York: T. Nelson, 1964), pp. 39-40.

⁴⁵ Karl RAHNER, *The Church After the Council*, trans. by D. Herron and R. Albrecht (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1966), p. 38.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴⁷ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 39.

⁴⁸ Nikos NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council Really Ecumenical?” in *The Ecumenical Review* 16:4 (1964), pp. 357-377.

“decisions will not be refused even in the context of ecumenical rapprochement.”⁴⁹ In fact, many Orthodox hierarchs⁵⁰ and theologians sincerely believed that the “values of all Eastern Churches” were represented at the Council by the “Eastern Churches united with Rome.”⁵¹ Despite the fact that most of the Eastern Catholic hierarchs were not prepared to take an active part in the lively conciliar discussions, some of the more prominent figures within Eastern Catholicism, such as Melkites Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh), Archbishops Elias (Zoghby) and Neophytos (Edelby), as well as Kyivan Catholics Metropolitan (later Major Archbishop) Josyf (Slipyj) and Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk) demonstrated a high level of “responsibility of their respective ecclesial communities for the Church of our age”⁵² and very considerably contributed to the elaboration of the major ecclesiological documents of the Council.⁵³

All together, the Eastern and Western Catholic bishops present at Vatican II managed to change the entire ecclesiological self-perception of the Catholic Church.⁵⁴ The

⁴⁹ Jean Marie Roger TILLARD, *The Bishop of Rome*, trans. by John de Satge (Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1983), p. 48.

⁵⁰ In January 1964, in the context of the pilgrimage of Pope Paul VI to the Holy Land, there also took place a fraternal meeting between Patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras I and Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV, during which Patriarch Athenagoras expressed his immense gratitude to all the Eastern Catholic bishops for representing Eastern Orthodox ecclesiological viewpoints at the Second Vatican Council. He said as much in his “Mandement patriarcal à l’occasion de son départ pour le Concile oecuménique,” in *Proche-Orient chrétien* (October-December 1962), pp. 348-351. See also Werner BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism: History of the Decree,” in Herbert VORGRIMLER, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 5 (Freiburg: Herder and Herder, Palm Publishers, 1967), p. 140-141. Alexander SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches: A Response,” in Walter ABBOTT, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, trans. by Joseph Gallagher (New York: America Press, 1966), pp. 140-141.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 140. See also Alexander SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches: A Response,” in ABBOTT, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 387.

⁵² John MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches and Its Ecumenical Importance,” *Diakonia*, 7:3 (1972), p. 223.

⁵³ Bernard LEEMING, *The Vatican Council and Christian Unity: A Commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council, Together With a Translation of the Text* (London, Darton: Longman & Todd, 1966), p. 160.

⁵⁴ Avery DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism: Current Challenges in the Theology of Church* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), pp. 132-153 and Karl RAHNER, *Ecclesiology, Questions in the Church, the Church in the World* (London: Longman & Todd, 1976), pp. 116-134.

emphasis on the institutional dimension of the Church was toned down by the stress on an understanding of the Church as “a mystery that finds its highest model and source in the unity of the persons of the Trinity”⁵⁵ and “a complex reality comprising a human and a divine element.”⁵⁶ The Council built its decisions on the principles of an ecclesiology of communion⁵⁷ reflecting an understanding that the Church has to be perceived as “a sacrament of intimate union with God and the unity of all humanity.”⁵⁸

The power of the Roman Pontiff, so strongly underlined by the First Vatican Council, was moderated by the emphasis on collegiality.⁵⁹ Thus, Vatican II’s *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* acknowledges that “episcopal conferences can today make a manifold and fruitful contribution on the concrete application of the spirit of collegiality.”⁶⁰ Vatican II also underlined the significance of establishing a proper balance between “the common priesthood of the faithful” and “the ministerial” or “hierarchical priesthood”.⁶¹ Consequently, the laity was recognized as an equally important part of the Church.

The restoration of unity among all Christians also became “one of the principal concerns of the second Vatican synod.”⁶² It was acknowledged that “the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the church itself can exist even outside of the visible boundaries of the catholic church.”⁶³ Particular

⁵⁵ UR 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 909.

⁵⁶ LG 8, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 854.

⁵⁷ UR 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908.

⁵⁸ LG 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 849.

⁵⁹ Herwi RIKHOT, “Vatican II and the Collegiality of Bishops: A Reading of *Lumen Gentium* 22 and 23,” in James PROVOST and Knut WALF, eds., *Collegiality Put to the Test*, trans. by James Bowden (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 71-94.

⁶⁰ LG 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 868.

⁶¹ LG 10, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 857.

⁶² UR 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908.

⁶³ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

attention was dedicated to the “special position”⁶⁴ of the Eastern Orthodox Churches and their faithful who, in accordance with the Council’s *Decree on Ecumenism*, “cannot be accused of the sin involved in the separation.”⁶⁵ Orthodox Christians, previously perceived as “schismatics,” were identified by the Second Vatican Council as “sisters and brothers” upon whom “the catholic church looks with respect and love.”⁶⁶

Another important change in Catholic ecclesiology was a clear acknowledgement of the fact that the Catholic Church should not be identified with the Latin Church alone. It was recognized by the documents of the Second Vatican Council that the Catholic Church consists of various “individual churches, both of the east and the west.”⁶⁷ The Council’s *Decree Orientalium Ecclesiarum* underlined that all the Churches of the Catholic communion should “enjoy equal dignity, so that none of them ranks higher than the others by reason of rite, and they enjoy the same rights.”⁶⁸ The same document expresses “due esteem and rightful praise” for the “ecclesiastical and spiritual heritage” of the Eastern Catholic Churches that has to be regarded “as the heritage of the whole church of Christ.”⁶⁹

Orientalium Ecclesiarum authoritatively encouraged the development of an ecclesiology of self-governing Churches⁷⁰ and in a special way promoted a re-awakening among the Eastern Catholic Churches of a self-awareness as Churches rather than simply ecclesiastical provinces or ethnic branches of Catholicism.⁷¹ Despite confusion in the usage

⁶⁴ UR 14-17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 916-918.

⁶⁵ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

⁶⁶ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910. See also Andriy CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches”: Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content,” in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 396-421.

⁶⁷ OE 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

⁶⁸ OE 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

⁶⁹ OE 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁷⁰ OE 5, 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902, 903.

⁷¹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 209-224.

of certain ecclesiological terminology,⁷² the Council at the same time manifested great respect for the rich spiritual and canonical heritage of the Eastern Catholic Churches.⁷³ *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* emphasized the importance of the “Patriarchal function” that “has been flourishing in the church from the earliest times.”⁷⁴ The Patriarchal office was clearly defined by the Second Vatican Council as a “traditional form of government” in the Eastern Churches.⁷⁵ What is more, the Council expressed its “earnest desire that where it is necessary new patriarchates be set up.”⁷⁶

All that has been just said leads me to the conclusion that most of the great changes in Catholic ecclesiology that took place at the Second Vatican Council came about as a result of the constructive strivings of the entire Catholic episcopate to realize more clearly of the Catholic Church’s authentic ecclesial “nature and universal mission” incarnated in the “particular circumstances” of the contemporary world.⁷⁷ Without a doubt, all of the conciliar documents can be regarded as being thoroughly ecclesiological in their contents.⁷⁸

Nevertheless, for the purposes of my analysis, which concentrates mainly on the possibility of assessing a Particular Church’s ecclesial identity and vocation, I am compelled to limit my special attention to only three documents of Vatican II, namely its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, its *Decree on Ecumenism*, and the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*. Very soon after their official promulgation, these documents

⁷² There is not enough clarity about the usage of the terms “Church” and “Rite.” In *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* these terms are often presented as identical. For example: *OE* 3, 10, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901, 903. In sub-sections I.3. and III.2.4. of my thesis I will try to clarify the significant difference between various approaches to understanding the above-mentioned terms. It is my suggestion that the term “Church” has much broader ecclesiological content in comparison with the term “Rite,” which in the past was often used simply in order to designate a particular way of liturgical worship.

⁷³ *OE* 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

⁷⁴ *OE* 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁷⁵ *OE* 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903.

⁷⁶ *OE* 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903.

⁷⁷ *LG* 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 849.

⁷⁸ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 86.

were evaluated by a large number of theologians of different theological and even confessional backgrounds. Among these were Joseph Ratzinger,⁷⁹ Timothy and Patrick O’Connell,⁸⁰ Bonaventure Kloppenburg,⁸¹ Kevin McNamara,⁸² Thomas Stransky,⁸³ Bernard Leeming,⁸⁴ Lorenz Jaeger,⁸⁵ Meletius Wojnar,⁸⁶ and Victor Pospishil,⁸⁷ to name only a few. Nevertheless, even without a methodical study of all of these commentaries, one readily discerns a number of crucial guiding principles⁸⁸ presented by *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* that can and should be applied to the contemporary ecclesial development taking place in the Catholic Church in general, as well as in the autonomous Churches of the Catholic communion in particular.

As a result of a focused reading of the three above-mentioned conciliar documents, I have identified seven basic principles or criteria for an assessment of a contemporary Particular Church’s ecclesial identity. These documents underline the importance of the revitalization of particular theologies, spiritualities, liturgies as well as canonical legacies,⁸⁹ and, at the same time, encourage all the Particular Churches to return to the genuine roots

⁷⁹ Joseph RATZINGER, “The Ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council,” in *Communio* 13:3 (1986), 239-252.

⁸⁰ Timothy O’CONNELL, ed., *Vatican II and Its Documents: An American Reappraisal* (Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1986), pp. 3-160 and Patrick O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Dublin: Scepter, 1965), pp. 3-29.

⁸¹ Bonaventure KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*, trans. by Matthew O’Connell (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1974), pp. 1-373.

⁸² Kevin McNAMARA, ed., *The Church: A Theological and Pastoral Commentary on the Constitution on the Church* (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1983), pp. 3-437.

⁸³ Thomas STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council: A New Translation by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, With a Commentary* (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965), pp. 7-43.

⁸⁴ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, pp. 19-254.

⁸⁵ Lorenz JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism: The Council’s Decree*, trans. by Hilda Graef (London: G. Chapman, 1965), pp. 3-242.

⁸⁶ Meletius WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental Catholic Churches,” in *The Jurist* 25 (1965), pp. 173-255.

⁸⁷ Victor POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum, The Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches of the II Council of Vatican: Canonical-Pastoral Commentary* (Bronx, N.Y: Fordham University, John XXIII Center for Eastern Christian Studies, 1965), pp. 5-72.

⁸⁸ OE 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

⁸⁹ See Peter GALADZA, “What is Eastern Catholic Theology?: Some Ecclesial and Programmatic Dimensions,” in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 114-115.

of their respective Traditions, to strengthen their relations within the Catholic Communion and to develop themselves with attentiveness to the demands of Catholic-Orthodox *rapprochement*.

The following is a list of the aforementioned criteria:

1st Criterion: The Necessity of the Return to Authentic Traditional Roots and the Possibility of Proper and Organic Ecclesial Development. The significance of the return of all Particular and especially Eastern Churches to the roots of their own Traditions, which does not exclude the possibility of a proper and organic development of their respective legacies, is emphasized by the documents of the Second Vatican Council in numerous places and in several different ways. One of the most typical references to this important criterion for an assessment of an authentic ecclesial identity can be found in the sixth paragraph of the Council's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*:

All eastern Christians should know and be certain that they may and should always preserve their own lawful liturgical rites and way of life, and that *changes should be made only by reason of their proper and organic development* [my emphasis]. All these things are to be observed with the greatest fidelity by the eastern Christians themselves. They should indeed, from day to day, acquire greater knowledge of these matters and more perfect practice of them and if for reasons or circumstances, times or persons they have fallen unduly short of this *they should have recourse to their age-old traditions* [my emphasis].⁹⁰

2nd-5th Criteria: Revitalization of a Particular Church's Theology, Liturgy, Legislation, and Spirituality. The next four criteria, underlining the importance of the traditional particularities as integral parts of an authentic identity of the Particular Churches

⁹⁰ OE 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

of the Catholic communion, are usually mentioned by the documents of the Second Vatican Council all together:

(i) *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* states that various Particular Churches,

while maintaining the unity of faith and the unique divine constitution of the universal church, enjoy their own *discipline*, their own *liturgical usage* and their own *theological* and *spiritual patrimony* [my emphasis].⁹¹

(ii) In the 4th and 17th paragraphs of the Council's *Decree on Ecumenism*, we read:

All in the church must preserve unity in essentials. But let all, according to the gifts they have received, maintain a proper freedom in their various forms of spiritual life and discipline, in their different liturgical rites, and even in their theological elaborations of revealed truth. In all things let charity prevail. If they are true to this course of action, they will be giving ever better expression to the authentic catholicity and apostolicity of the church.⁹²

This Synod thanks God that many eastern daughters and sons of the Catholic Church, who preserve this [Eastern] heritage and wish to express it more faithfully and completely in their lives, are already living in full communion with their brothers and sisters who follow the tradition of the west. It declares that all this heritage of *spirituality* and *liturgy*, of *discipline* and *theology*, [my emphasis] in its various traditions, belongs to the full catholic and apostolic character of the church.⁹³

(iii) Strangely, but not surprisingly, the Second Vatican Council's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* explicitly refers to only three of the above-mentioned criteria for an assessment of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity. In the third paragraph, it declares that

⁹¹ LG 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 868.

⁹² UR 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

⁹³ UR 17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 918.

individual churches, both of the east and the west, differ somewhat in what are called rites, such as *liturgy*, *ecclesiastical order* and *spiritual heritage* [my emphasis].⁹⁴

Nevertheless, most contemporary commentators on the Council's documents agree that “spiritual heritage” also incorporates “theology.”⁹⁵ It is a commonplace of the Eastern Christian Tradition that theology and spirituality are not entirely separate. In the second paragraph of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, the fathers of the Second Vatican Council clearly underlined that “the traditions” of each Particular Church have to be “kept whole and entire.”⁹⁶ In my opinion, the wholeness of the Tradition, so eagerly emphasized by the Council, would necessarily include theology alongside spirituality, liturgy and canonical legislation. The general context of the other major conciliar documents bears this out.

6th Criterion: Preservation of the Existing Communion within the Catholic Church.

In its documents on ecclesiology and ecumenism, the Second Vatican Council establishes a firm balance between the principles of unity and diversity in the Church. Making a strong emphasis on the “right” and “duty” of “the churches of both east and west to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules,”⁹⁷ the Council, in its *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* underlines that “various hierarchically linked groups” that “make up the various churches” are “growing together” as one “mystical body of Christ, made up of the faithful who are organically united in the holy Spirit by the same faith and sacraments and by the same government.”⁹⁸ Accordingly, there is “a remarkable

⁹⁴ OE 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

⁹⁵ GALADZA, “What is Eastern Catholic Theology?” p. 64. See also WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 181.

⁹⁶ OE 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 900-901.

⁹⁷ OE 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁹⁸ OE 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

interchange” between various Churches and their traditions, “so that the variety within the church not only does no harm to its unity, but rather makes it manifest.”⁹⁹

The importance of the preservation of internal unity among the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion can be regarded as one of the most fundamental criteria for an assessment of their ecclesial identity, because it safeguards them from staticism and isolation, and at the same time prevents them from the development of complacent and xenophobic tendencies.¹⁰⁰ It also helps each individual Church to open herself to an exchange of the spiritual gifts with all the Churches of the Catholic Communion that all together constitute “the heritage of the whole church of Christ.”¹⁰¹

7th Criterion: Work Towards Inter-Confessional Rapprochement, Inter-Religious Dialogue and Universal Integration. In the course of the contemporary ecclesial development of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, it is extremely important that these Churches take under consideration the concerns of their non-Catholic neighbors. In accordance with the documents of the Second Vatican Council, the search for a distinctive particular identity should not contradict or place any impediments in the way of Catholic-Orthodox or any other ecumenical *rapprochement*. On the contrary, in the words of the 24th paragraph of the Council’s *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*:

To the eastern churches maintaining communion with the apostolic Roman see belongs *the special responsibility of furthering the unity of all Christians, especially eastern Christians* [my emphasis], according to the principles of this synod’s decree on ecumenism, firstly with prayers, then by the examples of their life, religious fidelity towards ancient eastern

⁹⁹ OE 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

¹⁰⁰ CHIROVSKY, “Orthodox in Communion with Rome,” p. 79.

¹⁰¹ OE 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

traditions, better mutual understanding, working together and a sensitive appreciation of realities and feelings.¹⁰²

This thesis proposes to elucidate all seven fundamental criteria for an assessment of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity presented in the documents of the Second Vatican Council in order to find the appropriate ways of their application to the analysis and evaluation of ecclesiastical development taking place in various Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. Similar attempts were undertaken by several other theologians, such as Avery Dulles, who presented a system based on the understanding of different ecclesiological models of the Church¹⁰³ and Robert Schreiter, who concentrated mainly on issues related to the concept of "local theology."¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, none of the mentioned authors approached the subject of the ecclesial integrity of the particular ecclesiastical Tradition by working through the concrete ecclesiological principles delineated in the documents of Vatican II. From this perspective, I can presume that the methodological approach of this dissertation itself, aimed at a clear definition, evaluation and application of the conciliar criteria for an assessment of particular ecclesial identity and vocation, may serve as an important and original contribution to the developing field of a Particular Church's ecclesiology.

Each of the guiding principles underlined by the conciliar documents has its own significance. However, it is an assumption of this dissertation that only all seven criteria combined together can serve as an interpretive matrix for an assessment of the authenticity of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity. In the course of my work, I came to the

¹⁰² OE 24, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 906.

¹⁰³ DULLES, *Models*, 13-192.

¹⁰⁴ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, pp. 117-121 and SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity*, pp. 81-83.

conclusion that there exists an interrelation and interdependence among all of the criteria. None of them can be either underestimated or excluded from the ecclesiological model presented by the documents of the Second Vatican Council. For this reason, a great deal of attention in the second chapter of my thesis will be dedicated to an analysis of the question of the preservation of a proper internal balance between the various criteria for an assessment of an authentic particular ecclesial identity, as well as to the question of the methodological and theological adequacy of the entire interpretive system. It will also be essential to reflect upon the implications of all seven criteria from the perspective of the broader theological context presented by the conciliar documents that, on the one hand, underlined the significance of particularity in the Church and, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of a clearer realization of every Church's vocation to be life-giving and salvific for the entire human race.

In my analysis I will rely on certain tools of the descriptive, synthetic and practical hermeneutical methods which, I hope, will help me articulate the viability and adequacy of the seven criteria as an acceptable interpretive system for the clear identification of the ecclesial status and proper place for each of the Particular Churches within the Catholic communion. I realize that my work will not resolve all existing contemporary ecclesiological problems. Nevertheless, it is my hypothesis and my deep conviction that my interpretive matrix can be successfully applied to an assessment of the authentic ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. Of course, the manner of applying the criteria will considerably differ from Church to Church due to the fact that each of the Churches has her own traditional roots, unique theology,

liturgy, spirituality and legislation, her own partners in ecumenical dialogue, and her own original contribution to the unity of the Catholic Church.

Turning now to the other “pole” of my dissertation, note that the concrete empirical reality of a given Particular Church naturally is a very broad subject. It includes a whole variety of documents, events and historical occurrences, the adequate analysis and evaluation of which cannot be exhaustively accomplished within the scope of one dissertation. What can be achieved, however, is a “case study” – or something analogous to a case study – directed towards a comprehensive treatment of a concrete paradigm of ecclesiological thinking that exists within one of the Churches of Catholic communion, which can reveal the potential for this Church to construct her authentic ecclesial identity and vocation. Therefore, in attempting to demonstrate how exactly my interpretative system can be employed, I decided to apply the seven aforementioned criteria to the clarification of some aspects of the ecclesial identity and vocation of my own Catholic Church of Kyiv. Again, a dissertation cannot study more than a specific set of phenomena – actually, usually one. Thus, as mentioned previously, I was constrained to investigate how ecclesial identity and vocation were understood and explained in the context of the theological consultations between the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs and theologians who participated in the work of the Kyivan Church Study Group (KCSG).¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ The original transliteration of the name of the Group designated as the “Kievan Church Study Group” was later changed by the unanimous decision of its participants the “Kyivan Church Study Group” corresponding to the official transliteration used by the Ukrainian government since 1995. In an effort to avoid possible confusion with regard to transliteration of the name of the Group I will use the abbreviation “KCSG” throughout the whole text of this thesis. The name “Kievan (Kyivan) Church *Study* Group” which was proposed by Fr. Peter Galadza and others at the first meeting of the KCSG in Oxford, was meant to underline the essentially academic status of the Group as well as informal and unofficial character of its consultations. The decision to adopt and to hold on to this name throughout the whole time of the existence of the KCSG was in some measure due to the fact that many of its members, especially those representing Orthodox Churches affiliated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, would simply not agree to participate

The KCSG was a local ecumenical initiative founded in 1992 with the intention “to foster a relationship of love and growing mutual co-operation” between the Kyivan Catholic Church and her Mother-Church of Constantinople. It was hoped that this would be attained by means of “exploration of theological and historical questions” and a first-hand “mutual understanding” based on the renunciation of various “misconceptions on both sides.”¹⁰⁶ Soon after its establishment, the Group agreed to build its work around the context of the Balamand Statement, as well as the previous three Agreed Statements of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church in Munich (1982), Bari (1987), and Valaamo (1988).¹⁰⁷

Despite the fact that the participants of the Group decided “to keep with the informal nature” of their consultations, underlining the position that they “claim no authority to take binding decisions” on behalf of their respective Churches,¹⁰⁸ their efforts were noticed and blessed by leading Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs including the Head of the Kyivan Catholic Church, His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky¹⁰⁹ and the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, His All-Holiness Bartholomew I.¹¹⁰

in the work of the Group if its name would in any degree indicate that the future resolutions of this local ecumenical initiative could be regarded as being ecclesially sanctioned. However, it is also true that the Greco-Catholics approved of this name and the informal and unofficial status that it implied. Both sides saw that such status gave them more freedom to explore innovative ecclesiological ideas without looking over their shoulders for approval from ecclesiastical authorities at every step. The formal and official dialogue seemed to be crippled by precisely such limitations.

¹⁰⁶ KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP, “Kievan Church Study Group: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), p. 268.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

¹⁰⁹ Myroslav-Ivan LUBACHIVSKY, “Pastyr’ske zvernennia Blazhennishoho Myroslava-Ivana Kardynala Liubachiv’skoho pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov [Pastoral Letter of His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky on the Unity of the Holy Churches],” in *Kovcheh* 2 (2000), pp. 477-478 and Basil LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks of Bishop Basil (Losten), First Stamford Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group, October, 1992,” in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), p. 358.

¹¹⁰ Meliton KARAS, “Letter to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos (18 February, 1994),” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 425-427 and Losten, “Opening Remarks,” p. 358. At this point it is important to note that none of the above mentioned Catholic or Orthodox Church leaders including the Head of the UGCC in their letters addressed to the KCSG entrusted the bishops and theologians participating in the consultations of the Group

During the four years of its existence, the KCSG carried out seven unofficial consultations in Oxford (United Kingdom), Stamford (Connecticut, USA), Ottawa (Ontario, Canada), Chevetogne (Belgium), Rome (Italy), and Istanbul-Halki (Turkey).¹¹¹ The Group's yield consisted of three documents and thirty-six papers and responses delivered by the hierarchs and theologians (of various ethnic backgrounds) from the Kyivan Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.¹¹² All three documents, regarding the composition, aims, and purposes of the KCSG,¹¹³ the initiative of the Church of Antioch¹¹⁴ and the Ariccia working draft,¹¹⁵ as well as the revised texts of twenty-seven papers and responses were published in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*¹¹⁶ and *Eastern Churches Journal: A Review of Eastern Christendom*.¹¹⁷

During the seven unofficial consultations, the participants of the KCSG raised a large number of ecclesiological issues related to an understanding of the historical past and the contemporary development of their respective Churches in the new context of the Catholic-Orthodox *rapprochement*.¹¹⁸ Special attention was dedicated to the fundamental notion of the Church as a Communion of Churches¹¹⁹ that does not require any merger of

with any ecclesiastical mandate to arrive at certain historic decisions or to speak in the name of the highest authorities of their respective Churches. Therefore, they merely expressed their desire to encourage and to bless the efforts of the KCSG as an important ecumenical initiative without any indication that they would necessarily support and ratify the outcome of the work undertaken by the KCSG.

¹¹¹ Taras HRYNCHYSHYN, "Do istorii Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy [Towards a History of the Kyivan Church Study Group]," in *Kovcheh* 3 (2001), pp. 438-439.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 425.

¹¹³ KCSG, "KCSG: Compositions, Aims, and Purposes," pp. 268-270.

¹¹⁴ KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP, "Kievan Church Study Group Statement on Church of Antioch Initiative," in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 73-74.

¹¹⁵ KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP, "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft by the Kievan Church Study Group: Meeting in Ottawa, April 21-23, 1993," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 79-81.

¹¹⁶ *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 8-199; 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 355-463; 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 77-256; 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 125-164.

¹¹⁷ *Eastern Churches Journal: A Review of Eastern Christendom* 3:3 (1996), pp. 7-22, 73-74.

¹¹⁸ SHABAN, "Ekleziolohichni priorytety Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy," pp. 448-462.

¹¹⁹ Andriy CHIROVSKY, "Union of the Holy Churches of God: A Response to Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 33.

different Church structures¹²⁰ and should be built on the principles of Eucharistic ecclesiology.¹²¹

In their deliberations, the members of the KCSG: discussed their shared vision of the Church¹²² and different approaches for understanding primacy;¹²³ investigated historical reasons for the estrangement between the Kyivan Metropolitanate and the Patriarchate of Constantinople;¹²⁴ reflected on the various possibilities for a restoration of full and visible communion between the Kyivan Church and her Mother-Church of Constantinople;¹²⁵ analyzed and evaluated significant ecclesiological presuppositions of the Second Vatican Council's Decrees, *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*,¹²⁶ the new *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*¹²⁷ as well as the agreed statements of the contemporary Catholic-Orthodox theological dialogue in Freising, Ariccia and Balamand.¹²⁸

The Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG dedicated considerable attention to the existential problem of the Kyivan Catholic Church's self-identification.¹²⁹ They demonstrated their awareness of the guiding principles for the development of the Eastern

¹²⁰ LOSTEN, "Opening Remarks," p. 361.

¹²¹ Kallistos WARE, "Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: 'Towards an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church'," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), p. 127 and CHIROVSKY, "Union of the Holy Churches of God," p. 33.

¹²² Kallistos WARE, "The Church of God: Our Shared Vision," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 10-29 and CHIROVSKY, "Sister Churches," pp. 396-421.

¹²³ Basil LOSTEN, "Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 201-236, Basil LOSTEN, "The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 70-106 and Myroslaw TATARYN, "Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 117-143.

¹²⁴ Borys GUDZIAK, "How Did They Drift Apart? The Kievan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 43-66.

¹²⁵ Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, "Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?" in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 152-171, "Mediate' and 'Nearly Perfect' Communion?: Towards Full Communion," in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 7-22; "Divisions and Healing: Brest and Beyond," in *Logos* 36 (1995), pp. 133-151.

¹²⁶ Boniface LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later: Reflections on Vatican II's *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 364-387.

¹²⁷ Andrew ONUFERKO, "The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: Ecclesiological Presuppositions," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 133-168.

¹²⁸ Serge KELEHER, "The Freising, Ariccia and Balamand Statements: An Analysis," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 427-463.

¹²⁹ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," pp. 83-123 and Peter GALADZA, "Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism: Losing the *Koiné* of *Koinonia*," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 173-194.

Catholic Churches delineated by the Second Vatican Council.¹³⁰ In their papers and responses, the Kyivan Catholic hierarchs and theologians stressed that in order to find her own proper place in ecumenical dialogue, the Kyivan Catholic Church needs to rediscover her authentic historical roots in Kyivan Christianity, to redefine her status within the Communion of Catholic Churches and to clarify her ecclesial identity with special attentiveness to the development of her own approaches towards theology, spirituality, canonical and liturgical tradition.¹³¹

One of the most significant moments within the discussions of the KCSG was closely related to the issue of clear ecclesiological terminology.¹³² Already during the first consultation in Oxford, the participants of the Study Group chose to use the term, “Kievan (later Kyivan) Church,” which best reflects the common ecclesial roots of both the Orthodox and Catholic successors of the Kyivan Christian tradition. The decision of the KCSG to identify their respective Churches as “Kyivan” was also based on hopes for a restoration of full and visible communion between the divided parts of Kyivan Christianity.¹³³

The term “Kyivan Church” in the future may become the best and most acceptable name of the united Church that derives its sources from the ancient Kyivan Metropolia. Unfortunately, for the time being we can only speak of the “Kyivan Catholic” and “Kyivan Orthodox” Churches. But the term “Kyivan Catholic Church,” that will be extensively used in the third chapter of this dissertation, certainly seems so far to be one of the most adequate ways of self-identification for the Catholic Church of the Kyivan tradition as a

¹³⁰ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 364-387 and CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 114-115.

¹³¹ SHABAN, “Ekleziolohichni priorytety Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koi Tserkvy,” pp. 448-459.

¹³² CHIROVSKY, “The Liberating Character of the Truth,” pp. 4-7; “A Note on Terminology,” p. 7.

¹³³ HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koi Tserkvy,” p. 421.

Church, and not simply as a Rite, an ecclesiastical province or an ethnic branch of Catholicism.

Note, however, that so far the terms “Kyivan Catholic” and “Kyivan Orthodox,” introduced by some of the participants of the KCSG, have not appeared in any theological dictionary. Nonetheless, their reflections with regards to these names for the Churches of the Kyivan tradition have had an immense influence on the contemporary Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church (UGCC).¹³⁴ With each passing year, the term “Kyivan Catholic Church” more and more often appears in various scholarly publications. The use of this title has been supported by most of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic bishops as well as by the representatives of the entire Church gathered at one of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s Patriarchal Councils in 2002. A large number of contemporary Ukrainian Greco-Catholic hierarchs and theologians are also in favor of the use of the term “Kyivan Catholic Church” because it seems to be the best way of emphasizing the particular character of a Church that is fully aware of its origins and ecclesial vocation.

However, apart from ever-increasing interest in the use of the term “Kyivan Church,” the influence of the KCSG on the contemporary development of the Catholic Church of Kyiv remains minimal. For the most part, the ecclesiological dimensions within the discussions of the Group influenced only some scholars in the fields of ecclesiology and ecumenism.¹³⁵ Two unpublished major papers on the Kyivan Church Study Group that

¹³⁴ As I already mentioned, there is a certain terminological inadequacy with regard to the use of the contemporary official title of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church that emphasizes ethnicity instead of the ecclesiological significance of this Church, which is much better expressed by the title the Kyivan Catholic Church. Nevertheless, I will employ both of these names (including the abbreviation UGCC) in my thesis for the reason that both of them are concurrently used by most of the participants of the Kyivan Church Study Group. Their papers are going to become one of the most important focuses of my further analysis in the third chapter of the thesis.

¹³⁵ HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koï Tserkvy,” p. 417.

were written ten years ago and defended in Ukraine and Poland deserve special attention. One of the above-mentioned papers was written by a graduate of the L'viv Theological Academy, Taras Hrynchyshyn, as his Bachelor's thesis towards the fulfillment of the requirements of the Ecclesiastical Bachelor's Degree in Theology.¹³⁶ The other paper was written by another Ukrainian student, Ihor Shaban, as a Master's thesis emanating from a Master's seminar on Orthodox theology at the Catholic University of Lublin (Poland).¹³⁷

In their works, Hrynchyshyn and Shaban dedicate much attention to the genesis and history of the KCSG. They also make the first attempts at an analysis and evaluation of some of the important ecumenical dimensions within the discussions of the Group. Both works were equipped with an acceptable scholarly apparatus and demonstrated an overt dedication to historical and theological objectivity. Extracts from the above-mentioned works have been published in *Kovcheh*, the journal of the Institute of Church History at the Ukrainian Catholic University.¹³⁸

This dissertation differs considerably from previous scholarly efforts, which for the most part are aimed at an elucidation of the historical role of the KCSG in the context of ecumenical dialogue between the Kyivan Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. The focus of the third chapter of my thesis is the ecclesiological reflections within the KCSG, rather than the achievements of the Group in the field of ecumenism. I will concentrate mostly on the papers and responses presented by the Catholic participants of the Group, with special attentiveness to the questions related to the

¹³⁶ Taras HRYNCHYSHYN, *Studiina Hrupa Kyivs'koï Tserkvy: Istoriia ta otsinky* [The Kyivan Church Study Group: History and Evaluations] (Unpublished B.Th. Thesis, L'viv, Ukraine: L'viv Theological Academy, 2000).

¹³⁷ Ihor SHABAN, *Eklezjologiczne Poszukiwania Grupy Studyjnej Kosciola Kijowskiego* [Ecclesiological Searches of the Kyivan Church Study Group] (Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Lublin, Poland: Lublin Catholic University, 2000).

¹³⁸ HRYNCHYSHYN, "Do istorii Studiinoï Hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy," pp. 417-447 and SHABAN, "Ekleziolohichni priorityty Studiinoï Hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy," pp. 448-462.

clarification of an ecclesial identity for the Kyivan Catholic Church. I will also try to examine and evaluate in what way the criteria for assessing authentic Eastern Catholic ecclesial identity delineated by the documents of the Second Vatican Council have had direct or indirect influence on the ecclesiological thinking of the Kyivan Church Study Group, revealing the potential for the contemporary ecclesial development of the Kyivan Catholic Church.

In the course of my work on this thesis, which consists of three large chapters (organized in such a way that my original interpretative system – the primary object of study presented in the second chapter – is augmented by the treatment of its roots in the first chapter, and the issue of its practical application in the third chapter), I first of all reflect upon the principal task and major ecclesiological documents of the Second Vatican Council, concerned in one way or another with the ecclesial identity and vocation of a Particular Church. I focus as well on one of the most crucial conciliar shifts of emphasis from the uniformity of “universalistic ecclesiology” to the development of the concept of “unity in diversity” and the understanding of the Church as a “communion” of Particular Churches that influenced the process of the reshaping of Catholic ecclesiology.

In my opinion, as noted above, such a lengthy introduction to the main topic of this thesis (addressed in the second chapter) is needed because many Eastern Catholics up to the present day fail to fully apprehend and receive many of the Council’s vital insights, especially with regard to the understanding of the Catholic Church as a communion of Particular Churches. It is also my contention – again stated previously – that without this study of context, my further presentation and analysis of the criteria directly connected with the ecclesiological viewpoints expressed in the pertinent documents of Vatican II might

appear to be lacking a firm grounding in contemporary Catholic ecclesiology which evolved so significantly precisely due to the achievements of the Second Vatican Council.

The second chapter – the most creative part of the whole thesis – is dedicated to the elaboration of an original interpretative system composed of seven interdependent criteria enunciated by the documents of the Second Vatican Council. This system, according to my hypothesis, may well serve as one of the best methodological approaches for the assessment of the ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion.¹³⁹

The third chapter of the thesis, for the most part focused on the theological deliberations emanating from the Kyivan Church Study Group, may seem to introduce a new major object of study of this thesis. However, as stated above, it plays the role of a much needed “case study,” or something approximating a case study, which reveals how the interpretative system, which remains at the core of the present study, can elucidate the state of the ecclesial development of a concrete Particular Church, namely the Catholic Church of Kyiv.

¹³⁹ As I have already explained, it is impossible to study the full ecclesial self-understanding of each of the many Particular Churches of the Catholic communion in a single thesis. I therefore leave the task of testing the applicability of my seven-point interpretative system to other Particular Churches of the Catholic communion to future studies.

I. THE CLARIFICATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION, AND THE RENEWED APPRECIATION FOR ECCLESIAL PARTICULARITY ELABORATED IN SEVERAL DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II

I.1. The Documents of Vatican II as a Unified Body of Doctrine Concerned Primarily with the Catholic Church's Ecclesial Identity and Vocation

Vatican II promulgated two dogmatic constitutions, two constitutions, nine decrees, and three declarations that covered most of the areas of Christian life and most of the urgent problems facing the Church at the end of the second millennium. Naturally, it would be unrealistic to present an exhaustive analysis of all sixteen conciliar documents within this thesis. Thus, I will limit my investigation to sections of those documents, which elucidate two very crucial aspects of the Council's hermeneutics. The clarification of these two will help me to proceed with the further development of my argument and, at the same time, will hopefully lead to the possibility of arriving at a concise but accurate evaluation of the entire documentary corpus of the Second Vatican Council. The two aforementioned aspects are: 1) the "internal consistency" that emanates from the documents of Vatican II as a unified body of doctrine,¹ and 2) the "subordination" of all the conciliar texts to the Council's greatest concern, which was a reassessment of the Church's inner nature and her salvific mission.²

In spite of the enormous number of topics³ the documents of the Second Vatican Council demonstrated a high level of internal consistency.⁴ However, it was not attained through the juridical fiat typical of the theological pronouncements of the previous General

¹ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, pp. 132-133, and 149-153.

² RAHNER, *The Church After*, pp. 37-38, and DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, pp. 149-150.

³ RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 42.

⁴ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 149.

Councils of the West, but according to Nicholas Arseniev appeared as the result of the readiness of the fathers of Vatican II to accept “a revelation of the power of the Spirit, refreshing, building up, bringing back to the Ultimate Source of inspiration, leading therefore to unity.”⁵ The Russian Orthodox theologian believed that the Council was marked by a spirit of humility combined with “the acute sense of the great sanctity of the treasure entrusted to the Church by God.”⁶ This inspired the council fathers to adopt a radically new and ecumenically positive attitude⁷ allowing them to prepare the believing community for the future⁸ and to bring the hope of salvation to all humanity.

Without a doubt, we can find some inconsistencies that remained even in the final drafts of the Vatican II texts.⁹ One can also detect remnants of the old ecclesiological thinking that had been severely criticized by non-Catholic as well as many Catholic theologians.¹⁰ Nonetheless, these infrequent irregularities do not allow us to disregard or underestimate the incredible theological progress and the thoroughgoing reshaping of Catholicism that took place at the time of the Council. As Gregory Baum wrote in 1967:

The emergence of a new self-understanding is not something purely logical. It does not enter the minds of men imperiously, dethroning the principles of self-understanding that guided their lives in the past. New self-understanding means transition, including elements of growth and conversion. When such a process takes place in an historical community, its crystallization in words and sentences will necessarily be uneven, tentative, groping. The evidence

⁵ Nicholas ARSENIIEV, “The Meaning of Vatican II From an Ecumenical Point of View,” in *Diakonia*, 1:1 (1966), p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷ Nikos NISSIOTIS, “Towards a New Ecumenical Era,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 37 (1985), p. 328.

⁸ Gabor JUHASZ, *Ecclesial “Communio”: The Notion of Ecclesial “Communio” as Expressed in the Vatican II Teachings, the Code of Canon Law, and the Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Ottawa: Saint Paul University, 1995), p. 6.

⁹ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 87.

¹⁰ John MEYENDORFF, “Vatican II: A Preliminary Reaction,” in *St. Vladimir’s Seminary Quarterly* 9:1 (1965), pp. 26-37; Métropolitte DAMASKINOS, “Le vingtième anniversaire du décret “Unitatis Redintegratio,” in *Istina*, 30:2 (1985), pp. 186-190; NISSIOTIS, “The Main Ecclesiological Problem,” pp. 31-62 and NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” pp. 357-377.

for the Catholic Church's new self-understanding at the Vatican Council is, nonetheless, overwhelming.¹¹

In view of the fact that I will be arguing that the Council documents evince seven criteria that can be synthesized into an interpretative system, the question of a certain internal consistency in the documents is particularly relevant.

Another hermeneutical aspect that allows us to explore the documents of the Second Vatican Council as a unified body of doctrine was suggested by Karl Rahner. He noted that while the conciliar constitutions, decrees, and declarations were dedicated to a wide array of subjects, they in fact, present an integral teaching "concerned mainly with theology of the Church."¹² All the significant points stressed in the documents of Vatican II are, in one way or another, subordinated to the Church's renewed ecclesiology, which organically links together everything that was said at the Council.

Each of the conciliar documents, explicitly or implicitly, was aimed at elucidating the Church's essence and purpose by "establishing a hierarchy of ends"¹³ for the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of God. The inner nature and salvific mission of the Church was extensively treated in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* and in the *Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity*. The Church's vocation of sanctifying the Christian community through the Eucharist and other Sacraments was deftly explored in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. The Church's magisterium, how it relates to Tradition, and its role in the formation of Catholic doctrine were treated in the *Dogmatic Constitution*

¹¹ BAUM, "The Self-Understanding," p. 87.

¹² RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 37. Rahner's viewpoint was shared and developed by a large number of contemporary Eastern and Western Catholic ecclesiologists such as Avery Dulles, Gregory Baum and Clement Pujol. See DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, pp. 149-150; BAUM, "The Self-Understanding," pp. 86-123; Clement PUJOL, "The Care and Organization," p. 216.

¹³ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 149.

on *Divine Revelation* and in the *Declaration on Christian Education*.¹⁴ The Church's contribution to the consolidation of all of humanity and her relevance to the contemporary circumstances of life were discussed in depth in the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* and in the *Decree on the Instruments of Social Communication*.¹⁵ The governance of the Church and actualization of the Church's evangelical and apostolic mission directed toward achievement of an "ever greater perfection, both internal and external" became key issues for the Decrees on the *Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church, Ministry and Life of Priests, Priestly Formation*, and *Appropriate Renewal of the Religious Life*.¹⁶ The integration of ordinary believers into the Church's service to pluralistic modern society was carefully considered in the *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity* and in the *Declaration on Religious Freedom*. And last but not least, the Catholic Church's self-understanding as a communion of Particular Catholic Churches and her positive ecumenical attitude towards non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities as well as non-Christian religions, for the first time in history, were treated in the Decrees on the *Eastern Catholic Churches and Ecumenism* as well as in the *Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to the Non-Christian Religions*.¹⁷

The Catholic Church's experience of herself at the Vatican Council and the subsequent doctrinal development that has taken place have profoundly affected the self-understanding of this Church and, consequently, her understanding of her own role in human history. It is not my intention to suggest that this new self-understanding of the Catholic Church pervades the entire Church or that it already determines the policies and attitudes adopted by the ministerial hierarchy, the bishops and the pope. What I do suggest is that the solemn meeting of the bishops and the pope of Rome, during the

¹⁴ RAHNER, *The Church After*, 37.

¹⁵ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 149.

¹⁶ PUJOL, "The Care and Organization," p. 216.

¹⁷ RAHNER, *The Church After*, pp. 37-38.

Vatican Council, made them reflect on their existence as a Church, face a good deal of repressed material of the past, specify their relationship to other men [*sic*], Christian and non-Christian, and seek to reorientate the Church's life to meet the demands of the present age.¹⁸

A theology of the Church and its application to various dimensions of human life thus became the point of departure and the final goal of all of the conciliar documents; their profile was genuinely and thoroughly ecclesiological. This perception of the legacy of the Second Vatican Council corresponds directly to the general objectives of my investigation, oriented as it is towards a clarification of the Church's nature and mission in the light of the Council's teaching.

Before concluding our reflection on the ecclesiological focus of Vatican II, it is crucial that we stress that this "eclesiocentrism" was certainly not intended to be "self-referential." Later in this thesis we will see how ecclesial identity without an all-pervading sense of mission to the world is a contradiction in terms. Karl Rahner aptly summarized this thus:

The Second Vatican Council was a Council of the Church *about* the Church. It was a Council concerned with ecclesiology, the formal study of the Church — with a unity of theme than no previous Council ever had... In any dialogue or discourse, the Church must always consider herself the first and last problem. The very obviousness with which ecclesiology became almost automatically the key theme of the Council shows, therefore, how much man and the Church, with all their ability of reflection and all their responsibilities towards others, uncannily consider themselves to be the ultimate problem... We ask ourselves in dismay whether the Church has nothing more important to speak about than how she understands herself: for she exists not for herself, but for God, for her Lord, for mankind and its destiny. We could answer this question, of course, by saying that the Church speaks about all these fundamental realities and truths when she speaks about herself... Or we could say that because ecclesiology has now suddenly become one of the most vital questions, if not the primary question, among

¹⁸ BAUM, "The Self-Understanding," p. 86.

Christian Churches everywhere and among their theologians, it was only sensible, indeed requisite, that the Catholic Church partake in this ecclesiological dialogue... What the Church says about herself today implies also a recognition of what she intends to be tomorrow. The final question, therefore, is: How, in her life of faith, can the Church best realize all that she said about herself at the Council?¹⁹

Indeed, the Catholic Church's reflection on her own essence and vocation was far from portraying the Church in narcissistic or egocentric terms.²⁰ On the contrary, the reinforced awareness of her genuine ecclesial identity and the clearer realization of her specific vocation within human history²¹ were intended to open the Catholic Church to a more intensive dialogue with the contemporary world and to prepare her "for a fuller understanding of the message of divine revelation and the fulfillment of the will of God."²²

The council fathers were convinced that their exploration of the Church's inner nature and her mission should not be divided as two distinct objectives.²³ It is impossible to discern "what to do" without discovering a clear answer to the question "who am I?" At the same time, there is simply no point in searching for a clear definition of "who you are" if it does not lead to the explicit realization of "what to do." All of the actions undertaken by the Church should necessarily derive their roots from her very essence, that is, from her authentic identity. In turn, the process of the self-identification of the Church should not be closed in on itself, but should encourage the Church to concrete actions directed toward fulfillment of her natural potential.

¹⁹ RAHNER, *The Church After*, pp. 38-41.

²⁰ Stylianos HARKIANAKIS, "The Ecclesiology of Vatican II: An Orthodox Summary," in *Diakonia* 2:3 (1967), p. 238.

²¹ BAUM, "The Self-Understanding," p. 86.

²² HARKIANAKIS, "The Ecclesiology of Vatican II," p. 238.

²³ Vincent SAMUEL, *A Theological Reflection on Evangelization to the Full Realization of the Church As the Universal Sacrament of Salvation According to Lumen Gentium N. 48* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Urbaniana, Faculty of Theology, 1987), p. 103.

The renewed ecclesial self-perception of the Catholic Church and delineation of her salvific mission were not presented by the Council in a systematic doctrinal statement enshrined in a specific chapter or special paragraph of the conciliar texts.²⁴ What did happen is that “throughout all of the documents this new self-understanding expressed itself in many ways, some of which are quite startling, even if, in other parts of these documents, remnants of the Church’s past self-understanding found ample expressions.”²⁵

The council fathers generally demonstrated a zealous unanimity in their new assessment of the Church’s identity. This identity was expressed as “missionary” by its very nature.²⁶ The mission of the Church was understood as an integral part of the Church’s inner essence, stemming from the dynamic hypostatic relations within the Holy Trinity.²⁷ According to the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, from the very beginning of creation the Church was predestined to carry out the Father’s plan of salvation, revealed by the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Son, and accomplished by the Holy Spirit.²⁸ There remained varying and often contrasting attitudes with regard to theological interpretation of the Church’s mission,²⁹ but all attitudes were directed towards the

²⁴ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 97.

²⁵ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 86.

²⁶ The second paragraph of the Council’s *Decree on the Mission Activity of the Church* states that: “The pilgrim Church is missionary by her very nature, since it is from the mission of the Son and the mission of the Holy Spirit that she draws her origin, in accordance with the decree of God the Father.” Compare with *LG 2*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 850.

²⁷ Tai OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion on Mission: Vatican II Ecclesiology of Communion and Its Missionary Implications* (Rome: Pontifical Urban University, 1996), p. 44.

²⁸ *LG 2-8*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 850-855.

²⁹ Most of the Roman Catholic theologians such as Henri de Lubac, Joseph Ratzinger, Edward Schillebeeckx and many others were inclined to think that the primary missionary goal of the Church was “to bring Christ to men.” At the same time, there was also a comparatively smaller group of Roman and Eastern Catholic hierarchs and scholars that received the enthusiastic support of a large number of non-Catholic observers in their understanding of the Church’s vocation as aimed at the “lifting of men up to God.” These two seemingly contradictory positions in fact illustrate the perfect and complementary unity-in-diversity that existed among various interpretations of the Church’s mission at the time of the Council and in the subsequent decades. See Paul McPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1993), pp. 289-290.

achievement of one and the same principal goal of the Church that was “inspired by no earthly ambition” and consisted of the “carrying forward of the work of Christ under the lead of the befriending Spirit.” (GS 3) In the same way that the mission of Christ was to be “the light of all nations,” (LG 1) to “make men [*sic*] sharers in the divine nature,” (AG 3) “to take history up to Himself” and “to summarize it,” (GS 38) the mission of the Church was “to reveal the mystery of God,” (GS 41) to sanctify humanity and “praise God” (SC 10). The Church was to become an “instrumental sign of intimate union with God and of the unity of all humanity” (LG 1). The Church’s apostolate is to be fulfilled by the “spreading of the kingdom of Christ throughout the earth for the glory of God the Father, to enable all men [*sic*] to share in His saving redemption, that through them the whole world might enter into a relationship with Christ.” (AA 2)³⁰

The large number of conciliar statements regarding the Church’s mission manifested the great interest in this theme that had been developing in the years preceding the Council. The council fathers presented a clear dogmatic and pastoral rationale for the very existence of the Church. In the words of John Linnan, the Church was to reveal “Christian life as a specific vocation in the world, different from, but in relation to other vocations generated by other religions and systems of belief.”³¹ From this perspective, the Church’s “supernatural” mission of *evangelization* focused on the “promotion of the glory of God through the coming of His kingdom” and on the “obtaining of the eternal life for all men [*sic*] — that they may know the only true God and Him whom He sent, Jesus Christ” (AA 3). But this could only be accomplished by actualizing the Church’s “natural” mission

³⁰ For a more detailed and extensive record of the specific references regarding the mission of Christ and that of the Church, see KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 98-100.

³¹ John LINNAN, “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church and Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church,” in O’CONNELL, *Vatican II and Its Documents*, p. 59.

of *humanization* aimed at “preparation for the acceptance of the message of the Gospel” (*GS* 57). Taking for granted that the most “intimate vocation” of the Church was to bring everyone to “communication with each other in mutual love and in the praise of the most holy Trinity,” (*LG* 51) the council fathers also emphasized that “earthly goods and human institutions according to the plan of God the Creator are also disposed for man's salvation and therefore can contribute much to the building up of the body of Christ” (*CD* 12). In his analysis of the ecclesiological documents of Vatican II, Bonaventura Kloppenburg accentuated that

the Christian (“supernatural”) vocation does not eliminate the human (“natural”) vocation, and the search for the kingdom of God does not dispense us from earthly tasks... Evangelization cannot simply forget humanization... The two realms or two planes are both ordered to the same goal: the perfected kingdom of God, when God will be all in all. Then, and only then, Church and world will become identical in the kingdom of God. Until then the two advance along distinct paths, each retaining its autonomy, its internal coherence, its own laws. They are like two elements in tension (law of life), but also harmonizing with each other and even penetrating each other (*GS* 40), like the two cities that serve each other in many ways (*GS* 11).³²

The Second Vatican Council thus became a time of intense transformation of theological language and conceptual content pertaining to the very notion of the Church's self-perception. Thus, the term “missions” in the plural has been for the most part replaced by the substantially different idea summed up by the term “mission” in the singular. The predominance of the role played by evangelization has been enhanced by the acknowledgment of the necessity of humanization, the old attitudes towards enculturation

³² KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 101, 105. On the subject of the legitimate belonging of the faithful to the “two cities,” the Church and civil society, see *LG* 36, *AG* 21, *AA* 5, *GS* 40 and 76.

have been supplemented by attentiveness to the riches of local mentalities.³³ From the “world Church” in potentiality, the Catholic Church for the first time in its history officially declared her determination and willingness to become the “world Church” in reality.³⁴ The Council resolutely urged Catholics to undergo the mega-process of ecclesial transition analogous “to the major shifts in perspective required when the Church moved from the Semitic world into the Hellenistic, and from the Hellenistic world into the Latin West.”³⁵ Nothing similar had ever occurred since the emergence of the non-European Catholic Churches.³⁶ Turning from the ecclesiology of the “largely self-imposed ghetto,” the Catholic Church was exhorted to move closer “to other cultures besides the Western one,” to open herself to the contemporary world, and demonstrate her consistent desire to live up to her genuinely “catholic” character.³⁷ All that was said and written by the council fathers with reference to new attitudes toward the realization of an authentic ecclesial identity and mission was supposed to determine the Church’s future development³⁸ and her effective functioning in the highly-demanding circumstances of the post-modern era.

³³ Lucien RICHARD, “Vatican II and the Mission of the Church: A Contemporary Agenda,” in Lucien RICHARD, Daniel HARRINGTON and John O’MALLEY, eds., *Vatican II, the Unfinished Agenda: A Look to the Future* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), pp. 57-58.

³⁴ Karl RAHNER, “Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II,” in RICHARD, HARRINGTON and O’MALLEY, *Vatican II, the Unfinished Agenda*, p. 10.

³⁵ LINNAN, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 42.

³⁶ Karl Rahner suggests that the entirety of Christian history can be properly divided into three great epochs “of which the third has only just begun and made itself observable officially at Vatican II.” According to Rahner’s article, “Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II,” the first epoch was identified as a short period of Jewish Christianity; the second epoch derived its roots from the encounter of Christianity with Hellenistic and European civilizations; the third and the last epoch has begun at the time of the Second Vatican Council and is aimed at the integration of the whole world into the sphere of the Church’s life that would eventually lead all of humanity to ultimate union with God. See RAHNER, “Towards a Fundamental,” pp. 14-15, 17.

³⁷ Brian HEARNE, “Was Vatican II a Waste of Time?” in *AFER (African Ecclesiastical Review)* 25 (1983), pp. 97-98.

³⁸ RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 41.

I.2. A Review of Three Conciliar Documents of Central Import for a Theology of the Particular Church

The three most fundamental documents of Vatican II that include reflection on the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion are the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, the *Decree on Ecumenism*, and the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*.³⁹ Thus, in spite of what was said above about the ecclesiological import of all the conciliar documents, limitations of space require me to select these three aforementioned documents. Nonetheless, I will occasionally relate them to the larger ecclesiological context of the documents as a whole.

This thesis focusses on the notion of the Particular Church and her distinct ecclesial identity and vocation. As the reader reviews the three following conciliar documents, it is crucial that he/she note an idea that will be developed in greater detail below: the identity and vocation of the Particular Church are for the most part identical with the essence and mission of the Universal Church, while at the same time possessing certain specificities. As the specialist on Eastern canon law, Clement Pujol, asserted in 1970, everything that is “said of the Church in general is valid in its measure also for the Particular Churches.”⁴⁰ This, of course, derives from the conciliar pronouncement that the Catholic Church can no

³⁹ The author of this thesis is aware of the fact that an accurate picture of conciliar ecclesiology would not be complete without taking into attentive consideration Vatican II’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes*, which is regarded by many contemporary scholars as *the* most significant ecclesiological attainment of the Second Vatican Council. Nevertheless, I am not going to dedicate either a separate sub-chapter or any special attention to this document for the reason that it has very little to do with the narrow question of the ecclesial identity and vocation of a Particular Church of the Catholic communion. In contrast, *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (which were even promulgated on the same date) demonstrated an apparent mutual consistency and specific interest in the most principal theological problem addressed in this thesis.

⁴⁰ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 216.

longer be identified with the Church of Rome alone,⁴¹ which in turn derives from the Council's official recognition of the existence and value of the other Catholic Churches precisely as Churches "enjoying their own discipline, their own liturgical usage and their own theological and spiritual patrimony."⁴² I now turn to the three documents.

I.2.1. *Lumen Gentium*: History and Significance

The Second Vatican Council's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which has often been portrayed as the undisputed "principal achievement"⁴³ of Vatican II that provided a firm "foundation for most of the other conciliar and subsequent Church documents,"⁴⁴ has been also generally regarded as one of the most complicated and multi-layered theological texts ever promulgated by an Ecumenical Council.⁴⁵ The richness of the content and the impressive multi-dimensionality of *Lumen Gentium* gave rise to a great number of contrasting reactions and interpretations that naturally stressed some parts of the document while simultaneously almost entirely overlooking others.⁴⁶ Complicating the interpretive process was the fact that many theologians dealt exclusively with the final text of the Constitution without referring to the earlier drafts of the document. In this subsection of the thesis I will attempt a concise survey and evaluation of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* in its total inspiration, which can be achieved only through

⁴¹ *LG* 18-29, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 862-874; *UR* 14-18, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 916-918; *OE* 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁴² *LG* 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 868. Compare with *UR* 17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 918 and *OE* 1-6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 900-902.

⁴³ Gregory BAUM, "Commentary," in Edward PETERS and Gregory BAUM, eds., *De Ecclesia: The Constitution on the Church of Vatican Council II* (Glen Rock N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965), p. 15.

⁴⁴ JUHASZ, *Ecclesial "Communio,"* p. 5.

⁴⁵ Kevin McNAMARA, "Introduction to the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*," in McNAMARA, *The Church: A Theological and Pastoral Commentary on the Constitution on the Church*, p. 55.

⁴⁶ Nicholas ARSENIIEV, "The Second Vatican Council's 'Constitutio de Ecclesia,'" in *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 9:1 (1965), p. 16.

attentiveness to the document's *formgeschichte*⁴⁷ and careful study of the “different, and even contradictory influences that may have contributed to the shape”⁴⁸ of the Constitution.⁴⁹

The history of the conciliar *De Ecclesia* begins on 27 October 1960 when a sub-commission of the Theological Preparatory Commission, *De Doctrina Fidei et Morum*,⁵⁰ was established to compose a schema of the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*.⁵¹ The work on the document entitled *Aeternus Unigeniti Pater* lasted two years and in its final version⁵² included eleven chapters and an appendix on the “Virgin Mary, Mother of God and Mother of Men.” The greatest emphasis of the first schema had been placed on the “nature of the Church militant,” “membership in the Church” as the most important condition of salvation, the role of the episcopate “as the highest grade of the sacrament of the orders,” and only then, on the essential role played by priests, religious and laity. A great deal of attention had been dedicated to the “magisterium of the Church,” the question of “authority and obedience,” the “relationship between Church and state,” and “the necessity of proclaiming the Gospel to all peoples.” The highly significant issue of ecumenism had been placed at the very end of the schema.⁵³

For the most part the first draft of the schema on the Church demonstrated very little progress in comparison with Vatican I's Dogmatic Constitution, *Pastor Aeternus*, and

⁴⁷ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 87.

⁴⁸ ARSENEV, “The Second Vatican,” p. 16.

⁴⁹ Everything that has been said about the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* can, for the most part, also be attributed to the analysis of the conciliar decrees on *Ecumenism* and *Eastern Catholic Churches*.

⁵⁰ The Theological Preparatory Commission was comprised mostly of members of the Roman Curia and was headed by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani.

⁵¹ The work on the first draft of the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* had been based on the 8972 proposals (total of 9420 pages) sent to Rome by Catholic bishops and theologians from around the world at the request of Pope John XXIII. See Gérard PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: History of the Constitution,” in VORGRIMLER, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, p. 106.

⁵² The final version of the first draft of the schema *De Ecclesia* formed a volume of 123 pages.

⁵³ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 51 and PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 106.

simply reflected an older ecclesiological vision based on the “defensive mentality of the Counter-Reformation.”⁵⁴ An attempt was made to present a kind of “compromise ecclesiology” intended to bring together the outdated concept of the Church as the “perfect society” and the biblical notion of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ,⁵⁵ but it failed to “do justice to the self-understanding of the Church in its actual state of development.”⁵⁶ The language of the schema was still highly juridical and in many regards was no different from the dry definitions of the scholastic ecclesiology that had dominated theological manuals since the time of Trent and Vatican I.⁵⁷

The initial schema on the Church was presented to the general attention of the council fathers on 1 December 1962⁵⁸ and was extensively debated during the next six days.⁵⁹ From the very beginning it became clear that the text submitted by the pre-conciliar sub-commission *De Doctrina Fidei et Morum* was in need of major revision⁶⁰ and could not afford a basis for a productive conciliar discussion.⁶¹ On the one hand, most of the

⁵⁴ TAVARD, “Vatican II,” p. 213.

⁵⁵ For the first time, the possibility of binding together the concepts of the Church as a visible institution and the Mystical Body of Christ had been proposed by Pope Pius XII in his famous Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis* (1943), where he declared that only the Church of Rome alone can be properly identified with the “perfect society” as well as with the Mystical Body of her Savior (For the original text of Pius XII’s Encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis* see *AAS*, 35 (1943), pp. 193-248. An English translation of the document can be found at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi_en.html, accessed on 20 April 2006.). See also Peter DRILLING, “The Genesis of the Trinitarian Ecclesiology of Vatican II,” in *Science et Esprit* 45:1 (1993), p. 62; Antonio ACERBI, *Due ecclesiologie: ecclesiologia giuridica ed ecclesiologia di comunione nella “Lumen Gentium”* (Bologna: Ed. Dehoniane, 1975); Yves CONGAR, “Implicazioni cristologiche e pneumatologiche dell’ ecclesiologia del Vaticano II,” in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 2 (1981), pp. 98-110, esp. 98.

⁵⁶ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 51.

⁵⁷ Michael FAHEY, “Commentary on the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,” in George SCHNER, ed., *The Church Renewed: The Documents of Vatican II Reconsidered* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986), p. 12.

⁵⁸ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 51.

⁵⁹ The discussion of the first draft of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* took place between the thirty-first and thirty-sixth daily assemblies of the Council that were held from 1 to 7 December 1962. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 106.

⁶⁰ FAHEY, “Commentary,” p. 12.

⁶¹ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 51.

bishops were to a certain extent predisposed to the acceptance of most of the suggestions proposed by Pope John XXIII through the preliminary work accomplished by the preparatory commissions. On the other hand, they gradually started to become aware of the latent conflict between the Pope, who encouraged the Council to implement the principle of *aggiornamento* in all dimensions of the Church's life and the Roman Curia that presided over the preparatory work and expressed ultra-conservative ecclesiological viewpoints.⁶² The council fathers were conscious that their dogmatic teaching on the Church was supposed to become the central theme of all conciliar deliberations⁶³ and it is precisely for this reason that they expressed the sentiment that the schema on the Church had to be almost entirely rewritten.⁶⁴

Seventy-eight council fathers spoke during the six days and most of them expressed their deep dissatisfaction with many points raised by this initial schema.⁶⁵ The Christocentric attitude that was stressed by Cardinal Giovanni Battista Montini (later Pope Paul VI) was enthusiastically supported by Cardinal Leon Suenens of Malines-Brussels who proposed to name the Constitution, *Lumen Gentium*,⁶⁶ emphasizing that Christ alone is "the light of all nations," and that the Church, far from being a "perfect society," is only a reflection of this divine light.⁶⁷ Cardinals Ernesto Ruffini and Julius Döpfner, as well as

⁶² TAVARD, "Vatican II," p. 213.

⁶³ The intense and almost universal attention to ecclesiological issues had been developing already for several decades before the opening of the Second Vatican Council. The process of renaissance, the biblical, liturgical, and ecumenical movements, the publication of Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, and John XXIII's call for ecclesiastical renewal all together contributed to the noticeable growth of general interest in the question of the Church's self-understanding, which, prior to the beginning of the twentieth century, used to be confined exclusively to professional theologians. See PHILIPS, "Dogmatic Constitution," pp. 105-106.

⁶⁴ PHILIPS, "Dogmatic Constitution," pp. 105, 107.

⁶⁵ FAHEY, "Commentary," p. 12.

⁶⁶ PHILIPS, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 107.

⁶⁷ The same Cardinal Leon Suenens recommended the rewriting of the initial schema *De Ecclesia*. He also thought it a good idea to divide its content, having in mind the composition of two constitutions on the

Archbishop Emile Blanchet, pointed out the lack of intrinsic connection between various parts of the draft. However, most of the critical objections expressed by the council fathers were provoked by the very approach and spirit of the initial schema defended by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani.⁶⁸

Cardinals Josef Frings, Augustine Bea, and Achilles Liénart of Lille criticized the schema for its over-institutionalized and juridical orientation, which automatically excluded the understanding of the Church as a mystery.⁶⁹ Bishops Gérard-Maurice Huyghe and Emile Joseph de Smedt of Bruges proposed replacing the general tone of the draft (accused of being heavily encumbered by triumphalism, clericalism, and juridicalism) with the “spirit of the Gospel,” “the missionary spirit,” “a spirit of humble dedication,” and “a spirit of service rather than self-assertive power.”⁷⁰ Bishop Arthur Elchinger stressed the importance of the “community” aspect that should be included in the revised version of the Constitution through greater attentiveness of the editors to the symbolic image of the Church understood as “the People of God,” as well as the new interpretation of episcopal collegiality. He also encouraged ecumenical openness, so that the Catholic Church would be seen as being ecumenically open to the entire human race.⁷¹

Church, one of which would be dedicated to the exploration of the inner ecclesial nature of the Church, while the other would deal with the Church’s “tasks in the world to promote justice, peace and cultural development.” The first was to be named *Lumen Gentium*, and the second needed to be developed from the short *Schema 13* into the solemn *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*. See FAHEY, “Commentary,” p. 12.

⁶⁸ PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 107.

⁶⁹ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” pp. 62-63. Cardinal Achilles Liénart also noted that the Roman Church in the first schema was too closely identified with the Mystical Body of Christ. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 108.

⁷⁰ PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 109.

⁷¹ The last aspect was also stressed by Bishop Luigi Carli, who totally supported Bishop Arthur Elchinger’s idea that the Church has to become “the source of light and unity” for all humankind. He also said that the Church needs to demonstrate her patience, kindness, and a motherly mercifulness to all her children, including those who have been separated. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” pp. 109-110.

Many other bishops were disappointed by the poverty of the first schema with regard to biblical and patristic references.⁷² One by one, they suggested that the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* be reinforced with a large number of significant ideas that, for various reasons, had been omitted in the initial schema, *Aeternus Unigeniti Pater*.⁷³

Almost simultaneously with the distribution of the official schema on the Church prepared by the Theological Commission, the Council fathers had also received several alternative drafts composed and recommended by the national groups of hierarchs and theologians of Belgium, the German-speaking countries, Chile, Italy and France.⁷⁴ The most enthusiastic and lively interest of the conciliar assembly was provoked by the schema composed already in October 1962 by the Belgian theologian Gérard Philips,⁷⁵ a Council consultant and professor of the University of Louvain, famed for its liberal theological

⁷² Cardinal Julius Döpfner was unpleasantly surprised by the lack of biblical spirit in the schema, *Aeternus Unigeniti Pater*, while Cardinal Josef Frings and Bishop George Hakim noted that the schema very rarely relied on general patristic sources and specifically the Eastern Fathers. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” pp. 108-109.

⁷³ Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro suggested that the idea of poverty and the importance of ministry to the poor be incorporated in the future document. The bishops from the countries in which the Catholic Church was going through persecutions proposed some reflection upon the theological significance of suffering. Cardinal Franz König stressed the aspect of common solidarity. Cardinal Joseph Ritter drew general attention to the necessity of revitalizing the missionary spirit in the Church, which needs to be adopted by all the members of the royal priesthood, including the laity. The ecclesial dimensions of Christian family life and the question of freedom of conscience were also raised by Bishop Pietro Fiordelli and Cardinal Bernard Alfrink. Bishops Emile Guerry and Alexandre Renard, Cardinal José Maria Bueno and several Eastern Catholic bishops spoke on collegiality, the paternal role of hierarchs, and the pastoral mission of ordinary priests. Finally, the eschatological aspect of the Church understood as a “pilgrim on her way to the heavenly Jerusalem” was emphasized by Cardinal Josef Frings. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 109. Compare with McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” pp. 51-52.

⁷⁴ The Belgian draft of the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, composed by Gérard Philips, was presented to all of the council fathers on 22 November 1962, one day before the appearance of the official schema. The German-speaking bishops and groups of hierarchs from Chile, Italy, and France submitted their versions of the text on various dates during the period from December 1962 to January 1963. See DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 63.

⁷⁵ In contrast to the official schema, which focused on the “Church militant,” the first chapter of the draft prepared by Professor Philips was already entitled “De mysterio Ecclesiae.”

positions.⁷⁶ It was decided that the text proposed by Philips would supplement and, in many cases, even replace parts of the official schema.⁷⁷

As a member of the writing team that had produced the initial draft on the Church, Professor Philips was fully aware of the orientation of Ottaviani's Commission. At the same time, he sincerely supported ecclesiological viewpoints articulated by the Northern European bishops, whose theological position was principally different from that of the Roman Curia. Being informed firsthand of the theological preferences of both camps, "Philips was in a particularly good position to prepare a document that could incorporate the best of *Aeternus Unigeniti Pater* and yet provide the new orientation that was sought."⁷⁸ The Council put Professor Philips in charge of the process of preparing the new schema on the Church and appointed him the chief editor and secretary of the newly-formed sub-commission "De Ecclesia" that was established in February 1963.⁷⁹

The second draft of the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which was prepared between the First and Second Sessions of the Council, "received a much warmer welcome from the assembly than the original"⁸⁰ and was almost unanimously⁸¹ accepted as a suitable basis for the conciliar debates that took place from 30 September to 31 October 1963.⁸² The new schema contained four chapters, the first of which proposed an entirely new approach to the role played by the Church as a mystery of the Holy Trinity, the sign

⁷⁶ The University of Louvain was one of the first Catholic universities in the world to adopt modern theological viewpoints which were substantially different from the juridical ecclesiology and official scholastic Thomism canonized by Rome.

⁷⁷ Despite the unanimous decision to base the future schema on the text composed by Professor Philips, it was also recommended that as much of the official draft be retained as possible. See DILLING, "The Genesis," p. 63 and LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 43.

⁷⁸ DRILLING, "The Genesis," p. 63.

⁷⁹ LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 43 and DRILLING, "The Genesis," p. 63.

⁸⁰ PHILIPS, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 111.

⁸¹ 2231 votes against 43.

⁸² McNAMARA, "Introduction to the Constitution," p. 52 and PHILIPS, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 111.

“telling the world of salvation in Christ,” and an instrument “by which salvation continues to be communicated to the world.”⁸³ The subsequent chapters explored issues of episcopal collegiality, the self-perception of the Church as the “People of God,” and the universal call to holiness.⁸⁴

In spite of the exceedingly large amount⁸⁵ of amendments and constructively critical suggestions proposed in both oral and written form by the council fathers,⁸⁶ the draft was

⁸³ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 64 and Charles MOELLER, “Le Ferment des idées dans l’élaboration de la Constitution,” in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAUNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L’Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966), p. 102.

⁸⁴ PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 110 and McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 52.

⁸⁵ The council fathers suggested more than 4000 amendments (LINNAN, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 43). The preliminary amendments totaled 143 pages. The speeches and comments submitted in writing comprised 316 pages on the first chapter regarding the Church understood as a mystery (30 September to 4 October 1963), 887 pages on the second chapter regarding the question of episcopal collegiality (4 to 16 October), 493 pages on the third chapter regarding the laity (16-25 October), and 523 pages on the fourth chapter regarding religious orders and the general call to holiness (25 to 31 October). See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 111.

⁸⁶ The fathers of Vatican II generally admired the new schema’s content, structure and style (PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 111). They were also satisfied with its more Trinitarian, Christocentric, biblical, pastoral, and ecumenical orientation (McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 52). Nevertheless, there was still a whole series of crucial ecclesiological points that had not been given sufficient attention (KÜNG, “The Changing Church,” pp. 27-28). Some of the bishops and theologians suggested that more emphasis be placed on the dynamic and eschatological dimensions of the Church’s nature, that the theme of the Kingdom of God be explored more deeply, and “the precise relationship between the visible Church and the mystical body of Christ” be clarified (McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” pp. 52-53). A large number of council fathers proposed that the future Constitution incorporate a variety of additional ideas. They wanted to see the document include the understanding of the Eucharist as constitutive of the Church, and to have it use biblical terms such as “People of God” and “royal priesthood.” They asked for the inclusion of the notion of the Church’s sinfulness in this world, as well as the charismatic structure of the Church built not only on the apostles (bishops) but also on the prophets and teachers (theologians) and all Christians. They requested that ecclesiastical office be presented as service, and wanted to see some treatment of the question of separation between Church and state, the positive role played by “multiplicity and freedom within the one Church” and the significance of “different traditions, especially those of both West and East, as manifesting the Church’s catholicity” (KÜNG, “The Changing Church,” pp. 27-28). The most dynamic debates took place from the 4th to the 16th of October, when the fathers discussed the question of episcopal collegiality. Because of the numerous amendments in this regard, it was decided to build the Church’s hierarchical constitution on the biblical image of the “College of the Twelve,” to underline every bishop’s responsibility for the whole Church, to stress the theological significance of the Sacrament of episcopal consecration, to pay more attention to the local and particular Churches, and to restore the state of the permanent diaconate (PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” pp. 112-119). Cardinal Leon Suenens proposed splitting up the third chapter and dedicating two separate chapters of the future *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* to the People of God (this chapter was to be placed directly after the first chapter on the mystery of the Church) and to the laity. He also suggested adding to the Constitution a chapter on the heavenly Church and the cult of the saints. Finally, Cardinal Josef Frings along with the German-speaking bishops insisted on the incorporation of the schema on the Virgin Mary into the final draft of the future document *Lumen Gentium* as a concluding

commonly recognized as an adequate foundation, deserving to be transformed into the final conciliar document on the inner nature and mission of the Catholic Church.⁸⁷ After the careful synthesizing of all the comments and observations it was voted upon chapter by chapter during the Third Session until it was finally approved by nearly all⁸⁸ of the council fathers at a solemn assembly of the Council presided by Pope Paul VI on 21 November 1964.⁸⁹

The final version of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* promulgated by the Second Vatican Council was regarded by a large number of theologians as a “most momentous achievement”⁹⁰ and a “vitaly important center”⁹¹ to which most of the other conciliar and subsequent ecclesial documents must refer. Even several decades after its first publication, the “pride of place”⁹² which was often attributed to *Lumen Gentium* already at the time of the Council⁹³ remains unchallenged. This great document has never receded into the theological background.⁹⁴

The importance of the Church’s official self-definition expressed in Vatican II’s *De Ecclesia* lay not simply in the dogmatic teaching of the Constitution, but, rather, in the

chapter. The comments, suggestions, and amendments of the council fathers were taken into account during the time of composition of the third and the fourth schemas of the Constitution. (McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 54).

⁸⁷ JUHASZ, *Ecclesial “Communio,”* p. 5 and PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” pp. 110-126.

⁸⁸ 2151 positive votes against 5 negative.

⁸⁹ LINNAN, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 43.

⁹⁰ Avery DULLES, “Introduction,” in ABBOTT, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 10 and BAUM, “Commentary,” p. 15.

⁹¹ PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 105.

⁹² JUHASZ, *Ecclesial “Communio,”* p. 5.

⁹³ The extraordinary role played by *Lumen Gentium* was underlined by Pope Paul VI, who on the very day of final voting on the document solemnly promulgated a special “synodal” decree in which he expressed his high satisfaction with the final version of the conciliar *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*. See PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 137.

⁹⁴ PHILIPS, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 105.

doctrinal evolution that took place during various phases of the conciliar discussions.⁹⁵ The break-through in Catholic ecclesiological thought came about as a result of an open clash between the old Roman theology based on the understanding of the Church as a monarchical institution ruled by a powerful pope, and a new theology of the Church emanating from the rapidly-advancing movements of the patristic, liturgical, ecumenical, and spiritual renewals that changed the face of the Christian West in the first half of the twentieth century.

What emerged was a theology that was rooted in the teaching of Sacred Scripture and took into account a historical tradition more ancient and inclusive than that of the post-reformation period, or even that of the medieval West. Its emphases were shaped by the *lex orandi* and by the real experience of a believing community. It was set in a context which strived to embrace the whole world, its history, cultural diversity, and religious pluralism.⁹⁶

But the intention of the authors of *Lumen Gentium* was far from a relativization of the most fundamental truths about the Pope, the hierarchy and the institution of the Church which from at least the beginning of the second millennium had come to be regarded as integral parts of Catholic ecclesiology. The aim of the council fathers was to revitalize and to complement these elements of doctrine by stressing the Church as a mystery, as communion, and the universal sacrament of salvation. From this perspective, *Lumen Gentium* can be viewed as expressing an evolutionary shift of emphasis

a) from the juridical ecclesiology of the Counter-Reformation to the scriptural idea of the Mystical Body of Christ (*LG* 8), a mystery (*LG* 3, 5, 8), and the eschatological People of God (*LG* 9, 11-13, 16-17);

⁹⁵ BAUM, "Commentary," p. 16.

⁹⁶ LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 42

- b) from narcissistic ecclesiastical triumphalism to the humble recognition of the Church's sinfulness in this world (*LG 8*);
- c) from the old concept of power and authority in the Church to a new understanding of ecclesial office as self-giving service to all (*LG 8, 18, 28, 32*);
- d) from the overstatement of papal supremacy to the recognition of common responsibility for the Church shared by all bishops (*LG 23, 24*), who received their ecclesial authority directly from Christ through the sacrament of episcopal consecration (*LG 21, 22, 28*);
- e) from the emphasis on the clericalist and monarchical structure of the visible Church to the acknowledgement of her charismatic and pneumatic character (*LG 4*) based on the notion of the royal priesthood of all faithful in accordance with which each Christian is called to the same evangelical perfection (*LG 10*) and, together with the ordained successors of the apostles, shares the same responsibility for building up and strengthening the entire ecclesial community (*LG 37*);
- f) from the soteriological exclusivism and ecclesiological universalism underlined by Ultramontane scholastic theology to the patristic understanding of the Eucharist as constitutive of the Church (*LG 3, 7, 50*), as well as an appreciation of religious freedom (*LG 36-37*) and the multiplicity of various Traditions as manifesting the factual Church's catholicity (*LG 23*).⁹⁷

Note also that while on the one hand, the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* can be regarded as an intrinsically Christological text based on the understanding of Christ as the "light of all nations," the Redeemer and the Head of his Mystical Body,⁹⁸ on the other

⁹⁷ Hans KÜNG, *The Changing Church: Reflections on the Progress of the Second Vatican Council* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1965), pp. 27-30.

⁹⁸ ARSENIEV, "The Meaning of Vatican II," p. 11.

hand, it is often considered one of the most Trinitarian documents ever composed by an Ecumenical Council.⁹⁹ Thus, it antinomically unites Christology and Triadology, the Old and the New Testaments, the institutional and charismatic ecclesial dimensions, the twofold definition of the Church of Christ which subsists in the Catholic Church but which cannot be simply identified with the Roman Church alone, and the twofold conception of the Kingdom of God which is already present and still invites the People of God to eschatological perfection.¹⁰⁰

Even though the authors of *Lumen Gentium* originally divided their final text into eight chapters, most contemporary scholars favor a four-fold division according to which each of the four sections contains two chapters: 1) the mystery of the Church (the mystery in general and the mystery of the Trinity's love for all creation expressed in the establishment of a new People of God in Christ);¹⁰¹ 2) the structure of the Church (the hierarchy and the laity); 3) the purpose of the Church's existence (the universal call to holiness and the call to perfection in the religious life);¹⁰² 4) and the Church's ultimate goal (union with the heavenly Church and the Mother of God as a perfect archetype for all

⁹⁹ DRILLING, "The Genesis," pp. 61-62, 76-77 and MOELLER, "Le Ferment," p. 102.

¹⁰⁰ Most of the above-mentioned themes are extensively discussed in the first and, partially, in the second chapters of the Constitution. See *LG* 1-17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 849-862 and LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 43.

¹⁰¹ The chapter on the People of God comes directly after the chapter on the Church as a mystery and before chapters on the hierarchy, religious and laity. This structural sequence underlines an important ecclesiological idea that all the faithful, regardless of the extensive variety of their ministries in the Church, belong to one and the same chosen People of God. See FAHEY, "Commentary," p. 13 and LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 44.

¹⁰² In their attempt to overcome the legalistic and clericalist tendencies of Counter-Reformation ecclesiology, the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters of *Lumen Gentium* reject outdated notions of the pope, bishops, priest, and religious as being somehow above or apart from the Church. These chapters emphasize the special role played by the laity in the fulfillment of the common vocation of all the baptized to holiness and evangelical perfection. See FAHEY, "Commentary," pp. 12-13 and LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 44.

humanity).¹⁰³ In this way, the very structure of the final draft of the Constitution can be viewed as a significant contribution in the process of “reestablishing a more traditional order in the understanding of the Church” that consequently “undercuts the tendency to absolutize both institution and hierarchy.”¹⁰⁴ In sum, *Lumen Gentium* was “a great breakthrough and every advance [in ecclesiology] can be traced back to it.”¹⁰⁵ Together with conciliar documents such as *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Gaudium et Spes*, it provided the Catholic Church with a much clearer vision of its nature and vocation in the modern world. The Constitution suggested a much more acceptable model for the Church’s relationships with other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities,¹⁰⁶ and contributed in a notable way to a clearer, better understanding of the Church’s unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity.¹⁰⁷

We should note at this point that despite the fact that the teaching of Ecumenical Councils is generally accepted by Catholics as possessing the highest authority, the statements of the Second Vatican Council were not intended to make a claim to infallibility.¹⁰⁸ Even though Vatican II’s Constitution on the Church contained the word “dogmatic” in its official title, it did not define or proclaim any new dogmas.¹⁰⁹ This decision on the part of the council fathers corresponds to the predominantly pastoral character of the Council and a new understanding of Divine Revelation, according to which there is always room for development in understanding revealed truths. Although some of the conciliar pronouncements start with solemn phrases such as “this sacred synod

¹⁰³ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” pp. 55-56.

¹⁰⁴ LINNAN, “Dogmatic Constitution,” p. 44.

¹⁰⁵ Charles DAVIS, “The Parish and Theology,” in *The Clergy Review* (May, 1964), p. 266.

¹⁰⁶ FAHEY, “Commentary,” p. 12.

¹⁰⁷ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” pp. 68-70.

¹⁰⁸ BAUM, “Commentary,” p. 15.

¹⁰⁹ JUHASZ, *Ecclesial “Communio,”* p. 5.

teaches,”¹¹⁰ the authors of *Lumen Gentium* demonstrated no intention of offering the last word on various doctrinal subjects. In this way they were hoping to emphasize that the Christian Tradition is a living reality always open to deeper insights, situational interpretations, and organic development.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, as Kevin McNamara put in 1983:

it would be a perverse interpretation of the prevailing will of the Council fathers to make the pastoral character of the Council a basis for depriving its teaching of any genuine authority in the doctrinal field. It is quite clear that the pastoral objectives of the decrees presuppose the loyal acceptance of the doctrines taught. These doctrines, particularly those contained in the three [*sic*]¹¹² dogmatic constitutions (Church, Liturgy [*sic*],¹¹³ Revelation) are proposed for our acceptance by the supreme and universal teaching authority of the Church and we therefore owe them a true assent of mind and will. Only if they are received in this way can the spiritual renewal to which they are directed be brought about.¹¹⁴

In conclusion, the aim of the preceding section of the present study has been to present a profile of Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* as it was portrayed in the commentaries by a significant number of Catholic and non-Catholic theologians. One should be aware, however, that along with its great successes, it was not without some unresolved problems and contained noticeable remnants of the old ecclesiological thinking. But it would be unrealistic to expect more from the Council fathers than they could practically undertake. In the words of Karl Rahner, “some water will always be poured into

¹¹⁰ Such was the case with the two extremely important conciliar pronouncements on the authority of the bishops, according to which all the members of the episcopal college should be regarded as the direct successors of the apostles because of divine institution of their office in the Church and for the reason that they all receive the fullness of the sacrament of orders through episcopal consecration. See *LG* 20-21, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 864-865 and McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” pp. 70-71.

¹¹¹ BAUM, “Commentary,” p. 16.

¹¹² Vatican II promulgated only two dogmatic constitutions, on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) and on Divine Revelation (*Dei Verbum*).

¹¹³ Neither the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*) nor the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (*Gaudium et Spes*) were classified by the Second Vatican Council as “dogmatic.”

¹¹⁴ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 71.

the best wine.” But the same Rahner believed that by promulgating *Lumen Gentium* the Church had chosen “the right road” and prepared herself to “make further progress.”¹¹⁵ By deepening the authentic understanding of her own identity, the Church has become ready to be more faithful to her mission and to “put herself vigorously in the service of mankind.”¹¹⁶ As “a stepping stone and not a final accomplishment”¹¹⁷ “far from canonizing the past, or even consecrating the present,”¹¹⁸ the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* has become a “basic charter for the reform of the Church.”¹¹⁹

I.2.2. *Unitatis Redintegratio*: History and Significance

Vatican II’s document on ecumenism solemnly promulgated by Pope Paul VI on 21 November 1964 became the first official document of the Catholic Church dedicated explicitly to the subject of ecumenical theology. Most previous treatments of this issue were directed towards the resolution of existing problems, but none of them managed to “express a definite position on ecumenism based on the ecclesiology of a particular church.”¹²⁰ This was the first time in history that a General Council of the Catholic Church took upon itself the responsibility of generating a distinct decree on a topic which had never been specifically taken up by any of the earlier Councils.¹²¹ From this perspective, the

¹¹⁵ Quoted from an interview with Karl Rahner in *Guide* (January 1964), p. 17.

¹¹⁶ John POWELL, *The Mystery of the Church* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1967), p. 6.

¹¹⁷ Dom Christopher BUTLER, “Foreword,” in Dom Christopher BUTLER, ed., *The Constitution on the Church* (New York: Paulist Press / Deus Books, 1965), p. 9.

¹¹⁸ Georges DEJAIFVE, “La ‘Magna Carta’ de Vatican II,” in *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 87 (January, 1965), p. 21.

¹¹⁹ BAUM, “Commentary,” p. 15.

¹²⁰ Nikos NISSIOTIS, “Orthodox Reflections on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (1966), p. 329.

¹²¹ Claude SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment of the Catholic Church,” in ALBERIGO and KOMONCHAK, *History of Vatican II*, vol. 3 (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995), p. 266.

Second Vatican Council “revealed itself as being ecumenical in a two-fold sense,”¹²² inasmuch as it represented the universality of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church and, at the same time, promoted ecumenical theology as one of its most fundamental focal points.

The preoccupation of the Second Vatican Council with ecumenical questions had been prepared by the rapidly growing sense of openness of various Churches and ecclesial communities towards each other that had developed at the beginning of the twentieth century. Despite the fact that the Catholic Church at first did not participate in the World Council of Churches,¹²³ it initiated an ecumenical renewal of its own, which developed rapidly in France and Belgium, receiving theological grounding in Germany, and expanding its influence through the widespread movement *Una Sancta*.¹²⁴ The publication of the Instruction *Ecclesia Catholica* (1949)¹²⁵ has been regarded by many as a turning point in the advancement of the official Catholic attitude towards ecumenism. Despite the fact that the wording of this *Monitum* of the Holy Office (now the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith) was still “dominated by the tendency to admonish and warn,” it, at the same time, clearly admitted the presence of the Holy Spirit among all Christian communities seeking for the restoration of unity and encouraged the dialogue of the Catholic Church with non-Catholics as equals.¹²⁶ The same spirit can be detected in Pope

¹²² Charles BOYER, “The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council,” in *Unitas* 16:4 (1964), p. 243.

¹²³ World Council of Churches: International Christian ecumenical organization founded on a merger of the Faith and Order and Life and Work Movements that took place on 23 August 1948 in Amsterdam. Subsequent mergers were with the International Missionary Council in 1961 and the World Council of Christian Education in 1971. The organization is currently based in Geneva, Switzerland.

¹²⁴ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 1.

¹²⁵ *AAS*, 42 (1950), pp. 142-147.

¹²⁶ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 2.

John XXIII's first Encyclical, *Ad Petri Cathedram* (29 June 1959),¹²⁷ in which he suggested that the absolutely ineffectual "ecclesiology of return"¹²⁸ be replaced by mutually acceptable ways of promoting Christian unity.¹²⁹

In the historic announcement of his decision to call an Ecumenical Council (25 January 1959), the 78-year-old Pope, who "for several decades had had his own experience of divided Christianity in the Balkans,"¹³⁰ expressed his desire and hope that the coming gathering of all Catholic hierarchs would considerably contribute to the "enlightenment, edification and happiness of the whole Christian world, and would be a renewed invitation to the faithful of the separated communities to follow us in a friendly spirit in the search for unity and grace, yearned for by so many souls all over the earth."¹³¹ Even though there was a need for immediate correction of the false impression that the rapidly approaching Council would become a Council of restoration of Christian unity, there was also great anticipation that the Second Vatican Council would turn into "the first movement towards a gathering together once more of the whole mystical flock of our Lord."¹³² From the very beginning work towards Christian unity as well as the inner renewal of the Catholic Church as a necessary step towards the ultimate restoration of unity within divided Christendom were delineated as two principal goals of Vatican II.¹³³ This plan of action, along with

¹²⁷ JOHN XXIII, "Ad Petri Cathedram," in *AAS* 51 (1959), pp. 497-531; an English translation of the text can be found in *TPS* 5 (Autumn, 1959), pp. 359-383.

¹²⁸ According to this classical pre-Vatican Catholic attitude, the only possible way of restoration of unity among Christians was through the "return" of the separated non-Catholics to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church ruled by the legitimate successor of Peter.

¹²⁹ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 8.

¹³⁰ BECKER, "Decree on Ecumenism," p. 2.

¹³¹ *AAS*, 51 (1959), p. 69.

¹³² Cited from "The Address to General Chapter of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacraments" published in *L'Osservatore Romano* on July 1, 1961.

¹³³ JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 8.

openness to the presence of non-Catholic observers at the Council,¹³⁴ were “rightly understood and given a surprisingly friendly reception in many quarters.”¹³⁵

The more direct history of Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism*¹³⁶ can be traced back to the date when John XXIII established the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity¹³⁷ granting it an equal status with all the preparatory commissions¹³⁸ and entrusting to it the great task of formulating an “independent theological review” of all the conciliar topics, in order to supplement the future decrees and constitutions of the coming Council with a sound ecumenical dimension which would be easily comprehensible and generally acceptable even for non-Catholics.¹³⁹ Within the first two years of its functioning,¹⁴⁰ the Secretariat composed several significant documents that were submitted to the Central Commission¹⁴¹ and at a later time served as part of the groundwork for composing the first schema of the conciliar *De Oecumenismo*.¹⁴² Similar to the elaboration of Vatican II’s *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, the evolution in ecumenical thinking that took place

¹³⁴ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 31.

¹³⁵ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 2.

¹³⁶ The complete chronology of the origin and history of the conciliar schema on ecumenism can be found in JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, pp. 3-8.

¹³⁷ Avery DULLES, “The Decree on Ecumenism: Twenty-Five Years After,” in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990), p. 17.

¹³⁸ During the fourth general congregation of the Second Vatican Council (on 22 October 1962), Pope John XXIII confirmed that the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity is of absolutely equal rank with the other ten official conciliar commissions. From that time on, the Secretariat was allowed to “bring the schemata it had drawn up before the Council on its own responsibility.” See BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 6-7 and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

¹³⁹ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 3-4.

¹⁴⁰ Pope John XXIII established the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity on 5 June 1960 and appointed Augustine Cardinal Bea as its first President.

¹⁴¹ In addition to its direct responsibility of contacting and inviting non-Catholic observers to the Council, the Secretariat established first ten and later fifteen sub-committees that were required to study various doctrinal and practical issues related to the field of ecumenical theology. As a result, the five drafts (on the necessity of prayer for the unity of Christians, on the Word of God, on Catholic ecumenism, on the Jews, and on religious freedom) were submitted to the Central Preparatory Commission and discussed during its seventh session from 12 to 20 June 1962. See BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 3-6.

¹⁴² BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 2-6.

during the various stages of the conciliar discussions might be regarded as even more important than the content of the *Decree on Ecumenism* itself.¹⁴³ Indeed this “great and beautiful” document of the Second Vatican Council “was not merely a text,” but it can perhaps be more properly referred to as an indispensable ecumenical “deed.”¹⁴⁴

Before the opening of the First Session of the Second Vatican Council, no less than three distinct texts on the relations between separated Christians had been prepared for submission to the general attention of the council fathers.¹⁴⁵ The first draft, dedicated to the so-called problem of the “reconciliation of Eastern dissidents,”¹⁴⁶ had been composed by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches and therefore, for the most part, focused on various approaches to the restoration of unity with the Orthodox Churches.¹⁴⁷ This document was discussed and seriously criticized by a large number of Catholic hierarchs¹⁴⁸ from 25 to 31 November 1962.¹⁴⁹ The second draft, which in accordance with

¹⁴³ Howard ROOT, “Ecumenism,” in Bernard PAWLEY, ed., *The Second Vatican Council: Studies by Eight Anglican Observers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 112, 116, 122; Oscar CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), p. 93; JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, pp. X, 8.

¹⁴⁴ The expression belongs to French theologian and pioneer of ecumenical initiatives within the Catholic Church, Fr. Yves Congar. See also CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 93 and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. IX.

¹⁴⁵ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁶ Even while demonstrating considerable advances in the ecumenical attitude of Catholics toward their Orthodox sisters and brothers, this draft was still very much inspired by the ecclesiology of “return” suggesting that “those in error” must once and for all rejoin the Catholic and Apostolic Church. See BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 6-11.

¹⁴⁷ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 116.

¹⁴⁸ No less than fifty council fathers, including eleven patriarchs and cardinals, spoke on the document entitled *De Ecclesiae Unitate — Ut omnes unum sint* that had been drafted by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches (BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 11). The majority of the participants of the debate were Eastern Catholic (mostly Melkite) bishops (LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21) who were personally touched by the predominant preoccupation of the text with the problem of ecumenical cooperation between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches (JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 10). Despite the fact that after the official report made by Cardinal Amleto Giovanni Cicognani and Fr. Atanasii Velykyi some of the Eastern hierarchs (including Syrian Patriarch Ignatius Gabriel (Tappouni) and Chaldean Patriarch Paul II (Cheikho) from Babylon) expressed their support for the document, the majority of the bishops representing various Eastern Catholic Churches demanded that it be decisively rejected. Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh) and Kyivan Catholic Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk) of Winnipeg criticized the text under discussion for being “typically Roman.” In their opinion, the document should put much stronger emphasis on

the original plan was to be incorporated into Vatican II's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* as its final chapter,¹⁵⁰ had been prepared by the Theological Preparatory Commission and presented to the council fathers on 23 October 1962.¹⁵¹ This text was no different from the entire content of the first schema, *De Ecclesia*¹⁵² that was characterized by most of the delegates of the Council as “too negative in its conceptions,” lacking in genuine pastoral and ecumenical attitude, and “showing very little trace” of the ecclesiological advances which had been made.¹⁵³ The third draft, which concentrated mainly on general ecumenical principles,¹⁵⁴ had been produced by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, but it was never even printed and distributed to the members of the Council.¹⁵⁵ This frustrating incident caused a large wave of disappointment among the

the collegial structure of the universal episcopate for the reason that unity of the Church can in no sense be “limited to unity in Peter and his successors.” According to these fathers, the treatment of the Eastern Churches founded by the apostles as derivative ecclesial communities “would in fact embitter those of good will among the Orthodox, rather than attract them.” Archbishops Elias (Zoghby) and Neophytos (Edelby) underlined the importance of the usage of the term “Churches” with regard to the Eastern Orthodox Christians who share with Catholics the same dogmas of faith, even though their tradition, theology and discipline are different and must be preserved and cherished as such. Some of the Latin council fathers, such as Cardinal Achille Liénard and Archbishop Antonio Gregorio Vuccino severely judged the document for going too far in its legalistic approach and dealing exclusively with purely juridical or institutional aspects of the unity of the Church. The discussion was concluded by Cardinal Augustine Bea who praised the good intentions of the authors of the document, *De Ecclesiae Unitate — Ut omnes unum sint*, and, at the same time, admitted that it failed to take into account very urgent demands of the time. This discussion may have appeared fruitless or at least frustrating, but, in fact, it emphasized a completely new characteristic of the Second Vatican Council, which demonstrated to the whole world its resolute determination to become “ecumenical” in the fullest sense of this word (BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 11-15).

¹⁴⁹ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21.

¹⁵⁰ Miguel NICOLAU, *L'Ecumenismo nel Concilio Vaticano II: Testo del decreto e commento teologico-pastorale* (Rome: Coletti, 1966), p. 7.

¹⁵¹ A detailed evaluation of the structure and content of Chapter XI of the schema *De Ecclesia*, dedicated specifically to the question of ecumenical relations with non-Catholic Christians, can be found in BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 15-18.

¹⁵² *Unitatis Redintegratio: Texte du décret, notes et commentaries par une équipe de laïcs et de prêtres* (Tours: Mame, 1965), p. 8.

¹⁵³ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 15-16.

¹⁵⁴ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

¹⁵⁵ The distribution of the draft composed by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity had been postponed because the Central Preparatory Commission did not have enough time for its official approval. See BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 15.

council fathers,¹⁵⁶ who did not hesitate to express their complaints about the apparent lack of coordination at the stage of preparation for the First Session of the Council.¹⁵⁷ Despite the fact that most of them knew only of the existence of the document drafted by the Secretariat for Unity, a large number of the Catholic hierarchs as well as non-Catholic observers openly articulated in advance their support for this early version of the future conciliar schema *De Oecumenismo*.¹⁵⁸

At the end of the short discussion that occurred during the First Session of the Council, on 1 December 1962 the council fathers expressed their nearly unanimous decision¹⁵⁹ that all three drafts be incorporated into one single schema on ecumenism.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, the work of preparing a new unified document was entrusted to the for Promoting Christian Unity¹⁶¹ as the question of ecumenical relations with a wide range of non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities organically belonged to the area of its particular competence.¹⁶² It can be rightfully said that this decision of the council fathers as well as their trust in the Secretariat for Unity literally gave birth to the present *Decree on Ecumenism*.¹⁶³ It was able to rise above the evident contradiction of the two divergent ecclesiologies presented in the first three initial drafts and it illustrated the solid

¹⁵⁶ ROOT, "Ecumenism," p. 116.

¹⁵⁷ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 9 and BECKER, "Decree on Ecumenism," p. 12.

¹⁵⁸ Yves CONGAR, *Concile Oecuménique Vatican II, L'Église, L'Oecuménisme, Les Églises Orientales* (Paris: 1965), pp. 165-166 and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

¹⁵⁹ Of the 2112 council fathers present at the general conciliar congregation, 2068 voted for and only 36 against the proposal to form a single document on ecumenism (8 votes were invalid). See JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 12; BECKER, "Decree on Ecumenism," pp. 18-19; STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

¹⁶⁰ Michael FAHEY, "Before and After the Decree on Ecumenism of Vatican II," in HORGAN, *Walking Together*, p. 99.

¹⁶¹ ROOT, "Ecumenism," p. 116.

¹⁶² LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21. Fuller details are given in *Irénikon* 35 (1962), pp. 519-36.

¹⁶³ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

development of ecumenical thinking that had taken place during the Second Session of the Council.¹⁶⁴

On 22 April 1963¹⁶⁵ the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity finished its preparatory work on a new version of the conciliar document on ecumenism¹⁶⁶ and without hesitation distributed the text to the council fathers for their review.¹⁶⁷ Six sub-commissions had been organized to evaluate large number of observations coming from forty-seven individual fathers and eight national groups of bishops.¹⁶⁸ Upon careful inclusion of 192 amendments into the text, the first version of what would become Vatican II's *De Oecumenismo*¹⁶⁹ was approved by the Central Commission as ready for submission to the participants of the Council's Second Session.¹⁷⁰

“An historic day,”¹⁷¹ “the hour of truth”¹⁷²: such were the accolades used by many council fathers and theologians to designate the significance of the moment when the

¹⁶⁴ Camillus HAY, “Comparative Ecclesiology of the Documents Behind the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *One in Christ* 3:4 (1967), p. 399.

¹⁶⁵ It is important to note that this was during the period between the First and the Second Sessions of the Council when most of the fathers were at home. See BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 19.

¹⁶⁶ The schema consisted of three chapters: “The Principles of Catholic Ecumenism,” “The Implementation of Ecumenism,” and “Christians Separated From the Catholic Church.” This last chapter was further divided into two sections: “The Oriental Churches,” and “Christian Communities Arising After the Sixteenth Century.” For the most part the text reflected the ecclesiology of the initial text drafted by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 14). Later on, the Secretariat proposed to add another two chapters (IV. Attitudes of the Catholics Towards Non-Christians (Particularly Towards the Jews) and V. Religious Freedom) but it was decided that they did not entirely correspond to the general content of the *Decree on Ecumenism* and, therefore, should form two separate declarations of the Council. See ROOT, “Ecumenism,” pp. 116-117; FAHEY, “Before and After,” pp. 100; LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, pp. 21-22.

¹⁶⁷ FAHEY, “Before and After,” p. 99.

¹⁶⁸ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 259.

¹⁶⁹ The official title of this document was *Schema Decreti de Oecumenismo* (SDDE). It was published together with other preparatory documents in a series entitled *Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus* (SCD).

¹⁷⁰ The detailed analysis of the content and emendations to the first schema of Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* drafted by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity can be found in BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 19-27.

¹⁷¹ The expression belongs to the great theologian Yves Congar, who was regarded by many scholars as the “father” or the “forerunner” of contemporary Catholic ecumenism.

Second Vatican Council, presided by the newly-elected Pope Paul VI,¹⁷³ began its enthusiastic deliberations on the subject of searching for the most suitable means to restore of unity among all Christians.¹⁷⁴ To the great satisfaction of Cardinal Bea's Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity,¹⁷⁵ which, as noted above, had been the chief drafter of the first schema on ecumenism, its work was accepted from the very beginning by the overwhelming majority of the council fathers¹⁷⁶ as the basis for further discussion.¹⁷⁷ The document was debated during eleven general sessions¹⁷⁸ from 18 November to 2 December 1963.¹⁷⁹

As could have been easily predicted, the discussion of the council fathers on so central theme as the unity of the Church once again became an open battlefield for two

¹⁷² Such was the title of the article published in *La Croix* (November 20, 1963), p. 4, by the editor-in-chief of this well-known Catholic periodical, a theologian and professor of the Catholic Universities in Lyons and Strasburg, Antoine Wenger.

¹⁷³ Despite the fact that in the very first months of his pontificate, the newly-elected Pope Paul VI managed to revitalize friendly relations with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras I (SOETENS, "The Ecumenical Commitment," pp. 257-258), a large number of the council fathers doubted his ability to maintain ecumenical initiatives started by his direct predecessor (ROOT, "Ecumenism," p. 114). All these worries and uncertainties were dissolved during the first appearance of Paul VI before the bishops gathered together for the Second Session of the Council on 29 September 1963 (Xavier RYNNE, *The Second Session* (London: Herder & Herder 1964), p. 358). The Pope wholeheartedly welcomed the non-Catholic observers and encouraged the entire conciliar assembly to give a place of honor to Christian forgiveness (*AAS*, 55 (1963), pp. 841-859 and 879-880). At the same time, Paul VI mentioned "the unity of all Christians" among the principal aims of the Council (Vincent O'KEEFE, "Foreword," in Charles O'NEILL, ed., *Ecumenism and Vatican II* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1964), p. V) and designated Vatican II as a "Council of invitation, of expectation, of confidence, looking forward toward a more widespread, more fraternal participation in authentic ecumenicity." (Quoted in LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 22) From that time on "there could be no doubt that the Church of Rome was going to take ecumenism seriously." (ROOT, "Ecumenism," p. 115)

¹⁷⁴ SOETENS, "The Ecumenical Commitment," p. 261.

¹⁷⁵ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 10.

¹⁷⁶ 1996 council fathers voted for, and only 56 against, the proposal to accept the schema drafted by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity as a suitable foundation for conciliar discussions.

¹⁷⁷ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21.

¹⁷⁸ The detailed history and evaluation of the major speeches delivered during these eleven days of the debate on the first official schema of the future *Decree on Ecumenism* can be found in RYNNE, *The Second Session*, pp. 216-291; SOETENS, "The Ecumenical Commitment," pp. 261-195; BECKER, "Decree on Ecumenism," pp. 27-37; and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, pp. 14-23. Nineteen major speeches were published by Hans KÜNG and Yves CONGAR in *Council Speeches of Vatican II* (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1964). Unfortunately, some 110 other speeches were not included. See LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 22 and ROOT, "Ecumenism," p. 118.

¹⁷⁹ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21.

different ecclesiological attitudes.¹⁸⁰ On the one side, there were “the wholehearted defenders of the Counter-Reformation position, who regarded Christian unity as meaning nothing more than the return of the ‘others’ to the Catholic Church.” On the other side, there was the majority of bishops who “understood that all truths do not stand on the same level,” and “saw in the Gospel message itself and in the cries of the contemporary world the need of a common witness to the Christian faith.”¹⁸¹ Those who were unfavorable to the schema criticized it for being “too general, too superficial; insufficiently grounded

¹⁸⁰ At the end of the discussion most of the council fathers came to the same conclusion: that the schema prepared by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity was a great step forward from both ecclesiological and pastoral points of view. Nevertheless, some of the minority bishops were not very happy to see that the new schema was almost entirely deprived of its scholastic trappings. They were also not prepared to agree with the main concern of the schema according to which the Catholic Church was not to establish a parallel ecumenical movement of her own, but to take an active part in the already-existing ecumenical movement initiated by non-Catholics. This idea — as well as the general orientation of the schema on the dialogue among Churches, and not among individual Christians — raised a considerable number of objections from the conservative wing of the assembled hierarchs. The fathers who were inclined to think that participation in the ecumenical movement might lead to religious indifferentism regarded the schema as going too far in its usage of such biblical and patristic images of the Church as “College of the Apostles” and “communion of love.” In their opinion, a very clear distinction needed to be made between the “Church of love” and the “juridical Church” built on the infallibility of the Pope and on the clear notion that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. They refused to accept the concept proposed by the schema of different ways and levels of participation in the universal *communio* and held on to the old understanding of the Holy Spirit as the “soul of the Catholic Church” whose action outside the visible frontiers of the Church may be explained only as something accidental (*per accidentem*). That is why common prayer with those who are simply in need of conversion would be nothing but a waste of time. The criticism suggested by the representatives of the council majority was quite adamantly directed towards strengthening the tendency expressed in the schema. The bishops who were in favor of the general orientation of the schema as well as of the idea of the active participation of the Catholic Church in ecumenical dialogue proposed changing the title of Chapter I from “The Principles of Catholic Ecumenism” to “The Catholic Principles of Ecumenism.” In view of the fact that any division within Christendom had always involved both sides, the majority of the council fathers suggested avoiding the expression “separated brethren” and acknowledging the ecclesial reality of most of the non-Catholic “Churches and ecclesial communities.” The word “traces” needed to be replaced by the word “riches” of Christ in order to underline the presence of “elements” of the Church in non-Catholic communities. The majority fathers expressed their hopes that the future schema would take into account the notion of the People of God and the Holy Eucharist borrowed from the rapidly-developing ecclesiological doctrine of the conciliar schema, *De Ecclesia*, and would insist on the practice of ecumenism as one of the most important tasks of the whole Church. At the conclusion of the conciliar debates on the first schema on ecumenism, Cardinal Augustine Bea diplomatically explained the diversity of views as arising from the different circumstances of life in various individual countries. At the same time, he stressed the importance of the adaptation of general conciliar directives on ecumenism to the special conditions of the regions represented by the fathers. For more detailed information about the discussion on ecumenism that took place during the Second Session of the Council, see BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 32-37; JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, pp. 20-23; SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” pp. 261-295; and RYNNE, *The Second Session*, pp. 216-291.

¹⁸¹ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 263.

theologically; not practical enough to act upon,”¹⁸² while the supporters of the progressive spirit of the schema “were willing to go further still”¹⁸³ and characterized the document as being “rather too cautious than too bold.”¹⁸⁴ Providentially, at a certain point in the discussion, the proponents of these two divergent ecclesiological viewpoints arrived at mutually acceptable conclusions.

The first schema on ecumenism was recommended for final revision, which was completed between the Second and Third Sessions of the Council.¹⁸⁵ The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in cooperation with selected scholars from the Theological Commission and the Commission for the Eastern Churches studied 1,063 pages of catalogued written and oral suggestions coming from both Eastern and Western Catholic fathers of the Council¹⁸⁶ and, not without regret, accepted all of the reasonable suggestions regarding the “conservative overcautiousness” of some of the draft’s passages.¹⁸⁷ After substantial redrafting¹⁸⁸ and the official approval of the Central Commission, the final version of the future *Decree on Ecumenism* received personal approbation from the Pope on 27 April 1964.¹⁸⁹

Scholars have noted that this schema became noticeably bolder¹⁹⁰ and “less guarded than its immediate predecessor.”¹⁹¹ The fathers gathered together at the Third Session of the Second Vatican Council gladly accepted 29 textual changes proposed by the Secretariat for

¹⁸² Ibid., 264.

¹⁸³ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 118.

¹⁸⁴ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 22.

¹⁸⁵ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 37.

¹⁸⁶ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 118.

¹⁸⁷ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 10.

¹⁸⁸ Much more detailed information about the work of redrafting accomplished between the Second and Third Sessions of the Council can be found in BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 38-47.

¹⁸⁹ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 37.

¹⁹⁰ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 10.

¹⁹¹ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 118.

Promoting Christian Unity¹⁹² and, without further discussions, voted upon each chapter of the final schema.¹⁹³

On 19 November 1964, two days before the close of the Third Session and the final vote on the *Decree on Ecumenism* as a whole, Pope Paul VI introduced another nineteen minor emendations “that he felt could be made without marring the text, but that would reassure certain vacillating bishops and thus make the vote almost unanimous.”¹⁹⁴ Some of the council fathers who had gotten used to the collegial spirit of the Council’s work¹⁹⁵ were somewhat perplexed by such an action on the part of the Pope,¹⁹⁶ who once again exercised his supreme authority *outside* the Council.¹⁹⁷ Nevertheless, on 21 November, the majority of bishops almost unanimously¹⁹⁸ approved the revised version of text¹⁹⁹ that from that time on was to be called by its formal name, *Unitatis Redintegratio*.²⁰⁰

¹⁹² STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 10.

¹⁹³ NICOLAU, *L’Ecumenismo*, pp. 10-15.

¹⁹⁴ FAHEY, “Before and After,” p. 100.

¹⁹⁵ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 119.

¹⁹⁶ Some of the minority bishops who were deeply displeased with frequent rejections of their “modi” on the part of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity decided to turn directly to the Pope. On the one hand, Paul VI understood that the acceptance of their emendations would radically influence the content and orientation of the schema. On the other hand, he wanted to satisfy the wishes of all council fathers, including those who felt unfavorable towards the document. Searching for some middle ground, the Pope introduced nineteen minor alterations, none of which was of any doctrinal significance whatsoever. Some of them were merely stylistic, others helpful historical or theological precisions that, rather, added to the clarity than weakened the text. The story of this intervention by the Holy Father has been recorded in many places and by many authors such as Xavier RYNNE, *The Third Session* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1965), p. 263; BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 54-56; STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, pp. 10-12.

¹⁹⁷ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 119.

¹⁹⁸ There were 2,137 *placet* against only 11 *non placet* votes on the final text of Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism*. See Giovanni CAPRILE, “Aspetti positivi della terza Sessione del Concilio,” in *La Cività Cattolica*, 116 (1965), pp. 330-333 and NICOLAU, *L’Ecumenismo*, p. 15.

¹⁹⁹ For a more complete history of the voting and promulgation of the *Decree on Ecumenism*, see BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 47-56 and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, pp. 45-56.

²⁰⁰ FAHEY, “Before and After,” p. 101.

Despite the existence of some criticism regarding specific concepts and expressions in the Decree,²⁰¹ a prevailing majority of both Catholic and non-Catholic commentators did not hesitate to admit that, in comparison with all preceding statements of the Catholic Church on ecumenism, (e.g. Pius XI's Encyclical Letter, *Mortalium Animos* of 1928²⁰² and the Instruction of the Holy Office on the Ecumenical Movement, *Cum Compertum* of 1948), *Unitatis Redintegratio* was a “turning-point, even a complete change (surprising and unhoped-for) in the history of Rome's relations with the other Christian confessions.”²⁰³ A large number of the council fathers, theologians and observers, like Cardinal Augustine Bea,²⁰⁴ James Crumley,²⁰⁵ and Paul Evdokimov, were inclined to see “more than a reform” in the “revolutionary” changes introduced by the Decree.²⁰⁶ The decree presented “a completely new concept of ecumenism”²⁰⁷ allowing one “to examine with new eyes the very conditions for dialogue”²⁰⁸ and opening windows which had been “locked for

²⁰¹ Orthodox observers, such as Paul Evdokimov, expressed their dissatisfaction with “placing the Roman Church right in the center,” too extensive treatment of the role played by the “Uniate Churches,” premature encouragement to *communicatio in sacris*, the frequent usage of the concept *vestigia ecclesiae* and the term, “separated brothers.” (Paul EVDOKIMOV, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review*, 17:2 (1965), pp. 97-101) Protestant theologians, such as Oscar CULLMANN, criticized *Unitatis Redintegratio* for its attitude towards non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities as not possessing the “fullness” of the Church (CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 94). Some of the theologians went as far as to pronounce that there was “no indication of any shift in the basic Roman Catholic ecclesiology” (Russell CHANDRAN, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), p. 102). Nevertheless, most of the commentators were inclined to stress the positive elements of the Decree and to praise its ecumenical significance. For a more complete picture of non-Catholic criticism with regard to various questions raised by Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism*, see NISSIOTIS, “Orthodox Reflections on the Decree,” pp. 329-342.

²⁰² PIUS XI, “*Mortalium Animos*,” in *AAS* 20 (1928), pp. 5-7.

²⁰³ Hébert ROUX, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), p. 105.

²⁰⁴ In his interview published in *Civitas Catholica* 1 (1965), p. 11, Cardinal Augustine Bea said that Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* marks a “peaceful and constructive revolution in the Church.” See also LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 30.

²⁰⁵ James Crumley went as far as to say that the *Decree on Ecumenism* was so far-reaching that “one might conclude that the ecumenical movement began there.” See James CRUMLEY, “Reflections on Twenty-Five Years After the Decree on Ecumenism,” in HORGAN, *Walking Together*, p. 81.

²⁰⁶ EVDOKIMOV, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 97.

²⁰⁷ CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 93.

²⁰⁸ EVDOKIMOV, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 101.

centuries.”²⁰⁹ Various names and designations²¹⁰ have been given to this groundbreaking²¹¹ document and all of them have suggested the invaluable influence it has had on the whole of Christendom.²¹² And while demonstrating a deep awareness of the difficulties along the way of restoration of full and visible unity among the divided Christian Churches, the Decree has also clearly demonstrated that “a very important measure of unity already exists.”²¹³

Nevertheless, some Catholics have never regarded *Unitatis Redintegratio* as a revolutionary document,²¹⁴ for its primary aim was to solve all ecumenical problems but to create a “better climate”²¹⁵ and a “new atmosphere”²¹⁶ that would permit the Catholic Church to come out of her “previous isolation”²¹⁷ and to convert a “history of deepening division” into a “history of growing contact and mutual understanding.”²¹⁸

Some have noted that *Unitatis Redintegratio* is a comparatively short text.²¹⁹ To avoid losing pastoral effectiveness the council fathers rarely expanded the conciliar decrees to the size of theological treatises with an inordinate number of terms and concepts. Thus,

²⁰⁹ O’KEEFE, “Foreword,” p. V.

²¹⁰ Coadjutor Archbishop of Strasburg Arthur Elchinger regarded *Unitatis Redintegratio* as culmination of all efforts of the forerunners of Catholic ecumenism (JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. IX) and called it “a gracious gift of God to these our times.” (Quoted in LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 22) Another Catholic theologian, Avery DULLES, said that the *Decree on Ecumenism* was “one of the principal achievements of the Second Vatican Council” that “shines like a jewel among the council documents.” (DULLES, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 17)

²¹¹ In full accord with Yves Congar’s expression that the *Decree on Ecumenism* was not merely a text, but an ecumenical deed, Oscar Cullmann said that *Unitatis Redintegratio* was “more than opening of a door,” since “the new ground has been broken.” See JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. IX.

²¹² MEYER, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 320.

²¹³ DULLES, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 17.

²¹⁴ This opinion belongs to Archbishop Joseph Martin of Rouen. See JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. IX.

²¹⁵ Robert BROWN, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), p. 95.

²¹⁶ O’KEEFE, “Foreword,” p. V.

²¹⁷ DULLES, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 17.

²¹⁸ Harding MEYER, “The Decree on Ecumenism: A Protestant Viewpoint,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 37 (1985), p. 320.

²¹⁹ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” pp. 122-123.

this decree is less than five thousand words in length and occupies only thirteen pages in Norman Tanner's edition of the conciliar documents.²²⁰ One notes also that despite the fact that the Decree came into being as a result of a careful synthesis of at least three preparatory versions of the text, its content has the "qualities of an original document, uniform in style and carefully balanced."²²¹

The structure of *Unitatis Redintegratio* is very simple. The text opens with a short introduction focused on general theological and ecumenical presuppositions (n. 1) and ends with a plea to the Holy Spirit for the Spirit's continuing guidance directed towards the "reconciling of all Christians in the unity of the one and only church of Christ." (n. 24)²²² The main body of the Decree consists of three equally significant chapters.²²³ The first poses the state of the question and provides the reader with an explanation of the major Catholic principles of ecumenism (nos. 2-4). The second deals with an implementation of the already-mentioned ecumenical principles on the practical level (nos. 5-12). The third chapter reflects upon the special role played by the Eastern and Western Churches and ecclesial communities separated from the Roman Apostolic See and encourages the entire Catholic Church to assume an ecumenically-open, fraternal attitude in their regard (nos. 13-24).²²⁴

²²⁰ UR, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 908-920.

²²¹ JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 9.

²²² Agnes CUNNINGHAM, "Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 21 November, 1964," in O'CONNELL, *Vatican II and Its Documents*, pp. 63-64.

²²³ For a detailed description and analysis of the structure and content of the *Decree on Ecumenism*, see ROOT, "Ecumenism," pp. 126-141; CUNNINGHAM, "Decree on Ecumenism," pp. 63-67; STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, pp. 15-16.

²²⁴ BOYER, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 246.

Unitatis Redintegratio reaffirmed many truths that had been almost forgotten as a result of the antagonistic spirit of the Counter-Reformation.²²⁵ The Catholic Church's acknowledgment of her partial culpability for the sin of Christian division (n. 3, 7), as well as her humble recognition of the urgent necessity of the reform of Catholic ecclesial life at various levels (n. 4, 6), demonstrated the ecumenical potential of the Roman Church; it now became ready to fulfill the most important requirement of the ecumenical movement — sincere change of mind and heart (n. 7, 8). The *Decree on Ecumenism* courageously reaffirmed the existence of a “hierarchy of truths” (n. 11) according to which, *inter alia*, unity does not necessarily presuppose uniformity (n. 14-17). The new understanding of “separated brethren” as “Churches and ecclesial communities” (n. 13-19) that could be used by the Holy Spirit as “means of salvation” (n. 3) and the encouragement of all Christians to common prayer (n. 4, 8) and working together for social justice and peace (n. 23) eventually led the Decree to the very important conclusion that “the more effort the faithful make to live holier lives according to the gospel, the better will they further Christian unity and put it into practice.” (n. 7)²²⁶

Naturally, the *Decree on Ecumenism* attests to its dependence on a “unifying theme” running through all the conciliar texts.²²⁷ This theme is, of course, the Church.²²⁸ In the last paragraph of its introductory section, the Decree unambiguously indicates the source of its theological presuppositions²²⁹ which can be found in the “already declared

²²⁵ Arthur VOGEL, “The Decree on Ecumenism and the Challenge of the Future,” in HORGAN, *Walking Together*, p. 4.

²²⁶ Macbeath BROWN, “Commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in SCHNER, *The Church Renewed*, p. 37.

²²⁷ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 259.

²²⁸ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 12.

²²⁹ Francis SULLIVAN, “The Decree on Ecumenism: Presuppositions and Consequences,” in *One in Christ* 26:1-2 (1990), p. 8.

teaching about the church.” (n. 1)²³⁰ Even though the conciliar documents *De Ecclesia* and *De Oecumenismo* were composed and promulgated practically at the same time, one detects the clear subordination of *Unitatis Redintegratio* to *Lumen Gentium*.²³¹ The juridical terms *constitutio dogmatica* and *decretum* define their relative importance.²³²

Suggesting that one should study the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* before even looking at the contents of the *Decree on Ecumenism*,²³³ some Catholic commentators have gone as far as declaring the superiority of the Constitution over the Decree even with regard to ecumenical teaching.²³⁴ This approach is perhaps a bit exaggerated. It is true that “the resources, the ways and the means” (*UR* 1) directed towards the restoration of Christian unity stand in need of theological grounding that can be found in the conciliar doctrine on the Church.²³⁵ But this is because the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* was specifically intended to be supplemented by corresponding conciliar decrees.²³⁶

In this respect, the *Decree on Ecumenism* can be characterized as holding a special place among other decrees, for it not only provided Catholics with “practical instructions derived from the [Church’s] doctrinal teaching,”²³⁷ but was also intended “to set out theological grounds” of its own.²³⁸ In choosing the title “Catholic Principles of Ecumenism” for the first chapter of this decree,²³⁹ the council fathers were attempting to indicate that it would not be “simply functional, like those produced by ecumenical

²³⁰ This opinion was emphasized by Bishop Joseph Martin in his *relatio* introducing the final draft of *De Oecumenismo* to the fathers gathered for the Third Session of the Council. See STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, pp. 12-13.

²³¹ SULLIVAN, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 8.

²³² RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, pp. 63-64.

²³³ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 13.

²³⁴ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 123.

²³⁵ SULLIVAN, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 7 and ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 123.

²³⁶ RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, p. 68.

²³⁷ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 63.

²³⁸ SULLIVAN, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 15.

²³⁹ “Catholic Principles of Ecumenism.”

organizations, but truly ecclesiological.”²⁴⁰ The theological and ecclesiological boldness of the conciliar *Decree on Ecumenism* as well as its proficiency in the treatment of such an important dimension of Church life as ecumenism demonstrates that “our understanding of the Church through Vatican Council II documents is not derived solely from *De Ecclesia*.”²⁴¹ Therefore, taking both texts into account²⁴² allows us to “view in a positive light the undeniably limited ecumenical outlook of the schema on the Church.”²⁴³

By way of conclusion, it is important to note that Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* was not addressed to non-Catholics and therefore was not intended to present a “compromise statement” or become a “unity manifesto.”²⁴⁴ It did not introduce new dogmas,²⁴⁵ nor had it “presupposed any judgment about the sad history of the origins of the divisions.”²⁴⁶ It was “not a manual of theology, nor a part of a code of law, nor a historical treatise.”²⁴⁷ It was, first of all, an irenic and pastoral statement of the Catholic Church “on the problems of Christian unity, the ways in which that church can engage itself in ecumenical activity, and the ways in which its present self-understanding must set limits to that engagement.”²⁴⁸ Saying relatively little about earlier misunderstandings, the Decree focused on the analysis of contemporary relationships among various parts of divided

²⁴⁰ NISSIOTIS, “Orthodox Reflections on the Decree,” p. 329.

²⁴¹ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 13.

²⁴² For a more complete treatment of the mutual relations between *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Lumen Gentium*, see SULLIVAN, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 5-19 and ROOT, “Ecumenism,” pp. 123-126.

²⁴³ RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, p. 68.

²⁴⁴ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 266 and RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, p. 64.

²⁴⁵ Despite the fact that *Unitatis Redintegratio* has never been defined as an “infallible pronouncement,” it has to be understood as a directive coming from the Church’s highest authority (the *magisterium*). While it “leaves the doors open” to different theological opinions and judgments on the various points addressed in the Decree, “the ordinary rules, however, of interpreting a document according to its main purpose and intent, and of judging particular passages by the full context, are obviously to be observed.” See LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, pp. 28-29.

²⁴⁶ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 21.

²⁴⁷ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 266.

²⁴⁸ ROOT, “Ecumenism,” p. 123.

Christendom.²⁴⁹ Without trying to take up all questions, it concentrated mainly on major Catholic principles of ecumenism²⁵⁰ and, therefore, became a sort of charter, encouraging all Catholics “to respond to the call of Christ and to the grace of the Holy Spirit for the restoration of unity among all Christians.”²⁵¹

I.2.3. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*: History and Significance

On May 17, 1959 Pope John XXIII founded the so-called *Commissio Antepreparatoria* and appointed the Secretary of the State, Cardinal Domenico Tardini, to chair the entire process of preparation for the coming Council.²⁵² On 18 June, the newly assigned chairman of the Ante-preparatory Commission turned to the future council fathers as well as to the members of Roman congregations and numerous Catholic universities with an urgent request to submit their suggestions and proposals regarding the topics that should be collegially treated at the Council.²⁵³ This request was enthusiastically answered by a large number of Eastern Catholic bishops.²⁵⁴ The reaction of these Eastern hierarchs can be viewed as the distant origin of the decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*.

On 5 June 1960, Pope John XXIII published a *Motu proprio* entitled *Superno Dei nutu* (SDN) in which he announced his decision to establish ten preparatory commissions

²⁴⁹ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 20 and STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 14.

²⁵⁰ SOETENS, “The Ecumenical Commitment,” p. 266.

²⁵¹ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 14.

²⁵² Giovanni DISTANTE, “Introduzione,” in Salvatore MANNA, ed., *Decreto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche: Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1986), p. 7.

²⁵³ Atanasij VELYKYĪ and Rodion HOLOVATS’KYĪ, eds., *Vselens’kyi Sobor Vatykans’kyi II: Diyannia i postanovy* [Ecumenical Council Vatican II: Proceedings and Resolutions], vol. 3 (Rome: Vydavnytstvo Ottsiv Vasylian, 1965), p. 145.

²⁵⁴ In accordance with Eastern Christian tradition, some Eastern Catholic hierarchs decided that instead of sending their individual suggestions, they would express their thoughts through their synods (DISTANTE, “Introduzione,” p. 7). The most detailed and systematic proposals were elaborated by the Synod of Bishops of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church (Johannes HOECK, “Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches,” in VORGRIMLER, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, p. 307).

that would work out pertinent subjects on the basis of the proposals that had been sent to Rome during the previous year.²⁵⁵ Most of the material concerning the Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Churches was handed over to the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches²⁵⁶ which, in accordance with papal directives, was to concentrate on and further explore the following four points: 1) changes of rite and the possibility of transfer from one rite to another; 2) *communicatio in sacris* with non-Catholic Eastern Christians; 3) reconciliation with “Orthodox dissidents,” and 4) major disciplinary questions.²⁵⁷ From the summer of 1960 to the winter of 1961, the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches held 56 plenary sessions which resulted in the composition of the above-mentioned schema *De Ecclesiae Unitate* and 14 shorter schemas dedicated to such questions as establishing Eastern Patriarchates, the responsibilities of bishops and priests, the permanent diaconate, mixed marriages, use of the Gregorian and Julian calendars, celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the vernacular, etc.²⁵⁸

At the beginning of the First Session of Vatican II, the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches was transformed into one of the newly-organized conciliar commissions and went through a considerable change of personnel. Cardinal Amleto Cicognani remained its chairman and Atanasii Velykyi a Ukrainian Basilian its secretary, but the staff of the Commission was reduced to only 26 members, 16 of whom were elected by the council fathers and the other 10 nominated by the Pope.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁵ DISTANTE, “Introduzione,” p. 7.

²⁵⁶ The Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches included 30 members (most of whom were Eastern Catholics) and almost the same number of theological consultants and experts (most of whom resided in Rome). See HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 307.

²⁵⁷ DISTANTE, “Introduzione,” p. 8.

²⁵⁸ VELKYI and HOLOVATS'KYI, *Vselens'kyi Sobor*, vol. 3, p. 145.

²⁵⁹ The nomination of the ten *periti* of the Conciliar Commission for the Eastern Churches was predetermined by the necessity of giving equal representation to all the larger Eastern Catholic Churches directly through

After a brief discussion of the schema *De Ecclesiae Unitate* and the almost unanimous decision of the council fathers to entrust the work of composing the future *Decree on Ecumenism* to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity,²⁶⁰ the Conciliar Commission for the Eastern Churches was given the new task of working out a separate schema which would deal exclusively with questions peculiar to the Catholic Churches of the East and their relations with the Eastern Orthodox.²⁶¹

A single and somewhat abridged²⁶² schema had already been composed already after the conclusion of the First Session of the Council. Its first part (44 articles) was based on 8 of 14 drafts earlier prepared by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches,²⁶³ as well as on a large number of more recent observations that had been sent to Rome during the period February-April 1963.²⁶⁴ On 29 March, Cardinal Amleto Cicognani received permission from the Central Commission to add to the schema another 10 articles that were incorporated under the special title *De Unione Christianorum*.²⁶⁵ These latter articles were derived from the draft *De Ecclesiae Unitate* which had already been discussed by the fathers and which constituted the basis for the second part of the future *Decree on*

their heads (six of the newly-appointed members of the Commission were Eastern Catholic patriarchs). Such a theoretically positive decision on the part of the Pope in reality led to some negative consequences. Because of great distances and perpetually busy schedules most of the nominated members of the Commission could not participate in its work outside the period of the actual sessions of the Council. As a result, most of the editorial work was accomplished by just a few *periti* who did not always express the mind of the Eastern Catholic communities in general. In the opinion of one of the members of the Conciliar Commission for the Eastern Churches and the President of the Benedictine Congregation of Bavaria, Abbot Johannes Hoeck, "some of the unsatisfactory compromises and gaps of the Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches are to be traced to this." See HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 308.

²⁶⁰ Paul MAILLEUX, "Eastern Churches," in ABBOTT, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 371.

²⁶¹ O'CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 3.

²⁶² The abridgement of the schema on the Eastern Churches was requested by the Central Commission at its meeting at the end of January 1963.

²⁶³ According to the decision of the Central Commission, 3 out of 14 drafts composed by the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches were referred to other Preparatory Commissions, one was sent to the Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law and another two to the pertinent Roman congregations. See HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 308.

²⁶⁴ VELYKYĪ and HOLOVATS'KYĪ, *Vselens'kyĭ Sobor*, vol. 3, p. 145.

²⁶⁵ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 308.

the Eastern Catholic Churches.²⁶⁶ In this form the schema received papal approval (22 April 1963) and was sent to the council fathers for further comment.²⁶⁷ Owing to severe criticism and a lack of time the schema was not discussed at the Second Session of the Council.²⁶⁸ The deadline for written emendations was thus extended to January 1964.²⁶⁹ Despite a large number of valuable improvements,²⁷⁰ the Central Commission once again demanded the radical abridgement of the entire schema.²⁷¹ The 54 articles were reduced to a total of 29,²⁷² while the twofold structure of the previous schema was altered by dividing the text into six shorter sections.²⁷³ On 27 April 1964 Pope Paul VI authorized the document for submission to the council fathers.²⁷⁴

At the very beginning of the Third Session, the council fathers first accepted the schema prepared by the Commission for the Eastern Churches as a suitable basis for conciliar discussion. This took place from 15 to 20 October 1964.²⁷⁵ The new document, distributed under the title *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* exhibited a considerable shift in its ecclesiological emphases and its general tone, both of which definitely changed for the better. Nevertheless, the schema was still very much weighed down with juridical

²⁶⁶ DISTANTE, "Introduzione," pp. 8-9.

²⁶⁷ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 309.

²⁶⁸ MAILLEUX, "Eastern Churches," p. 371.

²⁶⁹ VELYKYĬ and HOLOVATS'KYĬ, *Vselens'kyĭ Sobor*, vol. 3, p. 146.

²⁷⁰ The council fathers submitted approximately 400 proposals for improvement of the text. See RYNNE, *The Third Session*, p. 95.

²⁷¹ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 309.

²⁷² Despite the reduction of the number of articles, the length of the schema remained approximately the same. See RYNNE, *The Third Session*, p. 95.

²⁷³ DISTANTE, "Introduzione," p. 9.

²⁷⁴ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 309.

²⁷⁵ O'CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 3.

terminology and latinizing elements. These characteristics would remain quite apparent even in the very last version of the text promulgated as a Council Decree.²⁷⁶

Thirty council fathers participated in the debate²⁷⁷ and about the same number of fathers submitted their written petitions directed towards improvement of the text.²⁷⁸ The opinions expressed in the conciliar aula can be characterized as extremely diverse and sometimes even contradictory, varying from unreserved approbation to almost complete refutation.²⁷⁹ The Eastern Catholic bishops themselves presented very ambiguous views

²⁷⁶ Most of the members of both Preparatory and Conciliar Commissions for the Eastern Churches, including their chairman, Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, failed to “abandon some of the preconceptions inherent in *romanità*” and to “rid themselves of their prejudices” with regard to the authentic meaning of some basic Eastern concepts. Therefore, the voices of some prominent experts in the field of Eastern Christianity who opposed the outmoded curial point of view were generally not even taken into account. The situation was further worsened by the adoption of mutually antagonistic attitudes on the part of Eastern Catholic delegates at the Council with so-called “divided loyalties,” while the majority of the council fathers demonstrated an obvious lack of interest in the subject. See RYNNE, *The Third Session*, pp. 95-97.

²⁷⁷ Some of the council fathers participating in the discussion on the schema *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* (particularly the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, Stephanos I (Sidarouss) and Bishop Ghattas (Hozim) of Thebes) repeatedly expressed their doubts regarding the very need for a separate document on the Eastern Churches, the content of which could be very organically incorporated into the schema *De Ecclesia* (RYNNE, *The Third Session*, p. 103). Nevertheless, we should not forget that these suggestions “came forth only when the texts in the various commissions had already for the most part been prepared or were at least so far advanced that such thorough changes were hardly possible, their execution would have necessitated a much larger representation of the Orientals in the pertinent commissions than had been the case.” (HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 311) At the same time, there was a large number of Eastern Catholic bishops who appeared to be in favor of issuing a decree that would deal with the needs of their Churches. The reasons for this were clearly articulated by the Melkite Synod of Bishops led by the Patriarch of Antioch, Maximos IV (Saigh). (a) The Eastern Catholic Churches for a long time had been facing certain problems (such as latinization and the Roman Curia’s disregard for their particular canonical discipline based on the prerogatives of the patriarch and of the Synod of bishops). These, of course, were very different from the style of governance of the Latin Church. Therefore, these problems could not be properly solved “if their treatment were dispersed among the other constitutions and decrees of the Council.” (b) There was an urgent necessity for the correction of some canonical regulations imposed by the Eastern Catholic law then in force (in many respects contrary to authentically Eastern traditions). Without a special decree, endowed with the authority of an Ecumenical Council, the removal of outdated legislation which crept into the canon law of the Eastern Catholic Churches over time through latinization (n. 4), validity of Confirmation performed by Eastern Catholic priests (n. 13-14), Sunday obligations (n. 15), norms for confession (n. 16) and mixed marriages (n. 18) “would be postponed indefinitely.” (c) A separate Decree could become a firm foundation for the establishment of an inter-ritual post-conciliar commission that would “carry on the work” along these lines. See WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

²⁷⁸ VELKYĀ and HOLOVATS’KYĀ, *Vselens’kyĀ Sobor*, vol. 3, p. 146.

²⁷⁹ After the short introduction of Cardinal Amleto Cicognani followed by the presentation of the official *relatio* by the Vice-president of the Commission for the Eastern Churches, Archbishop Gabriel Bukatko, and several other speeches that “reflected the inveterate pro-Latin outlook of certain circles in Rome,” the attention of the fathers was grabbed by the critical address of Cardinal Franz König of Vienna who did not

that caused some confusion among the Latin council fathers who were in favor of the decisive rejection of the schema, but at the same time did not want to be accused of being unfavorably predisposed towards the Eastern Catholic hierarchs.²⁸⁰ Without the rejection of the document as a whole, major modifications of the text were no longer possible because of the shortage of time. Some of the fathers still hoped to affect the content of the future Decree by submitting their *modi*.²⁸¹ However, “the rules of procedure excluded the possibility of substantial alterations being proposed in them.”²⁸²

hesitate to express his objections with regard to several significant points raised by the document under discussion. In his opinion, the schema did not sufficiently treat the Orthodox as Churches and it seemed to jump to the conclusion that they should be simply converted to the Catholic Church. Cardinal König also proposed bringing the attitude of *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* into line with that of *De Oecumenismo*, not emphasizing so much the “separateness” of the Eastern non-Catholic Churches, but first of all taking under consideration the things which they have “in common” with the Catholic Church. The discussion regarding the right of converts to choose whatever rite they pleased demonstrated an apparent diversity of personal standpoints held by the council fathers of various backgrounds. While some of the fathers, including the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, Stephanos I (Sidarouss), the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, Archbishop Alberto Gori, and Cardinal Jaime de Barros Câmara of Rio de Janeiro, were in favor of the freedom of choice, the other side, represented by the Melkite Patriarchal Vicar for Damascus, Archbishop Joseph (Tawil), and the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia, Peter XVI (Batanian), were all “for retaining the reading of the text which prohibited a choice of rite.” On the one hand, praising general progress and certain positive aspects of the schema, most of the council fathers, on the other hand, raised their voices against its easily detectable latinizing tendencies, as did Ukrainian Major Archbishop Josyf (Slipyj) of L’viv. Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh) criticized identification of the Catholic Church with the Latin Church and the very weak presentation of the institution of Patriarchates as peculiar exclusively to the East. Melkite Patriarchal Vicar Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) spoke regarding the general lack of knowledge and respect regarding the Eastern Christian tradition among Roman Catholics. Bishop Josef Stangl of Würzburg complained about insufficient clarification of the principle *communicatio in sacris*. Romanian Bishop Vasile Cristea of Lebedo criticized the decision not to decry the suppression of Eastern Catholic Churches in Romania, Ukraine and other countries. Maronite Bishop Michael (Doumith) of Tyr turned general attention to the deficiency of explanation of how the lines of authority are to be established among Eastern Catholic hierarchs outside the East. Attempting to offer constructive criticism, a large number of the council fathers such as Greek Catholic Archbishop Antonio Gregorio (Vuccino) of Corfu suggested eliminating the usage of the expression “separated brethren.” Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro of Bologna and Coptic Bishop Ghattas (Hazim) of Thebes suggested that the Council create an “Episcopal senate” of the Universal Church with the right to elect the Pope. Chaldean Patriarch Raphael I (Bidawid) of Baghdad wanted the Council to increase the number of patriarchs, while Patriarch Maximos IV and Abbot Johannes Hoeck suggested that the Council grant autonomous status to the Eastern Patriarchates and release them from subordination to the Curia. Unfortunately, most of the above-mentioned proposals were not accepted, neither were they adequately treated by the Commission. See RYNNE, *The Third Session*, pp. 97-108.

²⁸⁰ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 309.

²⁸¹ *Modi* — reservations or proposals for amendment.

²⁸² HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 310.

The voting of 21 and 22 October, during which most of the chapters of the schema²⁸³ barely obtained the required two-thirds majority, demonstrated that a comparatively large number of the council fathers had voted against the schema. The extraordinarily large number of conditional affirmative votes showed that the text still needed to go through a process of at least minor revision.²⁸⁴ The 1920 *modi* submitted by 1646 council fathers were analyzed by five sub-commissions and synthesized into 40 alterations.²⁸⁵ These were introduced into the schema with the newly modified title *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus Catholicis*.²⁸⁶ Under very heavy time constraints the document which commenced with the words *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* was officially approved by 2110 *placet* and only 39 *non placet* votes on 21 November 1964.²⁸⁷ On the same day it was solemnly promulgated by Pope Paul VI with a two month *vacatio legis*²⁸⁸ allowing the patriarchs of the Eastern Catholic Churches for pastoral reasons to shorten or prolong the time of legal deferment of the Decree.²⁸⁹

²⁸³ The very first section of the schema with regard to the individual Churches or Rites (*OE* 2-4) did not receive the required two-thirds majority of the votes. Out of 2170 council fathers, 1373 voted in its favor, 73 against it, 719 expressed their affirmation under certain conditions (*modi*), and 5 votes were judged invalid. See O'CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 3 and HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 310.

²⁸⁴ VELKYKYĪ and HOLOVATS'KYĪ, *Vselens'kyĭ Sobor*, vol. 3, pp. 146-147.

²⁸⁵ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 310.

²⁸⁶ The earlier title, *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus*, was rendered more specific by the addition of the word, *Catholicis* as a result of 100 *modi* requiring this extremely significant modification. (HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 311) The change in the title was also caused by the last-minute addition of the epilogue (n. 30), according to which the Decree could be applied exclusively to the Eastern Churches that already enjoyed full and visible communion with Rome. Therefore, the effect of the Decree itself was "limited to the present situation only" in anticipation of the moment "when the general reunion of the Churches would come about." See WOJNAR, "Decree on the Oriental," p. 175.

²⁸⁷ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 245 and DISTANTE, "Introduzione," pp. 13-14.

²⁸⁸ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 310 and VELKYKYĪ and HOLOVATS'KYĪ, *Vselens'kyĭ Sobor*, vol. 3, p. 147.

²⁸⁹ For instance, the Head of the Kyivan Catholic Church, Major Archbishop Josyf Cardinal (Slipyj), who according to *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (n. 10) had the same faculties as a patriarch, on 22 December 1964 issued a special declaration that for his Church the Decree should come into legal force only on 7 April 1965 (WOJNAR, "Decree on the Oriental," pp. 173-174). It is interesting to note that in this particular case the Oriental Congregation did not deny Slipyj's authority outside his home country (Victor POSPISHIL, *Ex Occidente Lex: The Eastern Catholic Churches Under the Tutelage of the Holy See of Rome* (Carteret, N.J.: St.

The text of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* is very short.²⁹⁰ It contains only 30 brief articles²⁹¹ divided into a preface (n. 1), epilogue (n. 30) and six small chapters on “the individual churches or rites” (nos. 2-4), “safeguarding the spiritual heritage of the eastern churches” (nos. 5-6), “the eastern patriarchs” (nos. 7-11), “regulation of the sacraments” (nos. 12-18), “Divine worship” (nos. 19-23), and “contacts with brothers and sisters of separated churches” (nos. 24-29).²⁹² Just as there was a drastic divergence of opinions expressed in the conciliar aula at the time of the discussion on the schema *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus*,²⁹³ the official promulgation and publication of the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*²⁹⁴ occasioned a nearly equivalent number of extremely diverse theological commentaries varying from the highest admiration for the document to complete disappointment with its tone and contents. Criticism was leveled by individual council fathers, numerous experts in the fields of ecumenism and Eastern canon law, and even by some of the former members of the Conciliar Commission for the Eastern Churches responsible for the drafting of the document.²⁹⁵

On the one hand, most of the Catholic and non-Catholic commentators appreciated the Decree’s “positive, irenic, and constructive intentions”²⁹⁶ according to which the minds

Mary’s Religious Action Fund, 1979), pp. 48-50) and by so doing affirmed that any Major Archbishop may lawfully exercise jurisdiction over his entire Church anywhere in the world (concerning the Major Archbishop’s power over the faithful outside the archiepiscopate, see Hieronimus CHIMY, *De Figura iuridica Archiepiscopi Maioris in iure canonico Orientali vigenti* (Rome: Analecta OSBM, 1968); Ihor MONCHAK, “Stanovyshche Verkhovnoho Arkhyiepyskopa v ierarhichnomu ustroiu Tserkvy [The Position of Major Archbishops in the Oriental Churches],” in *Bohoslovia* 28 (1964), pp. 125-151; Victor POSPISHIL, “The Ukrainian Major Archiepiscopate,” in *Diakonia* 3 (1968), pp. 5-24).

²⁹⁰ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 223.

²⁹¹ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 19.

²⁹² OE 1-30, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 900-907.

²⁹³ RYNNE, *The Third Session*, pp. 97-108.

²⁹⁴ AAS, 57 (1965), pp. 76-89.

²⁹⁵ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 6.

²⁹⁶ Alexander SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” in ABBOTT, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 387.

of many were opened to the existence of a large number of “particular Churches of different origins”²⁹⁷ that from this point on were to be considered absolutely “equal in dignity” (n. 3) to the Church of Rome.²⁹⁸ These Churches were strongly encouraged to “abandon all extraneous influences”²⁹⁹ and obliged³⁰⁰ to develop themselves in keeping with their genuine roots and traditions³⁰¹ which had been almost entirely disregarded in the past.³⁰² On the other hand, many theologians regretted that, in spite of the very positive intentions of its drafters, the Decree failed to adopt a more inspiring scriptural and patristic tone characteristic of Vatican II’s *De Ecclesia*. Thus, in their view, the decree became nothing more than a canonical document³⁰³ that relied on exclusively Western juridical ways of thinking³⁰⁴ and neither “corrected the prejudices held in the Catholic Church in respect to the Eastern Catholic Churches”³⁰⁵ nor presented a clear vision explaining the reason for their very existence, along with their special role in the reestablishment of ecumenical dialogue.³⁰⁶

Many Eastern canonists had hoped that *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* would at least “prevent some imminent consequences of existing legislation”³⁰⁷ and would become a significant supplement to Pius XII’s outdated *Motu proprio, Cleri Sanctitati*³⁰⁸ of 1957.³⁰⁹

²⁹⁷ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 249.

²⁹⁸ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 139.

²⁹⁹ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 5.

³⁰⁰ The Decree says that the Eastern Catholic Churches in the same way as the Church of Rome “enjoy the right, and are bound by duty, to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules.” See *OE* 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

³⁰¹ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 5.

³⁰² MAILLEUX, “Eastern Churches,” pp. 371-372.

³⁰³ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, pp. 20-21.

³⁰⁴ SCHMEMMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 388.

³⁰⁵ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 6.

³⁰⁶ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, pp. 19, 21.

³⁰⁷ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

³⁰⁸ PIUX XII, “Cleri Sanctitati,” in *AAS* 49 (1957), pp. 433-600.

But, even from the standpoint of canon law, the Decree was not entirely free of some flaws. Some complained about its “repeating of many common places already widely known in the Church,”³¹⁰ at the same time not always positively resolving urgent legal problems,³¹¹ and often providing no definite explication of some very specific canonical questions.³¹²

One of the principal goals of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* consisted in the elimination of all latinizing influences that had been imposed on the Eastern Catholic Churches and authorized by the Latin legislative system during the previous centuries.³¹³ Consequently, the process of a gradual revival of the Eastern Catholic Churches had to be accomplished through the restoration of the “rights and privileges” (n. 9) of Eastern patriarchs,³¹⁴ as well as the adaptation of ancient disciplinary norms to the concrete circumstances of the present time.³¹⁵ Nevertheless, in the opinion of the renowned Orthodox churchman and theologian, Alexander Schmemmann, the Decree remained a merely “Latin text about the Eastern tradition,” almost entirely neglecting any understanding of the important ecclesiological

³⁰⁹ The Decree has actually influenced the further development of Eastern Catholic legislation resulting in the promulgation of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium (CCEO)* on 18 October 1990. See Patrick VISCUSO, “Twenty-Five Years after Vatican II: An Orthodox Perspective,” in Perre HEGY, ed., *The Church in the Nineties: Its Legacy, Its Future* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1993), p. 283.

³¹⁰ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 7.

³¹¹ Father Meletius Wojnar, Professor of the School of Canon Law of the Catholic University of America, explained that “the particular decisions made in the decree are very few and only in urgent matters.” (WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175) One of the most respectful commentators of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Archimandrite Victor Pospishil, goes even further in his criticism of the Decree, stating that “the lack of juridical clarity in such a piece of legislation is deplorable.” (POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 7)

³¹² For instance, the question of “whether non-Catholic Christians who join the Catholic Church ought to be permitted to select any Catholic rite, or should be obliged to follow that Catholic rite according to which they received baptism as non-Catholics” was mentioned in n. 4 of the Decree but, nonetheless, left without any definite resolution. See POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 6.

³¹³ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

³¹⁴ VISCUSO, “Twenty-Five Years,” p. 283.

³¹⁵ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

principle of *primus inter pares* and describing the legal authority of the patriarchs in terms of “personal jurisdiction,” an approach “alien to the Eastern canonical tradition.”³¹⁶

As a remnant of the earlier schema, *De Ecclesiae Unitate — Ut omnes unum sint*, the Decree dedicated its entire concluding chapter to the question of ecumenism (nos. 24-29), presenting the Eastern Catholic Churches as bridges between various parts of divided Christendom,³¹⁷ allowing worship in common,³¹⁸ and “manifesting the hope of the Council for a corporate reunion of the Eastern Churches presently not in union with the Church of Rome.”³¹⁹ A large number of Orthodox theologians who traditionally regarded the “Uniate” Churches as major obstacles on the way of restoration of unity between Christian East and West appreciated the “efforts made in these last years by some spiritual leaders of these communities to represent and voice within the Roman Catholic Church the Eastern tradition as a whole.”³²⁰ Nonetheless, some of the most prominent non-Catholic commentators expressed their doubts with regard to the possibility of *communicatio in sacris*³²¹ and severely criticized the Decree for its perpetual underestimation of the actually-existing differences between the East and the West. These, in their view cannot be reduced solely to the “liturgy, ecclesiastical order and spiritual heritage,”³²² leaving aside crucial doctrinal

³¹⁶ SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 388.

³¹⁷ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 20.

³¹⁸ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 140.

³¹⁹ MAILLEUX, “Eastern Churches,” p. 372.

³²⁰ SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 387. Many Orthodox hierarchs and theologians openly recognized the activity of the Melkite Greek Catholic hierarchy at the Second Vatican Council. Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople publicly told Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch: “You spoke for Orthodoxy at Vatican II — you were the voice of our common hope!” See Emilius INGLESSIS, *Maximos IV: l’Orient conteste l’Occident* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969), p. 72.

³²¹ Most of the Orthodox commentators agreed that *communicatio in sacris* can only be possible as a result of a bilateral decision expressing consensus among all Churches of Catholic and Orthodox communions. See SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 388.

³²² OE 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

issues which constitute the “real issue between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy.”³²³

Nevertheless, one can argue that *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* puts forward several fundamental breakthroughs³²⁴ that cannot be restricted in their significance exclusively to a limited number of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, because their understanding and faithful implementation is of equal importance for the Latin Church and most of the Orthodox Churches.³²⁵

The greatness of the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* reveals itself only when read³²⁶ in the light of Vatican II’s *De Ecclesia* and *De Oecumenismo*,³²⁷ keeping in mind the ecclesiological axiom that everything said about the Particular Churches is valid for the Universal Church and everything that said about the Church in general can be applied to any of the Particular Churches.³²⁸ Only this perspective allows us to arrive at an

³²³ SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 387.

³²⁴ After publication of Pope Leo XIII’s Apostolic Letter on the Churches of the East, *Orientalium Dignitas* (1894), which recognized the importance and dignity of the Eastern Churches of Catholic communion (see Pope LEO XIII, “*Orientalium Dignitas*,” in *The Vatican and the Eastern Christian Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documents Concerning the Eastern Churches*, trans. by Edward Stickland (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996), pp. 179-189), the Decree of the Second Vatican Council on the Eastern Catholic Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, had become the first official document received by the entire Catholic Church (*Orientalium Dignitas* was not accepted on the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) insisting on the equality of all rites, avoidance of latinization, and the restoration of the authentic heritage of each Eastern Catholic Church. The most significant concessions of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* were the recognition of each group of Eastern Catholics as Churches (*OE* 1) with a particular rite or tradition (*OE* 2), and that these Churches are of equal rank among themselves as well as with the Church of Rome (*OE* 3), entitled to propagate the faith also outside their own region (*OE* 4) and having the right and the duty “to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules.” (*OE* 5)

³²⁵ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 213 and WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

³²⁶ Clemente Riva believes that *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* was in fact a document of “greatest importance” (*grandissima importanza*). See RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 138. For more detailed information on the significance and impact of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* on the self-understanding of the Catholic Church as a communion of the Particular Churches, see the next sub-chapter of the present study.

³²⁷ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 222. Paul MAILLEUX says that the “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches should be considered as a complement to the Decree on Ecumenism.” (MAILLEUX, “Eastern Churches,” p. 371) Patrick O’Connell suggests that “positively to interpret this document, regard must be had at all points for the Decree on Ecumenism and the Constitution on the Church, in order to complete our interpretation of the council’s mind.” (O’Connell, *Vatican II: The Decree*, 21)

³²⁸ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 213, 216.

objective evaluation of the text³²⁹ without paying inordinate attention to its weaknesses³³⁰ and focusing mostly on its valuable achievements.³³¹

Finally, note that the change in the title of the Decree³³² as well as the addition of the short epilogue (n. 30) clearly indicated two very significant limitations arising from the “transitory character” of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*.³³³ In line with the general intention of the council fathers, the Decree was addressed solely to the Eastern Churches in communion with Rome,³³⁴ and the validity of the document was restricted to the period until the restoration of full and visible unity between Christian East and West.³³⁵

I.3. Vatican II’s Ecclesiological Shifts with Regard to Ecclesial Particularity: From the Uniformity of “Universalistic Ecclesiology” to the Development of the Concept of “Unity in Diversity” and the Understanding of the Church as a “Communion” of Particular Churches

Having reviewed the three most pertinent to the present study ecclesiological documents of the Second Vatican Council, it is now time for us to turn directly to the question of “particularity.” What, in fact is a “Particular Church”? To answer this question

³²⁹ For the most detailed commentary and evaluation of the content of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, see MANNA, *Decreto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche*, pp. 7-52; WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” pp. 173-255; POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, pp. 5-72; MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 222-251.

³³⁰ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 19.

³³¹ Meletius Wojnar claimed that “the main purpose of the decree was to give some general and concrete directives for the future legislation of the Oriental canonical discipline.” (WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 174) Victor Pospishil said that “this solemn declaration of the II Council of the Vatican expounds, beautifully some general principles which ought to determine the attitudes and govern the relationships of Catholics towards Catholic and non-Catholic Eastern Christianity.” (POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 5) Paul Mailleux praised the Decree for bringing “most valuable clarifications in several fields concerning the Catholic Eastern Churches.” (MAILLEUX, “Eastern Churches,” p. 371) Patrick O’Connell summarized the above-mentioned evaluations saying that *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* “was not aimed at settling all questions concerning the Eastern Churches in union with Rome, but left much to be legislated for by Eastern synods (this in itself was very significant).” See O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 19.

³³² From *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus* to *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus Catholicis*.

³³³ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 175.

³³⁴ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 17.

³³⁵ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 222 and SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” p. 387.

one must first trace the modern theological shifts which enabled the Catholic Church to jettison the earlier identification of unity with uniformity and thus restore an ecclesiology of communion. Without an understanding of these two shifts, it is virtually impossible to appreciate the idea of “particularity” in all its multidimensionality.

From the very moment of her establishment at the heart of the Roman Empire, and especially after the proclamation of Christianity as the official religion of the state, the Western Church deliberately chose to rely on the model of the political state as the most appropriate mode of her own existence. In keeping with this model, it was necessary to introduce the principle of uniformity as a means to safeguard internal ecclesial unity.³³⁶ As time went on, the Church of Rome managed to develop a strong ecclesiological system based on the universalist and monarchical standards which for centuries seemed to be the perfect manner of preserving a very high degree of homogeneity within the very broad cultural context of the Christian West.³³⁷ Nevertheless, the whole second millennium of Christian history has demonstrated that the ideal of unity built upon uniformity and the centralizing power of the Roman Pontiff in reality failed to bring all Christians together, and, like the tower of Babel (Gen. 11, 1-9), was left unfinished, causing new “schisms, acrimony, and turmoil.”³³⁸ Paradoxically, in fact, this stress on uniformity became one of the greatest obstacles to the restoration of Christian unity.³³⁹

The acknowledgement of this negative phenomenon by Roman Catholic authorities was far from immediate. On the contrary, and especially at the time of the Counter-Reformation, the Church of Rome was inclined to think that the only possible way of

³³⁶ VOGEL, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 7.

³³⁷ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40.

³³⁸ Henri de LUBAC, *The Splendor of the Church* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), p. 9.

³³⁹ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 315.

restoring unity directly depended on an even greater reinforcement of uniformity and universalistic ecclesiology developed by medieval scholasticism. This is why the Church of Rome for a very long period of time failed to recognize the existence of other Apostolic sees besides the *Sedes Apostolica Romana* with the successor of St. Peter as the absolute monarch of the Universal Church.³⁴⁰ The insistence on the use of Latin as the only acceptable language of the Mass was just one symbol of this homogenizing thrust.³⁴¹

Even after the reintegration of a large number of Eastern Churches with their own spiritual, theological, liturgical and canonical traditions into the Catholic Communion, the Latin Church refused to recognize in the Roman Pontiff the “defender and guarantor of unity and of the *bonum commune* of the Church,” her “*summus iudex* and *arbiter*, who intervenes only where, and to the extent that, the unity and purity of the faith make it appear to be necessary.”³⁴² The focus in Rome as *the* Apostolic See and sheer numerical prevalence,³⁴³ caused the Latin rite Church to think of herself as the *ritus praestantior*. The canonical and liturgical consequences of this vision resulted in the frequent transfer of so-called “uniates” as well as Orthodox to the Western Church³⁴⁴ and a very intensive emulation of Latin practices and ceremonies on the part of those Eastern Catholics who remained members of their respective ecclesial bodies.³⁴⁵ Needless to say, missionary activity by the Eastern Catholic Churches was also prohibited, as only the Church of Rome was understood as the authentic bearer of the Catholic Tradition.³⁴⁶ According to Patriarch Maximos IV, the Latin Church before Vatican II had been quite successful if not in

³⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 313-315.

³⁴¹ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40.

³⁴² HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 315.

³⁴³ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 21.

³⁴⁴ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 182.

³⁴⁵ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 21.

³⁴⁶ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 182.

annihilating, then at least demeaning, much of what was different from her,³⁴⁷ imposing upon “all those many Christians who for hundreds of years have followed their own ways – who have developed their own specific forms of worship, their own religious traditions, their own expressions of piety; who within the context of their intellectual tradition have given Christian truth their own linguistic form” the Western type of religious experience, “including its choral music, its incense, and the form and color of its liturgical garb – as the only true Catholicism.”³⁴⁸ As a result, many traditional practices of the Eastern Catholic Churches were tolerated only as privileges or exceptions from the norm, while their members were often regarded as second-rate Catholics.³⁴⁹

The situation in which the Catholic communion manifested herself as a monolithic organization being “more Latin than anything else”³⁵⁰ gradually brought the Church of Rome to a new crisis of her ecclesial identity. On the eve of the Second Vatican Council many Catholics realized that their Church in reality would lack universality and catholicity if she were to continue to limit herself to only one particular Tradition,³⁵¹ being incapable of recognizing that diversity and manifoldness should not be “overcome and canceled out by unity” but “fostered and developed as one of the important tasks of the Church.”³⁵² This

³⁴⁷ MAXIMOS IV, “Der katholische Orient und die christliche Einheit, Unsere Berufung als Werkzeug der Einigung,” in *Una Sancta* 16 (1961), p. 6.

³⁴⁸ The cited text is a translation from Wilhelm de VRIES, *Wegbereitung zur Einheit der Christen aus ostkirchlicher Sicht* (Recklinghausen, 1961), pp. 5-7. See KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40.

³⁴⁹ MAXIMOS IV, “Der katholische Orient,” p. 3.

³⁵⁰ Elias ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western Tradition in the One Church,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, p. 52.

³⁵¹ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40.

³⁵² Karl RAHNER and Joseph RATZINGER, “Episkopat und Primat,” in *Quaestiones Disputatae* 11 (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1961), p. 97.

is why the principle *unitas non significat uniformitas* right from the beginning had been adopted by the Council as one of its principal slogans.³⁵³

The fathers of Vatican II understood very well that the Council would not be truly Ecumenical “if all the individual Churches, with their specific histories and their traditions, with their problems and needs, their objections and concerns, their wishes and demands, were denied full expression, or if one specific Church in a totalitarian fashion would force her particular Tradition, her particular doctrine, her particular discipline upon the others.”³⁵⁴ Therefore, Vatican II in itself became an ideal witness and manifestation of the principle of *unity in diversity*. Coming from different parts of the globe and being markedly different from one another in their cultural and educational backgrounds, the fathers of the Council expressed a great variety of theological opinions based on their own religious experiences. Nevertheless, this diversity of thoughts in no way undermined a profound unity which was very strongly felt by all the participants of Vatican II, encouraging them to unlock their minds and hearts for a new sense of the Church’s catholicity.³⁵⁵

Inspired by the example of the patristic Church that was marked by much greater openness to the diversity of liturgical and theological expressions,³⁵⁶ the fathers of the Second Vatican Council decisively rejected uniformity³⁵⁷ as something that is foreign to the

³⁵³ Domenico COLOMBO, *L’Ecumenismo secondo il decreto conciliare: Introduzione, testo, commenti dei fratelli separati* (Milano: Pontificio Istituto Missioni Estere, 1965), p. 39 and Melvin MICHALSKI, *The Relationship Between the Universal Priesthood of the Baptized and the Ministerial Priesthood of the Ordained in Vatican II and in Subsequent Theology: Understanding “Essentia et non Tantum,” Lumen Gentium no. 10* (Lewiston, N.Y, Queenston, Ont: E. Mellen Press, 1996), p. 55.

³⁵⁴ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 39.

³⁵⁵ Daniel DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic: An Exploration of Catholic Identity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1997), pp. 146-147, 177.

³⁵⁶ René BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity? The Decree on Ecumenism Ten Years Later — A Roman Catholic View,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 16:2 (1974), p. 205, KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40 and DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 177.

³⁵⁷ DULLES, *Models*, p. 189 and VOGEL, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 6.

Church's essence³⁵⁸ and stifles the work of the Holy Spirit.³⁵⁹ In several documents they declared that the Church, understood as a standardized institution with standard types of spirituality and worship,³⁶⁰ cannot fulfill her mission of serving the contemporary world with its vast variety of local cultural and religious customs and traditions (*UR* 4).³⁶¹ Furthermore, acknowledging that there is as much strength in diversity as there is in unity,³⁶² Vatican II emphasized the positive value of pluralism³⁶³ as not being an "unavoidable evil"³⁶⁴ or "something tolerated merely because it cannot be suppressed,"³⁶⁵ but as a "source of freedom and creativity"³⁶⁶ and something that "does no harm to unity," being rather "conducive to it." (*LG* 13)³⁶⁷

Opening herself to the originality and spontaneity with which various people reflect on the divine realities and worship one and the same God,³⁶⁸ the Catholic Church recognized that the primary aim of her missionary activity is not to destroy the variety of expression³⁶⁹ but to preserve and to foster everything that is good and better suited to the character of newly-established local Churches.³⁷⁰ Such an attitude based on the values of enculturation and adaptation of the Christian faith to the external forms produced by the

³⁵⁸ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 275.

³⁵⁹ Camillus HAY, "The Ecclesiological Significance of the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (1966), p. 352.

³⁶⁰ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 275.

³⁶¹ BEAUPÈRE, "What Sort of Unity?" pp. 205-206.

³⁶² DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 177.

³⁶³ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 139 and John LONG, "East and West in the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Unitas* 17:1 (1965), p. 11.

³⁶⁴ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 40.

³⁶⁵ LONG, "East and West," p. 11.

³⁶⁶ Hans KÜNG, *Reforming the Church Today: Keeping Hope Alive* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), p. 32.

³⁶⁷ *LG* 13, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 859. See also Léon-Étienne DUVAL, *L'Église: Constitution "Lumen gentium: " texte conciliaire, introduction, commentaries* (Tours: Mame, 1966), p. 185.

³⁶⁸ Clement PUJOL, "The Conciliar Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches," in *Unitas* 17 (1965), p. 30.

³⁶⁹ O'CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 21.

³⁷⁰ The benefits of this program of ecumenical and missionary activity even before Vatican II were explained in Pope Pius XII's Encyclical on the Missions, *Fidei Donum*. See RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, pp. 185-186.

native genius already in the present moment gives a positive answer to the objection on the part of a large number of separated Christians for whom throughout many centuries union with Rome necessarily meant submission to a “superior” Latin rite formed by the “more advanced” European culture.³⁷¹ According to the contemporary ecumenical approach enunciated by the Second Vatican Council, the future recomposition of unity will no longer “require uniformity nor the elimination of all differences, nor the peace of the graveyard.”³⁷²

After affirming the many advantages coming from the Church’s openness to legitimate variety,³⁷³ it is important to pose the question: “How far does acceptance of such diversity go?”³⁷⁴ From the time of early Christianity there has always been tension among conflicting camps in the Church which understood and interpreted one and the same message of Christ in different ways.³⁷⁵ Yet, their existence was not regarded as a problem or the result of human sin if they remained linked together in the unity of the same ecclesiastical Tradition.³⁷⁶ The real danger for the unity of the Church came from those parties which began to preach a completely different Gospel, cutting themselves off and bringing internal alienation to their ecclesial communities.³⁷⁷

At the present time, we also witness tension between “innovators” and “traditionalists,” “Easternizers” and “Westernizers,” “adherents of action” and “advocates of contemplation,” who can either neutralize each other, paralyzing the development of their Churches, or engage themselves in fruitful dialogue, searching for the possibility of

³⁷¹ LONG, “East and West,” p. 11.

³⁷² BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 206.

³⁷³ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 185.

³⁷⁴ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 207.

³⁷⁵ KÜNG, *Reforming the Church Today*, pp. 34-35.

³⁷⁶ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 207.

³⁷⁷ KÜNG, *Reforming the Church Today*, pp. 32-34.

cooperation and turning contradictions into complementarities.³⁷⁸ Without a doubt, the future Church will be even more pluralistic than she is now.³⁷⁹ Therefore, the important thing will be to preserve ecclesial communion and unity in essentials (*UR* 4).³⁸⁰ However, when ecclesial diversity concerns the variety of forms³⁸¹ and the Church's means of expression and "appearance,"³⁸² – elements not in conflict with the essential truths upon which everyone has to agree³⁸³ – this diversity can and should exist, "giving ever better expression to the authentic catholicity and apostolicity of the church."³⁸⁴

In the previous sub-chapter of the thesis I already mentioned the significance of the frequent use of the term *communio* with regard to Rome's ecumenical activity in inviting all separated brethren who possess only partial unity to the fullness of the visible ecclesiastical communion which already subsists in Catholicism and will be even more effectively actualized in a reconciled Church. Now it is time to explain another aspect of the very same term as it was applied by the fathers of Vatican II. This should facilitate a better comprehension of the internal ties which exist among various ecclesial bodies within the Catholic Church herself.

In contrast with several other concepts derived from the body image, the notion of "communion" appeared to be much deeper in content, not only for the reason that it allows one to distinguish different degrees and levels of unity, but first of all because it "defines

³⁷⁸ BEAUPÈRE, "What Sort of Unity?" p. 206.

³⁷⁹ Karl RAHNER, *The Shape of the Church to Come* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), p. 103.

³⁸⁰ Burkhard NEUNHEUSER, "Église Universelle et Église Locale," in CAMELOT, BARAÚNA, CONGAR, *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2, p. 637 and LONG, "East and West," p. 9.

³⁸¹ In his sermon preached in Cambridge in 1970, Cardinal Willebrands emphasized that even a future reintegrated Church must include various "types" (*typoi*) of religious expression. See VOGEL, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 6.

³⁸² MADEY, *Ecumenism*, p. 30.

³⁸³ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, pp. 40-41.

³⁸⁴ *UR* 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

the church in terms of those elements of faith and grace that create community rather than ecclesiastical structures.”³⁸⁵ That is why, in their reflections on the nature and mission of the manifold Universal Church composed of various local Churches, each with their own liturgical and theological traditions (*LG* 23), the council fathers did not hesitate to reach back to the original image of the early Church as *communio Ecclesiarum*. This was understood to be not only a society that embraces individual members but also fraternal community of individual Churches united together by the same faith and participation in the same Sacraments.³⁸⁶ Therefore, the fathers deliberately chose the biblical term *communio*, as a more accurate model for the further ecclesial development of the Catholic Church.³⁸⁷

The fathers of the Council touched the very heart of ecclesiology when they presented the dynamic interrelationship among the Divine Persons within the Holy Trinity as the prototype of the brotherly communion that must exist among all the Particular Churches.³⁸⁸ Both *Lumen Gentium* and *Unitatis Redintegratio* emphasized that “the unity of the one God, the Father and the Son in the holy Spirit” is the “highest model and source” (*LG* 4; *UR* 2) for the unity of the Universal Church realized through the diversity of Churches with their own spiritual, theological, liturgical, and canonical traditions.³⁸⁹ Expressing enthusiastic support for the famous saying of Joseph Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI) that the “Holy Trinity constitutes the true framework for every

³⁸⁵ Susan WOOD, “The Theology of Communion as an Ecumenical Resource,” in *Ecumenical Trends* 18:10 (1989), p. 103.

³⁸⁶ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 515.

³⁸⁷ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 33.

³⁸⁸ HARKIANAKIS, “The Ecclesiology of Vatican II,” pp. 245-246 and SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 202.

³⁸⁹ Elias ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité de l’Église,” in CAMELOT, BARAUNA, CONGAR, *L’Église de Vatican II*, p. 493.

ecclesiology,”³⁹⁰ another Catholic theologian, Yves Congar, drew attention to the Trinitarian model by emphasizing that the Church could not be understood only as being “paternal” (built upon the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff), or “Christological” (totally dependent on the clergy), for the reason that she is also “pneumatological” (open for the participation of all Christians in the common task of building up the community of saints).³⁹¹ As a true reflection and a living image of the inner life of the Holy Trinity,³⁹² the Catholic communion of Churches represented at the Second Vatican Council approached in a new way the crucial question of relations between the local and universal dimensions in the Church,³⁹³ insisting that variety in no way harms but rather contributes to Christian unity.³⁹⁴

In keeping with the teaching on the “analogy of being (*analogia entis*),” the image of the Eucharist in addition to that of the Holy Trinity³⁹⁵ was adopted by the Council as another powerful way of representing the Church as a *communio*³⁹⁶ of “local Churches in which One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church is truly present and active.” (CD 11)³⁹⁷ Vatican II’s *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* insists that while “by baptism we are made into the likeness of Christ,” by the “breaking of the eucharistic bread, we are raised up to communion with him and among ourselves.”³⁹⁸ Stressing the importance of the Eucharist as the “source and the summit of the Christian life,” (LG 13) the fathers of the

³⁹⁰ Joseph RATZINGER, *Konstitution über die Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder & Herder, 1965), p. 14.

³⁹¹ MICHALSKI, *The Relationship*, pp. 55-56.

³⁹² WOOD, “The Theology of Communion,” p. 150.

³⁹³ ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” pp. 496-497.

³⁹⁴ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 139.

³⁹⁵ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 77.

³⁹⁶ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 37.

³⁹⁷ See also Jean Marie Roger TILLARD, “The Church of God is a Communion: The Ecclesiological Perspective of Vatican II,” in *One in Christ* 17:2 (1981), p. 118.

³⁹⁸ LG 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 852-853. See also CEGLIELKA, *Handbook of Ecclesiology*, pp. 32-34.

Council also underlined its essential role as the “inner force in the Church’s make-up” (*LG* 3, 11, 26). From now on, we can speak of the existence of the “ecclesiology of communion” or “eucharistic ecclesiology” establishing solid ground for the future reconciliation between Christian East and West.³⁹⁹

Nevertheless, by saying that “there is no *communio* without Eucharist and no Eucharist without *communio*,”⁴⁰⁰ various theologians did not mean one and the same thing.⁴⁰¹ Some of them, still relying very heavily on the model described in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, were inclined to think of the Catholic Church as the *sum total* encompassing a certain number of individual Churches playing a similar role to that of the members in the body.⁴⁰² Yet, it is important to note that such a numerical interpretation of the “ecclesiology of communion,” based on the understanding of the mutual relations between the local and universal Churches as between the *parts* and the *whole*, was decisively rejected by the majority of both Orthodox and Catholic theologians who did not hesitate to recognize the fullness of ecclesial reality in each eucharistic community.⁴⁰³ In any case, the Eucharist as a link between God and his people and among Christians themselves⁴⁰⁴ was repeatedly explained by the documents of Vatican II as a living sign and an authentic manifestation of the unity that exists in the diversity of the Particular Churches

³⁹⁹ Henri de LUBAC, *The Church: Paradox and Mystery*, trans. by James Dunne (Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba House, 1969), p. 36

⁴⁰⁰ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 37.

⁴⁰¹ Gillian EVANS, “Orthodox and Roman Catholic Ecclesiology: the Recent Scene and the Residual Difficulties,” in *One in Christ* 30:1 (1994), pp. 36-37.

⁴⁰² WOOD, “The Theology of Communion,” p. 152 and PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 213.

⁴⁰³ Jean Marie Roger TILLARD, *Flesh of the Church, Flesh of Christ: at the Source of the Ecclesiology of Communion* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 61 and Joseph RATZINGER, *Church, Ecumenism, and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad, 1988), p. 9.

⁴⁰⁴ TILLARD, “The Church of God,” p. 118.

together searching for better ways to realize their nature and mission in this world.⁴⁰⁵ Furthermore, sharing in the same body and blood of Christ has been presented by the council fathers as a symbol of “spiritual solidarity” among all Christians living and dead, and a sacrament which is destined to unite the earthly pilgrim Church with the heavenly triumphant Church, creating the true *communio sanctorum* (communion of saints).⁴⁰⁶ This important observation contributed considerably to the development of the eschatological dimension of Vatican II’s ecclesiology (*LG* 48-51),⁴⁰⁷ according to which the Church as communion will not cease to exist even after the second coming of the Lord.⁴⁰⁸

The understanding of the Church as a unique divine fullness uniting the entire cosmos with its Creator⁴⁰⁹ brought the fathers of Vatican II to the original meaning of the notion of “catholicity.” In medieval and modern times the term “catholic” was generally understood and interpreted in the West as being equivalent to later terms such as “ecumenical” and “universal.” Nevertheless, this equation was theologically inadequate: it considerably narrowed a far deeper sense of the word “catholic” by limiting it to the quantitative and geographical dimensions of the Church as being universally spread throughout the entire *oikoumene*. The etymology of the Greek word *katholikos*, composed of *kata* and *holon* (according to the whole), helps us come closer to the authentic meaning of the term “catholic,” which primarily signifies wholeness and the “fullness of God’s

⁴⁰⁵ ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” p. 499.

⁴⁰⁶ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, pp. 37-38.

⁴⁰⁷ George FREIN, *Seven Lesson Plans on the Constitution on the Church of Vatican Council II* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1967), p. 22 and De LUBAC, *The Church*, pp. 47, 52.

⁴⁰⁸ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, pp. 18-19.

⁴⁰⁹ The all-encompassing nature of the Church is most realistically symbolized in the Byzantine Liturgy, when the priest preparing the Holy Gifts for the consecration places on the paten particles of bread commemorating Christ himself, the Holy Mother of God, the angels, all the saints, all the departed and all the living. See John MEYENDORFF, “Contemporary Orthodox Concept of the Church,” in O’NEILL, *Ecumenism and Vatican II*, p. 31.

action in Christ, who then - and only then - reveals the truth to all persons, at all times, and in all places.”⁴¹⁰ Using the word “catholic” for the first time, St. Ignatius of Antioch intended to explain that, wherever Christ is, there is also the fullness of the ecclesial reality.⁴¹¹ Therefore, the original understanding of ecclesial catholicity was more Christological than geographical and had much more in common with qualitative depth than with quantitative expansion. The term *katholikos* is closer to the biblical *plēroma* (fullness), which is first of all attributed to divine realities. Only as a sign of her inner coherence with the fullness of the heavenly Kingdom may the term be also used to designate the earthly Church.⁴¹² The Latin translators of the Creed wisely restrained themselves from replacing the Greek form of the words *catholica ecclesia* with the Western term *universalis*⁴¹³ for the reason that it would change the genuine understanding of the very essence and vocation of the Church as a living reflection of the fullness of God.⁴¹⁴ Even in cases when the documents of Vatican II still used the term “universal,” it was understood to have a much broader meaning and ontological significance.

Granting special magisterial attention for the first time in history to the local dimension of the Church,⁴¹⁵ the fathers of the Council came to the conclusion that the catholicity and universality of the Church is “better realized through particularity”⁴¹⁶ for the reason that catholicity can be fully manifested in each individual Church⁴¹⁷ and has nothing to do with the pseudo-ecclesiological image of the “super-Church” as something existing

⁴¹⁰ William LAZARETH, “Response to Avery Dulles,” in HORGAN, *Walking Together*, p. 29.

⁴¹¹ MEYENDORFF, “Contemporary,” pp. 30-31.

⁴¹² LAZARETH, “Response to Avery Dulles,” p. 30.

⁴¹³ In the Church-Slavonic language the word *katholikos* is translated by a new term *sobornaia*, which reflects both qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the Church.

⁴¹⁴ MEYENDORFF, “Contemporary,” p. 30.

⁴¹⁵ NISSIOTIS, “Orthodox Reflections on the Decree,” p. 329 and HEARNE, “Was Vatican II,” p. 105.

⁴¹⁶ NEUNHEUSER, “Église Universelle,” p. 637.

⁴¹⁷ MADEY, *Ecumenism*, p. 29 and TILLARD, “The Church of God,” p. 117.

“beside or above the local churches, as if she were of a different species.”⁴¹⁸ Despite the fact that it was very difficult to instill this idea in the consciousness of many Catholics who were used to thinking of the diversity of the local Churches in a “slightly impersonal way,”⁴¹⁹ the Second Vatican Council once again turned general attention to the ancient understanding of the term *ekklesia*⁴²⁰ described in the New Testament as an ecclesial Christian community of a particular city (LG 26).⁴²¹ Therefore, relying on the image of the local Church as a living cell containing the entire saving mystery of the Mystical Body of Christ,⁴²² the council fathers refused to think of the Universal Church as a super-organization and a world-wide administration made up merely of culturally and linguistically differentiated regional branches which, if necessary, could be swallowed by the superior and numerically largest Church of the Latin rite.⁴²³ Consequently, mutual relations between the local and universal dimensions of the Church⁴²⁴ were presented in the documents of Vatican II⁴²⁵ as relations between micro and macrocosm,⁴²⁶ expressing the same fullness of the ecclesial reality and allowing both local autonomy and universal catholicity not to cancel but to reinforce each other.⁴²⁷

⁴¹⁸ Michael SHERIDAN, *The Theology of the Local Church in Vatican II* (Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1980), p. 80.

⁴¹⁹ Eugenio CORECCO, “The Bishop as Head of the Local Church and Its Discipline,” in Neophytos EDELBY, Teodoro JIMENEZ-URRESTI, Petrus HUIZING, eds., trans. by Michael Tully, *The Sacraments in Theology and Canon Law* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1968), pp. 97-98.

⁴²⁰ Kevin MCNAMARA, “Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II,” in Michael ADAMS, ed., *Vatican II on Ecumenism* (Dublin: Scepter Books, 1967), p. 78.

⁴²¹ Edward SCHICK, “Importance of the Local Church,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, pp. 36-37.

⁴²² STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 27.

⁴²³ Karl RAHNER, *Humane Society and the Church of Tomorrow* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), p. 136.

⁴²⁴ SCHICK, “Importance of the Local Church,” pp. 36-37.

⁴²⁵ Despite the fact that in LG 3 and 23, the local Church was still designated as *portio ecclesiae universalis*, the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* also emphasized that all the Particular Churches are “formed in the likeness of the universal church” (LG 23) and “the church of Christ is truly present in all the lawful local congregations.” (LG 26) See also De LUBAC, *The Church*, pp. 30-31

⁴²⁶ EVANS, “Orthodox,” pp. 43-44.

⁴²⁷ SHERIDAN, *The Theology*, pp. 78-80.

The recognition in the local Christian fellowship gathered together in one place⁴²⁸ of the real manifestation and actualization of the entire Catholic Church⁴²⁹ opened an entirely new possibility of reflecting on the nature and mission of a Particular Church as being not only subject matter for the Church's canon law, but also the fundamental basis for the further development of conciliar ecclesiology.⁴³⁰ The local community becomes an authentic reflection of the Universal Church,⁴³¹ not only because on the local level it repeats the universal ecclesiastical structure, but, first and foremost, because it participates in the fullness of the saving reality perfectly realized through the reading of the Word, preaching of the Gospel, and celebration of the Eucharist⁴³² under the presidency of the local bishop surrounded by the priests and the laity.⁴³³ In this sense, the local Churches cannot complement each other, for the reason that each of them already "possesses the fullness of Christ's sacramental presence." Nevertheless, it has always been important for all of the Particular Churches to "recognize in each other the *same* faith, the *same* fullness, and the *same* divine life," safeguarding universal integrity from the danger of schisms and divisions.⁴³⁴ Therefore, the full and visible unity manifested through the diversity of the Particular Churches becomes possible only when all the local bishops preserve very firm inter-communion among themselves,⁴³⁵ which in its turn becomes a perfect reflection of the conciliar character of the Catholic Church.⁴³⁶

⁴²⁸ Camillus HAY, "The Church in the Decree on Ecumenism," in *One in Christ* 4:4 (1968), p. 365.

⁴²⁹ De LUBAC, *The Church*, p. 30.

⁴³⁰ SCHICK, "Importance of the Local Church," pp. 36-37.

⁴³¹ TILLARD, *The Bishop of Rome*, pp. 37-38.

⁴³² STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 27 and MEYENDORFF, "Contemporary," p. 31.

⁴³³ HEARNE, "Was Vatican II," p. 105.

⁴³⁴ MEYENDORFF, "Contemporary," p. 31.

⁴³⁵ In the Catholic Church this inter-communion is under the presidency of the Roman Pontiff. See WOOD, "The Theology of Communion," p. 152, Guido POZZO, ed., *Constituzione dogmatica sulla Chiesa Lumen*

As was accurately indicated by Joseph Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI), one can detect at least two distinct and at the same time complementary ecclesiologies adopted by the Second Vatican Council. The first started its theological analysis in a traditional manner from the universal level and went down to the local dimension of the Church, while the second ecclesiology in a new way chose the Particular Church as its point of departure and reflected on the value of diversity as contributing to universal unity.⁴³⁷ Despite the fact that there existed tension between the two attitudes in the conciliar documents, both ecclesiologies were regarded by the council fathers as positive attitudes towards the clarification of the Church's identity and mission.⁴³⁸ As a consequence, the theology of the local Church was placed in the center of the conciliar deliberations,⁴³⁹ although, being a somewhat new concept for many bishops it was not exempt from a large number of open questions, uncertainties and terminological discrepancies.⁴⁴⁰

Confusion in the understanding of basic ecclesiological concepts increased even more when Vatican II deliberately replaced the old two-tiered model of the Church based exclusively on relations between the Roman Pontiff presiding over the Universal Church and the rest of the episcopate exercising their ecclesiastical power on the local level with the three-tiered model that included intermediary authorities who govern autonomous

gentium: introduzione e commento di Guido Pozzo (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1988), p. 120 and MCNAMARA, "Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II," p. 78.

⁴³⁶ Joseph GEORGE, *The Principle of Subsidiarity, With Special Reference to Its Role in Papal and Episcopal Relations in the Light of Lumen Gentium* (Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI, 1988), pp. 80-81 and André SCRIMA, "Simples réflexions d'un Orthodoxe sur la Constitution," in CAMELOT, BARAUNA, CONGAR, *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2, p. 1282.

⁴³⁷ Joseph RATZINGER, "La collegialità episcopale: spiegazione teologica del testo conciliare," in Guilheme BARAUNA, ed., *La Chiesa del Vaticano II* (Firenze: Vallecchi, 1965), pp. 745-747.

⁴³⁸ Bernard PRUSAK, *The Canonical Concept of Particular Church Before and After Vatican II* (Rome: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1967), p. 121.

⁴³⁹ HEARNE, "Was Vatican II," p. 105.

⁴⁴⁰ Gianfranco GHIRLANDA, "Universal Church, Particular Church, and Local Church at the Second Vatican Council and in the New Code of Canon Law," in LATOURELLE, *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, p. 240.

Churches of the Catholic communion.⁴⁴¹ Therefore, anyone who examines the use of the various terms employed by the documents of the Second Vatican Council might encounter a considerable lack of clarity, especially when the council fathers talk about the Eastern Catholic Churches, which we now routinely call Churches of their own legal standing (*ecclesiae sui iuris*).⁴⁴²

This is a crucial issue in the context of the present thesis. The conciliar documents use the terms *Ecclesia particularis*, *Ecclesia localis*, *Ritus*, etc.⁴⁴³ Very often the exact meaning of these terms has to be drawn from the context⁴⁴⁴ for the reason that in many conciliar texts there is simply no consistency in the application of these ecclesiological designations. For example, one can distinguish at least three different meanings of one and the same conciliar expression “local Church” repeatedly used by various documents of Vatican II. Whereas *Unitatis Redintegratio* employs the term *ecclesiae locales* in order to designate the patriarchal Churches (*UR* 14), Vatican II’s *Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity* the same term to a mere diocese (*AG* 19, 27). The *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* adopts both meanings of the expression (*LG* 23, 26), while the conciliar *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* uses the term *ecclesia localis* to refer to a parish (*PO* 6).⁴⁴⁵ Some clarity was brought to the understanding of this concept only after the Second Vatican Council, when it was suggested that, in contrast to the term “Particular

⁴⁴¹ FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, pp. 140-141.

⁴⁴² ŽUŽEK, “The *Ecclesiae Sui Iuris*,” p. 290.

⁴⁴³ SHERIDAN, *The Theology*, pp. 86-87.

⁴⁴⁴ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 314.

⁴⁴⁵ The use of the term *ecclesia localis* in *PO* 6 in order to designate a parish can actually be regarded as an exception. In other conciliar documents local communities of baptized Christians presided over by a priest are usually referred to as *congregatio localis fidelium* (“local assembly of the faithful” - *LG* 28), *communitas localis* (“local community” - *PO* 6; *LG* 28; *AA* 30), or simply as *congregatio fidelium* (“assembly of the faithful” - *PO* 5; *AG* 15). See GHIRLANDA, “Universal Church,” p. 244 and SCHICK, “Importance of the Local Church,” pp. 36-37.

Church,” which has much more to do with theological, legislative, and spiritual peculiarities, the term “local Church” can be used for the same grouping of people when “it is more particularly considering territory as the distinguishing factor.”⁴⁴⁶ The World Synod of Bishops which took place in 1974 decided to use the expression “particular” for a diocese and the term “local” for interdiocesan institutions such as monasteries and parishes.⁴⁴⁷

Similar terminological confusion can be observed in the use of the expression *Ecclesia particularis*, which originally was meant to play an exceptionally significant role in Vatican II’s *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*.⁴⁴⁸ At the very beginning the authors of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* decided that they would no longer describe any of the Particular Churches with the traditional Latin term “Rite,”⁴⁴⁹ for the reason that this term has at least several different meanings,⁴⁵⁰ the most immediate of which designates a certain liturgical tradition.⁴⁵¹ The ecumenical atmosphere permeating the Council also demanded the abandonment of the outdated expression *ritus* for the reason that non-Catholic Eastern

⁴⁴⁶ GHIRLANDA, “Universal Church,” p. 243.

⁴⁴⁷ SHERIDAN, *The Theology*, pp. 86-87.

⁴⁴⁸ FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, pp. 148-149.

⁴⁴⁹ From the time of the promulgation of Pope Clement VIII’s *Instructio super Ritibus Graecorum* (1595), the Catholic Church has broadened the original meaning of the expression *ritus* (in its strict sense employed to mean any religious ceremony) to a new understanding of the very same term as designating the entirety of the liturgical and canonical tradition of the Eastern Churches (FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, pp. 147). In this sense the understanding of the term was developed by Popes Benedict XIV and Pius IX (Rosario ESPOSITO, *Il Decreto conciliare sulle Chiese Orientali “Orientalium Ecclesiarum”*: testo e commento (Rome: Edizioni Paoline, 1966), pp. 83-90 and MADEY, *Ecumenism*, pp. 14-15). In the twentieth century *ritus* was defined as a “group of faithful who are governed by laws and customs of their own, based on ancient traditions, not only in regard to liturgical matters, but also in respect to the canonical order, and which group is acknowledged by the Holy See as autonomous and distinct from others.” (Emil HERMAN, S.J. “De conceptu “ritus,” in *The Jurist* 2 (1942), p. 340) The canonical concept of Rite was presented in a similar light in the 1917 Code of Canon Law (CIC83) and in *Cleri Sanctitati* of 1957 (ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 288). *Motu proprio, Postquam Apostolicis* names five basic Eastern Rites (Alexandrian, Antiochian, Constantinopolitan, Chaldean, Armenian) saying that there are also other Rites “which the Church either expressly or tacitly recognizes as *sui iuris*.” (*PA (Mp)* c. 303, #1; see also POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, pp. 11-12 and WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 515)

⁴⁵⁰ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” pp. 288-289

⁴⁵¹ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 314.

Churches have never used this kind of terminology to define their own ecclesiastical status.⁴⁵² Therefore, the composers of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* initially expressed their common desire to change the title of the first section of their document from *De ritibus Ecclesiae* to *De Ecclesiis particularibus*.⁴⁵³ Nevertheless, as soon as they became familiar with the employment of the expression *Ecclesia particularis* in several of the other conciliar texts,⁴⁵⁴ they had to take a step backwards, calling the first section of the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches, De ecclesiis particularibus seu ritibus*.⁴⁵⁵ Once again, the problem was caused by a lack of consistency in the use of the term at the Council.⁴⁵⁶ Even though some of the documents brought into play the expression *Ecclesia particularis* in order to designate Churches of their own legal standing (*LG* 23),⁴⁵⁷ the majority of the conciliar texts in line with Vatican II's *Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church* (*CD* 11) assigned the term to a diocese.⁴⁵⁸ That is why the authors of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* had to return to the employment of the ambiguous word *ritus*, which was used as a parallel term and an equivalent of the expression *Ecclesia particularis*.⁴⁵⁹

The fact that these two concepts were identified may not have contributed immediately to the clarity of conciliar texts. However, after the Council's conclusion, this ambiguity stimulated deeper reflection.⁴⁶⁰ Some scholars proposed that the word *Ritus* be used with a capital "R" when it stands for a Particular Church and a small "r" when it

⁴⁵² ŽUŽEK, "The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris," p. 291.

⁴⁵³ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 314.

⁴⁵⁴ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 11.

⁴⁵⁵ William BASSETT, *The Determination of Rite* (unpublished dissertation in *Analecta Gregoriana* 157) (Rome, 1967), p. 69.

⁴⁵⁶ PRUSAK, *The Canonical Concept of Particular Church*, pp. 65-115.

⁴⁵⁷ GHIRLANDA, "Universal Church," p. 243 and JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 132.

⁴⁵⁸ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 11 and HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," p. 314.

⁴⁵⁹ SHERIDAN, *The Theology*, pp. 111-112, WOJNAR, "Decree on the Oriental," p. 178, and ŽUŽEK, "The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris," p. 289.

⁴⁶⁰ ŽUŽEK, "The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris," p. 288.

describes liturgy or ecclesiastical discipline alone.⁴⁶¹ Other thinkers⁴⁶² proposed that this term be employed solely in the liturgical sense, “as is more natural and more commonly used.”⁴⁶³ As a result of this discussion, the newly-established Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Eastern Canon Law in a meeting which took place in March 1974 issued the following concise instruction: “The concept of Rite should be reexamined and agreement should be reached on a new terminology to indicate the various particular Churches of the East and West.”⁴⁶⁴ The reexamination of the notion of *Ritus* finally led the canonists to the conclusion that it had to be once and for all separated from the concept of *Ecclesia particularis* and that the two they may no longer be understood as equivalents. It was decided that from now on the term *Ritus* would be applied exclusively to the whole “patrimonium liturgicum, disciplinarem spirituale et theologicum,” while the expression *Ecclesia particularis* would signify “coetus fidelium hierarchia” to which this heritage belongs.⁴⁶⁵

In their common search for new ways to describe the ecclesial realities of the individual Churches of the Catholic communion, both the Pontifical Commissions for the Revision of the Code of Eastern Canon Law and that for the Code of Canon Law of the Latin Church decided not only to abandon the notion *Ritus*⁴⁶⁶ but also to replace the term *Ecclesia particularis* employed so often by the documents of Vatican II with another concept which would be more accurate and more precise in underlining the autonomous

⁴⁶¹ Neophytos EDELBY, Ignace DICK, *Les Églises Catholiques Orientales. Décret “Orientalium Ecclesiarum”* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), p. 141 and MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 225.

⁴⁶² By “other thinkers” I mean scholars from the Faculty of Canon Law of the Pontifical Oriental Institute who on the invitation of the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Eastern Canon Law gathered together in 1973 in order to elaborate very concrete “Norms for the Verification of Eastern Canon Law.”

⁴⁶³ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 290.

⁴⁶⁴ FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 89.

⁴⁶⁵ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 292.

⁴⁶⁶ FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 149.

legal status of each of the Catholic Churches.⁴⁶⁷ The choice of the creators of the Western Code promulgated in 1983⁴⁶⁸ was *Ecclesia ritualis sui iuris* (CIC83 cc. 111 and 112),⁴⁶⁹ while the authors of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*⁴⁷⁰ decided to drop the superfluous and counterproductive term *ritualis* for the reason that there are “different *Ecclesiae sui iuris* belonging fundamentally to the same *Ritus*.”⁴⁷¹ Nevertheless, even the expression *Ecclesia sui iuris*, which was translated by the American Maronite canonist John Faris as “autonomous Church,” cannot be regarded as an ideal one since “it is restricted to only one facet of the nature of these churches, their juridic structure, and the realities of their spiritual, theological and liturgical traditions, which also contribute to the identity of these churches, are ignored.”⁴⁷² This is why in my further analysis of the nature and mission of the Churches of Catholic communion I will continue to employ the earlier expression, “Particular Church,”⁴⁷³ as an equivalent of the later term “Church of her own right.”⁴⁷⁴

The fact that Vatican II’s documents can be accused of some terminological inconsistency does not undercut the fundamental clarity of most of the ecclesiological ideas expressed by them. One of them was a solemn recognition of the essential equality of all

⁴⁶⁷ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 295.

⁴⁶⁸ Promulgating *Codex Iuris Canonici* of 1983, Pope John Paul II underlined that “the Code of Canon Law, which is the last conciliar document, will also be the first to integrate the whole of the Council into the whole of life,” since “in a certain sense this new Code could be understood as a great effort to translate this same conciliar ecclesiology into canonical language.” (See John Paul II’s Apostolic Constitution *Sacrae disciplinae leges* and GHIRLANDA, “Universal Church,” p. 233).

⁴⁶⁹ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 295.

⁴⁷⁰ The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches was promulgated with Pope John II’s Apostolic Constitution *Sacri Canones* on 25 October 1990 (See FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. xix).

⁴⁷¹ ŽUŽEK, “The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris,” p. 296.

⁴⁷² FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 149.

⁴⁷³ For continuation of the discussion on the adequate understanding of the term *Ecclesia Particularis*, see sub-section III.2.4. of this thesis.

⁴⁷⁴ Or, as I have used above, “Church of her own legal standing.” Of course, there should not be any confusion with the understanding of a Particular Church as a diocese for the simple reason that the ecclesial reality of the diocese is not the subject of investigation in the present study.

the Particular Churches of the East and of the West⁴⁷⁵ and a positive affirmation of their right and duty to “govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules” (*OE* 5).⁴⁷⁶ The later promulgation of two different Codes of Canon Law for the Latin and the Eastern Churches and the elaboration of new concepts such as *Ecclesia sui iuris* can be regarded as a natural outcome of the conciliar teaching on the equal dignity of all the Churches of the Catholic communion⁴⁷⁷ regardless of their geographical extension and the number of their faithful.⁴⁷⁸ It was no longer possible to claim the preeminence of one Church over another and encourage any transfers from one ecclesiastical Tradition to another.⁴⁷⁹ Any fundamental altering or mixing of rites (with “rite” being understood as an organic harmony of the liturgical, spiritual, theological, and canonical heritage of a given Church) was also prohibited.⁴⁸⁰ At least in theory, the Eastern Catholic Churches received rights equal with the Latin Church. They would now also be obliged to extend their missionary activity to the whole world, thereby establishing new ecclesiastical structures and new Churches of their own legal standing.⁴⁸¹

Even though the *sui iuris* status of all the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion involves a form of independence of one Church from another, being autonomous does not mean being independent from the visible center of unity⁴⁸² manifested through the service of the Roman Pontiff as the *suprema relationum interecclesialium*

⁴⁷⁵ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” pp. 514-515.

⁴⁷⁶ *OE* 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁴⁷⁷ MADEY, *Ecumenism*, p. 15.

⁴⁷⁸ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 21 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 21.

⁴⁷⁹ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 21.

⁴⁸⁰ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” pp. 516.

⁴⁸¹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 213.

⁴⁸² WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” pp. 515-516.

arbitra (OE 4).⁴⁸³ That is why the specifically Catholic ecclesiological understanding of autonomy corresponds with the principle of “unity in diversity,” for it does not destroy, but in actual fact conserves, the *Communio Ecclesiarum*.⁴⁸⁴ And it is important to note that the primates of the Particular Churches together with the synods of bishops are invested with real ecclesiastical authority and “constitute the supreme tribunal for matters pertaining” to their Churches.⁴⁸⁵ To be a Patriarch does not mean to hold a merely honorific title, but to be the Head and Father of an entire Church of her own right.⁴⁸⁶ At the same time, for a Church to receive Patriarchal status should not be understood as an award, for a Patriarchate is and should be a “natural mode of existence in the Church.”⁴⁸⁷

The Patriarchal Churches as matrices of the particular ways of spiritual life, theologizing, legislation, and worshiping give life to their daughter-Churches who, following the footsteps of their matrix-mothers, at the same time add their own particularities growing towards the time when they would also become *sui iuris*.⁴⁸⁸ From this perspective, the establishment of Particular Churches should not be limited only to the Christian East.⁴⁸⁹ The Latin Church is, in fact, just as capable of giving life to her daughter-Churches who are in fact already conceived. Karl Rahner wrote that “where energetic and effective national conferences of bishops exist or are in process of formation, a ‘patriarchate’ is already materially there.”⁴⁹⁰ Only in this context can we give a positive

⁴⁸³ OE 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901. See also O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 24.

⁴⁸⁴ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 515.

⁴⁸⁵ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, pp. 23-25.

⁴⁸⁶ Hans Joachim SCHULZ, “The Dialogue with the Orthodox,” in *Concilium* IV:1 (April, 1965), pp. 67-71.

⁴⁸⁷ EVANS, “Orthodox,” p. 46.

⁴⁸⁸ DUVAL, *L’Église*, p. 126.

⁴⁸⁹ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 181.

⁴⁹⁰ Karl RAHNER, *Concerning Vatican Council II* (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1969), p. 356. See also Miguel Nicolau PONS and Jean DANIELOU, eds., *La Iglesia del Concilio Vaticano II: Comentario a la Constitución*

appraisal to the very recent removal of the title “Patriarch of the West” by Pope Benedict XVI: that this might become the first step toward creating new Patriarchates in the West.⁴⁹¹ The Churches of Africa and Asia are ready to become *sui iuris*. The same autonomous status would inevitably become one of the most principal demands if the Anglican Church were ever to decide to restore communion with Rome.⁴⁹² In any event, the future Church in her organization and government “will not indeed be a return to, but will be somewhat more reminiscent of, that which prevailed in the early centuries, before the Roman centralization.”⁴⁹³

dogmática “Lumen Gentium” (Bilbao: Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1966), pp. 181-182 and *Constitution dogmatique “Lumen Gentium”*: *traduction et commentaire* (Bruxelles: La Pensée catholique, 1965), p. 74.

⁴⁹¹ For a more detailed discussion on the dropping of the title “Patriarch of the West,” see sub-section III.2.4. of this thesis.

⁴⁹² WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 181.

⁴⁹³ MCNAMARA, “Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II,” p. 68.

II. THE SEARCH FOR A PROPER SYSTEM OF EVALUATION OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH'S ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION

II.1. The Question of an Ecclesial Identity *Per Se*, Peculiarities of an Ecclesial Identity and the Vocation of a Particular Church; and a Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at Their Systematic Analysis

II.1.1. Reflections on an Ecclesial Identity *Per Se* in the Context of the Possibility of Its Organic Development and Its Inter-Connectedness with the Concept of Ecclesial Mission

When Christians of the Byzantine Tradition come together to celebrate the Eucharist, they are invited to recite the Creed by which they publicly declare their faith in “one God, the Father almighty,” “one Lord, Jesus Christ,” and the “Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life.” They also confess their belief in “One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.” Consequently, the Church is not simply a human institution, but an object of our faith, and a living reality endowed with her own mission and identity.¹ What is this identity? Can it be defined or assessed? Is it transcendent or immanent, universal or particular, closed or open, fixed or flexible? The search for the answer to these and other questions will be at the core of my theological reflections of this sub-chapter of the thesis. Thus, it is crucial that we deal with these issues before turning to the core section of this second chapter of my thesis in which I will elaborate seven criteria as an integrated system for the assessment of a Particular Church’s identity and vocation.

The notion of identity is a complicated philosophical concept; it can be interpreted in several different ways. Etymologically, “identity” derives from the Latin *idem*, which literally means “selfsameness,” something which makes a “given subject be one and the

¹ John ERICKSON, “The Formation of Orthodox Ecclesial Identity,” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 42:3-4 (1998), p. 314.

same yesterday, today, and forever.” Another meaning can be detected from the everyday use of the term in many contemporary languages, according to which the concept of “identity” is employed in order to emphasize someone’s individuality or personality, which “distinguishes a given subject from others” through the use of “the set of behavioral or individual characteristics by which a thing or a person is definitively recognizable or known.”² Nevertheless, it seems inadequate to define identity only as a static reality describing distinctiveness from everything or everyone else. This is because identity is also a living, antinomic reality, which along with the sense of preserving inner sameness, also embraces the sense of continuity, modification, and development.

In view of the fact that an ecclesial identity simultaneously comprises transcendent and immanent, visible and invisible, eternal and chronological dimensions, it becomes an even more complex subject for systematic analysis. On the one hand, the Church’s identity comes from the identity of the Divine Logos and in that sense can be regarded as having a “fixed origin”³ and “being permanent until the end of time.”⁴ On the other hand, an ecclesial identity derives its roots from the identity of the Incarnate Jesus whose message was received and developed in very concrete historical circumstances.⁵ The unattainable identity of the heavenly Church becomes attainable when it takes upon itself the flesh of the Christian Tradition, which makes an ecclesial identity alive and open to continuous progress and theological evaluation.⁶

² *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992), s.v.

³ Dewi PHILIPS, “Reflecting on Identity and Change,” in Marcel SAROT and Gijsbert van den BRINK, eds., *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition: Contributions to Philosophical Theology*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999), p. 14.

⁴ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 6.

⁵ POWELL, *The Mystery*, pp. 1-2.

⁶ ERICKSON, “The Formation,” p. 302.

In many of its documents, the Council repeatedly emphasized that an authentic realization of the Church's identity and vocation directly corresponds to the preservation and development of her genuine Tradition.⁷ There can be no real ecclesiastical development without maintaining uninterrupted continuity with the Church's roots, while there can also be no experiencing of the living Tradition without its careful adaptation to the demands of the times.

Tradition is thus the gospel becoming real in the life of the Church; it is the faithful, integral, living, and vigorous handing on of the gospel. Development springs from the Church's native capacity to carry out its mission among the peoples of the world, to adapt and renew itself, to purify itself. Tradition is fidelity to the gospel (grace and truth) which must reach men [*sic*] in order to save them; development is fidelity to man [*sic*] who is to receive the gospel. By its nature the Church is tradition; by its mission the Church is development. If the Church abandoned tradition it would be unfaithful; if it abandoned development it would play the traitor. It would sin against tradition if it denied development; it would sin against development if it let tradition harden. Tradition is viable only when it develops; development is possible only in tradition, in fidelity to gospel, Christ, and Church, in an identification with gospel, Christ, and Church.⁸

The understanding of a genuine ecclesial nature and vocation as "living tradition"⁹ in the Catholic Church presupposes that Catholics can preserve their original faith-experience while opening themselves to a new sense of identity which can be less dependent on boundaries and includes organic development as integral to it.¹⁰ Development in this case would have to proceed along two corresponding lines: one is the line of "better understanding of and penetration into revealed truths," the other is the line of "constant

⁷ RATZINGER, *Church*, pp. 241-242.

⁸ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 118.

⁹ ERICKSON, "The Formation," p. 302.

¹⁰ Frans Jozef van BEECK, *Catholic Identity after Vatican II: Three Types of Faith in the One Church* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985), p. 23.

adaptation of these truths and their practical implications to the varied historical, cultural, and religious situations of mankind.”¹¹ Natural growth and progress, modification and adjustment are of the essence of the Church’s life. As a historical reality, the Church constantly finds herself in different geographical and social contexts, struggling with various temptations and enduring many identity-crises.¹² Ecclesial identity is not easy to define precisely for the reason that the Church, similar to any human person, “grows gradually in wisdom, age, and, understanding” and being still “exiled from the Lord,” (2 Cor. 5:6) has to practice great patience in her continuous search for an authentic sense of her own nature and mission.¹³

In the same way that our individual identity is better realized through interpersonal relationships, ecclesial identity is fostered when the Church engages in fruitful dialogue with the world. Yet, it is very important for the world-Church not to become a worldly-Church, not to reduce “transcendent Christianity to a purely immanent humanism,” and not to identify the “kingdom of God with the development of peoples.”¹⁴ Not every change in the Church is in accord with her ecclesial identity.¹⁵ This is why any development has to be inspired by the Holy Spirit and born in an atmosphere of “serenity, maturity, love, study, dialogue, and a great deal of prayer.”¹⁶ In order to achieve a balance between dynamic development and the preservation of essentials, it is important to be permeated by the living Tradition to prevent the Church from becoming wounded by “mistakes and misconceptions,

¹¹ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 118-119.

¹² DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 53.

¹³ POWELL, *The Mystery*, pp. 1-2.

¹⁴ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 120.

¹⁵ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 263.

¹⁶ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 122.

errors of judgment and false developments” which would make the Church estranged from her own genuine identity.¹⁷

There is a huge difference between substantial and accidental change, as well as between a modification of the Church’s essence and her adjustment to new forms. Similar to a tree that, changing its shape over the years still remains the same tree, the Church can and should mature, renewing herself in order to be a better reflection of God’s love for mankind. However, in the same way as a tree would lose its identity if it caught fire and were reduced to ashes, the Church may cease to be the Church if she adopts changes alien to her very nature.¹⁸ The growth of the Christian Tradition is a cumulative process that involves interaction between the heritage of previous generations and contemporary expressions of faith contributing to a greater sense of clarity in understanding the Church’s nature and mission.¹⁹ Yet, we must not overlook the substantial difference that exists between those theological interpretations which can be regarded as merely speculative and the articles of faith which constitute the very essence of Christian doctrine.²⁰ Legitimate progress in the Church as part of her ecclesial identity is possible only when Christians find themselves ready to make a clear distinction between the “kernel and the husk,”²¹ at the

¹⁷ KÜNG, *The Church*, pp. 263, 300-302.

¹⁸ A similar analogy frequently employed in the discussion of identity theory is that of the ship of Theseus, which even after the replacement of all of its planks remained the same ship. See Vincent BRÜMMER, “The Identity of the Christian Tradition,” in SAROT and BRINK, *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition*, pp. 33-34.

¹⁹ Vincent Brümmer does not agree with Cantwell Smith’s perception of the Christian identity as residing exclusively in the “abiding Transcendent.” In his opinion, organic development can be regarded as an essential part of the Christian identity. See Stephen HOLMES, “Book Review: Marcel Sarot and Gijsbert van den Brink, eds. *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition: Contributions to Philosophical Theology*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999),” in *Religious Studies: An International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion*, 36:4 (2000), p. 504.

²⁰ BRÜMMER, “The Identity of the Christian Tradition,” p. 30.

²¹ The expression belongs to Helmut Thielicke. See Helmut THIELICKE, “The Restatement of New Testament Mythology,” in Hans BARTSCH, ed., *Kerygma and Myth* (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), pp. 139-140.

same time maintaining a very strong sense of the “continuity”²² that must exist on every level and throughout all the stages of ecclesiastical development.²³ Living in history, the Church can also experience inadequacies and failures; however, being not only a human society but first and foremost a people led by the Lord of history, the Church never loses her hope in divine support and does not cease to look forward to her own “ecclesial fulfillment with the final coming of Christ and his kingdom at the end of time.”²⁴

In the words of Lorenz Jaeger, “every renewal of the Church consists essentially in an increase of loyalty to her vocation.”²⁵ As I have already mentioned in previous section of the present thesis, the Church’s vocation and mission are a natural outcome of ecclesial identity.²⁶ Neither can exist without the other. It is not possible to present a satisfactory answer to the question “What is the Church?” without asking ourselves “What does the Church do?” This is why the Church’s identity *ad intra* and her mission *ad extra* were chosen as two central themes of the Second Vatican Council.

The two themes are, of course, intimately related, and in the final analysis they are identical: the life that we share in Christ demands that it be shared with the world. The Church must mediate: she has to do justice, in the Spirit, to the One God and Father of Jesus Christ, just as she must do justice to the world she lives in. The former must be the source, both of her identity and of her mission; the latter must be the very stuff she is made of, which she must assume and welcome, and which she must engage in order to find the way home to God.²⁷

²² The importance of continuity and resemblance in various stages of identity development was stressed by Ludwig Wittgenstein. See Ludwig WITTGENSTEIN, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), pp. 3-29.

²³ BRÜMMER, “The Identity of the Christian Tradition,” pp. 29-30.

²⁴ DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 53.

²⁵ JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 100.

²⁶ Joseph HOUGH, John COBB, *Christian Identity and Theological Education* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 19.

²⁷ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, pp. 1-2.

The Church fails to be the true Church if her identity is not expressed through her mission.²⁸ She never exists only for herself, but by her “very nature is there for others, for mankind, as a whole, for the entire world.”²⁹ When the Church spoke of herself at Vatican II, it was always in the context of her self-giving service to God and humanity.³⁰ Therefore, every time the council fathers reflected on the Church’s identity, they immediately engaged in lively debates on her authentic vocation.³¹

As was noted before, the mission of the Church comes from the mission of Christ and can be actualized in a number of different ways.³² Nevertheless, probably the most important of the Church’s ministries always was and still is her task and duty to bring salvation to all human beings and to restore all-encompassing catholic unity on both the horizontal and vertical levels.³³ The more the Church succeeds in fulfilling her mission, the more she manifests her authentic ecclesial identity to the world, at the same time making it more graspable and comprehensible.³⁴

II.1.2. Specificities of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of the Particular Churches of the Catholic Communion and the Special Role of the Eastern Catholic Churches

If in the past the ecclesial identities of any of the Particular Churches of the East and of the West were formed in the context of the constantly-deepening divisions among

²⁸ Francis Schüssler FIORENZA, “The Church’s Religious Identity and Its Social and Political Mission,” in *Theological Studies* 43 (1982), p. 197.

²⁹ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 302.

³⁰ RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 19.

³¹ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, pp. 3.

³² FIORENZA, “The Church’s Religious Identity,” pp. 197-203.

³³ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 18.

³⁴ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 287.

Christians,³⁵ in the twentieth century the development of the very same identities was strongly influenced by an ever-increasing number of ecumenical initiatives.³⁶ On the eve of Vatican II, it was no longer satisfactory to express any of the Church's self-perceptions through the use of apologetically-inclined notions better suited to proselytizing.³⁷ This is because most of these Churches and ecclesial communities had by now demonstrated their sincere commitment to the movement for Christian unity.³⁸ It was no longer sufficient for any of the Particular Churches to explain the formation of their unique nature as being merely a product of "emulation" (imitation of the claims, institutions or practices of another ecclesial body), or as a result of "contradiction" (rejection of the claims, institutions or practices of another ecclesial body).³⁹ As a consequence, by the second half of the twentieth century, most Christian Churches had arrived at a crisis in their self-identification, which in turn forced them to a positive process of re-examination and re-definition of the very essence and purpose of their existence. It was generally acknowledged that no single ecclesial body could accomplish the task of re-defining its own ecclesial identity in isolation from the other ecclesial communities. The new ecumenical situation demanded that the serious evaluation of the "particular heritage embodied in the positive tradition of each Church" be complemented by the clear manifestation of the "fidelity of each Church to the fullness of the apostolic witness." From this perspective, the re-definition of the ecclesial identities and vocations of all of the Particular Christian Churches could be

³⁵ ERICKSON, "The Formation," pp. 311-312.

³⁶ PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON THE ECUMENICAL DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN 1964 AND 1974, "The Decree on Ecumenism - Ten Years After: Observations and Reflections," in Gerard BÉKÉS and Vilmos VAJTA, eds., *Unitatis Redintegratio, 1964-1974: The Impact of the Decree on Ecumenism* (Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1977), pp. 164-165.

³⁷ POWELL, *The Mystery*, pp. 3-4.

³⁸ PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 164.

³⁹ ERICKSON, "The Formation," p. 304.

regarded as a constructive process enabling all to “grow into full ecclesial communion, a communion based on a common Christian identity but enriched by the particular identity of each Church tradition.”⁴⁰ Therefore, it was once again recognized that the existence of specific differences and particularities not restricted by apologetic ecclesiology can only contribute to the common commitment of the Particular Churches to Christ,⁴¹ who as proclaimed in *Unitatis Redintegratio* is the only “source and center of ecclesiastical communion.”⁴²

Being the sacrament and sign of God’s presence among his people,⁴³ the Church in a mysterious way combines the transcendent and immanent ecclesial elements constituting her very essence and vocation:⁴⁴ on the one hand, the Church “transcends both times and the boundaries of nations” (*LG* 9) and is not limited by a particular people or race (*GS* 58), on the other hand, she is immanent and, therefore, incarnated in very specific ways in the life of very particular peoples, cultures, and nations (*LG* 1, 13, 17; *GS* 1, 40, 44; *AG* 9, 10, 18, 22; *SC* 37; *NA* 2). This is why, according to Jean-Marie Tillard, everyone who decides to join the Church is invited to manifest his or her decision to become a Christian by the use of two baptismal “yesses”:

The “First Yes” is the fundamental, essential “yes” of faith and the expression of our conversion to the Gospel. It is acceptance of God’s revelation in Jesus Christ and of God’s plan of salvation to be accomplished through Jesus Christ... The “Second Yes” is the acceptance of the Gospel and of the Christian revelation, as they are mediated through a particular

⁴⁰ PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 164-165.

⁴¹ FIORENZA, “The Church’s Religious Identity,” p. 211, EVANS, “Orthodox,” p. 46 and Stephen GIBSON, “Called by the Lord”: *The Theme of Vocation in Lumen Gentium* (Romae: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1990), pp. 122-124.

⁴² *UR* 20, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 919.

⁴³ ERICKSON, “The Formation,” p. 313.

⁴⁴ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 109-111.

Church or ecclesial community. Thus, with the “First Yes,” I am a Christian; with the “Second Yes,” I am a Roman Catholic, an Anglican, a Lutheran.... Through the “First Yes,” I enter the One Church of God; through the “Second Yes,” I adhere to one of the many Christian Churches - all of which are called to a unity willed and prayed for by Christ.⁴⁵

The First and the Second “Yes” are operative in a particular way in the Catholic communion of Churches, since the Holy Sacrament of Baptism not only celebrates the baptizand’s conversion and opens to the newly-initiated Christian the doors of the Church of Christ, but also makes him or her a member of a Particular Church and an adherent of very definite ways of Christian faith and life.⁴⁶ The belonging of the Catholic Christian to one or another Particular Church is not “something abstract or purely theoretical,” for it involves a specific form of receiving the Gospel, “of living it and making of it a living spirit.”⁴⁷ It is a simple fact that people do not belong directly to the Church Universal, but rather to Particular Churches that together make up the Universal Church, even when populations overlap. That is where special care must be taken. To deprive the faithful of their natural right to live out their particular theological, liturgical, canonical, and spiritual tradition and to compel them to another mode of Christian thinking and acting⁴⁸ would “surely not be to provide for their spiritual good.”⁴⁹ It may eventually lead to the estrangement of Catholic believers from the understanding and practice of Christian life: not being allowed to experience the fulness of Catholicism they are provoked to leave the Catholic Church for other Churches or ecclesial communities that better suit their religious

⁴⁵ See Tillard’s article “Church, World and the Christian Life” in *Mid-Stream: An Ecumenical Journal* 20:3 (1984), p. 289 and CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 72-73.

⁴⁶ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 15.

⁴⁷ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 221-222.

⁴⁸ Victor POSPISHIL, “An Autonomous Ukrainian Catholic Church,” in *Diakonia* 6:3 (1971), p. 260.

⁴⁹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 222.

needs and ecclesial consciousness.⁵⁰ In the words of Clement Pujol, the “Church must honour the will of her founder, as it has always done indeed by giving shape to Particular Churches.”⁵¹ To accept and to cherish the concrete incarnation of the Word of God in the life of his people⁵² would serve as proof of an almost infinite capacity of the Catholic Church to “adapt herself to the temperament and character of each people, so that every man [*sic*], every nation may without betraying himself or itself, accept and live the Gospel.”⁵³ The fourth paragraph of Vatican II’s *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* asserts: “Steps should therefore be taken for the preservation and enlargement of all the particular churches throughout the world, and so parishes and their own hierarchy should be set up wherever the spiritual good of the faithful requires it.”⁵⁴

Speaking of “preservation” and “enlargement,” the Council puts forward two distinct and at the same time complementary models for the future development of the Particular Churches, according to which it is not enough merely to protect and defend the full heritage of each of the Churches of the Catholic communion. This is because any living organism needs to grow and increase, overcoming the dangers of anemia and constantly searching for improvement. Intrinsically, any Particular Church needs to develop her already-existing structures and institutions, paying special attention to the advancement of theological education and improved formation of priests, awakening lay apostolates and bettering pastoral care on every level. However, it is important not to forget that the

⁵⁰ Such was the case with a large number of Ukrainian Catholics at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth centuries who, being dissatisfied at being entrusted to the pastoral care of Latin bishops and priests started to leave their own Church and to establish her Orthodox counterparts in the United States of America and Canada. See POSPISHIL, “An Autonomous,” pp. 259-260 and MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 231.

⁵¹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 222.

⁵² KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 109

⁵³ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 222.

⁵⁴ OE 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

ecclesial development of all the Catholic Churches can and should be also outward looking. None of the Particular Churches can be required to remain enclosed exclusively in the territory of their origin, given that territorial enlargement for the sake of missionary activity or providing for the spiritual welfare of the faithful wherever they might live belongs to the proper mission and ecclesial vocation of any of the self-governing Churches of the Catholic communion.⁵⁵ Even “new patriarchates can be set up” (*OE* 11) where they are needed for the better care of the adherents of Particular Churches which demonstrate an adequate level of communal responsibility and ecclesial maturity.⁵⁶

Vatican II’s emphasis on the equality of all of the Churches of the Catholic communion⁵⁷ was intended to put an end to the development of a self-centered sense of superiority within to the Latin Church⁵⁸ at the same time encouraging this Church to realize that she is not a *Ritus praestantior*⁵⁹ but rather one of many responses to Divine Revelation in particular circumstances.⁶⁰ In his reflections on the ecclesial nature and vocation of the Catholic Church, Bonaventure Kloppenburg even insists that, despite the importance of the Church of Rome as the visible center of unity, she cannot be regarded as the only expression of the true Church. Therefore, even the disappearance of this Church would not affect the “permanence and survival of the Church as established by Christ (who certainly did not establish her as ‘Latin’).”⁶¹

⁵⁵ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 215-216.

⁵⁶ ESPOSITO, *Il Decreto*, pp. 166-176.

⁵⁷ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 139.

⁵⁸ SHERIDAN, *The Theology*, pp. 111-112.

⁵⁹ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 182.

⁶⁰ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 221.

⁶¹ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 111.

This new approach to the understanding of Catholic ecclesiology as based on the principle of the “ecclesial integrity” inherent to each of the Particular Churches⁶² has not only opened the eyes of the world to the existence of the other Catholic Churches⁶³ but also changed the attitude of many Roman Catholics toward Eastern Catholic Churches: from now on they cannot be regarded as “abnormal and uncomfortable things,”⁶⁴ “appendages to the Latin West,”⁶⁵ or “honorable museum pieces” to be “preserved as relics of the past.”⁶⁶ For the first time in history, Eastern Catholics were officially and universally recognized as not being Catholics of a lesser degree but “members of living and fully operative Churches.”⁶⁷

The Council also acknowledged the indispensable role of the Eastern Catholic Churches in the ecumenical dialogue on both inter-confessional and inter-religious levels.⁶⁸ It became clear that relations between the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches within the Catholic communion may become the best manifestation and the most apparent model for the restoration of full and visible union. Therefore, the attitude of the Latin Church to the other Churches already united with her may serve as an example and indication of what would happen with non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities if one day they decide to join the Catholic communion, retaining their own ecclesial integrity.⁶⁹ This is why the question of re-defining Catholic ecclesial identity in general and the assessment of the ecclesial identity of each of the Churches of the Catholic communion is so important.

⁶² EVANS, “Orthodox,” pp. 47-48.

⁶³ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 249.

⁶⁴ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 160.

⁶⁵ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 18.

⁶⁶ RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 23.

⁶⁷ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 21.

⁶⁸ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 315, MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 226-227 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 29.

⁶⁹ EVANS, “Orthodox,” pp. 47-48.

This not only stimulates vital energy for the future development of the Catholic Churches themselves, but is also destined to present the world with an eschatological picture of the future universal reintegration.⁷⁰

At the initial phase of the Second Vatican Council, most of the non-Catholic observers as well as many prominent Catholic ecclesiologists still wondered:

Will these Eastern Churches be listened to – more so than at the First Vatican Council – and will they be given their full value? Will they be regarded as a fully legitimate development of Catholicism or only as a (provisionally) tolerated marginal phenomenon, an appendage of the “authentic” Latin Church? Will they be regarded as independent and equal member Churches of the one Church acting with relative autonomy (with a different theology, liturgy, spirituality, piety, and church constitution) or only as forms (“rites”) of a different kind and archaic museum pieces? Will they be regarded as the important (often sadly misunderstood by both sides) representatives of their Eastern sister Churches separated from the Catholic Church (through the conculpability of the latter!) or as a “Fifth Column” of the Latin Church within the Church of the East under the guise of Oriental rites?.. Will they be regarded as a model for a future reunion (also with Protestant Christians!) or only as a repository of a catholicity heavily overplayed by Latinity and Romanity?⁷¹

Even several decades after the Council, we must admit that many of the above-listed questions remain open. The question is not only about the attitude of the Church of Rome toward the Eastern member-Churches of the Catholic communion, but also about the attitude of these Churches toward the Latin Church, and above all toward themselves. Each of the Churches of the Catholic communion needs not only to understand how she is treated by others, but must also come closer to a clearer self-treatment directed toward her better service to the already-existing communion and the task of the future recomposition of the one Christian Church.

⁷⁰ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 244.

⁷¹ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, pp. 50-51.

So far, trying to fulfill their ecclesial vocation by being equally loyal to the Catholic communion and the rich heritage of the Christian East, the Eastern Catholic Churches have made some successful – if limited – efforts aimed at presenting the values of the East to the West and vice versa.⁷² However, playing the role of “stages on the road to unity”⁷³ or the role of “bridges” somehow connecting the separated Christian worlds,⁷⁴ rather than that of the “witnesses” of true catholicity,⁷⁵ does not seem sufficient. Certainly, Eastern Catholics can help the Latin Church to acquire better knowledge of her partners in the ecumenical dialogue,⁷⁶ yet, in the words of Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh), the Eastern Catholic Churches are also called “to convert the Latin West to catholicism” and to the “universality of the message of Christ,”⁷⁷ in view of the fact that “without the heritage of the East, the tradition of the Church would lack its fullness.”⁷⁸ A “leveling conformity is not reconcilable with catholic universality”⁷⁹ if the latter is understood as an all-embracing freedom of religious expressions.⁸⁰ The Roman Church will never succeed in fulfilling her mission as the universal center of unity if she does not accept and appreciate the significance of each of the Particular Churches as a great gift of God to the whole world. This is why all the Churches of the Catholic communion have to be given the right and legitimate mandate to develop their own ecclesial identities in conformity with their own

⁷² Joseph TAWIL, “A Voice from the East,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, p. 196 and LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 160.

⁷³ TAWIL, “A Voice from the East,” p. 196.

⁷⁴ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 223 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 20.

⁷⁵ ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” p. 54

⁷⁶ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 158 and BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 136.

⁷⁷ As quoted in KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, p. 52.

⁷⁸ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 136.

⁷⁹ VRIES, *Wegbereitung*, p. 6.

⁸⁰ KÜNG, *Structures of the Church*, pp. 50-51.

spiritual legacies,⁸¹ which would not be directed toward the defense of any “petty parochial interests of church-oriented (ecclesiastical) politics or an obsolete traditionalism,” but toward a contribution to the “vital interests of the apostolic Church in order to remain true to her mission, to her calling, which we cannot betray without disowning ourselves and without distorting the message of Christ before our brethren.”⁸²

II.1.3. Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at the Systematic Analysis of an Ecclesial Identity in General

What is the Church’s genuine identity? Is it an object of religious experience or intellectual comprehension? Can it be defined in human language and theological terminology or shall it always remain a mystery abiding in the realm of faith, prayer and wonderment? For centuries these questions have been at the center of theological contemplation. The fact that an ecclesial identity of the Mystical Body of Christ directly corresponds to the identity of its Divine Founder who is truly God and truly man, makes the issue even more complicated as no human concept can grasp the full meaning of divine realities. Being an earthly reflection of God’s kingdom, the Church in her very essence can be characterized as being simultaneously hidden and revealed, inaccessible and reachable; at the same time open and closed to both apophatic and kataphatic theological approaches.

Not unlike now we approach the hypostatic union in Christ, the unity-in-tension that exists between various aspects of ecclesial identity does not need to be resolved or destroyed, for it would be “disastrous to divide or separate what God has bound together.”⁸³ Nevertheless, it is a contention of this thesis that the unfathomable mystery of the Church

⁸¹ ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” p. 54.

⁸² MAXIMOS IV, “Der katholische Orient,” p. 10.

⁸³ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 20.

expressed through the fact that it surpasses our understanding of ecclesial identity can and should be positively approached in a number of different ways but always with reverence, awe, and a humble recognition of human limitations. Throughout the centuries, the question of the possibility of a more or less accurate definition of the Church was frequently raised in varied historical circumstances. Not being able to evaluate all of them (that would be beyond the scope of this thesis), I will nevertheless try to review a few previous attempts to systematically analyze ecclesial identity starting with the Gospel as the source and groundwork of all further theological investigation.

During his lifetime Jesus was asked several times about his own identity. However, he never exhaustively revealed the whole truth (if that can even be imagined), thus inviting his followers and opponents to search for an answer to their question by using their own minds. When the disciples of John the Baptist approached him asking: “Are you the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another?” he answered: “Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them. And blessed is anyone who takes no offense at me.” (Matt. 11:3-6) Trying to provoke Jesus, the chief priests together with the scribes and the elders requested from him a direct response regarding his identity and mission: “Tell us, by what authority are you doing these things? Who is it who gave you this authority?” (Lk. 20: 1-2) Yet, seeing the hypocrisy of their hearts Jesus replied with another question, instead of revealing the truth to those who were not prepared to accept it. Finally, when Pilate asked Jesus: “Are you the King of the Jews?” he received only the short response, “You say so” (Mk. 15:2). The identity of Christ could not be expressed in a few words, but he still encouraged his disciples to reflect on it, giving

their own responses and taking a closer look at his life, his deeds and his message understood as the fullness of God's presence among his people.

When Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" And they said, "Some say John the Baptist, but others Elijah, and still others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answered him, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven. And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 16:13-19)

This passage from the Gospel of Matthew makes it clear that Christ had no intention of remaining unknown to his followers. The inaccessible Divine Logos became flesh precisely because the Second Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity wanted the whole world to recognize and experience God's love for creation, which through the incarnation became accessible to human hearts and minds. Therefore, God's existence can no longer be regarded as being only a purely transcendent reality, as Christ has already revealed and is still revealing his own identity and mission to those who open themselves to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The Christian Tradition cannot be regarded as having a fixed origin and being perfect in itself, for it needs to be repeatedly received, understood, and developed. As a consequence, the Church cannot be regarded as having an identity once and for all defined, for she continues to open herself to new religious responses and new interpretive systems directed toward a better understanding of her proper place and authentic mission in the world.⁸⁴ The confession of Saint Peter which was not revealed to him merely by "flesh

⁸⁴ PHILIPS, "Reflecting on Identity and Change," p. 14.

and blood,” and Christ’s promise to build the Church on the firm foundation of an accurate understanding of his identity, impels the contemporary Church to grow in the understanding of revealed truths and to deepen the sense of her own genuine essence and vocation, in order to receive the keys of the kingdom and not be destroyed by the gates of Hades.

Revealing the mysteries of the heavenly kingdom to his disciples, Christ often employed an easily-understandable linguistic method based on the use of symbols and imagery.⁸⁵ The same technique was borrowed in order to designate the Church in the early Patristic period.⁸⁶ Saint Clement of Rome (+97) developed the famous Pauline concept of the Church understood as the “Body of Christ.”⁸⁷ Saint Ignatius of Antioch (+110) fostered the idea of the Church being recognized in the “breaking of the bread.”⁸⁸ The author of “The Shepherd,” Saint Hermas (ca. 140), portrayed the Church as an unfinished tower constantly growing taller until the time of the second coming of the Lord.⁸⁹ Saint Irenaeus of Lyons (ca. 180-190) described the Church as the “gates of life,”⁹⁰ the “purest fountain,” and the “ladder of ascent to God.”⁹¹ Saint Clement of Alexandria (+215) depicted the Church as a “mother nourishing her children by the milk of the eternal Word.”⁹² And

⁸⁵ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 46.

⁸⁶ Mykhaïlo DMYD, *Khersones'ke tainstvo svobody: Ekkleziolohiia*, tom. 1 [The Mystery of Freedom of Chersonese: Ecclesiology, vol. 1] (L'viv: Svichado, 2007), pp. 59-71.

⁸⁷ Κλήμης επίσκοπος Ῥώμης, *Ἐπιστολή προς Κορινθίους* [The First Letter to Corinthians], in Jacques-Paul MIGNÉ, ed., *Patrologia Graeca 1 (PG 1)* (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1857-1866), pg. 288A-289A.

⁸⁸ Ἰγνάτιος ο Θεοφόρος, *Ἐπιστολή προς Ἐφεσίους* [The Letter to Ephesians], in *PG 5*, pp. 661C-662C.

⁸⁹ Ἑρμας, *Ποιμὴν* [The Shepherd], in *PG 2*, pp. 899-900.

⁹⁰ Εἰρηναῖος Λουγδούνων, *Ἐλεγχος και ανατροπή* III. 3.2. [Against Heresies], in *PG 7*, p. 855A-B.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 966A-867A.

⁹² Κλήμης ο Αλεξανδρεύς, *Παιδαγωγός* I. 6. 45 [Instructor], in *PG 8*, p. 300B-C

finally, Saint Cyprian (+ 258) articulated his understanding of the Church as the “bride of Christ” and the “mother of the people of God.”⁹³

The use of symbols and images instead of scholarly terminology allowed the Fathers of the Church, as well as many theologians of later periods, to reach beyond the understanding of the Church as a human society.⁹⁴ And while being only modest reflections of transcendent realities, the symbols still played the important role of a kind of intermediary between the limited human intellect and the heavenly truths signified by them.⁹⁵ The same role has been played by icons, which can also be regarded as powerful tools facilitating a deeper understanding of the ecclesial identity and mission of the Church. Just as linguistic images and symbols have the ability to transcend themselves in order to reveal “the depth-dimension of reality,”⁹⁶ icons are also originally intended to point to their divine prototype, never focusing on themselves.⁹⁷ This is why it is still hard to find a better expression of the Church’s inner nature than the classical Byzantine icon of Pentecost or the icon of the Holy Trinity painted in 1425 by the Russian monk, Andrey Rublev.⁹⁸ These icons present an ecclesiology in colors and encourage us to keep silent rather than speak, to contemplate rather than act, and to wonder rather than argue.⁹⁹

⁹³ Cyprianus Carthaginensis, *De unitate Ecclesiae* [On the Unity of the Church], in Jacques-Paul MIGNE, ed., *Patrologia Latina* 4 (PL 4) (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1844-1855), pp. 497D-498B.

⁹⁴ The Second Vatican Council also employed a large number of symbols and images borrowed from the New Testament in order to approach the Church as a mystery. See LG 6-7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 851-852 and ARSENIIEV, “The Meaning of Vatican II,” pp. 10-11.

⁹⁵ OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 46.

⁹⁶ Mary Ann STENGER, “The Significance of Paradox for Theological Verification: Difficulties and Possibilities,” in *The International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion* 14 (1983), p. 174.

⁹⁷ Verna HARRISON, “The Relation Between Apophatic and Kataphatic Theology,” in *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology*, 4 (1995), p. 322.

⁹⁸ Paul EVDOKIMOV, “Interpretation of Rublev’s Icon of the Trinity,” in *One in Christ* 3 (1967), pp. 304-310.

⁹⁹ DYMYD, *Khersones’ke taiinstvo svobody*, pp. 100-108.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that even during the Patristic period symbols, images and icons were not the only possible ways of describing the Church's identity. Starting already in the fourth century, the Church managed to elaborate a very precise linguistic definition of her inner nature and vocation which was incorporated into the Nicene Creed and became the foundation for the development of future systematic ecclesiologies. The fathers of the Ecumenical Councils of Nicea and Constantinople once and for all declared that the Church as the object of our faith must always include and preserve a set of very concrete indications of her authenticity, which would distinguish the true Church from all heretical communities. In order to be the legitimate continuation of the ecclesial community established by Christ, the Church had to be a) One, b) Holy, c) Catholic, d) and Apostolic. These four principal aspects of the ecclesial reality of the Church were not understood as symbolic expressions but as a set of clear theological criteria easily applicable for the assessment of the ecclesial identity and vocation of the true Church. It was not enough for a given Particular Church to correspond merely to one or two criteria emphasized by the Creed. All four dimensions of authentic ecclesial life had to be actively present in order to prove a Church's legitimacy. In later centuries the four criteria enshrined in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed became the most prominent and generally accepted interpretive matrix for the evaluation of the Church's identity. This four-fold matrix was included in classical theological schoolbooks and it was critically

developed by contemporary theologians such as Karl Rahner,¹⁰⁰ Joseph Ratzinger,¹⁰¹ Avery Dulles,¹⁰² Vladimir Lossky,¹⁰³ John Meyendorff,¹⁰⁴ and many others.

Special attention should be given to the definition of the Church formulated by Robert Bellarmine who was inclined to think of the true Church as absolutely identical to the visible institution of political states¹⁰⁵ formed by a specific group of Christians bound together by three major components, namely a) profession of the same faith; b) communion of the same Sacraments; and c) submission to legitimate pastors, especially “the Vicar of Christ on earth,” the Roman Pontiff.¹⁰⁶ For almost five centuries, this definition, which seemed to give clear answers to all possible questions, played a prominent role in the development of Catholic scholastic ecclesiology. It was especially convenient in the historical context of the Counter-Reformation and Catholic anti-Modernism, prompting the Church to defend herself by building impenetrable theological borders and expressing a clear sense of ecclesial identity that was directed against anyone who was not incorporated into the Body of Christ as identified with the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁰⁷ Bellarmine’s narrow and exclusivistic understanding of the Church’s inner essence as being unchangeable and having little to do with her mission¹⁰⁸ was not only accepted as the most

¹⁰⁰ Karl RAHNER, *Theological Investigations: Ecclesiology, Questions in the Church, The Church in the World*, trans. by David Bourke (New York: Seabury Press, 1976), pp. 3-65.

¹⁰¹ Joseph RATZINGER, *Introduction to Christianity* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990), pp. 255-267.

¹⁰² Avery DULLES and Patrick GRANFIELD, *Theology of the Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), pp. 59-80.

¹⁰³ Vladimir LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood: SVS Press, 1998), pp. 3-49.

¹⁰⁴ John MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), pp. 79-90.

¹⁰⁵ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, pp. 4-5.

¹⁰⁶ Robertus BELLARMINUS, *De controversiis Christianae fidei, adversus huius temporis haereticos*, vol. 2, book 3, *De Ecclesia militante*, chap. 2, “De definitione Ecclesiae” (Naples: Giuliano, 1857), p. 74. Translation in DULLES, *Models*, p. 14 and DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁷ POWELL, *The Mystery*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁸ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 25.

popular definition of the Catholic Church but also appeared in a large number of official documents of the Catholic Church including those of the Second Vatican Council.¹⁰⁹

The most recent changes in the ecclesiological thinking of the Catholic Church have shown that the paradigm of the *societas perfecta*, which seemed relevant for several previous centuries, can no longer be employed as an adequate expression of the Church's identity.¹¹⁰ In attempting to reform herself, the Church had to admit that it might be dangerous to overemphasize the institutional aspect of the Church's inner nature and overlook the other ecclesial dimensions expressing the beauty of the Church and her ability to confront the world of today.¹¹¹ The idealization of one, single ecclesiological concept could become an idol obstructing the Catholic Church's development and adjustment to the new circumstances of life.¹¹² Changing times demanded changes in ecclesiological paradigms. Thus, already in 1943 the concept of the Mystical Body almost completely replaced that of the perfect society, opening the way for a new understanding of the Church as "Mystery," "Sacrament," "People of God," and "Communion."¹¹³

The introduction of new ecclesiological paradigms by the Second Vatican Council inspired the American theologian and later Cardinal, Avery Dulles, to produce an interpretive system assessing ecclesial identity and the vocation of the Catholic Church, known under the same title as his famous book "Models of the Church." Borrowing the notion of "models" successfully used in physics, Dulles managed to apply them in

¹⁰⁹ The second paragraph of Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* says: "The holy catholic church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is made up of the faithful who are organically united in the holy Spirit by the same faith and sacraments and by the same government." *OE 2*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

¹¹⁰ FIORENZA, "The Church's Religious Identity," p. 202.

¹¹¹ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 20.

¹¹² OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 46.

¹¹³ DULLES, *Models*, p. 27.

ecclesiology as his original method.¹¹⁴ He named five basic models indicating that the Church in her very essence is a) Institution; b) Mystical Communion; c) Sacrament; d) Herald; and e) Servant.¹¹⁵ At the same time, Dulles admitted the possibility of other models that help us enter the mystery of the Church which cannot be encompassed merely by the use of terminology and definitions. Each of the models, in Dulles's opinion, combines two essential levels: *explanatory* (helping us to better understand something that we already know) and *exploratory* (opening a new theological insight of which previously we were not conscious).¹¹⁶ Every one of these models can also be evaluated by seven criteria: a) basis in Scripture; b) grounding in Christian Tradition; c) capacity to give Church members a sense of their corporate identity and mission; d) tendency to foster the virtues and values generally admired by Christians; e) correspondence with the religious experience of people today; f) theological fruitfulness; g) fruitfulness in enabling Church members to relate successfully to those outside their own group.¹¹⁷

Obtaining its own language, terminology, images, values and commitments, each of the models, in the mind of Avery Dulles, has also "its own uses and limitations."¹¹⁸ What is more, at first sight all five models seem to be in conflict and mutually antithetical.¹¹⁹ So, one can ask, are the models "compatible or incompatible, mutually exclusive or mutually complementary? Are they all equally good, or are some superior to others? What is the best model?"¹²⁰ In one of the concluding chapters, entitled "The Evaluation of Models," Avery Dulles gives a concise and comprehensive answer to all these questions. All of the models,

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 21.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 26-94.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 180-181.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 179.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 183.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 179.

in his opinion, are complementary and build on each other. None of them can be taken in isolation, interpreted in an exclusivistic way or regarded as a supermodel, since this would inevitably lead to “serious imbalances and distortions.”¹²¹ Only five models combined together as an undivided wholeness can “help the Church to find her true identity in a changing world.”¹²²

The aforementioned has not only served to deepen our analysis of ecclesial identity, but also to illustrate how others have synthesized several criteria into a balanced evaluative system. This is important, as one of the aims of the present thesis is to develop another such integrated system. Before doing so, however, we must first review several other attempts.

II.1.4. Brief Evaluation of Several Previous Attempts Aimed at a Systematic Analysis of a Particular Church’s Ecclesial Identity and Vocation Specifically as an Introduction to the Interpretive System Proposed in This Thesis

Unlike the question of the ecclesial identity of the Church *per se*, there are far fewer interpretations directed toward evaluating a Particular Church’s ecclesial identity. This, of course, is because before Vatican II, the very existence of the non-Latin Catholic Churches was often ignored and regarded as something insignificant. Naturally, the Church of Rome did not hesitate to mention the Oriental Rites in some of her documents, and even issued several *Motu proprio* decrees regulating the Eastern Churches’ discipline. Nonetheless, in practice, the concept of a *Ritus praestantior* basically deprived Eastern Catholics of the right to develop their own particularities, prompting them to adopt the theological system,

¹²¹ Ibid., p. 183.

¹²² Ibid., p. 28. See also HOUGH and COBB, *Christian Identity*, pp. 48-49 and FIORENZA, “The Church’s Religious Identity,” p. 202.

spirituality and customs of the “superior” Church.¹²³ Being substantially Latinized and absolutely subordinated to the Roman Curia, these Churches could not produce an ecclesiology that would adequately express their ecclesial identity and mission.¹²⁴ This is why only after the Second Vatican Council, with its stress on the Church as a *koinonia* of Particular Churches, do we see Eastern Catholics encouraged to return to their sources and the first and still weak attempts to realize the specific ecclesial nature and vocation of each Church.

One of the first interpretive systems elaborating the concept of a Particular Church¹²⁵ belongs to the Ukrainian canonist Meletius Wojnar, known for his commentary on Vatican II’s *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*. Heavily relying on both the *Motu proprio, Postquam Apostolicis* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Wojnar first of all distinguished two essential elements, material and formal, by which every Particular Church of the Catholic communion is constituted. The material element, in his opinion, was composed of a “group of faithful with their own hierarchy, with their own discipline, both canonical and liturgical, and with their own homogeneous spiritual heritage.”¹²⁶ The formal

¹²³ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 21.

¹²⁴ Two Eastern Churches of the Catholic communion, namely the Melkite and the Kyivan Catholic Churches, can be regarded as being slightly different in this respect. Even before Vatican II they managed to produce some very interesting ecclesiological concepts and ideas concerning their particularity; however, it must be admitted that, up to the time of the Council, these were never expressed as an official position of their Churches, remaining popular only in the realm of theological discussions among such prominent individuals as Metropolitan Andrey (Sheptytsky), Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh), Archbishops Elias (Zoghby) and Neophytos (Edelby), Metropolitan (later Major Archbishop) Josyf (Slipyj) and Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk).

¹²⁵ The system was produced already in 1965.

¹²⁶ In this regard, Wojnar also emphasized that the members of a specific Particular Church are held together by their hierarchy. Consequently, this “personal element shows that a canonical rite is not bound within territorial limits.” Particular canon law, according to Wojnar, may come from the Pope, the Patriarch or Major Archbishop, or from the Synod of a Particular Church. For the reason that liturgical discipline can be shared by several Particular Churches “it cannot, of itself, be sufficient to constitute a canonical rite.” See WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” pp. 515-516.

element presupposes the *express* or *tacit* “acknowledgement of the autonomy of the group as *sui iuris*, by the supreme authority of the universal Church.”¹²⁷

The understanding of the concept of a Particular Church, according to Meletius Wojnar, can also be built upon another set of elements: a) common; and b) differentiating, which must be faithfully preserved and developed by all of the Churches of the Catholic communion. The common elements are (i) confession of the same faith; (ii) partaking in the same sacraments; and (iii) subordination to the same supreme government.¹²⁸ These, of course, are Bellarmine’s well-worn descriptors of the “perfect society,” mentioned earlier. The differentiating elements are those which constitute the Particular Church as particular and make her different from the other Churches of the same communion.¹²⁹ These are (i) presence of a proper hierarchy with apostolic succession; (ii) distinct liturgy; (iii) distinct canon law; and (iv) a proper spiritual patrimony.¹³⁰ Unfortunately, Wojnar’s system presented only a limited picture of a Particular Church’s identity, approached exclusively from the canonical point of view and, therefore, did not expound her ecclesial mission or ecclesiological significance.

Another interesting system for evaluating a Particular Church’s identity that deserves attention was articulated by the Major Archbishop of L’viv, Josyf VII Cardinal

¹²⁷ Cited from WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 180. Since there is no concrete example of the formal constitution of a new Particular Church by the Pope, there must be at least a “*tacit* acknowledgement, which is given by equivalent facts, such as that a certain rite is mentioned in decrees of the Holy See or that the transfer from one group to another requires permission from the Holy See.” See WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 516.

¹²⁸ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 180.

¹²⁹ Wojnar deliberately refuses to include ethnicity or the usage of different liturgical languages as differentiating elements, for the reason that one and the same Particular Church can employ various languages and comprise together representatives of different national backgrounds. See WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 515.

¹³⁰ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 181. In the opinion of another Eastern canonist and commentator on Vatican II’s *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*, Victor Pospishil, only the first of the elements enumerated by Meletius Wojnar can be regarded as “differentiating,” since the other three can be shared by other Particular Churches. See POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, pp. 10-11.

Slipyj, in his “Report about the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine” delivered at the 30th Congress of the international organization “Kirche in Not” [Aid to the Church in Need] in August 1980.¹³¹ Slipyj attempts to demonstrate that the Kyivan Catholic Church in the fullest sense (*de iure* and *de facto*) can be regarded as an *Ecclesia Particularis sui iuris*, as she corresponds to the seven major marks expressing a Church’s particularity. They are a) a proper ecclesial Tradition; b) particular liturgical language; c) distinctive theological patrimony; d) proper liturgical heritage (which, in terms of the Byzantine rite in general, is held common with several other Churches); e) specific religious customs (different even from the other Churches of the Byzantine Tradition); f) proper spirituality; and g) unique canon law (including a specific form of hierarchical organization).¹³² Despite the fact that Slipyj does not elaborate the identity or mission of the Kyivan Catholic Church, his interpretive system helps one get a sense of what it means to have an operative autonomous ecclesial status for a Particular Church enjoying equal rights and equal responsibility with the other Churches of the Catholic communion.¹³³

¹³¹ Iosyf SLIPYĪ, “Zur Lage der Ukrainischen Katholischen Kirche in der Ukraine // Zvit Blazhennishoho Patriarkha Iosyfa pro Ukraïns’ku Katolyts’ku Tserkvy v Ukraïni [The Report of His Beatitude Patriarch Josyf about the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine],” in Ivan KHOMA and Ivan MUZYCHKA, eds., *Opera omnia Iosephi (Slipyj-Kobernyckyj-Dyčkovskij) Patriarchae et Cardinalis // Tvory Patriarkha I Kardynala Josyfa: Poslannia, propovidi, promovy I pryvity (1976-1984)* [Works by Patriarch and Cardinal Josyf: Letters, Sermons, Speeches, and Addresses (1976-1984)], vol. XIV (Rome: Universitas Catholica Ucrainorum, 1985), pp. 264-279.

¹³² Ibid., p. 265 (in German) and p. 273 (in Ukrainian translation).

¹³³ A proper theological evaluation of Slipyj’s interpretive system composed of the aforementioned seven marks of ecclesial particularity later became one of the main subjects matters of the unpublished doctoral dissertation written by a prominent contemporary Ukrainian theologian, Myron Bendyk, which was dedicated to the understanding of particularity of Metropolitan Andrey (Sheptytsky), Major Archbishop Josyf (Slipyj) and Major Archbishop Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky). See also Myron BENDYK, *Pomisnist’ Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolits’koï Tserkvy ta ïi bachennia Patriarkhom Iosyfom Slipym* [The Particularity of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and Its Understanding by Patriarch Josyf Slipyj] (L’viv: Svichado, 1996), pp. 28-35. See also John M. Freishyn Chirovsky, *Patriarch Josyf (Slipyj) the Confessor and His Ecclesiological Thought: An Analysis from the Perspective of Avery Dulles’ Models of the Church*. Unpublished Catholic Theological Union M. A. Thesis (Chicago, 1997).

This short review of the two interpretive systems described above might lead the reader to conclude that the assessment of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity has only attracted the attention of a few Eastern Catholic theologians and hierarchs. Ironically, however, my research of the literature on this topic has not only revealed the opposite, but also that it has been Western Catholic theologians who have done some of the best work in this area. Starting at least from the time of the Second Vatican Council, the question of diversity, particularity and locality on different levels and in diverse contexts has become one of the most popular subjects of theological investigation. Among the Roman Catholics we find the names of Yves Congar, Jean Daniélou, Henri de Lubac, Hans Küng, Avery Dulles, Jean-Marie Tillard, Gregory Baum, and Michael Fahey, to name but a few. A thorough analysis of their contribution is beyond the scope of this dissertation, and so I will review only two works of the Roman Catholic, Robert Schreiter.¹³⁴ I believe his interpretive system is the most relevant for the clarification of the main argument addressed in this thesis, and will argue this below.

Immediately I should note, however, that while the ecclesiology of a Particular Church and the assessment of her ecclesial identity were not at the center of Schreiter's theological thought, he has dedicated a great deal of attention to the analysis of the phenomenon of "local theology" as an expression of the religious identity of a "local Christian community" that tries to find its proper place in a contemporary multi-confessional and multi-cultural environment. Schreiter asks a question which at first glance might seem only theoretical: "Is the local theology developing in this community genuinely

¹³⁴ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, pp. 1-121 and SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity*, pp. 62-133.

reflective of the gospel, and faithful to the Christian Tradition?”¹³⁵ And he immediately comes up with a set of principles understood as a system aimed at responding to this question. In Shreiter’s opinion, the proper development of local theology can be verified by its conformity to five mutually dependent criteria. These are: a) cohesiveness (the local theology must be cohesive in all periods of its historical development); b) worshiping context (the proper development of the local theology must be affirmed in the context of communal prayer); c) the praxis of the community (the local theology has to be expressed through Christian praxis); d) the judgment of other Churches (the local theology should not ignore external judgments); and e) the challenge to other Churches (the genuine development of the local community’s theology has to be challenging for analogical theological developments taking place in other communities).¹³⁶

As is evident, Schreiter’s emphasis on the significance of local theology and local community is not divorced from the larger context of inter-personal and inter-confessional relations. This derives from his understanding of catholicity, which is equally present on the global and local levels, always encouraging Christians to be faithful to their common Tradition and to express this faithfulness through prayer and praxis.¹³⁷

As we have already seen, the documents of the Second Vatican Council directly or indirectly have inspired most of the interpretive systems reviewed in this sub-chapter of my thesis. The models of Avery Dulles emerged as a result of his understanding of the major images of the Church found in *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Gaudium et Spes*. Meletius Wojnar’s determination of the concept *Ecclesia Particularis seu Ritus*

¹³⁵ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, p. 117.

¹³⁶ SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity*, pp. 81-83 and SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, pp. 117-121.

¹³⁷ SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity*, pp. 62-83.

comes from his interpretation of the canonical content of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. The influence of Vatican II and its emphasis on the particular and local dimensions of the Church is also very strongly perceptible in the marks or criteria proposed by Josyf Slipyj and Robert Schreiter. As will become evident, I too will cull the ecclesiology of Vatican II to develop my own interpretive system composed of a set of seven criteria, together aimed at the systematic assessment of a Particular Church's identity and the evaluation of her present state of ecclesial development.

Note, however, that none of the documents of the Second Vatican Council present all seven criteria in a self-evident and consistent manner. Sometimes they are clearly proposed in various places in the conciliar documents. Yet, they can also be hidden within the context of certain expressions or definitions. Nevertheless, it is a contention of this thesis that all seven criteria carefully drawn together from all of the conciliar documents concerning ecclesial particularity and presented in the form of a unified interpretive matrix can be successfully applied to an assessment of the authentic ecclesial identity of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, despite the fact that the manner of applying the criteria would differ considerably from Church to Church. This is because each Particular Church has its own traditional roots, unique theology, liturgy, spirituality and legislation, its own privileged partners in ecumenical dialogue, and its own original ways of contributing to the unity of the Catholic Church.

The identification of the seven basic principles or criteria for evaluation of the contemporary state of development of a Particular Church's identity has been developed on the basis of my close reading of all of the documents of Vatican II, with special attention to

the three texts which, as already discussed, are most relevant in this regard, namely, *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*.

In attempting to “draw up some guiding principles” for each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion “in addition to the items applicable to the whole church,”¹³⁸ Vatican II articulated several basic exhortations which conform both terminologically and in substance to the seven criteria of my system. We find these in the Council’s emphasis on the importance of (i) the return to the genuine roots of a particular ecclesial Tradition; (ii-v) the revitalization of a Particular Church’s theology; liturgy; canon law; and spirituality; (vi) the strengthening of the position of any of the Particular Churches in the Catholic communion; and (vii) the contribution of each of the Catholic Particular Churches to inter-confessional and inter-religious reintegration.

Just as the first and the last two criteria of my system can be detected only in the larger ecclesiological context of Vatican II, the remaining four criteria are usually mentioned by the documents of the Second Vatican Council all together and in a very consistent manner. All three conciliar texts defining ecclesial particularity (LG, UR, and OE) are unanimous in underlining that each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, and especially the Eastern Catholic Churches,

(i) while maintaining the unity of faith and the unique divine constitution of the universal church, enjoy their own discipline, their own liturgical usage and their own theological and spiritual patrimony.¹³⁹

(ii) This Synod thanks God that many eastern daughters and sons of the Catholic Church, who preserve this [Eastern] heritage and wish to express it more faithfully and completely in their lives, are already living in full communion with their brothers and sisters who follow the tradition of the west. It declares that all this heritage of spirituality and liturgy, of discipline

¹³⁸ OE 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 900.

¹³⁹ LG 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 968.

and theology, in its various traditions, belongs to the full catholic and apostolic character of the church.¹⁴⁰

(iii) Although individual churches of this kind, both of the east and the west, differ somewhat in what are called rites, such as liturgy, ecclesiastical order and spiritual heritage, still they are entrusted on an equal footing to the pastoral guidance of the Roman pontiff.¹⁴¹

The methodological consistency of the conciliar documents in highlighting the four main elements constituting the ecclesial identity of a Particular Church was not overlooked by a large number of contemporary commentators. Some theologians, like Werner Becker,¹⁴² René Beaupère,¹⁴³ Hans Küng,¹⁴⁴ Peter Riga,¹⁴⁵ Salvatore Manna,¹⁴⁶ Domenico Colombo,¹⁴⁷ Clemente Riva,¹⁴⁸ Miguel Nicolau Pons and Jean Daniélou,¹⁴⁹ to name only a few, simply mentioned the four marks of particularity, not really attributing any special significance to their further ecclesiological employment. At the same time, there were theologians like Gustave Thils,¹⁵⁰ John Madey,¹⁵¹ Peter Galadza,¹⁵² and Andriy Chirovsky¹⁵³ who underlined the importance of the four conciliar criteria for the evaluation of proper ecclesial development within the Eastern Catholic Churches and indicated the

¹⁴⁰ UR 17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 918.

¹⁴¹ OE 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

¹⁴² BECKER, "Decree on Ecumenism," p. 140.

¹⁴³ BEAUPÈRE, "What Sort of Unity?" p. 205.

¹⁴⁴ KÜNG, *Reforming the Church Today*, p. 32.

¹⁴⁵ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 189.

¹⁴⁶ Salvatore MANNA, "Commento al Decreto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche," in DISTANTE and MANNA, *Concilium Vaticanum*, p. 121.

¹⁴⁷ COLOMBO, *L'Ecumenismo*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁸ RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 138.

¹⁴⁹ PONS and DANIELÉLOU, *La Iglesia del Concilio Vaticano II*, pp. 181-182.

¹⁵⁰ Gustave THILS, *Le décret sur l'oecuménisme: commentaire doctrinal* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1966), pp. 141-152.

¹⁵¹ MADEY, "Vatican Council II's Decree," p. 228.

¹⁵² GALADZA, "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?" pp. 62-65.

¹⁵³ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," pp. 114-115 and Andriy CHIROVSKY, "The Ukrainian Church in the Second Millennium," in Nicholas L. CHIROVSKY, ed., *The Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1988), pp. 265-274.

possibility of their practical application for the assessment of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity.

Nevertheless, after a careful analysis of all the documents of the Second Vatican Council understood as a unified body of texts articulating renewed Catholic ecclesiology, I have come to the conclusion that the authentic ecclesial identity of any of the Churches of the Catholic communion cannot be sufficiently and adequately expressed exclusively by the use of criteria solely underlining the Church's particularity. Identity is not only about specificities, but also about the values that are harmoniously shared by various Churches. It is not only about distinctive existential characteristics but also about the responsibility and contribution of the Particular Churches to the common good. It is not only about "who we are," but more importantly about "what we do" for the betterment of internal relations within the already-existing communion of Churches, for the dialogue with our separated "brethren," and for the salvation of the entire world. In order to be faithful to their genuine ecclesial identity, Churches must engage in mission – becoming dynamic agents that foster a sense of God's presence in the world.

An ecclesial identity should be properly depicted as a complex reality intended to establish a firm balance between principles of unity and diversity in the Church and at the same time reveal the Church as a mystery that simultaneously comprises human and divine elements.¹⁵⁴ It is crucial for every Church to be clearly defined by its particularity, in order to become "a standard lifted high for the nations to see it."¹⁵⁵ However, it is equally essential to realize that every Church is called to "serve all humanity through the gospel of peace" and to "make its pilgrim way in hope towards the homeland in heaven which is its

¹⁵⁴ *LG* 8, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 854.

¹⁵⁵ *UR* 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 909. See also *Is.* 11: 10-12.

goal.”¹⁵⁶ The Church is an earthly institution, but it is also a reflection of the inner life of the Trinity¹⁵⁷ and a true sign of the kingdom of God already present among humans.¹⁵⁸ That is why the search of any Christian Church for the proper expressions of her ecclesial self-identification should not be limited exclusively to a narrow understanding of her traditional distinctiveness. Even a well developed sense of ecclesial particularity may not protect a Church from stultifying staticism or complacent narcissism.¹⁵⁹ An authentic ecclesial identity is a dynamic reality that is meant to direct a particular Church to a clearer realization of her own values in order to strengthen unity among all the Churches of God¹⁶⁰ and to contribute to the salvific mission of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

Thus, factoring in some of the earlier theological reflections of Gustave Thils, John Madey, Peter Galadza and Andriy Chirovsky, I have chosen to go beyond their formulations and supplement the already-existing four-fold system of evaluation of a Particular Church’s identity enunciated by the documents of Vatican II by adding another criterion of particularity established by the conciliar encouragement to return to the sources, as well as by enlisting two additional criteria that express the ecclesial vocation of each of the Churches of the Catholic communion. Such an attitude, in my opinion, would secure my further theological analysis from the danger of being taken out of the larger ecclesiological context of the conciliar documents. It would also hopefully serve as a more adequate means of assessing the ecclesial identity of the Catholic Particular Churches as rooted in their vocational character inspired by the “one Spirit who distributes his various

¹⁵⁶ UR 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 909. See also 1 Pt. 1: 3-9.

¹⁵⁷ UR 2, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 909.

¹⁵⁸ LG 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 851.

¹⁵⁹ CHIROVSKY, “Orthodox in Communion with Rome,” p. 79.

¹⁶⁰ LG 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 863.

gifts for the good of the church according to his own riches and the needs of the ministries.”¹⁶¹

In the next sub-chapter of the present thesis I will look at various aspects of the ecclesial nature and mission of the Particular Churches. As will become evident, these exist not only for the sake of these Churches per se, but first of all because they are ultimately intended to inspire the entire Christian community to “pave the way to the full contemplation of Christian truth”¹⁶² – for the salvation of all.

II.2. An Interpretive System Composed of Seven Ecclesiological Criteria for an Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Particular Church

II.2.1. *Ad Fontes* and *Aggiornamento*: A Return to Authentic Traditional Roots and the Need for Proper and Organic Ecclesiastical Development

After many centuries marked by an apologetic spirit of struggle with Reformation, modernism, and other real or imagined threats to Roman centralism, at the start of the twentieth century the Catholic Church found herself faced with new trials and new challenges. The tactics, which by now had become customary for Catholicism, namely, a defensive attitude towards enemies both internal and external and exclusivism, which for a long time gave Catholics a feeling of artificial complacency, turned out to be ineffective in the new historical circumstances.¹⁶³ Gradually the Catholic Church started to realize that she would not be able to respond adequately to the modern world if she did not reject its own closed mentality and meet face to face the urgent problems that trouble modern society. The world ecumenical movement, whose aim was to unite the separated parts of

¹⁶¹ *LG* 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 853. See also 1 Cor. 12: 1-11.

¹⁶² *UR* 17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917.

¹⁶³ ALBERIGO, “The Authority,” p. 129.

Christianity, also demanded changes from the Catholic Church. Participation in this movement required not only a better knowledge of one's partners but first of all a re-thinking of one's own ecclesial identity¹⁶⁴ and a return to the authentic roots of one's own ecclesiastical Tradition.¹⁶⁵ Regarding this issue, Hans Küng said:

Our efforts for Church unity demand not less but more involvement in our own Church than ever; we have to discover what is sound in its roots, find out its true nature and follow its best intentions. If we become more involved in our own Church, we cannot but be aware of the other Churches as well.¹⁶⁶

The new historical and ecumenical situation arising at the start of the twentieth century caused a rebirth in the Catholic Church of a movement called *ressourcement* – “a return to the sources.” A brief overview of the history of this phenomenon is apropos, especially as it highlights how Western Catholics were instrumental in providing Eastern Catholics with the tools for the latter's renewal as Eastern Churches.

The most important historical marker for the rise of the Catholic *ressourcement* can be set at the second and third decades of the twentieth century, noted for the activation of research in the patristic sphere. French Jesuits and Dominicans from the theological faculties of Fourvière (Lyon) and Le Saulchoir (Paris) were crucial to this process.¹⁶⁷ The systematic character of the patristic revival was achieved thanks to the publication of the series of works of the Fathers, *Sources chrétiennes*, under the direction of Jean Daniélou, as well as the appearance of a whole range of works dedicated to a re-conceptualization of forgotten themes in Catholic ecclesiology which entered the world thanks to Yves Congar

¹⁶⁴ LONG, “East and West,” p. 13.

¹⁶⁵ John MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), p. 150.

¹⁶⁶ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 288.

¹⁶⁷ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” pp. 65-66.

under the general title *Unam Sanctam*. Eventually other German- and French-speaking theologians, such as Henri de Lubac, Charles Journet, Karl Adam, and Hans Urs Von Balthasar,¹⁶⁸ became involved in the sphere of re-discovering the patristic sources.

A rebirth in the sphere of biblical studies was inspired by Pius XII's Encyclical Letter on Promoting Biblical Studies, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943), and further developed by prominent theologians from Rome's Pontifical Biblical Institute, Louvain, and the École Biblique de Jerusalem.¹⁶⁹ The Benedictine monasteries of Solesmes near Sablé (France), Mont César and Chevetogne near Louvain (Belgium), Maria Laach near Andernach (Germany), and Klosterneuburg near Vienna (Austria) became centers for the revitalization of ecumenical and liturgical studies. Research work in these spheres came from the pens of such prominent Catholic historians, liturgists, and ecumenists as Romano Guardini, Josef Jungmann, Lambert Beauduin, Clément Lialine, Odo Casel, and Pius Parsch.¹⁷⁰

The majority of active leaders of the Catholic *ressourcement* movement became the leading participants of the Second Vatican Council, and their ideas were incorporated into practically all the conciliar documents. In this way the slogan *ad fontes* became one of the central calls of Vatican II; the "recovery of the tradition," in the words of Avery Dulles, became the "major theological achievement" of the Council.¹⁷¹ Trying to continue the unfinished work of Vatican I¹⁷² and hoping not to abandon the "enrichment of theology contributed in the great scholastic age,"¹⁷³ the council fathers at the same time made an attempt to return to the simpler, livelier, and symbolically rich language of the Bible and

¹⁶⁸ Henri de LUBAC, *Mémoire sur l'Occasion de mes Écrits* (Namur: Culture et vérité, 1989), pp. 35-36.

¹⁶⁹ Roger AUBERT, *La Théologie Catholique au milieu du XX Siècle* (Tournai: Castermann, 1954), pp. 7-89.

¹⁷⁰ DRILLING, "The Genesis," p. 67.

¹⁷¹ DULLES, *The Reshaping*, p. 75.

¹⁷² POWELL, *The Mystery*, p. 5.

¹⁷³ DRILLING, "The Genesis," p. 75.

Fathers. Thus, for example, just one of the conciliar texts, *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, according to the count of Michele Pellegrino, includes 184 quotations or references from Patristic sources,¹⁷⁴ approximately forty of which are from the Eastern Fathers.¹⁷⁵

Understanding well that true progress in theological thought can only be built on a better conceptualization of the legacy of the past,¹⁷⁶ the council fathers found themselves facing a dilemma regarding the correct understanding of the phenomenon of Divine Revelation and the sources of Christian Tradition.¹⁷⁷ On the one hand, this allowed them to take into account the faulty concept of Holy Scripture and Tradition as two “absolute and permanent kernels of truth,”¹⁷⁸ that have been given to the Church once and for all, to be “identified exclusively with the past.”¹⁷⁹ On the other hand, they had to develop conciliar thought in agreement with the principle of *aggiornamento*¹⁸⁰ introduced by Pope John XXIII. In this context, Revelation was understood as an ongoing action of the Holy Spirit who continues to speak through the Council as one of his channels and keeps on acting in the present age in the same way as he did in the past.¹⁸¹ Therefore, Tradition was presented by the council fathers as a living reality¹⁸² that can and should be “adapted to the needs and opportunities of the times.”¹⁸³ The return to the sources on the part of the Council was not

¹⁷⁴ Michele PELLEGRINO, “L’étude des pères de l’Eglise dans la perspective conciliaire,” in *Irenikon* 38 (1965), p. 454.

¹⁷⁵ De LUBAC, *The Church*, p. 31.

¹⁷⁶ De LUBAC, *The Splendor*, p. 11.

¹⁷⁷ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 74 and Thomas FOUUDY, *The Ecclesiology of George Tyrell: A Comparative Study: Its Relationship to John Henry Cardinal Newman and Lumen Gentium* (Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1975), p. 206.

¹⁷⁸ MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy*, p. 150.

¹⁷⁹ TAVARD, “Vatican II,” p. 220.

¹⁸⁰ DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 164.

¹⁸¹ TAVARD, “Vatican II,” p. 220.

¹⁸² KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 112.

¹⁸³ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 29.

aimed at a simple reiteration of already-given truths, but first of all to “deepen contemporary faith and religious life.”¹⁸⁴ It was to encourage the contemporary Christian community to “live out the gospel and bear witness to it under the conditions of today’s world.”¹⁸⁵ In the opinion of Avery Dulles, the “Church may keep pace with the times” and at the same time “enter fully into the new age now being born.” In so doing the Church will only “enrich herself” and will “better understand the treasures she has received from Christ.”¹⁸⁶

Acknowledging the existence of a large number of autonomous Churches of the Catholic communion, the Council simultaneously recognized that, along with the universally-shared sources of the common Christian Tradition, all of the Particular Churches have their own traditional roots.¹⁸⁷ Therefore, all of the Catholic Churches of the East and West are obliged to maintain equal faithfulness to the Holy Scripture and the Ecumenical Councils (which are shared by all Catholics), to the writings of the Church Fathers, as well as to the general liturgical and canonical sources (which could be shared by adherents of the Latin, Byzantine or Syrian ecclesiastical traditions), and to local liturgical, theological and canonical sources (which distinguish one Particular Church of the Catholic communion from another).¹⁸⁸

Most of the sources of the particular traditions can be found in the ancient history of the respective Particular Churches; however, some of them can also occur as a result of the “organic development” (*OE* 6) that took place in more recent times. Accepting the conciliar

¹⁸⁴ DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 164.

¹⁸⁵ DULLES, *The Reshaping*, p. 21.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

¹⁸⁷ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 249.

¹⁸⁸ Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* admits that the Orthodox (*UR* 14) and the Protestant Churches and ecclesial communities (*UR* 19) also have their own genuine origins and sources of tradition that distinguish them from one another. See *UR* 14, 19, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 916, 918.

understanding of Tradition as a living reality, we must also admit the possibility of the emergence of new sources in the future.

Vatican II's Decree, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, convinced Eastern Catholics¹⁸⁹ that

They may and should always preserve their own lawful liturgical rites and way of life, and that changes should be made only by reason of their proper and organic development. All these things are to be observed with the greatest fidelity by the eastern Christians themselves. They should indeed, from day to day, acquire greater knowledge of these matters and more perfect practice of them and if for reasons of circumstances, times or persons they have fallen unduly short of this they should have recourse to their age-old traditions.¹⁹⁰

The above-cited paragraph perfectly expresses the genuine conciliar attitude toward preservation of a particular heritage, the return to its origins and the possibility of its proper development. The Council admits the existence of a real antinomic tension between “preservation” and “development”; however, this tension must be understood in terms of complementarity rather than contradiction.¹⁹¹ The return to the sources secures renewal from the “evaporation of the original message” of the Gospel and does not allow the “way to salvation to be compromised,” while development safeguards the return to the sources from the “enclosure of the saving Word of God in an inaccessible sanctuary.”¹⁹²

The same trajectory of thought was supported by Avery Dulles, who saw in an overemphasis on the return to the sources the danger of conserving the Gospel, and in an

¹⁸⁹ It is important to note that everything that has been said in the cited paragraph about the Eastern Catholic Churches equally concerns the Latin Church.

¹⁹⁰ *OE* 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

¹⁹¹ Edward SCHILLEBEECKX, *Vatican II: A Struggle of Minds, and Other Essays* (Dublin: Gill, 1963), p. 19 and KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 112.

¹⁹² DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 74. See also Gérard PHILIPS, “Deux tendances dans la théologie du II Concile de Vatican,” in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 85:3 (1963), pp. 225-238.

overemphasis on reform the danger of violating the Church's essentials.¹⁹³ Nevertheless, there still remain two very important questions: "What does and what does not belong to the authentic sources of the particular Tradition?" and "How do we distinguish proper and organic development from false development that may distract the Church from her original course?"

A direct response to these truly significant queries can be found in the groundbreaking work of Yves Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église*, first published before Vatican II. Congar presents an interpretive system composed of four criteria assessing the authenticity of new developments within the Catholic Church, which at the same time can be employed for an evaluation of more recent sources of the particular Tradition.¹⁹⁴

First of all, in the opinion of Yves Congar, any reform must be based on the word and spirit of the Gospel, the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the pronouncements of the Ecumenical Councils. Secondly, reform should always be committed to the needs of the Church understood as a whole. Thirdly, the reformer must be aware of the fact that "all great acts take time."¹⁹⁵ Fourthly, every new development in the Church must be introduced only in the context of charity and pastoral sensitivity.¹⁹⁶

In accord with Congar, Robert Schreiter says that the emergence of new sources of a particular Tradition, which, in the words of Vatican II, were designated as "proper and organic developments," must correspond to the great principle of "cohesiveness" that preserves the entire Christian message from all major heresies and even minor

¹⁹³ Avery DULLES, *The Catholicity of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), p. 104.

¹⁹⁴ Yves CONGAR, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église* (2nd edn., revised, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), pp. 211-317.

¹⁹⁵ The expression belongs to Cardinal Newman. See John Henry NEWMAN, *Apologia pro vita sua* (Garden City: Doubleday Image, 1956), p. 264.

¹⁹⁶ Congar's system assessing true or false reform in the Catholic Church is explained and developed in DULLES, *The Catholicity*, pp. 104-105.

deviations.¹⁹⁷ The inner consistency expressed through the interrelation of the Church's doctrines does not need to follow the rules of Aristotelian logic and to be necessarily of a "linear kind."¹⁹⁸ Sometimes it can be presented in the form of an antinomic tension simultaneously emphasizing the divinity and humanity of Christ, the virginity and motherhood of Mary, the heavenly and earthly reality of the Church, and so on.¹⁹⁹ Nevertheless, when we come across a new development or new theological model "taking a position that skews the rest of belief, even though it may exhibit a logical consistency,"²⁰⁰ (as, for example, the teaching of Arius) it is a clear indication that such a development cannot be regarded as an integral part of the Christian Tradition. In the words of Robert Schreiter:

Cohesion is in itself hard to ascertain. It is partly an analytical, partly an intuitive reality. But if the theological formulation finds itself clearly at odds with the rest of Christian doctrine or requires a radical shifting of large parts of it, there is a very good chance that it is not a well-formed Christian performance.²⁰¹

The Church can modify herself in the process of her historical development, but she is also obliged to preserve founding essentials.²⁰² We can and should search for new ways of interpreting the original message received from our forebears, but in doing so we must also dedicate ourselves to the "sifting out of the truth from the distortions of human

¹⁹⁷ SCHREITER, *The New Catholicity*, p. 82.

¹⁹⁸ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, p. 118.

¹⁹⁹ STENGER, "The Significance of Paradox for Theological Verification," pp. 174-176.

²⁰⁰ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, p. 118.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²⁰² KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 302.

blindness and ignorance.”²⁰³ Every legitimate development in the Church, in the words of Avery Dulles, has to be tested by the “interpretive and corrective functions” of Tradition.²⁰⁴

Therefore, the theological renewal in the Church of Rome was not aimed at the introduction of completely new doctrines, but rather in the rejection of old stereotypes, purification of previously-proclaimed teaching from many of its distortions, and moving beyond Scholasticism back to the genuine sources of the common Christian and particular Latin Traditions.²⁰⁵ Correspondingly, the *proprii et organici progressus* (OE 6) for Eastern Catholics had absolutely nothing to do with giving up their legitimate Traditions “in which they received and lived the Gospel”²⁰⁶ for many centuries and which, according to the spirit of Vatican II, have to be “in effect without any restrictions,”²⁰⁷ but consisted precisely in the purification of their genuine particular Traditions from harmful latinizing elements²⁰⁸ introduced in more recent times because of a feeling of inferiority (which is still very perceptible among many adherents of Eastern Catholicism).²⁰⁹

In the opinion of John Madey, “latinization can never be considered as a rightful way of development,” for the reason that it has already caused many tragedies in the history of the Catholic Church.²¹⁰ The imposition of Latin theology, spirituality, liturgical customs and canonical legislation on the Eastern Catholics living in India, for example, caused a schism among St. Thomas Christians in 1653, which resulted in the flight of many

²⁰³ DULLES, *The Catholicity*, pp. 103-104.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

²⁰⁵ Giacomo MARTINA, “The Historical Context in Which the Idea of a New Ecumenical Council Was Born,” in LATOURELLE, *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, p. 31.

²⁰⁶ This opinion was expressed by Johannes Cardinal Willebrands in his interview for the daily paper *Eleftheros Kosmos* of Athens (December 20, 1970) and appeared in French translation in the Catholic bulletin *Typos-Bonne Press* of Athens in January 1971.

²⁰⁷ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 226.

²⁰⁸ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 23.

²⁰⁹ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, pp. 22-23.

²¹⁰ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 231.

members of the Catholic communion to the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch.²¹¹ The forceful application of Latin practices to the religious life of Ukrainian or Rusyn Catholic emigrants living in North America at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries caused their massive conversion to Orthodoxy. Almost ninety percent of contemporary Slav Orthodox in the United States and Canada are estimated to be direct descendants of former Eastern Catholics.²¹² Strong Latinizing influences were incarnated in the resolutions of the Synods of Zamosc (1720) and L'viv (1891) for Ukrainian (Ruthenian) Catholics, in the decisions of the Synod of Mount Lebanon (1736) for the Maronites, in the regulations of the Synod of Charfé (1888) for Syrians, in the prescriptions of the Synod of Blaj (1872) for Romanians, and the regulations of the Synod of Alexandria (1898) for Copts.²¹³

At this point in my reflection it is time to pose the question: “Can these Synods and their decisions be regarded as authentic sources for the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion? Are they consonant with the conciliar concept of *proprii et organici progressus*?” The answer becomes self-evident if one evaluates each of these cases from the perspective of Robert Schreiter’s principle of “coherence,”²¹⁴ or in the light of the four criteria that make up the interpretive system of Yves Congar.²¹⁵

²¹¹ Eugène TISSERANT, *Eastern Christianity in India* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1957), pp. 65-68.

²¹² Victor POSPISHIL, *The New Code of Oriental Canon Law: Law on Persons* (Ford City: St. Mary's Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1960), p.69.

²¹³ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 232. See also the note #27 of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 906.

²¹⁴ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, p. 118.

²¹⁵ CONGAR, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*, pp. 211-317.

Latinization²¹⁶ is not rooted in the genuine sources of the Eastern particular Traditions, and because of this it appears to be the result of inconsistent development. It does not contribute to the richness of the Church understood as communion and considerably violates the relations of mutual respect and charity that must exist among various Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. Finally, it does not pass even the “test of time” mentioned by Yves Congar, since most of the Eastern Catholic Churches, encouraged by Vatican II’s slogan *ad fontes*, at the present time are struggling against destructive latinizing influences, trying to revitalize already-forgotten theological concepts as well as spiritual, canonical, and liturgical practices, which are firmly rooted in the authentic sources of their respective ecclesial Traditions. In contrast, the most recent ecclesiological developments, based on better knowledge of the traditional sources and demonstrating high esteem for the “organic and autochthonic integrity”²¹⁷ of each of the Churches of the Catholic communion, not only do contribute to clarifying the Church’s identity but also in themselves can be regarded as an integral part of the Church’s ecclesial mission. The mission of the Church is to make her memory alive. In the words of George Tavard, as the “Church of today remembers its past, so does it behave in the present and anticipates the future.”²¹⁸

II.2.2. Theological Pluralism and Particular Theology

After the completion of the First Vatican Council, which was intended to express the Church’s clearly negative position towards so-called “modernizing tendencies”

²¹⁶ The meaning of the terms “latinization,” “liturgical latinization,” and “inappropriate latinization” as well as their influence on the ecclesial identity and vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church is treated in section III.2.3. of this thesis.

²¹⁷ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 23.

²¹⁸ TAVARD, “Vatican II,” p. 211.

produced by the spirit of secularization and anticlericalism so typical of the rapidly developing modern culture, the Catholic Church underwent probably the most painful crisis of her ecclesial self-identification, caused by the considerable loss of the Church's temporal power as well as her former influence on contemporary Christian society. During the pontificate of Leo XIII, marked by a large number of external pressures and internal afflictions, it seemed that the former prominent role of the Catholic Church could be salvaged only if this Church could find enough strength to reinforce her ecclesiastical discipline and clarify her salvific message to the world in such a way that everyone would be able to understand and to accept it, not being afraid of any uncertainties or ambiguities. In keeping with such notions, theology was in one sense taken away from the theologians and employed by the hierarchy as a practical "means of preserving ecclesiastical order."²¹⁹ It became in part a way of "forming imperative institutional solidarity"²²⁰ within the Catholic Church. Thomism was proclaimed the official doctrine of the Church in the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879) and was meant to assist Catholics in their "systematic commitment to the struggle against error." This was considered the most important aim of the Church's magisterium.²²¹ Almost forgetting that the "truth as a human 'possession' is never outside time and place,"²²² Roman officials imposed only one of its interpretations as an absolute standard for all times and all peoples, which gradually led Catholicism to the idolization of its magisterium,²²³ not allowing freedom of research or any serious theological discussions – especially at the level of the Particular Churches. Already at the

²¹⁹ ALBERIGO, "The Authority," p. 143.

²²⁰ Ibid., p. 129

²²¹ Ibid., p. 144.

²²² SCHILLEBEECKX, *Vatican II*, p. 31.

²²³ Joseph RATZINGER, "The Church as an Essential Dimension of Theology," in *Grail 6* (1990), p. 95.

end of the nineteenth century people like Cardinal Newman and George Tyrrell protested against the excessively “clerical” and monolithic character of Catholic theology, reflecting an exclusively static understanding of Christian truth.²²⁴ They suggested adopting a contrastingly different vision of the Church which would be built on dynamic and pluralistic ecclesiological principles and a deep appreciation of the role played by theologians and the entire community of the Catholic faithful.²²⁵ Nevertheless, their attitudes were severely criticized and remained rejected up to the time of the Catholic ecclesial renewal which culminated in the documents and pronouncements of the Second Vatican Council.²²⁶

Already in his opening discourse at the beginning of the inaugural session of 11 October 1962, John XXIII emphasized that the “substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another.”²²⁷ Therefore, he acknowledged that “adherence to one particular account of the truth” may eventually cause a “violation of the truth itself”²²⁸ and encouraged the Council to restore a proper balance between the official ecclesiastical magisterium and Catholic theology, “which had so badly deteriorated in the course of the prior century.”²²⁹ The fact that some theological viewpoints were passed over in silence during the Council of Trent and Vatican I did not

²²⁴ George TYRRELL, *External Religion: Its Use and Abuse* (London: Sands and co, 1899), pp. 35-36 and John Henry NEWMAN, “Letter to Lord Blachford” and “Letter to William Froude,” in Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall, eds., *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol. 27 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 212-213 and 336-338.

²²⁵ FOU DY, *The Ecclesiology of George Tyrrell*, pp. 206-215.

²²⁶ ALBERIGO, “The Authority,” p. 129.

²²⁷ JOHN XXIII, *The Opening Address*, at <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/21ecume1.htm>, accessed on 4 July 2008.

²²⁸ SCHILLEBEECKX, *Vatican II*, p. 27.

²²⁹ ALBERIGO, “The Authority,” p. 137.

mean that they should be regarded as having no significance at the time of Vatican II.²³⁰ On the contrary, new theological outlooks based on diversity and freedom of expression proved to be even more capable of articulating the Church's catholicity.²³¹

As a consequence, the council fathers gradually came to a clear realization of the importance of a "re-examination of methods of theological research and of the means of expressing the results of that research,"²³² which was intended to assist the Church in better understanding her genuine identity as well as her proper ecclesial mission. The new situation in the Church demanded the introduction of new methodological approaches in theology which would combine the "attitude of faith and rational analysis, along with authoritative conclusions (*auctores probati*) and freedom of research."²³³ It was certainly not possible in the past to hold all these diverse elements, but the emergence from the "era of magisteriology" at the time of the Second Vatican Council opened the real possibility for a qualitatively new understanding of the benefits that derive from a pluralistic theology which, because of the new vision adopted by Vatican II, appeared to be less confined by the Roman authorities and more responsive to the *sensus fidei* of the ecclesial community.²³⁴

The official recognition on the part of Vatican II of the new ecclesiological model of the Catholic Church as a Communion of Particular Churches also had a very significant impact on changes in understanding the role played by theology as one of the most important constitutive elements of particular ecclesial identity. According to the former universalist vision of the Church, the only legitimate diversity that could exist among

²³⁰ SCHILLEBEECKX, *Vatican II*, pp. 29-30.

²³¹ MCNAMARA, "Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II," p. 70.

²³² LONG, "East and West," p. 14.

²³³ ALBERIGO, "The Authority," p. 142.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

various groups of Catholic faithful was their rite, generally regarded as a complex of specific liturgical customs and canonical regulations, not including theology as an integral component. Therefore, Catholics from different parts of the world were allowed to pray in their own ways, but their faith had to be subordinated to the pervasive Scholastic theological system that was taught at most Catholic schools and universities around the globe. Of course, this approach on the part of the Roman Church guaranteed a high level of religious education even for those Catholic nations that were only at the initial stages of their ecclesial development. However, the split between the heart (worshiping God in one way) and the mind (trying to understand divine realities in a completely different way) gradually led the majority of Eastern Catholics to intellectual anemia, seriously injuring their ecclesial integrity.

The situation considerably changed with the decisions of Vatican II. Together with the acknowledgment of the full ecclesial character of the Eastern Catholic Churches, they also proclaimed their right and duty to develop their own theologies (*LG* 23; *UR* 17), contributing to the beauty and richness of the truly catholic character of the Church (*LG* 13). As a result of the conciliar deliberations, the Latin Church was also liberated from compulsory Thomism, thus making her more open to ecumenical dialogue. All this became possible as a consequence of the two very significant emphases of the conciliar *Decree on Ecumenism* introducing the notion of the “hierarchy of truths” (*UR* 11) and reaffirming a clear distinction between the “deposit of faith” and “doctrinal formulations” (*UR* 6). All of this was intended to help Catholics acquire a better knowledge of their religion and their ecclesial identity.²³⁵

²³⁵ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 192.

The ground-breaking attitude of the Council towards understanding the *depositum fidei* as an inexhaustible mystery being constantly revealed by the living Spirit,²³⁶ as opposed to its former vision as a “stone”²³⁷ or a “compendium of firmly established statements,”²³⁸ has opened before Catholics an entirely new possibility for the freedom of theological discussions.²³⁹ The teaching authority (*magisterium*) was now regarded as being pastoral in nature²⁴⁰ and exercising its stabilizing functions within, and not above, the Church.²⁴¹ The Truth gradually lost the “cold, forbidding, and geometric quality which the glorious age of ‘metaphysics’ assigned it” and regained the “warm, mysterious, and enveloping identity of Christ and his Spirit.”²⁴² Even Holy Scripture as “human reflections upon the event of revelation”²⁴³ and the dogmas of the Church understood as only “partial insights” into the mystery of God²⁴⁴ became legitimate objects of theological verification, which always searches for the new meanings of old contents.²⁴⁵

Consequently, if in the past the dogma of the Immaculate Conception stressed the exceptional characteristics of the Blessed Virgin Mary (1950), now this very same dogma could also be understood as emphasizing her role as a member of the Church (*LG* 52-69).²⁴⁶ If formerly the dogma on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was understood in terms of his personal infallibility and monarchical authority over all Catholics (1870), now it could be reinterpreted in terms of ecclesial infallibility and his pastoral service to the brothers in the

²³⁶ José BONINO, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), p. 110.

²³⁷ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

²³⁸ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 139.

²³⁹ SCHILLEBEECKX, *Vatican II*, p. 21.

²⁴⁰ JOHN XXIII, *The Opening Address*, at <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/21ecume1.htm>, accessed on 5 July 2008 and RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 187.

²⁴¹ ALBERIGO, “The Authority,” p. 144.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 145.

²⁴³ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 139.

²⁴⁴ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 185.

²⁴⁵ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

²⁴⁶ MCNAMARA, “Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II,” p. 71.

episcopate (*LG* 25).²⁴⁷ Finally, if before Vatican II Catholic dogmatic pronouncements were often employed in order to underline the differences between the Church of Rome and other Christians, and were regarded as the “products of fierce confrontations with hostile heresies and ramparts against particular errors,” the Council now would cause them to be “dissociated from the polemical plan of campaign they supported” as well as from the “narrow limitations of a specific historical moment” and to be reinterpreted in a “more balanced and suitable way, in a better way, by seeing them in the context of the saving fullness of the Old and New Testament message, a fullness which no formulas of the Church can ever exhaust.”²⁴⁸ Being fully conscious that there are still many matters of faith which are in dispute among Christians of various confessional backgrounds, the Catholic Church would now use various theological tools to present her teaching in such a manner that it would “never become an obstacle to dialogue with other Christians.”²⁴⁹ The days of fruitless polemics and controversy would hopefully come to an end.²⁵⁰

By emphasizing in the eleventh paragraph of the *Decree on Ecumenism* the existence of an “order” or “hierarchy of truths,” that “vary in their connection with the foundation of the christian faith,”²⁵¹ the council fathers touched a very significant aspect of the Catholic ecclesial identity²⁵² which was aimed at providing the Catholic Church with new methodological tools for external ecumenical dialogue.²⁵³ It also offered many new

²⁴⁷ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, pp. 178-179 and ARSENIIEV, “The Meaning of Vatican II,” p. 13.

²⁴⁸ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

²⁴⁹ *UR* 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 914.

²⁵⁰ LONG, “East and West,” p. 13.

²⁵¹ *UR* 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 915.

²⁵² BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 192.

²⁵³ MEYER, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 324.

possibilities for the intensification of internal theological discussions.²⁵⁴ Without refuting the fundamental notion that all revealed truths must be believed with the same faith, the Council made a distinction between those doctrines that are closer to the core of the common Christian heritage (such as dogmas concerning Christ and the Trinity)²⁵⁵ and those truths “that are not as central to the basic gospel message (such as purgatory, indulgences, and devotions to particular saints).”²⁵⁶ None of the documents of Vatican II present an official register of truths in order of their significance or priority, but a sense of this, in the opinion of an active promoter of the concept, Bishop Andreas Pangrazio of Gorizia (Italy), is self-evident, since there are truths that “belong to the order of the end (such as the mystery of the most Holy Trinity, of the incarnation of the Word and the redemption, of the divine love and grace towards sinful humanity, of eternal life in the fullness of the kingdom of God)” and there are other truths (sacraments, apostolic succession, hierarchical structure) which “belong to the order of the means of salvation” that were given by Christ to the Church “for her earthly pilgrimage.” Consequently, “when this is over, they cease.”²⁵⁷

Placing the dogmas of 1870 and 1950 on a different plane from the dogmas proclaimed at the first seven Ecumenical Councils²⁵⁸ became a real point of departure in discussing a number of controversial issues that formerly were regarded as major obstacles for the reestablishment of Christian unity.²⁵⁹ Despite a later statement of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith according to which the “order of truths did not signify that the

²⁵⁴ The concept of the “hierarchy of truths” was absent both from the first and second versions of the schema *De Oecumenismo* and was deliberately added at the last phase of the work on the document as a result of the fruitful conciliar discussion. See JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 114.

²⁵⁵ CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree,” pp. 94-95.

²⁵⁶ SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 212.

²⁵⁷ The text of the speech of Bishop Andreas Pangrazio appears in English translation in JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 115.

²⁵⁸ CULLMANN, “Comments on the Decree,” pp. 94-95.

²⁵⁹ BONINO, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 110.

individual dogmas varied in their degree of binding force,”²⁶⁰ the important notion of the “hierarchy of truths” introduced by Vatican II appeared to be a very functional methodological tool rapidly contributing to ecumenical dialogue, as well as to the emergence of “particular theologies” which emanated from various Particular Churches of the Catholic communion.²⁶¹

The awareness of the existence of a great variety of theological methods and models even within Western Catholicism quite logically led the Church of Rome to the recognition of the significance and value of “particular theologies” produced by non-Latin Catholic Churches (*UR* 17). By doing so, the Catholic Church once again proved that she no longer holds the view that “there is only one method and mode of procedure in theology and only one possible way of formulating revelation.”²⁶²

In this regard, the Second Vatican Council attested that the uniform “scholastic methods, modes of thought, concepts and language, however justified they may be, do not constitute the whole of the apparatus of Catholic theology,”²⁶³ and therefore, cannot be regarded as an integral part of the Catholic ecclesial identity.²⁶⁴ In the words of Peter Riga,

There are many diverse theologies within the Church for the simple reason that Christian teachings are too rich to be exhausted by any one man, any one school of thought. Each has his or its own partial and fruitful insight into revelation and all ought to be welcomed as progress as long as essential orthodoxy is respected. There are various cultural and artistic expressions of the Church’s life which are legitimate and even necessary so that each

²⁶⁰ The Latin text of the *Declaration in Defense of the Catholic Doctrine of the Church, *Mysterium Ecclesiae**, issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 24 June 1973, can be found in *AAS* 65 (1973), p. 397. See also MEYER, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 324.

²⁶¹ LONG, “East and West,” pp. 11-12.

²⁶² BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 139.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

²⁶⁴ *UR* 17, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917.

country, each ethnic and cultural group can better comprehend the good news of salvation.²⁶⁵

The adherence of all the Churches of the Catholic communion to one and the same faith reflecting the transcendent mystery of divine realities hidden in God, on the one hand,²⁶⁶ and the historical nature of human thought that can be expressed in different words and propositions because of diverse cultural and traditional circumstances, on the other hand,²⁶⁷ opened the possibility for a wide-ranging “diversity of theological reflection and theological language concerning the revelation of God.”²⁶⁸ In fact, the existence of “particular theologies” is a testimony to the existence of “different revelations of the Spirit”²⁶⁹ that do not harm the integrity of Catholic teaching but contribute to it by adding fresh insights into the commonly shared vision of God (*LG* 13).²⁷⁰ The Eucharistic communion that unites different Catholic Churches does not mean that they cannot have their own distinct theologies. Even if they have different formulations of doctrine, it does not mean that these Churches will no longer be able to recognize in each other Sisters belonging to one and the same ecclesial family.²⁷¹

If, in the past, legitimate ecclesial diversity was limited exclusively to differences in liturgical practice and hierarchical structure,²⁷² at present “particular theology” understood as a variety of “different systems, different styles of thought, different conceptual apparatus and terminology, different schools, traditions and areas of research, different theologians

²⁶⁵ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 185.

²⁶⁶ ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” p. 495.

²⁶⁷ DRILLING, “The Genesis,” p. 75.

²⁶⁸ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 139.

²⁶⁹ ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” p. 495.

²⁷⁰ DUVAL, *L'Église*, p. 127 and RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 185.

²⁷¹ RAHNER, *Humane Society*, p. 137.

²⁷² SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 387.

and universities”²⁷³ is generally regarded as an indispensable part of the Particular Church’s identity.²⁷⁴ Of course, theological pluralism can also become a threat to the integrity of a given ecclesial community if the faithful, the hierarchy or theologians of this community abuse the “legitimate share in the freedom of the Spirit” by placing it outside of the “traditional rules of the discernment of spirit.”

Consequently, we should pose ourselves two questions: “Can all contemporary theological conceptualizations be regarded as expressions of the same faith?” and “How can one make a clear distinction between authentic and false theologies?”²⁷⁵

One answer to these questions can already be found in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, according to which all the Churches of the Catholic communion can freely develop and express their own theological position (*UR 17*)²⁷⁶ only insofar as they do not contradict the “unity of faith and the unique divine constitution of the universal church” (*LG 23*).²⁷⁷ These must be preserved at all times and in all places, not allowing theological pluralism to turn into anarchy.²⁷⁸ Another response to the question of the authenticity of a particular theology is provided by the interpretive systems of Yves Congar²⁷⁹ and Robert Schreiter,²⁸⁰ which can be applied to the subject matter of theological pluralism just as they were applied in the previous sub-chapter of the thesis to the problem of proper and organic development.

²⁷³ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 275.

²⁷⁴ SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 387.

²⁷⁵ BRÜMMER, “The Identity of the Christian Tradition,” p. 29.

²⁷⁶ THILS, *Le décret sur l’oecuménisme*, pp. 149-152.

²⁷⁷ *LG 23*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 968.

²⁷⁸ RAHNER, *Humane Society*, p. 137.

²⁷⁹ CONGAR, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*, pp. 211-317.

²⁸⁰ SCHREITER, *Constructing Local Theologies*, p. 118.

Finally, we can note the insightful reflections of the present Pope, Benedict XVI, who, as prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, for quite a long time searched for “legal formulas by which we can safeguard the objective freedom of academic theology within appropriate limits, and at the same time, guarantee necessary room for maneuver for scientific discussion.”²⁸¹ Almost twenty years ago Cardinal Ratzinger posed the question: “How should the Church teach if on the one hand the teaching is not mere hypothesis, but on the other is not supposed to be binding for theologians?”²⁸² And he immediately replied:

The nature of the Church’s teaching is that it is a proclamation of the faith, and that proclamation in turn is a parameter for theology. In fact, it is precisely this proclamation which theologians are supposed to study. We need to see that the faith of the people is not to be derived from some theology from on high which is to be imposed on the masses. It is not a “Platonism for the people.” Theology does not provide the measure for the proclamation. The direct opposite is true: it is the proclamation which is the measure of the theology. Theology can change and theologians can come and go but the Lord Jesus is risen from the dead and will never die again. Expressions of the faith are constantly changing, but the deposit of faith stays yesterday, today, and tomorrow the same as the Lord Jesus himself.²⁸³

Along with the concept of “proclamation” understood as a “parameter for theology,” Cardinal Ratzinger proposed a set of principles evaluating the authenticity of a particular theological expression which, in a way, are very similar to the above-mentioned criteria of Yves Congar. First of all, in the opinion of Joseph Ratzinger, any theology that intends to bear good fruit must be firmly rooted in the origins of the Christian Tradition.²⁸⁴ Secondly, every legitimate theological development must be kept within the community of

²⁸¹ RATZINGER, “The Church as an Essential Dimension of Theology,” p. 97.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 91.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

the Church,²⁸⁵ since otherwise it would become “dissolved into arbitrary theory.”²⁸⁶ And thirdly, an authentic theology, according to Ratzinger, presumes strong faith and conversion of mind of the theologian,²⁸⁷ who must “live and breathe Christ through the Church” in order not to become a “mere sociologist, or historian, or philosopher.”²⁸⁸ In my opinion, this goes a long way towards providing a guide for resolving many a theological controversy.

Since the time of the Second Vatican Council, all of the Churches of the Catholic communion have been endowed with the right and duty to develop their own theologies according to their own genius and particular inspirations of the Spirit (*LG* 13, 23; *UR* 14, 17; *OE* 3). Nevertheless, this gift is to be used carefully and responsibly. If there still exist outdated theological concepts that no longer serve the spiritual need of the faithful, or some improper borrowings from other ecclesiastical traditions that cause damage to a Particular Church’s integrity, they can be gradually eliminated. In contrast, all constructive theological developments that are firmly rooted in the genuine sources of a particular Tradition and provide positive answers to contemporary problems have to be in every possible way supported and encouraged. All this has to be done with great attentiveness and confidence that it will not widen the gap that still exists between the Catholic Church and other Christian communities and would serve to the betterment of relations among various Particular Churches of the Catholic communion.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 77.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 76.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 84.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 82.

II.2.3. Particular Ways of Liturgical Worship

In the previous sub-chapter of the thesis I already mentioned that the great variety of particular theological expression comes about as a result of different interpretations of one and the same unchanged *depositum fidei*, which in antinomic fashion was already revealed to humanity through the message of the Gospel and at the same time remains hidden with Christ in God.²⁸⁹ The question is: “How do we get the knowledge of this *depositum* and in what way can it be communicated to the world, if our intellectual abilities are too weak to grasp the inexhaustible Truth, and our language is too limited to express realities which lay beyond words?” The answer is suggested by well-known Orthodox theologian Alexander Schmemmann, who wrote:

If theology is the attempt to express Truth itself, to find words adequate to the mind and experience of the Church, then it must of necessity have its source where the faith, the mind, and the experience of the Church have their living focus and expression, where faith in both essential meanings of that word, as Truth revealed and given, and as Truth accepted and “lived,” has its *epiphany*, and that is precisely the function of the “leitourgia.”²⁹⁰

Schmemmann has actually simply paraphrased and explained the ancient axiom of Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390-463), according to which the rule of prayer is to establish the rule for belief (*ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*).²⁹¹ We can spend much time discussing what comes first (liturgy or theology), and which of them is more significant,

²⁸⁹ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 64.

²⁹⁰ Alexander SCHMEMANN, “Liturgical Theology, Theology of Liturgy, and Liturgical Reform,” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 13:4 (1969), p. 219.

²⁹¹ Prosper TIRO, “Capitula Coelestini 8” in MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina* 51, pp. 205-212. An English translation of this work of Prosper of Aquitaine (Tiro) can be found in Geoffrey WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology* (London: Oxford University Press; New York: Epworth Press, 1980), pp. 225-226.

but this has already been treated by theologians as Aidan Kavanagh,²⁹² Geoffrey Wainwright,²⁹³ and Edward Kilmartin.²⁹⁴ In any case it surely lies beyond the scope of my analysis.²⁹⁵ What is really important is the notion that the inner nature of the Church cannot be described merely by theological expressions but must be known from within and experienced through liturgical practice. A Church's authentic ecclesial identity is hidden from the minds of unbelieving scholars, because it is not enough to obtain knowledge *about* the Church without taking part in her life culminating in celebration of the Eucharist. If the Church is not merely an institution but also a cosmic and eschatological living being, then only liturgical acts can provide us with the most genuine "experience of the new creation and the vision of the Kingdom which is to come."²⁹⁶

"The Church's sense of identity," according to a theologian from Netherlands, Frans Josef Van Beeck, "is an *ecstatic* sense of identity, of the kind that is received in the very act of total abandon and surrender, and born out of an act of casting all care and anxieties on God."²⁹⁷ Therefore, the liturgy understood as being not merely a set of rubrics, texts, and ritual acts, but the "unchanging principle, the living norm or 'logos' of worship as a whole, within what is accidental and temporary,"²⁹⁸ reveals to us its true significance as one of the

²⁹² Aidan KAVANAGH, "Response: Primary Theology and Liturgical Act," in *Worship* 57 (1983), p. 324.

²⁹³ Geoffrey WAINWRIGHT, "The Praise of God in the Theological Reflections of the Church," in *Interpretation* 39 (1985), p. 42 and WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, pp. 242-243.

²⁹⁴ Edward KILMARTIN, *Christian Liturgy I. Theology* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988), p. 97.

²⁹⁵ The systematic analysis of theological reflections of Alexander Schmemmann, Geoffrey Wainwright, Aidan Kavanagh, and Edward Kilmartin on the subject matter of *lex orandi, lex credendi* can be found in Maxwell JOHNSON, "Liturgy and Theology," in Paul BRADSHAW and Bryan SPINKS, eds., *Liturgy in Dialogue: Essays in Memory of Ronald Jasper* (Collegeville, MN.: The Liturgical Press, Pueblo Books, 1995), pp. 203-227.

²⁹⁶ Alexander SCHMEMANN, "Liturgy and Theology," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 (1972), p. 92.

²⁹⁷ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 64.

²⁹⁸ Alexander SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1975), p. 32.

most “crucial and indispensable ingredients”²⁹⁹ of the Catholic Church’s nature in general and the Particular Church’s identity in particular.

This identity is most pregnantly actualized in the Eucharist. The heart of what the Church is all about (the *res sacramenti*, as the Scholastics would say) is the worshipful communion, through and with and in Christ present and alive in the Spirit, with the Father. In the mystical dimension of this Sacrament the Church comes to full actuality, as do those Christians who have found there both themselves and God. We are dealing here with the mystical core of the Christian faith and identity experience. It is the gift of the Spirit who grants to Christians access to the depths of God through their participation in the mind of Christ.³⁰⁰

The council fathers gathered together at Vatican II were fully aware of the indispensable role played by liturgical experience for the assessment of Particular ecclesial identity, and it was no accident that in the *Decree on Ecumenism* they began the portrayal of the Eastern Churches with a reference to their great love for the “sacred liturgy, especially the Eucharistic mystery, which is the source of the church’s life and the pledge of future glory.”³⁰¹ The Council expressed its deep admiration for the rich liturgical heritage of the East, which in a particular way has allowed Eastern Christians to become familiar with Holy Scripture, to receive knowledge of the most fundamental doctrines, and to experience what the Church is in her very essence (*UR* 15).

If in the past Latin missionaries, guided by the conviction of the pre-eminence of their rite, were inclined to impose on Eastern Christians Western forms of worship and genuinely Latin devotions, looking down on particular Eastern liturgical practices as being

²⁹⁹ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 56.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

³⁰¹ *UR* 15, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 916.

full of errors and abuses,³⁰² then at Vatican II the Roman Church finally rejected the theory of her “natural superiority” based on the claim that her rites are the rites of the Successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ. Rome finally admitted the essential equality of all liturgical traditions of the Catholic Church (*OE 3*).³⁰³ From the time of Vatican II on, it was no longer possible to regard a uniform type of worship as an integral part of the Catholic Church’s ecclesial identity, because the fact that all Catholics share in the same baptismal gifts and in the commemoration of the same Lord’s Supper does not mean that we cannot have “different languages, different rites and forms of devotion, different prayers, hymns and vestments, different styles of art and in this sense different Churches.”³⁰⁴

Encouraging the Eastern Catholic Churches to have “recourse to their age-old traditions,”³⁰⁵ the Council placed a particular stress on the importance of the preservation of their genuine liturgical heritage.³⁰⁶ Becoming fully aware of the former unconstructive influence of Latin forms of worship on the Eastern ecclesial mentality, the council fathers obliged those Eastern Catholics who “for reasons of circumstances, times or persons have fallen unduly short” of fidelity to their own liturgical integrity to “acquire greater knowledge” of their authentic liturgical legacy and to restore those original practices and ceremonies which have been abused or even forgotten in the course of the last few centuries of communion with the Church of Rome (*OE 6*).³⁰⁷ *Orientalium ecclesiarum* emphasized in particular the importance of the return of Eastern Catholics to “ancient

³⁰² BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 136.

³⁰³ LONG, “East and West,” p. 9.

³⁰⁴ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 275.

³⁰⁵ *OE 6*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

³⁰⁶ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 23.

³⁰⁷ See also BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 140-141.

legislation concerning the sacraments” (OE 12-18)³⁰⁸ and encouraged them to more active participation in the liturgical life of their respective Churches “in accordance with the rules and traditions of their own rite” (OE 19-22).³⁰⁹ The Council also confirmed the “supreme authority” of the patriarchs and their synods in controlling the use of languages and other liturgical matters pertaining to their own Particular Churches (OE 23).³¹⁰

Nevertheless, in my opinion the most significant emphasis of Vatican II with regard to the role of the liturgy as an integral part of particular ecclesial identity can be found in the three previously cited paragraphs: *Lumen Gentium* 23, *Unitatis Redintegratio* 17, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* 3, where the importance of the particular liturgical heritage has been underlined in its mutual relationship with other criteria of particularity, such as theology, spirituality, and legislation.³¹¹

This thesis will not dwell further on a discussion of the indispensable value of liturgical factors for particular ecclesial consciousness, for the simple reason that it seems to be more obvious than some of the other issues addressed in this chapter. Indeed, even before Vatican II, Eastern Catholics were encouraged to retain their “Rite.” Despite strong latinizing influences and a large number of abuses of Eastern liturgical integrity, the consequences of which remain perceptible even today, the Church of Rome did not as

³⁰⁸ OE 13-14 abolished the latinizing prohibitions of the past with regard to the separation of the Holy Sacrament of Confirmation from Baptism and reaffirmed that the ordinary minister of the Sacrament of Confirmation in the Eastern Churches is a priest. OE 15 permitted the restoration of the permanent diaconate, which had temporally disappeared from the liturgical practice of the Eastern Churches as a result of their assimilation to the Latin Church. See OE 12-18, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 903-905 and MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 237-243.

³⁰⁹ OE 19-22 contained regulations with regard to the celebration of Easter and other feast-days and encouraged Eastern clergy, the members of Eastern religious orders, and the faithful to celebrate the “divine praises” in accordance with their respective traditions. See OE 19-22, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 905-906 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, pp. 25-26.

³¹⁰ See OE 23, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 906 and THILS, *Le décret sur l’oecuménisme*, pp. 141-144.

³¹¹ GALADZA, “What is Eastern Catholic Theology?” pp. 62-65.

consistently question the natural right of Eastern Catholics to be distinguished from Latin Catholics by somewhat different ways of liturgical celebrations.

Nevertheless, the source of the greatest problem in this regard comes from the fact that the liturgy was taken out of its original spiritual and theological context. This is what, in the opinion of Alexander Schmemmann, formed the “real basis for uniatism” in the worse sense of this word, “isolating the liturgical tradition of the East from doctrinal principles which it implies.”³¹² In support of Schmemman’s insightful comment on *Orientalium ecclesiarum*, another Orthodox theologian, Paul Lazor, emphasized:

A man cannot believe and think one way, and then worship according to a rite which expresses another way of believing and thinking. And, precisely, generations of Uniate clergy who have been trained in Roman Catholic schools or in Roman Catholic theology have produced a rite and a form of church life which are so confused and hybridized that, according to the admission of the Uniates themselves, they have simply lost their identity.³¹³

In order not to be an abstract reality and to regain its proper place in the life of the Eastern Catholic Churches,³¹⁴ the liturgy has to be reintegrated into a larger context which would include all the dimensions of authentic particular ecclesial identity.³¹⁵ The Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches may publish dozens of liturgical books, as it has already done for Eastern Catholic Greeks, Ukrainians, Ruthenians, Russians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Copts, and Chaldeans, but they would not be successfully applied in practice if Eastern Catholics would still follow Scholastic theology, which is foreign to their

³¹² SCHMEMMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 387.

³¹³ Paul LAZOR, “The Uniate Question,” in *The Orthodox Christian Way* 7:10 (1967), p. 4. See also Thomas HOPKO, “Reflections on Eastern Rite Catholicism,” in Thomas HOPKO, ed., *All the Fullness of God: Essays on Orthodoxy, Ecumenism and Modern Society* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1982), p. 118.

³¹⁴ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 221.

³¹⁵ LAZOR, “The Uniate Question,” p. 4.

ecclesial mentality.³¹⁶ The use of different languages, different vestments and customs is not sufficient for an integral revival of particular ecclesial Traditions, which embrace far more values than the preservation of correct liturgical rubrics and impressive ceremonies.³¹⁷ “Exaggerated reverence”³¹⁸ for the practices of the Latin Church will never disappear if Eastern Catholics do not start acknowledging the richness and beauty of their own respective Traditions, based not only on particular ways of worship, but also on a specific experience of God. A distinct liturgy, according to Meletius Wojnar, “cannot, of itself, be sufficient to constitute a canonical rite,”³¹⁹ precisely for the reason that it is inseparable from theology, legislation and spirituality. The process of de-latinization of the liturgy presupposes de-latinization of hearts and minds. The fact that we cannot imagine any Particular Church without her own liturgy does not mean that a particular way of worship exhausts the entire meaning of a particular ecclesial identity. Its role is certainly central, however, only when it is firmly rooted in the authentic sources of a given Tradition and genuinely expresses that Tradition’s specific theological and spiritual heritage.

II.2.4. Particular Ecclesiastical Legislation

Along with an emphasis on the positive significance of theological and liturgical diversity as expressions of the Church’s catholicity,³²⁰ the Second Vatican Council did not hesitate to give serious attention to and underline the legitimacy of a plurality of

³¹⁶ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 23.

³¹⁷ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 221-222.

³¹⁸ LONG, “East and West,” p. 11.

³¹⁹ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 516.

³²⁰ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 21.

disciplinary traditions,³²¹ which was not only “rightfully praised” and “esteemed,” but also fully recognized and in very concrete terms confirmed by the Council as an indispensable part of the “heritage of the whole church of Christ.”³²² In order to stress the extraordinary importance of this new understanding of the Catholic Church as a communion of autonomous Churches, the council fathers repeated their attitude to the issue of particular ecclesiastical legislation twice in two different Decrees, *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (UR 16; OE 5) using practically the same words. In both cases they began their treatment of the subject with the same expression: “this synod solemnly declares,” which can ordinarily be found only in the conciliar Constitutions.³²³

Both documents highlight a set of virtually identical points, namely (i) the right and the duty of all Particular Churches of the Christian East and West to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules; (ii) the necessity that diverse particular disciplines correspond to the ancient sources of ecclesiastical legislation; and (iii) the suitability of particular canonical regulations for the character of the faithful and the good of their souls.³²⁴ In addition, the *Decree on Ecumenism* accentuates that the “perfect observance” of the principle of self-governance should be regarded as “one of the essential prerequisites for the restoration of unity,”³²⁵ while the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* articulates the importance of the restoration of the authentic particular canonical

³²¹ LONG, “East and West,” p. 10.

³²² OE 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

³²³ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 230.

³²⁴ OE 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902, UR 16, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917, LONG, “East and West,” pp. 10-11, PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 219 and BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 136-137.

³²⁵ UR 16, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917 and LONG, “East and West,” p. 11.

traditions and elimination of improper borrowings which crept in from other ecclesiastical Traditions, which “cannot be considered to be due to organic progress.”³²⁶

In this context, one should note that, on the one hand, *Unitatis Redintegratio* 16 and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* 5 seem to present a very clear picture and provide absolutely unambiguous answers to all questions with regard to the autonomous canonical character of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. On the other hand, they do not always correspond to other statements made by the conciliar documents which may somewhat conflict with each other, putting the traditional autonomy of the Particular Churches in danger of not really being operative. The classic example of this discontinuity is the twenty-second paragraph of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which reaffirms the teaching of Vatican I on the “full, supreme and universal” jurisdiction of the Pope, who can freely act even without the consent of the body of bishops.³²⁷ The Orthodox theologian Metropolitan Stylianos Harkianakis severely criticized this particular concept of primacy expressed by the Council as canceling out all particularities and the very “ecclesiastical structure of the individual local churches.”³²⁸ Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh) emphasized in this regard that it would be a great mistake to “present the primacy in such a way that it would be impossible to explain the very existence of the Eastern Church and threaten all possibility of dialogue with the Orthodox Church.”³²⁹

Another example of the ambiguous ecclesiological position of the Council concerning the issue of self-governance is articulated in the fourth paragraph of the *Decree*

³²⁶ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 22, OE 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902, MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 230-232 and PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 219.

³²⁷ LG 22, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 866. See also RATZINGER, *Konstitution über die Kirche*, p. 14.

³²⁸ HARKIANAKIS, “The Ecclesiology of Vatican II,” p. 240.

³²⁹ MAXIMOS IV, “Servant of Servants of God,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, p. 74.

on the *Eastern Catholic Churches* where the conciliar fathers say that the “apostolic see in particular cases of persons, communities or regions... acting on its own or through other authorities” can issue “suitable laws, decrees or rescripts.”³³⁰ In the opinion of John Madey, this somewhat “disappointing” passage could be interpreted as offering real ecclesiastical authority not only to the heads and synods of the respective Particular Churches of the Catholic communion and not only to the Roman Pontiff as the supreme shepherd of the universal Church, but also to various dicasteries of the Roman Curia which “have no felicitous history in treating matters touching the life of the Eastern Churches.”³³¹ This is also true of “‘other authorities,’ e.g. Nuncios, Pro-Nuncios or Apostolic Delegates” whose “knowledge of things pertaining to the Eastern Churches is often very scant.”³³²

The understanding of universal jurisdiction and the personal responsibility of the Pope as “not taking the place of the power of each bishop in his diocese”³³³ and executing the functions of the visible center of unity³³⁴ and the arbiter in inter-church relations³³⁵ does not contradict the legitimacy of autonomous governance within the Catholic Church.³³⁶ In actual fact it should safeguard it, offering the successor of St. Peter the important role of being its most reliable guarantor.³³⁷

The same cannot be said, however, about the Roman Curia, and especially the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches, which has gradually turned into a kind of pseudo-patriarchate and, at least in the past, deprived the Eastern Patriarchs and their

³³⁰ OE 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, pp. 20-21.

³³¹ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 225.

³³² *Ibid.*, p. 229.

³³³ MAXIMOS IV, “Servant of Servants of God,” p. 74.

³³⁴ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 111.

³³⁵ ACERBI, *Due ecclesiology*, p. 483 and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 24.

³³⁶ TILLARD, “The Church of God,” p. 127.

³³⁷ TILLARD, *The Bishop of Rome*, p. 37 and HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 315.

synods of all real power. Despite the fact that many of the Eastern Catholic patriarchs were involved in the work of the *Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali* as associate members, in the opinion of Archbishop Elias (Zoghby), “to take Patriarchs, who by right are the presiding officers of their Synods, and make them secondary and minority members of a Congregation with authority to deal with the affairs of their own patriarchates” could be regarded as a “condemnation of the synodal form of government,”³³⁸ drawing the Catholic Church away from the ancient practice of inter-church relations,³³⁹ as well as away from the contemporary ecumenical dialogue with Churches and ecclesial communities seeking a restoration of unity that would not harm their ecclesial integrity.³⁴⁰ The only possibility of preserving some kind of inter-ecclesial government of the universal Church, according to Zoghby, was by founding a separate ecclesiastical body, similar to an Ecumenical Council, “whose members would be delegates of the Episcopal synods or conferences of the Eastern Churches.”³⁴¹ The same outlook was enthusiastically supported by Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh). He believed that neither the Roman Pontiff alone nor the members of the Roman Curia, and not even Cardinals understood as the local clergy of the Roman metropolitan province or diocese, can govern the universal Church in the the place of the College of the Apostles and their successors with the Pope as its member and head.³⁴²

Unfortunately, Vatican II, of course, did not limit the competence of the Roman Curia to matters concerning the Diocese of Rome and it did not create the kind of *Synodos*

³³⁸ Elias ZOGHBY, “The Eastern Churches and Bishop’s Conferences,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, p. 127.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

³⁴² MAXIMOS IV, “The Supreme Senate of the Catholic Church,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, pp. 133-136. See also MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 234 and ESPOSITO, *Il Decreto*, pp. 173-176.

endemousa hoped for by Patriarch Maximos IV³⁴³ and Archbishop Elias (Zoghby).³⁴⁴ However, in contrast to some restrictive canonical norms which can be found in 1957 Pius XII's *Motu proprio, Cleri Sanctitati* (CS cc. 248-258), Vatican II made a decisive step toward full recognition of the synodal form of government and acknowledgement of the rights and privileges of the Eastern patriarchs together with their synods when it spoke of their "making up a higher tribunal for all matters concerning the patriarchate." (*OE* 9)³⁴⁵ Nonetheless, the role of the patriarchs and major archbishops as "fathers and heads" (*OE* 9)³⁴⁶ of their respective Churches possessing "jurisdiction over all the bishops (including metropolitans), clergy and faithful" (*OE* 7)³⁴⁷ did not alter the "inalienable right of the Roman pontiff of intervening in individual cases" (*OE* 9).³⁴⁸ Note, however, that the section of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* on the Eastern patriarchs, unlike all other sections of the document, avoided the employment of the term "Apostolic See," under which the "dicasteries of the Roman Curia are to be understood,"³⁴⁹ and indicated the respect of the council fathers for the ancient origins of patriarchal government (*OE* 7-9).³⁵⁰ This government, incidentally, was not peculiar to the East, and at least up to the most recent times belonged to the common heritage of the entire Catholic Church.³⁵¹

³⁴³ MAXIMOS IV, "The Supreme Senate of the Catholic Church," 133-136.

³⁴⁴ ZOGHBY, "The Eastern Churches and Bishop's Conferences," 127.

³⁴⁵ *OE* 9, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903. See also O'CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, p. 23.

³⁴⁶ *OE* 9, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903. The paternal relation of patriarchs towards their Particular Churches is most apparently expressed by the Roman and Alexandrian titles "Pope" or "Abuna" (the title "our Father" is also used by the Ethiopians). See MADEY, "Vatican Council II's Decree," pp. 234, 236, and 250.

³⁴⁷ *OE* 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902. See also WOJNAR, "Decree on the Oriental," p. 193.

³⁴⁸ *OE* 9, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903.

³⁴⁹ MADEY, "Vatican Council II's Decree," p. 225.

³⁵⁰ WOJNAR, "Decree on the Oriental," p. 193 and MADEY, "Vatican Council II's Decree," p. 233.

³⁵¹ RYNNE, *The Third Session*, pp. 99-100.

The recognition of the real ecclesiastical authority of the Eastern patriarchs as not being “mere concessions accorded by the Roman Pontiff”³⁵² could serve as proof that the Latin Church would no longer regard the Eastern Catholic Churches as her own ecclesiastical provinces and would no longer try to bring these Churches into line with characteristically Latin ideas of Church organization.³⁵³ Acknowledging the historical “precedence of honor,” the Council simultaneously recognized the essential equality of dignity of all patriarchs of the Catholic communion (including the Roman Pontiff as the Patriarch of the West,³⁵⁴ but excluding those Latin bishops who were given merely honorific patriarchal titles).³⁵⁵

The Second Vatican Council not only encouraged the restoration and preservation of the particular ecclesiastical order as one of the most important elements of the Particular Church’s ecclesial identity (*LG* 23; *UR* 17; *OE* 3), but also approved the right of the Eastern Catholic patriarchs “to set up new eparchies and appoint new bishops of their own rite within the confines of their own patriarchal territory.” (*OE* 9)³⁵⁶ By doing this, the

³⁵² MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 235.

³⁵³ SCHULZ, “The Dialogue with the Orthodox,” pp. 67-71. Alexander Schmemmann still criticized *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* for giving the institution of Patriarchates “an importance it does not have, in fact, in the Eastern Churches.” He argued against Vatican II’s definition of a Patriarch expressed in terms of his “personal jurisdiction over bishops,” which in Schmemmann’s opinion “is alien to the Eastern canonical tradition, where the Patriarch or any other Primate is always a *primus inter pares*.” See SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 388.

³⁵⁴ Patristic tradition and Ecumenical Councils have always regarded the successor of Peter as being not only the universal Pontiff, but also the Patriarch of the West, “without ever believing that this could be prejudicial to his primacy.” According to Xavier Rynne, “if the Pope does not feel himself diminished by the fact that he is Bishop of Rome and in virtue of *this* equal to the bishops: why should he feel himself diminished by the fact that he is *also* Patriarch of the West and in virtue of *this*, on *this* level, the colleague of the Patriarchs of the East?” From this perspective, the very recent dropping of the title “Patriarch of the West” by Pope Benedict XVI seems to be at minimum strange and not really contributing to the contemporary ecumenical dialogue of the Catholic Church with the other Christian Churches, especially those of the East, unless, of course, the title was dropped because of the descriptive phrase “of the West,” which was, in fact, vague and out of time with all other particular titles that are always identified with a concrete see. Unfortunately, no such explanation has been officially given. See RYNNE, *The Third Session*, pp. 99-100.

³⁵⁵ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 233-234.

³⁵⁶ *OE* 9, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903. See also MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” pp. 235-236.

Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches emphasized two important points pertaining to the very essence of the notion of “particular legislation.”³⁵⁷ They are the acknowledgement on the part of the council fathers that “neither the naming of bishops nor their canonical commission are reserved by divine right to the Roman Pontiff only,” since “what was a contingent fact of the Christian West should not be made a rule for the universal Church or a matter of doctrine,”³⁵⁸ and the recognition of the natural right of each Church of the Catholic communion to develop her ecclesiastical structures even outside of her home country.³⁵⁹ This meant the suspension of the former “principle of territorial jurisdiction”³⁶⁰ and the invitation to the Eastern Catholic Churches to “live their own lives everywhere, where the spiritual good of their faithful demands it.”³⁶¹

However, this new turn in the conciliar teaching was once again not entirely free of certain inconsistencies with regard to terminology. The confusion comes from the perplexing employment by *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* of the terms “ecclesiastical area”³⁶² and “ecclesiastical territory,”³⁶³ which have different canonical meanings, causing ambiguities in the proper understanding of the document. Most of the commentators agree that the council fathers understood “area or region” to mean “original extension of an

³⁵⁷ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II: The Decree*, pp. 23-25.

³⁵⁸ MAXIMOS IV, “Servant of Servants of God,” p. 75.

³⁵⁹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 222.

³⁶⁰ According to John Madey, this decision on the part of the council fathers “was no innovation,” since there could be found “exceptions from the rule of territorial jurisdiction already in the first millennium. The Melkite Patriarchate of Antioch also followed its faithful into the emigration establishing *Catholikosates* for them. The Latin Church’s practice was *never* strictly bound to the principle of territorial jurisdiction. From the time of the Crusades, Latin bishoprics were established in all places where a handful of Latin Christians were to be rendered spiritual service and there is today not the smallest corner of the earth which would be exempt from the jurisdiction of a Latin bishop. Since all particular Churches enjoy, according to Vatican II, equal rights, they must be free to work everywhere to help their own faithful.” See MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 228.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 227-228.

³⁶² *OE* 4, 16, 19, 20, 21, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901, 904, 905.

³⁶³ *OE* 4, 7, 9, 16, 21, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901-903, 904-905.

Eastern Church or Rite”³⁶⁴ within the limits of a “country where this Rite has been observed from antiquity,”³⁶⁵ while “territory” was to be understood as the “territory outside of one’s own region,”³⁶⁶ where “at least an Apostolic Exarchate for the faithful of a certain Eastern Particular Church or Rite is established.”³⁶⁷ All the same, despite this helpful explanation, a certain confusion remains, especially with regard to some significant canonical issues concerning those Particular Churches of the Catholic communion which have not yet obtained the status of Patriarchate. For example, it is still not entirely clear why major archbishops, who theoretically were equated in dignity with all Catholic patriarchs (*OE* 10), still have to follow the old system of electing bishops, according to which their synods present several candidates from among whom not even the Roman Pontiff but the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Catholic Churches elects one.³⁶⁸ It is also not clear whether or not major archbishops have full jurisdiction over the bishops, clergy, and faithful living outside the ecclesiastical regions of their Particular Churches.³⁶⁹

All these and many other confusions could be resolved if the present Roman Pontiff would avail himself of the opportunity to follow Vatican II’s “earnest desire” to “set up new patriarchates” (*OE* 11)³⁷⁰ as a replacement for Major Archbishoprics, protecting the ecclesial integrity of these Churches from the danger of “being submerged in the vast ocean

³⁶⁴ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 234.

³⁶⁵ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 227.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

³⁶⁷ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 234.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

³⁶⁹ It looks at least strange when we see installations of metropolitans and bishops (serving outside the ecclesiastical regions of their Churches) by the Apostolic nuncios or their representatives and not by the heads and fathers of their Particular Churches. This happened, for instance, at the time of the enthronement of Metropolitan of Philadelphia for Ukrainian Catholics Stefan Soroka, which was conducted by the Apostolic Nuncio to the United States, Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo, in the presence of the primate of the Kyivan Catholic Church, Major Archbishop Lubomyr (Husar). See Andrij WOWK, “Soroka Enthroned as Metropolitan for Ukrainian Catholics in the U.S.,” in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 69:10 (11 March 2001).

³⁷⁰ *OE* 11, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 903.

of Latin Christianity”³⁷¹ and enabling these Churches to manifest freely their particular values, which “belong to the full catholicity and apostolicity of the Church of Christ.”³⁷²

In any event, the attitude of the Second Vatican Council towards the issue of the preservation, recovery, and organic development of particular ecclesiastical legislation can be regarded as a decisive step forward in comparison with earlier Church documents on the same subject issued by Leo XIII (Encyclical on the Reunion of Christendom, *Praeclara Gratulationis*, 20 June 1894) and Pius XII (Encyclical on the Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reunion of the Ruthenian Church with the Apostolic See, *Orientalis Omnes*, 23 December 1945).³⁷³ The same can be said about the current *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, which demonstrated a greater appreciation for the autonomous character of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion in comparison with the previous decrees promulgated by Pius XII (e.g. *Motu proprio Cleri Sanctitati*, 2 June 1957), which was “nothing more than a pale image of the already outmoded Code of Canon Law for the Latin Church.”³⁷⁴ Henceforth, no one can question possibility of having separate jurisdictions in the Catholic Church as well as separate *Codes* regulating the institutional life of various Particular Churches of the Catholic communion.³⁷⁵ So far there are only two *Codes*, for the Latin Church (*CIC83*) and the Eastern Catholic Churches (*CCEO*), which reflect specific disciplinary differences that exist among various Catholic Churches simultaneously binding each other “when the subject matter by its nature affects

³⁷¹ The recognition of Patriarchal rights for the Kyivan Catholic Church, in the opinion of John Madey, would also help this Particular Church to avoid the danger of her repartition, since in the last few decades there has been the “impression that the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches treated the Ukrainian Catholic Church often as if there were several Ukrainian Catholic Churches and not the one Ukrainian Catholic Church or Rite.” See MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 250.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 237.

³⁷³ THILS, *Le décret sur l’oecuménisme*, pp. 146-148.

³⁷⁴ RYNNE, *The Third Session*, p. 96.

³⁷⁵ TAWIL, “A Voice from the East,” p. 196.

the universal Church.”³⁷⁶ Yet, it is important to note that both *Codes* also contain very significant provisions with regard to the possibility of the promulgation of other *Codes* which would govern each of the existing Churches of the Catholic communion.³⁷⁷ Many contemporary Eastern Catholic Churches already find themselves at the stage of completing their particular *Codes*.³⁷⁸ These are to be more firmly rooted in the authentic canonical sources of their particular Traditions and suit the particular character and needs of their clergy and faithful. They should certainly serve as a better manifestation of the integrity of their particular ecclesial identities.

II.2.5. Particular Spiritual Patrimony

The right and the duty of all Particular Churches of the Catholic communion to follow their own expressions of spiritual life along with other constitutive elements of their particular ecclesial identity was mentioned in several Vatican II documents. Yet, while the authors of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* and the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* were inclined to position “spiritual heritage” at the end of the list of legitimate particularities (*LG* 23; *OE* 3), the authors of Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* in both passages specifying the four most fundamental components of ecclesial particularity (*UR* 4, 17) deliberately placed “spirituality” or “spiritual life” at the top of the list in order to emphasize its extraordinary significance. Thus, the fourth paragraph of *Unitatis Redintegratio* reads:

³⁷⁶ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 516.

³⁷⁷ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 13 and WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 516.

³⁷⁸ A former instructor at Saint Paul University, David Motiuk (present Bishop of Edmonton for Ukrainian Catholics), already in 1996 defended his doctoral dissertation on “The Particular Law of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Canada.

All in the church must preserve unity in essentials. But let all, according to the gifts they have received, maintain a proper freedom in their various forms of spiritual life and discipline, in their different liturgical rites, and even in their theological elaborations of revealed truth. In all things let charity prevail. If they are true to this course of action, they will be giving ever better expression to the authentic catholicity and apostolicity of the church.³⁷⁹

In my opinion, this specific passage of the *Decree on Ecumenism* can be regarded as the most powerful and precise definition of ecclesial particular identity, which includes all seven criteria of my interpretive system and even transcends the boundaries of institutional Catholicism. Here “spiritual life” is an integral part of the Church’s essence and a reality that must be rooted in the “revealed truth,” reflected upon by “theology,” expressed through “liturgy,” subordinated to “discipline,” and prepared to contribute to the “preservation of unity in essentials” as well as to “ever better expression of the authentic catholicity and apostolicity of the church” (*UR* 4). This is highlighted as playing the key role in the understanding of the ecclesial nature and vocation of each of the Churches of the Catholic communion.

There are also other places in the conciliar documents where the council fathers spoke specifically of the spiritual heritage of the Eastern Churches, which, in contrast with the former practice of thorough latinization,³⁸⁰ from now on had to be not only “duly esteemed and rightfully praised,” but also “regarded as the heritage of the whole church of

³⁷⁹ *UR* 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

³⁸⁰ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 136.

Christ” (*OE 5*)³⁸¹. This heritage is to be “known, venerated, preserved and cherished by all” (*UR 15*).³⁸²

Nevertheless, there still remains the question: What is the exact meaning of the concept “particular spirituality” and how exactly was it employed in the various documents of the Second Vatican Council? Many commentators, including John Long,³⁸³ Werner Becker,³⁸⁴ Elias Zoghby,³⁸⁵ and Gustave Thils,³⁸⁶ to name but a few, thought that every time the council fathers spoke of “spirituality,” “the spiritual life” or “spiritual heritage,” they had in mind Christian asceticism realized through monasticism, which, not being an individual but a truly ecclesial matter, naturally belongs to the identity of an authentic Church.³⁸⁷ This viewpoint becomes understandable in the light of *LG 44* and especially when we note the focused treatment of the “spiritual traditions” of the Eastern Churches in the fifteenth paragraph of the *Decree on Ecumenism*, according to which:

In the east are to be found the riches of those spiritual traditions which are given expressions in monastic life. From the glorious times of the holy fathers, monastic spirituality flourished in the east, then later flowed over into the western world, and there provided the source from which Latin monastic life took its rise and has drawn fresh vigour ever since. Catholics therefore are earnestly recommended to avail themselves still more of these spiritual riches of the eastern fathers which lift up the whole person to the contemplation of the divine.³⁸⁸

In attempting to further develop this conciliar statement, John Long noted that, especially in the context of the contemporary increase in the number of various ecumenical

³⁸¹ *OE 5*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

³⁸² *UR 15*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917 and BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 136.

³⁸³ LONG, “East and West,” pp. 9-10.

³⁸⁴ BECKER, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 135.

³⁸⁵ ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” p. 51.

³⁸⁶ THILS, *Le décret sur l’oecuménisme*, pp. 144-145.

³⁸⁷ Christos YANNARAS, *The Freedom of Morality* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1984), p. 109.

³⁸⁸ *UR 15*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 917.

initiatives, the religious orders of the West and the monasteries of the East can also engage themselves in fruitful dialogue. However, following the “impetus given by the Council,” Long emphasized, mutual contact among various monastic communities should no longer be based on the former one-sided model according to which Eastern monks were induced to copy Western practices, creating religious orders “Eastern in name but Western in structure and mentality,” but rather on a “true exchange in the fields of liturgical life, spirituality based on the bible, religious obedience and poverty, the apostolate etc. in which there will be a proper mixture of fidelity to one’s own tradition and an enrichment from the contact with other traditions.”³⁸⁹

Similar thoughts in this regard were expressed by John Madey,³⁹⁰ Basilios Stavridis,³⁹¹ Neophytos Edelby, and Ignace Dick,³⁹² who on the whole supported the possibility of mutually beneficial relations among various monastic traditions, but, at the same time, severely criticized attempts to hide “Latin imports” under an Oriental “cloak.”³⁹³ They also criticized the abnormal practice of “bi- or pluriritualism,”³⁹⁴ and the establishment of houses or provinces of those Latin Orders which refuse to understand that “joining a ‘Rite’ does not mean adopting some liturgical rites, but implies self-penetration with the Eastern spirituality.”³⁹⁵ The latter observation points to a more accurate interpretation of the concept of “spirituality,” which cannot be limited exclusively to monasticism or married life (as was done in the sixth paragraph of the *Decree on*

³⁸⁹ LONG, “East and West,” p. 10.

³⁹⁰ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 232.

³⁹¹ Basilios STAVRIDIS, “Zum Dekret über die katholischen Ostkirchen,” in Damaskinos PAPANDREOU, ed., *Stimmen der Orthodoxie. Zu Grundfragen des II. Vatikanums* (Wien-Freiburg-Basel: Herder, 1969), p. 121

³⁹² EDELBY and DICK, *Les Églises Catholiques Orientales. Décret “Orientalium Ecclesiarum,”* p. 265

³⁹³ STAVRIDIS, “Zum Dekret,” 121.

³⁹⁴ EDLEBY and DICK, *Les Églises Catholiques Orientales*, p. 265.

³⁹⁵ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 232.

Ecumenism).³⁹⁶ This is because monasticism and married life themselves must be penetrated by the spirituality of their own particular ecclesiastical Traditions understood in a much broader sense.

In his article on unity and diversity in the Church, Elias Zoghby noted that “national and cultural customs” are included in the notion of “particular spirituality”³⁹⁷ and, in line with him, even such a conservative commentator of the conciliar documents as Meletius Wojnar believed that the notion of “particular spiritual patrimony or heritage” in addition to monasticism also embraces a “special kind of ecclesiastical art, iconography, preaching, the methods of instruction, etc.”³⁹⁸ In his commentary Wojnar says that *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* 3, in contrast to *Lumen Gentium* 23 and *Unitatis Redintegratio* 17, identifies only three characteristic features of particular ecclesial identity, namely “liturgy, ecclesiastical order and spiritual heritage,” (*OE* 3) precisely for the reason that the “spiritual heritage” of the Eastern Catholic Churches includes their “own theological systems and expressions.”³⁹⁹

I will not develop a further analysis of the notion of “particular spiritual heritage” by enumerating its other components or by making judgments about diverse interpretations of it presented by a large number of theologians of various confessional backgrounds, because particular spirituality, first and foremost must be regarded as a living witness and a

³⁹⁶ According to *Unitatis Redintegratio* 6, the Church’s “renewal has therefore notable ecumenical importance. In various spheres of the church’s life, this renewal is already taking place. The biblical and liturgical movements, the preaching of the word of God and catechetics, the apostolate of the laity, new forms of religious life, the *spirituality of married life* [my emphasis] and the church’s social teaching and activity - all these should be considered as promises and guarantees for the future progress of ecumenism.” See *UR* 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 913.

³⁹⁷ ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” p. 500.

³⁹⁸ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 516.

³⁹⁹ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 181. See also GALADZA, “What is Eastern Catholic Theology?” p. 64.

concrete religious response on the part of the people of God to the unique presence of the Holy Spirit in their midst. As a reality coming directly from the Spirit, it cannot be grasped or exhaustively defined by means of scholarly terminology. Thus, in order to be understood, it must be experienced and lived. It certainly touches upon monastic and married life, iconography, music, prayer, deeds of charity as well as theology, liturgy, and even ecclesiastical legislation. However, it is not identical with any of these. In a certain sense, it holds all of these together, like mortar cementing bricks. Being firmly rooted in the authentic sources of the particular ecclesiastical Tradition, that is, in the particular revelation of the Spirit to a particular group of Christians,⁴⁰⁰ spirituality becomes capable of penetrating all the dimensions and occurrences of the ecclesial life of a given community, giving meaning to its existence, and in that sense playing a truly indispensable role in the understanding of the Particular Church's ecclesial identity and vocation.

II.2.6. Preservation of and Contribution to the Existing Communion

The last four sub-chapters of this thesis were dedicated to the evaluation of the four most discernible elements of the Particular Church's ecclesial identity, which were presented in the light of the natural reaction of groups of faithful to the Spirit's divine inspiration.⁴⁰¹ Nevertheless, we should not forget that the Holy Spirit is not only the source of diversity in the Church, but also, and above all, the source of her unity.⁴⁰² Vatican II teaches that, along with "proper freedom of various forms of spiritual life and discipline, different liturgical rites, and even theological elaborations of revealed truth," all in the

⁴⁰⁰ Eugene MEGYER, "Theological Trends: Spiritual Theology Today," in *The Way* 21 (1981), pp. 55-67.

⁴⁰¹ ZOGHBY, "Unité et diversité," p. 495.

⁴⁰² HAY, "The Church in the Decree," p. 367.

Church “must preserve unity in essentials” (*UR* 4).⁴⁰³ In line with this, Frans Josef van Beeck writes that the “Church’s real identity lies in the unity which coincides with her holiness.”⁴⁰⁴ Therefore, if the gift of unity plays such an important role on the level of the universal Church, it must also be regarded as an integral part of the Particular Church’s authentic ecclesial identity,⁴⁰⁵ the adequate understanding of which should not be limited exclusively to its specificities,⁴⁰⁶ but should also include the sincere concern of the particular ecclesial community for the wellbeing of other communities. All of them together belong to one and the same communion of Churches and are called to give common witness of faith and fraternal love. This may seem quite obvious. Yet there still remain two crucial questions in this regard: How far and in what sense are distinctive ecclesial identities compatible with communion?; and, How exactly are Catholics supposed to preserve the existing tension between the principles of diversity and unity in the Church, doing no harm to any of the just-mentioned apparently contradictory poles of this ecclesial antinomy?

From the earliest period of Christian history the word “ecclesia” was predominantly used in the plural and linked with concrete names of places: Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch or Corinth, etc. This traditional multiplicity of local Churches was not regarded as a threat to the Church’s unity, but as a sign of true catholicity expressed through different ecclesiastical structures and different forms of one and the same Church of Christ. The unity of the Church was not sought as a reality existing only outside the local communities, but rather as an essential part of their genuine ecclesial identities which, though implying something self-contained, were in no way aimed at isolation from the other Churches of

⁴⁰³ *UR* 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

⁴⁰⁴ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 66.

⁴⁰⁵ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” pp. 207-208.

⁴⁰⁶ FIORENZA, “The Church’s Religious Identity,” p. 211.

God.⁴⁰⁷ The local and particular character of the early Churches did not contradict their catholicity as long as even their striking differences still allowed them to share in the same Eucharist, enabling them to recognize in each other the fellowship of the same people of God praying and working together for the sake of their own salvation and the proclamation of the Good News to the whole world. According to Hans Küng, the Particular Churches did not become “uncatholic by being limited local Churches,” but only by becoming particularist Churches, which “trying to be self-sufficient” started to “concentrate solely on their own lives and faith,” cutting themselves off from the “faith and life of the entire Church (becoming schismatic) or excluding themselves from her (becoming heretical) or even rebelling against her (becoming apostate).”⁴⁰⁸ The same is true about the contemporary Particular Churches, the peculiar viewpoints of which do not necessarily stand in the way of essential ecclesial unity.

It is not the differences in themselves which are harmful, but only excluding and exclusive differences. Then these differences are no longer the expression of a legitimate diversity of Churches, but are used against other Churches as *notae ecclesiae*, they are endowed with an unqualified validity *vis-a-vis* other Churches, so that the latter can no longer be regarded as legitimate forms of the one Church, but must be seen as a distortion of the Church of Christ. Such differences are divisive and make Church fellowship impossible. The different local churches, regional Churches and rites become different confessions: Churches no longer simply of another place, another region, another rite, but belonging to a hostile confession. Their creeds, and therefore their worship and their fundamental order, conflict with one another, so that the unity of faith, baptism and communal meal is broken.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁷ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 274.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

In addition to the above-mentioned principles of ecclesial co-operation, the Catholic Church has another powerful and visible sign of unity represented by the service of the successor of St. Peter, the Roman Pontiff. Just as St. Peter was the leader of the College of the Apostles and the rock on which Christ promised to build his Church, the popes are also entrusted with the task of confirming their brethren in the episcopate in the true faith and maintaining the principle of cohesion of the entire communion of the Catholic Churches. The commemoration of the pope in the Divine Liturgies of all the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion is not accidental. It is not only the recognition of his primacy, but also a lucid expression of the existing unity of a given ecclesial community with the Church of Rome and with other Churches of the same communion.⁴¹⁰

Thus, for Catholics there exist at least three levels of unity, i.e. (i) universal (ensured by the successor of St. Peter), (ii) particular (guaranteed by the head and father of the Particular Church), and (iii) local (secured by the local bishop). All three are realized through the intermediary of the episcopate.⁴¹¹ Thus, there also exists an invisible dimension of unity on the level of contemplation of the divine mysteries, prayer and charity which cannot be so easily detected, because it derives from the unity of the Holy Trinity, permeating the lives of all Christians and crossing all artificial boundaries. This level of unity “flows from the dynamism of the Christian faith,”⁴¹² encouraging all Christian Churches and ecclesial communities to search for new ways of co-operation, communication and restoration of the full and visible unity so eagerly willed by Christ.

⁴¹⁰ HAY, “The Church in the Decree,” p. 367.

⁴¹¹ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p.p. 207-208.

⁴¹² HAY, “The Church in the Decree,” p. 367.

The genuine integrity of a Particular Church's identity is wounded when this Church struggles with challenges merely for the sake of her own satisfaction⁴¹³ or for the sake of overemphasizing values which are secondary to the Church's unity (nationalism, language, culture).⁴¹⁴ Egocentric absorption with self, ecclesiastical narcissism, racism and individualism are the gravest sins against the authentic understanding of particular ecclesial identity. These jeopardize the unity of the Church as part of her nature and the necessity of service for the entire world as part of her vocation.

All this is a divisiveness which is not really a diversity or richness, but a lack of true charity and true understanding of just what the Church really means in our individual lives. Our definition of our tribal group or social status becomes, in reality, our definition of the Church. This is a deep error since, as the Council states, the Church is a Communion of persons each at the service of the other. If one member has talents, intelligence, artistic abilities, etc., it is a gift, a charism, which he has received not so much for himself but so that he can be of service to others.⁴¹⁵

The unity among various Churches of the Catholic communion must be preserved, because it is among the greatest gifts of God, given to the Church as the most visible affirmation of her catholicity and the most explicit expression of her ecclesial identity. Therefore, the aim of the Particular Catholic Churches should not be limited to a kind of withdrawal into their individualities, but must also be directed towards appreciation of the ecclesial elements that they have in common. Leaving one's own Church in order to join another Church of the same communion, or in order to establish a kind of "neutral" Church outside of the existing communion, would not serve the cause of unity. In view of the existing diversity that exists among such a large number of Christian Churches and

⁴¹³ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 302.

⁴¹⁴ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, p. 189.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

ecclesial communities, “we can do nothing but search, humbly, unpretentiously, soberly and clear-headedly, for common ground within our own Church, declaring our loyalty, with determination but without presumption, to the Church we belong to; this must be our starting-point.”⁴¹⁶

II.2.7. Work towards Inter-Confessional Rapprochement and Universal Integration

At the very beginning of his book on the various dimensions of the post-conciliar Catholic Church, Avery Dulles described two contrastingly different types of religious society, the closed and the open.⁴¹⁷ The “open society,” in the words of Dulles, can be understood as a particular group of people that favors living in accordance with the spirit rather than the letter of the law, and, being inspired by the gift of divine love to humanity; excludes no one and nothing from its life, being ultimately oriented towards bringing everyone and everything closer to God. The “closed society,” to the contrary, is depicted as a group “turned in upon itself” and “anxiously concerned for its own survival” that chooses to live by the letter of the law, ignores outsiders and employs religion as an “agent of social cohesion and self-preservation.”⁴¹⁸

One of the major goals of the earthly mission of Christ, according to Dulles, was to reject a “static formalistic religion” as sometimes evident in certain elements of the Old Testament and to “lay the groundwork for an open society”⁴¹⁹ of the New Testament, which was directed at proclaiming the Good News to the whole world. Nevertheless, even this

⁴¹⁶ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 288.

⁴¹⁷ Avery Dulles himself in describing the two types of religious societies refers to a much earlier work, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion* (1932), written by the French Jewish philosopher Henri Bergson.

⁴¹⁸ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 2.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

originally open society of Christians after several centuries began to lose its outward orientation and, as a consequence of more than a few schisms which took place in the East as well as in the West, once again turned into a number of closed religious societies more preoccupied with their own inheritance than with an appreciation of the values of their neighbors, often viewed as competitors. In the opinion of Peter Riga and Elias Zoghby, the “pride of men” and the hostile opposition among various political states rather than “actual heresy” or “theological disagreements” became the real “cause of disunity in the Church.”⁴²⁰

To the present day not a few existing communions of Churches or ecclesial communities remain essentially closed in on themselves. This was also true of the Church of Rome, which at least before Vatican II could be characterized as being a highly defensive, “centralized, autocratic, and almost imperialistic” religious society with “iron discipline and blind obedience.”⁴²¹ Yet, the situation within the Catholic communion of Churches has drastically changed as a result of its last Council, which once again turned the Catholic Church from being closed to being an open religious society which, trying to follow the principle of “spiritual ecumenism” (*UR* 8),⁴²² became capable of “freeing itself from selfishness so as to share life in a reconciled community.”⁴²³ The council fathers understood very well and expressed in their documents the awareness that, despite a large number of differences in formulations of doctrine, as well as in some aspects of liturgical, spiritual and disciplinary life,⁴²⁴ the Latin and the Eastern ecclesiastical Traditions are in

⁴²⁰ RIGA, *The Church Renewed*, pp. 183-184 and ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” pp. 49-52.

⁴²¹ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 4.

⁴²² The term “spiritual ecumenism” that appears in the eighth paragraph of Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* is borrowed from the theological works of a prominent French ecumenist, Abbé Paul Couturier.

⁴²³ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 72.

⁴²⁴ CEGLIELKA, *Handbook of Ecclesiology*, pp. 55-58.

fact the “two halves of the Christian heritage” and only “taken together make up that total and integral Christianity which, as a whole, inherits the promise of divine protection to the end of time.”⁴²⁵ Accordingly, in the fourth paragraph of Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* we read that the restoration of the former unity that existed between Christian East and West in the first millennium belongs to the ecclesial vocation of the Catholic Church (*UR* 4).⁴²⁶ The Catholic Church must simultaneously include in itself a sense of preserving one’s own identity as well as a sense of openness “that is less dependent on negotiations across boundaries.”⁴²⁷ In the words of Karl Rahner, the Catholic Church had to become not only a Church with “open doors,” but an “open Church.”⁴²⁸ The task of “joining new orientations to the old traditions” that was successfully accomplished in “accelerated time” by the fathers of the Council had to become the task of the entire ecclesial community living in “real time,” even though various segments of the Church were not so easily prepared to give up its former exclusivist ecclesiological viewpoints that seemed to guarantee clarity and safety within the Catholic communion.⁴²⁹

Nonetheless, despite the painful process of a gradual change in attitude towards other Christian communities that included “risk, withdrawal, expansion and contraction, excitement and disappointment, integration and disintegration,”⁴³⁰ many Catholics showed themselves to be courageous enough to adopt feelings of love, peace, patience and humility⁴³¹ in place of “pride, arrogance and triumphalism in approaching other

⁴²⁵ ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” p. 52.

⁴²⁶ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 33.

⁴²⁷ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 23.

⁴²⁸ RAHNER, *The Shape of the Church*, p. 93.

⁴²⁹ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 19.

⁴³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴³¹ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 72.

Christians.”⁴³² These, according to *Unitatis Redintegratio*, also possess many “interior gifts of the holy Spirit,”⁴³³ and, therefore, can achieve formulations and adaptations of the Christian message in such a way that Catholics too can learn from them.⁴³⁴ On the one hand, the *Decree on Ecumenism* emphasizes that “it is only through Christ’s catholic church, which is the all-embracing means of salvation, that the fullness of the means of salvation can be attained.”⁴³⁵ On the other hand, the very next paragraph of the same document contains the humble recognition on the part of the council fathers that “the divisions among Christians prevent the church from realizing in practice the fullness of catholicity proper to her.”⁴³⁶

The antinomic approach to the concept of “as-yet-imperfect fulfillment in the Catholic Church itself”⁴³⁷ prevented the Church of Rome from being “caught up in her own ‘fullness,’ making Catholicism into a narrow sect”⁴³⁸ founded on the principle of self-sufficiency and the false awareness of her already achieved perfection. According to the seventh chapter of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, neither an individual person nor even the Church herself can claim that they already possess the fullness of the whole truth in this present age (*LG* 48) for the reason that the Church understood as a pilgrim in every generation must be “led anew by the Spirit of truth into all truth,”⁴³⁹ looking forward to her final completion, which will come about only after the second coming of Christ.⁴⁴⁰ The same can be said about the gift of unity that already “subsists in the catholic church as

⁴³² SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 210.

⁴³³ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

⁴³⁴ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p.

⁴³⁵ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

⁴³⁶ UR 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

⁴³⁷ BROWN, “Commentary on the Decree,” p. 48.

⁴³⁸ SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 211.

⁴³⁹ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

⁴⁴⁰ LEEMING, *The Vatican Council*, p. 97.

something she can never lose” (*UR* 4)⁴⁴¹ and at the same time is in need of “gradual realization” (*UR* 18)⁴⁴² and ultimate “restoration” (*UR* 1).⁴⁴³

On the way to her perfection and restoration of the full and visible unity “to which our Lord wills his body to grow in the course of time” (*UR* 24),⁴⁴⁴ the Catholic Church must be prepared to “sacrifice everything that has stood between it and the whole truth, everything that tempted it and which often led it into error.”⁴⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the new sense of openness that was enunciated by the Second Vatican Council and further developed through the notion of “evangelical space,” in implying that “visible division does not necessarily violate or destroy the given unity of grace,”⁴⁴⁶ did not mean that the Church when shedding her pride and arrogance should also lose her ecclesial integrity and her authentic understanding of Christian truth.⁴⁴⁷ The openness of post-conciliar Catholicism to fruitful relations with other Churches and individual non-Catholics should not be confused with various forms of religious syncretism, ecclesiastical indifferentism, or a kind of non-denominationalism viewing “different forms of Christianity as equally true and valid” and seeking “unity based on a minimal doctrinal content upon which all Christians can agree.”⁴⁴⁸ Catholics cannot, of course, forfeit their genuine ecclesial identity for the sake of unity, pretending that all the differences and disagreements that divide Christianity have

⁴⁴¹ *UR* 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 911.

⁴⁴² *UR* 18, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 918.

⁴⁴³ *UR* 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908. See also BROWN, “Commentary on the Decree,” p. 48.

⁴⁴⁴ *UR* 24, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 920.

⁴⁴⁵ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

⁴⁴⁶ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 72. See also TILLARD, “The Church of God,” p. 117 and PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 167.

⁴⁴⁷ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 290.

⁴⁴⁸ SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 211. See also DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 28 and BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 41.

already been resolved.⁴⁴⁹ The authentic search for the restoration of unity has nothing to do with blindly overlooking or simply “wishing away the remaining disagreements,” but should be grounded on “realism and good judgment”⁴⁵⁰ directed towards a resolution of the existing misunderstandings in the spirit of patience and love for close, and even distant, neighbors attempting the same undertakings.⁴⁵¹

All that has been said above leads me to the conclusion that the work directed towards inter-ecclesial rapprochement and universal integration is in need of certain principles that would guide and assist Catholics in their ecumenical activities, at the same time not allowing them to turn their attempts into something estranged from the authentic Church’s nature and genuine vocation. These principles can be derived from various contemporary sources, such as the statements of the official ecumenical dialogue of the Catholic Church with various non-Catholic Churches⁴⁵² and ecclesial communities, or from the works of individual contemporary ecumenists and ecclesiologists.⁴⁵³ However, we should not fail to notice that Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* itself already, by naming its first chapter “Catholic Principles of Ecumenism,” wished “to set before all Catholics the resources, the ways and the means by which they can respond to the grace of his divine

⁴⁴⁹ SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 211.

⁴⁵⁰ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 30.

⁴⁵¹ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 72.

⁴⁵² See as an example a paper by Jaroslav Skira presented at the American Academy of Religion meeting reviewing various documents of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. Jaroslav SKIRA, “Ecclesiology in the International Orthodox-Catholic Ecumenical Dialogue,” in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 41:4 (1996), pp. 359-373.

⁴⁵³ In his renowned book, *The Church*, Hans Küng enumerates five principles which, in his opinion, must be faithfully preserved by all participants in genuine inter-confessional rapprochement: (i) the existing common ecclesial reality must be recognized; (ii) the desired common ecclesial reality must be found; (iii) work for unity must start in one’s own Church, but with the other Churches in mind; (iv) truth must not be sacrificed, but rediscovered; (v) the standard for unity must be the Gospel of Jesus Christ, taken as a whole. See KÜNG, *The Church*, pp. 286-291.

call.” (UR 1)⁴⁵⁴ It encourages all Christians to restore unity among themselves and place the living witness of this unity in Christ before the eyes of the entire non-Christian and unbelieving world. In spite of the fact that *Unitatis Redintegratio* does not present an actual list of the Catholic principles of ecumenism, they can be easily detected from the general content of the document.

Firstly, any work of reconciliation must start from a “change of heart” (UR 7, 8) and internal conversion impelling Catholics to ask pardon and forgive. Secondly, any internal reform within the Catholic communion must be made in attentiveness to its impact on the lives of the other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities (UR 4, 6). Thirdly, ecumenical relations must presume mutual respect and dialogue on an equal footing (UR 9-11) Fourthly, any model of restoring unity should not presuppose a “return” of non-Catholics to the Church of Rome but the “return” of all to greater fidelity to the Gospel (UR 7, 24). And finally, any ecumenical activity on the part of the Catholic Church as well as on the part of other Christian Churches must be performed in accord with the genuine ecclesial mission of the Church of Christ, consisting in the Church’s loving service to all the needs of the contemporary world and the Church’s sincere dedication to proclaiming the Good News of salvation, ultimately aimed at bringing all people to communion with God (UR 1, 12). Let us now take a closer look at each of these principles individually.

1. *Change of heart*: Already in the introductory paragraph of their *Decree on Ecumenism* the council fathers did not hesitate to note that all Christians are equally responsible for the scandal of division which caused great damage to the Church’s “sacred

⁴⁵⁴ UR 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908.

cause of preaching the gospel to every creature.”⁴⁵⁵ The same opinion was reiterated in the third paragraph of the Decree, according to which “people of both sides were to blame”⁴⁵⁶ for the sin of separation from each other. Acts of “pride, ambition, impatience, rash judgment, downright calumny and hypocrisy, bad memories with unwillingness to forget, all mistrust, abuses of authority, exploitation of ignorance”⁴⁵⁷ considerably influenced the centuries-long development of various Christian Churches, often becoming parts of their ecclesial Traditions and their mutually exclusive ecclesiological viewpoints. These prevented them from recognizing in each other sister-Churches of the same Christian family.

In the same vein, one cannot accuse “those who are now born into these [separated] communities”⁴⁵⁸ of the sins of their ancestors and, by so doing, to contribute to the widening of the already existing gap among contemporary Churches and ecclesial communities.⁴⁵⁹ According to *Unitatis Reintegratio*, one is to ask pardon of the other for our own sins committed against unity and to forgive the other in turn (*UR 7*).⁴⁶⁰ The process of reconciliation is not an easy one, as it entails a great deal of self-denial, modesty and true humility (*UR 7*),⁴⁶¹ which must be expressed through heartfelt repentance and sincere conversion⁴⁶² realized not only on the level of individuals, but also on the level of ecclesial communities.⁴⁶³ One should not fear the transformation of his/her community’s

⁴⁵⁵ *UR 1*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908.

⁴⁵⁶ *UR 3*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

⁴⁵⁷ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 21.

⁴⁵⁸ *UR 3*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910.

⁴⁵⁹ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 284.

⁴⁶⁰ See also PAUL VI, “The Task,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, pp. 146-147.

⁴⁶¹ See also JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 105.

⁴⁶² SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 210.

⁴⁶³ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 66.

ecclesial consciousness in order to “meet the needs of our times and to serve further ecumenical advance.”⁴⁶⁴ Without this genuine “renewal of our minds” and “change of heart,”⁴⁶⁵ in the words of *The Decree on Ecumenism*, “there could be no ecumenism worthy of the name” and no witness of the “authentic catholicity and apostolicity of the church.”⁴⁶⁶

2. *Reform in attentiveness to other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities:*

Surprisingly enough, every ecumenical effort directed towards restoring unity among various Christian Churches must not start from our concern for ecumenism per se, but from the genuine renewal of our own ecclesial communities.⁴⁶⁷ The Council stresses this notion as a “key concept,”⁴⁶⁸ a “primary duty,”⁴⁶⁹ and the “first of all the activities in the ecumenical movement.”⁴⁷⁰ Ecumenism should not become a “specialty within the Church,” but a “dimension of every expression of her life”⁴⁷¹ expressed through an “increase of fidelity to the church’s own calling.”⁴⁷² The more Catholics are dedicated to the renewal of their own theology, liturgy, spirituality and legislation, the more they become prepared for fruitful dialogue with other participants of the ecumenical movement.⁴⁷³ Consequently, internal development taking place within the Catholic Church should no longer be carried out in the spirit of opposition to outsiders, but in attentiveness to their unique ecclesial

⁴⁶⁴ PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” pp. 160-161.

⁴⁶⁵ UR 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 913.

⁴⁶⁶ UR 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

⁴⁶⁷ CRUMLEY, “Reflections,” p. 149.

⁴⁶⁸ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 66.

⁴⁶⁹ Thomas STRANSKY, “The Decree on Ecumenism: An Analysis,” in *One in Christ 2:1* (1966), p. 19.

⁴⁷⁰ CUNNINGHAM, “Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 66.

⁴⁷¹ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 34.

⁴⁷² UR 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 913. See also JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 100.

⁴⁷³ HAY, “The Church in the Decree,” p. 368.

legacies⁴⁷⁴ which must be revered⁴⁷⁵ and, being “wrought by the grace of the holy Spirit,” could become a help for the Catholic Church’s “own edification.”⁴⁷⁶

3. *Dialogue on an equal footing*: The Council’s recognition of the ecclesial character of the non-Catholic Churches (*UR* 3, 13-24)⁴⁷⁷ as well as the essentially equal dignity of all the ecclesiastical traditions of the Christian East and West (*OE* 2-6)⁴⁷⁸ opened a new possibility for ecumenical discussion “on an equal footing” (*par cum pari*, *UR* 9),⁴⁷⁹ allowing all the partners of the dialogue to speak and to be listened to,⁴⁸⁰ to give and to receive, gaining reciprocal benefits from the encounter.⁴⁸¹ This qualitatively new attitude of the Church of Rome towards other ecclesiastical bodies, who often constitute a minority in countries with a large Roman Catholic majority, signified the readiness of the Catholic Church to take seriously the existence of the large number of non-Catholic Churches and ecclesial communities which were no longer understood as a threat to the “unity of the so-called Roman Catholic nations” and, therefore, subjects for Latin “proselytism.”⁴⁸²

Along with the acknowledgement of the ecclesiality of the non-Catholic Churches, the Roman Church also had to admit that her unique vocation of being the center of unity does not mean that she has to be regarded by all Christian Churches as their “mother-Church,” as if there were no other Apostolic Sees besides Rome.⁴⁸³ The fact that most of

⁴⁷⁴ Günther GASSMANN, “The Decree on Ecumenism and Its Ecclesiological Significance,” in *Ecumenical Trends* 18:10 (1989), p. 154.

⁴⁷⁵ PAUL VI, “The Task,” p. 148.

⁴⁷⁶ *UR* 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912.

⁴⁷⁷ EVANS, “Orthodox,” pp. 35, 38.

⁴⁷⁸ SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 387 and RIVA, *La Chiesa in dialogo*, p. 139.

⁴⁷⁹ *UR* 9, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 914 and BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 193.

⁴⁸⁰ EVDOKIMOV, “Comments on the Decree,” p. 99.

⁴⁸¹ ZOGHBY, “Eastern and Western,” pp. 52-53.

⁴⁸² Nikos NISSIOTIS, “Ecclesiology and Ecumenism of the Second Session of the Vatican Council II,” in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10:1 (1964), p. 33.

⁴⁸³ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 227.

the Western Churches in reality derive their origins from the Church of ancient Rome and can be referred to as her “daughter-Churches”⁴⁸⁴ has nothing to do with the vast majority of the Eastern Churches that received their ecclesiastical Traditions from their own “mother-Churches.” To these the Roman Church is only a “sister.”⁴⁸⁵

Consequently, even now, internal affairs within the Catholic communion should be more properly viewed not as relations between a “mother-Church” and her “ecclesial daughters,” but as relations among “sister-Churches” each herself being or having her own “ecclesial mother.”⁴⁸⁶ This portrayal of the Catholic Church as a family, or communion, guaranteeing equality and autonomous rights to all of its constituent members opened an entirely new perspective for the reinterpretation of papal primacy in terms of its service for the common good, as well as an entirely new opportunity for the restoration of visible unity as a “communion of communions.”⁴⁸⁷ In such a constellation, all the Particular Churches or communions of Churches would be able to retain their own ecclesial identities, not being afraid of the assimilation of their unique ecclesiastical Traditions⁴⁸⁸ or the absorption of their ecclesial individualities by a monolithic Church or communion of Churches.⁴⁸⁹

4. *The “Return” of all Christians to Christ as “the source and center of Church unity” (UR 20):* If in the past the attitude of the Catholic Church towards non-Catholics could be regarded primarily as an “appeal from inside to those outside,”⁴⁹⁰ inviting them to return to Roman submission,⁴⁹¹ Vatican II no longer spoke of ecumenical relations in terms

⁴⁸⁴ JAEGER, *A Stand on Ecumenism*, p. 132-133.

⁴⁸⁵ EVANS, “Orthodox,” p. 40.

⁴⁸⁶ RAHNER, *The Shape of the Church*, p. 103.

⁴⁸⁷ WOOD, “The Theology of Communion,” p. 153.

⁴⁸⁸ GASSMANN, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 156.

⁴⁸⁹ WOOD, “The Theology of Communion,” p. 153.

⁴⁹⁰ NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” p. 373.

⁴⁹¹ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 41.

of the “return” of outsiders to the one and only Church of Christ which was formerly identified with the Church of Rome.⁴⁹² Therefore, the practice of ecumenism was no longer understood by the Catholic Church only as a movement of all Christian Churches towards Rome, but also as the movement of the Catholic Church towards other communions of Churches. This two-way movement no longer implied weakening the other Churches by making converts or welcoming those ecclesial minorities that wished to leave their own communions. Instead it was to be genuinely concerned with strengthening the other communions and encouraging non-Catholic Churches to find authentic orthodoxy and catholicity in themselves and to retain their ecclesial integrity, so essential for the majority of their faithful, who always wanted to stay within the ecclesial context in which they received their Baptism and faith.⁴⁹³

Accordingly, the role of the Catholic Church in the contemporary ecumenical dialogue was no longer understood by the council fathers as being estranged from the respective tasks of many other Churches and ecclesial communities of the East and West, but as an integral part of the common Christian endeavor which, far from being oriented towards the restoration of some idealized age in the past, from now on was oriented to the establishment of a “new order of human relations.”⁴⁹⁴ This new order, according to *Unitatis Redintegratio*, can come about not only as a result of the movement of all Christian Churches towards each other, but first of all as a consequence of their common movement towards Christ (*UR 20*).⁴⁹⁵ It is he who constantly calls all of his followers to become one

⁴⁹² SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 213.

⁴⁹³ MCNAMARA, “Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II,” pp. 72-73 and NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” p. 373.

⁴⁹⁴ Andrea RICCARDI, “The Tumultuous Opening of the Council,” in ALBERIGO and KOMONCHAK, *History of Vatican II*, vol. 2, pp. 15-16.

⁴⁹⁵ STRANSKY, “The Decree on Ecumenism: An Analysis,” p. 25

flock and one eschatological people continually accomplishing its pilgrimage on earth “journeying into God’s future under the leading of the Holy Spirit.”⁴⁹⁶

5. *Work towards universal integration*: The significant shift of perspective in the understanding of the Catholic Church’s ecclesial identity and mission, as well as the very crucial transformation of her attitude towards other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities enunciated by the documents of Vatican II, also considerably changed the traditional Catholic account of the world’s great religions and various types of unbelievers.⁴⁹⁷ Showing high respect for the dignity and rights of the human person (including freedom of religious expression) and taking seriously the values espoused by non-Christians,⁴⁹⁸ the Catholic Church demonstrated her “solidarity with the whole human family” of the world, which was no longer viewed as a playground of demonic forces and a “region apart”⁴⁹⁹ from the perfect society of the Church, formerly understood as being exempt from any faults and afflictions. The world was no longer perceived as a reality existing outside the Church. At the very same time, the Church, understood as a “world transfigured,” was no longer regarded as something totally estranged from human progress.⁵⁰⁰ In contrast to the “hostility and suspicion towards the modern world that had characterized the Catholicism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,”⁵⁰¹ the

⁴⁹⁶ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 41.

⁴⁹⁷ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 11.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴⁹⁹ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 102.

⁵⁰⁰ Nikos NISSIOTIS, “Transfigured World,” in Philip MAURY, ed., *Discerning the Times: The Church in Today’s World* (Techy, Ill.: Divine Word Publications, 1968), p. 50.

⁵⁰¹ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 20.

Church of the Second Vatican Council recognized a number of benefits coming from mutual relations between the Church and the modern world (*GS* 42-44).⁵⁰²

The Catholic Church for the first time in post-Tridentine history was presented as being in need of the world,⁵⁰³ offering her very useful scholarly tools and theories based on modern discoveries, which for the most part did not contradict Christian morality and doctrine (*GS* 62).⁵⁰⁴ Nevertheless, being open to the modern world did not mean that the Church had to betray its genuine identity by approving “a new humanism founded on the self-sufficiency of human progress and technology.”⁵⁰⁵ On the contrary, following the “dialectic of identity and openness as part of the Church’s vocation”⁵⁰⁶ signified that the Catholic Church needs to restore a new order and a new justice in the world of today⁵⁰⁷ by serving it and playing the role of a “diaconal-charismatic body in the middle of human anxieties and wonderings.”⁵⁰⁸

The service of the Church to the contemporary world as an authentic expression of her ecclesial vocation is twofold.⁵⁰⁹ On the one hand, the Church is called to “relieve the afflictions of our times such as famine and natural disasters, illiteracy and poverty, lack of housing and the unequal distribution of wealth” (*UR* 12).⁵¹⁰ On the other hand, she is also and above all destined to bring the whole human race to God (*GS* 45) and to “be the continuing and living incarnation of Christ through whom and with whom and in whom the

⁵⁰² See also BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 150 and Joseph KOMONCHAK, “Clergy, Laity, and the Church’s Mission in the World,” in Madonna KOLBENSCHLAG, ed., *Between God and Caesar* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), p. 157.

⁵⁰³ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 150.

⁵⁰⁴ See also DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, pp. 20-21.

⁵⁰⁵ NISSIOTIS, “Transfigured World,” p. 54.

⁵⁰⁶ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 20.

⁵⁰⁷ NISSIOTIS, “Transfigured World,” p. 61.

⁵⁰⁸ NISSIOTIS, “Towards a New,” p. 330.

⁵⁰⁹ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 38.

⁵¹⁰ *UR* 12, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 915.

whole universe came, comes, and will come alive to the Father.”⁵¹¹ Both of these aspects or tasks of the Church’s service to the world are inseparable and, therefore, have to be regarded as an indivisible whole (*LG* 17; *AA* 2; *AG* 7) simultaneously “contributing to the glory of God” as the “ultimate goal of all creation.”⁵¹² The increase of fidelity of all Christians to the Church’s genuine mission (*UR* 6), ultimately aimed at the proclamation of the Good News to the unbelieving world so that the Kingdom of God and salvation of the whole human race may come to pass (*GS* 45), should not be isolated from the active involvement of the Church in the work of the secular world. In antinomic fashion, none of the Church’s genuinely vocational orientations can be neglected. Overemphasis of the “horizontal” orientation, establishing firm relations among human beings and concentrating solely on secular activity, may lead to neglecting the Gospel, while overemphasis on the “vertical” axis, establishing a firm connection between God and his Church and concentrating solely on the proclamation of the salvific message of the Gospel, may lead to overlooking the very urgent needs of humanity. In both of these cases, according to Eugene Fairweather, the Church would not be able to accomplish her mission in its fullness.⁵¹³

A slightly different perspective on the same issue can be found in several works of Karl Rahner and Avery Dulles who, on the one hand, simply confirmed the actual existence of the “mutually conditioning relationship between horizontalism and verticalism,”⁵¹⁴ but, on the other, decisively refused to regard them as equal parts of the Church’s authentic vocation. In their opinion, the task of engaging the Church in secular activities which “of

⁵¹¹ BEECK, *Catholic Identity*, p. 20.

⁵¹² DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 150.

⁵¹³ Eugene FAIRWEATHER, “The Church’s Ministry to the World,” in George JOHNSTON and Wolfgang ROTH, eds., *The Church in the Modern World: Essays in Honour of James Sutherland Thomson* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967), p. 136.

⁵¹⁴ RAHNER, *Ecclesiology*, p. 307.

itself implies a more radical duty on man's part"⁵¹⁵ had to be subordinated to the task of the completion of God's Kingdom and bringing salvation to the human family, in which the Church "depends continuously on God, in whose hands it serves as an instrument."⁵¹⁶ According to Rahner, both of the Church's essential duties with regard to her service to the world have to be preserved and fulfilled at one and the same time; however, the Church must always "uphold verticalism because it recognizes that without it, horizontalism cannot in the long run endure, or at most will survive in a blessed illogicality in which God is explicitly denied or neglected by it in order once more implicitly to assent to him precisely in the absoluteness of love of neighbor."⁵¹⁷

Taking into account this important observation, I decided that it would not be appropriate to add the criterion of the Church's service to the material needs of the world and her social activity as a separate criterion of my interpretive system analyzing the ecclesial identity and vocation of a Particular Church. This is because such social activity cannot be separated from the Church's salvific mission directed towards integrating the entire world in Christ and, therefore, should be more properly regarded as an integral part of my seventh criterion.

The Church as an imperfect human community is destined to live in the world, and as people on a journey she has to be prepared for constant change and renewal until she reaches her final fulfillment at the end of human history. Nevertheless, the Church is also the people of God. The Son of God is the Lord of history who promised to be actively present with his followers, "looking forward to their personal and ecclesial fulfillment with

⁵¹⁵ Ibid., p. 307. See also RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 23.

⁵¹⁶ DULLES, *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, p. 150.

⁵¹⁷ RAHNER, *Ecclesiology*, p. 307.

the final coming of Christ.”⁵¹⁸ Therefore, the ecclesial mission of the Church, which starts from the incarnated Christ as the “source and the center of Church unity” (*UR* 20)⁵¹⁹ has to be also oriented to the coming Lord who promised “to gather up all things in himself” (Eph 1: 10)⁵²⁰ and filled his Church with an “inner dynamism towards universality,” continually invoking his people to “work and pray for the spread of the gospel to all nations.”⁵²¹

According to the promise of Christ, at the end of days, the people of God will embrace all people living in the world. However, the Church herself makes this eschatological perspective more distant because she is still far from her own reintegration. The absence of the common witness of all Christians to the unbelieving world is a great impediment on the way to the universal integration of all creation in God. Yet, even following their own paths in serving the world, Christians of different Churches and ecclesial communities already at the present moment are able to cooperate among themselves “easily learning to acquire a better knowledge and appreciation of one another, so as to make the road which leads to christian unity more smooth” (*UR* 12).⁵²² The more effort Christians “make to live holier lives according to the gospel, the better will they further Christian unity and put it into practice.” (*UR* 7)⁵²³ In the same way, the more that faithful of different confessional backgrounds preach the same Gospel to the world of today, the more they contribute to the unity of Christendom.⁵²⁴ As much as the Church “involves herself more in the lives of other people – of mankind – to assist in the transformation which the Spirit effects in them, she herself enters more deeply into the

⁵¹⁸ DONOVAN, *Distinctively Catholic*, p. 53.

⁵¹⁹ *UR* 20, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 919.

⁵²⁰ PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 167.

⁵²¹ McNAMARA, “Introduction to the Constitution,” p. 58.

⁵²² *UR* 12, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 915.

⁵²³ *UR* 7, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 913. See also VOGEL, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 4.

⁵²⁴ ARSENIIEV, “The Second Vatican,” p. 17.

sanctification wrought by the Spirit, becomes more truly Church and manifests more visibly the body of Jesus in the world.”⁵²⁵

It cannot be stressed enough – especially in view of the focus of the present study, that what has just been said about the Church of Christ as a whole and about the Catholic Church as a communion, also equally concerns each of the Particular Churches of this communion.⁵²⁶ All of the Catholic Churches of the East and West are in the same way encouraged by Vatican II to engage themselves in “wider ecumenism”⁵²⁷ and to extend their missionary activity of preaching the Gospel and bringing salvation in Christ to the whole world.⁵²⁸ Despite the fact that in the past Eastern Catholics wishing to follow missionary vocations were obliged to join the Latin Church, which alone was given the privilege to perform missionary work among non-Christians,⁵²⁹ it was unequivocally recognized by the Council that in certain cases, for instance in India and Israel, the missionary efforts of Eastern Catholics can be even more effective than those of Latin Catholics.⁵³⁰ The same can be said about missionary initiatives undertaken by Eastern Catholic Churches in the Near East,⁵³¹ where followers of Christ and adherents of Islam are living side by side⁵³² and, therefore, can better understand each other than representatives of the Western culture.⁵³³

⁵²⁵ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 103.

⁵²⁶ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 243 and PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 213-214, 216.

⁵²⁷ HEARNE, “Was Vatican II,” p. 103.

⁵²⁸ RAHNER, *The Church After*, p. 23, PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 213, and O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 21.

⁵²⁹ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 226.

⁵³⁰ HOECK, “Decree on Eastern,” p. 315, O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 21 and WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 182.

⁵³¹ James CLARKE, *L’Enjeu chrétien au Proche-Orient* (Paris: Editions de Centurion, 1965), pp. 3-67.

⁵³² Joseph HAJJAR, *Les Chrétiens Uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1962), p. 11.

⁵³³ O’CONNELL, *Vatican II*, p. 29.

Unfortunately, so far the Eastern Catholic Churches, often being “absorbed in the task of organizing their own activities,”⁵³⁴ have not demonstrated sufficient interest and a satisfactory level of preparedness for participating in the inter-religious and ecumenical endeavors of the Catholic Church directed towards non-Christians or even non-Catholics. Sometimes they have also been restrained from active involvement in the ecumenical movement by officials of the Roman Curia who, in opposition to the exhortations of *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*,⁵³⁵ seem to remain strongly influenced by pre-Vatican II modes of acting and thinking. Nevertheless, this should not prevent Eastern Catholics from fulfilling the authentic ecclesial mission of their respective Churches, which – just like the Latin Church – must not be limited exclusively to the preservation of their own particularities, but must be also directed towards their more fruitful dialogue with all non-Catholic Churches, all ecclesial communities, and with all the great religions of the world.

Perhaps so far this task seems too difficult for the Eastern Catholic Churches, when at a minimum they are attempting to involve themselves in so-called “limited” ecumenical co-operation with their closest neighbors, namely their Orthodox counterparts.⁵³⁶ Even this

⁵³⁴ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 61.

⁵³⁵ *OE* 24, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 906 and *UR* 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 912. See also MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 244.

⁵³⁶ NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” p. 370. Extremely courageous attempts in this regard were undertaken by representatives of the Greek-Catholic and Greek-Orthodox Churches of Antioch (Archbishop-Emeritus of Baalbeck Elias (Zoghby) and Archbishop of Mount Lebanon George (Khodre) who signed an “Agreed Statement” based on their common confession of their faith, which could gradually lead these Particular Churches to the restoration of full and visible unity (Elias ZOGHBY, “Profession de foi de Mgr. Elias Zoghby,” in *Contacts* 3 (1995), Ukrainian translation in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), 271-275. See also MAJDANSKY, “‘Mediate’ and ‘nearly perfect’ Communion?” pp. 7-22, and KCSG, “Statement on Church of Antioch Initiative,” pp. 73-74). A similar possibility was discussed at several unofficial consultations among Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox theologians of the Kyivan Church Study Group, which seriously considered the possibility for the Kyivan Catholic Church to restore ecclesiastical communion with her mother-Church of Constantinople without breaking ties with the Church of Rome (MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 152-171; “Divisions and Healing,” pp. 133-151; “Orthodox-Catholic

is extremely challenging. According to Joseph Small, each of the Particular Christian Churches can and should react to distinct ecumenical proposals by making “specific decisions growing out of a Church’s ecclesial identity.”⁵³⁷ Hence, in the words of Nikos Nissiotis, closer contacts among various Particular Churches “standing nearer together” can be regarded as “healthy and necessary” if these Churches appreciate each other and learn from each other by engaging themselves in confessional debates trying to “find new interpretations of their doctrines and overcome the difficulties which still separate them.”⁵³⁸ Nevertheless, “any attempt to reunite two or three Churches,” in the opinion of Nissiotis, “must have an inclusive vision of the wholeness of the Church”⁵³⁹ and, therefore, should not contradict the accomplishments of “integral” ecumenism, fostering the restoration of unity of all Christendom.⁵⁴⁰

At this point, I would simply like to conclude the current sub-chapter of the thesis with a rather long quotation from Hans Küng that corresponds with the seventh criterion of my system. It stresses attentiveness to other Churches as an integral part of the Particular Church’s ecclesial identity and vocation:

Reconciliation and the Ukrainian Church,” in Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, ed., *We are ALL Brothers: A Collection of the Writings of Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1999), pp. 37-54). At the present moment, the head of the Kyivan Catholic Church, Major Archbishop Lubomyr (Husar), has come forward with an initiative to establish ecumenical dialogue between his Church and all the branches of Ukrainian Orthodoxy (Lubomyr HUSAR, Lyst Blazhennishoho Liubomyra (Huzara) do Blazhennishoho Mytropolyta Volodymyra, Predstoiatelia Urayıns’koı̄ Pravoslavnoı̄ Tserkvy [The Letter of His Beatitude Lubomyr (Husar) to His Beatitude Metropolitan Volodymyr, the Head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church], at <http://www.ugcc.org.ua/ukr/documents/appeal2008/soprychastya/>, accessed on 22 August 2008); however, his enthusiasm has not yet been supported either by the hierarchs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches or by officials of the Roman Curia.

⁵³⁷ Joseph SMALL, “Ecclesial Identity and Ecumenical Decisions in the Presbyterian Church,” in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 37 (2000) at <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-70654588.html>, accessed on 10 August 2008.

⁵³⁸ NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” p. 370.

⁵³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

⁵⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

Work for unity must start in one's own Church, but with the other Churches in mind. We will naturally start our search for common ground, if we are genuinely concerned about the divisions in the Church, by looking at the Church we belong to by baptism and in which we learned our faith: not in order to withdraw into its individuality, but to find out what elements it has in common with other Churches.... If we become more involved in our own Church, we cannot but be aware of the other Churches as well. We must not look so hard at our own Church that we do not see the other Churches which make the same claims to be the true Church of Christ, claims which in many respects may seem more justified than our own, since in this or that respect they are more attentive to the Gospel and more conscientious in carrying out its message. It then becomes inevitable that these other Churches call our own Church in question, ask of us how we follow the Gospel in this or that respect, and explicitly or implicitly ask us to observe the Gospel in this or that respect in the same way that they do, and so find common ground with them. Can a Church which desires the unity of the Church of Christ simply dispense itself from the need to grant the justified wishes and demands of other Churches? If we begin our ecumenical efforts by looking at our own Church, this is the acid test of a true desire for unity: the willingness to renew our own Church by fulfilling the justified request of other Churches. If this were done seriously on all sides, a rapprochement, indeed unity itself, would be inevitable. Unity cannot be achieved by looking backwards, however much we respect the past, however little we can change it. Unity is only possible on the path that leads forward. The future, to which the church must always be open, offers us new possibilities. If every Church, rejecting that unenlightened enthusiasm which takes no account of difficulties, but also decisively rejecting all kinds of confessional indifference and sloth, were to fulfill the justified wishes and demands of the other Churches, then no Church would be the same in the future as it is today. In the process of selfless giving and taking the common elements would come to light and be able to grow.⁵⁴¹

II.3. The Question of the Adequacy of an Interpretive System for the Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Particular Church Composed of Seven Criteria Delineated from the Documents of the Second Vatican Council

II.3.1. Methodological Evaluation of the System

As I already mentioned earlier in this chapter, an ecclesial identity is a complex reality that, being an authentic reflection of the Church understood as a mystery, contains

⁵⁴¹ KÜNG, *The Church*, pp. 287-289.

within itself many antinomically polarized ecclesial dimensions indicating that the Church is simultaneously a heavenly reality and an earthly institution, already perfect and in constant need of development, established by God and built with human building blocks, and so on. Unity and diversity, catholicity and locality, universality and particularity can also be regarded as extremely important aspects of the Church's genuine nature and, precisely for this reason, their analysis was chosen as the main focus of this dissertation. As I have noted several times already, all that is said in this dissertation about the ecclesial identity of the entire Catholic communion of Churches is also valid for a better understanding of the ecclesial essence and mission of each of the Particular Churches considered separately.⁵⁴² However, each of them also has her own specific differences contributing to the richness of the common Catholic heritage. Of course, an authentic understanding of particular identities in the Catholic Church should not be limited exclusively to the appreciation of the distinctive elements present in every Church without taking note of the great things that we all Christians have in common.⁵⁴³ Nevertheless, in my opinion, the understanding of the whole mystery of the Church of Christ very naturally starts from the understanding of the presence of this Church in the very concrete circumstances of life, which imply a very specific theological mindset, spirituality, worship, and legislation, as well as many other integral aspects of particular ecclesial identity that were touched upon in the previous pages of my work.

The main goal of this thesis is to find a method that would enable us to make a "test for authenticity" of a specific ecclesial self-perception that can be applied to all of the

⁵⁴² PUJOL, "The Care and Organization," pp. 213-214, 216 and MADEY, "Vatican Council II's Decree," p. 243.

⁵⁴³ FIORENZA, "The Church's Religious Identity," p. 211.

Churches of the Catholic communion, and, being expressed through easily understandable theological concepts, assist these Churches in the continuous process of their growing into the fullness of catholicity which in some way is already present in them. In my opinion, such a method was presented by the Second Vatican Council, but it was not self-evident. Therefore, I have been performing a thorough search of the main conciliar documents germane to the issue of ecclesial particularity in order to extract from them a certain number of principles that can all together define the ecclesial identity of a Particular Church in a concrete and comprehensible manner. In the final analysis, I arrived at seven conciliar principles or criteria which, being understood as a system, can be employed to assess the ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Churches of the Catholic communion. Being fully conscious that my interpretive system might not be the only one or the best one, I still believe that it is one of the most adequate ways for the proper evaluation of particular ecclesial identity, which so far has been often regarded as something very abstract and intangible.

In a way similar to the approach chosen by Avery Dulles in his evaluation of the five basic ecclesiological models of the Church,⁵⁴⁴ I am also inclined to start the methodological evaluation of my interpretive system composed of seven criteria by posing a set of somewhat provocative questions: What exactly is meant by the statement that all seven criteria create one system? Is there contradiction or complementarity among the various criteria? Can each of the criteria stand by itself? Are they all equal? What is the most important criterion of all? The answer to all of these questions will give us a key to a

⁵⁴⁴ DULLES, *Models*, pp. 179-192.

better understanding of the methodological consistency of the system and will also explain how exactly the system works in various circumstances of ecclesial life.

Each of the criteria drawn from the broader theological context of the conciliar documents and presented in this thesis has its own significance and is intended to resolve a variety of very urgent ecclesiological problems that harm the authentic ecclesial identities of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. Each of the criteria also has its own values, its own language and terminology, as well as its own tasks, potential and specific ways of implementation into the ecclesial life of concrete communities of Christians. Nevertheless, each of the criteria also has its own weaknesses and limitations that do not allow any of them to be regarded as self-sufficient and to present a clear image of a Particular Church's identity in its fullness. There is no super-criterion, nor a set of criteria which is superior to another set, for they all have equally significant roles in the story of a Particular Church's historical development. What is more, any of the criteria taken in isolation and interpreted in an exclusivistic sense as combining values of all the other criteria could lead a Church of the Catholic communion to very serious ecclesiological imbalances and deformations impeding its organic development.⁵⁴⁵

Despite the fact that many of the criteria seem to be contrastingly different, the tension that exists among them is of an antinomic character, and, therefore, must not be resolved, but preserved in order to present a clearer understanding of the Particular Church's integrity. The overstressing of one of the poles of the various antinomic couplets may result in dangerous distortions misrepresenting the authentic content of ecclesial particularity. Overemphasis on the first criterion (return to roots) may lead to destructive

⁵⁴⁵ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 20.

ecclesiological nostalgia and “traditionalism” hostile to change. The isolation of the next four criteria (particular theology, liturgy, spirituality, and legislation) from the general context of the system may produce feelings of self-sufficiency and complacent narcissism. The sixth criterion (preservation of communion), taken separately from the others, can provoke over-centralization, uniformity and soteriological exclusivism. Finally, overstressing the seventh criterion (ecumenism and universal integration) can become a source of centrifugal alienation, disrespected for one’s own values, and religious indifferentism.

Even if some of the criteria seem sometimes to contradict each other and to be mutually antithetical, they in fact represent different aspects of the same ecclesial picture and, therefore, have to be more properly regarded as being interrelated and interdependent in following one and the same aim of demonstrating the internal integrity of a Particular Church’s ecclesial identity and vocation. Patristic scholars may be more interested in the first criterion, while systematic theologians, liturgists, and ecumenists may have greater affinity for other criteria. Nonetheless, if their goal is ultimately directed at clarifying the Church’s ecclesial nature and mission, they will in the final analysis need to verify their findings in the light of the rest of the criteria. In order to avoid the danger of “ecclesiastical schizophrenia,” special interest in the reform of a particular liturgy (3^d criterion) has to be placed in the context of particular theology and spirituality (2^d and 5th criteria).⁵⁴⁶

The risk of revolutionary innovations in the course of development of various particularities (2^d to 5th criteria) can be greatly minimized by faithfulness to the authentic sources of the particular Tradition and the principles of proper and organic development (1st

⁵⁴⁶ SCHMEMANN, “Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches,” p. 387.

criterion). The chances that a Particular Church will be too strongly preoccupied with herself (1st to 5th criteria) can be brought to a minimum by her openness to other Churches within and outside the Catholic communion of Churches (6th and 7th criteria) in the same way as threats of religious syncretism and ecclesiastical indifferentism (6th and 7th criteria) can be more easily avoided through the fostering of esteem for a Particular Church's own values (1st to 5th criteria).

The genuine care for preservation of the already existing ecclesiastical communion (6th criterion) should not exclude the possibility and even necessity of inter-confessional rapprochement (7th criterion). At the same time, no ecumenical or inter-religious activities (7th criterion) should cause disagreements or even divisions within the Catholic communion of Churches (6th criterion).

Thus, it should become obvious, that there exists a strong internal balance among the various criteria that has to be preserved by building one criterion upon the other in search of their genuinely complementary contents. None of the criteria can be underestimated or excluded from the system, for only all of them, understood as an undivided whole, can effectively serve as an interpretive matrix for an assessment of the authenticity of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity.

At several different points in this thesis I have already mentioned that the concept of ecclesial identity (the Church's inner nature) and the notion of ecclesial vocation (the Church's mission) are two inseparable realities that cannot exist apart from each other. There should be no ecclesial identity so closed in upon itself that it does not flow into a realization of the ecclesial vocation that comes from the very essence of the Church and in its turn gives meaning to any Church's existence. At the same time, there can be no clear

sense of the Church's vocation without sufficient knowledge of the ecclesial identity that plays the role of the source of any ecclesial mission.⁵⁴⁷ In the contemporary circumstances of life when the Church finds herself in a state of division and in need of her constant renewal,⁵⁴⁸ an authentic understanding of the ecclesial identity and vocation of any Particular Church of the Catholic communion can be grasped as a result of the sincere search for the answer to three questions that are fundamental in this regard: "Who are you as a Church?"; "What are you doing for your own renewal?"; and "What are you doing to serve other Churches in their renewal?"⁵⁴⁹

On the level of my interpretive system, the interdependence between the Church's identity and her vocation is represented correspondingly by the first five and the last two criteria. The first five criteria are intended to explain who we are as a Particular Church, while the remaining two criteria, concerning our relations with other Churches within and outside the Catholic communion, help us to get a clearer understanding of what we can do in order to appreciate, to serve, and to love our neighbors. These two different blocks of the criteria as much complement each other as each single criterion is complemented by the rest of the criteria of the entire interpretive system.

Interdependence also exists between the principles of "preservation" (protection) and "growth" (development) of particular ecclesial Traditions. Both of them are also absolutely complementary and, because of this, Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* employs both of these concepts in one and the same paragraph cited

⁵⁴⁷ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 118-119.

⁵⁴⁸ STRANSKY, *The Decree on Ecumenism*, p. 33.

⁵⁴⁹ STRANSKY, "The Decree on Ecumenism: An Analysis," p. 21.

earlier in the text of this thesis.⁵⁵⁰ The commentators of the Decree, likewise, explain both of these principles as being equally significant and closely interrelated:

The particular Churches ought to be protected and defended from everything that could harm them or against any action that could be detrimental to them. In other words, they ought to be defended for their existence and preservation and for their maintenance, whether of their rites and traditions or of their rights and obligations: for such is the desire of the Catholic Church and such is the exigency of the very nature of the particular Churches. But a merely defensive provision could often turn out to be insufficient for the protection and preservation of these Churches; it could even produce occasionally the opposite effect, a kind of anemia, which would render them incapable of fulfilling their proper mission. No living organism can survive simply on defense, remaining in a static condition. It should grow and develop and reach its proper perfection.⁵⁵¹

For development, too, is and must be the work primarily of the Spirit. Only he who lives Tradition and is penetrated by it through study, meditation, and prayer will be able to work fruitfully for development. Otherwise he would be taking giant strides away from the right path. The development would be development outside the tradition; it would be betrayal and infidelity; it would be lost effort and wasted dedication.... There exists a tension, then, between dynamic development and constant tradition. Balance is not easy; it is not even clear just where it lies. But it is urgent that we reach a balance. The achievement of it takes time, serenity, maturity, love, study, dialogue, and a great deal of prayer.⁵⁵²

In the context of my interpretive system once again the mutual relationship between the concepts of “preservation” and “development” is reflected as interdependence between the first five and the last two criteria. All at once, the balance between the static and dynamic aspects of the particular ecclesial identity can also be detected even on the level of each of the criteria taken separately. The first criterion that is concerned with the genuine sources of a particular Tradition shows deep respect for the once-and-for-all given sacred

⁵⁵⁰ OE 4, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 901.

⁵⁵¹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 215.

⁵⁵² KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, pp. 119-120, 122.

texts of the Holy Scripture and writings of the Fathers of the Church, as well as the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils and various particular sources given to each of the Churches of the Catholic communion. Nevertheless, it does not mean that their understanding has to be one and the same in all places and for all times. Each Christian generation receives the Gospel and Tradition in its own way. Furthermore, Revelation cannot be limited only to past centuries, for it is still actively present in the contemporary Church, creating new traditional sources and giving new shape to the ancient Traditions of each of the Particular Churches.

The same can be said about the next four criteria, which are firmly based on the preservation of the same deposit of faith, the same Christian piety and the same Church structure received directly from Christ and his Apostles and, at the same time, open to different interpretations, different liturgical expressions and different experiences of God's presence in the midst of the particular ecclesial communities. The sixth and the seventh criteria, in their turn, exploring the question of integration on various ecclesiastical levels and underlining the existence of the invisible unity among all the peoples of the earth that has been already achieved by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, also have to admit the reality of divisions in the Church and in the world. The Kingdom of God is already present among us, but at the same time, it is still to come. Universal re-integration has been already accomplished by Christ, but it has to be freely accepted, and manifested by the Church if she intends to fulfill her mission ultimately aimed at eliminating all the existing divisions (not diversities) within and outside her visible boundaries.

Vatican II's principle of "unity and diversity," as well as the four "marks" of the Church confessed in the Nicene Creed, can also be explained by the use of my interpretive

system.⁵⁵³ The Church is One because there is only one message of Christ expressed through the Gospel and various sources of the Tradition (1st criterion, return to the traditional roots); there is also only one deposit of faith (2^d criterion, particular theology), one Baptism and Eucharist (3^d criterion, particular liturgy), one ecclesiastical structure built on the College of the Apostles (4th criterion, particular legislation), one set of commandments and one example for imitation (5th criterion, particular spirituality), and one salvific mission directed towards integration of the whole world in the community of the Church of Christ (6th and 7th criteria, preservation and contribution to the already existing communion of the Particular Churches and work towards inter-confessional rapprochement, inter-religious dialogue, and universal integration).

The Church is holy because she derives her holiness from God who revealed himself to us (1st criterion),⁵⁵⁴ she is also holy because she believes in God (2^d criterion), worships God (3^d criterion), obeys and lives in God (4th and 5th criteria), and desires to share the divine gifts with others serving them and trying to bring them to perfection (6th and 7th criteria).

The Church is catholic because God's Revelation is for all creation, all races, all nations, and all ages (1st criterion). The Church is also catholic because she respects all legitimate diversities, being fully aware that they do not destroy catholicity but contribute to it, making it richer, deeper, and much more colorful in spectrum (2^d to 5th criteria) and tend to enlighten, evangelize, transfigure, and integrate the entire world into the life with God and in God that will be fully realized at the end of time (6th and 7th criteria).

⁵⁵³ BEAUPÈRE, "What Sort of Unity?" p. 192.

⁵⁵⁴ The listing of all seven criteria on one page in easy-to-read format can be found in the "Abstract" of my thesis.

The Church is apostolic because she is founded on the Community of the Apostles and their faithful transmission of the original message of Christ (1st criterion). Each of the members of the Apostolic College had his own personality as well as his own understanding and experience of communication with Christ and, at the same time, all of the Apostles were united among themselves by the same message of Christ, the same Eucharist, the same standards of Christian living, and the same discipline including respect for the place Peter (2^d and 6th criteria). All of the Apostles were co-citizens, and at the same time they were all sent to different parts of the known world in order to proclaim the Good News to all peoples and to bring them all to the life in God (7th criterion).

The unity of the Church and the integration of the entire world in the coming Kingdom, which are ultimately aimed at elimination of all divisions (6th and 7th criteria), have to be properly regarded as being just as important as the existing diversities in the Church and in the world that help us protect our personal and ecclesial individualities from the danger of assimilation (1st to 5th criteria). If our personal and ecclesial identities are not going to be absorbed by God's divinity even after our death and even after the second coming of the Lord, then it is absolutely natural for us to preserve and develop them while we are still here on earth. My interpretive system allows one to assess and get a better knowledge of their own ecclesial identities, and therefore, one can benefit from using a system like this and applying it to different aspects of ecclesial life in order not to stray from the unique paths that lead each of us to one and the same destination point in the future Kingdom of God and the new Jerusalem.

II.3.2. Theological Evaluation of the System

In accord with Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism*, which designated the Church as a "mystery that finds its highest model and source in the unity of the persons of the Trinity" (*UR 2*),⁵⁵⁵ and in keeping with the insights of Joseph Ratzinger, in whose opinion the Holy Trinity constitutes the "true framework for every ecclesiology,"⁵⁵⁶ my interpretive system is likewise deeply concerned with understanding ecclesial identity as an authentic reflection of the unity in diversity that exists on the level of the Holy Trinity. Limited human intellect is not capable of comprehending the ineffable paradoxical logic of the inner Trinitarian life, according to which one plus one still equals one. However, we can get a much better knowledge and experience of God when we take a closer look at the Church which, being made in the image and likeness of Christ and the Trinity, truly manifests all the basic Trinitarian and Christological antinomies in her own life.

In the same way as in the Trinity the plurality of Divine Persons does not contradict the essential unity on the level of Divine Nature, the diversity of the various Particular Churches does not put at risk the essential unity of the Catholic communion of Churches. There is only one Church of God united by the same identity and the same mission, but, at the same time, there is also a communion of the Particular Churches, each with her own identity and vocation. This genuinely antinomic approach gives fuller expression to the mystery of the Church understood as an image of the Holy Trinity.

The universality of the Church should not overshadow the significance of her particular dimension, and *vice versa*. Unity in the Church does not mean uniformity, and it

⁵⁵⁵ *UR 2*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 909. See also *LG 4*, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 851 and Augustin BEA, "The Decree on Ecumenism - I," in *The Month* 33:3 (1965), p. 148.

⁵⁵⁶ RATZINGER, *Konstitution uber die Kirche*, p. 14 and HARKIANAKIS, "The Ecclesiology of Vatican II," p. 246.

presupposes diversity, while at the same time legitimate diversity does not exclude unity, and in fact contributes to it. This dynamic is intrinsic to the very nature (identity) of the Church, and therefore, is also reflected on the level of the inter-dependence among various criteria of my interpretive system, which equally stresses the significance of the universal and particular dimensions in the Church. What is unique about my system is its original approach, which starts from particularity and only then moves to universality, while many other interpretive systems, like that of Avery Dulles, seem to approach the mystery of the Church starting from her unity and only then move to her diversity.

The same distinction exists in the field of Trinitarian theology, where Eastern theologians are inclined to start their reflections from the plurality of Divine Persons and then approach their unity, while it is much easier for the Western mindset to start meditation on the mystery of the Holy Trinity from Divine unity gradually moving on to plurality on the hypostatic level. In my opinion, both approaches in Triadology and Ecclesiology have the right to exist, since they are equally important and absolutely complementary. What is essential for all of us is to recognize the Holy Trinity in the ecclesial identities of our respective Churches as well as in the various interpretive systems aimed at a better understanding and exploration of these identities.

1. *Trinitarian Dimension of the System*: As I already said, a corresponding analogy can be detected between the inter-relation of the criteria within my interpretive system, on the one hand, and the inter-relation of the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, on the other. Therefore, just as the Father is the Maker of heaven and the earth and the source of everything that exists and will ever exist, the 1st criterion (faithfulness to the authentic roots of the particular Tradition) plays the role of the source and foundation for all other criteria

of my entire interpretive system. In the same way as Christ did not hesitate to remind his followers that he came into this world in order not to reveal his own will but the will of his Father, all the criteria of the system look back to the 1st criterion, attempting to apply everything that has been said and written earlier to the contemporary circumstances of life.

By analogy to the Son, who continuously takes birth from the Father, the particular theology, liturgy, legislation and spirituality (2nd-5th criteria) are continuously taking birth from the sources of Revelation (1st criterion). Nevertheless, just as the uncreated Logos took upon himself human flesh and became a Jew, a male, and the son of his mother, living in a very concrete period of history, the Kingdom of God becomes incarnate in the concrete Churches with all of their distinctive features (2nd -5th criteria). The One who was the ineffable Truth, the Way, and the Life spoke to us in concrete language and by the use of concrete expressions (symbols and parables) in the same way as the hidden deposit of faith becomes known to us through the use of concrete theological formulations adapted to the concrete circumstances of life of the worshipping Christian community (2nd-5th criteria). There is only one Gospel, one faith, one truth, and one way to the Father through the Son, but they all take flesh in different expressions, different languages, different historical and cultural situations, different ways of experiencing life in Christ. All, as individual persons and particular ecclesial bodies, share the same goal of becoming as perfect as our Heavenly Father; yet, in order to reach this goal, each culture, nation, and Particular Church choose their own ways of theologizing, worship and life, those most suitable to their mentality and temperament (2nd-5th criteria).

According to Iakovos Canavaris, everything in the Church “finds its meaning and its expression in the incarnation” and because of this is “subject to God’s salvation.”⁵⁵⁷ If any of the Particular Churches refuses to follow her own authentic ways of worshipping and reflecting the divine mysteries, it will, in the words of René Beaupère, inevitably lead these Churches to the “betrayal of the very principle of incarnation.”⁵⁵⁸ In support of this, Clemente Pujol noted that following any of the particular rites, “whether Oriental or Latin,” means to accept them in their totality as being “incarnate and expressed in the everyday life of the people.”

The rites are in fact a definite form of life, of practicing the Christian religion: they are as it were an incarnation of the gospel teaching received by each believer under the garb that best suits his temperament, his situation, his mode of thinking and acting; so much so that the different formulae, the different rites and liturgical actions, as well as the various ways of administering the sacraments and of celebrating the sacred liturgy, and even the several types of hierarchical government are nothing but a particular form of receiving the teaching of the Gospel, of living it and making of it a living spirit. It is precisely for this that diverse rites grew up in the Church; and it is precisely for this that Christ wanted to give to his Church an almost infinite capacity to adapt itself to the temperament and character of each people, so that every man, every nation may without betraying himself of itself, accept and live the Gospel. And the Church must honour the will of its founder, as it has always done indeed by giving shape to particular Churches. Now, to deprive the faithful of the possibility to practice their own rite and in a way to force them to conform to another mode of life, would surely not be to provide for their spiritual good. And this applies to all Christians, whatever rite they might belong to.⁵⁵⁹

⁵⁵⁷ Iakovos CANAVARIS, *The Ecclesiology of Yves Congar: An Orthodox Evaluation* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1971), p. 118.

⁵⁵⁸ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 205.

⁵⁵⁹ PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” pp. 221-222.

The Holy Spirit is often referred to in various theological sources as the “Spirit of unity,”⁵⁶⁰ and, therefore, this perfectly corresponds to the 6th and the 7th criteria of my interpretive system. The Holy Spirit was always actively present in the entire history of salvation, but he was also in a special way sent after the resurrection and ascension of Christ in order to strengthen the still very weak community of Christ’s followers and to make them the one and holy People of God. The establishment of the original unity that existed on the level of the College of the Twelve, as well as on the level of the ancient Church (6th criterion), was due to the direct inspiration of the Comforter, who provided the disciples of Christ with a clear sense of their common and personal missions awakening their individual vocations (7th criterion) and making them apostles and the heads of the Particular Churches. The Spirit did not suppress the human individualities of any of Christ’s disciples but reinforced them with his special gifts. He took simple and sinful men and made each and all of them the living stones and foundations of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. In the same way as the Son offered to the community of his disciples the new sense of their religious identity (1st-5th criteria), the Holy Spirit granted them the new sense of their mission and vocation, ultimately aimed at bringing all peoples living on earth to unity among themselves and with the Father through the Son (6th and 7th criteria).

Just as the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son as a separate source, but proceeds from the Father through the Son, the already existing and still desirable unity in the Church (6th and 7th criteria) does not come from the particularities (2nd-5th criteria) but proceeds from the faithfulness of a Particular Church to her traditional roots (1st criterion)

⁵⁶⁰ STRANSKY, “The Decree on Ecumenism: An Analysis,” p. 20.

manifested through her particular features (2nd-5th criteria). If all the actions of the Holy Trinity *ad extra* can be regarded as being common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, then, by analogy, the presence of all Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity can be recognized both on the level of my entire interpretive system in general and on the level of each of its criteria in particular.

Each of the criteria represents the will of the Father realized through the Son and accomplished by the Holy Spirit. In the same way as the Father continuously gives birth to the Son and as the Spirit continuously proceeds from the Father, all the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity are continuously present in the life of the gradually developing Particular Church that constantly creates new sources of her Tradition (1st criterion), searches for new ways of expression of divine truth (2nd criterion), new experiences in the context of worship (3rd criterion), new improvements in the life of Christian communities (4th and 5th criteria), and new approaches to the preservation and restoration of Christian unity, as well as to evangelization and the integration of the entire universe (6th and 7th criteria).

2. Christological Dimension of the System: The incarnation of the uncreated Logos should not be understood simply as God's reaction to the original sin of Adam and Eve but as a part of the original intention of the Father, who already before the creation of all things knew that he would fully reveal himself through his Son and his message expressed in the human words of the Gospel and many other sources of the Tradition (1st criterion). This is why the incarnation of Christ and his earthly life may serve as a key to a better understanding ecclesial particularity (2nd-5th criteria) and vocation (6th and 7th criteria). Christ was the only-begotten and uncreated Son of the Heavenly Father, but he took flesh from the Virgin Mary in the very particular circumstances of life (2nd-5th criteria). He was

the Eternal Logos, but he also entered the world in a very concrete period of human history (2nd-5th criteria). He was the fullness of Truth, but he also formulated his wisdom in line with a Semitic type of thinking and preferred to teach by the use of parables, making himself clear even for peasants (2nd criterion). He was absolutely perfect as God and as a man, but he allowed himself to be circumcised, named and sacrificed to God in accordance with Jewish religious tradition (3rd criterion). He attended the Capernaum synagogue and the Temple of Jerusalem, he celebrated Jewish feasts and used to go on pilgrimages (3rd criterion). As God, he was present everywhere, but as man he chose Bethlehem as his birth place, Nazareth as the place of his childhood, Judea and Galilee as the territory of proclaiming his Gospel, and Jerusalem as the place of his death and resurrection (4th criterion). He was the Son of the Almighty God and the Ruler of the Universe, but he was also obedient to his earthly parents, and he respected the laws of the Old Testament and even the laws of the Roman Empire (4th criterion). He created the whole world, but he was also raised in the context of a concrete family and concrete nation with their specific cultural traditions and spiritualities (5th criterion). We suppose that he was raised on local fairytales, he sang local songs, danced local dances, and his works as a carpenter were pieces of local craftsmanship (5th criterion).

The mission of Christ can be properly explained in terms of the re-integration on many different levels that has been accomplished already by his incarnation. He became man so that man may become God. He accepted everything that is human in order to heal the entire human nature. He brought heaven to earth and raised earth up to heaven. He re-established a firm relation between God and humanity in order to overcome all the existing divisions in the world caused by human sin (6th and 7th criteria).

Similarly to the hypostatic union of two distinct natures in one hypostasis of Jesus Christ, the Church as his Mystical Body also comprises together in union without confusion the divine and human, the heavenly and earthly elements which can be regarded as being equally constituent to her charismatic and institutional life. My interpretive system as a whole, and each of its criteria in particular, likewise reflect the human and divine dimensions of the ecclesial identity and vocation of each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. The authentic sources of any of the particular ecclesiastical Traditions are simultaneously of divine and human origin, since they represent the incarnation of revealed truths in the writings of the concrete authors with their distinct intellectual abilities, cultural differences and skills (1st criterion).

The divine depth of the deposit of faith could not be expressed by a single theological definition and, therefore, needs to be approached in a number of different ways and by the employment of different terms and concepts (2nd criterion). The theology, liturgy, legislation, and spirituality of any of the Particular Churches reflect divine wisdom, heavenly beauty, perfect order, and the life of grace, but they are also incarnated in the concrete expressions, traditional customs and rituals, discipline, and very concrete examples of Christian living peculiar to certain historical periods and very specific cultural environments (2nd-5th criteria). The union of the entire Universe has already been achieved by the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ, but the Church still has to protect her existing unity (6th criterion) and struggle with a large number of sinful divisions in the Church and in the world in order to fulfill her mission of the integration of the entire cosmos into Eucharistic communion with God (7th criterion).

The identity (1st-5th criteria) and vocation (6th and 7th criteria) of a Particular Church are two different realities which, however, cannot exist one without the other, similarly to the mystery of the hypostatic union without confusion, simultaneously comprising human and divine natures in one and the same Person of the incarnated Logos. Nevertheless, this does not exclude the possibility of inter-dependence and mutual inter-penetration between the ecclesial nature and mission of a given Church by analogy to the theological principle of *perichoresis* or *communicatio idiomatum*, explaining the interchange of properties that exists between the divine and human natures in Christ.

3. *Soteriological Dimension of the System*: The identity and vocation of any Particular Church of the Catholic communion comes directly from the identity and mission of Christ, who came into this world not to condemn but to save it (Jn. 12:47). The life of the Savior was a perfect example of self-giving service and self-emptying sacrifice on the way to glorious resurrection. In the same way, the Church may reach her ultimate goal, which is union with God (*theosis*), only through sincere conversion (*metanoia*), self-emptying (*kenosis*), and self-purification (*katharsis*). These dynamics can best be described by the concept of “self-giving,” which can be regarded as the most important motto of Christ’s life and mission, and, correspondingly, very clearly manifests the antinomic interplay that exists between the ecclesial identity of a Particular Church represented by the word “self” (1st-5th criteria) and her vocation represented by the word “giving” (6th and 7th criteria).

A Christian is never saved by him-“self” or her-“self,” because salvation is a gift of God that we receive only in the context of our “giving” and “serving.” “Self-giving” service for others always presupposes the communal (ecclesial) dimension of authentic

Christian life. A person enters the monastery or gets married not solely for his or her own sake, but in order to serve his or her loved ones. In a similar way, a Particular Church does not exist in this world for her own sake alone, condemning or excluding everyone who does not belong to her, but, being a genuine “sacrament of universal salvation,” she manifests her authentic identity and vocation in the context of dedicating her life for others.

Christ has given his own life on the cross in order to reveal his love for humanity and to overcome the divisions that came about as a result of human sin. By doing so he restored the original unity between God and his creation, between heaven and earth, between the human spirit and human flesh. Nevertheless, he did not deprive human beings of their free will, which still leads many of them to the destructive realization of their selfishness through all kinds of abuses, such as racism, nationalism, sexism and many other –isms.

The mission of Christ has now been adopted by the Church which, being conscious of her supernatural identity (1st-5th criteria), does not hesitate to engage herself in all kinds of integrating activities, such as ecumenism, inter-religious dialogue, evangelization, humanization, peacemaking, charitable cooperation, and so on, which all together are oriented towards the completion of one and the same goal, which is the salvation of the entire universe and the restoration of the ultimate union of all creation with God (6th and 7th criteria).

4. *Eschatological Dimension of the System*: My entire interpretive system in general, and all of its criteria in particular, have an apparent eschatological connotation. The Father is the source and, at the same time, the ultimate goal for all creation. Therefore, attempting to recover the authentic meaning of the sources of our respective Traditions (1st

criterion), we are simultaneously approaching the end of history, in which the whole truth will be revealed. The development of particular theology, liturgy, legislation and spirituality demonstrates the richness of our life in God (2nd-5th criteria). Theology helps us to contemplate the invisible reality which is already mystically present in the life of our respective Churches and at the same time is still to come (2nd criterion). The liturgy brings heaven down to earth, giving us a taste of the things that still await us in the future (3rd criterion). Legislation introduces us to a better understanding of the divine order that will exist in the entire universe at the end of time (4th criterion). Spirituality gives us an opportunity to experience an intimate union with God that transcends any limitations of time and space (5th criterion). The full and visible unity that already exists among some of the Churches gives us a foretaste of the brotherly loving communion that, according to the will of Christ, will be restored in the future (6th criterion) and is an image of the life of the Trinity. The reestablishment of visible unity in the Church and the reintegration of the entire world that can be accomplished by means of ecumenical rapprochement, inter-religious dialogue, spiritual renewal, social and charitable work, evangelization and humanization is the most significant eschatological task of the Church, constantly moving towards her eventual encounter with God (7th criterion). The eschatological dimension of my interpretive system also becomes apparent in view of the fact that it can be applied to assess the ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Particular Churches that existed in the past, exist at the present time, or will exist in the future.

III. THE APPLICATION OF THE SEVEN-FOLD SYSTEM TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE ECCLESIAL IDENTITY AND VOCATION OF THE KYIVAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AS REVEALED IN THE PAPERS OF THE KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP

III.1. The Question of the Practical Possibility of Applying an Interpretative System to the Assessment of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of a Concrete Particular Church of the Catholic Communion

In the previous chapters of this thesis I made an attempt to present an evaluation of the mid-twentieth century changes in the ecclesiology of the Catholic Church with special emphasis on the gradual development of the self-perception of this Church as a communion of Churches. This communion unites within itself a multiplicity of particular ecclesial bodies, all of which have equal rights, equal dignity and the fullness of ecclesial life, subsisting in the Catholic Church.

As noted already, each of these Particular Churches also possesses a distinct ecclesial identity and vocation, which can never be entirely lost for the reason that they spring from the very fact of their existence. In order to be operative and to serve as a foundation for the process of ecclesial development, these particular identities and missions need to be realized in concrete circumstances rather than remain a theoretical desideratum.

Unfortunately, during various times and for a variety of reasons nearly all of the Churches of the Catholic communion became estranged – to a lesser or greater degree – from their true identities and authentic mission, failing to live up to their catholicity and to manifest their traditional values to the unbelieving world. In the present chapter, I will outline, analyze and evaluate the efforts of one group within a particular Church of the Catholic communion to work towards the elaboration of insights and principles that would

enable their Church to regain and manifest her particularity in the circumstances of the late twentieth century. The group is the Kyivan Church Study Group (KCSG).

Before providing a telegraphic overview of its work, however, let me note the importance of the following exercise in the context of the present dissertation. As hinted above, a test of Vatican II's success is the extent to which its decrees have been received by the Church, with "reception" understood in the ecclesio-theological sense. Even more importantly, however, is the question of whether the system that I have proposed in the preceding chapter possesses probity. Is it a system that reveals itself in concrete ecclesial initiatives – whether consciously or unconsciously? Analyzing the writings emanating from the KCSG will help us ascertain whether and how my system helps us evaluate these writings. Thus it is a heuristic device.

As we proceed, it will become evident that the members of the KCSG were generally faithful to the ecclesiological vision of Vatican II. Nonetheless, as we will see, the balance between the seven criteria – a balance that is crucial for the healthy growth of the organism known as the Body of Christ – was not always evident. However, throughout this chapter one must keep in mind that the KCSG did not set out, of course, to think according to the interpretative system that I have developed. Consequently, even though I will ultimately be using my interpretative system as a matrix for studying the thought of the KCSG, my focus on the Group makes this as much an exercise in comparative ecclesiology as it makes it a kind of case study for the application of my system. I must also stress this because, of course, the KCSG is not a Church per se, but a group of theologians. In sum, then, this chapter elaborates how my seven-fold system can be used to verify the presence or absence of a sound ecclesiology in a concrete manifestation of a Particular Church's life

without any suggestion that this concrete manifestation (the KCSG) was consciously following this system.

An Outline of the Kyivan Church Study Group's Work

I have written elsewhere about the genesis and history of the KCSG, and thus will not repeat myself here.¹ However, the following is a list of the venues, dates and participants in the seven meetings of the KCSG, along with their ecclesiastical affiliation.

Meeting no. 1 (Oxford, England, 8-10 August 1992)²

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware) (“The Church of God: Our Shared Vision” and “Response to the Presentation by His Grace, Bishop Basil (Losten): The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kyiv”)

Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) (“Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?”)

Archimandrite Ephrem (Lash) (“Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn: Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality”)

Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko (“Response to Borys Gudziak: How Did They Drift Apart?”)

Catholic: Bishop Basil (Losten) (“The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev”)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) (Response to the Presentation by

¹ Yuriy SAKVUK, “The Genesis and History of the Kyivan Church Study Group: Reflections on the Eve of Its Twentieth Anniversary,” in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, in press. The genesis and history of the KCSG were also treated in MAJDANSKY, “Orthodox-Catholic Reconciliation,” pp. 37-54 and HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koï Tserkvy,” pp. 417-447.

² The Oxford Papers and Responses of the KCSG were published in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 10-199.

Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos: “Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?”)

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky (“The Union of the Holy Churches of God: A Response to Bishop Kallistos [Ware] of Diokleia”)

Fr. Peter Galadza

Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn (“Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality”)

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Borys Gudziak (“How Did They Drift Apart? The Kievan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest”)

Meeting no. 2 (Stamford, Connecticut, USA, 12-14 October 1992)³

- Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware) (Towards an Orthodox Appreciation of the Roman Primacy)
- Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky)
- Archimandrite Ephrem (Lash)
- Archpriest Emmanuel Clapsis
- Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko (“Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: Sister Churches: Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content”)
- Archpriest Ihor (Kutash)
- Fr. Anthony Ugolnik (“An Anxiety of Influence: A Response to Archimandrite Boniface [Luykx]”)
- Catholic: Bishop Basil (Losten)
- Bishop Pavlo (Vasylyk)
- Bishop Julian (Voronovsky)

³ The First Stamford Papers and Responses of the KCSG were published in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 357-463.

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher) (“The Frising, Ariccia and Balamand Statements: An Analysis”)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) (“Thirty Years Later: Reflections on Vatican II’s *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*”)

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky (“Sister Churches: Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content”)

Fr. Peter Galadza

Fr. Roman Mirchuk

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Meeting no. 3 (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 21-23 April 1993)⁴

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware) (“Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: Towards an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church”)

Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky)

Archpriest Emmanuel Clapsis

Archpriest Ihor (Kutash) (“Response to Fr. Andrew Onuferko: The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches”)

Fr. Anthony Ugolnik (“Liturgical Drift and the Hermeneutic of Survival: Response to Fr. Peter Galadza: Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism”)

Roman Yereniuk

Catholic: Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk)

Bishop Basil (Losten)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx)

⁴ The Ottawa Papers and Responses of the KCSG were published in *Logos* 35 (1994), pp. 81-200. The KCSG’s “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft” can be found in *Logos* 35 (1994), pp. 79-81.

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky (“Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church”)

Fr. Peter Galadza (“Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism: Losing the Koine of Koinonia”)

Fr. Andrew Onuferko (“The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: Ecclesiological Presuppositions”)

Meeting no. 4 (Stamford, Connecticut, USA, 13-16 December 1993)⁵

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware)

Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) (“Response to Bishop Basil: Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority”)

Catholic: Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk)

Bishop Basil (Losten) (“Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority”)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky

Fr. Peter Galadza

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Borys Gudziak

Meeting no. 5 (Chevetogne, Belgium, 1-3 August 1994)⁶

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware)

Archimandrite Ephrem (Lash)

Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko

⁵ The Second Stamford Papers and Responses of the KCSG were published in *Logos* 35 (1994), pp. 201-255.

⁶ The Chevetogne Statement on the “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes” was published in *Logos* 36 (1995), pp. 268-270.

Archpriest Theodore van der Voort

Archpriest Nicholas Ozoline

Catholic: Bishop Michael (Koltun)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx)

Fr. Graham Woolfenden

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Fr. Nicholas Makar

Meeting no. 6 (Rome, Italy, 23-30 June 1995)⁷

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware)

Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) (“Divisions and Healing: Brest and Beyond”)

Archimandrite Ephrem (Lash)

Archimandrite Andriy (Partykevich)

Archpriest Theodore van der Voort

Roman Yereniuk

Catholic: Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk)

Bishop Basil (Losten)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx)

Fr. Graham Woolfenden

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky (“Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos: Divisions and Healing: Brest and Beyond”)

⁷ The Rome Papers and Responses of the KCSG were published in *Logos* 36 (1995), pp. 133-161.

Fr. Peter Galadza

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Fr. Nicholas Makar

Borys Gudziak

Meeting no. 7 (Istanbul/Halki, Turkey, 16-20 April 1996)⁸

Orthodox: Bishop Kallistos (Ware)

Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) (“‘Mediate’ and ‘nearly perfect’ Communion?: Towards full communion”)

Archbishop Anthony (Shcherba)

Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko

Fr. Anthony Ugolnik

Roman Yereniuk

Catholic: Bishop Julian (Voronovsky)

Bishop Basil (Losten)

Archimandrite Serge (Keleher)

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx)

Fr. Graham Woolfenden

Fr. Andriy Chirovsky

Fr. Peter Galadza

Fr. Andrew Onuferko

Borys Gudziak

⁸ The Istanbul/Halki Paper of Archbishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) was published in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 7-22. The KCSG’s “Statement on the Church of Antioch Initiative” was also published in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 73-74.

Before proceeding, however, I must deal with several more preliminaries. First, why the KCSG? To begin with, for obvious methodological reasons the present dissertation cannot examine the present state of ecclesial self-perception of an *entire* Church (and certainly not that of *all* of the Particular Churches!). This would require at least several – if not several hundred – volumes. If I had attempted to analyze the ecclesial identity of the Kyivan Catholic Church as a whole, the breadth of all of the aspects of her lived ecclesial experience would have proven to be overwhelming. This experience varies considerably depending on whether one speaks of the clergy or the majority of faithful, the Westernizing Order of Basilians or the Easternizing Studites, the Church in Ukraine or in the places of her settlement in the Americas, Europe and Australia.

Nevertheless, what can be accomplished is to concentrate on certain prominent expressions of the ecclesial identity and vocation of a given Particular Church that emanate from particular phenomena, such as a set of texts composed by representatives of this Church which manifest a vision of the inner nature and mission of their ecclesiastical community. The number of such texts in the case of the Kyivan Catholic Church is limited. Thus, they can be duly analyzed and evaluated with the help of a well-defined and limited methodology.

In the previous chapters of my thesis I analyzed and evaluated a specific vision of the ecclesial identity and vocation of the entire Catholic Church that emanate from three conciliar documents. Now, turning to the Particular Church that I am most competent to write on, and which also sorely lacks ecclesiological reflection, that is, my own Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv, I propose to analyze the papers of the KCSG.

Of course, there is a variety of other Ukrainian Catholic texts that could have been examined by the use of my interpretative system. These range from the early writings composed in the period of Kyivan Rus'⁹ to the thirty-three Articles of the Union of Brest (which outline the conditions on which the bishops of the Kyivan Church signed their union with Rome,¹⁰) to the most recent decisions of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Patriarchal Council¹¹ and Synod of Bishops¹² that react to certain urgent challenges facing the contemporary Church. One could also have chosen to study the “Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church”¹³ and several similar documents produced by the Catholic Church of Kyiv within the last decade. Then there are the writings of the last four primates of the UGCC, namely Metropolitan Andrey (Sheptytsky) (especially his theological work “The Gift of Pentecost”¹⁴), Major Archbishops Josyf (Slipyj) (especially his Pastoral Letter “On the Unity in Christ”¹⁵ and his spiritual “Testament”¹⁶), Myroslav-

⁹ See ten volumes of Omeljan PRITSAK, Ihor SHEVCHENKO, eds., “Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations” (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1989-2003).

¹⁰ See “Articles Which We Need Guarantees from the Lord Romans before We Enter into Unity with the Roman Church,” in Borys GUDZIAK, “Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Genesis of the Union of Brest” (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1998), pp. 264-272.

¹¹ See Mykhaïlo DYMID, ed., “Dokumenty Patriarshoho Soboru Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolyts’koï Tserkvy [Documents of the Patriarchal Council of the UGCC]” (L’viv, 2002). It is instructive to note that the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches refers to such gatherings with the term *conventus patriarchalis*. The UGCC explicitly uses the term *Sobor*, which translates into English as “council.” This is an interesting example of how the Roman point of view sometimes differs on certain ecclesiological realities from that of the Eastern Catholic Churches.

¹² See “Rishennia i postanovy Synodiv Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolyts’koï Tserkvy, 1989-1997 [Decisions and Resolutions of the Synods of the UGCC, 1989-1997]” (L’viv, 1998).

¹³ See “Kontseptsiiia ekumenichnoï pozytsii Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolyts’koï Tserkvy [The Conception of the Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church],” in *Bohoslovia* 65:1-4 (2001), pp. 52-68.

¹⁴ Andreï SHEPTYTSKYĬ, “Dar Piatydesiatnytsi [The Gift of Pentecost],” in Andreï SHEPTYTSKYĬ, *Tvory: Asketychno-moral’ni* [Works: Ascetical-Moral] (L’viv: Svichado, 1994), pp. 417-456.

¹⁵ Īosyf SLIPYĬ, “Pro poiednannia v Khrysti [On the Unity in Christ],” in ANTONIUK, MARYNOVYCH, *Znaky Chasu*, pp. 143-145.

¹⁶ Īosyf SLIPYĬ, “Zavishchannia Blazhennishoho Patriiarkha Īosyfa Slipoho [Testament of His Beatitude Patriarch Josyf Slipyj],” in *Bohoslovia* 66:3-4 (2002), pp. 10-27.

Ivan (Lubachivsky) (especially his Pastoral Letter “On the Unity of the Holy Churches”¹⁷), and Lubomyr (Husar) (especially his Pastoral Letter “One People of God in the Land of the Hills of Kyiv”¹⁸). Nevertheless, right from the beginning of my work on this thesis my attention was drawn to another significant and not yet sufficiently evaluated initiative within my Church, that is, the KCSG.

Despite the fact that the Group last met over fourteen years ago, no other ecumenical initiative within the Church of Kyiv has managed to surpass or even to pick up and maintain the truly significant work undertaken by the KCSG.¹⁹ This fact leads me to the conclusion that the KCSG and its unique ecumenical effort remain one of the most successful corporate attempts aimed at clarification of the very nature and mission of several Kyivan Churches, including the Catholic Church of Kyiv.²⁰

¹⁷ LUBACHIVSKY, “Pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov,” pp. 461-484.

¹⁸ Lubomyr HUSAR, “One People of God in the Land of the Hills of Kyiv,” at <http://lib.ugcc.org.ua/2004/04-13/kyiv/>, accessed on 28 July 2009.

¹⁹ Andrew ONUFERKO, “Doslidnyts’ka Hrupa Kyivs’koï Tserkvy: Svoiechasna initsiatyva [The Kyivan Church Study Group: A Timely Initiative],” at http://www.ecumenicalstudies.org.ua/data/doc/friendship/onusferko_ukr.doc, accessed on 14 July 2009.

²⁰ The significance of the efforts undertaken by the KCSG in Oxford and all the subsequent consultations of the Group is fascinating and truly remarkable. Nevertheless, in attempting to recompose an accurate picture of the historical background and achievements of the KCSG, I cannot overlook certain facts (brought to my attention by the director of this thesis and one of the members of my Committee who also happened to be among the founding members of the KCSG) that stood behind the work of the Group placing it in a little different light. For instance, one would be surprised to learn that both Catholic and Orthodox co-chairs of the KCSG, Bishop Basil (Losten) and Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) quite often could not explain certain theological formulations emanating from their presentations and sometimes even had a hard time reading them for the reason that most of their papers in the actual fact were written by another member of the Group, Archimandrite Serge (Keleher). This occurrence, however, should not distract us from the fact that both of the above mentioned leading figures of the Group were sincerely dedicated to the work directed towards reconciliation between the presently divided Churches of the Kyivan Christian Tradition. The very fact that, being fully conscious that the papers published under their names would certainly carry the weight of their offices, Bishops Basil and Vsevolod still agreed to approve and to deliver the highly controversial texts discussing the Roman primacy and the possibility of re-establishment of the ecclesiastical communion of the Kyivan Catholic Church with Constantinople without severing her relations with the Church of Rome attests that these papers and responses deserve to be carefully studied and accorded due attention. Besides the fact that the texts presented by the Orthodox Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) were composed by the Greco-Catholic Archimandrite Serge (Keleher), one can also be perplexed by the generally perceptible insufficiency of active involvement in the work of the Group on the part of the majority of its Orthodox members who most of the time preferred merely to respond to the presentations delivered by the Greco-Catholics rather than to prepare

Thus, the theological legacy of the KCSG commends itself as a kind of case study and can serve as a quite suitable basis for the verification of the adequacy of my interpretative system of seven criteria by applying it to the assessment of a specific vision of the ecclesial identity and vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church as they were understood and explained by the members of the KCSG.

Of course, the reflections of the Catholic members of the KCSG on the ecclesial nature and mission of the Kyivan Catholic Church on the one hand, and the actual state of their Church's ecclesial self-perception on the other, cannot be regarded as being identical. In contrast to the KCSG, whose ecclesiological position seems to be consonant with most of the standpoints emphasized by this thesis, the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv still needs to undertake many efforts in order to come closer to a realization of her ecclesial particularity that would fully correspond to all seven criteria of my interpretative system. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the KCSG, having no binding ecclesial mandate, was merely a small group of hierarchs and theologians representing exclusively themselves, it managed to reveal the potential for the Kyivan Catholic Church to construct her particular identity based on a better understanding of her own traditional roots, dedication to the

the original papers of their own (the fine presentations composed by Bishop Kallistos (Ware) can be regarded as the only exceptions from the just indicated general tendency). In several consultations of the KCSG the Catholic members of the Group outnumbered Orthodox two to one and in the words of Fr. Peter Galadza, their participation would probably have been even smaller, if Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford had not agreed to fund most of the travel and accommodation expenses for the majority of the Orthodox members of the KCSG (that includes Bishop Basil's funding of the concluding meeting of the KCSG at the Phanar/Halki which was provided via generous donation to the Ecumenical Patriarchate). All these and many other facts can certainly raise a number of questions with regard to the Orthodox commitment to the rapprochement between Kyivan Orthodox and Greco-Catholics. Nevertheless, it is my contention that even our conscious awareness of the existence of certain nuances that lurk in the background of the workings of the KCSG should not prevent us from acknowledging the significance of the effort undertaken by the Group and in the same vein, should not lead us to the underestimation of the bold ideas with regard to the clarification of the Kyivan Catholic Church's ecclesial identity and mission which were carefully articulated by the Catholic members of the KCSG in their papers and responses and for that reason were chosen as a an appropriate case study and a suitable basis for the application of my interpretative system composed of seven criteria delineated from the pertinent documents of the Second Vatican Council.

development of her own theology, liturgy, canonical legislation, and spirituality, as well as on the understanding of her own place in the ecumenical dialogue and the Catholic communion of the Particular Churches. Therefore, the legacy of the Kyivan Church Study Group deserves to be studied in the hope that the ideas which were once expressed by its Catholic members would be eventually heard and implemented in their Church's actual life and thought.

III.2. An Assessment of the Vision of the Ecclesial Identity and Vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church as Expressed in the Papers of the Kyivan Church Study Group by Means of the Use of an Interpretative System Composed of Seven Criteria Delineated from the Documents of the Second Vatican Council

III.2.1. A Return to Authentic Traditional Roots and the Need for Proper and Organic Ecclesiastical Development in the Kyivan Catholic Church

Members of the KCSG who gathered for the consultation in 1994 in Chevetogne agreed to consider the following as the fundamental sources of all their discussions: (i) Holy Scripture (in the case of the Old Testament, the Septuagint); (ii) the Seven Ecumenical Councils (recognized by both East and West); (iii) the liturgical texts (received in Greek and Church-Slavonic); and (iv) the writings of the Holy Fathers.²¹ They also noted that "Divine Revelation is so overwhelmingly rich that one tradition alone (for example, the Roman) would be unable to express it adequately and make it available efficiently."²² Subsequently, they affirmed the "principle of incarnation," and indicated how the ecclesiastical form in which the Gospel is received by a concrete Particular Church is a

²¹ KCSG, "KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes," pp. 268-269.

²² Boniface LUYKX, "Response to the Presentation by Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos: Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?" in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 179. Compare with *OE* 2, 5, 7,

“pearl of great price” that needs to be cherished and faithfully preserved even if at times this “pearl” appears to be “mistreated and tarnished” or “discarded as a result of disinterest, carelessness, vanity and endless other vices.”²³ In the same program document the participants of the Group manifested their agreement in “recognizing the normative nature of the first millennium of the history of the Church, while realizing the relevance of development during the second millennium.”²⁴ This perfectly corresponds to the first criterion of my interpretative system, which emphasizes the importance of the return of a Particular Church to her authentic traditional roots without being overly anxious about later ecclesiastical developments which might be characterized as proper and organic.

In his paper at the Rome consultation on the division caused by the Union of Brest and the healing that must be achieved, Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) seemed to suggest that in the case of the Kyivan Church one can speak not only of the normative character of the first millennium but in fact of the normativity of the first sixteen centuries of Christian history. This is because up to the end of the sixteenth century, the Church of Kyiv was in full communion with the Great Church of Constantinople, and never – according to Vsevolod – formally broke her ecclesiastical ties with the Church of Rome.²⁵ Consequently,

²³ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 131.

²⁴ KCSG, “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” p. 269.

²⁵ The same opinion was articulated in Pope John Paul II’s address to the Ukrainian community of Buenos Aires (Argentina) in which he stated that the “painful and inevitable development of a gradual distancing between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople touched and enveloped the Kievan Church somewhat later. Regarding Western and Constantinopolitan Christianity, in general it is more proper to speak about a ‘gradually realized division’ rather than a ‘formal split.’ In any case, such a split never existed between Rome and Kiev” (John Paul II, “Discourse to the Ukrainian Community,” Buenos Aires, Argentina, 10 April 1987). This interesting approach expressed by Pope John Paul II in Buenos Aires seems to have been based on the popular assertion of certain Ukrainian Greco-Catholic and Orthodox churchmen and historians according to which the Church of Kyiv did not lose her ecclesiastical ties with Rome even after the act of mutual excommunication of 1054. Nevertheless, I have to admit that this rather mythological theory of the existence of unceasing communion between Rome and Kyiv is at minimum doubtful and not capable of holding up to scholarly critique. Even though, Illarion of Kyiv was actually the only Metropolitan of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate who did not sign the document condemning Cardinal Humbert and his

the events that took place in Brest in 1596, in the opinion of Bishop Vsevolod, had nothing to do with the reunion of the Kyivan Church with the Roman Church to which Kyivan Catholics were already united. The Union of Brest caused nothing else but the formal estrangement of the Church of Kyiv from the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the juridical subordination of this Church to the exceedingly centralized Roman Apostolic See.²⁶

One could certainly argue with Bishop Vsevolod's viewpoint,²⁷ yet, what was significant was that all of the participants of the KCSG mutually agreed that in order to heal the existing divisions, both Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox must "re-examine the painful

delegation. This cannot be regarded simply as a conscious and deliberate ecclesiological decision on the part of this Kyivan Metropolitan, but rather should be viewed as a consequence of the election of Illarion in 1051 without the consent of Constantinople because of which Illarion simply was not invited to the Constantinopolitan Synod of 1054 anathemizing papal legates. Likewise, the periodic contacts of various Kyivan hierarchs and noblemen with the Roman Apostolic See that in fact were taking place even after 1054 came about as a result of the geographical location of the Kyivan State that was situated between the Christian East and West rather than because of the existence of some kind of ongoing ecclesial communion between Kyiv and Rome. One would inevitably make an anachronistic mistake by presuming that there could possibly exist any "communion" of the Kyivan Church with the Church of Rome in the first part of the second millennium, since the Roman Apostolic See prior to and even after the Union of Brest was inclined to understand its relations with any of the Particular Churches exclusively in terms of subordination rather than communion. Finally, it would be more than strange for Pope Clement VIII to emphasize in his bull *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis* of 23 December 1595 that the future union of the Ruthenians with Rome would become an act of conversion of a group of schismatics to the one and the only true Church of God (CLEMENT VIII, *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis*, in VELYKY, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis*, p. 255), if we take for granted the assertion of Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) according to which the "members of the Church of Kiev were already Catholics long before 1596 and the expression 'union of Brest' is again a misnomer because nobody 'unites' with a Church to which he already belongs" (MAJDANSKY, "Divisions and Healing," p. 135).

²⁶ MAJDANSKY, "Divisions and Healing," pp. 134-135.

²⁷ In his "Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos," Fr. Andriy Chirovsky on the one hand, expresses his agreement with Bishop Vsevolod's assertion that the Union of Brest was the first division within the Kyivan Church that implied confessional differences but on the other hand, underlined that there were at least three other jurisdictional divisions within the Kyivan Church (caused by a certain Metropolitans of Kyiv abandoning their See and seeking refuge among the principalities of the North, the erection of a separate Metropolia by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the partition of the Kyivan Metropolia into the Upper and Lower territories after the failure of the Florentine Union) that rent this Church long before 1596 (CHIROVSKY, "Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos," pp. 154-156). In contrast to the generally negative evaluations of the Union of Brest articulated by Bishop Vsevolod (MAJDANSKY, "Divisions and Healing," pp. 134-137) as well as by Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko (see his "Response to Borys Gudziak," pp. 67-69), Dr. Borys Gudziak (now rector of the Ukrainian Catholic University) suggested that the Union of Brest has to be more properly perceived as an ultimate "reform" solving many problems with regard to a "crisis" experienced by the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its affiliated Churches since the fall of Constantinople in 1453 (GUDZIAK, "How Did They Drift Apart?" pp. 43-66).

past together” and arrive at a “calm, clear-sighted and truthful vision of things.”²⁸ This, they felt, can come about only as a result of their greater appreciation for the authentic traditional roots of Kyivan Christianity and as a consequence of their preparedness to “engage themselves in the admittedly complex task of developing a common historiography.”²⁹

This question received much attention already at the first consultation of the KCSG in Oxford which, more than any other consultation, was dedicated to the questions that in terms of Vatican II can be designated as *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento*.³⁰ The very fact that Borys Gudziak’s presentation on the genesis of the Union of Brest and the history of the gradual estrangement between the Kyivan Metropolitanate and the Patriarchate of Constantinople was placed second, right after Bishop Kallistos’ opening ecclesiological reflections, indicated that the KCSG would build its further discussions on the principle *ad fontes*. From the beginning it became clear that the development of a mutually acceptable interpretation of the Kyivan Church’s history should “constitute a point of departure for the fostering of a common future”³¹ of the Kyivan Orthodox and Catholics. In this context it should be noted that for the Orthodox participants of the KCSG it was a surprise to learn that even after four centuries of union with the Church of Rome, the Catholic members of the KCSG still regarded the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople as their Mother-

²⁸ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 134. Encouragements similar in content emanate from Pope John Paul II’s Encyclical Letter *Ut Unum Sint* (par. 2).

²⁹ The readiness to engage themselves in the process of development of a common Orthodox-Catholic historiography was mentioned by the participants of the KCSG in their “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” p. 81. The importance of this issue was also specially emphasized by two papers presented by Dr. Roman Yereniuk and Fr. Roman Mirchuk at the Ottawa consultation of the KCSG (“KCSG: Ottawa Consultation,” p. 78). Unfortunately, I cannot look at these texts in my further analysis of the work of the KCSG for the reason that they never appeared in print (see HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koï Tserkvy,” p. 442).

³⁰ LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” pp. 359-362.

³¹ GUDZIAK, “How Did They Drift Apart?” p. 66.

Church whose historical role can never be replaced by any other (even more powerful) ecclesiastical centers such as the Roman Apostolic See.

In his “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos” Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) made a clear distinction between on the one hand the role of the Mother-Church, that hands down the “divine heritage of a living faith” to her Daughter-Church, thereby establishing with her an everlasting “organic and ontological relationship” that can never be entirely broken on the one hand, and the role on the other hand of the divinely instituted Petrine Ministry functioning as the “Rock, the head and overseer of all the Churches.” The latter’s authority should not be “superimposed upon the deeper, more existential relationship of motherhood-in-faith, which is primary.”³² If in the West the preservation of the Holy Tradition was regarded as something directly linked with the Ministry of the Roman Pontiff as the main custodian of the Latin Church’s orthodoxy and orthopraxy, in the East Holy Tradition was not “seen as an institution, especially linked with the magisterium,” but rather as the “real and active presence of the Holy Spirit” realized through Holy Scripture and the Councils, the Church Fathers and saints, the Creeds, divine worship and iconography, all of which act together as the principal sources of the living Tradition. This Tradition could be provided only by one of the five Mother-Churches of the apostolic Pentarchy and not by the universal “Super-Church.”³³

Consequently, Archimandrite Boniface tended to regard the Tradition of his own Kyivan Catholic Church as remaining qualitatively the same natural extension of the heritage of her Mother-Church of Constantinople. Being as equally Apostolic as the Petrine Ministry itself, this heritage needs to be perceived by the Church of Rome as the Tradition

³² LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 189.

³³ Ibid., p. 194-195.

of a Sister-Church equal in dignity, which carries full responsibility for her own theology, spirituality, liturgy and legislation. These are authentic reflections of the unique incarnation of the Divine Revelation entrusted to her by the Holy Spirit.³⁴

The fact that the Catholic Church of Kyiv, according to *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, is entrusted to the vigilance and guidance of the Petrine Ministry does not mean that she must lose her authentic identity, which was formed owing to her intimate relations with her Mother-Church. The Church of Kyiv cannot merge with the another member of the Pentarchy to become an “insignificant appendage” to a “domineering Step-Mother.”³⁵ As Luykx pointed out, the Catholic Church is coming to the understanding that it is beyond the authority of the Roman Pontiff to “suppress or to alter substantially” the living Tradition of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion as they are all destined to co-exist as “adult” Sister-Churches, each with traditional values of equal worth and equal rights to self-determination.³⁶ According to Archimandrite Boniface, the unity of the Kyivan Church with Rome makes sense only if the Church of Rome, “which is at the same time endowed with the overarching task of the Petrine Ministry, distinct from her Romanità”³⁷ positively appreciates the contribution of the Kyivan Tradition to the enrichment of the Catholic heritage³⁸ and will not try to swallow it by a process of latinization.³⁹ Rome would thus help the Catholic Church of Kyiv to “develop her own

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 182-183, 190. Compare with *OE* 8 and the Encyclical Letter *Orientalium Dignitas* of Pope Leo XIII.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 182-183.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 183.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 183.

³⁸ The significance of this matter has already been emphasized by the Vatican II’s Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches.

³⁹ The term “latinization” that has already been several times mentioned in the previous chapters of my thesis can be interpreted in a number of different ways expressing sometimes contrastingly divergent theological viewpoints, all of which have the right to exist in the context of the contemporary pluralistic society.

identity more fully” and to “become more of a ‘Byzantine Church with a Ukrainian cultural setting,’ even if she – at this moment – has to develop or restore this identity against some latinizers in her own bosom.”⁴⁰

All of the benefits accruing from this mutually profitable model of relations among Sister-Churches of the Catholic communion were acknowledged only as a result of the changes in Catholic ecclesiological thinking that took place on the eve of Vatican II. Up to that moment, Kyivan Catholics, alienated from the authentic Byzantine roots of their

Nevertheless, at this very point of my work it becomes critically important to clearly define the precise meaning of this term as it is employed by the author of the current thesis. In my opinion, the concept of “latinization” stands for all elements of the Latin ecclesiastical Tradition that were imposed by the Roman Catholic Church onto non-Latin Churches or ecclesiastical communities and for a variety of different reasons accepted as more suitable substitutes for elements of their own respective Traditions. Evidently, not all of the borrowings have to be regarded as being necessarily negative. Quite the opposite, they can in fact, serve as very creative inspirations leading to new theological insights and ecclesiological models and at the same time securing non-Latin Churches from the immoderate purism, ecclesiastical sterility and many other dangers which were designated by one of the participants of the KCSG, Fr. Anthony Ugolnik as an “anxiety of influence” (Anthony UGOLNIK, “An Anxiety of Influence”: A Response to Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx),” in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 392-393). The same opinion was supported by another KCSG member, Fr. Peter Galadza who evaluated the more frequent receiving of the Eucharist among Eastern Catholics that came about as a result of Rome’s exhortation of 1905, *Sacra Tridentina Synodus* as a positive influence of the Latin Church on the Catholic Church of Kyiv in effect “re-establishing the common practice of the early Church” (GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 177). Consequently, in treating any latinizing influences it is always important to take under careful consideration the origins of their occurrence, the reasons for which they were received as well as the consequences that came to pass as a result of their implementation. Nonetheless, it is important to admit that most of the time the spirit, practices and priorities of the Latin Tradition have being adopted by the Kyivan Catholics for no other reason than their ecclesiastical inferiority complex strongly felt by the majority of the Eastern Catholics and often driving them to becoming no different from the Roman Catholics by imitating their customs, devotions and distinctively Western ways of life regardless of the damaging influence of “latinization” on the ecclesial identities and traditional integrities of their respective Churches (CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 100). In this case we are clearly dealing with “latinization” which according to Fr. Peter Galadza can be designated as “inappropriate” and “inorganic to the Byzantine system” for the reason that it clearly violates the “structural, theological or spiritual genius of the Byzantine Tradition” (Peter GALADZA, “Canadian Ukrainian Catholic Worship: Towards A Framework for Analysis,” in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 251 and GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 176). In the past there was a tendency of limiting the implications of the “inappropriate latinization” exclusively to liturgical matters. It should be more properly understood as influencing the entirety of the ecclesial life of the Eastern Catholic Church including her theology, worship, legislation, spirituality and ecumenical aspirations (LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 192). In this precise meaning as being foreign to the organic development of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s ecclesial identity and vocation and stimulating the growth of “uniate” consciousness the term “latinization” (or “inappropriate latinization”) is going to be further employed by this dissertation (for a more complete explanation of the terms “latinization,” “inappropriate latinization,” and “liturgical latinization,” see Peter GALADZA, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 272 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2004).

⁴⁰ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 183.

genuine ecclesiastical Tradition,⁴¹ were “drawn into a process of bastardization through latinization not only of the liturgy and of monastic life, but also of theology, of spirituality, and of all of their Church life.”⁴² The Church of Rome that seemed to take over the role of the ecclesiastical Mother of the Catholic Church of Kyiv was in actual fact also “impeded from duly performing it,”⁴³ because of her own preoccupation with strengthening papal authority and developing the highly centralized model of dependency of all Catholics regardless of their traditional background on the dictates of the more powerful Roman See.⁴⁴ As a result, Kyivan Catholics began losing the awareness of their authentic ecclesial identity and vocation, cultivating instead an “increasingly ‘Catholic’ consciousness in a post-Tridentine sense.”⁴⁵

Being educated, for example, exclusively on the basis of Latin manuals, the Kyivan Catholic clergy started to lose their connection with their Byzantine heritage.⁴⁶ The intent

⁴¹ In his “Pastoral Letter on Byzantinism,” the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Bishop Hryhoriy (Khomyshyn) of Stanislaviv as late as in 1929 suggested that the Tradition of his Church that accepted the union with Rome in 1596 has nothing to do with the Christian Byzantium at all (Hryhorii KHOMYSHYN, “Pastyr’skyi lyst pro vizantiïstvo [Pastoral Letter on Byzantinism],” in *Nova Zoria* 29 (1931), p. 7 and GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 177).

⁴² LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 192. In my own opinion, the process of alienation of the Kyivan Church from the authentic Byzantine roots of her ecclesiastical Tradition in the actual fact started long before the Union of Brest, since due to a crisis of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (which was masterfully depicted by one of the members of the KCSG, Dr. Borys Gudziak in his book “Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest,” pp. 59-76) this Church has already begun to gradually lose the lively connection with her Mother-Church of Constantinople. This loss, along with many other factors, deeply affected the process of her ecclesial self-identification.

⁴³ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 192.

⁴⁴ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 103. At the same time, it is important to admit that the strong dependence of Kyivan Catholics on the Roman Apostolic See has prevented their Church from the very possibility of the kind of internal fragmentation that could potentially impede the very process of the ecclesial self-realization of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv to an even greater extent than this was done by latinization.

⁴⁵ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 139.

⁴⁶ The insistence of several members of the KCSG on the opinion that it was solely the Church of Rome who was responsible for the “bastardization” of the Kyivan Church through latinization and “imposition” of Latin manuals on her clergy seems to be a little too simplistic in view of the fact that starting already from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and especially in the 17th and 18th centuries (with such prominent church leaders as Metropolitan Petro Mohyla and Archbishop Theophan Prokopovich) many of the Particular Churches of the

was to distance themselves from the potentially dangerous influences of “schismatic Orthodoxy” and to fully identify with Roman Catholicism. The preservation of ritual peculiarities were no longer regarded as values of ecclesiological significance but rather as expressions of national distinctiveness.⁴⁷ Latinization gained official status after its ultimate reception and confirmation by the Synod of Zamość of 1720⁴⁸ and the Synod of L’viv of 1891.⁴⁹

As members of the KCSG pointed out, the situation began to change at the beginning of the twentieth century when, after several centuries of a “lack of authentic leadership,”⁵⁰ the newly ordained Bishop Andrey (Sheptytsky) was nominated to the Metropolitan See of Halych in 1901. Despite his purely Latin training, he personally loved the Byzantine liturgical tradition as well as the Greek Fathers and attempted to turn his Church to the Christian East⁵¹ by cleansing her liturgical practice from many forms of inappropriate latinization⁵² and by combining the compulsory Thomism of the time with

Orthodox communion (above all Slav Orthodox Churches) as well as the Kyivan Catholic Church showed themselves willing to open themselves up to the riches of the Christian West, widely employing scholasticism as the main method and Latin as the primary language of theological instruction in their theological schools up until 1830s. Of course, the Orthodox were able to maintain more of a connection with their patristic heritage because their scholastic theologians mined patristic sources for anti-Roman apologetic purposes, but more importantly because their liturgical life had not become as latinized as that of the Eastern Catholics. The dichotomy between theology and liturgy is something that Fr. Peter Galadza has described as “the ‘original sin’ of ‘Uniatism,’ understood theologico-spiritually” (GALADZA, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky*, p. 66).

⁴⁷ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 141.

⁴⁸ *Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum habita in civitate Zamosciae anno MDCCXX*, edition tertia (Rome: Propaganda Fide, 1883); Joannes BILANYCH, ed., *Synodus Zamostiana an. 1720: eius celebratio, approbatio et momentum* (Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1960); Yuriï FEDORIV, “Zamois’kyi Synod, 1720 [The Synod of Zamość],” in *Bohoslovia* 35 (1971), pp. 5-71 and TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 132.

⁴⁹ *Dodatok do chynnostei i rishen' Rus'koho Provintsial'noho Sobora v Halychyni otbutohosia vo L'vovi v r. 1891* [An Appendix to the Proceedings and Decisions of the Ruthenian Provincial Synod That Took Place in L’viv in 1891] (L’viv: Stavropihij'skyi Instytut, 1897).

⁵⁰ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 192.

⁵¹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 107.

⁵² TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 133.

elements of an emerging neo-byzantinism.⁵³ Being a “papalist to the core,”⁵⁴ he nonetheless tried to act in some instances as a Head of a Particular Church by re-establishing the proper authority of his See of L’viv-Halych and by exercising pastoral care over the Greco-Catholic diaspora in Europe as well as North and South America.⁵⁵

Unfortunately, in his ecumenical aspirations Sheptytsky was still very heavily dependent on the notions of exclusivist soteriology.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, he realized that any positive encounter between Greco-Catholics and Orthodox can come about only as a result of a return of the Catholic Church of Kyiv to her traditional Byzantine roots, especially in the areas of liturgy and monasticism.⁵⁷

Similar attitudes were adopted and developed by Sheptytsky’s successor, Metropolitan (later Major Archbishop) Josyf (Slipyj). After eighteen years of imprisonment in the Soviet Gulag he was able to perform his duties as Head of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church in exile, establishing the Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome and

⁵³ Andriy CHIROVSKY, *Pray for God’s Wisdom: The Mystical Sophiology of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky* (Ottawa: MASI, 1992), pp. 1-36 and CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 107-108.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107. Fr. Peter Galadza calls him a “committed apologist for the papacy” (GALADZA, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky*, p. 116).

⁵⁵ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 133 and Andrii KRAWCHUK, *Christian Social Ethics: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky* (Edmonton, Ottawa, Toronto: MASI, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, The Basilian Press, 1997), pp. 75-94.

⁵⁶ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 108 and Lubomyr HUSAR, “Sheptytsky and Ecumenism,” in Paul MAGOCSI, ed., *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts’kyi* (Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1989), pp. 185-200. Fr. Peter Galadza notes that “on at least five separate occasions he speaks of the institutional Catholic Church as uniquely salvific,” the last dated to the 1941 Archieparchial Council (Galadza, *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky*, p. 169). Interestingly, on p. 171 Galadza introduces a sixth citation, from a 1942 decree on education and upbringing of youth where the notion that the Orthodox Church can be equally salvific is rejected.

⁵⁷ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 108. This is one of the subjects of the excellent dissertation of Fr. Peter Galadza, published as *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 272 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2004).

struggling for the recognition of Patriarchal dignity for the Kyivan Catholic Church⁵⁸ as well as the restoration of her legal rights in Ukraine.⁵⁹

To further contextualize this part of our reflection on the work and thought of the Catholic members of the KCSG, we need to note that as a result of forty three years of harsh persecutions and ecclesiastical isolation experienced by the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church in her homeland, the majority of the Kyivan Catholics (which means people in Ukraine and the rest of the Eastern bloc) were simply unaware of the changes in the Catholic ecclesiology and ecumenism articulated in Vatican II's Decrees and subsequent documents.⁶⁰ Struggling for their very existence "in the face of the kind of government intrusion that had severely compromised the Moscow Patriarchate,"⁶¹ they saw no other way to preserve their ecclesiastical integrity than to emphasize even more emphatically their dependence on the Vatican in the hope that it would eventually liberate them from an interfering state power. They tended to stress the latinizing elements in their religious practice that manifested how their national and ecclesial identity was absolutely distinct from that of the Russian Orthodox.⁶² Consequently, even after the emergence of the Kyivan

⁵⁸ In the words of Myroslaw Tataryn "Slipyj's struggle for the Patriarchate was nothing less than a struggle to restore within the Catholic Church a proper understanding of Particular Churches and the prerogatives of primacy which history had granted their primates (be they Patriarchs Archbishops)" (TATARYN, "Papal Primacy," p. 135).

⁵⁹ Jaroslav PELIKAN, *Confessor Between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Josyf Slipyj* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 172-231.

⁶⁰ CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, "Kyivan Church Study Group," p. 10. The article was first published in *Patriarchate* 5 (384), 2004.

⁶¹ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 120.

⁶² In his article on the "Reception of the Second Vatican Council by Greco-Catholics in Ukraine" one of the key members of the KCSG, Fr. Peter Galadza noted that it was "no surprise" that a large number of the underground Kyivan Catholics were not prepared to "welcome the Easternizing trend endorsed by *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*" for the reason that "Easternization was identified by many with a Russian Orthodoxy set up in Western Ukraine by the Soviets to neutralize and then absorb Ukrainian Catholicism." As a consequence, in the same vein as the struggle of Josyf (Slipyj) for the recognition of a patriarchate had become the "emblem of Ukrainian Catholic distinctiveness in the West, in Ukraine this emblem became Latinized worship" (GALADZA, "The Reception of the Second Vatican Council," pp. 328-329).

Catholic Church from the underground, many of her bishops, clergy and faithful remained very hesitant regarding rapprochement with the Orthodox by way of purification of their ecclesiastical Tradition from latinization.⁶³ It was a great surprise for them to realize that Rome had begun to consider Orthodoxy as her Sister Church and decisively rejected uniatism as a method for Church unity.⁶⁴ Most of them also did not appreciate that Rome was encouraging Eastern Catholics to rediscover their true ecclesial identity through a return to the “original values and norms” of their age-old Traditions “as opposed to later changes and deviations from this ancient pattern.”⁶⁵

Nonetheless, a significant proportion of Kyivan Catholics soon began to accept the post-conciliar vision. This was in part aided by the several hundred clergy who had switched from the Moscow Patriarchate to the Greco-Catholic Church between 1990 and 1992. Interestingly, these formerly Orthodox priests were more disposed to accept the ecclesiological vision of Vatican II precisely because they were less latinized than underground clergy. Also, most Greco-Catholics rejected the so-called “Eastern-Rite Lefebvrist schism, which proposed to be ‘more Catholic than the Pope’.”⁶⁶

⁶³ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 137. Considering that the Second Vatican Council encouraged Kyivan Catholics to free themselves of inappropriate latinizing elements that at the time of persecution were generally regarded as a symbol enabling them to “manifest their differences vis-à-vis Russian Orthodoxy” (GALADZA, “The Reception of the Second Vatican Council,” p. 329), the former underground clergy and faithful in the first years of decriminalization of their Church were still inclined to adopt what was for the most part a negative attitude towards Vatican II and its decisions that had become for them a symbol of dangerous “modernism that allegedly brings ‘spiritual impoverishment’ in its wake” (GALADZA, “The Reception of the Second Vatican Council,” p. 331).

⁶⁴ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 143.

⁶⁵ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 376-377.

⁶⁶ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 144. See also GALADZA, “The Reception of the Second Vatican Council,” pp. 338-339. At the same time, one can come across the existence of several quite influential groups of Ukrainian Greco-Catholic clergy and faithful who being deeply wounded by the most recent persecutions of their Church would be still very hesitant if not opposed to the very idea of being designated as “Orthodox in communion with Rome.”

In the words of several Catholic and Orthodox participants of the KCSG – fully consonant with the statements by John Paul II in his Encyclical Letter *Oriente Lumen* – it was truly indispensable for the Kyivan Church just emerged from the catacombs to acknowledge that being “flesh torn from the Orthodox Church,” her ecclesial identity was deeply wounded by the fact that for a long time she had been estranged from full communion with her Orthodox counterparts as well as from sharing with them in the rich traditional heritage of their common Mother Church of Constantinople.⁶⁷ The process of rediscovery of her ecclesial authenticity and originality had to involve a conversion of the minds and hearts of Kyivan Catholics along with their “spiritual preparedness for a full reception of that *metanoia*.”⁶⁸

According to Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) this conversion, which must include a decisive counteraction against the “still-remaining threat of latinization,” can come about only as a result of proper education and the recognition of the “undying role of Byzantium, with all that follows from this practical theological acceptance.”⁶⁹ Each step that would bring the Kyivan Catholics closer to the realization of these important goals, in the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface, would become an “important gain” for their Church and the Catholic Church as a whole.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 141. Compare with *Oriente Lumen*, par. 21 b.

⁶⁸ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198 and MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 141.

⁶⁹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 191, 198. Unfortunately, Archimandrite Boniface goes too far in stating that latinization is the “main stumbling block for unity.” As I clearly point out elsewhere, the main stumbling block really can be found in the relations among the “three Romes.”

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 191. Compare with *OE* 1.

If, as Peter Galadza has said, the acceptance of elements of inappropriate latinization in the past “came to be based on ignorance,”⁷¹ then their “natural death,” according to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos can only occur through a better knowledge of history and the sources forming the “specific tradition of the Church of Kyiv.”⁷² The fact that the process of “gradual, respectful, but resolute and total, giving-up of all latinizations” of due education of the Kyivan Catholic clergy, monks, and laity⁷³ “could not be done overnight” and could even take many decades of very intensive work, in the words of Bishop Vsevolod, could only “add more reason” to start the work of *ressourcement* immediately. This could be done by (i) reprinting the most significant liturgical texts such as *Trebnyk* of Metropolitan Peter (Mohyla)⁷⁴ and the 1639 Kyiv *Liturgicon*; (ii) translating and publishing basic patristic texts; (iii) the opening Orthodox theological schools to those Eastern Catholics who want to “learn more of the teaching and tradition of the Holy Fathers;” and (iv) replacing the scholastic philosophy and Latin theology in the curricula of theological studies offered by Kyivan Catholic seminaries with courses based on sources common to Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox that express the Byzantine theological, liturgical, canonical and spiritual heritage.⁷⁵

At this point it is important to note that already at the time of the existence of the KCSG the work of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* within the Catholic Church of Kyiv was already being undertaken by the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern

⁷¹ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 177. In many cases, the acceptance of the latinizing influences on the part of a large number of Kyivan Catholic as well as Slav Orthodox Church leaders, clergy, and faithful was precisely due to their scholastic training rather than their ignorance.

⁷² MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 169.

⁷³ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198.

⁷⁴ Many works published by Metropolitan Peter (Mohyla) already included some latinizing elements, since their editor was among the first protagonists of spreading scholasticism among the Kyivan as well as many other Slav Orthodox Christians.

⁷⁵ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 143 and MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 169.

Christian Studies founded in 1986 by Andriy Chirovsky, as well as by the L'viv Theological Academy (now the Ukrainian Catholic University), re-established in 1994. The present rector of the University, Borys Gudziak, was an active member of the KCSG.⁷⁶

Along with due emphasis on the importance of *ressourcement* and the acknowledgment of the historical role played by Byzantium, the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, in the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), needed also to engage herself in the process of rapprochement with her Mother Church, Constantinople. This in itself could serve as another “natural antidote” against the “ailment of infatuation with a foreign (Latin) cultural tradition” that almost “choked or mongrelized” the Kyivan Catholic Church’s true identity.⁷⁷ If by attempting to “avoid every deed, and straighten out all the situations, that could hurt” their respective ecclesiastical integrities⁷⁸ both of these Churches could actually succeed in establishing firm ecumenical relations, then this bond of reciprocal respect and co-operation could become mutually beneficial, enhancing the importance of the Church of Constantinople as the Ecumenical Patriarchate and healing the Kyivan Catholic Church “from harmful exclusivist nationalism” by “opening-up” her “to her more universal heritage.”⁷⁹ From this perspective, the work of the KCSG, “constituting

⁷⁶ During the final day of the KCSG’s consultation in Rome, Dr. Borys Gudziak presented the Group with his vision of the revival of the L’viv Theological Academy, which right from the beginning of its re-establishment had chosen a decidedly ecumenical orientation and implemented *ressourcement* (based on scripture, patristic, and liturgy) as the principal basis for its curriculum “The Rome 1995 Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group,” in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 126-127). The former rector and vice-rector of Holy Spirit Seminary in L’viv, Ukraine, Bishop Julian (Voronovsky) and Archpriest Roman Mirchuk also participated briefly in the work of the KCSG.

⁷⁷ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 177. I do not fully support the judgmental tone of this particular observation expressed by Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx). Due to her geographical location as well as many historical and cultural factors, the Kyivan Catholic Church has most of the time simultaneously incorporated the values of the Christian East and West. Thus, the influence of Latin ecclesiastical and cultural traditions on the elaboration of the Kyivan Catholic ecclesial identity cannot be regarded as being entirely “foreign.”

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

the most important encounter between the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople since the end of the sixteenth century,⁸⁰ could become another source for the restored Kyivan Catholic Church's ecclesiastical Tradition. This would help this Church to rediscover her authentic ecclesial identity and vocation.

III.2.2. Theological Pluralism and the Particular Theology of the Kyivan Catholic Church

Many Kyivan Catholics were surprised by the encouragement of the Second Vatican Council to return to their Byzantine roots. But even more were perplexed when they learned that their Church also had the right and obligation to develop her own theology (*LG* 13, 23; *UR* 14, 17; *OE* 3). In the words of Andriy Chirovsky, most Ukrainian Greco-Catholics “had been taught to think in Latin theological categories.” Thus the idea that they have their own theology “was entirely new” and at first “it was difficult even to conceive what this could mean.”⁸¹

For centuries Kyivan Catholics were taught to think that, in line with Pope Clement VIII's bull, *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis*, they are “permitted, conceded, and granted” out of the papal “Apostolic benevolence” a certain particularity in their liturgical practices and canonical order but only “to the extent that these are not in opposition to the truth and doctrine of the Catholic faith and do not exclude communion with the Roman Church.”⁸² Therefore, at least from 1624, when the Kyivan Catholic Church was placed

⁸⁰ GUDZIAK, “How Did They Drift Apart?” p. 45.

⁸¹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 114.

⁸² Cited in GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 182. The original text can be found in Athanasius VELYKY, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis Eiusque Auctorum (1590-1600)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III (Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1970), p. 255.

under the care of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*⁸³ and up to Vatican II, this Church according to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, found herself in a “completely vulnerable position” by being compelled to accept “Latin Scholasticism in general, and Thomism in particular” as the “dominant mode of theologizing.”⁸⁴

By the eighteenth century, the majority of Ukrainian Catholics had almost “entirely lost any contact with their own theological tradition.”⁸⁵ In addition to the fact that they had been in a situation of cultural and intellectual decline for centuries, and thus unwilling or unable to develop their own theological resources, Rome for its part also capitalized on this decline. The resolutions of the Synod of Zamość (1720) typify this decline and Rome’s exploitation thereof. Zamość, the bishops seemed to be unaware of the very existence of the thirty-three Articles of the Union of Brest.⁸⁶ According to Luyks mandating the

⁸³ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 132.

⁸⁴ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 101. The awareness of the truly deplorable state of ecclesiastical development in which the Kyivan Church found herself before and even several decades after the Union of Brest leads me to the conclusion that it is very doubtful that the Kyivan Christians at that particular historical juncture were really capable of elaborating original theological approaches towards the understanding of the most fundamental Christian truths as a solid alternative to the highly developed Western theology imposed on them. Of course, some of them – as for instance, the authors of the thirty three Articles of the Union of – Brest could still remember the deepness of the rich Byzantine theological tradition emanating from their Mother-Church of Constantinople that was once shared by all of Slavic Orthodox Christianity. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that most of the Slav Orthodox Churches voluntarily accepted scholasticism in the 17th and 18th centuries, the position of the Kyivan Catholic Church, which that considerably upgraded the level of theological education for her clergy and faithful due to her union with Rome no longer seems so “vulnerable.”

⁸⁵ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 101.

⁸⁶ The reasons for which the thirty three Articles of the Union of Brest were deliberately filed away soon after their presentation to Pope Clement VIII in 1595 are many. This was a list of demands and Rome during the Counter-Reformation was not amenable to demands. Furthermore, some of the demands touched upon doctrinal issues and pointed to divergences of theological tradition which Rome was especially averse to during these centuries of Catholic consolidation. The first of the thirty three Articles reads: “Since there is a disagreement between the Romans and the Greeks over the procession of the Holy Spirit which greatly prejudices union for no other reason than that we mutually do not wish to understand each other, we, therefore, request that we not be compelled to any other faith but that testified to by the Gospel and the writings of the Holy Fathers of the Greek faith, that is, that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from two principles nor through a double procession but proceeds from one principle as source, from the Father through the Son.” Cited in CHIROVSKY, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,” p. 158. For the original text, see VELYKY, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis*, p. 61. For the English translation, see Russell

introduction of the *Filioque* into the Creed,⁸⁷ the hierarchy “deeply altered” the Kyivan Church’s original “vision of the intra-Trinitarian life of God” and at the same time changed the “deeper inspiration of her worship and the specifically Eastern, i.e. Trinitarian approach of her spirituality and traditions.”⁸⁸ Especially after Pope Leo XIII’s 1879 bull *Aeterni Patris*, even such “Easternizing” leaders as Andrey (Sheptytsky) and Josyf (Slipyj), felt compelled to hold on to Thomistic categories of thought and scholastic terminology.⁸⁹ The Catholic participants of the KCSG, however, right from the beginning of their consultations demonstrated the capacity to present creative theological interpretations of various ecclesiological issues.

An interesting example of such creative theologizing was already evident in the two sets of presentations and responses delivered at the first consultation of the Study Group in Oxford. These touched upon the basic question of the priority of the universal in the area of ecclesiology as understood and interpreted by contemporary Orthodox and Catholic theologians. The discussion was initiated by Bishop Kallistos (Ware). He noted that the Orthodox understanding of unity in the Church is based on the Eucharistic ecclesiology of *koinonia*, according to which: (i) ecclesial unity is not understood as something “imposed from the outside by power of jurisdiction,” but as something “created from within through the act of Holy Communion from the one Eucharistic loaf and the one chalice”; (ii) every

MOROZIUK, *Politics of a Church Union* (Chicago: Church Herald, 1983), p. 17 and MAGOCSI, *Morality and Reality*, p. 167. For the Ukrainian translation, see ANTONIUK, MARYNOVYCH, *Znaky Chasu*, p. 73.

⁸⁷ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” pp. 184-185. One of the Orthodox participants of the KCSG, Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos, in his presentation on the division caused by the Union of Brest and the possibility of healing of that division, confessed that most of the Orthodox are “puzzled when their Eastern Catholic brothers, who should be able to understand their pain, so frequently use the *Filioque* themselves and so rarely show any appreciation for their sensitivity on the point” (MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 150).

⁸⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 385.

⁸⁹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 101.

celebration of the Eucharist is dependent on the local bishop and in itself presupposes a fundamental equality among all bishops, be they bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Kyiv or of the “humblest rural” diocese. Consequently, the “Eucharist comes first,” while hierarchical structure and the “levels of primacy are secondary to this.” Moreover, continued Bishop Kallistos, every “primacy needs to have a local Eucharistic foundation” it “needs to be ‘earthed’ in a specific local soil.” In view of the fact that the *whole* Christ and not just a part of Him is present at each local Eucharistic celebration, the “notion of the Church’s catholicity” has to be reflected as “not so much extensive as intensive” since the “universal Church is a communion of local Churches, each inwardly identical with all the others” and “related to each other, not as parts subordinated to a greater whole, but on the principle of identity.”⁹⁰

A very different viewpoint on the same subject was presented by the “Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” issued on 28 May 1992 by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and signed by its Prefect, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI).⁹¹ Myroslaw Tataryn took up the challenge posed by this letter. One will recall that in contrast to the spirit of Vatican II, this text stressed the following: (i) “the Church that is one and unique ... gives birth to particular Churches as her daughters. She expresses herself in

⁹⁰ WARE, “The Church of God,” pp. 19-25. The same Eucharistic ecclesiological approach towards Orthodox understanding of the Church was to an even greater extent developed by John Zizioulas in his book *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* first published in 1985 (reprinted in 1993 and 1997 and translated into many languages, including Ukrainian). It is interesting to note that Bishop Kallistos (Ware) together with Prof. Christos Yannaras contributed to the preparation of this renowned theological study for publication as the members of its Editorial Committee.

⁹¹ CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, “Communio Notio: Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” in *Origins* 22:7 (1992), pp. 108-112, in *One in Christ* 28:3 (1992), pp. 290-294 and at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_28051992_communio-notio_en.html, accessed on 10 August 2009.

them: she is the mother and not the offspring of the particular Churches... Arising within and out of the universal Church, they have their ecclesiality in her and from her” (par. 9).

(ii) “The unity of the Church is also rooted in the unity of the episcopate... As the very idea of the Body of the Churches calls for the existence of a Church that is *Head* of the Churches, which is precisely the Church of Rome ... so too the unity of the episcopate involves the existence of a bishop who is head of the body or college of bishops, namely the Roman Pontiff” (par. 12). Accordingly, “communion with the universal Church, represented by Peter’s Successor,” was depicted by the Letter as “not an external complement to the particular Church, but one of its internal constituents.” Therefore, the very existence of the Eastern Orthodox Churches as Particular Churches that are not in communion with the Church of Rome was described by this Letter to the Catholic Bishops as being deeply “wounded” (par. 17).

Tataryn noted how disturbed he was at the ambiguity of Ratzinger’s articulation of the position of the Church of Rome within the communion of the Catholic Churches. According to the Letter, the Church of Rome seemed to be regarded not as one of the Particular Churches of that communion but rather as the “Universal Church represented by Peter’s Successor” (par. 12).⁹² Along with Tataryn, Andriy Chirovsky, in his presentation on the terminology of the Sister-Churches, emphasized that the situation of the Orthodox Churches may in fact be regarded as wounded because of the lack of their communion with the Church of Rome, but only if the Catholic Churches would be perceived as being equally wounded owing to their separation from the Orthodox Church. Otherwise it would not be possible to continue an Orthodox-Catholic “dialogue of equal partners,” if a “return to the

⁹² TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 130.

model of *reductio in obedientiam*” would be once again re-affirmed by the Vatican as the “only avenue left open” to all non-Catholic Churches as seemed to be suggested by Ratzinger’s statement.⁹³

The Letter to the Catholic Bishops was even more severely critiqued by the Orthodox participants of the KCSG. Ephrem Lash, stated, for example, that “even if the Universal Church is not identified, as Cardinal Ratzinger seems to assume, with the Church of Rome” she can be understood neither as the “Mother, nor as the offspring of the Particular Churches” for the reason that as a “body is the sum of its parts” and not “something other than them” in the same way the “Church of Christ is the network of particular Churches, including among them the Church of Rome, not some meta-Church.”⁹⁴ Therefore, the “very idea of the Body of the Churches” that should necessarily “call for the existence of a Church that is Head of the Churches, which is precisely the Church of Rome” (par. 12) does not seem to be entirely logical or to correspond to life. For instance, the twenty ruling monasteries of Mount Athos “do not call for the existence of a monastery that is head of the monasteries” and the existence of the Oxford colleges creating one body of Oxford University does not presuppose the existence of a college that can be generally regarded as their head.⁹⁵

⁹³ CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 405.

⁹⁴ Ephrem LASH, “Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn: Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality,” in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 148-149. Similar thoughts are expressed by Bishop Vsevolod’s “Comments on the “Church Understood as Communion” published in the collection of his writings entitled *We Are All Brothers*, pp. 99-108. Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko, in particular, stated in this regard: “If the Church of Rome is to be treated not as a Local Church but as the Universal Church, and other Churches are simply parts of this “greater whole,” as Cardinal Ratzinger’s letter seems to imply, then what do we really mean when we speak of Rome and Constantinople (or Alexandria, or Antioch, or Jerusalem for that matter) as sister-Churches?” (Oleh KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: Sister Churches: Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content,” p. 424).

⁹⁵ LASH, “Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn,” p. 149 and MAJDANSKY, “Comments on the “Church Understood as Communion,” in MAJDANSKY, *We Are All Brothers*, pp. 102-103.

The urgent need to find middle ground in the discussion of these very different approaches to the understanding of the relations between the local and universal Church was mentioned already in one of the responses of Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko who suggested that common deliberations on this complicated ecclesiological issue be transferred to the strictly dogmatic field of Trinitarian theology. He suggested that a persistent tendency among some of the Latin Church Fathers and especially among later adherents of Western scholastic Triadology was to start the reflections on the inner life of the Trinity from the essential consubstantiality that exists among the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity on the level of the Divine Nature shared by them,⁹⁶ while the “starting point of Orthodox Trinitarian theology is the hypostasis (that which is concrete and unique).”⁹⁷ In

⁹⁶ John Norman Davidson KELLY, *Early Christian Doctrines* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1978), pp. 269-271. According to one of the experts in the field of Trinitarian theology, Boris Bobrinskoy, the classical method of Western scholastic theology consisted of the presentation of the “doctrine of God” via “distinguishing between, on the one hand, *De Deo Uno*, “On the One God” (including the divine essence and attributes or energies), and, on the other hand, *De Deo Trino*, which concerns the mystery of the Trinity as such.” This made it possible to “speak of the divine essence itself, prior to or apart from the Hypostases or Persons of the Trinity,” thereby, “separating these two aspects of the divine mystery.” As a much healthier alternative, Bobrinskoy proposes to stress both the “simultaneous and the reciprocal character of the relations that exist between the three Persons,” since according to his opinion the “Trinity cannot in any way be dissected, and it would be a mistake to try to determine, even for the sake of discussion, whether one of the terms – Unity or Trinity – is prior to the other” (Boris BOBRINSKOY, *The Mystery of the Trinity: Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition* (Crestwood, N. Y.: SVS Press, 1999), p. 1). Expressing basically the same opinion, another Orthodox theologian, John Zizioulas wrote: “The subsequent developments of Trinitarian theology, especially in the West with Augustine and the scholastics, have led us to see the term *ousia*, not *hypostasis*, as the expression of the ultimate character and the causal principle (ἀρχή) in God’s being. The result has been that in textbooks on dogmatics, the Trinity gets placed after the chapter on the One God (the unique *ousia*) with all the difficulties which we still meet when trying to accommodate the Trinity to our doctrine of God. By contrast, the Cappadocians’ position – characteristic of all the Greek Fathers – lay in that the final assertion of ontology in God has to be attached not to the unique *ousia* of God but to the Father, that is, to a *hypostasis* or person” (ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, p. 88). See also Mary CLARK, “The Trinity in Latin Christianity,” in Louis DUPRÉ, Don SALIERS and John MEYENDORFF, eds., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Crossroad: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), pp. 276-289. It is important to remember that Eastern and Western positions on the Trinity have been described by scholars such as Yves Congar as complementary. Congar reminds us that “it is important first of all the logic by which the Greeks on the one hand and the Latins on the other theologically (or dogmatically) elaborated their common faith in the mystery of the Trinity...” (Yves CONGAR, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit: The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West*, Vol. 3 (New York: The Seabury Press, 1983), p. xvi.

⁹⁷ KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 423. See also Vladimir LOSSKY, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1985), pp. 13-29, LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology*, pp.

the same way, the Universal dimension holds a certain priority in the ecclesiological thinking of Roman Catholics, while “Orthodox ecclesiology proceeds naturally from the Local Church.”⁹⁸ The latter is truly the “Church, i.e., the “Body of Christ” and the “Fullness of the Holy Spirit” (*soma* and *plêroma*), and not simply a piece, or parcel, of the Church.” It establishes the “model for the Universal Church, and not vice versa.”⁹⁹

In his attempt to sum up the whole discussion and at the same time to express a particular Kyivan Catholic theological standpoint on this subject matter, Andriy Chirovsky in the antinomic fashion characteristic of him suggested that according to the “deepest lived experience of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church” it is possible to be at the same time faithful to the principle of equality among various Particular Churches and to recognize the papal claims of universal primacy on the basis of a Trinitarian theology that emphasizes the essential equality among all Persons of the Holy Trinity, but at the same time underlines the role of the Father as being somehow “more equal” in comparison with the other Divine Persons as “*archê* and *pêgê*, from whom the Son is generated and the Spirit proceeds.”¹⁰⁰ In

36-53, Thomas HOPKO, “The Trinity in the Cappadocians,” in DUPRÉ, SALIERS and MEYENDORFF, eds., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, pp. 260-275, and especially, the cogent analysis of Brian E. DALEY, SS, “Revisiting the ‘Filioque:’ Roots and Branches of an Old Debate,” in *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001), pp. 31-62, 195-212.

⁹⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 402. The same attitude emanates from the article of Archbishop Rembert Weakland cited by Fr. Andrew Onuferko that underscores the divergent Roman Catholic and Orthodox approaches to the understanding of the local and universal dimensions in the Church as follows: “... we Roman Catholics use the phrase ‘Universal Church’ more often than we realize. It is a phrase that most characterizes our ecclesiological position. Whether we are aware of it or not, it is at the basis of all our thinking about Church and how Church functions. Especially since Vatican II, we have evolved an elaborate thinking on how the universal Church is present in the local Church and is realized there. We Roman Catholics almost always begin with such universalism and then proceed to local manifestations... The Orthodox begin with the local Church and the celebration of the Eucharist on the local level. The local Eucharistic community – rather than the concept of universal Church – is their starting point...” (Rembert WEAKLAND, “Roman Catholic and Orthodox Dialogue: The Larger Picture,” in *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), p. 31 cited in ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” pp. 165-166).

⁹⁹ KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 423.

¹⁰⁰ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” pp. 36-38. In his response to the Fr. Andriy Chirovsky’s presentation on the terminology of the “Sister-Churches,” Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko on the one hand, enthusiastically confirmed the Orthodox acceptance of the basic Triadological antinomy according

my opinion, Triadological and ecclesiological model, presented in accordance with the original antinomic method later developed by several other writings of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky¹⁰¹ and his students,¹⁰² can serve as proof of the existence of creative particular theologizing within the Catholic Church of Kyiv. To a certain extent it was instigated and/or fostered by the discussions that took place in the context of the consultations of the KCSG.¹⁰³

Another, and to some extent even more interesting discussion, expressing the particular theological approach of the Catholic participants of the KCSG towards the understanding of the supreme teaching authority in the Catholic Church in general and the

to which the “unity of *ousia* or *physis* does not exclude the plurality of hypostases,” but, on the other hand, he also emphasized that the “*archê* of the Father” should never be understood as “diminishing the value or dignity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.” Consequently, he expressed his full accord with Fr. Chirovsky’s approach understood as simultaneous acceptance of the ontological equality of the “Holy Churches of God” and the concept of “primacy, whether local, regional, or universal,” but only to the extent that this “primacy or presidency” is understood as “relational in character,” and, therefore, as something that cannot be interpreted in terms of “power” and “subordination” but, rather, “in terms of *diakonia* and *leitourgia*” (KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 424).

¹⁰¹ See his Inaugural Lecture of 22 September 1994 delivered on the occasion of the establishment of the Peter and Doris Kule Chair of Eastern Christian Theology and Spirituality at Saint Paul University “Going West to Find the East,” in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 219-232 and especially his article “Orthodox in Communion with Rome: The Antinomic Character of Eastern Catholic Theology,” published in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 71-87.

¹⁰² See Yuliya KOMAR, *Basic Antinomies of Spiritual Life in the Theological Thought of Paul Evdokimov*, Iryna SOLUK-FIGOL, *The Paradox of Service*, Daniel KUC, *The Antinomic Approach to Theology and the Issue of the Dual Authorship of Sacred Scripture*, Oksana LUKA, *Antinomy in Eastern Christian Iconography*, Yuriy SAKVUK, *Theology of Paradox and a Search for Antinomy in Paul’s Evdokimov’s Life and Thought* (Unpublished M.A./L.Th. Major Papers, Ottawa, Saint Paul University, 2001).

¹⁰³ The very possibility of the existence and significance of particular theologizing within the Eastern Catholic Churches in general and within the Kyivan Catholic Church in particular was raised in a more systematic way two years after the premature interruption of the work of the KCSG in the context of the Panel, “What is Eastern Catholic Theology?” held during the Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America that took place in Ottawa (June 1998). Despite the fact that it would probably be an exaggeration to trace back the roots of the just mentioned discussion back to the similar reflections arising from the consultations of the KCSG, it is fascinating to note that three out of four papers presented at the Ottawa Panel (published in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 13-107) were composed by former members of the KCSG, Frs. Andriy Chirovsky, Peter Galadza, and Myroslaw Tataryn. Of course, these papers would probably appear in print even without the influence of the KCSG. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is important to admit the existence of certain continuity in the process of elaborating the still developing distinctive theology of the Kyivan Catholic Church in which many of the former members of the KCSG still seem to play very important if not key roles. An apparent focus of the KCSG on the questions of ecumenism did not allow the Group to produce particular viewpoints regarding all the dimensions of systematic theology. However, they still managed to accomplish some serious preparatory work in the field of elaborating a genuinely Eastern Catholic ecclesiology with special emphasis on better understanding of the truly indispensable question of primacy.

authority of infallible papal pronouncements in particular, was initiated by Bishop Basil (Losten's) presentation on the "Roman Primacy and the Church of Kyiv" and in part by Myroslaw Tataryn's paper on the "Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality." Both of these were delivered at the first consultation of the KCSG in Oxford. To the surprise of some of the many other members of the KCSG, Bishop Basil found himself in full accord with Bishop Vsevolod's statement that all the dogmatic pronouncements produced by the Roman Church after the schism that have been received by the Eastern Catholic Churches but not yet received by the Orthodox Churches¹⁰⁴ should be regarded rather as *theologoumena* that do not cancel the fundamental unity in faith that still exists between Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox.¹⁰⁵ Bishop Basil further relied on Paul

¹⁰⁴ "Reception" here similarly as in the Bishop Basil's paper is "understood in its canonical, orthodox meaning, common to Catholics and Orthodox" (LOSTEN, "The Roman Primacy," p. 80).

¹⁰⁵ MAJDANSKY, "Restoration of Communion," p. 168. The interesting suggestion of Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) that the newer Catholic dogmas can be regarded as being merely *theologoumena* which was on the whole supported by Bishop Basil (Losten) also encountered some apparent resistance from several other members of the KCSG. Bishop Kallistos (Ware), for instance, in his response to Bishop Basil, stressed that the "doctrinal difficulties between Orthodoxy and Rome, while not insuperable, need to be discussed and overcome before sacramental communion can be restored" (Kallistos WARE, "Response to the Presentation by His Grace, Bishop Basil (Losten): The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 113). Reflecting on this particular point of disagreement among the participants of the KCSG, I came across a small book in my private library describing a typical liturgical rite of consecration of a bishop in the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church before Vatican II, according to which a newly elected and nominated Bishop is obliged to profess his faith in these words: "I profess that Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Tradition should be accepted and revered; that the power of granting indulgences was left by Christ to His Church, and that their use is extremely salutary for the Christian people. In like manner I accept and profess whatever was declared and defined by the aforementioned Council of Trent as regards Original Sin, Justification, and the number and interpretation of the sacred books of the Old and New Testament. Furthermore, I reverence and accept the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican and whatever it declares proclaimed and defined, and especially do I wholeheartedly receive and confess its definitions about the Primacy and infallible teaching authority of the Roman Church. I also accept and profess whatever else the Holy Roman Church accepts and professes, and on the other hand, all contrary teaching as well as the Schisms and Heresies condemned, rejected and detested by the same Church, I also condemn, reject and detest. Moreover, I promise and pledge true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of St. Peter" (*The Ceremony of Consecration and the Pontifical Divine Liturgy of His Excellency the Most Reverend Isidore Borecky, Exarch for Ukrainian Catholics of Eastern Canada and His Excellency the Most Reverend Andrew Roborecky, Auxiliary Bishop to His Excellency Basil Ladyka, Exarch for Ukrainian Catholics of Central Canada* (Toronto: St. Michael's Cathedral, 1948), p. 43). A very similar text can also be found in the typical contemporary rite of the "Profession of the Catholic Faith" for converts that necessarily includes sections on the indulgences, immaculate conception, infallibility, obedience to the Pope, etc. (see, for instance, *Profession of the Catholic Faith*, at <http://www.calefactory.org/lit-professionoffaith.htm>, accessed on 17 June 2010). Perhaps these texts

VI's hint about a distinction between the first Seven Ecumenical Councils and the subsequent General Councils held in the West that still await to be received by the Orthodox East.¹⁰⁶ He also stressed the importance of Ratzinger's statement that "Rome must not require more from the East with respect of the primacy than had been formulated and was lived in the first millennium."¹⁰⁷ He therefore emphasized that the concept of "Sister-Churches" should be taken very seriously. According to Losten, "Pope John Paul II assured us that this is no mere courtesy, but a fundamental principle of ecclesiology."¹⁰⁸ The Catholic Church should be able to recognize the essential orthodoxy of all of her

have very little to do with the discussion among Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs and theologians taking place in the nineteen nineties. Nevertheless, they clearly demonstrate that most of the clergy and lay Catholics of whatever ecclesiastical background have already accepted the newer Catholic dogmas into their *depositum fidei*. The ground-breaking teaching of the Second Vatican Council on the "hierarchy of truths" (UR 11) according to which Catholic dogmas are no longer regarded as having absolutely equivalent significance still does not allow anyone to declare that there are absolutely no differences in faith between Orthodox and Catholics or that their Churches have not evolved since the end of the first millennium. Such a picture would be by far too simplistic, while such a conclusion would be merely wishful thinking. Therefore, if the Christian East and West have serious intentions to recognize the identity of faith in each other, they have also to involve themselves in the serious work of rapprochement on the level of theology. Consequently, in my opinion, the proper role of the Kyivan Catholic Church which equally belongs to the East and West, would not be to pretend that she regards the later Catholic dogmas as being merely *theologumena* but to make an important contribution to the ecumenical dialogue on the level of theology by way of translation of a number of the dogmas already received by the Kyivan Catholics into language understandable to their Orthodox brethren.

¹⁰⁶ In his letter *Lugduni, in urbe Galliae nobilissima* of 5 October 1974 addressed to Cardinal Willebrands, Pope Paul VI designated the Council of Lyons as the "Sixth General Council celebrated in the Western world" (cited in Yves CONGAR, *Diversity and Communion* (London: SCM Press, 1984), p. 85). The discussion about the "ecumenicity" of the fourteen Councils held in the West after the first millennium constitutes a very broad and complex theological problem, the adequate treatment of which would require many pages of explanation of various viewpoints that would not necessarily lead to indisputable conclusions. Therefore, the presumption made by Bishop Basil (Losten) that Pope Paul VI made a clear distinction between the "Seven Ecumenical Councils and the General Councils held in the West" (LOSTEN, "The Roman Primacy," p. 81) based on one papal letter of secondary importance may well seem unjustifiably exaggerated. In view of the fact that for the better part of the second millennium, the Church of Rome regarded herself as the only true Church of God and her members as the only true Christians, the decisions of her Councils have also been perceived as having ecumenical significance. The situation actually changed with popes John XXIII and Paul VI as well as with the Second Vatican Council proclaiming that the true Church of God only *subsists in* the Catholic Church which means that she can also to a certain degree *subsist in* many other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities. In any event, the decisions of the Ecumenical or General Councils held in the West (no matter how we designate them) are still considered to be binding for all Catholics including all Eastern Christians who are in communion with Rome.

¹⁰⁷ Joseph RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987), p. 199.

¹⁰⁸ See the English translation of Pope John Paul II address in the Orthodox Cathedral in Bialystok (Poland) of 5 June 1991, published in the English edition of *L'Osservatore Romano* (17 June 1991), p. 8.

Sister-Churches by not attempting to integrate her particular dogmatic teachings into the general Christian “deposit of faith” until such time as they will be also received by the Eastern Orthodox.¹⁰⁹

Such formulations by Losten, and other Catholic members of the KCSG, were possible because of the Catholic principle that even dogmatic “pronouncements of faith” of the Church are directly dependent on the “expressive power of the language used at a certain point of time and in particular circumstances.” Consequently these should not be imposed on her Sister-Churches as something already perfect and unaffected. This is because even dogmatic truths could be at first “expressed incompletely (but not falsely), and at a later date, when considered in a broader context of faith or human knowledge” to receive a “fuller and more perfect expression.”¹¹⁰

At the same time, members of the KCSG noted that the Orthodox Churches, while avoiding of course, an uncritical acceptance of all the dogmatic pronouncements of the Catholic Church elaborated in the second millennium¹¹¹ should nonetheless not approach them as something to be simply “dismissed with a wave of the hand, as if General Councils of the Roman Church were insignificant assemblies of non-entities.”¹¹² On the contrary, “instead of examining each other’s pronouncements like hawks for points they may disagree on,”¹¹³ it is, in the opinion of Bishop Basil, the common duty of all the Particular Churches of whatever communion to learn each other’s theological viewpoints and to make

¹⁰⁹ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 80-81.

¹¹⁰ See the English translation of the Declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith *Mysterium Ecclesiae* issued on 24 June 1973 in Austin FLANNERY, *Vatican Council II, More Post-Conciliar Documents* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1982), p. 433 cited in Losten, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 82.

¹¹¹ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 168.

¹¹² Losten, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 82.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

an attempt to receive them in the context of the contemporary rapprochement among Sister-Churches.¹¹⁴

An important contribution of the Eastern Catholic Churches in general and the Catholic Church of Kyiv in particular in this regard would be to introduce the West to the East, and the East to the West not only by performing the role of a kind of bridge, but, rather, by the elaborating of an original Eastern Catholic theology that would be equally understandable to both parts of a divided Christendom. Therefore, not intending to “contaminate” their Orthodox brethren or to “dilute their Orthodoxy, if such a thing was possible,”¹¹⁵ the Kyivan Catholics who have already received the dogmatic developments particular to the Church of Rome after the schism should, according to Bishop Basil, demonstrate their capacity for reinterpreting the Western teaching in a way that is “fully consistent with the first millennium, and fully consistent with Orthodox teaching.”¹¹⁶ In the

¹¹⁴ Similar thoughts were expressed by the renowned Catholic theologian Louis Bouyer who in particular said the following: “This comes down to saying that pure and simple acceptance, without discussion, of the general councils of the West and their definitions cannot be a prerequisite to reunion between East and West. All that the West can and must ask of the East is that the work of these councils be accepted provisionally, with favorable prejudgment as an essential, positive element for a broader and more profound common examination of the questions. At the same time, the West ought to offer the East the same consideration of the dogmatic councils and decisions that this other part of the Church is unanimous in judging equally important” (Louis BOUYER, *The Church of God* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1982), pp. 552-553).

¹¹⁵ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 169.

¹¹⁶ Losten, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 82. To give just one example of such an original piece of theological thinking within the Catholic Church of Kyiv emanating from the discussions of the KCSG, it would be enough to take a closer look at the reinterpretation of one of the most recent dogmatic pronouncements of the Catholic Church with regard to the notion of the papal infallibility that according to the Vatican I and Vatican II did not even need the “consent of the Church.” This was more comprehensibly explained by Bishop Basil as not being a gift personally entrusted to the Roman Pontiff as the Head of the Universal Church, but as one of the dimensions of his Petrine service to be the “voice of the whole episcopate, articulating beliefs which the bishops held, and had indeed asked the Bishop of Rome to articulate with a remarkable moral unanimity” (Ibid., p. 101). In the case of the problematic formulation *ex sese non ex consensus ecclesiae*, Bishop Basil in tune with Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk), Fr. Louis Bouyer and Fr. Jean Marie Roger Tillard explains that despite the absence in the Catholic Church of the “higher authority validating a solemn doctrinal definitions from the Bishop of Rome,” the “process of reception” of these definitions has to be regarded as being “in itself part of the Church’s infallibility” (Ibid., p. 102 and Tillard, *The Bishop of Rome*, p. 168). Moreover, the “dogmas do not become true” only “because the Pope, or the Council, declare them so. To take two obvious examples, the Son did not *become* ‘of one essence’ with the Father because Nicaea I defined this, nor did the Blessed Virgin Mary become ‘Theotokos’ at the Council of Ephesus.” Consequently, the Roman Pontiffs and

opinion of Myroslaw Tataryn, by doing so the Kyivan Catholics would receive a chance to express an “alternative ecclesiology,” which already maintained by them for quite a long time – “albeit meekly at times” – could be offered to the entire “body of the Catholic Church.”¹¹⁷ Opening herself to the new inspirations of the ecclesiology of “Sister-Churches,” revitalizing her own self-understanding as a “Particular Church” and not merely as a “Rite,” the Catholic Church of Kyiv would be able to achieve a clearer realization of her own ecclesial identity and vocation which she “has fought (most often without much success) to preserve over the centuries.”¹¹⁸

III.2.3. Liturgical Latinization and Particular Ways of Liturgical Worship in the Kyivan Catholic Church

The right of the Kyivan Catholic Church to maintain and to develop her own liturgical worship was probably the only aspect of her ecclesial identity which from the very beginning of her union with Rome served as visible proof of her traditional uniqueness.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, in contrast to the Second Vatican Council, which emphasized the significance of a distinctive liturgical patrimony as one of many other characteristics establishing a Particular Church (*LG* 13, 23; *UR* 14, 17; *OE* 3). Rome, at the time of the

the “Ecumenical Councils defined truths, but did not create them, and thus these dogmas are Orthodox of themselves, not from the consent of the Church” (LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” p. 360). Being generally satisfied by the Bishop Basil’s reinterpretation of papal infallibility, Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia in his “Response to Basil Losten” noted that “instead of talking about ‘infallibility,’ a number of Orthodox theologians prefer to speak rather in terms of the ‘invincibility’ of the truth within the Church... We cannot predict beforehand that the Pope will inevitably proclaim the truth, provided certain formal conditions are fulfilled. Equally, we cannot predict beforehand that a particular assembly of bishops will inevitably constitute, in the full theological sense, an Ecumenical Council. Every pronouncement, whether by a Pope or by a Council, has also to be “received” by the People of God... If we Orthodox can indeed be assured that it is not the intention of the 1870 definition of papal infallibility to make it possible to predict in advance when the Pope will speak the truth, this will remove a major difficulty from our minds” (WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 110).

¹¹⁷ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 129.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 128-129.

¹¹⁹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 114.

Union of Brest viewed Eastern worship as something of relative value.¹²⁰ Rome being inclined towards soteriological exclusivism viewed the reception of the Ruthenian “schismatics” as an act of mercy opening before these former heretics, who were still hesitant to deal decisively with the remnants of the suspicious Byzantine heritage integrated into their practices, the very possibility of salvation in the one and only Church of Christ, identified with the Church of Rome.¹²¹

Eventually, the Eastern Christians of the Church of Kyiv came to be designated as “Eastern Rite Catholics” and later, “Ruthenian Greek Catholics.” This not only marked their greater acceptance by Rome; it also marked the crucially significant shift of ecclesiological emphasis from their former ecclesial self-realization as members of one of the Churches of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate. With time, in the absence of theological criteria for particularity (besides ritual and distinct hierarchy) they would become representatives of a specific ethnic branch of universal Catholicism.¹²²

The first Catholic Metropolitans of Kyiv hoped that preservation of their rich liturgical patrimony understood as the “celebration of the Mysteries in communion with the Redeemer,” the authentic source of the original Kyivan theologizing, and the “principal *raison d’être* of the Church”¹²³ would secure their faithful from ecclesiastical disintegration and the eventual loss of their ecclesial identity. These hopes were very soon dissipated by

¹²⁰ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 179.

¹²¹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 99. Ernst Suttner refers to the restoration of unity between the Kyivan Catholics and the Church of Rome that has been perceived by the Roman Apostolic See as the submission of a “repentant schismatic body to Roman authority rather than a sister-Church entering into a relationship of equality” as *reductio in obedientiam* (Ernst SUTTNER, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism* (Rome: Bangalore, Dharmaram Publications, 1991), pp. 26-35, 62-65). The Apostolic Nuncio who represented the Pope at the time of the Union of Brest used this kind of terminology in his letter of 1 July 1595: “la riduzione delli scismatici Rutheni alla unione” (see *Monumenta Ucrainae Historica*, Vol. 9-10 (Rome: Ukrainian Catholic University, 1971), p. 170).

¹²² CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 112-113.

¹²³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 375.

the insistence of the Roman See on the necessity of the reception by all Catholics, of whatever Rite, of the unified theological system elaborated by the Council of Trent.¹²⁴ Therefore, as I already mentioned in the previous sub-chapter of the present study, already in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Kyivan Catholics found themselves in the confusing situation of being, on the one hand, allowed to retain their liturgical rite, but, on the other hand, forced to cut themselves off from the “sources that give life to that rite.”¹²⁵ They were now obliged to adjust their whole ecclesial life to the “spirit, practices and priorities of Latin liturgy and theology” imposed on their Church by the highest Roman authorities.¹²⁶ The “breaking adrift” from their natural Mother, the Church of Constantinople,¹²⁷ and the gradual latinization of their theological thinking became the direct causes of the liturgical latinization of the Kyivan Catholic Church “partly self-imposed” and “partly fostered by the Latins”¹²⁸ that was only intensified by a “sometimes unstated, but sometimes official teaching on the priority of the Latin liturgical tradition in the Catholic Church.”¹²⁹

¹²⁴ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 101.

¹²⁵ Sophia SENYK, “The Ukrainian Church and Latinization,” in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56 (1990), p. 167. As I already mentioned above, even if the Church of Kyiv had chosen not to join Rome in 1596 and to remain in communion with her Mother-Church of Constantinople, it would not have entirely secured this Church from the powerful influence of the Latin West in the 17th and 18th centuries that was also highly perceptible among most of the Slav Orthodox Churches, predisposing their clergy and faithful to deliberately accept latinization and scholasticism as more advanced models for the development of their own Christian life and thought. Nevertheless, Orthodox scholasticism was not entirely identical with Catholic scholasticism. In addition to a general approach to and methodology for teaching and writing theology, Eastern Catholics were obliged to uphold the anti-Orthodox polemics of Catholic apologetic discourse. The Orthodox for their part elaborated an anti-Catholic apologetics. It is here that Eastern Catholic and Orthodox scholastic theologies differ most significantly.

¹²⁶ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 176.

¹²⁷ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 177.

¹²⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 115.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 101. As an example of the continuous insistence of the Roman Pontiffs on the priority of the Latin Rite, see Pope Benedict XIV’s letter *Etsi pastoralis* in *Opera Omnia* vol. 15: *Bullarium*, I (Prati, 1845), p. 202. The inferiority complex adopted by the Kyivan Catholic Church precisely because of her ritual distinctiveness from Roman Catholicism in Ukraine (CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 100) was to an even greater extent developed by the first Ukrainian Greco-Catholic emigrants. Trying to

Unfortunately, most of the Kyivan Catholic hierarchs – who by the time of their first Synod after the Union of Brest were already to a significant degree voluntarily predisposed to the acceptance of many Latinizing elements into their Church’s liturgical practice, – found themselves in no position to stop the process of latinization rapidly developing among their clergy and faithful. Many of these tended to expunge a large number of pre-Union liturgical practices in order to be “more Catholic.”¹³⁰ Therefore, gathered together in Zamość in 1720 under the presidency of the Papal Nuncio to Poland, Archbishop Girolamo Grimaldi, they decided that the best way to reform their Church¹³¹ and to protect her already wounded liturgical tradition from further latinization would be to officially accept and regulate the already existing Latinizing practices such as separation of infant Baptism-Chrismation from its fulfillment in Holy Communion,¹³² (“that indicated a typically Western, activist approach to Christian initiation,”¹³³) the abolishment of the use of zeon¹³⁴ and the Eucharistic sponge,¹³⁵ a prohibition of accepting multiple “intentions” for the Divine Liturgy¹³⁶ as well as the approval of a tendency to “view marriage primarily under the aspect of (horizontal) mutual consent, diminishing its (vertical) character as a

establish their ecclesiastical life in North America they came across the apparent lack of tolerance and even ill-preparedness on the part of the RC bishops who at the height of Vatican I centralism confused the unity of the Catholic Church with the uniformity of the Latin ritual and liturgical expressions which, according to their understanding, had to be absolutely identical everywhere in the world (Bohdan PROCKO, *Ukrainian Catholics in America: A History* (Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1987), pp. 11-14).

¹³⁰ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 132.

¹³¹ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 183.

¹³² *Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum*, p. 65.

¹³³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 385.

¹³⁴ *Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum*, pp. 73-74.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73. For a more detailed explanation of this subject matter, see Laurence HUCULAK, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome (1596-1839)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Section I, Opera, no. 47 (Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1990), pp. 188-190.

¹³⁶ *Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum*, p. 74.

Mystery and consecration performed by the presbyteral Crowning.”¹³⁷ The right of the Kyivan Catholic presbyterate to chrismate their faithful was now regarded as deriving from “a dispensation from the Apostolic See,”¹³⁸ that could at anytime be revoked. (This was actually attempted in 1907 by the special Vatican document *Ea semper*¹³⁹ intended to regulate Greco-Catholic life in the United States.)¹⁴⁰

Of course, not all the examples of the Latin heritage that were incorporated by the liturgical practice of the Kyivan Catholic Church can be considered as undeniable latinization or at least “inappropriate latinization.” According to Peter Galadza, “determining which elements undeniably accrue from the Latin tradition, and which of them deform the genius and common patrimony of the Byzantine tradition” should always be subjected to adequate study and clarification.¹⁴¹ Moreover, I would also agree with Fr. Anthony Ugolnik, that the Byzantine tradition itself did not “lay immobile and unchanged as all this nudging and prodding was affecting”¹⁴² Kyivan Catholics throughout at least three and a half centuries of their union with Rome.

For our purposes, in the context of our analysis of the KCSG what is truly significant is that the entire Study Group in general, and Fr. Peter Galadza as its only professional liturgist in particular,¹⁴³ managed to delineate the principal reasons for the imposition of liturgical latinisms on Kyivan Catholics as well as the motives fostering their

¹³⁷ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 385.

¹³⁸ *Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum*, p. 66.

¹³⁹ *AAS* 41 (1908), p. 7.

¹⁴⁰ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 184.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

¹⁴² Anthony UGOLNIK, “Response to Fr. Peter Galadza: Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism,” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), p. 197. The original title of this paper was “Liturgical Drift and the Hermeneutic of Survival.”

¹⁴³ At the time of presentation of his paper on “Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism” Fr. Peter was working on the completion of his doctoral dissertation on the “Theological Foundations of the Liturgical Work of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky.” In 1997 he became the holder of the first endowed university chair of Eastern Christian Liturgy in North America.

acceptance. Naturally, this opens the possibility of healing wounds through a re-evaluation of the past and the application of clear principles to the present liturgical situation in the Catholic Church of Kyiv and the contemporary development of her ecclesial identity and vocation.¹⁴⁴

In the context of his reflections on the mutual relationship between liturgical latinization and the question of truth, Galadza made a clear distinction at the “level of motivation, or intention, which all moral theology considers to be of prime importance” between those Kyivan Catholics on the one hand, who acting in “good faith,” ceased speaking the “intelligible *koinê* of Kyivan worship” out of innocent ignorance, causing them to “view their Latinized practices as authentically Eastern in contradiction to the ‘innovations’ of the Orthodox,”¹⁴⁵ and those “Uniate” Greco-Catholics on the other hand, who, being attracted by the seeming “moral ascendance of the powerful Roman See,”¹⁴⁶ consciously violated truth by decisively excluding any possibility of reconciliation within the Kyivan Church by their explicit refusal to learn and practice Byzantine ways of liturgical worship out of their hatred towards the Orthodox.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ The reflections of Fr. Peter Galadza on the Kyivan Catholic Church’s liturgical patrimony as an integral element of her ecclesial identity was further developed in his more recent article “Liturgiina identychnist’ Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolyts’koï Tserkvy iak *locus theologicus*: Kil’ka bohoslavs’ko-pastyr’skykh propozytsiï [The Liturgical Identity of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a *Locus Theologicus*: Several Theological and Pastoral Proposals],” published in Ukrainian in *Bohoslovia* 67 (2003), pp. 72-83.

¹⁴⁵ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 176. In 1834, fifty seven priests of the Navahrudek region refused to use the “innovatory” 1831 Moscow *Leiturgicon* which correctly reflected the liturgical practice of the Kyivan Catholic Church exercised for almost a century after the Union of Brest and insisted on the usage of the “genuinely Eastern” *leiturgicons* of Metropolitans Cyprian Zochowski (1692), Leo Kiszka (1727) and Athanasius Sheptytsky which - being based on the *leiturgicon* of Cardinal Nerli for the Basilians of Grottaferrata (1683) and the Latin *Missale Plenum* - in fact incorporated in themselves many latinizing elements and influences (See Wasyl LENCYK, *The Eastern Catholic Church and Czar Nicholas I* (Rome, New York: Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1966), p. 66; HUCULAK, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, pp. 90-98 and GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” pp. 190-191).

¹⁴⁶ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 177.

¹⁴⁷ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 176.

Despite the fact that such hatred was clearly false and that ironically it did not even manifest an “interest in the real substance of Latin theology and practice,” being predetermined by the specific national and geo-political circumstances that caused the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church to constantly react to Russian Tsarist and Moscovite Orthodox encroachments, it was still very often employed by the soteriologically exclusivist Roman Apostolic See as a weapon in the Catholic Church’s battle against the schism.¹⁴⁸ The highest Roman authorities did not hesitate to urge Kyivan Catholics to avoid any re-easternization of their liturgy because of its direct connection with Orthodoxy.¹⁴⁹ For example, in his missive *Perlatum ad nos* of 1841 addressed to the Greco-Catholic Metropolitan of Halych Mykhaïlo Levyts’kyi, Pope Gregory XVI warns the Ruthenian Catholics against their “sharing in various practices” with the non-Catholic “Greco-Russians” for the reason that they may be attracted to re-enter the Orthodox “schismatic communion.”¹⁵⁰ Moreover, the Pope advised that it “behooves” the Head of the Kyivan Catholic Church to take all necessary precautions

because this danger of seduction could become greater should any changes be introduced which would make the Rite of the Ruthenian Catholics more similar to that of the schismatics. This is especially true of those rites which have the function of demonstrating a hatred for schism. Such rites absolutely must not be altered. However, there are also other rites which should not be changed. Some of these were retained by the Catholic Ruthenians from antiquity, others were eventually adopted to safeguard their separation from the schismatics. Especially during the present period of danger [from Orthodox encroachments] it would be most imprudent to alter, add, or subtract anything out of deference to the schismatics. Moreover, at this time it is crucial that you carefully note whether the clergy

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 179.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 187.

¹⁵⁰ See Pope GREGORY XVI, *Perlatum ad nos*, in VELYKY, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum*, p. 369.

and people are employing missals, catechisms, liturgical books or any other kind of religious publications derived from schismatic sources.¹⁵¹

Similar standpoints were adopted by Pius IX in his Encyclical *Omnem Sollicitudinem* of 1874. He highly praised the introduction of Latin rites into the liturgical tradition of Kyivan Catholics as positive and “distinguishing marks separating them from the heretics and schismatics.”¹⁵² Rome’s attitude towards the liturgical patrimony of the Kyivan Catholics began to change towards the end of the nineteenth century with the arrival of Pope Leo XIII on the throne of St. Peter. During his pontificate he issued six different documents¹⁵³ “appealing for a greater appreciation for, and knowledge of, Eastern traditions”¹⁵⁴ and opened the Catholic Church to the possibility of a new mode of relations with Eastern Orthodoxy.

The same dynamics were imitated and developed by Metropolitan Andrey (Sheptytsky) who relied on the most recent papal documents in order to start a multi-faceted program of re-easternization within his own Church. He even initiated a form of dialogue with his Orthodox counterparts.¹⁵⁵

Nevertheless, coming back to the question of “motives,” it is important to admit that this shift in Catholic standpoints was hardly expressive of ecumenism, as we understand it today. The Vatican was still not really concerned about the integrity of the Eastern heritage as a final goal and something truly beneficial for the entire Catholic Church, but tried afresh

¹⁵¹ Cited in GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 186.

¹⁵² Pope PIUS IX, *Omnem Sollicitudinem*, in *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* 6:1 (Rome: Typographia Vaticana, 1878), p. 317, cited in GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 186.

¹⁵³ Pope LEO XIII, *Grande Munus*, in *AAS* 4, 13 (1880), pp. 145-153; *Orientalium Dignitas*, in *AAS* 27 (1894), pp. 257-264; *Praeclara Gratulationis*, in *AAS* 26 (1894), pp. 705-717; *Provida Matris*, in *AAS* 27 (1895), pp. 645-647; *Satis Cognitum*, in *AAS* 28 (1896), pp. 708-739; and *Divinum Illud*, in *AAS* 29 (1897), pp. 644-658.

¹⁵⁴ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 187.

¹⁵⁵ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 107-108.

to employ this heritage, shared with the “schismatics,” as a handy tool for Catholic proselytism among the Orthodox.¹⁵⁶

At this point, however, it is important to note that the KCSG showed a particular commitment to a common historiography and comprehensive evaluation of the past by drawing attention to an often forgotten factor in liturgical Latinization. As Galadza noted in his paper at the Ottawa meeting of the KCSG, Orthodox proselytism among Greco-Catholics, supported first by the Russian imperial regime and later by a militantly atheistic Soviet system, also contributed considerably (though in a roundabout way) to the growth of latinization. After several anti-Uniate campaigns of the seventeenth century, the violent takeover of parishes, and the forced conversion of Greco-Catholic priests in the eighteen forties (headed by Āosyf Semashko) and the eighteen seventies (led by Markel Popel); and especially after the brutal liquidation of the Kyivan Catholic Church by the pseudo-Synod of 1946, a large number of Ukrainian Greco-Catholics “no longer felt any desire to remain faithful to a tradition which was increasingly identified with the enemy.”¹⁵⁷ Therefore, the pattern of latinization in many cases was nothing other than a concrete reaction against the encroachments of Muscovite Orthodoxy closely associated with Russian imperialism and Soviet atheism.

In his book on the history of the persecution of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Serge Keleher describes this reaction:

The parishioners found ways to manifest their Catholic adherence – they would loudly sing the “Filioque” in the Creed, ostentatiously pray on rosary beads, display badges showing the Sacred Heart, or the picture of some saint

¹⁵⁶ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 187.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

venerated by the Catholics but not by the Orthodox... such ways were innumerable.¹⁵⁸

A concise analysis of the main reasons, motives, and consequences of the liturgical latinization that still affects the Kyivan Catholic Church clearly demonstrates the significance of liturgical practice, which has often been considered one of the “greatest stumbling blocks” and – at the same time – one of the “greatest building blocks” in the history of Ukrainian Catholic-Orthodox relations.¹⁵⁹ The analysis, however, must always take note of a principle, again enunciated by Galadza at the Ottawa meeting: “a knowledge of history is never sufficient, as one must always determine how to appropriate the past.”¹⁶⁰ Therefore, in order not to arrive at an “even greater obfuscation of the liturgical question” one must avoid the earlier mistakes of misinterpreting the particular Kyivan Catholic liturgical patrimony in the light of “present-day ideologies, myths, and prejudices.”¹⁶¹ In the past, the liturgical question was too often used and abused by various sides with wrong intentions that violated the truth. This is why, at the very beginning of the present study, I dedicated so much attention to the qualitative change in the Catholic ecclesiology that took place at the Second Vatican Council. It is this shift that provides the context for resolving liturgical questions as well. Kyivan Catholics should now be able to search for proper avenues of re-discovering and developing their own ways of liturgical worship without being constrained by false motives that would induce them to either proselytize or oppose their Orthodox brethren out of motives of soteriological exclusivism, nationalism, and

¹⁵⁸ Serge KELEHER, *Passion and Resurrection: The Persecution of the Greek Catholic Church in Soviet Ukraine (1939-1989)* (L'viv: Stauropegion, 1993), p. 73, cited in GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 193.

¹⁵⁹ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 174.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

ethno-phyletism.¹⁶² The post-Vatican II climate theoretically enables them to “reappropriate the treasures of Byzantine theology and liturgy without the deadening and futile artificiality of archeologism, which instead of bringing the Kyivan Catholics to God, has

¹⁶² The term *phyletism* or *ethno-phyletism* (from *φυλή*: race or tribe) was coined at the Holy and Great pan-Orthodox Synod that met in Istanbul (former Constantinople) in 1872 in order to react against the establishment by the Bulgarian community of Istanbul of a separate bishopric, the parishes of which were meant to be open exclusively to Bulgarians. The roots of *phyletism* as a historical phenomenon revealing the existence of the quite unhealthy tendency among Christians of various ecclesiastical and ethnic backgrounds (Greeks, Russians, Ukrainians and many others) directed towards limiting the membership of their respective Churches, eparchies, or parishes exclusively to the bearers of a certain nationality or language can be traced back to many historical occurrences which came to pass long before 1872. Therefore, the founding of a separate eparchy by Bulgarians in Istanbul, which was based on the principle of ethnic identity rather than on the principle of territory and commonly shared faith, had probably become not the first but the last straw convincing the Orthodox hierarchs gathered together at their pan-Orthodox Synod that at last some decisive steps towards the rejection of *phyletism* needed to be taken. Nevertheless, despite the fact that *phyletism* and its theological argumentation were unequivocally rejected and condemned as being “contrary to the teaching of the Gospel, the holy canons and the constant practice of the Church” while its adherents “accepting the division according to races” were designated as being “real schismatics,” *ethno-phyletism* or ecclesiastical racism even after 1872 remains a real threat not only for Orthodoxy but also for world-wide Catholicism which also at times failed to demonstrate to the world the common expression of unity that should supersede any ethnic, linguistic and cultural divisions. The contemporary situation demands from all Christians regardless of their ecclesiastical backgrounds to clearly acknowledge that for the Christian Church, which is a “spiritual communion, predestined by its Leader and Founder to contain all nations in one brotherhood in Christ, racism is alien and quite unthinkable” (see the section on the “Heresy of Racism,” of the online edition of Hildo BOS and Jim FOREST, eds., *For the Peace from Above: an Orthodox Resource Book on War, Peace and Nationalism* (Athens: Syndesmos Press, 1999), at <http://incommunion.org/?p=263>, accessed on 13 August 2009). Furthermore, being based primarily on ethnic identity, *phyletism* is also absolutely foreign to the concept of the Church’s particularity. The latter is founded on a genuinely Christian identity that is open to all nations and the age-old traditions transmitted from Apostolic times when there was only one bishop for each city. This bishop would unite all of its Christian inhabitants regardless of their ethnic background by having them share in the same Eucharistic gifts. That is why I have more often than not relied on the use of the name *Kyivan Catholic Church* as a healthier alternative to the official name of this Church, which is still designated as *Ukrainian Greek Catholic*. It is important to admit that Ukrainian Greco-Catholics, because they were not really familiar with the theory of *phyletism*, did in practice quite often act in line with this conception, dangerously confusing Christian identity with a specific ethnic identity. We can still hear many voices among both Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox suggesting that every nation should have its own independent Church, the boundaries of ecclesiastical administration of which should correspond to the vagaries of ethnicity and political borders. Nevertheless, such an approach has nothing to do with the ecclesiology of a Particular Church as it was presented by the Second Vatican Council, interpreted by the KCSG and evaluated by this present study. Founded on Byzantine traditional roots held in common with many other Churches and preserving her communion with many other Particular Churches of the Catholic communion while still searching a possibility of restoring the visible unity within the divided Christendom, the ecclesial identity of the Kyivan Catholic Church benefits considerably from the great values of the Ukrainian culture, language and national traditions, but it should in no way be limited to them, because the ultimate vocation of this Church just as that of any other Church is to lead the whole human race (not any particular race) to salvation in Christ. Of course, the often-heard recourse of the Moscow Patriarchate to supposed universalism in claiming to safeguard Orthodoxy from phyletism sounds rather hollow when applied to neighbouring peoples. It is precisely Russian Orthodoxy that some Ukrainians find intolerable because of its often imperialistic nature. Ecclesiastical imperialism can, in fact, be quite phyletistic, even while protesting its internationalism.

frequently only led them to their past, or their ‘identity,’ understood purely sociologically.”¹⁶³ Thus, they can come to a clearer realization that the authentic Byzantine liturgical tradition still practiced by the Orthodox as a “living force” can once again equally become a “truly powerful and unique medium of salvation” for Kyivan Catholics who are no longer bound by false unionistic objectives.¹⁶⁴ In sum, as soon as both the Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox actually accept the ecclesiology of Sister-Churches and simultaneously attempt to heal certain still existing national and political animosities, liturgical latinization “will be on its way to becoming value neutral”¹⁶⁵ allowing the Orthodox to “see beyond the veil of liturgical culture” and to “perceive the Spirit and Truth vibrant in even the most latinized” Greco-Catholic services. At the same time the new ecclesiology will help Kyivan Catholics themselves to re-discover their roots in the Byzantine-Slavonic liturgical tradition and eventually enable them to “differentiate more consistently between the particular and the universal,” that is, to “divorce Orthodoxy as a whole from its associations with particular regimes”¹⁶⁶ such as the tsarist or Soviet.

¹⁶³ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 180.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 178. In one of his papers, Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos expressed a hope that in the same way as the “practical problems of different ritual traditions” that exist between the Chalcedonian and the Non-Chalcedonian Antiochian Churches were regarded by the leaders of these Churches as problems of minor importance that would easily “sort themselves out” after the restoration of Eucharistic communion, there will also be no problem if the Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox ever decide to concelebrate the Divine Liturgy for the reason that in actual fact the differences that still exist between a pre-Niconian ritual (overlaid with some later borrowings from the Latins) used by the Ukrainian Greco-Catholics and the Niconian service-books of the Synodal tradition (with some remnants of the pre-Niconian tradition) used by the Ukrainian Orthodox are even less significant than those between the Oriental and Orthodox Churches of Antioch (MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 167).

¹⁶⁶ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 194.

III.2.4. The Kyivan Catholic Church and the Question of Particular Ecclesiastical Legislation

The Catholic members of the KCSG were inspired by Vatican II's insistence that all of the Churches of the Catholic communion follow their natural right and duty to "govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules" (*OE* 5). As this right and duty have not infrequently been at odds with the concrete exercise of Roman primacy the KCSG dedicated much of its attention precisely to the question of Roman Primacy and its responsibility towards self-governing Sister-Churches which either already belong - or for various reasons are still hesitant to enter into communion with – the Church of Rome. The issue of the Petrine Ministry in its relation to the real or merely imaginary particularity of the Eastern Catholic Churches was a priority during various consultations of the KCSG. The crucial significance of this matter for the development of the authentic ecclesial identity of the Kyivan Catholic Church cannot be stressed enough. Of course, this development could also serve as a clear illustration of what might happen with the Orthodox Churches once they decide to restore their communion with Rome.¹⁶⁷

Nearly half of both the Orthodox and Catholic participants of the KCSG took pains to present the history of the development of the contemporary concept of the Roman Primacy.¹⁶⁸ However, this does not need to be discussed here at length as we have already done so elsewhere in the present study. The members of the KCSG demonstrated a

¹⁶⁷ Roma HAYDA, "News and Views: Orientale Lumen Conference Advances Ecumenism," in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 67:39 (26 September 1999), pp. 6, 18 at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/12845193/The-Ukrainian-Weekly-199939>, accessed on 27 July 2009.

¹⁶⁸ WARE, "The Church of God," pp. 21-29; CHIROVSKY, "The Union of the Holy Churches of God," pp. 36-42; LOSTEN, "The Roman Primacy," pp. 83-106; WARE "Response to Bishop Basil (Losten)," pp. 108-116; TATARYN, "Papal Primacy," pp. 119-141; LASH, "Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn," pp. 142-151; LOSTEN, "Patriarch and Pope," pp. 201-238; Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, "Response to Bishop Basil (Losten): Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 239-255.

surprisingly high level of agreement on the understanding of most of the past events surrounding the establishment and the exercise of the Petrine Ministry throughout many centuries of Christian history. They all were of the same opinion that in the first millennium Rome, as the site of the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, very rapidly “gained a place of respect among the various Churches,”¹⁶⁹ while the Roman Pontiffs as the direct successors of St. Peter and as the heads of the “Church which presides in love” were generally perceived as performing certain supervisory, organizational, inspirational, supportive and pastoral (not juridical) functions¹⁷⁰ that “have never really been denied by Byzantium or the other Sees.”¹⁷¹ Nevertheless, as time progressed, these Pontiffs, already beginning with Leo the Great, and especially with Nicholas I, Gregory VII and Innocent III, began to claim that the “Roman Church alone enjoys the plenitude of power in the Universal Church”¹⁷² and that therefore, all the bishops need to be subordinated to the Bishop of Rome, who is in a special way entrusted with a “charism that is in some way more ‘assured’ and more ‘certain’ than that ascribed to the other bishops.”¹⁷³

As Myroslaw Tataryn pointed out at the Oxford meeting of the KCSG, Rome’s attitude towards Eastern Christians and their hierarchies became even more condescending after the Council of Trent, which – in a manner pre-determined by the necessities of the Counter-Reformation – placed even greater emphasis on centralization within the Catholic Church.¹⁷⁴ It was precisely at this time that the majority of the Kyivan hierarchs decided to

¹⁶⁹ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 120 and LASH, “Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn,” pp. 144.

¹⁷⁰ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 187 and WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 28.

¹⁷¹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 187.

¹⁷² TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 124.

¹⁷³ WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 25.

¹⁷⁴ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 125.

join, as they thought, the Catholic communion of Churches.¹⁷⁵ As we have already seen, they ended up subordinating their Church¹⁷⁶ to the Roman Apostolic See and allowed it to be gradually transformed into one of the “ritual appendages” of the Roman Church.¹⁷⁷ Again, as already mentioned on several occasions, the union of the Kyivan Church with Rome was in the eyes of Pope Clement VIII¹⁷⁸ nothing but a reception of a group of schismatics into the Roman Patriarchate.¹⁷⁹ Thus, their *reductio ad obedientiam*¹⁸⁰ from the very beginning opened this Church to inappropriate latinization and the acceptance of everything that we today associate with the term “uniatism” (an unsatisfactory model for the restoration of Christian unity).¹⁸¹

Despite the fact that for a short time after the Union of Brest the Kyivan Metropolitans could still appoint their bishops without Roman approval,¹⁸² by the beginning of the eighteenth century the decisions of the Synods of the Kyivan Catholic bishops were regarded by Rome as being in need of ratification by the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*. Suddenly the Heads of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church were deprived of the exercise of their “traditional primacy in any real sense.”¹⁸³ In spite of the partial successful attempts on the part of Sheptytsky¹⁸⁴ and Slipyj¹⁸⁵ to re-establish aspects of the authority of their See¹⁸⁶ most of their claims – especially before Vatican II – were

¹⁷⁵ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 98-99.

¹⁷⁶ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 126.

¹⁷⁷ LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 212.

¹⁷⁸ See his bull *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis* of 23 December 1595 in VELYKY, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis*, p. 255.

¹⁷⁹ MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 137.

¹⁸⁰ SUTTNER, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism*, p. 26-35.

¹⁸¹ MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” pp. 242, 252.

¹⁸² TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 131.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 132 and CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 106.

¹⁸⁴ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 133.

¹⁸⁵ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 113.

¹⁸⁶ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” pp. 133-137.

hampered by the fact that they had to contend with “the foundation point of the Roman Catholic system, that is, the primacy of the Pope of Rome defined as direct, universal jurisdiction.”¹⁸⁷

The situation considerably changed when – in contrast to the First Vatican Council, which had overstated the Roman Primacy at the expense of Episcopal collegiality¹⁸⁸ – the Second Vatican Council partially restored the balance in the understanding of the highest Church authority by insisting that primatial and Episcopal powers are not mutually, exclusive but in actual fact exist for each other.¹⁸⁹ The positioning of the Bishop of Rome in the midst of the Episcopal college on the part of Vatican II signified that the “monarchical model which had come to dominate Roman Catholic ecclesiology was amended” and replaced by a “more Eastern model of the Church as a communion of communions.”¹⁹⁰ In response to this new outlook as well as the inspiring Encyclical of John Paul II by which he once again confirmed the normativity of the first millennium and invited Eastern Christians to assist him in re-envisioning his primacy, Andriy Chirovsky suggested that the Synod of the Kyivan Catholic Church might revisit its four hundred year old Articles of the Union of Brest in order to reinterpret the attitude of their Church towards the primacy of the Roman Pontiff in the light of the first Article.¹⁹¹ That Article asks the

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 126.

¹⁸⁸ It is striking that even at the time of Vatican I the Greco-Catholic Patriarch Gregory Joseph of Antioch and all the bishops of his Synod agreed to accept the formulations of *Pastor Aeternus* only with the clause *salvis omnibus juribus et privilegiis patriarcharum* and refused to revoke their position according to which the Bishop of Rome was not understood as an absolute monarch “even when Pius IX used force in an effort to compel the deletion of this clause” (Losten, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 79).

¹⁸⁹ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 127.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁹¹ CHIROVSKY, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,” p. 158.

Roman Church not to compel the Kyivan hierarchs “to any other faith but that testified to by the Gospel and the writings of the Holy Fathers of the Greek faith.”¹⁹²

An even more courageous attempt was undertaken by Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford, who expressed his hope that “perhaps it will be interesting to hear an Eastern Catholic voice in the matter,”¹⁹³ and in his presentation on the “Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev” made a “deliberate effort to understand and reveal the Roman Primacy in the language of the Christian East, in the tradition of the first millennium.” He indicated how he personally believes “that the teaching of Vatican I and Vatican II can and must be rooted solidly in the Great Tradition” which the Catholics and Orthodox have in common.¹⁹⁴ Thus, commenting on Vatican I’s Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, Bishop Basil indicated that both the supporters and the opponents of the document agreed¹⁹⁵ that the whole point of emphasizing the Roman Primacy is to foster the “service of the Church’s unity over which it is the vocation of the Church of Rome to watch.”¹⁹⁶

The passionate discussions that had taken place at Vatican I manifested that even such dangerous expressions as “ordinary primacy of jurisdiction” need to be understood as referring to the fact that the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff is *ex officio* and not delegated by someone else (so it is “ordinary”)¹⁹⁷ similarly to the jurisdiction of each local bishop in

¹⁹² MOROZIUK, *Politics of a Church Union*, p. 17.

¹⁹³ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 79. At one point in his presentation on the Eastern Catholic understanding of the Roman Primacy, Bishop Basil reminded the other participants of the KCSG that the voice of Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch blessed memory as well as of the other Eastern Catholic bishops (who constituted only five percent of the council fathers present at Vatican II) was understood by Patriarch Athenagoras as the voice of Orthodoxy at the Council, and that it in actual fact contributed very much to the change in Catholic ecclesiology in the nineteen sixties (Ibid., pp. 102-103).

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 80.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁹⁶ Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 3050-51, cited in LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 85.

¹⁹⁷ In his response to Bishop Basil’s presentation Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia said: “I was reassured by Bishop Basil’s explanation of the term “ordinary jurisdiction.” Orthodox commonly take this to signify that the Pope in effect replaces the local bishop assuming in each diocese the authority which properly

his own diocese, the responsibilities of whom should never be compromised.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, the oft-used title “Vicar of Christ” which is habitually applied to the Roman Pontiff as an alternative to the title the “Vicar of the Apostles Peter and Paul,”¹⁹⁹ which is peculiar to him, should actually be applied equally to every bishop whose vocation is not to be the “Vicar of the Pope” but to bear in a manner essentially analogous to him, “responsibility for the whole Church, for the universal Church, and for the unity of the Church.”²⁰⁰

Losten continued: the special service of the Roman Primacy in this regard would be to “enable this responsibility entrusted to every bishop to find itself within the *sobornist*’, as we call it in Ukrainian – the Latins would say the *catholica*, and the Greeks would say the *koinonia*.”²⁰¹ In tune with the ecclesiology of Metropolitan John Zizioulas, Bishop Basil expressed his strong belief in the significance of the local Churches (dioceses). Being governed by local bishops, they still create a mysterious unity among themselves not “by virtue of a superimposed external structure, but by virtue of the whole Christ who is present in each.”²⁰² Therefore, each of the local Churches should be able to recognize herself in other local Churches, as for instance is the case in the local Church of Stamford (Losten’s diocese), where despite “variations of language, music, ethnic culture, discipline,

belongs to the diocesan. It is good to know that this is not all the true meaning of the phrase” (WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” pp. 108-109).

¹⁹⁸ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 87-89 and Tillard, *The Bishop of Rome*, pp. 150-151.

¹⁹⁹ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 83.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 88. Compare with *LG* 23 and *CD* 6. Bishop Basil notes that the responsibility of a local bishop for the entire Church is in particular emphasized by the obligatory participation of several bishops in the ordination of each new bishop (Ibid., p. 91).

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 88.

²⁰² John ZIZIOULAS, “La Communauté eucharistique et la Catholicité de l’église,” in *Istina* 14/78 (1986), passage cited in English in TILLARD, *The Bishop of Rome*, p. 151 and in LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 90.

theological expression, calendar, and so forth such recognition exists.”²⁰³ Furthermore, Bishop Basil went as far as to stress something truly memorable:

The Bishop of Stamford – not the Bishop of Rome – has the charge and authority, directly from the Holy Spirit, to build up the Church of Stamford, and to maintain the Church of Stamford in the fullness of Orthodox faith and Catholic communion to keep the Church of Stamford “Orthodox in faith and Catholic in love,” in the phrase which the present Bishop of Rome likes to use. This is accomplished in communion with “the Church which presides in love,” in the famous phrase of Saint Ignatius, and therefore in communion with the Bishop of that Church – the Bishop of Rome. *Pastor Aeternus* expressed this in words which could easily be misinterpreted terming the Roman primacy *principium unitatis*. This is capable of correct interpretation, but it is also ambiguous. The Bishop of Rome does not create unity; the local bishop directed by the Holy Spirit creates unity within his local Church, and the local bishop directed by the Holy Spirit creates the unity of his local Church within the *koinonia*, the *catholica*.²⁰⁴ Directed by the same Holy Spirit, the Bishop of Rome is the sentinel, the guardian; he *watches over* this unity; he *presides* in this unity, of which each bishop is the source and foundation in his own Local Church (LG 23).²⁰⁵

²⁰³ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 91.

²⁰⁴ In his response, Bishop Kallistos defined with more accuracy that “it is the Eucharist rather than the bishop that “creates unity” within the local Church; the bishop, when presiding at the Eucharist, is the *symbol* of local unity but not its *source*. The source and foundation of the Local Church is not the bishop but Christ Himself, present in the Divine Liturgy (WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 109)

²⁰⁵ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 93. In his presentation at the Rome 1995 consultation of the KCSG, Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos turned everyone’s attention to and congratulated Bishop Basil for his 1992 paper on the Roman Primacy in view of the fact that the most recent Encyclical of Pope John Paul II (*Ut Unum Sint*) appeared to be a “splendid vindication” of the reflections of Bishop Basil presented in Oxford. Bishop Vsevolod also noted that “one or another of our Orthodox participants in Oxford and later in Stamford suggested that Bishop Basil had gone too far, and that Rome would even reprimand him for his paper; it is now clear that Bishop Basil was firmly in the line of thought of Pope John Paul II; Bishop Basil’s paper uses several of the sources and citations which appear in the encyclical (MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” pp. 143-144). Moreover, Bishop Basil has also been congratulated for his paper in a special letter sent to him by the President of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy who in particular said: “I have read with much interest your presentation of the Roman Primacy and noted with pleasure that the Orthodox present found it possible to recognize the identity of their own faith in what the Ukrainian Catholics were saying in this connection... Here in the Pontifical Council we shall certainly reflect on your presentation of the ecclesiological conclusions to be drawn from the status of Sister Churches which Catholics and Orthodox recognize in each other, your comments on the Vatican I definition of the Primacy and your presentation of the Local Church in relation to the Universal Church. By this time you will have had a second meeting of the Kievan Church Study Group. I look forward to hearing of your discussions, and I thank you all for the inspiration that you have given us. A particular word of gratitude to you, dear Bishop Losten, for the trouble you have taken in bringing the results of your first meeting to my attention” (Edward Idris CASSIDY, “Letter to Bishop Basil (Losten), 20 October, 1992,” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), p. 393).

In the opinion of Bishop Basil, the reciprocal relations between the Roman Pontiff and all of the local bishops of the Catholic Church is best reflected by one of the titles of the Bishop of Rome “not popular among the Latins” designating him as *primus inter pares*.²⁰⁶ The Pope is actually *primus* because the Church of Rome is the “center or touchstone” of communion among the local Churches and thus its Bishop, who presides and “watches over” the unity among the local bishops, truly represents this *centrum unitatis*, exercising his primacy as a “condition of communion,” rather than the ultimate “cause of communion.”²⁰⁷ His place is actually *inter* (among) the bishops, because he stands “within” the episcopacy and not “above” or “outside” the Church and her hierarchy. And the bishops are actually *pares* (pares) among themselves, because they all represent Christ (not the Pope) in their dioceses in cooperation and communion with the Bishop of Rome as their authentic leader whose responsibility is the service for the good of the whole Church – *ad aedificationem ecclesiae*.²⁰⁸

The interpretation of the Petrine Ministry in its relation to the responsibilities of the local bishops as expressed from a Kyivan Catholic perspective by Bishop Basil (Losten) certainly deserves further study and reflection, but it was already commented on by another participant of the KCSG, Fr. Andrew Onuferko. The latter indicated that unfortunately the

²⁰⁶ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 94.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 92-94. Precisely for the reason that only Christ himself can be regarded as the basic “cause of communion” in the Church, Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch during the Second Vatican Council rejected the distinction between a “visible head” – the Pope – and an “invisible head” – Christ, and objected to the application of the phrase the “head of the Church” to the Pope (MAXIMOS IV, *L’Eglise Greque Melkite au Concile* (Damas, Syrie: Patriarcats Grec Melkite Catholique, 1967), pp. 133-134).

²⁰⁸ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 94-96. In this regard several members of the KCSG mentioned in their papers the meeting of Pope Paul VI with Metropolitan Meliton representing the Ecumenical Patriarchate that took place on 14 December 1976 in the Sistine Chapel, during which the Pope spontaneously fell to his knees and kissed the feet of the delegate of Patriarch Athenagoras. In the opinions of Bishop Basil (Losten) and Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) this gesture on the part of the Roman Pontiff better than any words manifested that the prime aim of the papacy in this world “is not to domineer, but to serve, as Jesus did” (LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198 and LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” pp. 235-236).

newly promulgated *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* (CCEO), only partially reflected the kind of ecclesiology elaborated by Losten. Onuferko made the ecclesiological presuppositions of the new Code the main focus of his paper delivered at the Ottawa consultation of the KCSG.²⁰⁹ In Onuferko's opinion, the *CCEO* relies only to a certain extent on the ancient canons of the Eastern Churches and in actual fact appears to be heavily dependent on the Latin *Codex Iuris Canonici* of 1983.²¹⁰ This Eastern Code fails to reflect the authentically Eastern understanding of the relations between the universal and local dimensions in the Church. It emphasizes that all Catholics regardless of their traditional background, should acknowledge that they are first of all "members of the Universal Catholic Church under the Pope," while, according to the experience of the Eastern Catholics, the understanding of their membership in the Universal Church starts from "their parish, their bishop, their Patriarch and the Synod of Bishops, and through them communion with the entire Catholic Church."²¹¹ According to Onuferko, the *CCEO* also failed to clarify the ecclesiological vision of the Church as a Communion of Particular Churches that had been elaborated by the Second Vatican Council. The Code should have done this through the use of more precise terminology and concepts of ecclesiastical law,²¹² but failed because the *CCEO* introduced the new term *Ecclesia sui iuris*, based on the parallel concept of *Ecclesia ritualis sui iuris* employed by the *CIC83* (cc. 111 and 112)²¹³ which may have seemed to the codification commission to be "arguably adequate from a canonical point of view" but nonetheless indicated the inability of the canonists involved to

²⁰⁹ ONUFERKO, "The New Code of Canons," pp. 133-168.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 144.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

“find an ecclesiological foundation for the Eastern Catholic Churches,”²¹⁴ the existence of which cannot be exhaustively exhaustively by the *CCEO*’s limited definition. According to the latter each of them is considered merely “a group of faithful united by a hierarchy according to the norm of law which the supreme authority of the Church expressly or tacitly recognizes as *sui iuris*” (can. 27).²¹⁵ Onuferko agrees with the Syro-Malankara canonist Fr. Anthony Valiyavilayil,²¹⁶ who found the definition of *Ecclesia sui iuris* to be “basically flawed” for the reason that “by stating that *sui iuris* Churches are Churches recognized as *sui iuris*, the statement becomes circular and defective according to the rules of definition.”²¹⁷

Onuferko, who incidentally noted that there is no real difference between the terms *sui iuris* and *autonomous*,²¹⁸ suggested that a more precise rendering of Canon 27 could have been: “A portion of the people of God, united by a hierarchy under the leadership of a common head according to the norm of law, which the supreme authority of the Church

²¹⁴ Ibid., p. 147.

²¹⁵ It is interesting to compare this canon with canon 57, which even more clearly defines that the *Ecclesia sui iuris* is basically a grouping of eparchies that is in need of recognition by the supreme authority of the Catholic Church, meaning the Roman Pontiff or Ecumenical Councils who can legally “erect, restore, modify and suppress” any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion (*CCEO*, can. 57).

²¹⁶ In one of his articles that was basically an extract of his doctoral dissertation entitled “The Nature of the *Sui Iuris* Church” that was defended at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Fr. Anthony Valiyavilayil presented a good survey of various terms such as *Ecclesia particularis seu ritus*, *Ecclesia peculiaris*, *Ecclesia individualis*, *Ecclesia ritualis*, *Ecclesia ritualis sui iuris*, *Ecclesia sui iuris*, as well as two other designations of the Eastern Catholic Churches as *autonomous* or *autocephalous* (Anthony VALIYAVILAYIL, “The Notion of a *Sui Iuris* Church,” in José CHIRAMEL and Kuriakose BHARANIKULANGARA, eds., *The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: A Study and Interpretation. Essays in Honour of Joseph Cardinal Parecatil, President, Pontifical Commission for the Revision of Eastern Canon Law* (Alwaye, India, 1992), pp. 60-64). The last two terms were “rejected, as having acquired a particular meaning in Orthodox usage, which, in the minds of the legislators, did not correspond with Catholic ecclesiology” (ONUFRKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 145).

²¹⁷ VALIYAVILAYIL, “The Notion of a *Sui Iuris* Church,” p. 60.

²¹⁸ Fr. Andrew Onuferko criticized the arguments of the legislators against the usage of the term *autonomous* as a parallel term to *sui iuris* as being unconvincing especially in view of the fact that the accepted term *sui iuris* “has already proved itself lacking from a linguistic point of view, since it cannot be adequately translated into modern languages” (ONUFRKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 145). Practically the same opinion was later expressed by the prominent American Maronite canonist, John Faris (FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 149).

expressly or tacitly recognizes as having determined autonomous rights to govern itself with legislative, administrative and juridical powers, is called in this Code a Church *Sui Iuris*.”²¹⁹ However, even in this case, according to Onuferko, the concept *sui iuris* emphasizes little more than a “determined autonomy” of the Eastern Catholic Churches to “govern themselves with legislative, administrative and juridical powers” and still does not fully reflect the historical, theological, spiritual, liturgical and pastoral reasons for their existence as an intermediate level of communion. This is crucial as one needs to clearly “indicate the ecclesiological basis for calling these communities ‘Churches.’”²²⁰ Such an ecclesiological basis should involve the understanding of these Churches as divinely instituted by Christ and should express much more than merely their right to rule themselves in accordance with their particular legislation.²²¹

Note that we once again come across an important question of a terminological definition of the Eastern Catholic Churches (already addressed, though not fully clarified in one of the previous sections of the present work).²²² The problem lies in the fact that none of the existing concepts, such as the unfortunate term *ritus*, used to reduce the ecclesiastical character of the Churches of Catholic communion, or *Ecclesia localis* employed to designate a diocese or a parish, or even the more canonically precise *Ecclesia sui iuris*, – none of these, according to Onuferko, and Chorbishop John Faris – and my own analysis, –

²¹⁹ Fr. Andrew Onuferko preferred to use expressions “portion of the people of God” instead of “group of faithful,” and “under the leadership of a common head” meaning Patriarch, Major Archbishop, or Metropolitan instead of “under a hierarchy” (ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 147). In my own opinion, the expression “portion of the people of God” is also inadequate from the ecclesiological point of view, since according to the genuinely Eastern understanding of the Eucharistic ecclesial nature of a Particular Church, she can never be regarded as constituting merely a certain “part” of the general “whole.” Therefore, the expression “portion of the people of God” can and should also be replaced by another more relevant expression such as for instance “community of clergy and faithful” or “community of Christians,” etc.

²²⁰ Ibid., pp. 147-148.

²²¹ FARIS, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, p. 149.

²²² See pp. 250-256 of this thesis.

are up to the task of fully elucidating the ecclesiological vision of the Second Vatican Council that designated the Catholic Church as a communion of Particular Churches which reveal the *plenitudo catholicitatis* by representing different incarnations of the essentially one and the same Divine Revelation.

Therefore, despite the fact that the PCCICR (Latin Code Commission) forced the CCEO to employ the term *Ecclesia particularis* to designate a diocese,²²³ I still insist in keeping with the thinking of Onuferko and Chirovsky expressed at different sessions of the KCSG that this somewhat “juridically imprecise” but clearly “ecclesiological rich”²²⁴ term be used for a Church per se. As we have seen, it appears in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, precisely because it was the most adequate term for defining all of the Churches of the Catholic communion as equal ecclesiastical bodies of Apostolic origin, containing essentially the same constitutive elements that make them the Holy Churches of God.²²⁵ Of course, I am fully conscious of certain weaknesses of this term, which are due to the confusion caused by the aforementioned divergences in various Church documents as well as the possibility of a false association of this term with the Latin word “pars” meaning “part” or “piece,” which could suggest that a Particular Church is simply a “part” of the Universal Church. This latter concept – being contrary to Eucharistic ecclesiology²²⁶ – is certainly not my understanding of the term. I still think that the term “Particular Church”

²²³ ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” pp. 144-145.

²²⁴ Ibid., p. 144.

²²⁵ According to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky “in the last twenty-five years the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church throughout the world has been struggling with the meaning of the ecclesiological notion of particularity or ‘pomisnist’”. This is a concept which has undergone considerable evolution in Catholic circles, and therefore has various shades of meaning. While for Latin Catholics the term ‘particular Church’ generally is taken to refer to the individual diocese, for Ukrainian Catholics this term refers to the Particular Ritual Church *Sui Iuris*, roughly corresponding to the Orthodox notion of an autonomous or even autocephalous Church” (CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 34).

²²⁶ ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, pp. 145-170.

(as designating not a parish, a diocese, or a group of dioceses but rather the Catholic Churches of the Roman, Constantinopolitan, Antiochian, Alexandrian, Armenian, and Chaldean traditions) can at least temporarily be employed to best render the ecclesiological standpoints of Vatican II. It can be understood to emphasize that all of the Churches of the Catholic communion obtain identical ecclesiastical character (each of them is fully *Ecclesia*) but differ from each other in the particular elements of their ecclesiastical traditions (*Particularis*), (that is, their sources, specific theological approaches, liturgy, spirituality, legislation, as well as their understanding of approaches to ecumenical rapprochement and missionary activity).²²⁷

At the conclusion of his reflections on the ecclesiological presuppositions and practical implications of the various terms that attempt to designate the canonical status of the Churches of the Catholic communion, Onuferko posed two questions that lead directly into the next point of my analysis. He asked: Can the Latin Church also be considered a *sui iuris* Church, and can all the *sui iuris* Churches be placed on the same level?²²⁸ Unfortunately, the answer to these extremely important questions remains somewhat

²²⁷ In the Ukrainian language the most frequently employed term in this regard is *Pomisna Tserkva* which directly corresponds to the term *Ecclesia Localis* (Peter GALADZA, "Ecclesial Integrity and Effective Pastoring: Validating the Spirit's Gift to Particular Churches," in Roma HAYDA and Andrew SOROKOWSKI, eds., *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church: Papers Presented at the Ukrainian Catholic Laity Conference Manor Junior College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, 11-13 November 1994* (L'viv: Svichado, 1996), p. 67). Some of the Ukrainian ecclesiologists preferred to use the term *Samoupravna Tserkva* that literally means Self-governing Church or *Ecclesia sui iuris* (Ihor MONCHAK, *Samoupravna Kyïvs'ka Tserkva* [The Self-Governing Kyivan Church] (L'viv: Svichado, 1994), pp. 1-144). However, it is interesting to note that in the nineteen sixties and the nineteen seventies the self-designation of this Church as *Ukrains'ka Pomisna Katolyts'ka Tserkva* was commonly translated as the Ukrainian Particular Catholic Church. Therefore, even after the promulgation of the *CCEO*, the usage of the term, "Particular Church" understood as the terminology of Vatican II which had never been officially abrogated can still be regarded as the most popular among Kyivan Catholic scholars (ONUFERKO, "The New Code of Canons," p. 144. See also Michael FAHEY, "Challenges to Today's Ukrainian Catholic Church: The Vocation to Particularity in an Age of Centralism," in HAYDA, SOROKOWSKI, *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church*, pp. 27-46 and Andriy CHIROVSKY, "The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv," in HAYDA, SOROKOWSKI, *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church*, pp. 11-26).

²²⁸ ONUFERKO, "The New Code of Canons," pp. 148-149.

unclear to the present moment. On the one hand, Vatican II's Decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*²²⁹ as well as many canons of both *CIC83*²³⁰ and *CCEO*²³¹ underline *de iure* the essential equality of all the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, but on the other hand, it becomes very difficult to assign equal rights to the Roman *sui iuris* Church in view of the fact that its Head is also the Successor of Peter, with ordinary, immediate and universal powers over the entire Catholic Church. Furthermore, in contrast to the limited territories of the other *sui iuris* Churches of the Catholic communion, the ecclesiastical territory of the Church of Rome extends to the whole world. Thus, the outdated emphasis on the role of the Roman rite as being “*de facto* the universal rite of the Catholic Church with no territorial limits or restrictions” whatsoever, continues.²³²

As various Catholic members of the KCSG noted at several meetings, since the time of Vatican II, which “revived the ancient theology and practice of Episcopal collegiality to counterbalance Vatican I’s one-sided emphasis on papal primacy,”²³³ and especially since the time of the pontificate of John Paul II, who underlined the role of the primacy as “service to the needs of a Particular Church”²³⁴ the Church of Rome theoretically has made a decisive step towards an appreciation of the genuinely Eastern understanding of primatial jurisdiction. According to their approach, the Patriarch is always perceived as the “real spiritual father, the mediator of life, the heart of his ecclesial family”²³⁵ and the guarantor of the fullness and catholicity of each of the local Churches entrusted to the care of his

²²⁹ *OE* 2-6

²³⁰ See *CIC83* 111, 112, see also 535 #2; 214, 372 #2, see also 476, 479 #2, 518; 450 #1, 846 #2, 923, see 1248 #1; 991; 1015 #2, see 1021; 1109, 1127.

²³¹ See *CCEO* 207, 696 #1-2, 1465.

²³² ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” pp. 149-150.

²³³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 373.

²³⁴ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 119.

²³⁵ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 373.

brother bishops who, together with him as their real Head, constitute the synodal structure of a given Particular Church.²³⁶ Acknowledging a clear distinction among the specific functions of the Roman Cardinals,²³⁷ the nominal dignities of the Latin Patriarchs, and the real ecclesiastical authority of the Eastern Patriarchs, Vatican II's *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* in principle recognized the "rights and privileges" of the latter confirmed at the time of the union of their Churches with Rome (*OE* 9).

The same real jurisdiction of the Eastern Patriarchs over the bishops, priests, and the faithful of their Particular Churches in the image of the jurisdiction of the Pope as the Patriarch of the West²³⁸ was at least theoretically confirmed anew by the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* (cc. 55-150).²³⁹ Yet, in Onuferko's opinion, there still exist a number of canons in the *CCEO* that seem to contradict the genuinely Eastern understanding of the highest primatial authority of the Eastern Patriarchs. These make the Heads of the Eastern Catholic Churches merely sharers in the supreme ecclesiastical authority that still belongs

²³⁶ John ZIZIOULAS, "The Church as Communion," in Thomas BEST and Günther GASSMANN, eds., *One the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, Faith and Order Paper No. 166 (WCC Publications: Geneva, 1994), p. 108 cited in LOSTEN, "Patriarch and Pope," pp. 205-206.

²³⁷ Up to the present day many of the Eastern Catholic Patriarchs and Major Archbishops, including the current Head of the Kyivan Catholic Church, His Beatitude Lubomyr (Husar), combine together the primatial authority in their Particular Churches with their membership in the college of the Roman Cardinals. Certainly, this no less than strange combination that in my opinion creates serious ecclesiological inconsistencies, deserves separate study. Yet, at this point it would be worthwhile to simply mention an interesting private audience of February 1965 during which Pope Paul VI asked Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch about the possibility of making him a Cardinal of the Roman Church and received the unexpected reply that the Patriarch would accept this degrading proposal only if the Roman Pontiff in his turn would agree to become a Cardinal of his Particular Church, which was the first See of St. Peter (LUYKX, "Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos," pp. 184).

²³⁸ I already mentioned elsewhere in this study that Alexander Schmemmann severely criticized this particular standpoint of renewed Catholic ecclesiology by saying that the notion of the authority of the Eastern Patriarchs as having "personal jurisdiction" over the bishops, clergy and faithful of their Particular Churches and placing them above their Synods is foreign to the genuinely Eastern ecclesial consciousness (SCHMEMMANN, "A Response to the Decree," p. 388 and LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," p. 372).

²³⁹ LUYKX, "Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos," pp. 184-185.

in the Catholic Church exclusively to the Roman Pontiff.²⁴⁰ For example, after his canonical election by the Synod of Bishops (can. 63-72), the Eastern Catholic Patriarch is obliged to request ecclesiastical communion with the Bishop of Rome,²⁴¹ without which he would not be able to convoke Synods of Bishops or to legitimately ordain new bishops, etc. This, according to Onuferko and Fr. John Chiramel, literally means that “in this instance the *CCEO* uses the term ‘ecclesiastical communion’ euphemistically, and that some kind of canonical determination from the Roman Pontiff is intended.”²⁴²

A similar problem can be detected with regard to the procedure of the election of bishops outside the territory of the Patriarchal Church. The Synod of Bishops is required to submit a list of at least three proposed candidates for the vacant episcopal office to the Roman Pontiff for appointment (can. 149). Moreover, the process of making proposals on the part of the Synod can be regarded as being only of a consultative nature, since the

²⁴⁰ In promulgating the *CCEO* Pope John Paul II wrote: “In these Churches the Patriarchs and Synods are by canon law sharers in the supreme authority of the Church” (*Code of Canons of the Eastern Church. Latin-English Edition* (Washington D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1992), p. xiv). According to Fr. Andrew Onuferko, it can certainly be “argued that the Patriarchs share not only in the supreme authority of the Church, but also in the legitimate authority of the eparchial bishops of their *Sui Iuris* Church, from whom some of their powers derive” (ONUFRKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 155).

²⁴¹ Wondering as an Eastern Catholic “why does the new Patriarch personally request ecclesiastical communion only from the Roman Pontiff and not from the other Eastern Patriarchs,” Fr. Andrew Onuferko had to admit that from a Roman perspective it is only the Pope in the Catholic Church “who determines who is Catholic and who is not.” Therefore, “by granting ecclesiastical communion to the new Patriarch, *ipso facto* communion with all the other Patriarchs is granted through the Roman Pontiff” (ONUFRKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 154). Even more wonder was expressed by Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos who was present at the Pontifical Holy Mass offered by John Paul II in Denver and at the Divine Liturgy presided by the Head of the Kyivan Catholic Church, His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky in L’viv. He was unpleasantly surprised to learn that the Heads of the Eastern Catholic Churches commemorate at the diptychs solely the Universal Pontiff, while the Pope commemorates only himself, not even mentioning the other Heads of the Particular Churches who are in communion with him (MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” pp. 246-249).

²⁴² ONUFRKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 155 and José CHIRAMEL, “Hierarchical Structuring in the Oriental Legislation,” in CHIRAMEL, BHARANIKULANGARA, *The CCEO: A Study and Interpretation*, p. 98.

Roman Pontiff is not bound by the list of candidates and can appoint someone not on the list (can. 181 #2).²⁴³

Finally, as a consequence of canon 146, allowing the Synods of Bishops to petition the Roman Pontiff to make a final determination in cases of doubts with regard to the modification of territorial boundaries of their Particular Churches, the Head of the Particular Roman Catholic Church (the territorial boundaries of which, to the utter shock of the Orthodox, up to the present day remain unlimited)²⁴⁴ receives the right to definitively expand or limitat the jurisdictional territory of any of the *sui iuris* Churches of the Catholic communion, thus placing the Bishop of Rome above all the Heads of the Eastern Catholic Churches.²⁴⁵

In the opinions of Losten and Tataryn, all of these and many other inconsistencies in contemporary Catholic ecclesiology and canon law can be resolved if, in antinomic fashion, the Roman Pontiff would clearly distinguish between his functions as the Pope on the one hand and Patriarch of the West, on the other.²⁴⁶ This would allow a “healthy tension” between his primacy and the authority of the episcopal college “to guarantee a true *koinonia*.”²⁴⁷

²⁴³ ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 162.

²⁴⁴ Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos was literally scandalized by the canon 146, #2 of the *CCEO* according to which “only the Pope can determine the ‘territory’ of patriarchates,” for the reason that “no such law or tradition can be found in the first millennium; if it had existed, Greece would be part of the Roman Patriarchate today.” In his opinion, “there can be no justification for making this matter the exclusive competence of the Pope” because the practical result of this would be the “unending aggrandizement of the Roman Patriarchate at everyone else’s expense” (MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” p. 244).

²⁴⁵ ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” pp. 159-160.

²⁴⁶ LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” pp. 230-231.

²⁴⁷ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 127.

In this regard, John Paul II repeatedly stressed that Eastern Christians should not be obliged to accept the forms in which the Petrine Ministry has developed in the West.²⁴⁸ As Luykx noted during a session of the KCSG, these forms “have grown one-sidedly since the break of 1054 without mutual corrections from the Eastern Churches; hence, having been coined totally by Western historical circumstances, they have blurred the distinction between the Pope as Patriarch of the West and the Pope as successor of Peter the Rock.”²⁴⁹

Note, incidentally, that same point was emphasized in one of the early writings of Cardinal Ratzinger, who thirty-three years prior to his election as pope did not hesitate to state that

The Bishop of Rome holds an *administrative* office for the churches of Italy (and of the West generally) *but not for the Church as a whole*; for that he has a primacy as a direction finder and as a touchstone of unity. It is also true to say that the primates of Alexandria and Antioch are regional primates, while the Bishop of Rome holds a regional primacy and in addition a primacy *of quite a different type* in relation to the Church as a whole.²⁵⁰

At this point, a brief excursus may be apropos. I have allowed myself to include it here in part because it demonstrates how important it could be for the KCSG – or analogous body – to begin work again. Keeping in mind the above-cited quotation by Cardinal Ratzinger, it is quite astounding that the very same person who in 1972 acknowledge the importance of the distinction between the functions of the universal and regional

²⁴⁸ See Pope John Paul II’s homily at Mass in the presence of Patriarch Dimitrios I delivered at Saint Peter’s Basilica, Rome, 6 December 1987, Pope JOHN PAUL II, *Liturgie dell’Oriente Cristiano a Roma nell’Anno Mariano 1987-88* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990), pp. 237-238; English translation from *Information Service*, Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity 66:1 (1988), p. 23. See also LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 209 and Paul MCPARTLAN, “Towards Catholic-Orthodox Unity,” in *Communion* (Summer, 1992), pp. 305-320.

²⁴⁹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 193.

²⁵⁰ Joseph RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1972), p. 131, cited in LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 214.

primacies²⁵¹ within the second year of his pontificate (cf. the 2006 edition of the *Annuario Pontificio*) chose to eliminate the very title that designates his service as Patriarch of the West.²⁵² This decision on the part of Benedict XVI has already been discussed by a number of both Eastern Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs and theologians.²⁵³ Some of them were

²⁵¹ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 374.

²⁵² Still hoping that the dropping of the title may be “due to an editorial oversight or a printing error, the Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Athens, Christodoulos, shared with Pope Benedict XVI the unease of many of his theologians who being “again about to engage in mutual dialogue” felt that they could be simply “deprived of a common basis upon which they could build the reunification” between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Therefore, Archbishop Christodoulos expressed his hope that prior to the restoration of the formal Theological Dialogue Pope Benedict XVI would “give the matter most careful attention,” since retaining the ancient title, “Patriarch of the West,” in his opinion, remained up to the present day “fundamentally important” for both Eastern and Western ecclesiologies (The letter is Protocol 1343 (Dispatch No. 173) and is posted on the official website of the Greek Church: http://www.ecclesia.gr/English/archbishop/letters/archi_to_benedict.html, accessed on 17 August 2007). In view of the fact that the official explanation regarding the suppression of the title “Patriarch of the West” provided by the President of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Cardinal Walter Kasper, contained only six paragraphs and was issued in the form of a press release despite the hopes of Archbishop Christodoulos, the matter did not seem to have been given the most careful attention. Thus, in his attempt to explain the mind of Pope Benedict XVI, Cardinal Kasper wrote in particular: “The title ‘Patriarch of the West,’ lacking clarity from its beginning and in its evolution from history, became obsolete and practically no longer useful. It appears, therefore, deprived of sense to insist on dragging it along. This has become more the case for the Catholic Church which, with the Second Vatican Council, has found in the form of the Episcopal Conferences the canonical ordering adequate to the necessities of today. To omit the title of ‘Patriarch of the West’ clearly changes nothing in the recognition, so solemnly declared by the Second Vatican Council, of the ancient Patriarchal Churches (*Lumen Gentium* 23). Even less, this suppression can seek to say that it understands new claims. The renunciation of the said title wishes to express a historical and theological reality and, at the same time, to be the leaving behind of a pretense, the renouncement of which could contribute to the benefit of ecumenical dialogue” (The press release of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity regarding the suppression of the title “Patriarch of the West” in the *Annuario Pontificio* of 2006 was posted in Italian and then French on the Vatican website: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/sub-index/index_general-docs.htm; the English translation of this text can be found at <http://whispersinthelog-gia.blogspot.com/2006/03/more-on-late-patriarchate.html>, accessed on 17 August 2009).

²⁵³ In spite of the evident clarity of Cardinal Kasper’s argumentation, the document issued by the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity was substantially criticized by another six paragraph document drafted by the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, according to which the hierarchs of the Church of Constantinople recognize the “undeniable reality that in the recent past the term ‘West’ has acquired a cultural context, and has expanded to areas unknown during the times of the ancient Church, such as the American continent, Oceania etc.” Still, the Synod insisted that it is “unthinkable for the Orthodox ecclesiology to denounce the geographical principle and to replace it with a ‘cultural’ one in the structure of the Church.” According to their document the “unity of the Church cannot be conceived as a sum of culturally distinct Churches, but as a unity of local, namely geographically determined, Churches. The removal of the title ‘Patriarch of the West’ must not lead to the absorption of the clearly distinct geographical ecclesiastical ‘jurisdictions’ by a ‘universal’ Church, consisting of Churches which are distinguished on the basis of either ‘culture’ or ‘confession’ or ‘rite’. Even in today’s historical circumstances, the one Church must, from an ecclesiological point of view, be considered as a unity of full local Churches. At this point it is of extreme importance to the Orthodox Church that Pope Benedict, while having rejected the title ‘Patriarch of the West’,

inclined to look with suspicion at the willingness of the Pope to set aside Vatican II's understanding of the Roman Church as one of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion and to strengthen papal authority over the entire world. This inevitably impedes ecumenical dialogue, and introduces even more confusion into the interaction among various Catholic Particular Churches.

In my opinion, this matter, which has direct implications for the clarification of the ecclesial identity and vocation of both Western and Eastern Particular Churches, still needs to be further explained by the Vatican. Otherwise, it will only intensify the existing unease in relations between the Eastern Catholic Churches, the Church of Rome, and Orthodox Churches.

Returning now to the question of territory as discussed by Catholic members of the KCSG, Chirovsky noted in that for many Eastern Catholics one of the most welcome – and surprising – conciliar pronouncements was the openness to set up new patriarchates “where

retained the titles ‘Vicar of Christ’ and ‘Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church’. These titles create serious difficulties to the Orthodox, given the fact that they are perceived as implying a universal jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome over the entire Church, which is something the Orthodox have never accepted. By retaining these titles and discarding the ‘Patriarch of the West’ the term and concept of ‘sister Churches’ between the Roman-Catholic and Orthodox Church becomes hard to use... In view of the reopening of the official theological dialogue between the Roman-Catholic and Orthodox Churches and the discussion of the issue of primacy, the Ecumenical Patriarchate expresses its wish and prayer that no further difficulties may be added in the discussion of such a thorny problem, as that of the primacy of the bishop of Rome. In this connection we find it appropriate to recall the view of Professor Joseph Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI, published some years ago, that ‘Rome cannot demand from the East regarding the primacy issue more than what has been expressed and applied during the first millennium’. If such a principle is accompanied by an ecclesiology of ‘koinonia –communion’ through placing every aspect of primacy within the context of the synodical structure of the Church, this would greatly facilitate the effort to solve a very serious issue for the unity of the Church of Christ” (See “Announcement of the Chief Secretary of the Holy and Sacred Synod Regarding the Denouncement by Pope Benedict XVI of Rome of the Title ‘Patriarch of the West’” available on the official website of the Ecumenical Patriarch: <http://ec-patr.org/docdisplay.php?lang=en&id=679&tl=la=en>, accessed on 17 August 2009). For a more detailed discussion of this subject matter, see two articles by Adam DEVILLE, “Kenosis vs. *La Bella Figura*,” in *The Canadian Journal of Orthodox Christianity* 2:3 (2007), pp. 96-101 and “On the Patriarchate of the West,” in *Ecumenical Trends* 35 (June 2006), pp. 1-7. The Kyivan Catholic ecclesologist and my colleague, Fr. Michael Dymyd of the Ukrainian Catholic University, in one of his articles sketched out nine possible scenarios whereby Rome’s decision could work for the good of Orthodox-Catholic rapprochement. See Michael DYMID, “Les enjeux de l’abandon du titre de ‘patriarche d’Occident’,” in *Istina* 51 (2006), pp. 24-32.

it is necessary” (*OE* 11).²⁵⁴ For the Kyivan Catholic clergy and faithful this meant that eventually they could claim a status that would symbolize greater security in the face of Soviet Russian assaults and the danger of being swallowed up either by the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine or in the free world by the Roman Catholic Church which is preponderant in both numbers and influence.²⁵⁵

The creation of new patriarchates seemed also to imply real synodal rule. According to Luykx, the “United” were invited by the Council to become no different from their Orthodox counterparts, that is, to share with them in their common heritage and to live “according to the same institutions, having, for example, their own synods who run the Churches as independent units, on the same level as the Roman Church – with only one difference: the recognition by the Eastern Catholics of the Petrine Ministry of the Pope.”²⁵⁶ This very last demand, which should simply have underlined that the Eastern Catholic Churches must be in communion with the Church of Rome, in practice came to almost sweep away their hopes for ecclesiastical autonomy. The latter was once again replaced by the model of their direct subordination to Vatican dicasteries “at the expense of the primacy of the primates of those Churches, and at the expense of the Particularity of the Churches.”²⁵⁷

Note that despite the fact that soon after his arrival in Rome the Head of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Metropolitan Josyf (Slipyj), was recognized as a Major Archbishop, which equated him with the Eastern Catholic Patriarchs (*OE* 7), he was prohibited by the Congregation for the Oriental Churches to convoke Synods of Bishops of

²⁵⁴ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 111-113.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²⁵⁶ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 368-369.

²⁵⁷ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 137.

his Particular Church. The reason provided was that, being outside of his See, he had no right to exercise jurisdictional power over clergy and faithful living outside of Ukraine.²⁵⁸ However, both the letter and spirit of Vatican II favoured relating the concept of Patriarchal “jurisdiction” to the Particular Church’s “Rite” (its whole approach to life) rather than to her “territory of origin” (*OE* 7).²⁵⁹ That would allow “communities of Eastern Catholics to maintain ecclesiastical bonds with their Church of origin while residing outside her established territory.” This relationship was even described with the Latin term *aggregatus*. Despite all of this, the Roman Curia limited the authority of the Head and Synod of the Kyivan Catholic Church to the confines of this Church’s traditional territory. This essentially nullified their authority as the “home territory” was at the time part of the USSR, where the Moscow Patriarchate had been given control by the Soviets over all Greco-Catholic properties.²⁶⁰ The papers of the Oxford meeting reveal an interesting disagreement among members of the KCSG. Boniface Luykx was inclined to consider the idea of limiting a Particular Church to her “by-gone historical and political boundaries” as “theological nonsense.”²⁶¹ Bishop Vsevolod and Andriy Chirovsky, on the other hand, insisted that the ancient Church knew no example of establishing new Particular Churches “without a definite territory.”²⁶² They emphasized that the concept of territorial determination in itself “was a quite traditional one.”²⁶³

Returning to the concrete example of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s territory, we note that Josyf (Slipyj) and the majority of Kyivan Catholics led by him, had come to

²⁵⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 116-117.

²⁵⁹ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 374-375.

²⁶⁰ ONUFERKO, “The New Code of Canons,” p. 161.

²⁶¹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 186.

²⁶² MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” p. 243.

²⁶³ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 115.

believe that the traditional approach to territory was being abused by the Roman Church. She applied the territorial principle to the Eastern Catholic Churches alone, boxing them into what amounted to ecclesiastical “reservations,” while “claiming for the Latin Patriarchate no territorial limitations whatsoever.”²⁶⁴ As a consequence, the Kyivan Catholic Church was not only deprived of her natural right to be ruled by her own Head and Synod of Bishops (and to give birth to daughter-Churches outside of her home territory),²⁶⁵ but she was also restrained from the implementation of many of the essential elements of her particularity,²⁶⁶ including her mission to engage in ecumenical dialogue and to evangelize “the whole world.” This, as Luykx pointed out, was not only contrary to the decisions of the Second Vatican Council, but very clearly “ran counter to the Gospel itself.”²⁶⁷

Note that the restriction on the Kyivan Catholic Church (deriving from the Roman Curia’s understanding of territorial principles but above all from the *Ostpolitik* of the Vatican, which was prepared to sacrifice the very existence of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church in order to improve its relations with Moscow),²⁶⁸ gradually led numerous Ukrainian Catholics to become involved in opposition to Roman centralization. The

²⁶⁴ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 41.

²⁶⁵ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 186.

²⁶⁶ Probably the example, which was most frequently mentioned by the participants of the KCSG, illustrates only one of many similar aspects of the multi-faceted program of restrictions imposed on the Kyivan Catholic Church by the Roman Curia. This was the “exclusion of married men from the priesthood (in the diaspora), separating Kyivan Catholics from the age-old, legitimate custom of all the Eastern Churches” (LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 385 and CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 109, 115). In view of the fact that several married members of the KCSG were secretly ordained by His Beatitude Josyf (Slipyj) to the priesthood, it is no wonder that they even included the demand to restore this traditional custom in their “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft” (KCSG, “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” p. 80). The author of this study also experienced the seriousness of this particular problem in August 1994 when he, as a seminarian, refused to sign an “agreement of celibacy” before he was formally accepted for continuation of his priestly formation at Saint Josaphat Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington D.C.

²⁶⁷ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 375.

²⁶⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 117.

opposition crystallized around the movement of the Ukrainian Catholic Church for the recognition of her Patriarchal rights.²⁶⁹ In 1975, after almost a decade of peaceful demands directed towards the restoration of juridically autonomous status for his Church,²⁷⁰ Slipyj, without the consent of the Vatican, accepted the title of Patriarch. In his opinion only the establishment of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Patriarchate as the “normal status of a fully evolved Eastern Church,” could safeguard the Catholic Church of Kyiv from an “illegitimate incorporation of this Church into another jurisdiction (as has certainly been attempted several times in this century).”²⁷¹

Not all Kyivan Catholics, however, understood that the striving of their Church for ecclesiastical autonomy and particularity was fundamentally an ecclesiological issue, or rather, not all of them possessed a properly scriptural ecclesiology. Even figures as prominent as Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk), not to mention other hierarchs, clergy and faithful, tended to confuse their ecclesial identity with Ukrainian national identity, therefore, becoming promoters of a so-called “cultural ecclesiality.” This only confirmed

²⁶⁹ This striving for the recognition of the Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate is most often identified exclusively with the work of His Beatitude Josyf the Confessor (Slipyj). However, he was not the only member of the Kyivan Catholic hierarchy who at the highest level tried to defend the rights of this Church to full ecclesial autonomy. Similar attempts were made by several other Ukrainian Catholic bishops, and most notably by Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk) of Winnipeg. For an example of just one of his many writings and public speeches on the ecclesial particularity of the Catholic Church of Kyiv, see his intervention at the Fourth World Synod of Bishops, October, 1974, in *Litterae-Nuntiae Archiepiscopi Maioris Ritus Byzantino-Ucraini* 10 (1974), pp. 17-19. In his truly courageous speech, Metropolitan Maxim “calls for a return to full synodal rule for the Eastern Catholic Churches and recourse to the Holy See only in matters of gravest importance, as well as the abolition of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Catholic Churches or at the very least its radical reform” (CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 34).

²⁷⁰ For a summary of the historical, theological, and pastoral arguments for the establishment of Greco-Catholic Patriarchate of Kyiv see a letter from Archbishop Ivan (Buchko) to His Beatitude Josyf Cardinal (Slipyj) dated 10 March, 1971 and published in *Litterae-Nuntiae Archiepiscopi Maioris Ritus Byzantino-Ucraini* 10 (1974), pp. 136-139. See also MADEY, *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien*, pp. 15-243.

²⁷¹ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 35. It is enough to remind ourselves of the infamous Quadripartite Commission that just after the resurrection of the Kyivan Catholic Church in Ukraine was assembled apparently with the intention to deal conclusively with this Church by subordinating of her clergy and faithful either to the Roman Catholic hierarchy or to that of the Moscow Patriarchate (See CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” pp. 9-10).

the stereotypes of “those in the Curia who saw Ukrainian Catholicism as a cultural concession to a particular group, with little value as a genuine ecclesial reality.”²⁷²

Of course, because the Ukrainian nation for the greater part of its history had suffered foreign domination, being repeatedly unsuccessful in its struggle for independence, many Ukrainian Catholics were inclined to perceive ecclesiastical autonomy as a surrogate for their long-awaited state sovereignty.²⁷³ They responded to Roman centralization “with Ukrainian nationalism, which was entirely out of place in the discussion.”²⁷⁴ For a certain period of time this attitude considerably distracted the Kyivan Catholic Church from proper approaches to her ecclesial self-identification as a Particular Church of the Catholic communion.²⁷⁵

²⁷² CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 113.

²⁷³ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 34.

²⁷⁴ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 118.

²⁷⁵ One of the best explanations of the inadequacy of the nationalistic approach to the understanding of the authentic ecclesial identity and vocation of the Kyivan Catholic Church can be found in Fr. Peter Galadza’s article on ecclesial integrity and effective pastoring within the UGCC, one of the sections of which was entitled “The Ecclesiology of an Integrated, Particular Church.” There Fr. Peter state: “One would ask how a Church called ‘Ukrainian Catholic’ can pretend to possess the universality of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church when it is composed of people of primarily one national, or ethnic background. The present demography of the Church of Kyiv-Halych, however, has nothing to do with her theological identity; the Ukrainian Catholic Church *is* not, certainly *was* not, and *cannot* be a Church exclusively for Ukrainians. As Metropolitan Andrei (Sheptytsky) frequently noted, a Church mirroring national divisions would not be Christ’s. The name ‘Ukrainian Catholic Church,’ then, denotes the Church that follows the theological, liturgical, spiritual and canonical traditions of Ukraine; but this tradition, the Ukrainian-Byzantine, can be followed by anyone – and should be followed by as many people as Ukrainian Catholics can evangelize. Analogously the Roman Catholic Church is not a Church for Italians only, even though Rome is the capital of Italy. ‘Kyivan Catholic Church’ or ‘Kyivan Catholic-Orthodox’ would thus be an ecclesiological more correct designation for our Church, especially as Particular Churches have traditionally been identified with cities, not countries or nations” (GALADZA, “Ecclesial Integrity and Effective Pastoring,” in HAYDA, SOROKOWSKI, *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church*, pp. 68-69). Another reflection with regard to the inadequacy of an ethnically based attitude towards the understanding of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s authentic ecclesial identity was presented by Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) in his paper on Vatican II’s Decrees *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, delivered at the Stamford consultation of the KCSG. He said: “The question of the Eastern Catholic Church’s identity is first a *theological* question. Since the Council decrees that they must be treated as real, full-fledged Churches, equal in dignity with the Roman Church because of their apostolic origin and uninterrupted faithfulness to the heritage of Christ (Holy Tradition), their identity is *not constituted* by their ethnic origin or association. Ethnicity can have many merits, e.g. as a cohesive power keeping a people together and protecting them from the encroachment of others. But ethnic values, however important they may be in a certain period of history, have a character that is *essentially temporary*. And as soon as ethnicity blurs the perspective of the common

After her miraculous resurrection in Ukraine in 1989 and especially after the achievement of Ukrainian national independence in 1991, the situation significantly changed,²⁷⁶ giving birth to new initiatives within the Catholic Church of Kyiv. One of these was certainly the KCSG, which appeared to be capable not only of a scholarly evaluation of past events, but also of elaborating a multi-faceted program for the integral ecclesial development of this Church in the future. Such development, in the opinions of Chirovsky and Onuferko, would also have ecumenical repercussions not only for the Catholic Church of Kyiv, but also for her Orthodox counterparts.²⁷⁷ The latter would inevitably base their conclusions about Rome's real intentions towards them not only on official ecumenical statements issued by the Vatican but first and foremost on the existing relationships of the Roman Church with those Eastern Churches already in communion with the former.²⁷⁸

From this perspective, the establishment of the Kyivan Catholic Patriarchate should be generally regarded as a step forward in the ecumenical rapprochement between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches and especially between the divided Churches of Kyiv, who could again be brought together by the idea of a common Kyivan Patriarchate that would be in communion with the Churches of Rome and Constantinople simultaneously.²⁷⁹ Chirovsky expressed his "hope against hope" that the Orthodox Mother-Church and the Sister-Churches of the Kyivan Catholic Church would "join in chorus of support," so that the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv could "rule itself the way it would in the

apostolic heritage and of the theological value of the Church or Holy Tradition as such, this ethnic dimension becomes a liability (LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," p. 370).

²⁷⁶ CHIROVSKY, "The Union of the Holy Churches of God," p. 34.

²⁷⁷ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 85.

²⁷⁸ ONUFERKO, "The New Code of Canons," p. 166.

²⁷⁹ CHIROVSKY, "The Union of the Holy Churches of God," p. 35.

Orthodox Communion, and the way it should according to the teachings of the Second Vatican Council.”²⁸⁰

Let us now turn more directly to the issue of the Orthodox members of the KCSG, that is, their interaction with some of the ideas concerning Church structure espoused by the Catholic members, and the Catholic responses. In spite of the general silence on the part of the Orthodox who seem to not care about the ecclesiastical integrity of the Eastern Catholics, regarding them rather as “traitors to Orthodoxy,” the Orthodox participants of the KCSG did not hesitate to express how disturbed they were by the “concentration of administrative power in the hands of the Roman Curia, and also by the way in which the Pope has intruded into the every-day life of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.”²⁸¹

In the opinion of Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, the commitment of the Kyivan Catholics to the synodal structure of their Church as well as their continuous struggle for the recognition of the Patriarchate is “equally a struggle for what the Orthodox Church deems fundamental.” According to Ware, “Orthodoxy could never accept any project for reunion in which the Eastern Patriarchs are seen merely as ‘sharers’ in the Pope’s power; that is not what they mean by ‘catholicity’ or ‘collegiality’.”²⁸² Similarly, Bishop Vsevolod very sincerely articulated the existing fear of many Orthodox who are familiar with the history of the Eastern Catholic Churches and “do not want the same fate to befall them.”²⁸³ Vsevolod proceeded to pose three questions: If everyone seems to agree that the model of uniatism “is unsatisfactory, and does not offer a pattern for Church Unity, why should the Eastern Catholics be required to live this way? If Rome does not wish to

²⁸⁰ CHIROVSKY, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,” p. 160.

²⁸¹ WARE, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” pp. 130-131.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 131.

²⁸³ MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” p. 243.

reduce Orthodoxy to the status of ritual appendages of the Roman Patriarchate, why does she continue to hold the Eastern Churches in that inappropriate position? Why do the ecumenical utterances of the Roman Church to Eastern Orthodoxy say one thing, while the behavior of the Roman Church to Eastern Catholicism says something different?”²⁸⁴ If the Roman See and its Curia want the Orthodox to believe in their assurances that no restrictions will be imposed on them after the reunion, continued Bishop Vsevolod, then “let Rome prove it by ceasing to impose such restrictions” on the Kyivan Catholics. Many of the latter, just as their Orthodox brethren, find unacceptable the “attempt to impose clerical celibacy, the appointment of hierarchs without canonical election, the claim that the ordinary disciplinary decisions of Synods must have the confirmation of the Pope, the bestowal of the cardinalate on the chief hierarch.”²⁸⁵

Unfortunately, the proposals of the Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh)²⁸⁶ and the Ukrainian Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk)²⁸⁷ to entirely suspend the Congregation for the Oriental Churches have gone unheard. The latter continues to this day to exercise power over the Eastern Catholic Churches on the basis of the principle designated by Ernst

²⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 249. Apart from the strictly ecclesiological questions, one should be aware of the fact that very often Kyivan Catholics themselves are themselves partly to blame for being placed in an “inappropriate position,” for the reason that they still continue to gladly accept generous donations from various Western funds and institutions, so far demonstrating very little ability to exist and to act as an autonomous Particular Church in the fullest meaning of this word.

²⁸⁵ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 170. At the same time, one can come across many historical occurrences that to a certain extent disprove the grand narrative of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s victimization. This Particular Church of the Catholic communion in fact benefited from various interventions of Rome that prevented the UGCC Synod from making a number of inconsiderate or regrettable decisions. To present at least one example of such interference, it would be enough to reflect upon the refusal on the part of the Roman Pontiff to recognize the ordinary disciplinary decision of the L’viv Synod of 1992 to re-confirm and to re-enforce all the pronouncements of the Latinizing Synod of Zamość of 1720 throughout the entire Kyivan Catholic Church. The election of the present Head of the UGCC, His Beatitude Lubomyr (Husar), instead of another candidate favored by many of the Kyivan Catholic bishops, was also successfully achieved not without the active involvement of Pope John Paul II.

²⁸⁶ MAXIMOS IV, “The Supreme Senate of the Catholic Church,” in KÜNG, CONGAR and O’HANLON, *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, pp. 133-136

²⁸⁷ *Litterae-Nuntiae Archiepiscopi Maioris Ritus Byzantino-Ucraini* 10 (1974), pp. 17-19.

Suttner as *reductio in obedientiam*.²⁸⁸ It is as if these communities were an integral part of the Roman Patriarchate.²⁸⁹ Thus even such prominent Orthodox figures as Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople noted that the road to the restoration of unity between Orthodox and Catholics does not necessarily need to run through the Oriental Congregation!²⁹⁰

The present state of the Kyivan Catholic Church also compelled an Orthodox member of the KCSG, Archpriest Ihor Kutash to say that “it seems to be impossible to have a truly Eastern Church in communion with Rome as the case stands currently.” He added: “One can only offer admiration and loving respect to our Eastern Catholic brethren for their heroic efforts in attempting to do just that.” In particular Kutash found the definition of “*sui iuris*” to be absolutely inadequate because of its determination by the “supreme authority in the Church.”²⁹¹

The current canonical status of the Kyivan Catholic Church and her still very detectable dependency on the Roman Curia, in the words of Myroslaw Tataryn, indicates that it is not the existence of the “Uniate Churches” as such, but rather the improper exercise of the Roman Primacy, that constitutes the whole issue of “uniatism.” In actuality, it is this that should be viewed a “roadblock to unity.”²⁹² To remove this “roadblock” and to open a real possibility for the integral development of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s authentic ecclesial identity and vocation as a Particular Church of the Catholic communion,

²⁸⁸ SUTTNER, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism*, pp. 26-35, 62-65.

²⁸⁹ LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” pp. 228-229.

²⁹⁰ This opinion expressed by Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople was cited in LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 229. Unfortunately, Bishop Basil did not indicate where exactly in the writings of Patriarch Bartholomew his interesting outlook with regard to the role played by the Congregation for the Oriental Churches can be found. It might have been expressed during a personal conversation.

²⁹¹ Ihor KUTASH, “Response to Fr. Andrew Onuferko: The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches,” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), p. 171.

²⁹² TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” pp. 137-138.

the Church of Rome needs to “establish a clear, credible set of boundaries to the Roman Patriarchate”²⁹³ and to clarify the canonical obligation of the Bishop of Rome as the Head of the Latin Church.²⁹⁴ Moreover, the Roman Church needs to confirm her sincere ecumenical intentions by not intruding in the internal affairs of any of the Particular Churches.²⁹⁵ She needs to stop acting as if she were the only “super-Church” or Mother-Church of all the other Churches of the Catholic communion,²⁹⁶ who in actual fact should be formally recognized as her Sister-Churches.²⁹⁷

According to Luykx, Kyivan Catholics (who at times appear to be “their own greatest enemies” because of their excessive nationalism, the lack of competence in ecclesiological matters and their self-imposed latinization)²⁹⁸ should not wait to be granted ecclesiastical autonomy in the form of a Patriarchate, since this would be simply another manifestation of “uniatism.” Rather, they should rediscover their authentic ecclesial identity (which includes particular legislation) in their own being.²⁹⁹ In order to do that, they would

²⁹³ MAJDANSKY, “Response to Bishop Basil,” p. 255.

²⁹⁴ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 190.

²⁹⁵ LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 223 and Jean Marie Roger TILLARD, *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 272.

²⁹⁶ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 182-183.

²⁹⁷ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 128-129. In his letter to Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky wrote: “This, of course, relates to the Church over which I preside, since an Eastern Catholic Church should also be seen as a ‘Sister Church,’ both in relation to the local Orthodox Churches (see *UR* 14-15), as well as to the Church of Rome. Otherwise, one would have to claim that once full communion is achieved between Churches, they cease to be ‘sisters’” (Myroslav-Ivan LUBACHIVSKY, “Letter to Cardinal Cassidy (3 August, 1993),” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), p. 419).

²⁹⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 383, 370.

²⁹⁹ In his response to the presentation of Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), Fr. Anthony Ugolnik noted: “One party may *acknowledge* the dignity and integrity of the other, but if one party even appears to *grant* those qualities, then there is the implosion of paradox: condescension undoes dialogue. Rome seeks to admit that she does not *grant* dignity to the Eastern Churches: those Churches bear, inherently, their full dignity and grace in their own ecclesiological being” (UGOLNIK, “An Anxiety of Influence,” 391). The same opinion was at least in theory confirmed by Pope John Paul II’s Apostolic Letter *Euntes in Mundum* of 25 January 1988 dedicated to the celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of the Kyivan Rus’, where the Holy Father stated: “... the characteristic disciplinary autonomy which the Eastern Churches enjoy... is not the result of privileges granted by the Church of Rome, but of the law itself which those Churches have possessed since Apostolic times” (cited in MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 137. The original can be found at

need to decisively reject all forms of ethno-nationalism which, granted, “could be a great blessing, as it was in the very beginning and in times of oppression,” but can “become self-destructive as soon as it starts identifying the Eastern Churches’ enormously rich spiritual heritage and universal responsibility for the whole Church (*OE* 1, 3, 5) with more narrow ethnic or national concerns and needs – or even subordinating the former to the latter.”³⁰⁰

III.2.5. The Kyivan Catholic Church and Her Particular Spiritual Patrimony

Compared to the passionate and lengthy discussions on the problems regarding the Roman Primacy and the Kyivan Catholic Church’s ecclesiastical autonomy, the question of the particularity of the Kyivan Catholic spiritual patrimony received considerably less attention from the participants of the KCSG. On the one hand, this may have been due to the fact that this particular element of ecclesial identity has never been as easily discernible as the much more concrete issues of canon law. On the other hand, most of the hierarchs and theologians who participated in the deliberations of the Study Group may also have been inclined to think that they automatically covered this area when they reflected on their Church’s traditional sources, theology and liturgy. Nonetheless, I consider this to be an unfortunate lacuna in the KCSG’s deliberations.

Only two of the members of the KCSG, Boniface Luykx and Andriy Chirovsky, clearly mentioned spirituality as a distinct criterion of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s particularity. This may be explained in part by the specific positions occupied by them. Archimandrite Boniface was for many years the abbot of Mount Tabor (Holy

http://www.vatican.va/holy_fa-ther/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_25011988_euntes-in-mundum-universum_it.html, accessed on 19 August 2009).

³⁰⁰ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 384.

Transfiguration) Monastery in California, while Fr. Andriy to the very present holds a Chair of Eastern Christian Theology and Spirituality.

Chirovsky asserted that in spite of “various elements of the *devotio moderna* and later Catholic pietism” which had made their way into the Ukrainian Catholic Church, this Church was on “slightly more solid ground” with regard to the preservation of her genuine spiritual patrimony. According to Chirovsky, it is still “readily identifiable.”³⁰¹ Luykx, on the other hand, insisted that many dimensions of the Kyivan Catholic “way of life” and this Church’s rich spiritual heritage were devastated through self-imposed latinization. Kyivan Catholics had forfeited “this God-given heritage in favour of something inferior or at least something which does not nourish our true identity and spiritual growth.”³⁰² According to Archimandrite Boniface, even Eastern Catholic monasteries, which had opened themselves to the influences of Western monasticism and had been gradually transformed into monastic Orders, started to lose their “evangelical and patristic mooring,” therefore, depriving their Church of the “salt and yeast” that has always kept her from becoming merely an earthly institution.³⁰³ In his opinion, the way back for the Kyivan Catholic Church is through a return to the genuine sources of her spirituality and the fulfillment of her vocation to *holiness* - repeatedly underlined by Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* (UR 4, 6, 7, 8). It should also consist of the restoration of her authentic monastic tradition and the active involvement of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Religious in the work of “replacing

³⁰¹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 114.

³⁰² LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 376.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

latinizations” through the recovery of a genuine Kyivan Catholic spiritual patrimony. Without their enthusiastic co-operation, the “whole project would be nipped in the bud.”³⁰⁴

If many Kyivan Catholics are still fascinated by the richness of “dynamic symbols” by means of which “Eastern spirituality thinks and lives,” then they need to admit that it was first and foremost “monasticism that has given the paradigm for all Christian life and Church unity.”³⁰⁵ In the East it was the direct responsibility of the monasteries to carry on the Church’s most important mission of converting the pagans and evangelizing the faithful by presenting them the Good News of Christ as “*lived* in its purest and most truly genuine form.”³⁰⁶ From the earliest times of Kyivan Christianity, the monks inspired the entire Kyivan Church to “take the Gospel seriously, and to practice it fully in daily life and in loving sharing, or hospitality – beyond all ethnic, social and spiritual divisions, and thus to anticipate the undivided Kingdom and that very Kingdom’s holiness.”³⁰⁷

These “good and genuine monasteries, venerated and visited from of old” were authentic keepers of the original Byzantine ecclesiastical Tradition and patristic spirituality that deeply transfigured the whole Christian life of the Kyivan Catholics, “permeating their

³⁰⁴ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 199. The insistence of Archimandrite Boniface on the opinion that only the return of Kyivan Catholic monasteries to their genuinely Eastern spiritual roots would secure them therefore all existing problems is highly questionable. His own project of restoring purely Eastern monasticism through the example of one particular Monastery, Mount Tabor in California, appears to be not entirely successful. At the present moment the monastic life at this monastery that in the past has actually seen much better days is declining, while most of the monastic Orders founded on the supposedly “Western” principles of strong centralization and discipline continue to exist. Consequently, the monastic “Eastern-ness” should be more properly regarded as being one of the most important elements greatly contributing to the spiritual vitality of the Kyivan Catholic monasteries and not as a panacea capable of resolving any crises. On the other hand, Archimandrite Boniface’s contribution to monastic life at Mount Tabor should not be easily discounted. The monastery’s present difficulties lie largely in the eremitical inclinations of Fr. Boniface’s successor, who took the monastery in a very different direction, including a fundamental departure from what its founder would claim to be an Eastern characteristic: the centrality of a common liturgical life vibrantly celebrated in a full cycle of the Divine Office.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 198.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 198.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 197.

home customs and their whole way of thinking and praying – of relating to God, to other people and to the world.”³⁰⁸ Therefore, the restoration of a “vigorous and genuine monasticism” in the Kyivan Catholic Church, in the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface, would not only greatly contribute to the revitalization of this Church’s authentic ecclesial identity, but also (as the foremost manifestation of the mystery of *synergia* that allows Christ’s followers to share in his Divine *Holiness*) become a firm basis for accomplishing the Kyivan Catholic Church’s mission – a mission ultimately aimed at the “eschatological union-in-holiness among the Churches.”³⁰⁹

In conclusion, the Archimandrite did not hesitate to encourage the whole Kyivan Catholic Church – and especially her hierarchs – to make the establishment of genuinely Eastern monasteries “one of their top priorities”³¹⁰ and to expend the greatest efforts possible “to restore the role of monasticism as the paradigm of their Church by working toward many good monastic foundations as powerhouses of orthodoxy, orthopraxy, and – in short – of true holiness” according to authentic Kyivan Catholic Tradition.³¹¹

The important emphasis placed by Archimandrite Boniface on *holiness* and *Christ-likeness*, as they were experienced by the entire Kyivan Church owing to her genuine monasticism, was wholeheartedly supported by Andriy Chirovsky. In order to further develop the fundamental significance of these two themes, he introduced another ancient concept of Christian spirituality that had already been expressed by St. Paul in his letter to Phillipians (2:6-8) – that of *kenosis*.³¹² In Chirovsky’s view, the notion of *kenosis* or *self-*

³⁰⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 376.

³⁰⁹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 196-197. This truly powerful standpoint of Archimandrite Boniface was also quoted in LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 231.

³¹⁰ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 376.

³¹¹ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198.

³¹² CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 114.

emptying, which expresses the whole meaning of Christ's incarnation and self-sacrificing crucifixion, can be easily applied to the delineation of the most crucial goal of every Christian life: "letting go of one's ego."³¹³ Furthermore, it can also be employed in order to reveal the innermost basis of the ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Christian Churches in general and the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv in particular.³¹⁴

According to Fr. Andriy, the genuinely kenotic spirituality of the Kyivan Church derives its roots from the self-abnegating witness of radical humiliation in Christ manifested by the hundreds of monks of the Kyivan Caves Monastery³¹⁵ as well as from the lives of Saints Borys and Hlib,³¹⁶ princes of the Kyivan realm. In the face of persecution by their elder brother, who used every means to seize the Kyivan throne, these princes refused to raise armies in their own defense and freely chose their own deaths instead of violence. Thus, in a very radical way, they imitated Christ who "could have raised up hosts of angels to defend himself," but instead voluntarily chose death on the cross.³¹⁷

Despite the fact that Borys and Hlib did not seem to fit any traditional Byzantine category of saints,³¹⁸ due to the insistence of simple Kyivan Christians, the hierarchy went

³¹³ CHIROVSKY, "The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv," p. 12.

³¹⁴ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 114.

³¹⁵ Muriel HEPPELL, trans., *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1989). Before starting to write the present study, its author went on a pilgrimage to the relics of the Kyivan monks, the incorruptible bodies of whom are still kept for veneration in the underground caves of the thousand-year-old Kyivan Monastery of the Caves (Kyivo-Pechers'ka Lavra).

³¹⁶ Paul HOLLINGSWORTH, "The Lesson Concerning the Life and Murder of the Blessed Passion-Bearers Borys and Hlib," "The Tale and Passion and Encomium of the Holy Martyrs Borys and Hlib," and "The Tale of the Miracles of the Holy Passion-Bearers of Christ Roman and David," in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1992), pp. 3-32, 97-116, 117-134.

³¹⁷ CHIROVSKY, "The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv," pp. 12-13.

³¹⁸ They were not apostles or evangelists, not hierarchs, not priest-martyrs or monks "renowned for their ascetic feats" (George FEDOTOV, *The Russian Religious Mind. Volume One: Kievan Christianity, The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Volume Three in the Collected Works of George Fedotov (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1975), pp. 94-110).

so far as to found a new category, that of “passion-bearers.”³¹⁹ From that time on it was used to “refer to those who could have defended themselves but did not, because they wanted to identify with Jesus Christ.”³²⁰ This approach deeply influenced Kyivan Christian spirituality, which at many stages of its historical development appeared to be authentically *kenotic* and *passion-bearing*.³²¹

To a certain extent, the kenotic experience of Kyivan Catholicism seems to continue at the time of the union of their Church with the Church of Rome. They were received under the authority of Rome as a group of schismatics, who - in order to attain salvation - were required to accept a reduction unto obedience (*reductio in obedientiam*).³²² Their thirty three Articles were virtually ignored by a triumphalist Rome, and any “gain in status” was accompanied by a humiliation of their Church’s very identity as a Church. This then leads to the vilification of Kyivan Catholics by the Orthodox – a double kenosis. This kenoticism could also be detected in a certain manner in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when Kyivan Catholics found themselves giving up many of their age-old traditions and accepting various elements of inappropriate latinization.³²³

In the twentieth century kenotic spirituality became incarnate in the lives of the most prominent leaders of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Andrey Sheptytsky, and

³¹⁹ Franklin Sciacca argues that the newly invented Slavic word *strastoterpets*’ (passion-bearer) was a literal translation of the already existing Greek words *athletes* or *athlophoros* (Franklin SCIACCA, “In Imitation of Christ: Boris and Gleb and the Ritual Conversion of the Russian Land,” in *Slavic Review* 49 (1990), pp. 253-260). Nevertheless, before the voluntary deaths of Saints Borys and Hlib, this concept had never been used in this very specific connotation as standing for “non-resistance” (CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” p. 25 and FEDOTOV, *The Russian Religious Mind*, pp. 94-110).

³²⁰ CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” p. 14.

³²¹ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 114.

³²² CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” p. 14 and SUTTNER, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism*, pp. 26-35, 62-65.

³²³ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 101.

Josyf Slipyj³²⁴ and Myroslav-Ivan Lubachivsky who dedicated much of their often misunderstood efforts to the struggle for the recognition of the autonomous rights of the Kyivan Catholic Church and the effectiveness of her Synod of Bishops, in order to “exercise their authority wherever the members of this Church live.”³²⁵ Moreover, the forcible act of liquidation of the Kyivan Catholic Church by the decisions of the L’viv pseudo-Council of 1946 and the subsequent forty-three years of severe persecution by the Soviet regime became the “greatest kenotic exercise” for Ukrainian Greco-Catholics, who struggled for their very existence in the catacombs and gave many witnesses of modern passion-bearing to the entire Catholic Church.³²⁶

Therefore, according to Chirovsky, the awareness of the kenotic dimension of Kyivan Christian spirituality must necessarily be integrated into the rediscovered ecclesial identity of the Kyivan Catholic Church as the “Church of the martyrs” whose genuine vocation is “to speak of her kenotic experience” as the “joy of bearing Christ’s cross” and “from that message, to challenge the efficient and the successful of this world.”³²⁷

Attributing the many successes accomplished by the KCSG to the conformity of all of its members to the “humble yet courageous kenotic spirit of the Kyivan Passion-Bearers Borys and Hlib,”³²⁸ Bishop Kallistos, in his response to Chirovsky’s, stressed that kenotic

³²⁴ Ibid., pp. 107-108.

³²⁵ CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” p. 14. Even after the resurrection of the Kyivan Catholic Church in 1989, its original canonical territory, which at the time of the Union of Brest included most of the territory of contemporary Ukraine, was reduced by the Vatican to only two pre-World War II eparchies of L’viv and Stanislaviv, the territory whose bishops initially had rejected the Union with Rome. This in itself was a truly kenotic experience (CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 95).

³²⁶ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 108.

³²⁷ CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” pp. 15-16.

³²⁸ WARE, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 131.

spirituality is something that is “valued to an equal degree” by the Orthodox.³²⁹ Nevertheless, he also emphasized that it would certainly be wrong to regard kenoticism as readiness for some sort of untoward compromise. According to Bishop Kallistos:

When the Holy Passion-Bearers St. Borys and St. Hlib chose the path of non-resistance and self-emptying love, insisting that if any blood were to be shed it should be their own, they were not in any way compromising the truth; and if we today as Catholics and Orthodox are to rediscover our fragmented unity, then it cannot be through compromise but only through a total commitment to the truth in its undiminished fullness.³³⁰

As I conclude my reflections on the distinctive character of Kyivan Catholic monastic spirituality and this Church’s intrinsic kenoticism, let me once again turn to the ideas expressed by Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx). According to him, Ukrainian Greco-Catholics should rediscover and cherish their authentic spiritual heritage not only because they need to avoid “hurting the feelings” of the Orthodox³³¹ or to resist the still very perceptible influences of Western spirituality,³³² but because their rich and venerable spiritual values – far from being some sort of “eccentricities or archaeologisms” – provide them with “indispensable food for building up and nourishing their spiritual identity for the glory of God” as is demanded by the very “principle of incarnation.”³³³ Therefore, the particular spirituality of the Kyivan Catholic Church should be most properly regarded as a special gift of God that encourages Kyivan Catholics to share it with the whole world,³³⁴ so

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 127.

³³⁰ Ibid., p. 128.

³³¹ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 377.

³³² LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 195.

³³³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 377-378.

³³⁴ In his article describing the difficult relations that exist today between the Roman Curia and the Eastern Catholic Churches, Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford paraphrased an interesting idea suggested by Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) according to which it is important to “require or insist that the staff of both Congregation for the Oriental Churches and the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity must

it can “transcend both East and West” and contribute to the enrichment of the spiritual heritage of the entire Universal Church of Christ.³³⁵

III.2.6. Mutual Benefits Arising from the Preservation of the Full and Visible Communion of the Kyivan Catholic Church with the Church of Rome

In the era of soteriological exclusivism the question of preserving existing ecclesiastical communion was often stressed and even overemphasized by both Catholic and Orthodox theologians in the so-called polemical literature.³³⁶ Both sides of a divided Christendom repeatedly emphasized that it is indisputably essential for the individual Christians and their communities to stay within the existing communion of Churches (either Catholic or Orthodox) because only their communion obtains the exclusive means providing its adherents with the very possibility of salvation.³³⁷ The painful division between the Christian East and West induced both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches to establish very firm institutional boundaries and to warn their faithful that anyone who might attempt to cross these boundaries would immediately be considered a traitor, schismatic and most assuredly a candidate for eternal damnation.³³⁸ As a consequence, on the one hand, in the past the question of preserving existing communion seemed to be much more clear and conventional than it is today, but, on the other hand, at

actually live for a significant period of their lives in authentically Orthodox (that includes Eastern Catholic) monasteries or parishes, so as to study the spirit, the traditions, and the rights of the Eastern Churches and experience an authentic conversion from Western *hubris* to Eastern humility!” (LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 229).

³³⁵ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 371-372.

³³⁶ In their “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft” the participants of the KCSG stated that they “deplore the distribution and importation of polemical literature in regions of inter-ecclesial conflict” (KCSG, “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” p. 81).

³³⁷ These mutually exclusive soteriological viewpoints were described in concise form by par. 10 of the Balamand Statement (*Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), p. 669). See also CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” p. 99 and TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 126.

³³⁸ CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” p. 9.

present it becomes obvious that the seeming clarity of this question during past centuries was due to faulty reasoning based on mutual disrespect, fear and hatred, therefore, causing grave violation of the truth.³³⁹

The establishment of the Dialogue of Love and the Dialogue of Truth between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the twentieth century can certainly be regarded as a considerable advance in ecumenical relations among the Churches who were for a long time estranged from each other.³⁴⁰ The elaboration of such ecumenical terms as “Sister-Churches” and the reciprocal recognition of each other’s ecclesial reality have to a large degree swept out exclusivist soteriology, allowing both the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches to acknowledge that salvation can be operative even outside of their contemporary institutional boundaries.³⁴¹

Nevertheless, coming back to an important question of their respective ecclesiastical integrity (which was now approached from a different angle and once again reaffirmed), the formal Theological Dialogue was nearly derailed by the revival and the rapid expansion of those Churches that in the past for a variety of different reasons decided to cross certain old boundaries and joined the Roman Church, which was formerly regarded by many Orthodox as their greatest enemy.³⁴² In view of the removal of soteriologically exclusivistic standpoints from ecumenical discussion, a logical question was raised: if preservation of communion is regarded by all as being still very essential then to what communion should the Eastern Catholic Churches belong? Should they return to their Mother-Churches, from

³³⁹ GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” p. 176.

³⁴⁰ ONUFERKO, “Doslidnyts’ka Hrupa Kyïvs’koï Tserkvy,” pp. 1-2.

³⁴¹ CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 418, and KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” p. 462.

³⁴² ONUFERKO, “Doslidnyts’ka Hrupa Kyïvs’koï Tserkvy,” pp. 2-3, CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” p. 9, MAJDANSKY, “Orthodox-Catholic Reconciliation,” p. 46.

whom in their ecclesiastical childhood they received their genuinely Eastern Tradition, or should they stay with their Sister-Church of Rome (who for a certain period of time performed the duties of a sort of step-Mother) with whom they spent many years of their adult ecclesiastical life as Catholics?

Many within the KCSG insisted that they should be in communion with both, and I will certainly discuss this somewhat questionable proposal at the end of this chapter.³⁴³ Most of the Orthodox Churches are inclined to think that the prodigal “Uniates” need to return home, while the Roman Church remains hesitant to let these Churches go.³⁴⁴ We could go on and on, attempting to suggest different answers to this perfectly legitimate question, but in all of these attempts we should never forget that we are talking about full-fledged and mature Particular Churches whose own voice in this complicated matter should never be overlooked or ignored.³⁴⁵ Such was the most basic and fundamental standpoint of both Orthodox and Catholic participants of the KCSG - very clearly articulated already at their first consultation in Oxford.³⁴⁶ In response to Bishop Kallistos, Chirovsky states that in the past, and especially at present, the very existence of the Kyivan Catholic Church “has been challenged precisely by those who devote themselves to the important work of ecumenical rapprochement.” Nevertheless, in his opinion it was a “hopeful sign” that at the very beginning of theological deliberations within the KCSG the Kyivan Catholics could

³⁴³ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 152-171 and LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 172-199.

³⁴⁴ KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” pp. 438-439.

³⁴⁵ In one of his papers Fr. Andriy Chirovsky mentioned that he “has been personally told by a number of both Roman Catholic and Orthodox “ecumenists” that the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church must cease to exist as soon as possible, with its six to seven million members given the opportunity to choose either Latin-rite Catholicism or membership in the Moscow Patriarchate. It is amazing that these same people will profess respect for the notion of “Sister Churches,” but cannot see that they are actually proposing the suppression of an ancient Church. This Church may currently find itself in an ecclesiologicaly confusing situation, but it is nevertheless a Church!” (CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 33).

³⁴⁶ WARE, “The Church of God,” pp. 14-15 and CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 33.

“hear one of the most distinguished theologians and hierarchs of the Orthodox Church (Bishop Kallistos) assure us that our right to exist – to be in communion with the See of Rome while attempting to retain our Eastern identity – should not be challenged precisely because it is founded on freedom of conscience.”³⁴⁷

Fortunately, the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, which resumed its work at its Seventh Plenary Session in Balamand, demonstrated considerable progress in comparison with its earlier meetings in Freising and Ariccia.³⁴⁸ It acknowledged that, despite the fact and precisely for the reason that “uniatism” as a model of Church union is no longer valid and should never be applied to any of the Particular Churches again (par. 2, 4, 12), at least at the present moment there is no point in the immediate return of the Eastern Catholic Churches to the Orthodox communion since old divisions can never be healed by the creation of new ones (par 9, 15-16). Therefore, the Eastern Catholic Churches whose ecclesial character and right to exist were recognized (par. 3) have been invited to participate and to contribute to the ecumenical dialogue on the local and universal levels (par. 16) in order to bring nearer the moment when the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches will be able to restore ecclesiastical communion between themselves and the question of “uniatism” will be once and for all resolved in the most natural way without hurting anyone’s present ecclesiastical integrity (par. 21).³⁴⁹

³⁴⁷ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 33.

³⁴⁸ KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” p. 461.

³⁴⁹ This last statement was even more clearly articulated by par. 9 of the Ariccia Working Draft, see *Sobornost* 13 (1992), pp. 49-54, cited in KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” pp. 458-459.

Certainly, this significant shift in ecumenical thinking has influenced the contemporary development of the ecclesial identity of the Kyivan Catholic Church.³⁵⁰ But in order to be received consciously and responsibly, it was necessary that this Church find proper justification for preserving her communion with the Church of Rome.³⁵¹ In attempting to address this important issue, the KCSG seemed to suggest that the Catholic Church of Kyiv should retain her present relations with Rome because it is *mutually beneficial*. Despite many regrettable moments experienced by both of these Churches in the past, the Kyivan Catholic Church can still not only receive much that is profitable from the existing communion,³⁵² but also to make her own contribution to this communion, greatly enriching it by her own particular gifts that emanate from her rediscovered ecclesiastical Tradition.³⁵³

According to Bishop Losten, no matter how critical Kyivan Catholics can be of contemporary decisions on the part of the Roman Curia, the communion of their Church with the Church of Rome “has proved to be a blessed grace” for them and, in fact, especially in the most recent times it has been viewed and received by most of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholics both in Ukraine and in the diaspora as a “gift” and a “source of

³⁵⁰ LUBACHIVSKY, “Pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov,” pp. 461-484. See also KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” p. 462 and Serge KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group: ‘Impossible Dialogue?’” in Bert GROEN and Wil van den BERCKEN, eds., *Four Hundred Years of the Union of Brest (1596-1996): A Critical Re-evaluation: Acta of the Congress Held at Hermen Castle, the Netherlands, in March 1996* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), p. 189.

³⁵¹ At the very beginning of his presentation on the “Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev,” Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford posed an absolutely valid question: if “we claim the same theological, liturgical, disciplinary and spiritual tradition as the rest of our Orthodox brothers and sisters,” so “*why* do we maintain that communion with Rome which seems to be such an outmoded, pointless stumbling block?” (LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 73). In the subsequent pages of his paper Bishop Basil presented his version of justification for preservation of the contemporary communion between the Kyivan Catholic Church and the Church of Rome (Ibid., pp. 73-106).

³⁵² LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 73-75.

³⁵³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 378-380.

joy” which they “could not even consider rejecting” although they “certainly could and did consider how the realization of that communion must be modified and improved.”³⁵⁴

Lostén noted that in the difficult years after World War II, when all of the Kyivan Catholic bishops and leading clergy were imprisoned in Ukraine, while the three hierarchs remaining at liberty in the West “could not act on behalf of their Church as a unit” for the reason that they were not ruling bishops or ordinaries,³⁵⁵ the Roman Pontiff “did what no one else could have done.”³⁵⁶ Exercising his primacy in the form of pastoral care for the well being of all Churches of the Catholic communion rather than his ordinary and immediate jurisdiction, the Pope did not subordinate the Kyivan Catholics to the care of the Roman Catholic bishops, but within a decade supported the establishment of two Archdioceses: in Winnipeg (with eparchies in Toronto, Saskatoon and Edmonton, later joined by New Westminster) and in Philadelphia (with eparchies in Stamford, and eventually Chicago and Parma), and later erected even more dioceses and exarchates for the Kyivan Catholic living in Australia, West Germany, France, England, Brazil and Argentina, enabling the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church to “emerge from disaster and bring the treasures of her faith to her people scattered all over the world, while preparing for the moment when religious freedom might come once again in Ukraine.”³⁵⁷

It was also the Pope of Rome, John Paul II who “assured a canonical successor” to His Beatitude Josyf (Slip'j). He also emphasized the historical significance of the Kyivan Catholic Church by his patronage for the observances of the Millennium of the Baptism of

³⁵⁴ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 73.

³⁵⁵ The auxiliary of L'viv, Bishop Ivan (Buchko) had been visiting Kyivan Catholics in South America when World War II began and could not return home, while the other two bishops were merely exarchs in the United States of America and Canada.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

Kyivan Rus', "supported the cause of the Church in Ukraine when no one else believed that this Church had survived" in her homeland, and despite some disagreements with regard to the *Ostpolitik* of the Vatican and the Kyivan Catholic Church's ecclesiastical autonomy, "advanced her synodal development" to the extent that when her bishops assembled together for their historic Synod of June 1990 in Rome, they could recognize that despite the "persecution and chaos," their Church had been brought "through the crucible with more bishops, more dioceses, and better developed structure than ever before in the history of the Church of Kiev."³⁵⁸

Therefore, once again stressing that he still can be "sharply critical of Roman administration," Bishop Losten at the same time acknowledged that it was also Rome itself which due to its most recent documents opened hitherto unseen possibilities for free discussion and enabled him to "criticize that administration."³⁵⁹ Therefore, according to him, it would be "stunning ingratitude" if the Kyivan Catholics did not appreciate what the most recent Roman Pontiffs and the Church of Rome have done for them thus far.³⁶⁰

In full accord with Bishop Basil (Losten), Myroslaw Tatarzyn in his Oxford paper on the "Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality" emphasized that even if Kyivan Catholics are tending at the present moment to "replace the traditional Universalist ecclesiology with an ecclesiology of *koinonia*," thus trying to "reestablish the autonomy" of their Church as a Particular Church of the Catholic communion, they by no means intend to accomplish this "at the expense of the unity of the Church Universal."³⁶¹ This is because the Church of Rome as *centrum unitatis* and the Roman Pontiff as the *primus inter pares*

³⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 74-75.

³⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 74.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 75.

³⁶¹ TATARZYN, "Papal Primacy," p. 138.

are playing extremely significant roles in the Catholic communion by keeping all the Particular Churches with their “local bishops, local synods, or local Episcopal conferences” in touch with each other, so that they “do not drift apart into unintended and dangerous isolation.”³⁶²

In one of the sub-sections of this chapter of the present study dealing with “Theological pluralism and the Particular Theological Approaches of the Kyivan Catholic Church” I already mentioned that, according to Andriy Chirovsky, many Kyivan Catholics found it antinomically possible to remain simultaneously faithful to both the main principles of Eucharistic ecclesiology and to the papal claims emanating from the Universalistic ecclesiology of Vatican I and to a certain extent Vatican II. This they do by modeling themselves on the antinomic approach of the Chalcedonian formula regarding “union without confusion” that exists on the level of hypostatic union between the two Divine Natures combined together in one Divine Person of Christ.³⁶³

Developing his reflections even further, Fr. Chirovsky insisted that there should always exist a counterbalance between the just mentioned two poles of the antinomy “that can be lost when the ecclesiology of Eucharistic communion is emphasized to the point of forgetfulness of universal ecclesiology.”³⁶⁴ Sometimes, in his opinion, it is important to rely on “strong leadership in terms of universal primacy,” especially when we approach a question that is difficult for both Catholics and Orthodox: how the newly established

³⁶² Ibid., p. 100.

³⁶³ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” pp. 36-38. In the opinion of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, “it was not so outrageous for Greco-Catholics to claim to hold both ecclesiologies simultaneously, even if they seem to be in conflict with each other” in view of the fact that the Council of Chalcedon in its final document had actually succeeded in holding the “seemingly irreconcilable Christologies of the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools in perfect tension” (Ibid., p. 38).

³⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 40.

daughter-Churches “in the Western hemisphere are to relate to their Mother Churches in traditional Eastern homelands and to each other in their new countries?”³⁶⁵

Thus, while remaining critical of the territorial limitation of the Kyivan Catholic Church confirmed by the newly promulgated *Code of Canons for the Eastern Churches*, Chirovsky did not hesitate to underline the positive values of notions introduced by the *CCEO*: that of *ius generale* (common to all the Eastern Catholic Churches), *ius particulare* (which allows each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion to elaborate their own synodal legislation), and *ius speciale ad tempus* (which regulates the evolving relations between the Mother-Churches and their daughter-Churches throughout the world).³⁶⁶ In his opinion, the “just application” of the temporary *ius speciale*, coming from the central authority could considerably help both the Mother and daughter-Churches of the Catholic communion to properly govern their internal relations until the rapidly developing Churches of the Western hemisphere would be able to “reach some maturity” and to be “reorganized as a more indigenous bodies.”

Concluding his reflections, Chirovsky stated:

Perhaps if that central authority were less like a bureaucracy and more like a ruling synod, the antinomic tension of universal versus Eucharistic ecclesiologies could be better preserved and the whole enterprise could be protected from inordinate centralism and paternalism on the part of more powerful Churches.³⁶⁷

After examining the great benefits that the Eastern Catholic Churches in general and the Kyivan Catholic Church in particular received from their ecclesiastical relations with

³⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 40.

³⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 41.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 41-42.

the Roman Apostolic See, it is important not to overlook that the Church of Rome herself benefited considerably from her communion with these Churches. Together with the Orthodox Churches, they introduced her to the principles of Eucharistic ecclesiology, and a more precise understanding of the Church as a *koinonia* of Particular Churches. In general they presented her firsthand with the rich values of the Christian East. Many steps forward have already been made on both sides in order to enable the Catholic Church to learn how is it possible to breathe again with two lungs, the Eastern and the Western, as this was beautifully described by the first Slavic Pope, John Paul II.³⁶⁸

Unfortunately, according to Archimandrite Boniface up to the present day there are still many Roman Catholics who, because of their “indifference and prejudice,” seem not to be aware of Vatican II’s decrees as well as of many other Catholic Church documents that stress the equal dignity and the significance of the exchange of the spiritual gifts between the Western and the Eastern Churches of the Catholic communion. They still insist that “there can be but one true Church, and that is the Western Church; only one true spirituality, and that is the Western; only one true theology, and that is the Western, etc.”³⁶⁹

Nevertheless, it is important to admit that the great progress in the mutual recognition and appreciation between the Church of Rome and the Catholic Church of Kyiv has actually taken place in the last century. If only a little more than a hundred years ago, before the Jerusalem Eucharistic congress of 1893 and Pope Leo XIII’s Encyclical *Orientalium Dignitas* of 1894, Latins could not even receive Holy Communion in the

³⁶⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 379.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

Eastern Catholic Churches and vice versa,³⁷⁰ already in the nineteen sixties, the voice of the Kyivan Catholic hierarchs such as Josyf Slipyj and Maxim Hermaniuk, who stood together with other Eastern Catholic bishops on some truly significant ecclesiological issues, has finally been heard and very seriously taken into account by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.³⁷¹

Hermaniuk went so far as to counterbalance their universalistic ecclesiology with more Eastern attitudes towards understanding the Catholic Church as a communion of autonomous Churches with their own rights and values.³⁷² In the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface, many of the “‘revolutionary’ aspects of renewal at Vatican II would never have occurred” without the “peaceful revenge” of the Eastern Catholic Churches on their Western Sister.³⁷³ Moreover, Archimandrite Boniface insisted that the Church of Rome would probably not be ready to accept the collegiality of the bishops and the permanent diaconate, Communion under two species and the Divine Office as the prayer of the Church, the use of the vernacular, concelebration by priests and the active participation of the faithful in the Liturgy if these truly important advances had not been “borrowed from” and “backed by” the “age-old and successful apostolic practice preserved in the Eastern

³⁷⁰ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 77. See also HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed 8 July, 2009.

³⁷¹ For the sake of historical accuracy, it is important to note that at the time of the Second Vatican Council, just few months after his release from the long-term imprisonment in the Soviet Gulag, where he had no chance to get familiarized with the contemporary situation in the Church, Metropolitan Josyf (Slipyj) very sincerely argued against so precious for Eastern Christians issue of collegiality in contrast to the quite the opposite standpoints expressed by Metropolitan Maxim (Hermaniuk) and many other Eastern Catholic bishops whose knowledge of various difficulties and inconstancies with regard to the internal ecclesiastical relations within the Catholic Church was much more advanced.

³⁷² CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” pp. 37-38.

³⁷³ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 380.

Churches.”³⁷⁴ All this, in the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface, very clearly manifested that the “Holy Spirit is moving in his Church, and certainly in favour of the Eastern Churches, because what the Western Church needs in her crisis is exactly what the Eastern Churches represent.”³⁷⁵

As late as 6 January 1987 the Prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education, Cardinal William Baum, admitted the “general lack of understanding of the spiritual traditions and values of Eastern Christianity” that have truly “vital importance” for the entire Catholic Church. He had to issue a special mandate ordering a “thorough formation of all Western priests in the Eastern Churches’ heritage, especially the Greek Fathers.”³⁷⁶ Thus, it is not enough for the Kyivan Catholics merely to develop their own ecclesial self-understanding internally. They also need to come closer to the realization of their ecclesial mission consisting, among many other things, in sharing the riches of their heritage with their Western brethren in order to “overcome general indifference or negativism and to change that atmosphere of hidden hostility, ignorance, or indifference into an openness and willingness to learn from the East.”³⁷⁷

III.2.7. The Kyivan Catholic Church and Her Role in the Contemporary Rapprochement Between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches

At the very beginning of this sub-section of the concluding chapter of the present study it is important to admit that in spite of the great hopes inspired by the Vatican II’s

³⁷⁴ In the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), even the contemporary procedure of annulments of invalid marriages in the Catholic Church “would have probably not have developed, had the West not familiarized itself with the practice of the ‘marriage of mercy’” that exists in the Orthodox Church (Ibid., p. 380).

³⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 380.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 379.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 378.

Decrees *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* and regardless of many efforts undertaken by such prominent Eastern Catholic hierarchs and theologians as Sheptytsky, Slipyj, Hermaniuk, Maximos IV, Zoghby, in the contemporary circumstances the Eastern Catholic Churches in general and the Kyivan Catholic Church in particular are not regarded by most of the Orthodox as “mediators” enabling the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches to find common ground in their theological dialogue, but rather as “barriers,” “obstacles,” and “roadblocks” along the way of present-day ecumenical rapprochement.³⁷⁸

What are the reasons for this situation and what means should be employed in order to change it? These were among the most fundamental questions permeating all the consultations of the KCSG, the very existence of which could serve as a proof that dialogue between Orthodox and Greco-Catholics is possible.³⁷⁹ Kyivan Catholics also demonstrated that they are capable of playing a positive and constructive role in this dialogue, by expressing the potential for the elaboration of a clear ecclesial identity and vocation for their Church - ultimately directed towards the recomposition of full and visible union within a presently divided Kyivan Christianity.

Being fully aware that the scope and the quality of contemporary relations between Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox do not satisfy the demands of the present time, both Orthodox and Catholic participants of the KCSG, already during their Oxford consultation, agreed that “despite the statements of extremists,” it is not entirely true that the Kyivan

³⁷⁸ Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia wonders about this reversal in the general Orthodox perception of the Eastern Catholics in his presentation “The Church of God: Our Shared Vision,” pp. 12-13.

³⁷⁹ KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group,” p. 183.

Catholic and Orthodox Churches “never talk to each other” and do not really desire the reunion that could eventually heal their wounds.³⁸⁰

Sharing his memories about his last visit to Ukraine with the other members of the Study Group, Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos noted that in contrast to “many other parts of the world” where the “ecumenists favour Christian union, but the ordinary faithful do not care,” in Ukraine none of the Orthodox with whom Bishop Vsevolod spoke objected to his presence at the Kyivan Catholic Synod of Bishops for the reason that everyone seemed to be deeply concerned and “thoroughly worn out with church division and quarrels,” impatiently demanding that their religious leaders resolve the present disunity as soon as possible.³⁸¹

In full support of this observation, Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford underlined that even if in some places of the world Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy have each become comparatively “comfortable with the schism,” this would never happen to the Eastern Catholics who “can never truly become accustomed to the schism” for the reason that their very existence is a living antinomy combining together in tension (that at times might be invisible, but is always there, and always reappears) simultaneous love for Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Therefore, “separation from either of them”³⁸² would inevitably lead Kyivan Catholics to the loss of their authentic ecclesial identity.³⁸³ So, if

³⁸⁰ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 77.

³⁸¹ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 162-163.

³⁸² LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 78-79. See also HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed 8 July, 2009.

³⁸³ In confirmation of his statement, Bishop Basil (Losten) cited the intervention of Patriarch Maximos IV (Saigh) during the general session of Vatican II on 27 November 1962, when the Patriarch said: “for us Eastern Catholics of the Byzantine tradition in particular, the split of the Churches is always a bloody wound which we feel at the most profound depth of our souls... The Orthodox and we, their Catholic Byzantine brothers, peoples of various nationalities, constitute only one family in our religious mentality, in Liturgy, in

both Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox seem to be so eagerly desirous for reunion between themselves, why do they most of the time still hesitate to actively involve themselves in ecumenical dialogue on both universal and local levels?

In the opinion of Bishop Vsevolod, the first reason was the *lack of information* about the imperatives of the Dialogue of Love and the Dialogue of Truth taking place between the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Churches.³⁸⁴ Even while still striving for the restoration of full Eucharistic communion, these Churches have already emphatically asserted that they constitute one Church of Christ.³⁸⁵ The second reason was the *confusion of purely ecclesiastical matters with politics* – a situation that did not allow Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox to acknowledge that even in the past most of the divisions between worldwide Catholicism and Orthodoxy had occurred as a result of cultural dichotomies and ethno-religious conflicts³⁸⁶ rather than irreconcilable theological divergences.³⁸⁷ The third and the most important reason, according to Bishop Vsevolod, was the *fear of accepting responsibility* that for centuries has been provoking Ukrainians regardless of their religious background to “be acted upon” rather than “act themselves” and to be “afraid to accept

our spiritual history, and in many of our instincts” (*L’Eglise Greque Melkite au Concile* (Damas, Syrie: Patriarcat Grec Melkite Catholique, 1967), p. 986, cited in LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 78).

³⁸⁴ Bishop Vsevolod admitted that for a certain period of time he himself “along with the rest of the Ukrainian community” was not aware of the “ecumenical work that has been done between the Catholics and Orthodox (*Tomos Agapes*), documents of dialogue, agreed statements” and “had paid no serious attention to this dialogue, and had never even seen all these documents” since “none of these materials existed in Ukrainian translation” and “even the English-language press did not normally publish them” (MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 157). This is a little difficult to correlate with the fact that by December 1989 he was reviewing the Agreed Statements in a public lecture. While such protestations of ignorance may seem shocking to some, the simple fact is that while ecumenists may believe their work to be well disseminated, neither the Orthodox nor the Catholic press place enough emphasis on Orthodox-Catholic relations. When they do publish news on ecumenical breakthroughs, the implications of these advances for the daily life of the Church are rarely presented.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 156-158.

³⁸⁶ See my unpublished M.A. major paper, *The Origins and Development of the Ethnoreligious Conflict Between Chalcedonians and Monophysites: Analysis and Theological Reflections* (Ottawa, 2000).

³⁸⁷ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 180-181.

responsibility, afraid of anyone else who acts responsibly, and always frightened that someone is trying to deprive them of what little they seem to have.”³⁸⁸

All of these factors were really destructive, at least in the past. Therefore, in order to overcome them, Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox need to acknowledge that (i) they have no right to be idle and indifferent to the dialogue between the Old and the New Rome because their own internal split came about precisely as a consequence of the division in worldwide Christianity;³⁸⁹ (ii) they still share essentially the same “Orthodox-Catholic faith as taught and confessed by the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers;”³⁹⁰ (iii) they should not take “sinful pleasure in their isolation” because “it is the time, not to bar the door, but to rush out and welcome one another as the merciful father rushed out to welcome his returning son”³⁹¹ with sincere patience and love or what the Church calls *oikonomia* and the “concession to human weakness” often designated among theologians as *synkatavasis*.³⁹²

Nevertheless, there still remains one final question: even if Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox decide to involve themselves in dialogue (as the participants of the KCSG have already done), what means should be used and what practical steps have to be taken in

³⁸⁸ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 153.

³⁸⁹ LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” p. 361 and MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 158.

³⁹⁰ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 165.

³⁹¹ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 71.

³⁹² MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 155 and LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 71. In response to the request of Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford to explain the meaning of the terms *oikonomia* (household management) and *synkatavasis* (accommodation, condescension), Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia clarified that both of these terms “signify a departure from the strict rules of the Church, so as to assist the salvation of souls” presupposing special attentiveness to the “attitude and spiritual state of the persons to whom these principles are being applied.” Therefore, in spite of the fact that these concepts can only be applied to the “administration and governing of the Church and not to the realm of doctrine,” they, in the opinion of Bishop Kallistos, can still be successfully employed in order to “heal relations between separated Christians” who are “sharply conscious of the pain of separation and are actively seeking reconciliation” (WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” pp. 113-116). In tune with Bishop Kallistos and Fr. Theodore Stylianopoulos, Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko admitted that it is truly important for the Orthodox Churches to recognize that all the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion are their Sisters “even if it is – for the time being – via *synkatavasis* and *oikonomia* (KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 425).

order to guarantee the fruitfulness of their hard work while at the same time safeguarding their efforts from being merely “flamboyant gestures and fine words” which could even “cause many believers to lose all trust in the Church?”³⁹³

In this regard, the participants of the KCSG suggested as many as seven very concrete means, guidelines or principles that might constitute a multi-faceted program of ecumenical rapprochement between Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox. While these were already practically applied to the work of the Study Group, in my opinion, they can also serve as a suitable basis for the founding and development of many future ecumenical initiatives both within and beyond the Church of Kyiv. They emphasized the importance of (i) mutual forgiveness; (ii) freedom of conscience; (iii) rejection of the love of power and an inappropriate reliance on secular authorities; (iv) reciprocal respect; (v) appreciation of the ecclesiastical integrity of each of the Particular Churches participating in the dialogue; (vi) recognition of all Orthodox and Catholic Churches, including Eastern Catholic Churches as Sisters who enjoy full ecclesial character and the same dignity; and (vii) acknowledgement of the equal right of all of the Particular Churches to develop their own ways of ecumenical rapprochement.³⁹⁴

Most of the above ecumenical principles, were indicated in one way or another in the document entitled “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft” that was elaborated by the KCSG during its consultation in Ottawa with the intention of contributing to the work of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman

³⁹³ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 163.

³⁹⁴ Most of these guidelines one way or another correspond to the analogous “Catholic Principles of Ecumenism” emanating from the Vatican II’s *Decree on Ecumenism* which were discussed in detail in the sub-section II.2.7. of a previous chapter of this study.

Catholic and Orthodox Churches in general and the preparation of its Balamand Statement in particular.³⁹⁵

1. *Significance of mutual forgiveness*: The KCSG was not the first to emphasize the importance of this truly indispensable factor in any ecumenical relations. At least thirty years before the KCSG it was underlined by the Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* (OE 7)³⁹⁶ and on many occasions was practically applied in the context of the Dialogue of Love between Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras, as well as between Pope John Paul and Patriarchs Dimitrios and Bartholomew.³⁹⁷

Nevertheless, there were also very sad moments in the history of the recent ecumenical rapprochement when the extended hand of mutual forgiveness would be simply ignored by those who up to the present day seem to be simply incapable of acknowledging their own faults.³⁹⁸ In this regard, His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky) wrote in his letter to Cardinal Cassidy the following words:

While I personally have in the past extended my hand in forgiveness and will continue to do so, at the same time I am deeply saddened by the fact

³⁹⁵ At the very beginning of their "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft" the participants of the KCSG articulated that they "appreciate the need for a set of guidelines aimed at the urgent task of establishing and developing positive relations between Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches" and (i and ii) underlined that they "welcome the emphatic insistence upon respect for freedom of conscience and upon the need for mutual forgiveness;" (iii) stressed that sometimes not only "secular authorities" but also both Catholic and Orthodox Churches can be regarded as culpable in the "use of inappropriate methods;" (iv) confirmed the importance of "mutual respect" and asked for a more precise definition of the term "proselytism" at the same time expressing their preparedness to "engage in the admittedly complex task of developing a common historiography," while deploring the "distribution and importation of polemical literature in regions of inter-eclesial conflict;" (v) demanded the removal of restrictions imposed on the Eastern Catholic Churches by the Church of Rome; and (vi) asked for - clarification of the "precise ecclesiological implications of the term 'Sister Churches,'" emphasizing the "need for further and better development of this concept." The seventh principle was not mentioned explicitly but it tacitly emanated from the very fact that the KCSG as a local ecumenical initiative did not hesitate to search for her own solutions for current ecumenical conflicts and went as far as to present its original reflections, comments and recommendations to the attention of the formal Theological Dialogue (KCSG, "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft," pp. 79-81).

³⁹⁶ LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," p. 368.

³⁹⁷ CHIROVSKY, "The Union of the Holy Churches of God," p. 32.

³⁹⁸ KELEHER, *Passion and Resurrection*, p. 113.

that the Orthodox seem incapable of dealing honestly with their own history. Until she is ready to do so, the Orthodox Church will continue to see herself as a victim and will resist the process of internal healing which is necessary for her to respond positively to the call of preaching the Gospel of Our Lord, and indeed to act as a fair and equal partner in ecumenical dialogue at various levels.³⁹⁹

Even before their first consultation in Oxford, many of the future participants of the KCSG were already fully aware that without a “full reception of *metanoia* and deep conversion of heart” their dialogue would not be possible.⁴⁰⁰ Bishop Vsevolod, for instance, was deeply moved by his personal encounter with the Kyivan Catholic *locum tenens*, Metropolitan Volodymyr (Sterniuk) of L’viv, as well as with the other bishops of the 1992 Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Synod of Bishops who, regardless of many years of severe persecutions and most recent conflicts, welcomed him, an Orthodox bishop, with great love and warmth - which he did not expect.⁴⁰¹

In the same way, Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, who knew about the sufferings of the Ukrainian Catholics and expected more bitterness and pain from the Catholic participants of the Study Group, was pleasantly surprised by the friendly and brotherly atmosphere that permeated the whole Oxford consultation of the KCSG.⁴⁰² Therefore, right at the beginning of his opening presentation he underlined the importance of mutual forgiveness as the “only way forward” in any ecumenical endeavor and in the spirit of the Lenten Vespers of Forgiveness and the Paschal Midnight liturgical services with a “full heart and in all sincerity” in his “capacity as a bishop of the Orthodox Church”

³⁹⁹ LUBACHIVSKY, “Letter to Cardinal Cassidy,” p. 420.

⁴⁰⁰ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198.

⁴⁰¹ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 160-161

⁴⁰² Andrew ONUFERKO, “Interviu z Vladykoiu Kallistos (Ware): Oksford, 12 serpnia 1992 [Interview with Bishop Kallistos (Ware): Oxford, 12 August 1992],” in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 317-318.

asked the Kyivan Catholics present in Oxford to “forgive him”⁴⁰³ for “everything the Orthodox had done, or were perceived to have done.”⁴⁰⁴

In his response to the paper of Bishop Kallistos, Andriy Chirovsky underlined that, especially in view of the fact that up to the present day Moscow remains hesitant to react to the initiative of His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky),⁴⁰⁵ the Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG were deeply moved by the call for mutual forgiveness coming from a “bishop of the Orthodox Church who recognized the sufferings” which the UGCC underwent in her “forced incorporation into the Moscow Patriarchate in 1946.”⁴⁰⁶ As a consequence, being fully aware of the crucial role of mutual forgiveness as a “powerful herald of good things to come” and the most efficient means capable of “excluding any haughtiness,” Fr. Andriy Chirovsky sincerely acknowledged that the Kyivan Catholics in the same way as Kyivan Orthodox need to repent and to ask for forgiveness since in the past they both have been all too ready to “appeal to secular powers for support against each other... to judge one another (publicly or in the secret bitterness of their hearts)” and to write of one another as “impossible partners in dialogue.”⁴⁰⁷

⁴⁰³ WARE, “The Church of God,” pp. 16-17.

⁴⁰⁴ MAJDANSKY, “Orthodox-Catholic Reconciliation,” p. 51-52. The same words have been repeated in the interview of Bishop Kallistos to the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic “Radio Resurrection” (ONUFERKO, “Interviu z Vladykoiu Kallistos (Ware),” p. 318).

⁴⁰⁵ In his official public radio address on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the organization “Church in Need” on 6 November 1987, the Head of the UGCC, Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky, said the following significant words: “Following the spirit of Christ, we are offering our hand of forgiveness, reconciliation and love to the Russian people and the Moscow Patriarchate. As in our reconciliation with the Polish people, we repeat the words of Christ: ‘Forgive us, as we forgive’ (Cfr. Mt. 6:12). We are all brethren in Christ. Let us respect each other; let us learn to live together, being aware that we are united by one faith in our Savior. Mary, the Mother of God, is such a strong bond in our religious tradition that she will help us to overcome all the difficulties on the way to unity, for the sake of the salvation of our peoples.” For the complete Ukrainian text, see *Svoboda* (28 November 1987). Unfortunately, both this call and a further similar appeal of the Synod of Bishops of the UGCC to the Patriarch of Moscow, Pimen, of 14 October 1989, remain unanswered. See Michael HRYNCHYSHYN, “The Current Situation of the Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine,” in GROEN and BERCKEN, *Four Hundred Years of the Union of Brest*, p. 163.

⁴⁰⁶ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 32.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

Thus, if both Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches still want to develop any relations, they, in the opinion of Fr. Andriy, should “move ahead only in the spirit of mutual forgiveness” that by itself constitutes one of the most significant ecumenical principles which “needs to be further fostered.”⁴⁰⁸

2. *Significance of freedom of conscience*: Right after reflecting on the importance of mutual forgiveness, both Kallistos Ware and Andriy Chirovsky dedicated much attention to another “guiding criterion” fundamental for any ecumenical activity, that of freedom of conscience, understood as a sacred principle. The violation of this principle might be regarded as “blasphemy against the divine image” of God who being free, created all human beings likewise free⁴⁰⁹ and, in the words of Nicholas Berdyaev, “He is still truly present and operative only in freedom.”⁴¹⁰

The “liberty of choice,” in the opinion of Bishop Kallistos, especially in “all matters of religious conscience, must be at all costs fiercely defended,” since any abuse of this vital concept caused by “any form of physical or moral coercion, all threats, bribes and deceit” would inevitably lead to the loss of the Church’s ecclesial identity and the “betrayal of her Orthodoxy.”⁴¹¹ Therefore, according to Bishop Kallistos, even though the Orthodox may consider the decision on the part of the Kyivan Catholics to enter the the Catholic Church while retaining their Eastern ecclesial identity to be mistaken, they are still “bound to

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 32.

⁴⁰⁹ WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 14.

⁴¹⁰ Nicholas BERDYAEV, *Dream and Reality* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1950), p. 46. Much has been written on the same subject by Christos Yannaras in his book *The Freedom of Morality* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1984).

⁴¹¹ WARE, “The Church of God,” pp. 14-15.

respect” the choice of their brethren precisely for the reason that it comes about as a result of the “exercise of their divinely-given freedom of conscience.”⁴¹²

Affirming the “absolute value of freedom of conscience,” Chirovsky expressed his joy that the Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG as early as at the very beginning of the Oxford consultation could hear the voice of a prominent Orthodox bishop and theologian confirming the right of their Church to exist as a Particular Church of the Catholic communion, at the same time recognizing their natural right, deeply “rooted in the image of God,” to make free choices with regard to their own ecclesial life.⁴¹³

3. *The need for elimination of the love of power*: The “love of power” as probably the greatest violation of the previously discussed principles of *metanoia* and “freedom of conscience” was from at least three different perspectives approached by Bishop Kallistos, Andriy Chirovsky and Archimandrite Boniface. Bishop Kallistos very early in his presentation emphasized that the “freedom of consciousness presupposes freedom of the Church from state control.” For him the *drive for power* on the part of both Kyivan Catholics and Kyivan Orthodox was closely related with their “readiness to rely on the secular arm” which, even in cases “when they thought it to their advantage,” in fact only “added immeasurably to the bitterness of their mutual conflicts.”⁴¹⁴

Ware presented several historical instances of religious persecutions of Orthodox by Eastern Catholics (then just reunited with Rome) supported by the Polish and Hungarian civil authorities in the seventeenth century. He also cited examples of forceful incorporations of Greco-Catholics into the Russian Orthodox Church in 1796, 1839, 1875

⁴¹² Ibid., p. 15.

⁴¹³ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 33.

⁴¹⁴ WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 15.

and 1946, backed at first by the Tsarist government and later by the Soviet regime. According to Bishop Kallistos, all of these and many other “attempts of the state to settle questions of religious consciousness through prison camps, the sword, the gun and the whip – through the use of the police and the military – have always been a disaster” that caused much pain and harm to the relations among Christians who, being seduced by a love for power and trying to profit from the maltreatment of their brethren by the state, failed to fulfill one of the most clear commandments of Christ that insists on the importance of rendering to “Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s” (Matt. 22:21).⁴¹⁵ Chirovsky agreed that the “interference of the state in the life of the Church” whether this state is the “Polish Roman Catholic or the Russian Orthodox or the officially atheist Soviet Union or even a democratic Ukrainian Republic” already proved to be an “oppressive reality” experienced by both Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox in the past.⁴¹⁶ Therefore, he directly indicated that the “lust for power” on the part of various “governments and Churches alike” is surely at the root of all present inter-ecclesiastical disagreements that can be resolved only through *metanoia* and repentance of their excessive love for power on the part of all the Churches and their leaders. This is what still prevents many of them from extending the hand of mutual forgiveness.⁴¹⁷

Deeply concerned by the tacit refusal of the Moscow Patriarchate to accept apologies of Cardinal Lubachivsky and to extend the same request for forgiveness in return, Archimandrite Boniface drew everyone’s attention to “several beautiful gestures” made by Eastern Catholic hierarchs in the twentieth century. These clearly manifested that the drive

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., p. 15-16.

⁴¹⁶ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 35.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., p. 42.

for power has not always permeated all Churches and their leaders. For example, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and Patriarch Maximos IV both “offered to resign in favour of their Orthodox brothers as soon as full union” between the Eastern Catholic Churches presided over by them and their Orthodox counterparts is restored.⁴¹⁸

4. *Significance of mutual respect*: In view of the fact that “there was not always mutual respect between Ukrainian Greco-Catholics and Ukrainian Orthodox” in the past, the provision for this fundamental ecumenical principle, in the opinion of Bishop Vsevolod, should be regarded as being truly “essential in all relations between all Christian bodies” commonly seeking reconciliation at present.⁴¹⁹ Therefore, in the words of Archimandrite Boniface, contemporary ecumenical work can no longer be founded on the out-dated Catholic and Orthodox models of missionary activity, according to which the whole ecumenical process was envisaged through the apparently wrong formula: “‘we’ are ‘here,’ and ‘over there’ are ‘the others’ and the others must join ‘us’ in order to share in the true Church of Christ.”⁴²⁰ That is why many of the participants of the KCSG insisted that such an attitude, based on “enticing people to leave one Church and join another,”⁴²¹ as well as all forms of proselytism leading to such inappropriate conversions, need to be decisively rejected as having nothing to do with any future efforts ultimately aimed at Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement.⁴²² For that reason, in the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface, both Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox should by all means keep away from “every deed, and straighten out all the situations, that could hurt the other,”⁴²³ if they really want to bring

⁴¹⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 386.

⁴¹⁹ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 166.

⁴²⁰ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 366.

⁴²¹ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 75.

⁴²² MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 167.

⁴²³ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 198.

closer the day of their reconciliation. That can only be reached if they commonly agree to “avoid in speech, writing, action, etc., all that could constitute a barrier to building up good relations, on the personal and corporate levels.”⁴²⁴

5. *Significance of the rediscovery of authentic ecclesial identity and strengthening of inner ecclesiastical integrity*: In tune with the Joint Statement of the 43rd meeting of the US Bishops’ Commission for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of May 1992, Luykx emphasized that the “very concept of ‘uniatism’ should be nuanced”⁴²⁵ by making a clear distinction between on the one hand “uniatism” as an inappropriate and no longer acceptable method for Church unity (that being considered as a “point of particular difficulty between Rome and Eastern Orthodoxy”⁴²⁶ has been “justly renounced by both Churches,”)⁴²⁷ and on the other “uniatism” as the very right of those Eastern Christians who “accepted full communion with the See of Rome as part of their self-understanding as Churches,” to exist.⁴²⁸ The latter, based on the principle of religious freedom, must be recognized by all the participants of the ecumenical dialogue.⁴²⁹

In his article on the “Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev,” Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford unequivocally acknowledged that, at least in the past, since they were highly Latinized, the Eastern Catholic Churches could not “constitute a model for the full communion of the Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church.”⁴³⁰

⁴²⁴ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 368.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 382.

⁴²⁶ KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” p. 428.

⁴²⁷ “U.S. Orthodox/Roman Catholic dialogue – Eastern Europe: Antipathy Between Churches,” *Origins* 22 (11 June, 1992), p. 80.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁴²⁹ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 382-383.

⁴³⁰ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 72.

Nevertheless, in the opinion of many members of the KCSG, it would be a great mistake if the contemporary ecumenical dialogue would ignore the fact that most of these Churches, including the Catholic Church of Kyiv, are at present searching for ways to eliminate the remnants of “uniatism” from their own ecclesial consciousness, all the while attempting to rediscover their true ecclesial identity and vocation as full-fledged Orthodox Churches in communion with Rome.⁴³¹

Therefore, both Orthodox and Catholic participants of the KCSG insisted that it is important not only to recognize the right of the Kyivan Catholic Church to exist, but also to reject efforts that prevent this Church from further ecclesiastical development⁴³² and limiting her territory merely to the Western Ukraine.⁴³³ Furthermore, it is necessary to stop treating her as “Uniate” in the worst meaning of this term,⁴³⁴ to release her from most of improper latinizing influences and restrictions⁴³⁵ and to assist her in the rediscovery and strengthening of her true ecclesial identity and ecclesiastical integrity.⁴³⁶ This, in Chirovsky’s opinion, could be accomplished through the recognition of the Kyivan Catholic Patriarchate as a “stepping-stone to the eventual reunion with a Ukrainian

⁴³¹ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 42. In his response to the presentation of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky on the ecclesial self-identity of the UGCC, Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia underlined that despite the fact that the Union of Brest “did not lead to a wider reconciliation” between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches as it was hoped for in 1596, it should not lead contemporary ecumenists to the conclusion that the Kyivan Catholic Church has no right to exist. Thus, according to Bishop Kallistos, much more attention of the participants of the current ecumenical dialogue should be drawn to their common search for the answer to the really urgent questions: “why was it so in 1596 and how can we do better four hundred years later?” (WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 131).

⁴³² MAJDANSKY, “Divisions and Healing,” p. 144.

⁴³³ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 41 and CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 84-85.

⁴³⁴ KCSG, “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” p. 80.

⁴³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁴³⁶ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 42.

Orthodox Patriarchate of Kiev in order to reconstitute the one, undivided Church of Kiev, in full communion with both Rome and Constantinople.”⁴³⁷

6. *Significance of recognition of all Orthodox and Catholic Churches, including Eastern Catholic Churches, as Sisters enjoying full ecclesiastical reality and the same responsibility to participate in ecumenical dialogue: Vatican II’s Decrees Unitatis Redintegratio and Orientalium Ecclesiarum prepared the ground for the recognition of the Orthodox Churches as Sisters of the Roman Church by acknowledging that the true Church of Christ manifests herself even outside of the ecclesiastical boundaries of the Catholic Church and is present especially in those separated brethren who are baptized in the one Trinity (UR 4) and share with the Church of Rome many elements of authentic ecclesial life, including essentially the same faith, even though its expressions may be somewhat different (UR 17).*⁴³⁸ Therefore, the Eastern Catholic Churches were no longer viewed as a replacement or a substitute for the Orthodox Churches in the Catholic communion, but as “bridges” to the restoration of unity between the Church of Rome and the Eastern Orthodox Churches (OE 24-29).⁴³⁹

Moreover, the anticipated reunion, in the words of Vatican II, had to be founded on the reestablishment of relations among the Churches of the West and of the East that would be practically the same as they were in the first millennium (UR 14, 16; OE 9). This naturally presupposed mutual recognition of the ecclesial reality of each of the Particular Churches (UR 3, 13-24).⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁷ Ibid., p. 35.

⁴³⁸ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” pp. 366-367.

⁴³⁹ Ibid., pp. 376, 386 and SCHMEMANN, “A Response to the Decree,” pp. 387-388.

⁴⁴⁰ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 80 and Francis DVORNIK, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979). This last standpoint of *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* was criticized by Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko as being ambiguous, for the reason that

This important shift in the ecumenical thinking of the Catholic Church was later considerably developed by the elaboration of the ecclesiology of Sister-Churches, which at first was somewhat ambiguous and unclear.⁴⁴¹ In time it would culminate in the Balamand Statement, which quite plainly stated that the “Catholic and the Orthodox Churches recognize each other as Sister Churches, responsible together for maintaining the Church of God in fidelity to the divine purpose, most especially in what concerns unity.”

This was elaborated on the basis of the mutually accepted understanding that Christ entrusted each of these Churches with essentially the same “profession of apostolic faith, participation in the same sacraments, above all the one priesthood celebrating the one sacrifice of Christ, the apostolic succession of bishops.” From now on these could no longer be considered the “exclusive property” of only one of the Particular Churches (par. 13).⁴⁴²

“recognition of Orthodox ecclesial reality,” in his opinion, could not possibly coexist with the notion of “‘Uniatism’ held up as a ‘model’ for future relations” (KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 424).

⁴⁴¹ Fr. Andriy Chirovsky dedicated the entirety of his presentation delivered at the Stamford consultation of the KCSG to the clarification of the term “Sister-Churches.” According to his analysis, at least until the promulgation of the Balamand Statement this term had a “more precise meaning” as an “official acceptance of the full ecclesial reality of the Orthodox, even in the condition of imperfect communion” when it was used by Catholics and “seemed to denote something more than just a gesture of good will but less than an official position” when it was employed by the Orthodox Churches (CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” pp. 404- 405). In his response to the paper of Fr. Chirovsky, Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko expressed his doubts with regard to the existence of a “common Catholic understanding of this terminology,” since according to Cardinal Ratzinger’s “Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” the Church of Rome seemed to treat herself “not as a Local Church but as the Universal Church,” at the same time designating other Churches as being “simply parts of this greater whole,” therefore, depriving the term “Sister-Churches” of its most fundamental connotation (KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 424).

⁴⁴² The full text of the Statement of the Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church, VIIth Plenary Session, Balamand School of Theology (Lebanon), 18-24 June, 1993, “Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion,” appears in English translation in *Eastern Churches Journal* 1:1 (1993/1994), pp. 29-35. After all, even the Balamand Statement, in the opinion of Fr. Andriy, did not eliminate all doubts with regard to the official Orthodox understanding of the term “Sister Churches,” since no representatives were sent to Balamand from the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Bulgaria, Serbia and the Churches of Georgia and Greece, not only due to “practical obstacles” but also because some of them seemed to gradually adopt an apparent “distrust of the progress of the dialogue” (CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” pp. 405- 406). Therefore, even

In spite of the former indifference on the part of the majority of the Kyivan Catholics with regard to the rapidly developing relations between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches (which had evolved considerably since the time of Vatican II due to the achievements of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue)⁴⁴³ the decisions of that Dialogue's Seventh Plenary were immediately welcomed by the Head of

after Balamand, most of the suggestions expressed by the KCSG in their document entitled "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft," and especially those regarding the need for further clarification of the "precise ecclesiological implications of the term "Sister Churches" remain extremely relevant and urgent up to the present day (KCSG, "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft," p. 80). According to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, the term "Sister Churches" should be reserved "exclusively to those Churches which mutually recognize each other's sacraments, priesthood, and apostolic succession." That, in his opinion, should be sufficient for re-establishment of "inter-communion unless there is very clear evidence that one of the Churches is in heresy on a matter essential for salvation" (CHIROVSKY, "Sister Churches," p. 418). The latter understanding of the term, "Sister Churches" expressed by Fr. Chirovsky seems to be for the most part consonant with a special "Note on the Expression 'Sister Churches,'" issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 30 June 2000, with of which the former Prefect of the Congregation, Cardinal Ratzinger instructed the presidents of the Catholic conferences of bishops to properly apply the expression "Sister Churches" exclusively to those "particular Catholic and non-Catholic Churches" (#11) that "have preserved a valid Episcopate and Eucharist" (#12). At the same time, the very fact that all of the Particular Churches of both the Catholic and Orthodox communions, including the "particular Church of Rome" can be regarded as *sisters* (#11), according to the Note, should not contradict the general recognition of the "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Universal Church" as being "not sister but *mother* of all particular Churches" (See ## 10-12 of the CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, "Note on the Expression 'Sister Churches,'" at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000630_chiese-sorelle_en.html, accessed on 14 August 2010. The document can also be found in *L'Osservatore Romano* (1 November 2000), p. 9 and in *The Tablet* 9 (September 2000), pp. 1205-1206). In spite of the fact that the Note was aimed at a final settlement of the discussion around the use of the term "Sister Churches," in reality it only instigated a new wave of criticism on the part of the world-wide Anglican communion and other non-Catholic Reformed ecclesial communities, all of which in the words of the Note and according to another document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church," have been designated as being "not Churches in the proper sense" (See # 17 of the CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, "Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church," at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc-con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html, accessed on 14 August 2010 and in *AAS* 92 (2000), pp. 759-761). In contrast to the World Council of Churches that issued a special statement warning that progress in ecumenical dialogue could be "hindered – or even damaged" by the language of *Dominus Iesus*, which "precludes further discussion of the issues," (See "Reactions to *Dominus Iesus* (2000)," at http://www.religioustolerance.-org/rcc_othe5.htm, accessed on 14 August 2010), the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches seemed not to be very interested in expressing any particular standpoints with regard to both the aforementioned documents, since their status as Sister Churches alongside that of the Roman Church was clearly recognized.

⁴⁴³ In the opinion of Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), the highly perceptible indifference and the lack of knowledge of the spirit and letter of *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* as well as the achievements of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, at least in the past, often prevented the Kyivan Catholics "from acting as 'Sister-Churches,'" at the same time "depriving them of the possibility of being treated as such, either by the Orthodox or Latins" (LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," p. 383).

the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky),⁴⁴⁴ – as well as by most of the leading hierarchs and theologians of this Church, including those participating in the KCSG – as having truly vital significance for the elaboration of the contemporary ecclesial identity and vocation of the Catholic Church of Kyiv.⁴⁴⁵

Being fully aware that someday “there will be no need for the Eastern Catholic Churches to exist as some sort of third reality between the Catholic and Orthodox communions,”⁴⁴⁶ many Kyivan Catholics appeared to be deeply moved by the Balamand Statement that not only invited them to “enter into the theological dialogue, with all its practical implications” (par. 16), but also - at least tacitly - recognized their Church as a Sister-Church of both Orthodox settlement and Roman Churches.⁴⁴⁷ Eventually, both sides of the formal Theological Dialogue seemed to express their respect for the “Eucharistic reality” of the Eastern Catholic Churches who were no longer treated merely as parts of the Roman Patriarchate but as real, full-fledged autonomous Churches, the rediscovery and strengthening of the ecclesial identity of whom was encouraged.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁴ LUBACHIVSKY, “Pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov,” pp. 461-484 and “Letter to Cardinal Cassidy,” pp. 418-424.

⁴⁴⁵ Peter GALADZA, “Good News from Balamand,” in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 352-354, KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group,” pp. 461-463 and CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” pp. 405- 406.

⁴⁴⁶ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” p. 42.

⁴⁴⁷ In the opinion of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, the free choice on the part of the majority of the Kyivan bishops to “align their Church with the See of Rome” did not mean that from the time of the Union of Brest this Church entirely lost her ecclesiastical reality and her genuine identity, thus ceasing to be a Sister-Church to her Orthodox counterparts. Unfortunately, both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches of a divided Kyivan Christendom went through a significant reduction of their real ecclesiastical autonomy, inappropriate changes in many aspects of their ecclesial lives, and considerable weakening of their authentic self-identification. Nevertheless, “something at the core of these Churches has not changed.” Therefore, “if the involvement of both Ottoman and modern Turkish governments in the election of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and the infiltration of the KGB into the Russian Orthodox Hierarchy did not mean that these Churches ceased to be themselves, then why should the decision of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church to allow some fundamental issues in its internal Church life to be resolved through the agency of the Roman Papacy disqualify it from communion with its Orthodox Sister-Churches?” (Ibid., pp. 38-39).

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 42.

Nevertheless, according to the KCSG, in order to “bear good fruits,” the vision and recommendations proposed by the Joint International Commission had to be “put into practice.”⁴⁴⁹ This presupposed the elimination of a number of restrictions that had been imposed on the Eastern Catholic Churches by the Roman Church, the rejection of prejudices towards them on the part of the Orthodox Churches and the practical acceptance of their representatives in the ecumenical dialogue held both on the universal and local levels.⁴⁵⁰ And, yet, it is important to admit that until now most of the inspired declarations of the Balamand Statement still await the time when it will be possible to fully apply them to the real life of the Kyivan Catholic Church. At the present, this Church still finds herself in extremely complicated relations with her Orthodox counterparts, especially in Ukraine.

7. Significance of the recognition of equal rights of all of the Particular Churches to develop their own ways of ecumenical rapprochement: Quite regrettably, the great progress achieved by the elaboration of the Balamand Statement and especially its insistence on the need to incorporate the Eastern Catholic delegates into the work of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue for quite some time turned into somewhat of a “moot point” in view of the fact that, after its last Plenary in 1993, the Commission failed for many years to resume its regular meetings due to the lack of common ground for

⁴⁴⁹ KCSG, “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” p. 80.

⁴⁵⁰ Encouraged by the President of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, who highly appreciated the work of the KCSG by emphasizing the “importance of Orthodox and Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rite coming together to rediscover one another and reflect on their differences, practical problems and ways forward” (CASSIDY, “Letter to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 392), the Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG took advantage of their audience with Cardinal Cassidy during their consultation in Rome (1995) in order to express the readiness of their Church to participate in the work of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue (“Editorial: The ‘Final Solution?’ – Reflections on Recent Orthodox Statements Concerning Eastern Catholics,” in *Logos* 37:1-4 (1996), p. 24). See also KCSG, “Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft,” pp. 80-81.

continuation of the formal dialogue between the Roman Church and the Orthodox Churches.⁴⁵¹

Therefore, employing their natural right to be engaged in ecumenical dialogue on all levels (which was unequivocally confirmed at Ariccia and Balamand), both Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox hierarchs and theologians involved in the work of the KCSG did not hesitate to conduct their own informal theological consultations, directed towards healing the local schism within their own divided Church of Kyiv.⁴⁵² Encouraged by the blessings received from the heads of their respective Churches⁴⁵³ as well as by an apparent interest in their efforts on the part of both co-chairmen of the Joint International Commission,⁴⁵⁴ and seeing their “own work in the context of the Balamand Statement, and the previous three Agreed Statements of the Theological Dialogue: Munich 1982, Bari, 1987, and Valaamo 1988,”⁴⁵⁵ the participants of the KCSG, due to the unofficial and informal character of their Study Group, actively functioned even after the temporary suspension of the work of the formal Theological Dialogue, quite efficiently addressing urgent issues which were only hinted at by the Joint International Commission⁴⁵⁶ and in its own way attempting to approach the possibility of universal restoration of full and visible unity between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. This the KCSG did by starting to work towards Catholic-Orthodox ecumenical rapprochement on the local level.

⁴⁵¹ “Editorial: The ‘Final Solution?’” p. 24.

⁴⁵² KCSG, “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” p. 268.

⁴⁵³ LUBACHIVSKY, “Pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov,” pp. 477-478 and MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 162.

⁴⁵⁴ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 174 and MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 160.

⁴⁵⁵ KCSG, “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” p. 268.

⁴⁵⁶ CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” p. 9.

Acknowledging from the very beginning that neither the present schism between worldwide Catholicism and Orthodoxy nor the “uniatism” which resulted from that schism could any longer be regarded as satisfactory models for contemporary inter-ecclesial relations, the Group concentrated its efforts on the elaboration of a “better model” of Christian unity, which would demonstrate due respect to all Sister-Churches participating in the dialogue.⁴⁵⁷

As a consequence, the KCSG came up with the idea of the possibility of healing the local schism by the establishment of so-called “double communion,” according to which the Kyivan Catholic Church would restore her ecclesiastical communion with her Mother-Church of Constantinople without breaking ties with the Church of Rome, thereby establishing a sort of “intermediary communion” between Rome and Constantinople via the reunited Church of Kyiv.⁴⁵⁸ In the opinion of a former scholar of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Dr. Andrew Sorokowski, such an “ecumenical scenario” could actually serve as an example for all Sister-Churches and a mutually acceptable model capable of gradually restoring universal Christian unity.⁴⁵⁹ Thus, according to him,

⁴⁵⁷ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 76-78.

⁴⁵⁸ Andrew SOROKOWSKI, “Vatican Diplomacy and the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church,” in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 63-64.

⁴⁵⁹ The KCSG’s proposed model of restoring local Eucharistic communion as a step towards the recomposition of universal Christian unity was not without very serious difficulties even on the level of ecumenical rapprochement within the Kyivan Church. Being fully aware that no effective participation by the Kyivan Orthodox of Ukraine could be expected “until the three jurisdictions in Ukraine – the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches of the Moscow and the Kiev Patriarchates and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church – overcome their essentially political divisions” (Ibid., p. 64), the Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG have chosen the Church of Constantinople and her affiliated Ukrainian Churches of Canada and of the United States as their partners in informal ecumenical dialogue in the hope that eventually all the Kyivan Orthodox would join their initiative as soon as they manage to reach their internal integration (CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” p. 10). In the words of Waclaw Hryniewicz, “at present, thanks to a great extent to the documents of the international Catholic-Orthodox dialogue, there is an intensified effort among Ukrainian Greek Catholics to heal the schism with Constantinople. The first step of the utmost importance would be reconciliation of the three main Orthodox Churches in Ukraine (two with autocephalous jurisdiction and one tied with the Moscow Patriarchate). The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church could then efficaciously strive towards union with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It follows that Constantinople would

If the UGCC were to unite with the Ukrainian Orthodox to revive a Kievan Church in communion with both Rome and Constantinople, it would assume an historic and central place as the first link in the ecumenical chain and the keystone, as it were, of the arch of Christian unity. It would require extraordinary humility on the part of the Churches of Rome and Constantinople to accord such honour to the oft-neglected Ukrainian Church. On the part of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholics it would require even greater humility to avoid triumphalism – and the tempting metaphor of the erstwhile stumbling-block to Church union, cast aside by the Vatican and Muscovite builders of the ecumenical edifice, and now serving as its cornerstone.⁴⁶⁰

The “bold initiative” of the KCSG - as it was designated by the renowned Polish ecumenist Waclaw Hryniewicz - gathered in itself the best expectations and ideals of the Kyivan Church. She had been the first among the Particular Churches to suffer an internal split as a consequence of the external schism between Rome and Constantinople and now this same Church attempted to recompose her inner unity, constituting a “stimulus, leading to a complete reconciliation between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches.”⁴⁶¹

recognize all the Churches of Kiev, including the Greek-Catholic Church, as Sister Churches. The question is whether these intentions could be realized” (HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed on 8 July, 2009). In the opinion of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, if the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches in Ukraine “have difficulty with negotiating a quadrilateral ecumenical agreement, perhaps they should turn to their Mother Church, the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople for assistance. This would only be possible if Constantinople recognized the Kievan Churches as Sister Churches rather than as portions of another Church. In the long term, it is important to heal the painful rift between the three major Orthodox Churches in Ukraine while concomitantly pursuing the ideal of a local ecumenical solution” (CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 419). The same opinion was further developed by Fr. Andriy Chirovsky in his response to the presentation of Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos on the divisions and healing within the Kyivan Church, where Fr. Andriy stated: “Before our eyes three competing Orthodox jurisdictions in Ukraine are engaged in a debilitating struggle against each other. It is time for the Great Church of Constantinople to act strongly and decisively. Let us not forget that it was Constantinople’s inability to act strongly and effectively to aid the Kyivan Metropolia in the late 1500’s that led to the Brest Union and the Brest Division... If my words seem impetuous it is only because in a healthy family a daughter has the right to insist on her mother’s aid. The sorely divided Kyivan Church needs her mother *now*, not when it will be less controversial, but now, when the need is greatest” (CHIROVSKY, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,” p. 157).

⁴⁶⁰ SOROKOWSKI, “Vatican Diplomacy and the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church,” p. 66.

⁴⁶¹ HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed on 8 July, 2009.

This notion received a lot of attention and interest on the part of the press⁴⁶² as well as on the part of a large number of leading hierarchs⁴⁶³ and theologians⁴⁶⁴ of various ethnic and ecclesiastical backgrounds.⁴⁶⁵ In the words of Hryniewicz the “readiness of Ukrainian Catholics to return to communion with the Mother Church of Constantinople without breaking unity with Rome” was not merely a “noble dream,” since at least from the historical viewpoint, the “notion of dual allegiance and loyalty was totally justified.”⁴⁶⁶

Hryniewicz noted that there was a time when the Patriarchate of Constantinople was not in Eucharistic communion with the Bulgarian Orthodox Church while the Patriarchate of Moscow remained in communion with both (1872-1945). Similarly the Orthodox Church of Serbia for several decades refused to sever her relations with the Patriarchate of

⁴⁶² See BEHEN, “On the Ways of the Church’s Development,” in *Postup* 96 (540) (3-4 June 2000), at http://postup.brama.com/000603/96_13_1.html, accessed on 8 June 2009, “Church Study Group Convened at Stamford Center,” in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 61:2 (10 January 1993), “Kyivan Church Study Group Meets with Pope and Ecumenical Patriarch,” in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 63:49 (3 March 1995), etc.

⁴⁶³ At the beginning of this chapter I already mentioned that the important work of the KCSG, directed towards the restoration of internal unity within the Kyivan Church as an anticipatory part of the contemporary dialogue between Catholics and Orthodox, was noticed and highly admired by the Patriarch of Constantinople Bartholomew I (KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group,” pp. 191-192) and Pope John Paul II (“Rome Consultation of the KCSG,” p. 127), the President of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy (CASSIDY, “Letter to Bishop Basil (Losten),” pp. 391-393) and the Chief Secretary of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate Metropolitan Meliton (Karas) of Philadelphia (KARAS, “Letter to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 425-427), the Head of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky) (LUBACHIVSKY, “Pro iednist’ Sviatykh Tserkov,” pp. 477-478 and “Letter to the KCSG,” pp. 388-389) and most of the bishops of the UGCC Synod (Julian VORONOVSKY, “Ekumenichni Pytannia: Referat pid chas Synodu Yepyskopiv u L’vovi, 16-31 travnia 1992 // Ecumenical Questions: A Paper Composed at the Time of the Synod of Bishops, 16-31 May, 1992,” in *Logos* 34: 1-2 (1993), pp. 302-304).

⁴⁶⁴ HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope: Christian Faith in Dialogue,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed on 8 July, 2009, Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, “An Ecumenist Analyzes the History and Prospects Of Religion In Ukraine,” at <http://www.ecumenicalstudies.org.ua/eng/materials.texts/marynovych/chapter.2/>, accessed on June 8, 2009, SHABAN, “Ekleziolohichni priorytety Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koi Tserkvy,” pp. 448-459, HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiinoi Hrupy Kyivs’koi Tserkvy,” p. 417-446, and Mariya HORIACHA, “Ideia iedynoi Ukraïns’koi Tserkvy ta Ukraïns’kyi ekumenizm [The Idea of One Ukrainian Church and Ukrainian Ecumenism],” in BACHYNS’KA and MARYNOVYCH, *Ekumenizm v istorii Tserkvy*, p. 84.

⁴⁶⁵ The work of the KCSG was not only noticed by the hierarchs and theologians of various Ukrainian Churches as well as Churches of Rome and Constantinople but also served as an inspiration for the renewed ecumenical efforts undertaken by Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) and the Melkite Synod of Bishops (“The Profession of Faith of Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) and Support of the Melkite Synod,” p. 274).

⁴⁶⁶ HRYNIEWICZ, “The Challenge of Our Hope,” at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>, accessed on 8 July, 2009.

Moscow or the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad even before restoration of their communion in 2006. He also mentioned several other historical occurrences when the individual Greek bishops being oppressed by the Turkish yoke concluded unions with the See of Rome while retaining communion with the other bishops of their Mother Church or when the Church of Moldova for a certain period of time “maintained relations with other Orthodox Churches, while at the same time, recognizing the supremacy of the Pope.”⁴⁶⁷

The idea of “double communion” or “dual loyalty” was not entirely new also for the Kyivan Church. Despite the gradual estrangement between Rome and Constantinople, for a certain period of time it supported a mutual link with both and even after the Union of Brest many times attempted to restore her internal unity through the ecumenical efforts undertaken by Metropolitans Yosyf (Rutsky), Petro (Mohyla) and Andrey (Sheptytsky).⁴⁶⁸

In the most recent times, hopes for a renewal of the relationship between the Kyivan Catholic Church and her Mother-Church of Constantinople were once again expressed in the context of the celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of Kyivan Rus,⁹ owing to

⁴⁶⁷ Acknowledging the importance of various Eastern precedents for double communion which were briefly surveyed by Waclaw Hryniewicz in his book *To Leave the Past to God* (pp. 155-157), one should not overlook an essential difference that exists between the establishment of mediate communion involving several Orthodox Churches united by the same profession of faith and the possibility of reinstatement of the Eucharistic communion linking together Eastern Catholic Churches that have already received the newer Catholic dogmas with their Orthodox counterparts. Whilst the restoration of ecclesiastical relations among the former do not presuppose the existence of serious theological divergence, the initiation of any ecumenical endeavor taking place among the latter would inevitably lead all the participants of the dialogue to the necessity of discussing and then positively resolving a number of Church-dividing dogmas and above all the dogmatic teachings with regard to the Roman primacy emanating from Vatican I's Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*. At the same time, it is important to note that the restoration of communion between the Antiochian Orthodox Church and the Syrian Orthodox Church (which has already been several times mentioned and will be treated to an even greater extent later in this chapter) is a clear example of two Churches who seemed for centuries to be divided on clearly theological (specifically Christological) grounds, but who came together locally, thus placing all of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in mediate communion with all of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches.

⁴⁶⁸ Waclaw HRYNIEWICZ, *Przeszłość zostawić Bogu. Unia I uniatyzm w perspektywie ekumenicznej // To Leave the Past to God. Unia and Uniatism in an Ecumenical Perspective* (Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża, 1995), pp. 155-157. See also BEHEN, “On the Ways of the Church's Development,” in *Postup* 96 (540) (3-4 June 2000), at http://postup.brama.com/000603/96_13_1.html, accessed on 8 June 2009.

the dedicated ecumenical work of many, with an exceptional contribution by Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos.⁴⁶⁹ At the beginning of this chapter, I already mentioned that Bishop Vsevolod was the first among the future participants of the KCSG who spoke of the project of “double communion” at the conference organized by the Saint Sophia Religious Association of Ukrainian Catholics in Toronto, Canada (December 1989)⁴⁷⁰ and during the pastoral visit of Patriarch Dimitrios of Constantinople to the United States (July 1990).⁴⁷¹ He received much support for his ideas from the leading hierarchs of the Ecumenical Patriarchate⁴⁷² and most of the members of the Kyivan Catholic Synod of Bishops,⁴⁷³ especially Myroslav Ivan Lubachivsky,⁴⁷⁴ Metropolitan Volodymyr Sterniuk,⁴⁷⁵ Bishop Julian Voronovsky,⁴⁷⁶ and Bishop Losten.⁴⁷⁷

Bishop Vsevolod was also the first of the members of the KCSG who dedicated an entire presentation to the question of “dual loyalty,” entitled “Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?”⁴⁷⁸ Starting from the first consultation of the KCSG in Oxford and up to its seventh consultation in Halki, this idea was regarded by the majority

⁴⁶⁹ KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group,” pp. 183-184.

⁴⁷⁰ Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, “The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church: Address on the Occasion of the Religious Conference Sponsored by the St. Sophia Association of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada, St. Michael’s College, University of Toronto, 2 December 1989,” in MAJDANSKY, *We Are All Brothers*, pp. 1-19.

⁴⁷¹ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 159-160.

⁴⁷² KARAS, “Letter to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 425-427.

⁴⁷³ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 161.

⁴⁷⁴ Myroslav-Ivan LUBACHIVSKY, “Letter to the Kievan Church Study Group,” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 388-389.

⁴⁷⁵ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 160.

⁴⁷⁶ VORONOVSKY, “Ekumenichni Pytannia,” pp. 302-304.

⁴⁷⁷ LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” p. 361 and “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 76, 78, 105-106.

⁴⁷⁸ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” pp. 152-171.

of the members of the Study Group as the most principal subject matter standing behind all of their theological reflections.⁴⁷⁹ In the words of Bishop Vsevolod:

Responsible hierarchs, clergy, theologians, monastics and faithful of the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev have already realized that the heritage and the destiny of that Church are in communion with the Great Church of Constantinople, from whom Kiev received the grace of Holy Baptism – it is that realization which has assembled us for this meeting.⁴⁸⁰

Seeing the goal of restoration of communion between the Kyivan Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate “within the parameters and the terms of reference” of the formal Theological Dialogue and the ecclesiology of Sister-Churches,⁴⁸¹ Bishop Vsevolod suggested that the establishment of “double communion” can in fact “prove the solidity” of the contemporary ecumenical relations that exist between the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Churches,⁴⁸² since the resolution of the problem of “uniatism,” in his opinion, could not come about as a result of the estrangement of the Eastern Catholics from Rome or their forceful incorporation into the respective Orthodox Churches, but as a result of the free choice of the autonomous Eastern Catholic Churches to return to their respective Mother-Churches without breaking communion with the Roman Apostolic See.⁴⁸³

In this regard, according to Bishop Vsevolod, the most recent establishment of Eucharistic communion between the Orthodox Church of Antioch and the corresponding

⁴⁷⁹ KELEHER, “The Kievan Church Study Group,” pp. 187-192, Petro GALADZA, “Ekumenichnyi dosvid Studiynoi hrupy Kyivs’koï Tserkvy [The Ecumenical Experience of the Kyivan Church Study Group],” in Lesia BACHYNS’KA and Liuba MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Ekumenizm v istorii Tserkvy: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy* [Ecumenism in the History of the Church: Achievements, Failures, and Hopes for the Future] (L’viv: L’viv Theological Academy, 2001), pp. 17-18, CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” pp. 9-10, ONUFERKO, “Doslidnyts’ka Hrupa Kyivs’koï Tserkvy,” pp. 1-10, HRYNCHYSHYN, “Do istorii Studiinoï Hrupy Kyivs’koï Tserkvy,” pp. 418-435.

⁴⁸⁰ MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 169.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 171.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

Oriental Syriac Church, which did not require severing of the relations of the latter with the other Non-Chalcedonian Churches,⁴⁸⁴ could serve as a model for reestablishing internal unity in the Church of Kyiv, based on the maintaining of “dual loyalty” of this Church to the Churches of Rome and Constantinople.⁴⁸⁵

Further developing Bishop Vsevolod’s line of thought, Chirovsky found it striking that both the Orthodox and Oriental Churches of Antioch did not hesitate to employ the term “Sister Churches” as describing their relations even before the restoration of the Eucharistic communion between them.⁴⁸⁶ This attitude allowed both of these Churches to “remain fully intact” and to reestablish intercommunion based on the model of “union without confusion,” clearly manifesting that the removal of barriers between two Churches does not presuppose the “absorption of one Church by the other” or “commingling of their structures.”⁴⁸⁷

Thus, if Antiochian Christians of both sides found it possible to coexist within one and the same See of Antioch, “remaining confidently within their own dogmatic tradition while recognizing the validity of the other” and considering the heads of their respective

⁴⁸⁴ The series of documents detailing the arrangement on the restoration of the Eucharistic communion between the Antiochian Orthodox and Syriac Orthodox Churches were published under the collective title “On the Unity of the Eastern and Syriac Orthodox Churches,” in *The World* (April 1992), pp. 5-9.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-168. See also LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” p. 361.

⁴⁸⁶ In the opinion of Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, in the same way “uniatism” can be replaced by a “more healthy ecclesiology” only if Orthodox Churches start to consistently apply the terminology of Sister-Churches to Eastern Catholic Churches, at the same time assisting them “to come to a fuller awareness of their own ecclesial identity.” After all, such an attitude on the part of the Orthodox could also significantly contribute to the progress of the contemporary Catholic-Orthodox ecumenical dialogue, since according to the former Chairman of the U.S. Catholic Bishops’ Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, Archbishop Rembert Weakland, “no union between the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church is thinkable without first working out how it will be possible for Byzantine Catholics and Orthodox to exist in communion” (Quoted in CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 420).

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 412. According to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky, even after restoration of communion between the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches, both of these Churches at least temporarily would have to preserve their respective ecclesiastical structures until the time of re-establishment of full communion between Rome and the Orthodox Churches. At that time the structure of the Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv would naturally “cease to exist as a separate entity apart from the Orthodox Church of Kyiv,” allowing for the “full integration of the Kyivan Church as one unit” (*Ibid.*, p. 420, See also *OE* 30).

Churches as equally legitimate Patriarchs of Antioch,⁴⁸⁸ then, according to Chirovsky, a similar communion can and should be established between the Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches which share even greater “commonality of faith, spirituality and worship.”⁴⁸⁹ In the opinion of Fr. Chirovsky, just as the Antiochian Churches,⁴⁹⁰ the Ukrainian Churches should also be naturally drawn together by their belonging to the tradition of one and the same See of Kyiv.⁴⁹¹

However, in order to reach this mutually desired unity, “much healing of memories is needed, along with much quieting of emotions.”⁴⁹² The notion of “dual loyalty,” according to Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), is deeply rooted in the anthropology and mentality of the people living in Ukraine, which long before the Christian era had always been an “open land of exchange, of cultural contacts and movements.”⁴⁹³ As a consequence, “like the Byzantine eagle, looking both East and West,” the Kyivan Church, which in the past at least to some measure had already experienced the possibility of retaining simultaneous relations with both Christian East and West (even at the time of their estrangement), at present could very naturally combine in herself both the *Orthodoxy* coming from her Mother-Church of Constantinople and the *Catholicity* arising from her faithfulness to Rome as the “principle of universal unity.”

⁴⁸⁸ “On the Unity of the Eastern and Syriac Orthodox Churches,” pp. 5-9.

⁴⁸⁹ CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 420.

⁴⁹⁰ As I already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the KCSG was also attracted by the another Antiochene initiative this time directed towards restoration of the Eucharistic communion between the Orthodox and Greco-Catholic Churches of Antioch. This, in the opinion of most of the participants of the Study Group, could also serve as a suitable model for restoration of internal unity within the Church of Kyiv (KCSG, “Statement on Church of Antioch Initiative,” p. 73 and MAJDANSKY, “‘Mediate’ and ‘Nearly Perfect Communion?’” pp. 7-22).

⁴⁹¹ CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” p. 413.

⁴⁹² *Ibit.*, p. 420.

⁴⁹³ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 176.

This would establish a unique ecumenical model which, according to Archimandrite Boniface, would “answer a real psychological need of the Ukrainian people” and “will work well in Ukraine, as perhaps it would not in other parts of the *oikoumene*.”⁴⁹⁴ This way, the model of “double communion” as a replacement of previous unsatisfactory models,⁴⁹⁵ could, in the opinion of Bishop Basil (Losten), become capable of not only resolving certain urgent problems that still exist between the Kyivan Catholics and Orthodox, but also of contributing in a valuable way to the cause of restoration of universal Christian unity *ad aedificationem ecclesiae*.⁴⁹⁶

In his response to the presentation of Bishop Basil dedicated to the issue of Roman Primacy in its relation to the Church of Kyiv, Bishop Kallistos admitted that he is “attracted,” but not “entirely convinced” by Bishop Basil’s suggestion that the Kyivan Catholics might renew their Eucharistic communion with their Mother-Church of Constantinople without severing their relations with the Roman Apostolic See, thus, making the Kyivan Church a “creative mediator” in the contemporary ecumenical relations between the Church of Rome and the Ecumenical Patriarchate.⁴⁹⁷ Despite the fact that the severing of communion occurred “in different times and different situations” and so quite logically, the restoration of unity could also come about as a result of various local ecumenical initiatives undertaken “in different times and different situations,”⁴⁹⁸ the major complexity that still separated the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches, according to Bishop Kallistos, was not due to the inability of these Churches to find the most suitable

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 176, 195-196.

⁴⁹⁵ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 76.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 105-106.

⁴⁹⁷ WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” pp. 111-112.

⁴⁹⁸ LOSTEN, “Opening Remarks,” p. 361.

model that would eventually lead to overcoming of their division, but rather owing to their disagreements over doctrinal questions.⁴⁹⁹

Looming above other issues is disagreement over the understanding of the Roman Primacy,⁵⁰⁰ which not only in the mind of Bishop Kallistos, but also in the opinions of Cardinal Edward Cassidy,⁵⁰¹ Fr. Waclaw Hryniewicz⁵⁰² and KCSG member Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko⁵⁰³ necessarily needs to be discussed and resolved prior to the restoration of Eucharistic communion between any of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches.⁵⁰⁴

In any event, the valuable reflections of the participants of the KCSG on the still highly debatable question of “double communion” - that up to the present day remains merely an interesting theory - manifested something really precious for the development of the contemporary ecclesial identity and vocation of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church. The courageous thoughts expressed throughout all seven consultations of the KCSG by its Catholic members demonstrated that their Church – at least on the level of her most prominent thinkers – is not only deeply concerned with the absence of unity among Christians, but that she is potentially prepared to discover her own ways of ecumenical

⁴⁹⁹ Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) and Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos disagreed with Bishop Kallistos (Ware)’s statement that “double communion” is not possible because of the doctrinal divergence that still exists between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, since, in their opinions, if the Eastern Orthodox Church of Antioch could recognize the same faith in her Oriental counterpart that did not accept the Council of Chalcedon, the three later Ecumenical Councils, and the Council of Trullo, then the Kyivan Orthodox Church cannot claim that she does not have the same faith with her Greco-Catholic counterpart, which fully accepted all the decisions of the first seven Ecumenical Councils as well as the writings of the Greek Fathers and up to the present day remains faithful to most of the elements of the Byzantine ecclesiastical Tradition. Therefore, if the Catholic Church of Kyiv that “received certain particular teachings of the Roman Church” would be able to re-interpret them in a way equally understandable for the Christian East and West, then the establishment of “double communion” would become not only “pastorally indicated,” but also “*theologically possible*” (LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 177-178 and MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 168).

⁵⁰⁰ WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 113.

⁵⁰¹ CASSIDY, “Letter to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 393.

⁵⁰² HRYNIEWICZ, *Przeszłość zostawić Bogu*, p. 154.

⁵⁰³ KRAWCHENKO, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 425.

⁵⁰⁴ WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 113.

rapprochement and to elaborate her own ecumenical models that could replace the previous inappropriate models of “return” or “uniatism” by much healthier alternatives based on the mutual respect that should exist between Sister-Churches searching together for the possibility of restoring the unity that was so eagerly willed by Christ.⁵⁰⁵ Thus, the Catholic participants of the KCSG not only appeared to be humble enough to admit that their Church bears accountability for the distraction of unity within the Church of Kyiv. They also did not hesitate to take upon themselves the responsibility of “building up this unity again,”⁵⁰⁶ thus, in their own way contributing to the ultimate task of universal Christian reintegration, and opening themselves to the “impact of the Holy Spirit as the main Principle and Author of unity, who has to bring us all together in Christ, the Centre of all true unity, in the Holy Trinity.”⁵⁰⁷

III.3. Some Concluding Reflections on the Legacy of the Kyivan Church Study Group as one that Reveals the Potential for the Catholic Church of Kyiv to Construct Her Ecclesial Identity and Vocation According to the Seven Criteria of the Interpretative System Developed Here

In the previous two sections of this concluding chapter of the thesis I attempted to present an analysis and evaluation of most of the theological insights expressed in the course of all seven consultations held by the KCSG during the four years of its existence. My intention was not only to review the ideas developed by the Group, but to correlate these to the question of ecclesial particularity as elaborated in the seven criteria of my original interpretative system described in chapter two of this thesis. For the purposes of the present project, I concentrated mainly on the ecclesiological reflections of the Catholic

⁵⁰⁵ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” p. 76.

⁵⁰⁶ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 367. See also *UR* 4, 7, 8.

⁵⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 368.

participants of the KCSG, at the same time trying not to overlook the important standpoints of the Orthodox members. These played an equally significant role in clarifying a variety of issues addressed by the KCSG, and in some way even safeguarded their Catholic colleagues from going too far in their statements⁵⁰⁸ or not far enough,⁵⁰⁹ from being too romantic⁵¹⁰ or failing to take into account the realities of the highly complicated contemporary ecumenical situation.⁵¹¹ From this perspective, the thought of the Catholics as engaged by the Orthodox members of the KCSG can be regarded as a kind of case study for demonstrating – on a practical level – how exactly my interpretative system can function.

The close reading of the papers and responses delivered by the participants of the KCSG has led me to the confident conclusion that there exists a reciprocal relationship between searching for the restoration of Eucharistic communion among Sister-Churches and a clear ecclesial self-perception of a Particular Church. Without an adequate

⁵⁰⁸ Fr. Anthony Ugolnik, for instance, in his short article entitled “An Anxiety of Influence” criticized Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) for being too anxious with regard to the effects of latinization in the Kyivan Catholic tradition. In his opinion, immoderate purism on the part of Kyivan Catholics can very easily turn from being a “creative force” into a “sterile and confining affliction” (UGOLNIK, “An Anxiety of Influence,” p. 393).

⁵⁰⁹ Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos suggested that the Kyivan Catholics should be more persistent in their struggle against many juridical restrictions imposed on the Kyivan Catholic Church by Rome, such as “obligatory clerical celibacy, the appointment of hierarchs without canonical election, the claim that the ordinary disciplinary decisions of Synods must have the confirmation of the Pope, the bestowal of the cardinalate on the chief hierarch,” etc. which - at least from the Orthodox perspective - seem to be absolutely unacceptable (MAJDANSKY, “Restoration of Communion,” p. 170).

⁵¹⁰ Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia found the idea of “double” or “mediate” communion “difficult, if not impossible” to accomplish in view of the present circumstances when both sides of the dialogue “suspect each other of a grave deviation in the faith” (WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 113).

⁵¹¹ In response to the demand of the Kyivan Catholic participants of the KCSG that the Ecumenical Patriarchate should act “strongly and decisively” especially in contemporary circumstances when the “three competing Orthodox jurisdictions in Ukraine are engaged in a debilitating struggle against each other” (CHIROVSKY, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,” p. 157), Bishop Kallistos (Ware) stated that the Church of Constantinople “would never wish to decide the question of autocephaly in isolation from the other Orthodox Churches, but it would seek a pan-Orthodox consensus; and in that consensus the Church of Russia would obviously occupy an all-important place. From Constantinople’s viewpoint, no lasting solution can be found to the Ukrainian situation without the full co-operation of the Moscow Patriarchate” (WARE, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” p. 130).

understanding of the latter their ecumenical efforts will not be able to bear fruit. In order to enter ecumenical dialogue with any hope of success, in my opinion, a Particular Church has first of all to come closer to the realization of her own ecclesial identity and vocation. This will enable her to find her own voice in the discussion. From the opposite perspective, this may well have been the very reason why the “Uniate” Churches were absent from ecumenical dialogue. Although they were encouraged to participate by the various mandates of the Second Vatican Council, they often failed to act as full-fledged Churches. They were confused about their authentic ecclesial nature and mission.⁵¹² Thus, they were simply not ready for such dialogue.

Of course, the actual state of ecclesial development of the Kyivan Catholic Church is one thing and the ecclesiological reflections of the Catholic participants of the KCSG revealing the potential for their Church to construct an authentic self-realization and mission are another. But the importance of the latter for the life of the Kyivan Catholic Church as a whole should not be underestimated. Thus, it is significant that the KCSG attained a certain success in elaborating a multifaceted vision of the Kyivan Church’s ecclesial identity and vocation as a Particular Church which for the most part corresponds to all seven criteria of my interpretative system.⁵¹³ Moreover, the Catholic hierarchs and theologians of the KCSG demonstrated that they are no longer bound by “uniate” concepts

⁵¹² LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 383.

⁵¹³ In one of her articles, Roma Hayda positively evaluated the work accomplished by the KCSG by saying that the Group managed to “address theological issues brought to the forefront by the International Joint Commission and by doing so the Ukrainian Catholic Church’s position was presented from learned theologians. In the process, the Study Group continues to define the particularity of the Kyivan Christian Tradition and bring about an increasingly clearer picture of the internally divided Church that endured a painful and complex past” (HAYDA, “News and Views,” at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/12845193/The-Ukrainian-Weekly-199939>, accessed on 27 July 2009. See also CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, “Kyivan Church Study Group,” p. 10).

and terminology and can freely express their original ecclesiological viewpoints. Thus, they emphasized:

(i) the Kyivan Catholic Church was not born at the time of the Union of Brest when she joined the Roman Apostolic See (1596) but at the time of the Baptism of Kyivan Rus' when she received the living Christian faith from her Mother-Church of Constantinople (988).⁵¹⁴ Therefore, she shares with her Orthodox counterparts essentially the same ecclesiastical Tradition⁵¹⁵ developed by the Kyivan hierarchs, monastic leaders and theologians on the basis of the Holy Scripture, the first Seven Ecumenical Councils and the Eastern Church Fathers;⁵¹⁶

(ii) the Kyivan Catholic Church – or at the very least some of her prominent thinkers – exhibit the capacity to elaborate fruitful ecclesiological viewpoints, especially with regard to the understanding of Roman primacy.⁵¹⁷ At the present moment they tend to explain these in terms of complementarity rather than contradiction to the parallel theological concepts which evolved since the time of the East-West schism;⁵¹⁸

(iii) the Kyivan Catholic Church is taking some important steps directed towards restoring her proper *lex orandi*. In order to become once again the heart and the center of her ecclesial life⁵¹⁹ and the source for her *lex credendi*, the rich Kyivan Catholic liturgical heritage needs to be cleansed from inappropriate latinizing influences,⁵²⁰ whether self-imposed or forced on the Catholic Church of Kyiv due to uniformist Roman tendencies⁵²¹ or her own inferiority complex, including the minimalism that would diminish the importance of the Liturgy of the Hours;⁵²²

(iv) the Kyivan Catholic Church has her own ecclesiastical territory which should extend at the very least to all of Ukraine,⁵²³ and she elects her own Head, whose Patriarchal rights over all Kyivan Catholics should be recognized by her Sister-Church, Rome, and the other Eastern Catholic Churches.⁵²⁴ Therefore, simultaneously regarding the Roman Pontiff as

⁵¹⁴ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," pp. 86-108.

⁵¹⁵ LUYKX, "Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos," p. 190, LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," p. 376, TATARYN, "Papal Primacy," pp. 133-134, and KELEHER, "Freising, Ariccia and Balamand," p. 449.

⁵¹⁶ MAJDANSKY, "Restoration of Communion," p. 165.

⁵¹⁷ LOSTEN, "The Roman Primacy," pp. 82-83, 79-80.

⁵¹⁸ CHIROVSKY, "The Union of the Holy Churches of God," pp. 36-38.

⁵¹⁹ LUYKX, "Thirty Years Later," pp. 375-376.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

⁵²¹ LUYKX, "Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos," p. 177.

⁵²² CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," p. 100.

⁵²³ CHIROVSKY, "Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity," pp. 84-85.

⁵²⁴ CHIROVSKY, HAYDA, "Kyivan Church Study Group," pp. 9-10.

*primus inter pares*⁵²⁵ and enjoying real autonomy, she should freely exercise her right to govern herself in accordance with her own legislation, which emanates from her own Synod of Bishops and not from the Roman Curia;⁵²⁶

(v) the Kyivan Catholic Church has her own spirituality, which permeates the entirety of her particular Christian “lifestyle.” It is incarnated in her worship and the concrete examples of saintly lives, her specific traditions of fasts and feasts, her symbolic architecture and iconography, which from of old were preserved and cherished especially by the venerable Kyivan monastic tradition,⁵²⁷ and profoundly rooted in *kenoticism* as the premier way of imitating the suffering Christ;⁵²⁸

(vi) the Kyivan Catholic Church acknowledges the importance of her communion with the Church of Rome as the *centrum unitatis*,⁵²⁹ but refuses to regard her relations with the Roman Apostolic See in terms of *reductio in obedientiam*⁵³⁰ which would reduce her ecclesial status to being simply one of the Rites of the Roman Church⁵³¹ or one of the ethnic branches of universal Catholicism,⁵³² for she is not merely a group of Catholics following a distinct way of worship but a full-fledged Particular Church equal in dignity to all the other Particular Churches of the Catholic communion;⁵³³

(vii) the Kyivan Catholic Church is deeply concerned by the painful disunity that still exists among various Christian Churches and ecclesial communities.⁵³⁴ Demonstrating deep respect for contemporary Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement,⁵³⁵ this Church is prepared to take an active part in the formal theological dialogue between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches⁵³⁶ and to engage in various local ecumenical initiatives directed towards elaboration of new models of unity that will be mutually acceptable for all Sister Churches participating in the dialogue.⁵³⁷

⁵²⁵ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 94-96.

⁵²⁶ CHIROVSKY, “The Union of the Holy Churches of God,” pp. 34-35, 40-42.

⁵²⁷ LUYKX, “Thirty Years Later,” p. 376 and “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 196-199.

⁵²⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 95, 101, 107-108, 114, CHIROVSKY, “The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv,” pp. 12-16, and WARE, “Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky,” pp. 127-128, 131.

⁵²⁹ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 93, 100.

⁵³⁰ SUTTNER, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism*, pp. 26-35, 62-65.

⁵³¹ LOSTEN, “Patriarch and Pope,” p. 212.

⁵³² CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 112-113.

⁵³³ TATARYN, “Papal Primacy,” p. 128.

⁵³⁴ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 78-79.

⁵³⁵ KELEHER, “Freising, Ariccia and Balamand,” pp. 461-463, CHIROVSKY, “Sister Churches,” pp. 405-406, KCSG, “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” p. 268.

⁵³⁶ GALADZA, “Good News from Balamand,” pp. 352-354 and “Editorial: The ‘Final Solution?’” p. 24.

⁵³⁷ LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 76-78.

The whole previous sub-chapter as well as the preceding concise survey of the ecclesiological viewpoints expressed by the Catholic participants of the KCSG provide evidence that the KCSG, in one way or another, covered all seven criteria with regard to the ecclesial nature and mission of a Particular Church of the Catholic communion. However, at this point of the discussion it is also important to recall once again a crucial emphasis made earlier by the author of this study, according to which it is not the set of criteria itself, but the interpretative *system* composed of them that allows one to make an assessment of a Particular Church's ecclesial identity and vocation. Therefore, in order to make an accurate evaluation of the state of the contemporary ecclesial development of a given Church it is not enough only to identify that all seven criteria are individually present in her self-identification. One needs also to analyze to what extent they are present and whether there is an internal balance among them. An exaggerated emphasis on only one or two criteria, or the under-valuing of the role played by the other criteria can lead to serious distortions and, as a consequence, to wrong conclusions.

It is now time, then, to note some of these exaggerated emphases and undervaluations in the proceedings of the KCSG. One notices that the KCSG dedicated more attention to the question of the Kyivan Catholic Church's particular legislation (4th criteria) and to the possibility of the restoration of Eucharistic communion between the UGCC and the Ecumenical Patriarchate (7th criteria) than it did to the issue of the preservation of the already existing communion (6th criteria) and to the questions of the Kyivan Catholic particular liturgy (3^d criteria) or its genuine spirituality (5th criteria). Of course, the imbalance, no doubt, came about because some matters were more controversial

than others and therefore needed to be clarified with more precision. Nonetheless, as I will note below, the imbalance is not devoid of significance.

Note also that a certain disproportion with regard to the KCSG's attention to various dimensions of the ecclesiology of a Particular Church can be detected if we compare the various consultations. These were not equal in their theological significance. The pride of place with reference to the importance of ecclesiological discussions definitely belongs to the Oxford consultation.⁵³⁸ It established a firm grounding for all the further work of the KCSG. The two subsequent consultations, in Stamford and Ottawa, were less creative, but still productive enough from the perspective of a broad range of subjects covered by them. The same cannot be said about the last four consultations, which were dedicated more to the Dialogue of Love than the Dialogue of Truth.⁵³⁹ While these were still important due to the elaboration of the three agreed statements of the KCSG and to a variety of encounters with various Church officials that took place in their context, they might be considered less significant from the theological point of view.

Turning specifically to the inconsistencies or omissions in the work of the KCSG we note the following:

- (i) In spite of the fact that in its program document entitled "Kievan Church Study Group: Composition, Aims, and Purposes" the KCSG declared that it "considers the basic sources of the discussion to be: the Holy Scripture, the Seven Ecumenical Councils, the liturgical texts, and the writings of the Holy

⁵³⁸ It also becomes evident from the fact that the author of this dissertation referred to the papers presented in Oxford much more frequently than to the presentations delivered at all the other consultations of the KCSG.

⁵³⁹ HRYNCHYSHYN, "Do istoriï Studiïnoï Hrupy Kyïvs'koï Tserkvy," pp. 423-424. The application of the terms the "Dialogue of Love" and the "Dialogue of Truth" to the rapprochement between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches on the international level and their importance for local ecumenical initiatives like that of the KCSG is further discussed by one of the members of the Group, Archpriest Oleh Krawchenko in his article on Orthodox-Catholic relations published in *Logos*. See Oleh KRAWCHENKO, "Katolyts'ko-Pravoslavnyi dialoh I suchasna kryza mizh-tserkovnykh vidnosyn [Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue and the Current Crisis in Inter-Church Relations], in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 286-296.

Fathers,”⁵⁴⁰ in reality, the members very rarely discussed or even referred to the question of the nature of these fundamental sources of Tradition. To give just one example: even though the Septuagint was listed as the authoritative version of the Old Testament, no one discussed the curious fact that the Ukrainian Bibles used by the Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox contain Masoretic-based translation of the Old Testament. More significantly, the anthology for the Liturgy of the Hours used by Ukrainian Catholics has OT lections derived from a Masoretic-based translation.

(ii) In his opening presentation Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia suggested that besides the questions of ecclesiology and reflections on the Roman Primacy, the Study Group in her “reunion discussions” needs also “to take into account the doctrine of the Trinity (the Double Procession of the Holy Spirit), the state of the departed (Purgatory), the place of the Mother of God in salvation history (the Roman teaching on the Immaculate Conception), and the pastoral practice over the Sacrament of Matrimony (the Orthodox theology of divorce and remarriage).”⁵⁴¹ Nevertheless, the KCSG demonstrated a lack of interest in discussing any of these subjects, the clarification of which, in the opinion of Bishop Kallistos, was essential before considering the possibility of double communion.⁵⁴² To imagine that the Catholic and Orthodox members of the KCSG could have easily arrived at agreement on these questions is illusory. Each of them has nuances that require a fair amount of expertise in historical – not to mention other forms of theology.

(iii) Many of the Catholic and Orthodox participants of the KCSG to a certain extent misinterpreted the whole dynamics of the relations between the Catholic Church of Kyiv and the Church of Rome. On the one hand they overstated the negative influence of the centralized Roman Apostolic See that has prevented the Eastern Catholic Churches from the organic development of their own ecclesiastical traditions.⁵⁴³ On the other hand they largely overlooked the benefits coming from the unity of the Eastern Catholics with the *centrum unitatis*, which has safeguarded the ecclesiastical integrity of their respective Churches from the dangers of a variety of internal splits.⁵⁴⁴ A simple comparison of the contemporary relations among

⁵⁴⁰ KCSG, “KCSG: Composition, Aims, and Purposes,” pp. 268-269.

⁵⁴¹ WARE, “The Church of God,” p. 14.

⁵⁴² WARE, “Response to Bishop Basil (Losten),” p. 113. Of course, once they established that their doctrinal viewpoints were complementary rather than contradictory, they may have considered these issues to be moot points.

⁵⁴³ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 173-188, CHIROVSKY, “Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity,” pp. 99-108, 116-118.

⁵⁴⁴ The only exception in this regard was a paper delivered by Bishop Basil (Losten) of Stamford who did not hesitate to acknowledge the significance of the contribution of the Roman Apostolic See to the preservation and development of the ecclesiastical structures of the Kyivan Catholic Church after the attempt of the forceful liquidation of this Church by the Soviet Regime in 1946 (LOSTEN, “The Roman Primacy,” pp. 73-75).

the divided Kyivan Orthodox Churches who incessantly argue over questions of “canonicity” and “jurisdiction” and the present state of the Kyivan Catholic Church – which incorporates a number of different factions within herself, but still exists as a unity – should lead us to the conclusion that the communion of the Eastern Catholic Churches with the Roman Church does not always need to be treated exclusively as the source of suffering. It can and should also be regarded as a blessing and a source of joy. After all, it was precisely due to the universal authority of the Roman Pontiff who convoked Vatican II that the Catholic members of the KCSG could receive the conciliar teaching on the ecclesial particularity enabling them to discuss the issue of their Church’s genuine identity and vocation from a new perspective.

(iv) Some of the papers and responses of the members of the KCSG, especially those by Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), argued that latinization should be regarded as the “main stumbling block for Church unity,” while the easternization of the Kyivan Catholic Church can become a sort of panacea capable of healing this Church of all her existing problems.⁵⁴⁵ This viewpoint underestimates the significance of a number of theological difficulties (above all the divergent interpretations of Roman primacy) as well as many historical disagreements that to a degree much greater than latinization impede the possibility of restoration of unity between the “three Romes.” Stated simply, if Rome, Constantinople, and Moscow would actually desire the reinstatement of unity and could manage to arrive at agreement on the most fundamental *theological* questions, the issue of latinization as well as the very existence of the Eastern Catholic Churches would no longer be matters of primary importance. One notes that for decades the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (the Johnstown diocese) remained far more latinized than any Greco-Catholic Church today, and yet was able to maintain communion with canonical Orthodoxy worldwide.

(v) In various texts composed by the participants of the KCSG, one can often come across examples of anachronistic analysis that involve the use of contemporary terminology and concepts to explain various occurrences in the early history of the Kyivan Catholic Church.⁵⁴⁶

(vi) Some of the participants of the KCSG too often employed superlatives which do not belong in scholarly discourse. In his response to the presentation of the Bishop Vsevolod (Majdansky) of Scopelos,

⁵⁴⁵ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 188-199. Frs. Antony Ugolnik and Peter Galadza disagreed with this clearly mistaken standpoint by insisting on the quite contrary opinion that not all of the Western influences imposed by the Church of Rome on the Kyivan Catholic Church were necessarily harmful or inappropriate (GALADZA, “Liturgical Latinization,” pp. 175-180, UGOLNIK, “Response to Fr. Peter Galadza,” pp. 196-200).

⁵⁴⁶ See, for instance, LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” pp. 182-195.

Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx) wrote: “Now a first and basic fact that passes through *all of* Ukrainian history from 988 up to the present is this: Kievan Rus’, *more than any other* Byzantine Particular Church, *has always kept* close ties with its Mother, Byzantium; and at the same time with Rome, in spite of the difficult vicissitudes (which are bound to erupt in *every* human relationship of *any* importance and duration).”⁵⁴⁷ History, of course, demonstrates the fallacy of such assertions.

Before concluding, however, I should note that none of these imbalances, omissions or exaggerations proceeded from a foreordained agenda. Thus, the papers of the KCSG certainly contribute to a clearer realization of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church’s ecclesial identity and mission, and remain one of the most interesting endeavors in recent Eastern Church history. In any case, the papers of the KCSG allowed me to apply my interpretative system of seven criteria delineated from the pertinent documents of the Second Vatican Council.

I must also note that my system can also be verified by being applied to various other occurrences and initiatives that are directed towards the elaboration of particular law, the implementation of synodal decisions, or the ongoing renewal of liturgical life. All of these are taking place in the Catholic Church of Kyiv at the present time. The system can also be employed for the assessment of the ecclesial identity and vocation of many other Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. Nevertheless, I intentionally avoided crossing the boundaries delineated at the beginning of this chapter in order to avoid the confusion that might have arisen as a result of dealing with too many facts and issues that in any event go beyond the scope of this thesis.

⁵⁴⁷ LUYKX, “Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos,” p. 175. The author of this thesis humbly acknowledges that he is culpable of the weakness of frequently using superlatives as well.

In conclusion, the work accomplished by the KCSG can be duly regarded as one of the better examples of mature and insightful theological thinking on the part of Kyivan hierarchs and theologians in the tortured history of this Church. It demonstrated that Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox Churches can actually live and act as Particular Churches of their respective communions as well as Sister-Churches that are striving to come closer to the realization of their belonging to essentially the same ecclesial Tradition once received from their Mother-Church of Constantinople and still found its home in the cradle of Ukrainian Christianity, the ancient city of Kyiv.

CONCLUSION

In the course of her history, the Catholic Church has undergone many significant transformations in the understanding of her ecclesial identity and mission. And while on the one hand, she has certainly made significant progress in extending her ecclesiastical structures to the whole world, on the other, she has failed to resolve some very serious ecclesiological problems. In some cases, the latter have fostered dramatic distortions within Christianity. These, in turn, have facilitated or helped to maintain the division of Christians into ecclesial bodies, often antagonistically disposed towards each other. These have appeared to be no longer capable of manifesting to an unbelieving world the strength and beauty of the Gospel. Indeed, its proclamation has been seriously hampered by a lack of the kind of communion of mutual love desired by Christ.⁵⁴⁸

Not really considering the dialogue with the divided parts of universal Christendom as her primary concern,⁵⁴⁹ for centuries the Catholic Church was inclined to present herself as the most authentic remnant of the original Apostolic Community of the New Testament.⁵⁵⁰ The existence of other groups of faithful was often interpreted in terms of their betrayal of the one true Church of Christ, which had survived for the most part solely in Catholicism.⁵⁵¹ This position on the part of Rome gradually led this Church to a form of ecclesial remoteness, seriously injuring and to a certain extent emptying the genuine meaning of her catholic character.⁵⁵² What is more, through a decisive refutation of the

⁵⁴⁸ UR 1, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 908.

⁵⁴⁹ Thomas STRANSKY, "The Separated Churches and Ecclesial Communities: Commentary on Chapter Three of the Decree," in ADAMS, *Vatican II on Ecumenism*, p. 48.

⁵⁵⁰ BAUM, "The Self-Understanding," p. 87.

⁵⁵¹ RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, p. 69 and DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 31.

⁵⁵² KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 115 and DULLES, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 17.

ecclesial character of all non-Catholic communities⁵⁵³ and through the insistence that Rome is the only remaining Apostolic See to which everyone who wishes salvation must be subordinated,⁵⁵⁴ the Catholic Church slowly but surely started to manifest ecclesiological symptoms which seemed to be more typical of a religious sect⁵⁵⁵ than of the true Church of God. Overemphasis on the institutional ecclesial dimension,⁵⁵⁶ an almost militaristic discipline,⁵⁵⁷ an easily perceptible defensive posture towards all outsiders,⁵⁵⁸ soteriological exclusivism⁵⁵⁹ and the enthusiastic promotion of uniform types of thinking, praying and living⁵⁶⁰ have gradually led the Roman Church to the brink of being closed in on itself as an ecclesiastical ghetto (albeit a very large one),⁵⁶¹ and to the risk of being estranged from its authentic ecclesial identity and mission.⁵⁶²

The situation changed considerably on the eve of the Second Vatican Council when the Catholic Church started to realize that, just as she had already lost her earthly power, she would also inevitably lose her influence on society if she failed to give positive answers to the most urgent questions posed by the rapidly developing modern world.⁵⁶³ Also, the establishment and growth of the ecumenical movement compelled a Catholic adjustment to the changing demands of contemporary humanity. The movement demonstrated that a large number of Christian communities around the globe no longer regarded each other as opponents but rather as equal partners in the common Christian task of proclaiming the

⁵⁵³ GASSMANN, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 155.

⁵⁵⁴ HOECK, "Decree on Eastern," pp. 313-315.

⁵⁵⁵ SCHRECK, *The Catholic Challenge*, p. 211.

⁵⁵⁶ DRILLING, "The Genesis," pp. 62-63.

⁵⁵⁷ VOGEL, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 90.

⁵⁵⁸ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 4.

⁵⁵⁹ GASSMANN, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 155.

⁵⁶⁰ VOGEL, "The Decree on Ecumenism," p. 7.

⁵⁶¹ HEARNE, "Was Vatican II," pp. 97-98.

⁵⁶² KÜNG, *The Church*, pp. 263, 300-302 and KÜNG, *The Living Church*, p. 401.

⁵⁶³ LINNAN, "Dogmatic Constitution," p. 41.

Good News to the entire human race.⁵⁶⁴ In order to join this movement and to become more relevant for her own faithful, the Catholic Church had to submit herself to a thorough reform of her former theological viewpoints by adopting a more adequate ecclesiological self-perception.⁵⁶⁵

This reform of the entire Catholic Church was undertaken at the Second Vatican Council which, far from rejecting old doctrines, filled them with qualitatively new content⁵⁶⁶ and opened the formerly closed Church of Rome to fruitful dialogue with other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities⁵⁶⁷ whose ecclesial character was now clearly recognized (*UR* 19).⁵⁶⁸ Vatican II did not introduce any novelties into Catholic teaching,⁵⁶⁹ but considerably changed the general orientation of Catholic ecclesiology by giving strong emphases to many important ecclesial dimensions that, for a variety of different reasons, were formerly disregarded or even entirely overlooked. The overemphasis on the concept of *societas perfecta*⁵⁷⁰ would be balanced by an understanding of the Church as “pilgrim”⁵⁷¹ and “mystery.”⁵⁷² Pyramidal ecclesiology based on the monarchical centralization of ecclesiastical power in the hands of the popes and the Roman Curia⁵⁷³ would be at least partially supplemented by an understanding of the Church as a

⁵⁶⁴ LONG, “East and West,” p. 13.

⁵⁶⁵ NISSIOTIS, “Is the Vatican Council,” p. 361.

⁵⁶⁶ Johannes WILLEBRANDS, “Vatican II’s Ecclesiology of Communion,” in *One in Christ 23:3-4* (1987), p. 180.

⁵⁶⁷ BONINO, “Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 110 and KÜNG, *The Living Church*, p. 406.

⁵⁶⁸ BAUM, “The Self-Understanding,” p. 88.

⁵⁶⁹ De LUBAC, *The Church*, p. 33.

⁵⁷⁰ POWELL, *The Mystery*, p. 3, Einar SIGURBJÖRNSSON, *Ministry Within the People of God: The Development of the Doctrines on the Church and on the Ministry in the Second Vatican Council’s De Ecclesia* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), p. 12 and POWELL, *The Mystery*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁷¹ RATZINGER, *Theological Highlights*, p. 46.

⁵⁷² OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 41. ZOGHBY, “Unité et diversité,” p. 493.

⁵⁷³ DULLES, *The Reshaping*, p. 24 and OLUDARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 48.

“hierarchical communion”⁵⁷⁴ and the “people of God.”⁵⁷⁵ The principle of soteriological exclusivism,⁵⁷⁶ formerly held as an axiom, would be almost totally replaced by the patristic image of the Church as the “universal sacrament of salvation.”⁵⁷⁷ And most important within the context of the present dissertation, the earlier universalistic self-understanding of the Catholic Church as a monolithic organization based on principles of uniformity⁵⁷⁸ would be balanced by the recognition of the great strength that proceeds from the application of the concept of “unity in diversity”⁵⁷⁹ to the renewed identity of the Catholic Church as a “communion of Particular Churches.”⁵⁸⁰

The recognition on the part of the Council⁵⁸¹ of the existence of many autonomous Churches of the Catholic communion with their own ecclesiastical Traditions, theologies, liturgies, legislative systems, spiritualities, as well as their own tasks in ecumenical dialogue, was in some sense a shock for the entire Christian world, including the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion themselves. Most of the non-Catholic Churches judged this ecclesiological shift of the Catholic Church positively, seeing in it a first step towards her further de-centralization.⁵⁸² However, it has taken time for some Western Catholics to adapt to this new ecclesiological perspective, which no longer considers the Latin rite to be the *ritus praestantior*.⁵⁸³

⁵⁷⁴ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 157.

⁵⁷⁵ HEARNE, “Was Vatican II,” pp. 105-106.

⁵⁷⁶ DULLES, *The Dimensions*, p. 21.

⁵⁷⁷ KLOPPENBURG, *The Ecclesiology*, p. 115.

⁵⁷⁸ VOGEL, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” p. 7.

⁵⁷⁹ WOJNAR, “Rites, Canonical,” p. 515.

⁵⁸⁰ HEARNE, “Was Vatican II,” p. 104.

⁵⁸¹ MADEY, “Vatican Council II’s Decree,” p. 235 and PUJOL, “The Care and Organization,” p. 222.

⁵⁸² BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 192 and MCNAMARA, “Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II,” p. 68.

⁵⁸³ WOJNAR, “Decree on the Oriental,” p. 182.

Surprisingly enough, the Eastern Catholic Churches, some of which had been waiting for this change in Catholic ecclesiology for a long time, appeared to be the most unprepared to receive it. In the course of several centuries of their subordination to Rome they had gradually become accustomed to their inferior position in the Catholic Church.⁵⁸⁴ Some Eastern Catholics had almost totally lost an understanding of the values that proceed from their own rich traditional legacies and, fascinated by Western practices, had started to incorporate them into their own lives, regarding them as an integral part of their own heritage, which made them distinctively Catholic, in contrast to the practices of their Orthodox neighbors.

The model of subordination to Rome also seemed to be advantageous for some Eastern Catholic hierarchs who were not courageous enough to make decisions on their own and, even in the smallest matters, relied on directives coming from the Roman Curia. The lack of courage was frequently related to financial considerations. It was certainly safer to retain the deference towards the Curia as this helped guarantee financial and moral support for various projects. (This continues to the present day.) Therefore, Vatican II's encouragement of the Eastern Catholic Churches to govern themselves⁵⁸⁵ and to restore their age-old traditions, even if they were lost and could now be found only in the Orthodox Churches,⁵⁸⁶ was at first hardly welcomed by many Eastern Catholics.⁵⁸⁷

Even after the nearly fifty years that separate us from the momentous decisions of Vatican II, many Eastern Catholic Churches are still somewhat confused about the

⁵⁸⁴ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, pp. 22-23.

⁵⁸⁵ *OE* 5, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁵⁸⁶ *OE* 6, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 902.

⁵⁸⁷ The reception of the Second Vatican Council by one of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, namely, the Kyivan Catholic Church, is accurately treated in an article of a professor of the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, Fr. Peter Galadza. See GALADZA, "The Reception of the Second Vatican Council," pp. 312-339.

authentic understanding of their ecclesial identity and mission.⁵⁸⁸ Granted, some have made considerable progress in re-establishing their ecclesial structures, as well as in maturing their ecclesiological viewpoints.⁵⁸⁹ However, even a sketchy analysis of the state of their ecclesial development reveals the large number of imbalances and inconsistencies on various levels of their ecclesial lives.⁵⁹⁰ I am, therefore, convinced that all of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion are in need of a systematic clarification of their respective ecclesial identities and missions. But there remains the question: “How can this be achieved on a practical level?”

The primary aim of my thesis was to propose a method capable of evaluating the present state of ecclesial development of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, based on a set of concrete principles delineated from the pertinent documents of the Second Vatican Council (*Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*). As I demonstrated, there are seven such principles or criteria, namely: (i) return to the authentic traditional roots of a particular Tradition and the need for proper and organic reform within a given Particular Church; (ii) restoration and development of particular theology; (iii) restoration and development of particular ways of liturgical worship; (iv) restoration and development of the particular ecclesiastical legislation; (v) restoration and development of particular spiritual patrimony; (vi) preservation and contribution to the already existing communion of Particular Churches; and (vii) work towards inter-confessional rapprochement, inter-religious dialogue and universal integration.

⁵⁸⁸ CHIROVSKY, “Orthodox in Communion with Rome,” p. 78.

⁵⁸⁹ Robert TAFT, “Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner,” in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), p. 27.

⁵⁹⁰ MARYNOVYCH, “Rozdumy odnoho myrianyna,” pp. 495-501.

All seven criteria create an interpretive system aimed at the assessment of a particular ecclesial identity and vocation in which each of the criteria plays a truly indispensable role, and cannot be isolated from the rest of the principles. Only all together can they clarify the question of the authenticity of a Particular Church's ecclesial nature and mission and indicate proper ways for the further harmonious development of any of these Churches within their given ecclesiastical communions.

Being firmly rooted in the ecclesiology and ecumenism of Vatican II, which was the last General Council of all Catholic bishops representing different countries and their respective Churches, my interpretive system is primarily aimed at serving the needs of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion. These, according to the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* and the *Decree on Ecumenism*, already possess the “fullness of the means of salvation.”⁵⁹¹ Nevertheless, none of these Churches can regard themselves as being a “perfect society” and identify themselves with the Kingdom of God on earth, which is exempt from any faults and no longer requires any development.

Thus, I believe that any of these Churches making an honest attempt to apply my interpretive system to their own ecclesial lives, would inevitably realize that many dimensions peculiar to their Churches are still in need of reform, since they do not equally correspond to all seven criteria presented by the system. Of course, the task of preserving a firm balance among various aspects of particular ecclesial life is not an easy one and cannot be achieved where internal ecclesiastical confusion reigns. For this reason, each of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion should continuously search for a better understanding of their ecclesial identity and vocation, repeatedly testing their state of

⁵⁹¹ UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910. See also LG 7, 14, in TANNER, *Decrees*, pp. 853, 860.

development in a methodical and systematic way. One such means is suggested by my interpretive system.

Expanding our horizons, note that all that has just been said about the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion is also true about the non-Catholic Particular Churches and their respective ecclesiastical communions, with the only exception that, according to *Unitatis Redintegratio*, they have “deficiencies in some respects.”⁵⁹² Correspondingly, my interpretive system can be applied to any of the Particular Christian Churches. However, many of them will not be able to correspond to each of the criteria of the system in the same degree and in the same manner. For instance, it would be difficult for the Particular Churches of the Orthodox communion to test themselves by the use of my sixth criteria, which presupposes preservation of communion with the “center of unity,” that is, with the Church which – at least in the first millennium – presided in love.⁵⁹³ But one must hope that all the Particular Christian Churches, including the Catholic ones, will in the future arrive at a better understanding of the necessity of the existence of visible unity among them, which, along with apparent complementarities, may also include some antinomic tension between contrastingly different viewpoints. These should be “harnessed together in such a way that it is possible for them to cooperate. All that is needed – difficult though this may be – is that the partisans of each should agree to engage in dialogue.”⁵⁹⁴

In order to demonstrate how my interpretative system can effectively elucidate the state of ecclesial development of a concrete Church of the Catholic communion that is at the present moment searching for a better understanding of the particular character of her

⁵⁹² UR 3, in TANNER, *Decrees*, p. 910. Even though, it is my contention that this interpretive system has deep theological validity to it that goes far beyond simple adherence to confessionally “Catholic” viewpoints.

⁵⁹³ They may also find that they are lacking communion even with some of the Particular Orthodox Churches.

⁵⁹⁴ BEAUPÈRE, “What Sort of Unity?” p. 206.

theology, liturgy, spirituality and legislation at the same time trying to rediscover her authentic roots and to define her own place in Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement, I decided to dedicate considerable attention to a kind of “case study.” I thus attempted to apply all seven criteria delineated from the pertinent documents of the Second Vatican Council to the clarification of certain questions regarding the ecclesial identity and vocation of my own Kyivan Catholic Church as they were understood and explained in a partial but scholarly way in the papers and responses of both Kyivan Catholic and Orthodox participants of the Kyivan Church Study Group. Focussing on a Group was important. This is because in spite of the fact that in recent years there have been many other significant moments and initiatives in which prominent Kyivan Catholic hierarchs and theologians have exhibited an ever-stronger understanding of their Church in terms of the Second Vatican Council’s Communion ecclesiology,⁵⁹⁵ most such attempts remained the personal viewpoints of certain individuals. Their efforts were not as significant because they were not able to act as a team that is open to various ecclesiological approaches and at the same time shares the same aspirations and goals.

From this perspective, the work of the KCSG, which brought together hierarchs and scholars of various ethnic and ecclesial backgrounds and in addition to ecumenical goals was also directed towards the joint discussion of certain crucial issues regarding ecclesial particularity, can be regarded as a unique achievement that influenced the contemporary process of the development of the Kyivan Catholic Church’s ecclesiology.

⁵⁹⁵ For example, Victor POSPISHIL, *The Quest for an Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate* (Philadelphia: Ukrainian Publications, 1971), MONCHAK, *Samoupravna Kyïvs'ka Tserkva*, MADEY, *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien*, GALADZA, “What is Eastern,” pp. 68-69, etc.

In line with the formal hypothesis of this dissertation, according to which I insist that my interpretative system can be successfully applied to the assessment of the ecclesial identity and vocation of any of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion, I would add that it is the contention of this thesis that the papers and responses of the Catholic members of the Kyivan Church Study Group represent the first corporate analytical-theological attempt to expound a vision of the Kyivan Catholic Church consonant with the seven criteria regarding the authentic ecclesial identity of a Particular Catholic Church enunciated by the documents of the Second Vatican Council. It is also my deep conviction that an appropriately defined ecclesial identity of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church of Kyiv emanating from the papers of the KCSG and demonstrating the validity of my interpretative system may also contribute to a better understanding of the very notion of particularity in the Catholic Church. This would assist all the Particular Catholic Churches to resolve some of the most urgent problems related to both their present and future ecclesial development and to come closer to a clearer realization of their broader ecclesial mission and vocation as God's chosen vehicles for the salvation of the human race.

It was beyond of the scope of this thesis to demonstrate how the interpretative system can be employed to clarification of *all* of the existing aspects of the concrete lived experience of the Kyivan Catholic Church or how it works in the context of any other (Latin, for instance) Particular Church of the Catholic communion. However, this is certainly a task that can be undertaken by other scholars using the interpretative system outlined here. Without doubt, the teaching of the Second Vatican Council on the ecclesiological significance of particularity in the Catholic Church, summarized and

evaluated in this thesis, leaves the doors wide open for further application of my method in a variety of different ecclesiological contexts.

Of course, my interpretive system may not be the only one or the best one. Every Church is in a continuous process of development and, therefore, demands different systems,⁵⁹⁶ and after all, no system, nor any set of even very precise criteria can ever “exhaust the deepness of the meaning of what it means to be the Church.”⁵⁹⁷ Still, it is my contention that for the time being the system composed of seven criteria delineated from the documents of the Second Vatican Council presented in this dissertation can be regarded as one of the most adequate interpretive matrices for the assessment of the ecclesial identity and vocation of all of the Particular Churches of the Catholic communion already in existence or to be established in the future.⁵⁹⁸ This is because it seems to encompass all the dimensions of their particular ecclesial lives and is capable of a careful examination of their traditional roots, theologies, liturgies, legislative systems, spiritualities, and ecumenical aspirations.

Of course, Christians are only recognized by their fruits (cf. Matt. 7, 16). Among the proofs that the present thesis has achieved some of its practical goals will be the reconvocation of the KCSG along with comprehensive renewal within the Kyivan Church. But that is certainly beyond the perview of any text. May the Spirit give life where letters have killed. Maranatha!

⁵⁹⁶ DULLES, *Models*, pp. 187-188.

⁵⁹⁷ KÜNG, *The Church*, p. 286. See also OLUJARE, *The Church as Communion*, p. 46.

⁵⁹⁸ POSPISHIL, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, p. 11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACERBI, Antonio. *Due ecclesiologie: ecclesiologia giuridica ed ecclesiologia di comunione nella "Lumen Gentium."* Bologna: Ed. Dehoniane, 1975.
- Acta synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II.* Vatican City: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970.
- AFANASSIEFF, Nicholas. "The Church Which Presides in Love," in John MEYENDORFF, ed., *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church.* Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992, pp. 91-143.
- ALBERIGO, Giuseppe. "The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II," in Leonard SWIDLER and PIET FRANSEN, eds., *Authority in the Church, and the Schillebeeckx Case.* New York: Crossroad, 1982, pp. 119-145.
- _____. "Conclusion: Preparing for What Kind of Council?" in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 501-508.
- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.
- "Announcement of the Chief Secretary of the Holy and Sacred Synod Regarding the Denouncement by Pope Benedict XVI of Rome of the Title 'Patriarch of the West'," at <http://ec-patr.org/docdisplay.php?lang=en&id=679&tla=en>.
- ARSENIEV, Nicholas. "The Second Vatican Council's "Constitutio de Ecclesia," in *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 9:1 (1965), pp. 16-25.
- _____. "The Meaning of Vatican II From an Ecumenical Point of View," in *Diakonia* 1:1 (1966), pp. 7-14.
- "Articles Which We Need Guarantees from the Lord Romans before We Enter into Unity with the Roman Church," in Borys GUDZIAK, "Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Genesis of the Union of Brest." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1998, pp. 264-272.
- ATHENAGORAS I. "Mandement patriarchal à l'occasion de son départ pour le Concile oecuménique," in *Proche-Orient chrétien* (October-December 1962), pp. 348-351.
- AUBERT, Roger. *La Théologie Catholique au milieu du XX Siècle.* Tournai: Castermann, 1954.

- _____. "Cardinal Mercier, Cardinal Bourne and the Malines Conversations," in *One in Christ* 4:4 (1986), pp. 372-379.
- BASSETT, William. *The Determination of Rite* (unpublished dissertation in *Analecta Gregoriana* 157), Rome, 1967.
- BAUM, Gregory. "The Ecclesial Reality of the Other Churches," in *Concilium* 4. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965, pp. 65-82.
- _____. "Commentary," in Edward PETERS and Gregory BAUM, eds., *De Ecclesia: The Constitution on the Church of Vatican Council II*. Glen Rock N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965, pp. 3-28.
- _____. "The Self-Understanding of the Roman Catholic Church at Vatican II," in George JOHNSTON and Wolfgang ROTH, eds., *The Church in the Modern World: Essays in Honour of James Sutherland Thomson*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967, pp. 86-123.
- BEA, Augustin. "The Decree on Ecumenism - I," in *The Month* 33:3 (1965), pp. 145-156.
- BEAUPÈRE, René. "What Sort of Unity? The Decree on Ecumenism Ten Years Later — A Roman Catholic View," in *The Ecumenical Review* 16:2 (1974), pp. 191-209.
- BECKER, Werner. "Decree on Ecumenism: History of the Decree," in Herbert VORGRIMMLER, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 5. Freiburg: Herder and Herder / Palm Publishers, 1967, pp. 1-56.
- BEECK, Frans Jozef van. *Catholic Identity after Vatican II: Three Types of Faith in the One Church*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985.
- BEHEN, Oleh. "Pro shliakhy zrostannia Tserkvy [On the Ways of the Church's Development]," in *Postup* 96 (540) (3-4 June 2000), at http://postup.brama.com/000603/96_13_1.html.
- BELLARMINUS, Robertus. *De controversiis Christianae fidei, adversus huius tetmporis haereticos*. Naples: Giuliano, 1857.
- BELLUCCI, Dino. "The Council's Teaching on Ecumenism," in *Unitas* 17:4 (1965), pp. 264-270.
- BENDYK, Myron. *Pomisnist' Ukraïns'koï Hreko-Katolyts'koï Tserkvy ta ïï bachennia Patriarkhom Āosyfom Slipym* [The Particularity of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and Its Understanding by the Patriarch Josyf Slipyj]. L'viv: Svichado, 1996.

- _____. "Ekleziolohiia Patriarkha Myroslava Ivana (Liubachivs'koho) [The Ecclesiology of Patriarch Myroslav-Ivan (Lubachivsky)]," in *Bohosloviia* 65:1-4 (2001), pp. 18-32.
- BENEDICT XIV. "Etsi Pastoralis," in *Opera Omnia* vol. 15: *Bullarium*, I. Prati, 1845. pp. 190-214.
- BENEDICT XV. "Codex Iuris Canonici," in *AAS* 9 (1917), pp. 5-593.
- BEOZZO, Oskar. "The External Climate," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 357-404.
- BERDYAEV, Nicholas. *Dream and Reality*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1950.
- BILANYCH, Joannes. *Synodus Zamostiana an. 1720: eius celebratio, approbatio et momentum*. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1960.
- BOBRINSKOY, Boris. *The Mystery of the Trinity: Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition*. Crestwood, N. Y.: SVS Press, 1999.
- BOCIURKIW, Bohdan. "The Re-Emergence of the Eastern Catholic Church in Ukraine," in *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), pp. 14-18.
- BONIFACE VII. "Unam Sanctam," at <http://www.romancatholicism.org/unam-sanctam.htm> and <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Bon08/B8unam.htm>.
- BONINO, José. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 109-112.
- BOS, Hildo, FOREST, Jim, eds. *For the Peace from Above: an Orthodox Resource Book on War, Peace and Nationalism*. Athens: Syndesmos Press, 1999.
- BOUYER, Louis. *The Church of God*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1982.
- BOYER, Charles. "The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council," in *Unitas* 16:4 (1964), pp. 243-253.
- BROWN, Macbeath. "Commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism," in George SCHNER, ed., *The Church Renewed: The Documents of Vatican II Reconsidered*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986, pp. 37-54.
- BROWN, Robert. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 95-97.

- BRÜMMER, Vincent. "The Identity of the Christian Tradition," in Marcel SAROT and Gijbert van den BRINK, eds., *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition: Contributions to Philosophical Theology*, vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999, pp. 23-37.
- BUCHKO, Ivan. "Letter to His Beatitude Josyf Slipyj (10 March 1971)," in *Litterae-Nuntiae Archiepiscopi Maioris Ritus Byzantino-Ucraini* 10 (1974), pp. 136-139.
- BUTLER, Basil Christopher. *The Idea of the Church*. Darton: Longman & Todd, 1962.
- _____. "Institution Versus Charismata," in Laurence Kennedy SHOOK, ed., *Theology of Renewal*, vol. 2. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1964, pp. 42-54.
- _____. "Foreword," in Basil Christopher BUTLER, ed., *The Constitution on the Church*. New York: Paulist Press / Deus Books, 1965, pp. 3-12.
- CANAVARIS, Iakovos. *The Ecclesiology of Yves Congar: An Orthodox Evaluation*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1971.
- CAPRILE, Giovanni. "Aspetti positivi della terza Sessione del Concilio," in *La Cività Cattolica* 116 (1965), pp. 330-333.
- _____. "Pio XI e la ripresa del concilio Vaticano," *La Cività Cattolica* 3 (1966), pp. 27-39.
- _____. "Pio XII e un nuovo progetto di Concilio Ecumenico," *La Cività Cattolica* 3 (1966), pp. 209-227.
- _____. "Pio XI, la Curia romana e il concilio," *La Cività Cattolica* 2 (1969), pp. 121-133.
- CASSIDY, Edward Idris. "Letter to Bishop Basil (Losten), 20 October, 1992," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 391-394.
- CEGIELKA, Francis. *Handbook of Ecclesiology and Christology: A Concise Authoritative Review of the Mystery of the Church and the Incarnation in the Light of Vatican II*. Staten Island, N.Y: Alba House, 1971.
- CHADWICK, Owen. *A history of the Popes, 1830-1914*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- CHANDRAN, Russell. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 97-104.
- CHIMY, Hieronimus. *De Figura iuridica Archiepiscopi Maioris in iure canonico Orientali Viginti*. Rome: Analecta OSBM, 1968.

- CHIRAMEL, José. "Hierarchical Structuring in the Oriental Legislation," in José CHIRAMEL and Kuriakose BHARANIKULANGARA, eds., *The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: A Study and Interpretation. Essays in Honour of Joseph Cardinal Parecatil, President, Pontifical Commission for the Revision of Eastern Canon Law*. Alwaye, India, 1992, pp. 91-115.
- CHIROVSKY, Andriy. "The Ukrainian Church in the Second Millennium," in Nicholas L. CHIROVSKY, ed., *The Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1988, pp. 260-286.
- _____. *Pray for God's Wisdom: The Mystical Sophiology of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky*. Ottawa: MASI, 1992.
- _____. "A Note on Terminology," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), p. 7.
- _____. "The Liberating Character of the Truth," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 4-7.
- _____. "Sister Churches": Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 296-421.
- _____. "The Union of the Holy Churches of God: A Response to Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 31-42.
- _____. "Towards an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 83-124.
- _____. "Response to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos' Paper: Divisions and Healing," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 153-162.
- _____. "Going West to Find the East: Inaugural Lecture of the Peter and Doris Kule Chair of Eastern Christian Theology and Spirituality," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 219-233.
- _____. "The World-Wide Mission of the Church of Kyiv," in Roma HAYDA and Andrew SOROKOWSKI, eds., *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church: Papers Presented at the Ukrainian Catholic Laity Conference Manor Junior College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, 11-13 November 1994*. L'viv: Svichado, 1996, pp. 11-26.
- _____. "Orthodox in Communion with Rome: The Antinomic Character of Eastern Catholic Theology," in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 71-87.
- _____. and HAYDA, Roma "Kyivan Church Study Group: An Ecumenical Dialogue Team for Our Times," in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 72:37 (2004), pp. 9-10.

- CHIROVSKY, John M. Freishyn. *Patriarch Josyf (Slippy) the Confessor and His Ecclesiological Thought: An Analysis from the Perspective of Avery Dulles' Models of the Church*. Unpublished Catholic Theological Union M. A. Thesis. Chicago, 1997.
- CHRISTODOULOS. "Letter to His Hiliness Pope Benedict XVI, Protocol 1343, (Dispatch 173)," at http://www.ecclesia.gr/English/archbishop/letters/archi_to_benedict.html.
- CLEMENT VIII. *Dominus et laudabilis nimis* of 23 December 1595 in Athanasius VELYKY *Documenta Unionis Berestensis Eiusque Auctorum (1590-1600)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III. Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1970, pp. 217-255.
- CLARK, Mary. "The Trinity in Latin Christianity," in Louis DUPRÉ, Don SALIERS and John MEYENDORFF, eds., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*. Crossroad: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997, pp. 276-290.
- CLARKE, James. *L'Enjeu chrétien au Proche-Orient*. Paris: Editions de Centurion, 1965.
- CLARKSON, John. *The Church Teaches*. St. Louis: Herder, 1955.
- Code of Canons of the Eastern Church. Latin-English Edition*. Washington D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1992.
- COLOMBO, Domenico. *L'Ecumenismo secondo il decreto conciliare: Introduzione, testo, commenti dei fratelli separate*. Milano: Pontificio Istituto Missioni Estere, 1965.
- COLOMBO, Giuseppe. *La Costituzione dogmatica "De Ecclesia."* Reggio Emilia: Scuola di Pastorale per le Diocesi della Regione Emiliana, 1966.
- CONGAR, Yves. "Ecclesia ab Abel," in Marcel REDING, ed., *Abhandlungen über Theologie und Kirche*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1952, pp. 79-108.
- _____. "The Church: The People of God," in *Concilium* 1:1 (1965), pp. 7-19.
- _____. *Concile Oecuménique Vatican II, L'Église, L'Oecuménisme, Les Églises Orientales*. Paris, 1965.
- _____. "Le Développement de l'évaluation ecclésiologique des Églises non-Catholiques," in Gerard BÉKÉS and Vilmos VAJTA, eds., *Unitatis Redintegratio, 1964-1974: The Impact of the Decree on Ecumenism*. Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1977, pp. 63-75.
- _____. *Diversity and Communion*. London: SCM Press, 1984.
- _____. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit: The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West*, Vol. 3. New York: The Seabury Press, 1983.

- _____. “Implicazioni christologiche e pneumatologiche dell’ ecclesiologia del Vatican II,” in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 2 (1981), pp. 98-110.
- _____. “The Role of the Church in the Modern World,” in Herbert VORGRIMLER, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder and Herder / Palm Publishers, 1967, pp. 200-223.
- _____. *Tradition and Traditions*. London: Burns and Oates, 1966.
- _____. *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. “Mysterium Ecclesiae,” in *AAS* 65 (1973), pp. 405-407.
- _____. “Communio Notio: Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” in *One in Christ* 28:3 (1992), pp. 282-293 in *Origins* 22:7 (1992), pp. 108-112 and at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_concfaith_doc_28051992_communio-notio_en.html.
- _____. “Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church,” in *AAS* 92 (2000), pp. 742-765.
- _____. “Note on the Expression ‘Sister Churches’,” at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_concfaith_doc_20000630_chiese-sorelle_en.html.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE EASTERN CHURCHES. “Prot. No. 251/75,” at <http://www.ratzinger.it/documenti/BeatitudeMaximos.htm>.
- Constitution dogmatique “Lumen Gentium”: traduction et commentaire*. Bruxelles: La Pensée catholique, 1965.
- CORECCO, Eugenio. “The Bishop as Head of the Local Church and Its Discipline,” in Neophytos EDELBY, Teodoro JIMENEZ-URRESTI, Petrus HUIZING, eds., trans, by Michael Tully, *The Sacraments in Theology and Canon Law*. New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1968, pp. 85-103.
- COSTIGAN, Richard. *The Consensus of the Church and Papal Infallibility: A Study in the Background of Vatican I*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005.
- CRUMLEY, James. “Reflections on Twenty-Five Years After the Decree on Ecumenism,” in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism*

- Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 81-88.
- CULLMANN, Oscar. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 93-95.
- CUNNINGHAM, Agnes. "Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio* 21 November, 1964," in Timothy O'CONNELL, ed., *Vatican II and Its Documents: An American Reappraisal*. Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1986, pp. 62-78.
- CUSHING, Kathleen. *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- CYPRIANUS Carthaginensis. *De unitate Ecclesiae* [On the Unity of the Church], in Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina* 4. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1844-1855, pp. 497D-498B.
- DAMASKINOS. "Le vingtième anniversaire du décret "Unitatis Redintegratio," in *Istina* 30:2 (1985), pp. 186-190.
- DALEY, Brian. "Revisiting the 'Filioque:' Roots and Branches of an Old Debate," in *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001), pp. 31-62.
- DAVIS, Charles. "The Parish and Theology," in *The Clergy Review* (May, 1964), pp. 254-269.
- DEJAIFVE, Georges. "La 'Magna Carta' de Vatican II," in *Nouvelle revue théologique* 87 (January, 1965), pp. 15-26.
- DEVILLE, Adam. "On the Patriarchate of the West," in *Ecumenical Trends* 35 (June 2006), pp. 1-7.
- _____. "Kenosis vs. *La Bella Figura*," in *The Canadian Journal of Orthodox Christianity* 2:3 (2007), pp. 96-101.
- DISTANTE, Giovanni. "Introduzione," in Giovanni DISTANTE and Salvatore MANNA eds., *Concilium Vaticanum (2um: 1962-1965): Decretto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche: Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1986, pp. 7-14.
- Dodatok do chynnosteĭ i rishen' Rus'koho Provintsial'noho Sobora v Halychyni otbutohosia vo L'vovi v r.1891* [An Appendix to the Proceedings and Decisions of the Ruthenian Provincial Synod That Took Place in L'viv in 1891]. L'viv: Stavropihijs'kyi Instytut, 1897.
- DONOVAN, Daniel. *Distinctively Catholic: An Exploration of Catholic Identity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.

- DRILLING, Peter. "The Genesis of the Trinitarian Ecclesiology of Vatican II," in *Science et Esprit* 45:1 (1993), pp. 61-78.
- DULLES, Avery. "Introduction," in Walter ABBOTT, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, trans. by Joseph Gallagher. New York: America Press, 1966, pp. 9-13.
- _____. *The Dimensions of the Church: A Postconciliar Reflection*. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1967.
- _____. "Intercommunion and the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Diakonia* 2 (1970), pp. 101-114.
- _____. *Models of the Church*, Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1974.
- _____. *A Church to Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- _____. *The Catholicity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- _____. *The Reshaping of Catholicism: Current Challenges in the Theology of Church*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- _____. "The Decree on Ecumenism: Twenty-Five Years After," in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 17-25.
- _____. and GRANFIELD, Patrick, *Theology of the Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- DUPREY, Peter, "Brief Reflections on the Title *Primus Inter Pares*," in *One in Christ* 10 (1974), pp. 7-12.
- DUVAL, Léon-Étienne, *L'Église: Constitution "Lumen gentium:" texte conciliaire, introduction, commentaries*. Tours: Mame, 1966.
- DVORNIK, Francis. *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979.
- DYMYD, Mykhaïlo, ed. "Dokumenty Patriarshoho Soboru Ukraïns'koï Hreko-Katolyts'koï Tserkvy [Documents of the Patriarchal Council of the UGCC]," L'viv, 2002.
- _____. "Les enjeux de l'abandon du titre de 'patriarche d'Occident'," in *Istina* 51 (2006), pp. 24-32.

- _____. *Khersones'ke taïnstvo svobody: Ekkleziolohiia*, tom. 1 [The Mystery of Freedom of Chersonese: Ecclesiology], vol. 1. L'viv: Svichado, 2007.
- _____. and DIDULA, Petro. "Patriarshyĭ Sobor i proholoshennia Patriarkhatu [The Patriarchal Council and Proclamation of the Patriarchate]," in *Patriarkhat* 4 (2002), pp. 12-13.
- EDELBY, Neophytos. *Les Eglises Catholiques Orientales. Décret "Orientalium Ecclesiarum."* Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970.
- "Editorial: The 'Final Solution?' – Reflections on Recent Orthodox Statements Concerning Eastern Catholics," in *Logos* 37:1-4 (1996), pp. 7-33.
- ERICKSON, John. "The Formation of Orthodox Ecclesial Identity," in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42:3-4 (1998), pp. 301-314.
- ESPOSITO, Rosario. *Il Decreto conciliare sulle Chiese Orientali "Orientalium Ecclesiarum": testo e commento.* Rome: Edizioni Paoline, 1966.
- EVANS, Gillian. "Orthodox and Roman Catholic Ecclesiology: The Recent Scene and the Residual Difficulties," in *One in Christ* 30:1 (1994), pp. 34-49.
- EVDOKIMOV, Paul. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 97-101.
- _____. "Interpretation of Rublev's Icon of the Trinity," in *One in Christ* 3 (1967), pp. 304-310.
- _____. "Exclusivism," in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, at <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/197844/exclusivism#tab=active~checked%2Citems~checked&title=exclusivism%20%20Britannica%20Online%20Encyclopedia>.
- FAHEY, Michael. "Commentary on the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," in George SCHNER, ed., *The Church Renewed: The Documents of Vatican II Reconsidered.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986, pp. 11-18.
- _____. "Before and After the Decree on Ecumenism of Vatican II," in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II.* Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 96-102.
- _____. "Challenges to Today's Ukrainian Catholic Church: The Vocation to Particularity in an Age of Centralism," in Roma HAYDA and Andrew SOROKOWSKI, eds., *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church: Papers Presented at the Ukrainian Catholic Laity Conference Manor Junior College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, 11-13 November 1994.* L'viv: Svichado, 1996, pp. 47-66.

- FAIRWEATHER, Eugene. "The Church's Ministry to the World," in George JOHNSTON and Wolfgang ROTH, eds., *The Church in the Modern World: Essays in Honour of James Sutherland Thomson*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967, pp. 124-136.
- FALCONI, Carlo. *Pope John and the Ecumenical Council*. New York: Hawthorn, 1964.
- FAMERÉE, Joseph. "Bishops and Dioceses and the Communications Media (November 5-25, 1963)," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 3. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 117-191.
- FARIS, John. *The Communion of Catholic Churches: Terminology and Ecclesiology*. Brooklyn N.Y.: Diocese of Saint Maron, 1985.
- _____. *The Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance: According to the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*. New York: Saint Maron Publications, 1992.
- FEDORIV, Yuriĭ. "Zamoï's'kyĭ Synod, 1720 [The Synod of Zamość]," in *Bohosloviia* 35 (1971), pp. 5-71.
- FEDOTOV, George. *The Russian Religious Mind. Volume One: Kievan Christianity, The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Volume Three in the Collected Works of George Fedotov. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1975.
- FIorenza, Francis Schüssler. "The Church's Religious Identity and Its Social and Political Mission," in *Theological Studies* 43 (1982), pp. 197-225.
- FLANNERY, Austin. *Vatican Council II, More Post-Conciliar Documents*. Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1982.
- FOUDY, Thomas. *The Ecclesiology of George Tyrell: A Comparative Study: Its Relationship to John Henry Cardinal Newman and Lumen Gentium*. Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1975.
- FOUILLOUX, Étienne. "The Antepreparatory Phase: The Slow Emergence from Inertia (January, 1959 - October, 1962)," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 55-166.
- FRANSEN, Piet. "Unity and Confessional Statements: Historical and Theological Inquiry of Roman Catholic Traditional Conception," in *Bijdragen* 33 (1972), pp. 2-38.

- FREIN, George. *Seven Lesson Plans on the Constitution on the Church of Vatican Council II*. Cork: Mercier Press, 1967.
- FRIES, Hainrich, RAHNER, Karl. *Unity of the Churches: An Actual Possibility*, trans. by Ruth and Eric Gritschs. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- GALADZA, Peter. "Good News from Balamand," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 352-354.
- _____. "Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism: Losing the *Koinê* of *Koinonia*," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 173-194.
- _____. "Ecclesial Integrity and Effective Pastoring: Validating the Spirit's Gift to Particular Churches," in Roma HAYDA and Andrew SOROKOWSKI, eds., *A More Perfect Knowledge of Our Rite and Church: Papers Presented at the Ukrainian Catholic Laity Conference Manor Junior College, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania, 11-13 November 1994*. L'viv: Svichado, 1996, pp. 67-82.
- _____. "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?: Some Ecclesial and Programmatic Dimensions," in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 59-70.
- _____. "The Reception of the Second Vatican Council by Greco-Catholics in Ukraine," in *Communio: International Catholics Review* 27:2 (2000), pp. 312-339.
- _____. "Ekumenichnyi dosvid Studiinoi hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy [The Ecumenical Experience of the Kyivan Church Study Group]," in Lesia BACHYNS'KA and Liuba MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Ekumenizm v istorii Tserkvy: zdotuky, vtraty, perspektyvy* [Ecumenism in the History of the Church: Achievements, Failures, and Hopes for the Future]. L'viv: L'viv Theological Academy, 2001, pp. 12-18.
- _____. "Liturgiina identychnist' Ukraïns'koï Hreko-Katolyts'koï Tserkvy iak *locus theologicus*: Kil'ka bohoslovs'ko-pastyr'skykh propozytsii [The Liturgical Identity of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a *Locus Theologicus*: Several Theological and Pastoral Proposals]," in *Bohosloviia* 67 (2003), pp. 72-83.
- _____. *The Theology and Liturgical Work of Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944)*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 272. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2004.
- GASSMANN, Günther. "The Decree on Ecumenism and Its Ecclesiological Significance," in *Ecumenical Trends* 18:10 (1989), pp. 153-156.
- GEORGE, Joseph. *The Principle of Subsidiarity, With Special Reference to Its Role in Papal and Episcopal Relations in the Light of Lumen Gentium*. Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI, 1988.

- GHIRLANDA, Gianfranco. "Universal Church, Particular Church, and Local Church at the Second Vatican Council and in the New Code of Canon Law," in Rene LATOURELLE, ed., *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, vol. 3. New York: Paulist Press, 1988-1989, pp. 233-271.
- GIBSON, Stephen. "*Called by the Lord*": *The Theme of Vocation in Lumen Gentium*. Romae: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1990.
- GOA, David, ed. *The Ukrainian Religious Experience: Tradition and the Canadian Cultural Context*. Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1989.
- GREGORY VII. "The Dictates of the Pope," at <http://www.ford-ham.edu/halsall/source/g7-dictpap.html>.
- GREGORY XVI. *Perlatum ad nos*, in Athanasius VELKY, *Documenta Unionis Berestensis Eiusque Auctorum (1590-1600)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III. Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1970, pp. 352-374.
- GUARDINI, Romano. *La realta della Chiesa. Il senso della Chiesa*. Brescia, 1923.
- GUDZIAK, Borys. "How Did They Drift Apart?: The Kievan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Genesis of the Union of Brest," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 43-66.
- HAJJAR, Joseph. *Les Chrétiens Uniates du Proche-Orient*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1962.
- HAMER, Jerome. *The Church is a Communion*, trans. by Ronald Matthews. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1964.
- HARING, Bernard. "The Hierarchical Structure of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular," in John WRIGHT, ed., *Meditations on the Church, Based on the Constitution on the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967, pp. 109-110.
- HARKIANAKIS, Stylianos. "The Ecclesiology of Vatican II: An Orthodox Summary," in *Diakonia* 2:3 (1967), pp. 233-249.
- HARRISON, Verna. "The Relation Between Apophatic and Kataphatic Theology," in *Pro Ecclesia: A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology* 4 (1995), pp. 318-322.
- HAY, Camillus. "The Ecclesiological Significance of the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (1966), pp. 343-353.
- _____. "Comparative Ecclesiology of the Documents Behind the Decree on Ecumenism," in *One in Christ* 3:4 (1967), pp. 399-416.

- _____. "The Church in the Decree on Ecumenism," in *One in Christ* 4:4 (1968), pp. 358-371.
- HAYDA, Roma. "Ekumenizm Papy Ivana Pavla II ta Ukraïns'ki Tserkvy [Ecumenism of Pope John Paul II and the Ukrainian Churches]," in *Patriarchate* 5 (390) (2005), at <http://www.patriyarkhat.org.ua/ukr/archive/article;173;390/>.
- _____. "News and Views: Orientale Lumen Conference Advances Ecumenism," in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 67:39 (26 September 1999), at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/12845193/The-Ukrainian-Weekly-199939>.
- HEARNE, Brian. "Was Vatican II a Waste of Time?" in *AFER* 25 (1983), pp. 97-108.
- HENDERSON, Ernest, ed. *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1910.
- HEPPELL, Muriel, trans. *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 1. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1989.
- HERMAN, Emil. "De conceptu "ritus," in *The Jurist* 2 (1942), pp. 333-345.
- HERMANIUK, Maxim. "Intervention at the Fourth World Synod of Bishops," in *Litterae-Nuntiae Archiepiscopi Maioris Ritus Byzantino-Ucraini* 10 (1974), pp. 17-19.
- HOECK, Johannes. "Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches," in Herbert VORGRIMLER, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder and Herder / Palm Publishers, 1967, pp. 307-331.
- HOLLINGSWORTH, Paul. "The Lesson Concerning the Life and Murder of the Blessed Passion-Bearers Borys and Hlib," in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1992, pp. 3-32.
- _____. "The Tale and Passion and Encomium of the Holy Martyrs Borys and Hlib," in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1992, pp. 97-116.
- _____. "The Tale of the Miracles of the Holy Passion-Bearers of Christ Roman and David," in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: English Translations, Vol. 2. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1992, pp. 117-134.

- HOLMES, Stephen. "Book Review: Marcel Sarot and Gijsbert van den Brink, eds. *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition: Contributions to Philosophical Theology*, vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999," in *Religious Studies: An International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion*, 36:4 (2000), pp. 501-504.
- HOLY OFFICE. "Ecclesia Catholica," in *AAS* 42 (1950), pp. 142-147.
- HOPKO, Thomas. *All the Fullness of God: Essays on Orthodoxy, Ecumenism and Modern Society*. Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1982.
- _____. "The Trinity in the Cappadocians," in Louis DUPRÉ, Don SALIERS and John MEYENDORFF, eds., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*. Crossroad: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997, pp. 260-275.
- HORIACHA, Mariia. "Ideia iedynoï Ukraïns'koyi Tserkvy ta Ukraïns'kyi ecumenizm [The Idea of One Ukrainian Church and Ukrainian Ecumenism]," in Lesia BACHYNS'KA and Liuba MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Ekumenizm v istorii Tserkvy: zdobutky, vtraty, perspektyvy* [Ecumenism in the History of the Church: Achievements, Failures, and Hopes for the Future]. L'viv: L'viv Theological Academy, 2001, pp. 70-89.
- HOUGH, Joseph, COBB, John. *Christian Identity and Theological Education*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- HRYNCHYSHYN, Michael. "The Current Situation of the Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine," in Bert GROEN and Wil van den BERCKEN, eds., *Four Hundred Years of the Union of Brest (1596-1996): A Critical Re-evaluation: Acta of the Congress Held at Hermen Castle, the Netherlands, in March 1996*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998, pp. 163-182.
- HRYNCHYSHYN, Taras. *Studiïna Hrupa Kyïvs'koï Tserkvy: Istorii ta otsinky* [The Kyivan Church Study Group: History and Evaluations]. Unpublished B.Th. Thesis. L'viv, Ukraine: L'viv Theological Academy, 2000.
- _____. "Do istorii Studiïnoi Hrupy Kyïvs'koï Tserkvy [Towards a History of the Kyivan Church Study Group]," in *Kovchek* 3 (2001), pp. 417-447.
- _____. "An Interview with the Patriarch of the Armenian Catholic Church, His Beatitude Nerses (Bedros) XIX," at http://www.risu.org.ua/content.php?page_id=114&l=en.
- HRYNIEWICZ, Waclaw,. *Przeszłość zostawić Bogu. Unia I uniatyzm w perspektywie ekumenicznej*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża, 1995; *Mynule zalyshyty Bohovi. Uniya I Uniatyzm v ekumenichniy persepektyvi* [To Leave the Past to God. Unia and Uniatism in an Ecumenical Perspective]." L'viv: Svichado, 1998.
- _____. "The Challenge of Our Hope: Christian Faith in Dialogue," at <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series04/IVA-32/chapter-17.htm>.

HUCULAK, Laurence. *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome (1596-1839)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Section I, Opera, no. 47. Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1990.

HUILLIER, Peter. *The Church of the Ancient Councils: The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992.

HUSAR, Lubomyr. "Lyst Blazhennishoho Liubomyra Huzara do Blazhennishoho Mytropolyta Volodymyra, Predstoiatelia Urayıns'koyı Pravoslavnoı Tserkvy [The Letter of His Beatitude Lubomyr Husar to His Beatitude Metropolitan Volodymyr, the Head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church]," at <http://www.ugcc.org.ua/ukr/documents/appeal2008/soprychastya/>.

_____. "One People of God in the Land of the Hills of Kyiv," at <http://lib.ugcc.org.ua/2004/04/13/kyiv/>.

INGLESSIS, Emilios. *Maximos IV: l'Orient conteste l'Occident*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

"Ispovid' viry vладыky Illi Zogbiia I pidderzhka Melkhits'koho Synodu [The Profession of Faith of Archbishop Elias (Zoghby) and Support of the Melkite Synod]," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 271-275.

JAEGER, Lorenz. *A Stand on Ecumenism: The Council's Decree*, trans. by Hilda Graef. London: G. Chapman, 1965.

JOINT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE
BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.
"The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity (Munich, 6 July 1982)," at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19820706_munich_en.html.

_____. "Faith, Sacraments and the Unity of the Church (Bari, 16 June 1987)," at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19870616_bari_en.html

_____. "The Sacrament of Order in the Sacramental Structure of the Church, with Particular Reference to the Importance of the Apostolic Succession for the Sanctification and Unity of the People of God (Valaamo 26 June 1988)," at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19880626_finland_en.html

_____. "Freising Statement," in *One in Christ* 26 (1990), pp. 362-365.

- _____. "Ariccia Working Draft," in *Sobornost* 13 (1992), pp. 49-54.
- _____. "Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion (Balamand Statement)," in *Eastern Churches Journal* 1:1 (1993/1994), pp. 29-35. Ukrainian translation in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 667-675.
- JOHN XXIII. "Ad Petri Cathedram," in *AAS* 51 (1959), pp. 497-531. English translation in *TPS* 5 (Autumn, 1959), pp. 359-383.
- _____. "Superno Dei Nutu," in *AAS* 52 (1960), pp. 435-436.
- _____. "Humanae Salutis," in *AAS* 54 (1962), pp. 5-13. English translation, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/apost_constitutions-/documents/hf_j-xxiii_apc_19611225_humanae-salutis_po.html
- _____. "Sacrae Laudis," in *AAS* 54 (1962), pp. 7-10.
- _____. "The Opening Address," at <http://www.dailycatholic.org-/history/21ecume1.htm>
- JOHN PAUL II. "Codex Iuris Canonici," in *AAS* 75/II (1983), pp. 1-324.
- _____. "Sacrae Disciplinae Leges," in *AAS* 75/II (1983), vii-xiv.
- _____. "Euntes in Mundum," at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_25011988_euntes-in-mundum-universum_it.html.
- _____. "Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium," in *AAS* 82 (1990), pp. 1033-1363.
- _____. "Sacri Canones," in *AAS* 82 (1990), pp. 1033-1044.
- _____. "Ut Unum Sint," in *AAS* 87 (1995), pp. 921-982.
- _____. "Orientale Lumen," in *AAS* 87 (1995), pp. 745-774.
- _____. "Address to the Conference Studying the Implementation of the Second Vatican Council," at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2000/janmar/documents/hf_jpii_spe-_0000227_vatican-council-ii_en.html
- JOHNSON, Maxwell. "Liturgy and Theology," in Paul BRADSHAW and Bryan SPINKS, eds., *Liturgy in Dialogue: Essays in Memory of Ronald Jasper*. Collegeville, MN.: The Liturgical Press, Pueblo Books, 1995, pp. 203-227.

- _____. "Lumen Gentium, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Vatican II," in JOHNSTON and ROTH, *The Church in the Modern World*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1967, 97-118.
- JUHASZ, Gabor. *Ecclesial "Communio": The Notion of Ecclesial "Communio" as Expressed in the Vatican II Teachings, the Code of Canon Law, and the Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Ottawa: Saint Paul University, 1995.
- KANAVATES, Vasos. "An Observer's Comment," in *Eastern Churches Review* 1 (1966), pp. 159-162.
- KARAS, Meliton. "Letter to Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos (18 February, 1994)," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 425-427.
- KARMIRIS, John. "Orthodox Comment on Vatican II: Declaration on Religious Freedom," in *Eastern Churches Review* 1 (1966), pp. 152-167.
- KAVANAGH, Aidan. "Response: Primary Theology and Liturgical Act," in *Worship* 57 (1983), pp. 321-324.
- KELEHER, Serge. "Out of the Catacombs: The Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine," in *Religion in Communist Lands* 19 (Wint. 1991), pp. 251-255.
- _____. "The Freising, Ariccia and Balamand Statements: An Analysis," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 427-463.
- _____. *Passion and Resurrection: The Persecution of the Greek Catholic Church in Soviet Ukraine (1939-1989)*. L'viv: Stauropegion, 1993.
- _____. "The Kievan Church Study Group: 'Impossible Dialogue'?" in Bert GROEN and Wil van den BERCKEN, eds., *Four Hundred Years of the Union of Brest (1596-1996): A Critical Re-evaluation: Acta of the Congress Held at Hermen Castle, the Netherlands, in March 1996*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998, pp.183-192.
- KELLY, John Norman Davidson. *Early Christian Doctrines*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1978.
- KESICH, Veselin. "Peter's Primacy in the New Testament and Early Tradition," in John MEYENDORFF, ed., *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992, pp. 35-66.
- "The Kievan Church Study Group," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 8-9.
- "Kievan Church Study Group Consultation at Chevetogne," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 265-267.
- "The Kievan Church Study Group: Ottawa Consultation," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 77-78.

- “The Kievan Church Study Group Convenes at Stamford Center,” in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 61:2 (10 January 1993), at <http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/19-93/029323>.
- KHOMYSHYN, Hryhoriï. “Pastyr’skyï lyst pro vizantiïstvo [Pastoral Letter on Byzantinism],” in *Nova Zoria* 29 (1931), pp. 3-9.
- KILMARTIN, Edward. *Christian Liturgy I. Theology*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988.
- KLOPPENBURG, Bonaventure. *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*, trans. by Matthew O’Connell. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1974.
- KOCHAN, Nataliya. “Chy Mozlyvyï Pravoslavno-Katolyts’kyï Dialoh v Ukraïni v Realiakh 90-kh Rokiv? [Is the Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue Possible in the Realities of the Last Decade of the XX Century in Ukraine?],” in Zenoviy ANTONIUK and Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Znaky Chasu* [The Signs of the Time]. Kyiv: Sfera, 1999, pp. 479-485.
- KOMAR, Yuliya. *Basic Antinomies of Spiritual Life in the Theological Thought of Paul Evdokimov*. Unpublished Saint Paul University M.A. Major Paper. Ottawa, 2001.
- KOMONCHAK, Joseph. “Clergy, Laity, and the Church’s Mission in the World,” in Madonna KOLBENSCHLAG, ed., *Between God and Caesar*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985, pp. 149-173.
- _____. “The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962),” in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 2. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 167-356.
- _____. “Vatican II as Ecumenical Council: Yves Congar’s Vision Realized,” at <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Vatican+II+as+ecumenical+council:+Yves+Gongar’s+vi-sion+realized-a094960929>.
- “Kontseptsiiia ekumenichnoï pozytsii Ukraïns’koï Hreko-Katolyts’koï Tserkvy [The Conception of the Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church],” in *Bohosloviia* 65:1-4 (2001), pp. 52-68.
- KOROLEVSKY, Cyril. *Metropolitan Andrey (1865-1944)*. L’viv: Stauropegion, 1993.
- _____. *Uniatism: Definition, Causes, Effects, Scope, Dangers, Remedies*, trans. by Serge Keleher. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publication, 2001.
- KOULOMZINE, Nicholas. “Peter’s Place in the Primitive Church,” in John MEYENDORFF, ed., *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992, pp. 11-34.

- KRAWCHENKO, Oleh. "Katolyts'ko-Pravoslavnyi dialoh I suchasna kryza mizh-tserkovnykh vidnosyn [Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue and the Current Crisis in Inter-Church Relations]," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 286-296.
- _____. "Response to Borys Gudziak: How Did They Drift Apart?" in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 67-69.
- _____. "Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: Sister Churches: Ecumenical Terminology in Search of Content," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 422- 426.
- KRAWCHUK, Andrii. "Volumen XXXV: Remarks from the Volume Editor," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 1-3.
- _____. *Christian Social Ethics: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky*, Edmonton, Ottawa, Toronto: MASI, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press. The Basilian Press, 1997.
- KUC, Daniel. *The Antinomic Approach to Theology and the Issue of the Dual Authorship of Sacred Scripture*. Unpublished Saint Paul University M.A./L.Th. Major Paper. Ottawa, 2001.
- KÜNG, Hans. *The Living Church: Reflections on the Second Vatican Council*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- _____. Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964.
- _____. *Structures of the Church*. New York: T. Nelson, 1964.
- _____. *The Changing Church: Reflections on the Progress of the Second Vatican Council*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1965.
- _____. *The Church*, trans. by Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden. London: Burns and Oates, 1967.
- _____. "On the State of the Catholic Church or Why a Book Like This is Necessary," in Hans KÜNG and Leonard SWIDLER, eds., *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987, pp. 1-17.
- _____. *Reforming the Church Today: Keeping Hope Alive*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- KUTASH, Ihor. "Response to Fr. Andrew Onuferko: The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 169-172.

- KYIVAN CHURCH STUDY GROUP. "Reflections on the Ariccia Working Draft by the Kievan Church Study Group: Meeting in Ottawa, April 21-23, 1993," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 79-81.
- _____. "Kievan Church Study Group: Composition, Aims, and Purposes," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 268-270.
- _____. "Kievan Church Study Group Statement on Church of Antioch Initiative," in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 73-74.
- "Kyivan Church Study Group Meets with Pope and Ecumenical Patriarch," in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 63:49 (3 March 1995), p. 3.
- LASH, Ephrem. "Response to Fr. Myroslaw Tataryn: Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 142-151.
- LAZARETH, William. "Response to Avery Dulles," in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 26-32.
- LAZOR, Paul. "The Uniate Question," in *The Orthodox Christian Way* 7:10 (1967), pp. 3-7.
- LEEMING, Bernard. *The Churches and the Church*. London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1960.
- _____. *The Vatican Council and Christian Unity: A Commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council, Together With a Translation of the Text*. London, Darton: Longman & Todd, 1966.
- LENCYK, Wasyl. *The Eastern Catholic Church and Czar Nicholas I*. Rome, New York: Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1966.
- Leo XIII. "Aeterni Patris" in *AAS* 12 (1879), pp. 97-115.
- _____. *Grande Munus*, in *AAS* 4, 13 (1880), 132-164.
- _____. *Praeclara Gratulationis*, in *AAS* 26 (1894), pp. 705-717.
- _____. *Provida Matris*, in *AAS* 27 (1895), pp. 178-187.
- _____. *Satis Cognitum*, in *AAS* 28 (1896), pp. 711-732.
- _____. "Divinum Illud Munus" in *AAS* 29 (1897), pp. 664-658.

- _____. "Orientalium Dignitas," in *AAS* 26 (1894), pp. 318-327. English translation in *The Vatican and the Eastern Christian Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documents Concerning the Eastern Churches*, trans. by Edward Stickland. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996, pp. 179-189.
- LERCARO, James. "De Oecumenismo on Common Worship," in Georges BAVAUD, ed., *Le Décret conciliaire sur l'oecuménisme: L'évolution d'une théologie et d'une Mentalité*. Fribourg-Paris: Editions Saint Paul, 1966, pp. 299-306.
- LIMOURIS, Gennadios. *Aide Mémoire on "Uniatism: A Concise Historical-Theological Study*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, July 1992.
- LINNAN, John. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church and Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church," in Timothy O'CONNELL, ed., *Vatican II and Its Documents: An American Reappraisal*. Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1986, pp. 39-61.
- LONG, John. "East and West in the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Unitas* 17:1 (1965), pp. 3-16.
- LOSSKY, Vladimir. *In the Image and Likeness of God*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1985.
- _____. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1998.
- LOSTEN, Basil. "The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 70-106.
- _____. "Opening Remarks of Bishop Basil (Losten), First Stamford Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group, October, 1992," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 357-363.
- _____. "Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 201-238.
- LUBAC, Henri de. *The Splendor of the Church*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- _____. "Quid significet Ecclesiam esse mysterium," in Adolfus SCHONMETZGER, ed., *Acta Congressus Internationalis de Theologia Concilii Vaticani II*. Vatican: Polyglot, 1968, pp. 23-38.
- _____. *The Church: Paradox and Mystery*, trans. by James Dunne. Staten Island, N.Y: Alba House, 1969.
- _____. *Mémoire sur l'Occasion de mes Écrits*. Namur: Culture et vérité, 1989.

- LUBACHIVSKY, Myroslav-Ivan. "Address on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Organization 'Church in Need' (6 November 1987)," in *Svoboda* (28 November 1987), p. 1.
- _____. "Letter to Cardinal Cassidy (3 August, 1993)," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 417-424.
- _____. "Letter to the Kievan Church Study Group," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 387-391.
- _____. "Pastyr's'ke zvernennia Blazhennishoho Myroslava-Ivana Kardynala Liubachiv's'koho pro iednist' Sviatykh Tserkov [Pastoral Letter of His Beatitude Myroslav-Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky on the Unity of the Holy Churches]," in *Eastern Churches Journal* 1:2 (1993/1994), pp. 7-47 and in *Kovcheh* 2 (2000), pp. 461-486.
- LUKA, Oksana. *Antinomy in Eastern Christian Iconography*. Unpublished Saint Paul University L.Th. Major Paper. Ottawa, 2001.
- LUYKX, Boniface. "Response to the Presentation by Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos: Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?" in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 172-199.
- _____. "Thirty Years Later: Reflections on Vatican II's *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 364-387.
- MACDONALD, Allan. *Hildebrand: A Life of Gregory VII*. Merrick, NY: Richwood, 1976.
- MACQUARRIE, John. *Principles of Christian Theology*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.
- MADEY, John. *Ecumenism, Ecumenical Movement and Eastern Churches*. Kottayam, India: Oriental Institute of Religious Studies Publications, 1987.
- _____. *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien: Vers la Perfection de l'État Juridique Actuel*. Rome: Opera Theologicae Societatis Scientificaе Ucrainorum, 1971.
- _____. "Vatican Council II's Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches and Its Ecumenical Importance," *Diakonia* 7:3 (1972), pp. 222-251.
- MAGOCSI, Paul, ed. *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts'kyi*. Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1989.

- MAILLEUX, Paul. "Eastern Churches," in Walter ABBOTT, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, trans. by Joseph Gallagher. New York: America Press, 1966, pp. 371-372.
- MAJDANSKY, Vsevolod. "Response to Bishop Basil (Losten): Patriarch and Pope: Different Levels of Roman Authority," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 239-258.
- _____. "Divisions and Healing: Brest and Beyond," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 133-152.
- _____. "Does the Restoration of Communion between Constantinople and the Greco-Catholic Church of Kiev Require a Break of Communion with Rome?" in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 152-171.
- _____. "'Mediate' and 'nearly perfect' Communion?" in *Eastern Churches Journal* 3:3 (1996), pp. 7-22.
- _____. "Orthodox-Catholic Reconciliation and the Ukrainian Church," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 199-218.
- _____. "The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church: Address on the Occasion of the Religious Conference Sponsored by the St. Sophia Association of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, 2 December 1989," in Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, ed., *We are ALL Brothers: A Collection of the Writings of Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos*. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1999, pp. 1-20.
- _____. "Shine Forth, O Jerusalem," in Vsevolod MAJDANSKY, ed., *We are ALL Brothers: A Collection of the Writings of Bishop Vsevolod of Scopelos*. Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1999, pp. 21-28.
- MANNA, Salvatore. "Commento al Decreto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche," in Giovanni DISTANTE and Salvatore MANNA eds., *Concilium Vaticanum (2um: 1962-1965): Decreto sulle Chiese Orientali Cattoliche: Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1986, 118-135.
- MARTINA, Giacomo. "The Historical Context in Which the Idea of a New Ecumenical Council Was Born," in Rene LATOURELLE, ed., *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, vol. 3. New York: Paulist Press, 1988-1989, pp. 3-81.
- MARYNOVYCH, Myroslav. "Rozdumy odnoho myrianyyna nad problemoiu ekumenizmu [Reflections of a Layman on the Problem of Ecumenism]," in Zenoviy ANTONIUK and Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Znaky Chasu [The Signs of the Time]*. Kyiv: Sfera, 1999, pp. 486-501.

- _____. "An Ecumenist Analyzes the History and Prospects of Religion In Ukraine," at <http://www.ecumenicalstudies.org.ua/eng/materials.texts/marynovych/chapter.2/> .
- MASCALL, Eric. "Vatican II on the Church and Ecumenism: An Anglican Comment," in *New Blackfriars* (April, 1965), pp. 386-395.
- MAXIMOS IV. "Der katholische Orient und die christliche Einheit, Unsere Berufung als Werkzeug der Einigung," in *Una Sancta* 16 (1961), pp. 5- 12.
- _____. "Servant of Servants of God," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 72-75.
- _____. "The Supreme Senate of the Catholic Church," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 133-137.
- _____. *L'Eglise Greque Melkite au Concile*. Damas, Syrie: Patriarcats Grec Melkite Catholique, 1967.
- MCNAMARA, Kevin. "Ecumenism in the Light of Vatican II," in Michael Adams, ed., *Vatican II on Ecumenism*. Dublin: Scepter Books, 1967.
- _____. "Introduction to the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*," in Kevin McNAMARA, ed., *The Church: A Theological and Pastoral Commentary on the Constitution on the Church*. Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1983, pp. 51-234.
- MCPARTLAN, Paul. *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*. Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1993.
- MEGYER, Eugene. "Theological Trends: Spiritual Theology Today," in *The Way* 21 (1981), pp. 55-66.
- MEYENDORFF, John. "Towards the Roman Council: Notes and Comments," in *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 5:3 (1961), pp. 45-47.
- _____. "Contemporary Orthodox Concept of the Church, in Charles O'NEILL, ed., *Ecumenism and Vatican II*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1964, pp. 28-43.
- _____. "Vatican II: A Preliminary Reaction," in *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 9:1 (1965), pp. 26-37.
- _____. *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

- _____. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- _____. "Saint Peter in Byzantine Theology," in John MEYENDORFF, ed., *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992, pp. 67-90.
- MEYER, Harding. "The Decree on Ecumenism: A Protestant Viewpoint," in *The Ecumenical Review* 37 (1985), pp. 320-325.
- MICHALSKI, Melvin. *The Relationship Between the Universal Priesthood of the Baptized and the Ministerial Priesthood of the Ordained in Vatican II and in Subsequent Theology: Understanding "Essentia et non Tantum," Lumen Gentium no. 10*. Lewiston, N.Y, Queenston, Ont: E. Mellen Press, 1996.
- MIGNE, Jacques-Paul, ed. *Patrologia Latina*. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1844-1855.
- _____. *Patrologia Graeca*. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1857-1866.
- Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine: A Symposium*. Ottawa: Saint Paul University, 1987.
- MOELLER, Charles. "Le Ferment des idées dans l'élaboration de la Constitution," in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAUNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, pp. 85-120.
- MÖHLER, Johann. *Die Einheit in der Kirche* [Unity in the Church]. Tübingen, 1825.
- MONCHAK, Ihor. "Stanovyshche Verkhovnoho Arkhyiepyskopa v iierarkhichnomu ustroiu Tserkvy [The Position of Major Archbishops in the Oriental Churches]," in *Bohosloviia* 28 (1964), pp. 125-151.
- _____. *Samoupravna Kyivs'ka Tserkva* [The Self-Governing Kyivan Church]. L'viv: Svichado, 1994.
- MOROZIUK, Russell. *Politics of a Church Union*. Chicago: Church Herald, 1983.
- NABAA, Philip. "Ecumenism and Intercommunion According to Vatican Council II," in Georges BAVAUD, ed., *Le Décret conciliaire sur l'oecuménisme: L'évolution d'une théologie et d'une mentalité*. Fribourg-Paris: Editions Saint Paul, 1966, pp. 294-299.

- NAZAROV, Illya, FILIPDENKO, Nataliya. "Zamietki po povodu odnoï ekumenicheskoi initsyativy [Comments Regarding One Ecumenical Initiative]," in *Vesnik of the UOC*, at http://www.pravosla-vye.org.ua/index.php?action=fullinfo&r_type=article&id=12981.
- NELSON, Claud. *The Vatican Council and All Christians*. New York: Association Press, 1962.
- NEUNHEUSER, Burkhard. "Église Universelle et Église Locale," in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAÚNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L'Église de Vatican II*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, pp. 607-638.
- NEWMAN, John Henry. "Letter to Lord Blachford" and "Letter to William Froude," in Charles Stephen Dessain and Thomas Gornall, eds., *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol. 27. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, pp. 212-213 and 336-338.
- New Revised Standard Version, The Holy Bible*. New York: American Bible Society, 1989.
- NICOLAU, Miguel. *L'Ecumenismo nel Concilio Vaticano II: Testo del decreto e commento teologico-pastorale*. Rome: Coletti, 1966.
- NISSIOTIS, Nikos. "Ecclesiology and Ecumenism of the Second Session of the Vatican Council II," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10:1 (1964), pp. 15-36.
- _____. "Is the Vatican Council Really Ecumenical?" in *The Ecumenical Review* 16:4 (1964), pp. 357-377.
- _____. "The Main Ecclesiological Problem of the Second Vatican Council and the Position of the Non-Roman Churches Facing It," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 2:1 (1965), pp. 31-62.
- _____. "Orthodox Reflections on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (1966), pp. 329-342.
- _____. "Report on the Second Vatican Council," in *The Ecumenical Review* 18:2 (1966), pp. 190-206.
- _____. "Transfigured World," in Philip MAURY, ed., *Discerning the Times: The Church in Today's World*. Techny, Ill.: Divine Word Publications, 1968, pp. 47-72.
- _____. "Towards a New Ecumenical Era," in *The Ecumenical Review*, 37 (1985), pp. 326-335.
- O'CONNELL, Patrick. *Vatican II: The Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Dublin: Scepter, 1965.

- O’GARA, Margaret. *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988.
- O’KEEFE, Vincent. “Foreword,” in Charles O’NEILL, ed., *Ecumenism and Vatican II*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1964, p. v.
- OLUDARE, Tai. *The Church as Communion on Mission: Vatican II Ecclesiology of Communion and Its Missionary Implications*. Rome: Pontifical Urban University, 1996.
- O’NEILL, Colman. “Commentary on Chapter One: The Mystery of the Church,” in Austin FLANNERY, ed., *Vatican II: The Church Constitution*. Chicago: Priory Press, 1966, pp. 27-42.
- “On the Unity of the Eastern and Syriac Orthodox Churches,” in *The World* (April 1992), pp. 5-9 and in *Eastern Churches Journal* 1 (1993-1994), pp. 1, 114-117.
- ONUFERKO, Andrew. “Interviu z Vladykoiu Kallistos (Ware): Oksford, 12 serpnia 1992 [Interview with Bishop Kallistos (Ware): Oxford, 12 August 1992],” in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 314-318.
- _____. “The New Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: Ecclesiological Presuppositions,” in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 133-168.
- _____. “Doslidnyts’ka hrupa Kyïvs’koï Tserkvy: Svoiechasna initsiatyva [The Kyivan Church Study Group: A Timely Initiative],” at http://www.ecumenicalstudies.org.ua/data/doc/friendship/onu-ferko_ukr.doc.
- "Oxford Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 29:3-4 (1992), p. 501.
- PAPADOPOULOS, Chrysostom. *Nature and Character of Uniatism*. Athens, 1928.
- PARKER, Matthew. “The Medieval Origins of the Idea of the Church as a ‘Societas Perfecta,’” in *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1961.
- PARTICIPANTS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON THE ECUMENICAL DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN 1964 AND 1974. “The Decree on Ecumenism - Ten Years After: Observations and Reflections,” in Gerard BÉKÉS and Vilmos VAJTA, eds., *Unitatis Redintegratio, 1964-1974: The Impact of the Decree on Ecumenism*. Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1977, pp. 164-176.
- PAUL VI. “Salvete Fratres,” in *AAS* 55 (1963), pp. 841-859. English translation in *TPS* 9 (29 September 1963), pp. 125-141.

- _____. "The Task," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 25-28.
- _____. *Speech at End of Vatican II*. Vatican City: Vatican Press Office, 1965.
- _____. "The Speech to the Participants in the General Session of the Vatican Council (November 18, 1965)," at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_pvi_spe_19651118_pe-nultima-sessione-concilio_lt.html.
- _____. "Quanti Pensieri," in *AAS* 59 (1967), pp. 39-40.
- _____. Lugduni, in Urbe, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/letters/1974/documents/hf_p-vi_let_19741019_centenario-concilio-ecumenico_lt.html.
- PELIKAN, Jaroslav. *Confessor Between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Josyf Slipyj*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- _____. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine: Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (Since 1700)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- PELLEGRINO, Michele. "L'étude des pères de l'Eglise dans la perspective conciliaire," in *Irénikon* 38 (1965), pp. 453-461.
- PHILIPS, Dewi. "Reflecting on Identity and Change," in Marcel SAROT and Gijsbert van den BRINK, eds., *Identity and Change in the Christian Tradition: Contributions to Philosophical Theology*, vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999, pp. 13-41.
- PHILIPS, Gérard. "Die Geschichte der Dogmatischen Konstitution über die Kirche 'Lumen gentium,'" in *LTK - Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil*, vol. I. Freiburg: Herder & Herder, 1966, pp. 139-155.
- _____. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: History of the Constitution," in Herbert VORGRIMLER, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder and Herder / Palm Publishers, 1967, pp. 105-137.
- PIUS IX. *Omnem Sollicitudinem*, in *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* 6:1. Rome: Typographia Vaticana, 1878.
- PIUS X. "Doctoris Angelici," in *AAS* 6 (1914), pp. 336-341.
- _____. "Ea Semper," in *AAS* 41 (1908), pp. 7-12.
- PIUS XI. "Studiorum Ducem," in *AAS* 15 (1923), pp. 309-326.

_____. "Mortalium Animos," in *AAS* 20 (1928), pp. 5-16.

PIUS XII. "Divino Afflante Spiritu," in *AAS* 35 (1943), pp. 297-335.

_____. "Mystici Corporis," in *AAS* 35 (1943), pp. 193-248. English translation, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_pxii_enc_29061943_mysti-ci-corporis-christi_en.html.

_____. "Orientales Omnes," in *AAS* 38 (1946), pp. 33-63.

_____. "Mediator Dei," in *AAS* 39 (1947), pp. 521-595.

_____. "Humani Generis," in *AAS* 42 (1950), pp. 561-577.

_____. "Postquam Apostolicis Litteris," in *AAS* 44 (1952), pp. 65-152.

_____. "Cleri Sanctitati," in *AAS* 49 (1957), pp. 433-600.

_____. "Fidei Donum," in *AAS* 49 (1957), pp. 225-248.

PLIGUZOV, Andrei. "On the Title 'Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'," in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15 (1991), pp. 340-353.

PONS, Miguel Nicolau, and DANIELLOU, Jean, eds. *La Iglesia del Concilio Vaticano II: Comentario a la Constitución dogmática "Lumen Gentium."* Bilbao: Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1966.

PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY. "Press Release Regarding the Suppression of the Title 'Patriarch of the West' in the 'Anuario Pontificio' 2006," at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/general-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20060322_patriarca-occidente_fr.html.

POSPIELOVSKY, Dimitriy. "The Eastern Rite Catholics and the Orthodox in Today's Ukraine," *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), pp. 17-23.

POSPISHIL, Victor. *The New Code of Oriental Canon Law: Law on Persons*. Ford City: St. Mary's Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1960.

_____. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum, The Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches of the II Council of Vatican: Canonical-Pastoral Commentary*. Bronx, N.Y: Fordham University, John XXIII Center for Eastern Christian Studies, 1965.

_____. "The Ukrainian Major Archiepiscopate," in *Diakonia* 3 (1968), pp. 3-24.

_____. "An Autonomous Ukrainian Catholic Church," in *Diakonia* 6:3 (1971), pp. 232-266.

- _____. The Quest for an Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate. Philadelphia: Ukrainian Publishin, 1971.
- _____. *Ex Occidente Lex: The Eastern Catholic Churches Under the Tutelage of the Holy See of Rome*. Carteret, N.J.: St. Mary's Religious Action Fund, 1979.
- POTTMEYER, Hermann. *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I and II*, trans. by Matthew O'Connell. New York: Crossroad, 1998.
- _____. "Recent Discussions on Primacy in Relation to Vatican I," in Walter KASPER, ed., *The Petrine Ministry: Catholics and Orthodox in Dialogue*, trans. by the Staff of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. New York: Newman Press, 2006, pp. 210-230.
- POWELL, John. *The Mystery of the Church*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1967.
- PROCKO, Bohdan. *Ukrainian Catholics in America: A History*. Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1987.
- PRUSAK, Bernard. *The Canonical Concept of Particular Church Before and After Vatican II*. Rome: Pontificia Universita Lateranense, 1967.
- PUJOL, Clement. "The Conciliar Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches," in *Unitas* 17 (1965), pp. 22-39.
- _____. "The Care and Organization of Particular Churches (Second Vatican Council, Decree 'Orientalium Ecclesiarum' n. 4)," in Jacob VELLIAN, ed., *The Malabar Church: Symposium in Honour of Rev. Placid Podipara C.M.I.* Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970, pp. 209-224.
- RAHNER, Karl. "The Episcopate and the Primacy," in *Quaestiones disputatae* 4. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961, pp. 11-36.
- _____. *The Church and the Sacraments*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- _____. *The Church After the Council*, trans. by D. Herron and R. Albrecht. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1966.
- _____. "The Hierarchical Structure of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular," in John WRIGHT, ed., *Meditations on the Church, Based on the Constitution on the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967, pp. 104-107.
- _____. *The Shape of the Church to Come*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.

- _____. *Ecclesiology, Questions in the Church, the Church in the World*. London: Longman & Todd, 1976.
- _____. *Theological Investigations: Ecclesiology, Questions in the Church, The Church in the World*, trans. by David Bourke. New York: Seabury Press, 1976.
- _____. "Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II," in RICHARD, HARRINGTON and O'MALLEY, *Vatican II, the Unfinished Agenda*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987, pp. 9-70.
- _____. *Humane Society and the Church of Tomorrow*. New York: Crossroad, 1991.
- RATZINGER, Joseph. "La collegialita episcopale: spiegazione teologica del testo conciliare," in Guilheme BARAUNA, ed., *La Chiesa del Vaticano II*. Firenze: Vallecchi, 1965, pp. 738-747.
- _____. *Konstitution über die Kirche*. Freiburg: Herder & Herder, 1965.
- _____. "Primacy, Episcopate, and Apostolic Succession," in *Quaestiones disputatae* 4. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961, pp. 37-63.
- _____. *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*. New York: Paulist Press, 1966.
- _____. *Das neue Volk Gottes*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1972.
- _____. "The Ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council," in *Communio* 13:3 (1986), pp. 239-252.
- _____. *Principles of Catholic Theology*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987.
- _____. *Church, Ecumenism, and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology*. New York: Crossroad, 1988.
- _____. "The Church as an Essential Dimension of Theology," in *Grail* 6 (1990), pp. 73-100.
- _____. *Introduction to Christianity*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990.
- RICCARDI, Andrea. "The Tumultuous Opening of the Council," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 2. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 1-68.
- RICHARD, Lucien. "Vatican II and the Mission of the Church: A Contemporary Agenda," in Lucien RICHARD, Daniel HARRINGTON and John O'MALLEY, eds., *Vatican II, the Unfinished Agenda: A Look to the Future*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987, pp. 57-67.

RIGA, Peter. *The Church Renewed*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

_____. *New Horizons for the People of God: A Commentary on Vatican II's Constitution on the Church*. Wichita: Liturgical Commission, 1966.

RIKHOT, Herwi. "Vatican II and the Collegiality of Bishops: A Reading of *Lumen Gentium* 22 and 23," in James PROVOST and Knut WALF, eds., *Collegiality Put to the Test*, trans. by James Bowden. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 71-94.

"Rishennia i postanovy Synodiv Ukraïns'koï Hreko-Katolyts'koï Tserkvy, 1989-1997 [Decisions and Resolutions of the Synods of the UGCC, 1989-1997]," L'viv, 1998.

RIVA, Clemente. *La Chiesa in dialogo: la 3a sessione del Concilio Ecumenico*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1965.

ROBINSON, Ian. *The Papacy 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

_____. ed. *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century: Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

"The Rome 1995 Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 125-132.

ROOT, Howard. "Ecumenism," in Bernard PAWLEY, ed., *The Second Vatican Council: Studies by Eight Anglican Observers*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 112-148.

ROUSSEAU, Olivier. "La Constitution 'Lumen Gentium' dans le cadre des mouvements rénovateurs de théologie et de pastorale des dernières décades," in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAUNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, pp. 37-56.

_____. "Une des grandes figures du concile. Le Patriarche Maximos IV (1878-1967)," in *Revue Nouvelle* 47 (1968), pp. 64-70.

ROUX, Hébert. "Comments on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *The Ecumenical Review* 17:2 (1965), pp. 104-107.

RUGGIERI, Giuseppe. "Appunti per una teologia in papa Roncalli," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO, ed., *Papa Giovanni*. Rome-Bari, 1987, pp. 245-271.

RUNCIE, Robert. "Address on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Decree on Ecumenism: Westminster Cathedral Celebrates," in *One in Christ* 25:4 (1989), pp. 383-387.

RYNNE, Xavier. *The Second Session*. London: Herder & Herder 1964.

_____. *The Third Session*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1965.

SAKVUK, Yuriy. *The Origins and Development of the Ethnoreligious Conflict Between Chalcedonians and Monophysites: Analysis and Theological Reflections*. Unpublished M.A. Major Paper. Ottawa, Saint Paul University, 2000.

_____. *Theology of Paradox and a Search for Antinomy in Paul's Evdokimov's Life and Thought*. Unpublished L.Th. Major Paper. Ottawa, Saint Paul University, 2001.

SAMUEL, Vincent. *A Theological Reflection on Evangelization to the Full Realization of the Church As the Universal Sacrament of Salvation According to Lumen Gentium N. 48*. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Urbaniana, Faculty of Theology, 1987.

SCHICK, Edward. "Importance of the Local Church," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 35-38.

SCHILLEBEECKX, Edward. *Vatican II: A Struggle of Minds, and Other Essays*. Dublin: Gill, 1963.

_____. "The Church and Mankind," in *Concilium* 1. New York: Paulist Press, 1965, pp. 34-50.

SCHMEMANN, Alexander. "Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches: A Responce," in Walter ABBOTT, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, trans. by Joseph Gallagher. New York: America Press, 1966, pp. 387-388.

_____. "Liturgical Theology, Theology of Liturgy, and Liturgical Reform," in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 13:4 (1969), pp. 217-224.

_____. "Liturgy and Theology," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 (1972), 86-100.

_____. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1975.

_____. "The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," in John MEYENDORFF, ed., *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1992, pp. 145-171.

SCHRECK, Alan. *The Catholic Challenge: Why Just "Being Catholic" Isn't Enough Anymore*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Publications, 1991.

- SCHREITER, Robert. *Constructing Local Theologies*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1985.
- _____. *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997.
- SCHULZ, Hans Joachim. "The Dialogue with the Orthodox," in *Concilium* IV:1 (April, 1965), pp. 67-71.
- SCIACCA, Franklin. "In Imitation of Christ: Boris and Gleb and the Ritual Conversion of the Russian Land," in *Slavic Review* 49 (1990), pp. 253-260.
- SCRIMA, André. "Simples réflexions d'un Orthodoxe sur la Constitution," in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAUNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, pp. 1279-1294.
- SENYK, Sophia. "The Ukrainian Church and Latinization," in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56 (1990), pp. 165-187.
- _____. "The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church Today: Universal Values Versus Nationalist Doctrines," in *Religion, State and Society* 30:4 (2002), pp. 317-332.
- SHABAN, Ihor. *Eklezjologiczne Poszukiwania Grupy Studyjnej Kosciola Kijowskiego* [Ecclesiological Searches of the Kyivan Church Study Group]. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Lublin, Poland: Lublin Catholic University, 2000.
- _____. "Ekleziolohichni Priorytety Studiynoï Hrupy Kyivs'koï Tserkvy [Ecclesiological Priorities of the Kyivan Church Study Group]," in *Kovcheh* 3 (2001), pp. 448-462.
- SHEPTYTSKYĬ, Andreï. "Dar Piatydesiatnytsi [The Gift of Pentecost]," in Andreï SHEPTYTSKYĬ, *Tvory: Asketychno-moral'ni* [Works: Ascetical-Moral]. L'viv: Svichado, 1994, pp. 417-456.
- SHERIDAN, Michael. *The Theology of the Local Church in Vatican II*. Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1980.
- SIGURBJÜRNSSON, Einar. *Ministry Within the People of God: The Development of the Doctrines on the Church and on the Ministry in the Second Vatican Council's De Ecclesia*. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974.
- SILANES, Nereo. *La Iglesia de la Trinidad: La Santísima Trinidad en el Vaticano II*. Salamanca: Ediciones Secretariado Trinitario, 1981.
- SKIRA, Jaroslav. "Ecclesiology in the International Orthodox-Catholic Ecumenical Dialogue," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 41:4 (1996), pp. 359-374.

- SLIPYĬ, Īosyf. "Zur Lage der Ukrainischen Katholischen Kirche in der Ukraine?" // Zvit Blazhennishoho Patriarkha Īosyfa pro Ukraĭns'ku Katolyts'ku Tserkvu v Ukraĭni [The Report of His Beatitude Patriarch Josyf about the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine], in Ivan KHOMA and Ivan MUZYCHKA, eds., *Opera omnia Josephi (Slipyj-Kobernyckyj-Dyčkovskyj) Patriarchae et Cardinalis // Tvory Patriarkha I Kardynala Īosyfa: Poslannia, propovidi, promovy I pryvity (1976-1984)* [Works by the Patriarch and Cardinal Josyf: Letters, Sermons, Speeches, and Addresses (1976-1984)], vol. XIV. Rome: Universitas Catholica Ucrainorum, 1985, pp. 264-279.
- _____. "Pro poiednannia v Khrysti [On the Unity in Christ]," in Zenoviy ANTONIUK and Myroslav MARYNOVYCH, eds., *Znaky Chasu* [The Signs of the Time]. Kyiv: Sfera, 1999, pp. 143-145.
- _____. "Zavishchannia Blazhennishoho Patriarkha Īosyfa Slipoho [Testament of His Beatitude Patriarch Josyf Slipyj]," in *Bohosloviia* 66:3-4 (2002), pp. 10-27.
- SMALL, Joseph. "Ecclesial Identity and Ecumenical Decisions in the Presbyterian Church," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 37 (2000), pp. 1-12.
- SMEDT, Emile Joseph de. "The Priesthood of All Believers," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 38-41.
- SOETENS, Claude. "The Ecumenical Commitment of the Catholic Church," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 3. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 257-346.
- SOROKOWSKI, Andrew. "Vatican Diplomacy and the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church," in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 47-66.
- STACPOOLE, Alberic, ed. *Vatican II by Those Who Were There*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986.
- "The Stamford Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 355-356.
- STAVRIDIS, Basilios. "Zum Dekret über die katholischen Ostkirchen," in Damaskinos PAPANDREOU, ed., *Stimmen der Orthodoxie. Zu Grundfragen des II. Vatikanums*. Wien-Freiburg-Basel: Herder, 1969, pp. 117-134.
- STENGER, Mary Ann. "The Significance of Paradox for Theological Verification: Difficulties and Possibilities," in *The International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion* 14 (1983), pp. 170-179.

- STOGRE, Michael. "Commentary on the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," in George SCHNER, ed., *The Church Renewed: The Documents of Vatican II Reconsidered*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986, pp. 19-38.
- STRANSKY, Thomas. "The Decree on Ecumenism: An Analysis," in *One in Christ* 2:1 (1966), pp. 5-26.
- _____. *The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council: A New Translation by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, With a Commentary*. Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965.
- _____. "The Separated Churches and Ecclesial Communities: Commentary on Chapter Three of the Decree," in Michael ADAMS, ed., *Vatican II on Ecumenism*. Dublin: Scepter Books, 1967, pp. 44-58.
- SULLIVAN, Francis. "The Decree on Ecumenism: Presuppositions and Consequences," in *One in Christ* 26:1-2 (1990), pp. 7-19.
- SUTTNER, Ernst. *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism*. Rome: Bangalore, Dharmaram Publications, 1991.
- SYNOD OF THE ANTIOCHIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH. "Letter to His Beatitude Maximos V (Hakim)," at <http://www.ratzinger.it/documenti/BeatitudeMaximos.htm>.
- Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum habita in civitate Zamosciae anno MDCCXX*, edition tertia. Rome: Propaganda Fide, 1883.
- TAFT, Robert. "Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner," in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 13-58.
- _____. "Reflections on 'Uniatism' in the Light of Some Recent Books," in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 65:11 (1999), pp. 33-71.
- TANNER, Norman, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 2. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press, 1990.
- TATARYN, Myroslaw. "Russian Orthodox Attitudes Towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church," in *Religion in Communist Lands* 17 (Wint. 1989), pp. 313-331.
- _____. "Papal Primacy, Local Primacy and Episcopal Collegiality," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 117-141.
- _____. "What is Eastern Catholic Theology? Beyond Classicism Towards Liberation," in *Logos* 39:1 (1998), pp. 89-107.

- TAVARD, George. *The Church of Tomorrow*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.
- _____. "The Hierarchical Structure of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular," in John WRIGHT, ed., *Meditations on the Church, Based on the Constitution on the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967, pp. 103-104.
- _____. "Vatican II, Understood and Misunderstood," in *One in Christ* 27:3 (1991), pp. 209-221.
- _____. *The Church, Community of Salvation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- TAWIL, Joseph. "A Voice from the East," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 193-196.
- TEKIPPE, Terry. *Papal Infallibility: An Application of Lonergan's Theological Method*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983.
- TELLENBACH, Gerd. *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Crisis*, trans. by Ralf Bennett. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- TETTAMANZI, Dionigi. "The Church: Mystery, Communion, Mission," in *The Laity Today* 32-33 (1989-1990), pp. 21-32.
- THIELICKE, Helmut. "The Restatement of New Testament Mythology," in Hans BARTSCH, ed., *Kerygma and Myth*. London: S.P.C.K., 1957, pp. 138-174.
- THILS, Gustave. *Le décret sur l'oecuménisme: commentaire doctrinal*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1966.
- TIERNEY, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- TILLARD, Jean Marie Roger. "The Church of God is a Communion: The Ecclesiological Perspective of Vatican II," in *One in Christ* 17:2 (1981), pp. 117-131.
- _____. *The Bishop of Rome*, trans. by John de Satge. Wilmington, Del: M. Glazier, 1983.
- _____. *Flesh of the Church, Flesh of Christ: at the Source of the Ecclesiology of Communion*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- _____. *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992.

- TIRO, Prosper. "Capitula Coelestini 8," in MIGNE, in Jacques-Paul, ed., *Patrologia Graeca* 51. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1857-1866, pp. 205-212.
- TISSERANT, Eugène. *Eastern Christianity in India*. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1957.
- TRACY, David. "Recent Catholic Spirituality: Unity amid Diversity," in Louis DUPRÉ, Don SALIERS and John MEYENDORFF, eds., *Christian Spirituality: Post-Reformation and Modern*. Crossroad: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998, pp. 143-173.
- TYRRELL, George. *Unitatis Redintegratio: Texte du décret, notes et commentaries par une équipe de laïcs et de prêtres*. Tours: Mame, 1965.
- _____. *External Religion: Its Use and Abuse*. London: Sands and co, 1899.
- "UCAF: Ecumenical Organization," at <http://www.ecumenicalstudies.org.ua/eng/fellowship/>.
- UGOLNIK, Anthony. "An Anxiety of Influence": A Response to Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx)," in *Logos* 34:3-4 (1993), pp. 388-395.
- _____. "Response to Fr. Peter Galadza: Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 195-200.
- "U.S. Orthodox/Roman Catholic dialogue – Eastern Europe: Antipathy Between Churches," in *Origins* 22 (11 June, 1992), pp. 76-89.
- VALDMAN, Traian. "Che Cosa Significa per un Ortodosso Unitatis Redintegratio?" in *Studi Ecumenici* 2:4 (1984), pp. 597-615.
- VALIYAVILAYIL, Anthony. "The Notion of a *Sui Iuris* Church," in José CHIRAMEL and Kuriakose BHARANIKULANGARA, eds., *The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: A Study and Interpretation. Essays in Honour of Joseph Cardinal Parecatil, President, Pontifical Commission for the Revision of Eastern Canon Law*. Alwaye, India, 1992, pp. 60-64.
- VELYKY, Athanasius, ed. *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia*, vol. 2. Rome, 1955.
- _____ and HOLOVATS'KYĬ, Rodion, eds. *Vselens'kyĭ Sobor Vatykans'kyĭ II: Diiannia i postanovy* [Ecumenical Council Vatican II: Proceedings and Resolutions], vol. 1. Rome: Vydavnytstvo Ottsiv Vasylian, 1965.
- _____. *Documenta Unionis Berestensis Eiusque Auctorum (1590-1600)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Sectio III. Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1970.

- VILLIAN, Maurice. "The Debate on the Decree on Ecumenism," in *Concilium* 14. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1966, pp. 114-136.
- VISCUSO, Patrick. "Twenty-Five Years after Vatican II: An Orthodox Perspective," in Perre HEGY, ed., *The Church in the Nineties: Its Legacy, Its Future*. Collgeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1993, pp. 279-289.
- VODOPIVEC, Janez. *Ecclesiologia: Originale nel Dizionario del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*. Rome: Urbaniana University Press, 1981.
- VOGEL, Arthur. "The Decree on Ecumenism and the Challenge of the Future," in Thaddeus HORGAN, ed., *Walking Together: Roman Catholics and Ecumenism Twenty-Five Years After Vatican II*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990, pp. 1-10.
- VORONOVSKYĬ, Iulian. "Ekumenichni Pytannia: Referat pid chas Synodu Iepyskopiv u L'vovi, 16-31 travnia, 1992 [Ecumenical Questions: A Paper Composed at the Time of the Synod of Bishops, 16-31 May, 1992]," in *Logos* 34: 1-2 (1993), pp. 302-304.
- VRIES, Wilhelm de. *Wegbereitung zur Einheit der Christen aus ostkirchlicher Sicht*. Recklinghausen, 1961.
- WAINWRIGHT, Geoffrey. *Doxology*. London: Oxford University Press; New York: Epworth Press, 1980.
- _____. "The Praise of God in the Theological Reflections of the Church," in *Interpretation* 39 (1985), pp. 34-45.
- WALF, Knut. "Die Katholische Kirche: eine 'societas perfecta,'" in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 157 (1977), pp. 32-48.
- WARE, Kallistos. "The Church of God: Our Shared Vision," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 10-30.
- _____. "Response to the Presentation by His Grace, Bishop Basil (Losten): The Roman Primacy and the Church of Kiev," in *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), pp. 107-116.
- _____. "Response to Fr. Andriy Chirovsky: Toward an Ecclesial Self-Identity for the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church," in *Logos* 35:1-4 (1994), pp. 125-132.
- WEAKLAND, Rembert. "Roman Catholic and Orthodox Dialogue: The Larger Picture," in *Ecumenism* 107 (1992), pp. 27-38.
- WEIGEL, Gustave. "How Is the Council Going?" in *America* 109 (December 7, 1963), pp. 730-732.

- WILLEBRANDS, Johannes. "Vatican II's Ecclesiology of Communion," in *One in Christ*, 23:3-4 (1987), pp. 179-191.
- _____. "Message to Cardinal Hume," in *One in Christ* 25:4 (1989), pp. 381-382.
- WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- WITTSTADT, Klaus. "On the Eve of the Second Vatican Council (July 1 - October 10, 1962)," in Giuseppe ALBERIGO and Joseph KOMONCHAK (English version), eds., *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1995, pp. 405-500.
- WOJNAR, Meletius. "Decree on the Oriental Catholic Churches," in *The Jurist* 25 (1965), pp. 173-255.
- _____. "Rites, Canonical," in William MCDONALD, editor in chief, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 12. New York, Saint Louis, San Francisco, Toronto, London, Sydney: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967, pp. 514-518.
- WOOD, Susan. "The Theology of Communion as an Ecumenical Resource," in *Ecumenical Trends* 18:10 (1989), pp. 150-153.
- WOWK, Andrij. "Soroka Enthroned as Metropolitan for Ukrainian Catholics in the U.S.," in *The Ukrainian Weekly* 69:10 (11 March 2001), p. 1.
- YANNARAS, Christos. *The Freedom of Morality*. Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 1984.
- YARNOLD, Edward. "Church as Communion," in *The Tablet* 12 (12 December 1992), pp. 1564-1565.
- ZIADE, Ignatius. "The Rights of Bishops," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 111-113.
- ZISSIS, Theodore. "Uniatism: A Problem in the Dialogue Between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics," in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 35 (Spr. 1990), pp. 21-31.
- ZIZIOULAS, John. "La Communauté eucharistique et la Catholicité de l'Église," in *Istina* 14/78 (1986), pp. 67-88.
- _____. "The Church as Communion," in Thomas BEST and Günther GASSMANN, eds., *One the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, Faith and Order Paper No. 166. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994, pp. 3-16.

- _____. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood: SVS Press, 1997.
- ZOGHBY, Elias. "Eastern and Western Tradition in the One Church," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 49-54.
- _____. "The Eastern Churches and Bishop's Conferences," in Hans KÜNG, Yves CONGAR, Daniel O'HANLON, eds., *Council Speeches of Vatican II*. Glen Rock, N.J: Paulist Press, 1964, pp. 126-128.
- _____. "Unité et diversité de l'Église," in Thomas CAMELOT, Guilheme BARAUNA, Yves CONGAR, eds., *L'Église de Vatican II*, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966, pp. 493-515.
- _____. *Tous Schismatiques?* Beirut: Heidelberg Press-Lebanon, 1981.
- _____. "Profession de foi de Mgr. Elias Zohgby," in *Contacts* 3 (1995). English translation in *Eastern Churches Journal* 2:3 (1995), pp. 11-14. Ukrainian translation in *Logos* 36:1-4 (1995), pp. 271-275.
- ŽUŽEK, Ivan. "The Ecclesiae Sui Iuris in the Revision of Canon Law," in Rene LATOURELLE, ed., *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, vol. 3. New York: Paulist Press, 1988-1989, pp. 288-304.