A First Step Toward the Dialogue Between Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches

Vladimir Latinovic

How does a dialogue between the two separated Christian churches begin? At present we have several larger and smaller bilateral ecumenical dialogues[1] and we also have a multilateral dialogue that takes place at the World Council of Churches.[2] These dialogues are led by powerful church

---

[1] On different bilateral dialogues see Angelo Maffeis, *Ecumenical Dialogue* (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 2005), 39–48.

[2] On different documents produced during this dialogue see Lukas Vischer and Harding Meyer, eds., *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984); Jeffrey Gros et al., eds., *Growth in Agreement 2: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level 1982–1998* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992); Jeffrey Gros et al., eds., *Growth in Agreement 3: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level 1998–2005* (New York: Paulist Press, 2007); Thomas F. Best et al., eds., *Growth in Agreement 4.1: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level 2004–2014* (Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 2017); Thomas F. Best et al., eds., *Growth in Agreement 4.2: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a*

V. Latinovic (✉)
University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

Academy DRS, Stuttgart, Germany

leaders and esteemed and highly educated theology professors. Hundreds or even thousands of pages of ecumenical documents are discussed, drafted, produced, and signed (although in most cases, unfortunately, not enforced). Scholarly books and articles in journals are written analyzing them and exploring their potential for the good of the church and world. Theology students learn about them in their classes and bemoan the fact that there are so many that need to be memorized. And finally, in some cases, if they are successful, these dialogues open new perspectives for Christian collaboration and joint action. But, how does a new dialogue begin?

At the University of Tübingen, where I taught for many years, there is a story about the university founder Count Eberhard (1445–1496), who decided he wanted to have his own university.[3] At that time, it was a matter of prestige to have one so everyone understood *why* he wanted this. The real surprise came when he said *where* he wanted to establish it. Everyone was shocked at the announcement of his choice for Tübingen. At that time Tübingen was nothing but a small village far away from the main roads and with no real historical or political significance. Of course, his advisors tried to persuade him against such madness by warning him of the strategic liability of the town that no one would want to study there and so on. But, despite the criticism, he stood firm by his choice. When asked to explain his decision, he simply responded with "*attempto*" (Latin for "I dare"). With this phrase, he meant that one must take risks in order to succeed. The Count went on to establish the university where he wanted. And, not only did it work but it became one of the most eminent universities in Germany and one of the most respected across the world. "*Attempto*" to this day remains the motto of the University of Tübingen,

---

World Level 2004–2014 (Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 2017). In addition to the bilateral and multilateral dialogues we also have the so-called interreligious dialogue, which although it is a dialogue it is not considered an ecumenical dialogue because its goal is not unity between different religions but tolerance between them. On the achievements of interreligious dialogue see Catherine Cornille, ed., *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2013); Douglas Pratt, *Christian Engagement with Islam: Ecumenical Journeys Since 1910* (Leiden: Brill, 2017); Francis X. Clooney, *The Future of Hindu–Christian Studies: A Theological Inquiry* (Oxon/New York: Routledge, 2017.).

[3] About the foundation of the University of Tübingen see Waldemar Teufel, "Die Gründung der Universität Tübingen. Wagnis und Gelingen—Anstöße und Vorbilder." In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Tübingen 1477 bis 1977*, edited by Hansmartin Decker-Hauff et al., Vol. 1 (Tübingen: Universität Tübingen, 1977).

Caught in the Crossfire: Toward Understanding Medieval and Early Modern Advocates of Church Union

Yury P. Avvakumov

This chapter is an attempt to bridge historiography and ecclesiology. It critically engages modern historical research on a series of Later Medieval and Early Modern intellectuals and ecclesiastics who advocated for the union of Eastern Christians with the Roman Church and the pope. Late Byzantine adherents of union called themselves ἑνωτικοί ("united"). It seems possible to trace a "henotic," or unionist, tradition as a religious movement spanning centuries and geographic regions. Despite undeniable differences of cultural contexts, there are a few essential features that unite all the "united" Eastern theologians and church leaders irrespective of their time, ethnicity, and culture. By exploring the interplay of continuities and discontinuities in their history and theological legacy, historians can contribute to a better ecclesiological understanding of the "Uniates" of our own day and thus to contemporary ecumenical discourse involving both Eastern Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Christians.

Y. P. Avvakumov (✉)
Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

19

1   BYZANTINE ἑνωτικοι: PROSOPOGRAPHY

Efforts to achieve reconciliation between the Roman Church and Byzantine Christianity began almost simultaneously with the rise of their disagreements and conflicts. Clashes between Old and New Rome (such as those in 867, 1054, and 1204, to mention only the best-known text-book dates) produced a vast amount of heated polemical literature, but also works of a more discreet and conciliatory nature. Starting from at least the thirteenth century, a group of ecclesiastical personalities and intellectuals slowly emerged on both sides who advocated for "peace" and "union" between the churches (*pax/unio ecclesiarum*, ἡ εἰρήνη/ἡ ἕνωσις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν). Attempting to cross the borderline of their own ecclesiastical culture, many of them devoted their time to the study of the language, traditions, and theological writings of their counterparts. Most of them traveled between East and West and made acquaintances and friends among Christians of the other church. Their literary activity provided the theoretical backdrop for the formal act of union between Rome and Constantinople concluded in Florence in 1439.

For the Byzantine period (prior to 1453), there were three "waves" of henotic movement among the Byzantines. The first one was connected with the union concluded at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274. The most prominent advocates of that union were Patriarch John Bekkos of Constantinople (ca. 1225–1297)[1] and his associates Georgios Metochites (ca. 1250–1328)[2] and Konstantinos Meliteniotes (d. 1307).[3] The second wave came in the mid-fourteenth century with the figures of Barlaam of Calabria (d. 1348)[4] and particularly Demetrios Kydones (c. 1324–c. 1397/1398).[5] The latter was a high-ranking imperial official, a *mesazon* with personal ties to at least two Byzantine emperors (John V and John VI), in addition to being a bright intellectual and translator of Thomas Aquinas and other Latin authors into Greek. Demetrios stands in the

---

[1] Erich Trapp (ed.), *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (Wien, 1976–1996; henceforth, PLP), 2548.

[2] PLP 17979.

[3] PLP 17856.

[4] PLP 2284.

[5] PLP 13876; Judith R. Ryder, *The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones. A Study of Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Politics, Religion and Society* (Leiden and Boston, 2010); Frinz Tinnefeld, "Einleitung," in Demetrios Kydones, *Briefe*. Übers. und erläutert von Franz Tinnefeld. Vol. I, 1 (Stuttgart, 1981), 1–87.

A Brief History of the Union of Brest and Its Interpretations

Anastacia K. Wooden

1   INTRODUCTION: STATEMENT OF INTENT

This chapter on the historical context of the Union of 1595–1596 is not a result of a dedicated historical research but, rather, a survey of widely used sources and most frequent interpretations.[1] The idea to write this historical overview came as a result of an engagement with a project about bishops Josaphat Kuncevich and Joseph Siamashka, presented in this volume. Even before the start of the project, it was expected that evaluation of these controversial historical figures will differ greatly along

[1] The main sources include the following: Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962); Uladzimir Arlou, Zmicier Hierasimovic, *Belarus: The Epoch of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* (Minsk: Technalohija, 2018). (This book is intended as a popular, not scholarly, edition. I found it acceptable to use it as a reference because it is written by the eminent Belarusian scholars and is the only book on Belarusian history very well translated into English.) *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (www.encyclopediaofukraine.com) hosted by Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. *Православная Энциклопедия под редакцией Патриарха Московского и Всея Руси Кирилла* www.pravenc.ru

A. K. Wooden (✉)
The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

confessional lines. After all, as a distinguished historian of the church in Ukraine, Sophia Senyk observed, "almost everything that has been written about the Union of Brest in the last four hundred years has been partisan."[2] However, what came as a surprise is that the way the story of these two persons is told today largely depends not only on confessional but also on political preferences of a teller. In Belarus, for example, the preferences roughly summed up as pro-Russian or pro-Western often run deeper and cannot be simply seen as corresponding to such confessional leanings as pro-Orthodox or pro-Catholic. These preferences are recognizable even in the works of professional historians.[3]

As a result, those readers or researchers who are not closely familiar with the specific historical complexities behind the Union of Brest and who have no intention to pick sides in the ongoing debate often do so without knowing. This chapter is written mostly with this group. Its goal is not to speak in favor of any position but to make the readers aware of the complexities of the Union's history and its interpretations. To achieve this goal, this chapter will be divided into two sections: one devoted to the establishment of the Union and one to the elimination of it. Within each of these sections, a simple chronology of events will be given followed by an analysis of their stereotypical interpretations. The goal is not to discredit any of those interpretations but, rather, to show that none of them can be seen as decisive and unequivocal without deliberately ignoring parts of history.

Geographically, the survey is centered on the proto-Belarusian territories. Often the events under consideration, spanning the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, are described using the names of political units as they exist today: Poland, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Lithuania. This chronologically inconsistent usage obscures the fact that these events took place on the territory of a large multinational state, Grand Duchy of Lithuania

---

[2] Sophia Senyk. "The Union of Brest: An Evaluation," 1–16. In *Four Hundred Years Union of Brest (1596–1996): A Critical Re-evaluation*. Edited by Bert Groen and Wil van den (Bercken. Leuven: Peeters, 1998). P. 1. Sophia Senyk is a former professor of church history at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome; now she is a nun living at the ecumenical monastic community in Bose, Italy.

[3] It is not an intention of this chapter to actually classify concrete historical works as belonging to certain "ideological camps." Rather, the goal is to alert the readers to the *likelihood* of ideological as well as confessional bias and trust that readers themselves will recognize the bias where it exists.

Union of Brest: Saints or Villains?

Anastacia K. Wooden and Natallia Vasilevich

1   INTRODUCTION

As a collaborative effort, this chapter is born from two papers devoted to two key figures in the process of establishment and demolition of the Union on proto-Belarusian territories: Bishops Josaphat Kuncevich (Sects. 4 and 5) and Joseph Siamaška (Sects. 2 and 3). No other characters better symbolize the seemingly irreconcilable differences in evaluation of the significance Union of Brest. Kuncevich is revered in the Catholic Church as a "hero" who played an important role in the establishment of the Eastern Catholic Church (ECC) in what today is Belarus and Ukraine while Siamaška is seen as a "hero" by the Orthodox Church for the equally important role he played in the elimination of the ECC in the same lands. At the same time, they are both considered villains by each other's churches. While these papers differ greatly in their approach (one being socio-political and another theological-ecumenical), they share the same desire to find a way to look at these characters in a way that transcends uncompromising confessionally predetermined titles of saints or villains.

A. K. Wooden (✉)
The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

N. Vasilevich (✉)
Centre Ecumena, Minsk, Belarus

2   Joseph Siamaška: Will the Icon of the *Westernrussianism* Become a Saint of the Orthodox Church?[1]

This first part takes an in-depth look at the canonization initiative of the Metropolitan Joseph Siamaška of Vilnia which was launched in 2011 by the Belarusian Orthodox Church. As was already mentioned in the essay "A Brief History of the Union of Brest and Its Interpretations,"[2] Siamaška played a key role in the events leading to the Polacak Council of 1839 that abolished the Union of Brest of 1596 and effectively made the Greek-Catholic (Uniate) Church in the Western Rus' (Belarus) part of the Orthodox Church of Russia. Despite of his role in these events, until now the name of Siamaška was known mostly to historians specialized in this narrow topic and there was no spontaneous veneration (cult) by the faithful or devotions connected with his body and relics interned in the crypt of the cathedral of the Holy Spirit Monastery in Vilnius. The chapter aims to analyze what motivated the canonization initiative and to explore if those motives could lie outside of theological sphere and pertain to ideology of national politics.

2.1   *Canonization Initiative*

Although very sensitive to the question of venerating converted Orthodox as individuals, Orthodox Church itself venerates a number of saints whose earthly activities contributed to the conversion of the Uniates to Orthodoxy. The best-known example is, perhaps, that of Saint Alexis (Toth)[3] of Wilkes-Barre who is honored with the title "Confessor and Defender of Orthodoxy in America." As a priest in the Ruthenian Catholic Church, Fr. Toth came into conflict with his Latin bishop of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese Fr. John Irish[4] over the attempts of the latter to Americanize all the Catholics under his jurisdiction by eradication of their ethnic traditions. In addition to that, Bishop Irish openly denied full equality of the Roman and Ruthenian Catholics and obstructed Fr. Toth's pastoral ministry. Perceiving his church to be under the threat of

---

[1] This part of the chapter is authored by Natallia Vasilevich.

[2] See chapter "A Brief History of the Union of Brest and Its Interpretations."

[3] https://oca.org/fs/st-alexis-toth.

[4] There were no Byzantine rite bishops in the US at this time.

"Kyivan Christianity": Early Modern Cultural History and Impulses for Dialogue Between Churches in Ukraine

Ivan Almes

Cultural history remains one of the most popular research areas in the Western historical studies of the last decades. It explores *inter alia* the ways in which people in the past orientated themselves as individuals and groups toward other individuals or groups. New religious and cultural issues arising in contemporary Ukraine, as, for example, the cultural identity of Ukrainian churches, require up-to-date interpretation. The answers to modern controversial questions can be found in the early modern cultural history (specifically the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in this research). It's worth noting that Christianity closely relates to culture, and, moreover, the topic of Christianity and culture is represented well enough in historiography and has been studied by theologians as well as historians, especially concerning the Middle Ages

I. Almes (✉)
Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine

87

and early modern period.[1] In Christian understanding, humanity creates culture by God's will and providence. This pattern is consistent with the idea that cultural activity relates to Christian soteriology.[2] That is why a comprehensive study of the church is impossible without the work of historians who investigate primarily not ecclesiastical but cultural processes within the church.[3]

Among different approaches to religious and cultural studies of processes in premodern time, the concept of "confessionalization" became one of the most widespread and convenient tools for historical research, primarily concerning Latin Europe.[4] In the paradigm of confessionalization, religion is taken as a cultural system and, consequently, ecclesial topics are investigated first of all as cultural activities (not as religious in themselves).[5] It's worth noting that applicability of this paradigm for the Eastern European context was carefully discussed and confirmed by different studies.[6] For example, researchers have noticed how the "Orthodox confession" in Eastern Europe, with the features that distinguish it from the Catholic and Protestant confessions, was formed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[7]

---

[1] The treatise written by Protestant author and one of the most outstanding and widely discussed works on the problem of Christianity and culture was authored by a Protestant thinker Richard H. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1951). Also see: Carter A. Craig, *Rethinking Christ and Culture. A Post-Christendom Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2006).

[2] George Florovsky, "Faith and Culture" in *Christianity and Culture. Volume two in the Collected Works of Georges Florovsky* (Belmont: Nordland Publishing Company, 1974), 14–21.

[3] See, for instance: C. T. McIntire, ed., *God, History, and Historians. An Anthology of Modern Christian Views of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

[4] For example, see: Ute Lotz-Heumann, "The Concept of 'Confessionalization': A Historiographical Paradigm in Dispute," *Memoria y civilización* 4 (2001): 93–114.

[5] On this shift, see: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Religion und Kultur. Europa 1500–1800* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), and Kaspar von Greyerz, Manfred Jakubowski-Tiessen, Thomas Kaufmann, and Hartmut Lehmann, ed., *Interkonfessionalität – Transkonfessionalität – binnenkonfessionelle Pluralität. Neue Forschungen zur Konfessionalisierungsthese* (Heidelberg: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2003).

[6] Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, ed., *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa. Wirkungen des religiösen Wandels in 16. und 17. Jahrhundert im Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), and Alfons Brüning, *Unio non est unitas. Polen-Litauens Weg im konfessionellen Zeitalter (1569–1648)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008).

[7] Suttner Ernst Christoph, "Orthodoxe Kultur in Ost- und Südosteuropa im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert" in *Religion und Kultur im Europa des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Peter Claus Hartmann (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004), 215–231, and

Identity and Institutional Allegiance in Romanian Uniate Church History (1700–1900)

Laura Stanciu

1   INTRODUCTION

The History Department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest initiated an international interdisciplinary project studying the documents of the Catholic synods in the kingdom of Hungary for the period 1790–1920.[1] The project focused on a systematic research of the Roman-Catholic diocesan synods in the Hungarian provinces.[2] The

---

[1] For more about the project see: *A katolikus egyház zsinatai és nagygyűlései Magyarországon* (1790–2010)/ *NKFI-EPR: Synods and Assemblies of the Catholic Church in Hungary (1790–2010)*; Principal Investigator Balogh Margit.

[2] It is about the former Hungarian provinces of Cenad (Csanád), Eger (Erlau), Alba Iulia (now Karlsburg/Gyulafehérvár, Romania), Esztergom (Strigoniu), Győr (Raab), Kalocsa, Kassa (Košice, Slovakia), Oradea (Nagyvárad, Romania), Nyitra (Nitra, Slovakia), Pannonhalma (Győrszentmárton), Pécs (Beci), Pozsony (Pressburg/Bratislava, Slovakia), Rozsnyó (Rosenau/Rožňava, Slovakia), Sătmar County (Szatmár, Romania), Székesfehérvár

L. Stanciu (✉)
University of Alba Iulia, Alba Iulia, Romania

research naturally also included the systematic analysis of the Greek-Catholic synods of Blaj-Făgăraş (Romania), Hajdúdorog (Hungary), Munkács (Munkatsch, Ukraine), and Szamosjvár (Gherla, Romania).

This chapter is an integral part of this larger project and studies the relationship between state and society in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries, particularly how the Uniate Church contributed to the modernization of society through the decisions taken at these synods. The analysis of its institutional history is conducted through the examination of synodal acts and decrees of the church beginning in 1782, when Ioan Bob, who at the institutional level prepared the church for the modern age, was elected Bishop, and continuing to 1900 and the decisions taken by the provincial synod in that year. These synods were forums in which participants debated and made decisions about the internal administrative and canonical organization of the Romanian Uniate Church.

In the second part of the seventeenth century,[3] when the negotiations for the Union started, the Romanians in Transylvania had found that religion was the most efficient social mediator. Religion transmitted ethical and moral values, and the role of the church was (and is) to provide practical guidance and norms of application for establishing and spreading these values. This guiding role was also the reason for the success of the Transylvanian Church. As a result, the decisions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, such as synodal decrees, were a source of authority for the lower clergy, who were expected to apply as quickly and efficiently as possible the decisions of the church leaders. Analysis of the synodal acts also reveals the balance between the continuity and the discontinuity in the messages of Union/Unity and the preservation of the so-called Byzantine tradition[4] (called by the peasants "the Law of the Fathers").[5]

(Stuhlweißenburg), Szepes (Zips/Spiš, Slovakia), Szombathely (Steinamanger), Vác (Waitzen), and Veszprém (Weißbrunn).

[3] Keith Hitchins, "The Fact that, in accordance with the Social Order of European States at the End of the 17th Century, a Close Connection Existed between the Religious Affiliation/Non-affiliation of Subjects to the Religion of Their Rulers and the Civic Rights Enjoyed by Subject" in: Johann Marte et al., eds., *Die Union der Rumänen Siebenbürgens mit der Kirche von Rom/Unirea românilor transilvăneni cu Biserica Romei* (Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică, 2010): 152–165.

[4] Cristian Barta, *Autoritate, comuniune şi sinodalitate: coordonate fundamentale ale drumului Bisericii Române Unite cu Roma în comuniunea catolică* (Cluj-Napoca – Gatineau: Argonaut Publishing – Symphologic Publishing 2015): 150, 152.

[5] Ernst Christoph Suttner, "*Legea strămoşească:* Glaubensordnung und Garantie des sozialen Zusammenhalts," *OstkStud,* 56 (2007): 138–154; Idem, "*Legea Strămoşească* and

The Judicial and Canonical Situation of the Romanian Byzantine Catholics in Hungary Around 1900

Paul Brusanowski

1 Romanian Greek Catholicism Between the Oriental Tradition in Transylvania and the Latinising Tendencies in Hungary

The Hungarian State before 1918 had a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional character. The Hungarians represented about 54% of the whole population of the country and were mostly Roman Catholics. The Romanians represented 17% of the population and were divided into two different Churches: Orthodox and Greek Catholic. There also existed 11% Slovaks, 11% Germans (Catholics and Lutherans), 5% Serbs (Orthodox), and a small number of Ruthenians/Ukrainians (Greek Catholics).

The Orthodox believers made up about 13% of the population and were divided into two different *de facto* autocephalous (i.e. self-governing) churches: the Romanian Metropolitanate of Sibiu and the Serbian

P. Brusanowski (✉)

Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Sibiu, Romania

Metropolitanate of Sremski Karlovci. The Greek Catholics made up approximately 10.9% of Hungary's[1] population. Most of them (58.84%) were Romanians, and the rest were Ruthenians, Magyars, and Slovaks.[2] Ruthenian Greek Catholicism took shape by the middle of the seventeenth century.[3] Replacing the old Orthodox Bishopric in Mukachevo, a Ruthenian Greek Catholic vicariate under the authority of the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Eger was instituted. A Ruthenian Greek Catholic Bishopric was only reinstated in 1771 in Mukachevo and moved in 1776 to Užhorod. In 1816 a second Ruthenian Greek Catholic Bishopric was established with its seat in Prešov (to shepherd the Western Ruthenian territories), while the Bishopric of Užhorod maintained its jurisdiction over the Eastern territories, including Maramureş, Ugocea, and Sătmar that were also shared with Romanians.[4]

The Greek Catholic Romanians were organised in a metropolitan province, established in 1853. This comprised two already existing dioceses (the Archdiocese in Blaj and the Bishopric of Oradea) together with other two newly instituted dioceses (Gherla and Lugoj). For one thing, these four dioceses were not of equal sizes; they differed very much in terms of a number of parishes (and members of congregations). If the Archdiocese in Blaj could count 706 parishes (with 406,330 members), the Archdiocese in Gherla had 489 (474,538), in Lugoj 159 (97,566), and the Diocese in Oradea only had 168 parishes (217,891).[5] Yet, even more important was the fact that "the new ecclesial territory was bringing very different traditions, customs and norms of canonical justice under the same roof."[6] The big separation line that was still in place was the old border (maintained until 1867) between Hungary and the Principality of Transylvania.

[1] "Ungaria" in *Enciclopedia Română publicată din însărcinarea și sub auspiciile Asociațiunii Pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român*, edited by C. Diaconovich (Sibiu: W. Krafft, 1904), III, 1156.

[2] Moritz Csáky, "Die Römisch-Katholische Kirche in Ungarn," in *Die Habsburgermonarchie. 1848–1918*, edited by Adam Wandruszka, Peter Urbanitsch (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985), IV 283.

[3] Michael Lacko, *The Union of Užhorod* (Cleveland: The Slovak Institute, 1966). 100–113, 150–153.

[4] Albert Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Wien: Morus Presse, 1950), 656–659.

[5] "Ungaria," 1161.

[6] N. Bocşan, "Ortodocşi şi uniţi în Transilvania în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea," in *Identitate Naţională şi Spirit European. Academicianul Dan Berindei la 80 de ani.* (Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2003). 600–601.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church and Its Perception of the Bulgarian "Uniates"

Vladislav Atanassov

The question of whether the Bulgarian Church belonged to the Eastern or Western Church and thus of its independence arose at the baptism of the Bulgarians in the ninth century, when the then ruler Boris I (who bore the baptismal name Mikhail) addressed both Rome and Constantinople and wanted to see the status of the newly established church regulated at the Council of 870. The Council decided in favor of Constantinople, but already his son Simeon I tried to realize his father's wish for a Patriarchate of his own. Petår I, the son of Simeon, succeeded in obtaining the official recognition of this Patriarchate. After the conquest of Bulgaria by Byzantium (1018), the Patriarchate temporarily ceased to exist. When the Bulgarian Empire was restored at the end of the twelfth century, the question of the status of the Church in Bulgaria arose again. In view of the political situation at that time, Tsar Kaloyan decided to sign a union with Rome. It had a purely formal character and lasted barely 30 years. It was ended by the recognition of a Bulgarian Patriarchate at the Council of

V. Atanassov (✉)
Bulgarian Orthodox Church Stuttgart, Nuertingen, Germany

Lampsak in 1235, in which many bishops from the Patriarchates of the East took part. After its status and autonomy had been consolidated by such a high forum, the Bulgarian Church showed no interest in the Lyon Council of 1274 and stayed away from it. The Ottoman conquest of Bulgaria put an end to ecclesiastical autonomy, and most Bulgarians came under the jurisdiction of Constantinople.[1]

1   Origin and Development of the Catholic Church of the Eastern Rite in Bulgaria

Nationalist, pastoral, and pragmatic reasons contributed to the emergence of the Bulgarian "Uniates".[2]

The struggle for national identity and freedom played a dominant role in the nineteenth century. At that time the Bulgarians were subjects of the Ottoman Sultan and the church was under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Since the clergy often consisted of Greek priests and bishops, many Bulgarians had to hear the liturgy in Greek and were exposed to several attempts at Hellenization. As a result, a combative movement arose for its own church, which gained much momentum in the middle of the nineteenth century. In their disputes with the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Bulgarians often had to learn that he was supported by Russian diplomacy, which saw the Bulgarian efforts as a danger to the Orthodox cause in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, some of the leaders of this struggle were using pressure to persuade their opponents to compromise: an alliance with the Pope and the support of the Catholic superpowers like it was the case with Tsar Kaloyan. Especially from 1859 the idea of the Union began to

---

[1] More literature on the described developments and on the Bulgarian church and state in the Middle Ages in general in the following: Kiril Petkov, *The Voices of Medieval Bulgaria, Seventh-Fifteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Alexandru Madgearu, *The Assanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)* (Leiden: Brill, 2017); Gerhard Podskalsky, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865–1459* (München: Beck, 2000); Lothar Heiser, *Die Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum des Papstes Nikolaus I.* (858–867) (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1979); H.D. Döpmann, "Zum Streit zwischen Rom und Byzanz um die Christianisierung Bulgariens," *Palaeobulgarica* no. 5 (1981) p. 62–73; Todor Sâbev, *Samostojna narodnostna Tsârkva v srednovekovna Bâlgaria* (Sofia: Sinodalno izdatelstvo, 1987); Vasil Giuzelev, *Papstvoto i bâlgarite prez Srednovekovieto* (Plovdiv: Fondatsia Bâlgarsko istorichesko nasledstvo, 2009).

[2] In my chapter, I often use the term "Uniates" to describe believers of the Eastern Orthodox churches for brevity. I am aware of the negative connotation with which this term is sometimes used, and I want to emphasize that I do not use it that way. For this reason I have always put this term in quotation marks.

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Bishops at the Second Vatican Council: The Participation in the Council and Contribution to the Discussions of Conciliar Documents

Mariia Ivaniv

The first part of this chapter will focus on the condition and activities of the Ukrainian Bishops' Conference before and during the Second Vatican Council and the obstacles which it faced during the Council. Also, the participation and activities of the bishops in preparatory and conciliar commissions will be presented. The second part of the chapter focuses on the analysis of the ideas of Metropolitan Maxim Hermaniuk who actively supported the concept of collegiality. The third part is dedicated to the discussions of opinions of the Ukrainian bishops about the first part of the

M. Ivaniv (✉)
Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto School of Theology, Toronto, ON, Canada

third chapter of the decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* as well as the speech of Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj and written observations of Bishop Volodymyr Malanczuk on the decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*.

1   ACTIVITY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN BISHOPS' CONFERENCE DURING THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

The condition of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) before the Second Vatican Council was quite difficult. All the bishops in Ukraine were imprisoned, clergy and laity were persecuted, and the UGCC itself was forbidden and liquidated as a church during the pseudo-council in Lviv in 1946.[1] At the same time, the situation in the diaspora was better. Two metropolitanates were established in North America: in Winnipeg, Canada, and in Philadelphia, the United States. Also, eparchies and exarchates were created in other parts of the world, namely, in South America—the Exarchate in Brazil and an Apostolic Visitation in Argentina; in Europe—the Apostolic Exarchate for Germany and Scandinavia, the Exarchate for France, Benelux and Switzerland, the Exarchate in Great Britain, and the Eparchy of Križevci in Bosnia; and the Exarchate in Australia. Therefore, only the Ukrainian diaspora bishops had the opportunity to participate in the Second Vatican Council.

1.1   *The Ukrainian Bishops at the Beginning of the Second Vatican Council*

In his book about this Council[2] Fr. Atanasij Welykyj, O.S.B.M., who actively participated in its work, mentions seventeen Ukrainian diaspora bishops who were active on January 25, 1959, when the Council was announced. Eleven of them were diaspora bishops, namely Constantine

---

[1] It was pseudo-council because an Initiative Group, with Father Hryhorii Kostel'nyk as a leader, organized the "reunion" of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church with the Russian Orthodox Church. This movement was forced by the Soviet regime and NKGB (People's Commissariat of State Security). This event led to the destruction of all UGCC structures. After this event the Church in Ukraine was forced to go underground. For more about this "council," see Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939–1950)* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1996), 164–178.

[2] Atanasiy Welykyj, R. Holowackyj, ed., *Diyannya Vatykans'koho Soboru* (Rome: Edizioni dei P Basiliani, 1966), 272–273.

The U.S.S.R., Greek Catholics, and the Vatican "Ostpolitik" in the 1960s–1970s: Grey Zone and the Stumbling Blocks

Nadezhda Beliakova

How were the Vatican and the Catholic Church perceived by representatives of the states and regimes of the Eastern Bloc, and how this perception of the "other" changed in the post-war period—these are questions that bear a heavy political charge and that are only starting to manifest themselves in the academic field, captivating the attention of historians. The very term "Ostpolitik" of the Vatican's Eastern policy bears a mark of

N. Beliakova (✉)
Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Science,
Moscow, Russian Federation

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55442-2_10

the Cold War and is its product. From the perception of the Catholic Church the so-called Eastern policy remains a matter of discussion.[1]

According to the Hungarian historian András Fejérdy,

> [t]he appraisal of the political dialogue and negotiations with the communist regimes of East Central Europe commenced by the Holy See in the 1960s did not provoke only lively debates among contemporaries, but remains to the present day one of the most debated questions of the twentieth-century history: should it be assessed a fixed path to which no alternative existed, or was it a flawed initiative which merely served the international legitimacy of the communist totalitarian system?[2]

How was the Vatican's Eastern policy perceived in the U.S.S.R.? This question, in my opinion, is both politicized and unstudied. An Italian Soviet Studies specialist Prof. Adriano Roccucci underscores the importance of the Vatican in the eyes of the Soviet political leaders. Roccucci notes that

> Moscow had a keen interest in the Catholic Church as a whole. The question of the relationship with the Holy See concerned issues of major importance for the Soviet Union: not only the international weight of the Church of Rome, with its global reach and the influence of Catholics in the political affairs of many countries, but also, and perhaps especially from the Kremlin's point of view, the importance of the Catholic Church for the geopolitical balance of the communist bloc and within the Soviet Union itself. These

---

[1] Hansjakob Stehle, *Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans, 1917–1975* (München-Zürich: R. Piper & Co Verlag, 1975); Antoine Wenger, *Rome et Moscou: 1900–1950* (Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1987); Andrea Riccardi, *Il Vaticano e Mosca 1940–1990* (Roma–Bari: Laterza, 1992), Hansjakob Stehle, *Geheimdiplomatie im Vatikan. Die Päpste und die Kommunisten* (Zürich: Piper, 1993); Alberto Melloni, *L'Ostpolitik Vaticana di Agostino Casaroli* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2006); Alberto Riccardi, *Il Vaticano e Mosca 1940–1990* (Roma-Bari: Laterza 1992); Giovanni Barberini, *L'Ostpolitik della Santa Sede: Un dialogo lungo e faticoso* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2007); Giovanni Barberini, *La politica del dialogo. Le carte Casaroli sull'Ostpolitik vaticana* (Bologna, Il Mulino, 2008); Philippe Chenaux, L'Église catholique et le communisme en Europe (1917–1989): De Lénine à Jean-Paul II (Paris: Cerf, 2009); Marco Lavopa, *La diplomazia dei "piccoli passi". L'Ostpolitik vaticana di Mons. Agostino Casaroli* (Rome: Ginevra Bentivoglio Editoria, 2013); Roberto Morozzo della Rocca. *Tra Est e Ovest: Agostino Casaroli diplomatico vaticano* (Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo, 2014).

[2] András Fejérdy "New Perspectives in Researching the Vatican's Eastern Policy" in *The Vatican «Ostpolitik» 1958–1978 Responsibility and Witness During John XXIII and Paul VI,* ed. András Fejérdy (Rome: Viella, 2015), 10.

The Filioque Issue in the Light of the Catechism of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and in Dialogue with V. Bolotov's "33 Theses"

Theodoros Alexopoulos

The question of the *filioque*, without a doubt, remains the thorniest of all the issues to be discussed and examined in the future by the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church. At the very beginning of the twenty-first century (2003), the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation dealt with this problem, although without taking in consideration two thorough and innovative German studies on the history of the *filioque* controversy shedding light into the theological arguments pro and contra *filioque*: B. Oberdorfer's *Filioque. Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problem*s (Göttingen 2001) and P. Gemeinhardt's *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Berlin 2002). Perhaps this reluctance to engage more thoroughly with

T. Alexopoulos (✉)
University College of Teacher Education Vienna/Krems, Vienna, Austria

the theological and philosophical arguments of both traditions, Catholic and Orthodox, explains why the efforts of the joint commission were not very successful, for by doing so, they not only diminished the dogmatical weight of the *filioque* but also the power it has had to divide the Church throughout the centuries. Thus the Joint Commission concluded: "We offer these recommendations to our Churches in the conviction, based on our own intense study and discussion, that our traditions' different ways of understanding the procession of the Holy Spirit need no longer divide us."[1]

In contrast to this statement, renowned church historians and patristic scholars who took part in the international conference in Vienna (15–17.05.1998) dealing extensively with the Vatican document on the procession on the Holy Spirit (issued in Rome 1995)[2] have rightly stressed that the *filioque* still remains an essential dogmatic obstacle on the way of reunion between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches.[3] The introducing keynote statement of the Austrian church historian Peter Hofrichter on the dividing character of the *filioque* is very characteristic: "The procession of the Holy Spirit is probably the most known and historically the most burdened teaching of division between Western and Eastern Christianity."[4]

This chapter will, first, focus on the Catechism of the Greek Catholic Church in order to detect and analyze positive and constructive elements for resolving the problem of the *filioque*. Second, it will discuss how to deal with the issue using selectively the 33 Theses of the famous Russian

---

[1] "The Filioque. A Church Dividing Issue?" http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/orthodox/filioque-church-dividing-issue-english.cfm. On the first critical approach from an Orthodox point of view to this document, see the study T. Alexopoulos, "Der Konsens des Nordamerikanischen Orthodox-Katholischen Beratungsausschusses bezüglich des Filioque: 'The Filioque: A Church Dividing Issue?' Der Versuch einer ersten Würdigung aus orthodoxer Sicht," *Orthodoxes Forum* 32, no. 2 (2018): 159–175.

[2] See title below note 12.

[3] See indicative Hans-Joachim Schulz, "Der wissenschaftliche Ertrag der Studientagung." In *Vom Heiligen Geist. Der gemeinsame trinitarische Glaube und das Problem des Filioque*, edited by Alfred Stirnemann and Gerhard Wilflinger, 15–21 (Innsbruck-Wien: Tyrolia, 1998), 15.

[4] Peter Hofrichter, "Einführung in die Problemlage," in *Stirnemann Vom Heiligen Geist*, 36.

Eastern Catholicism and the Reunion of the Churches in Vladimir Soloviev's Political Ecclesiology

Nathaniel Wood

This chapter examines the place of Eastern Catholicism in the political theology of Vladimir Sergeevich Soloviev (1853–1900), the man once hailed by his fellow Russian religious philosopher S. L. Frank "the greatest of Russian philosophers and systematic religious thinkers"[1] and considered by Hans Urs von Balthasar as "perhaps second only to Thomas Aquinas as the greatest artist of order and organization in the history of thought."[2] Soloviev is best known for his controversial investigations into the

---

[1] *A Solovyov Anthology*, ed. S. L. Frank, trans. Nathalie Duddington (London: SCM Press, 1950), 9.

[2] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics. Volume III: Studies in Theological Style: Lay Styles*, trans. Andrew Louth, John Saward, Martin Simon, et al. (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius, 1986), p. 284.

N. Wood (✉)
Orthodox Christian Studies Center, Fordham University, New York, NY, USA

metaphysics of Sophia, or Divine Wisdom, but he is also well known for his pioneering advocacy of ecumenical theology and for championing Orthodox-Catholic unity. As Georges Florovsky notes, it was Soloviev's work that "formally raised" the question of the reunion of the Orthodox and Catholic churches in modern Orthodox circles.[3] Although Soloviev never abandoned the metaphysical and anti-positivist interests that defined his early career,[4] during the 1880s, the problem of the East-West schism became the central preoccupation of his intellectual efforts. Together with pro-union Catholics with whom he was in communication during this period, Soloviev became a forerunner of the twentieth-century ecumenical movement, and his radical vision of ecclesial unity is still appreciated today. For example, in his address to a 2003 conference on Soloviev's ecumenical contributions at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, Pope John Paul II expressed deep admiration for the Russian religious philosopher, adeptly capturing the heart of Soloviev's ecumenical vision:

> This event, which gathers people of the Eastern and Western cultures, will enable them to compare their reflections on the truth of the one Gospel of Christ and to see the reciprocal fruitfulness that can result, confirming the Church's need to be able to breathe with both her lungs: the Eastern Tradition and the Western Tradition […]. Especially in his later years, Solovyov harboured the ardent desire that the Churches would likewise enter into a perspective of encounter and communion, each one contributing the treasures of her own tradition and feeling mutually responsible for the unity of the faith and for ecclesial discipline.[5]

This vision of communion and mutual exchange between the churches is a crucial feature of Soloviev's religious-philosophical project centered on the restoration of cosmic unity within the divine-human unity of Christ—the doctrine of *theosis* or deification. For Soloviev, *theosis* is also the foundation for a Christian humanism and a politics devoted to the freedom and

---

[3] Georges Florovsky, "The Problem of Ecumenical Encounter," in *Rediscovering Eastern Christendom: Essays in Commemoration of Dom Bede Winslow*. Eds. E.J.B. Fry and A.H. Armstrong (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1963), 69.

[4] On the connections between Soloviev's metaphysics and his ecumenical theology, see Teresa Obolevitch, "The Metaphysical Foundations of the Ecumenical Project of Vladimir Solovyov," *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 67 (1–2) (2015) 31–43.

[5] Address to Conference, "Vladimir Soloviev, Russia and the Universal Church," Lviv, Ukraine, October 28, 2003, *L'Osservatore Romano*, Eng. edition (12/10/03).

Eucharistic Ecclesiology in the Russian Religious Renaissance as Instruction in Orthodox - Eastern Catholic Ecumenism

Daniel Kisliakov

Much took place in ecumenical engagement between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism in the mid-twentieth century; by any measure, this was one of the most productive encounters in the history of modern ecumenism. Less has been written, however, about the engagement between the Eastern Orthodox and the Eastern Catholics. Largely this is a result of the historically difficult relationship between Russia and Ukraine, as well as other places in which Orthodoxy and Eastern Catholicism feature strongly. However, in light of the connection to the Eastern Christian tradition that both of these groups share, it is proper to question whether this should actually be the case. It might be argued that, overall, the potential for ecumenism between these two established traditions of the East is greater than that of the Christians of the East and of the West. To date little has been accomplished in this regard.

This chapter constitutes an attempt to make a contribution to this need by focusing on the history of early Orthodox participation in the

D. Kisliakov (✉)
University of Divinity, Kew, VIC, Australia

239

ecumenical movement and, in particular, the notion of eucharistic ecclesiology as it manifested in the writings of Sergius Bulgakov (1871–1944) and Nicholas Afanasiev (1893–1966). Acknowledging the differences but also drawing attention to the similarities between these two theologians, the chapter argues that eucharistic ecclesiology, which also featured strongly in the ecumenical engagement between the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics in the twentieth century, is helpful in establishing engagement between the Eastern Orthodox and the Eastern Catholics. There are less significant theological differences with this interface compared to the earlier dialogue between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism, which met with considerable success. Historically, there is also a precedent of *rapprochement* between the Eastern Catholics and Eastern Orthodox to learn from, and this has been related to eucharistic ecclesiology. This, it will be argued, is helpful in overcoming obstacles such as ethnophyletism, which hinders the proper activity of the Church. Thus, recognizing the value of eucharistic ecclesiology in ecumenical encounter is instructive in developing an approach to ecumenical engagement between Eastern Orthodoxy and Eastern Catholicism.

To demonstrate this, the chapter will firstly consider the value of the study of the history of early ecumenism, in particular the productive historic encounters between East and West. It will stress the value of spiritual communion in situations in which fraternal eucharistic communion is not yet possible. Ecumenical initiatives involving Eastern Catholicism will also be considered. The chapter will then look at the development of a eucharistic focus in Bulgakov's ecumenical theology, considering it in light of Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology. Finally, it will consider the scope of potential ecumenical engagement between Eastern Orthodoxy and Eastern Catholicism, and in conclusion, some thoughts will be presented about the potential for a eucharistically focused approach to this particular ecumenical interface.

1   THE VALUE OF EARLY ECUMENISM

On the whole, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the twentieth century was one of the most destructive in the history of human civilization. The advent of modern warfare led to a situation in which human grievances played out with the most devastating consequences. Empires fell and new nations emerged in their stead, resulting in an unprecedented level of human displacement. People's sources of security in respect of

Paul Evdokimov and *Una Sancta*: A Russian Orthodox Theologian in Search of Ecumenical Unity

Peter C. Phan

The Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church, the official name of what was planned to be the pan-Orthodox council, which met in Kolymvari, Crete, Greece, June 9–26, 2016, has been justly praised for its concern for ecumenical unity.[1] It is the fruit of over a century of preparation if we count from the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III's 1920 encyclical urging the Orthodox Churches to come together to consider the relations of their Churches to the Catholic and Protestant Churches. Its proximate preparation was carried out by four pan-Orthodox conferences starting in 1961, a secretariat, several inter-Orthodox preparatory

---

[1] This official name of the council is not accepted by all the Orthodox Churches, in particular by those Churches that refused to attend the council, namely, the Church of Antioch, the Russian Orthodox Church, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, the Church of Georgia, and the Orthodox Church in America. The refusal of this title is part of the "reception" of this council in Orthodoxy.

P. C. Phan (✉)
Department of Theology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

commissions, five pan-Orthodox pre-conciliar conferences beginning in 1976, a series of synaxes (meetings of the heads of the Orthodox Churches) starting in 1992, and a special inter-Orthodox commission. From these meetings, six themes were selected and texts drafted for deliberation at the council.[2]

One of these six texts is entitled "The Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World," which combines into one the two preparatory documents dealing with the relationship of the Orthodox Church to the ecumenical movement and its relationship to the Christian world respectively.[3] This combined text was approved by the fifth pan-Orthodox pre-conciliar conference in October 2015, placed on the conciliar agenda by the synaxis in January 2016, and officially approved by the council in Crete.[4]

Numerous studies have detailed the influence of ecclesiastical bodies as well as individual theologians on the conception, development, and execution of this pan-Orthodox council.[5] Among the latter, Paul Evdokimov (1901–1970), a lay Russian Orthodox theologian and émigré in the West, whose activities for church union and theology of ecumenical unity are still understudied compared with his fellow Russian theologians, deserves to be seriously considered in the aftermath of the pan-Orthodox council. This chapter first gives a brief survey of Evdokimov's life and work, especially what he calls his "ecumenical vocation" in his existence outside his native country. Second, it examines the theological principles that Evdokimov believes should govern ecumenical theology. Third, it expounds some of Evdokimov's proposals to resolve key issues that were

[2] The six themes discussed by the council are mission, diaspora, autonomy, marriage, fasting, and ecumenism.

[3] Note that the council uses both the singular and the plural of "Church" (the Orthodox Church and Orthodox Church*es*). By "Orthodox Church" are meant here the Eastern (Greek/Byzantine/Chalcedonian) Orthodox Churches, the Oriental (non-Chalcedonian) Churches, and the Church of the East (Persian/Nestorian).

[4] For the text of the council on ecumenical unity, "Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World," see https://www.holycouncil.org/offical-documents/-/asset_publisher/VA0WE2pZ4Y0I/content/rest-of-christian-world?

[5] See in particular Archbishop Job (Getcha) of Telmessos, "The Ecumenical Significance of the Holy ad Great Council of the Orthodox Church," *The Ecumenical Review* vol. 69, no. 2 (2017), 274–287, and Dagmar Heller, "The (Holy and Great) Council of the Orthodox Churches: An Ecumenical Perspective," *The Ecumenical Review* vol. 69, no. 2 (2017), 288–300.

The Specificity of the Greek-Catholic Ecclesiology in the Thinking of the Romanian Theological School

Alexandru Buzalic

1 INTRODUCTION

In 1979, in the United States, Father Alexandru Raţiu (1906–2002) published the book *Stolen Church*.[1] American-born, son of Romanian emigrants, he returned to the Kingdom of Romania to study theology, following his philosophical and theological studies in Oradea/Transylvania and then in Rome/Italy. After receiving his doctorate, he started his priesthood in the Romanian Greek-Catholic Church, serving as a priest in the countryside and then in the church of the Theological Seminary in Oradea.

---

[1] Alexandru Raţiu, William Virtue, *Stolen Church. Martyrdom in Communist Romania* (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc. 1979).

A. Buzalic (✉)
Faculty of Greek-Catholic Theology, Babeş-Bolyai University,
Cluj-Napoca, Romania

281

In October 1948, declaring that "the will of the people was to join the Romanian Orthodox Church" the Romanian government dissolved the Greek-Catholic Church in the country on Stalin's orders, who intended to subordinate and supervise ecclesiastical institutions in order to become docile to the Soviet political system. During the Stalinist period, which lasted until 1963–1965, Romania was subordinated to the policy of Moscow, with which it signed a Treaty of friendship and mutual assistance in 1948, which allowed the USSR to get involved in the security issues of Romania.[2] Romanian political police, "Securitatea," and the Communist government confiscated all the Greek-Catholic churches and institutions and gave them to the Orthodox Church. The government then arrested all six bishops of the Greek-Catholic Church, along with many other priests and lay leaders, and attempted to persuade them to declare publicly their allegiance to the Orthodox Church.

Refusal would have led to torture and often death, as it was the case with the seven martyred bishops beatified in June 2019, by Pope Francis. Between 1948 and 1964, Rațiu was imprisoned in several prisons: Căldărușani, Sighet prison, Gherla, Jilava, Bătești, and finally sent to different labor camps in different locations, such as Strâmba, Stoenești, and Great Brăila Island. He was subsequently placed under house arrest for another two years. In 1970, the Communist authorities allowed him to leave Romania, and he rejoined his family in the United States in 1971. Rațiu served as a priest in the United States from 1974 until his retirement. Even though he was a Catholic priest and theologian and was serving as a priest in the Romanian Church, he was also living in the "Orthodox" spirituality.[3] Through his book *Stolen Church*, Rațiu wanted to draw attention to the suffering and martyrdom of the Greek-Catholic Church in the dark decades of communism. During communism, the Greek-Catholic Churches of Eastern Europe were "stolen Churches" that called to bear witness to the faith by the restoration of unity among Christian churches.

The promulgation of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches (*Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*) in 1991 and the recognition of the term "church *sui iuris*"[4] opens the way to an ecclesiological vision

---

[2] Dennis Deletant, *România sub regimul comunist* (București: Fundația Academia Civică, 2006), 20–33.

[3] Alexandru Rațiu, William Virtue, *Stolen Church*, 184–185.

[4] CCEO, can. 27.

Synodical Principle as the Key to Church Unity

Irakli Jinjolava

Irakli Jinjolava

Tension regarding the issue of synodality has dramatically intensified in the past few years and has become one of the most discussed and crucial issues not only in the Orthodox Church but also in other Christian communities. Two recent ecclesial events, each generating significant documents, may be cited as contributing to this trend: on one hand, the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church, with its lengthy preparatory process until which took place in Crete in 2016, and on the other hand, the *Chieti Document*, which is the common statement of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, whose members met in September 2016 in Chieti, Italy.

For the Orthodox Church, the synodal structure has always been an indispensable part of its ecclesiological existence—from the beginning of its creation until today. From the Apostolic Era through the holding of the apostolic council around the year 49–50 for the solution of the then most

I. Jinjolava (✉)
The Institute of Orthodox Theology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany

301

difficult question of the early church: the dissemination of the Christian message and the inclusion in the Church of all people, including non-Jews without circumcision. The Acts 15 tells us about this charismatic event of the Church, which is considered the biblical foundation of the church's synodality. The double dimension—that is, the vertical between God and man and the horizontal between believers—is also clearly expressed, in this case through the collegial cooperation of the participants in the apostolic council, namely the apostles and the presbyters. Literally, the Bible says: "The Holy Spirit and we have decided" (Acts 15:28). The synodical principle has as its paradigm the apostolic council of Jerusalem and how the apostles and elders faced with the disruptive problem of circumcision, gathered in Jerusalem and how openly the problem was discussed (Acts 15). Thus, the pneumatological dimension of the synodality of the Church of Jesus Christ is also expressed. This means that we believe that in these synodal decisions, not only the leaders of the Church work together in a collegial way, but above all they work under the guidance and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Synodality itself is based on the principle of communion, starting from Triune God to the last creature. Therefore, the "model and source of all communion is […] perfect communion of Trinitarian Persons in infinite mutual love, self-experience and continually given to the entire creation".[1]

In the second millennium, major synods were held in the Orthodox Church, but they did not have the same rank as the joint Ecumenical Councils.[2] Also, in the Roman Catholic Church, many synods were convened. The Roman Catholic refer to them as Ecumenical Councils, but the Orthodox Church only as synods of the West. Pope Paul VI seemed to differentiate in a letter between these two types of conciliar meetings: in the first millennium we have the joint Ecumenical Councils. The relevant distinction of Pope Paul VI from 1974 is of great ecclesiological and ecumenical significance. As such, in the second millennium,

---

[1] Irimie Marga, "The Holy and Great Council of the Orthodoxy according to Rev. Prof. Liviu Stan," *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai Theologia Orthodoxa* 62, no. 1 (June 2017): 74, doi:https://doi.org/10.24193/subbto.2017.1.05

[2] For example, historically the Church convened Great Councils at the time of St Gregory Palamas (1341, 1351, 1368), in 1484 to refute the unionist Council of Florence (1438–1439), in 1638, 1642, 1672, and 1691 to refute Protestant beliefs, and in 1872 to condemn ethnophyletism as an ecclesiological heresy. Those synods were referred in the Encyclical of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church (Crete 2016) as having "universal authority".

Church as *Koinonia:* Exploring the Ecumenical Potential of John Zizioulas's *Communio* Ecclesiology

Tihomir Lazić

In the aftermath of Vatican II, the concept of *koinonia* emerged as a key idea in contemporary self-definition of the church.[1] The significance of this multivalent concept for the understanding of the church's faith, life,

---

[1] To understand the centrality of *koinonia* and different approaches to this concept in the contemporary ecumenical debates, see, for instance: Lorelei F. Fuchs, *Koinonia and the Quest for an Ecumenical Ecclesiology: Foundations through Dialogue to Symbolic Competence for Communionality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008); Verna Lewis-Elgidely, *Koinonia in the Three Great Abrahamic Faiths: Acclaiming the Mystery and Diversity of Faiths* (South Bend, IN: Cloverdale Books, 2007); Susan H. Moore, "Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness: Theological Insights and Emphases from the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order, Santiago de Compostela, 1993," *Ecumenical Review*, 47 (1995): 3–11; Gunther Gassmann, "From Montreal 1963 to Santiago de Compostela 1993: Issues and Results of Faith and Order Work," *Ecumenical Review*, 45 (1993): 27–43; "The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Ecumenical Perspectives on the 1991 Canberra Statement on Unity," in *Faith and Order, No. 163*, ed. Gunther Gassmann and John A. Radano (Geneva: WCC Publications,

T. Lazić (✉)
Newbold College of Higher Education, Binfield, UK

and witness was given special emphasis at the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order in Santiago de Compostela (1993),[2] after which it assumed a critical role in the work of Faith and Order, assemblies of the World Council of Churches, and theological self-understanding of individual churches.[3] Because it sought to incorporate all its rival theological proposals, at least partially, *koinonia* quickly gained a worldwide reputation as one of the most stimulating and promising ideas in the ecumenical dialogue.[4]

With the passing of time, it became almost impossible to write or talk about ecumenical ecclesiology without employing the term *koinonia* to express the relational unity of the churches. Nowadays the notion of *koinonia*, commonly translated as *communio* in Latin and "communion" or "fellowship" in English, appears ubiquitously in ecumenical literature and is generally used as "an expression of the most profound and all-embracing [relational] reality that establishes 'the church of God.'"[5] Due to the popularity of its foundational concept, *communion ecclesiology* has been recognized by some as the ultimate and "the most basic form of ecclesiology."[6]

1993); Jean Tillard, "Koinonia," in *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. Georges Florovsky (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991), 56.

[2] World Council of Churches, "Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life, and Witness: A Discussion Paper," *Proceedings of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order in Santiago de Compostela* (Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 1993).

[3] Fuchs, *Koinonia and the Quest for an Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, 70–247.

[4] Ernest Skublics, *Aspects and Implications of Communion Ecclesiology* (Cumbria, UK: Theophania Publishing, 2001), 13–34; World Council of Churches, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision (Faith and Order Paper No. 214)* (Geneva: World Council of Churches Publications, 2013); Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998); Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, "The Church as the Fellowship of Persons: An Emerging Pentecostal Ecclesiology of *Koinonia*," *PentecoStudies,* 6 (2007); Scott MacDougall, *More Than Communion: Imagining an Eschatological Ecclesiology* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015).

[5] Thomas F. Günther, World Council of Churches, *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994). This notion is considered to be "the central and fundamental idea of the Council's documents." See Extraordinary Synod of 1985, "The Final Report," *Origins* 15 (19 December 1985): 448.

[6] When producing the document, "Some Aspects of the Church Understood as a Communion," Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger openly argued that "communion ecclesiology" represents the ultimate and the most basic form of ecclesiology. See *L'Osservatore Romano* (English Edition), 17 June 1992, 1. See also Fuchs, *Koinonia and the Quest for an Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, xxxiii.

Theological Reflections on the Dialogue with the Orthodox Church from an Eastern Catholic Perspective

Thomas Mark Németh

1   State of the Question

This chapter presents methodological and thematic considerations for a dialogue between the Orthodox Church and Eastern Catholic Churches in the hope to contribute to such an ecumenical undertaking. This topic belongs in the wider context of Orthodox-Catholic relations.[1] First of all, it seems useful to raise the question of the names of the partners of the

---

[1] For the history and content of this dialogue see Pantelis Kalaitzidis et al., eds., *Orthodox Handbook on Ecumenism. Resources for Theological Education* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 2014); Richard Potz and Eva Synek, *Orthodoxes Kirchenrecht. Eine Einführung*, 2nd ed. (Freistadt: Plöchl, 2014), 558–363; Johann Marte, ed., *Herausforderung sichtbarer Einheit. Beiträge zu den Dokumenten des katholisch-orthodoxen Dialogs* (Würzburg: Echter, 2014); Johannes Oeldemann, *Orthodoxe Kirchen im ökumenischen Dialog. Positionen, Probleme, Perspektiven* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2004).

T. M. Németh (✉)
University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

dialogue. The long-standing name "Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church"[2] stems from the fact that the Orthodox partner insists on the attribute "Roman" for the Catholic side.[3] This does not mean that the Eastern Catholic Churches are fully excluded, since some members of the dialogue group belong(ed) to them.[4] Moreover, some documents—like the Balamand Statement, which will be treated later—take them into consideration. However, the Orthodox side seems to argue that Eastern Catholics are in communion with Rome and that they are therefore Roman. This will be discussed in more detail later. There are several other issues which raise questions about the future of the dialogue. The title of this volume shows that Eastern Catholic Churches are still frequently regarded by Orthodoxy as "stolen churches," while they still regard themselves sometimes as "bridges" between the confessions. However, there seems to be growing consensus among scholars interested in the dialogue that the Eastern Catholic Churches should not be excluded from participation.[5] There are several examples of a more intensive participation of Eastern Catholic Churches at lower levels of dialogue such as the Kyivan

[2] For relevant documents see Harding Meyer, et al., eds., *Growth in Agreement*, 4 vols. (New York: Paulist Press and Geneva: WCC Publications, 1984–2017); Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, accessed January 21, 2020, http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-orientale/chiese-ortodosse-di-tradizione-bizantina/commissione-mista-internazionale-per-il-dialogo-teologico-tra-la.html; in German: Marte, *Herausforderung*, 166–255; Pro Oriente, et al., eds., *Dokumente des offiziellen orthodox-katholischen Dialogs* (1980–2010) (Wien, 2010), accessed January 21, 2020, http://dokumente.pro-oriente.at/dokumente/dialog_web.pdf; for other levels of dialogue: Thomas Bremer, ed., *Orthodxie im Dialog. Bilaterale Dialoge der orthodoxen und der orientalisch-orthodoxen Kirchen 1945–1997. Eine Dokumentensammlung* (Trier: Paulinus, 1999) 17–484; John Borelli and John H. Ericksons, eds., *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue: Documents of the Joint International Commission and Official Dialogues in the United States 1965–1995* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996).

[3] Although the attribute "Roman" is sometimes omitted, even on the website of the Vatican quoted in the previous footnote, it is a part of the official name of this commission. I am grateful to Prof. Theresia Hainthaler for information regarding this institution.

[4] For example, Dr. Eleuterio Fortino (Italo-Alban Greek Catholic Church), Prof. Dr. Ernst Christoph Suttner (Russian Greek Catholic Church), Dr. Ivan Dacko (Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church), Bishop Prof. Dimitrios Salachas (Greek Catholic Church of Greece), Bishop Florentin Crihălmeanu (Romanian Greek Catholic Church); Metr. Paul Sayah (Maronite Church).

[5] See for example, the presentation in Volume II by Petros Vassiliadis, "Orthodox-Catholic and Greek Catholic Relations After The Ukrainian Crisis".

The Question of "Uniatism" in the Framework of the Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue and the Ecclesiological Option of *Communio*

Dimitrios Keramidas

The question of "Uniatism"[1] was pursued by the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and

---

[1] Usually, the terms "Uniatism" and "Uniates" have a derogatory connotation, as they are used to underline the negative view that the Orthodox historically have had for the Catholic Churches of Byzantine rite. The term had been coined by Pope Benedict XIV in his Encyclical *Ex quo* (1756) to designate the Eastern rite Churches reunited with Rome. Since then, the label "Uniates" appeared in various Catholic official documents. See Edmond Farrugia, "Uniatism," in *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Christian East*, ed. Edmond Farrugia (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2015, 2nd edition), 1881. The term "Eastern (or Oriental) Catholic Churches" was an improvement on the term "Uniate"; in fact, Vatican's II Decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (hereafter OE) makes no use of the word "Uniate(s)." The Freising

D. Keramidas (✉)
School of Humanities, Hellenic Open University, Patras, Greece

Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas (Angelicum), Rome, Italy

the Orthodox Church (hereafter JIC) nearly three decades ago, in two Plenary Sessions: in Freising (hereafter F.)[2] and in Balamand (hereafter B.),[3] in the aftermath of the fall of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the re-emersion of Byzantine rite Catholic Churches, who demanded the restitution of their church properties and their freedom of worship,[4] but mainly on the insistence of the Orthodox Churches to treat Uniatism "as an urgent problem" and "with priority over all the other

---

Statement speaks of "Catholic Churches of Byzantine rite" and of "Uniate Churches" (5), while the Balamand document speaks of "Oriental Catholic Churches." The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation issued in 1992 a *Communique* on the "Tensions in Eastern Europe Related to 'Uniatism'" (https://bit.ly/2PfYhHI), in which it specified that "a distinction should be made between 'Uniatism' understood as inappropriate, indeed unacceptable, model or method for church union, and 'Uniatism' understood as the existence of convinced Eastern Christians who have accepted full communion with the See of Rome as part of their self-understanding as a church. 'Uniatism' in the former sense is no longer accepted by either of our churches" (par. 5). In the context of the O-RC dialogue, the term "Uniatism" has been used to indicate the annexation of groups of Orthodox faithful to the Catholic Church, which provoked intentionally and consciously the break of communion with their local Orthodox Church of origin. In the last decades the topic has produced a rich and interesting literature. See among other titles: Josef Macha, *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework Together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations* (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1974); Ronald Roberson, *The Eastern Catholic Churches* (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2010, 7th edition); Ernst Suttner, *Church Unity. Union or Uniatism? Catholic-Orthodox Ecumenical Perspectives* (Rome: Centre for Indian and Inter-Religious Studies, 1991); Jean-Claude Roberti, *Les Uniates* (Paris: Cerf, 1992); Robert Taft "The Problem of 'Uniatism' and the 'Healing of Memories': Anamnesis, not Amnesia," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 41–42, (200–2001): 155–196.

[2] See Sixth Plenary Meeting of the JIC "Communiqué: Uniatism," *Information Service* 73, (1990/II): 52–53. A sub-commission in Vienna, in 1990, studied the "Questions concerning the Churches of Byzantine Rite United with Rome and the Problems of Uniatism and Proselytism." See "Mixed Coordinating Committee of the JIC. February 1–8, 1990," *Information Service* 73, (1990/II): 34–35. The Coordinating Committee of the JIC prepared a working paper in 1991 in Ariccia on "Uniatism as a Method of Union of the Past and the Present Search for Full Communion," *Sobornost* 13.2, (1992): 49–54.

[3] See Seventh Plenary Meeting of the JIC between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church "Uniatism. Method of union of the past, and the present search for full communion," *Information Service* 83, (1993/II): 96–99, and, with corrections, in *Information Service* 84, (1993/III-IV): 149.

[4] The radical social changes and political turnabouts in Eastern Europe in the 1990s favoured the discussion of the "Uniate" question, which nonetheless concerned the Orthodox and the Catholics alike, as there were victims of violence and anti-Christian persecutions for both churches (F., 4).