



Church Unions of the Early Modern Period in Relation and Contradiction to the Council of Ferrara/Florence

Barbara Hallensleben

In order to understand the church unions and their ecumenical consequences, a historical review of the Council of Florence is helpful, even inevitable. On this basis, the following chapter will show how contemporary ecclesial and theological tensions can be adequately understood and potentially resolved.¹

¹I strongly recommend the book of Ernst Christoph Suttner who translated the most relevant historical sources on the Church Unions into German, presenting also the Latin documents: Ernst Christoph Suttner, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Kirchenunionen des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd edition (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag 2017).

B. Hallensleben (✉)
Center for the Study of Eastern Churches, University of Fribourg,
Fribourg, Switzerland

© The Author(s) 2021
V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to
Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_1

1 THE COUNCIL OF FERRARA/FLORENCE (1438/1439)

The motives of the church unions since the sixteenth century clearly and essentially refer to the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438/1439). The Union Bull *Laetentur Caeli* did not find an immediate reception, but it repeatedly gave occasion to remember the period of common ecclesial life and to seek the restoration of full communion.

In 1071 Byzantium had suffered a great defeat at Manzikert against the Seljuks. The crusades began in response to the Byzantine Emperor's call for military support in the struggle for free access to the holy sites in Palestine. Unfortunately, they were soon associated with Western political expansionist interests and with Western efforts to "latinize" the Christian East. Initially, however, no separate patriarchates and dioceses were established for Latin Christians, but Latin bishops were appointed to the existing Greek sees. The Western rulers at that time, in addition to increasing their own influence, also wanted to reunite Greek and Latin Christians² who had developed apart. Although both sides regretted the differences in church traditions, they acknowledged the sacramental life of the others. In spite of a certain suspicion, the existing differences on both sides were not regarded as a division in faith which would have prevented a mutual recognition as the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ. In this situation, there developed an idea to seek ecclesial unity through the establishment of common church structure by appointing (Latin) hierarchs.³ The Fourth Lateran Council explicitly recognized this way of proceeding by determining:

Since there are many areas where people of different languages live in a colourful mixture within the same city and diocese, who have the same faith but different rites and habits, we issue the following strict regulation: The bishops of such cities or dioceses appoint suitable men to celebrate liturgy for these people in the different rites and languages, to administer the ecclesiastical sacraments to them and to instruct them by word and also by example. We prohibit without exception that the same city or diocese has different bishops. It would be like a body with several heads, as it were a monster. If, however, it should be absolutely necessary for the reasons mentioned, the

² As in the sources of the historical period dealt with here, in the present contribution the Christians with a Western ecclesial life are called "Latins" and those following the Byzantine tradition are called "Greeks"—without regard to their actual mother tongue and national origin.

³ Cf. Ernst Christoph Suttner, "Kircheneinheit im 11. bis 13. Jahrhundert durch einen gemeinsamen Patriarchen und gemeinsame Bischöfe für Griechen und Lateiner." In *Ostkirchliche Studien* 49 (2000) 314–324.



“They Shall Beat Their Swords into Plowshares”: Orthodox-Eastern Catholics Conflicts and the Ecumenical Progress That They Generated

Radu Bordeianu

Are Eastern Catholic Churches “bridges to Catholicism”? Are they “bridges to Orthodoxy”? Both of these options imply a combative attitude that attempts to seize the other church’s faithful into one’s fold and understands Christian unity after the return model.¹ If this is the case,

¹The return model of Christian unity starts from the belief that one Christian denomination contains the fullness of truth and Church life to the exclusion of other Christians, who have splintered away from this fullness. The way to Christian unity is to simply absorb back the schismatics, who are called to repent of their errors and return to the fullness of the Church found in that specific denomination. While this return model dominated especially the Catholic Church until the beginning of the twentieth century and it is still found in some Orthodox circles, it is now clearly not the way toward a united Church that, at their best, either of the two churches advocates. For more on this subject, see: Radu Bordeianu, “The Unity We Seek: Orthodox Perspectives,” in *The [Oxford] Handbook of Ecumenical Studies*, ed. Geoffrey Wainwright and Paul McPartlan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

R. Bordeianu (✉)

Department of Theology, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_2

Byzantine Catholic churches are not bridges that one crosses freely and knowingly, connecting different lands; they are swords menacingly wielded at the other. Throughout history, this has often been the case, and the swords were not only allegorical but also used for literal forms of violence. I propose that Byzantine Catholic Churches could teach us how to cross the bridge toward a land that was once fruitful, but is now forgotten—a united Church that is neither the Orthodox Church nor the Catholic Church in their present forms. As the unity of the Church is not currently manifested in its fullness, unity can be compared to a land that needs to be rediscovered, purged, and recultivated, and for this we need to beat our swords into plowshares. Prophet Isaiah foresaw a time when the LORD’s house shall be established in Zion—that Promised Land of unity, when

they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.²

Before highlighting important historical markers that have shaped the relationship between the Orthodox, Roman, and Byzantine Catholic churches, as well as the ecclesiological considerations that they raise, two terminological clarifications are necessary. First, in this chapter the term “Uniatism” is regarded as pejorative, but it cannot be avoided in citing statements by other authors. Moreover, in this chapter the terms “Byzantine Catholic,” “Eastern Catholic,” “Oriental Catholic,” “Greek Catholic,” and “Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rite” are used interchangeably.

I HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Writing a Common History

The history of the interactions between East and West as they relate to Eastern Catholic Churches is illustrative of how Orthodox-Catholic unity might look, but also how it should *not* look. This history is mostly an allegorical (and sometimes literal) sword, marred by opposing readings of

² Isaiah 2:2–4



Giorgio Agamben's *Stasis* (Civil War): An Illuminating Paradigm for Ecumenical Studies?

Craig A. Phillips

This chapter employs the writings of Giorgio Agamben on *stasis* (the ancient Greek word for “civil war”) to show how his analysis might shed light on ecumenical discourses, particularly as it applies to relationships between Eastern Catholic Churches and Eastern Orthodox Churches. At first it might seem counterintuitive or shocking to hear the words “civil war” uttered in the context of ecumenical discourses and engagements. Is it not the intention of ecumenical discourse to bring ecclesiastical bodies at least into a greater harmony and at best into a more organic union? How then could a theory of civil war be helpful for these purposes? It is the contention of this chapter that an exploration of *stasis* not only illuminates the characteristics of the conflict itself, but the nature of the “peace” achieved after the resolution of the conflict.

The first section of this chapter investigates Giorgio Agamben’s analysis of *stasis*, locating its importance and role in Agamben’s larger philosophical

C. A. Phillips (✉)
Virginia Theological Seminary, Arlington, VA, USA

© The Author(s) 2021
V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to
Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_3

and political project. Agamben often begins his inquiries with a philological investigation of a word, an idea, or a citation—in this case *stasis*—and then without a discernable break, his argument becomes a philosophical investigation. Because for Agamben the philological is the philosophical and vice versa, he investigates the identified word or citation further by taking it out of its original context so that it can be redeployed for his own purposes in an entirely different context.¹

The second section of the chapter employs elements taken from Agamben’s discussion of *stasis*, *mutatis mutandis*, to illuminate the document “Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion” issued by the seventh plenary session of the Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church at the Balamand School of Theology in Lebanon in 1993 (the Balamand Statement).² The juxtaposition of the work of Agamben with this ecumenical document offers insights about the nature of the conflict and into its possible resolution, not otherwise available in an analysis of the ecumenical document alone.

Finally, the chapter employs the paradigm of *stasis* heuristically, focusing on Agamben’s analysis of the Athenian Civil War and conflicts between ancient Greek city states, and the mode of their resolution, applying it to Orthodox–Eastern Catholic conflicts and engagements.

¹In October 2001, Agamben presented two seminars at Princeton University, which were published with minor variations under the title, *Stasis: Civil War as Political Paradigm*. This volume was identified as Part II, 2 of Agamben’s multivolume *Homo Sacer* project. The name of the series comes from Agamben’s 1995 book *Homo Sacer* that began his in-depth investigations into the nature and function of political sovereignty in Western democracies. See Giorgio Agamben, *Stasis: La guerre civile come paradigma politico* (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri editore, 2015); English edition: *Stasis: Civil War as Political Paradigm*, trans. Nicholas Heron (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2015). See also Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998). Because of the brevity of these Princeton seminars, Agamben’s discussion of *stasis* is more suggestive than complete, leaving the reader with the task of filling out the implications and application of his work.

²The Seventh Plenary Session, Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, Balamand, Lebanon, June 17–24, 1993. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19930624_lebanon_en.html



The Church of England as a Bridge Church

Mark D. Chapman

I THE VIA MEDIA OR BRIDGE CHURCH

This is not a chapter that is explicitly about either the Eastern Orthodox or the Eastern Catholic Churches, although it has many possible applications for any churches seeking to work out how they might be able to engage in constructive ecumenical dialogue. It is principally a discussion of the concept of a “bridge church”, one of the themes of the Conference. This relates chiefly to the concept of catholicity, particularly as it has been understood within the Church of England and the wider Anglican Communion. My main concern is to discuss the not uncommon idea that somehow the Church of England acts as a “bridge church”¹ or is some sort of *via media* between Protestants and Catholics (and Orthodox). According to the Anglo-Catholic priest and founder of the Catholic

¹ See Richard Langford James, *The Bridge Church: an Outspoken Essay*, with a preface by Sidney Dark (London: Philip Allan for the Catholic Literature Association, 1930). See also the rather more nuanced discussion by the early Anglican ecumenist, Oliver Chase Quick: *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity* (London: Longmans, 1924). Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom* (London, Geoffrey Bles, 1939), 163.

M. D. Chapman (✉)

Ripon College Cuddesdon, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_4

League for the Unity of Christians, Richard Langford James, the term “bridge church” applied to Anglicanism appears to have emerged at the Lausanne Conference of Faith and Order in 1927, although the use does not appear to have been recorded in the proceedings.² The idea certainly appears much earlier. For instance, the first Anglo-Catholic Bishop, Alexander Penrose Forbes of Brechin in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, noted that the Anglican Church had a particular “providential position” as a church “stretching forth one hand to the Protestant bodies, and the other to the Latin and Greek Churches”.³ In his short book Langford took issue with such understandings of Anglicanism, describing the “central churchman” (rather than the Anglo-Catholic)⁴ as the one most likely to build a bridge since he is able to comprehend a form of catholicity broader than that of either the Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Churches. The Bridge Church in this sense was a *tertium quid*, “a fresh presentation of the Christian religion which shall be a real blend of Catholicism and Protestantism”.⁵

To the intractable Anglo-Papalist, Langford James, however, the form of religion of the enlightened central party seemed to have died a death with Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, the great Victorian Dean of Westminster. This left Protestants and Catholics within the Church of England to fight it out between themselves and to make their own ecumenical moves in different directions.⁶ At the same time, he held, there was still a possibility for “bridge building” which might emanate from different places: rather than one bridge there would be two.⁷ For Anglo-Catholics it was crucial to resist Protestantism and Modernism within the Church of England and to oppose all those who sought to build bridges to Protestant Churches,⁸

² James, *The Bridge Church*, 13. See H N Bate, ed., *Faith and order: proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3–21, 1927* (London: SCM, 1928). More generally, see Damian J. Palmer, ‘Negotiating the Historic Episcopate: Christian Unity Discussions Between the Anglican and Non-Episcopal Communion, 1888–1938’, unpublished PhD dissertation, Charles Sturt University, 2014.

³ Alexander Penrose Forbes, *An Explanation of the thirty-nine Articles: Volume One: Arts I–XXI with an Epistle Dedicatory to the Rev. E. B. Pusey D.D.* (Oxford: Parker, 1867); Volume Two: Arts XXII–end (Oxford: Parker, 1868), here vol. 1, pp. xxx–xxxii.

⁴ James, *The Bridge Church*, 23.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 114.



Kenotic Ecumenism: What Can Eastern Catholics and Orthodox Learn from the Parable of the Grain of Wheat?

Pavlo Smytsnyuk

Unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit. Whoever loves his life loses it, and whoever hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life.

Jn 12: 24–25

The Second Vatican Council invited the Eastern Catholic Churches (ECC) to promote Christian unity in a special way (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum* 24). The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) proclaims to be happy with such a task and wants to serve as a mediator between Eastern and Western Christianity.¹ Paradoxically, however, Ukrainian Greek Catholics

¹Cf. The Synod of Bishops of UGCC, *The Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church* (Lviv: Koleso, 2016), §11 [p. 49], §34 [p. 57], §53 [65].

P. Smytsnyuk (✉)

Institute of Ecumenical Studies, Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_5

are often perceived by the Orthodox and others as the paramount obstacle to ecumenical dialogue. One could perhaps propose an analogy with the See of Rome: the primacy of the Pope, the rock of faith, which is intended to serve the unity of Christians, became a stumbling block to achieving this unity.² Today, the Orthodox have much better relations with the Roman Curia and Latin dioceses around the world than with the Greek Catholics. Can this be changed?

Lubomyr Husar, the late Primate of the UGCC, was asked in an interview whether the lack of unity between Christians is a consequence of the reluctance or unwillingness to unite on the part of the churches themselves. He replied: “It seems it me that [we are separated] because we ourselves do not want [to be united]. We are not ready to sacrifice anything. [W]hat is needed is the readiness to sacrifice [our benefits, our interests [...]]. We all talk about unity. All without exception. [...] But what are we ready to sacrifice to be united?”³

This chapter offers a reflection on what I suggest are the presuppositions and repercussions of Lubomyr Husar’s intuition on Christian unity. Husar grasped the key to ecumenical success, both in Ukraine and on a broader scale. This key consists in sacrifice, rejection of one’s legitimate interests, or, to use more theological language, *kenosis*.

Husar’s idea could be pushed a bit further and to reflect on the concept of *kenosis*, in its both Christological and ecclesiological implications. It will be argued that, in order for ECC to accomplish their mission of being the “bridges” between East and West, their attitude toward the Orthodox should be kenotic, asymmetrical, and eschato-centric: ECC should (a) consider themselves as a means of unity of the Body of Christ, (b) reject the model of reciprocity, and (c) embrace the eschatological perspective, which transcends the logic of mundane successes, and models itself after the “grain of wheat” which is not afraid to die (Jn 12:24–25).

² See Pierre Lathuilière, “Le ‘stumbling block’ du ministère papal,” *Lumière & Vie* 56, no. 274 (2007): 93–104.

³ Lybomyr Husar, “Chrystyjanstvo v Ukraini. Chy mozhlyva yednist? Interview by Inna Kuznetsova,” *Religija v Ukraini* (2011), https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/ukrainian_zmi/11207-xristyjanstvo-v-ukrayini-chi-mozhlyva-yednist.html. My translation.



Eastern Catholic Churches and the Theological Dialogue Between the Latin Church and the Orthodox Church Seen Through the Category of Prophetic Dialogue

Sandra Mazzolini

In the theological dialogue between the Latin Church and the Orthodox Church, many relevant ecclesiological questions are still open. In a few words, they also concern the identity of the Church and, consequently its unity, which is the *conditio sine qua non* for the fulfillment of the ecclesial evangelizing mission,¹ according to the Great Commission (see *Matthew*

¹“The divisions still existing among Christian Churches openly contradict the will of Christ” (see *John* 17: 20–23) and scandalize the world and damage “the holy cause of preaching the Gospel to every creature” (*Unitatis Redintegratio* 1). In fact, the lack of full and real unity “still harms the authenticity of the fulfillment of God’s mission in the world” (*Together Towards Life* 61) or, in other words, “the credibility of Christian message would be greater if Christians could overcome their divisions” (*Evangelii Gaudium* 245; see also 246).

S. Mazzolini (✉)
Faculty of Missiology, Pontifical Urbaniana University, Rome, Italy

28:16–20). Today, “there is a need to open up our reflections on church and unity to an even wider understanding of unity: the unity of humanity and even the cosmic unity of the whole of God’s creation,”² at the same time identifying and practicing increasingly ways of common witness. In the course of time, each ecclesial body has followed its own path, developing its own tradition and way of understanding and expressing the ecclesial nature and mission, and the like. Nonetheless, there is today an undeniable commitment to integrate the different positions, as can be verified in statements and other documents of global Christian bodies, which, among other things, allow Christians, whatever their ecclesial membership, to recognize fundamental common principles, as well as new theoretical and practical perspectives for further shared developments. From this viewpoint, it is doubtless necessary to implement dialogical processes, which allow Christian traditions both to deepen their own identity within a relational network and—consequently—to remove the obstacles which prevent a full communion between them all.

Could this issue be investigated through the lens of the concept of prophetic dialogue? Could this concept be useful in order to understand the role of the Eastern Catholic Churches with reference to the theological dialogue between the Latin Church and the Orthodox Church, in particular to the understanding of the ecclesial identity? This twofold question underlies this chapter, the purpose of which is simply to introduce succinctly some of the main elements of this issue. The contribution is in three parts: the first introduces some remarks concerning the category of the prophetic dialogue; the second focuses on some consequent ecclesiological implications, which must be also assessed from an ecumenical perspective; the third rereads in this framework the role and contribution of the Eastern Catholic Churches in the theological dialogue between the

See Council Vatican II, *Decree on ecumenism Unitatis redintegratio* (November 21, 1964). http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html; [accessed November 30, 2019]; *Together Towards Life. Mission and Evangelism in Changing Landscapes. New WWC Affirmation on Mission and Evangelism* (September 5, 2012). <https://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/commissions/mission-and-evangelism/together-towards-life-mission-and-evangelism-in-changing-landscapes> [accessed November 30, 2019]; Pope Francis, *Apostolic Exhortation Evangelii Gaudium* (November 24, 2013). http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html [accessed November 30, 2019].

² *Together Towards Life* 61.



An Answer of an Orthodox Missiologist to the Question “Stolen Churches” or “Bridges to Orthodoxy”?

Vladimir Fedorov

It is the Day of Resurrection, let us be radiant for the feast, and let us embrace one another. Let us say, Brethren, even to them that hate us, let us forgive all things on the Resurrection, and thus let us cry out: Christ is risen from the dead, trampling down death by death, and upon those in the tombs bestowing life.¹

An answer to the question of “Stolen Churches” or “Bridges to Orthodoxy” requires not only ecclesiological, but, above all, missiological perspective and analysis. It is worth turning to the past to qualify the legal, moral, ecclesiastical, and political factors that determined divisions and conflicts between churches. However, it cannot replace looking into the

¹Stichera from Paschal Matins of the Byzantine tradition of both Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches.

https://azbyka.ru/bogosluzhenie/triod_tsvetnaya/zvet00u.shtml

https://mci.archpitt.org/liturgy/Pascha_1.html [Accessed: 10. September 2020].

V. Fedorov (✉)

Orthodox Research Institute of Missiology, Ecumenism and New Religious Movements, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_7

103

future and seeking for a path to reconciliation. This is a mission of the church. In the twentieth century reflections on this mission both in the East and in the West formed a special theological discipline, missiology.

Although church mission is a multidirectional and multifaceted reality, many people in our society and in our churches reduce mission to Christian missionary activity aimed at the geographic spread of Christianity, that is to Christian preaching (in the narrow and literal sense) to a non-Christian world. No doubt, such a task of witness, proclamation, self-expression, and growth does exist; it is a natural and intrinsic process within the church life. According to a traditional definition of mission at the beginning of the last century in Russia, “Mission is preaching of one religious teaching among people of another faith.”² As a rule, such a definition summed up how people understood missionary activity among the pagan peoples of the far-flung Russian Orthodox state, or even beyond its borders. It was always assumed that Russian people, living in a country where the church was tightly linked to the state, were deeply Orthodox. Such an understanding was not adequate then and in the current situation it compels us to an even greater degree to deepen our understanding of mission. Sadly, today Russian society remains as it was during the period of state atheism and the Church that used to exercise a foreign, external mission is faced with the task of an internal mission for which it needs a new, contemporary understanding of the mission of the Church. For that, we need to be able to see the phenomenon of Christianity in contemporary society through secular eyes: it is very important to know how Christianity and Christian mission are perceived by society if we want this mission to be successful.

It seems reasonable to turn to the specificities of Orthodox mission and of the Orthodox understanding of mission. In the last 30 years Moscow Patriarchate published several missiological documents, three of which deserve special attention: “The Concept of Reviving Missionary Activities of the Russian Orthodox Church” (1995),³ “The Concept of the

² *Complete Orthodox Theological Encyclopedia Soikina*, vol 2, p. 1572. [*Polnyii pravoslavnyi bogoslovskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar*]. T.2. <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Spravochniki/polnyj-pravoslavnyj-bogoslovsko-entsiklopedicheskij-slovar/1350>

³ The Concept of the Revival of the Missionary Activity of the Russian Orthodox Church / Концепция возрождения миссионерской деятельности Русской Православной Церкви (1995) (2007). <http://xn%2D%2D%2D7sbzamhkhkpf1p.xn%2D%2Dp1ai/blog/2014/03/07/konceptiya-vozzhdeniya-missionerskoj-deyatelnosti-russkoj-pravoslavnoj-cerkvi/> [Accessed: 4. June 2020].



How Modern Orthodox Ecclesiology Hinders the Orthodox-Catholic Theological Dialogue on Uniatism: Romantic Approach, Nationalism, and Anti-colonial Narrative

Andrey Shishkov

The themes of Eastern Catholic Churches and the phenomenon of Uniatism remain quite painful for the Orthodox. This issue has already been addressed in the official Orthodox-Catholic theological dialogue, but the result of discussions represented by the Joint International Commission's Balamand document cannot be called successful. It caused great criticism in the Orthodox churches.¹ The Eastern Catholic Churches

¹See, for example, an overview of the discussion about the Balamand document in the ROC made by the Synodal Theological Commission of the ROC in 1997: "The Synodal Theological Commission Studies Issues Related to the Dialogue between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches," DECRMP official web-site, accessed February 3, 2019, <https://mospat.ru/archive/en/1997/07/ve110771/>

A. Shishkov (✉)
Saints Cyril and Methodius Institute for Post-Graduate Studies,
Moscow, Russia

are still seen as a negative phenomenon by the Orthodox majority. So, for example, in the document of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church in 2016, this topic is mentioned in a negative context: “The Orthodox Church [...] believes that this dialogue should always be accompanied by witness to the world through acts expressing mutual understanding and love, which express the “ineffable joy” of the Gospel (1 Pt 1:8), eschewing every act of proselytism, *uniatism* [highlight mine], or other provocative act of inter-confessional competition.”² The Joint Declaration of Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill provides a more diplomatic formulation: “It is today clear that the past method of ‘uniatism’, understood as the union of one community to the other, separating it from its Church, is not the way to re-establish unity.”³ I believe that the reason for this negative attitude toward Uniatism and the Eastern Catholic Churches lies at the very heart of modern Orthodox ecclesiology.

1 EASTERN ORTHODOX ANTI-COLONIAL NARRATIVE

The narrative that forms the modern Orthodox identity and conciseness is a history of colonization and decolonization, where “East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.”⁴

A prominent Orthodox theologian Fr. Alexander Schmemmann writes in his famous book *The Historical Road of the Eastern Orthodoxy* (1954): “The Byzantine period in the history of Orthodoxy begins with estrangement between East and West. It ends in complete separation. Henceforth the Orthodox East has separated from the Roman West by an impenetrable wall. Orthodoxy finally becomes ‘Eastern.’”⁵ The reason for the construction of this wall was the growing division between Eastern and Western Christianity, which, as Schmemmann says, began as a “theological dispute of the hierarchs” in 1054 and entered the “flesh and blood

²“Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World,” Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church, accessed November 15, 2019, <https://www.holy-council.org/-/rest-of-christian-world>

³“The Joint Declaration of Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and All Russia,” DECRMP official web-site, accessed November 15, 2019, <https://mospat.ru/en/2016/02/13/news128178/>

⁴This is a line from Rudyard Kipling’s poem “The Ballad of East and West” first published in 1889.

⁵Alexander Schmemmann, *Istoricheski Put’ Pravoslavija [The Historical Road of the Eastern Orthodoxy]* (New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1954), 301.



Ordination of Women: A “Bridge” or a “Brake” for Christian Unity?

Patricia Madigan OP

In the West the topic of ordination of women had been a point of growing major contention in the churches during the course of the twentieth century, especially since the 1960s with the advent of second-wave feminism. The question was not an existential one for the Orthodox Christian world, which was in a very different sociopolitical context from Western Christianity, until later in the twentieth century. The Eastern Catholic Churches which, due to pressures of forced migration, now had members spread throughout many different countries and cultures, including those of the West, often found themselves struggling and negotiating between culture and ecclesial tradition in their various contexts. I will first provide a general overview of whether and how each group of churches—Latin Rite, Orthodox, and Eastern Catholic—has so far approached the question of the ordination of women as a theological question, and then make some suggestions about a possible way forward for dialogue and

P. Madigan OP (✉)

Dominican Centre for Interfaith Ministry, Education and Research,
Dominican Administration Centre, Sydney, Australia

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to
Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_9

139

collaboration. Since there is not one agreed position by all the Eastern Catholic Churches, I will use the Maronite Church in Australia as an example.

1 ROMAN CATHOLIC TEACHING ON THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

In the most authoritative Catholic teaching that we have up to this time, that of the Second Vatican Council, the baptised faithful are not described according to gender roles but in accord with their participation in the mystery of Christ through baptism.

The Council refrained from adopting a theology of complementarity or of ascribing a set of charisms to women and another to men, one role for women and another for men. Women were presented as full participants in the life of the church and society.¹ This still needs further development and reception in official church teaching and law.

In the constitution *Lumen gentium*, both the priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial priesthood are described as being in their “own special way” a “participation in the one priesthood of Christ.”² There is, in Christ and in the Church, no distinction on the basis of race or nationality, social condition or sex, because “there is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all ‘one’ in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:28; cf. Col. 3.11).³ As well as intimately linking them to his life and his mission, Christ “gives men and women a sharing in his priestly function of offering spiritual worship for the glory of God and the salvation of all.”⁴

The Council’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et spes* taught that all people “possess a rational soul and are created in God’s likeness, since they have the same nature and origin, have been redeemed by Christ and enjoy the same divine calling and destiny.” Accordingly, “with respect to the fundamental rights of the person, every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on

¹ Catherine Clifford, *Decoding Vatican II: Interpretation and Ongoing Reception* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2014), 74.

² Catholic Church, *Lumen gentium* (LG) 10, 21 November 1964, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html,

³ LG, 32.

⁴ LG, 34.



Ecclesiological Differences and Law: Is the Eastern Churches Canon Law a Bridge Between the Western and the Eastern Canonical Tradition?

Irina Borshch

The Catholic and Orthodox Churches are separated not only through doctrinal and cultural differences but also through their canonical traditions. The variety of traditions arises from different answers to historical challenges in the main centers of church government in the first millennium. Nevertheless, we can speak not only about local and historical differences but also about certain ecclesiological differences. It is ecclesiology and theology in principle that play a major role in the development of these canonical traditions. Here lie the fundamental differences between church and state law: the former has obvious theological grounds.¹

¹ See Francesco Coccopalmerio, “Fondare teologicamente il diritto della Chiesa?” in Facoltà Teologica dell’Italia Settentrionale (ed.), *La teologia italiana oggi. Ricerca dedicata a Carlo Colombo nel 70° compleanno* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1979), 395–410.

I. Borshch (✉)

Theology Department, St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_10

161

The codification of the church law of the Eastern Catholic Churches in twentieth century can be regarded as an attempt to create legal and cultural synthesis. It is the synthesis, which combines the historical canonical material of the Eastern tradition with the Western canonical doctrine and juridical technology. All canonists consider this attempt to be of great value although it also provokes many questions. First of all, how deep are the Canonical differences between Catholic and Orthodox Churches? Second, can the separation, based on these differences, be overcome? Third, what role did ecclesiology play in the development of legal differences? Fourth, does the unity of the church mean the unity of the church law systems? Currently, there are no exhaustive studies on these questions, focused on the experience of codifications in the twentieth century. It's causing problems for researchers of more specific topics in the field of comparative theology.

The main question of this chapter is whether the Eastern Catholic law can serve as a bridge between Catholic and Orthodox Churches. To answer this question, it is necessary to consider two codification projects of the Eastern Catholic Church law in the twentieth century and the project *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamental*, which preceded two Canonical Codes of 1980s.²

The apostolic constitution *Sacri canones*³ by which John Paul II promulgated Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches (*CCEO*)⁴ in 1990 traces the historical background of the so-called Eastern code. The very title *Sacri canones* means to pinpoint the origins of *CCEO* in the sacred canons of the councils of Eastern Churches. Given this bridge with the sacred canons of the first millennium, the constitution *Sacri canones* in fact proposes *CCEO* as a vehicle for future ecumenical dialogue. But can we really see it like the bridge between canonical traditions?

The approach presented in this chapter assumes that Eastern Catholic law is rather a pier/berth than a bridge. Moreover, it is the pier built from the "Latin" side and built in such a way that it is quite difficult for the Orthodox Church to approach it, if not directly impossible. As this

² *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*. (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983). Abbreviated as "Latin Code" or "CIC."

³ John Paul II, Apostolic Constitution *Sacri Canones*, Acta Apostolicae Sedes 82 (1990): 1033–1044.

⁴ *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990. Abbreviated as "Eastern Code" or "CCEO."



The Principle of Synodality: Similarities and Differences Between Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Canon Law

Burkhard J. Berkmann and Tobias Stümpfl

1 THE IMPORTANCE OF CANON LAW IN INTER-CHURCH RELATIONS

When it comes to dialogue between the Orthodox Churches and the Eastern Catholic Churches, the dimension of canon law cannot be ignored. With regard to canon law, too, the question may be asked: Is it something “stolen” because a large part of the body of law that goes back to the sources of early Christianity is identical? Or is it a bridge because one function of the law is to secure peace and establish links between people and between institutions?

There are but few studies that examine the relations between different churches from a canon law perspective. The first chapter¹ of this essay will

¹Written by Burkhard J. Berkmann.

B. J. Berkmann (✉) • T. Stümpfl (✉)
Faculty of Catholic Theology, Klaus Mörsdorf Institute of Canon Law,
Ludwig-Maximilian-University of Munich, Munich, Germany

demonstrate the importance of canon law for ecumenism in general. On this basis, the second chapter² will deal with a very specific research topic: the principle of synodality in Eastern Catholic canon law and in the law of the Russian Orthodox Church.

1.1 *Encouraging the Adoption of a Canon Law Perspective*

Some official documents and speeches relating to ecumenical dialogue encourage the study of canon law. A very recent example is a conference held in Rome and organized by the Society for the Law of the Eastern Churches on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary (September 16–20, 2019). The title of the conference included the question “How Canon Law Assists in the Ecumenical dialogue?” The Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew gave the introductory keynote speech in which he emphasized that “[...] the canons are not juridical walls between the separated churches that distinguish those within the Church from those outside of it. On the contrary, [...] the ecclesial regulatory instruments are considered as essential components for the advancement of the ecumenical movement [...].”³ The conference also included a private audience with Pope Francis, who pointed out that “canon law is not only an aid to ecumenical dialogue, but also an essential dimension. Then too it is clear that ecumenical dialogue also enriches canon law.”⁴

This is not only a topical issue, however, but also one that has been taking centre stage in ecumenical dialogue for some time. As early as 1974, the World Council of Churches, or, more precisely, its Commission on Faith and Order, adopted a document entitled “The Ecumenical Movement and Church Law” at its conference in Accra. Even then it was recognized:

²Written by Tobias Stümpfl.

³Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, Keynote Address “The Society for the Law of the Eastern Churches 50 Years Later and the Ecumenical Movement” (September 16, 2019), <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-orientale/chiese-ortodosse-di-tradizione-bizantina/relazioni-bilaterali/patriarcato-ecumenico/altri-documenti-ed-eventi/2019-conference-du-patriarche-bartholomee-a-l-occasion-du50e-ann.html>

⁴Pope Francis, “Udienza ai partecipanti al Convegno promosso dalla Società per il Diritto delle Chiese Orientali,” Bolletino Sala Stampa della Santa Sede, No. B0714, (September 19, 2019), <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2019/09/19/0714/01466.html#inglese>



The Canonical Territory Concept and the Eastern Catholic Churches: Challenges on the Ukrainian Example

Ihor Rantsya

With regard to both the controversy regarding Uniatism and internal conflicts, the Orthodox Church often uses the concept of “canonical territory” which before has never been a direct issue in the Catholic-Orthodox or inter-Orthodox theological dialogue. Despite the fact that it is one of the most widespread territorial concepts of traditional ecclesiology, its practical usage has political and even military undertones: the existence of someone’s territory means that there is someone who possesses, protects or extends this territory, even by the annexation of the territories of others.

As a matter of fact, the Church of Christ not only has a sacramental dimension as the mystical Body of Christ but is also manifested as a territorially organized institution that exists not only in geographical but also in human dimension. The latter has recently undergone major transformations for which the church has proved to be unprepared. In an institutional sense, while remaining strictly hierarchical, the church finds itself in a de-hierarchized and de-structured society in which relations,

I. Rantsya (✉)

Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Eparchy of Paris, Paris, France

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_12

201

communication, and mission as such function on a network principle. Under these circumstances, the usage of traditional territorial categories clashes with the reality of the church and is a great challenge for ecclesiastical theological thought.

This state of affairs gives rise to a new interest in territorial concepts of ecclesiology in order to rethink the new human and geographical realities in which the postmodern church has found itself. Canonical territory, one of the most interesting and the most controversial geo-ecclesiological concepts, is being denied by the Catholic Church, exaggerated by the Orthodox Churches and ignored by the Protestant Churches.

I PRINCIPAL ISSUES CONCERNING THE CONCEPT OF CANONICAL TERRITORY FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF ECCLESIOLOGY AND CANON LAW

The concept of canonical territory has been in usage since the 1930s. From the early 1990s it was promoted by Russian theologians, Metropolitan Kirill (Gundyayev),¹ and priest Vsevolod Chaplin² as an ecclesiological concept with the purpose of arguing the impossibility of separating the Orthodox Churches in the newly independent countries of the former Soviet Union from the Moscow Patriarchate. The idea of canonical territory was also used by the Russian Orthodox Church to limit the development of so-called heterodox churches in the Russian Federation with the beginning of religious freedom after the collapse of the Soviet regime in 1991 as well as to prevent the proselytism.³ At the same time, the other Orthodox Churches utilized the Russian idea of canonical territory to serve their own interests, including in the field of inter-Orthodox relations. While some local churches in the Balkan and Baltic regions addressed the territorial limits of their jurisdiction in virtue of the concept of canonical territory, the patriarchate of Constantinople used it for their own

¹In 1989–2009, chairman of the Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate.

²In 1991–1997, head of the Section of public relations of the Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate.

³Jaroslav Buciora, “Canonical Territory of the Moscow Patriarchate: an Analysis of Contemporary Russian Orthodox Thought,” http://www.orthodox-christian-comment.co.uk/canonical_territory_of_the_moscow_patriarchate.htm [Accessed: January 30, 2020].



Fr. John Long on Ukraine Between the Three Romes

Theodore Dedon

In April 2016 at Georgetown University, there was a celebration of the legacy of Fr. John Long, a Jesuit who worked on Orthodox-Catholic engagement during the twilight of the Soviet Union in the 1980s and 1990s. This celebration was held to inaugurate the fact that his archives would now be held at the Georgetown University library and would therefore be catalogued and explored. Here we will examine one of his still unpublished papers (written in October 1989 and revised in April 1990) where he discusses the historical observations on the origin and development of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church.¹ This text broadly traces the outlines and developments of how the church came to be, how it came under the yoke of the Roman Catholic Church, and also how the Union of Brest may have been a model in the past but does not sufficiently

¹John Long, "Historical Observations on the Origins and Development of the Ruthenian (Greek) Catholic Church," Unpublished (April, 1990). This article is the main text we will be using, alongside other unpublished analyses on Long's contribution to both a Roman Catholic understanding of Ukrainian Catholics and ecumenism.

T. Dedon (✉)

Department of Theology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

© The Author(s) 2021

V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_13

221

account for the future of ecumenical engagement. This essay, written on the eve of Ukraine's declaration of sovereignty (July 16, 1990), and well before the creation of its constitution (June 28, 1996), is a particularly interesting time-capsule. On the one hand, it offers a reflection on ecumenical engagement between what he calls Ukrainian Catholics and Roman Catholics, with the assumption that the Soviet Union was there to stay. On the other hand, he accurately predicts that the religious situation of the Soviet Union was one wherein Christianity was on the verge of a resurgence.

1 THE ECUMENICAL CAREER OF FR. JOHN LONG

Because he is not known to the wide audience, it is important to note who Fr. John Long was or why his perspective might matter today. He was, according to John Borelli, "one of the pope's storm troopers ready to be spirited into the Soviet Union once the Stalinist Empire had collapsed."² John Borelli, one of the archive's main curators, noting what treasures we might find, described Fr. Long in his college days. A student of Russian at Georgetown University during the height of the Stalinist era, he was inspired by the message of Fatima to draw Russia nearer to the Catholic faith for eschatological reasons. His life was something out of a Cold War thriller. Beginning his Jesuit training at Georgetown in the 1940s by studying Russian, he was thrust into what Fr. Brian Daley, S.J. described as, "what now seems like a mixture of spy-novel romance and ecumenical insensitivity—to begin preaching the Gospel again in what Westerners then assumed was a totally de-Christianized culture."³ Fr. Thomas Stransky, a friend and collaborator of Fr. Long's, said of this: "We naïve Paulists were under the impression the group was a kind of Jesuit CIA, training people to parachute into Russia, sprinkle about earth from Fatima,

² John Borelli, "Who was John Long, S.J.? Reflections Inspired by a Conversation with Thomas F. Stransky, C.S.P., Former Colleague at the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and Life-long Friend," at *A Legacy to Ecumenism: The Gifts and Archives of Rev. John F. Long, S.J.*, Unpublished, (April 21, 2016). Delivered at Riggs Library, (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University), 2.

³ Brian E. Daley, "The Gift of Mutual Understanding: Fr. John F. Long, S.J., and Orthodox-Catholic Relations," at *A Legacy to Ecumenism: The Gifts and Archives of Rev. John F. Long, S.J.*, Unpublished, (April 21, 2016). Delivered at Riggs Library, (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University), 1–2.



An Ecumenical Revolution in Ukraine?: Perspectives for a Regional Greek-Catholic/ Orthodox Dialogue

Dietmar Schon OP

The year 2016 saw the publication of the document “The Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church” (UGCC).¹ This ecumenically oriented text can be regarded as something new in the efforts of a catholic eastern church to overcome the schism of the Church. Its time of publication is overshadowed by recent conflicts in Ukraine, which beside (geo)political also have confessional connotations. The current confrontation contains a component of political power; it includes the

This paper, translated into English by Dr. J. Ritzke Rutherford (Regensburg), draws on a more extensive treatment of the topic; see Dietmar Schon, “Die Ukraine als ‚Laboratorium der Ökumene‘—Perspektiven des Ökumenedokuments der Ukrainischen Griechisch-Katholischen Kirche”, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 67 (2018): 149–186.

¹ Cf. *The Ecumenical Position of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church*, (Lviv: Koleso, 2016).

D. Schon OP (✉)
Eastern Churches Institute of the Diocese Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

struggle for a political stabilization of Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea, and the “hybrid war” in the Eastern Ukraine. Part of the commixture is also a component of church politics, perceptible in the competing presence of various Orthodox churches, but also in the competitive mentality between the Orthodox and non-Orthodox Christian churches.

The document is divided into three main parts. Historical aspects are discussed, followed by a theological analysis and practical applications.

I POSITIONING ON THE BASIS OF HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE

The first part of the document consists of 21 sections. The goal of this exposition can be called positioning the UGCC in the “landscape” of the churches and confessions.

The first of these positions regards the relationship to the Roman Catholic Church. Here the focus is on the complete *communio* of the UGCC with the Roman Church as an indispensable component of the self-image and ecclesiology of this church. Nevertheless, there are also critical demands. For example, “defective theological grounds” are postulated for the results of ecumenical dialogue in the twentieth century.² It might seem at first sight to be a critique of the Balamand Statement³ agreed by the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church in 1993. But concealed behind this is an attack on the description of the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Catholic Churches as “*ecclesia sui iuris*” in can 27 of the Code of Canons for the Eastern Churches (CCEC); it is said to comprise not enough real autonomy.

In respect to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the first positioning consists of a reminder of the historical fact that the Metropolitanate of Kyiv was a mission church of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, from which its byzantine legacy derived.⁴ The resultant permanent bond of the Metropolitanate with the Ecumenical Patriarchate is said to have remained,

² Cf. The Ecumenical Position, No. 11.

³ Cf. “Dokument der Gemeinsamen Internationalen Kommission für den theologischen Dialog zwischen der Katholischen Kirche und der Orthodoxen Kirche Balamand/Libanon 1993” in: *Dokumente wachsender Übereinstimmung*, Vol. 3, edited by Harding Meyer et al., (Paderborn: Bonifatius Druck, 2003), 560–567.

⁴ Cf. The Ecumenical Position, No. 5.



Orthodox-Catholic and Greek Catholic Relations After the Ukrainian Crisis

Petros Vassiliadis

1 PREAMBLE

One of the most significant initiatives of the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, in addition to his determination to bring into completion, after nearly 70 years of preparation a Pan-Orthodox Synod,¹ was his

¹Only a few years ago there were some Orthodox circles who seriously considered, or even pressed in the direction of, abandoning all ecumenical dialogues, both multilateral and bilateral. The recent Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church in Crete (2016) has definitely put an end to these trends and officially determined the ecumenical character of Orthodoxy, reaffirming its commitment toward the search for the visible unity of the Church and its struggle for the unity of humankind and the integrity of the entire created world. There is no doubt that a leading figure in the ecumenical dialogue is His All-Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew. The successful and pleasant outcome of the official theological dialogue of the Orthodox Church with the family of the Oriental Orthodox Churches, which broke communion with the still undivided One Holy Catholic Church since the fifth century AD, but kept despite their separation the same teaching, even the Christological one, with the mainstream Eastern Orthodoxy, was one such clear indication, though the entire project of re-unification is still unfinished. Another, and most important

P. Vassiliadis (✉)
CEMES, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece

© The Author(s) 2021
V. Latinovic, A. K. Wooden (eds.), *Stolen Churches or Bridges to
Orthodoxy?*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55458-3_15

253

Patriarchal and Synodical initiative to heal the painful schism in Ukraine by granting an autocephalous status to a united Orthodox Church in Ukraine. This initiative, although it was taken according to all canonical preconditions,² was strongly and vehemently opposed by the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC), to the extent that she broke Eucharistic communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate (EP). The ROC spoke of the EP's initiative as an invasion into their own territory and an act which may result in the major schism since the 1054, even threatening that this initiative may lead to a new religious war. To most observers the entire situation is characterized as an intra-Orthodox "Ukrainian crisis," perhaps the most serious within the family of the Orthodox Churches.

What lies behind this regrettable crisis is the dispute on an effective *primacy role* to deal with inter-Orthodox secondary issues, because of the Russian Orthodox Church's refusal to accept the ages-old canonical and ecumenically decreed prerogatives of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Unfortunately, for many centuries, especially after the second half of the second millennium, we, the Orthodox, have unconsciously developed a "negative" Orthodox identity: we are not what our tradition has left us as a legacy, but what the others, mainly the Catholics, are not, that is, without a primacy, a visible expression of the Church's unity, accompanied, of course, by synodality.

The present Ukrainian crisis has revealed and brought to the surface yet another problem, indirectly related to primacy: Uniatism.³ This historical structure within the Catholic Church, rightly or wrongly,⁴ has been

one, was the convocation of the Holy and Great Council, which has declared: "The Orthodox Church, which prays unceasingly *for the union of all*,⁵ has always cultivated dialogue with those estranged from her, those both far and near. In particular, she has played a leading role in the contemporary search for ways and means to restore the unity of those who believe in Christ, and she has participated in the Ecumenical Movement from its outset and has contributed to its formation and further development." *Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World*, par. 4.

² Cf. a critical assessment of the Phanar-Moscow debate in Greek in <https://cemes.weebly.com/pialpharhoepsilonmubeta940sigmaepsiloniotasigmaf.html>, in Italian in <http://www.settimananews.it/ecumenismo-dialogo/ucraina-teologia-unita-dellortodossia>, and in English in <https://cemes-en.weebly.com>.

³ I avoid the Slavic neologism "unija," and use the commonly agreed term in the Balamand Declaration.

⁴ Uniatism, as the most reliable Greek Catholic scholar, and expert in Byzantine liturgy, the late Robert Taft, pointed out, "far from restoring the broken communion between East and West ... led to new divisions" ("Anamnesis, Not Amnesia: The 'Healing Memories' and the



The Eastern Catholic Churches and the Furtherance of Catholic-Orthodox Unity: Three Possible Paths

A. Edward Sicienski

I INTRODUCTION

For most of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and especially over the last thirty years, people have talked about the deleterious effect the Eastern Catholic or “uniate” Churches have had on Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement. Ecumenical progress, these individuals claim, which was swift throughout the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s, has stalled almost completely since the resurrection of the Eastern Catholic Churches in 1989. Instead of “bridges to Orthodoxy,”¹ these churches have become the chief barriers to restored communion—ecumenical stumbling blocks in need of removal. However, as appealing as this narrative may be to

¹ Among the many interesting discussions that took place at the conference, both in formal sessions and in informal conversations, was the appropriateness of this term in describing the Eastern Catholic Churches.

A. E. Sicienski (✉)
Stockton University, Galloway, NJ, USA

some, it neglects the oft-forgotten truth that over the centuries there also have been several occasions when Eastern Catholics actually *served* the cause of unity; when they acted, or had the potential to act, as true “bridges” between East and West. Perhaps a way forward might thus be found by looking back to those moments when the Eastern Catholic churches were seen not as barriers to, but as champions of, church unity. Gleaned from history, these examples provide three possible paths for Eastern Catholics today, although which, if any, the most productive option might be under the present circumstances I leave for others to decide.

2 THE LOYAL OPPOSITION

The first possible path is that the Eastern Catholics continue to remain part of the Catholic communion of churches, but at the same time increasingly work to become “the Orthodox voice” within it. This would entail not only continued resistance to theological and liturgical Latinization, but also, when necessary, actively opposing those Roman policies, practices, and doctrines that they believe contrary to the faith of the Eastern Church. They would essentially become “the loyal opposition” to the governing bureaucracy of the Roman curia—loyal because they would maintain communion with the See of Peter and the essential teachings of the Catholic faith, and an opposition because as autonomous churches within the Catholic communion they would be free enough to speak out on issues of concern to their Orthodox brothers and sisters.

Historically there are at least two examples of how this might work. The first is Melkite Patriarch Gregory II Youssef (1864–97), who at Vatican I was one of the strongest voices raised against the dogmas contained in *Pastor Aeternus*. Of course, the debate on the pope’s jurisdiction and his infallibility were of great interest to the Christian East whose bishops had long questioned the extent of the pope’s authority. However, the Orthodox had refused Pope Pius IX’s invitation to attend the council,² and thus it seemed that they could only watch and wait to see how the

²Tactlessly the invitation was published in the Italian newspapers prior to being sent to the patriarchs, so Patriarch Gregory VI of Constantinople (1835–40, 67–71) knew of its contents before the Pope’s representatives had even arrived. Gregory returned the letter unopened, telling the papal delegation that he could not attend such a gathering. The Patriarch of Alexandria similarly rejected Pius’s letter, asking the papal envoy how he could attend a council scheduled to open on the “Feast of the Immaculate Conception,” which