Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies
Vol. 39 (1998) No. 1, pp. 89–107

What is Eastern Catholic Theology?: Beyond Classicism Towards Liberation[1]

Myroslaw Tataryn

Abstract

(Українське резюме на ст. 106)

Bernard Lonergan's definition of theology as mediation between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of religion in that matrix is used to analyze the "classicist" worldview that constrained Eastern Catholic theology in the past. This enables a validation of all theology done previously by Eastern Catholics regardless of how it was or is viewed by those inclined to define it as "other." The insights of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* are then applied to the situation of Eastern Catholics. The very term "Eastern Catholic" is questioned because of its inability to characterize the experience of communities as diverse as Ukrainians and Malabars. The author concludes by listing several characteristics of an authentic and effective Ukrainian Catholic theology.

✚✚✚✚✚✚✚✚

[1] Paper presented during CTSA panel, Ottawa, June, 1998, devoted to the topic, "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?"

A Definition of Theology

Implicit in the question "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?" is the need to clarify an understanding of "theology" itself. Theology, I suggest, is essentially discourse. But whose discourse? Many Orthodox note that a Western perspective sees theology as human discourse upon divine revelation – *fides quaerens intellectum*. Orthodox scholars have viewed the Western perspective as "rationalist formulae": a grasping of divine realities by means of reason, intellect, philosophical discourse.[2] These same scholars will define Orthodox theology as divine discourse "experienced" by the human and apprehended on the order of intuition rather than of intellect.[3] Staniloae states that Orthodox theology "allows the light of the inexhaustible mystery to appear"; for him theology is a "theology of spirituality and communion."[4] Similarly, some Western thinkers do not challenge this binary analysis and are comfortable describing the difference between Eastern and Western theology as that of intellectual inquiry "vs." mystical experience.[5] Some will, of course, also argue that the difference lies in the distinction between "true" theology, that is, reflection upon the Trinity, and discourse on the divine economy.[6] The true theologian meditates, "knows" as much as is possible, sees the Trinity; whereas others only philosophize on the divine economy and thus participate in a theology of a lesser sort. I do not think that these distinctions are particularly helpful or accurate. Can we "know" God as other than revealed – albeit revealed by the Divine Self?

[2] Dumitru Staniloae, "The Problems and Perspectives of Orthodox Theology" in *Theology and the Church*, Trans. Robert Barringer (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1980), 214. John Meyendorff describes Western theology as "a rational deduction from 'revealed' premises." *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes.* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 8.

[3] Meyendorff, 9.

[4] Staniloae, 218.

[5] A.M. Allchin, *The Kingdom of Love and Knowledge.* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1979), 4.

[6] Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Culture.* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993), 203–204, 265–66.

All we can convey is God communicated, described, "apprehended" within and by our limiting human condition. In other words all theology, both "high" and "low," is about appropriating, comprehending, and communicating the Divine Self-Communication. All theology is about human discourse, just as everything human involves and is conditioned by human discourse. Thus, my operative definition of theology can be found in the masterful work of Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*.[7] A theology mediates between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of a religion in that matrix.

This definition is extremely helpful in addressing our primary question: *What is Eastern Catholic Theology*? Lonergan comes to this definition of theology after reflecting upon the demise of what he calls the "classicist worldview."[8] This perspective captured both Western and Eastern European Christianity, each in different ways, by the time of the Fourth Crusade and led each part of the continent to regard its own experience, its own perspective, as not simply normative, but as universal. Let us remember that the much decried universalist claims of Western Pontiffs are no less absolutist than the Byzantine claim to encompass the *oikoumene*. Classicism had the beauty of being singular, absolute, and unerringly certain of its own correctness. Culture and religion were one: theology was the great achievement of this marriage. In this *Weltanschaung* the Byzantines had no doubt: there was but one way of being civilized, Christian, and enlightened – their way. Similarly, to be a citizen of the "Christendom" of the tenth, twelfth or fourteenth centuries, one was faithful to the Church of Rome, prayed in Latin, and knew the central contribution to civilized thought of Augustine of Hippo. Theology, in those two parts of the world, was within the particular areas singular and normative. The

[7] Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Seabury, 1979), xi.

[8] For Lonergan's discussion of the classicist world view and its demise see his work: "The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness" and "Theology in Its New Context" both in *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* ed. by William F.J. Ryan, S.J. and Bernard J. Tyrrell, S.J. (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1974).

historic debates and mistakes tied to such issues as the azyme controversy, the *filioque* debate, and the Papacy demonstrate irrefutably how classicism dominated the estranged worlds of Rome and Byzantium. Additionally, I would note that this classicist isolation lies at the root of the failure of Florence and the Union of Brest to be a true dialogue; dialogue demands that the other's position be heard, valued and authentically responded to. The classicist world view precludes dialogue because "the other" is by definition uncivilized, unenlightened – essentially ignorant. In this perspective there was no question of an "Eastern Catholic theology" because, in the Christian West, there was only one true theology – that of the Holy, Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic See.

But lest my observations be regarded as overly anti-Roman, I would add immediately that Orthodoxy was and continues to be no less absolutist. There is no possibility for an Eastern Catholic theology, because the Eastern Catholic communities are aberrant, "neither fish nor fowl," and cannot author authentic theological reflections because they are not "authentic ecclesiastical communities" – they are not "Church"![9] Prominent theological expositions by some Orthodox theologians in our own day continue this "Church triumphant" mentality by inextricably uniting Orthodoxy with a Hellenist world view: Georges Florovsky clearly regarded the "Byzantine" mentality as a prerequisite for understanding Orthodox theology[10] and Christos Yannaras openly states that one must adopt a Hellene mentality to do justice to Orthodox thinking.[11] The one truth is apparent within the framework of the one culture which bears it![12]

[9] See my "Changing Russian Orthodox Attitudes Towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church," *Religion in Communist Lands* 4 (1989): 313–31.

[10] "Catholic theology can only exist in Hellenism [...]. Hellenism in the Church has been as if immortalised, it has entered into the very fabric of the Church as an integral category of Christian existence." Georges Florovsky, *Puti russkago bogosloviia* (Paris: YMCA, 1988), 509.

[11] Christos Yannaras, *Philosophie sans rupture* (Geneva: 1986), 7f.

[12] I have argued for the recognition of the common Orthodox view as reflecting a classicist mindset in my "Orthodox Ecclesiology and Cultural Pluralism." *Sobornost'* 19:1. 62–65.

Ecclesial Minorities Validating Their Experience and Thought

However, the question "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?" stands before us and we must ask "why?" How does it arise? Where does it come from? I believe the answers to these questions have been addressed in Professor Taft's paper. The initial question itself arises, however, because neither history, nor well-intentioned Roman paternalism, nor at times blatant Orthodox disdain has succeeded in destroying these Churches. In other words, in the wake of Vatican II in a manner not previously experienced, the Roman Church has been coming to grips with the fact that for centuries it has been in communion with Christian Churches which were and remain "other." After Vatican II the Catholic Church (Roman and non-Roman alike) has been struggling with the lie that was the classicist mentality. There is not one normative culture underlying Catholicism; there is no one universal culture out of which Catholic experience or thought have arisen. Lonergan argues that today Catholic thinking is grappling with the "empirical notion of culture. It is the set of meanings and values that informs a way of life. It may remain unchanged for ages. It may be in process of slow development or rapid dissolution."[13]

This same recognition of culture's fluidity and the need to constantly address the question of the actual character of a given culture underlies the valuable scholarship on Russian history by cultural historians such as David A. Frick.[14] Professor Taft's often repeated remark that Eastern Catholic theology is in process of self-definition and formation demonstrates that he is working with just such an empirical notion of culture. Our central question arises

[13] Lonergan xi. An equally valid definition of culture is cited by Carl F. Starkloff in his "Inculturation and Cultural Systems," *Theological Studies* 55:1. 70.

[14] Frick speaks of the "ad hoc nature" of culture and how its truths are "contingent and constructed." David A. Frick, "Misrepresentations, Misunderstandings, and Silences: Problems of Seventeenth-Century Ruthenian and Muscovite Cultural History." In *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Russia and Ukraine* ed. Samuel H. Baron and Nancy Shields Kollman (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University, 1997), 156.

because we have no problem today admitting that theology arises from a dialogue between cultural values and religious experience.[15] Thus, to discuss Eastern Catholic theology, we must recognize this dynamic and address the factors which constitute the underlying cultural matrix. To reflect upon the content of a theology we must simultaneously reflect upon the cultural context in which that theology is being configured!

What Professor Taft made perfectly clear in his paper was that the question of Eastern Catholic Theology is, as he states, "embryonic" because it is only recently that Eastern Catholics have begun to raise their own voice. Interestingly, Professor Taft dates the birth pangs of this phenomenon to Vatican I. What is of interest in this "birth moment" is that it suggests that "Eastern Catholic" is the voice of internal Catholic opposition to the aforementioned classicist mentality. "Eastern Catholic" is the internal voice of "other" claiming its authentic place within (not outside) the Catholic community, albeit in a minority position. In other words, integral to the experience of "Eastern Catholic" is the experience of being a minority. This minority position is comprehensive because it is an experience of being a minority both within the ecclesial community of Catholicism, and the cultural setting within which the ecclesial community finds itself. No matter how much a given Church may act as if it were not, one cannot deny that Ukrainian Catholics, Melkites, the Greek Catholic Exarchate, the Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara Catholics all represent minorities within their "nations" and/or minority histories within their national story. To be Eastern Catholic is to be a minority and, as such, defined by the majority. It is not surprising that in Professor Taft's presentation so much attention was drawn to non-Easterners who were (and are) critical in the rising consciousness of Eastern Catholics as possessors of an authentic Catholic voice. But it also raises a question: is the very notion of "Eastern Catholic" born of

[15] Today we call this dynamic "inculturation" and it is regarded as occurring optimally when it does not destroy the uniqueness of each particular culture. For an excellent presentation of current thinking on inculturation see Carl F. Starkloff, "Inculturation and Cultural Systems" *Theological Studies* 55. 66–81 and 274–94.

the experience of those who actually are "Eastern Catholic"? Are "Eastern Catholics" the authentic subjects of the inquiry, or is it perhaps a notion thrust upon "the other" by the majority. If so, rather than being subjects, have "Eastern Catholics" become a convenient object by which the dominant majority can contain the "enemy within"?

It is true that Eastern Catholic theology is in an embryonic stage, but not in the sense that Eastern Catholics are just now beginning to develop a theology: academic institutions, long lists of professional theologians, publications imbued with philosophical language etc., do not a theology make. Eastern Catholic theology is embryonic only in the sense that the theological voices of non-Roman Catholics are finally now being heard and as they are heard they gain confidence, strength and clarity. They also gain the audacity to re-appropriate their own history and theology. Professor Taft accurately described Eastern Catholic theology as "open and eclectic." However, this characteristic must be applied not only in the way he did to explain such phenomena as Catherine de Hueck Doherty, but also the volumes and volumes of Thomistic scholarship done by eminent figures in the Eastern Catholic Churches. Notwithstanding its clear Thomistic basis, does not the work of Josyf Slipyj[16] on the Holy Spirit need to be integrated into the corpus of Eastern Catholic theology? It is after all part of "our" story, part of "our" Church's reflection on the Christian experience in the context of the life of the Ukrainian people. Does not even the most crassly Western flavoured theological work of someone authentically and self-consciously a member of an Eastern Catholic Church serve to mediate between the cultural matrix within which the theologian finds him/herself and *the significance and role of religion in that matrix*? In other words, there is no such thing as an absolute form of Eastern Catholic theology. It is rather the ongoing product of the theological enterprise of those who participate in an Eastern Catholic *ecclesia*. However, I will

[16] On Slipyj's Thomistic bent see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Confessor Between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Josyf Slipyj* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1990).

admit a certain unease at suggesting that blatantly Western inspired theology written by Easterners should be held up as an example of Eastern Catholic Theology. I must, therefore, in the name of intellectual honesty attempt a stronger justification or, if you will, rationalization.

Conscientization Among Eastern Catholics

I thus turn with thanks to the insights of liberation theology, and most particularly for my purposes here to Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* I would argue that the process upon which Eastern Catholic theology has now embarked is one of *conscientization*: consciously emerging from a state of oppression. Earlier I described the Eastern Catholic experience as that of being "other" and being minority. I will now argue that this experience of having been marginalized on the one hand by Western Catholic classicism and on the other by the classicism of the Orthodox is an experience of oppression. Historically those Catholics who are not Roman have been denigrated, exploited, de-humanized (or perhaps more accurately de-Catholicized). The history of Eastern Catholic Churches is one of the erosion of their autonomy, their authentic traditions, their sense of being Catholic by being other than Roman. Similarly, the sister Orthodox Churches have de-valued the Catholic counterpart, hurling accusations of apostasy, treachery, hybridism, etc. When political circumstances allowed it, the very existence of Eastern Catholic Churches was denied. Oppression was real and constant.[17]

A particularly acute and deleterious phase in this oppression was experienced here in North America where, since the arrival of the first Ukrainian Catholic immigrants, their needs and values were not respected by the Roman Catholic majority. Mark McGowan summarizes this experience: "It is surprising that, faced by a dearth of clergy, Vatican restrictions, and the competing

[17] Paulo Freire terms oppression: "Any situation in which 'A' objectively exploits 'B' or hinders his pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person." *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1988), 40.

visions of French- and English-speaking Roman Catholics, the Uniate Church was able to survive its first half-century in Canada."[18]

McGowan also refers to attempts at overt Latinization, accusations of sedition, and Roman Catholic silence in the face of internment. Without denying the valiant work and devotion of individual Roman Catholic clergy who came to serve Ukrainian Catholics in the frontier West, McGowan makes it very clear that the need for such "missionaries" was singularly a result of the restrictions placed upon Ukrainian Catholics by the Roman hierarchy; only 5% of the clergy in Galician Ukraine were celibate, and these were generally unwilling to come to North America. By banning married clergy, the Roman hierarchy made it impossible for the pastoral needs of Ukrainian Catholics to be met by their own clergy! The resulting dissension among the faithful, the rise of the Orthodox Church, and a significant movement to other Western Churches can be directly explained by this repressive policy. Oppression is not too strong a word to describe the experience of non-Roman Catholics within the fold of the Catholic Church.

Freire provides a model for understanding how the oppressed move out of oppression to freedom, and it is my contention that this model can help us understand what is going on (in varying degrees) within these non-Roman Catholic Churches today. He notes that in "the initial stage of the struggle, the oppressed, instead of striving for liberation, tend themselves to become oppressors or 'sub-oppressors.' The very structure of their thought has been conditioned by the contradictions of the concrete, existential situation by which they were shaped. Their ideal is to be men; but to be men is to be oppressors. This is their model of humanity."[19]

This phenomenon is what helps us understand Professor Taft's reference to the responses of certain Eastern Catholic hierarchs to

[18] Mark G. McGowan, "'A Portion for the Vanquished": Roman Catholics and the Ukrainian Catholic Church," in *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*, ed. Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 218–19.

[19] Freire. 29–30.

the bold pronouncements of Patriarch Gregory II Youssef Sayyour at Vatican I. The oppressed becoming oppressors in the nascent period of liberation also explains why leading representatives of Eastern Catholic Churches embrace the "Western" way of doing theology and produce the type of work done by Josyf Slipyj and others. This phase in the liberation struggle is also evidenced by the work on the Code of Canons for the Eastern Catholic Churches. The editor of the English-language versions accurately states that this was a Code written "for Eastern Catholics," not "by Eastern Catholics,"[20] and yet the commission instructed to author the Code was comprised predominantly of Eastern Catholics nominated by Rome, rather than by their own particular Churches. Again we see intelligent, faithful people, who adopt the mindset and manner, if you will, of the dominant oppressive majority. True liberation, an authentic Eastern Catholic voice, is only possible once the duality that "to be is to be like" has been surmounted. "The pedagogy of the oppressed is an instrument for their critical discovery that both they and their oppressors are manifestations of dehumanization."[21]

The recognition of the history of oppression is, as Prof. Taft has demonstrated, something new to the Catholic world. In fact, on a formal level it can be dated to Vatican II in its initial phase, and it continues with the many acts of contrition initiated by the current Pontiff. However, liberation of the oppressed is not something which can be done for them. Freire maintains: "Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift."[22] What we see today among the hierarchy of the various non-Roman Catholic Churches is a conscious attempt to be pro-active in their ecclesial decision-making, to "confront reality critically, simultaneously objectifying and acting upon that reality."[23] Such events as the attempts at rapprochement of Metropolitan Elias Zoghby and the Melkite Synod in relation to the Antiochene Orthodox Patriarchate, as well

[20] John D. Faris, "Preface." *The Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance*, (New York: Saint Maron, 1992), xx.

[21] Freire, 33.

[22] *Ibid.*, 31.

[23] *Ibid.*, 37.

as the campaign of Josyf Slipyj for a Patriarchal structure for his Church demonstrate that these Churches are moving beyond the paralysis of oppression. Yet one can also observe that much more needs to be done not only by individual Churches, but as Freire points out, by the Churches together: there is an acute need for developing a sense of solidarity. "The oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption."[24] In other words, the oppressed must come together to set their own paradigm(s) and not simply accept the paradigm of the oppressor. Liberation involves rejecting the classicist mindset in all its manifestations.

The Inadequacies of the Designation "Eastern Catholic"

Following upon this first stage in the process of liberation, Freire observes the emergence of a second stage "in which the reality of oppression has already been transformed. This pedagogy ceases to belong to the oppressed and becomes a pedagogy of all men in the process of permanent liberation."[25] Liberation comes to be recognized as not simply the oppressed doing something for themselves, but rather engaging in a process which leads to the liberation of the oppressor as well. In this stage a critical moment is that of discarding the myths "created and developed in the old order" which "like specters haunt the new structure emerging from the revolutionary transformation."[26] This is the stage into which we are now entering; it is the reason for the question "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?" It is being asked because, as we become conscious of ourselves as authentically Catholic and authentically not-Roman Catholic, we begin to address the possibilities of an answer. At this point I believe that it is valuable to ask whether the term "Eastern Catholic" is a helpful one; is it one which reflects our growing self-consciousness or is it again a "myth" superimposed on us by the old order? I am not simply attempting to be de-construc-

[24] *Ibid.*, 39.

[25] *Ibid.*, 40.

[26] *Ibid.*, 40.

tionist; I pose the question because of my operative definition of theology. If theology mediates between the cultural matrix and the importance of religion in that cultural matrix, an Eastern Catholic theology, I would presume, must share the same cultural matrix. This is true only in the sense that the so-called Eastern Catholic Churches all share the experience of being non-Roman minorities within the Catholic Church. I would argue at this point that even this condition derives from the experience of oppression and is in fact a superimposed term supporting the classicist Roman perspective.[27] It is difficult to imagine a significant number of "Eastern Catholics" who would first and foremost define themselves as such. A much more common form of self-definition would be "Ukrainian Catholic," "Melkite," "Malankarese," "Maronite," etc. Even the "two lungs" language of the current pontificate is representative of a polarized perception which serves to sustain the classicist notion in a somewhat mellower form, rather than radically authenticating the diverse and pluralist experience of those Catholics who do not belong to the Roman Catholic tradition. (The recently completed Asian Synod suggests that a similar process of diversification and an embracing of pluralism are well under way in the Roman Church as well.[28]) As a result we need to consider whether the umbrella "Eastern Catholic" is a helpful one or whether it is in fact constraining. Would our theological efforts be better served and would they be more open to "other" by reflecting the full inculturation and authentic genesis of these Churches?

[27] Another reason for this paradigmatic polarity is suggested by David Frick as being a product of an inherently human tendency to "impose dual models upon their reality in order to control it, to make sense of it." These binary oppositions do not hold up for long, however, and there is an inevitable search for a third way. Frick, 152.

[28] Cindy Wooden, "Bishops are not 'branch secretaries.'" *Prairie Messenger*, April 29, 1998 (Vol. 75, 41), 1–2.

John Thavis, "To evangelize, church must find Asian ways." *Prairie Messenger*, May 20, 1998 (Vol. 75, 44), 2.

Reflections on Ukrainian Catholicism in Particular

I hope these observations will serve as a stimulus to do just what Prof. Taft has suggested: enter into a dialogue in which we non-Roman Catholics, not exclusively, but with some priority, define what our authentic theology is. In so doing I believe we must integrate Lonergan's insight that we have moved beyond the classicist world view which is neither sustainable in the universal Church nor within our local Churches. Specifically, reflecting on the life of Ukrainian Catholics as a minority in North America, we must admit that the cultural matrices of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada and Ukraine are no longer identical. Are we then destined to become "estranged"? Not necessarily. Here is where the other arm, so to speak, of Lonergan's definition comes into play. Theology mediates between the cultural matrix and the value of religion in that matrix. Although there is much that is similar in the cultural identity of Ukrainians throughout the world,[29] sociological data tells us very clearly that the Ukrainian community in North America, and Canada specifically, is highly assimilated.[30] Wsevolod Isajiw offers us some statistics on ethnic identity retention which demonstrate the gradual drop from first to third generation.[31] In Western Canada particularly, Ukrainians have

[29] According to the 1996 Canadian census, over a million Canadians continue to identify themselves as being of Ukrainian background, demonstrating the strength of their shared cultural history. www.statcan.ca/english/census.96/feb17/eo1can.htm.

[30] William Darcovich, "The 'Statistical Compendium': An Overview of Trends," in *Changing Realities: Social Trends Among Ukrainian Canadians*, ed. W.R. Petryshyn (Edmonton: CIUS, 1980), 17.

[31] Isajiw gives the following statistics for retention of external aspects of identity which decline from 78% of the first-generation to 57% of the second-generation and then to 26% in the third-generation; similarly with language retention the trend is 71% retention in the second generation and only 12% in the third. Wsevolod W. Isajiw, "The Changing Community," in Luciuk & Hryniuk, 262. The 1996 census demonstrates that this trend is continuing unabated: in 1996 47% of those who identified Ukrainian as their mother tongue were over 65 years old, and the gross figure of those with Ukrainian as a mother tongue declined from 309,890 in 1971 to 201,320 in 1991 and only 174,830 in 1996. www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/971202.htm.

integrated almost seamlessly into the Canadian mainstream and share the values, attitudes, and concerns of that mainstream. They are very distant from the cultural experience and struggles of Ukrainians in Ukraine. Having said this, however, it need not mean that the future is one of increased separation and isolation. In fact, what I hope to indicate is how an authentic integration of the insights given above may help to overcome this cultural diversity.

My earlier argument that non-Roman Catholics need to rise from their experience of oppression is doubly applicable to Ukrainian Catholics, who both ecclesiastically and politically have endured much oppression in this century. This very experience of oppression and the way in which a common religious experience has or has not addressed the oppression may be the bridge that binds Ukrainian Catholics in Canada with Ukrainian Catholics in Ukraine. Clearly the experience of Ukrainian Catholics in Ukraine from 1945 to 1989 was one of political repression, persecution and near annihilation. That experience was also shared by the Ukrainian population at large, although the Ukrainian Catholics found within their religious experience a bulwark which assisted them in enduring the persecutions and sustaining their identity in the face of comprehensive and exhausting policies of Sovietisation and Russification. More succinctly, the Ukrainian Catholic experiences empowered Ukrainian Catholics to be authentically who they were. The limited and popular theology that existed was nonetheless liberating and humanizing. The Church and its theology stood on the side of the oppressed and today is able to co-celebrate the resurrection of a nation. Ukrainian Catholic theology, notwithstanding its rudimentary character, ably mediated between the cultural matrix and the significance of religion within that matrix.

When we apply this model to the experience of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada we soon recognize a less than positive picture. Can one argue that the religious experience of Ukrainian Catholics in Canada was empowering and humanizing? I suspect not. The well-known issue of the Vatican ban on the ordination of married men to the priesthood in North America is a case in point. The fact that Roman hierarchs banned married clergy and that the Ukrainian hierarchy stood by silently surely suggests that the first Ukrainian

immigrants to Canada were being told that their "old" practices were "other" and simply not good for the "New World." The submission of parishes to clergy of other ethnic backgrounds who often could not or would not speak Ukrainian, again signalled that the Ukrainian character of the people was something unacceptable, "second-rate," unworthy of consideration.[32] The accusations of treason and sedition against Bishop Budka and other clergy during World War I meant that even the hierarchy had to limit their attachments to the homeland. Even the rise of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church served only to further denigrate the life and experience of Ukrainian Catholics. McGowan writes,

> The new church expressed its disdain for the Uniate church, which it felt existed "according to the wishes and under the rigid control of the French Roman Catholic Church, in contradiction to our national interests." The Orthodox presence directly threatened Catholic membership, so much so that by 1931 it could claim the allegiance of one-quarter of Canada's Ukrainians.[33]

All these factors simply served, in the Canadian setting, to accentuate the antagonism which had already existed in Galicia between the clerical class of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the rising nationalist intelligentsia. Rather than dialoguing with this intelligentsia, who by the 1920's were the inspirers of the new cultural matrix, the Ukrainian Catholic Church increasingly found itself at odds with them.[34] In as much as the Ukrainian Catholic

---

[32] The experience of Fr. Delaere is a particularly poignant example of how the ethnic character and value of the Ukrainian Catholic immigrant was systematically denied. Notwithstanding the honest and Christian intentions of Fr. Delaere, the fact that in preparation for his work among Ukrainian Catholics in Western Canada he lived for a year in Galicia and learned Polish (!) demonstrates the sheer ignorance of "the other" by the dominant Roman majority. Andrii Krawchuk, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Francophone Missionaries among Ukrainian Catholics," in Luciuk and Hryniuk, 207.

[33] McGowan, 231.

[34] Oleh W. Gerus, "Consolidating the Community: The Ukrainian Self-Reliance League," in Luciuk & Hryniuk, 158–59.

Church empowered and authenticated Ukrainians in Ukraine in their struggle for survival, the same cannot be said about the history of the Church's interaction with the community in Canada, its culture and its values. I am not suggesting that the Church should have served as a bulwark against assimilation or that it should have supported every new social force that affected the community. Rather, the issue is one of interaction or mediation. Was the Church in its theology able to mediate, or more clearly demonstrate, elucidate, and express the manner in which its religious experience could help the community as it struggled with the various social, political, and cultural questions it faced? Having suggested that my answer is in the negative, I would further argue that this was so because the leadership of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in this historical period had adopted the status of the oppressed and so was paralysed, unable to be other than it was: "the other," marginalized and voiceless. Today, however, the situation is different. The success of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in being a voice for the oppressed in the Soviet period, and our discussions today about the nature of "our" theology, all lead me to suggest that in North America we can elaborate a theology that will be empowering and authentic for the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Characteristics of a Ukrainian Catholic Theology

Thus we can address the character of the Ukrainian Catholic Church's theology arising from the experience of this ecclesial community in North America. In order for this theology to be true to its experience it must first be authenticating. The ecclesial community from which it arises must recognize it as affirming their religious experience and aiding it in the integration of that experience with their cultural questions or issues. Any true theology must aid a community to discover and express the value of their religious experience within the context of their lived experience.

Secondly, this theology must be critical. By this I mean honest and open to other voices and other possibilities. It must recognize that for many years it was not only oppressed, but served the oppressor. This theology must be able to look back, interpret its ecclesial history and judge that history in relation to the question of self-authentication.

Thirdly, this theology must be dialogic and as such also ecumenical. The emerging theology must be made in community, it must reflect what Freire calls "the practice of permanent dialogue between leaders and people, consolidating the participation of the people in power."[35] It must develop as a result of a dialogue with mainstream Canadian society, other Christian Churches and communities: a dialogue of partners within the given Church. But preeminently it must be in dialogue with the Orthodox. The impetus for dialogue comes not only from a need to be generous and open to others, but more importantly, from a recognition that the classicist model is outdated and so truth is not held within the confines of the one culture but is rather the goal of the common effort enjoined by the many, each in their own particular manner.

Fourthly, this theology must be patristic, reflecting the ability of the great teachers of the patristic era to speak authoritatively and genuinely to their cultures from their faith perspective. I reject a notion of Patristics as the mere parroting of the words and phrases of "the Fathers" as if their meaning magically transcends time, geography and culture.

Fifthly, this theology must be liturgico-sacramental. That is to say, it must be rooted in a common liturgico-sacramental experience and world view. It must be born of the common experience of the community as the worshipping Body of Christ. But additionally it must reflect the liturgico-sacramental presumption that the world is imbued with the power, the energies, of the Triune God. I believe that an eco-theology is a pre-condition for any authentic liturgico-sacramental approach.

---

[35] Freire, 158.

Conclusion

An Eastern Catholic Theology is to be rooted in both the religious and the cultural experience of the community and this demands that we reject any concept of a theology which is for all time. Theology is rather the product of our contemporary dialogue with, and reception of the Christian Gospel through the prism of, our historic community. For an Eastern Catholic theology to be, it must be inculturated and reflective of a given community's experience of the Risen Lord. One cannot create an Eastern Catholic theology for the simple purpose of juxtaposition to Roman Catholic or Orthodox theology. An organic and vital discourse must occur within a particular Christian community and serve to authenticate both the religious and historical experience of the community. This paper has demonstrated how such a discourse must be particularized and that it cannot be defined only by external forces. It must be made the community's own and reflect its own efforts at self-definition. It is a process which is just beginning and hopefully will be well served by the results of our panel today.

✚✚✚✚✚✚✚✚

Резюме

Професор богослов'я Колеґії св. Томи Мур при Саскачеванському Університеті, о. д-р Мирослав Татарин, застосовує дефініцію богослов'я канадського богослова Бернарда Лонерґана до питання, „Що це є 'східньо-католицьке богослов'я'?" Згідно з цією дефініцією богослов'я є інтерпретативним посередником між системою культури та ролею і значенням релігії в тій культурі. Лонеґран підкреслював, що так довго як домінував „клясицистичний світогляд", який дозволяв тільки одній філософії служити ґрунтом для осмислення життя, східнім католикам тяжко було визначатися чи то серед римо-католиків чи серед православних.

Автор тоді застосовує мислення Паоло Фрера, який в творі *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, пропонує переслідуваним процес для відзискання їхньої гідности і ідентичности через відкинення понять накинутих „згори" чи „зі зовні" тими, які бажають дискримінувати меншості.

✚
✚ ✚
✚