

Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies
Vol. 39 (1998) No. 1, pp. 71–87

Orthodox in Communion with Rome: The Antinomic Character of Eastern Catholic Theology[1]

Andriy Chirovsky

Abstract

(Українське резюме на ст. 86)

Since the Second Vatican Council Eastern Catholic Churches have been enjoined to preserve and develop their own, non-Roman, yet Catholic theologies. This article presents Eastern Catholic theology as Eastern Orthodox theology, which, however, considers divergences between itself and Roman approaches as complementary rather than contradictory. This includes even the very volatile issue of ecclesiology and an understanding of the role of the Roman papacy. The author goes on to examine Eastern Catholic approaches to missiology, inter-religious explorations, relations with the Reformed traditions and the contingent nature of Eastern Catholicism.

[1] The original version of this paper was delivered at the Catholic Theological Society of America, Ottawa, Canada, June 1998. It has been expanded for publication.

A Disputed Identity

At the 1988 World Mission Institute in Chicago (of which I was one of the organizers and which focused on Eastern Christian mission), I identified myself at one point as an Orthodox Christian in communion with Rome. This was met with protest from the eminent Romanian Orthodox theologian, Fr. Ion Brian, who said: "This is impossible. This cannot be. We have no category for you." Feeling acutely the wounds inflicted by various Latin Catholics, Eastern Orthodox and even fellow Eastern Catholics who had refused me this identity, which I still claim and cherish, I responded, paraphrasing the Risen Lord: "Put your hands into my wounds and see that I am real and do not be an unbeliever, but rather believe." While Dale Carnegie might not have thought this the optimum way to win friends and influence people, I made what I considered to be a prophetic stand for a reality that is too often ignored or misunderstood.

If to be an Eastern Catholic is to believe that one can simultaneously live the fulness of Orthodox tradition and enjoy the fulness of Catholic communion, then to do Eastern Catholic theology is to be reconciled to the inevitable and unresolvable tension between these two loyalties in the theological realm.[2]

[2] I have written on similar subjects elsewhere. See A. Chirovsky, "The Ukrainian Church in the Second Millennium," in Nicholas L. Fr. Chirovsky, ed. *The Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1988), 260–86. "Ukrainskyi Katolytskyi Universytet: Konechnist dlia Kozhnoho Ukraintsia," [A Ukrainian Catholic University: A necessity for every Ukrainian], *Svoboda* 83 (nos. 31–35, Feb. 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 1976): 2. "Dukhovo-Studiyniy Tsentr dlya Torontons'koyi Eparkhiyi" [A spiritual and religious studies center for the Toronto Eparchy] *Nasha Meta [Our Aim]* 31 (no. 6, Feb. 10, 1979): 3. "Pravoslavni u Ziednanni z Rymom: Deyaki Ekumenichni Rozvazhannia" [Orthodox in communion with Rome: Some ecumenical considerations] *Church Herald,* 16 (no. 2, Jan. 23, 1983): 4–6. "Misia Ukrayinskykh Tserkov v druhomu tysiacholitti." [The Mission of the Ukrainian Churches in the second millennium] *Suchasnist* 28 (no. 9, 1988): 71–79. "Toward the Second Millennium of Kievan Christianity" *New Theology Review* 1 (1988): 56–65. "The Tradition of Ukrainian Spirituality," in Anne Laszok and Joseph Stoutzenberger, eds. *Conversion of Ukraine: The Continuing Story*. Parma, OH: Ukrainian Catholic Diocese of St. Josaphat, (1988), 27–43. "Several Twentieth Century Institutions and their Contribution to Ukrainian Catholic Scholarship" *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 48 (1992): 136–55.

Contradiction or Complementarity?

Is it an oversimplification to say that where there is a difference of opinion between Eastern and Western Christianity, Orthodox theologians see the difference as a contradiction, while Eastern Catholic theologians consider it a case of complementary views challenging the other, perhaps even teasing or chiding the other, but not fundamentally contradictory? If they were contradictory, would not the communion which we have with the Latin Church be false? As an aside, one might perhaps add that when such a difference of opinion arises between East and West or is discovered as long-standing by Western theologians, their reaction, all too often, is to yawn at the allegedly irrelevant ideas emanating from either Orthodox or Eastern Catholic minds. That is due partly to the arrogance of a very dominant and self-confident West, and partly to the ineffective presentation of vital issues by the Eastern parties in question, who are adept at linking up with two thousand years of Tradition (Scriptures, Fathers, liturgy) but less successful sometimes in connecting with the concerns of the here and now. To jump antinomically to the other pole of this reality, one must add that the Christian West is today more often better at connecting with contemporary society but less effective at holding onto the sources of Tradition in this encounter with modernity.

This brings us to the question of starting points. It will come as no surprise to anyone that, while we must constantly be on guard for oversimplifications, I would reiterate the common assertion that Eastern and Western Christians arrive at the same conclusions about central trinitarian, christological, anthropological and soteriological doctrines, even though their starting points differ. This difference, however, is significant. Whereas Eastern Christians have to struggle to maintain the unity of the Holy Triad (by means of a metaphysically weak *monarchia* of the Father), the Christian West has always started its discussions of God from the unity of essence and proceeded to what has at times been a less than convin-

cing exposition of the tri-Personhood. Ultimately both arrive at a God who is simultaneously three and one, but their voyages towards this destination – their theologies – are diverse. Similar descriptions can be made of Christological and other central doctrines as held and developed in the Eastern and Western Churches.

A Tentative Definition

Eastern Catholic theology is the theology of Churches that are Eastern Christian.[3] This defines one of the starting points of Eastern Catholic theologizing. I was asked recently by an Orthodox doctoral student what I meant by the term "Eastern Christian Theology." He, like many of my Orthodox colleagues, could not see any coherence in the term "Eastern Christian." Indeed, many Orthodox theologians abhor the notion of Eastern Christian Studies, preferring a distinction not between Eastern and Western Churches, but rather between Orthodox and heterodox.

I explained to the doctoral candidate in question in the same way as I have explained to countless students and visitors of the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies that there are four families of Eastern Christian Churches[4]: the Eastern Orthodox; the Oriental (or Pre-Chalcedonian) Orthodox; the Assyrian Church of the East; the Eastern Catholic Churches, almost all of which have counterparts in the previous three families.

[3] For an analysis of the notion of "Easternness" which goes beyond geographical designations see Edward G. Farrugia, S.J. "The Eastern Vision: The Rise of Modern Eastern Theology," *Ephrem's Theological Journal* 1 (1997): 5–16. See also Andriy Chirovsky "Going West to Find the East" *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 36 (1995): 219–32.

[4] See Athanasius Holub, "Toward a Golden Age of the Eastern Churches: The Sheptytsky Institute Cultivates a Serious Study of God while Fostering Prayer and Contemplation," *Catholic Near East* 28 (no. 6, November-December, 1998): 16–20. This article explores some of the practical ramifications of studying the four families of Eastern Churches.

The four families of Eastern Churches differ widely from each other in concrete liturgical practice, but in theology (including liturgical theology) and spirituality they have an astounding congruence. Even though their canonical formulations are different owing to diverse histories, their basic approach to the canonical tradition is also oftentimes similar. The one area in which I must concede some serious differences is in the field of ecclesiology, but even here the single greatest issue of contention is the Roman papacy and how it should relate to the other apostolic Churches.

I therefore believe that Eastern Christian theology shares almost all of the patrimony of the theologies of the three other Eastern Christian families as this patrimony was transmitted in a living fashion from apostolic times, through the Fathers of the Church, in a very particular way. However, when it comes to an understanding of the Roman papacy, Eastern Catholic theology, by virtue of the full and visible communion that exists between the Eastern Catholic Churches and the Church of Rome, must hold its typically conciliar, communion ecclesiology (which it shares with Orthodox theology) in a complementary tension with the universalist centralist views currently held as the official teaching of the Roman Church. The other, non-Catholic Eastern Churches, not being in communion with the Church of Rome, are under no such constraint. They may and often do hold that the official teaching of the Roman Church regarding the ministry of Pope is in grave error.

But these non-Catholic Eastern Christians would be wrong in contending that the Eastern Catholics must hold the Catholic position in exactly the same way as the Romans do.[5] (There are many Roman Catholics who do not share the official Roman view of the papacy, but that question transcends the scope of this paper.)

[5] See Yaroslav Buciora, "Український Католицький Патріярхат в перспективі Берестейської Унії: екклезіологічно-канонічний аналіз" [A Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate from the perspective of the Union of Brest: an ecclesiologico-canonical analysis] *Православний Вісник* [Orthodox Herald] January-February, 1997, pp. 36–44.

New Possibilities

It is my contention that Eastern Catholic theology has been officially allowed to exist and flourish only since Vatican II. The operative word here is "officially." While implicit theologizing continued in the adherence (to a lesser or greater degree) to Eastern worship and there had been some outstanding attempts to explicitly theologize earlier,[6] only since Vatican II have Eastern Catholics been allowed to speak officially of their own theology as legitimately *different* from Roman theology.[7] We are still taking the first steps in the rebuilding of what had been intended at such great

[6] See, for example, Joseph Slipy (Josyf Slipyj) "Consideration on Theological Development in the East," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 7 (1947–8) pp. 54–71.

[7] See *Lumen Gentium*, no. 23: "They enjoy their own discipline, their own liturgical usage and inherit a theological and spiritual patrimony." There are similar statements in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, no. 3 and *Unitatis Redintegratio* nos. 14–18. Until Vatican II, Eastern Catholic liturgy and canonical tradition alone were acknowledged as being diverse. The addition of theology and spirituality at the Second Vatican Council was a quantum leap, the likes of which Eastern Catholics have rarely seen. Of course, it should be noted that the Eastern Orthodox had undergone a lengthy period of scholasticism in both the Russian and the Greek Churches, where theology was modeled on Jesuit and other Latin approaches. Georges Florovsky referred to this as the "pseudomorphosis" of Orthodox theology. See his *Ways of Russian Theology*, Vol. 1 (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1987), 85. Not all Russian theologians took such a dim view of the period. See Alexis Kniazeff, *L'Institut Saint-Serge* (Paris, 1974), 13–14. The Russians would begin their patristic revival in the late nineteenth century, and the Greeks in the twentieth. See Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church*. Revised edition. (London: Penguin, 1993), 117, 145. Alexander Schmemann dates the Russian patristic revival earlier, to around 1840. See his "Russian Theology: 1920–1972, An Introductory Survey" *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 16 (1972): 182–83. Daniel Ciobotea dates the Greek patristic revival from the First Congress of Orthodox Schools of Theology in 1936. See his "Tasks of Orthodox Theology Today," *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 33 (1989): 117–26. A very important distinction must be made. The Eastern Orthodox fell under the sway of scholasticism on their own and disentangled themselves on their own. Eastern Catholics, however, were expected by their Roman superiors to conform to the official theology of the Catholic Church, which was even identified for a while as Thomism – only one of a few major theological currents in the Latin Church. But Eastern Catholics were then informed by Vatican II that they had their own theology, which they were to safeguard and develop. The question of free choice is of extreme significance here. See Andriy Chirovsky, "The Place of Patristic Studies in the Restoration of Ukrainian Theological Education" *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 34 (1993): 270–85.

(though controversial) moments as the 1596 Union of Brest. There the intention was to preserve not only the Kyivan liturgical practice but Eastern Orthodox *theology*, especially as regards the procession of the Holy Spirit. We can see this clearly in article one of the thirty-three Conditions for Union drawn up by the Kyivan hierarchy, but other articles of that document also hint at this.[8] This Orthodox theology was not perceived by the authors of the Conditions as incompatible with full and visible communion with the Roman See. Unfortunately, the Counter-reformation was not the most auspicious time to pursue such ideals. The Roman Church would not understand the issue for another 360 years. In the meantime, Eastern Catholic theology was continually thwarted by Rome and its Eastern Catholic appointees and wards. Our generation is witness to the rebirth of this ideal and its humble first steps.[9]

The Issue of Reception

What of the time between Union and the Second Vatican Council? Have the Eastern Catholic Churches received the tea-

[8] The most recent English translation of the "Articles for Which We Need Guarantees from the Lord Romans [sic] before We Enter into Unity with the Roman Church" appear in Appendix Three of Borys A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Reserach Institute, 1998), 264–72. (The reference should be to the "Roman Lords" rather than to the "Lord Romans" – A.C.) The first article reads: "Firstly, since among the Romans and the Greeks there is a dispute as to the procession of the H(oly) Spirit, which is a considerable obstacle to unification and which probably endures for no other reason than that we do not want to understand each other, we, therefore, request that we not be constrained to a different confession [of faith], but that we remain with the one we find expressed in the S(acred) Scriptures, in the Gospels, and also in the writings of the H(oly) Greek Doctors [i.e. Church Fathers], namely that the H(oly) Spirit does not have two origins, nor a double procession, but that he proceeds from one origin, as from a source – from the Father through the Son." p. 264.

[9] Even with the recognition of Eastern Catholic theologies as legitimately diverse, there remains the problem of their being treated as quaint museum pieces rather than living, dynamic forces for today. See the editorial "Are the Eastern Theologies Museum Pieces" by Paul Maniyattu in *Ephrem's Theological Journal* 1 (1997): 2–4.

chings of Vatican I? I believe this to be a very central issue for the further development of Eastern Catholic theology. In my conversations and debates, my friend and colleague, Fr. Peter Galadza, and I have disagreed on this point. It has been his contention (as I understand it) that since the decrees of this council have been translated into the language of a given Eastern Catholic Church (in the case of our discussions particularly the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church), and the Bishops of this Church have promulgated these decrees, they are understood to have been received in at least the technical ecclesiological sense of the term.

I cannot agree. If one has been prevented from theologizing in one's own tradition, then can one really claim that the given Eastern Catholic Church has *received* a conciliar decree? To rely on the Roman universalist definition of reception which contends that it has been achieved once the Roman Pontiff has deemed it so is to deny outright the very possibility of a divergent, but authentically Catholic Eastern, notion of reception. This, in turn, might deny legitimacy to the Vatican II statements regarding the necessity of rediscovering and fostering Eastern Catholic theology. The very fact that over three decades after the Council we are here, discussing the nature of Eastern Catholic theology, is proof that the Vatican II teaching on legitimately diverse Eastern Catholic theology is only now *beginning* to be received. And that reception is taking place in a characteristically Eastern fashion: a slow mulling over of conciliar decrees in an effort to see whether and how they can be implemented.

Analagous, the reception of the Council of Trent by Eastern Churches which were not represented there, and would later enter into communion with Rome, is an open question. That may be difficult for some to accept. It is, however, a question that will not go away.

Advantages of a Truly Eastern, Truly Catholic Theology

Fundamentally, I would insist that Eastern Catholic theology should be seen as at least a variant of the theology of its corresponding Orthodox Church (while never losing its status as a validly Catholic, though non-Roman theology). Eastern Catholic theology

is thus Eastern Orthodox theology which, however, takes seriously the additional factor of full and visible communion with the Roman Church. This communion carries with it one very necessary corollary already noted above: where the Roman and Eastern Christian views seem to disagree, Eastern Catholics must view this disagreement as a challenge to discover the complementarity of the positions (which may entail some movement in one or the other direction in the course of this discovery). This safeguards Eastern and Western Catholics from i) isolation, complacency and xenophobia, ii) a stultlifing staticism of two solitudes, iii) a disintegration of the one apostolic heritage as a result of the incredibly powerful centrifugal forces of culture and history.

It is my belief that in time the ecumenical climate (which today seems terribly stalled) will again improve and the other three families of Eastern Christian Churches will see the salutary nature of this approach rather than viewing divergences as a contradiction between East and West, as some polemicists do.

Perhaps then the thirteenth article of the Thirty-three Conditions of the Union of Brest will be heard. "And if with time God deigns to grant that the remainder of our brethren of the Greek nation and religion join this holy unity, that it not be deemed a fault of ours that we preceeded them in this unity..."[10]

Eastern Catholic Theology and Inter-religious Dialogue

In addition to all of the above-mentioned considerations, Eastern Catholic theology, were it respected and assigned the necessary resources to carry out its mission, can also have an important role to play in interreligious dialogue. In the last few decades interest in Eastern non-Christian religions among Christian authors of the Western world has flourished. The ascetical and mystical practices of these religions are examined and bridges to Roman Catholicism are sought. It is ironic that almost none of the authors engaged in this positive endeavour bothers to even glance

[10] Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 267.

at the Eastern Catholic Churches. Doing so, however, would make one cognizant of two essential realities: Eastern Christianity shares with several Eastern non-Christian religions many concrete ascetical practices and approaches to prayer and contemplation, culminating in conceptless union with God. And, Eastern Catholic Churches represent part of the patrimony of the whole Catholic Church, with the result that explorations of the "other" (in this case Eastern modes of prayer and contemplation) no longer represent a foray into something entirely foreign to explicit Christianity and even Catholicism. Efforts analogous to those of modern Western authors to synthesize Christianity and the best of what Eastern religions have to offer had been attempted in numerous cases more than a millennium ago.[11]

But perhaps we venture too far afield when we speak of Eastern Catholic theology and spirituality already carrying within itself a kind of synthesis of Eastern non-Christian practice and the Holy Tradition of Christianity. Certainly, most Eastern Catholics are unaware of this rich dimension of their own heritage, real though it be. But, alas, most Eastern Catholics (including the clergy and religious), by virtue of their latinized education, know more about the spirituality of St. Theresa of Avila or St. Anthony of Padua than of the *Philokalia*, of hesychasm, *kenosis*, *theosis* and other hallmarks of Eastern Christianity. Only as Eastern Catholic theologians gain training in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council's respect for their own heritage, will this Tradition begin to filter down to the "front-line" clergy, religious and laypeople. Then a truly vivid encounter with the non-Christian East might well occur among these people who from birth walk the fault-line between East and West.

[11] This should by no means be limited to the Byzantine tradition. I use it as a primary example because it is the tradition in which I live. The Thomas Christians of India, a great many of them Eastern Catholics, have been in dialogue with Hinduism and other religions for many centuries. In fact, the colonialist Portuguese-led Synod of Diamper (1599) was concerned to remove what were perceived to be Hindu practices from the liturgy of the Malabarese Thomas Christians. See Bishop Mar Abraham Mattam, "Christianity and Inculturation" *Ephrem's Theological Journal* 1 (1997): 43–68.

Eastern Catholic Theology and the Reformation

There is another orientation, rarely studied, which requires examination. One of the factors in the decision of the bishops of the Kyivan Orthodox Metropolia to seek communion with Rome in the sixteenth century was the onslaught of a refined and scholarly attack on their faithful by Reformation preachers and teachers.[12] The Orthodox Bishops of the Church of Kyiv sought assistance from their Mother Church in Constantinople, but received little if nothing to help defend the faith, especially against those viewed as the most threatening – the anti-trinitarian Socinians. These same Kyivan Orthodox, having become Eastern Catholics through Union with Rome, relied on the Jesuits and other Catholic Counter-reformation polemicists for many of their rebuttals. Today, it would be fascinating to see Eastern Catholics discussing matters of the faith, at first in informal study groups, but later in bilateral dialogues, with Anglican, Lutheran and various Protestant bodies. With the liturgical renewal still flowering among many of these non-Catholic Western Christians, and with a growing appreciation among them for the non-linear, apophatic and antinomic character of Eastern theology (which appreciation may be a product of a post-Enlightenment or post-modern phase of development), I am approached more and more frequently by thinkers from these communions who want to know what it means to be in communion with Rome while remaining non-Roman. This is a challenge awaiting Eastern Catholic theology in the years to come.

Contributions to Missiology

Western Christian missiology (whether Catholic or not) is currently in crisis. In a post-modern world sensitivity to the cultural (including religious) traditions of other societies is mandatory, consequently Christian evangelization in a pluralistic world evokes embarassment. Is it right to continue spreading the Gospel in a

[12] See Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 77–88.

world rife with judicial or out-of-court settlements and compensation programs for aboriginals who feel that their culture was trampled by European missionaries until the middle of the twentieth century?

Embarrassment is not the only obstacle to mission work. No longer can civil empires be expected to help buttress Christian missionary efforts. In fact, it is unreasonable to assume that such a thing could actually occur (even if it were desirable, which it is not), since the empires of today are not created through military conquest but through market share, and the new "emperors" are the CEO's of multinational corporations. Do Eastern Catholics have anything to offer in this confusing situation? I think that they do, because they have always been minorities. In fact, they have been double minorities: within the Eastern Christian world because of their communion with Rome, and within the Catholic Church because of their Eastern way of life. In addition to this, the majority of Eastern Christians (both Orthodox and Catholic) have had to deal with persecution from either hostile Muslim or atheist regimes. This sense of always being a minority, and always living in jeapordy can help Eastern Catholics be sensitive in presenting the Gospel to other people and other civilizations in a gentle way, the way that Eastern monks traditionally spread the Gospel: setting up a praying, loving community and offering an invitation: "Come and see..."

This approach requires immense patience, of course, but it is not frustrating if one embraces monasticism's eschatological spirit. The liturgy, the fraternal life, and the ascetical practices are all-consuming. The only seemingly direct "mission work" *per se* is in learning the language and culture of the people, in offering hospitality and assistance when required. This is evangelization by example, not by program.[13] It is a process which requires great

[13] Orthodox missiology is a subject that has only begun to receive wider attention in publications since the 1980's. A few notable works are available: James Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986). Michael Oleksa, *Orthodox Alaska: A Theology of Mission*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Pres, 1992). Ion Bria, ed., *Go Forth in Peace: Orthodox Perspectives on Mission*, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986). Michael Oleksa, "Orthodox Missiological Education for the 21st Century," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37(1993): 353–62. For an account of how Eastern Catholics in India are dealing with some of these issues see Joseph Maleparampil, "Missionary Christianity and Missionary Hinduism: Challenges of Inter-religious Dialogue," *Ephrem's Theological Journal* 1 (1997): 69–85. Note that with no colonialist forces to support them, Assyrian Christians of the Church of the East fostered a stupendous evangelization of Asia. Regrettably, most Christians are woefully unaware that until the destruction by the Mongols of much of this Asian Christianity, which stretched from Persia to China, India and Japan, the Assyrian Patriarch-Catholicos "exercised ecclesiastical authority over more of the earth than either Rome or Constantinople." See Samuel Hugh Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia* (New York, 1992), xiii, see also p. 434.

patience and humility, and an overwhelming desire to tread lightly (as one would expect persecuted minorites to be adept at doing).

Objectivity requires us to see the obverse as well, however. While one might hope that a persecuted minority would treat others gently, this same minority may have internalized the barbarity which it has known to such an extent that it in turn becomes "persecutor." In any event, the question of Eastern Catholic missiology requires exploration. Sadly, Eastern Catholics were not allowed by Rome to engage in missionary activities until Vatican II. This was seen as an exclusive prerogative of the Latin Church. The rules have now changed.[14] How long will it take for Eastern Catholics to emerge from their protective enclaves and mature in their desire to be participants in worldwide evangelization? Much will depend on how the issue is studied and pesented to the Eastern Catholic Churches by their own theologians.

Conclusion: An Antinomic and Contingent Reality

In their present incarnation, the Eastern Catholic Churches are a contingent reality.[15] They are to exist as distinct entities only

[14] *Ad gentes*, nos. 29, 36, 38.

[15] *Ecclesiarum orientalium*, no. 30. In the Apostolic Constitution *Sacri Canones* by which the new Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches was promulgated by Pope John Paul II, we read: "[...] it is necessary that the canons of the Code of the Eastern Catholic Churches [...] be in force until abrogated or changed by the supreme authority of the Church for a just cause, of which causes full communion of all of the Eastern Churches with the Catholic Churches is

until the time of full reconciliation between worldwide Orthodoxy and worldwide Catholicism. Some have seen this as imminent. Others think it impossible. There have been those who see the very existence of the Eastern Catholic Churches as the prime obstacle to Orthodox-Catholic rapprochement.[16] Whichever of the three scenarios one might subscribe to, the case for developing Eastern Catholic theology as something different from both Roman Catholic theology and Orthodox theology seems to many a futile proposition, precisely because of the contingent nature of the arrangement. But although the hoped-for result is the eventual full reconcilaition of the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, Eastern Catholics need not see this as a dismissal of their contribution. In fact, Eastern Catholics are called to be, to some degree at least, the voice of Orthodoxy in the Catholic Church and the voice of the Catholicism in the Christian East.

Much has been written and said of how Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople regarded the Melkite Greek Catholic Patriarch of Antioch, Maximos IV, as Orthodoxy's voice at Vatican II. This vocation has been carried on with greater or lesser success by other Eastern Catholic leaders and thinkers. The late Metropolitan Maxim Hermaniuk, Ukrainian Greco-Catholic primate for Canada, is remembered by his Roman Catholic colleagues in the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops and beyond, for his insistence on synodal rule in the Catholic Church. Unacquainted with the refined way in which an Eastern Patriarch and his Synod of Bishops interact according to tradition, some Roman Catholics saw Metropolitan Maxim's interventions as an undermining of papal authority and a return to the conciliarist battles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In fact, what Metropolitan Maxim proposed was the creation of a Permanent Synod (a *synodos endemou-*

indeed the most serious, besides being especially in accord with the desire of Our Savior Jesus Christ himself." *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: Latin-English Edition*, translation prepared under the auspices of the Canon Law Society of America (Washington: Canon Law Society of America, 1992), xiii.

[16] See the editorial, "The 'Final Solution?' – Reflections on Recent Orthodox Statements Concerning Eastern Catholics," *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 37 (1996): 7–33.

sa) which would represent the worldwide Church: this body, and not the Roman Curia, would make the day-to-day decisions of the Church. The Curia would be reduced to an executive role, leaving real decision-making power in the synod's hands.

The crucial element in understanding this reality lies in the powers of the two constituent parts of such a *synodos endemousa*: its head and its members. The head of this particular synod would be the Pope of Rome. Its members would be elected by the various synods and episcopal conferences. The *synodos endemousa* and the Pope would have to act together. The synod would not make any decision without its head. But its head would not make any decision without the synod. To the head of the synod would be reserved a veto, so that decisions made, even with overwhelming majorities, would not be promulgated without the acquiescence of the synod's head.

In light of the request from Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Ut unum sint*, to help him re-envisgae the papacy in such a way as to retain its effective ability to safeguard the unity of the Church while simultaneously removing those elements which estrange non-Catholics, Metroplitan Maxim's proposal should be seriously studied. When I presented this vision of Church governance to several eminent Orthodox thinkers, their response was quite positive. One went so far as to say that if the heads of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches were automatic members of such a synod, at least theoretically Orthodox ecclesiology would be safeguarded.

Eastern Christian theology prides itself on its use of antinomy: God is One yet Three, Christ is Divine yet Human, Salvation consists in complete union with God while retaining one's unique personhood. The common underlying idea is that of union without confusion, a concept worked out eloquently in the Christological definition of the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Perhaps Eastern Catholics, as they take their early steps in beginning to theologize again, should seize upon precisely this profound undergirding of all patristic thought, expressed in the colloquial words: "Yes, but..." To Roman Catholics Eastern Catholics should answer, after listening to a prolific and dynamic deluge of ideas and sometimes airtight conclusions, with a quiet "yes, but..." To their non-

Catholic Eastern brothers and sisters, the Eastern Catholic theologians, after listening to weighty and profound arguments arising from the scriptural, patristic and liturgical heritage of the East, should answer quietly: "yes, but..." Knowing both sides, remaining themselves, straining to be true to the Truth who is a Who and not a What, Eastern Catholics have their job cut out for them. If it should come about that Eastern Catholics will understand this challenge and rise up to meet it, then the Christian East and West (at least the *Catholic* West, at first) will speak the all important "yes, but..." to each other rather than deride, denigrate, or dismiss the other. If that day comes, the fact that Eastern Catholic theology had been a "contingent reality" will cease to be a concern.

+++++++

Резюме

Стаття о. д-ра Андрія Чировського, директора Інституту ім. Митр. Андрея Шептицького при Університеті св. Павла в Оттаві, п. з. „Православні в сопричасті з Римом: Антиномічний характер східньо-католицької теології" це поширена версія доповіді з Конгресу Католицького Богословського Товариства Америки, виголошена 9-го червня 1998 в Оттаві. Автор твердить, що східньо-католицьке богослов'я – це нічого іншого як православне богослов'я, яке бере під увагу повне сопричастя з римською Церквою, й тому інтерпретує відмінності між східніми а західніми позиціями не як заперечення, але радше як доповнення чи комплементарність. Це стосується і еклезіологічних спорів, особливо про папство. Дальше стаття розглядає ролю, яку могло б відіграти східньо-католицьке богослов'я в між-релігійних стосунках, особливо коли ходить про східні не-християнські релігії. Автор встрягає в питання місіології, потреби віднайдення доріг до діялогу з християнами, які приналежні до спільнот, які вийшли з протестантської реформації, та заторкує особливу ролю, яку східні католики могли б відіграти в віднайденні відновленого розуміння папства, яке співпрацювало б з постійним синодом, на взір східніх патріярхій, розвиваючи

твердження покійного вінніпезького Митр. Максима (Германюка) на цю тему. На кінець стаття береться до питання дочасности місії східньо-католицьких Церков, до часу повного поєднання Православної та Католицької Церков.

