Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies
Vol. 39 (1998) No. 1, pp. 13–58

Eastern Catholic Theology – Is There Any Such Thing? Reflections of a Practitioner

Robert F. Taft, S.J.

Abstract

(Українське резюме на ст. 57)

The author traces the development of Eastern Catholic theology to the reaction of certain Eastern Catholic hierarchs, especially Melkite, to the erosion of their rights during the pontificate of Pius IX, and then outlines its history to the present.

He describes this theology in its present form as "embryonic, not widespread, still struggling to define itself, often embattled, even besieged, but by no means in retreat or about to surrender," and then defines it as "the theology of Catholic practitioners with a knowledge and love for the traditions of the Christian East, a Catholic theology that seeks to breathe with both lungs, nourishing a sometimes anaemic Catholic thought with oxygen from both sides of the East-West Christian divide."

This paper was delivered during the panel, "What is Eastern Catholic Theology?" during the Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America, Ottawa, June, 1998.

+++++++

I. Preliminaries

In 1995, when I was named to the recently established Sir Daniel and Countess Bernardine Murphy Donohue Chair in Eastern Catholic Theology at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome,[1] I must confess I asked myself, "Eastern Catholic Theology – is there any such thing?" Whence the title of these reflections. The name of the prestigious Chair I have been privileged to hold was, of course, not of my coining. Did its founders unwittingly make an unjustified presumption? Or were they engaging in wish-fulfillment, hoping that founding a "chair of Eastern Catholic theology" would make its material object come true?

Not being overly introspective, and not at all a hand-wringer, I put these thoughts aside and just went about the business of my Chair and my Institute, dedicated to scholarly research and graduate-level teaching on the traditions of the Christian East. But I could not put the nagging question completely out of my mind, for it raised its head every time I saw the title of my Chair blazoned across my own letterhead. So I welcome the invitation of Prof. Peter Galadza to address the topic head on, since I knew it would have to be done sooner or later.

Let me proceed in Western scholastic-thesis fashion to dispense immediately with some presuppositions, define parameters and terms, anticipate the conclusion, then go back and talk about it.

Parameters

First, then, the parameters. What I shall say here represents no more than my own opinion, the result of tentative first reflections on a topic about which nothing, as far as I know, has ever been written *ex professo*. But there are informed and uninformed opinions. Aeronautical engineers have an intellectual right to hold

[1] The Chair, a rotating annually renewable appointment, was held by the present writer for three consecutive academic years from 1995 to 1998. A new chairholder, Prof. Christian Troll, S.J., has been named to the chair for the academic year 1998/9.

opinions on the safe design of aircraft. I do not, since I know nothing about it. Though in the free world I would have every *political right* to hold it, any opinion of mine on the topic would be worthless *intellectually*. With respect to the topic at hand, however, as one who has spent his entire student and adult professional life studying the Christian East, thirty-three of those years first as a graduate student, then as professor at an institute of higher (i.e., graduate) studies specializing exclusively in Eastern Christianity and its traditions, I do not believe I am presumptuous in claiming the right to have an informed opinion on the topic.

By that I do not in any way presume some magisterial authority that would pretend to put my views beyond challenge, or claim for them unquestioned acceptance. I insist on the point because the Christian East finds itself awash in people who presume a mandate to identify and define what others are, rewrite their history, tell them what ecclesial communion they should belong to, and imperiously deny their Christianity any "Eastern authenticity" if it has the affrontery to reject the imposition of their prefabricated interpretive framework. Unfortunately, concepts such as the freedom to be what one wants to be are all "Western," as are the virtues of fairness, objectivity, freedom of conscience, and the right of peoples not only to be what they want to be, but to define for themselves what their self-identity is, without having presumptuous outsiders arrogantly mucking around with their psyche. Eastern Catholics have had more than enough of others telling them who and what they are or should be. If basic human rights are not enough, then their martyrdom over the past half century or more has earned them the right not to have others rewrite their history or tell them who they are or must be.

Allow me to adhere to these same sentiments with respect to the topic at hand. I am talking about Eastern Catholic theology, not

about Western Catholic or Orthodox theology,[2] and Eastern Catholics are the ones who have the the first claim to define what they think their authentic theology is. Though this claim is prior, it is not of course exclusive, since intellectual discourse is open to anyone of honesty, objectivity, and good will – a category by no means as all-inclusive as some would naively presume, at any rate certainly not in today's Christian East.

So in these reflections I offer a personal, tentative approach to our topic with the hope of stimulating, not ending, the discussion. I am in no way attempting to impose definitions, nor do I wish to place other Catholic writers and their thought within categories they would themselves reject. If I have done so below, let me apologize *ante factum.* I am just trying to describe a phenomenon as I see it, not in any way trying to predetermine anyone else's identity.

Terms

So much for the parameters. As for the terms, it is not possible to define in any definitive way what Eastern Catholic theology is or might be, except to say what it is not: it is not Eastern/Oriental Orthodox theology, since to claim that would be simply to beg the question, and would also run the risk of co-opting someone else's intellectual and theological tradition. This does not mean that Eastern Catholic theology stands in opposition to Orthodox theology. On the contrary, both claim to derive from the patristic and liturgical sources of a common tradition. And besides, Eastern Catholics have been strongly influenced by modern Orthodox writers, an influence they unashamedly welcome and gratefully acknowledge.

[2] On Orthodox theology today, see the posthumously published anthology of John Meyendorff (†1992), *Rome, Constantinople, Moscow. Historical and Theological Studies* (Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996) chaps. 7 and 9; and Yanni Spiteris, *La teologia ortodossa neo-greca* (Collani di studi religiosi, Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1992).

Secondly, Eastern Catholic theology is not Western theology, not even Western Catholic theology, though it has obviously undergone strong Western Catholic influence, more so than has Orthodox theology, though Orthodox theology has also absorbed much from modern Western thought,[3] even if it is sometimes reluctant to acknowledge it.

Does that mean Eastern Catholic theology is any theology done by theologians who happen to be Eastern Catholics? Not at all. Just as the Orthodox reject Orthodox thinkers whom they judge too "Western" or "scholastic" to be representative Orthodox theologians, the same is true of Eastern Catholic theology. There are Eastern Catholic writings on the liturgy that just parrot Latin manual-theology of the pre-World War II period, before the effects of the scriptural, patristic, and liturgical renewal that led up to Vatican II had filtered down to the Catholic East. I would in no way call such writings Eastern Catholic liturgical theology.

Furthermore, there are Catholic theologians not belonging canonically to any Eastern Catholic Church whom I would consider to be doing an "Eastern" type of theology. That is also the view of some Romanian Orthodox, who, on granting an honourary doctorate to Tomáš Špidlík, S.J., professor-emeritus of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, referred to him as "One of ours."[4] And Romanian Orthodox theologians have called him "a

[3] Just check the sources referred to in Alexander Schmemann's *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (The Library of Orthodox Theology 4, London: Faith Press/Portland Maine: The American Orthodox Press, 1966, reissued since by St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY).

[4] "...nous avons toujours su que vous étiez un des nôtres." *Laudatio pour le Révérend Père Tomáš Špidlík, Professeur à l'Institut Pontifical Oriental et à l'Université Grégorienne de Rome, prononcée par Le Professeur Ioan Ica, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie Orthodoxe, Université «Babes-Bolyai» de Cluj-Napoca, 29 mai 1997,* p. 9. Cf. also Prof. Dr. Nicolae D. Necula, Romanian Orthodox priest and pro-dean of the Orthodox Theology Faculty of Bucharest, in his introduction to T. Špidlík, *Marii mistici rusi* (Galati, 1997) 7; and Romanian Orthodox Deacon Ioan I. Ica, Jr., introduction to T. Špidlík, *Spiritualitatea Rasaritului Crestin* (Sibiu, 1997), 5–20, esp. 17ff. I owe these references to Dr. Maria Campitelli of the Centro di Studi "Ezio Aletti," Rome.

starets from Rome,"[5] and "the best Orthodox theologian writing today." So perhaps it would be better to speak of "Catholic Eastern theology," meaning by that *a style of Catholic theological thinking in which "Eastern" is not an ecclesial or ethnic attribute of those doing this theology, but an epithet specifying the nature and quality of the theology itself.*

Other Catholic theologians, while decidedly "Western" in the scientific rigour, philosophic-speculative quality, systematic order, and universally inclusive scope of their thought, never neglected the Eastern sources and remained fully open to having Western theological thought enriched and even corrected by the insights of the East. I am thinking of my late teacher and colleague Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J. (†June 16, 1994), professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome.

So with regard to such categorizing, it is good to recall Richard Jenkyns' caveat in his recent essay, "Points of Order":

> The fact that the boundary between two entities may be unclear does not mean that they are not distinct: there is no exact line of demarcation between a patois, pidgin, or creole and an independent language, but we all know that German is a different language from English, and that Glaswegian is not.[6]

That is apposite to my view of Eastern Catholic theology: I am not trying to deny its similarities with Western Catholic theology on the one hand, nor with Orthodox theology on the other. Why shouldn't it be similar to them, since it obviously derives so much from both these far older, fuller, and richer theological traditions? My only point is that Eastern Catholic theology does exist despite problems in defining its distinctiveness, and like any other cultural

[5] *Ibid.*, 5.

[6] R. Jenkyns. "Points of Order." Review of H. Ritvo, *The Platypus and the Mermaid and Other Figments of the Classifying Imagination* (Harvard University Press), in *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 44 no. 18 (Nov. 20, 1997), 38.

reality, it deserves to be dealt with in its own right, and not as viewed through someone else's tinted lenses.

Thesis

So you already have my answer. My thesis is that there is indeed an Eastern Catholic theology, embryonic, not widespread, still struggling to define itself, often embattled, even beseiged, but by no means in retreat or about to surrender. How can one define this theology? Can one define any theology? Should one even try? I would describe it as *the theology of Catholic practitioners with a knowledge and love for the traditions of the Christian East, a Catholic theology that seeks to breathe with both lungs, nourishing a sometimes anemic Catholic thought with oxygen from both sides of the East-West Christian divide.*

In the essay cited just above, Jenkyns goes on to comment on Rivo's view that disputes over the naming and classifying of things are "related to conflicts in society as a whole," which is certainly true of Eastern Catholicism and its tradition vis-à-vis their neighbours, East and West. Jenkins comments: "One might rather suspect that the cause [of these disputes] was *odium academicum* and the notorious tendency of the learned to get heated about matters which seem to the rest of the world of very limited importance."[7] That, too, is apposite here. So I do not pretend that what I call "Eastern Catholic theology" or how I would identify it has any independence outside the Catholic-Orthodox axis. I am only trying to answer the question because it was asked.

[7] *Ibid.*, 39.

II. History

Before entering into greater detail on the nature and characteristics of this theology, a brief overview of its origins is in order.[8] Nothing whatever can be understood apart from its history, and that is doubly true here.

Vatican I

Paradoxically, I would place at that most narrow, most ultramontane, least "Eastern" of all councils, Vatican I (1869–1870) the remote beginnings of the renewal of Eastern Catholicism that would eventually spill over into liturgy, theology, and indeed, all areas of church life.[9] Appalled at the Council's lack of understanding or respect for the distinctness of the Catholic East and its age-old traditions and the peculiar dignity of its supreme hierarchs – suffice it to note that the Eastern Catholic patriarchs were assimilated to and ranked with the titular Latin pseudo-patriarchs and ranked with them at the Council – Eastern Catholic bishops at Vatican I rose up in protest. On January 25, 1870, at the 16th General Session of the Council, the Chaldean Patriarch Joseph Audo took the floor in an historic speech insisting that the particular discipine of the Christian East be respected. Two days later the Romanian Catholic bishop of Nagyvárad (Grosswardein), Joseph Papp-Szilágyi, expressed his support of Audo's views. Anyone familiar with the highly charged atmosphere of Vatican I and the suffocatingly authoritarian papalism of Pius IX (1846–1878) could guess that the reaction would not be long in coming.[10] On January 29, the pope

[8] J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris: Seuil, 1962), 301–309.

[9] On Vatican I and the Eastern Catholic bishops, see Constantin G. Patelos, *Vatican I et les évêques uniates. Une étape éclairante de la politique romaine à l'égard des orientaux (1867–1870)* (Bibliothèque de la *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 65, Louvain, 1981).

[10] On "Pio Nono," as he is called, the fundamental work is the 3 volume biography of Giacomo Martina, S.J., vol. 1: *Pio IX (1846–1850)* (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 38, Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1974), vol. 2: *Pio IX (1851–1866)* (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 51, Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1986), vol. 3: *Pio IX (1867–1878)* (Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae 58, Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1990). On Pius IX and the Eastern Catholic Churches, see esp. vol. 3, chap. 2, though the matter is handled more fully by Patelos, cited in the previous note. On Pius IX's treatment of the Melkite patriarch, see also C. Snider, *Pio IX nella luce dei processi canonici* (Studi Piani 8, Vatican, 1992), 192–233.

summoned Patriarch Audo to his quarters like a miscreant and made him subscribe to the dispositions of the bull *Reversurus* that for all practical purposes turned Catholic bishops into altar-boys, to be treated as Audo had just been. Not all Eastern Catholic patriarchs and hierarchs, notably the Armenians, Syrians, and Maronites, held the same views as Audo, and most of them certainly did not have the same courage. But the Melkite patriarch and hierarchy also played at Vatican I a role that presaged their crucial importance at Vatican II (on which more later). At the 54th General Session on May 19, Melkite Patriarch Gregory II Youssef Sayyour created a sensation with his intervention in defense of the patriarchal system of government traditional in the Christian East, and against the proposed anathematizing of the "schismatic" Greeks, a proposal for which, if carried out, the patriarch was quite right in predicting disastrous consequences. Attacked on all sides, not least by the Armenian Catholic patriarch Peter IX Hassoun and the Syrian archbishop of Mosul Cyril Behnam Benni, and deeply offended by the way the pope manifested his displeasure, Patriarch Gregory took the floor again on June 14 to defend himself from the accusation of having "schismatic tendencies," and to reiterate his views.

These profound divisions in the Catholic East, manifested with utmost clarity at Vatican I, remain with us today. There are those Churches that have set out resolutely on the path to the recovery of their heritage, and others that are so latinized they do not even understand the nature of the problematic, or are too small and weak or disinterested to do anything about it even if they did. But even in the latter communities, individual voices have been heard at and since Vatican II, calling for an end to the Babylonian captivity of the Catholic East.

Leo XIII and the 1893 Eucharistic Congress of Jerusalem

Another key date is 1893. The election to the papacy of Leo XIII (1878–1903), soon to become known as "the pope of the Christian East," marked the beginnings of the emancipation of the Eastern Catholic Churches.[11] The story has been told and retold many times, and does need repeating here, beyond a few highlights especially pertinent to our topic. The April 11, 1883 report of Vanutelli, the apostolic delegate at Constantinople and later cardinal, outlined Latin failures in dealing adequately with the East, and insisted on the teaching in Catholic seminaries of special courses in Oriental theology, liturgy, and history. This, of course, implies the recognition of what some were trying to say at Vatican I: that the East has a peculiar patrimony, even in theology, and is not just Western Christianity in different vestments.

Preparations for the 1893 Eucharistic Congress of Jerusalem brought things to a head, showing the weakness of the Catholic East confronted with the assault of Latin missionaries. Cardinal Langénieux, archbishop of Rheims, was Pope Leo's Cardinal-legate for relations with the Eastern hierarchies in view of the upcoming Congress. His courageous and far-seeing report of July 2, 1893, informed the pope in undisguised terms of the problems caused by the Latin assault on the East, and of the need for a radically new policy. Leo XIII took swift and decisive action. The encyclical *Praeclara gratulationis* of June 20, 1894, was followed in the fall with frank discussions at the Vatican where the Eastern Catholic patriarchs could express their griefs freely, without the fear of reprisals that reigned under the repressive regime of Pius IX. Swiftly thereafter came the historic encyclical *Orientalium dignitas,* dated November 30, 1894, but promulgated on December 6, the feast of St. Nicholas so dear to the Byzantine East. This document has been called the "Magna Carta" of Eastern Catholicism. The fact that recent histories of the papacy do not even consider this aspect of Leo XIII's pontificate worth mentioning[12] is symptomatic of the modest place Eastern Catholicism still occupies in the minds of Catholic academia, if indeed it can be said to be present there at all.

[11] C. Soetens, *Le Congrès Eucharistique international de Jérusalem (1893) dans le cadre de la politique orientale du pape Léon XIII* (Recueil de travaux d'histore et de philologie, série 6, fasc. 12, Louvain, 1977); Rosario F. Esposito, *Leone XIII e l'Oriente cristiano: Studio storico-sistematico* (Rome, 1960) 367–84; Hajjar (note 8 above) 309–11; further bibliography on Leo's policies regarding the East in G. Croce, *La Badia Greca di Grottaferrata e la rivista "Roma e l'Oriente." Cattolicesimo e ortodossia fra unionismo e ecumenismo (1799–1923)*, 2 vols. (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990) I, 126–26 note 48.

Further Developments Intellectual and Institutional

These may seem to be purely formal, constitutional matters, but they soon had their effect on the intellectual level that is our interest here: the work of the Assumptionists and their journal *Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* followed by *Echos d'Orient*: the foundation in Germany of the still existing review *Oriens Christianus,* edited from 1901 by the great German Catholic orientalist and liturgiologist Anton Baumstark (†1948). And the pontificate of Pius X (1903–1914), though more reticent toward the East (and indeed, toward anything remotely resembling openness, intellectual or otherwise) than that of his great predecessor, witnessed, nevertheless, the celebrations surrounding the 15th centenary of the death of Saint John Chrysostom in 1907, and the commemorative volume of still irreplaceable studies on the Eastern traditions, especially liturgy, published for the occasion.[13]

Within a decade, Benedict XV's (1914–1922) foundation on May 1, 1917, of the Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, and of the Pontificio Istituto di Studi Orientali the following October 15,[14] would lead, ultimately, to a whole new status for the

[12] Richard P. McBrien, *Lives of the Popes: The Pontiffs from St. Peter to John Paul II* (SanFrancisco: Harper, 1997), 347–51.

[13] *XPYCOCTOMIKA. Studi e ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo,* a cura del comitato per il XV° centenario della sua morte, 407–1907 (Rome: Pustet, 1908).

[14] See various studies in E.G. Farrugia (ed.), *The Pontifical Oriental Institute: The First Seventy-Five Years, 1917–1992* (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1993); R.F. Taft & J.L. Dugan (eds.), *Il 75° anniversario del Pontificio Istituto*

Catholic East, and, more important for our theme, a new seriousness in the intellectual approach to its traditions. Knowledge of and service to the Christian East were the watchwords of the fledgling Oriental Institute, and later, with the birth of Catholic ecumenism, that too became an integral component of the *Orientale's* work.

We must skip over many other steps in this long and slow trek,[15] a progress not without numerous detours and contretemps, especially under Pius X, whose disastrously unenlightened pontificate set back for generations the renewal of Catholic intellectual life and nascent ecumenism timidly fostered by Leo XIII (1878–1903).

Lambert Beauduin and Amay/Chevetogne, Cyril Korolevsky, Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky

It is at this point that several key figures in our saga appear on the stage: Lambert Beauduin, O.S.B. (1873–1960), and his monks of Amay/Chevetogne (1925–)[16] with their seminal periodical *Irénikon* (1926–), Cyril Korolevskij (1878–1959), and Andrey Sheptytsky (1865–1944). From here on I feel as if I were recounting my autobiography. For the figures and movements were those that provided the intellectual and spiritual nourishment of my own vocation in service of the Christian East and of ecumenism.

The French stormy petrel and scourge of "Uniatism," Jean-François-Joseph Charon, a.k.a. Cyril Korolevskij, was born in Caen

Orientale. Atti delle celebrazioni giubilari, 15–17 ottobre 1992 (OCA 244, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1994).

[15] E.g., the reform of the Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, magisterially detailed in the fascinating study of G. Croce (note 11 above). Also the saga of Prince Max of Saxony and the review *Roma e l'Oriente* in *ibid.*, 64–140, 283–96. On Max, see also Iso Baumer, *Max von Sachsen, Prinz und Prophet* (Freiburg: Universität Verlag, 1992); *Priester und Professor* (1990); *Primat des anderen. Texte und Kommentare* (1996).

[16] On the foundation of this monastery at Amay, Belgium, in 1925 (it moved to Chevetogne, also in Belgium, in 1939), see the biography of its founder: Sonya A. Quitslund, *Beauduin: A Prophet Vindicated* (New York/Paramus NJ/Toronto: Newman, 1973), esp. chapters 5ff.

on December 16, 1878, and died in Rome on April 19, 1959.[17] How so interesting a character has not yet found his definitive Swift, especially in the light of all this century's human detritus that continues to be dissected if not lionized in endless biographies, must remain a source of wonder. Perhaps prospective biographers are daunted by Korolevskij's own huge, unpublished autobiography in three typewritten volumes languishing in the Vatican Archives.[18] What interests us here, however, in the midst of Korolevskij's indefatigable work for the restoration of Eastern Catholicism, especially of its liturgical traditions to their pristine integrity, is the bombshell essay of 1924, *L'uniatisme*.[19] In a way never done before nor superceded since, this essay set the parameters of the problem and its solution in the most trenchant and convincing terms. It remains to this day the fundamental statement of the entire problematic of Eastern Catholicism.

While Korolevskij, as consultor for liturgy of the Oriental Congregation and a key member of its commissions for the reform of the Eastern Catholic liturgical books,[20] was able to implement his ideas in that concrete realm, his friend Andrey Sheptytsky (1865–1944), Archbishop of L'viv, Metropolitan of Halych, and primate of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, helped to implement and diffuse the same vision thoughout his Church and the

[17] On Korolevskij, see E. Tisserant, "Father Cyril Korolevsky. A Biographical Note," in Cyril Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew (1865–1944)*, translated and revised by Serge Keleher (L'viv: Stauropegion 1993) 17–36; also Croce (note 11 above) II, 32–54, 283–296, and the further references there, 33–35 note 71.

[18] Croce (note 11 above) II, 33–35 note 71.

[19] *L'uniatisme* (Irénikon collection 5–6, Amay, Belgium, 1927), not to be confused with the review of the same name. This essay is at long last available in English translation in Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew* (note 17 above) Appendix II, pp. 543–598. To the translation is appended S. Keleher, "Sixty Years After: Some Comments on Cyril Korolevsky's *Uniatism*, pp. 599–602.

[20] Some relevant bibliography on the Vatican reform of Eastern liturgical books is cited in M. Brogi, O.F.M., "La Congregazione per le Chiese Orientali," in P.A. Bonnet, C. Gullo (eds.), *La Curia Romana nella Cost. Ap. «Pastor Bonus»* (Studi giuridici 23, Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990) 239–67, here 263–64. Here is another PhD thesis waiting to be written.

whole Catholic world,[21] again, not without opposition even at home among his fellow bishops. It is not a coincidence that the biography of this remarkable man, easily one of the greatest Catholic hierarchs of the 20th century and certainly, along with Melkite Catholic Patriarch Maximos IV (1947–1967) and Cardinal Josyf Slipyj (1892–1984), one of the greatest Eastern Catholic leaders of modern times, was written by Korolevskij himself. Further, the book is prefaced by a brief biography of Korolevskij from the pen of no less an orientalist and defender of Eastern Catholicism than Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, one of the greatest Prefects in the short history of the Vatican Oriental Congregation.[22] So this indispensable and fascinating book contains between its covers the essence of the saga I am talking about here, and some of its chief *dramatis personae*.

The collaboration of Korolevskij and Sheptytsky in this enterprise is a story that deserves a treatise to itself. Korolevskij has told part of it in a lengthy and wide-ranging Vatican "votum" that has never been published for a larger audience,[23] though it certainly deserves to be, just as other key publications of Korolevskij would merit being dusted off and rendered into English by someone's able pen.[24]

[21] On Metropolitan Andrey and the various aspects of his struggle for Eastern Catholic authenticity and renewal, see Korolevskij, *Metropolitan Andrew* (note 17 above); P.R. Magosci (ed.), *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts'kyi* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1989).

[22] "Father Cyril Korolevsky: A Biographical Note by Eugène Cardinal Tisserant," in Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew* (note 17 above), 17–36.

[23] Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, Prot. N. 1219/28, *La liturgia ed il rito praticati dai ruteni.* Voto del P. Cirillo Korolevskij (Vatican City: Tipografia. Poliglotta Vaticana, 1937), 292 pp. In those pre-computer days, the Vatican press did private, limited-edition printings of such briefs or "vota," as they are still called, in which consultors express their opinions in writing to the Congregations of the Holy See.

[24] C. Korolevskij, "Le clergé occidentale et l'apostolat dans l'Orient asiatique et greco-slave," *Revue apologetique* 35 (1922–1923), 204–23, 273–86, 365–73, 470–76, 524–29, 610–28.; *idem*, "Le passage et l'adaptation des occidentaux au rite oriental," *Irénikon* 6 (1929): 457–87; 7 (1930): 136–66, 257–75, 402–19, 538–51; 8 (1931): 282–22 (to my knowledge, this article was never completed).

Another of Andrey Sheptytsky's prophetic projects was his founding of the L'viv Theological Academy (LTA) in 1928. In Eastern Slavic parlance a "Spiritual Academy" – Духовная Академия in Russian – is not a seminary (though it may include one) but a graduate level institution of higher ecclesiastical studies. Metropolitan Andrey's vision of providing his own clergy with a university-level education in their own Eastern tradition free of latinization, interrupted for over fifty years by the Soviets, who forcibly closed the LTA in 1944, resumed when the present head of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivsky, reestablished the LTA on September 1, 1994. This flourishing institution under the vigorous and imaginative leadership of young Ukrainian Catholic clergy and laity, some of them educated in the best institutions of the diaspora and fully imbued with the spirit of their Ukrainian Catholic Eastern heritage, is but one concrete sign that the vision and labours of the pioneers of renewal have not been in vain. Commissioned by the Holy See to make an official visitation of the LTA from September 27 – Ocotber 3, 1995, I can testify to this first hand.[25]

Ex Occidente Lux

Before moving on, let me draw attention at this point to an essential element of our story: thus far the early pioneers of the intellectual and theological renewal of Eastern Catholicism were to a man products of the West. Korolevskij was a French Latin Catholic who had heard the call of the East. Even Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky, though ethnically Ukrainian, came from one of the many noble Ukrainian families that had long been latinized and polonized. His decision to return to his own ancestral Church and people and serve them as a Ukrainian Basilian monk was unheard

[25] Details of the visitation were reported officially in Robert F. Taft, S.J., *Report to the Synod of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church on a Visitation to the Lviv Theological Academy, 27 September – 3 October 1995* (October 24, 1995); and in my December 4, 1995 final report to the Holy See: *Visitation of the Lviv Theological Academy of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, Lviv (Leopoli), Ukraine, 27 September – 3 October 1995.*

of, and provoked scandal and strong opposition.[26] At that time most native Eastern Catholics, mired in their latinisation and defensive about it, suffering from an inferiority-complex vis-à-vis a Catholic West that neither recognized nor respected them, were in no position socially, culturally or intellectually to recognize, analyze, and do anything about the impasse in which they found themselves. The rebellion of the hierarchs at Vatican I was largely a gut-reaction against the imposition of foreign canonical and hierarchical structures and procedures, not a declaration of intellectual independence and renewal, of which they were then by and large incapable.

Enter the Melkites

All this changes radically when the Melkites hear the wakeup call and enter the fray. In the years immediately preceding Vatican II, early signs of an enormous shift in mentality can be observed among the more enlightened Melkite clergy, previously reputed to be highly latinized. Here, too, we enter a realm deserving a doctoral dissertation to itself.

Two names spring to mind as those who first drew my attention to this phenomenon: Archimandrite Orestes Kerame (1895–1983),[27] and Patriarch Maximos IV Saïgh (1878–1967).[28] Maximos, of course, achieved instant world-wide recognition for himself and his Melkite Greek-Catholic Church because of his interventions at Vatican II.[29] But he had provided an ummistakeable prelude of what was to come then in a talk given in Düsseldorf, Germany, on

[26] See A.S. Zięba, "Szeptycki/Sheptyts'kyi Genealogy," in P.R Magosci (ed.), *Morality and Reality: The Life and Times of Andrei Sheptyts'kyi*, 437–39; Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew* (note 17 above) 43–73.

[27] On Kerame, see Archbishop Joseph Tawil, "In memoriam: l'archimandrite Oreste Kéramé," *Le Lien. Revue du Patriarcat grec-melkite-catholique* 48 no. 2 (Beyrouth, mars-avril, 1983): 32–35.

[28] See Emilios Inglessis, *Maximos IV. L'Orient conteste l'Occident* (Paris: Cerf, 1969).

[29] See the next section below.

August 9, 1960.[30] Like a shot heard round the world, this talk, swiftly translated into English, French, and Italian, received wide diffusion as the Catholic Church geared up for the Vatican II, announced the year before by Pope John XXIII on January 25, 1959. The now defunct *Jubilee* published it in English in January 1962,[31] and the impact it had on me is fresh in my mind still today.

Kerame, though not a bishop or Council Father, was another major source of Melkite Catholic thought at Vatican II. I had the privilege of knowing Kerame personally. In long talks, this former Jesuit explained to me why he had felt obliged to leave in 1941 the order he obviously still loved. At that time there was no real room in a Latin religious order for one who wished to remain fully faithful to his Eastern heritage, and Kerame chose the higher loyalty, unlike so many others who were prepared to abandon the ecclesial heritage of their birth for the traditions of a religious congregation, an ecclesial reality far more limited and less important in every way.

The remarks of Archbishop Joseph Tawil on this separation from the Jesuits, despite their discretion, is sufficient commentary on how things were at that time: "Sa sortie de la Compagnie (1941) pour douloureuse qu'elle fut, était providentielle car il n'aurait jamais pu y accomplir ce qu'il était appelé à réaliser."[32] That he could not have accomplished what he did had he remained a Jesuit is far more a judgment on the Jesuits of that day than on Kerame. Long before meeting Kerame, I had myself formulated the principle that has guided my life as an Eastern Catholic priest: the traditions of the Byzantine Rite in which I was ordained and to which I have tried to remain faithful in spirit and action, are an ecclesial reality superior to the contingent customs of any monastery, religious order or congregation, including my own. When there is a conflict, it is the usages of the order that must cede.

[30] Inglessis, *Maximos IV* (note 28 above), 99–100.

[31] Vol. 9 no. 9 (Jan. 1962) 26–31, reprinted as "The Eastern Rôle in Christian Reunion," in Maximus IV Sayegh (ed.), *The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1963) 46–61.

[32] *Ibid.*, 33.

My conversations with Kerame in his later years only confirmed the absolute rightness of my chosen route, and what had always been a guiding principle of my own double vocation as an Eastern Rite member of a Latin religious order: whenever there is a conflict, real or apparent (i.e., so perceived by superiors), between the demands of my Rite and those of the order, the Rite must always take precedence.

Fortunately, the problem has never arisen for me in any substantive way, for times have changed since the early 1940's. The December 25, 1950, letter and decree of the Jesuit General John Baptist Janssens, *Pro ramo orientali Societatis Iesu (On the Eastern Branch of the Society of Jesus)*,[33] can be considered the "Magna Carta" of Eastern-Rite Jesuits. It legislates explicitly that they are to live their Rite in its integrity, and elements of the Jesuit Institute that by nature pertain to the Latin Rite do not apply to them. Kerame, whose love for the Society of Jesus never lessened in spite of the painful choice he was forced to make, not only lived long enough to witness this greater openness in the Catholic Church and the Jesuit order. His life and thought prepared for it.

Kerame's literary output was extremely slim, but his thought was extraordinarily visionary, and his influence great and lasting.[34]

The Melkite Catholic Church at Vatican II (1962–1965)

L'Eglise Grecque Melkite au Concile (The Melkite Greek Church at the Council) was the title of a book first published in

[33] *Act Romana Societatis Iesu* XI, 887–891.

[34] Among his writings one can cite: *Notre vocation et notre âme de chrétiens d'Orient* (Cairo, 1954); *Constantinople et le Grand Schisme chrétien* (Cairo, 1954); *Unionisme, uniatisme, arabisme chrétien* (Bulletin d'orientations œcuméniques, Beyrouth, 1957); *Le prochain Concile œcumenique. Catholiques et Orthodoxes bientôt réunit?* (Bulletin d'orientations œcuméniques 23–24, Beyrouth, 1959) = "The Ecumenical Council: are Catholics and Orthodox soon to be reunited?," in P. Sherwood (ed.), *The Unity of the Churches of God* (Baltimore/Dublin: Helicon, 1963), 34–83.

French in 1967.[35] Then as now, twenty-five years later, it would be difficult to imagine a book of this title about the role of any other Eastern Catholic Church at Vatican II. At that time no other Eastern Church in communion with Rome had as yet played any significantly "Eastern" leadership role in the wider Catholic Church. In the case of the Ukrainian and Romanian Greco-Catholic Churches, this was prevented by persecution. In the case of other Churches, their insignificant numbers, the vagaries of their history, or the mediocrity of their leadership at the time of the Council, rendered any such corporate role unlikely, though outstanding individual bishops from these Churches, such as Ignatius Ziade, Maronite Archbishop of Beirut, and Isaac Ghattas, Coptic Catholic Bishop of Luxor-Thebes, gave eloquent voice, and in a fully Eastern spirit, to the aspirations of these Churches too. But if size, persecution, or other factors explain why other Churches played no notable corporate role at Vatican II, this does not explain why the Melkite Church did.

To what, then, can one attribute the remarkable *essor* of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church at the Council? In his "Preface" to the 1967 French edition of the above-mentioned volume, *L'Eglise Grecque Melkite au Concile,* Patriarch Maximos IV attributes it, first, to the fact that the Catholic Melkites had never lost contact with their Orthodox roots, and thus never became closed in on themselves. This allowed them to discern what is essential (i.e., *Catholic*) from what is contingent (i.e., *Latin*) in Catholicism, enabling them at Vatican II to witness to a *pensée complémentaire*, another, complementary way of seeing things, as a counterbalance to Latin Catholic unilateralism. Maximos IV also offers a second reason, the synodal cohesion of the Melkite hierarchy – at that time the patriarch with sixteen bishops and four general religious superiors – in its preconciliar discussions preparatory to Vatican II, and the consequent unity of its voice at the Council. We see this

[35] *L'Eglise Grecque Melkite au Concile. Discours et notes du Patriarche Maximos IV et des Prélats de son Église au concile œcuménique Vatican II* (Beyrouth: Dar Al-Kalima, 1967). An English translation, in preparation in the USA for a decade, has yet to appear.

exemplary Eastern conciliarity from the start, in the letter of August 29, 1959, accompanying the first Melkite response to the Preparatory Commission of the Council: "We have believed it more useful to give our proposals together, in common..."[36] This was collegiality *ante factum*, long before the later work of the Council had made this ecclesiology common coin.

With the advantages of hindsight, I would suggest adding to Maximos' list three other reasons that facilitated Melkite leadership at Vatican II: 1) *education*; 2) *courageous, intelligent, innovative leadership*; 3) *imaginative and universal vision*. None of these can be considered traditional clerical virtues. By training and tradition, the clergy are more inclined to conservatism, obedience, regularity, stability, the attributes of any social organization where too much imagination is a liability, and routine is prized above initiative.

First, *education*. All of us are at once the beneficiaries as well as the victims of our background and training. Eastern Catholicism is often criticized, sometimes exaggeratedly, for its "Westernization," an accusation, every honest person must admit, that contains some truth. This Westernization has brought with it obvious disadvantages, specifically a certain erosion of the Eastern heritage.

But every coin has two sides, and contact with the "West," a term some Orthodox writers use like a "four-letter word," has also had decided advantages. It is "Western" culture that invented "modernity" with its traditional values of pluralism, civility, respect for individuals and their rights, and an intellectual, artistic and cultural life that strives to be free of outside restraint or manipulation, and seeks to be objective, even-handed, and fair. These ideals may not always be realized, but in the West they are at least ideals, and one cannot always say the same for the Christian East, where it is not uncommon even for representatives of the intellectual elite to engage in the most grotesque and bigoted caricatures of the Christian West.[37]

[36] Cited in "Vatican II: 25 ans après," *Le Lien* 55 nos. 1–2 (janvier-avril, 1990): 37.

[37] See numerous examples in Spiteris, cited above, note 2.

But from that same bugaboo, "the West," one can learn the "Western" secular values of intellectual honesty, coherence, consistency, self-criticism, objectivity, fairness, dialogue; moderation and courtesy of tone and language even when in disagreement; and a reciprocity which, eschewing all "double-standard" criticism, applies the same criteria and standards of judgment to one's interlocutor's thought and actions that one applies to one's own. Such "Western" values lead to cultural openness, and the desire to know the other. Just look at the endless list of objective, positive, sympathetic – yes, let's say it again – "Western" studies and publications on the Christian East, its Fathers, its spirituality, its liturgy, its monasticism, its theology, its history. How preferable this is to the ghetto-like insularity, the smug self-satisfaction of those convinced they have nothing to learn from anyone else!

So if a dose of the East can be good medicine for the West, something that the Catholic West has long accepted without demur, the West can also be good medicine indeed for the East, and Melkite bishops at Vatican II, imbued with what was best in the superb postwar French Catholic intellectual tradition, speaking French fluently and thus accessible to personal contacts and dialogue, were enabled to understand and appreciate what was happening in the Catholic Church in a way they never could have done with a simplistic caricature-image and paranoid rejection of the West.

That is why the Melkites at Vatican II were repeatedly called a "bridge" between East and West: they knew both sides of the river and could mediate between them. Those who would deny this should remember that it is a question here of the lived experience of the Catholic Church. Catholics did experience the Melkites to be a bridge that allowed the voice of the East to be heard at the Council sessions, and only Catholics have the right to judge their own experience. Whether Eastern Catholics at Vatican II were also a bridge between Orthodoxy and Rome is something we must let the Orthodox decide. But no less an authoritative Orthodox exponent than Professor Alivizatos of Athens wrote in 1963 of the "persuasive way in which he [Maximos IV] expounded the Eastern

point of view" at Vatican II.[38] These sentiments were echoed by the highest Orthodox hierarch, Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras, when Maximos IV and he met for the first time, on January 5, 1964, during Paul VI's pilgrimage to the Holy Land. In reply to Maximos' affirmation that he was trying to represent the authentic Eastern tradition at Vatcan II, Athenagoras replied, "You represent all of us. Thank you! (Vous nous répresentez tous; merci!)."[39] And at their meeting in Constantinople on June 2 of the same year, Athenagoras referred to Maximos as a gift of God to His Church.[40]

Of the other qualities, *courageous, intelligent, innovative leadership* was not proper to the Melkite bishops alone but shared by all the great progressive leaders of Vatican II, to the discomfiture of the conservative minority and the astonished admiration of the rest of the world. Peculiar to the Melkites, however, was the disproportion between their conciliar leadership and their numbers, a patriarch and a mere sixteen bishops awash in a Latin sea.

Equally unique to the Melkite Council Fathers as a group was the truly remarkable *imaginative and universal vision* they showed. Altogether too often, Eastern Christians think only within their own frame of reference, address only their own problems, protest only against injustices done to them, further only their own interests. Not so the Melkites. In addition to being among the first to state categorically that the Council should avoid definitions and condemnations, the list of important items of general import on the Vatican II and postconciliar agenda that the Melkite bishops first proposed is simply astonishing: the vernacular, eucharistic concelebration, and communion under both species in the Latin liturgy; the permanent diaconate; the establishment of what ultimately became the Synod of Bishops held periodically in Rome, as well as the Secretariat (now Pontifical Council) for Christian Unity; new attitudes and a less offensive ecumenical vocabulary for dealing with non-Catholic Christians, especially with the Orthodox

[38] Inglessis, *Maximos IV* (note 28 above), 74.

[39] *Ibid.*, 72.

[40] *Ibid.*, 72–73.

Churches; the recognition and acceptance of Eastern Catholic communities for what they are, "Churches," not just different "Rites," an ecclesiology ultimately canonized by the Council documents concerning the Eastern Catholic Churches.[41]

But for the Melkites, perhaps none of the above-mentioned qualities would have "worked" without the audacious yet unfailingly courteous courage of Maximos IV and his close collaborators. I first encountered this in 1959, I think it was, just after returning from three years teaching in Baghdad. I was doing Russian studies at Fordham University in New York, preparing for theological studies and ordination in the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. With barely repressible glee the late Fr. Paul Mailleux, S.J., then superior of the Byzantine Jesuit Community of the Russian Center at Fordham, showed me a copy of a letter Maximos IV had sent to the formidable Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York. For some time the Byzantine Rite Jesuits of that community had, on occasion, been following the lead of the U.S. Melkites in celebrating the Byzantine Divine Liturgy in English, in accordance with the age-old principle of the Byzantine Churches to use whatever language, vernacular or not, was deemed pastorally most suitable. The Cardinal had written Patriarch Maximos to challenge this practice, surely not because of any special concern for the East, but, as with the issue of married clergy, from fear of "contamination." This was before the vernacular debate at Vatican II, and if U.S. Catholics were exposed to vernacular Catholic eucharists, especially in their own parish churches on the *dies orientales* or "Oriental Days" held in those years to acquaint Western Catholics with the East, they might be led to the ineluctable conclusion that vernacular liturgy was not only possible, but even a good thing![42]

[41] See R.F. Taft, "Eastern Catholic Churches (*Qrientalium Ecclesiarum*)," in: *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings (London: SPCK/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 135–40, esp. 135–36.

[42] On the whole issue, see Inglessis *Maximos IV* (note 28 above), 54–65: "La querelle des langues."

Here as elsewhere, Melkite attitudes and usage were prophetic, and the Cardinal's fears real. Maximos IV, fully conscious of being an Eastern Patriarch and not some curial flunky, responded with dignity and courtesy, but with great firmness and unambiguous clarity, that the liturgical languages of the Byzantine Church were none of His Eminence's business. It is of such stuff that leaders are made. And prophets, too. For it is thus that in North America, Melkites and others, celebrated Catholic eucharistic liturgies in English long before anyone ever heard of Vatican II.[43]

Maximos IV did not stand alone at Vatican II, however. He was the first to acknowledge the synodal, collegial nature of the Melkite enterprise, and other major Melkite Council figures like Bishops Elias Zoghby, Neophytos Edelby, Peter Medawar, and Archbishop Joseph Tawil, also made the trenchant and eloquent "voice of the East" heard at Vatican II.

But when all is said and done, our basic point of reference will always remain the great figure of Patriarch Maximos IV and the role he played in his own and the broader Church during the twenty critical years (Oct. 30, 1947 – Nov. 5, 1967) of his historic patriarchate. Among the dozen or so most quoted Council Fathers in the published histories of Vatican II, he gave from the start a hitherto unimaginable importance to the Eastern Catholic minority at the Council by the content and élan of his interventions. The legendary Xavier Rynne first brought him to the attention of Americans in his gripping account of Session I serialized in *The New Yorker*, awakening the Western mass-media to the importance of this hitherto ignored minority. Rynne described Maximos as "the colorful and outspoken Melchite patriarch, His Beatitude Maximos IV Saigh, of Antioch," and spoke of His Beatitude's conciliar interventions as "laying the cards squarely on the table as was his custom, and speaking in French, as was also his habit."[44]

[43] Further documentation in N. Edelby, "The Byzantine Liturgy in the Vernacular," in: Maximus IV Sayegh (ed.), *The Eastern Churches and Catholic Unity*, 195–218.

[44] X. Rynne, *Letters from Vatican City* (London: Faber & Faber, 1963), 26, 85.

At the First Session of the Council, Maximos' electrifying opening speech on October 23, 1962, set the tone for the Melkite onslought on the one-sided, Latin vision of the Church. He refused to speak in Latin, the language of the Latin Church, but not, he insisted, of the whole Catholic Church nor of his particular Church. He refused to follow protocol and address "their Eminences," the cardinals, before "their Beatitudes," the Eastern Catholic patriarchs, for in his, and any sane, ecclesiology patriarchs, the heads of local Churches, did not take second place to cardinals, who are but second-rank dignitaries of one such communion, the Latin Church. He also urged the West to allow the vernacular in the liturgy, following the lead of the East, "where every language is, in effect, liturgical." And he concluded, in true Eastern Christian synodal fashion, that the matter at any rate should be left to the local Churches to decide.[45] All this in his first intervention at the First Sesson! No wonder numerous Council Fathers, overcoming their initial surprise, hastened to congratulate him for his speech. And no wonder it hit the news. That was a language even journalists, impervious to the torturously endless periods of clericalese, could understand. Maximos spoke simply, clearly, directly.

Has postconciliar Eastern Catholic thought lived up to its promise at Vatican II? Has any of us? Ideals always have a head-start on reality. That is why we call them ideals, something not yet fully attained, that towards which we strive. So it is natural that certain Melkite ideas advanced at the Council remain undeveloped and unrealized in the Catholic Church. Furthermore, there can be no denying that the Melkites, like other Eastern Catholics, are often better at giving speeches and making proposals than at observing them. Even before the Council, Melkite rhetoric and Melkite reality had often been miles apart.

We are a long way from Vatican II, and the world has a very short attention span, so the "romance with the Christian East," especially with Eastern liturgy, that marked those years has long

[45] *Ibid.*, 102–105.

passed. This indifference has been accentuated in recent years by the marked decelleration of the Ecumenical Movement, and by widespread disillusionment with the failure of the Orthodox leadership to cope with the postcommunist era as was expected, by demanding the same freedom, justice, and religious rights for all, not just for themselves. But the leaven was planted, and since Vatican II the message has spread bit by bit throughout the Eastern Catholic world, and with it have come many small but unmistakeable signs of renewal.

Catholic Intellectual Commitment to the Christian East: The Pontificio Istituto Orientale (PIO) and Other Institutions

More hidden and indirect, doubtless, but nonetheless real in laying the groundwork for the impact the Melkites made at Vatican II, and for the still ongoing postconciliar fallout, was the massive commitment to the Christian East of the Catholic Church in our century. It is impossible to mention every individual, nor even every group, institution, or publication. I have already spoken of Amay/Chevetogne. Pride of place would also have to be given to the Assumptionists. I shall limit myself to the areas of publications, scholarly research institutes, and graduate schools. Witness the endless list of "Western" studies and publications on the Christian East, its Fathers, its spirituality, its liturgy, its monasticism, its theology, its history. Witness the huge list of serious journals founded by Catholics or published under Catholic auspices that deal with the culture of the Christian East objectively, sympathetically, even with admiration and love. A short list, off the top of my head, would include, in alphabetical order: *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, Christian Orient, Der christliche Osten, Diakonia, Eastern Churches Journal, Eastern Churches Quarterly, Eastern Churches Review, Echos d'orient, Ephrem's Theological Journal, The Harp, Het christelijk oosten, Irénikon, Istina, Le Lien, Logos, Le Muséon, Nicolaus, Oriens Christianus, Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Oriente cristiano, L'Orient syrien, Ostkirchliche Studien, Pokrof, Parole de l'Orient, Proche-orient chrétien, Revue de l'orient chrétien, Revue des études byzantines; Roma e l'oriente, Russia cristiana = L'altra europa, Stoudion, Tanima,...*[46]

Among Catholic academic institutions, pride of place must be accorded, I believe, to the role of my own Pontifical Oriental Institute (PIO) in Eastern Catholic theological renewal. Institute alumni were engaged from the start in the foundation and formative years of the Secretariat, later Pontifical Council, for Christian Unity. The role of PIO professors and alumni in Eastern Catholic liturgical renewal is well-known.[47] And as noted below, the study of Eastern Spirituality as an academic discipline was invented at the PIO. More important for the theological enterprise is how this immersion in the sources of Eastern liturgy and spirituality, and in the beginnings of Catholic Ecumenism, served as a leaven to transform the study of Eastern theology. Of course, Eastern theology had been taught at PIO from the start. But apart from patristics, which was considered a distinct discipline, it was largely a study of "Orthodox theology" considered as something "non-Catholic," and therefore to be studied as the theology of someone else; studied, to be sure, fairly, from an objective, historico-critical point of view; but studied the way one is supposed to drive on the

[46] In the light of such a list one can perhaps understand the perplexity of poor benighted "Westerners," accustomed to dealing with facts, at the following opening sentence of a recent article by two Serbian Orthodox writers: "In the Western literature and periodicals there is an inadmissable small number of articles, studies and books dealing with either Orthodoxy in general or Serbian Orthodoxy and the Serbian Orthodox Church in particular." D.B. Djordjevic and B. Djurovic, "Secularization and Orthodoxy: The Case of the Serbians," *Orthodoxes Forum* 7 (1993): 215. Incidentally, the journal containing the complaint is published in Munich with "Western" funds. How many Orthodox journals are dedicated to an open, sympathetic, objective study of the Christian West? How many books does one find by Orthodox authors (excluding those living in the Western diaspora) that treat the Catholic Church and its history and tradition with objectivity, fairness, and Christian love? I am, of course, perfectly aware that the Catholic world has greater resources available for this sort of work. But in the light of the above-cited list of publications, we might at least be spared this gross distortion of the facts.

[47] See See Gabriele Winkler, "The Achievements of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in the Study of Oriental Liturgiology," in *Il 75° anniversario del Pontificio Istituto Orientale. Atti delle celebrazioni giubilari, 15–17 ottobre 1992*, ed. R.F. Taft & J.L. Dugan (OCA 244, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1994): 115–41.

German Autobahn, "mit Abstand," from a detached and uninvolved, if not apologetic and even polemic, point of view, as a part of *Kontroverstheologie.*

That has now totally changed. Eastern theology is not just studied. It is done from within, with sympathy and love. One may disagree with how it is done. It may not be done perfectly. But what is new and important is that the point of departure, the perspective, the method, and above all the mentality, have completely changed. *Eastern theology is no longer an object, someone else's theology, that one studies, but the subject of creation, a way of theology that engages one creatively and personally, in one's life as well as in one's thought.*[48]

The Orientale is by no means alone, of course. The excellent work of the Dominican fathers' Centro Ecumenico San Nicola in Bari, with their first-rate journal *Nicolaus,* must be mentioned, an institution in my view less staid and dryly academic, and with considerably more flexibility and imagination than the Orientale, whose vastly greater resources are underexploited because of a lack of imagination and initiative.

And in the USA there is the University of Scranton Center for Eastern Christian Studies with its journal *Diakonia* (1966–), successor institution to the John XXIII Center for Eastern Christian Studies which existed for many fruitful years at Fordham University in N.Y. before its eventual transferral to Scranton in 1984.

[48] On the history of theology at PIO, see E.G. Farrugia, "The Theological Profile of the Pontifical Oriental Institute," in id. (ed.), *The Pontifical Oriental Institute: the First Seventy-Five Years* (note 14 above), 9–47; id., "La dogmatica al PIO," in *Il 75° anniversario del Pontificio Istituto Orientale* (previous note) 95–113; E.G. Farrugia, "The Rise of Modern Eastern Theology," *Ephrem's Theological journal* 1/1–2 (October, 1997): 5–16, and, in Bulgarian and at greater length: id., "Теология на символа," in R.F. Taft and Edward Farrugia, S.J., *Теология на литургия та и теология на символа [The Theology of the Liturgy and the Theology of Symbol],* ed. with an introd. by Gheorghi Minčev, trans. Elena Velkovska and Elizaveta Musakova (Sofia: Нов Български университет – Rome: Папски Институт за Востока, 1992), 97–199.

New Institutions

With regard to what was just said concerning the new approach to Eastern Catholic theology, one must mention the new institutions springing to life all over the world. Surely one of the most interesting and innovative of these projects is the "Centro di Studi e Ricerche «Ezio Aletti»," a filial institute of the Pontifical Oriental Institute animated by three Jesuits of the Institute and four religious women associated with the Center since its foundation in 1992, one of whom, Michelina Tenace, Doctor in Theology, is also professor at the Orientale.

Centro Aletti Director Marko Ivan Rupnik, S.J., Doctor in Missiology, professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, and a renowned modern artist imbued with the spirit of Byzantine iconography, has opened at the Center an "Atelier of Religious Art" actively engaged in the teaching and production of religious painting and mosaic of Eastern Christian inspiration, but fully modern and not a slavish imitation of canonized medieval forms. This constant interaction of art and theological reflection on the present reality of the Christian East, in a climate of intense intellectual and ecumenical dialogue, is carried out not only through the day-to-day work of teaching at the Oriental Institute, but also through the organization of study-days and conferences throughout the year on a bewildering variety of fascinating cultural and religious topics, and via the hospitality offered to guests from the East, intellectuals, writers, artists, theologians, clergy...

The Centro Aletti also has its own publishing house "Lipa." The Eastern inspiration of its works is apparent from their titles: Tomáš Špidlík, *L'idée russe* (1994); Mark Ivan Rupnik, *L'arte, memoria della comunione* (1994); id., *Dire l'uomo I: persona, cultura della Pasqua* (1997); Michelina Tenace, *La bellezza, unità spirituale* (1994); eadem, *Dire l'uomo II: dall'imagine di Dio alla somiglianza. La salvezza come divinizzazione* (1997); eadem, *Fondamenti spirituali del futuro* (1997); Yannis Spiteris, *Cabasilas: teologo e mistico bizantino* (1996); id. *Palamas: la grazia e l'esperienza* (1996). Such facinating titles, all Eastern in inspiration and thought, based on an anthropology of modern

women and men as image of God, are matched only by the dizzying rhythm of their appearance.

In addition, I have already mentioned the revival of the LTA in L'viv. And here in Ottawa, at Saint Paul University's Faculty of Theology, there is the Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, founded in Chicago in 1986 and moved to Ottawa in 1990. This enterprise, so full of promise for the renewal of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church in Ukraine and the diaspora, fosters study, research, and dialogue on the Christian East today, as it seeks to confront the challenges of modernity in the postcommunist era. Its rapid growth and growing list of major publications merits our attention here.[49] Especially noteworthy is the Sheptytsky Institute's quintessentially Eastern Catholic approach to theological education, in which "the liturgical experience serves to make theology come alive," as Kule Family Professor of Eastern Christian Liturgy Dr. Peter Galadza explained in his inaugural lecture on assuming the Kule Chair.[50] This notion was seconded by Institute director Fr. Chirovsky:

> One of the important characteristics of all Sheptytsky Institute programs ... is the unity of theological study and liturgical prayer. Whereas in the classroom we often make God the object of our study, in the chapel we seek to restore the proper relationship between God – the Creator, the Saviour, the Source of all Life, and human beings – redeemed, living creatures, whose proud intellect is a mere reflection of the infinite Wisdom of God.[51]

That says it all.

[49] E.g., A. Chirovsky, *Pray for God's Wisdom: The Mystical Sophiology of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky;* id. (ed.), *Following the Star from the East: Essays in Honour of Archimandrite Bonfiace Luykx;* A. Krawchuk, *Christian Social Ethics in Ukraine: The Legacy of Andrei Sheptytsky.*

[50] *Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies Newsletter,* vol. 4. no. 1 (Ottawa, November 1997) 2.

[51] *Ibid.*, 3.

Nor is French Canada aloof from this new ferment. The Centre Emmaüs in Montréal, has made itself known not only through its newsletter *THEOSIS, le bulletin du Centre Emmaüs,* but by the increasingly noted activities of the bulletin's new director, young Romanian Greco-Catholic theologian Horia Roscanu.

And at the Catholic University of Eichstätt in Germany, the Diocese of Eichstätt under the vigorous leadership of its new Bishop Walter Mixa, has just founded a "Collegium Orientale" to make it possible for students of the theological disciplines from the Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches to study at the University. An initiative of one of my former doctoral students, Rev. Dr. Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, whom Bishop Mixa has named first Rector of the college effective April 19, 1998, the college will open its doors to students in the fall of 1998. The author of these reflections, actively engaged in this project for several years, has been named by Bishop Mixa to the College "Beirat" or Advisory Board.

This initiative, aimed at fostering theological studies in *all the Eastern traditions, not just in the Byzantine,* leads directly to my next point.

Eastern Catholic Theology is Not Just Byzantine

Thus far we have been speaking largely of the Byzantines, and legitimately so, because Eastern Catholic spiritual, liturgical, and theological renewal began largely with them. But Eastern Catholic theology is not just *Byzantine Catholic* theology. There has also been a remarkable renewal in the non-Byzantine Catholic Eastern traditions. This is a major point. By and large today, the only Orthodox theology worth the name is Eastern – i.e., Byzantine – Orthodox theology. The state to which the communities Adrian Fortescue (1874–1923) called "the lesser Eastern Churches"[52] have been reduced by persecution (or in the case of the Armenians, outright genocide) and by Islamic, Russian, then Soviet,

[52] A. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (London: Catholic Truth Society 1913, reprint AMS Press NY, 1972).

domination, has by-and-large precluded the development in modern times of any intellectually productive modern theological tradition. In no way do I mean to imply that these Churches have no theology. They have their age-old traditional theology, rooted in their liturgy, their synods, their Fathers, their monasticism, their spirituality. In the case of the Syrians and Armenians, this theology is an astonishingly rich one. But the struggle for physical survival has, with some notable exceptions, largely precluded the serenity needed for the theological scholarship and speculation to build on and develop this heritage.

Non-Byzantine Eastern Catholic Theology and Institutions

But the Catholic counterparts of some of these traditions, strengthened by union with the West, have manifested an astonishing theological productivity within the past few decades. The Syro-Malabar (and to a lesser extent because of their far fewer numbers, the Syro-Malankara) Catholic Churches of India have developed a rich and academically productive centre of theological education, reflection, and publication at Paurastya Vidyapitham, the Pontifical Institute of Religious Studies at Vadavathoor near Kottayam (Kerala). Their journal, *Christian Orient,* provides a remarkably rich diet of studies on every aspect of the East and West Syrian traditions: history, liturgy, spirituality, theology, catechetics, ecumenism, inculturation, interreligious dialogue... I am happy to serve on the advisory board of this journal, and read every issue with pleasure. And their monograph series, OIRSI (= Oriental Institute of Religious Studies India) Publications, has now reached the astonishing number of 192 volumes in English and Malayalam.

Nor are these the only theological publications of this dynamic Church. There is also the journal *Tanima: A Review of St. Thomas Academy for Research,* edited by the Carmelites of Mary Immaculate fathers in Kerala. The St. Thomas Academy for Research founded in 1980, "promotes research into the Apostolic traditions of St. Thomas Christians in the context of the quest for an Indian identity of the Church," i.e., to study history, theology, worship, spiritual and pastoral questions with an Indian and Oriental Christian emphasis, according to their own masthead.

On June 14, 1997, this movement received a major new impulse with the inauguration at the Pastoral Centre in Changanachery of the Eastern Theological Association. The Rev. Prof. Dr. Mathew Vellanickal, former President of Paurastya Vidyapitham, presided over the meeting and delivered the inaugural address, entitled "The Relevance of Eastern Theology in the Indian and Asian Context." Described as an "orientation paper," its title alone is enough to show the exciting direction Eastern Catholic theological reflection is taking in India: recovering the tradition while addressing the needs of the Church's vital context in Indian society and culture. "Indian in culture, Christian in religion, Oriental in worship," is the watchword of this orientation.[53]

In Syro-Malabar India one senses great dynamism and vigor, but also an atmosphere of urgency, even haste, of playing "catch-up," which can be very risky in matters of such seriousness as the recovery of tradition and its simultaneous "Indianization."[54]

As if all this were not enough, a new journal of Eastern theology, *Ephrem's Theological Journal,* has just been launched in Satna, its promotional blurb promising that it "introduces to you the great riches of the theologies of the Eastern Churches."

In Kottayam, Kerala, the Syro-Malankara Catholic tradition is also represented, by the St. Ephrem Ecumenical and Research Institute (= SEERI), with its periodical *The Harp: A Review of Syriac and Oriental Ecumenical Studies.*

In the Arab world, one of the most noteworthy new initiatives is the CEDRAC (Centre for Documentation and Research on Arab Christianity = Centre de Documentation et de recherches Arabes Chrétiennes) created in 1991 by Samir Khalil Samir, S.J., former and still visiting professor at Rome's Pontifical Oriental Institute. Fr. Samir has single-handedly put on the academic and ecclesial

---

[53] From "News," *Christian Orient* 18 (1997): 102–3.

[54] See my intervention at the Syro-Malabar Synod in R.F. Taft, "The Syro-Malabar Liturgical Controversy," in Jose Porunnedom (ed.), *Acts of the Synod of the Syro-Malabar Church Held in the Vatican from 8 to 16 January 1996* (The Syro-Malabar Archiepiscopal Curia, Mount St. Thomas, Kochi, 1996), 122–38; ibid. reprinted in *Tanima: A Review of St. Thomas Acacemy for Research* (Kerala, India) 4 (1996): 60–78.

map the field of Arabic Christian theology. By that I do not mean Samir is the only reputable scholar working it the field. But working in a field and making its product widely known are two entirely different skills. Samir is one of the few with both.

CEDRAC, incorporated since 1996 into the Jesuit Université Saint-Joseph, Beirut, continues the work begun by its director, Fr. Samir, to promote the study of Arab Christianity in all relevant areas of research: methodology and bibliography, linguistics and philology, exegesis, patristics, theology, spirituality, liturgy, canon law, church history, literature, and above all Islamic-Christian studies. An indefatigable and prolific scholar, conferencier, organizer, and publicist, Fr. Samir himself has published some twenty volumes in various languages plus over 400 scholarly articles. Under his direction appear the volumes of the collection *Patrimoine arabe chrétien,* of which volumes 14–16 are already in press, and a new collection, *Sources arabes chrétiennes (manâhil)*, will make its appearance in Beirut beginning in 1999.

Fr. Samir has brought results of these initiatives to the attention of the Western academic world via several international congresses, beginning in 1980, the Acts of which have appeared in the series *Orientalia Christiana Analecta,* and thereafter in *Parole de l'Orient,* of which Fr. Samir became Co-Director in 1986, a development reflected in its new subtitle, beginning with volume 14 (1987): *Revue d'études syriaques et arabes chrétiennes.*

For those familiar with the academic prejudice, propagated largely by islamicists and orientalists in Western universities, that Arabic culture equals Islam *tout court*, the importance of this work not only to redress the academic balance, but also for the future of a truly inculturated Christianity in the Arab world, is incalculable.

Another Lebanese success-story is the Maronite Catholic Church, with its Université Saint-Esprit de Kaslik at Jounieh on the coast north of Beirut, and its superb journal *Parole de l'Orient,* which faltered a bit during the disruptive years of the Civil War in Lebanon, but has now resumed regular publication.

The Chaldean Catholic Church, though not large, also has an extraordinarily well-educated and intellectually productive clergy, even if not many of them are engaged full-time in teaching and research or writing on theological matters. Suffice it to mention the

writings of the Rt. Rev. Chorbishop Dr. Pierre Yousif, Associate Professor of Chaldean Liturgy and Syriac patristics, and of Rev. Dr. Joseph Habbi, Associate Professor of Oriental Canon Law, both at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, to say nothing of the numerous doctoral dissertations on the East-Syrian tradition defended at the Orientale.[55]

Much less known, since their publications are almost exclusively in modern Armenian, is the heroic work of the Armenian Catholic Mekhitarist Monks at their two major monasteries in Venice and Vienna, where they have quietly done as much as all others combined to preserve and promote knowledge of the Armenian religious heritage.

III. Characteristics of Catholic Eastern Theology

Since serious intellectual reflection on the nature of contemporary Eastern Catholic theology is in its infancy – among Catholic writers my colleague Edward G. Farrugia, S.J., is one of the few I know of who has published on the topic[56] – Eastern Catholic theology is a moving target that has not yet been pinned down and had its characteristics identified. So all I can provide here are some fleeting impressions.

Eastern Catholic theology is a theology in reaction. Karl Barth once said that the theologian must have the Bible in one hand and the daily newspaper in the other. What he meant was that any true existential theology exists at the intersection of God's eternal Revelation and the evolving day-to-day nitty-gritty of human history in every epoch. So like any true theology, Eastern Catholic theology is a theology in reaction to the world-situation in which it finds itself. Traditionally, that situation has been one of enemies right and left: on one side the *"praestantia ritus Latini"* of Benedict XIV's constitution *Etsi pastoralis* of May 26, 1742,[57]

[55] Indications up to 1990 in P. Yousif et. al. (eds.), *A Classified Bibliography on the East Syrian Liturgy* (Rome: Mar Thomas Yogam, 1990), *passim.*

[56] See note 48.

[57] See Croce (note 11 above) I, 13–15, note 60.

apparently said with a straight face in those days when ecclesiastical arrogance came combined with a healthier dose of ingenuousness than we would be ready to tolerate today; on the other the Orthodox rejection and systematic calumniation of "Uniatism"; a status of rejection by both sides of the East-West divide that is the source of ongoing reflection.[58] Very few besides the Catholics are doing this, since the Crusades and "Uniatism" are for the Orthodox what the Holocaust is for the Jews: they have rendered history impossible.

Eastern Catholic theology is not made but in the making. This characteristic derives directly from the situation just described. Eastern Catholic theology is a theology *in via*, a theology of Eastern Catholics in the process of recuperating and repossessing, with the help of both East and West, their ancestal tradition. Still tentative and unsure of itself, it is a theology largely without pretense. Like Anglo-Catholicism vis-à-vis Rome, Eastern Catholic theology keeps one eye over its shoulder at the "other," the Orthodox (the Protestants don't count). This distinguishes it radically from the self-satisfied isolationism so characteristic of certain strains in contemporary Orthodox theology. I see this process as alive, exciting, dynamic, full of hope.

Eastern Catholic theology is self-conscious. Like Orthodox theology, Eastern Catholic theology is self-conscious in ways the West, complacent in its size and strength, never needs to be. But it is not xenophobic or paranoid, unlike much in modern Orthodox theology.[59] On the contrary, Eastern Catholic theology is open to the modern West, which it does not reject, and whose objectivity and fairness it embraces.

Eastern Catholic theology is open and unashamedly eclectic. Because of the Western influence – indeed, dominance would not

[58] E.g., Melkite Catholic Archbishop Elia Zoghby, *We are All Schismatics* (Newton MA, 1996); M. Pelishka, "From Easternization to Inculturation: Reinterpreting the Mission of the Eastern Catholic Churches," *Worship* 71 (1997) 317–35.

[59] For entertaining if disconcerting reading, just dip into the book of Spiteris cited above, note 2. This book should be translated into English, if only to show the world what some Orthodox theologians really think and say.

be too strong a term – it has long been subjected to, Eastern Catholic theology is also eclectic in ways that would be an abomination to most Orthodox thinkers. A quintessential representative of this spirit lived right here in Ontario, Catherine de Hueck Doherty.[60] Her spiritual eclecticism joining East and West, the sort of thing that sends tremors through those so fixated in their pretense to the exclusivity of their tradition, was so vitally contemporary! This Western influence, if often deleterious, has also had the postive effect noted in the follwing characteristic.

Eastern Catholic theology rejects the pseudo-antitheses between Eastern and Western thought, and the false polarization consequent to it. As that versatile polymath Louis Bouyer, equally at ease in the theological and spiritual traditions of both East and West, was fond of asking those who liked to tout the famous Western spiritual classic, Thomas à Kempis' *The Imitation of Christ,* as propagating a "typically Western" spirituality inimical to the spirit of the Christian East, how it was, then, that Kempis went through fifteen editions in Russian?[61] And then there is that "Eastern spiritual classic," the *Unseen Warfare* of Nikodemos the Hagiorite (1748–1809), the strikingly erudite Athonite monk who produced both the *Philokalia* and the *Pedalion,* to this day the classic standard anthologies of Orthodox canon law and spirituality. Since we now know that Nikodemos' *Unseen Warfare,* published in Venice in 1796, is no more than a slightly abridged translation,

[60] See the recent biography Lorene Hanley Duquin, *They Called Her the Baroness: The Life of Catherine de Hueck Doherty* (New York: Alba House, 1995), and my review of it in *OCP* 62 (1996): 517–19.

[61] L. Bouyer, "Les catholiques occidentaux et la liturgie byzantine," *Dieu vivant* 21 (1951–52): 17–31. On the same question, see the more thorough discussion and references in G. Podskalsky, "Entwicklungslinien des griechisch-byzantinischen theologischen Denkens (bis zum Ende der Turkokratie)," *OKS* 47 (1998): 34–43, esp. 35–36. On the Orthodox tendency to overdo the East-West distinction/opposition, see id., "Ostkirchliche Theologie in der Weltkirche: Alternative (Antithese), Annex oder Allheilmittel?" in R.F. Taft (ed.), *The Christian East: Its Institutions & Its Thought: A Critical Reflection.* Papers of the International Scholarly Congress for the 75th Anniversary of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, 30 May – 5 June 1993 (OCA 251, Rome, 1996), 531–41; also, D. Wendebourg, "'Pseudomorphosis' – ein theologisches Urteil des Axiom der kirchen- und theologiegeschichtlichen Forschung," *ibid.*, 565–89.

with adaptations and additional notes, of the Neapolitan Barnabite Lorenzo Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat* and *Road to Paradise*, one can understand the scathing ridicule serious scholars reserve for those commentators who have put forward Nikodemos' work as a pure expression of Eastern Orthodox spirituality in contrast to that of the benighted West![62]

Eastern Catholic theology is a theology rooted in the Fathers of the Church, and especially in the lived experience of the Church's liturgy and the spirituality that flows from it. This distinguishes it sharply from typically Western theology. Professional liturgists apart, when does one ever hear a Western theologian citing the liturgy? From this flows the next characteristic.

Eastern Catholic theology forms an integrated whole. Like Orthodox theology, it is an integral (though not closed) world in which liturgy, spirituality, art, and architecture comprise an integrated, harmonious whole in a way unthinkable in the West, with its clash of competing methodologies and philosophies. Like the difference between a gothic cathedral and a small, fully decorated Middle-Byzantine church, Eastern Catholic theology is an enclosed world, one that can be taken in at a glance, but also one in which every tessera is an essential piece of the mosaic. Nothing could be more totally different from it than the pick-and-choose, à la carte, self-service buffet approach to religion fast becoming widespread in the West. A classic instance of this integrality is the Centro Ezio Aletti, which comprises also a school of Christian Art. As a result of this integral nature, Eastern Catholic theology has not just a different liturgy and liturgical iconography, and monasticism. It also has a different pneumatology, a different liturgical and spiritual theology, a different theological anthropology, a different Mariology, a different feminism...

Eastern Catholic theology is ecumenical. From the very start, the Eastern Catholic renewal has sought to build bridges to

[62] L. Bouyer, *Orthodox Spirituality and Protestant and Anglican Sprituality* (= *A History of Christian Spirituality,* III. A Crossroad Book, New York: The Seabury Press, 1969), 39–44.

Orthodoxy[63] despite – with some notable exceptions – the latter's systematic rejection of the outstretched hand. I have already defined elsewhere what ecumenical theology means in a study that I hope exemplifies the same, the Opening Lecture upon assuming The Sir Daniel and Countess Bernardine Murphy Donohue Chair in Eastern Catholic Theology, already referred to above.[64] Ecumenical scholarship is not content with the purely natural virtues of honesty and fairness, virtues one should be able to expect from any true scholar. Ecumenical scholarship takes things a long step further. Ecumenical scholarship is a new and specifically Christian way of studying Christian tradition in order to reconcile and unite, rather than to confute and dominate. Its deliberate intention is to emphasize the common tradition underlying differences which, though real, can be the accidental product of history, culture, language, rather than essential differences in the doctrine of the faith. Of course, to remain scholarly this effort must be carried out realistically, without in any way glossing over real differences.

But even in recognizing differences, this ecumenical effort must remain a two-way street where each side in the dialogue judges itself and its tradition by the exact same criteria and standards with which it judges the other. Eschewing all scapegoating and the double-standard, ecumenical scholarship seeks to describe the beliefs, traditions, and usages of other confessions in ways their own objective spokespersons would recognise as reliable and fair. Such a method renounces all caricature or "oblique criticism," in which the not-always-realized ideal of one Church is compared to the not-always-glorious realities of another.

So ecumenical scholarship rejects the very notion of contest or debate, seeking not confrontation but agreement and understanding. It tries to enter into the other's point of view, to understand it insofar as possible with sympathy and agreement. It takes seriously the other's critique of one's own tradition, seeking to incorporate

[63] See Inglessis *Maximos IV* (note 28 above) and Korolevsky, *Metropolitan Andrew, passim.*

[64] R.F. Taft, "Ecumenical Scholarship and the Catholic-Orthodox Epiclesis Dispute," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45 (1996): 201–26, here 202–4.

its positive contributions into one's own thinking. It is a contest in reverse, a contest of love, one in which the parties seek to understand and justify not their own point of view, but that of their interlocutor.

Such an effort and method, far from being baseless romanticism, is rooted in generally accepted evangelical and Catholic theological principles. Let me sum up the principal ones, beginning with the three theological virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity:

1. The theological foundation for this method is our faith that God's Holy Spirit is with His Church, protecting the integrity of its witness above all in the millennium of its undivided unity. Since some of the issues that divide us go right back to that first millennium, one must ineluctably conclude that these differences do not affect the substance of the apostolic faith. For if they did, then contrary to Jesus' promise (Mt 16:18), the "gates of hell" would have indeed prevailed against His Church.

2. The next principle is also based on ecclesiology. The Catholic Church recognizes the Orthodox Churches to be the historic apostolic Christianity of the East, and Sister Churches of the Catholic Church. Consequently, no view of Christian tradition can be considered anything but partial that does not take full account of the age-old, traditional teaching of these Orthodox Sister Churches. Any theology must be measured not only against the common tradition of the undivided Church of the first millennium, but also against the ongoing witness of Orthodoxy as the Spirit-guided apostolic Christendom of the East. That does not mean that East or West has never been wrong. It does mean that neither can ever be ignored.

3. An authentic magisterium cannot contradict itself. Therefore, without denying the legitimate development of doctrine, in the case of apparently conflicting traditions of East and West, preferential consideration must be given to the witness of the undivided Church. This is especially true with respect to later polemics resulting from unilateral departures

from or narrowing of the common tradition during the second millennium, of divided Christendom.

4. Those who have unilaterally modified or narrowed a commonly accepted tradition of the first millennium of the undivided Church bear the principal responsiblity for any divisions caused thereby. So it is incumbant first of all on them to seek an acceptable solution to that problem.

5. Within a single Church, any legitimate view of its particular tradition must encompass the complete spectrum of its witnesses throughout the whole continuum of its history, and not just its presently accepted expression.

6. Doctrinal formulations produced in the heat of polemics must be construed narrowly, within the strict compass of the errors they were meant to confute. When Trent said the bread and wine are transformed into the Body and Blood of Christ after the consecration (Dz 1640, 1654) it was combatting those who denied that transformation, and not making a statement about the "moment" or "formula" of consecration.

IV. Eastern Catholic vis-à-vis Orthodox Theology

How does Eastern Catholic theology stack up in relation to Orthodox theology? Not too badly, in fact, contrary to what one might be initially inclined to suspect. Among the non-Byzantines, Eastern Catholic theology in the Syriac traditions far outstrips in every area its Orthodox counterparts, though that is less true of the Armenians and not at all true of the Ethiopians. As for the Churches of the Byzantine tradition, at the moment, I would judge Byzantine Catholic theological work clearly superior in what it produces on spirituality, liturgy, Mariology, and church history.

The study of Oriental spirituality did not even exist as a serious academic theological discipline until it was invented by Irenée Hausherr, S.J., at the Pontifical Oriental Institute. His work, still carried on by his disciple and successor, the great "*starets*" Tomáš Špidlík, S.J., prolific and renowned author on Eastern spirituality,

and others of Špidlík's school at the Oriental Institute and its filial Centro di Studi «Ezio Aletti», needs no introduction to anyone who has even a nodding acquaintance with the field.

Eastern Mariology has also been more developed in the Catholic Church than in the Orthodox East, as witness the major works on the Dormition by the noted French Assumptionists and Byzantinists Jugie and Wenger,[65] of Melkite Catholic Joseph Nasrallah and Russian-rite Jesuit Joseph Lédit, S.J., on Mary in the Byzantine liturgy,[66] and of Ermanno Toniolo, O.S.M., and his disciples at the Oriental Institute.

The same is even more true of liturgy. Far and away the best writing on Eastern liturgy today is produced in the Catholic Church, much of it by the liturgy professors and their disciples of the same Oriental Institute[67] and others, like French Benedictines Emmanuel Lanne, René Bornert, and Charles Renoux, Sebastià Janeras in Barcelona, U.S. Trappist Gabriel Bertonière, and, in Germany, Professors Gabriele Winkler of Tübingen and Hans-Joachim Schulz of Würzburg, and Dr. Heinzgerd Brakmann of the Franz Dölger Institut in Bonn.

Eastern Catholic theology also has growing strengths in ecclesiology, though is not as rich and original in this sphere as contemporary Orthodox thought.

In church history, Catholic writers of Eastern inspiration are capable of objectivity,[68] unlike much contemporary Orthodox

[65] M. Jugie, *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vierge. Étude historico-doctrinale* (ST 114, Vatican, 1944); A.A. Wenger, *L'assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle* (Paris, 1955).

[66] J. Nasrallah, *Marie dans la Sainte et Divine Liturgie byzantine* (Paris, 1955); J. Ledit, *Marie dans la liturgie de Byzance* (Théologie historique 39, Paris, 1976).

[67] See Winkler, "The Achievements" (note 40 above).

[68] Suffice it to mention such serenely objective Catholic studies on controverted East-West issues as Y. Congar, *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1959); F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966); J. Macha, S.J, *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework Together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations* (OCA 198, Rome: PIO, 1974); E.C. Suttner, *Church Unity. Union or Uniatism? Catholic-Orthodox Ecumenical Perspectives* (Rome: Centre for Indian and Inter-religious Studies – Bangalore: Dhamaram Publications, 1991).

ecclesiastical writing in the field, where what passes for church history is often little more than highly selective, one-sided apologetic self-justification and confessional propaganda, sometimes of the crudest variety.[69]

On the debit side, Eastern Catholic theology, like contemporary Orthodox theology, is extremely weak in modern scriptural studies, and its ignorance of contemporary Protestant thought and modern Western philosophy and spiritual "movements" also distances it from Western Catholic theology.

In a word, Eastern Catholic theology is a theology still uncertain of itself, still groping to find its way, but in the midst of all the insufferable arrogance produced by today's Christian East, that is perhaps not a bad thing.

V. Looking to the Future

What the future will offer I leave to the prophets, though there can be little doubt that it will be in the hands of those who embrace the "Western" values of balance, fairness, objectivity, openness, and historical truth. The ecumenical "dialogue of love," which seeks to stress that which unites rather than that which divides, is an ideal to be striven for but not yet achieved. A glance at the extremely negative commentary by Greek Orthodox Archbishop Stylianos (Harkianakis) of Australia, on Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter *Orientale Lumen* of May 2, 1995,[70] is proof-

[69] I am not, of course, referring to the serious scholarly work done by the excellent Byzantinists in the Orthodox world, whose writings also cover church matters directly or tangentially, but of the *ex professo* ecclesiastical writers and publications. Just read any article by Greek-American Orthodox priest John Romanides in, for example Ὀρθοδοξία, the official publication of the Church of Greece, to see what I mean.

[70] See note 73 below.

positive of how far we have to go.[71] The reader attentive not only to the content of Archbishop Stylianos' remarks but also to the tone of his language – especially striking in view of his position as Orthodox Co-Chairman of the International Catholic-Orthodox dialogue – will not have been surprised at Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I's by now notorious October 21, 1997 speech at Georgetown University during his 1997 visit to the US, considered by some an ecumenical and public-relations disaster despite subsequent efforts at damage control by Catholic ecumenists and others.[72]

But the very different tone of the Pope John Paul II's recent repeated attempts to reach out in reverential respect and love to our Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Sister Churches,[73] and the highly successful Meeting of the Bishops and Religious Superiors of the Eastern Catholic Churches of Europe, organized by the Vatican Congregation for the Oriental Churches at Nyíregyháza in Eastern Hungary, from June 30 to July 6, 1997, where the firm will toward renewal and restoration of the Eastern heritage was once again

[71] "A Comment on the Papal Encyclical *Orientale Lumen*," *Phronema*. An Annual Review Published by the Faculty of St Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College, Redfern, Australia, 10 (1995): 51–60.

[72] The official text has been widely printed in the media, e.g. the *SEIA Newsletter on the Eastern Churches and Ecumenism*, no. 25, Nov. 1991, pp. 1–3. Edited by Romald G. Roberson, C.S.P., Secretariat for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 3211 Fourth St. NE, Washington, D.C. 20017–1194. U.S. Greek Orthodox Church representatives, who requested that the honorary doctorate be awarded the patriarch at the special convocation, had assured Georgetown University officials that Patriarch Bartholomew's talk would be a response to the recent Apostolic Letter *Orientale Lumen*, in which Pope John Paul II reaches out in love and respect to the Orthodox East and its spiritual heritage (see the following note). Readers can judge for themselves the tone and content of the patriarch's talk, which does not even mention the pope or his Apostolic Letter, and was certainly not a response to it. The lengthy report on the patriarch's October-November US visit and the Georgetown talk in "Chronique des Églises," *Irénikon* 70 (1997): 543–49, refers to the "consternation" which greeted the latter.

[73] See *Ecumenical Documents of 1995. Orientale Lumen, Ut Unum Sint, Addresses in Rome* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 1996).

affirmed,[74] has made it clear that negativity is not the voice of the future – at least not of *our* future. In fact, Patriarch Bartholomew's Georgetown speech has boomeranged, working in effect as an "emancipation proclamation" for Eastern Catholics, who now see clearly that they must continue their pilgrimage toward renewal by themselves, with the help of those of good will, regardless of what others think or say. We Eastern Catholics would prefer to proceed hand in hand with our Orthodox brothers and sisters. But let no one doubt for a minute that with them or without them – and the choice is theirs – we shall stay the course, confident that God is with us. For that is the mandate we have received from our Catholic Church, and that, under God, is the positive voice of encouragement and hope to which we must attend.

+++++++

Резюме

Під час Конґресу Американського Товариства Католицького Богослов'я в місті Оттава в червні 1998-го року, о. проф. Роберт Тафт з Папського Орієнтального Інституту в Римі, виголосив вищеподану доповідь про історію та прикмети східньо-католицького богослов'я в модерній добі. Автор уважає, що пониження східніх католицьких єпископів за часів понтифікату Пія IX-го довело до реакції і дало поштовх осмисленню притаманностей східньо-католицького богослов'я. Описуючи сучасний стан того богослов'я о. Тафт заявляє, що воно є «в початкових стадіях розвитку; покищо не дуже поширене; намагається себе окреслити;

[74] See the Allocution of Cardinal Achille Silvestrini, Prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Oriental Churches, and the Final Document of the meeting, in *L'Osservatore romano* for July 13, 1997, pp. 4–5. The author of this paper was summoned by Cardinal Silvestrini to participate in this meeting, where he gave a conference on "Liturgy as an Expression of Church Identity."