

***The Ukrainian Catholic Church  
and Eastern Spirituality***

by Jaroslav Pelikan

Delivered at a

***Symposium***

La Salle College  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
April 19, 1975

***The Ukrainian Catholic Church  
and Eastern Spirituality***

by Jaroslav Pelikan

***The Ukrainian Catholic Church  
1945-1975***

Miroslav Labunka & Leonid Rudnytzky  
Editors

Redistributed A.D. 2009 with permission of the publisher

***St. Sophia Religious Association  
of Ukrainian Catholics, Inc.***

7911 Whitewood Road  
Elkins Park, PA 19127

The twentieth century will probably be remembered in the history of Christian historiography as the time when “spirituality” was discovered as a distinct element in Christian thought and experience. The term seems to have come into English usage from French theology, which has produced much of the scholarship dealing with this phenomenon, including the monumental *La spiritualite chretienne* of Pierre Pourrat<sup>1</sup> and the indispensable encyclopedia, *Dictionnaire de spiritualite ascetique. Doctrine et histoire*.<sup>2</sup> It is not an accident that the twentieth century has also been the time in which the legacy of the Church fathers, especially of the Eastern fathers, once more came into its own in the theology and liturgy of the West. For the somewhat vague term “spirituality” – for which, I must confess, I have only limited enthusiasm – has come to express those elements of Christian theology and liturgy that are grounded in experience rather than in institutions, in mystery rather than in law; and these elements have also come to be seen as representing a distinctive contribution of the Eastern patristic tradition.

\* \* \*

The topic assigned to me for this lecture, “The Ukrainian Catholic Church and Eastern Spirituality,” is obviously one on which it would be possible to discourse at great length and from many different perspectives. I hope that a Slavic scholar who is not a Ukrainian Catholic, but whose most recent book bears the title: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*,<sup>3</sup> will be permitted to treat this topic by seeking to identify several themes in the history of Eastern spirituality that do indeed have a special Ukrainian provenance, but are not the exclusive property of Kievan Christianity. Spirituality can make an

important contribution to our understanding of the identity of a Christian community, supplementing and correcting the definition of identity that is based on doctrine or polity or liturgy or even on a combination of these.

When we are attempting to establish the similarities and differences between Eastern and Western churches, questions of polity, especially the role of the Papacy, often assume an exaggerated importance; conversely, when a part of Eastern Christianity comes back into communion with Rome, it is the definition of identity based on liturgy that often preponderates, with the result that “rite” becomes the overriding concern. At least since the Reformation, moreover, a definition of identity derived from doctrine has often taken the central place, and the relations between East and West have been treated as though the doctrinal differences were the decisive ones. No doubt all of these areas have an important place, but they can all lead to distortion unless spirituality is permitted to refine the definition. Doubly is this principle true in the interpretation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The *context* of Eastern spirituality is the *liturgy*. It has long been recognized in Western thought that how the Church worships is both a source and a norm for what the Church believes, teaches, and confesses. In the controversies over St. Augustine's doctrine during the century following his death, St. Prosper of Aquitaine (d. post 455) set down the principle “that the rule of prayer should establish the rule of faith”.<sup>4</sup> When for example, Latin Christianity finally took up the question of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist,

it was not chiefly the exegesis of the words of institution, but the implications of the words and practices of the Eucharist liturgy that carried the day for the doctrine of the Real Presence. The same was true, I am convinced, for the doctrine of Redemption itself: the work of Christ never became a dogma in the same sense that the person of Christ did, but the liturgical concept of “sacrifice” together with the idea of “satisfaction” derived from Western sacramental practice in the penitential system, shaped Anselm's theory of the Atonement. Despite the condemnation of the Modernists<sup>5</sup> application of the principle “*lex orandi lex credendi*”<sup>6</sup> the principle itself has had an honored place in Roman Catholic theology, and the liturgical movement of the twentieth century has helped to confirm its importance.

It seems undeniable, however, that this principle has been applied more consistently and more thoroughly in Eastern than in Western Christianity. When the ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople, St. Nicephorus (806-815), spoke of “the melody of theology,” he was referring not only to the Trisagion of the angels in the Book of Isaiah (6:31) but to the Church's sharing in that song of praise, which was “theology” in the deepest sense of the word. And when a Ukrainian Christian insists that the liturgy be carried out *po nashomu*, identifying this usage with the practice of the universal Church, he may be mistaken historically, but he is right theologically. That is why the “Latinization” of Eastern rites is correctly seen as a pernicious understanding of the identity of such communities as the Ukrainian Catholic Church. For it is in the liturgy, more than in the form of church organization, that this identity is established and preserved. Western communities have identified themselves on the basis of their polity as “Presbyterian” or “Congregationalist” or even “Roman Catholic;” but in the

East “Orthodoxy” is “*Pravoslavie*,” the right was to worship, and even some Eastern sectarians have recognized this when they called themselves *Staroobriadniki*, which does not mean “Old Believers,” but “Old Ritualists.” Eastern Christians, even those who are in communion with Rome, do insist on the recovery of the patriarchate as a mark of their identity, but the deepest and fullest expression of that identity is in their liturgy.

Lest this be dismissed as nationalism (or, to use the current fad word, “ethnicity”), one must remember the role that Christianity has played in the establishment of nationhood in the East. When St. Boniface (d. 755) came to the Germans or St. Augustine (d. 604) to the English, they brought the gospel and the Latin language, civilizing the tribes and incorporating them into Christian culture by teaching them the Latin Mass. But when SS. Cyril (d. 869) and Methodius (d. 885) and other missionaries converted your ancestors and mine, they translated not only the Bible, but the liturgy, into Slavic. Thus the gift of the Christian message to our peoples has been the gift of their own language and of their nationhood. To be sure, this has made it much harder for Eastern Christians to affirm the universality and catholicity of the Church, but it has also bound together the tradition of the Church and the tradition of the nation in an indissoluble union. The great prince of Kiev,<sup>7</sup> whose name I proudly bear, gave to the Ukrainian tradition an integrated Christian culture of its own, embodied in the Church of St. Sophia, provided with a kind of constitution in the *Rus'ka Pravda*,<sup>8</sup> and articulated in the distinctive accents of the Slavic liturgy. Neither the well-meaning efforts to achieve catholicity by Latinizing this liturgy nor the malicious efforts to uproot the Christian origins of Ukrainian nationality in the name of the proletarian revolution have

succeeded in dissolving the union of faith and culture; for the foundation of this union is not in how the people speak, not in how they organize themselves in church or state, but in how they pray.

If the liturgy is the context of Eastern spirituality, its *discipline* is the *Christian way of life*. It would be fatuous to claim that this is unique to Eastern Christianity, but there is a distinctively Eastern approach to the discipline of the Christian way of life, as a comparison with the Lutheran Reformation and with Roman Catholicism will show. There is a continuity of subject matter between Western and Eastern Christian thought, yet a difference of accent that is quite unmistakable. Common to all Christian thought is the recognition that the gospel is more than a way of life and that a reduction of it to its ethical aspects is a betrayal both of the gospel itself and of the Christian life. But the relation between faith and life is not the same in various strains of theology, so that a comparison of how this relation is treated in the East with Western versions of it provides an index to the identity that we are seeking to define here.

The early classic of Ukrainian Christianity, for example, is *Slovo o zakoni i blahadati* by Ilarion of Kiev (d. post 955).<sup>9</sup> In it he set forth the meaning of the Christian way of life, and described for the neophyte believers how the gospel differed from other systems of belief, including Judaism. "The salvation of the Christian," he wrote, "is liberal and bountiful, stretching to all the countries of the earth."<sup>10</sup> The word "*zakon*" in the title of the work is ordinarily translated "law," but that is somewhat misleading. Particularly must we avoid reading into it the connotations that the term "law" has acquired in the Protestant, especially the Lutheran, interpretation of the relation between "law" and "gospel," where it has been

taken to refer to the oppressive and accusing commandment of God. Although this may accurately reflect what the word "law" means in the Epistle to the Galatians, biblical and patristic usage cannot be restricted to this meaning. Therefore, when the Church Fathers call Christian revelation "the new law," they do not intend to confirm it to its ethical and "legalistic" aspects, but to combine in a single term both the motivation and the norm of the Christian life. Some such combination is also the proper connotation of Ilarion's term "*zakon*." Hence, his little tract brings together perspectives on Christian teaching that the Lutheran Reformation separated quite sharply. "*Zakon*" is a way of life in which the discipline of the yoke of Christ is seen as not a burden, but a joyous gift.

Another Monument of the Kievan tradition provides some insight into the differences between the Eastern discipline and medieval Roman Catholicism. I am referring to the *Kormcha knyha*.<sup>11</sup> In Western terminology, the *Kormcha knyha* is a part of canon law, for it collects into a handy compendium various items of church legislation on conduct and practice. Yet if we relate it to the history of such legislation in the Christian East, both Greek and Slavic, the contrast with the Latin West is striking. Neither from the *Kormcha knyha* nor from the several recensions of the *Nomocanon*<sup>12</sup> is it possible to derive a system of canon law comparable to those of the Western Church. One reason for the difference is probably the difference in the pattern of church-state relations, for in the East imperial law governed many of the aspects of the Christian life that were thought to be the proper subject of ecclesiastical legislation in the West. But one senses a different attitude also toward law itself. It is, I think, significant that despite the work done on Eastern canon law by such Orthodox scholars as the late Hamilcar S.

Alivisatos,<sup>13</sup> to whose investigation of the concept of “economy” I am much indebted, the most important contemporary research on the canon law of the Eastern churches has been coming from historians and canon lawyers working in the West, as, for example, Victor J. Pospishil.<sup>14</sup> This tendency of the East to handle canon law somewhat carelessly can be very confusing, as I do not need to remind the adherents of the Union of Brest-Litovsk. But it has also helped Eastern Christians to realize what Western Christians have sometimes been tempted to forget, that Christian discipline is not merely a set of rules, but an entire way of life.

Because of this emphasis, the *style* of Eastern Christian spirituality is articulated in the Pauline idea of *kenosis*, “self-emptying.” To accept Christian discipline is to become a disciple of Jesus Christ, and the Christian way of life may be summarized in the simple command of our Lord, “Follow Me.” In the *Imitation of Christ* of Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471)<sup>15</sup> or in the ideals of St. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) or in the piety of the sixteenth century Anabaptists, we can see the power of this call to deny oneself, take up the cross, and follow Christ. If we take it in this broader sense, we may see “*kenosis*” as a term for many kinds of Christian spirituality, not only for the Eastern form. But the concept of “*kenosis*” acquired a special significance in the history of Eastern monastic spirituality, a significance that was expanded when Byzantine monasticism was transplanted into the Slavic lands.

The seedbed of kenotic spirituality among the Slavs was the Pechers'ka Lavra, founded in the eleventh century by Ss. Anthony (d. 1073) and Theodosius (d. 1074). Together with the Cathedral of St. Sophia, begun by Yaroslav the Wise, this monastery became the focus of religious life for

Ukrainian and eventually of Russian Christianity. Here the monastic traditions of “the holy mountain,” Mount Athos, took on the qualities that have been associated with Ukraine and its traditions ever since. In his *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*<sup>16</sup> and in his *The Russian Religious Mind*,<sup>17</sup> the late George P. Fedotov introduced the English-reading public to these traditions, stressing the “conformity with Christ” that was central to the kenoticism of the Pechers'ka Lavra. The message of the apostle in such statements as that of Romans 8:17, “provided we suffer with Him in order that we may also be glorified with Him,” became a paradigm for the monk of how the Christians ought to live. For example, fasting – which was one of the points of discipline at issue between East and West – was interpreted not merely as a form of self-mortification, but as a way of knowing in one's own experiences the power of Christ made perfect in our weakness. The imitation of Christ, which has so easily been given a moralistic content in the West, was thus transported into the principle that by the Incarnation God has taken on the form of our weakness, so that we, by identifying ourselves with that weakness and self-emptying, may participate in His power and grace.

From the path finding monograph of Karl Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischem Monchtum*,<sup>18</sup> we know that the roots of this Ukrainian kenoticism lie deep in the soil of Greek monastic history. There is also a direct line from the monastic theology of St. Symeon the New Theologian to the speeches of Father Zosima, the “starets” in Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Another early Ukrainian work in which the *kenotic* message took form is the remarkable spiritual self-portrait of Vladimir II Monomakh (1053-1125) entitled *Pouchenie ditiam*,<sup>19</sup> from around the year 1117. Although it is presented as an instruction for his children, the book

is in fact the testament of a soul and the document of a monastic spirituality in which the Gospel has begun to shape the mores and traditions of the Slavs. Already evident here is an attitude toward the earth (“zemilia”) that Western critics of Eastern Christianity have often caricatured as “pantheistic,” but that is in fact the obverse side of this kenoticism, a recognition of the holiness with which the earth has been invested through creation. (A modern instance of this attitude is evident in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, when Roskolnikov, repentant at last, kisses the earth which he has profaned by his sin.)

The *goal* of spirituality in this Slavic tradition, as in the Eastern tradition generally, is nothing less than “obozhenie,” *deification*. There is probably no aspect of Eastern spirituality and theology that those trained in Western ways find more strange than this, and consequently none that has suffered more at the hand of Western interpreters, Protestant and even Roman Catholic. It has been characterized, in particular by historians of doctrine coming out of the school of Albrecht Ritschl (1806-1889),<sup>20</sup> as a “physical doctrine of redemption,” and it has been accused, also by Roman Catholic theologians, of a “Platonizing” tendency to obscure the distinction between Creator and creature. Indeed, we do not even have adequate English term for the concept of “theosis,” for neither “deification” nor “divinization” carry quite the proper connotation.

For Eastern Christians spirituality, beginning with St. Irenaeus (d. ca. 202) and Athanasius (d. 373) and with the Cappadocian fathers, the definition of salvation as “theosis” is grounded in the words of the New Testament (2 Peter 1:4), “his precious and very great promises, that through these you may escape from the corruption that is

in the world because of passion, and become *partakers of the divine nature*.” These words mean that it does not belong to human nature, as designed by God the Creator, to be the victim of passion and turbulence. As God Himself is capable of compassion without being subject to passion, so man was intended to live in a relation of love with God and with other men, but not to pervert this love into pride, selfishness, and lust. The fall of man into sin was responsible for making man lose this divine quality. As a consequence, he is not caught in passion and in its result, which is corruption and transiency. Having been created out of nothing, he is now threatened with a return to that nothingness from which he emerged through the creation. If he is to be saved, therefore, it is not enough that his sins be forgiven or that satisfaction be made to the offended justice and wrath of God or that he have a revelation of God's love. All of these are necessary, but over and above them all man needs to have his nature transformed into that for which it was originally intended, a capacity to partake of the divine nature itself.

And this, according to Eastern spirituality, is the answer to the Anselmic question, “Cur Deus homo?”<sup>21</sup> As Clement of Alexandria (d. ca. 215) already put it, “the Logos of God became man so that you might learn from a man how a man may become God:”<sup>22</sup> St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), employing a favorite metaphor, declared that the incarnate Logos “has dyed the soul of man with the stability and unchangeability of His own nature;”<sup>23</sup> and the Pseudo-Dionysius (d. 265) defined “deification” as “assimilation to God and union with Him.”<sup>24</sup> The potential dangers of such formulations were recognized by Eastern theologians, not least by the ones I have just quoted. But by casting its doctrines of redemption in the framework of the concept of deification, Eastern theology, as I have suggested in my foreword to

the Festschrift for my friend, Father Georges Florovsky,<sup>25</sup> has been enabled to go beyond the antitheses that have dogged Augustinianism. It manages to avoid being either Pelagian or deterministic, either moralist or magical, either deistic or pantheistic. And it brings the Incarnation and the Redemption into closer correlation than any of the Western theories of the atonement can.

The Eastern emphasis on deification and Incarnation is also responsible for the emphasis upon the *Bohorodytsia* or *Theotokos* as the *paradigm* of this spirituality. In the great church of St. Sophia in Kiev, there is a representation of the Virgin as “*nerushymastina*,” which, even in its present state of preservation (as it can be seen in Lazarev's book on the mosaics of St. Sophia)<sup>26</sup> makes visible the central function of Mary in Ukrainian spirituality. Since she is the creature whose participation made possible the Incarnation of the Creator, she occupies a mediatorial position - not as a substitute for the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, but as a human participant in the one act of mediation which He carried out by becoming man. The artistic depiction of Mary as a wall, supports her celebration in the liturgy and the hymnody of the East, for, in Fedotov's words: “To introduce the name of Mary and hymns to Mary into all possible pieces of ancient liturgical treasure was one of the predominant concerns of the Byzantine liturgists,<sup>27</sup> and also of the Kievan adapters of the Byzantine forms. From the Annunciation - or, as it is termed in Eastern theology, the “evangelization” - to the Assumption, Mary occupies in Eastern spirituality a unique position as the exemplar of how God deals with the human race and as the example of how humanity can respond to the divine initiative. Liberal Protestantism has sensed the need for such an exemplar and example, but by assigning this role to Jesus, Protestant liberalism has lost the orthodox

doctrine of redeeming grace in Christ. Eastern theology, far more than Western theology, has identified Mary as the figure in the history of salvation who is out paradigm.

Ukrainian Catholics will, I hope, forgive me for saying that, for my tastes, the most profound liturgical representation of Mary as paradigm was expressed not in any Slavic language (nor, to be sure in Latin, despite the *Sub tuum praesidium*),<sup>28</sup> but in Greek, in the Byzantine hymn now usually attributed to Romanus the Melodist (d. 556), the *Akathistos*.<sup>29</sup> For here, more than in any other single formulation, all the facets of the Eastern picture of the Virgin are brought together. Contrary to what Protestants polemics may say about “Mariolatry,” she is seen as dependent upon her Son for all the graces that set her apart from other creatures. She stands, however, as a type of the Church, as the first believer, the one whose response to the Word of God anticipated the Church's response of faith. There is not, in Eastern theology, a doctrine of Mary separate from the doctrines of Christ and of the Church; on the contrary, Eastern systematic theology (if such a term may even be used of the way Eastern theologians go about their work) develops its ecclesiology, such as it is, by its exposition of the idea of *Theotokos*. When the doctrine of Mary has been treated on its own, in isolation, on the one hand, from the doctrine of Christ and, on the other hand, from the doctrine of the Church, it has been distorted, until, in some Western systems, a separate tract identified as “Josephology” has been permitted to develop alongside it.

It is clear from the history of the doctrine of Mary throughout the patristic and medieval periods that the West has had to learn from the East about the place of the Virgin in the plan of salvation. As the researches of Joseph Huhn<sup>30</sup> have shown, the most influential patristic

Mariology in the Latin tradition was that of St. Ambrose of Milan (d. 397) who carried out the transmission of Greek ideas to the West. Similarly, the identification of Mary as *Theotokos* was an achievement of theology and liturgy, where the title was sufficiently established by the fourth century for Julian the Apostate (361-363), to complain: Why do you incessantly call Mary *Theotokos*?"<sup>31</sup> The liturgical practice reflected by that title ultimately received conciliar and dogmatic approbation when the Council of Ephesus in 431 officially declared it to be a prerogative of the Virgin; twenty years later, at Chalcedon in 451, this declaration received its definitive Christological foundation. Western theology took its cue from the East, and eventually the Greek title "*Theotokos*" became standard in the Western equivalent "*Deipara*" or, less precisely but perhaps more frequently, "*Mater Dei*." The Ukrainian "*Bohorodytsia*" is a direct translation of "*Theotokos*," and one that has been preserved as the standard name for the Virgin. Here again the peculiar place of Ukrainian Christianity on the borderline between East and West is its most striking feature.

Within the economy of salvation, the distinctive element emphasized by Eastern spirituality as its *ground* is the "*preobrazhenie*" of Christ. This event is called in Greek "metamorphosis" and therefore in the Western languages "transformation" or, more commonly, "Transfiguration." But the Slavic term "*preobrazhenie*" makes it clearer that, in this spirituality, the external and visible form of the event is to be found in the obraz or icon. This is not the place to expound the theology of icons, as it emerged from the iconoclastic controversies of the eighth and ninth centuries; I have written about this at some length elsewhere.<sup>32</sup> But it is important to see that, contrary to the claims of the ancient iconoclasts and of modern theologians, the devotion of Eastern Christians to the

icons is not to be seen as a vestigial remnant of pre-Christian idolatry, but as the recognition that the Incarnation of the Logos altered the very place of the creation, and specifically of the human creation, in the relation between God and man. As argued by such spokesmen of Eastern spirituality as St. John of Damascus (d. ca. 749), St. Nicephorus (d. 829), and St. Theodore of Studios (d. 826) the case for the icons was fundamentally the same as the case for the reality of the Incarnation itself.

It was an extrapolation of that case for the icons when later Eastern monastic spirituality focused on the Transfiguration ("preobrazhenie") of Christ as a link in the chain of the redemptive work of Christ. It had been neglected in the patristic interpretations of salvation, and it was not until the rise of Hesychasm<sup>33</sup> that it became important. But if salvation is properly defined as deification and if the self-emptying of Christ is correctly seen as the means by which that salvation was carried out, the Transfiguration assumes an importance that it had not had earlier. For it was here that the conjunction of divine and human in Him was dramatically manifested, and this just at the time when He was about to undertake the way of sorrows. His humanity disclosed, for a brief glimpse, the glory it had possessed throughout His years of humble service, so that in His suffering and death we might be reminded that this was no mere martyr or hero, but the incarnate Logos, who bore the pain and sorrow of our sin. At the same time His "preobrazhenie" came as an earnest of the fundamental change in human nature that was to be the gift of salvation. Significantly, the reference to this event in the first chapter of 2 Peter comes only a few verses after the locus classicus on salvation as deification, quoted earlier; for in the exegesis of the Greek theologians, what happened to the human nature of



Christ on the mountain was a prefiguration and a guarantee of what happens to the human nature in salvation.

Because the classic Eastern statement of this teaching did not come until after the period of the Fathers, its most important expositor among Slavic theologians was not one of the Kievan founders about whom we have been speaking, but the fifteenth-century Russian monk, Nil Sorskij (d. 1508), (so named because of the Sora Hermitage).<sup>34</sup> He it was who introduced into the Slavic lands the spirituality developed by the Hesychast tradition, with its roots in St. Symeon the New Theologian (d. 1022)<sup>35</sup> and its definitive exposition at the hands of St. Gregory Palamas (d. 1359)<sup>36</sup> When it came into Slavic Christianity, however, this theology of the Transfiguration was quickly acknowledged as a legitimate expression of ideas that were already current there. The liturgies for the Feast of the Transfiguration, not only in the Greek service books but also in Church Slavonic, were a celebration of its place in the life of Christ and in the life of the Church, so that it was relatively easy for the Hesychasts' theology of Transfiguration to attach itself to an existing liturgical usage and to become a part of Slavic as well as of Greek spirituality.

\* \* \*

Throughout this lecture I have perforce been concentrating on aspects of the history of Eastern spirituality that stand in some sort of contrast to the Latin experience, for Ukrainian Christianity, whether it has been on communion with the patriarchates of the East or whether it has established fellowship with the Holy See, has maintained an uneasy and ambiguous relation to both. It still does, as this conference has once more made evident. But unlike the countless encounters

and conferences since the Union of Brest Litovsk, our discussion of this relation today takes place in an atmosphere where there is a recognition on both sides that the West and the East need each other, and that the very ambiguity of the history of the Ukrainian Church, buffeted by political and religious forces from both directions, may now become an asset. Thanks to the Second Vatican Council, Roman Catholics of all cultures have begun to worship, as Ukrainian Catholics have insisted on worshipping, in the accents of their own language.\* The principle of collegiality<sup>+</sup> among bishops has introduced into the polity of various national Catholic churches the very pattern of identity-with-universality which the adherents of the Ukrainian Rite have been demanding for themselves all along. And the valiant band of orthodox believers, struggling under Muslim and Marxist regimes, have emerged from the ghetto into which their history had thrust them. Having preserved the substance of the faith despite persecution and neglect, they now yearn for *sobornist'* and fellowship with orthodox and catholic (or Orthodox and Catholic) believers everywhere. The obstacles to reunion are enormous, and no one should minimize them. *But it does seem fair to say that the prospects for such reunion are brighter today than they have been for many centuries, and that if it is achieved, the spirituality of the Ukrainian Catholic Church will be seen as a harbinger of what we all affirm in principle but may now possess in historical reality, Una Sancta Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia.*

-----  
\* So long as is meant that the *language* of liturgy remains orthodox, regardless a particular *tongue* in which a given instance of the Church's public prayer is uttered, it can be a simple thing to agree with the author on this point. For orthodoxy is the recititude of belief or/and theology, without which no offering, no matter the intention, is acceptable to God. "But without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi, 6.

+ Collegiality is not to be confused with *synodality*, which is more likely the sense intended by the author in using the former term.

## ENDNOTES

---

- <sup>1</sup> For bibliographical description of this work, see supra, p. 113, footnote no. 2
- <sup>2</sup> Begun and edited by Marcel Viller, S.J. and continued by Andre` Rayez, S.J. and others, Vol. 1 (Paris ,1937).
- <sup>3</sup> Published by the University of Chicago Press (Chicago and London, 1974) as vol. 2 of 5 vols. work, appearing under the general title: *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Bibliographical data on works referred to in this paper can be found *ibid.*, pp. XI-XXV ("Primary Sources") and 299-315. Consult also the *Index*, pp. 317-329.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine. Translated and Annotated* by P. De Letter, S.J. (Westminster, Md. And London, 1963), pp. 183 and 234, footnote no. 42. (=Ancient Christian Writer. *The Works of the Father in Translation*, No. 32).
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. The Papal Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* of September 8, 1907, by Pope Pius X.
- <sup>6</sup> Comp. P. De Letter, S.J., ed., *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine...*, p. 234, footnote no. 42.
- <sup>7</sup> I.e., Grand Prince of Kiev Yaroslav the Wise (1019-1054), son of Volodymyr Sviatoslavych, during whose reign the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev was built.
- <sup>8</sup> For a critical edition of its text (in various variants), cf. *Pravda Russkaia*, t. 1-3 (Moscow – Leningrad, 1940-1963).
- <sup>9</sup> See *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis. Nach der Erstaussgabe (by A.B. Gorskii) von 1844 neu herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erläutert von Ludolf Muller. Worterverzeichnis von Suzanne Kehrer und Wolfgang Seegatz (Wiesbaden, 1962).* (=Slavistische Studienbücher, II); and N. N. Rozov, "Rukopysnais traditsiia 'Slova o zakone I blagodati'," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury, Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom), XVII (1961)*, pp. 42-53. For an English translation, cf. "Metropolitan Hilarion: Sermon on Law and Grace," in *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles, Tales*. Edited, translated, and with an Introduction by Serge G. Zenkovsky. Revised and Enlarged (New York, 1975; also a Dutton paperback) pp. 86-92. This translation does not include the complete text.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. Serge G. Zenkovsky, ed., *op cit.*, p.88: "This blessed faith spreads now over the entire earth, and finally it reached the Russian (*i.e. Rus'*) nation. And whereas the lake of the Law dried up, the fount of the Gospel became rich in water and overflowed upon our land and reached us. And now, together with all Christians, we glorify the Holy Trinity, while Judea remains silent..."
- <sup>11</sup> On the significance and importance of this literary monument in the Slavic world, see Ivan Zuzek, *Kormcaja kniga. Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law (Roma, 1964).* (=Orientalia Christiana analecta, 168). For the published text, see, for example, V.N. Beneshevich, *Drevneslavianskaia kormchaia XIV titulov bez tolkovanii, t. I (Sanktpeterburg, 1906).*
- <sup>12</sup> For its early Slavic text, see A.S. Pavlov, *Pervonachal'nyi slavianorusskii nomokanon (Kazan', 1869)*
- <sup>13</sup> Cf., for example, his *Hoi hieroi kanones kai hoi ekklesiastikoi nomoi ... Ekd. 2 (Athens, 1949).* (=Bibliotheke Apostolikes Diakonais, 19); and *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I (Berlin, 1913; reprint: Aalen, 1973.* =*Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche, 17. Stuck).*
- <sup>14</sup> Cf., for example, his 1) *Divorce and Remarriage. Towards a New Catholic Teaching (New York, 1967);* and 2) *Code of Oriental Canon Law. The Law on Persons: Rites, Persons in General, Clergy and Hierarchy, Monks and Religious, Laity. English Translation and Differential Commentary by Victor J. Pospishil (Ford City, Pa., 1960).*

- <sup>15</sup> A translation of this work into modern Ukrainian was made by Bishop of Luts'k Joseph Botsian (d. 1926). Cf., *Nasliduvannia Khrysta. Chotyry knyhy Tomy Hemerkena Kempii's'koho...Druhe vydannia zladyu o. d-r Iosyf Slipyi (L'viv, 1930).* (=Asketychna biblioteka Hr. Kat. Dukh. Seminarii u L'vovi, t. III-IV. Reprinted in Winnipeg, Man., 1956, as a 3rd ed.).
- <sup>16</sup> This work of G.P. Fedotov, ed., was published by Sheed and Ward in New York, 1948.
- <sup>17</sup> Vol. I: *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*; and vol. II: *The Middle Ages: The Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries*. Edited, with a Foreword, by John Meyendorff (Cambridge, Mass.; vol. I, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> eds., 1949 and 1966, available also as a Harper Torchbook paperback, 1960; and vol. II, 1966).
- <sup>18</sup> K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Monchtum. Eine Studie zum Symeon dem Neuen Theologen (Leipzig, 1898).*
- <sup>19</sup> For the published text of the "Instruction to his Children" by Grand Prince Volodymyr Monomakh in Church Slavonic, as well as in Ukrainian and English translation, see *Pamiatniki drevne-russkoi tserkovno-uchitel'noi literatury. Izdanie zhurnala "Strannik", pod redaktsiei prof. A.I. Ponomareva, vyp. 3 (S.-Peterburg, 1897), pp. 134-140; M. Vozniak, Stare ukrains'ke pys'menstvo. Vybira dlia serednikh shkyl (L'viv, 1922), pp. 171-176; and Serge A. Zenkovsky, ed., op. cit., pp. 94-100. Cf. also I.M. Ivakin, Kniaz' Vladimir Monomakh i ego Pouchenie. Chast pervaiia: Pouchenie k detiam, pis'mo k Olegu i otryvki (Moscow, 1901); and A.S. Orlov, Vladimir Monomakh (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946).*
- <sup>20</sup> Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889), a German Lutheran historian and theologian, proposed a social-ethical redefinition of the doctrine of justification, as well as interpretation of the saving work of Christ as the establishment of the community of faith rather than as "vicarious satisfaction."
- <sup>21</sup> For a recent edition in Latin, see *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera omnia. Ad fidem codicum recensuit Franciscus Salesius Schmitt, OSB, t. I, vol.2 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1968, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; 1<sup>st</sup> ed. was published in Rome, 1940), pp. 37-133. Cf. also English translation: Why God Became Man, and The Virgin Conception and Original Sin, by Anselm of Canterbury. Translation, Introduction and Notes by Joseph M. Colleran (Albany, N.Y., 1969), pp. 55-63.*
- <sup>22</sup> Cf. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of "The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325."* Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, editors. American Reprint of the Elinburgh Edition..., vol.II: *Fathers of the Second Century...* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1951), pp. 173 (Exhortation to the Heathen"), 210 ("The Instructor"), and 438 ("The Stromata"). Comp. Iraeneus (d.ca. 200), "Against Heresies," op. cit.,vol. I (1950), pp. 487-477; and Hippolytus (d. ca. 236), "The Refutation of all Heresies," op. cit., vol. V (195), pp. 151-152.
- <sup>23</sup> See his "On the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten," in: *Cyrille d'Alexandrie:Deux dialogues christologiques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par G.M. deDurand, O.P. (Paris, 1964), pp. 230 and 231. (=Sources Chretiennes, No. 97). Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition..., vol. 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600) (Chicago and London, 1971), p. 233.*
- <sup>24</sup> See his "Celestial Hierarchy" in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia graeca*, t. 3 (Paris, 1857) col. 165, 372-376, and 393. Cf. also Jose Ramon Bada Panilo, *La doctrina de la mediacion dinamica y universal de Cristo, Salvadore Nuestro, en el "Corpus Areopagiticum,"* (Zaragoza, 1965), pp. 121-122; and J. Pelikan, op. cit., pp. 344-345.
- <sup>25</sup> "Puti russkogo Bogoslova: When Orthodoxy Comes West," in: *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of The Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday.* Edited by David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin (Rome, 1973), pp. 11-16. (=Orientalia Christiana analecta, 195).
- <sup>26</sup> Viktor N. Lazarev, *Mozaiki Sofii Kievskoi. Sprilozheniem*

stat' I A.A. Belet'skogo o grecheskikh nadpisiakh na mozaikakh (Moscow, 1960). Cf. also Safiia Kyivs'ka. *Derzhavnyi arkhitekturno-istorychnyi zapovidnyk*. Avtor stati ta uporiadnyk Hryhorii Nykonovych Lohvyn (Kiev, 1971).

<sup>27</sup> G.P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. I, p. 54.

<sup>28</sup> This is an early hymn to Mary. Cf. J. Pelikan, op. cit., p. 241

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Sophronius Eustratiades, ed., *Romanos ho melodos kai he Akathistos* (Thessalonica, 1917).

<sup>30</sup> See especially, his *Das Geheimnis der Jungfrau-Mutter nach dem Kirchenvater Ambrosius* (Wurzburg, 1954).

<sup>31</sup> See *The Works of Emperor Julian. With an English Translation* by Wilmer Cave Wright, vol. 3 (London and New York, 1923), pp. 398, 399. (= *The Loeb Classical Library*).

<sup>32</sup> See *The Christian Tradition...*, vol. 2, pp. 91-145 and *passim*.

<sup>33</sup> For the background on Hesychasm, see *Die Gottesschau im palamitischen Hesychasmus: Ein Handbuch der spatbyzantinischen Mystik. Eingeleitet und ubersetzt von A.A. Ammann. 2. Aufl.* (Wurzburg, 1947), and works listed in the footnotes nos. 34-36.

<sup>34</sup> See A.S. Arkhangel'skii, *Nil Sorskii I Vassian Patrikeev. Ikh literaturnye trudy I idei v drevnei Rusi*, ch. I (Sanktpeterburg, 1882); Fairy von Lilienfeld, *Nil Sorkij und seine Schriften. Die Krise der Tradition im Russland Ivans des III* (Berlin, 1963); and George A. Maloney, S.J., *The Spirituality of Nil Sorsky* (Westmalle, Belgium, 1964). Cf. also N.A. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev i ego sochineniia* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960).

<sup>35</sup> For his works, see *Symeon le Nouveau Theologien: Catecheses, 1-34. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Basile Krivocheine, Traduction par Joseph Paramelle, S.J., t. I-III* (Paris, 1963-1965). (= *Sources Chretiennes*, Nos. 96, 104-113); and *Traites theologiques et ethiques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean Darrouzes, A. A., t. I-II* (Paris, 1966-1967). (= *Sources Chretiennes*, Nos. 122, 129).

<sup>36</sup> See Leonidas C. Contos, *The Concept of Theosis in Saint Gregory Palamas. With Critical Text of the "Contra Akindynum,"* vol. 1-2 (Los Angeles, 1963); Jean Meyendorff, *Introduction a l'etude de Gregoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959); and *idem*, *A Study of Gregory Palamas. Translated by George Lawrence* (London, 1964).

Redistributed GRATIS with the permission of the publisher\* by

***National Coalition of Clergy & Laity***

621 Jordan Circle  
Whitehall, PA 18052 USA

610/435-2634  
coalition@fast.net  
national-coalition.org  
LookingEast.stblogs.com

\* Publisher:

***St. Sophia Religious Association  
of Ukrainian Catholics, Inc.***

7911 Whitewood Road  
Elkins Park, PA 19127