

The Ukrainian Catholic Church

1945-1975

A Symposium

Miroslav Labunka and Leonid Rudnytsky
Editors

PHILADELPHIA, PA.
1976

The Ukrainian Catholic Church

1945-1975

A Symposium

Held at La Salle College in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

April 19, 1975

Miroslav Labunka and Leonid Rudnytzky
Editors

Published by:

The St. Sophia Religious Association of Ukrainian Catholics, Inc.
Philadelphia, 1976

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 76-26753

Copyright © 1976 by St. Sophia Religious Association of Ukrainian
Catholics, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
<i>Miroslav Labunka and Leonid Rudnytzky</i>	
Opening Remarks	9
<i>Daniel Burke, F.S.C.</i>	
SESSION ONE:	
<i>The Soviet Government and the Ukrainian Churches</i>	
The Saga of the Ukrainian Churches. Introductory Remarks	13
<i>Victor J. Pospishil</i>	
The Soviet Government and the Ukrainian Catholic Church	20
<i>Vasyl Markus</i>	
The Soviet Government and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church	36
<i>George Szumowski</i>	
The Ukrainian Baptists: A Case Study in Soviet Persecution and the Resistance to It	39
<i>Roger Hayden and Michael Bourdeaux</i>	
SESSION TWO:	
<i>The Vatican and the Ukrainian Catholic Church</i>	
The Vatican and Ukraine. Introductory Remarks	55
<i>Miroslav Labunka</i>	
The Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Recent Ecumenical Movement	63
<i>Eugene J. Fitzsimmons</i>	
The Vatican and the Silent Church	70
<i>John J. Mowatt</i>	
The Ukrainian Catholic Lay Movement 1945-1975: An Interpretation	90
<i>Petro B. T. Bilaniuk</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

SESSION THREE:

The Ukrainian Catholic Church and Eastern Spirituality

Eastern and Western Spirituality. Introductory Remarks	109
<i>George Maloney, S.J.</i>	
The Ukrainian Catholic Church and Eastern Spirituality	114
<i>Jaroslav Pelikan</i>	
Selective Bibliography	128
<i>Compiled by M. Labunka</i>	
A Calendar of Selected Dates and Events in the Ukrainian Catholic Church: 1945-1975	146
<i>Prepared by L. Rudnytzky</i>	
Conclusion	158
<i>L. Rudnytzky</i>	
Our Contributors	.. 160

INTRODUCTION

The present volume consists of papers delivered at a symposium on the Ukrainian Catholic Church held at La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on April 19, 1975. The Symposium was organized by the Pope St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome (U.S. Affiliate) and the St. Sophia Religious Association of Ukrainian Catholics; its sponsor was the Society for the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The Symposium was the third of a series of scholarly conferences on the Ukrainian Catholic Church organized by Ukrainian Catholic laity in the United States. The first was held at the Lincoln Center of Fordham University, New York, on July 15, 1972. The papers presented at that conference were subsequently published (under the editorship of Thomas E. Bird and Eva Piddubcheshen) in a separate volume entitled *Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Autonomy* (1972). The scope of the second Symposium was broadened to include all the Eastern Churches. It was held at the Marquette Center of Loyola University in Chicago, on November 15-17, 1974, and its proceedings are currently being prepared for publication.

Although the title of this Symposium and of the collection reads "The Ukrainian Catholic Church: 1945-1975," the volume also touches on the other Churches in Ukraine, i.e., the Ukrainian Orthodox and the Ukrainian Protestant Churches, especially the Baptists. Thus, in effect, the present volume offers an over-all view of church and religious life in Ukraine for the past thirty years, as well as a detailed account and analysis of some of the major problems besetting the Ukrainian Catholic Church today. In addition, the collection also has what might be termed a symbolic meaning. As Brother Daniel Burke stated in his Opening Remarks, the interest in the Ukrainian Catholic Church as manifested by the Ukrainian people thirty years after her official liquidation in the homeland, is an eloquent testimony of her ability to survive and to prevail.

To maintain the organizational structure of the Symposium, the collection is divided into three main sections representing the three respective sessions. The first session, "The Soviet Government and the Ukrainian Churches," was chaired by Msgr. Victor J. Pospishil, whose remarks provide a historical setting for the prob-

lem. Vasyl Markus' paper assesses the results of the Soviet religious policy vis-à-vis the Ukrainian Catholic Church and analyzes the means used by the Soviet regime to liquidate her. Rev. George Szumowski's paper focused on the liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and its forceful incorporation into the Russian Orthodox Church. The next paper, "The Ukrainian Baptists: A Case Study in Soviet Persecution and the Resistance to It," is, in a sense, a position paper of the Centre for Study of Religion and Communism of Keston College, Keston, Kent, England, inasmuch as it was prepared by Reverend Michael Bourdeaux, the Director of the Centre, and his colleague, Reverend Roger Hayden, who presented the paper at the Symposium. Of special value here is also the "Appendix: Selected Holdings of Original *Samizdat* (*Samvydav*) from Ukrainian Baptists," following the body of the paper. The authors analyze the tragic plight of Georgii (Iurii) Vins, the Ukrainian Baptist leader, using his case as a model of Soviet persecution of Baptists in Ukraine.

The second session, devoted to the Vatican and its relations with the Ukrainian Catholic Church, was chaired by Professor Miroslav Labunka whose introductory remarks provide the framework for the three papers delivered. This section of the collection can be thematically divided in two parts: Fr. Fitzsimmons' and Fr. Mowatt's papers form one thematic unit, and Professor Bilaniuk's study, the other. Frs. Fitzsimmons and Mowatt provide an interesting contrast. Relying exclusively on Western Canon Law, Fr. Fitzsimmons presented what can be considered the official Vatican position on the Eastern Catholic (Uniate) Churches and ecumenism. Fr. Fitzsimmons' use of the term "a sturdy bridge" in reference to these Churches in general and to the Ukrainian Catholic Church in particular, used in assessing their role in the reunification with the Orthodox, is of special interest. This concept, it should be noted, was dominant in Roman Catholic thinking prior to Vatican II and the inception of the "dialogue" with Moscow. In recent years, however, the "bridge" concept seems to have been abandoned by the Vatican.

Father Mowatt's paper, on the other hand, focuses on the injustices suffered by the Ukrainian Catholic Church at the hands of the Soviet regime and the Moscow Patriarchate and, more recently, because of interference by the Roman Curia in her internal affairs. Fr. Mowatt attempts to expose these machinations and calls on the Ukrainian faithful to defend more vigorously the rights and privileges of their Church.

Professor Bilaniuk's paper examines the Ukrainian psyche as the primary factor in the Ukrainian Catholic lay movement. His analysis of the movement's shortcomings and failures may be seen by some as overly critical, but the criticism expressed is, indeed,

a constructive one. His paper is an attempt to strengthen this movement and with it the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The third and final session of the Symposium was chaired by Fr. George Maloney, S.J., with Professor Jaroslav Pelikan as the sole speaker. Both Fr. Maloney in his introductory remarks and Professor Pelikan in his presentation attempt to come to terms with Eastern spirituality; to isolate its specifically Ukrainian features; to point out differences between Eastern and Western type of spirituality; and to draw some conclusions regarding the future of Eastern Christianity and Christianity in general. Implicitly, this section provides many answers to problems raised in the preceding two and, what is perhaps even more important, sheds some light on the current developments in the intellectual and spiritual life in Soviet Ukraine.

Professor Pelikan's analysis of Ukrainian spirituality reveals its importance for the survival of the Ukrainian people. It is safe to state that this spirituality, which is perhaps the most precious heritage of the Ukrainian tradition, provides strength and sustenance to the downtrodden and persecuted people in Ukraine. Perhaps too it was the source of strength for Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj enabling him to survive eighteen years of Soviet imprisonment and come to the Free World to shape the destiny of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as her first Patriarch.

M. L. and L. R.

Acknowledgement

The editors wish to express their gratitude to Father Martin Canavan, Pastor of the Nativity of the Mother of God Ukrainian Catholic Church in Philadelphia, for his advice on the planning of the Symposium, to Brother William J. Martin, F.S.C., Department of Religion, La Salle College, for his cooperation and assistance, to Mr. Wasyl Kaczmar for supplying information on the beginnings of the Ukrainian patriarchal lay movement in the United States, and to Father Volodymyr Andrushkiw of the St. Andrew Society of Ukrainian Catholic Priests for information on the clergy's involvement in the patriarchal movement. Financial support for the Symposium was provided by the Society for the Promotion of the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Finally, we wish to thank all those people whose generous contributions made the publication of these papers possible.

OPENING REMARKS

Daniel Burke, F.S.C.

It is a very great pleasure for me to welcome to La Salle College such a distinguished group of international scholars, experts not only in the Ukrainian Catholic Church, but in many aspects of Church history and historical theology.

The Slavic East, i.e., that part of Europe inhabited primarily by Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Russians, has always been somewhat shrouded in mystery insofar as the Westerner is concerned. We of the West were never fully aware of the various distinct forms of worship prevalent among the Slavic peoples; we never fully realized the depth of Slavic spirituality.

This, I think, is particularly true of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, the largest of all the Oriental Churches in Union with Rome. And yet, to a historian of Eastern Europe, Ukraine, and especially the Ukrainian Catholic Church, may well appear as a natural, organic link between East and West, containing the best of the two respective cultural realms. Pope Urban VIII knew of this, when speaking to the Ukrainians he stated:

"Per vos, mei Rutheni, Orientem convertendum spero."

A Symposium such as ours, which takes into consideration not only the Ukrainian Catholic Church, but other Churches of Ukraine as well, is a timely event of great importance. It should deepen our understanding of the ties which exist between religion and national or ethnic awareness; it should contribute to interdenominational understanding, and thus toward a true ecumenism; and finally, it should shed the necessary light on the plight of the Church under the Communist regime, and on the relations between religion and politics.

In welcoming the Ukrainian people to our Institution, I think that it is particularly fitting to mention that a scholarly conference on the Ukrainian Catholic Church should be held today, thirty years after the Church was officially liquidated by the regime

and forced to go underground in her native Ukraine. Your presence here and your interest in your Church demonstrate her vitality, her ability to survive and to prevail.

At this time, I would like to thank Professor Leo Rudnytzky and all those who helped him in organizing this Symposium, and extend my very best wishes to you for the success of your deliberations today.

SESSION ONE:

**THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
AND
THE UKRAINIAN CHURCHES**

THE SAGA OF THE UKRAINIAN CHURCHES

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Victor J. Pospishil
Chairman of the Session

The heroic character of a historical epoch is as a rule recognized only in retrospect. I am convinced that historians will be able to see in a not too distant future the struggle of the Christian Churches of the Ukrainian people through five centuries against oppression from Moscow as one of the truly great, gallant contests in the history of mankind. But it is necessary to assert at once that it would be a mistake to view this battle as merely a defense mounted by religious structures against annihilation, a simple combat for survival of religious ideas and institutions. The Ukrainian Churches, Catholic and Orthodox, as well as more recently also Protestant groups, stood and continue to stand here as an *antemurale humanitatis*, an advanced bulwark of all mankind, exposed to the onslaught of a long tradition of suppression of basic human freedoms in all manifestations of human creativity, which is linked by the historical past with the city of Moscow and the people of Russia. He who knows the history of Eastern Europe will not make the blunder to see the fight of the Ukrainian Churches in the last half century simply as the struggle of religion with atheism. After all, the assault by the Russian state upon the Church preceded communism by centuries, and communism itself, at least in the Russian version, is not a mere antireligious philosophy, but a true religion and church, with its dogmas, holy fathers, index of prohibited books, its heretics, its inquisition. While the Russian nation can proudly list among its writers, composers, scientists, many great contributors to the common treasury of human achievements, it cannot be passed over in silence that the same nation has been the arena of the most outrageous acts of inhumanity.

The beginning of the woes of Ukrainian Christianity can be sought in the 15th century when the Muscovite grand princes succeeded in suppressing the claims of the other competing territorial princes of the family of Ruryk and in establishing a central-

ized state. This was possible only with the military assistance which the Tartars gave to the Grand Prince of Moscow in his capacity as their chief tax collector. It was also their own final undoing, because the prince, whom they had foolishly strengthened in his struggle with the other Rurikides, became gradually so powerful that he could defy his Tartar masters.

When the Turks occupied Constantinople, the last remnant of the Eastern Roman Empire (1453), a political vacuum was created. Institutionalized religion of that time had to be allied with political might. The Eastern Orthodox Church had rejected the connection with the West, attempted at the Council of Florence (1438), and this rejection was seconded by Moscow. It was natural now that the Muscovite ruler, the sole Eastern Orthodox prince remaining after the collapse of the Serbian and Bulgarian empires, should see himself as called by God to take on the role of the *basileos* of Byzantium.

It is of course amazing that the city of Moscow should ever aspire to a messianic role. Even now, after five centuries have passed since the tsars confronted the world with their claim to be the rightful successors to the throne of Constantinople, Moscow and the Russians have produced no original ideology, one grown on their own soil. The more it is astonishing to see the claims based on the idea of the Third Rome pass smoothly from the tsars, the anointed servants of God, to the people's commissars, the avowed enemies of any god.

The political situation in Eastern Europe in the second part of the 16th century accelerated the pace of events. While Ivan IV the Terrible had not been successful in the West, he inaugurated the conquest of the East by the incorporation of the Tartar states of Kazan and Astrakhan (1556), establishing an unassailable position of strength and an opportunity for expansion of the Muscovite state. The threat from Moscow had suggested a strengthening of the Polish state, which was achieved by transforming the dynastic union between Poland and Lithuania into a real union (Lublin, 1569). The Orthodox constituted the majority of the population in this state, but were far behind the Roman Catholic Church in many aspects: religious life, political rights, cultural development within the Church, etc. It was not absurd to propose to the Orthodox, if they were desirous of rejuvenating their Church, that they should look for assistance to the Western Church, which in those times could mean only juridical union or submission to the pope.

The adherents of the subsequent church union, originally agreed upon at Brest in 1595, not rarely play down the political factors which led to this decision to unite themselves with the Church of Rome, and prefer to explain this step with religious

motives. While the latter ones certainly were not absent, the historian must assay them as one of several components, and cannot overlook the decisive political dynamics which urged and propelled the representatives of the Ukrainian-Byelorussian Church toward the Western Church. It was a choice between on one hand, Moscow, a barbaric tyranny, still intimately connected with its Tartar roots, just a few years past the rule of one of the great monsters of cruelty of all times, Ivan IV the Terrible (†1584), and on the other hand, the new renaissance which expressed itself in Poland in the Counterreformation, with its phenomenal growth of a school system, entirely founded, maintained and directed by the Catholic Church, and a lively interest in the national culture of all ethnic groups, expressed in an extensive use of the vernacular, a legacy from Protestantism.

The year 1589 saw a crowning attainment of Muscovite diplomacy, the erection of the patriarchate. The Orthodox of the Polish-Lithuanian state, since the Union of Lublin (1569) unified in a "Royal Republic", recognized clearly what would be their fate, and which then actually became their fate, namely, subjugation to Moscow ecclesiastically and politically. But why should they object to it? Was it not better to be under the rule of a tsar and patriarch of the same religious allegiance? Not at all. How could one expect that the ancient Church of Kiev, the mother of Christianity in Eastern Europe, should cherish submission to Moscow, an ecclesiastical and political center which was known for its backwardness, total lack of the rudiments of ecclesiastical learning, its chilling atmosphere of arbitrary cruelty, expressed in secret arrests and perpetual imprisonment in isolated convents, the absolute subservience of the Church to the holder of political power, and similar manifestations of the Muscovite system of government.

In such a quandary the West, represented by the Polish-Lithuanian state and the Catholic Church, in spite of their wrinkles and warts, seemed preferable by a long shot. Of course, not all the Orthodox Ukrainians and Byelorussians saw it that way, and they refused to join the Union. But this was to no avail. It was, after all, not so much a religious-ecclesiastical struggle, as a cultural-political, and this was confirmed by the suppression, first of the Ukrainian Cossack state, and then of the Church of Kiev which was declared abolished and subjected to the Patriarch of Moscow (1668).

The subsequent events substantiate the view that the relationship between the Ukrainian Churches and Moscow must be seen correctly as a contest on the level of cultural and political clashes. Since the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was now out of the way, the well-aimed fury of the tsars could be concentrated upon

the Ruthenian or Ukrainian-Byelorussian Church. It ought not to amaze us that this Church tied its fate with that of the tottering Polish state, and in an attempt to increase the distance between herself and the pursuing Muscovites became the victim of self-inflicted Latinization. The Ukrainian-Byelorussian nobility had often given expression of their dislike of the rapacious fist of Moscow by leaving their native ecclesiastical heritage, accepting the Latin rite and thereby becoming Poles. The endeavor of the Uniate Church to secure a better future within the Polish realm and the Catholic Church was of little avail. The promises, solemnly made, that the Uniate bishops and clergy would be accorded the same political rights and privileges which those of the Latin rite enjoyed, was never fulfilled, and while the popes forcefully supported these demands, as documents from archives now being published prove, the Polish Latin rite hierarchy, the kings and the nobility ignored them.

The Ukrainian-Byelorussian Church found itself in an impossible situation. There was only a choice between two evils. One was to be subject to the tyranny of the autocrat-tsar in St. Petersburg, who soon went so far against the hallowed tradition of the Christian East as to replace permanently the patriarch with a collegial body, the factual head of which was a layman, the *oberprokuror* (1722), and thereby demoting the Church to a part of the spiritless bureaucratic machinery of the state. The other alternative was the second-class status in a religiously free Polish state, still a bridge to the free world beyond the pales of Eastern Europe.

The wrath of the tsars was not late to arrive. Whenever parts of Poland came under Russian domination, one of the first tasks of the forces of occupation was the suppression of the Union. Since the Latin Rite Church was permitted to continue to exist and even flourish, as when Catherine II prevented the dissolution of the Jesuits in her land against the papal decision, we must conclude that the persecution of the Uniates was due not as much to true religious opposition, as it was the result of political considerations; after all, they represented Ukrainian and Byelorussian national aspirations.

The calm which settled after the Napoleonic wars upon Europe in Metternich's political system permitted the Uniate Church, with the tolerance of Tsar Alexander I, to reorganize itself in several dioceses. But not for long. The return of absolute autocracy under Nicholas I meant the end of the Uniate Church. The method used to subject the Ukrainian-Byelorussian Church was the same as that employed by the Communists in 1946. An insignificant group of ecclesiastics were summoned to sign a petition for the

dissolution of their Church, which was then confirmed by the tsar, and carried into execution at once, with the usual cruelty. The only diocese remaining, that of Kholm, was liquidated in 1875.

When the twentieth century arrived, the ultimate triumph of Moscow-St. Petersburg seemed assured forever. There was a slight exception, which in the long run became the Piedmont of Ukrainian ecclesiastical as well as national aspirations. The only part of the national territory of the Ukrainians where a church of their own was able to survive were the provinces occupied by Austria since 1772. As part of the Catholic Church of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Ukrainian Church was in a relatively short time raised to the level of an efficient, western-type ecclesiastical institution. This was visible especially in the clergy, who all had a graduate education, and who were thereby able through their sons and daughters to refill the ranks of the leading social class which had been depleted nearly entirely by the defection of the nobility to the Poles.

A ray of hope shone even under the tsar, when Nicholas II in the wake of the Russo-Japanese War had to grant religious freedom to the citizens of the Russian empire (1905). Unfortunately again for the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, this liberty did not extend to them. Consequently, some three hundred thousand Byelorussians, forcefully declared members of the Russian Orthodox Church, were permitted on their insistence to return to the Catholic Church but only in the Latin rite.

The coming of communism in the Russian Empire, starting with the overthrow of the autocratic rule of the tsar (March 1917), seemed to promise freedom for the churches, or, if it should be an atheistic and antireligious government (October 1917), at least equality of treatment should be expected. This dream was soon shattered. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church, recently re-constituted under Metropolitan Vasyl' Lypkiv's'kyi (1921), was mercilessly suppressed and re-subjected to the Russian Orthodox Church. And it was not only a symbolic gesture that the political capital should be transferred back from Petrograd to Moscow. The ecclesiastical center followed suit, and Moscow not only continued the travesty of its messianic claim as the Third Rome, now under the aegis of atheism, but expanded it to a papacy of World Communism.

World War II ended in the triumph of Moscow thanks to the generous assistance of the United States during the war and in consequence of the gratuitous cession at Yalta of all Eastern Europe by President Roosevelt to the Soviet sphere of influence. The last part of a free Ukrainian Church, the Ukrainian Catholic Church of Western Ukraine (Galicia) came under the power of

the Kremlin together with the Ukrainian Catholics in the Transcarpathian region. The ancient Romans had been successful in subjecting so many nations by following the axiom *divide et impera*. This is usually cited with a negative ethical connotation. Only when we compare the political methods of the Romans with those of the Soviets do we realize how humane and considerate the former were in employing such a policy. The Communists know only one: crude and cruel suppression. And this they applied at once to the Ukrainian Catholics in Galicia (1946) and then to those in Transcarpathia (1949), which meant that they were made by the decision of an antireligious government parts of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow. That the reason for this persecution was not so much the religious aspect but rather the national character of the Church is visible at once when we are aware that the Latin Rite Church, composed of Poles, Lithuanians and other ethnic minorities, was not subjected to the same annihilatory policy of the Soviet government. It is, therefore, not solely Catholicism as such and the consequent dependence upon an ecclesiastical center, the pope, out of the reach of the Soviets, which is the criterion of suppression, but the hatred of anything Ukrainian. This is also underlined by the pertractations between Moscow and the Vatican, in which concessions are expected to be made on both sides, with one exception: no mercy for the Ukrainian and the Byelorussian Churches.

The last page of the history of Christianity in Ukraine has not yet been written. The memory of better times linger on tenaciously. The Ukrainian Catholics in the Soviet Union are in a difficult position. An underground hierarchy and clergy can only partially satisfy the needs of the faithful. Many more churches are left open in Western Ukraine than anywhere else because of the strong attachment of the Ukrainian Catholics to their Church is recognized also by the Soviets. The hope of a better future is kept up by the news broadcast from the Western world, as those of the Vatican Radio, about the active life of their Church in the free world under the spiritual leadership of His Beatitude Joseph Cardinal Slipyj. Even the Ukrainian Orthodox in the Soviet Ukraine see the Church of Rome as the only prospective assurance of a future freedom for their religious beliefs, in spite of the disheartening news of the rapprochement between Moscow and the Vatican. The celebration of religious feasts, especially the Divine Liturgy, heard over the Vatican Radio, are a great consolation to all Christians, and in many families in all parts of Ukraine the broadcast is received by them on their knees.

To this we may add the manifestations of continued religious activity on the part of the Orthodox faithful, which is often

brought to our attention through the lamentation of the governmental press, which is exacerbated because after nearly six decades they were still unable to eradicate Christianity. The believers all over the globe are heartened also by the examples of heroic resistance of Protestant Christians in Ukraine and in all the Soviet Union.

N. B. For a selected bibliography of monographs in Western languages on the history of Christianity in Ukraine, see "Bibliography" — Part I.

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AND THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Vasyl Markus

The Eastern-Rite Catholics in Ukraine, also known by their historic name of Uniates, constitute an autonomous religious body called the Ukrainian Catholic Church (U.C.C.). Over the last thirty years they have been subjected to the most atrocious and perverse form of social engineering. The late Walter Kolarz remarked in his pioneering work on the situation of religion in the U.S.S.R. after World War II: "Indeed there are few religious groups in the whole of the Soviet Union which have been as ruthlessly persecuted as the Ukrainian Greek Catholics or Uniates."¹

The tragic fate of that Church under the Soviet regime has already been sufficiently documented by a number of authors in various publications (I. Hrynioch, A. Welykyj, B. Bociurkiw, G. Luzhnycky, W. Dushnyk, and this author; non-Ukrainian authors who have treated this subject as part of general religious history and situation in the U.S.S.R. include W. Kolarz, A. Galther, N. Struve, and others.)²

This presentation does not intend to relate the history of the liquidation of the Uniate Church in the U.S.S.R. Within the space allotted to me, I will attempt to analyze political motivations for, as well as the methods used in, the process of the suppression of this Church. I will also assess the results of that policy with some observations on the continuously active Soviet interest in the status of the Uniates.

I

The Eastern-Rite Catholic Church in Ukraine was naturally subject to Soviet religious policies applicable to all religions and church bodies. That policy resulted from Marxist-Leninist premises and from the historical experience of the Bolshevik regime with organized religion prior to its confrontation with Ukrainian Catholics. Moreover, that policy was influenced by the cultural-political role of Ukrainian Catholicism in national history, and was condi-

tioned through precedents of its treatment by the tsarist government of Russia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Briefly, ideology and political realities determined the fate of the U.C.C. after 1944, with the latter prevailing at times over the former.

Western Ukrainian lands, formerly under Polish, Rumanian, Czechoslovak or, earlier, under Austrian and Hungarian domination, were parts of Ukraine, the least integrated into the Russian politico-cultural orbit. This has also been the area where the Ukrainian nationalist movement evolved in relative freedom into a potent factor. The U.C.C., pursuing her traditional social function in that nation's history, a function characteristic of all Eastern Churches, closely allied herself with the national life and destiny of the Ukrainian people. Her spiritual leaders were leading national figures. The basic objectives of awakening Ukrainian nationalism and of the Russian, now Soviet state, were exclusive of each other: Ukrainians aspired to emancipation, full-fledged nationhood, and unification of all the Ukrainian lands, Russians on the other hand pressed for dominance, strengthening of their rule over Eastern Slavs, and intended the elimination of all disintegrative factors. One of them was considered to be a separate church body, not integrated into the traditional Russian church establishment and not sufficiently loyal to the regime. Another reason for the negative attitude of the Soviet government to the U.C.C. was her jurisdictional subordination to a foreign-based authority, that of the Roman Pontiff. True, this was not the main reason for the Soviet initiation of efforts drastically designed to suppress the Ukrainian Church, since in other cases some nominal, though controlled allegiance, to Rome has been tolerated (in Lithuania, or in the case of a few remnants of Catholics of Latin Rite in Ukraine or Byelorussia).

The Western-educated Ukrainian Catholic clergy with their organic roots in Ukrainian society had to be weakened and their eventual impeding function in the Sovietization of the land frustrated. This motive was so evident (and relevant for other groups of society as well) that the whole process of physically eliminating potential opponents acquired the characteristic nature of a preventive rather than a punitive measure. In other words, many Ukrainian Catholic leaders were eliminated or deported from the scene not simply because of their opposition to Soviet policies but with the view to break the Ukrainian elements *per se*. With this in mind, even the mass exodus to the West of the intelligentsia and about 10% of the clergy from Western Ukraine was considered as serving the Soviet purpose. (Of course, future ramifications of the phenomenon of *émigrés* came to be assessed differently.) Summing up the previous remarks, it is fair to state the close religion-nationality coalescence in the case of the U.C.C. and political

implications of such relationships were accountable for the fate of that Church under Soviet rule.

Similarly, the servicing role of the Russian Orthodox Church (R.O.C.) in the U.S.S.R., as far as "Soviet national interest" is concerned, provided her with a special mission vis-à-vis the Ukrainian Catholic Church, that of her gravedigger. Here also, a similar symbiosis between religious and political factors was manifested. The Orthodox Church in Russia and in Russian-influenced areas became long ago a national, patriotic, and legitimizing institution. Since the Soviet Union very soon ceased to be a cosmopolitan internationalist system and coalesced in terms of power with the Russian Empire, the Orthodox Church was not a totally alien or hostile entity. She gained in stature, respectability and credibility, especially since the mid-1920's, when her leadership abandoned its opposition to the new regime. The Russian Church had already fulfilled a useful role for communist policy by opposing separatist trends among the Ukrainian Orthodox and providing a setting for the dissolution of the Autocephalous Church in Ukraine. The reconciliation between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Soviet government constituted a pragmatic move on both sides, to utilize that Church for political purposes in the newly acquired Western areas, and, in the case of the R.O.C., to gain additional life-span from the regime as a token for services performed. In that sense, the tacit reconciliation between the two took place already in 1939-1940 when Ukrainian and Byelorussian parts of Poland, and later the Baltic states were incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Incidentally, a tentative design for encroaching on the Ukrainian Catholic Church was advanced during the first Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine. Due to the internal situation of the land and international uncertainty, those plans did not materialize. However, it is sufficient to recall that an Orthodox bishop, Panteleimon Rudyk, was sent to L'viv, and that persecuted Uniate priests, among them Havryil Kostel'nyk, were pressured to cooperate with the "reunification" of the Uniates with the Russian Orthodoxy. Some authors, like Harvey Fireside, argue that the 1943 Stalin - Patriarch Sergei arrangement was primarily the result of the Soviet realization that religion regained ground under the German occupation of Soviet territories.³ Still, it seems that more than facing the facts of life, it was a look into the future instrumentality of the Russian Church in the same areas and elsewhere that Moscow set in motion a new *modus vivendi* with the R.O.C.

True, it was a policy with many purposes, but somehow the instrumental role of R.O.C. in Western areas had been anticipated in 1943 in an effort to counteract the revived Autocephalous Churches in Ukraine and Byelorussia, as well as to suppress the Ukrainian Uniates. The R.O.C. came out of the war as an in-

vigorated, rehabilitated, respected, and desired partner of the Soviet regime. At what time the leaders of R.O.C. became involved in plans concerning the suppression of the U.C.C. is difficult to prove. It is likely that this did not happen before the end of 1944.

In this regard the initial attitude of the Soviet government toward the Uniates in the re-occupied and the newly occupied regions was characteristic. In November of 1944 a special Council for denominations other than the R.O.C. was established and attached to the Soviet of People's Commissars headed by Polianskyi. It was designed to administer, among others, the Uniates (Greek-Catholics).⁴

The initial attitude of the new regime seemed also to be conciliatory. For example, the death of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptyts'kyi (November 1, 1944) was duly reported in the Soviet press; his funeral was respectfully observed with homage paid to an undisputed Ukrainian spiritual leader by Soviet leaders of Ukraine, including Nikita Krushchev. Note was taken of the ascendance to the Metropolitan See by Archbishop Josyf Slipyj and this too was reported in the press. In December, 1944, Metropolitan Josyf made a serious attempt to normalize relations with the new government. A delegation, headed by the late Metropolitan's brother, Hegumen Klementii Sheptyts'kyi, and including Havryil Kostel'nyk as one of its members, was sent to Moscow. The Uniate delegation was received by the Council for Religious Affairs, however, rather than by other high officials. Nothing tangible was achieved by the Ukrainians, but in Moscow the proposal was made that they cooperate with the Orthodox Church leaders in view of reunification (*vossoedinenie*).⁵

It appears that the failure of this mission was the first hint of what the future held for the Uniates, since it signaled the end of the initial toleration of the Church in Western Ukraine. In February, 1945, the Local Synod of the R.O.C. elected a new Patriarch of Moscow, Aleksei. One of his first public pronouncements was a pastoral letter "To the clergy and the faithful of the Greek-Catholic Church" urging them "to break your ties with the Vatican which, because of its dogmatic errors, leads you into darkness."⁶ Thus the plans of suppression of the Ukrainian Church entered a decisive and open phase which ended in March, 1946, with the well-known L'viv Synod. Instead of relating the facts of this process, I prefer to give an analysis of it.

II

Before discussing the process and methods of forcefully converting Ukrainian Catholics to Orthodoxy, an obvious fact must be stated. This process was possible only as a result of the new politi-

cal reality: Soviet domination over the area. This fact is generally recognized but rarely admitted by its perpetrators. Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev recognized this in his speech in L'viv on the 25th anniversary of the so-called "reunion". He stated:

The victory won by the Soviet people (in World War II) offered favorable conditions for the religious reunion of the Greek Catholics. It only became feasible when, after the liberation of the Western Ukrainian lands, the possibility emerged of suppressing the Brest Union of 1596 which was imposed on our ancestors, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, who are close kin of the brotherly Russian people.⁷

Thus, we have an authoritative statement that the suppression of the Uniate Church was a political act and took place only thanks to the political and military presence of the Soviet regime in the area. I have had an opportunity in another presentation to refer to the strategies and tactics of this process and to look for the models followed in earlier, similar cases.⁸

Certain analogies with the religious developments in the Western Ukraine in 1945-1949 can be discovered in the forceful liquidation of the same Uniate Church in Tsarist Russia on two occasions: in 1839, with the suppression of the Kievan Metropolitan See and Uniate eparchies of Byelorussia and Ukraine; and in 1875, with the violent persecution of the Ukrainian Uniates in the Kholm-Pidliashshia region. In both cases it is possible to single out the strong pressure against the Uniates exerted by both civil administrative authorities and Russian Orthodox leaders. The subversion of the Church body to be converted, and the use of its individual spokesmen facilitated the task as if it had been an initiative from within. Favors were promised to those willing to cooperate, and reprisals applied to opponents. Terror was spread by mass arrests of the "recalcitrants," all efforts at resistance failed, and contacts with potential centers of counteraction, as well as with the outside world, were cut off. In this manner, a climate of desperation and helplessness was created in which the individual either passively gave up resistance or accepted martyrdom. Similar situations occurred in the 1940's, but there was no organized, well-planned and realistically conceived strategy of defense or counteraction. The conditions for that were lacking.

The enormous suffering and martyrdom during both these tsarist "reunions" came as a result of that policy. Its authors may have regretted it, but they used it as a warning and a deterrent. Finally, the government and Church leaders resorted to means of legitimizing the forced conversions through the convocation of Church-lay synods or other types of assemblies of the representa-

tives of the subjected Church body. Occasionally there were efforts to have the situation recognized by "protecting" outside powers.

Another partial analogy can be drawn between the liquidation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in 1930 and the events in Western Ukraine after World War II. In Ukraine as well as in Russia, the communist regime decided to liquidate a national Ukrainian Church because of her actual or potential role in the national movement. In both cases the atheist regime exploited the R.O.C. and her subservient leadership to suppress another politically undesirable religious community. Subversion from within, plus terror against non-compliant resisters, were applied vis-à-vis both national Churches, i.e., the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and the Ukrainian Catholic Churches. The final acts of liquidation were officiated in the name of, and at, the bogus assemblies of those Churches.

One is tempted to draw a parallelism between the church "reunion" in the Western Ukraine and the process of Sovietization in Eastern Europe after 1945. This refers particularly to the methods and tactics used and not so much to the objectives or roles assigned to the agents. Nevertheless, in Eastern Europe the overall goal was the same – to check potential centrifugal forces, to impose patterns of compliance and of total regimentation in the sphere of political control. Some of the specific analogies will appear in the analysis of the process of the "reunion", to be discussed later.

Granted that the objectives and motivations of Soviet conduct were such as we have described, the Soviet rulers still had a number of options in proceeding to neutralize the Ukrainian Catholic Church in her anti-Soviet attitudes. These were:

- a) The Soviet government could theoretically have initiated a blunt anti-religious struggle aiming at the liquidation of the Uniate and other Churches in the newly incorporated Western regions. This would have been a frontal attack against the Church as such, and her believers in the style of early 1920's atheist campaigns. The previous experience, the new religious policy initiated in the 1940's with a view to controlling and exploiting religion instead of making it a sanctuary of resistance or martyrdom, as well as the international situation of the U.S.S.R., militated against such an option.
- b) The Soviet regime had a second option – to recognize the Ukrainian Catholic Church while imposing institutional controls on the compliant hierarchy and clergy; this would have resulted in the existence of a subservient and obliging separate church body in the service of the regime with minimum contacts with the outside world. Such an option might

have developed into a precarious *modus vivendi* along the pattern of R.O.C.—Soviet regime arrangements. Supposedly, this was a solution desired under the circumstances by the hierarchy of the Church herself.

- c) The Soviets in fact chose a middle way with the largest possible returns at minimum cost and without taking unnecessary risks. This option was dictated by historic experience and pragmatism, but without sufficient evaluation of the Western Ukrainian religious and national reality. It consisted of striking a mortal blow at the Ukrainian Church (i.e., her suppression), simultaneously pretending that this was not a classical anti-religious struggle. All efforts were made to present this as an "internal problem" of that Church and the legitimizing devices were skillfully conceived.

The third option became the strategy in the area of Soviet religious policy vis-à-vis Ukrainian Catholics since 1945. This policy was not able to call upon much of the specific experience of 1939-41 since that was only short-lived, the full-fledged policy was neither implemented, or even explored at that time. In this sense, the new policy was the result of an *ad hoc* rationalization, a fresh appraisal of the situation, and, often, of improved decisions; however, these decisions were rational and dialectically consistent with previous experience and with the general politico-ideological posture of the regime.

If we sum up the strategic goals of the Soviet government in the suppression of the Uniates as: a) isolation of the Church from the outside world and other forces of resistance, b) weakening of her position, c) disqualifying her as a national institution, and d) overall preparation for "reunion" to be consummated with apparent legality, then the tactics were subordinated to those operational objectives. Correspondingly, the timetable was designed and the roles divided between the agents.

The process of the "reunion" in the three eparchies of the Halych Metropolia followed more or less the following pattern and chronological timetable.

1. Until February, 1945, there was a phase of relative calm with a sense of uncertainty and of study, observation, and planning on the part of the regime. There was a hope for, and efforts were made by the U.C.C. to find, an accommodation with the new political system (see *supra*).
2. The next phase was one of precarious tolerance of the Church with the aims already advanced regarding the future policy of her unification with the R.O.C. First, attacks were launched

against the U.C.C.'s hierarchy, questioning their loyalty and tarnishing the image of the Church.⁹ This period, lasting only two months (February-April, 1945), coincided with the selective arrests of clergy, and with an active search for collaborator elements among them.

3. From April 11, 1945, until the L'viv Synod (March 8-10, 1946), i.e., for almost one year, there existed a period which may be called an intensive and overt execution of the plans of "reunion." As for tactics, the following synopsis will illustrate them:
 - a) The "reunionist" campaign started with the imprisonment of the hierarchy, accompanied by attempts to find collaborators among them, or to prepare a legal case demonstrating their criminal involvement ("anti-people acts," etc.).
 - b) Then followed consecutive waves of arrests of the clergy next in rank in diocesan centers and locally, with the additional aim of spreading terror and breaking resistance. Major arrests took place at the end of May, 1945 (May 25-26). The mass arrests had a shock effect on the remaining clergy and people.¹⁰
 - c) Those in the ranks of leading clergy (canons, deans, professors of theology, administrators) who attempted to resolve the canonical-administrative vacuum in the absence of bishops (e.g., by trying to elect vicars) were singled out for arrest.
 - d) The main instrument of action, the *Initiative Group* (I.G.) was set up, consisting of a dozen Uniate priests. There is much proof that all its members joined the group only after considerable pressure was exerted upon them and their families (some were married priests). A few of them were recruited to the group after having been jailed. None of the priests, including Archpriest H. Kostel'nyk, a protagonist of the Eastern tradition in the U.C.C., voluntarily embraced the cause.
 - e) The I.G. became the principal tool in carrying out the task of "reunion." Behind this group were the organs of the State political power, the *aktiv* of the Party, Regional, and District Executive Committees, agents of the Council for Religious Affairs, and the NKVD, as well as representatives of the R.O.C.; the latter were sent here from the outside, among them Bishop Makarii Oksiuk who in May, 1945, had taken possession of the Metropolitan See in L'viv and started to run its administrative affairs. He was given the title of (Orthodox) Bishop of L'viv and Halych.

- f) The I.G. made a first public appeal to the clergy on May 25th inviting all priests to register and obtain from that body authorization, "the only one recognized by the government," for pastoral activity.
- g) By a decision of the Ukrainian Council for Religious Affairs dated June 18, 1945, the government of the Ukrainian S.S.R. recognized the I. G. as "the sole provisional administrative organ of the Greek-Catholic Church." The decree, in fact, amounted to the suppression of that Church by the regime since she was prevented from governing herself according to her own canonical status.
- h) The I.G., enjoying the full support of political and police organs, attempted to attract new adherents among the clergy. At district conferences with clergy, a choice was clearly proposed — sign the declaration of support and stay in the parish, or relinquish it immediately and face arrest.¹¹
- i) Organized opposition to these activities was frustrated; for instance, an attempt was made to send a petition to Moscow on behalf of 300 priests, condemning the activity of the I.G. and requesting the release of bishops. Here is a quote from that unusual document sent on July 1, 1945, by the Western Ukrainian clergy:
- "In the name of justice, in the name of the glorious victory of the U.S.S.R., we request for us and our people in Western Ukraine the same freedom of religious self-government which we have enjoyed for centuries, a freedom which is also guaranteed to us by the Soviet law."¹²
- j) As a result of almost one year's active campaign in repressing the Church, its clergy, monastic communities, and the faithful, coupled with efforts to gain among them supporters of the reunion, the following balance sheet results: the entire hierarchy arrested (8 prelates), one-third of the clergy jailed or deported (800-1000), a more or less equal number signed the "declaration of adherence" (according to Soviet sources, 981), one-third formally left their priestly duties rather than join the R.O.C.
- k) Arrests, trials and deportations were designed to produce a cleavage between the Church leadership and the masses. This objective was never achieved. The U.C.C. was highly regarded and it was not easy to tarnish her image. Moreover, the conduct of her persecuted representatives added to her aura as a Martyr-Church.

- 1) Ukrainian political and armed resistance provided some support and a certain degree of protection for the Church. However, it was also a liability for her since many arrested clergymen or church activists were accused of cooperating with the political underground movement. In the initial phase, the church leaders were urged by the government to condemn nationalist resistance and especially the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, known as the U.P.A.
4. After this essential phase of implementing the action plan for "reunion" came its finalization. This consisted of at least three events or activities:
 - a) the formal, secret admission of the initiators into the R.O.C. along with the consecration of two of them (Rev. Mykhailo Mel'nyk and Rev. Antonii Pel'vets'kyi) as Orthodox bishops in February, 1946, in Kiev;
 - b) simultaneous secret trials of the hierarchy headed by imprisoned Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj, in the capital of Ukraine; similar military trials against lower clergy were staged in West Ukrainian cities,
 - c) convocation of a Church Synod in L'viv, March 8-10, 1946, with the purpose of legitimizing the *fait accompli*, i.e., suppression of the U.C.C.

The L'viv Synod (or *Sobor*) lacked all representative character as a voice of a Particular Church of close to 4 million faithful, and it was void of canonical validity according to both Orthodox and Catholic canon law.¹³

As for this last stage, the Soviet government scrupulously tended to stay in the shadows and attribute a purely ecclesiastical character to all activities. True, there were political references in speeches and debates, and the Synod sent a message to Stalin, together with one addressed to Patriarch Aleksei. But formally the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church was received by the R.O.C. without any legislative or other intervention by the secular power.

The L'viv Synod denounced the Brest Union by which the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Churches entered into unity with Rome in 1596. The Synod also formalized the "reunion" with the Russian Orthodox Church under the Moscow Patriarchate. (The term itself is contradictory, since the Church of Rus' prior to the Brest Union was a dependency of the Constantinople Patriarchate and not of Moscow.) The L'viv Synod which nominally terminated the Union of Brest was followed by two consecutive acts suppressing the remnants of the Uniate Church in other Ukrainian ethnic territories:

1. The union of Uzhorod of 1646 was abolished in the Transcarpathian diocese of Mukachiv in August 1949 under the rather unconventional setting of a religious manifestation in the city of Mukachiv.
2. The same Union was once more formally abrogated for the diocese of Priashiv in Eastern Slovakia in April 1950, by a clergy-lay assembly in the same city.

Consequently, three variations of the same model of forceful liquidation of the Uniate Church evolved: ecclesiastical synod, religious-popular manifestations, and the intermediary form of a larger assembly. There were, of course, some differences and specific features in each case.

III

Official acts of the dissolution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church obviously did not solve the problem of the Uniates in the U.S.S.R. She continues as a disturbing factor in the Western Ukrainian socio-political panorama with repercussions far beyond that area. One of the consequences of the suppression of the U.C.C. was her submergence into the underground.

"The continued existence of the 'catacomb' Greek Catholic Church has been serving as a reminder of the unstable nature of ecclesiastical 'reunion' with Moscow," writes Bohdan Bociurkiw, a noted authority on Soviet religious policy.¹⁴

The post-L'viv Synod (post-1949 in the Mukachiv diocese) situation of the Ukrainian Catholics was marked by the following events or developments.

The Stalinist period continued the previous policy of the government. Additional arrests and pacifications of the Uniates accompanied the process of consolidation of the Orthodox victory, gained by the regime. For instance, the R.O.C. authorities, not without government participation, pressed for the "Orthodoxization" of former Uniates. This was an effort to impose on former Uniate clergy and parishes Russian Orthodox customs, liturgical traditions, and rituals. This program was rather passively accepted, although locally it did not work as anticipated.

Active opposition against the Soviet government because of its religious policy appeared on the political plane. The nationalist underground movement embraced the cause of the Uniates from the very beginning. A number of leading priests who took part in the movement which started as anti-German resistance were members of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR). In 1945-50, some Catholic priests were active in guerrilla groups as

chaplains, while other priests and nuns found protection in the nationalist underground. It is significant that the "Manifesto to Ukrainians Abroad" addressed by the leadership of that movement in 1949, was among others also signed by Rev. Lavrivs'kyi as "Head of the Underground Ukrainian Catholic Church." It is known, that the representatives of the movement abroad appealed to the Vatican for the appointment of a bishop-chaplain to the Ukrainian Army.

Soviet sources exploited the close relationship between the outlawed Uniate Church and the political underground by attributing the killing of Rev. H. Kostel'nyk in 1947 to the "Ukrainian fascist bands acting under orders of the Vatican." Fr. Kostel'nyk's death was surrounded by mystery. Unlike the case of the Soviet Ukrainian writer Anatol' Galan, who actively participated in anti-nationalist propaganda, Ukrainian guerrillas really did not in 1947 have a valid reason to kill Kostel'nyk, one of the initiators of the Uniates' suppression. Should he have been a target of the nationalists, they were in a position to liquidate him much earlier, say in 1945, when they were stronger, and could have achieved some tangible result from his disappearance. It is more likely that he was liquidated by NKVD agents because of the fear that he knew too much about the way the whole "reunion" was arranged. They wanted to silence forever the only major witness to this process of the regime's involvement in religious affairs. Incidentally, two other collaborators, Bishops Mel'nyk and Pelvets'kyi died suddenly and under suspicious circumstances in the mid-1950's. (This was the time when Shelepin headed the KGB.)¹⁵

Some new developments in the situation of the Uniates occurred in the mid-1950's. This was the period of the initial "thaw" when the survivors of the labor camps returned home, among them many priests and nuns. They had professed their religion in the relative freedom of the camps. No one could have expected that they would cease to practice it in Ukraine. Thus, Western Ukraine experienced a revival of the "Underground Church" under Krushchev's rule. As early as 1957, some Uniate priests petitioned the authorities for recognition of the Greek Catholic communities under Soviet legal regulations concerning the exercise of the freedom of cult. Naturally, such initiatives were rebuked but local authorities tolerated the activities of Uniate priests which went so far as conducting services, administering sacraments, limited charitable activity among friends, private religious instructions of children, and even training for the priesthood. A few small monastic communities began to operate, the printing and the distribution of prayerbooks and icons was organized, and the ordinations of priests and, even more astounding, the consecrations of secret bishops, were held.¹⁶

Attempts to legalize the Uniate communities with the authorities multiplied but they failed. With the increased pressure of the Krushchev regime against all religions which began in 1962, and with the closure of some existing churches and prayerhouses, a defensive action by the believers was launched. Uniate priests, as independent clergymen, urged the people to protect their rights and, at times, overtly challenged the authorities.

This revived activism, particularly after 1968, when the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia was legally re-established, alarmed both the civil authorities and the spokesmen for the R.O.C. whose vital interests in the very existence of the Western Ukrainian regions were challenged. The latter resorted to the proven path of urging the Soviet authorities to extinguish the remnants of Uniatism in Ukraine. Metropolitan Filaret requested this of the First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Petro Shelest. The representatives of the regime were anxious to intervene against resurgent Ukrainian Catholicism for their own reasons — to weaken dissent in general in view of a rising coalition among all factions of opposition in the Soviet Union whether political, religious, literary, or ethnic. There is now ample evidence testifying to this trend from 1965 on.¹⁷

As a result, the government attacked this front with a new wave of arrests, trials, and reprisals. The secretly consecrated bishop, Vasyl' Velychkovs'kyi (1903-1973), was one of the victims arrested and sentenced in 1969. This policy of persecution is fairly well documented in the *samvydav* (Underground publications in Ukraine) and other sources. It is still being practiced, as most recent information testifies.¹⁸ Again, the reason why the Soviet regime singled out the U.C.C. appears to be its close relationship with the national interest of Ukraine. A specialist in anti-religious scholarship, Professor V. Tancher of Kiev University, has written:

All churches serve the interests of the exploiting classes. But the Uniate Church played a particularly reactionary role. Uniate believers desired an opposition between the Ukrainian and Russian nations; they wanted to see the countries quarrel, they attempted to isolate these two friends from each other. Religious differences shook the foundations of Ukraine's unity.¹⁹

IV

Thus, the present Soviet attitude to the Ukrainian Catholics continues to be that of repression, non-recognition as a legally established group, and consistently, that of opposition to the U.C.C. beyond the Soviet sphere of control. The R.O.C. continues in this

regard to play the same auxiliary role that she has played in the last thirty years. There again the interests of both the regime and the official Church coincide. One may ironically surmise that the very existence of the R.O.C. in Ukraine or, at least her relatively unobstructed activity, is due to the fact that Ukrainian Catholics are still active and challenge both the regime and the R.O.C. Under such circumstances, the Russian Orthodox Church continues to offer her usefulness and instrumentality to the regime for the struggle against its main enemy in the area, the Uniates.

The timely relevance of the perseverance and persecutions suffered by Ukrainian Catholics has been dramatized in the most recent issue of the *samvydav* publication, *Ukrains'kyi visnyk* (Ukrainian Herald) where report is given of how the ideological department of the Communist Party of Ukraine handles the situation of the Uniates. According to *Ukrains'kyi visnyk*, the repressions were intensified after the matter of Uniate activity was brought before the Politburo of the Communist Party of Ukraine:

V. Malanchuk (a member of the Ukrainian Politburo) stated that the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine has not been completely liquidated, and that the party must give more attention to this matter since the Church has always been the vanguard of Ukrainian nationalism.²⁰

As a result of new party measures, Ukrainian Catholic priests are subjected to increased persecution as they continue to perform their pastoral duties under extremely harsh conditions. "They are abused, imprisoned, and tortured."²¹

While applying pressures and reprisals against religion and especially against Ukrainian Catholics, the Soviets attempt to present their own policies abroad as liberal and tolerant. Not only representatives of the party and government but also official representatives of the Churches are obliged to condone such policy. During the recent stay in the U.S.A. of a large religious delegation from the U.S.S.R., its head, Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev, the Ukrainian Exarch of the R.O.C. was asked at press conferences in New York and Chicago about the persecution of the Uniates. He consistently denied such "allegations" and stated that the people of Western Ukraine "voluntarily" joined the R.O.C. in 1946; according to Filaret they are content with the existing situation, and do not desire a "separate Ukrainian Church."²²

The problem of the Uniates, according to this Orthodox prelate, has been adequately solved, and presently does not exist any more in the U.S.S.R. However, there exists ample evidence to the contrary stemming from many sources, including those in the Soviet Union. The facts and developments related here cannot be

denied. They indicate that the problem of the Ukrainian Catholics in the Soviet Union does exist. It is there, unresolved, complex, painful, and pregnant with many unpredictable consequences.

This has been confirmed by the Russian religious dissenter, Anatolii Levitin-Krasnov (now an émigré in the West) who said that the Ukrainian Uniate Church "became an organic facet of life in Western Ukrainian territories." Noting the enormous sufferings of Ukrainian Catholics, "beaten and broken by the violation of their consciences," Levitin-Krasnov calls on international authorities to intervene in this grave matter of human persecution under the illusory auspices of an international detente:

It behooves the U.N. Commission (of Human Rights) to come to the defense of the persecuted Uniates. This is a matter of elementary humanity.²³

¹*Religion in the Soviet Union* (London, 1961), p. 227.

²For an analysis of the liquidation of the U.C.C., see Ivan Hryniokh, "The Destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the Soviet Union," *Prologue*, vol. IV (New York, 1960), pp. 5-51; an expanded version of this work appeared in Ukrainian: *Znyshchennia Ukraïns'koi Katolyts'koi Tserkvy rosiys'ko-bil'shovyts'kym rezhymom* (Munich, Suchasnist', 1970). A well documented survey of the developments in 1945-1965 is presented by Bohdan Bociurkiw, "The Uniate Church in the Soviet Ukraine: A Case Study in the Soviet Church Policy," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. VIII (1965), pp. 89-113. See also this writer's "Religion and Nationality: The Uniates of the Ukraine," in: *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe*, edited by B. Bociurkiw and J. Strong (London, 1975), pp. 101-122; and "The Suppressed Church: Ukrainian Catholics in the Soviet Union," in: *Marxism and Religion in Eastern Europe*, edited by R. T. De George and J. P. Scanlan (Dordrecht, Holland, 1975), pp. 105-118. In 1971, two students of Hunter College, New York, Liuba Kostyryba and Isabel Pepe compiled a valuable, albeit only partial, bibliography on the Ukrainian Catholic Church after 1945; this work, conducted under direction of Dr. Andrew Q. Blane, remained unpublished. The Soviet view of the so-called L'viv Synod is presented in: *Diiannia soboru Hreko-Katolyts'koi Tserkvy u L'vovi 8-10 bereznia 1946. Vydannia Prezydii Soboru* (L'viv, 1946). Cf. also "Selected Bibliography" at the end of this volume.

³Harvey Fireside, *Icon and Swastika. The Russian Orthodox Church under Nazi and Soviet Control* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 179-180.

⁴*Izvestiia*, June 1, 1944.

⁵*Izvestiia*, Dec. 30, 1944. On the results of this mission, see I. Hryniokh, *op. cit.*, p. 12 (Ukrainian ed.).

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷*Pravoslavnyi visnyk*, 1971 (Kiev), No. 7, p. 10.

⁸See "The Suppressed Church. . ." in: *Marxism and Religion in Eastern Europe*, pp. 106-108.

⁹V. Rosovych, *Z khrestom chy nozhem* (L'viv, 1946).

¹⁰See Hryhorii Budzyn's'kyi, "Zaiava" in *Ukrains'kyi visnyk*, vol. I-II, (1970, published in Paris-Baltimore, 1971), pp. 66-71.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹²I. Hryniach, *op. cit.*, p. 33 (Ukrainian ed.).

¹³For an analysis of the canonical aspects of this Synod, see I. Hryniach, *ibid.*, pp. 36-53; additional criticism can be found in Fr. Budzyn's'kyi's "Statement" *op. cit.*

¹⁴B. Bociurkiw, "The Orthodox Church and the Soviet Regime in the Ukraine, 1953-1971," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. XIV (1972), p. 198.

¹⁵Aleksander Shelepin ordered the assassination of two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile, Lev Rebet (1957) and Stepan Bandera (1959). According to the information received from private sources in Ukraine, Bishop M. Mel'nyk was urgently invited to Kiev where, he died suddenly upon his arrival; there was suspicion among his relatives that he was poisoned. Bishop Pel'vets'kyi's death was also sudden. According to eyewitnesses, Fr. Kostel'nyk's murder was skillfully staged by Soviet secret police.

¹⁶Numerous facts on the repression of the Ukrainian Catholic "Underground" Church in recent years are found in *Ukrains'kyi visnyk*, vol. I (Jan. 1970), pp. 56-71; vol. II (May, 1970), pp. 204-205; vol. IV (Jan. 1971), pp. 98-100 ("*Suchasnist'*" publication); vol. VI (March 1972), pp. 159-160, 162; vol. VII-VIII (Spring 1974), pp. 134, 138-145. All *Ukrains'kyi visnyk* volumes except vol. IV were published abroad by *Smoloskyp* (Paris-Baltimore).

¹⁷Political dissenters in Ukraine and spokesmen for the Human Rights Movement in the U.S.S.R. in general expressed their solidarity with the persecuted Ukrainian Catholics, e.g. V. Moroz, A. Sakharov, A. Solzhenitsyn, A. Levitin-Krasnov and others. The editors of the *Ukrains'kyi visnyk* made the following statement in response to critical remarks from certain readers concerning the *Visnyk's* extensive coverage of the religious situation in Ukraine: "Religious persecutions, including the wanton liquidation of the Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church by the henchmen of Beria, were illegal and unconstitutional, and therefore *Ukrains'kyi visnyk* will write on them in the same way as on other similar issues. By the way, the person who collected information about the persecution of Greek Catholics is not a practicing Greek Catholic himself — as far as we can judge, he is an atheist". See *Ukrains'kyi visnyk*, vol. III (1970, i.e., Winnipeg-Baltimore, 1971), pp. 108-109.

¹⁸*Khronika tekushchikh sobytii*, vol. 35 (March 31, 1975), reports on recent arrests of Ukrainian Catholic priests in Western Ukraine, among others of two secret bishops, Frs. Dwyterko and Slezniuk. Quoted from *Russia Cristiana*, vol. XVI (143) (Milano, 1975), p. 56.

¹⁹*Pravda Ukrainy* (Kiev), No. 28, 1968.

²⁰Published in *Svoboda* (Jersey City), June 14, 1975 (English section).

²¹*Ibidem*.

²²*Svoboda*, February 22, 1975 (English section).

²³"Soviet Writer Appeals to U.N. against Persecution in Ukraine," *The New World* (Chicago), Nov. 22, 1974.

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AND THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH*

George Szumowski

Emulating faithfully and applying with fanatical brutality Karl Marx's slogan the *religion is the opium of the people*, the government of the USSR institutionalized a permanent persecution of religion in general, of religious organizations, especially the churches and of believers. Many bishops, priests, faithful, Christian and Muslim, lost their lives; nearly all churches and houses of prayer are closed; the citizens are inundated with anti-religious propaganda published at the expense of the state; mere suspicion of being a believer is sufficient to exclude a citizen from any advancement in his vocation, to exclude him permanently from the professions; and cause other grave disabilities.

In response to an inquiry of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1964, directed to all member nations, the Soviet Government denied that there had ever occurred any persecution by governmental bodies on account of religion or membership in an ethnic or racial group. The Constitution of the Soviet Union, especially Art. 104, guarantees full religious liberty and tolerance, while at the same time the same government uses the same article to insure freedom of anti-religious propaganda by actively supporting all efforts directed against the persons and the religious institutions of the believers.

Over the past decades, loud voices have been heard in the international arena against the suppression of religion in the USSR. The representatives of Judaism have protested with insistent frequency. The Roman Catholic Church has discussed it at the Ecumenical Council Vatican II, and has drawn the attention of the world to this persecution. On behalf of the Ukrainian Orthodox

*The paper, read in Ukrainian, is here summarized by Monsignor Victor J. Pospishil. It was published in Ukrainian under the title "Soviets'ka vlada, relihiine pytannia i Ukrains'ka Pravoslavna Tserkva" in *Svoboda* (Jersey City, New Jersey), May 31, June 3, 4 and 5, 1975 (No. 104 to 107).

Church in the free world, His Eminence Metropolitan Mstyslav has submitted energetic and well-documented protests to the United Nations, and has sent petitions to the governments and statesmen in the free world, pleading with them to take up this matter before the United Nations Committee for Human Rights. Unfortunately, all these appeals have remained "voices in the desert."

After the fall of the Russian Empire, the government of the Ukrainian National Republic confirmed on January 1, 1919, the existence of an independent (autocephalous) Ukrainian Orthodox Church. A Supreme Ecclesiastical Council was established, which on May 5, 1920, declared the total separation of this Church from the Russian Orthodox Church. The All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council elected in 1921 Metropolitan Vasyl' Lypkivs'kyi (1854-1938) head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Under his leadership the Church developed rapidly, and in 1927 the Church counted 30 bishops, 2,300 priests and more than 3,000 parishes. The communist government of Moscow and the Russian Orthodox Church of Moscow joined forces in order to annihilate the independence and autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. This liquidation involved the physical slaying of many bishops, priests and church members. The venerable religious shrines were stripped of all artistic treasures of gold and precious stones to have them sold for the benefit of the atheistic government. The Russian Patriarchate disbanded the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and erected its own Exarchate in Kiev. The Russian bishops began at once with the Russification of church life, supported in this by the government.

The relaxation in the battle against the Orthodox Church allowed by Stalin during World War II was of short duration and this time of grace never extended to the Ukrainian Orthodox people. During the occupation of Ukraine by the Germans, it was possible to re-establish the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church under Metropolitan Polikarp Sikors'kyi (1875-1953) though she had to contend with a so-called Autonomous Ukrainian Orthodox Church that was supported by Moscow. In spite of the political and economical difficulties in a country overrun by warring armies and although the number of the clergy was small, there was a miraculous renaissance of all expressions of religious life. However, it could not last long, and when the fortunes of war turned in favor of the communists, the bishops, the clergy and many of the faithful had to abandon their country and flee to the West.

The Soviets returned to Ukraine together with the Communist Party and its extensive apparatus of anti-religious activities, accompanied also by the Russian Orthodox Church. The same de-Christianizing and de-Ukrainizing process was started over again, not rarely entrusted to be executed by sons of the Ukrainian nation,

as the present Patriarchal Exarch of Ukraine, Filaret Denysenko. This Exarchate counts today 18 dioceses with some 3,000 parishes, but only an insignificant number of priests. The forceful liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine and its incorporation into the Russian Orthodox Church placed under Soviet power a large group of active Christians. This compelled the Soviets to tolerate for the time being in Western Ukraine much larger limits of religious freedom than in other parts. Actually, from the 3,000 Ukrainian parishes mentioned above, 2,500 are in this former Catholic part of Ukraine.

Ukraine, once rich in monasteries, has now only nine active ones left, among which are the ancient and distinguished Pochaiv Lavra, the Pokrovs'kyi and the Florovs'kyi Monasteries in Kiev, and the monasteries in Mukachiv, Oleksandrivka, Chumaliv, Korets' and Zolotonosha. Only one clerical seminary is now left, in Odessa, with approximately 100 students. The majority of the bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine are Ukrainians, chiefly from the western parts, i.e., Galicia and Volhynia. While most bishops are engaged in their pastoral duties, some are sent abroad in order to promote political aims of the Soviet Government. Thus, the Exarch of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, Metropolitan Filaret, has appeared on numerous trips in all parts of the world.

As to the faithful themselves, alongside the majority of the clergy, they can do nothing but suffer in the patient hope that the gates of hell will not triumph in the end over the Church of Christ.

THE UKRAINIAN BAPTISTS: A CASE STUDY IN SOVIET PERSECUTION AND THE RESISTANCE TO IT

Roger Hayden and Michael Bourdeaux

I. Introduction: History

Although, historically, the Ukrainian Baptists form an entity with their own development and leadership, they have never considered their particular denomination of the Christian faith to be a vehicle for Ukrainian nationalism. Rather, they have been more successful than Soviet institutions in engendering an ideal of brotherhood which does not suppress national characteristics. At the same time, the specifically Ukrainian contribution to the Soviet Evangelical Christian and Baptist movement, both in the past and now, is intensely strong.

It is one particular aspect of this — the role of Georgii (Iurii) Vins and his family in the "Reform Baptist" movement — which is the subject of this paper. The introduction, however, deals with the historical perspectives and the supplementary section mentions just some of the wealth of recent information which cannot be treated in a short paper. In covering the crucial developments of the last fifteen years, we must keep the USSR as a whole in mind as the constant background to what we are saying, firstly because — in contrast to the Soviet campaign against the Orthodox Church and the Eastern-Rite Catholics — that against the Protestant Churches does not have any easily-identifiable special characteristics relating to Ukraine; secondly, because the general severity of Soviet policy has led to constant imprisonment and exile, resulting in a spread of Ukrainian Protestants in many areas of Siberia and elsewhere.

In highlighting the Baptist movement in this paper, we are picking out by far the most important aspect of Protestantism in Ukraine. We simply record the fact that other Protestant denominations exist more than marginally: Lutherans (among the German community), Reformed, Mennonites, Pentecostals, Seventh-Day Adventists, as well as Jehovah's Witnesses (whom Soviet com-

mentators would list loosely but not strictly correctly within this grouping). It is not possible to draw these together for consideration within the confines of one paper, because they retain such individuality that one cannot generalize about them.¹

To clarify an initial point of terminology, it is more correct to speak of "Ukrainian Baptists" than "Russian Baptists." Those usually designated by the latter phrase in the imprecise language of Western observers are neither specifically Russian (they come from all over the Soviet Union), nor are they Baptist (they have belonged, from 1944, to a united Evangelical Christian and Baptist Church, with some adherents also from among the Pentecostals and Mennonites). But the Baptist movement in the Tsarist Empire was of specifically Ukrainian origin and did not merge with other Protestant groups from different areas of the Soviet Union until the end of the Second World War.

There was a strong German influence in Ukrainian Baptist origins, but this rapidly became assimilated and transformed into a totally spontaneous and genuine expression of Ukrainian peasant piety. There were Lutheran, Reformed, and Mennonite preachers active in Ukraine by the mid-nineteenth century. They gathered people together for "Bibelstunden" — Bible-study hours — whence they acquired the name *Shtundysty*.² The 1850's and 60's was the era of the emancipation of the peasants. Their interest in Protestantism became one of the modes of expression of their determination to shake off the domination of the Orthodox Church, the religion of the oppressive state authorities. As Walter Kolarz states: "It was the religion of the prosperous German colonists and this alone was sufficient to instill a certain respect for it among the less fortunate Ukrainian smallholders and labourers."³

The German Baptist leader, Johann Gerhard Oncken, spent some time in Ukraine from 1869 and soon used his organizational ability to weld these different groups together into a specific denomination. He led the first mass baptism of adult Ukrainians in 1871. The Baptist Union was formally founded in the Russian Empire at a conference held in 1884 in the Ukrainian village of Novo-Vasylivka, near Berdiansk, in the Zaporozhe Province. For twenty-one years the authorities banned it, but the new laws promulgated after the 1905 Revolution permitted it legal existence. The leaders organized the first open congress in Kiev, attended by a hundred delegates; in 1907 the first Protestant journal of Ukraine, *Baptist*, began publication and the next year a publishing company was established.

This was the era of the influential Russian Protestant, Ivan Stepanovich Prokhanov, a man with a Western theological education (at the Baptist College in Bristol, England), who became leader of the Russian Evangelical Christians, a movement which

had originated about the same time as the Ukrainian Baptists in the circles of the St. Petersburg nobility. Prokhanov tried to merge the two groups into one. Although there were no significant differences in the theological orientation of the two, the union was not effected in Prokhanov's lifetime (he died in 1935), because of their very different social origins and resistance by Ukrainians to Prokhanov's dominating personality which he seemed to them to be using to attempt to take over the whole movement on his own terms. Moreover, there was also tsarist police activity preventing unity conferences. There is no evidence that any specific Ukrainian nationalist tendencies hindered the union which eventually took place in 1944.

But this was not until the Ukrainian Baptists had experienced two totally contrasting periods of history in quick succession after the 1917 Revolution. For a time it looked as though the groups worst oppressed under the tsars (including most religious denominations other than the Russian Orthodox) would have a substantially better deal under the Soviets. The years 1917-27 have been called the "Golden Decade" for the Protestants. During them publishing activities expanded, in Kiev as well as in Leningrad. The Baptist printing house issued, for example, 10,000 copies of a partial edition of the Bible (Kiev, 1927), and a *Concise Guide for Preachers*.⁴ Protestant collective farms and communes sprang up in various parts of the Soviet Union and there were Bible schools in Leningrad and Moscow which Ukrainians could attend. The secretary of the Baptist organization, Ivanov-Klichnikov, who had been arrested over thirty times under the tsars, attended the Baptist World Alliance Congress in Toronto as late as the end of 1928 and was still able to speak optimistically about the future.⁵

Already the net had started to close in on the threatened Ukrainian Baptists, as on their Russian Evangelical counterparts. The *volte-face* of Soviet policy was as sudden as it was catastrophic, with Stalin inexorably drawing all the reins of control into his own hands. The era of the purges had begun. In April 1929, Stalin tightened the legal controls on all religious communities. Ivanov-Klichnikov was arrested a few weeks after his return from Toronto; most Ukrainian Baptist leaders soon shared his fate. Many did not survive the camps, though those who did tenaciously carried their faith into remote corners of Siberia which had never before known Christianity, let alone Protestantism.⁶ This remarkable, almost undocumented, page of Christian history saw Ukrainian and other Protestant leaders compensating through their heroism for the collapse of the Bible schools, the publishing and even the congregational and organizational structure which had been such a feature of the "golden decade."

As early as 1929, Baptists in Volhynia and Kiev were charged

with engaging in under-cover espionage activity for the hostile foreign power of Poland.⁷ The Soviet regime declared Ukrainian Baptists — then, as now, among the most reliable and conscientious workers in the whole of Soviet society — to be guilty of industrial sabotage.

The closing of Christian ranks under this persecution brought various groups much closer together than ever before. Baptist pastors, where there were any, looked after Evangelical Christian congregations, and *vice-versa*. By the time the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, the two groups were ready for the union which the Soviet State undoubtedly facilitated, but in the effecting of which it cannot be said to have been the prime mover. Some of those who took over leading roles in the new organization (All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists: AUCECB), were released from prison by the regime to do so, but there is no information on what kind of threats were made or what conditions imposed. The regime encouraged these leaders to travel in the "new territories" acquired by conquest after the German retreat and secure the allegiance of potentially-recalcitrant Protestant groups,⁸ but whatever the nature of the compromise, the Soviet regime had in fact permitted the emergence of a movement more spiritually powerful than ever before, bearing the marks of suffering, and bringing together in a common allegiance Protestants from all over the Soviet Union. Ukrainian congregations and their leaders played a fully constructive role in this new era of consolidation and expansion, reinforced by the stimulus of acquiring new congregations in the Western Ukraine, which had formerly been under Polish and Czechoslovak rule and had not suffered the experience of the purges.

Surprisingly, but in common with most other religious communities throughout the Soviet Union, Ukrainian Baptists led a far more untroubled existence under Stalin, at the end of his life, than they did under his supposedly-liberal eventual successor, Khrushchev.

II. Renewed Persecution

The strange alliance of Church and State, which had evolved out of a common concern to defend the Soviet Union during the Second World War, came to an end in the late 1950's. Khrushchev launched an extensive anti-religious campaign to educate the populace in "scientific atheism."⁹ The campaign aimed to point out the total incompatibility of science and religion, and the no less radical opposition between communist and religious morality. In Ukraine alone, over 7,000 anti-religious agitators were assigned to "individual work" with believers. All branches of the media were involved. Secular rites were vigorously promoted; some specifically

designed to replace religious festivals.¹⁰ Chairs in the history and theory of scientific atheism were established, initially at Moscow and Kiev.

There was a revision of the administration procedures which effectively reduced the number of religious institutions, narrowed the range of permissible religious activity, and introduced "new crimes." Moreover, there was a deliberate policy of hiding or obscuring what the revised law said.

Believers, both young and old, also had problems. "Individual workers with believers" (in the Soviet phrase) sought to persuade them against Christianity. If persuasion failed, then threats were made regarding jobs, salaries, education.

Ten thousand Orthodox churches and nearly 2,500 Baptist chapels, were closed in this period. But most disturbing of all was the attack by the State on Church life itself. Revised "Church Statutes" and an accompanying "Letter of Instructions" were distributed in Spring 1960 to all Baptist churches under the name of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

III. Emergence of Opposition: The Ukrainian Role

The involvement of their religious leaders in the demolition of the visible Church and the perversion of saving faith, whether by compromise or complicity, were seen by a critical core of Baptists as acts of infidelity and betrayal which had to be exposed and resisted. An Action Group (*Initsiativnaia grupp*a) for setting up a Congress was formed on August 13, 1961. It had strong Ukrainian participation from the first, especially in the person of Georgii Vins (see below) and A. F. Prokofiev who secured Ukrainian support for his movement at the outset.¹¹

The Action Group delivered a letter to the AUCECB office in Moscow calling for repentance, for compliance with the New Statutes by all AUCECB officers and a Baptist Congress which would rectify the statutes and elect a new leadership. All Baptist churches received a letter detailing the action, and a request was made to the government for an All-Union Congress.

During 1961-1962, the Action Group repeatedly attacked the AUCECB leadership and pressed for a Congress, claiming in a letter to the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, that the present Council had not been elected by the churches, had not been authorized by them and did not represent them. They also claimed that the AUCECB had cut themselves off from the masses of believers and abolished the rights of local churches to self-determination. The AUCECB held an enlarged session from November 29 - December 2, 1961, "in connection with the activities of the so-called Action Group."

By February 25, 1962, the Action Group had noted the failure of the official leaders to repent, and made its own plans to call a Congress, drawing up a list of acceptable statutes and one of "anti-church activities" of the Council. In an enlarged conference held on June 23, the Action Group excommunicated the Council and several senior presbyters.

All this resulted in a host of unauthorized meetings and the circulation of *samizdat*, just at the moment when the Soviet State was waging a vicious restricting attack on religion. A wave of arrests and trials ensued. By January 1963 more than 100 Baptists were in prison, a number of them Ukrainians.¹²

The Action Group now began to plead that the State call off its religious persecution, emphasizing the fundamental illegality of many of the State's actions, particularly its trespass on the inner life of the Church.

The result was that for the first time since 1944 an AUCECB Congress was allowed. It met October 15-18, 1963, in the Moscow Baptist Church, with 450 present. The 1960 Statutes and Instructions were modified. However, the fact that the Action Group received no advance warning of the Congress and were forbidden to present a statement shaped their response and they dubbed it a "pseudo-Congress."

By now the Action Group was subjected to further reprisals designed "to suppress the illegal activities of the followers of the Organizing Committee," particularly in Ukraine.

IV. The Role of Georgii (Iurii) Vins

Georgii Vins (born 1928) experienced as a child the very worst of Stalin's purges. His father died in a labor camp in 1943. However, Vins somehow obtained higher education and was first employed as an economist at Kiev.¹³

It was apparently his opposition to the new anti-religious policy introduced by Khrushchev which eventually led to his call to the ministry. When the New Statutes and a Letter of Instruction were sent out by the AUCECB, A. L. Andreev, the senior Baptist pastor in Kiev, is believed to have pressed them home very hard on his congregation. Vins challenged him.

Having decided that a stand must be taken against the encroachment of the state on internal Church affairs, Vins, from 1960-64, was actively involved in a series of meetings and writing documents to the government authorities, the AUCECB leaders, Baptist believers throughout the Soviet Union and to the Baptist World Alliance.

It is in 1964, however, that Vins and his mother, Lidiia, now appear in the front of the reform movement, and the Action Group now begins a third phase of its development. They now attempted

to secure an audience with Khrushchev, since they believed the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults was "the main culprit for all the inner-Church disorders and repressions."

It is at this point that the significant part played by Vins appears. Together with P. S. Zinchenko of the Organizing Committee, Vins shared in a series of telephone conversations primarily with M. A. Morozov, a director within the Ideological Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, who claimed that their request for a Congress was being referred to the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults.

On June 4, 1964, Vins and Zinchenko met the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, and an assistant at the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults for three hours. Charge and counter-charge dominated the conversations and consequently nothing was achieved.

By September 17, 1964, the Organizing Committee were still unconvinced of any real change of government policy, but, nevertheless, they had achieved some verbal concessions in the Council, which said it was prepared to reconsider policy towards the Evangelical Christian and Baptist believers. In Spring 1964, public opinion abroad was being aroused for the first time, which gave the struggle an international dimension. Above all, the Baptists had secured their first Congress for twenty years. No less significant was the hearing the Reform Baptists had at a very high national political level which secured them direct contact with the Council.

Around this time, there were some extremely important more general developments in Church-State relationships.

In January 1964, the Party journal *Partiinaiia zhizn'* had reported that the Ideological Commission had prepared a plan for "promoting the Atheist Education of the Population."¹⁴ The study of scientific atheism was to find a place within the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR. A battalion of "atheist cadres" were to be trained for the struggle against religion at all levels of society. Khrushchev's removal from power temporarily stayed the program's advance. But by the end of 1966, the new leadership unveiled a remarkably similar policy which forecasted harsh treatment for "uncooperative" believers.

The Organizing Committee went into formal schism at a special secret session in Moscow, on September 18-19, 1965. The group adopted a new name, and since then have been known as the Council of Churches of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (CCECB).

The persistent pleas for a Congress were not met, and so on May 16-17, 1966, five hundred CCECB members from all over the Soviet Union converged on the buildings of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow to demonstrate for an opportunity to have their case heard. Georgii Vins and Gennadii Kriuchkov (another leading member of the Action Group and subsequently elected Chairman of the CCECB) walked openly into the offices and along with thirty others were arrested on May 19. Vins and Kriuchkov were tried under extremely difficult conditions in November 1966, in Moscow. Both men received three years' imprisonment.

According to Vins' own record, the prisoners' convoy left Moscow on February 20, 1967. Towards the end of March it reached "Chapechanka" labor camp in an unpopulated region of the Northern Urals.

In this camp Vins met with two other Baptists and carried on active Christian prayer and evangelism. This ministry, however, was not allowed to continue for long. As Vins himself explains:

"Within three months we were once more on the prisoners' trail."¹⁶

The reason for this removal was the effective evangelism of the three Baptists. Vins reports the camp commandant's remark, "Another six months and half the camp will be Baptists!" A special commission from Moscow arrived in the camp in June, 1967, with the intention of stopping this. On July 6, Vins and another Baptist went via Solikamsk to the "Aniusha" camp in Kizel, Perm region, where he served the remainder of his sentence.

Within a year Vins' health was beginning to decline seriously. On May 15, 1968, the Council of Baptist Prisoners' (see below) reported that, though healthy when sentenced, he now suffered from high blood pressure, heart disease, and a double inguinal hernia threatened with strangulation.¹⁷ Vins simply records that his health worsened in January 1968, and he thought that perhaps the end had already come.

Vins was not free from harassment even in prison:

In the summer and autumn of 1968, KGB officials were constant visitors to the camp. I was summoned to conversations lasting many hours. They suggested, cautiously at first, and then quite blatantly, that I should collaborate with them against the Church. There were threats, and also offers of an early release. But at what a price! The price for an early release was betrayal of God and His works! At the end of September, I took no food for ten days, demanding that the KGB should leave me in peace.¹⁸

Vins was eventually released in May 1969. He celebrated his release in a short poem. (Many of such writings of his have reached the West.) This is an extract:

RETURN

I stand once more at the family doorway,
I breathe the fragrance of the fields of home.
The hard road is left behind,
The road of convoys and *taiga* camps.

And He who is the nearest and dearest of all,
Who is the cornerstone of our life,
Who increases our strength in the battles of the faith,
Watches over us from heaven with a gentle smile!¹⁹

While Vins was in prison, his wife and children also suffered. Nadezhda (Nadiia) Vins was discriminated against because of her husband's imprisonment. Though she possessed a degree in foreign languages, the only job she could get in Kiev was selling ice cream. Their daughter Natasha, according to an open letter of May 25, 1968, was "terrorized at school."²⁰

V. Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives

Vins' mother, Lidiia, had become a leading member of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives after the 1966 demonstration when some of its leaders were imprisoned. The CBPR was formed by the women folk of the prisoners to campaign for those in prison. No such organization existed in any communist country before this group of Evangelical Christians and Baptists was formed on February 23, 1964, in Moscow.²¹

The CBPR had clear objectives. It kept churches informed about the persecution and imprisonment of Christians all over the USSR; encouraged prayer for specific people; and kept a file on all prisoners and children of Christian parents who were removed to state boarding schools.

The CBPR has supplied the West with much of its information. The material is marked by objectivity, integrity, and the deep spirituality of those suffering. Typical of the detailed material sent to the West is that published in *Christian Appeals from Russia*, which reports, among other things, the beating of a Kiev pastor.²²

A most remarkable aspect of the CBPR's work is the documented list of prisoners with all important facts carefully recorded.²³

When the CBPR convened a Conference in Kiev in December, 1970, it was overshadowed by the arrest of the aging Lidiia Vins. This situation called forth a new development. It was the publica-

tion of the *Bulletin of the Council of Prisoners' Relatives*, the first issue appearing in April 1971. It contains copies of appeals sent to the government, exhortations to the churches, and news of events far and wide.

Lidiia Vins' trial took place in Kiev on February 8-9, 1971. She spoke calmly and confidently, pointing out the absurdity of a trial in which only those who were guilty of acts of persecution appeared as witnesses. She received a sentence of three years' deprivation of freedom.²⁴

VI. Georgii Vins' Second Arrest

By this time Vins had been Secretary of the CCECB for just over one year. Since his release he had not been free from official harassment. His activity as a pastor in Kiev was curtailed. Despite being an elected officer of the Church and the fact that his church notified the authorities of this in a letter dated January 21, 1970, he was sentenced to one year's forced labor, with a ten per cent wage deduction, by a Kiev local People's Court. The sentence was to be served at home and Vins was assigned to work at the Kalinin Factory in Kiev.²⁵

By mid-summer 1970, Vins was under great pressure, and a new criminal case was being prepared against him. He was served with two summonses which he failed to obey. At the end of August 1970, he left the Kalinin factory in order to continue a fulltime spiritual ministry. In October 1970, the CBPR reported that Vins was charged on two issues and had been forced to leave home to fulfill his church duties.

The Christian activity of Georgii and Lidiia Vins provoked the atheist Ukrainian monthly, *Liudyna i svit*, to launch a savage attack on them.²⁶ The Kiev church came to the defense of the Vins family in a statement signed by 180 believers, dated January 6, 1971. They protested against the persecution of Georgii and the arrest of Lidiia.

At the end of March 1974, Vins was arrested and held incommunicado in a Kiev prison. His family and his Kiev church appealed for his release, lodging various petitions with the authorities. On September 29, 1974, Lidiia Vins, not having dared to see her son since her release from prison in November 1973, addressed an appeal to Amnesty International giving details of three charges to be brought against him under the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

In the autumn the chorus of support for Vins began to grow. Anatolii Levitin, just days after being exiled to the West, urged Vins' plight on the BBC. The World Council of Churches received a request for a Christian lawyer to be present at the trial, and Dr. Philip Potter wrote to the Soviet Government and to AUCECB

leaders about Vins. A Baptist World Alliance delegation pressed Vins' case at the AUCECB Congress held in Moscow in December, 1974, and secured an interview with the Council for Religious Affairs Department. They also revealed that AUCECB leaders had appealed on his behalf a few weeks before. Andrei Sakharov also urged the West to take up the case of Vins. An American, Senator Harold Hughes, asked Dr. Henry Kissinger to discuss the issue with Russian leaders. But it was all to be of no avail.

Vins was eventually tried in Kiev at the end of January 1975, and received a ten year sentence, five years in a labor camp, and five years more in exile.

On February 24, 1975, Lidiia Vins wrote a brief account of her son's trial, which she says, "was not a court tribunal — it was an act of violence." Because of the absence of a Christian lawyer, Vins refused to defend himself. He rejected the entire court presidium as invalid, asking that a scientific and Christian tribunal investigate his case. Vins was accused of falsifying reality in his writings *Vernost'* and *Semeinaia khronika*, of violating the law on religious cults, and violating the rights of citizens. When the sentence was read out, all the Christians who had managed with great difficulty to enter the court-room, threw flowers to Vins. Her daughter Natasha climbed on a seat and said:

"No, daddy, the Church will not die. With Christ you are free in prison. And freedom without Him is prison."²⁷

Outside the court five hundred believers had gathered. They began to sing, but Vins was secretly led out another way.

The activity of Georgii Vins over the last fifteen years and of those who support him both in Ukraine and other republics forms one of the most remarkable episodes in the development of a desire for religious liberty and human rights in the Soviet Union. Vins' ideals are democratic in the truest sense. The originality and bravery of what he has been doing has yet to be properly appreciated in the West, though it is already obvious that his significance far exceeds the confines of both the Evangelical Christian and Baptist Church and of Ukraine.

¹Information about all of them is available in the files of Keston College. For general background, see the relevant chapters of Walter Kolarz, *Religion in the Soviet Union* (London, 1961), to which we are also grateful for information about Baptist history in the introductory section of this paper.

²Waldemar Gutsche, *Westliche Quellen des russischen Stundismus* (Kassel, 1956); A. V. Karev, "Russkoe Evangel'sko-Baptistskoe dvizhenie",

in *Bratskii vestnik*, 3 & 4 (1957); see also the unpublished thesis by Andrew Q. Blane, deposited at Duke University, North Carolina, 1964, *The Relations between the Russian Protestant Sects and the State*.

³W. Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

⁴For a more complete account of this publishing activity, see Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

⁵*Baptist Times*, London, October 11, 1928.

⁶Some vignettes from this story are recounted by Vins in his *samizdat* manuscript, *Vernost'*, now in process of translation at Keston College and to be published by Hodder and Stoughton, London, in 1976.

⁷W. Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 305; cf. Boris Kandidov, *Tserkov i shpionazh. O nekotorykh faktakh kontrrevoliutsionnoi i shpionskoi deiatel'nosti religioznykh organizatsii* (Moscow, 1938), pp. 71-73.

⁸W. Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

⁹For a full study, see William C. Fletcher and Donald A. Lowrie, "Khrushchev's Religious Policy, 1959-1964," in *Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967*. Edited by Richard H. Marshall, Jr., Associate Editors: Thomas E. Bird and Andrew Q. Blane (Chicago, 1971), pp. 131-155; and Michael Bourdeaux, 1) *Religious Ferment in Russia* (London, 1968; henceforth *RFR*); and 2) *Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today* (London, 1969; henceforth *P&P*).

¹⁰Vello Salo, "Anti-religious Rites in Estonia," *Religion in Communist Lands*, vol. 1, nos. 4-5 (July-October, 1973; henceforth *RCL*), pp. 28-33; the bi-monthly journal of CSRC, Keston College.

¹¹*Sovetskaiia Moldaviia*, Kishinev, January 27, 1963. For documents on the emergencies of the schism in the period 1960-67, see M. Bourdeaux, *RFR*.

¹²M. Bourdeaux, *RFR*, pp. 212-29.

¹³Information from Michael Bourdeaux, *Faith on Trial in Russia*, (London, 1971, henceforth *FOT*).

¹⁴*Partiinaiia zhizn*, Moscow, Jan. 2, 1964, pp. 22-6. See M. Bourdeaux, *P&P*, pp. 39-41.

¹⁵Partial transcript in M. Bourdeaux, *FOT*, pp. 110-30.

¹⁶All this section based on Vins' autobiography, *Semeinaia khronika*, now in process of translation at Keston College and to be published by Hodder and Stoughton, London, in 1976.

¹⁷See M. Bourdeaux, *FOT*, p. 147.

¹⁸See 16 above, chapter entitled "My Labour Camp Diary."

¹⁹*Ibidem*.

²⁰See paper prepared by CSRC, "The Vins Family," for *Radio Liberty Research Bulletin*, November 8, 1974, p. 4.

²¹See Bourdeaux, *RFR*, pp. 83-93 (on origins).

²²Rosemary Harris and Xenia Howard-Johnston, eds., *Christian Appeals from Russia* (London, 1969), p. 57.

²³See M. Bourdeaux, *RFR*, pp. 211-29; and *RCL*, Volume 1, no. 2 (March-April 1973), pp. 18-27.

²⁴See 16 above, chapter entitled "My Mother's Imprisonment."

²⁵See 20 above, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

²⁶*Liudyna i sviat*, Kiev, 1970, No. 12, pp. 43-46.

²⁷Unpublished report of brief article in *Baptist Times*, Feb. 27, 1975.

APPENDIX

Selected Keston College Holdings of Original Samizdat from Ukrainian Baptists

1. July 31, 1966 *Open Letter* to Brezhnev from A. I. Koval'chuk, Rivne.
2. February 2-7, 1967 *Trial* of N. P. Shevchenko, Ia. N. Krivoi, S. P. Soloviova, V. I. Alekseeva, H. H. Borushko, V. T. Tymchak, V. M. Zaborskii in Odessa.
3. February 25, 1968 *Open Letter* to Brezhnev, Podgorny, Kosygin, Rudenko, Andropov, Shchelokov, and Gorkin from ECB community in Kiev.
4. March 20, 1969 *Bill of Indictment* against A. Ia. Antonov, Kirovohrad.
5. May 13, 1969 *Open Letter* to Brezhnev, Podgorny, and Kosygin from young ECB believers of Odessa and Odessa oblast' (district).
6. May 22, 1969 *Sentence* of N. I. Nikolaev, Novo-Troiany, Odessa oblast'.
7. August 27, 1969 *Sentence* of S. N. Misiruk, selo (village) Usarovo, Odessa oblast'.
8. October 10, 1969 *Declaration* to Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives from the four children of prisoner N. I. Nikolaev, Novo-Troiany, Odessa oblast'.
9. October 10, 1969 *Complaint* to Podgorny from 117 inhabitants of Novo-Troiany, present at trial of N. I. Nikolaev.
10. March 30, 1970 *Open Letter* to all Christian mothers from V. Ia. Zinchenko, Kharkiv.
11. August 18, 1970 *Complaint* to Kosygin, Grechko, the Chairman of the Party Supervisory Committee, Kutakov, Council of Prisoners' Relatives, Council of Churches from V. K. Kondratiuk, Rivne.
12. Undated, 1970 *Abbreviated Communication* from A. N. Hnidenko, selo Budo-Makiivka, Cherkasy oblast'.
13. January 6, 1971 *Declaration* to Kosygin, Podgorny, Brezhnev, Rudenko, and Hlukh from 180 members of ECB community in Kiev. Reply to article attacking Vins family in *Liudyna i svit*.
14. July 28, 1971 *Bill of Indictment* against N. A. Mashnyts'kyi, Vynnytsia.
15. January 24-27, 1972 *Typical Court Case* of ECB believers H. D. Zheltonozhko and N. T. Troshchenko, Mykolaiv.

16. January 29, 1972 *Complaint* from P. F. Petrovka, Kryvyi Rih.
17. July 1973 *Open Letter* to Brezhnev, Podgorny, World Federation of Youth, Council of Prisoners' Relatives, Council of Churches and all believers from 50 young believers of the ECB congregation in Kharkiv, in *Bulletin of the CBPR*.
18. April 18, 1974 *Appeal* to Kosygin and Podgorny from four of Georgii Vins' children.
19. April 21, 1974 *Declaration* to Kosygin, Rudenko and Kuroedov from 174 members of the ECB community in Kiev.
20. April 25, 1974 *Telegram* to Kosygin and Rudenko from Nadezhda Vins, Lidiia Vins and four children.
21. June 28, 1974 *Open Letter* to all Christians from G. Iu. Rytikova, Krasnodon.
22. July 26, 1974 *Bill of Indictment* against S. H. Ohorodnyk, A. N. Honcharov, A. T. Tysiachuk, and I.A. Mashnyts'kyi, Vynnytsia.
23. September 15, 1974 *Declaration* to the International Committee for the Defense of Human Rights from the Mashnyts'kyi family, Vynnytsia.
24. December 1974 *Request* to Kurt Waldheim from 27 ECB believers in selo Khutory, Cherkasy oblast'.
25. Undated 1974 *Defense Speeches* of B. M. Shokha, I. L. Budzynovs'kyi, H. A. Romanovych and I. A. Zdorov, Saki, in *Vestnik spaseniia*, No. 1-2, 1974.

SESSION TWO:

THE VATICAN

AND

THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

THE VATICAN AND UKRAINE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Miroslav Labunka
Chairman of the Session

The theme of this Session, the Vatican and the Ukrainian Catholic Church, is by its nature a complicated one. Any student of the relations between the Holy See and a particular country — any country as a matter of fact — discovers soon that his task is not an easy one. Difficulties exist regardless whether he deals with the past or the present. In the case of Ukraine this task is even more difficult.

Neither the Ukrainian public nor even Ukrainian scholars are able to view relations between the Vatican and Ukraine in their proper historical perspective and with the necessary objectivity. These relations are often examined from the point of view of the individual investigator, or with the vested interests of particular groups of people in mind. Past events still have too great an influence upon the present realities, and contemporary relations are too often interpreted in the light of the past. Because of this, the history of the relations between the Holy See and Ukraine has not yet been written.¹

The historiography of relations between the Holy See and Eastern Europe is in itself a topic worthy of serious study. In this historiography several opposing schools are represented, e.g., the Russian — usually hostile to Rome, and the Polish — more often than not favorable and even flattering. In Ukrainian historiography both of these attitudes are strongly represented, and this is understandable in the light of past and present religious divisions within the Ukrainian nation.

* * *

The participants in the Symposium who will present papers at this session: Fr. Fitzsimmons, a canon lawyer, Fr. Mowatt, whom I would like to call a missionary, and Professor Bilaniuk, who could best be described as an ecclesiologist, will, I am sure,

enlighten us on various aspects concerning the present relations between the Holy See and the Ukrainians. I myself would like to recall a few instances from the past which illustrate these relations.

* * *

Although the ancient Rus'-Ukraine was in the cultural and political orbit of the Eastern, Byzantine Empire and developed eventually as a "daughter civilization" of this imperial society and of the second Rome (i.e., Constantinople),² the first Rome was never completely ignored or rejected in Rus'. Indeed, the first Rome was often remembered and sought out by rulers of Rus'-Ukraine and by other Ukrainian lay and ecclesiastical leaders, especially in times of crisis. It is rather interesting to note that somehow critical periods in Ukraine coincided with, resulted from, or were part of crises which beset European society at this or that particular time.

The tenth century, for example, was a critical period in the history of Rus'-Ukraine and for Europe in general. It witnessed the final effort by both Rome and Constantinople to convert the remaining non-Christian peoples on the European continent (viz. the conversion of Scandinavian nations, of Poland, of Rus', and of Hungary). For all these peoples Christianization signified the beginning of a new period in their cultural and political life. Rus'-Ukraine was the only one of the countries mentioned which accepted Eastern Byzantine rather than Western Roman Christianity. Prior to the time when this conversion actually occurred (988), however, Rome had made an effort, in connivance with the princely court of Kiev, to prevent the future success of Constantinople. I am referring here to the Rus' mission (961-962) by the Benedictine Monk, Adalbert of Trier (subsequently Archbishop of Magdeburg, d. 981), during the reign of Princess Ol'ha of Kiev (d. 969).³

The eleventh century brought about the final division of the Universal Christian Church (1054) into the two separate Churches — the Eastern Byzantine Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic. During this century the reformed Roman Papacy was involved in a prolonged struggle with the Western, German Empire for control over the Church and Western European society in general. While the Papacy in 1054 freed itself of the remaining vestiges of the Eastern imperial authority over the Church, it was also waging war against the domination of the Church by the Western imperial power and by lesser European rulers and secular lords in various Western European countries. The two protagonists of this struggle at its high point, Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) and Emperor Henry IV (1056-1106), are well known and remembered, as is also the momentous victory of the Papacy at Canossa (1077). The Investiture Controversy (the confrontation between *sacerdo-*

tium et imperium) was viewed and presented to the general public by the Papacy as a fight for *libertas ecclesiae*, i.e., freedom from an alleged oppression by secular lords.⁴ The Papacy and the *sacerdotium* won substantial freedom from secular power for the Church at that time, i.e., then as well as later during the struggle against encroachments by German Hohenstauffen and other European rulers (in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries). This freedom secured the Church's independence as well as the relative freedom of its clergy to engage in spiritual and temporal activities among the faithful. This is how and why the Church was able to influence these people and maintain religious discipline among them to the end of the Middle Ages and, to a lesser extent, for centuries thereafter. But the year 1054 and the Investiture Controversy left Europe and Christian society divided into opposing and hostile camps. This division found its repercussions in the ancient Ukraine, which experienced its own difficulties in the second half of the eleventh century due to the succession strife among the sons of Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054).⁵ When deposed from his throne of Kiev and exiled by his younger brothers, Sviatoslav (d. 1076) and Vsevolod (d. 1093), Grand Prince Iziaslav (d. 1078) sought refuge and help at the court of Henry IV, but soon sent his son and heir apparent, Yaropolk (d. 1088), to Pope Gregory VII to ask intercession on his behalf in his struggle to regain the patrimonial throne in Kiev and the personal treasury appropriated unlawfully by Boleslaw II (d. 1083) of Poland.⁶ While in Rome, Prince Yaropolk and his wife, Irene, seem to have received royal crowns.⁷ The Roman visit by Yaropolk and his wife, Irene, took place in 1075. Thus, the year 1975 is the nine hundredth anniversary of this historic event, which, it should be said, is often recalled and commented upon by Catholic historians, both Ukrainian and foreign, and — no less frequently — ignored by others.

The most crucial single event in the history of Eastern Europe and of Rus'-Ukraine in particular was, no doubt, the Mongolian-Tartar invasion in the thirteenth century. This invasion brought about significant changes in the political structure of ancient Rus' and subsequently had a considerable influence upon the future cultural development of the Ukrainian nation. In its early stage the Tartar invasion threatened imminent destruction to the rest of Europe. The Mongolian thrust to the West was thus a political crisis of all-European importance. And it is from this early period of the Tartar invasion and occupation of Ukraine that interesting documents have been preserved in the Vatican Archives which deal with relations between the Holy See and Ukrainian princes, especially Daniel (d. 1264) and Vasyľko (d. 1271) of Volhynia and Galicia.⁸ This documentation reveals that the two mentioned Ukrainian princes must have viewed the Roman Papacy as a force

which could have helped them defend themselves against the superior Tartar Empire. The Papacy, on its part, was also genuinely interested in aiding Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples in this predicament. For the promised help by the Roman Catholic Europe, Ukraine had, it should be said, to pay a price. The price was union of the Ukrainian Church with the Roman Catholic Church. The promised help seemed to have been conceived by the Papacy as military action in the form of a crusade against the Tartars (which did not materialize), and as pacification of the Great Horde by Catholic missionaries, several of whom were in fact able to reach the court of the Great Khan. Both of these well-intentioned attempts failed, however, and the union of Churches was not effected.

Notwithstanding the outcome, two events from the period of these active relations between the Holy See and the princes of Western Ukraine stand out and should be mentioned here. The first was the presence at and the participation in the Ecumenical Council of Lyons (1245) by a Ruthenian-Ukrainian Orthodox Bishop, Petro Akerovych (probably the Archbishop and Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Rus'). He delivered an address in the presence of Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254) and the Council Fathers on the Tartars and the danger they represented for Western Europe. His address contained first-hand information on this new aggressor.⁹ The second event was the coronation of Prince Daniel of Galicia with a papal royal crown by the Apostolic Legate Opizo in 1253.¹⁰ The tolerance exhibited at the Council of Lyons toward an Orthodox bishop from Ukraine and the gesture of 1253 exemplify some of the better intentions of the Holy See in the past toward Ukraine and its representatives.

The "Babylonian Captivity" (the period of the Avignon Papacy) and the Great Schism within the Roman Catholic Church during the fourteenth century, on the one hand, and the continuous occupation of the greater part of the Ukrainian territory by the Tartars, on the other hand, mark a less fortunate period in the history of both the Holy See and the Ukrainian nation. It should be added that it was during this fateful fourteenth century that the independence of the Western Ukrainian principalities of Volhynia and Galicia came to an end when the native dynasty died out.

The next century witnessed the conclusion of the Union of Florence (1439) between the Eastern Orthodox and Western Roman Catholic Churches.¹¹ The temporary success and subsequent failure of the Union were due to political developments of the time, i.e., the Ottoman Turkish threat to and the eventual conquest of Constantinople (1453), as well as of the remnants of the Byzantine Empire (soon thereafter). It would be incorrect to assume, how-

ever, that all the actors of the drama of Florence acted only with political considerations in mind and were devoid of genuine Christian ideals and of the never-dying ideal of the One Universal and United Christian Church. The initial success of this Union was, to a great degree, the work of the distinguished Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Rus', Isidore (d. 1463 in Rome), and he was the one person who could least be blamed for its failure.¹² Being himself a Greek, Isidore represented at Florence, in addition to his own nation and its state, the Byzantine Empire, three Eastern Slavic nations — the Ukrainian, the Byelorussian, and the Muscovite (Russian), and two powerful states — the Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy.

The Union of Florence was resurrected and re-enacted at Brest Litovsk (Berestia Lytovsky) in the next, i.e., the sixteenth century.¹³ The Union of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Church with the Roman Catholic, concluded in 1596, divided the population of these two nations into religious camps which, it should be added, still exist in mutual separation, negation, and hostility. Much has been written on the subject of the Union of 1596; not much, however, with objectivity. From a perspective of more than three and a half centuries it should be possible now to draw general conclusions concerning the Union of 1596 and its results for Ukraine.

It has been often said that each of the parties interested in effecting this Union, the Ukrainian-Byelorussian hierarchy, the Papacy (also the Roman Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), and the government of Poland-Lithuania pursued their own political ends. It would be too much to enumerate and to comment upon these ends here, as well as to describe their eventual fulfillments and/or failures. Besides, this is being done too often anyway. However, two things can and probably should be said. The first is that the Union of 1596 was a phenomenon which fitted into the period of time when unification and centralization were pursued by practically every European country. This general trend was strengthened and accelerated by the Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation. It led eventually to the emergence of European mono-national states as we know them today. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which included Ukraine and Byelorussia, was not, it should be said, an exception to this trend, albeit it was not able to achieve either political or religious unity (even with the Union of the Churches) and preserve it. The second thing is that the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniate) Church, which emerged in 1596, was able to survive, despite all the vicissitudes of politics in Eastern Europe, until the present times as a national institution of the faithful in western parts of present Ukraine.

Following the Union of Brest Litovsk a new period began in

the relations between the Ukrainians and the Holy See and continued until the most recent times. During that prolonged period the Ukrainian Catholics remained, on the whole, loyal to Rome. Their hierarchy and clergy, directed at first by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and then by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches (since 1917) executed faithfully Roman instructions and were usually obedient to the Vatican curial officials. In return, Rome was able to ascertain their relative security and freedom under various regimes of neighboring Catholic countries (e.g., Austria-Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia) which occupied western Ukrainian territories in the past. During the same period the Ukrainian Orthodox had little if any contact with the Roman Curia.

* * *

The situation for the Ukrainian Catholic Church and its faithful has changed drastically since World War II, however.¹⁴ Immediately following the War, this Church faced the prospect of, and subsequently experienced, gradual liquidation by new regimes in Eastern Europe. At the same time it experienced expansion and gained some strength in the diaspora, namely in the United States of America and in Canada. It is this latest period in the history of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and in the relations between the Ukrainians and the Holy See that is the object of this Symposium.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to say that the survival of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as an institution which has served a great many Ukrainians over three and a half centuries was in itself an achievement worthy of being remembered, especially when one considers that the Ukrainians did not enjoy independent statehood for most of that time and were, therefore, unable to develop and to preserve for long their other national institutions.

At present, this same Church is struggling for its survival and *libertas* against the secular powers which are bent on destroying it. In this struggle, the Ukrainian Church and the faithful justly expect help from Rome which, unfortunately, does not always come when it is most needed.

¹⁴Particular events of these relations and comments upon them, quite often reflecting the views of individual authors, can be found in: Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, t. I-X (New York, 1954-1958; reprinted by Knyho-spilka from earlier editions); Ivan Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys istorii ukrains'koi Pravoslavnoï Tserkvy*, t. I-IV/1 (New York—Bound

Brook, N.J., 1957-1961); E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi Tserkvi*, t. I-II in 4 vols. ([The Hague, 1969], a reprint from previous editions); Mykola Chubatyi, *Istoriia khrystianstva na Rusy-Ukraini*, t. I (do r. 1353) (Rome—New York, 1965). (= *Editiones Catholicae Universitatis Ucrainorum. Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*, vol. XXIV-XXVI); Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukrains'ka Tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom. Narys istorii ukrains'koi Tserkvy* (Philadelphia, 1954); Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den aeltesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, Bd. I-II (Würzburg—Wien, 1879-1881); Eduard Winter: 1) *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine 955-1939* (Leipzig, 1942; cf. also a Ukrainian translation, *Vizantiia i Rym v borot'bi za Ukrainu*, Prague, 1942); 2) *Russland und das Papstum*, Bd. I-III (Berlin, 1960-1972); B. Ia. Ramm, *Papstvo i Rus' v X-XV vekakh* (Moscow—Leningrad, 1959); and A.M. Ammann, "Gedanken zu einigen neueren Veröffentlichungen aus der früh-russischen Kirchengeschichte," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, Bd. IX (1960), pp. 97-122. See also "Selective Bibliography," pt. I, at the end of this volume.

²Cf., for example, Dmitri Obolensky, "Russia's Byzantine Heritage," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. I (1950), pp. 37-63; Georges Florovsky, "The Problem of Old Russian Culture," *Slavic Review*, vol. XXI (1962), pp. 1-15, especially pp. 6-7; Ihor Sevcenko, "Three Paradoxes of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission," *ibid.*, vol. XXIII (1964), pp. 220-236, especially pp. 225-226 and 231-236; and A.A. Vasiliev, "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?" *Speculum*, vol. VII (1932), pp. 350-360. For general background on Byzantine and Rus'-Ukrainian relations, see Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *op. cit.*, t. I-VI; and Eduard Winter, *Byzanz und Rom . . .* and/or the Ukrainian translation of the same work.

³See Albert M. Ammann, S.J., *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna, [1950]), pp. 12, 13; and Mykola Chubatyi, *op. cit.*, pp. 176, 183, 192, 193. Sources and literature cited in both of these works.

⁴Cf. *Studi Gregoriani per la storia della libertas ecclesiae*. A cura di A.M. Stickler, O. Bertolini, O. Capitani, H. Fuhrmann, M. Maccarone and J.J. Ryan (Rome, 1972). (= *Studi Gregoriani*, vol. IX); and P. Hlisch, "Der Kampf um die *Libertas Ecclesiae* im Bistum Prag," in *Bohemia sacra. Das Christentum in Böhmen: 973-1973* (Düsseldorf, 1974), pp. 295-306.

⁵For the general background on this and subsequent developments in Kievan Rus', see Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *op. cit.*, t. II (1954), pp. 51-71 and *passim*; S.M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen v piatnadtsati knigakh*, kn. I (t. 1-2) (Moscow, 1962), pp. 350-367; Julian Pelesz, *op. cit.*, Bd. I, pp. 137-142; Mykola Chubatyi, *op. cit.*, pp. 371-401; and E. Golubinskii, *op. cit.*, t. I, ch. I, pp. 600-603.

⁶See two letters by Gregory VII addressed to Iziaslav and Boleslaw respectively, in *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia* (1075-1953). *Collegit, introductione et adnotationibus auxit* Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I (Romae, 1953), nos. 1-2, pp. 5-6 and 7-8.

⁷See A.W. Ziegler, "Gregor VII. und der Kijewer Grossfürst Izjaslav," *Studi Gregoriani*, vol. I (1941), pp. 387-411; A.H. Velykyi (A.G. Welykyj), "Korona Danyla Romanovycha: 1253-1953," *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni, series II, sectio II: Articuli, documenta collectanea, miscellanea, bibliographia*, vol. II (1954), pp. 95-104, cf. pp. 100-103; Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi.

kyi, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-82; and Mykola Chubaty, *op. cit.*, pp. 377-392. Cf. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *op. cit.*, t. II, pp. 64-65; and S.M. Solov'ev, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-359.

⁸See, for example documents nos. 11-35, in *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia...*, vol. I, pp. 27-51.

⁹See S. Tomashivs'kyi, "Predtecha Isydora, Petro Akerovych, neznanyi mytropolyt rus'kyi 1241-1245," *Zapysky Chyna sv. Vasylia Velykoho*, t. II (1927), pp. 221-313; D. Doroshenko, *Pravoslavna Tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu zhytti ukrains'koho narodu* (Berlin, 1940), p. 26; Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi, *op. cit.*, pp. 114, 124-125; and Mykola Chubaty, *op. cit.*, pp. 603-614.

¹⁰See A.H. Velykyi, "Korona Danyla Romanovycha...", *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni*, series II, sectio II, vol. II (1954), pp. 95-104; M.M. Voinar, "Korona Danyla v pravno-politychnii strukturi Skhodu (Vizantii)," *ibid.*, pp. 105-118; E. Kamins'kyi, "Korona Danyla v pravno-politychnii strukturi Zakhodu," *ibid.*, pp. 119-125; Ivan Khoma, "Skhidno-evropeiska polityka papy Inokentii IV," *ibid.*, pp. 126-136; M. Stasiv, "Korona Danyla i tatory," *ibid.*, pp. 137-152; and I. Nazarko, "Vplyv staro-rus'koho khrystiianstva na monholiv," *ibid.*, pp. 153-163. These contributions were first read by the authors at the Conference of the Shevchenko Scientific Society held in Rome 1953, on the occasion of the 900th Anniversary of Prince Daniel's coronation.

¹¹For general background, see J. Gill: 1) *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, Engl., 1959); and 2) *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (Oxford, 1964). Cf. also Oskar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest* (1439-1596). 2d ed. ([Hamden, Conn.], 1968).

¹²For biographical data and literature on Metropolitan Isidore, see works listed in the footnote no. 11; and "Miscellanea in honorem Cardinalis Isidori (1463-1963)," *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni*, series II, sectio II, vol. IV (Rome, 1963), especially "Prefatio" by A.G. Welykyj, pp. VII-X, and "Isidore's Tradition" by O. Halecki, pp. 27-43.

¹³For the literature on the Union of Brest Litovsk, see "Selective Bibliography," pt. I.

¹⁴On the contemporary problems of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, consult "Selective Bibliography," pt. II.

THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE RECENT ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

Eugene J. Fitzsimmons

Just a little over ten years ago on the same day that the Successor of Peter together with the Successors of the Apostles promulgated the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)*¹ they promulgated the juridic *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* which they described as of venerable antiquity and as being witnesses of that tradition handed down from the Apostles through the Fathers which is a part of Divine Revelation. The two documents, the doctrinal one and the juridic one, acknowledge that lamentable fact of history that Christians are divided. This scandalous division is found among the Christians of the East as well as of those of the West.

That same day that the world's Catholic Episcopate published the two mentioned documents, they signed and promulgated another Conciliar enactment, the juridic *Decree on Ecumenism*, announcing—as Pope John XXIII also announced in January, 1959,² when he declared his intention to call them together — that “promoting the restoration of unity among all Christians is one of the Chief concerns of the Second Sacred Ecumenical Synod of the Vatican.” It was this juridic enactment, the *Decree on Ecumenism*, that formally and fully launched the *whole* Catholic Church into the Ecumenical Movement. Non-Catholic Christians had years earlier inaugurated this movement because they were troubled in conscience about the scandalous divisions which prevailed in Christendom. But the Holy See was suspicious of such movements, and for the most part kept Catholics clear of their gatherings.

In the same Canon 1325 of the Code of Canon Law which gives the definition of heresy, apostasy and schism, and which tells Catholics when they are obliged to make an open profession of faith, the legislator stated his warning against Catholics holding conferences or disputations, especially public ones, with non-Catholics without the permission of the Holy See. The commen-

tators point out that these conferences are obviously not seen to be evil *in se* for otherwise they could not be permitted at all. Rather, the disciplinary norm of the Canon reflects what had been the attitude of the Holy See since the early seventeenth century. The Holy Office was accustomed to prohibiting such gatherings on the principle that they would do more harm than good, since false eloquence may cause error seemingly to triumph over truth. The Holy See had been negative even in 1864 and again in 1919 about Catholics participating in the Society for Union of Christendom founded in London. In 1893 the World Parliament of Religions had opened in Chicago with Cardinal Gibbons leading the *Our Father*; in 1895 Pope Leo XIII sent a letter to the United States Apostolic Delegate discontinuing the Catholic participation in such promiscuous religious meetings. The prohibition was repeated for the Lusanne (Switzerland) Conference for Christian Unity in 1927. The Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. sponsored a World Conference of Christian Churches beginning in 1910. In 1914 its secretariat sought by letter the prayers of the Holy Father for its success, and received a gracious reply. In 1919 some of its delegates visited the Holy Father and were received, but at the same time were informed that the Catholic doctrine on the unity of the visible Church of Christ made it impossible for the Pope to join in their meetings.³

In 1948 came a *Monitum* from the Holy Office reminding Catholics the world over of Canon 1325 whereby laymen and clerics, secular and religious, are forbidden to attend "mixed congresses of Catholics with non-Catholics where matters of faith are discussed" without the permission of the Holy See. Much less was it allowed that Catholics should convoke such congresses. And a further word of warning was added in that *Monitum* against participation in "so-called ecumenical congresses." At the same time, the prohibitions against *communication in sacris* were renewed.⁴

In 1949 the Holy Office issued a lengthy "Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement," noting the activity of the Holy Spirit in the growing desire of many who were separated from the Catholic Church to return to the unity of believers in the Lord Jesus. It instructed ordinaries to send well prepared priests to participate by communicating to non-Catholics Catholic doctrine which is not sufficiently known to them. Note the thrust of the Instruction: Catholics are being sent merely to present Catholic doctrine; nothing was said about learning anything from the others.⁵

Fourteen years later, November 1964, the Second Vatican Council's juridic *Decree on Ecumenism* directs Catholics to meet with their separated brothers, *on an equal footing (par cum pari agat)* to understand their outlook. "Catholics need to acquire a

more adequate understanding of the distinctive doctrines of our separated brethren, as well as of their own history, spiritual and liturgical life, their religious and cultural background. Of great value for this purpose are meetings between the two sides, especially for discussion of theological problems where each can deal with the other on an equal footing." (No. 9)

What had happened, of course, to bring about this major advance was the activity of the Holy Spirit guiding the Council Fathers' deliberations as they probed the mystery which is the Church, leading them — and all of us whom they teach — to see the activity of God's grace operating in *all* baptized believers. With the final voting of the Fathers on *Lumen Gentium* we saw a new vision of the Church which went far beyond the definition of Robert Bellarmine⁸ that we all had memorized. Vatican II had given us an organic development of ecclesiology. It had shown in principle, and without using a single *Anathema sit*, that "the Church⁸ constituted and organized in the world as a society, *subsists* in the Catholic Church which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the bishops in union with that successor, although many elements of sanctification and of truth can be found outside of her visible structure. These elements, however, as gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, possess an inner dynamism toward Catholic unity." (No. 8)

It was this major opening in official doctrine that demanded a new attitude toward the Ecumenical Movement. Now that the Church knew this much about herself, she had to search into the realities of the baptized believers who were banded together in Churches and ecclesial communities apart from her visible unity.

In the hidden Providence of God is the reason why only at this late date have we come to know and recognize these things from the sources of Revelation. In that same Divine Providence, hidden from us, is the reason why so many in the East and in the West have suffered imprisonment and death itself for the visible unity of the Church. In the hidden Providence of God, too, lies the future structure that the Church will take when His Grace impels separated Christians into that visible unity which is the Catholic Church. In the meantime we have to prepare the way for that reunion. And that is why the *Decree on Ecumenism* is a juridic document, the enactment of positive laws, rather than a dogmatic statement of lasting value. These laws will some day be of no further use — and that will be the day when Christendom is again one in visible unity. Somewhat analogous is the reason for the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* which is also a juridic document; it proposes means by way of laws to prepare for the welcome into visible unity of those large numbers of baptized believers who, like yourselves, trace your origins to that tradition

handed down from the Apostles through the Fathers. Once that visible unity exists, the provisional or transitory elements in the Decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* will need to be modified because we will then have a different situation. The Decree concludes by noting that:

these directives of law are laid down in view of the present situation, until such time as the Catholic Church and the separated Eastern Churches come together into complete unity (No. 30)

What structure the Church will then have we do not know; therefore what structure the revised norms will endorse we cannot predict with certainty.

The two juridic decrees look toward the future. And the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* prescribes also something for the present. It states:

The Eastern Churches in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome have a *special* role in promoting the unity of all Christians, *particularly Easterners*, according to the principles of the Sacred Synod's *Decree on Ecumenism*: first of all by prayer, then by the example of their lives, by religious fidelity to ancient Eastern traditions, by greater mutual knowledge, by collaboration, and by a brotherly regard for objects and attitudes (No. 24)

Note that the pragraph does not exonerate the Eastern Catholics from working in the area of ecumenism with regard to the non-Eastern separated Christians; it prescribes this. Furthermore, it assigns you a *special role* or task as regards the incorporation of the Orthodox into full communion with the visible Church. Though the text might have been clearer in spelling out the details of the *special role*, it chose to state them in principle. Some applications come to mind. First and foremost is the role of prayer and example. This is so because ecumenism is of God. Its inspiration is from Him, and its purpose is to lead us to Him by leading all Christians into the fullness of His Church; the Church is no mere human thing. If we lose this perspective, we become submerged by political and human, earthly concerns, and true ecumenism vanishes altogether.

Certainly as Ukrainian Catholics you have the distinct advantage of being in the same tradition as the Ukrainian Orthodox, and therefore of understanding their history, their liturgy, their spiritual and liturgical life, their religious psychology, their cultural background. These are the very reasons why your part in the ecumenical dialogue will be so valuable.⁷

Your hierarchy recently requested to erect the Kiev-Halych Ukrainian Patriarchate. You know the answer was negative. The reply to Cardinal Slipyj stated that among the reasons prompting the negative reply there were *ecumenical* reasons. These, as we have said, are necessarily "transitory." The reply did not say that the request could never be granted. For the present, since the patriarchate is not in the tradition or history of the Ukrainian Church, sacrificing this now means fidelity to your tradition. Who can say that in the future, after the hoped-for reunion, episcopal conferences will not develop into genuine "patriarchates"?

I noticed in the most recent Kenedy Directory of Catholic Churches in the USA (1974)⁸ that none of the three Ukrainian sees in the United States lists among the curial officers any person or group who is entrusted with the concern of ecumenism. I thought the lack of such persons strange in the light of the emphasis that ecumenism is receiving in Orthodox circles, in Protestantism, in the Latin Church, and at the level of the Apostolic See. Then I read Monsignor Pospishil's article "An Autonomous Ukrainian Catholic Church" in *Diakonia* where he writes, to my surprise, that: "... the continued existence of the Eastern Catholic Churches is an embarrassment in the difficult task of establishing ecumenical relationships with the Eastern Orthodox Churches."⁹ And in Johannes Hoeck's commentary on the "Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches"¹⁰ I found him stating that the *special role* of the Eastern Catholic Churches in promoting unity was unfortunately more a pious hope than a realistic possibility. This, he says, is due not so much to the attitude of the Eastern Catholic Churches themselves but to the manner in which they came into being and to the fact of their existence. He adds: "In the view of the Orthodox, these small splinter Churches came into being through 'plunder'; that is, through apostasy from the Orthodox Churches, and bear till this day the odium of ignoble competition. Even through the Council, hardly anything can be altered in this regard."¹¹

If I am not mistaken, the very fact that an Ecumenical Council, the Supreme Authority in the Church, by giving Eastern Catholic Churches a *special work* in reconciling the Orthodox Churches, *publicly* testified to their legitimacy. Not only does their existence not stand as an obstacle to true and authentic unity, it does not constitute an obstacle to the reunion of the separated Eastern Churches with the Catholic Church. Your existing Eastern Catholic Churches are, in the view of the Council, a sturdy bridge facilitating unity. The Supreme Authority of the Church, an Ecumenical Council, did not hesitate to reproach even those Catholics who would defame or belittle your Churches. With Father Clement Pujol, I believe that the Ecumenical Council assigned the *special role* in the work of reuniting the Orthodox Churches partly for the

express purpose of answering those who would see the Eastern Catholic Churches as an obstacle to unity.¹² I say this because the Council at this same moment placed emphasis on the role of prayer and example which is so essential to *true ecumenism*. Yes, looked at from the merely human, political perspective, there might be something to the objection . . . but ecumenical activity and ecumenical promptings are not genuine unless they are divinely inspired, divinely motivated, divinely directed. That is why the first task enunciated for your special role in the reconciliation of the separated Churches is prayer, and the second is the example of your lives. Recall that the Council Fathers concluded the *Decree on Ecumenism* declaring that "the holy task of reconciling all Christians in the unity of the one and only Church of Christ transcends human energies and abilities." (No. 24)

I hope that these considerations will encourage you to greater efforts in the task of restoring unity among all Christians and, in particular, to exercising with greater confidence your "special role" in regard to incorporating the Orthodox into full communion with the visible Church.

¹The published version of this and other decrees referred to in this paper, is the English edition by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *The Documents of Vatican II. In a New and Definitive Translation with Commentaries and Notes by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities. Introduction by Lawrence Cardinal Shehan. Translations Directed by Joseph Gallagher* ([New York, 1966]).

²Cf. "From an Address of Pope John XXIII to the Roman Cardinals," (January 25, 1959), in *The Encyclicals and Other Messages of John XXIII. With Commentaries by John F. Cronin (et al.). Arranged and Edited by the Staff of The Pope Speaks Magazine* (Washington, D.C., [1964]), pp. 20-23.

³See T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., *The Canon Law Digest, [Vol. I:] Officially Published Documents Affecting the Code of Canon Law, 1917-1933* (Milwaukee, [1934]), pp. 619-622.

⁴T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., *op. cit.* Supplement 1948 (Milwaukee [1949]), pp. 191-192.

⁵T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., *op. cit.*, vol. III (Milwaukee [1954]), pp. 531 and 436-542.

⁶Roberto Francesco Romolo Bellarmino (1542-1621), a Jesuit and Cardinal of the Roman Church, was a noted apologist of the Counter Reformation. He often engaged in theological disputations with Protestants, including James I of England. He was declared Doctor of the Church by Pius XI and beatified in 1924.

⁷See Walter M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *op. cit.*, "Decree on Ecumenism," No. 9, p. 353.

⁸The reference here is to *The Official Catholic Directory for the Year of Our Lord 1974, Giving Status of the Catholic Church as of January 1, 1974 . . .* (New York, P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1974).

⁹See vol. 6 (1971), p. 252.

¹⁰See Herbert Vorgrimler, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol. I: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Decree on the Instruments of Social Communication, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches* ([New York, 1967]. Original edition in German, Freiburg, 1966), pp. 307-331.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 328.

¹²Clement Pujol, *Decretum Concilii Vaticani II 'Orientalium Ecclesiarum'* (Rome, 1970), p. 153.

THE VATICAN AND THE SILENT CHURCH

John J. Mowatt

I. INTRODUCTION

As we begin the final quarter of the twentieth century, we find humanity in a desperate struggle for justice and peace as it searches for new ideas and theories which will bring about this utopia for mankind. The materialistic philosophy of the German socialist, Karl Marx, was supposed to fulfill all that mankind could possibly desire in this world and so it was forcibly imposed upon millions of peoples beginning in 1917. Being essentially atheistic and rejecting any moral law which is based on transcendental principles, communism cannot fulfill these lofty aspirations of mankind and can only maintain itself by the use of dictatorial force, thus violating all the basic rights and liberties of man. Nevertheless, in spite of the great evil it represents, Marxist ideology continues to seep into every nation, great and small, advanced and developing, so that no corner of the earth is untouched by it. Even such former anti-communist bastions as Spain, Portugal and Italy are falling victim to the "red plague." Communism no longer shows itself in its ugly and perverse dress of days gone by. Long ago it learned to change those of its tactics which alienated religious people and all others who held basic moral values. Today it uses all forms of trickery, double-talk, catchy slogans, and lofty ideas to win the masses over. Well aware of the universal desire for peace, the leaders of communism pretend to be the most zealous promoters and propagandists of world peace and amity. They are the first to organize all sorts of international world congresses and invite the various Christian churches and communities to take part in them. One of their foremost collaborators in these communist-inspired congresses, especially in the international "peace movement," is unfortunately, the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow. It has proven itself, time and again, the useful tool of a regime sworn to dominate the entire world and dedicated to the destruction of the Church and every Christian principle.

While dedicated to the eventual complete destruction of all religion, the leaders of atheistic communism are not averse to using ecclesiastical institutions and persons when they can be advantageous to the advancement of their cause. Not satisfied with the infiltration of the Russian Orthodox Church, militant communists have gained considerable recognition in the World Council of Churches which they have used as a mouth-piece in Southeast Asia and in Africa. Their success in the circles of Protestant Christianity has encouraged them to new goals and they have sought perfidiously to gain entrance into professedly Catholic organizations and institutions. Since the end of World War II they have made great strides in this sphere, having devoted much time and attention to it. Under the cloak of humanitarianism, charity, ecumenism, dialogue, and the so-called liberation movements, they have managed, to an alarming extent, to subvert Christianity and even the Catholic Church itself — long considered their greatest foe. The Moscow Patriarchate has been the Soviet government's staunchest ally and most ardent agent in this world-wide "missionary activity." Russian Orthodox hierarchs and clergy, in the Soviet homeland and abroad, always play a prominent role at every "peace rally," "cultural gathering," and "ecumenical study seminar." They even managed to be the first "official observers" at Vatican II Council after previously having told the heads of the other Orthodox Churches that they had no intention of attending, thus discouraging participation. This deception and arrogance towards other national Orthodox bishops has been rewarded generously; today they are the most sought after of all the Orthodox in certain Vatican circles where they are frequent visitors.¹

The Russian Orthodox Church was not always in a favored position in the Soviet system. Shortly after seizing power in Russia, the Bolsheviks unleashed fierce nation-wide anti-religious persecution and the Russian Orthodox Church, the largest religious body in the country, suffered most from this violence. By 1922, the Russian Church was all but totally destroyed; remnants were constantly persecuted right up to the eve of World War II.² When the Nazi armies invaded the Soviet Union on the morning of June 22, 1941, parts of communist ideology were laid to rest. The "inevitable revolution" could be postponed until the fatherland was out of danger. Immediately, the Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne, Metropolitan Sergei, pledged the complete support of the Church to the defense of the fatherland. By November of 1942, he was hailing Stalin as the "divinely anointed leader" of the Russian people and, little by little, the Soviet State began to make concessions to the Church. After a lapse of 25 years, the Orthodox Church of Moscow was permitted to elect a Patriarch and a group of seventeen bishops held a Synod for that purpose on September 8,

1943, in Moscow. Their choice fell on Metropolitan Sergei, the hierarch who had effected the "reconciliation" of the civil and religious powers within the Soviet Union.³ In this way, the Communist Party found a new way to combat religion: by making use of religion itself. As it became more and more useful to the Soviet State, the more privileges it received so that today it is an official (if only temporary) department of the professedly atheistic Soviet government.

This Soviet strategy had the advantage of furthering the advent of communism in countries outside of Russia and aiding its plans for political hegemony in Europe. The Orthodox Church of Moscow had a well defined place and a specific task to perform within the plan of international communism. It was to be used as a magnet to unite the different Christian communities in Russia as well as those within the communist sphere of influence. The strategy of the master-minds of the Kremlin was to build up a strong, effective Moscow-dominated Orthodox front in opposition to the Catholic Church under the jurisdiction and authority of the pope.

Before going into specifics, it is useful to recall atheistic communism's reasons for its implacable hatred of the Catholic Church. The reasons are two-fold. The first reason stems from the irreconcilability of the philosophies of Catholicism and communism. The second reason stems from the jealous fear which communism has for the strength resulting from the solidarity and discipline of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy.

The Catholic Church recognizes only one supreme power, that of God. It believes in Christ as the Son of God, who is represented on earth in the person of a visible spiritual Vicar, the Bishop of Rome. To this Vicar is due allegiance and obedience in the field of religion and in matters of morality. It enters into the political field only to the extent necessary to guide human society towards the higher and more important goal of eternal salvation. The Catholic Church, as the institution willed by God to help man attain spiritual perfection, considers itself duty-bound to be concerned directly with the moral aspects of all human activities and regards life on earth as a transitory period during which each individual prepares himself for the life to come in eternity. In view of this, the Church has the mission to spread Christian principles, because it maintains that through them man can fulfill the spiritual destiny for which he was created.

The state, as viewed by the Catholic Church, is the representative of a human, and therefore a transitory, society, hence it is "relative," (in other words, the opposite of absolute). This is why the Church can never accept state absolutism, a system of government which does not take into account the spiritual destiny

of mankind and which arrogates all rights to itself. According to Catholic doctrine, the state should be the promoter of social welfare, the protector of human rights and the instrument that guarantees the social order as the representative of the community from which it springs. As the protector of human rights, the state must guarantee political freedom against any arbitrary use of power which might lead to oppression. The authority of the state is delegated by the individuals of that state for the purpose of promoting the social order and protecting freedom. This authority is not an end in itself since it must be at the service of the community as a whole to prevent abuses and to uphold the rights of each individual without distinction.

Since communism is opposed to reason and to Divine Revelation, it must be opposed to the Catholic Church which upholds the spiritual value of both. Communism sees the state as supreme and humanity as an end in itself . . . with atheism as its dogmatic basis for a new world order. It opposes the Catholic Church because it seeks to set itself up as the new "religion" for the material salvation of mankind. Although communism denies the existence of God, it affirms the dogmatic existence of another "god", the state collectivity before which men must prostrate themselves; to whose new shrines — the factories and the collective farms — they must make their pilgrimages, to whose will, expressed by the dictatorial party chiefs, they must offer complete abandonment of the self; before whose secret police, as the new unholy priesthood, they must confess themselves, do penance, and make atonement, and though they do not have an empty tomb to give them hope, they still have the shell-like body of Lenin, periodically injected with embalming fluids, to give the false appearance of life where there is only death and decay. In view of the deceitfulness of this system of government can it be possible for the Catholic Church, or any believing Christian, to hope for a real détente or dialogue?

Before the "age of détente," communism opposed the Catholic Church because of the strength, the solidarity, and the discipline of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy. In past centuries of religious and political struggles, the doctrinal unity and the compact organization of the Catholic Church enabled it to weather the severest storms even when the antagonism of its foes took the form of physical persecution. Alas! Today, it seems that the enemy has entered its ranks and has weakened this age-old position of strength and solidarity.

The defeat of the Nazi and Fascist armies in World War II did not bring the promised peace and prosperity nor the guaranteed democracy to the peoples of Eastern Europe. The allied Western nations, morally weak, stood aside as they allowed a new totalitarian regime, the Soviet Union, to occupy country after

country and force them into the slavery of dictatorial communism. These newly "liberated" nations soon felt the heavy hand of Soviet oppression as they witnessed the arrest and deportation of their leading national and political leaders. The communist authorities, after consolidating their position, soon turned their wrathful attention towards the Catholic Church in these occupied countries. One of the first nations to see its Local Catholic Church attacked was that of Western Ukraine.

II. THE UKRAINIAN GREEK-CATHOLIC CHURCH

The majority of the people living in the Western Ukrainian territories belonged to the Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite. This Church traces its origin to the Union of Brest in 1596,⁴ when the Orthodox Ruthenian Church of Kiev whose jurisdiction covered all the Ukrainian and Byelorussian territories, (at that time under the control of the Polish-Lithuanian Kingdom), decided, after mutual consent and the decision of a majority of its bishops, to unite with the Apostolic See of Rome. This Union was concluded in the Church of St. Nicholas on October 10, 1596 at Brest-Litovsk by the Metropolitan of Kiev, Mikhail Rohoza (d. 1599) and his bishops. In spite of the fact that it was the very first major step in reconciliation between Eastern and Western Christianity since the collapse of the Union of Florence in 1439, when the Greek and Latin Churches were briefly reunited, the Union of Brest-Litovsk was soon put to the test of endurance. The Polish kings and the Latin rite hierarchy who first favored this re-union of the Orthodox Church became its fiercest opposers and antagonists. The Patriarch of Constantinople, angered by his loss of jurisdiction over the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Orthodox Churches, encouraged hostility towards the Union. In 1620, Theophan, the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, took advantage of his journey through the Polish-Lithuanian Kingdom and consecrated a hierarchy for the Orthodox Ukrainians and Byelorussians. Thus a dual jurisdiction was set up in the ancient Ruthenian lands which led to much animosity and religious litigations between Catholics and Orthodox. The Zaporozhe Cossacks, traditionalists who were deeply attached to the Byzantine rite and disliked the latinizing policies of the Polish clergy towards the newly-united Greek Catholic Church, came to the support of the newly organized Orthodox hierarchy. The enemies of the Union often incited violence and on November 12, 1623, the Greek-Catholic Archbishop of Polotsk, Josaphat Kuntsevych, was murdered and the Union of Brest-Litovsk gained its first martyr. Josaphat Kuntsevych was beatified on May 16, 1643, just twenty years after his sacrificial death. Due to the persecution which followed him even after death, Josaphat Kuntsevych

was not canonized until June 29, 1867, when Pope Pius IX publicly declared his sanctity.⁵

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church with its Metropolitan See of Kiev-Halych under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople lost its autonomous status when Moscow took the eastern Ukrainian lands under its domination in the eighteenth century. In 1685 the Russian State prevailed on the Patriarch of Constantinople to relinquish his jurisdiction over the Ukrainian Church and to hand it over to the Patriarch of Moscow. With this done, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, little by little, was absorbed into the Russian Orthodox Church and consequently lost its identity.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church, on the other hand, free from the political and ecclesiastical control of Moscow, prospered in spite of the many difficulties which it encountered at the hands of the Polish Church and state. So strong was its position in Galicia that it became increasingly identified with Ukrainian national life and culture and served as a bulkhead against Polonization which constantly threatened the Ukrainians of the western territories.⁶ Nevertheless, the Ukrainian Catholic Church also had its trials and tribulations. Already in 1721, Tsar Peter I issued orders for the liquidation of the Greek Rite Catholic Church within the borders of the Russian Empire. Catherine II continued the persecution of the Uniate Church throughout her reign. The death blow to Byzantine Rite Catholicism in the territories of Byelorussia and Ukraine, which had been annexed by Russia after the second partition of Poland, was launched by Tsar Nicholas I in 1826, when he sent in troops to use military force in "uniting" the Byzantine Rite Catholics with the Orthodox Church of Moscow. The last Ukrainian Catholic diocese within the Russian Empire, Kholm, was suppressed by Tsar Alexander II in 1875. The brutal policy of the Tsarist government caused the Eastern Rite Byelorussian and Ukrainian Churches to suffer the loss of more than eight million souls. The Byzantine Rite Catholic Church now existed only in Galicia and in the Trans-Carpathian territories which were under Austrian and Hungarian control.

But even here, in these territories outside the confines of the Russian Empire, the Ukrainian Catholic Church did not escape the meddling of tsarist agents who planted the seeds of discord among the Ukrainian faithful in Galicia and in northern Hungary, causing schisms and apostasies among them. During World War I the Russian armies invaded eastern sections of Galicia and one of their first acts was to proclaim the annulment of the Union of Brest-Litovsk. The venerable Metropolitan of L'viv, Archbishop Andrew Sheptyts'kyi, was arrested and taken to Russia and the Greek Catholic Church was subordinated to the Russian Orthodox Church. In 1915, the Russian troops were forced to retreat, the

Ukrainian Catholic Church regained its former status, and a few years later Metropolitan Sheptyts'kyi returned to his Episcopal See.

Peace and security were not to endure long for the Ukrainian Catholics and their Church. In September of 1939 the Polish State collapsed and its territories were divided between the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Galicia was given to the Soviets. For two years (1939-1941), the Nazis and the Communists cooperated with one another and the Ukrainian Catholic Church found itself severely restricted and much of its property confiscated. The Soviets, however, treaded cautiously, realizing the great support and popularity which the Church enjoyed among the masses of Western Ukrainians. In June 1941 the Nazi armies attacked the Soviet Union and the Bolshevik army made a hasty retreat from Western Ukraine.

In 1944 the picture was reversed and the German armies were in retreat. Once more Soviet troops occupied Western Ukraine. The Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy, in spite of rumors of reprisals, remained in their dioceses. Since the war with Germany was still going on, the Soviet occupying force pursued a deceptively moderate policy with regard to the Ukrainian Catholic Church in order not to arouse the discontent of the people. On November 1, 1944, the greatly beloved Ukrainian churchman and patriot, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptyts'kyi, died; his funeral was attended by thousands of persons including members of the Soviet Armed Forces and the Communist Party.

Archbishop Josyf Slipyj, as Coadjutor, immediately succeeded Archbishop Sheptyts'kyi as Metropolitan of L'viv. The local communist authorities began to intensify their drive against the Catholic hierarchy and clergy and compelled them to attend meetings at which religion was attacked and ridiculed. In the meantime, the Patriarch of Moscow addressed a letter to Metropolitan Slipyj and the bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic Church asking them to renounce their allegiance to the Pope of Rome and to "return to the fold of their Mother Russian Orthodox Church," i.e., to submit to his jurisdiction. This demand was, naturally, rejected by the Ukrainian Catholic bishops. Suddenly, without warning, April 11, 1945, Metropolitan Slipyj and all the Ukrainian Catholic bishops residing in Galicia and Volynia were rounded up, arrested, and taken to Kiev.⁷ At about the same time the Polish Communist authorities arrested the Ukrainian Catholic Bishop of Peremyshl together with his auxiliary and coadjutor and had them extradited to Soviet Russia. Thus, the entire Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy was removed from the scene, leaving their dioceses shepherdless. After eleven months of confinement and abusive treatment they were brought before a military tribunal and charged with high treason under the Criminal Code, Article 54, sections 1 and 11,

of the Ukrainian SSR. The accusations were, needless to say, groundless but were needed in order to remove the Ukrainian Catholic bishops from their sees, to be replaced by bishops of the Soviet-dominated Moscow Patriarchate. The fact that it took the prosecution eleven months to prepare the trial, and even then that it had to be conducted *in camera*, in total secrecy, is indirect proof that the charges made could not be substantiated.

On March 6, 1946, the Soviet press reported that at the conclusion of a secret trial Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj, and Bishops Nykyta Budka and Ivan Liatyshevs'kyi were each sentenced to eight years hard labor in concentration camps, while Bishop Hryhorii Khomyshyn received 10 years and Bishop Mykola Char-nets'kyi 5 years imprisonment.

With the entire Catholic hierarchy and all leading priests of the Ukrainian Church in prison or in slave labor camps, the stage was set for the Communist Party, abetted by the cooperation of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow, to abrogate the Union of Brest-Litovsk. An intimidated priest, Father Havryil Kostel'nyk, of the Archdiocese of L'viv, with the aid of the Soviet secret police, organized an "Initiative Committee" and convoked an illegal *Sobor* (Church Council) which met in L'viv for three days, March 8 through 10, 1946, at which the Union of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Apostolic See of Rome was declared null and void.⁸ The *Sobor* was poorly attended. Of some 2,500 priests, only 216 persons attended and this figure included some laymen. The majority of the clergy and faithful refused to accept the decision made by this uncanonical Council and so a reign of terror was organized in the region by the secret police. The clergy were threatened with imprisonment and deportation if they did not sign statements that they had freely accepted the decisions of the illegal *Sobor* and that they had voluntarily submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow. In 1946, more than 800 priests who refused to sign any such declaration were arrested and deported to distant areas of the Soviet Union. A minority of priests, mostly members of the married or "White" clergy, fearful for the safety of their families, were blackmailed into accepting the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. The terrorization and violent persecution of the clergy, religious, and faithful continued for more than one year. On January 1, 1948, the Soviet press agency, TASS, published an official communiqué stating that the Ukrainian Catholic Church had ceased to exist and that it no longer had any legal rights within the territories of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Encouraged by their bold action in Galicia, the Soviets and the Moscow Patriarchate then began to employ the same tactics against the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Carpatho-Ukraine and

in Eastern Slovakia.⁹ After arresting the more outspoken clergy and deporting them to Siberia, the communist officials then began to intimidate all the others. The Ukrainian Catholic Bishop of Mukachiv, Theodore Romzha (an alumnus of the Pontifical Russian College, the Russicum, in Rome), died mysteriously on November 1, 1947, while recovering from a Soviet military engineered "road accident." Pavlo Goydych, Bishop of Priashiv, was arrested in 1950 and died in a Czechoslovak concentration camp on July 17, 1960. His Auxiliary Bishop, Vasyl' Hopko, was arrested at the same time but was released in 1964, and in 1968, during the liberalizing period of Dubchek, he was permitted by the government to "restore" the Greek-Catholic Church. Unfortunately, Slovak nationalists were able to exert enormous influence in Rome and, at their insistence, the Vatican appointed a Slovak priest as administrator of the Priashiv Diocese in 1969, which virtually compelled Bishop Hopko, who represented the Ukrainian majority of this Local Church, to go into involuntary retirement. The Byzantine Rite Catholic Church of Carpatho-Ukraine and Slovakia was considered abolished when, on August 28, 1949, a document was published claiming that this particular Church had "reunited" with the Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁰ Details of the meeting at which the so-called "reunification" was accomplished have never been made fully known which indicates that it lacked the popular support of the clergy and the laity.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church has ceased to exist legally in its native territories but it does continue to exist in the Soviet Union and to prosper in all areas of the free world. Its churches and institutions, its hierarchy, clergy and faithful, stand as witnesses to the deep-seated loyalty to the principles of the Union of Brest-Litovsk and they point an accusing finger to the deceitful lie which the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow, has tried to foster in the Western world. It is incredible that Western governments and religious institutions, have remained blind and indifferent to this most flagrant infringement of human rights.

III. THE VATICAN AND THE UKRAINIAN CHURCH

While communism is dedicated to the eventual annihilation of ALL religion it does not hesitate to use religious persons or institutions to help spread its ideology. The Soviet periodical, *Kommunist*, on page 12 of its April 1958 issue, explains the fact that religion still exists in the Soviet Union in these words — "Communism is just like a large building which is being built brick by brick; now we are only at the first stage; gradually the whole building will be finished and then religion shall die and disappear completely. In diffusing atheistic propaganda, we must show that

it is a useless and desperate attempt on the part of the clergy to try to keep religion alive in a communist state." Communism could not care one way or another whether a particular Church is in union with Rome or not. Its concern was to destroy one religious organization which was strong in opposition in favor of one which they could easily control and manipulate. The Orthodox Church of Moscow, to its everlasting shame, was the instrument of atheistic communism in this wanton destruction and continuing persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. In view of the fact that the Ukrainian Church was dissolved in a legal sense on its home territories, not because of doctrinal differences between it and the Russian Orthodox Church but because it was in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome and because it gave allegiance to the Pope of Rome, our attention is directed to the attitude and action of this same Apostolic See concerning the plight of the Catholic Ukrainians and their Particular Church.

Shortly after the imprisonment of the entire Catholic Ukrainian hierarchy, Pope Pius XII issued two encyclical letters, "*Orientalis omnes Ecclesiae*," December 23, 1945, and "*Orientalis Ecclesias*," December 15, 1952. The first Letter concerned the Union of Brest-Litovsk which was then observing its 350th anniversary. In this Encyclical the Holy Father recalled the sufferings of Ukraine and in particular the long martyrdom of the Eastern Rite Catholic Church beginning in the days of St. Josaphat. The Pope took this occasion to protest publicly the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and to beseech prayers for its persecuted faithful. In the second Encyclical, Pope Pius XII addressed himself to the entire hierarchy of all the Eastern Catholic Churches and spoke of the sufferings and the persecutions of the bishops and faithful in Ukraine.

Of course, the early years which followed World War II were marked by vicious anti-Catholic attacks made not only by the Soviet state but also by the Moscow Patriarchate; they were countered by an anti-communist reaction on the part of the authorities in the Vatican. Even the Pontifical Russian College in Rome, now so highly favored by the Moscow Patriarchate, was not spared abuse; in 1951 the government press of the Soviet Union published a volume of several hundred pages attacking this "school of highly trained Vatican agents and provocateurs" whose students were being prepared to "invade" the Soviet Fatherland. From 1948 through 1961, right up to the eve of Vatican Council II, the Moscow Patriarchate lost no opportunity, in official pastoral letters and at international congresses, to attack the pope, the cardinals, and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, calling them Fascists and enemies of peace and progress.

As early as 1954, Pope Pius XII warned the Catholics of the

world of the dubious intentions of Moscow's policy of "peaceful coexistence," a propagandist project sponsored by the Soviet government and championed by the Moscow Patriarchate. Alas! his warnings went unheeded and the Marxist "missionaries," more diligent than ever, have succeeded in confusing the thinking and the actions of many ecclesiastical leaders.

Pope Pius XII remained until his death concerned and troubled by the sufferings of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and its faithful. On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the sacerdotal ordination of the imprisoned Metropolitan-Archbishop of L'viv, Josyf Slipyj, the Holy Father addressed a letter to him saying "Because of your fidelity to this Apostolic See you were sentenced to imprisonment and thus forced to leave your faithful flock. We express our heartfelt gratitude to you, Venerable Brother, for the zealous fulfillment of your priestly and pastoral office at the cost of freedom." This letter was sent on Christmas Day in 1957.¹¹

The unjust sentence imposed upon Metropolitan Slipyj was completed in 1953 but, without any legal justification, he was again sentenced to an indefinite term of imprisonment. In 1957 another secret court session was held and he was given another seven years of imprisonment at hard labor. In 1962, he was again sentenced to imprisonment in the Mordovian concentration camp. Perhaps the communists were trying to kill him or hoped that, like all the other Ukrainian Catholic bishops, he would succumb to the hardships imposed on him. But God had other plans for His Ukrainian Shepherd! Early in 1963 he was given the sudden news that he was to be released and that he would be going to Rome.

The release of Metropolitan Slipyj was secured by the Vatican through the intercession of Pope John XXIII. Already the Second Council of the Vatican was meeting in its initial session and present for these meetings were official observers of the Moscow Patriarchate. No doubt, the imprisonment of Metropolitan Slipyj in the Soviet Union proved a source of embarrassment both to the Vatican and to the Soviet government which approved the participation of the Orthodox observers at the Council. This Confessor of the Faith, representing the Silent Church of the Catacombs in Ukraine, arrived in Rome on February 10, 1963. As he entered the Basilica of St. Peter to take his place among the Council Fathers he was welcomed by an enthusiastic standing ovation on the part of his brother bishops. The release of the Ukrainian Metropolitan was one of the last great acts, in favor of the silent and persecuted Church in Ukraine, performed by Pope John. A few months later he was dead.

The new pope, Paul VI, on December 23, 1963 announced to the Catholic world that the Metropolitan of L'viv, Josyf Slipyj,

was to be recognized as a Major Archbishop in accordance with the provisions of the *Motu Proprio Cleri Sanctitati* of June 2, 1957. This title, according to the norms of Canon Law, implies, regardless of the attempts of some to interpret it otherwise, certain patriarchal prerogatives. It seemed that at long last the Vatican was making a serious attempt to honor its promises so solemnly made to the Ukrainian Church at the time of the Union of Brest.

Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj was to receive still another honor from the Bishop of Rome. On February 22, 1965, Pope Paul announced that he was nominating the Church's only Major Archbishop to membership in the Sacred College of Cardinals. The Holy Father, by this act, no doubt intended to honor, not only the person of the Major Archbishop but all Catholic Ukrainians as well. In a special audience which he granted to the newly-created cardinal and the Ukrainian delegation, Pope Paul said: "You are scattered throughout the world. . . . By this elevation of your Metropolitan in the eyes of the Church and the world We wished to give you an authoritative leader on whom you can rely and whom you can trust implicitly. . . . We hope to give you, Ukrainians, a high spokesman for your unity to establish a strong center for your religious and national life. . . ."12 Once again it seemed that the Holy See had not forgotten the suffering of the Ukrainian Church and new hope was enkindled in the hearts of Ukrainian Catholics throughout the world.

IV. A VOICE FOR THE CHURCH OF SILENCE

For nearly two decades the official circles of the Vatican have remained silent concerning the plight and the persecution of Ukrainian Catholic in Ukraine as well as of those Byzantine Rite Catholics in Trans-Carpathia and Rumania. This, in spite of the fact that the Union still exists in these countries, although clandestinely, in the hidden "churches of the catacombs." Many Catholic priests, at great personal risks to their lives and to the lives of their families, continue to offer the Divine Liturgy in their homes and elsewhere and bring the comfort of the Sacraments to the sick and dying. Other priests, while officiating in the Moscow Patriarchal sponsored churches, remain faithful to the Union of Brest-Litovsk in the secrecy of their hearts. *The Vatican*, while it seeks détente and political arrangement with various communist regimes in favor of Latin Rite Catholics, is *making no moves on behalf of the Catholics of the Eastern rite*. This double-faced policy does not do credit to a Church which claims that all rites are equal. In fact, it can only prove once more, as it has in the past, that the Roman Church belittles other liturgical rites and considers them inferior to its own. All the troubles between East and

West in the past had, as its basis, differences of rite, and unfortunately, in spite of words and statements to the contrary, this remains so to this day.

The deaths of Pope John XXIII and Nikita Khrushchev released Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj from the silence he felt himself obliged to keep, and on October 23, 1971, he addressed the World Synod of Bishops in Rome and spoke, for the very first time since he had left the confines of a Soviet concentration camp, of the Silent Church of the Ukraine. His Beatitude addressed the 210 bishops in the presence of Pope Paul VI and stated the following:

Some of the Synod Fathers have asked me to say something related to the East because the exotic Orient is always very attractive to the mind of the Western Fathers. Indeed there are many singular things worthy of attention even in the Orient in reference to justice. Nevertheless, the situation of today, as already noted, is very sad.

Our mind is primarily occupied with the Catholic Church of the Ukrainians whose current status could be described as "to be or not to be" . . . Catholic Ukrainians, who have sacrificed mountains of bodies and shed rivers of blood for the Catholic Faith and their fidelity to the Holy See, even now are undergoing a very terrible persecution, but what is worse, they are defended by no one. From the beginning of history, I don't know of any people who have suffered as much as Ukrainians . . . Our Catholic faithful, prohibited from celebrating the Liturgy and administering the Sacraments, must descend into the catacombs. Thousands and thousands of faithful, priests, and bishops have been thrown into prison and deported to the polar regions of Siberia. Now, however, because of negotiations and diplomacy, Ukrainian Catholics, who as martyrs and confessors suffered so much are thrust aside as inconvenient witnesses of past evils.

In recent letters and communications which I have received, our faithful lament: "Why have we suffered so much? Where is justice to be found? Ecclesiastical diplomacy has labeled us as impediments. Cardinal Slipyj does nothing for his Church." And I reply: "What can he do? Intercession is made in behalf of Latin Catholics, but the six million faithful Ukrainians who have suffered religious persecution have been ignored."

When Pimen, the Patriarch of Moscow, in an electoral synod openly declared that the Union of Brest was annulled, not one of the Vatican delegates present protested.

It is amazing that the Soviets have raised a very highly voiced

protest against colonialism while they themselves oppress their people. In this Synod we have also heard about the diabolic manners of exterminating defeated nations, and about the evils that the Poles have suffered because of these same oppressors. From the bottom of our hearts we must have sympathy for them. And yet, in no way has it been conceded that in communist and Catholic Poland half a million Ukrainians have been deprived of their most basic rights, expelled from their domiciles and indeed are even denied the right to call themselves Ukrainians. Three dioceses of ours in Poland have been without a bishop for 30 years, and not even an auxiliary bishop has been installed; and not one Ukrainian priest from there has been admitted to this Synod. On the other hand, the Ukrainian Orthodox have four bishops in Poland and are to receive three more. It is little wonder that our people complain that they have lost everything, their rite and their discipline, while the Orthodox have kept everything. Even the Ukrainian diocese of Priashiv in Czechoslovakia has been lost.

One of the eminent Cardinals here expressed astonishment that the Ukrainians who have been treated so badly and unjustly have, nevertheless, remained Catholic...¹³

The voice of the Silent Church had, at long last, spoken out. That voice was spoken in the Vatican but not *by* the Vatican. It seems painfully clear that the curial departments are too preoccupied with matters of questionable diplomacy and pseudo-ecumenical adventures to care about mere suffering Catholic souls and their persecuted Church. Events of the past few years have been such that we must realize that if the Silent Church, or the "Church of the Catacombs," is to have a voice then it must be expressed by those of us who, in the free world, do care and are concerned. We cannot speak in whispers while the deceivers loudly proclaim their blatant lies such as was done only recently in these very United States when the Moscow Patriarchal Exarch of Ukraine, Metropolitan Filaret, a guest of the National Council of Churches, boldly told the American public that "Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox do not wish to have their own churches but are content to belong to the Russian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate."¹⁴ Fortunately, the voices of Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox leaders here were not silent and strongly refuted this lie. And standing in the foreground is that heroic figure, Patriarch Josyf Slipyj, a powerful voice and a constant reminder of the perpetual lies issued forth from the Moscow Patriarchate and the Soviet government. His Beatitude Josyf I, has given a "voice" not only to the Silent Church in Ukraine but also to the Ukrainian

Catholic Church in the diaspora. In its hour of grave need, God has provided the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and all of us, with a capable leader and a good shepherd whose voice we can recognize, understand, and obey.

In the recorded writings of the Gospels, Christ tells us that each of us must take up our own cross if we wish to be His followers. The cross of Patriarch Josyf Slipyj is a particularly heavy cross. In spite of the fact that he has been invested with titles which canonically grant him the power to organize the Ukrainian Church and to restore to it all the rights and privileges which have so long been denied to it, the Patriarch is hindered by various curial departments of the Vatican in each and every attempt he makes in its behalf. Every imaginable canon is brought up to prevent the "restoration" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church according to the norms set forth by Vatican II Council. The situation is all the more incredible since this Council was supposed to be ecumenical in character, its decisions binding on all. While we can have sympathetic understanding of the precarious position of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union and are cognizant of all the hinderances placed in its way by an atheistic government, we cannot comprehend the actions of the Holy See towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church nor the fact that a policy matter of such importance can be dictated by some inferior curial departments, especially the Secretariat for Christian Unity and the Congregation for Oriental Churches. In spite of their prestigious sounding names, neither of these Vatican departments shows much sympathy for, nor interest in, Catholics of Eastern rites. Both of these offices are headed by Latin rite cardinals and their staffs, and for most part, are made up of Latin rite clergy and bi-ritual priests. It appears that as far as they are concerned, the Ukrainian Catholic Church, both in Ukraine as well as in the emigration, should *remain* a "Silent Church." A silent Church will be a subservient Church and will not interfere in the political maneuvering and the ecumenical game-playing of some of these departments of the Vatican.

None of these adventures will be successful nor can they have God's blessing on them since they are carried out unjustly to the detriment and expense of other Christians. Already the political expediency of the Vatican officials has backfired in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia with the appointment of some "Pax" bishops and more woes for the Church are sure to follow. The game-playing of ecumenism has led to a great number of absurd experiments all over the world. When we see the nonsense going on within Roman Catholicism — apparently with episcopal approval — in the name of "ecumenism," the Vatican's attitude towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church seems all the more ridiculous.

Hurt, but undaunted by all this, His Beatitude Josyf has forged ahead. Quietly, without fanfare, he devotes his time and energy to the strengthening and solidifying of the Local Ukrainian Church in the diaspora in the hopes that it will give solace and encouragement to the Church and the faithful in Ukraine. He is, in truth, their spokesman, their "voice," speaking loud and clear, reminding the Vatican and the entire world of the injustice and deceit that is being perpetrated. He has given a new image and a new vitality to the entire Ukrainian Catholic Church. He has awakened enthusiasm in the laity and for the first time in many decades they show a new interest and concern for their Particular Church as a real living entity and not just a *part* of the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁵ For too long a time now, Eastern Rite Catholics, and especially their bishops and their clergy, have been content to play subservient roles and provide "ancient ritual" and "colorful pageantry" for Roman Catholicism as they become systematically absorbed into the melting pot of Roman centralization. Today, in spite of all the cries of protest and regardless of the Vatican's refusal of recognition, Patriarch Josyf Slipyj has a Permanent Synod for the Ukrainian Church whereby he has guaranteed its survival in face of opposition from the atheistic Soviet state, its puppet Patriarchate, and the "yes-men" within the Vatican. In the past, communism feared and opposed the Catholic Church because of the strength, the solidarity, and the discipline of her hierarchy and clergy. We might add that they feared the great sense of unity which fortified the Church and its members. Today's Church sees a lack of discipline and too little solidarity. Unity among hierarchy, clergy, and laity is fragile. The trend of the present is to challenge authority and make appeasements. Wherever there is a breakdown of law and order and whenever there is a lack of unity, the field is fertile for communism as is so painfully evident today in events taking place in various countries in Western Europe. Catholic Ukrainians are indeed fortunate to have such a strong and valiant leader as His Beatitude, Patriarch Josyf Slipyj. He has given the Ukrainian Church and its people a solidarity, a discipline, and a unity as well as a purpose to fight for.

The Primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church has, by the Will of Divine Providence, escaped the enclosure of the stockades of communist concentration camps and he will, with God's help, surmount the walls of political expediency and the fences of pseudo-ecumenism. From within the walls of the Vatican he has spoken out about the injustices suffered by the Ukrainian Church and its people. He has broken the silence and given a voice to the Silent Church of Ukraine.

Our voices too, like that of His Beatitude Josyf Slipyj, must be loud, strong and clear. Never shall we speak or publish enough

concerning the "forced reunion in L'viv 1946" about which the West cares so little and of which, for the most part, it is completely ignorant. We must never let the Vatican, especially its Secretariat for Christian Unity, forget its betrayal, compliancy, and hypocrisy shown at Zagorsk in June of 1971. We must be persistent in calling frequent attention to the bilateral agreement of the Holy Union of Brest-Litovsk. If the Vatican Secretariat of State and the Congregation for the Eastern Churches continue to ignore the provisions of this Union, then we should seek action elsewhere. Several years ago the Holy See instituted an organization known as *Pontificia Commissione di Studio "Iustitia et Pax."* For what reasons does this Commission exist if not to hear complaints of injustice? If the terms of the Union of Brest-Litovsk are still binding and in force, and I presume that they are, then we are in conscience duty-bound to make public assessment of them and to hold the Vatican responsible to the terms of that bilateral agreement. For this purpose no time should be lost in presenting this case to the above mentioned Pontifical Commission. The God of truth and justice will not be mocked!

The Union of the Ukrainian Church with the Apostolic See of Rome has not been without many blessings. During times of tribulation and persecution the reigning popes have always spoken out in defense of the Ukrainian Church and its people. Much material aid has been given over the centuries by the Holy See to Ukrainian causes. Ukrainians are cognizant and grateful for all that has been done for them in the past by this Holy and Apostolic See. Their love and loyalty to the Roman See has been proven again and again, not by flowery words but by the blood of their numerous martyrs and confessors, beginning with St. Josaphat, the martyred Archbishop of Polotsk, and continuing in our own day in the prisons and slave labor camps of the Soviet Union. These people, as well as St. Josaphat himself, suffered and died, not for the sake of some dogma or teaching of the Church, but for the sake of the Union between their Church and the Church of Rome. Today, more than ever, the Ukrainian Church needs to know that all this suffering and anguish has not been in vain.

As the theme for the 1975 Holy Year Pope Paul VI has given us the beautiful motto "Renewal and Reconciliation." Are not the Churches of Silence a part of this Holy Year? Have they no place or voice in this jubilee celebration? The Churches of Silence cry out to the world for recognition and their pleas are echoed by millions of their compatriots scattered throughout the diaspora. Deeply hurt and wounded, sorely oppressed, highly confused by the false mask of ecumenism and politically expedient maneuvering, they seek not only renewal and reconciliation but also justice and recognition. Perhaps the most severely wounded members of the

Mystical Body are those Eastern Rite Catholics, the Ukrainians, the Carpatho-Ukrainians, and the Rumanians who have seen their Church organization and life destroyed by the combined shameful machinations of Communists and Orthodox working together in this wanton destruction. The hurt goes that much deeper when one realizes that their persecution and oppression is not because of faith or dogma but only because they were in communion with the Bishop of Rome. How ironic it is that some of the departments of this same Apostolic See ignore the sufferings of mind and body of these Catholics, whose only crime is that of "loyalty to Rome," as it extends the hand of friendship under the guise of ecumenism, to persecutors of its own brethren. No ecclesiastical leader of East or West — Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox — can dare speak with any sincerity of civil and human rights as long as this crime remains on the books demanding redress. May this Holy Year 1975 give the blessing of courage to our Church leaders so that they may speak out in favor of justice so that wounds may be healed. We cannot alleviate the pains of others, outside the Church, if some of our own members are hurt and wounded. We cannot demand compassion and justice from the state and secular society for oppressed peoples unless we first give the example of being compassionate and just to our own members within the Church. We cannot extend the hand of ecumenism to those who are separated and ask them to join us in the Fold with lofty promises of maintaining their own identity if first we cannot recognize the individuality and rights of our own members. We cannot seek the Kingdom of God, nor can we spread it, by living a lie. Renewal and reconciliation begins first, at home, among our own. The Church of Silence cannot remain silent forever . . . it must speak out . . . and we must be its voice.

¹Cf. Alexis U. Floridi, "The Role of Ukraine in Recent Soviet-Vatican Diplomacy," in *Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Autonomy; a Symposium held on July 15, 1972, at Lincoln Center Campus*. Editors: Thomas E. Bird [and] Eva Piddubcheshen (New York, 1972), pp. 63-69; and Reinhard Raffalt, *Wohin steuert der Vatikan? Papst zwischen Religion und Politik* (Munich, 1973).

²For general background, see, for example, Alexander Kischkowsky, *Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche* (Munich, 1957). (= Institut zur Erforschung der USSR, München. *Monographien*, Serie I, Nr. 37; and Boleslaw Szczesniak, ed. and tr., *The Russian Revolution and Religion. A Collection of Documents Concerning the Suppression of Religion by the Communists, 1917-1925*. With Introductory Essays, Appendices, and a Selective Bibliography (Notre Dame, Ind., 1959).

³See Józef Mackiewicz, *In the Shadow of the Cross* (New York, 1973), p. 68 ff.

⁴See "Constitutio Clementis VIII de unione Metropolitae Kioviensis eiusque ecclesiasticae provinciae cum S. Romana Ecclesia," in *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia* (1075-1953), vol. I: 1075-1700. *Collegit, introductione et annotationibus auxit Athanasius G. Welykyj, OSBM* (Romae, 1953), no. 132, pp. 236-243. (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III, vol. I). Cf. also Julian Pelcz, *Geschichte der Union der Ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von der ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, Bd. I: *Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Wiederherstellung der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* (1595) (Würzburg—Wien, 1881), pp. 498-556; and Hryhor Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukrains'ka Tserkva mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom. Narys istorii Ukrains'koi Tserkvy* (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 251-288. For a recent reappraisal, see also M. S. Emilianova, "The Union of Brest-Litovsk 1595/96," *Looking East*, vol. 6, No. 12 (Fatima, 1972), pp. 5-29.

⁵See Iosyf Slipyi, "Bohoslovs'ke obrazovannia i pys'mens'ka tvorchist' sv. Iosafata Kuntsevycha," in his *Tvory Kyr Iosyfa Verkhovnoho Arkhi-epyskopa i Kardynala. Zibraly Ivan Khoma i Ivan Iatskiv*, t. II (Rome, 1969), pp. 177-196; and Leonid Rudnytzky, "The Eternal Pledge: the Significance of St. Josaphat for the Ukrainian Catholic Layman," *Looking East*, vol. 9, No. 16, 46-51.

⁶Cf. Yaroslav Bihun, ed., *The Works of Valentyn Moroz: Boomerang* (Baltimore-Paris-Toronto, 1974), pp. 103-104.

⁷On the arrest and subsequent plight of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy, see the *White Book of Religious Persecution in Ukraine* (Rome, 1953), pp. 33-42; Lev Mydlowsky, *Bolshevist Persecution of Religion and Church in Ukraine: 1917-1957* (London, 1958), pp. 13-24; Gregory Luznycky, *Persecution and Destruction of the Ukrainian Church by the Russian Bolsheviks* (New York, 1960), pp. 47-60; *idem*, *The Persecution of the Ukrainian Church by Soviet Russian Regime* (Winnipeg—New York—London, 1972), pp. 16-25; and Roman Reynarowych, "The Catholic Church in the West Ukraine after World War II," *Diakonia*, vol. 5 (1970), p. 378 ff.

⁸For the official Soviet view of this pseudo-Synod of L'viv, see *Diïannia Soboru Hreko-Katolyts'koi Tserkvy u L'vovi 8-10 bereznia 1946*. Vydannia Prezydii soboru (L'viv, 1946). For an analysis of the "Synod" and its aftermath in the English language, see I. Hryniach, "The Destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the Soviet Union," *Prologue*, vol. IV (New York, 1960), No. 1-2, pp. 33-51.

⁹See Julius Kubinyi, *The History of the Prjasiv Eparchy* (Rome, 1970), pp. 165-193. (*Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae. Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*, vol. XXXII).

¹⁰Mydlowsky, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

¹¹For the text of this letter, see *Shepherd in Chains. Persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church* (Philadelphia, 1962; published by the Ukrainian Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia), p. 14.

¹²As quoted by Eva Piddubcheshen, "... *And Bless Thine Inheritance*" (Schenectady, N.Y., 1970), p. 17.

¹³For a résumé of His Beatitude's participation in this Synod, see *Visti z Rymu*, rik 9, nos. 16-17 (Rome, Dec. 10, 1971), pp. 6-8. An unofficial

English translation of this speech has been published in *Za Patriarkhat*, rik VI, no. 1 (20) (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 27-29.

¹⁴*Svoboda* (Jersey City), February 22, 1975 (English section).

¹⁵See M. Labunka, "On the 80th Birthday of Our Archbishop Major, His Beatitude Josyf Slipyj," *Za Patriarkhat*, rik VI, no. 1 (20), pp. 31-36; and Leonid Rudnytsky, "The Voice of the Christian Conscience: A Note on the Popularity of His Beatitude Major-Archbishop Joseph Cardinal Slipyj," *Looking East*, vol. 7, No. 13 (Fatima, 1972), pp. 17-19.

ADDITIONAL WORKS CONSULTED:

The Tragedy of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia. Published by Carpathian Alliance (New York, 1971).

Camille M. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and Kremlin* (New York, 1950).

John J. Mowatt, 1) "Prince and Prisoner—Tenth Anniversary"; and 2) "Renewal and Reconciliation," *Looking East*, vol. 9, No. 16 (1975), pp. 5-9; and pp. 64-65.

W. Mykula, *The Gun and the Faith. Religion and Church in the Ukraine under the Communist Russian Rule: A Brief Survey* (London, 1969).

Newsletters, published by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches, for the period from 1946 to the present, especially the following issues: 1946, nos. 7 and 11; 1947, nos. 2, 5, and 13.

W. A. Purdy, *The Church on the Move. The Character and Policies of Pius XII and John XXIII* (London, 1966), pp. 93-97 and *passim*.

Roman Reynarowych, "Perspectives of Religion under the Communist System," *Diakonia*, vol. VI (1971), pp. 321-332.

Ivan Shevciv, *Za iednist' Tserkvy i narodu* (Melbourne, 1973).

THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC LAY MOVEMENT 1945-1975: AN INTERPRETATION

Petro B. T. Bilaniuk

In addressing a group of Ukrainians, Father George Maloney, S.J., once said the following words:

You too must come to know who you are. You must know the family you came from with all its history. And how little we really know about the Ukrainian nation.¹

I

In order to respond to this challenging statement and to grasp at least superficially the inner condition of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the diaspora, and understand the activity and mentality of its hierarchy, as well as the ethos of its lay movement, it is necessary to analyze the Ukrainian psyche and the religiosity which emanates from it. Thus we must discuss some aspects of *ethnopsychology* of the Ukrainian nation.

Ethnopsychology is understood here as a branch of science investigating the psyche or a psychological set-up and distinctive characteristics of a particular people or nation with all of its constituent elements, aspects or factors, i.e., psychosomatic (racial), geographical (geophysics), historical, psychosocial, cultural (including religion and religiosity), and psychoanalytical.²

The term *nation* as used in this paper is not synonymous with the American usage of the term. It should not be understood here as a body of inhabitants of a country united under a single independent government, i.e. a state. The term is used here to denote a biological and cultural entity characterized by ties of blood, by a common language, culture, religion, tradition, customs, art as well as by a consciousness of a socio-cultural homogeneity; a people with a collective will, common memory, mutual interest, and future goals.³

The ethnopsychology of the Ukrainian nation⁴ reveals to us that the Ukrainian psyche was formed and determined by four principle frontiers: geographical, geopolitical, philosophical and spiritual. Geographically, Ukraine is located on the Eastern frontier of Europe. Therefore, it comprises both geographically and culturally a transitional situation between East and West. The rich Ukrainian soil, the natural beauty of the country and its moderate climate made Ukraine a very coveted country by all its neighbors. Both trade and cultural routes crossed in Ukraine leaving upon it a distinctive cosmopolitan imprint.

On the other hand, this geopolitical situation was a constant invitation to innumerable invasions by Asiatic hordes as well as by other neighbors, who brought with them destruction, suffering, plagues, hunger, and death. This state of affairs had a very profound influence upon the spiritual formation of the Ukrainian people; it placed them in an existential frontier situation between life and death, existence and non-existence. This in turn precipitated inner psychological crises and imposed a profound sapiential reflection about the meaning of existence which resulted in uncertainty, anxiety, pessimism, and melancholic resignation.

Throughout the centuries, the chivalrous type of Ukrainian man took up the sword and defended his native land from hostile invaders. Since the odds were usually against the defending force, the number of defenders constantly diminished, for they died on the battlefield and left reproduction to the cautious peasant, who evaded battles in order to stay alive. Thus there was a constant diminishing of the heroic type of life and a constant increase of a private and withdrawn type of existence of the peasant who feels responsibility only for his immediate surroundings.

The central problem of the Ukrainian spiritual make-up is the co-existence of two contrasting elements: the heroic, chivalrous (or simply Cossack) ideal of life and the withdrawn, passive, private and asocial existence of the peasant. The heroic ideal lives on in songs, rites, folklore, preaching and in the very intense historic memory of the Ukrainian nation. Everybody looks up to this ideal, and yet it remains an unattainable good. This, in turn, results in a profound introversion, guilt complex and unrealistic dreams of glory.⁵ In order to compensate for their failure and to rid themselves of the guilt complex, Ukrainians are unique as a nation in celebrating major military defeats as national feast days, e.g., Kruty, Bazar, Brody,⁶ paying tribute to their dead heroes not because they gained anything for Ukraine (except glory) but because they

⁴These are the names of the three towns in Ukraine where Ukrainians suffered defeats at the hands of the Soviet Russian armed forces in 1918, 1921, and 1944 respectively.

correspond to the heroic ideal which the majority of Ukrainians is not capable of achieving.

Nevertheless, there are also positive sides to the Ukrainian psyche. In spite of catastrophes and disasters which the Ukrainian nation has had to suffer and which it has successfully survived, Ukrainians have developed some positive characteristics, i.e., attitudes, which do not directly seek socio-political or economic expansion, but which strive toward moral values, which make up the meaning of the "Ukrainian glory," i.e., a sapiential type of synthesis of goodness, beauty, truth, justice and love. This is the optimistic side of the Ukrainian national psyche, the source of its incredible resistance and persistence and which has helped the Ukrainian nation to survive centuries of adverse conditions.

The most negative trait of the Ukrainian psyche, however, is an exaggerated individualism which, if kept in check, is a sign of the unity of the Ukrainian nation with Western European individualism. In its exaggerated form it leads to the abyss of anarchy. Thus we can conclude with Wolodymyr Janiw that:

Basically the reasons for our historical calamities, inasmuch as they emerged from an exaggerated Ukrainian individualism, can be characterized by a paradox: we landed in subjugation, because we have an excessive love of freedom. In desiring equality and brotherhood we were afraid of our own despot and weakened ourselves by internal strife, until aliens began to dominate us.⁶

Furthermore, under foreign domination, where free self-expression is impossible, the spirit of resistance to and hatred of the alien yoke quite naturally gives rise to an inner negative attitude of rejecting any authority, anarchical outbursts, lack of discipline, and a generally negative attitude towards life. The Ukrainian people are thus inwardly torn between a desire for freedom and a desire for a strong personality, who would reunite and lead the nation to statehood and the Church to autonomy in the Ukrainian Patriarchate. Thus two tendencies of the unbalanced Ukrainian psyche are destroying each other: the disposition to self-expression and autonomy constantly revolts against the necessity to submit to the legitimate authority and to cooperate with it.

On the other hand Ukrainians in authority, beset by an inferiority complex, often compensate by tyrannical tendencies and attitudes, which recall those of their foreign overlords, thus destroying confidence and making the authority in question ineffective and prone to be rejected by their compatriots. Some attitudes of this kind are: demands for instant obedience, refusal to listen to other ideas, a tendency to answer criticism with insults, and an inability to respect a dissenting position and still lead effectively.

Without exception all investigators of the ethnopsychic make-up of the Ukrainian nation have arrived at the conclusion that Ukrainians are a highly emotional people. In their lives emotions play such an important role that they dominate or even overshadow the functioning of the intellect and will. This expresses itself in emotionalism, sentimentality, delicacy of feelings and lyricism, and more concretely in the aestheticism of the Ukrainian folklore, ritualism, embroideries, music, and songs. This emotionalism creates an aura of a profound introversion which, in combination with a relatively weak intellect and will, explains why Ukrainians very easily display incredible enthusiasm and cool down even more quickly. This in turn explains why Ukrainians are excited by relatively unimportant details and remain passive when confronted by important matters which overwhelm them and which, in many instances, they are unable to comprehend.⁸

Many of us have witnessed and participated in what appeared to be rallies on national and ecclesial feastdays which seemed to signify a great awakening, the beginning of a new era and of a new movement. And yet, they passed without a trace, except for the emotional remorse of being unable to continue this trend. This temporary megalomania is actually an artificially created state of mind, a pretense of power and unity to compensate for the deep-rooted inferiority complex resulting from a long stateless existence.

II

The above definitions of ethnopsychology and nation, as well as the observations of the ethnopsychological peculiarities of the Ukrainians, are important for the correct understanding of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The Ukrainian Catholic Church, like most of the Eastern Churches, is a national Church in which these specific Ukrainian ethnopsychological peculiarities are clearly manifested. For example, whenever a Ukrainian Catholic speaks of a "patriarch," he has simultaneously in mind an "ethnarch," a religious leader who is the father of the nation and at the same time its chief representative on the international scene. Many Ukrainians accord priority to the idea of ethnarch over the idea of patriarch, although they may not even be aware of the term "ethnarch".⁹ The same can be said of an Eastern Christian idea of patriarchate or of a particular and autonomous church. In the Christian East these are understood quite rightly not as exclusively religious institutions, but as properties of each particular Christian nation in which the entire national patrimony lives and is handed down from generation to generation as a sacred, religious and national good. Thus the Western type of separation of Church and state is alien to the mind of Eastern Christians in general and to the Ukrainian mind in particular because the stress is placed on

a different plane, namely on the Church-nation relationship. It is understood that should a free and independent Ukrainian state emerge, there will be a very intimate cooperation between Church and state, just as there is now a very close bond between Church and nation.

This religious (or rather ecclesiological) ideology produces among Ukrainians a nostalgic desire for "One Nation - One Church" which found its strongest expression in a booklet with a homonymous title by M. Bradovych.¹⁰ Understanding of these interrelationships is important for non-Ukrainians, for they explain why there is a lack of ecumenical dialogue and cooperation between different Ukrainian ecclesial groups, i.e., Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant. Each of the Churches desires to be the only true Ukrainian Church which would reunite under its auspices all Ukrainians. This is also the reason why my proposal and terminology of the three branches of the one Ukrainian Church, viz., Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant,¹¹ was in fact rejected by the representatives of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic branches even if it did find some resonance among the people at large. It was accepted by the Ukrainian Protestants, who are desperately trying to prove that they are not a "foreign import" into the Ukrainian community and that they constitute an integral part of Ukrainian ecclesial reality. In other words, the idea of religious pluralism is extremely weak among Ukrainians, for most of them seem to be persuaded that there must be one nation, one Church, one denomination, one civil and one religious government.

For many centuries Ukrainians made up an agricultural society of peasants; they constituted practically a one-class nation. The upper classes were usually foreign overlords. As recently as in 1926, 92% of all Ukrainians in Ukraine and in the diaspora were peasants. Therefore, a very typical ethnopsychological trait of the Ukrainian nation is its spiritual bond with the soil, which in the Ukrainian mind assumed mythical and mystical dimensions and became a legendary entity with secret and life-giving powers. Ukrainians were always sensitive to the processes of nature. They perceived very strongly nature's goodness, its fruitfulness and graciousness, which they interpreted in the moral and mystical dimension as the bestowing love, with which such phenomena as the fruitful soil, the golden sun, the friendly breeze, and light rain cooperate. Therefore Ukrainians as an agricultural nation developed a very strong cosmic religious sense, which in theological terminology is described as pantheism, that is, an intense presence and immanence of God in His creatures.¹²

Ukrainian religiosity is not based on the *phobos*-type of religion; it is not based on fear. It is partially an *eros*-type of religion, in the center of which stands the archetype of mother with all her

female and motherly qualities and characteristics: goodness, economic sense, and an intense love of children for whom it is necessary to preserve the fruits of the soil. Thus the native soil is called the Great Mother who among other things is a remnant of primitive Indo-Germanic religion.¹³ This *eros*-type of religion among Ukrainians is closely connected with the *agape*-type of religion, based on mutual and social love. The consequences of this has been a very great prominence of the mother in social life, which very often bordered on a matriarchal system of society. This also explains why Mariology and Marian devotion in Ukraine reached their pinnacle and are unsurpassed in the whole world.

Among Ukrainians the *nomos*-type of religion is relatively little developed. There are few laws, few good lawyers and canonists, few philosophical and speculative minds. Therefore any written agreement or concordat in Ukrainian history or church-life have been typically poorly worded and usually have been abused by unscrupulous non-Ukrainian parties. A further consequence of a certain lack of *nomos*-type of religion among Ukrainians is the confusion of wishful thinking and actual rights which must be defended and used. From this originates a lack of analysis of history and Church-history in particular, a lack of understanding of diplomacy and its intricacies and a naive acceptance of the statements of others at face value. Usually there is a lack of long-range planning and an inability to foresee the consequences of certain actions and events.

III

The above theoretical ethnopsychological and ethnoreligious considerations will help us to interpret the Ukrainian lay movement since 1945. At the end of World War II many Ukrainians found themselves in Western Europe, especially in Germany, Austria, and Italy, but also in Great Britain, France, and Belgium. During this period several religiously oriented organizations emerged which continued the tradition of the organized laity in Ukraine. These were Catholic Action;¹⁴ *Obnova* - Ukrainian Catholic Students' Organization, which was part of the International Catholic Students' Organization, *Pax Romana*; *Mariis'ka Druzhyna*, (the Sodality of Our Lady) belonging to the Roman *Prima Primaria*; and many other local organizations, like the Brotherhood of Prayer and Church Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods.

All these organizations had several things in common: they were created and fully controlled by the hierarchy, at that time the Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainians in Western Europe, Archbishop Ivan Buchko (1891-1974) in Rome, his vicars general in different countries, and local priests. This was during the pontificate of

Pius XII (1939-1958), a stout anticommunist, a great friend of all suffering Churches, and especially of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as expressed in his encyclical *Orientalis omnes ecclesias*, dated December 23, 1945, which was totally dedicated to the history and contemporary condition of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Thus the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the diaspora and especially in Western Europe felt quite secure and did not anticipate any change of policy by the Holy Roman Apostolic See. At that time the Congregation for the Eastern Churches was headed by the Pope himself in the capacity of prefect. The Secretariate of the Congregation rested in the hands of His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant (a great friend of the Eastern Churches in general and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in particular despite his strong Russophile tendencies). In the long history of the relations of the Apostolic Roman See with the Eastern Churches, Cardinal Tisserant played a very important role. He worked hard to de-Latinize the Eastern Churches, especially in liturgical matters. Under his guidance the Roman See started to issue liturgical books. A rule (*Ordo celebrationis*) how to celebrate liturgical functions was also issued (Rome, 1944). Incredibly enough both the clergy and in many instances the laity resented these "innovations" and clung tenaciously to their Latinized form of worship, structure of Church organizations, and to a Western type of spirituality. This situation can be explained in the following way: Pope Pius XII represented to the Ukrainians the figure of a good father who was taking care of his Ukrainian children, especially of the Ukrainian theological students in the Pontifical Ukrainian College of St. Josaphat in Rome, the Ukrainian lay students at the University of Louvain for whom a special Ukrainian house was established, the Ukrainian scholarly center of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Sarcelles, France, etc. As pointed out above, the Ukrainian Catholic community in Europe was fully satisfied with their "Mother Church," with the exception of the "liturgical innovations" which were usually interpreted as an attempt to conform the Ukrainian Catholic Church to the Russian liturgical tradition.

We can safely say that generally speaking this period of time was not very conducive to the further development of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The Ukrainian laity and clergy did not manage to delve into deeper study and rediscovery of their rich, profound Eastern Christian heritage. They were overwhelmed by the Roman Church and in their inferiority complex looked up to the Latin rite, Latin ecclesiastical tradition, and centralism.

The Ukrainian Catholic lay organizations which have been mentioned performed positive socio-political and ecclesial functions. They organized many important rallies in defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the catacombs and informed the

world about this by special publications as well as through the international press.¹⁵

The situation started to change very rapidly in the late forties and early fifties when the major bulk of Ukrainians emigrated to the USA, Canada, Australia, and the countries of Latin America. In the countries of their new settlement they found church-sponsored organizations of Ukrainian laity which were organized on the parish and exarchate levels. In Canada they found and joined the Ukrainian Catholic Brotherhood in Canada (*BUKK*), the Ukrainian Catholic Women's League, Ukrainian Catholic Youth, the Ukrainian Mutual Benefit Association of St. Nicholas (also called St. Nicholas Brotherhood) of Canada, the Knights of Columbus of St. Josaphat, and many others.¹⁶ In the USA they found and joined "the Apostleship of Prayer, Sodality, Children of Mary, Holy Name Society, Knights of Columbus councils, Ukrainian Catholic Youth League and Altar Boy Society . . . fraternal-benevolent societies, the Providence Association with its publication *America*."¹⁷

These Church organizations of the laity were even less in the line of tradition of Ukrainian Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods which existed in Ukraine throughout history.¹⁸ Their statutes and rules stipulate to the present day that the so-called "spiritual assistant," always a bishop or priest, can veto any decision of the chapter entrusted to him, or of the eparchial or national executive.¹⁹ Therefore these organizations rarely ventured beyond purely auxiliary duties in the parish churches, such as the collection of money and the organization of banquets and feast-days. Sometimes they organized retreats or lectures which rarely went beyond the level of catechism. Therefore, when the Second Vatican Council came into session, and especially when His Beatitude the Metropolitan of Halych, Archbishop of L'viv and Bishop of Kamianets' Podil's'kyi, Josyf Slipyj was released from his imprisonment in Siberia and the struggle for Ukrainian Patriarchate and Church autonomy became acute, these organizations not only were not prepared for these tasks, but on the contrary, assumed a negative stance or lapsed into total passivity.

By 1955 the resettlement of Ukrainians from Europe to the Americas and Australia was over. It was necessary to reorganize the Ukrainian diaspora in Europe, which by now was relatively small. Under the dynamic leadership of Professor Wolodymyr Janiw there came into being in 1953 the *Ukrainian Christian Movement*, which encompassed most of the European countries in which Ukrainians lived. This organization merits special attention for it exists to the present day as an ecumenically structured entity consisting of Catholic and Orthodox branches, which cooperate very closely with

each other. Further, this organization was able to establish very good contacts with Latin rite Catholic organizations in different countries of Western Europe and to participate in world congresses of the Catholic laity. It served all classes of the Ukrainian diaspora by organizing pilgrimages, feastdays, lectures, etc., and by its publications. The latter merit special consideration; the Ukrainian Christian Movement has published a volume of essays entitled *Ukrainian Laymen in the Life of the Church, the Society and Mankind*.²⁰ In this volume 17 authors try to give a scholarly assessment of the rights, possibilities, and obligations of the Ukrainian laity in the changing conditions of the modern world. Unfortunately this volume has not received the attention it deserves. However, the Ukrainian Christian Movement was unable to establish itself in the New World and to compete with existing lay organizations. Nor did it participate fully in the struggle for the establishment of the Ukrainian Patriarchate.

IV

The year 1964 marked the promulgation of the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* by Vatican II and the emergence of several groups in Toronto, Chicago, and Cleveland, which called themselves Committees for the Defense of Rite and Tradition of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, or used similar names. This was the beginning of the protest movement against the Latinization and assimilation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Canada and the United States of America, perpetrated by the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy, under pressure from the Roman Curia and the representatives of the Latin hierarchies of these countries. The situation had changed completely since 1959 when Cardinal Tisserant was recalled from the office of the Secretary of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches — the prelates who succeeded him in that office reflected the renewed trend of Latinization and assimilation of the Eastern Catholic Churches in general, and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in particular. These same people wanted to sabotage the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches* even before its official promulgation (e.g. Maximilian Cardinal de Fuerstenberg).

The issues in question which were raised by the Committees mentioned above were the forceful introduction of the Gregorian calendar, Latinization of liturgical practices, church art and architecture, the prohibition against ordaining married candidates to the priesthood and the realization of the autonomy of the Eastern Catholic Churches as reaffirmed by Vatican II.

These Defense Committees, as they became known in abbreviated form, were trying to fight a double battle; on the parish and eparchial levels they tried to defend the spiritual heritage of the

Ukrainian Church, its rights, tradition, and language while at the same time they tried to support the movement for the establishment of the Ukrainian Patriarchate of Kyiv and Halych. In addition, they tried to realize in practice the personal jurisdiction of the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church over all members of that Church, including metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, clergy, all monastic orders, and the laity throughout the world, who belonged to Byzantine-Ukrainian (Greek-Ruthenian) Rite. The Committee of Defense in Toronto scored a first by initiating a religious type of publication without the *imprimatur* of the Church authorities. This was a little pamphlet in Ukrainian by Reverend Clayton Barclay entitled *A Foreigner in the Defense of the Ukrainian Church* (Toronto, 1966).²¹ This was followed by my pamphlet in Ukrainian entitled *The Ukrainian Church — Its Present and Future* (Toronto — Chicago, 1966). Finally in July of 1966, there appeared the first issue of the bulletin *Za ridnu Tserkvu* (*For Our Native Church*) which appears irregularly to the present day.

In December 1966, all existing committees held their first Congress in Chicago, Illinois, and created the Central Committee for the Defense of Rite, Tradition and Language of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in USA and Canada.²² This strengthened the defensive front and soon the hierarchy was obliged to revise many of its positions. However, for quite a while the work of the Committee in Toronto was paralyzed by an internal division into two warring factions, which greatly decreased the effectiveness of its work.

In 1965, there emerged in the United States the Society for the Promotion of the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church, the members of which became known as *patriarkhal'nyky*. This Society exhibited tremendous dynamism and soon numbered 17 chapters, scattered all over the United States with many representatives in smaller localities. In 1967, the Society started to publish its bulletin *Za Patriarkhat* (*For the Patriarchate*), which over the years assembled a tremendous wealth of material and informed the Ukrainian and later, through its English pages, the non-Ukrainian audience as well.²³

At the suggestion of Major Archbishop and Cardinal Josyf Slipyj there came into being in July of 1969 the World Association for the Erection of the Patriarchate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. This central organization soon was able to establish national executives in those countries of the world with Ukrainian settlements, such as Argentina, Belgium, England, France, Germany, Spain, and Venezuela. Two representatives from Australia were appointed to work with the World Association.²⁴

Tensions arose between the World Association and the Nation-

al Executive of the Society for the Promotion of the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the USA which were never satisfactorily resolved until the dissolution of the World Federation on December 29, 1974 in Washington, when the Ukrainian Patriarchal World Federation came into being, which united all Ukrainian lay organizations and committees as well as some church-sponsored organizations of laity. In the meantime, a conference held in Toronto on March 7-8, 1970, created by a rather undemocratic procedure the Coordinating Committee of the Ukrainian Organizations in Canada and USA for the Realization of the Patriarchate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.²⁵ This new umbrella organization coordinated different religious and civic Ukrainian organizations which had expressed a willingness to participate in the struggle for the establishment of the Ukrainian Patriarchate and for strengthening the autonomy of the Particular Ukrainian Catholic Church. In major centers of Ukrainian settlement, local councils of these organizations emerged which organized petitions to the Pope and the Roman Curia as well as rallies and festivities in honor of His Beatitude Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj, or in honor of the Particular and Patriarchal Ukrainian Catholic Church.

All these organizations and bodies of organizations had several things in common. There was a definite lack of necessary contact with the lay movements and organizations of other autonomous and local churches in the Catholic Church including organizations of Latin rite laity. In spite of assurances that they act independently and on their own initiative, these organizations soon became dominated by the hierarchy, for in many instances they did not know what steps to take. Thus the painful lack of theologically, canonically, and historically trained laity became apparent. In many instances these organizations did not cooperate with their local hierarchy, but established contacts with members of the hierarchy in a different country of Ukrainian settlement, preferably beyond the ocean, on the assumption that this distant hierarchy was better than their immediate ecclesiastical superiors. Little did they realize that all members of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy were equally intimidated by the Roman Curia and were unwilling to jeopardize their positions. The leaders of these organizations lacked knowledge of Church history in general and of Ukrainian Church history in particular. Therefore they were prone to take documents and statements emanating from the Pope, the Roman Curia, or the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy at face value. They had no diplomatic skill and no understanding of the operations of Vatican diplomacy. As a result there were usually no preliminaries through contacts with intermediaries but always a direct and open frontal attack of the problem, e.g., writing of petitions directly to

the top authority – the Pope – without even ensuring that he would get their message or that he would be influenced by his advisors to take them seriously into consideration. All this became quite evident during the furor which was raised by the letter of Cardinal Tisserant in which he succinctly stated the position of the Vatican and not his own as regards the dignity of the Patriarchate of Moscow and its Russian possessors and the relative unimportance or even non-existence of Ukrainians and their Church.²⁶

A detailed analysis of the activities of the Ukrainian Catholic lay organizations reveals a definite pattern:

1. A spectacular beginning with an overloaded and unrealistic program.
2. A short period of rest during which the unrealistic nature of the program became apparent and the first signs of rivalries appeared, which grew until the end of an organization.
3. Petitions to the Pope, resolutions, and letters full of emotionalism, written either in a subservient tone or containing the kind of strongly worded statements which people are prone to make when they are offended. Most of the time these letters remain unanswered. This in turn aggravates the inferiority complex and increases the rivalries and disputes.
4. Having written petitions and letters, the executive of a certain organization convened rallies and in highly pitched tones informed the audience of its achievements, promising an even brighter and more glorious future.
5. Next followed different types of publications, including materials gathered from the four previous activities described above, apologies of the executive and attacks against enemies and incompetent persons from within and without the Ukrainian Catholic Church.
6. Having exhausted all their inner energy, organizations entered a period of disenchantment, divisions, and a slow lapse into oblivion or an act of self-liquidation.

V

From the ethnopsychological point of view the Ukrainian lay organizations founded and dominated by the hierarchy represent the passive, quiet, cautious, and matriarchal segment of the Ukrainian Church and nation. Their members are concerned with the immediate problems of their parish and their horizon usually ends at the level of their own eparchy.

Lay organizations founded by the laity, on the other hand, resemble the hero-type of Ukrainian, who in decisive moments

gathers his inner energy and reacts with vehemence and extroversion seeking glory first of all and freedom, independence, and other human values. Their life is short and intense. They seek to transform the Ukrainian Church and Ukrainian nation from a matriarchal type of society and from divided fiefdoms ruled by aristocracy into a strongly centralized patriarchal type of society, operated monarchically from above. They seem to believe that a patriarch will be able to solve all the problems in a church which from a closed society in Galicia (Western Ukraine) has become a worldwide empire, while trying desperately to preserve its identity and connection with the Mother Church in Ukraine. This, obviously, is an illusion, for while the establishment of the Patriarchate would be a tremendous step forward and a great help in the struggle of the Ukrainian Catholic Church to preserve its identity, success can be attained only as the result of a regeneration of the whole Ukrainian Catholic Church in all its aspects and dimensions. This is an extremely complex process which demands tremendous and continuous effort and the cooperation of the hierarchy, clergy, and laity. For the time being neither segment of the Ukrainian Catholic Church seems to be ready for this task.

¹G. Maloney, *What Does it Mean to be a Ukrainian Catholic? And Ukrainian Catholic Autonomy* (Weston, Ont., St. Demetrius Ukrainian Catholic Church [1975]), p. 19.

²The division proposed here is adapted from A. Kultschytsky (O. Kul'chyts'kyi), "National Characteristics of the Ukrainian People", *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*, vol. I ([Toronto, 1963]), pp. 946-953. Ethnopsychology became an independent discipline with the publication of the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* (Bd. 1-20, edited by M. Lazarus, H. Steinthal, and others, 1860-1890, in Berlin and, for a short period of time, in Leipzig. Afterwards it was continued as: *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde.*)

³On the origin, formation, and the nature of the Ukrainian nation, cf.: V. Pachovs'kyi, *Ukrainci iak narid* (Chernivtsi, 1907?); B. Ol'khivs'kyi, *Vil'nyi narid* (Warsaw, 1938); V. Shcherbakivs'kyi, *Formatsiia ukrains'koi natsii* (Prague, 1941); D. Dontsov, *Dukh nashoi davnyny* (Prague, 1944; 2nd abbr. ed., Regensburg, 1951); V. Petrov, *Pokhodzhennia ukrains'koho narodu* (Regensburg, 1947); Iu. Rusov, *Dusha narodu i dukh natsii* (Philadelphia, 1948); and L. Rebet, *Formuvannia ukrains'koi natsii* (Munich, 1951).

⁴On ethnopsychology of the Ukrainian nation — in addition to the works listed in footnote no. 3, cf.: N. Kostomarov, "Dve russkie narodnosti", *Osnova*, 1861 (St. Petersburg), no. 3; I. Nechui-Levyts'kyi, *Svitohliad ukrains'koho narodu* (L'viv, 1878); V. Antonovych, "Try natsional'ni typy", *Pravda*, 1888 (L'viv); T. R[yl'skii], "K izucheniiu ukrainskago narodnago mirovozzreniia", *Kievskaiia starina*, 1888 (Kiev), no. 11; 1890, nos. 9-10; 1905, nos. 4-5; L. Tschel's'kyi, *Rus'-Ukraina i*

Moskovshchyna (L'viv, 1900); *idem*, *Rus'-Ukraina i Moskovshchyna-Rosiiia* (Constantinople, 1915); V. Sikorskii, *Vseobshchaia psikhologuia s fiziognomikoi* (Kiev, 1912); I. Ohienko, *Istoriia ukrains'koi kul'tury* (Kamianets' Podil's'kyi, 1920); V. Lypyns'kyi, *Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv . . .* (Vienna, 1926; Kh. Vovk, *Studii z ukrains'koi etnografii ta antropolohii* (Prague, 1927); D. Chyzhevs'kyi, *Narys z istorii filozofii na Ukraini* (Prague, 1931); *idem*, "Holovni rysy ukrains'koho svitohliadu", in: *Ukrains'ka kul'tura* (Podebrady, 1940); R. Iendyk, *Antropolohichni prykmety ukrains'koho narodu* (L'viv, 1934); I. Mirtschuk (I. Mirchuk): 1) "Die slavische Philosophie in ihren Grundzügen und Hauptproblemen", *Kyrios*, Bd. 2 (Königsberg, 1936), pp. 157-175; 2) "Die geistigen Merkmale des ukrainischen Volkes", in: *Handbuch der Ukraine* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 74-83 (Published also in English: "The Basic Traits of the Ukrainian People," in: *Ukraine and its People* (Munich, 1949), pp. 35-54; 3) *Das Dämonische bei den Russen und Ukrainern*; (Augsburg, 1950) (*Ukrains'ka Vil'na Akademia Nauk*, VIII); 4) *Geschichte der ukrainischen Kultur* (Munich, [1957]), pp. 55-69, 256-257. (*Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München*, Bd. 12); I. Krypiakievych, *Istoriia ukrains'koi kul'tury* (L'viv, 1937); Iu. Lypa, *Pryznachennia Ukrainy* (L'viv, 1937; reprinted in New York, 1953); P. Fedenko, "Vplyv istorii na ukrains'kyi narodnii kharakter", *Naukovyi zbirnyk UVU*, III (Prague, 1942); *idem*, "Svitohliad ukrains'koho narodu", *ibidem*; A. Brückner, *Dzieje kultury polskiej*, t. I-IV (Cracow, 1946); O. Kul'chyts'kyi, "Rysy kharakterolohii ukrains'koho narodu", in: *Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva*, t. 1/II (Munich, 1949), pp. 708-718; M. Shlemkevych, ed., *Ukrains'ka dusha* (New York, 1956). It includes contributions by the following authors: Ie. Onats'kyi, "Ukrains'ka emotsiinizm", pp. 5-12; O. Kul'chyts'kyi, "Svitovidchuvannia ukraintsia", pp. 13-25; B. Tymbalistyi, "Rodyna i dusha narodu", pp. 26-43; and M. Shlemkevych, "Dusha i pisnia", pp. 44-54; V. Ianiv (V. Janiw) "Ukrains'ka vdacha i nash vykhovnyi ideal", in: *Pedahohichni problemy ta dydaktychni porady* (Munich, 1969), pp. 1-17; and *idem*, "Do systematyzatsii pohliadiv Ivana Mirchuka na ukrains'ku liudynu", in: *Zbirnyk na poshanu Ivana Mirchuka. Symbolae in memoriam Ioannis Mirtschuk (1891-1961)*, A. v. Kultschytzkyj, ed. (Munich et. al., 1974), pp. 149-194 (Bibliography) (Universitas Libera Ucrainensis, *Studia*, t. VIII).

⁵A. H. Velykyi ("Relihiia i Tserkva — osnovni rushii ukrains'koi istorii", in: V. Ianiv, ed., *Relihiia v zhytti ukrains'koho narodu* (Munich-Rome, Paris, 1966), pp. 3-38), is right when he observes that "glory" (*slava*) is the true catalyst of and the key to the Ukrainian history. For him glory is goodness and beauty in all their humanistic broadness, accepted and recognized as such. In support of this view, the author adduces very interesting arguments, one of which is most significant. In 250 years of Ukrainian history (X-XIII centuries) the names of more than 120 Ukrainian princes and 27 princesses contain the word *slava* or its variants in various combinations, e.g. Boleslav, Briachyslav, Vysheslav, Iaroslav. Comp. also G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. I. *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, Mass., MCMLXVI. Available also as a *Harper Torchbooks*, TB 70, ed., New York, 1960), pp. 329-333.

⁶V. Ianiv, "Ukrains'ka vdacha i nash vykhovnyi ideal," pp. 6-7.

⁷It would be to the benefit of Ukrainian leaders, both civic and ecclesiastical, to examine the ideas set forth in: *Problems of Authority*, ed. by J. M. Todd (Baltimore-London, 1962).

⁸I. Mirtschuk (*Geschichte der ukrainischen Kultur*, pp. 64-65), for example, makes the following observations about the Ukrainian mentality: "Keine übermassige Systematik, sondern eher Systemlosigkeit, dafür aber oft geniale Intuition, die unbewusst und aus dem Gefühl heraus ihre Konstruktionen schafft. Keine Gründlichkeit, keine Vertiefung mit zwangsläufiger Einschränkung des Tätigkeitsgebietes, sondern im Gegenteil eine viel zu starke Erweiterung der Interessensphäre mit gleichzeitiger Verflachung der Arbeit. Keine vernunftgemässe begriffliche Behandlung der Probleme in Theorie und Praxis, sondern gefühlsmässige Erfassung der Wirklichkeit, Unmittelbarkeit des Entschlusses aus dem Affekt heraus und endlich die Vermengung der theoretischen und praktischen Momente . . . Da alle drei Funktionen: Verstand, Gefühl und Wille in enger Abhängigkeit voneinander stehen, wird die Vorherrschaft der ersten oder der zweiten auch die Tätigkeit der dritten notwendigerweise beeinflussen. Das vom Gefühl und nicht vom Verstand beherrschte Wollen wird keinesfalls grosse Festigkeit, Ausdauer und Planmässigkeit aufweisen, sondern den emotionalen Elementen gleich die polaren Gegensätze in kurzer Schwingungszeit durchlaufen, so dass auf Perioden gesteigerter, ungewöhnlicher Aktivität und Arbeitsfreude Zeiten gänzlicher Passivität und verzweifelten Nichtstuns folgen."

⁹During the *Symposium*, while this lecture was being delivered, somebody distributed an anonymous leaflet signed, "A Prophetic Voice of the People", demanding an election, "of our Patriarch Joseph I as the President of the Ukrainian State".

¹⁰M. Bradovych (pseud. of M. Trotskyi), *Odna natsiia - odna tserkva* (n. p., 1950).

¹¹P. B. T. Bilaniuk, *Ukrains'ka Tserkva — ü suchasne i maibutnie* (Toronto-Chicago, 1966).

¹²On religion and religiosity of the Ukrainian people, cf. V. Mansikka, *Die Religion der Ostslaven* (Helsinki, 1922); V. Lypyns'kyi, *Relihiia i tserkva v istorii Ukraïny* (Philadelphia, 1935); M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Z istorii relihünoi dumky na Ukraini* (2nd ed., Winnipeg-Munich-Detroit, 1962); S. Lesnoi, *Rus', otkuda ty? Osnovnye problemy istorii drevnei Rusi* (Winnipeg, 1964); Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohiienko), *Dokhrystüans'ki viruvannia ukrains'koho narodu* (Winnipeg, 1965); V. Ianiv, ed., *Relihiia v zhytti ukrains'koho narodu*; and G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. I.

¹³O. Kul'tshyts'kyi ("National Characteristics of the Ukrainian People," p. 952), observes: "The center of the collective unconscious in the Ukrainian peasantry may be regarded as the eulogized image of the *magna Mater* — Mother Earth, the Demeter (Franko's* Mother Nature), who has the power to change the demons into comic little devils (Mirchuk)".

¹⁴Cf. *Pastyr's'kyi lyst vysokopreosviashchennishoho iepyskopa kyr Ivana Buchka, Apostof's'koho vizytatora ukraïntsiu u Zakhidnii Evropi pro Katolyts'ku Aktsiiu* (n. p., 1952. It is dated: Dec. 22, 1951). In this "Pas-

toral Letter" the prevailing contemporary ideas and ideals concerning Ukrainian lay organizations are spelled out.

¹⁵The outstanding publication of this period was: *First Victims of Communism. White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine. (Translated from the Italian)* (Rome, 1953). It was published also in: Italian, German, Spanish, French, and Ukrainian.

¹⁶For a complete list of organizations, cf. M. H. Marunchak, *The Ukrainian Canadians: A History* (Winnipeg-Ottawa, 1970), pp. 755-758, and *passim*.

¹⁷A. Senyshyn, "Ukrainians in the U. S.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 14 (New York, etc., 1967), pp. 375-376.

¹⁸On the traditional role of the Church Brotherhoods in Ukraine, cf. M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, t. VI (Kiev-L'viv, 1907; reprinted by Knyho-Spilka, New York, 1955), pp. 412-663; and Ia. D. Isaievych, *Bratstva ta ikh rol' v rozvytku ukrains'koi kul'tury XVI-XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1966).

¹⁹See *Statut Mariis'koi Druzhyny* (n. p., n. d.). It was approved by Rev. N. Voiakovs'kyi, the Apostolic Visitor and Administrator for the Catholic Ukrainians in Germany, on March 5, 1947. The §17 (p. 10) reads: "The [spiritual] leader is the superior and director of the Sodality [of the Immaculate Conception of the Most Holy Virgin Mary]. Without his express or tacit approval no decision of the Council can have binding power. Decisions and elections performed in his absence become binding only after his additional confirmation". Even greater and broader are the prerogatives of the "Spiritual Caretaker" of the Ukrainian Catholic Brotherhood in Canada. Cf. *Statut Bratstva Ukraintsiv Katolykiv Kanady* (Toronto, 1957), §8-10 (pp. 5-6). The rights of "spiritual assistants" are mentioned in §34 (pp. 21-22).

²⁰V. Ianiv, ed., *Ukrains'kyi myriany v zhytti tserkvy, spil'noty ta liudstva. Materiialy Studiiynykh dnev UKhR (Rocca di Papa, 13-16 zhovtnia, 1963)* (Paris-Rome, 1966).

²¹*Chuzhynets' v oboroni Ukraints'koi Tserkvy* (Toronto, 1966). Reverend Clayton Barclay died in the summer of 1974. He was a priest of the newly created Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of New Westminster, B. C., Canada.

²²Prof. Bohdan Popel became the first head of the Central Committee and remained in office until his death on January 1, 1971. His prudence, wisdom, and strong character were a source of inspiration for Ukrainian Catholic laity in their confrontations with the hierarchy. Prof. Popel was succeeded by Hryhorii Holovatyi from Toronto.

²³The impetus for organizing the Society for the Promotion of the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church was provided by Professor Mykola Chubatyj (1889-1975) in his series of articles entitled "Sprava Kyivs'koho Patriarkhatu ta maibutnie nashoho khrystiianstva," published in *Amerika* (Philadelphia), June 5-7, 1964. Soon thereafter the Committee for the Patriarchate was created under the chairmanship of Bohdan Shebunchak, M.D. The first convention of delegates and representatives from various local committees in the U.S. met in New York on June 19, 1965, drew up bylaws and elected Wasyl Pasiczniak (currently the editor of the Society's journal *Za Patriarkhat*) president of the Society. The second convention, held in 1968, elected Wasyl Kaczmar of Newark presi-

dent. He was followed by Zenovij Gill, M.D. of Trenton, who was elected in 1970, and by Myroslaw Nawrockyj, M.D. of Philadelphia (elected in 1972). The Society also established a Council of Laity. It was headed in succession by Roman Osinchuk, M.D., Miroslav Labunka, Ph.D., and Roman Danylewycz. The initial goal of the Society was to induce the Vatican to recognize the Kyiv-Halych Metropolia as a patriarchate and to install the Confessor of Faith Josyf Slipyj as the first patriarch. However, because of strong opposition by the Vatican Curia and principally by the S. Congregation for the Eastern Churches, the Society has developed a far-ranging program for the defense of the rights of the Autonomous Ukrainian Catholic Church and for the eventual culmination of her organizational structure in a patriarchate. In addition to lobbying and writing letters and petitions to Pope Paul VI and to Ukrainian and Latin rite hierarchy, the Society has staged several demonstrations and called several press conferences both in the U.S. and in Europe with the intent to dramatize the plight of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. These activities of the Society have been widely reported by the news media.

²⁴Cf. "Informatsii pro pratsiu Svitovoho Tovarystva za Patriiarkhal'nyi Ustrij Ukrain's'koi Katolyts'koi Tserkvy," dated June, 1974, and signed by Volodymyr Pushkar, President, and Daria Kuzyk, Secretary. Over the period of five years these two people worked assiduously to organize patriarchal movement in various countries of the world. Without their efforts The Ukrainian Patriarchal World Federation would not have materialized. At this time I would like to express my gratitude to Mrs. Kuzyk for supplying me with valuable source-materials for this paper.

²⁵On June 3, 1973, a new organization, the Inter-Country Coordinating Centre of Ecclesial, Lay and Civic Organizations for Autonomy and Patriarchate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church was founded in Toronto, Ontario, and headed by Julian Pelech. Vasyl Markus was elected Secretary pro tem. Cf. *Biuletyn' Mizhkraiovoho Koordynatsiinoho Oseredku Tserkovno-Myrians'kykh i Hromads'kykh Organizatsii za Pomisnist' i Patriiarkhat UKTserkvy*, No. 1 (Toronto-Chicago, 31 August, 1973). On p. 14, this organization calls itself the "Provisional Supreme Council of Laity" ("Tymchasova Holovna Rada Myrian").

²⁶For the text of Eugene Cardinal Tisserant's letter, see *Stoboda* (Jersey City), Oct. 10, 1970, and *Za Patriiarkhat*, rik IV, ch. 3 (14) (Oct. 1970), p. 24. The letter was addressed to Dr. Mary Klachko of New York in response to her letter sent to the Cardinal with the booklet: ". . . *And Bless Thine Inheritance*" by Eva Piddubcheshen ([Schenectady, N.Y., 1970]).

*Ivan Franko (1856-1916) - a noted Ukrainian poet and scholar.

SESSION THREE:

**THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
AND EASTERN SPIRITUALITY**

EASTERN AND WESTERN SPIRITUALITY

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

George Maloney, S.J.
Chairman of the Session

My one task today will be to give some general idea about Eastern Christian spirituality and then to introduce Dr. Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University.

As I am sure Dr. Pelikan has so much to say to all of us, I will not go into great details, except perhaps to put a setting into which he can place his remarks, more specifically around the theme of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and Eastern spirituality. St. Hilary of Poitiers of the fourth century once stated:

The guilt of the heretics and blasphemers compels us to undertake what is unlawful, to scale arduous heights, to speak of the ineffable, and to trespass upon forbidden places. And since by faith alone we should fulfill what is commanded, namely, to adore the Father, to venerate the Son with Him, and to abound in the Holy Spirit, we are forced to raise our lowly words to subjects which cannot be described. By the guilt of another we are forced into guilt, so that what should have been restricted to the pious contemplation of our minds is now exposed to the dangers of human speech.¹

The early Church could never describe what the spiritual life or spirituality would be. I think that has become an occupational hazard of the West with all its Cartesian clear and distinct ideas where we can find Pourrat writing four volumes on the history of spirituality² and delineating with fine distinctions the differences between the Franciscan and the Jesuit as well as the Dominican and the de Berulle³ types of spirituality. Surely, it seems to me, there is only one spirituality and that is what the early Fathers of the Church call: "Ho bios pneumaticos," the life of the Holy Spirit living in each one, and of course, accepting each one as a unique creation of God, made according to that image and likeness that is Jesus Christ. Hence each person would be different as star differs from star. If this is true for you and for me, how much more true

this would be for a whole nation with its different ethos and its different experiences in history. Much has been written, however, about the two basic spiritualities of East and West. I would like to put this in the proper perspective, so that we can see the specific spirituality of a given nation as a part of a whole.

I would like to say, in general, that all religions, whether Christian or non-Christian, are under the power of God's Spirit and divide into two great polarities. One is the religions that express the transcendent element of God. God is the totally Other, the One outside of us and we human beings, in our simpleness and loneliness, are separated from God by an infinite abyss. We come to know God in fear and trepidation and we continuously approach Him in a continued conversion.

The other is the immanent religion that is more mystical. When a man purifies his heart and turns within, he finds the ground of his being already there. He finds the spark of Divinity. He finds the uncreated energies of God dynamically divinizing the potential in man. The East geographically is depicted more by the immanent religion. It manifests the sense of the feminine, to use not a biological but the psychological language of Carl August Jung.⁴ It is man in his tender and open, feminine receptivity (emulating the Mother of God who depicts the Church in Christian thought), who waits upon the Holy Spirit to impregnate the Word of God, but within man's being.

The Western spirituality more or less emphasizes God outside while man, by his action, goes toward God, meets God in a movement of a moral life modelled upon the imitation of Jesus Christ. Without exaggerating these two tendencies, I would say that all Christians must, whether they have been born in the East or in the West, whether they are Roman Catholics, or Orthodox of the East, or Ukrainian Catholics, or Melchites, make a synthesis under the power of the Spirit. At the very same time they must live in this tension of a pilgrim that is always approaching the burning bush that is outside of him; but he approaches it in fear and trepidation, in a conversion of purity of heart, by a life of action, of recreating this world by man's doing. On the other hand, man must also and primarily be the Christian of the East.

Carl Jung would be the first to say that the Christian must be Eastern before he can be Western. He must sit before the Lord and hear of the Spirit before he can move and act. And how many in the West, with all of the organizations in their churches, move before they have listened to the Word of God, before they have experienced the divinization process by the uncreated energies of God lying deeply within each man's heart, by the purification in their dying process, by control over every thought, so that man will

be that empty vessel, that empty reed through which God will blow and play His most beautiful, celestial music.

So I think that, although we can make these distinctions, (and these, to be sure, are very great polarities), we all need to become Christians both of the East and the West. In our dialogue we can open ourselves up: those who were born in the West – to the insights of the East; those who were born in the East – to the insights of the West. Thus as Christ is moving by His Spirit through the Churches, He is bringing one body into existence, a totally integrated Church of East and West, immanent and transcendent. Each Christian has an obligation, in deep prayer, first to become Eastern, then to become Western, to become a whole person, to become a whole, real-living human being.

Though much has been said about these two spiritualities, I think that it is legitimate to say that there is a particular intensity in the Eastern Christian spirituality, because of its stresses, its emphasis on mysticism, because its traditional sources are the Greek Fathers, who were, first of all, mystics and, because they were mystics, they were then theologians. As Evagrius (345?-399?) used to say, "If you are a theologian, you will pray and, if you pray, you will be a theologian."³ There was no dichotomy between theology and the spiritual life in the early Churches of the East. Theology was precisely the life of the Spirit within us revealing the mysteries of the Father, loving us and begetting us as children in Christ Jesus, making us co-heirs with Him forever.

Though there may be a vast difference, let us say, between a Ukrainian Orthodox or Catholic compared with an Abyssinian or a Coptic Christian, who would still be of the East, probably more of a difference than between a Russian Orthodox and an American Roman Catholic, we find, nonetheless, basic to all of the Eastern Christians, a common inheritance of spiritual literature of the early Fathers with their emphasis on the liturgical and the traditional elements. One such element very evident in the East is the accent on the transcendence of God. We see this so powerfully captured in every Byzantine Liturgy in the Trisagion Hymn, that recalls to the people and the priest celebrating this heavenly Jerusalem the throne of God, the inner sanctum, the Holy of Holies, before which the six-winged Seraphim bow in adoration and cover their eyes and shout: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Heaven." (Comp. *Isaiah*, 6:3). It is seen in the bowing of the people down to the earth. We find no lector telling them to stand, now sit, now rise. Rather each person, as he is overcome by this reverence for the Almighty God, is free to make the Sign of the Cross and bow profoundly. One is free to use the whole body in adoration before the transcendent God.

We have the iconostasis which separates the profane world from the Holy of Holies inside. We see the icons all over the icon screen, depicting this heavenly Jerusalem and the transformed universe.

Another theme in Eastern spirituality is precisely the theological anthropology drawn from Scripture. When one asks in the East what man is, one goes to Scripture, Genesis 1:26, and finds that God creates man according to His own image and likeness, that is, Jesus Christ. Man's nature, therefore, is basically good. It possesses this divine indwelling and, like a seed, it must grow into a continued conscious relationship to the Word of God. It is a spirituality that is rooted in the Holy Spirit. He is the Sanctifier, the One who brings us into total freedom by the development of all of our individual gifts. We see it especially in the *epiklesis*, in all the sacraments, but especially in the Eucharist. It is the power of the Spirit that comes down to transform the gifts of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. And the same Spirit comes down upon you and me and gradually, through His divinization process, He divinizes us to become one with Christ. He is the One who brings this world into its transfiguration. This is the great feast of August 6th and it is one of the key insights of Eastern spirituality.

Not only is the Eastern Christian drawn, in a way, forward to this God who is totally beyond him, but he is also drawn down deeply into himself through what the Greek Fathers called *enthos*, a state of continued, abiding sorrow, where God does comfort those who mourn. And in that crying out for healing, *Kyrie eleison*, *Hospody pomylui*, repeated over and over again in the individual Christian prayer, in the Liturgy especially, there is a tender intimacy (*parrhesia*), that trust in Our Heavenly Father who will hear the plea of His children, when we cry out in the name of Jesus. There is that tender thirsting for greater union with God, that is beyond any word or concept.

The icons give us an incarnational theology, that the whole world is impregnated by the *logoi*. Matter is in movement toward spirit. The whole world is moving toward a transfiguration. Our world will not be destroyed or annihilated, but will be transformed into the very body of Christ.

And lastly, it is a theology, a spirituality that is heavily rooted in the Mother of God. Here, it is not just a historical person who is venerated, but Mary who is the Church; she is you and I in a very real sense. When we pray to her, we are praying to the fulfilled humanity, we are really praying to Christ, through the channel that brings Christ to us and that leads us to Him. When we think of Mary and the great feast that is central in the East, August 15th, the *Uspennia* (the Feast of the Dormition of the Holy Virgin) we are really praying for the coming of the Kingdom of God, the

eschaton, the end of time. We are professing that we are already living in the Resurrection of Christ, that He lives in us and that He has already done it, and yet — not yet.

Thus there is the happy tension between the *not yet* and the already realized Kingdom of God within us. There is the realization that God lives in us, dynamically divinizing us and we stretch out to be filled; we are joyfully a part of a whole world that will one day be made into the conscious body of Jesus Christ.

¹*Saint Hilary of Poitiers: The Trinity. Translated by Stephen McKenna, C.S.S.R. (New York, 1954) p. 36. (The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation, vol. 25).*

²For an English translation of his: *La spiritualité chrétienne*, see Pierre Pourrat, *Christian Spirituality*, vols. 1-4. (Westminster, Md., 1953-55)

³Pierre de Bérulle (1575-1629) was a Cardinal and the founder of the Congregation of the Oratory (1611). See his: *Oeuvres complètes. Reproduction de l'édition princeps (1644)*, (Montsoul, Seine-et-Oise, [1960]); and *Les mystères de Marie: Vie de Jésus. Elevations. Oeuvres de piété. Textes recueillis et présentés par Marcel Rigal.* (Paris, [1961]).

⁴See, for example, his: *Psychology and Religion: West and East. Translated [from the German: *Zur Psychologie westlicher and östlicher Religion*] by R. F. C. Hull. 2d ed. (Princeton [1969]). (His: *Collected Works*, vol. 11).*

⁵*Evagrius Ponticus: The Praktikos. Chapters on Prayer. Translated with an Introduction and Notes, by John Eudes Bamberger. (Spencer, Mass., 1970 [c 1972]), p. 65, "Chapters on Prayer," no. 60. (Cistercian Studies Series, no. 4).*

THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND EASTERN SPIRITUALITY

Jaroslav Pelikan

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 spiritualité chrétienne* of Pierre Pourrat¹ and the indispensable encyclopedia, *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique. Doctrine et histoire*.² 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)*,³ 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."⁴ 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 Eucharistic 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 Modernists⁵ application of the principle "*lex orandi lex credendi*"⁶ 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 undermining 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 Catholics;" but in the East "Orthodoxy" is "*Pravoslavie*," the right way to worship, and even some Eastern sectarians have recognized this when they called themselves *Starobriadniki*, 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,⁷ 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*,⁸ 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 blahodati* by Ilarion of Kiev (d. post 955).⁹ 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."¹⁰ 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 confine 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*.¹¹ 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*¹² 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 ec-

clesiastical 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,¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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 a Kempis (1380-1471)¹⁵ 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*¹⁶ and in his *The Russian Religious Mind*,¹⁷ 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 Christian 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 experience 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 transposed 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 pathfinding monograph of Karl Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*,¹⁸ 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*,¹⁹ 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 ("zemlia") 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 Raskolnikov, 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 hands 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),²⁰ 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 an adequate English term for the concept of "theosis," for neither "deification" nor "divinization" carry quite the proper connotation.

For Eastern Christian spirituality, beginning with SS. 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 cor-

ruption 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?"²¹ 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."²² 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;"²³ and the Pseudo-Dionysius (d. 265) defined "deification" as "assimilation to God and union with Him."²⁴ 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,²⁵ has been enabled to go beyond the antitheses that have dogged Augustinianism. It manages to avoid being either Pelagian or deterministic, either moralistic 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 "*nerushyma stina*," which, even in its present state of preservation (as it can be seen in Lazarev's book on the mosaics of St. Sophia)²⁶ 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 substi-

tute 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,"²⁷ 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 our 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*),²⁸ but in Greek, in the Byzantine hymn now usually attributed to Romanus the Melodist (d. 556), the *Akathistos*.²⁹ 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 Protestant 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 Huhn³⁰ 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*?"³¹ 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 the icons, as it emerged from the iconoclastic controversies of the eighth and ninth centuries; I have written about this as some length elsewhere.³² 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 Hesychasm³³ 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).³⁴ 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)³⁵ and its definitive exposition at the hands of St. Gregory Palamas (d. 1359).³⁶ 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 in 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 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*¹ 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*.

¹For bibliographical description of this work, see *supra*, p. 113, footnote no. 2.

²Begun and edited by Marcel Viller, S.J. and continued by André Rayez, S.J. and others. Vol. 1 (Paris, 1937).

³Published 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.

⁴Cf. *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 Writers. The Works of the Fathers in Translation*, No. 32).

⁵Cf. the Papal Encyclic *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* of September 8, 1907, by Pope Pius X.

⁶Comp. P. De Letter, S.J., ed., *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine* . . . , p. 234, footnote no. 42.

⁷I.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.

⁸For a critical edition of its text (in various variants), cf. *Pravda Russkaia*, t. 1-3 (Moscow - Leningrad, 1940-1963).

⁹See *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis. Nach der Erstausgabe (by A. B. Gorskiï) von 1814 neu herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erläutert von Ludolf Müller. Wörterverzeichnis von Suzanne Kehrer und Wolfgang Seegatz* (Wiesbaden, 1962). (= *Slavistische Studienbücher*, II); and N. N. Rozov, "Rukopysnaia traditsiia 'Slova o zakone i blagodatii,'" *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 Edition* (New York, 1975; also a Dutton paperback) pp. 86-92. This translation does not include the complete text.

¹⁰Cf. 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..."

¹¹On 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).

¹²For its early Slavic text, see A. S. Pavlov, *Pervonachal'nyi slaviano-russkii nomokanon* (Kazan' 1869).

¹³Cf., for example, his *Hoi hieroi kanones kai hoi ekklesiastikoi nomoi* ... Ekd. 2 (Athens, 1949). (= *Bibliothéké Apostolikés Diakonias*, 19); and *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I* (Berlin, 1913; reprint: Aalen, 1973. = *Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche*, 17. Stück).

¹⁴Cf., 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).

¹⁵A 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 Kempis'koho . . . Druhe vydannia zladyv 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.).

¹⁶This work of G. P. Fedotov, ed., was published by Sheed and Ward in New York, 1948.

¹⁷Vol. 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, 1st and 2nd eds., 1949 and 1966, available also as a Harper Torchbook paperback, 1960; and vol. II, 1966).

¹⁸K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgeualt beim griechischen Mönchtum. Eine Studie zum Symeon dem Neuen Theologen* (Leipzig, 1898).

¹⁹For 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*

ukraïns'ke pys'menstvo. *Vybir dlia serednikh shkil* (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).

²⁰Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889), a German Lutheran historian and theologian, proposed a social-ethical redefinition of the doctrine of justification, as well as an interpretation of the saving work of Christ as the establishment of the community of faith rather than as "vicarious satisfaction."

²¹For 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, 2nd ed.; 1st 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. Collier* (Albany, N.Y., 1969), pp. 55-63.

²²Cf. *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.

²³See his "On the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten," in: *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Deux dialogues christologiques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par G. M. de Durand, O.P.* (Paris, 1964), pp. 230 and 231. (= *Sources Chrétiennes*, No. 97). Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition* . . . , vol. 1: *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago and London, 1971), p. 233.

²⁴See his "Celestial Hierarchy" in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia graeca*, t. 3 (Paris, 1857) col. 165, 372-376, and 393. Cf. also José Ramon Bada Panilo, *La doctrina de la mediación dinámica y universal de Cristo, Salvadore Nuestro, en el "Corpus Areopagiticum,"* (Zaragoza, 1965), pp. 121-122; and J. Pelikan, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-345.

²⁵"Puti russkogo Bogoslova: When Orthodoxy Comes West," in: *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of The Very Reverend Georges Vasiliévich Florovsky on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday.* Edited by David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin (Rome, 1973), pp. 11-16. (= *Orientalia Christiana analecta*, 195).

²⁶Viktor N. Lazarev, *Mozaiki Sofiï Kievskoi. S prilozheniem stat'i A. A. Beletskogo o grecheskikh nadpisiakh na mozaikakh* (Moscow, 1960). Cf. also *Sofiïa Kyiv'ska. Derzhavnyi arkhitekturno-istorichnyi zapovidnyk. Avtor stat'i ta uporiadnyk Hryhorii Nykonovych Lohvyn* (Kiev, 1971).

²⁷G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, vol. I, p. 54.

²⁸This is an early hymn to Mary. Cf. J. Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

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

³⁰See, especially, his *Das Geheimnis der Jungfrau-Mutter nach dem Kirchenvater Ambrosius* (Würzburg, 1954).

³¹See *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*).

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

³³For the background on Hesychasm, see *Die Gottesschau im palamitischen Hesychasmus: Ein Handbuch der spätbyzantinischen Mystik. Eingeleitet und übersetzt von A. A. Ammann. 2. Aufl.* (Würzburg, 1947), and works listed in the footnotes nos. 34-36.

³⁴See 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 Sorskij 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).

³⁵For his works, see *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien: Catéchèses, 1-34. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Basile Krivochéine, Traduction par Joseph Paramelle, S.J., t. I-III* (Paris, 1963-1965). (= *Sources Chrétiennes*, Nos. 96, 104, 113); and *Traité théologiques et éthiques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean Darrouzès, A. A., t. I-II* (Paris, 1966-1967). (= *Sources Chrétiennes*, Nos. 122, 129).

³⁶See 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 à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959); and *idem, A Study of Gregory Palamas. Translated by George Lawrence* (London, 1964).

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Compiled by M. Labunka

Collections of documents, monographs, and pamphlets, published in Western languages, have been selected for inclusion in this 'Bibliographical Check List' to serve the reader interested in the history of Christianity in Eastern Europe in general (Pt. I), and in the present situation of various Church bodies, as well as in religious life in Ukraine in particular (Pt. II).

Dean Timothy Andrew, *The Eastern Orthodox Church; a bibliography*. 2d ed. (Brookline, Mass., 1957).

Felix Haase, "Die Zeitschriftenliteratur zur russischen Kirchenkunde von 1924-1928," *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, N. F., Bd. IV, Heft 3 (1928), pp. 418-445. Available also as a reprint.

I. Patrylo, "Sources and Bibliography on the History of the Ukrainian Church," (In Ukrainian: "Dzherela i bibliohrafiia Ukrain's'koi Tserkvy"), *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni*, Series II, Sectio II, vol. VIII (1973), pp. 305-434.

Angel Santos Hernandez, *Iglesias de Oriente*, vol. II: *Repertorio bibliografico* (Santander, 1963). (= *Bibliotheca comillensis*)

I

Acta et decreta Synodi Provincialis Ruthenorum Galiciae, habitae Leopoli an. 1891 (Rome, 1896).

Acta S. C. de Propaganda Fide Ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarussiae spectantia. Collegit et adnotationibus illustravit Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-V: 1622-1862 (Rome, 1953-1955). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarussiae. Acta S. Congregationum*).

Audientiae Sanctissimi de rebus Ucrainae et Bielarussiae (1650-1850). Collegit, adnotavit, paravit editionemque curavit Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-II (Rome, 1963-1965). (= *Ana-*

lecta OSBM, series II, sectio III: Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Documenta Pontificum Romanorum. Audientiae, vol. I-II).

Bullae et brevia Summorum Pontificum, Sacrarum Congregationum decreta, nec non Serenissimorum Poloniae Regum diplomata Congregationem Ruthenorum OSBM concernantia vel eidem opportuna, iussu Generalis Consultationis cum interventu Provincialium Officiorum sub annum 1764 celebratae (Pochaiv, 1767).

Congregationes particulares ecclesiam Catholicam Ucrainae et Bielarusjae spectantes. Collegit et adnotationibus illustravit editionibus curavit Athanasius G. Welykyj (vol. I – adlaborante Eugenio Kaminskyj), vol. I: 1622-1728 – II: 1729-1862 (Rome, 1956-57). (= *Analecta OSBM, series II, sectio III. Documenta Romana ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Acta litterae et decreta Sacrarum Congregationum*).

Constitutiones Congregationis Ruthenae Ordinis S. Basilii Magni (Zhovkva, 1910).

De constitutione patriarchali Particularis Ecclesiae Catholicae Ucrainorum (Ruthenorum) (Castelgandolfo, 1974). (= *Editiones "Litterae nuntiae" Particularis Ecclesiae Catholicae Ucrainorum, N. 3*). T. p. also in Ukr., the text in Ukr., Lat., Eng., and Ital.

Diplomata statuarum a Patriarchis orientalibus Confraternitati Stauropigianae Leopoliensi a. 1586-1592 data, cum aliis litteris coaevis et appendice, vol. II (L'viv, 1895).

Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075-1953). Collegit, introductione et adnotationibus auxit Athanasius G. Welykyj, OSBM, vol. I: 1075-1700 – II: 1700-1953 (Rome, 1953-1954). (= *Analecta OSBM, series II, sectio III: Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Belorusjae. Documenta Pontificum Romanorum, vol. I-II*).

Documenta unionis Berestensis eiusque auctorum. (1590-1600). Collegit, adnotavit, paravit editionemque curavit Athanasius G. Welykyj (Rome, 1970). (= *Analecta OSBM, series II, sectio III: Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Unitae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Documenta unionis Berestensis*).

Documents officiels publiés par le gouvernement anglais au sujet du traitement barbare des Uniates en Pologne (Zurich, 1877).

"L'Église Orthodoxe Panukrainienne", créée en 1921 à Kiev. Documents inédits (Rome, 1923). (= *Orientalia Christiana, no. 3-4*).

Epistolae metropolitaram, archiepiscoporum et episcoporum. Collegit, paravit, adnotavit editionemque curavit Athanasius G. Welykyj, OSBM, vol. I-IV (Rome, 1956-1959). (= *Analectu*

OSBM, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae*).

Ius particulare Ruthenorum (Rome, 1933). (= *Codificazione canonica orientale. Fonti*, fasciculo XI).

Litterae nuntiorum apostolicorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes (1550-1850). *Collegit, paravit, adnotavit editionemque curavit* Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-XII: 1550-1850 (Rome, 1958-1967). (*Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Litterae nuntiorum* , vol. I-XII).

Litterae S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide. Collegit et adnotationibus illustravit Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-VII: 1626-1862 (Rome, 1954-1957). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Acta litterate et decreta Sacrarum Congregationum*).

Giovanni Mercati, *Scritti d'Isidoro il cardinale ruteno e codici a lui appartenuti che si conservano nella Biblioteca apostolica vaticana* (Rome, MCMXXVI). (= *Studi e testi*, 46).

Fr. Miklosich and J. Muller, (eds.), *Acta et diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi, sacra et profana*, vol. I-II (Vienna, 1860-1862).

W. Milkowicz, (ed.), *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigianae Leopoliensis*, vol. I-II (L'viv, 1895-1896).

Monumenta Ucrainae historica. Collegit Metropolita Andreas Septyckyj [ed. Cardinalis Josephus Slipyj], vol. I-XIII: 1075-1853 (Rome, 1964-1973). (*Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae*). Vol. XIII: *De processibus canonicis Ecclesiae Catholicae Ucrainorum in Transcarpathia, collegit* Alexander Baran.

S. Josafat hieromartyr. *Documenta Romana beatificationis et canonizationis. Collegit, adnotavit, paravit editionemque curavit* Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-III (Rome, 1952-1971). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Documenta biographica*, vol. I-III).

Supplicationes Ecclesiae unitae Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Collegit, adnotavit, paravit editionemque curavit Athanasius G. Welykyj, vol. I-XIII (Rome, 1960-1971). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio III: *Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae. Supplicationes* , vol. I-XIII).

Synodus Provincialis Ruthenorum habita in civitate Zamosciae anno 1720, S.D.N. Benedicto P.P. XIII. dicata (Rome, 1838. Ed. III, 1883).

Augustinus Theiner, *Monuments historiques relatifs aux règnes d'Alexis Michaelowitsch, Fedor III et Pierre le Grand, Czars*

de Russie. Extraits des archives du Vatican et de Naples (Rome, 1859).

—, *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitarum historiam illustrantia, maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta, collecta ac serie chronologica disposita*, vol. I-IV (Rome, 1860-1864).

Erich Amburger, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Russland* (Stuttgart, 1961).

Albert M. Ammann, *Storia della Chiesa Russa e dei paesi limitrofi* (Turin, 1948).

—, *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna, 1950).

—, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Kultur und des religiösen Lebens bei den Ostslawen*, vol. I: *Die ostslawische Kirche im jurisdiktionellen Verband der byzantinischen Grosskirche (988-1459)* (Wurzburg, 1955). (= *Das östliche Christentum*, N. F., Heft 13).

Alexander Baran, *Eparchia Maramosiensis eiusque unio*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1962). (= *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio I: *Opera*, vol. XVIII).

—, *Metropolia Kioviensis et Eparchia Mukacoviensis*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1960). (= *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio I: *Opera*, vol. X).

Caesar Barounius, *Historica relatio de Ruthenorum . . . origine eorumque conversione* (Cologne, 1598).

—, *Discours de l'origine des Russiens et de leur miraculeuse conversion*. Tr. en françois par Marc Lescarbot. Nouv. éd., rev. et cor. par le prince Augustin Galitzin (Paris, 1856).

N. de Baumgarten, *Chronologie ecclésiastique des terres russes du Xe au XIIIe siècle* [vol. I] (Rome 1930). (= *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. XVII.-1, no. 58).

—, *Généalogie et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides russes du Xe au XIIIe siècle* (Rome, 1927). (= *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. IX.-1, no. 35).

—, *Saint Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie* (Rome, 1932). (= *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. XXVII, no. 79).

—, *San Vladimiro e la conversione della Russia* (Rome, n. d.).

Erich Beck, *Die russische Kirche. Ihre Geschichte, Lehre und Liturgie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Unterscheidungslehren und ihres Verhältnisses zur römischen Kirche* (Bühllin Baden, [1921]; and 1926).

Joannes Bilanych, *Synodus Zamostiana an. 1720. (Eius celebratio, approbatio et momentum)*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1960). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio I: *Opera*, vol. XI).

- Demetrius Blazejovskij, *De potestate Metropolitanorum Kioviensium Catholicorum in clerum regularem* (Rome, 1943).
- Alexander Bobák, *De jure patronatus quoad Ecclesiam Ruthenicam in Hungaria* (Rome, 1943).
- G. N. Bonwetsch, *Kirchengeschichte Russlands im Abriss* (Leipzig, 1923). (= *Sammlung Wissenschaft und Bildung. Einzeldarstellungen auf allen Gebieten des Wissens*, 190).
- Basil Boysak, *The Fate of the Holy Union in Carpatho-Ukraine* (Toronto—New York, 1963).
- Maria Teresa Carloni, *S. Giosafat Kunccevyč martire dell'unità della Chiesa, nel Centenario della sua canonizzazione 1867-1967* (Rome, 1969). (= *Editiones populares Facultatis theologiae in Catholica Universitate Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae*, vol. II).
- Natala Carynnyk-Sinclair, *Die Unterstellung der Kiewer Metropole unter das Moskauer Patriarchat* (Munich, 1971). (= *Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Geschichte Osteuropas und Südosteuropas an der Universität München*, Bd. 3).
- Clemens Chodykiewicz, *Dissertationes historico-criticae de utroque Archiepiscopatu, Metropolitano Kioviensi et Haliciensi, uti olim distincto, nec non de Episcopatu Leopoliensi ritus Graecouniti à P. C. Ch. S. Th. Praesentatio, Chronologo Provinciae Russiae Ordinis Praedicatorum, certioribus documentis illustratae. Anno Domini 1770* (L'viv).
- Johannes Chrysostomus (Fr. of Niederalteich), *Die religiösen Kräfte in der russischen Geschichte* (Munich [1961]). (= *Sammlung Wissenschaft und Gegenwart*).
- , *Kirchengeschichte Russlands der neuesten Zeit*, vol. I-II (Munich—Salzburg, 1965-66).
- Iwan Dacko, *Metropolitan Andrej Szeptyckij, Rediscoverer of Traditional Eastern Ecclesiology and Ecumenism* (Unpub. PhD dissert., Innsbruck, 1974).
- Castremont L. D'Elessalde, *Histoire de l'introduction du christianisme sur le continent russe et vie de Sainte Olga* (Paris, 1879).
- A. Dmytrievskij, *L'union des églises et le persecutions polonaises en Ukraine* (Bruxelles, 1939).
- A. Dukie, *The Canonical Status of the Orientals in the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1928).
- Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1962).
- Rosario F. Esposito, *Leone XIII e l'Oriente cristiano. Studio storico-sistemático* ([Rome, 1961]), (= *Multiformis sapientis, collana universale*, 17).
- Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del Sommo Pontifice Pio IX a riparo del mali che soffre la Chiesa Cattolica nei*

dominii di Russia e Polonia (Rome, 1866. Ed. by Segretaria di Stato).

William C. Fletcher, *A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia, 1927-1943* (London, 1965).

A. Florovskii, *Le conflit de deux traditions – la latine et la byzantine – dans la vie intellectuelle de l'Europe orientale aux XVI-XVII siècles* (Prague, 1937). (= *Bulletin de l'Association russe pour les recherches scientifiques à Prague*, vol. 5 (10), no. 31).

Karl, Kritzler, *Zwei Abhandlungen über altrussisches Recht. 1. Die sogenannte Kirchenordnung Jaroslaws, ein Denkmal russisch-germanischen Rechts. (Promotionschrift). 2. Die fürstliche Erbfolge im alten Russland. (Habilitationsschrift)* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1923).

Joseph Gill, S.J., *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, Engl., 1959).

—, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (Oxford, 1964).

Leopold Karl Goetz, *Das Kiewer Höhlenkloster als Kulturzentrum des vormongolischen Russlands* (Passau, 1904).

—, *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands nebst Geschichte des russischen Kirchenrechts* (= *Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen*, Heft 18 und 19).

—, *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland. Kiewer Periode: 889-1240* (Berlin, 1908).

Alphonse Guépin, *Saint Josaphat, archevêque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'Église grecque unie en Pologne*, vol. 1-2 (Poitiers, 1874; [2d ed.], Paris, 1897-1898, appeared under the title: *Un apôtre de l'union des Églises au XVIIe siècle: Saint Josaphat et l'Église greco-slave en Pologne et en Russie*).

Filaret [Gumilevskii], *Geschichte der Kirche in Russland. Ins Deutsche übersetzt von Dr. Blumenthal*, vol. I-II (Frankfort, 1872).

Felix Haase, *Volksglaube und Brauchtum der Ostslaven* (Breslau, 1939). (= *Wort und Brauch*, Heft 26).

Oscar Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization. A History of East Central Europe* (New York, [1952]).

—, *From Florence to Brest (1439-1596)* (Rome, 1958).

Michael Harasiewicz, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae, gratiam et communionem cum S. Sede Romana habentis, ritumque Graeco-Slavicum observantis, cum singulari respectu ad dioceses Ruthenas Leopoliensem, Premisliensem et Chelmensensem* (L'viv, 1962; reprinted in Rome, n. d.).

Harvey F. Fireside, *The Russian Orthodox Church under German Occupation in World War II* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation) (New School for Social Research, 1968).

—, *Icon and Swastika. The Russian Orthodox Church under Nazi*

- and *Soviet Control* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971). (= *Russian Research Center*, 62).
- Albert F. Heard, *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent, Comprising Orthodoxy, Dissent, and Erratic Sects* (New York, 1887; reprinted [1917]).
- Friedrich Heyer, *Die Begegnung der römischen mit der orthodoxen Kirche in der russischen Geschichte* (Hamburg, 1956). (= Deutsche Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde. *Die Ost-Reihe*, Heft 13).
- , *Die orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine von 1917 bis 1945* (Colonge-Braunsfeld, 1953). (= Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster. *Osteuropa und der deutsche Osten*, Reihe 3).
- Romanus Holowackyj, *Seminarium Vilnense SS Trinitatis (1601-1621)*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1957). (= *Analecta OSBM*, Series II, Sectio I: *Opera*, vol. VIII).
- Demetrius Holoweckyj, *Fontes Juris Canonicae Ecclesiae Ruthenae* (Vatican, 1932).
- Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, (Michel Hrushevsky) *Abrégé de l'histoire de l'Ukraine* (Paris, etc., 1920).
- , (Michael Hruschewskij) *Geschichte der Ukraine*, pt. I (L'viv, 1918).
- , (Michael Hruschewskij) *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*, vol. I: *Urgeschichte des Landes und Volkes, Anfänge des Kijever Staates. Autorisierte Übersetzung aus der zweiten ukrainischen Ausgabe* (Leipzig, 1906).
- , (Michael Hruschewskij) *A History of Ukraine*. Edited by O. J. Frederiksen. Pref. by George Vernadsky (New Haven, etc., 1941; and subsequent printings and reprintings).
- , *The Historical Evolution of the Ukrainian Problem. Translated with Permission of the Editor of La Revue politique internationale*, [Nos. 11-12, 1914], by George Raffalovich (London, 1915).
- , (Michael Hruschewskij) *Die ukrainische Frage in historischer Entwicklung* (Vienna, 1915). Translated from the French.
- Isidorus, *Archiepiscopus Kioviensis et totius Russiae: Sermones inter Concilium Florentinum conscripti, e codicibus graecis authographis deprompti, additis versione latina, notis, indicibus a Georgio Hofmann et Emmanuele Candal, editi...* (Rome, 1971). (= *Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores*, 20).
- A. I[wano]witsch, *Material zur Denkschrift der galizischen Russen über die Massregeln, welche neuester Zeit unter dem Vorwande einer Reform des galizischen Regularclerus in's Leben gerufen, die grr-kath. Kirche Galziens in ihrem Bestande gefährden* (Vienna, 1885).

- , (A. Iwanowicz) *Über die historische Bedeutung des Basilianerordens in Galizien und seine gegenwärtige Verhältnisse* (Leipzig, 1885).
- Wilhelm Kahle, *Aufsätze zur Entwicklung der evangelischen Gemeinden in Russland* (Leiden, 1962). (= *Oekumenische Studien*, Bd. IV).
- Eugenius Kaminskyj, *De potestate Metropolitanorum Kioviensium-Haliciensium (a. 1596-1805)* (Rome, 1969). (= *Editiones Universitatis Catholicae S. Clementis Papae. Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*, vol. XXXI).
- R. A. Klostermann, *Probleme der Ostkirche. Untersuchungen zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche* (Göteborg, 1955) (= Göteborgs kungl. vetenskaps- och vitterhets-samhälles handlingar, 6 följden, ser. A, bd. 5).
- Anton Korczok, *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien. Mit einem Vorwort von Prof. Dr. Haase: Die Aufgaben der osteuropäischen Religionswissenschaft* (Leipzig und Breslau, 1921). (= *Quellen und Studien des Osteuropa Institutes*, Breslau, 5. Abt.: Religionswissenschaft, Heft 1).
- Cyril Korolevsky, *L'Uniatisme: définition, causes, effets, étendu, dangers, remèdes* (Amay s. Meuse, 1927). (= *Irénikon collection*, no. 5-6).
- , *Le métropolitain André Szeptyckyj. Son action pastorale, scientifique et philhenotique* (Grottaferrata, 1920).
- C. Kortchaghin, OSBM, *La Iglesia ortodossa autocefala ucraniana (1917-1937)* (Dissert. hist. dogm., Madrid, 1955).
- Borys Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine. Von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1917*. 3., durchgesehene Auflage (Wiesbaden 1963; 1st ed., Berlin 1939).
- Julius Kubinyi, *The History of Prjasiv Eparchy* (Rome, 1970). (= *Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae*, vol. XXXII).
- Ignatius Kulczyński, *Specimen Ecclesiae Ruthenicae, ab origine susceptae fidei ad nostra tempora in suis capitibus seu primitibus Russiae cum S. Sede Apostolica semper unitae* (Rome, 1733; [2nd ed.], Paris—Tournai [1859]).
- Michael Lacko, *Unio Uzhorodensis Ruthenorum Carpathicorum cum Ecclesia Catholica* (Rome, 1955). (= *Orientalia Christiana analecta*, 143).
- Hugo Laemmer, *In decreta Concilii Ruthenorum Zamosciensis animadversiones theologico-canonicae* (Freiburg i. B., 1865).
- Bernard Leib, *Rome, Kiev, et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle. Rapports religieux des Latins et des Gréco-Russes sous le pontificat d'Urbain II (1088-1099)* (Paris, 1924).
- Wasył Lencyk, *The Eastern Catholic Church and Czar Nicholas I*

- (Rome, New York, 1966). (= *Editiones Catholicae Universitatis Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae*, vol. II).
- Wilhelm Leonhardt, *Kreml und Vatikan. Ein Kampf um die Macht durch fünf Jahrhunderte* (Hannover, 1965).
- Louis Lescoeur, *L'Église catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe* (Paris, 1860).
- , *L'Église catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe depuis le premier partage jusques nos jours (1772-1875)*, vol. I-II (Paris, 1876).
- W. Lettenbauer, *Moskau das Dritte Rom. Zur Geschichte einer politischen Theorie* (Munich, [1961]).
- Eduard Likowski, *Geschichte des allmaeligen Verfalls der unirten ruthenischen Kirche im XVIII und XIX Jahrhundert unter polnischem und russischem Scepter. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet vom . . . Praemiirt durch die Polnische Historisch-Literarische Gesellschaft in Paris. Mit Genehmigung des Verfassers in's Deutsche übertragen von Apollinaris Tloczynski . . .* (Cracow, 1903).
- , *Die ruthenisch-romische Kirchenvereinigung genannt Union zu Brest* (Freiburg i. Br., 1904).
- P. Lozovei, *De Metropolitaram Kioviensium potestate (988-1596)*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1962). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio I: *Opera*, vol. XV).
- Johannes (Jean) Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ukrainischen und weissruthenischen Kirche* (Munich, 1969). (= *Ukrainische Freie Universität. Reihe: Monographien*, Bd. 15).
- Michael von Malinowski, *Die Kirchen- und Staats-Satzungen bezüglich des griechisch-katholischen Ritus der Ruthenen in Galizien* (L'viv, 1861).
- Franz Manthey, *Polnische Kirchengeschichte* (Hildesheim, 1965).
- Vladimir F. Martsinkovskii, *With Christ in Soviet Union* (Prague, 1933).
- I. Mirtschuk, *Geschichte der ukrainischen Kultur* (Munich, [1957]). (= *Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes*, München, Bd. 12).
- Ludolf Müller, *Zum Problem des hierarchischen Status und der jurisdiktionellen Abhängigkeit der russischen Kirche vor 1039* (Cologne-Braunsfeld, 1959). (= *Osteuropa und der deutsche Osten*. Reihe 3: Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster, Buch 6).
- Pietro Mugna, *Della Chiesa russa in relazione alla cattolica e ad altre chiese cristiane. Con documenti* (Padua, 1864).
- Nicolas Nilles, *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiae Orientalis in terris Coronae S. Stephani*, vol. I-II. *Maximam*

partem nunc primum ex variis tabulariis, romanis, austriacis, hungaricis, transilvanis, croaticis, Societatis Jesu aliisque fontibus accessu difficilibus erutae . . . , Nicolas Nilles patrocinantibus almīs hungarica et rumena literarum academus editae . . . (Innsbruck, 1885) (= *His Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis, pars III*).

Opera omnia Card. Josephi (Slipyj Kobernyckyj-Dyckowskyj) Archiepiscopi Maioris. Collegerunt Johannes Choma et al., vol. I-VII/VIII (Rome, 1968-1976). The title changes slightly, e.g., vol. VII/VIII: *Opera omnia S. Beatid. Patr. Josephi . . .* Texts in Ukrainian, Latin, German, English and Italian.

William Palmer, *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, 6 vols. (London, 1871-1876).

I. Patrylo, *Archiepiscopi-Metropolitani Kievo-Haliciensis. Attentis praescriptis M.P. "Cleri Sanctitati"* (Rome, 1962).

Basilius Pekar, *De Ereptione canonica Eparchiae Mukacoviensis (an. 1771). Ed. 2.* (Rome, 1956). (= *Analecta OSBM, series II, sectio I: Opera, vol. VII*).

Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den aeltesten Zeiten bis auf Gegenwart*, vol. I-II (Wurzburg-Vienna, 1878-1881; reprinted by Scientia, Aalen, 1966).

W. Philipp, *Ansätze zum geschichtlichen und politischen Denken im Kiewer Russland* (Breslau, 1940).

P. Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, I-V (Paris, 1896-1912; reprinted in 1 vol. by Mouton, Paris, 1967).

Ioannes Praszko, *De Ecclesia Ruthena Catholica sede metropolitana vacante 1655-1665* (Rome, 1944).

Gregor Prokoptschuk, *Der Metropolit. Leben und Wirken des grossen Förderers der Kirchenunion Graf Andreas Scheptytzkyj* (Munich, 1955; 2., *neubearbeitete Auflage*, 1967). The title is slightly changed in the 2d ed., i.e., *Metropolit Andreas Graf Scheptyckyj . . .*

M. J. Rouët de Journal, *Nonciatures de Russie d'après les documents authentiques*, vol. I-V (Vatican, 1922-1952, [vol. I, 1952]). (= *Studi e testi*, 166-169, 194).

Cassianus Sakowicz, *Epanorthosis seu Perspectiva et declaratio errorum, haeresium ac superstitionum, quae in Graeco-Ruthena Ecclesia Disunita cum in articulis Fidei tum in administratione Sacramentorum ac in aliis Ritibus et Caeremoniis reperiuntur* (Cracow, 1642).

Emanuel Sarkisyanz, *Russland und der Messianismus des Orients. Sendungsbewusstsein und politischer Chiliasmus des Ostens* (Tübingen, 1955).

Hildegard Schaeder, *Moskau das Dritte Rom. Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorien in der slawischen Welt* (Hamburg,

- 1929). (= *Osteuropäische Studien*, Nr. 1). 2nd ed., Darmstadt [1957].
- Johannes Schleuning, *Die Stummen reden. 400 Jahre evangelisch-lutherischer Kirche in Russland* (Erlangen-Würzburg, 1952).
- Ursula M. Schuver, OSB, *De reus op de Sint-Jorisberg, Flitsen uit het leven van de grote metropoliet, graaf Anndreas Szep-tuckyj van Galicie* (Rotterdam, 1959).
- Igor Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche: 1700-1917*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1964). (= *Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas*, 9).
- , *Russisches Monchtum. Entstehung, Entwicklung und Wesen: 988-1917* (Würzburg, [1953]). (= *Das östliche Christentum; Abhandlungen*, N. F., Heft 10/11).
- Stanislaus Smolka, *Die russische Welt. Historisch-politische Studien: Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Vienna, 1916).
- , *Les Ruthènes et les problème religieux du monde* (Bern, New York, [etc.], 1917). A translation of the above.
- L. Smurlo, *Le Saint Siège et l'Orient Orthodoxe russe 1609-1654* (Prague, 1928).
- Myron Stasiw, *Metropolia Haliciensis. (Eius historia et iuridica forma)*. Ed. 2. (Rome, 1960). (= *Analecta OSBM*, series II, sectio I: *Opera*, vol. XII).
- Philipp Strahl, *Geschichte der Gründung und Ausbreitung der christlichen Lehren unter den Völkern des ganzen russischen Kreises seit 988 bis auf neue Zeiten* (Halle, 1827).
- Iacobus Susza, *Cursus Vitae et certamen martyrii B. Josaphat Kuncevicii, editio nova, emendatior et auctior curante Joanne Martinov, S.J.* (Paris, 1865).
- Boleslaw Szczesniak, (ed. and tr.), *The Russian Revolution and Religion. A Collection of Documents Concerning the Suppression of Religion by Communists: 1917-1925. With Introductory Essays, Appendices, and a Selective Bibliography* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1959).
- Augustinus Theiner, *Die neuesten Zustände der katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katharina II bis auf unsere Tage* (Augsburg, 1841).
- Emilién Tremblay, *Le Père Delaere et l'Église Ukrainienne du Canada* (Berthierville, Qué., 1961).
- Erika Unger-Dreiling, *Josafat: Vorkämpfer und Martyrer für die Einheit der Cristen* (Vienna, [1960]). A novel based on historical sources.
- Karl Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1930). (= *Grundriss der slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte*, [Bd. VII]).
- Wilhelm de Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens. Unter Mitarbeit von Octavian Bârlea, Josef Gill, Michael Lacko* (Freiburg, [1963]). (= *Orbis academicus. Problemgeschichten*

- der Wissenschaft in Dokumenten und Darstellungen*, Bd. III/4).
 P. Werhun, *Andreas Graf Scheptyckyj* (Glogau, n. d.).
 Eduard Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine: 955-1939* (Leipzig, 1942).
 —, *Russland und die slawischen Völker in der Diplomatie des Vatikans: 1878-1909* (Berlin, 1950).
 —, *Russland und das Papsttum*, vol. 1-3 (Berlin, 1960-1962). (= *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas*, Bd. 6).
 Ivan Wlasowsky, *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*, vol. I: [From] *the Baptism of Ukraine to the Union of Berestye (988-1596)* (New York, 1956).
 M. Yavdas, *Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Documents for the History of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church* (Munich, 1956). The text in Ukrainian, English, and German.
 James J. Zatko, *The Destruction of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, 1917-1923* (Ann Arbor, 1959).
 Adolf Ziegler, *Die Union des Konzils von Florenz in der russischen Kirche* (Würzburg, 1938). (= *Das östliche Christentum*, Heft 4/5)

II

- American Committee for Liberation, *The Beleaguered Fortress. A Survey of the Present Status of Religion in the USSR* (New York, [1963]).
 Paul B. Anderson, *People, Church, and State in Modern Russia* (New York, 1944).
Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe. Hearings, Eighty-ninth Congress, First Session. May 10, 11, and 12, 1965 (Washington, 1965).
Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Autonomy. A Symposium Held on July 15, 1972, at Lincoln Center Campus, Fordham University. Editors: Thomas E. Bird [and] Eva Piddubcheshen (New York, 1972).
 Trevor Beeson, *Discretion and Valour. Religious Conditions in Russia and Eastern Europe. With a Foreword by John Lawrence* (London, 1974).
 Louis E. Bélanger, *Les Ukrainiens Catholiques du rit grec-ruthène au Canada* [Québec, 1945?] (= *Les theses canoniques de Laval*)
 Francois A.A. Bernard, *Où en est l'Eglise du silence? U.R.S.S. et pays satellites* (Paris, [1960]).
 Peter Bilon, *Ukrainians and Their Church. Translated from the Ukrainian by S.P. Symchych* (Johnstown, Pa., 1953).

- Walter Birnbaum, *Christenheit in Sowjetrußland. Was wissen wir von ihr?* (Tübingen, 1961).
- Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, *Soviet Church Policy in the Ukraine: 1919-1939*. (Unpubl. Ph.D. dissert., University of Chicago, 1961).
- and John W. Strong, (eds.), *Religion and Atheism in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe* (Toronto, 1975).
- Michael Bourdeaux, *Opium of the People. The Christian Religion in the U.S.S.R.* (London [1955]; and Indianapolis [1966]).
- , *Religious Ferment in Russia. Protestant Opposition to Soviet Religious Policy* (London [etc.], 1968).
- Arne Bugge, *Moskva – det tredje Rom. Den ortodokse kirke i Rusland* (Copenhagen, 1970). (= Kosmos-serien).
- Church and State Behind the Iron Curtain: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania. With an Introduction on the Soviet Union. Prepared Under the General Editorship of Vladimir Gsovski* (New York, 1955). (= Mid-European Studies Center of the Free Europe Committee. Mid-European Law Project).
- Camille M. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin* (New York, 1950).
- 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).
- John Shelton Curtiss, *Church and State in Russia. The Last Years of the Empire, 1900-1917* (New York, 1965; [c1940]).
- , *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917-1950* (Boston, [1953]; and Gloucester, Mass., 1965).
- N.A. Czuba, *History of the Ukrainian Catholic Parochial Schools in the United States* (Chicago, 1956).
- Nathaniel Davis, *Religion and Communist Government in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 1960).
- Pierre Debray, *Ein Katholik erlebt die Sowjetunion. Mit einem Vorwort von Abbé Boulier. [Aus dem Französischen übersetzt. von Hedwig Hänsel]* (Leipzig, 1952).
- Richard T. DeGeorge and James P. Scanlan, (eds.), *Marxism and Religion in Eastern Europe. Papers presented at the Banff International Slavic Conference, September 4-7, 1974*, (Dordrecht, Holland, 1976). (= *Sovietica*, 36)
- A. Dragan, *Our Ukrainian Cardinal [Joseph Slipyj]. Designed and Layout by Bohdan Tytla* (Jersey City, N.J.—New York, N.Y. [1966]).
- E. Düring, *Bolsjevismens kamp mot kristendomen* (Örebro, 1956).
- Walter Dushnyck, *The Ukrainian-Rite Catholic Church at the Ecumenical Council, 1962-1965. A Collection of Articles, Books Reviews, Editorials, Reports, and Commentaries with Special*

- Emphasis on Ukrainian-Rite and Other Eastern Churches* (New York, 1967). (= Shevchenko Scientific Society. *Ukrainian Studies. English Section*, vol. 5 (23)).
- Die Ersten Opfer des Kommunismus. Weissbuch über die religiösen Verfolgungen in der Ukraine.* [Übersetzt aus dem Englischen von Maria Mirtschuk] (Munich, 1953).
- 'Father George', *God's Underground* (New York, 1949).
- F. Fedorov, *L'Église et le culte en U.R.S.S.* (Paris, 1945).
- First Victims of Communism. White Book on the Religious Persecution in Ukraine.* (Translated from the Italian) (Rome, 1953; appeared also in German and French. Published by *Analecta O.S.B.M.*).
- Ulisse A. Floridi, *Mosca e il Vaticano. I dissidenti sovietici di fronte al "dialogo".* Introduzione di M. Agurskij ([Milano, 1976]). (= *Collana "Ricerche" 1*).
- Albert Galter, *Le "livre rouge" de l'Église persécutée.* [Publié sous les auspices de la Commission pour l'Église persécutée des organisations internationales catholiques] 2. éd. (Paris, [1957, 1956]).
- , *The Red Book of the Persecuted Church* (Westminster, Md., 1957).
- Hilario Gómez, *Russia y el Vaticano* (Madrid [1961]). (= *Perspectivas*, 17)
- Constantin de Grunwald, *La vie religieuse en U.R.S.S.* ([Paris, 1961]).
- , *The Churches and the Soviet Union.* Translated by G.J. Robinson-Paskevsky (New York, [1961], 1962).
- Lino Gussoni and Aristide Brunello, *The Silent Church. Facts and Documents Concerning Religious Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain* (New York, [1954]).
- Arfved Gustavson, *The Catacomb Church* (Jordanville, N.Y., 1960).
- W. Gutsche, *Religion und Evangelium in Sowjetrussland zwischen zwei Weltkriegen, 1917-1944* (Kassel, 1959).
- Karl Hardt, *Die Opfer des Kommunismus. Eine kurze Bilanz.* [2. Aufl.] (Augsburg, [1960]).
- R. Harris, (comp.), *Christian Appeals from Russia.* Edited by Rosemary Harris & Xenia Howard-Johnston. With an introduction by Michael Bourdeaux (London, 1969).
- Michael Hrynchyshyn, CSSR, (Postulator), *Beatificationis et canonizationis Servi Dei Andreae Szeptyckyj, archiepiscopi Leopoliensis Ucrainorum, metropolitae Halyciensis, Articuli pro causae instructione* (Rome, 1958).
- I. Hrynioch, *Die Zerstörung der Ukrainisch-Katholischen Kirche in der Sowjetunion* (Würzburg, [1963?]).

- Kurt Hutten, *Christen hinter dem Eisernen Vorhang. Die christlichen Gemeinden in der kommunistischen Welt*, vol. I-II (Stuttgart, [1962-1963]).
- , *Iron Curtain Christians. The Church in the Communist Countries Today*. Translated by Walter G. Tillmans (Minneapolis, [1967]). 1 vol.
- Institute for the Study of the USSR. *Genocide in the U.S.S.R. Studies in Group Destruction* (New York, 1958).
- Wolodymyr Janiw, *Die Lage der Ukrainischen Katholischen Kirche* (Regensburg, 1975).
- Joseph Johnston, *God's Secret Armies within the Soviet Empire* (New York, 1954).
- Kampf des Glaubens. Dokumente aus der Sowjetunion*. (Herausgeber: Gustav A. Wetter.) (Bern, [1967]).
- Alexander Kischkowsky, *Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche* ([Munich, 1957]; 2. ergänzte Auflage, 1960). (= Institut zur Erforschung der UdSSR, München. Monographien, Serie I, Nr. 37 and 58 respectively).
- Walter Kolarz, *Religion in the Soviet Union* ([New York], 1961 [i.e., 1962]).
- , *Die Religionen in der Sowjetunion. Überleben in Anpassung und Widerstand* (Fribourg—Basel—Vienna, [1963]).
- D. Konstantinov, *Religious Persecution in USSR* (London, Ont., 1965). (= Abr. version appeared in the *Bulletin* of the Institute for the Study of the USSR, Munich, No. 5, 1965).
- Daria Kuzyk, *Death Verdict for a Church* [Trenton, 1972]).
- Elinor Lipper, *Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps* (London, [1951?]).
- Gregory Luznycky, *Persecution and Destruction of the Ukrainian Church by the Russian Bolsheviks* (New York, 1960).
- , *The Persecution of the Ukrainian Church by Soviet Russian Regime. (Violation of Human Rights in Ukraine)* (Winnipeg, etc., 1972).
- Józef Mackiewicz, *In the Shadow of the Cross*. Translated from Polish by Wiktor Moszczyński (New York, 1973).
- Jean Madey, *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien. Vers la perfection de l'état juridique actuel* (Rome, 1971). (= *Opera Theologicae Societatis Scientificaе Ucrainorum*, vol. XIX).
- George A. Maloney and Eva Piddubcheshen, *Critique of Msgr. Pospishil's 'The Quest for an Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate'* (Philadelphia, 1972).
- Reuben Henry Markham, (ed.), *Communists Crush Churches in Eastern Europe* (Boston, 1950).
- Richard H. Marshall, Jr., (ed.), *Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967* (Chicago, 1971).
- André Martin, *Les croyants un U.R.S.S. L'Église orthodoxe off-*

- cielle contestée: *persecutions et procès des croyants. Préface de Gabriel Marcel* (Paris, 1970).
- , *Die Gläubigen in Russland* (Luzern—Munich, 1971).
- Maxime Mourin, *Le Vatican et l'URSS* (Paris, 1965). (= *Études et documents Payot*).
- , *Der Vatikan und die Sowjetunion. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt von Hildegard Krage* (Munich, 1967).
- Lev W. Mydlowsky, *Bolshevist Persecution of Church and Religion in Ukraine, 1917-1957. (Informative Outline)* (London, 1958, [2d rev. ed., 1962]).
- Wolodymyr Mykula, *The Gun and the Faith. Religion and Church in the Ukraine under the Communist Russian Rule. A Brief Survey* (London, 1969).
- , *La Religion et l'Église en Ukraine sous le régime communiste russe. [Préface de Wolodymyr Kosyk]* (Paris, 1971). (= *Collection: Études historiques et politiques*).
- National Peace Council, London. Commission on East-West Relations. *Christians and Communists. A Study of Relations Between Church and State in Eastern Europe* (London, [1953]).
- Eva Piddubcheshen, "... *And Bless Thine Inheritance.*" *Introduction by George A. Maloney, S.J.* (Schenectady, N.Y., 1970).
- J.C. Pollock, *The Faith of Russian Evangelicals* (New York, [c1964]; and Grand Rapids, [1969]).
- , *The Christians from Siberia* (London, 1965). The contents are the same as in the preceding.
- Claudia Helen Popowych, SSMI, *To Serve is to Love. The Canadian Story of the Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate. With a Foreword by Vladimir J. Kaye* (Toronto, 1971).
- Victor J. Pospishil and Hryhor M. Luznycky, *The Quest for an Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate* (Philadelphia, 1971).
- Radio Liberty Committee. *The Beleaguered Fortress. A Survey of the Present Status of Religion in the USSR* (New York, 1963).
- Religion in the USSR.* [Edited by Boris Iwanow. Translation edited by James Larkin] (Munich, 1960). (= Institute for the Study of the USSR. [Research and Materials], Series I, No. 59)
- Reinhard Raffalt, *Wohin steuert der Vatikan? Papst zwischen Religion und Politik* (Munich, 1973).
- A.A. Esteban Romero, *Juan XXIII y las iglesias ortodoxas* (Madrid, [1961]). (= *Colección "Manuales dei pensamiento católico,"* no. 10).
- S. Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. *Oriente Cattolico. Cenni storici e statistiche* (Vatican, 1962).
- Winrick Scheffbuch, *Christen unter Hammer und Sichel* (Wuppertal, 1972).
- Heinz Horst Schrey, *Die Generation der Entscheidung. Staat und*

Kirche in Europa und im europäischen Russland, 1918 bis 1953
(Munich, 1955).

R.C. Scott, *Quakers in Russia* (London, 1964).

Shepherd in Chains. Persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church
([Philadelphia, Publ. by Ukrainian Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia, 1962]).

Gerhard Simon, *Der sowjetische Staat und die Kirche. Die Lage der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche seit dem Ende der 50er Jahre*
(Cologne, [1968])

—, *Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion, 1967/68* (Cologne, 1969).

—, *Die Kirchen in Russland. Berichte und Dokumente* (Munich, 1970).

—, *Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche nach dem Tode des Patriarchen Aleksij* (Cologne, 1970).

—, *Die Kirchen in der Sowjetunion heute* (Cologne, 1970).

N.B. The above titles appeared as: *Berichte des Bundesinstituts für Ostwissenschaftliche und Internationale Studien*; 56/1968; 9/1969; 40/1970; 34-35/1970, respectively.

—, *Church, State, and Opposition in the U.S.S.R. Translated by Kathleen Matchett in Collaboration with Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism* (Berkeley, Calif., [1974]).

Matthew Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia* (New York, 1956).

W.B. Stroyen, *Communist Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church, 1943-9162* (Washington, [1967]).

Nikita Struve, *Les chrétiens en U.R.S.S.* (Paris, [1963; *Nouv. éd., rev. corr., mise à jour et augm.*, 1964]).

—, *Die Christen in der UdSSR* (Mainz, 1965).

—, *Christians in Contemporary Russia. Translated by Lancelot Sheppard and A. Manson from [the French] 2nd rev. and augm. ed.* (London, [1966]; and New York [1967]).

R. Stupperich, (ed.), *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion; Gesetze und Verordnungen.* (Witten, 1962). (= *Schriftenreihe des Studienausschusses der EKU für Fragen der orthodoxen Kirche, Heft 1*).

[I. Szewciw], *Ukraine — A Christian Nation. 40th International Eucharistic Congress in Australia* ([Melbourne, 1973]).

Nadeshda Theodorowitsch, *Religion und Atheismus in der UdSSR. Dokumente und Berichte.* [*Übersetzung aus dem Russischen: Irmgard Stoldt und Peter Braun*] (Munich, [1970]).

The Tragedy of the Greek Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia
(New York, 1971).

Nils Jacob Tommessen, *Var tids martyrer. En utfordring til den frie verden* (Oslo, 1968).

URSS: *dibattito nella comunità cristiana. Quattordici documenti dei cristiani sovietici.* Due saggi di N. Struve e M. Bourdeaux (Milano, 1968). (= *Cronache alla prova. Chiesa e società*, 4).

- Roger Vanhopplinus, *Sowjets "bevrijden" Oost-Europa; bloedige bladzijden uit de geschiedenis van landen in de communistische machtsgreep* (Wervik, 1957).
- Wilhelm de Vries, *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion* (Munich, 1959). (= *Sammlung Wissenschaft und Gegenwart*).
- Meletius M. Wojnar, O.S.B.M., *The Code of Oriental Canon Law: De ritibus orientalibus and De personis* (Washington, D.C., [1959]). (Reprinted from *The Jurist*, vol. XIX (1959), pp. 212-45; 277-99; and 413-64).
- Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ. Today's Martyr Church. With a Foreword by the Rev. W. Stuart Harris* (London, 1967).
- , *Blod og tarer. Kristnes og joders lidelser i kommunistiske fengsler* (Oslo, 1968). (= *Na-debatt*, 9).
- , *Underground Saints* (Old Tappan, N.J., 1968).

The following periodicals are to be checked for articles and current bibliographies on Church history and present problems of religion in Ukraine:

- Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni*, series II, sectio II: *Articuli, documenta collectanea, miscellanea, bibliographia* (Rome)
- The Catholic Historical Review* (Washington, D.C.).
- Het Christelijk Osten* (Nijmegen, The Netherlands).
- Diakonia* (Bronx, N.Y.).
- Forschungen zur osteuropaischen Geschichte* (Berlin).
- Glaube in der 2. Welt. Zeitschrift für Fragen von Religion, Atheismus und Menschenrecht in kommunistisch regierten Ländern* (Kusnacht-Zurich).
- The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* (Brookline, Mass.).
- Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Bern).
- Irénikon* (Amay-Chevotgne, Belgium.)
- Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (Wiesbaden).
- Kirche in Not* (Königstein/Ts).
- Kirche im Osten* (Göttingen).
- Kyrios. Vierteljahresschrift für Kirchen- und Gestesgeschichte Osteuropas* (Berlin).
- Looking East* (Fatima).
- Oriens christianus* (Wiesbaden).
- Orientalia christiana periodica* (Rome).
- Ostkirchliche Studien* (Wurzburg).
- RCDA - Religion in Communist Dominated Areas* (New York, N.Y.).
- Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain, Belgium).
- St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* (Tuckahoe, N.Y.).
- Za Patriarkhat* (Philadelphia, Pa., *English Section*).
- Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* (Marburg).

A CALENDAR
OF
SELECTED DATES AND EVENTS IN
THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
1945 -- 1975

Prepared by L. Rudnytzky

November 1, 1944 — Metropolitan Andrei Sheptyts'kyi, Archbishop of Kiev-Halych, died; Archbishop Josyf Slipyj assumed his duties as Metropolitan of Halych in L'viv.

April 11, 1945 — Metropolitan Slipyj and five Ukrainian Catholic bishops were arrested by the Soviet government in L'viv and Stanyslaviv: Bishops N. Budka, N. Charnets'kyi, G. Khomyshyn, G. Latyshevs'kyi and P. Verhun, the Apostolic Administrator for Ukrainians residing in Germany, who was arrested in Berlin.

May 28, 1945 — A group of apostate priests (the "Initiative Group") under the leadership of the Orthodox Bishop Macarius of the Russian Orthodox Church submitted a request to the Council of the People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR to "lead our church out of the state of anarchy into a state of consolidation for transforming it into the Orthodox Church."

June 1, 1945 — Over 300 courageous priests of the Ukrainian Catholic Church signed a protest to the Vice-President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, V. Molotov condemning the activities of the "Initiative Group" as harmful to Church and state.

June 18, 1945 — The Soviet government sent a reply to the "Initiative Group" approving it as the "sole interim church administrative organ" and granted it authority to administer the Ukrainian Catholic Church parishes for the realization of "the union" with the Russian Orthodox Church.

- June 29, 1945 – The Carpatho-Ukraine was officially incorporated into the Ukrainian SSR, and the persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church by the Soviet administration began in this area as well.
- October 22, 1945 – A Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church held in Moscow nominated Nestor, former Bishop of Uman', as Bishop of Mukachiv-Priashiv in Carpatho-Ukraine.
- December 23, 1945 – Pope Pius XII issued an Encyclical commemorating the 350th anniversary of the Union of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Apostolic See entitled "Orientales omnes Ecclesias."
- February 24 and 25, 1946 – The Russian Orthodox Metropolitan Ioan of Kiev consecrated Rev. A. Pelvets'kyi as bishop of the Stanyslaviv and Rev. M. Mel'nyk as bishop of Drohobych-Sambir dioceses. (All Ukrainian Catholic bishops were already in Soviet prisons.)
- March 8-10, 1946 – The "pseudo-Sobor" of L'viv was held and members of the "Sobor," 216 priests and 19 lay delegates, decided, under the pressure of the state's security officials, to "liquidate the decisions of the Council of Brest of 1596," and to "return to the Holy Orthodox Church. . . ."
- October 22, 1946 – The Patriarchal Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church dispatched Bishop Nestor of Uman' to Carpatho-Ukraine, charging him with the task of liquidating the Ukrainian Catholic Church.
- March 22, 1947 – The MVD closed the Basilian Order Monastery in Chernecha Hora, the largest monastery in Carpatho-Ukraine. The monks were arrested and deported, and the monastery was handed over to Russian Orthodox monks.
- January 1, 1948 – The Soviet press agency TASS issued an official communiqué stating that the Ukrainian Catholic Church had ceased to exist.
- March 3, 1948 – The Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of Canada was divided into the three dioceses (with the residences of bishops in Winnipeg, Toronto and Edmonton). In addition to Bishop Wasyl Ladyka, who was the Exarch of entire Canada, three new bishops were nominated: Rev. Neil Savaryn – the Exarch of the West, Rev. Izydor Boreckyj – the Exarch of the East,

and Rev. Andrij Roboreckyj, as an Auxiliary to the Most Rev. Wasyl Ladyka — now the Exarch of Central Canada.

August 28, 1949 — Ireneus Kondratovych, the Vicar General for Carpatho-Ukraine, was compelled to announce the “abolition” of the Union of Brest and to declare “the union” with the Russian Orthodox Church. Catholic priests who refused to accept Orthodoxy were arrested and deported to Siberia, and the Ukrainian Catholic Church was declared “illegal.”

April 28, 1950 — 844 delegates of local and district “committees” voted in Priashiv for “the union” with the Russian Orthodox Church. This assembly declared that the “Greek-Catholic Church in the Priashiv area has ceased to exist.”

December 15, 1952 — Pope Pius bemoaned the plight of the Ukrainian people in his Encyclical “Orientales Ecclesias.”

February 20, 1956 — Pope Pius XII issued an Apostolic Letter to the Ukrainian hierarchy in Ukraine and in the diaspora on the occasion of the 1000th Anniversary of the baptism (955) of St. Ol'ha, the Grand Princess of Kiev. Ukrainian communities in the diaspora had previously honored this anniversary with solemn celebrations during the entire year of 1955.

November 1956 — Most Rev. Maksym Hermaniuk was nominated and installed Metropolitan of Canada following the death of his predecessor Metropolitan Wasyl Ladyka.

December 2, 1957 — Ivan Latyshes'kyi, Auxiliary Bishop of Stanislaviv (now Ivano-Frankiv'sk) died, having spent ten years in Soviet imprisonment.

December 25, 1957 — Pope Pius XII released an Apostolic Statement with greetings, good wishes, and blessings to Josyf Slipyj, Metropolitan of Halych, who was in prison at the time.

July 12, 1958 — The eparchy of Philadelphia for the Ukrainians was raised to the rank of a metropolia by the Apostolic Constitution “*Apostolicam hanc*.” The Most Rev. Konstantyn Bohaczewskyj became the first metropolitan.

July 19, 1960 — Pavlo Goidych, Bishop of Priashiv, died in a Czechoslovak concentration camp.

January 6, 1961 — Metropolitan Konstantyn Bohaczewskyj died.

- August 14, 1961 – Most Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, Bishop of Stamford, Conn., was nominated Metropolitan of Philadelphia.
- February 4, 1963 – Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj, accompanied by Msgr. Jan Willebrands, left Moscow for Rome, having been summoned by Pope John XXIII and released from prison by the Soviet government.
- February 9, 1963 (10:30 p.m.) – Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj arrived in Orte, Italy, where he was greeted by Msgr. Lorio Capovilla, Secretary of Pope John XXIII and Msgr. Igino Cardinale, Chief of Protocol of the Vatican. Upon his arrival in Italy, the Metropolitan's first residence was at the Monastery of Grotaferrata.
- February 10, 1963 – Cardinal Cicognani and Cardinal Testa arrived in Grotaferrata to welcome Metropolitan Slipyj.
- February 11, 1963 – Pope John XXIII and Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj met for the first time.
- May 14, 1963 – On the intercession of Metropolitan Slipyj, Pope John XXIII signed an Apostolic Breve ("The Church, a Caring Mother"), designating the Ukrainian Seminary in Rome a Pontifical Seminary. The official proclamation of this was made on October 14, 1963.
- May 31, 1963 – Pope John XXIII and Metropolitan Slipyj met for the last time.
- June 3, 1963 – Pope John XXIII died.
- June 21, 1963 – Giovanni Battista Montini was elected Pope Paul VI by the conclave of the College of Cardinals.
- September 22 - November 25, 1963 – The first Archiepiscopal Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic Church was held in Rome.
- October 10, 1963 – Metropolitan Slipyj spoke at the 46th General Assembly of the Second Vatican Council. He concluded his speech by proposing that the Kiev-Halych Metropolia be raised to the dignity of a Patriarchal See.
- October 18, 1963 – Pope Paul VI received in an audience representatives of Ukrainian scholarly and lay organizations. This delegation was headed by Metropolitan Slipyj.

- October 29, 1963 – Metropolitan Slipyj celebrated Holy Liturgy in Ukrainian rite for the Council Fathers of Vatican II.
- November 12, 1963 – Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj delivered his second speech at the deliberations of Vatican II.
- November 22, 1963 – In a solemn ceremony the sacred relics of St. Josaphat were transferred to St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.
- November 25, 1963 – Metropolitan Josyf Slipyj issued the decree establishing the Pope St. Clement Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome.
- November 25, 1963 – Ukrainian Catholic bishops issued first joint pastoral letter signed by all Ukrainian bishops who attended the second session of Vatican II.
- December 23, 1963 – Pope Paul VI declared through the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches that in accordance with Canons 324-339 *Cleri Sanctitati*, the Metropolitan of L'viv has the title of a "Major Archbishop."
- December 23, 1963 – Pope Paul VI appointed his Beatitude Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj to the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches.
- January 31, 1964 – S.I.C.O., the official bulletin of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches, published an article by Msgr. Mario Rizzi emphasizing the fact that traditionally the Primate of the Church in Ukraine has a status equal to that of a patriarch. This article was reprinted in *L'Osservatore Romano*, February 6, 1964.
- July 23, 1964 – His Beatitude Josyf issued a pastoral letter marking the official opening of the Studite Monastery in Rome.
- November 12, 1964 – Ukrainian Catholic Bishops who attended the third session of Vatican II issued the second joint pastoral letter.
- November 21, 1964 – Pope Paul promulgated the Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches. Sections 9 and 10 of said Decree define the authority of Patriarch/Major Archbishop.
- February 22, 1965 – Pope Paul VI announced the appointment of new cardinals to the Sacred College, including His Beatitude Josyf Cardinal Slipyj.

February 25, 1965 – On the occasion of the installation of His Beatitude Josyf as cardinal, Pope Paul VI spoke the following words to the Ukrainian delegation in Rome: "... By this elevation of Your Metropolitan in the eyes of the Church and the world We wished to give you an authoritative leader, on whom you can rely, and whom you can trust implicitly.... We wish to say that by elevating your great Metropolitan to the dignity of cardinal, We hoped to give you, Ukrainians, a high spokesman for your unity, to establish a strong center for your religious and national life.... We wish to revive great hopes among the Ukrainian people. Continue your struggle! Lift up your hearts, my dear Ukrainian sons! Work, pray, rely on God! May the Lord bless your efforts, fulfill your hopes and your dreams."

June 19, 1965 – The Founding Convention of the Society for the Promotion of Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Church was held in New York, N.Y.

December 13, 1965 – Ukrainian Catholic Bishops issued their third joint pastoral letter on the occasion of the termination of the fourth and last session of Vatican II.

January 24, 1966 – In a letter (No. 62282), signed by A.G. Cardinal Cicognani, the Secretary of the Vatican State, Pope Paul VI bestowed his Papal Blessing on the Ukrainian Catholic University of Pope St. Clement in Rome.

September 6, 1968 – His Beatitude Josyf met with Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk and other members of the Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy in Bound Brook, New Jersey.

January 27, 1969 – Bishop Vasyl' Velychkovskyi was re-arrested by the Soviet secret police following the escalation of religious persecution in Ukraine during the 1960's.

February 21, 1969 – The Vatican created the Byzantine Rite Archeparchy of Munhall in the United States for the faithful described as "Byzantine Ruthenian Rite Catholics."

September 27-28, 1969 – Pope Paul VI attended (September 28) the festivities marking the official consecration of the Saint Sophia Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral in Rome.

September 29 - October 4, 1969 – The Fourth Archiepiscopal Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic bishops deliberated in Rome. The Synod agreed to petition Pope Paul VI to establish a Patriarchate for the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

October 15, 1969 – His Beatitude Josyf addressed the Papal Synod of Bishops stressing the sacrifices (“mountains of bodies and rivers of blood”) of the Ukrainian Catholic faithful for their faith and for the fidelity to the Holy See.

October 23, 1969 – His Beatitude Josyf convoked a conference of the representatives of Eastern Churches who attended the Papal Synod of Bishops. The goal of the conference was to prepare a Common Ecumenical Conference of Eastern Churches. Among the participants were six patriarchs and seven archbishops-metropolitans.

October 25, 1969 – Major Archbishop Josyf Slipyj forwarded to the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches a report on the Fourth Archiepiscopal Synod, together with a petition to Pope Paul VI to elevate the Kiev-Halych Metropolia to the status of a patriarchate.

December 1, 1969 – Maximilian Cardinal de Furstenberg, The Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches, replied to the memorandum by Cardinal Slipyj of October 25, stating that no one in the Ukrainian Catholic Church has the right to convoke a “legislative or elective Synod.”

December 7, 1969 – Ukrainian Catholics demonstrated against the visit of Maximilian Cardinal de Furstenberg, the Prefect of the Congregation for Eastern Churches, to Philadelphia, for the tenth anniversary of the elevation of the Philadelphia Ukrainian Catholic diocese to the status of a Metropolitan See, and against the pro-Congregation policy of Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn.

December 15, 1969 – His Beatitude Josyf refuted Cardinal de Furstenberg’s claim that no one in the Ukrainian Catholic Church has the right to convoke a “legislative or elective synod,” (December 1, 1969), by stating that “the decisions of more than 21 bishops are law to us . . .”

March 25, 1970 – A “Declaration” issued on that date (AAS, 62, 179), imposed a territorial limitation on the rights of a patriarchs/major archbishops and clarified the relationship between

patriarch/major archbishop and their bishops living outside their limited territory. It was decreed that bishops may participate with deliberative vote in all patriarchal synods both for the election of a new patriarch or a new bishop or for any other synodal business.

April 10, 1970 – Cardinal de Furstenberg, as Prefect of the Congregation for Eastern Churches, communicated the decision of Pope Paul VI, that the Ukrainian Catholic bishops, when they meet together, do not constitute a synod but only “a conference of Ukrainian bishops.”

May 28, 1970 – The St. Andrew Society of Ukrainian Catholic Priests was established in Cohoes, N.Y.

September 8, 1970 – The Ukrainian Catholic parish of SS Sergius and Bacchus was officially established in Rome.

November 3, 1970 – The Saint Sophia Association of Ukrainian Catholics was officially established in Rome.

February 22, 1971 – The nomination of Msgr. John Stock (d. June 30, 1972) as auxiliary bishop to Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn of Philadelphia was announced through the office of Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

May 4, 1971 – The nomination of Msgr. Basil Losten as auxiliary to Metropolitan Senyshyn was announced in the same manner as in the case of Msgr. Stock. Ukrainian Catholics vigorously protested these nominations, inasmuch as they were made without the knowledge or consent of Major Archbishop Josyf and the Archiepiscopal Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic Hierarchy.

May 25, 1971 – Thousands of Ukrainian Catholics demonstrated at the Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, against the consecration of Msgrs. Losten and Stock.

June, 1971 – During his enthronization Patriarch Pimen of Moscow reiterated the announcement of the complete liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Jan Cardinal Willebrands and other Curia members, who represented the Pope at the ceremonies, failed to protest Pimen's statement.

- July 7, 1971 – In a letter to his Beatitude Josyf Pope Paul VI denied “at least at this time,” a patriarchate to the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The letter is entitled: “Observantia paternique amoris.”
- October 29, 1971 – Jean Cardinal Villot, Secretary of the Vatican State, sent a letter to all Ukrainian Catholic bishops forbidding them to participate in the Fifth Archiepiscopal Synod convoked by his Beatitude Josyf in Rome.
- October 31, 1971 – The deliberations of the Fifth Archiepiscopal Synod began in Rome, following the solemn commemoration of the 375th Anniversary of the Union of Brest and the 225th Anniversary of the Union of Uzhhorod. Fifteen Ukrainian Catholic bishops participated under the leadership of His Beatitude Josyf. The Permanent Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic Church was established, and a draft of the Constitution for the Ukrainian Catholic Church was discussed.
- Spring 1972 – The Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate in Brazil was raised to an Eparchy but it was made suffragan see of the Latin Rite Archdiocese of Curitiba.
- June 8, 1972 – The first joint pastoral letter of the Permanent Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic Church was issued.
- August 21-24, 1972 – In an Eparchial *soborchyk* held in Melbourne under the chairmanship of Bishop Ivan Prashko, the Ukrainian Catholic priests of Australia condemned the negative attitude of the Congregation for Eastern Churches toward the Ukrainian Catholic Church and reaffirmed their loyalty to the Primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, His Beatitude Josyf.
- October 13-17, 1972 – The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church held its Synod (*Sobor*) in London. In one of the resolutions (No. 8), the Orthodox prelates expressed their sympathy to the Ukrainian Catholics for their suffering resulting from “the close cooperation of the Vatican and the atheistic Kremlin.”
- October 28, 1972 – The Ukrainian Catholic bishops received from the Apostolic delegates of their respective countries of residence letters challenging the validity of the action taken by his Beatitude Josyf in sending to his bishops a draft of a constitution for the Ukrainian Catholic Church for the bishops’ comments and eventual acceptance.

November 25, 1972 — Over 700 Ukrainian Catholics staged a protest march before the building of the Apostolic Delegation in Washington, D.C., protesting Jean Cardinal Villot's letter of October 28, 1972.

January 22, 1973 — Jean Cardinal Villot, Secretary of the Vatican State, sent a letter to His Beatitude Josyf concerning his planned voyage to Australia for the 40th Eucharistic Congress. The letter, written in the name of Pope Paul VI, exhorts the Primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church to concern himself exclusively with matters of his rite and avoid events "which could be interpreted as pressure on the Apostolic See in matters which are not in accordance with existing laws."

February 9, 1973 — Jean Cardinal Villot, Secretary of the Vatican State, sent another letter to His Beatitude Josyf in which he asked the Primate to convey Pope Paul's Apostolic Blessing on the Ukrainians in Australia during the 40th Eucharistic Congress.

February 9-15, 1973 — Jean Cardinal Villot sent out copies of his letter (of January 22) to His Beatitude Josyf to the bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

February 22, 1973 — A Laymen Council of Ukrainian Catholics was held in Melbourne, Australia. During its proceedings the text of a letter to Pope Paul VI was approved. The letter was subsequently signed by approximately 5,000 Ukrainian Catholic faithful and sent to Pope Paul VI.

April 18, 1973 — The Society for the Patriarchate sent a documented eight page memorandum on the condition of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the diaspora to Pope Paul VI with the request for his blessings of a patriarchal status for the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

June 30, 1973 — Bishop Vasyl' Velychkovs'kyi (b. June 1, 1903; consecrated secretly in 1959), died in Winnipeg, Canada, having lived but one year in the Free World after his release from Soviet imprisonment.

October 1, 1974 — Metropolitan Maxym Hermaniuk, C.S.R., Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop of Winnipeg, Canada, addressed the Synod of Bishops in Rome, stressing among others, the need to restore to the Synods of the Eastern Churches all their proper rights, to reorganize the Congregation for the Eastern

Churches (if the Congregation is judged still necessary), and to acknowledge a personal jurisdiction to Patriarchs and Major Archbishops over their faithful in the immigration.

October 16, 1973 — Pope Paul VI sent a letter to Paul Cardinal Philippe, the Prefect of the Congregation for Eastern Churches, on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of St. Josaphat's martyrdom, ignoring His Beatitude Josyf and the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy.

July 27, 1974 — The Vatican Radio announced the appointment of three Ukrainian Catholic bishops and the establishment of a new eparchy. Fathers Jerome Chymij, O.S.B.M., Rector of the Pontifical Ukrainian College of St. Josaphat in Rome, was named head of the New Westminster Eparchy in British Columbia, Msgr. Myroslav Marusyn would continue to serve as Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainian Catholics in Western Europe in the rank of bishop, and Father Martin Greschuk of St. Stephen's parish of Calgary, Alta., was named auxiliary to Bishop Neil N. Savaryn of Edmonton. These appointments, made without the knowledge or consent of the Primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, His Beatitude Josyf, precipitated a series of protests from Ukrainian Catholics in all parts of the world.

October 16, 1974 — The Society for the Patriarchate in the Ukrainian Catholic Church sent a memorandum, entitled "An Appeal to the Conscience of the World Synod of Bishops," to all participants of the Synod in Rome. The memorandum, accompanied by a personal letter to each of the participants, urged them to raise their voices on behalf of the persecuted Ukrainian Catholic Church and her faithful.

December 28-29, 1974 — A world convention of delegates of the Ukrainian Patriarchal Organizations of Europe, North and South America, and Australia, convened in Washington, D.C., and established the Ukrainian Patriarchal World Federation.

Easter 1975 — His Beatitude Josyf signed the Easter Pastoral Letter as *Patriarch* (see *Visti z Rymu*, rik 13, ch. 5-7 [255-257]).

May 24, 1975 — His Beatitude Patriarch Josyf I received a letter from Pope Paul VI with the request not to use the title Patriarch so as not "to put this Apostolic See before a fact which, lacking the necessary approval . . . risks to produce sad and serious wounds in the already too lacerated Mystical Body of Christ. . . ."

June 21, 1975 — The Society for the Patriarchate sent a letter to Jean Cardinal Villot, Secretary of the Vatican State, asking for a Papal pronouncement concerning the suffering of the Ukrainian Catholic faithful behind the "iron curtain."

July 12, 1975 — More than three thousand Ukrainian Catholics from all over the world gathered in Rome for the Holy Year Celebrations, attended a Holy Liturgy in the St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, celebrated by His Beatitude Josyf and fourteen Ukrainian bishops. During this Liturgy His Beatitude was commemorated as Patriarch of Kiev-Halych and the entire Rus'-Ukraine. To the Ukrainians this was the installation of His Beatitude Josyf I as Patriarch of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

CONCLUSION

At the end of each of the three sessions of the Symposium a short discussion period was held during which a number of informative and interesting comments were made. They are not reproduced here, but the attempt has been made to reflect the substance and the spirit of these discussions in the Introduction and in the Conclusion. Neither the bibliography nor the Calendar of Dates and Events are to be considered complete and exhaustive. They are provided solely for the convenience of the reader interested in pursuing in greater depth some of the problems touched upon in this collection.

If nothing else, the Symposium confirmed the existence of a special sort of piety inherent in the spiritual make-up of the Ukrainian people and the quiet tenacity with which they cling to their Church. It appears that rooted deeply in the Ukrainian psyche is the firm and unwaivering conviction that the Church is their only hope of self-preservation, the only source of redemption of their national and personal self. This perhaps was best understood by the contemporary Ukrainian historian Valentyn Moroz, who formulated it thus in his *A Chronicle of Resistance*:

Generally speaking, the easiest way to destroy the foundation of a nation is to do it under the pretext of fighting the Church. The Church has rooted itself in the cultural life so deeply that it is impossible to touch it without damaging the spiritual structure of a nation. It is impossible to imagine traditional cultural values without the Church. It is ultimately necessary to understand that an attack against the Church is an attack against culture. How many times has the nation been saved by the Church? This was especially important when a change in faith meant a change in nationality. There were a number of villages near Kholm where Ukrainians spoke Polish. But they remained Ukrainians as long as they adhered to the Ukrainian faith and Church. Similarly, a Polish family in a Ukrainian village in Podilia would remain Polish for generations without knowing the Polish language as long as the family remained Catholic.

According to Moroz, there is an indissoluble union between

the Church and the people, thus one can equate the Church and the nation. This vision of Valentyn Moroz is not unconsonant with the Christian vision of man's lot on earth although it may indeed appear somewhat strange to the Western reader conditioned to see a distinct line of demarcation drawn between Church and state. The religious consciousness of the Ukrainians, however, still perceives things in a more integral state, in which the sacred and the secular are not seen as opposite poles. Pope Paul VI, quite clearly, was aware of this when in speaking to the Ukrainians of His Beatitude Josyf on February 25, 1965, he stated: "We hoped to give you, Ukrainians, a high spokesman for your religious and national life . . ." However, it would appear today, that the Pontiff has forgotten his own words. The ultimate tragedy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church today lies in the wanton attempt on the part of the Vatican and its dialogue partners in Moscow, to ruin both these dimensions of Ukrainian existence by destroying the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Professor Bird put it best, when speaking on curial policies vis-à-vis the Ukrainian Catholic Church at the Fordham Symposium in 1972, he stated:

The revered policy of autonomy and collegiality, validated by a millennium and a half of use, is being jettisoned; the ecclesiology carefully elaborated by the Fathers of Vatican II is being systematically reversed; the martyrdom of the largest Eastern Catholic community is being passed over in embarrassed silence; and the solemn synodal decisions of an entire national hierarchy are being brought to naught by the stroke of a curialist's pen. Moreover, all this is being accomplished for the sake of short-term political gain masquerading as a history-making ecumenical break-through.

Today, several years after, the situation, unfortunately, shows no signs of having changed for the better.

Still, our Symposium, by focusing on the latest developments in the Church, provides hope. It emphasized once more the tremendous achievement of Patriarch Josyf I in rebuilding the Church and in restoring a feeling of pride in his people and confidence in their identity as Ukrainians. Seen in this light, the present struggle of the Ukrainian Catholic faithful for the rights and privileges of their Church, is but a prologue to a greater quest.

L. R.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Petro B. T. Bilaniuk is Professor of Theology and Religious Knowledge at the University of St. Michael's College in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. He is the author of numerous studies on ecclesiastical history, on various aspects of Ukrainian Church life, and a member of several learned societies. In addition to his scholarly interest, Professor Bilaniuk is actively involved in the Ukrainian Catholic lay movement in Canada.

The Reverend Michael Bourdeaux, a minister of the Anglican Church, is the Director of the Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism at Keston College, Keston, Kent, England. He is the author of several books and numerous articles on religion and communism and the founder of a new methodology for the study of religion in the USSR. He has lectured at various universities and institutes including the London University, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, New York, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) London, Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Oxford University, as well as at various institutions in Africa and Australasia.

Brother Daniel Burke, F.S.C. has served as the President of La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, since 1969. He holds bachelor's, master's and doctor's degrees in English from the Catholic University in Washington, D.C., and he has also pursued advanced studies at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of London. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa honor society. Brother Burke is a contributor of verse and criticism to scholarly journals and collections — among them *Modern Fiction Studies*, *The Commonweal*, *Thought*, *Four Quarters*, *Journal of Arts and Letters*, and the *Encyclopedia Americana*.

The Reverend Eugene J. Fitzsimmons, a Roman Catholic priest, serves in the Camden Diocesan Tribunal as Defender of the Bond and Advocate; he is a member of the Canon Law Society of America and the Canadian Canon Law Society. He did graduate work in

science at Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania, and taught at Camden Catholic High School until 1966, when he entered the Canon Law Institute at the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome. He was awarded a doctoral degree by that University following the publication of his dissertation entitled *Competence of the Sacred Congregation in the Reform of Pope Paul VI*.

The Reverend Roger Hayden is a Baptist minister presently at Haven Green Baptist Church, Earling, London, W5. He is a member of the Baptist Historical Society of England, and author of several articles on seventeenth century Baptist life in Bristol, as well as on William Staughton (1770-1834), First Secretary of the American Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. One of his recent studies is a new edition of *Records of a Church of Christ in Bristol, 1640-87*, published by the Bristol Record Society. Reverend Hayden's special interest includes the life of the Baptists in Eastern Europe, especially Rumania and the Soviet Union. Reverend Hayden is a member of the Council of the Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism at Keston College, Keston, Kent, England.

Miroslav Labunka, the co-editor of this collection, is an Assistant Professor of History at La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He holds graduate degrees in history (*Licence*, Université Cath. de Louvain, and Ph.D., Columbia University, New York) and in library science (M.S., Columbia Univ.). Prior to his appointment at La Salle, he worked for Columbia University Libraries.

The Reverend George A. Maloney, S.J., earned his doctorate at the Pontifical Oriental Institute and was ordained in Rome in the Byzantine rite. He taught courses in Patristic Theology and Christian Spirituality at Fordham University in New York, and he currently serves as the editor of *Diakonia*, a theological quarterly devoted to advancing Orthodox-Catholic dialogue. Father Maloney is the author of several books, the most recent of which is *Inward Stillness*.

Vasyl Markus, Professor of Political Science at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, is an author of several monographs on Church history and politics written in various West European languages as well as of numerous articles on varied topics published in Ukrainian journals and newspapers. He is a member of several learned societies and a contributing editor to *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia*. Professor Markus is also very active in Ukrainian Catholic Church affairs on both the parish and the national level.

The Rt. Reverend Mitered Archpriest John J. Mowatt is the director of the Byzantine Center in Fatima, Portugal, and the editor of its revue *Looking East*. He is an Eastern rite priest, a graduate of the Pontifical Russian College and the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome. Fr. Mowatt has published extensively on various aspects of the Eastern Churches and on the relations between religion and communism.

Jaroslav Pelikan is Sterling Professor of History and Religious Studies and Dean of the Yale University Graduate School, New Haven, Connecticut. He is the author of several voluminous works on theology and ecclesiastical history. His most recent study bears the title *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*. He is also the editor of *Luther's Works*, American Edition, 22 volumes (1955-1970), sometime Departmental Editor for Religion of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and of several other series and individual collections. Professor Pelikan has lectured at many universities in the United States and abroad, and he has received many academic honors.

Msgr. Victor J. Pospishil, professor at Manhattan College, Riverdale, New York, is a priest in the Ukrainian Catholic Archeparchy of Philadelphia. His publications on the Eastern Churches study their history, especially of the Slavic Churches in Eastern Europe and in North America, their canonical set-up, focusing on constitutional law, foremost on patriarchal structure, and on the implications of their marriage law, and their ecumenical encounters with the Roman Catholic Church.

Leonid Rudnytzky is the organizer of the Symposium and the co-editor of this collection. He has published a number of articles on various aspects of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and he currently serves as the National Secretary of the Society for the Promotion of the Patriarchal System in the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The Reverend George Szumowski, a priest in the Autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, is an Associate Professor of Anthropology and Archeology at the Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York, a member of many learned societies, and author of numerous publications in various languages. In addition to his work in archeology and anthropology, Fr. Szumowski has a special scholarly interest in the history of the Slavic cultures and in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

NOTES

