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ORTHODOX CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE WEST
On the feast of St. Andrew, November 30, 2000, His All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I said after Divine Liturgy at the Cathedral of St. George in the Phanar: “Revisiting the past and examining human faults must continue in all directions . . . because whoever consents to the misdeeds of another or tolerates them by his silence, shares the responsibility of their author.”¹ In the same vein, in an extraordinary assembly on December 8–10, 1993, the Serbian Orthodox hierarchy formulated the following principle: “On this earth there is not nor can there be any true peace among men and nations without complete justice and the whole truth. The future cannot be built on lies and injustice.”² It is in the same spirit of these authoritative Orthodox declarations that I shall express today my views on my own Catholic Church and on the Churches of the Orthodox tradition.

I have on more than one occasion made clear in print positions I am happy to repeat here: that I consider the Orthodox Churches the historic apostolic Christianity of the East and sister churches of the Catholic Church;³ that I recognize and rejoice in the fact that Orthodox peoples remain Orthodox; the Catholic Church should support and collaborate with the Orthodox Churches in every way, foster the most cordial relations with them, earnestly work to restore communion with them, recognize their legitimate interests especially on their home ground, avoid all proselytism among their flocks there or elsewhere, not seek in any way to
undercut them, nor rejoice in or exploit their weaknesses, nor fish in their pond, nor seek to convert their faithful to the Catholic Church. But I espouse with equal explicitness the view that it is counterproductive for the cause of Christian unity and ecumenism to roll over and play dead in the face of any Catholic or Orthodox misbehavior, misinformation, or outright lying with regard to our dolorous past or to problems that exist between us in the present.4

On these issues I speak from a lifetime of personal experience and proven love for Orthodoxy and its tradition, as clearly demonstrated by over half a century of study, scholarship, and innumerable publications, both scholarly and popular. On that basis I view our present relationship with mixed emotions of encouragement and disillusionment: encouragement that the Catholic-Orthodox International Ecumenical Dialogue is back on track under competent and vigorous leadership on both sides; disillusionment at our failure to bring this progress to the grass-roots level among our people, where in some places bigotry and fanaticism still reign, and, more seriously for those of us in academia, at our inability to face our difficult past with objective scholarship instead of confessional propaganda masquerading as history.

The Catholic Church, the Jesuits, and the Christian East: Perceptions

Since charity begins at home and I am a Jesuit, let me begin by examining our Catholic and Jesuit conscience, an exercise necessary because collective religious institutions like churches and religious orders have the tendency to indulge in hagiographic glorification of their own history: while they admit that individual members may be sinners, the collectivity itself is supposedly above reproach. Furthermore, a seminal aspect of the Jesuit vocation and spirituality—our “way of proceeding,” as we call it—is discernment: Jesuits don’t just do things; they also reflect on what they do, have done, and are going to do.

The Orthodox East views the Catholic Church and its Jesuits with deep suspicion and distrust. I cite one paradigmatic example from an article by an American-Russian Orthodox priest, Fr. David F.Abramtsov:

The Papal Eastern Rite is an invention of the Roman Curia, a creation for the purpose of deceit, subterfuge for immutable beliefs, unchang-
ing dogmas. One enters a Uniate Church—here are the same icons, the same banners, the same vestments, the same tongue and singing, the very same services, and often the same Creed without the *filioque*. If an Orthodox émigré colony in utter destitution is found to have been cast on the cruel waves of life by a catastrophic war, one may be positive that nearby is an Eastern rite Roman Jesuit, sporting a beard and speaking the mother tongue of these unfortunates, innocently helping to educate Orthodox children (in the doctrines of the Roman faith). It would seem that nothing is changed in the Uniate “Byzantine rite” Churches. The people simply agree to commemorate the Bishop of Rome, and are lulled and soothed by the thought that the whole familiar aspect of Church life has remained unchanged. 

**Realities**

Whether or not this description is fair should not distract us from our purpose here. As Nietzsche liked to say, “There are no facts—only perceptions,” by which he did not mean to deny objective reality, but only to emphasize that things exist for us only as we perceive them. The legitimacy of perceptions, however, can be ascertained only by a square look at reality. What that reality shows is the relentless proselytizing of Catholic missionaries, especially Jesuits, among Eastern Christians at a time when they had their backs to the wall, subjected to Western imperialism and/or non-Christian or non-Orthodox governments in the Ottoman Empire, India, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This has left a legacy of bitterness still felt today.

The Catholic Church inserted itself dramatically into the life of the Christian East on two occasions: first during the Crusades and then, especially, in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century “Age of Discovery,” when it established parallel church structures in lands of already existing apostolic Christianity and created problems that exist to this day. In so doing, the Catholic Church was true to its evolving, exclusivist ecclesiology in which there was but one valid Christendom, its own, entirely under the sway of the Bishop of Rome, who thought he could use his minions to do almost anything he pleased. Can one wonder that the hierarchies of age-old apostolic Eastern Churches in places like India were more than bewildered by this sudden, uninvited intrusion into the life of their churches by
a group of educated, dynamic, and foreign priests perfectly suited for the task by Jesuit founder St. Ignatius of Loyola’s universalist and papalist ecclesiology, claiming to owe obedience not to the local hierarchy but to a foreign “universal bishop” thousands of miles away? This invasion—in reality, if not in intention, little more than imperialism on the ecclesial level—could not but spell trouble. Two paradigmatic vignettes suffice to illustrate this:

_Ethiopia_

Jesuit involvement with the Christian East goes right back to their founder, St. Ignatius of Loyola. In the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century “Age of Discovery,” when gentlemen-explorers from Portugal and Spain spent their time discovering America and colonizing the rest of the world, Portuguese adventurer Peres de Covilham came into contact with what he thought was the mythical priest-king Prester John in the person of the Negus of Abyssinia. That legendary African potentate, who had not the slightest interest in contacting anybody, promptly interned de Covilham for life, though he had the courtesy to provide him with a wife.

Eventually, contact with the Negus was made again, and after a certain amount of skirmishing and feinting, relations were established and the Ethiopians, adherents of an ancient, pre-Chalcedonian Oriental Orthodox Church, even hinted at possible ecclesiastical union. That is how the Jesuits got into the act. On December 22, 1553, St. Ignatius’s faithful Jesuit secretary Polanco wrote that King John of Portugal “has this month urgently requested our Father Ignatius to nominate twelve of the Society, including a patriarch, for the lands of Prester John.”

After much consultation and searching about, not as much for the right men as for anyone who could be freed up for the job in those busy days, Ignatius of Loyola, a mere presbyter of the Roman Church, chose a Portuguese Jesuit as patriarch for hapless Ethiopia. On January 24, 1554, Pope Julius III confirmed the nomination of Father John Nuñez Barreto, S.J., a Portuguese nobleman, as first Catholic patriarch of Ethiopia. From today’s perspective, the absurdity of the undertaking is simply breathtaking, as if President George Bush Senior had authorized Billy Graham to choose some American Baptist preacher to head the ancient, apostolic Assyrian Church of Iraq once things were cleaned up after the First Gulf War!
Fortified with instructions from his presbyter-superior, St. Ignatius, the fledgling patriarch and his coadjutor bishop, the Spanish Jesuit Andrew d’Oviedo, set sail for Ethiopia. What sort of ecclesiology puts a mere priest as boss of a patriarch still escapes me. Be that as it may, Patriarch Barreto died at Goa in 1561, but Oviedo, who succeeded him on the patriarchal throne, eventually reached Ethiopia, where Jesuits continued to labor heroically for three-quarters of a century until they got themselves kicked out.

The trouble began under the Negus Susneyios, who had already embraced Catholicism privately. At the Negus’s behest, the Holy See named Jesuit Alfonso Mendez patriarch. Mendez arrived in Ethiopia in 1625, the next year the union of the Ethiopian Church with Rome was proclaimed, and the Jesuits proceeded to make the same mistakes their confrères were busily engaged in making on the Malabar coast of Southwest India. The Gregorian calendar and Latin fasts and abstinences were imposed by force of arms. Mendez even wanted to impose the Roman liturgy translated into Ge’ez. Inevitably, the people revolted, the Jesuits were expelled in 1636, and Ethiopia was closed to the Catholic Church for two hundred years.

India

Things were not much different in Malabar on the Fishery Coast of southwest India under the Portuguese “Padroado.” In 1599, the Latins co-opted the hierarchical structure of this ancient native church and Jesuit Francis Roz became the first Latin prelate of the Syrians that same year. Portuguese archbishops of Angamali-Cranganore, all Jesuits, governed thereafter the once independent Syro-Malabar Church that had flourished in those parts for a millennium before anyone had ever heard of the Society of Jesus. The chauvinistic Jesuit missionaries allowed only Jesuits to work in Malabar, with predictable results. On January 3, 1653, the exasperated people revolted. Gathering at the cross before the church at Mattancherry, they took a solemn oath no longer to recognize the archbishop at Cranganore, and to drive out their Jesuit oppressors.

When I was a young Jesuit, our mythology gave pride of place to what we called the presuppression “Old Society,” and we took justifiable pride in the remarkable cultural openness and inculturation of our famed missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, like Matteo Ricci and Michele Ruggieri in China, Roberto de Nobili among the
Tamils of Madurai in southeast India, Alessandro Valignano in India and Japan, all Italians. But not all Jesuit missionaries were un-chauvinistic Italians open to other cultures, so what I did was tell the other half of the story.

**Uniatism**

Then there is the phenomenon known today as “Uniatism,”¹² judged to be the major problem blocking fruitful dialogue and communion with the Orthodox Churches.¹³ Uniatism is a pejorative term for a method of church union perceived to be politically rather than religiously motivated, and contrary to the communion ecclesiology of the Church of the first millennium.¹⁴ In Uniatism, one church is seen as an aggressor against another church with which it is not in communion, absorbing groups of its faithful deceptively by allowing them to retain their own rite and a certain autonomy.

Today we realize that such partial reunions remove the whole ecumenical problem from its proper context. The separation between our churches resulted between the hierarchies of East and West over ecclesial questions like the primacy of Rome, and it is up to those hierarchies together, and not individuals or splinter groups of bishops, to solve these common problems. Partial reunions only divide the Eastern Churches and are seen as deceiving the simple faithful, who follow their bishops in good faith with little understanding of the issues involved. No realistic Catholic approach to the Christian East can fail to take this into account.

**The Effect of Uniatism on Orthodox-Catholic Relations**

Until Catholic aggression towards Greek Orthodoxy began to manifest itself in the eighteenth century, relations between our two churches were remarkably cordial in areas where Greek Orthodox and Catholic communities lived side by side. “Long after the anathemas of 1054, the sack of Constantinople in 1204, and the formal repudiation of the union of Florence in 1484, Greeks and Latins continued in practice quietly to ignore the separation and to behave as if no breach in communion had occurred. . . . Instances of *communicatio in sacris* are especially abundant in the seventeenth century,”¹⁵ when we find that Greek Orthodox bishops invited Jesuits to catechize and preach to their people and hear their con-
fessions, and Catholics and Orthodox participated in each other’s religious festivities and services and engaged in “every sort of communicatio in divinis.”

Relations later deteriorated when Catholics attempted to foist Uniatism upon the Greeks, to say nothing of other absurdities one is embarrassed even to mention. For instance, in the fallout from World War I when plans to partition Ottoman territories, including Russian designs on Constantinople and the Straits, were afoot in 1915–20 before the final settlement in the Treaty of Versailles (July 24, 1923), Vatican authorities made the madcap proposal that, because Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, the most hallowed shrine of Byzantine Orthodoxy, was built before the schism of 1054, and the Greeks were still in communion with Rome when Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453, Hagia Sophia can be considered a “Catholic Church” and should therefore be put in Catholic hands!

Learning to Cope with the Problem of Uniatism

How are we to cope with the problem of Uniatism, which has become especially acute since the restoration of religious freedom in the Soviet bloc at the end of the 1980s? Only the re-establishment of communion between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches will solve our problems satisfactorily. But if, in the meantime, solutions remain provisional, interim answers to the pastoral and ecumenical problems posed by the existence of Eastern Catholic Churches must be sought with charity, objectivity, and realism. Both Catholics and Orthodox must reach the point where they can view and discuss not only Uniatism’s origins, but also its past and present history—all of it. They must do so without gliding over the problematic nature—in some (though by no means all) instances—of its origins, its ultimate development, and its ideology, but also without the use of selective memory, double standard, and even outright slander with which Orthodox writings sometimes treat it.

Prospects for the Future: “The Healing of Memories”

What must be done to solve such problems that still divide us? I have begun with an indictment of Catholics, which is only fair, since Matthew 7:3–5 tells us to take the log out of our own eye before poking at the specks in our brother’s eye. That being said, it is neither unfair nor illegitimate to
put Orthodox as well as Catholics on the wish list of what must be done to resolve our common problems.

In this context, it has become customary to speak of the need for a “healing of memories.” That means coming to terms with history in its entirety, not just that of others, but also our own. The uses of history are complex, as professional historians know only too well, for nations and peoples live not only by their histories but by their myths as well. As one historian put it, “A nation is a group of people who hold the same mistaken view of their common history,” and “every nation is a community of shared memory and of shared forgetting.” So this is a problem not just of churches, but of all social groupings from churches to nations. We Americans like to think of our country as “the land of the free and the home of the brave,” a beacon of liberty, justice, and democracy for all humankind—right? Well, how about the era of lynchings throughout the first half of the twentieth century, in which 4,742 black Americans were murdered by white mobs, or the fact that the Ku Klux Klan is alive and well in several states today? That is America’s “shared forgetting.”

This healing of memories will require us to put aside our myths and confront our common past with historical objectivity and truth, own up to our responsibilities, seek forgiveness, and turn the page to move on to a hopefully better future. I would like to suggest some hermeneutical principles germane to arriving at such a balanced historical view of our common Catholic-Orthodox past. Contrary to what the non-historian might imagine, history is not the past, but a vision of the past. For ecumenism to advance, we must put aside our own limited, often hagiographical vision of our common past and try to see ourselves as others see us.

This is what I did for the Jesuits, and the Catholic Church is learning to do the same. Ecumenically-minded Catholic theologians and Church historians like Congar, Eno, Tillard, Dvornik, and others have already begun to study the origins and development of papal primacy, showing thereby some problematic aspects of its evolution, especially in the ninth century under Pope St. Nicholas I (858–867). This has resulted in a needed change in Catholic perception and terminology. No longer do we speak of the “Eastern” or “Byzantine Schism,” as was once customary in Western writing. Today we recognize our Catholic share of responsibility for the Schism, and call it “the East-West Schism.”

Furthermore, I do not know a single reputable Catholic theologian competent in East-West issues who would not agree that to foster communion
with the Orthodox East, Rome will have to moderate its overly centralized government and change substantially the way in which the “Petrine Primacy” it claims is presently exercised. The Catholic Church should have the courage to put aside the excesses of a servile Vatican curial centralism and push forward relentlessly with the renewed “sister churches” and “collegial” ecclesiology proclaimed at Vatican II but insufficiently developed and implemented since then.

For our apostolic Eastern sister churches correctly view many aspects of Catholic Church governance as foreign to their ancient tradition. Anyone who thinks that the Orthodox East is ever going to sacrifice its age-old apostolic autonomy for this centralized Roman administration as presently exercised is gravely mistaken. So, I believe that each apostolic sister church—including the Catholic Church—should now ask itself, and proclaim publicly with supporting arguments, what it believes it must demand of other equally apostolic churches as the price of communion in order to remain true to its apostolic faith, and then be willing to undertake constructive, ecumenical dialogue on the topic. Meanwhile, our Orthodox dialogue partners might reflect honestly on the enormous benefits the Roman Primacy has brought to Catholicism in maintaining its unity in the face of all the crises posed by the present postmodern and post-Western world, and on the problems endemic to world Orthodoxy where one gets the impression that the only means available in an inter-Orthodox crisis is the rupture of communion.

Another aspect of progress towards an objective, noncontroversial, historical thinking as distinct from the blame-game approach to the past would be for the Orthodox to revise their attitude towards Uniatism, of which they continue to have a mythological view that ill corresponds to reality. According to that mythology, Uniatism began as the product of Jesuit machinations and Polish enforcement. The truth is somewhat different. Classical Uniatism originated during the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the struggle with Protestant denominations for the soul of Europe. In this struggle, the Orthodox Church was, in a sense, a bystander, caught in the crossfire of the main belligerents in the sixteenth-century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where on October 19, 1596, in the city of Brest (in what was then the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), five of the seven Orthodox bishops in the commonwealth entered into union with Rome. This union, far from being “forced” or “imposed” on the Orthodox, as is repeatedly asserted, was the outcome not only of long negotiations, but
also of a parallel religious movement tirelessly propagated for twenty years by Jesuits Peter Skarga and Anthony Possevino.

But those Jesuits, far from inventing Uniatism as they are often accused, took a dim view of Ruthenian Orthodoxy and favored conversion of the Ruthenians to the Latin rite of the Roman Church, plain and simple.\textsuperscript{24} Possevino initially considered the retention of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite by the Ruthenians as merely a temporary expedient. In a letter from Krakow dated September 11, 1583, Possevino wrote that nothing could be accomplished among the Ruthenians unless their rite were left alone. But this was just a concession to be tolerated, Possevino said, with an anti-Semitic slur and obvious contempt for the Ruthenian Orthodox Church, “until that synagogue can be honorably buried” (\textit{Insino che quella sinogoga si seppelisse con honore}).\textsuperscript{25}

Thus, the idea of having the Ruthenian Orthodox enter the Catholic Church as a body, preserving their own hierarchy and rite, was not the invention of the Jesuits. Initially, at least, the union was not viewed favorably by any of the three parties—Rome, the Poles, or the Jesuits—traditionally indicted in the mythological view. Far from being the result of some preconceived Catholic strategy, Uniatism was wholly an invention of the Ruthenian Orthodox bishops themselves, and grew out of the difficult situation in which the Ruthenian hierarchy found itself, squeezed between Moscow and Poland, Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation. All of this has been amply demonstrated by the latest, reliable historical scholarship on the question.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{Prospects for the Future: What Can the Orthodox Do?}

So, “purifying their historical memory” will demand that the Orthodox, too, learn the uses of history in a modern, academic climate that seeks to be fair and objective insofar as that is possible. Amid the diversity of perceptions of the past, one must eschew scapegoating, the “our-hands-are-always-clean” victimhood pretense, the use of the double standard, and must learn instead a little self-criticism and fairness. This will require that the Orthodox make their own frank examination of conscience.

Western Christianity’s historic defects of imperialism, power, and domination led to the crimes for which Pope John Paul II asked pardon in Rome on the First Sunday of Lent, 2000.\textsuperscript{27} An Orthodox response was not long in coming: Metropolitan Kallinikos of Piraeus, an official spokes-
man of the Orthodox Church of Greece,²⁸ and Russian Orthodox Bishop Pavel of Vienna,²⁹ responded to the pope’s request for pardon and forgiveness not by forgiving and asking forgiveness in turn, as one should expect from any Christian who has ever read the New Testament, but by declaring there was nothing for which Orthodoxy had to ask pardon. More recently, an authoritative Orthodox hierarch asserted in an interview that, whereas in its history, the Catholic Church had exploited the civil authorities to achieve its aims—which is true enough—this is something the Orthodox had never done.³⁰ Apart from the fact that such responses make their authors the butt of sarcasm and derision from responsible, thinking people, they are also untrue. For when it had the power of the Byzantine Empire behind it, the Orthodox Church rammed itself down the throats of others without scruple (if you do not believe that, you have never talked to a Copt or an Armenian).

A short list of what the Orthodox might consider, were they to examine their historical conscience, would begin in Byzantine times with the forced conversion of Jews already from the fourth and fifth centuries but especially in the sixth and seventh;³¹ with the persecution of the Syrian Jacobites, Armenians, and Copts in the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon; and with the forced unions of the Armenians with the Byzantine Church, as in 590 AD under Emperor Maurice,³² a clear example of Orthodox Uniatism repeated in modern times by the Russian Orthodox mission among the Assyrians³³ and the “Western-rite Orthodoxy” fostered in North America, Great Britain, and Western Europe,³⁴ despite the false claims that Uniatism is an exclusively Catholic phenomenon.³⁵

Then, towards the middle of the eighth century, the Byzantines unilaterally and uncanonically removed the dioceses of Calabria, Sicily, Eastern Illyricum, and perhaps also Otranto—all areas historically within the patriarchate of the West from time immemorial—from the Roman obedience and placed them under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.³⁶ This incorporation by political force, of areas that belonged by age-old right to the patriarchate of the West under Rome, included the forced imposition of Byzantine ecclesiastical authority on conquered areas of the non-Orthodox East,³⁷ including Catholic Southern Italy.³⁸

Indeed, Southern Italy provides an interesting parallel to the Crusades, about which the Orthodox remain continually exercised, collapsing chronology and acting as if the Crusades happened yesterday.³⁹ By the end of the sixth century, Southern Italy was almost totally Latin except for
colonies of Greeks in Reggio-Calabria and some of the coastal towns. This situation was to change rapidly from the seventh century, when the campaign of Byzantine Emperor Constans II drove the Saracens from Sicily, reviving Byzantine imperial and ecclesiastical hegemony there and in Calabria.

The Byzantine re-conquest of Southern Italy was carried out with thorough consistency across the whole socio-political horizon, including the ecclesiastical. Those who deplore the incursions of the Latin Crusaders in the East and their setting up of Latin hierarchies in competition with the already existing age-old Oriental ecclesiastical structures conveniently forget that the Byzantines did the exact same thing in Italy. Their military help against the Arab incursions in Italy was no more disinterested than the Latin help against the Turks during the Crusades, and Byzantine ecclesiastical politics in Italy also involved an imposed religious Byzantinization of the conquered areas under Byzantine political control.

The list of things the Orthodox might wish to seek pardon for would also include the anti-Latin pogrom in Constantinople in the years immediately preceding the Fourth Crusade. Latin hostility to the Greeks in the infamous Fourth Crusade was well prepared for by the Greek massacre of the Latins in Constantinople in 1182, when the papal envoy, John, was beheaded and his severed head tied to a dog’s tail “in contempt for the [Catholic] Church,” according to the contemporary account of reliable chronicler William of Tyre.

Nor is it any secret to historians that in the Fourth Crusade the Byzantine ruling class diverted the Crusaders from fighting the Muslim invaders to attacking Constantinople. Alexis IV Angelos, co-emperor with his father Isaac II Angelos, had been overthrown by his elder brother Alexis III Angelos, and sought the help of the Crusaders to regain the imperial throne for his father and himself. So, the machinations of the Byzantines themselves played a key role in the resulting horrendous Fourth-Crusade disaster of 1204. None of that justifies what the Crusaders did, but a dose of truth might help to re-dimension traditional Orthodox slanted views on the issue and apportion responsibilities where they belong—certainly not to the Catholic Church, in whose name Pope Innocent III bitterly condemned the Crusaders’ horrific actions in no uncertain terms.

Nor was the Orthodox use of force to suppress the religious rights of others limited to the Byzantine millennium. In modern times, we have the case of Benjamin Evsevidis, a Greek Orthodox bishop who became a Cath-
olic and in 1851 was named titular bishop of Neapolis and auxiliary to the titular of St. Nicholas of Galata, serving the small Byzantine-rite Catholic community in that quarter of Constantinople on the northern side of the Golden Horn. In 1858 the Phanar had him arrested and imprisoned in the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria, then still part of the Ottoman Empire. Released upon the intervention of the French Embassy to the Sublime Porte, Bishop Benjamin was arrested again in 1861, imprisoned first in the Phanar, and then exiled to imprisonment on Mt. Athos that same year. Released once again through the intervention of the French, he fled and sought asylum in their embassy in Constantinople, where he directed the small Byzantine-rite Greek Catholic community there until he died in 1895.44

But Constantinople was minor in comparison with Russia. The history of Russia is so full of the Russian Orthodox use of force against non-Orthodox Christians that a few of the more lurid examples will have to suffice.45 In the turbulent period of the Cossack Wars and the struggle over Uniatism, two classic examples are the Polish Jesuit St. Andrew Bobola and St. Josaphat Kuntsevych, Ruthenian-Catholic Archbishop of Polotsk, who had been lynched by an Orthodox mob. The martyrdom of St. Andrew Bobola was horrendously savage: the Orthodox Cossacks tortured him, flayed him alive, and literally butchered him at Janow on May 10, 1657.46

In the next century, we see the persecution and martyrdom of Catholics in the Russian Empire following the partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793, and 1795, and in the wake of the Polish uprisings that Russian oppression had provoked in the second half of the nineteenth century,47 when Latin Catholic monasteries were suppressed—two hundred of them in 1832 alone—and Catholic clergy exiled to Siberia. Rounding off that century, we see the forced conversion of Catholics—including Latin Catholics—to Orthodoxy in 1839 under Nicholas I.48 Then, the reign of Nicholas’s successor, Alexander II, witnessed the infamous slaughter of simple Greek-Catholic villagers in Drelov on January 18, 1874, and in Pratulin on January 24 of the same year, when Russian Imperial Cossack troops opened fire on the Catholic faithful gathered in front of their churches.49

To conclude the tale: Before the Soviet-era persecution of all believers in Russia, one of the more bizarre incidents in the well-documented history of Russian Orthodox violence against Uniatism is the saga of the Bulgarian Greek-Catholic prelate, Archbishop Josif Sokolski (1786–1879). Ordained bishop in Rome by Pius IX in 1861, Sokolski, upon his return
to Bulgaria that same year, was tricked into accompanying to Constanti-
ople the Imperial Russian Ambassador to the Sublime Porte under pre-
text of a meeting, and was invited to visit the waiting Russian packet
Elbrus docked in the Bosphorus. As soon as the Russians had the naïve and
trusting Sokolski restrained on board, the ship weighed anchor, deporting
Sokolski to Odessa and eventual confinement in the Goloseevskaja Pus-
tin’ Monastery—a dependent skete of the Kievo-Pecherskaja Lavra (Kie-
vlan Monastery of the Caves) eight versts (5.3 miles) from Kiev that St.
Peter Mohyla, Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev from 1633–46, founded
in 1631. Sokolski died on September 30, 1879, without ever seeing Bul-
garia again.

Nor was Russian Orthodox use of the civil arm to suppress other Chris-
tians limited to systematic interference in the affairs of the Catholic Church
and its adherents. Recall the brutal suppression of the Old-Believer schism
in seventeenth-century Russia; the forcible suppression of the Georgian
Orthodox Catholicosate in 1811 and the imposition of a Russian Metrop-
olitan and the Church Slavonic liturgical language on the Georgian Or-
thodox Church that dates back to long before anyone ever heard of Russia.
So much for the claim that Orthodoxy has never exploited the civil power
to promote its cause!

Without an objective reading of the recent past, too, the present atti-
tudes of the Orthodox and of the Eastern Catholics, and the new prob-
lems that have arisen between them in the former Soviet Empire, cannot
even begin to be understood. No fair judgment on present tensions be-
tween Orthodox and Greek Catholics in the former Soviet bloc is possible
without an objective view of the martyrdom of the Greek Catholic Churches
from the end of World War II until 1989.

The Uses of History

But the uses of objective history also teach us a very important lesson
concerning such a list of horrors on both sides of the confessional divide.
One must not be anachronistic and read history backwards, basing nega-
tive judgments of the past on social structures and moral principles totally
foreign to the era in question. In premodern times, there was no idea of
our present conception of individual freedom of conscience and civil
rights for all. In earlier times, when the reigning principle was of cuius
regio, eius et religio, it was the group, the clan, that enjoyed certain rights,
but not its individual members. Even today, in still-existing societies without such modern principles, it is the group that counts. In the Middle East, for example, even an atheist is a Muslim or Christian atheist, just as in surveys taken in present-day, post-Soviet Russia, unbelievers will identify themselves as Orthodox.

So, did politics and coercion play a part in the establishment and protection of the majority’s churches in the Catholic West as in the Byzantine East? Of course they did, just as they did in the establishment of Lutheranism and Anglicanism. Or does someone think the sixteenth-century German princlings that went over to the Reformation, taking with them into Protestantism their principalities and all the Catholics within their borders, first put the issue to a vote? Or that Henry VIII took a plebiscite to see if the English wanted to separate from Rome and be reinvented as Anglicans?

The case of present-day, eminently respectable, secular (if nominally Lutheran) Scandinavia is especially pertinent. When Denmark, which had ruled Catholic Iceland since 1380, went over to the Reformation, Lutheranism was introduced there by force between 1537–52 under King Christian III, and the last two Icelandic Catholic bishops were taken prisoner. One, the old and blind Bishop Ogmundur, died in captivity; the other, Bishop Jón Araso of Hólar, was beheaded in 1550, and Iceland became Lutheran by fiat. Then, there is the case of Estonia, which had been Catholic since 1227. It ceased to be so by force when, under Swedish Lutheran rule (1561–1710), the Catholic faith was forbidden, the last of the Catholic recusants were expelled in 1626, and the Catholic tradition in Estonia was extirpated.

We are thus faced here with a game everyone played without exception according to the rules of the age; the refusal (or inability) of some to view things in their historical context has by now become tiresome for those with a modicum of historical sophistication.

Towards an Ecumenical Scholarship and Theology

My overall thesis has been quite simple: contrary to what one might think, the main problem we Catholics and Orthodox face in our ecumenical dialogue is not doctrine but behavior. The issue is not that Catholics and Orthodox do not know how to pray and believe and live Christianity in the right and true apostolic way. The problem is that we do not know how to behave.
Learning to do so will mean adopting what I call “ecumenical scholarship and theology.” Ecumenical scholarship is not content with the purely natural virtues of honesty and fairness, virtues one should be able to expect from any true scholar. Ecumenical scholarship is a new and specifically Christian way of studying Christian tradition in order to reconcile and unite, rather than to confute and dominate. Its deliberate intention is to emphasize the common tradition underlying our differences, which, though real, are usually the accidental product of history, culture, and language, rather than essential differences in the doctrine of faith.

Of course, to remain scholarly, this effort must be carried out realistically, without glossing over real differences. But even in recognizing differences, this ecumenical effort must remain a two-way street with each side judging itself and its tradition by the exact same criteria and standards with which it judges the other. Eschewing all scapegoating and the double standard, ecumenical scholarship seeks to describe the beliefs, traditions, and usages of other confessions in ways their own objective spokespersons recognize as reliable and fair.

Ecumenical scholarship seeks not confrontation but agreement and understanding. It tries to enter into the other’s point of view, to understand it as far as possible with sympathy and agreement. It takes seriously the other’s critique of one’s own tradition, seeking to incorporate its positive contributions into one’s own thinking. It is a contest in reverse, a contest of Christian love, one in which the parties seek to understand and justify not their own point of view, but that of their interlocutor.

Such an effort and method is not baseless romanticism. Its theological foundation is our common faith that God’s Holy Spirit is always with his Church, protecting the integrity of its witness, especially in the millennium of its undivided unity. Since some of the issues that divide us go right back to that first millennium, one must ineluctably conclude that these differences do not affect the substance of the apostolic faith. For if they did, then contrary to Jesus’s promise in Matthew 16:18, the “gates of hell” would have indeed prevailed against his Church.

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

Furthermore, an authentic magisterium cannot contradict itself. Therefore, without denying the legitimate development of doctrine, in the case of apparently conflicting traditions of East and West, preferential consideration must be given to the witness of the undivided Church. This is especially true with respect to later polemics resulting from unilateral departures from or narrowing of the common tradition during the second millennium of divided Christendom.

For Catholics, such an “ecumenical theology” must mean an end to declarations on the nature of the priesthood that exalt the celibate clerical state of the Latin tradition in a way that is demeaning to the thousands of legitimately married eastern clergy, Orthodox and Catholic, who are also priests of God’s Holy Church—and in my not-inconsiderable personal experience, often much better priests than their celibate or monastic counterparts on both sides of the confessional divide.55

It might also mean Catholic theologians realizing that Latin Scholastic theology of the Eucharist is a theology, not the theology of the Eucharist—a theology that has a limited cultural context and an observable history. As recent, fully Catholic theological studies have shown, the hylomorphic theory of Eucharistic consecration—based on the Medieval Latin theology of the priest acting at the Eucharist in persona Christi—is a theology that became current only in the twelfth-century West,56 and as such is a theology of the Eucharist (and a perfectly legitimate one), but by no means the only legitimate one.

To recognize that, one must learn, first of all, to distinguish between dogma and theology, and, in my view, the failure of some theologians to do so, is at the root of any real or perceived theological dissonance between East and West on this and other issues. Our common apostolic faith East and West teaches that during the celebration of the Eucharistic mysteries, the offered bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ. That is dogma. Theology is what attempts to explain how that can be, and that is historically limited and variable according to the different traditions.

The Eucharistic theology of the Latin tradition, radically Christological—the Roman Canon does not even mention the Holy Spirit except in its
concluding doxology—developed, as we saw above, a theology of the
celebrating priest acting in persona Christi and explained its workings in
the hylomorphic “matter” and “form” terminology of Scholastic theology:
The bread and wine are the “matter,” the Words of Institution are the
“form.” All well and good.

But other traditions, the Byzantine Orthodox, for example, ground their
sacramental theology in the pneumatology so prominent in that tradition
since St. Basil the Great’s seminal treatise On the Holy Spirit and the
teaching of the Second Ecumenical Council Constantinople I in 381. In
this theology, the priest is not the main actor in the sacramental work: “I
baptize, I absolve, I consecrate in persona Christi.” Rather, the priest calls
on God to accomplish the mystery: “The servant of God N. is baptized,
is absolved. . . . Come down upon these gifts, O Holy Spirit and make
this bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ, changing—i.e.,
consecrating—them by your Holy Spirit.” Which of these two theologies
is “right”? For anyone with a smattering of common sense, theological
sophistication, and a knowledge of the history of theology, they both are,
of course, since they both do what theologies are supposed to do: explain,
explain theologically how what the faith affirms is possible.

However, according to the present teaching and liturgical discipline of
the Roman Catholic Church, no minister in priestly orders is deemed to
concelebrate “validly” the Eucharist unless he recites the Words of Institu-
tion (“This is my body . . . This is my blood.”), regardless of what else he
might do in gesture or symbol to show his clear intention to participate in—
i.e., to concelebrate—the Eucharistic liturgy exercising his ministerial
priesthood. If this is meant as determining the sacramental practice of
the Latin Church, it is acceptable; if it is meant to dogmatize and univer-
salize Latin, Eucharistic theology, it is unacceptable.

If one were to approach the sources of the past with such presupposi-
tions, one would be forced either to conclude that no “real” concelebration
ever existed in ancient Christendom—or else to invent for the ancient
Church a new form of concelebration never heard of then, “ceremonial” as
opposed to “sacramental” concelebration, the latter being the only one
deemed “real.” To maintain that verbal co-consecratory concelebration
as practiced in the post–Vatican II Roman rite is the only “real” one, how-
ever, would be to question not only much of the Eastern tradition but, in-
deed, the whole early history of Eucharistic concelebration—a procedure
patently absurd. These are just some of the issues to which Catholics might
apply a bit more ecumenical thinking if we really want to solve our common problems.

For the Orthodox, too, an ecumenical theology will mean distinguishing theology from dogma, and stressing what unites us, instead of using clichés as a substitute for evidence, and setting up pseudo-antitheses between our two traditions with the false polarization they cause. A few examples will have to suffice. In his Orthodox spiritual classic *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, Vladimir Lossky claimed that the spiritual “imitation of Christ” was a Western notion foreign to Orthodoxy. “Oh is that so?” thought a surprised Irenée Hausherr, S.J., founder of the field of Eastern Spirituality as a scientific academic discipline, who then proceeded in a famous study on the topic to cite reams of quotations from the Eastern Fathers of the Church explicitly advocating this imitation of Christ. And it is fair to ask those who like to tout the famous Western spiritual classic, *The Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, as propagating a “typically Western” spirituality inimical to the spirit of the Christian East, how come Kempis went through some fifteen editions in Russian? The cliché becomes even more ridiculous when one recalls that one of the most popular—though not the only—Russian translation of *The Imitation of Christ* was the work of the arch-conservative and deeply pious Russian Orthodox jurist and university professor Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev. From 1880 to 1905, he was lay procurator (*Ober-Prokurator*) or director general of the Most Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church; this was the office of the government official who effectively governed the Church for the tsarist autocracy in the synodal period of 1721 to 1917 after Peter the Great replaced the Moscow patriarchate with a Ruling Synod of bishops in an attempt to transform the Russian Church into a lapdog institution at the service of the state. Strongly opposed to all Westernizing influence on Russia and its Orthodoxy—he was nicknamed “The Grand Inquisitor” for his ultra-reactionary political and religious views—Pobedonostsev saw no problem in translating this supposedly “typically Western,” devotional manual for Russian Orthodox use. His translation achieved instant popularity, and went through eight editions between 1869 and 1899.

Another such shopworn cliché contrasts the “legalistic, canonical West” with a more laid-back, “mystical East.” One recent instance is a press release of March 11, 2008, reporting that the Secretary for Internal Christian Affairs of the Moscow patriarchate’s Department for External Church
Relations, reacting to the Vatican’s updating a list of “traditional” mortal sins so as to stigmatize new types of immoral behavior such as polluting the environment, social injustice, and so on, made the following remarks: “Western Christianity is more inclined to classify even spiritual things, to file and arrange everything. Eastern Christianity is not used to a rigorous system of spiritual notions. No doubt, Orthodox religious practice names and finds proper place for each sin, but it usually relates to a concrete human soul with its various shades and transitions, so it’s hardly possible to list it.”

The numbering and listing of sins began not with “Western Christianity” but with the Bible and its Ten Commandments (Ex 20:2–17; Dt 5:6–21), and is in no way foreign to the author’s Orthodox tradition, as is obvious from the traditional penitential books of Orthodoxy, which list the number and kinds of sins in exhaustive detail. This Orthodox tradition goes back to Byzantine times, as described by internationally known Byzantinist George Dennis, who informs us that “The Byzantines loved to place everything in its proper category, and so they compiled encyclopedias of heresy.” Like the Panarion of Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and the equally enormous Panoplia dogmatica of Euthymios Zigabenos.

Therefore, the old maxim that the West is fixated on laws—Ex Occidente lex—in contrast to the Ex Oriente lux cliché about a supposedly unlegalistic “mystical East,” is just mistaken, as is perfectly obvious to anyone who has dipped into Orthodox canonical sources like the Pedalion, or Orthodox anthology of canons over one thousand pages long with detailed legislation on just about everything imaginable, to say nothing of the “ritual purity” restrictions still placed on women in most branches of Eastern Christianity. Such pseudo-East-West antitheses have also been excoriated by well-known Orthodox “Monk of the Eastern Church” Lev Gillet, as they were by Greek Orthodox theologians like Prof. Ioannis Petrou of the Theological Faculty of Thessaloniki.

More importantly from a doctrinal point of view, it would be helpful if neo-Palamite Orthodox theologians stopped exaggerating their theology into a dogmatic divide between Orthodoxy and Catholicism—if for no other reason than that it is just not true. Contrary to what many Orthodox seem to think, not only has St. Gregory Palamas and his theology never been condemned by the Catholic Church, but some highly respectable Catholic theologians like André de Halleux defend its orthodoxy.

Far from condemning Palamas, the official Vatican edition of the Greek
Anthologion of liturgical offices for the whole year includes St. Gregory’s office for the Second Sunday of Lent. Furthermore, St. Gregory is studied at my Pontifical Oriental Institute with the same interest and respect given him in an Orthodox theological academy, and a recent doctoral dissertation on his spiritual doctrine by one of our Catholic priest-students has just been published.

**Concluding Reflections: Learning from the Secular West**

By way of conclusion let me say that, despite grave defects in contemporary Western society, there is also a positive side to Western values from which the East could well learn. For it is this Western culture that invented “modernity” and its traditional values: a public life that is democratic and civil; respect for individuals and their civil and religious rights; a tradition of public service and beneficence in favor of the stricken or disadvantaged both at home and abroad; an academic, intellectual, artistic, and cultural life free of political restraint or the manipulation of state-ideology, and open to all; to name but a few of its qualities. Those educated in this oft-derided “Western” culture seek to acquire habits of thought and judgment, ways of behaving and acting that, I think, we should try to instill in all those with whom we have contact.

Deliberately setting aside caricature, the virulent, one-sided, vituperative, rude, and dishonorable academic institutions and scholarly establishment in this much-berated “secularized West” try to instill the values of fairness, objectivity, dialogue, courtesy, and common human decency. This leads to openness and the desire to know the other, rather than the ghetto-like insularity and smug self-satisfaction of those who think they have nothing to learn from other traditions. Just look at the endless list of fair, objective, positive, scholarly, Western studies and publications on the Christian East, its Fathers, its spirituality, its liturgy, its monasticism, its theology, and its history. Just look at the huge list of serious journals published under Catholic auspices that deal with the culture of the Christian East objectively, sympathetically, even with admiration and love, and the number of major Catholic educational institutions of higher education dedicated to the sympathetic, scholarly, objective study of the Christian East, including the one we are at today.

I think that these qualities are already elemental ideals and broadly acquired realities in the Anglican-Roman Catholic ecumenical dialogue.
The point is not that Catholics and Anglicans never disagree. What it does mean is that, at the official level, disagreements can be discussed truthfully and courteously without invective, rudeness, and slander. This is a source of great hope when one recalls that not many centuries ago Catholics and Anglicans were busily engaged in killing one another; today in Great Britain, Anglicans and Catholics venerate together the martyrs from each side—Catholics martyred by Anglicans and Anglicans by Catholics—who were sacrificed for their Anglicanism or Catholicism in the horrors of their mutual past. Now *that* is real, adult ecumenism!¹⁸²

Until hearts and minds are changed, none of our other ecumenical efforts will amount to anything of substance for the unity of the Churches of God. Let us not doubt for one minute that this has repercussions for humanity that go far beyond the question of Christian unity. One thing the twentieth century, and especially the Holocaust, have taught us is that there is no such thing as ideological neutrality. One is part of the solution or part of the problem. And to be part of the solution, one must be an instrument of peace and harmony, for to be anything less is to be part of the problem.

54. Ann Joh, for example, has argued that the ancient Korean concept of *jeong* provides the modern theologian with a vocabulary and conceptual framework missing in colonial (i.e., Western European) Christianity, and that it is only through the insight of *jeong* that we can adequately understand what she calls the “double gesture” of the cross. For Joh, the double gesture relates to the way in which the cross simultaneously (and subversively) affirms that it represents both pain and suffering as well as love and compassion (Ann Joh, *The Heart of the Cross: A Postcolonial Christology* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006]).

55. Young carefully differentiates the categories of “imperialism” and “colonialism,” arguing that there is a fundamental difference between the empires of Rome or Byzantium and the colonial projects of Western Europe in the early modern period. While Young’s thesis works for the examples he provides, it does not seem to apply to the Norman and Venetian “colonies” in the East during the era of the Crusades, nor does it account for the Eastern Christian and Western Christian interaction that occurred within the Ottoman empire (Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* [Oxford: Blackwell’s, 2001], especially 16–43).


Abbreviations used in the notes

AAS = *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.

DHGE = *Dictionnaire d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*.

DSp = *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*.

ECJ = *Eastern Churches Journal*.

ECP = Eastern Christian Publications, Fairfax, VA.

GCS = Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller.

OCA = *Oriantia Christiana Analecta*.


OCP = *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*.

OKS = Ostkirchliche Studien.
OSBM = Ordo Sancti Basilii Magni.
PIO = Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome.
SL = Studia liturgica.

1. Translated from the French as reported in *Irénikon* 73 (2000): 112.

2. Translated from the French as reported in *Irénikon* 66 (1993): 135. In the same vein, the *Irénikon* obituary of Protopresbyter John Meyendorff, noted Orthodox historian and theologian and a personal friend of mine, says he had “a friendship for many Catholics and Catholic institutions that was exigent and sometimes severe” (*Irénikon* 65 [1992]: 544).


5. Published in the journal *Edinaja Cerkov’—One Church*, the official organ of the Russian Orthodox exarchate of the patriarchate of Moscow in the United States. I have been unable to recover the exact reference to this statement, which I cite here from my student notes of many years ago. For a very different vision of what Jesuit work for Russia should comprise, see Vincenzo Poggi, “Le travail futur, d’après Philippe de Régis S.J. (1897–1955),” *OCP* 58 (1992): 5–21.


7. This has been detailed in a recent study every Jesuit should read: Ernst Chr. Suttner, “Jesuiten—Helfer und Ärgernis für die Kirchen des Ostens,” *Der christliche Osten* 49, no. 2 (1994): 80–95. Fr. Suttner, Professor Emeritus of the University of Vienna, is a Catholic priest, visiting professor at my Jesuit-run Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, and no enemy of the Jesuits.
8. In none of this am I judging anyone’s motives or good will, but good will, the cheapest of all virtues, cannot be used to excuse mistakes before the bar of history, but only at the Last Judgment. Three recent books illustrate all too painfully what a comedy of errors modern Catholic policy toward the Christian East, and especially toward Russia, has been: Giuseppe M. Croce, *La Badia Greca di Grottaferrata e la Rivista “Roma e l’Oriente.” Cattolicesimo e ortodossia fra unionismo ed ecumenismo (1799–1923), con appendici e documenti inediti, 2 vols.* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990); Angelo Tamborra, *Chiesa cattolica e Ortodossia russa. Due secoli di confronto e dialogo. Dalla Santa Allianza ai nostri giorni* (Cinisello Balsamo: Edizioni Paoloine, 1992); Léon Tretjakewitsch, *Bishop Michel d’Herbigny SJ and Russia. A Pre-Ecumenical Approach to Christian Unity* (Das östliche Christentum, Neue Folge, Bd. 39. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1990). In this context it is not irrelevant to emphasize that the first two of these books are by Catholic authors. It is not often (if indeed ever) that one sees such devastatingly honest self-criticism of Orthodox activities from the pen of an Orthodox writer.


11. Namely, the period before 1773–1814, when the Jesuit order was suppressed as a result of pressure from the Bourbon monarchies.

12. I put the word “Uniatism” in quotation marks because it is now continuously used by some authors as a pejorative term of contempt, like “papist.” I believe that to use it as a name for Eastern Catholics can be gratuitously offensive. To permit without demur its use in official Catholic-Orthodox ecumenical documents is impermissible and ultimately counter-productive. Here, I use the term “Uniatism” in precisely that pejorative sense, just as a Catholic might use the term “papalism” for some exaggerated interpretations of the Petrine office without meaning thereby “Catholicism.” Because it is that phenomenon of “Uniatism” too—i.e., not just the reality of Eastern Christians in union with Rome but the prejudicial way that phenomenon, those groups, and their history are viewed, rightly or wrongly—which like everything else in history must be studied with objectivity and fairness.

13. I have expressed my views on the whole question in the study cited above in note 4.

14. For a fair and objective analysis of the problem by a Catholic priest-scholar, see Ernst Chr. Suttner, *Church Unity: Union or Uniatism? Catholic-Orthodox*...


18. See the detailed account of this insanity in Croce, La Badia Greca di Grottaferrata 2:267–82 plus the invaluable footnotes.


20. A ghastly crime recently preserved for posterity, lest we dare to forget, in an anthology of photos recording the horrors man can inflict upon man: James


Cyril Korolevskij, born in Caen on December 16, 1878, and died in Rome on April 19, 1959, took a while to decide what his name was to be, from Charon, to Karalevskij, or Korolevskij/Korolevsky. On K. see Eugène Tisserant, “Father Cyril Korolevsky. A Biographical Note,” in Metropolitan Andrew (1865–1944), by Cyril Korolevsky, translated and revised by Serge Keleher (L’viv: Stauropegion, 1993) 17–36; also Croce, La Badia Greca di Grottaferrata 2:32–54, 283–96, and the further references there, 33–35 note 71; and now especially the massive Cyrille Korolevskij, Kniga bytija moego (Le livre de ma vie: Mémoires autobiographiques, Texte établi, édité et annoté par Giuseppe M. Croce, Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 45 [Vatican: Archives Secrètes Vaticanes 2007]).

26. See the work cited in note 22 above. In the well-informed, balanced, and objective view of historian Ambroise Jobert, “The Union of Brest is not the work of Polish or Roman policies. The Russian bishops, irritated by the reforms of [ Constantinopolitan patriarch] Jeremias II, requested it, the Polish court decided, not without hesitation, to risk it, and Rome received the Ruthenians into union without making any precise commitments in their regard” (De Luther à Mohila 343).


30. In the Italian original: “Di tutte le discordanze tra le Chiese d’Oriente e d’Occidente quella che può essere compresa più è il perché e il come la Chiesa d’Occidente ha fondata la sua speranza nella sua forza mondana.” And again “Le Chiese ortodosse dell’Oriente non hanno mai cercato il potere mondano e non hanno mai appoggiato la loro esistenza e vita su di esso”: Gianni Valente, Intervista con Bartolomeo I, patriarca ecumenico di Costantinopoli: “Le radice dello scisma: un pensiero mondano nella Chiesa,” in 30 GIORNI NELLA CHIESA E NEL MONDO. Mensile internazionale diretto da Giulio Andreotti (January 2004); text also available online at http://www.30giorni.it/it/articolo.asp?id=2524.


NOTES TO PAGE 33


35. See, for example, the disclaimer of Greek-Orthodox theologian Soterios Varnalides, “L’ecclésiologie de l’uniatisme dans la création des exarchats de Constantinople et d’Athènes,” Irénikon 65 (1992): 400–22, here 400: “l’uniatisme . . . a crée dans l’histoire de l’Église et dans la théologie chrétienne une ecclésiologie artificielle, inconnue jusqu’alors et étrangère à l’Église unie des premiers siècles. Même après le schisme et jusqu’à maintenant elle est inconnue à l’Église orthodoxe.” See also ibid. 420.


39. As modern studies continue to show, Medieval Latin ecclesiastical rule in areas of the Orthodox East was like the shepherding of Little-Bo-Peep compared to what the Latins suffered under the Russian Orthodox in the Tsarist empire. Greek dioceses in lands under the control of the Italian maritime city-states, as in the islands of the Aegean, automatically came under Latin ecclesiastical rule as well. The same was true in the Latin Kingdoms the Crusaders carved out for themselves in the Middle East, where Latin hierarchies were imposed on the conquered lands. But this was long before the East-West schism had hardened after the seventeenth century (see Ware, “Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century,” 259–76), and on the parish level the Orthodox clergy and people were pretty much left alone (see Brand, Cutler, “Latin Empire,” ODB 2:1184). For example, in thirteenth-century Cyprus under Latin domination, the Orthodox were free to elect their own bishops. See Gregorios A. Ioannides, “Il manoscritto Barberini greco 390: edizione e commento liturgico” (PhD diss., Rome: PIO, 2000), 337; and most recently, Christopher H. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance*, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).


41. *Chronicle* 22, 13 (12): churches and holy places were destroyed and lay as well as clergy massacred, including the envoy subdeacon John: “Inter quos virum venerabilem, Iohannem nomine, sancte Romane ecclesie subdiaconum, quem pro negotiis ecclesie dominus papa illuc direxerat, comprehendentes, in contumeliam ecclesie decollaverunt, caput eius ad caudam canis immunde religantes.” *Willhemi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. Robert B.C. Huygens, 2 vols., Corpus Christianorum series Latina, continuatio mediaevalis 63–63A (Turnhout: Brepols 1986; 63A:1023. William’s *Chronicle* is the major source for relations between Byzantium and the Crusader states: see Michael McCormick,

42. The Later Crusades 181ff, tells the story in detail.

43. Of course none of that justifies what the Crusaders did, but a dose of truth might help to re-dimension traditional Orthodox slanted views on the issue and apportion responsibilities where they belong—certainly not to the Catholic Church, in whose name Pope Innocent III bitterly condemned the Crusaders’ horrific actions in no uncertain terms: see ibid. 180, 185. Interestingly, the immediate aftermath to the Fourth Crusade does not seem to have provoked, even among the Greeks, the universal revulsion that it does today. Some Byzantine nobles joined the Latins and some Orthodox Greeks even fought for Latin Emperor Henry against the Byzantine armies: See The Later Crusades, 180, 185; Brand, Cutler, “Latin Empire,” ODB 2:1184.


45. Further evidence of this well-documented Russian Orthodox persecution of Catholics, both Roman and Eastern, can be found most recently in Simon, Pro Russia ch. 2 passim. The evidence is especially damning, coming as it does from this markedly pro-Russian author.


49. Killing thirteen and eleven faithful, respectively, on the two occasions (Glinka, _Diocesi ucraino-cattolica di Cholm_, 85–86).

50. It has been reactivated as a men’s monastery since the fall of the Soviet Union. In 2006 it had thirty monks. See Brakhaus-Ephron, _Enciklopedicheskij Slovar’_ 82+4 supplementary vols. (St. Petersburg: 1890–1907), 17:109; and especially N. B. Alatarceva, “Goloseevskij v chest’ Pokrova presvijatoj Bogorodicy muzheskoj monastyr’,” in the excellent new post-Soviet _Pravoslavnaja Enciklopedija_ (Moscow 2000–): 11:712, with photo and further bibliography. Needless to say, the Russian encyclopedias consulted have no entry for Sokolski, on whom see the best, serenely objective available history of the origins of this Church by Bulgarian Orthodox author Ivan Elenkov, _La Chiesa cattolica di rito bizantino-slavo in Bulgaria dalla sua costituzione nel 1860 fino alla metà del XX sec_, trans. from the Bulgarian by Neli Radanova (Sofia: Montecchi Editore 2000), 73–75; see Ritzer-Sefrin, _Hierarchia Catholica_ 8:162. On Popov’s episcopate, see Elenkov chaps. 3–5 passim.

51. Among the examples that could be given is one cited by Tamborra, _Chiesa cattolica e ortodossia russa_ 182: when Princess Zinaida Volkonskaja became a Catholic in 1833, Tsar Nicholas I ordered that her property be confiscated, that her minor children be taken away from her, and that she be confined to an Orthodox monastery. On Volkonskaja, see also Simon, _Pro Russia_, 53–57. Of course, the West at an earlier period knew this sort of thing too. In England, for example, Catholics suffered the same thing at Anglican hands: in 1593 an Act of Parliament decreed that the children of recusants (i.e., those who refused to accept the established Anglican Church) over seven years old “are to be committed to others to be educated.” Only at the end of the eighteenth century could English Catholics legally own, inherit, and transfer property, and only in 1828 were their civil rights restored. The difference is that, in the meantime, Catholics and Anglicans have learned something from their turbulent earlier history: see below at note 82.


57. See note 56.


61. Bernard Botte, “Note historique sur la concélébration dans l’église ancienne,” *La Maison-Dieu* 35 (1953): 9–23, holds this view strongly, whereas Jean-Michel Hanssens, “De concelebratione eucharistica in ritibus orientalibus,” *Periodica de re morali, canonica, liturgica* 16 (1927): 142–54, 181–210; 17 (1928): 93–127; 21 (1932): 193–219, here 144, 219, asserted that his distinction between “ceremonial” and “sacramental” concelebration was a merely ritual distinction that did not prejudge whether what he deemed “ceremonial” concelebration could have been a “real” participation of the concelebrants in the consecration of the gifts.


63. On Hausherr and his writings, see his *Hésychasme et prière* (Pont. Instituta Studiorum, 1966), ix–xi, which gives his bibliography up to that date; also Thomáš Špidlík, “In Memoriam Irenée Hausherr S.J. (7-6–1891—5-12–1978),” *OCF* 45 (1979): 159–65, with Hausherr’s later writings indicated.

64. Irenée Hausherr, “L’imitation de Jésus Christ dans la spiritualité byzantine,” in *Mélanges offerts au R. P. Ferdinand Cavallera . . .* (Toulouse: Institut


66. Another, contemporary translation I have found in the Russian sources available to me is the second edition of a translation by a certain Speranskov published in Moscow: Tipografiia V. Ja. Barbej Mjasnic. Georgiev. Per. Bojковој. 1877, with the approval of the censors at the Moscow Spiritual Academy. I am indebted to my colleague, PIO professor of Russian Church History, Constantin Simon S.J., for assisting me in my search for Russian editions of Kempis.

67. The basic work on Pobedonostsev is Robert F. Byrnes, Pobedonostsev: His Life and Thought (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968): on P’s work as Procurator of the Synod, see ch. 8; on his translation of The Imitation, see 286.


76. As for example the author of a recent article seems to do: Jean-Claude Larchet, “La théologie des énergies divines: l’enjeu, les difficultés et les perspectives du dialogue entre catholiques et orthodoxes,” Logos 50 (2009): 369–85,


80. Just a few off the top of my head, in alphabetical order: Bessarione, Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, Christian Orient, ContaCOR, Der christli-
che Osten, Diakonia, Eastern Churches Journal, Eastern Churches Quarterly, Eastern Churches Review, Échos d’Orient, Ephrem’s Theological Journal, Irénikon, Istina, Journal of St. Thomas Christians, Le Muséon, Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies (Ottawa), Logos (Slovakia), One, One in Christ, Oriens Christianus; Orientalia Christiana, Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Oriente cristiano, Ostkirchliche Studien, Nicolaus, Pokrov, Proche-orient chrétien, Revue des études byzantines, Roma e l’Oriente, Russia cristiana (formerly L’altra europa), Simvol, Stoudion, Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano, The Harp: A Review of Syriac Oriental Ecumenical Studies, The Journal of Eastern Christian Studies, Thomas Christian Heritage, Urba—The Way. A Journal of Theology, etc., Some of these rank among the major international scholarly journals on the Christian East today, along with Oriens Christianus founded under Catholic auspices by Anton Baumstark but now under secular academic direction. Of course, some of the older journals suffering, inevitably, from the limited mentality of the times, were “unionistic” in approach. My point is not to support their orientation but to insist that one cannot say Catholicism ever ignored the Christian East. In that light, one can, perhaps, understand the perplexity of “Westerners,” accustomed to dealing with facts, at the following opening sentence of a recent article by two Serbian Orthodox: “In the Western literature and periodicals there is an inadmissible [sic.] small number of articles, studies and books dealing with either Orthodoxy in general or the Serbian Orthodoxy and the Serbian Orthodox Church in particular”: D.B. Djordjevic and B. Djurovic, “Secularization and Orthodoxy: The Case of the Serbians,” Orthodoxes Forum 7 (1993): 215. Incidentally, the journal containing the complaint cited above is published by the Institut für Orthodoxe Theologie within the Faculty of Catholic Theology of the University of Munich. So much for objectivity.
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