

Liturgical Latinization and Kievan Ecumenism: Losing the *Koinê* of *Koinonia*¹

Peter Galadza

Резюме

У цьому рефераті, виголошеному на оттавській сесії Студійної Групи Київської Церкви в квітні, 1993 п.з. «Літургічна латинізація і київський екуменізм – затрачання спільної мови причасної спільности», о. Петро Галадза твердить, що незважаючи на те, що поодинокі обряди мають тільки відносне значення в християнстві, все таки літургічне зближення Української Православної і Греко-католицької Церков може відіграти велику роль у змаганнях про церковне об'єднання. Крім цього, свідоме ігнорування київської літургічної спадщини тими, які бажають її латинізації, це форма ненависти до власної ідентичности, що веде до щораз більшого відчуження цих Церков.

У минулому існувала тенденція наголошувати вину тільки однієї із трьох Церков – Латинської, Православної, чи Греко-католицької. Однак, всі три відіграли роль в процесі латинізації. Зокрема в періодах переслідування Греко-католицької Церкви православними (наприклад, за часів Семашка, чи Попеля) самі папи наказували греко-католикам зберігати златинщені обряди, тим більше, що в Римі панувало підозріння до візантійського передання. 3

¹ Paper delivered at the Ottawa Consultation of the Kievan Church Study Group, April, 1993.

другої сторони, репресивні дії Російської Православної Церкви спонтанно викликували бажання серед греко-католиків віддалюватися від східнього. Та занепад української Церкви не дозволяв їй реагувати в органічний спосіб на тиск як зі Заходу так і з Півночі. Брак історичних знань довів до того, що деякі греко-католики взагалі заперечували що їхня традиція візантійська. Сьогодні, коли ці три Церкви вважають себе сестрами, літургічне питання повинно розвиватися зовсім інакше як в добі полеміки і прозелітизму.



For those accustomed to the standard themes and methods of ecumenical dialogue, the topic of liturgical latinization may seem secondary in the effort to reconcile estranged Churches. However, the history of Ukrainian Orthodox/Catholic relations demonstrates that liturgical practice has always been one of the greatest stumbling blocks – as well as one of the greatest building blocks – in efforts to “rebuild the walls” of the “second Jerusalem.”²

This fact was illustrated even in our own Kievan Church Study Group in October, 1992. After witnessing part of a Liturgy served by Catholic members in the seminary chapel in Stamford, an Orthodox member of our group who, according to his own admission, had never had an opportunity to acquaint himself with Greco-Catholic worship, and who previously was rather critical of “Uniate” Churches, declared quite spontaneously, “I now see how we could be one Church.”³

² In the 17th century Kiev came to be known as the second Jerusalem owing to its role as the mother of Churches to the north and east.

³ Unfortunately, however, there are still all-too-many Greco-Catholic parishes where an Orthodox observer might be driven to precisely the opposite conclusion.

The Relative Status of Discrete Rites and the Quest for Truth and Unity

The following deserves mention before turning to our analysis. Within the last several years, two scholars, one Catholic and the other Orthodox, both of whom would usually be identified with opposing “camps” in the debate over “Uniate” worship, have reminded us of a fundamental scriptural truth: individual Church rites have only a relative, not absolute value.⁴ What is of ultimate importance is faith and doctrine along with worship *in spirit and truth*.⁵ The Spirit and Truth alone are the criteria by which ecclesial life, and liturgy in particular, should be judged, and it is only when estranged Christians totally submit to the power of the Holy One and cast off all falsehood that unity will be restored.

This seems to contradict our earlier assertion about the importance of the latinization question in Kievan ecumenism. If this be the case, why devote attention in our dialogue to what apparently is simply a matter of ecclesial culture? My answer is two-fold. First, in the case of our own Kievan Church what in fact is torn in twain is the same “Ritual *ecclesia particularis*,” to use the current Roman terminology. Since liturgy functions as a language, the existence of a common “tongue” would be of central importance in helping the divided members of this “ecclesial family” to begin effectively communicating again. This is especially true as the overwhelming majority of our faithful – probably more than in some other Churches, appropriate their faith intuitively, and not discursively. If Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox again come to share a liturgical *koinê*, this will be of no

⁴ Thomas Hopko, “Reflections on Eastern Rite Catholicism,” in *All the Fulness of God: Essays on Orthodoxy, Ecumenism, and Modern Society* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1982), 126; and Sophia Senyk, OSBM, “The Ukrainian Church and Latinization,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56 (1990), 187.

⁵ This does not mean that worship as such has relative status – all Christians are obliged to do so according to the express will of Christ. What it does mean is that most of the particular forms of Christian worship, manifested differently in varying traditions, dare never be dogmatized.

small significance in helping them to communicate of the One *Communio*, and re-establish *koinonia*.

Second, and more importantly, the issue of liturgical latinization does in fact relate to the question of truth. It does so at the level of motivation, or intention, which all moral theology considers to be of prime importance. Allow me to employ a very secular, but also very precise analogy. In Ukraine today, even many nationalists are willing to overlook the inability of a political leader to speak Ukrainian, for being Ukrainian, (like being a Christian), is much more than a matter of expression. However, should it become evident that a leader does not speak Ukrainian out of hatred for the language – considering it to be inferior or uncultured, or should it become obvious that he refuses to study it because of its alleged irrelevance, then most Ukrainians, and in fact, most non-Ukrainians, will naturally express indignation.

Our analogy suggests that one must distinguish between the latinization of those who in good faith and possibly out of benign ignorance do not speak the intelligible *koinê* of Kievan worship, and those who refuse to speak it or learn it out of hatred. Where there is hatred for the good, there can be no truth, and where hatred and falsity predominate, there can be no reconciliation.

A Definition of Latinization

Before proceeding, allow me to clarify the meaning that I attach to the notion of liturgical latinization.⁶ I understand it to be the importing or imposition onto Byzantine Rite worship of the spirit, practices and priorities of Latin liturgy and theology. For such an imposition or importation to constitute inappropriate latinization, it must be inorganic to the Byzantine system. By inorganic I mean that the structural, theological or spiritual genius of the Byzantine tradition is violated by these borrowings.

⁶ Here I expand the definition presented in my article "Canadian Ukrainian Catholic Worship: Towards A Framework for Analysis," *Logos* 34:1-2 (1993), 251.

Thus not every form of influence from the Latin Church constitutes latinization – or at least inappropriate latinization. For example, Greco-Catholics began receiving the Eucharist more frequently as a result of Rome's exhortation of 1905, *Sacra tridentina synodus*.⁷ But here Pius X was only re-establishing the common practice of the early Church.

Determining which elements undeniably accrue from the Latin tradition, and which of them deform the genius and common patrimony of the Byzantine tradition requires study and reflection. For many centuries, Ukrainian Christians, and Greco-Catholics in particular, were not aware of their own liturgical history. Decisions and judgments came to be based on ignorance. As late as 1929, the Ukrainian Catholic bishop of Stanyslaviv (present-day Ivano-Frankivs'k) Hryhoriy Khomyshyn [Chomyszyn] could insist that the tradition of his Church was not in fact Byzantine at all.⁸ Today, however, solid studies on the history of worship in Ukraine are being written by Ukrainian Catholics,⁹ not to mention other scholars. Thus in the future, at least the history of these questions should be less disputed.

Nonetheless, a knowledge of history is never sufficient, as one must always determine how to appropriate the past. Such determinations are necessarily made on the basis of present-day ideologies, myths, prejudices, experiences, and theologies. Frequently these remained unexamined, leading to an even greater obfuscation of the liturgical question.

A Broader Context for Evaluating Latinization

This brings us to the core of my presentation. First, in evaluating the past, and this includes events as late as 1989, we must note

⁷ ASS 38 (1905), 400–406.

⁸ «Пастирський лист про византийство», *Нова Зоря* 29 (1931), 7.

⁹ See, for example, Laurence Huculak, OSBM, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province During the Period of Union with Rome (1596–1839)*, Analecta OSBM, Series II, Section I, Opera, no. 47 (Rome: Basilian Fathers, 1990).

that latinization has always sparked controversy in the Kievan Metropolia because, first, it has usually come in the wake of political oppression, and second, it has tended to serve and manifest divisive or even destructive ecclesiologies. Ultimately, latinization will cease to be a problem only once national and political animosities are healed, and once Christians accept the ecclesiological paradigm of Sister Churches. Once this happens, latinization will be on its way to becoming value neutral, in the same way that computerization or urbanization, for example, are essentially descriptive terms. Individual Latin importations will then be evaluated according to their inherent theological, spiritual, liturgical merits, or *lack thereof*, and not a priori on the basis of their provenance in Western practice.

Second, in evaluating latinization today we are obliged to follow the paradigm shift in Orthodox/Catholic ecclesiologies. Now that, at least in principle, most of the Orthodox, Catholic, and Greco-Catholic Churches consider each other to be sisters, not enemies, any discussion and treatment of latinization, to mention only the topic at hand, could benefit by employing the insights of *family counselling*. In family therapy all the members together are viewed as a system with their respective role in, and responsibility for, dysfunction.

In the past, latinization was usually viewed as the problem or fault of only one of the three Sisters. For example, in his seminal, but biased, tract on Uniatism, the Vatican official, Cyril Korolevsky, almost entirely ignored Rome's role in fostering latinization.¹⁰ On the other hand, popular sentiment has tended to focus on the role of Roman Catholics, in particular the Vatican and the Poles, in fostering this phenomenon. Again, such an approach is inadequate because it ignores the other two "siblings." As a result of the Sister-Churches paradigm I would posit that we must also insist on the role of the Orthodox, and in particular, the Russian Orthodox, in contributing to this dysfunction. Consequently, I propose the following evaluative matrix: Latinization in the

¹⁰ Cirillo Korolevskij, *L'Uniatisme: définition, cause, effets, étendue, dangers, remèdes*, Irénikon-Collection, nos. 5-6 (Amay-sur-Meuse, 1927), 50-55.

Kievan Church was (and is) the result of Roman and/or Polish Catholic pressure exerted on a declining Greco-Catholic Church located in a territory where, as a result of geo-political circumstances, occidentalization was an inevitable cultural trait. This latinization has always manifested itself most markedly whenever the (Russian) Orthodox Church has attempted to forcibly liquidate the Greco-Catholic Church.

As regards Greco-Catholic “culpability,” latinization was used, especially by Greco-Catholic *leaders*, as a means of ecclesiastical aggrandizement with higher authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical. Among the flock at large, it was frequently employed as a superficial tool to counter Orthodox encroachments, sometimes without any interest in the real substance of Latin theology and practice.

The Positive Goals Sought Through Latinization and the Reaction Against It

Before analyzing the individual members of our ecclesial family, we need to perform one more task: to elucidate the positive goals sought by each of the three Sister Churches in fostering or reacting against latinization. Family therapy reminds us that there is usually a good which any given dysfunction is either seeking or attempting to compensate for. Without establishing which goods were sought, we all too easily demonize the “patient,” something which in this case would be especially inappropriate, as we are speaking of the Body of Christ.

From the Roman perspective, latinization was an attempt to maintain the unity of the Church and defend the doctrines of Tridentine and Catholic theology at large. From the Greco-Catholic perspective, in addition to the unity factor just mentioned, latinization was an attempt to respond to the spiritual needs of the faithful in the way most feasible considering the intellectual and cultural resources of Ukraine and Belarus after 1453. From the (Russian) Orthodox perspective, the reaction against latinization was an attempt to restore the integrity of the Byzantine tradition and maintain the unity, both doctrinally and ecclesially, of Orthodoxy, against those tearing at the seams of Eastern Christianity.

Today, of course, shifts in theology, and ecclesiology in particular, enable us to seek these same goods in radically different and far more appropriate ways. The desire for Catholic unity no longer presupposes domination of, and isolation from, the Orthodox (and vice versa). Also the theologies of East and West are now viewed as complements rather than contradictions. Finally, Greco-Catholics are more frequently in a position to re-appropriate the treasures of Byzantine theology and liturgy without the deadening and futile artificiality of archeologism, which instead of bringing them to God, has frequently only lead them to their past, or their "identity," understood purely sociologically.

The Roman Catholic Role in the Latinization of the Kievan Church

Let us now turn to each of the members of our ecclesial trinity. We start from Roman and/or Polish Catholic pressure, if only because latinization must ultimately have a Latin source. The examples of Latin influence discussed below have been chosen either because of their importance, or because they have been ignored by other scholars. To illustrate something of the history of this phenomenon I have provided examples from each century starting with the 16th. I readily admit, however, that my treatment here is only cursory at best, as entire tomes would be needed to demonstrate Roman Catholic influence on Byzantine worship in Ukraine and Belarus.

The Brest Period

While a study of the Kievan Metropolia's liturgy on the eve of the Union of Brest has yet to be written, it is apparent to anyone who knows how to read historical documents that Latin-Rite pressure was being exerted on the Kievan Church even before the latter had entered into communion with Rome. Of the 33 articles of the Union of Brest, at least 10 of them deal explicitly and