

IMPONDERABILIA  
or  
IN SEARCH OF THE SOURCES  
OF UKRAINIAN CHRISTIAN  
IDENTITY

Prof. Dr. Ivan Hryniach

---

BRIEF SYNOPSIS

TRUTH—ALETHEIA—VERITAS—ISTYNA

CHRIST—TRUTH—CHURCH  
versus  
PILATE—POWER—STATE

KIEVAN RUS' versus MUSCOVITE RUSSIA

1. People born and raised in a country of militant atheism yearn for something immaterial—spiritual—intangible—imponderable.
2. Birth certificate of Kievan (not Muscovite) Rus'.
3. Historical manipulation of TRUTH by those in power.
4. Differences between Ukrainian and Russian Christianity are rooted in different perceptions of two concepts: TRUTH & POWER (CHRIST & PILATE).
5. Subservience of the Moscow Patriarchate to either "white" or "red" tsars.
6. CHRIST & Satan — Is it not time to say: BEGONE SATAN!?
7. The UKRAINIAN people have always been conscious of belonging to ONE FAITH, ONE CHURCH.
8. Christianity enlightens and does not "stupefy" its faithful followers.
9. The Church's principal mission is to educate man yearning for "imponderabilia" to become the spiritual temple of God.

**IMPONDERABILIA**  
**OR**  
**IN SEARCH OF THE SOURCES**  
**OF UKRAINIAN CHRISTIAN**  
**IDENTITY**

**Prof. Dr. Ivan Hryniach**

**diasporiana.org.ua**

Translated from Ukrainian from *Suchasnist* , 1988, No. 7-8 by  
Marta Skorupsky  
English text edited by Prof. M. Werchnyk

# "IMPONDERABILIA" OR IN SEARCH OF THE SOURCES OF UKRAINIAN CHRISTIAN IDENTITY

by Prof. Dr. Ivan Hryniach

*Put out into the deep and let down  
your nets for a catch . (Luke 5: 4)*

More than thirty years ago, in September, 1957, while sailing on the Dutch liner *New Statendam* from Rotterdam to Hoboken, N. J., I made the acquaintance of a Dutch merchant. For the eight days that it took to cross the Atlantic, he was my travelling companion, roommate, and, most important, an exceptionally interesting colloquutor. As it happened, he had a degree in philosophy. Since I had absolutely no understanding of commerce, it was quite natural that most of our conversations centered on philosophy.

We examined various philosophical concepts, their definition, meaning, and different interpretations, particularly in the light of medieval Scholasticism. This philosophical system, as we know, once also flourished in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, which, though oppressed in the political sphere, had nonetheless grown by the 17th century into the richest cultural and scholarly center in all of Eastern Europe. I might add that it was the *only* such center at that time on this vast territory.

In one of our conversations, we considered the Latin term *imponderabile*. What did it mean? Inexplicable, incapable of being measured, having no weight? My travelling companion remembered the exact definition in Latin, which he had heard from his former professor of philosophy: "Imponderabilia dicuntur quae sunt maximi ponderis." Loosely translated, it means: "That which has no weight, no ponderosity, is the most weighty."

This statement sounds paradoxical, inconceivable! Especially to anyone who willingly or unwillingly has become ensnared in the web of materialistic and atheistic doctrine. To such a person the world of *imponderabilia* is not only alien but also impossible and therefore unreal. And yet, contrary to this doctrine, this world exists, because even individuals born and bred in a land where atheism is the official doctrine yearn for this spiritual world and discover the

path that leads toward it. That this is so is attested by the presence in countries where militant atheism prevails of millions of believers and of tens of thousands of those who search for the truth and find it. As proof that in our own time one man spoke out in the name of millions and expressed his yearning and thirst for the spiritual world, for a "New World of Love and Unity," I will name Oles' Berdnyk.<sup>1</sup> How else should we understand the words he wrote in his Epistle to Pope John-Paul II: "*Born and educated in a land where atheism is the official doctrine, I came to Christ in the midst of struggle and suffering.*"<sup>2</sup>

It is true that instead of honoring the discoverer of the "New World of Love and Unity" and commending him for seeking this world in the midst of "struggle and suffering" the subservient idolaters quenched his thirst with bitter vinegar. But have they quenched it forever? That, too, is an imponderable! Yet there can be no doubt that this *imponderabile*, which is incapable of being measured or weighed because it is *spiritual and sacramental*, exists and is real in every individual and in all human societies. It has also endured throughout the centuries in Ukrainian Christianity, which this year, 1988, celebrates its *Millennium*.

When a child is born, we record all important facts about it so that we may know *who this is*. We document the child's name, day and place of birth, the names of the parents and witnesses, and, if it receives the Sacrament of Baptism, also the names of its godparents. This first document is the child's birth certificate; this is its first record of identity. According to the revealed Word of God, there appears during the Holy Sacrament of Baptism a spiritually transfigured individual, *nea ktisis*, "a new creature." This, too, is a

---

<sup>1</sup> A Soviet Ukrainian novelist and poet (b. 1927), one of the founding members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group in 1976, charged in 1979 with "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation" and sentenced that same year to a term of 6 years of labor camps and 3 years of exile. In May, 1984, he recanted his views in a published statement and was released from imprisonment. He now lives in Kiev.

<sup>2</sup> For a fuller discussion of Berdnyk's letter to the Pope, entitled *Vidkryte druzhnie poslannia* and dated November 25, 1978, see my "Oles' Berdnyk," *Suchasnist'*, 1980, No. 4, pp. 86-99. Here and elsewhere in quoted passages the italics are mine—I. H.

spiritual and sacramental *imponderabile* that is part of that "New World of Love and Unity."

Researchers and historians turn to surviving documents in an attempt to find and establish all the facts of birth; they endeavor to seek out and pass on from generation to generation the genuine, unfalsified certificate of birth, so that it will remain part of the memory of mankind. I find it astonishing that an incredible controversy still surrounds the birth certificate of Christianity in my native land Ukraine. A controversy that centers on *who the newborn is, whom it belongs to, and who are its parents*. Because this controversy exists, allow me to reiterate the data from the record:

Name of the newborn: "the rich and the poor, the beggar and the laborer...", the inhabitants of the princely seat of Kiev. So tell us the chronicles of that period.

Day and year of birth: August 1 (Julian Calendar), 988.

Place of birth: Kiev, the Pochaina River where it flows into the Dnieper.

Name of godfather: Volodymyr I (the Great), saint, the Grand Prince of Kiev.

\*

When I recall here the facts about the birth of Christianity among my ancestors, I am well aware that I am revealing nothing new. I am compelled to repeat this data by the strange events that are taking place in connection with this important anniversary. With the "blessing" of an atheistic regime (similar to the "blessings" once given by the Russian tsars), the Moscow Patriarchate is staging a triumphant celebration of the "jubilee of the Millennium of the Baptism of Russia" rather than of Kievan Rus'. Its emissaries—church leaders and officials of high and low rank—have visited all the lands of the world issuing invitations to take part in the festivities and pilgrimages. Invitations to where? To Moscow, of course, to Zagorsk, even to hastily refurbished monasteries in the north—everywhere except to the holy places of Kievan Rus', to the Monastery of the Caves in Kiev and to Ukraine's Jordan River—the Dnieper.

I confess that in all this bustle by the Moscow Patriarchate in connection with the celebration of the Millennium of Christianity I would like to find a bright ray of evidence of the renewal of long suppressed Christian consciousness. I would like to uncover in it

the element of *imponderabile* and of the sacramental. When I consider that not that long ago, in 1938, both branches of the Ukrainian Church—the Orthodox and the Catholic—the direct heirs of the religious legacy of the Metropolia of Kiev and of all Rus', had to celebrate the 950th anniversary of their Christianization outside the borders of Moscow's atheistic regime because every expression of religiosity had been suppressed inside that regime's dominion, and when I recall that the faithful of the Moscow Patriarchate, too, fell victim to the "new Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist religion without God," I am even inclined to rejoice that the Russian Christians, our northern neighbors, are joining the Ukrainian Christians in the mighty worldwide chorus of celebration of the Millennium of *our* Christianity. One could rejoice that the light of Kievan Christianity reached as far as Moscow and the ancestors of the Russian people. One could also expect the Russian Christians, who are well aware of the historical truth, to express at least a modest word of gratitude to Kiev for bringing them enlightenment in the Christian faith. There is nothing shameful about this. Neither Byzantium nor Rome feels shame that the light of Christ's faith came to them from Jerusalem. Nor did Kiev feel shame that it accepted the light of Christian faith from Byzantium, the city of Constantine. Calling it the "pious Greek land," Metropolitan Ilarion<sup>3</sup> expressed admiration and gratitude to Byzantium in his famous *Sermon on the Law and Grace and an Eulogy to our Kagan Volodymyr*.<sup>4</sup> Extolling Volodymyr the Great, the author of the *Sermon* also expressed praise that "[Volodymyr] always heard about the pious Greek land, full of love of Christ and strong in faith [...], where the churches are filled with people, where the villages and cities are all pious and pray zealously and all adore God."

---

<sup>3</sup> Ilarion (Hilarion) was the first non-Greek Metropolitan of Kiev (1051-1054), installed by a synod of bishops assembled in Kiev on the orders of Yaroslav the Wise, the son and successor of Volodymyr the Great. Ilarion's writings are among the earliest literary monuments of Kievan Rus'.

<sup>4</sup> *Slovo o zakoni i o blagodati i pokhvala kaganu nashemu Volodymeru*, a collection of works written by Ilarion between 1037 and his installation as Metropolitan in 1051. The passage quoted here is from Ilarion's panygeric to Volodymyr the Great and is translated from the original contained in: Ludolf Müller, *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis* (Wiesbaden, 1962), pp. 102-103.

It appears that it will take quite some time yet before we hear a similar expression of recognition and gratitude to Kiev and the Ukrainian land from the Moscow Patriarchate. But it is not even a question of gratitude; it is a question of historical truth. And that is the reason why I took time to cite the record of the birth of Christianity in Kievan Rus', the first proof of the identity of Christianity in Eastern Europe, even though this document is known to all. I dwell on it, because I cannot rid myself of the feeling that the truth is being "bartered away."

My early elation at the unexpected participation of the Moscow Patriarchate and its Russian Christian believers in the solemn celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of Kievan Rus' has proven to have been premature, because it is darkened by the shadow of the realities of life. The authentic certificate of identity of Kievan Christianity is being vociferously "restructured," primarily for the benefit of the public in the countries of the democratic West. Upon closer examination, we see that the aim of this "open restructuring" [*glasna perestroika*] is not the discovery of truth (one cannot help but be reminded of Pilate's ironic: "What is truth?"—John 18: 38, and his similarly arrogant: "Do you not know that I have power to release you, and power to crucify you?"—John 19: 10), but an attempt to suppress and obliterate the memory and consciousness of the descendants and heirs of Kievan Christianity of their identity. The truth, which is being crucified with such "openness" [*glasnost*], is indisputable, because the birth certificate of Kievan Christianity describes Kiev as the cradle of this Christianity. And Kiev is the capital of Ukraine. Kiev has withstood the attacks of neighbors from the north and the south, from the east and the west. Kiev has been plundered, burned, and destroyed—and still it lives and has refused to die even unto our time. And this same Kiev is not Moscow, of which there is no mention in history until 1147, and which did not become the capital of the Muscovite (not Rus') principality until 1328—centuries after the Baptism of the Kievites in the reign of Volodymyr the Great.

And the Dnieper River—the place of the Baptism of the Kievites—is not the Moskva River, far removed to the north. And Rus' is not Russia—the new name assumed by the Muscovite realm which emerged in the historical arena only several centuries later. And even the ancient title borne by the heads of the Christian Church that was born and hierarchically formed in Kiev, "the Metropolitan of

Kiev and of all Rus'," is not identical to the title of the head of the Russian Church—"Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia." Yet, even though it has proven physically impossible to move Kiev and the Dnieper River north to the center of Muscovy, the virtuosos of historical "restructuring," who possess the power "to crucify," have no difficulty whatsoever "appropriating" all the valuable attainments of Kiev: its icons, its ancient literary and artistic monuments, and even the name "Rus'," which has been "restructured" into "Russia."

One could continue the list of historical lies, omissions, and distortions... The root of this evil lies in the fact that the Christianity of Russia's ruling circles, both secular and ecclesiastic, is thoroughly dissimilar from that of the Ukrainians.

As I see it, the difference between the forms of Christianity professed by the Ukrainian and Russian peoples is rooted in the intermingling of two concepts, which leave their indelible mark on the spirit of individuals, societies, and nations. These concepts are *truth and power*. The manner in which these concepts are concretized in all aspects of a people's life—in the lives of individuals and of the collective, in a nation's civic, cultural, and political life—shapes the spirit of each individual and of society as a whole.

The Russians have from the beginning of their emergence as a people syncretized the concepts of truth and power, both in the national consciousness and in everyday life. By syncretism I mean the reconciliation or even union of two fundamentally conflicting views, of two world outlooks.

Yet syncretism is not the only mode in which these two concepts can coexist in both the individual and collective consciousness, as well as be implemented in everyday life. They can also exist in a symbiotic state, as when two dissimilar organisms live together in intimate association and yet each of them retains and fulfills the primary function dictated by its nature. The Christian spirit of the Ukrainian people, unlike that of the Russians, is characterized by symbiosis rather than syncretism, namely, by the harmonious coexistence of two dissimilar organisms with their original and unique functions intact.

It seems to me that historians and legal scholars might find it of some importance to examine the relationship in Kievan Rus' between secular power, that is, the embodiment of Pilate's words, "I have power," and the Christian Church in Ukraine—the institution charged by Christ to continue His mission: "For this I was born,



and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth" (John 18: 37), and to compare this relationship with its counterpart in the Muscovite realm, which later became the Russian Empire.

At the heart of my own investigation of this question lies a dramatic scene played out two thousand years ago and recorded in the Gospel according to John, Chapters 18-19. The principal characters in this scene are Jesus of Nazareth and Pilate. Jesus is a prisoner, the Herald of Truth, Faith, and Love, the Herald of a new just world. Pilate is a judge, a holder of power, a representative of a world in which material power determines what is truth, what is justice, what is love.

Jesus and Pilate—a helpless prisoner and an all-powerful judge—engage in a dialogue about different "kingships"—one "of this world" and the other "not of this world"; and about truth—one truth that "everyone, who is of truth, listens to the voice" of the Herald of truth, who "for this [...] was born, and for this [...] came into the world, to bear witness to the truth," the other, that of which Pilate speaks with irony "What is truth?", because truth, as Pilate understands it, is subject by law to power-authority. Power and truth have merged into one, indivisible concept... Two different worlds of understanding and two different worlds of earthly and cosmic reality: the evangelical world of Jesus the Herald, the world of *imponderabilia* as I call it, the world of mystery; and the world of Pilate the lover of power. How disparate these two worlds are! Small wonder that the dramatic scene of the dialogue between Jesus and Pilate ended in mockery, scourging, a crown of thorns, a purple robe, and savage cries: "Crucify him, crucify him!"

Small wonder also that, disturbed by this turn in the unfinished dialogue with his prisoner, and hearing the high priests and their servants angrily invoke the law by which the defendant had to be put to death "because he has made himself the Son of God," Pilate tried to continue his conversation with Jesus in order to understand the enigma. Pilate could not comprehend how this prisoner, scourged and tortured, at the sight of whom Pilate himself exclaimed "Behold the man!" ("*Ecce homo!*" ), could be the Son of God. Even more disturbed, Pilate asked: "Where are you from?" The prisoner gave no answer, because spiritual mysteries cannot be fathomed by force, by brute strength, by demeaning a man. And so Pilate turned to his ultimate weapon, to his power: "Do you not know that I have the power to release you, and the power to crucify you?" Was power,

material force, to be the key to the understanding of the mystery? Most certainly not the power to which Pilate was resorting. Only another power, the evangelical power of which the prisoner Jesus said: "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above."

Reflecting upon the dramatic dialogue between Jesus and Pilate, I have come to the conclusion that one of the principal differences between Kievan and Muscovite Christianity lies in their utterly disparate understanding of the concepts of *truth-justice* and of *power-authority*. These different perceptions have accompanied the two forms of Christianity throughout the centuries, and they are apparent today. We have already examined the *truth* to which Christ's Church must bear witness throughout the world and the fate of this truth in Russian Christianity, where it has become the servant of Pilate's power. The evangelical, Christian understanding of power as a gift that is given "from above" has become extinct. What is power, that concept that is designated in Ukrainian as *vlada* ("political power"; *potestas* or *auctoritas* in Latin) or *vlast'* in the archaic form of the language? The question is important because the concepts of power and authority exist in the family, in the community, in the nation, and in the state. They also exist in the Church of Christ. The Greek language has an abundance of terms that contain the notion of power and authority. Perhaps the most interesting, however, is the definition of the archaic Ukrainian *vlast'*. It is to this definition of power and authority that Jesus is referring when he says that it is given "from above," and it is of this authority and power that other evangelical texts speak—for example, "for his word was with authority" (Luke 4: 32)—when they describe the teaching of Jesus. It is to this authority and power that Jesus is referring when He charges his apostles to go into the world and teach, preach, and baptize—"All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me..." (Matthew 28: 18)—because authority, as the concept itself attests, is something that flows from the highest being, from the essence of the most sacred, which is what Almighty and Omnipotent God is. This authority is given to its earthly possessors even when they are unaware of this or when they reject it, consciously renouncing God Almighty. They then exercise authority in the manner of Pilate.

In his work, *Le Phenomen Humain*, a leading thinker of our century, the French priest, naturalist, archaeologist, modern Christian

philosopher and theologian (perhaps forgotten in contemporary Catholic theology for this very reason) Pierre Teilhard de Chardin defines the task of the Christian thinker with the brief words: "Voir et faire de voir"—"To see and to make see."<sup>5</sup>

When I try to cast a ray of light on the spiritual repository of Ukrainian Christianity from its birth to our own times in order to seek out the sources of its identity, I have only one wish: *to see* and to convey what I see to others so that they too can *see*.

I also want to see the fate of Christianity among neighboring nations, especially among the Russians, who were baptized in the same Christian faith and who also developed in accordance with Eastern Christian traditions. I want to *see* what it is that makes Russian Christianity so obviously different from that of Kiev. Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky<sup>6</sup> also sought to understand this phenomenon. I recall his epistles to the Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs<sup>7</sup> and the decrees of the Lviv Archdiocesan Councils between 1940 and 1943.<sup>8</sup> As head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and custodian of evangelical truth and piety amidst his own flock, he drew attention to the element of hatred, so foreign to the faith of Christ, which had gradually begun to triumph over the intrinsic symbols of Christian faith—repentance, forgiveness, and love. Metropolitan Sheptytsky saw clearly the cultivation of this element of hatred in official Russian Orthodoxy, irrespective of which regime was in power. He also saw how this element of hatred, supported by Pilate's concept of authority, had begun to seep into the ancient Kievan Christianity of the Ukrainian people. All of Metropolitan Sheptytsky's creative energy, thoughts, and vision, his entire life and readiness to die a martyr's death, were directed at

---

<sup>5</sup> (Paris, 1947), p. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Andrei Sheptytsky (1865-1944), Metropolitan of Galicia and Archbishop of Lviv (1900-1944), was a distinguished Ukrainian Catholic church leader and theologian and an important organizer of church, educational, cultural, and scholarly life. He was declared Blessed by the Catholic Church.

<sup>7</sup> These letters were written in 1941 to Archbishop Ilarion Ohienko and to the Ukrainian Orthodox Hierarchy as a whole. They are published in Ukrainian in: S. Baran, *Mytropolyt Andrei Sheptyts'kyi* (Munich, 1947), pp. 123-124, 127-128.

<sup>8</sup> Their transactions are published as: *Diiannia i postanovy L'vivs'kykh arkhyeparkhiial'nykh soboriv: 1940-1943* (Winnipeg, 1984).

eradicating the poison of hatred from the souls of Christian nations and at leading them to repentance—*metanoia* (cf. Luke 5: 32: "I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance"), which echoes in the *Tale of Bygone Years*:—"Perhaps through you God will turn Rus' to repentance, and you will relieve the Greek land from fierce war"<sup>9</sup> — forgiveness and reconciliation.

I also see that the heirs of the legacy of Kievan Christianity, the heads of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and successors of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, the late Patriarch Yosyf Slipyj<sup>10</sup> and Archbishop Major Myroslav Ivan Liubachivsky<sup>11</sup> have followed in the steps of their predecessor. In the spirit of repentance and forgiveness, with a passionate desire for reconciliation, Archbishop Major Myroslav Ivan has extended his hand to the Christians of Russia and to the Moscow Patriarchate. But his hand has been left hanging in midair...

I look for a reason. After all, in both Churches during Lent we recite the words of the moving prayer of St. Ephraem:<sup>12</sup> "Lord and Master of my life, drive away from me the spirit of apathy and selfishness, of love of power and idle talk. Grant me, your unworthy servant, sound sense, humility, steadfastness, and love." It is in the spirit of this prayer that the extended hand hangs suspended in midair. The spirit of this prayer has been retained in Ukrainian Christianity. There is no need to illustrate this with observations and experiences from my own youth, which I spent among the lower strata of our nation—the Ukrainian peasantry. What surprised me was that the feeling expressed in St. Ephraem's prayer has not died even among those Ukrainian intellectuals who lived

---

<sup>9</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*. "Lavrentievskaja letopis'," I: *Povest' vremennykh let*, 2nd ed. (Leningrad, 1926; reprint: Moscow, 1962), col. 110.

<sup>10</sup> Yosyf Slipyj (1892-1984), Patriarch of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Metropolitan of Galicia (1944-1984), imprisoned by the Soviets from 1945 to 1963. Upon his release to the West owing to the efforts of Pope John XXIII and President John F. Kennedy, he was elevated to the rank of cardinal in 1965.

<sup>11</sup> Myroslav Ivan Liubachivsky (1914- ), head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as Archbishop Major since 1984, elevated to the rank of cardinal in 1985.

<sup>12</sup> Saint Ephraem Syrus (Ephraim the Syrian) (c. 306-373), the most celebrated writer among the Syrian Fathers, the author of hymns, homilies, and biblical commentaries. His feast day is June 18 in the west, January 28 (February 10 o.s.) in the Eastern Church.

through two wars, revolutions, and the numerous fashionable strident slogans of our age. Let the late well-known Ukrainian writer Yevhen Malaniuk<sup>13</sup> serve as testimony to this fact. In 1967, in his 70th year, Yevhen Malaniuk visited Rome for the first time in his life and was the guest of Cardinal Slipyj. He stayed at the Ukrainian Catholic University and took a special interest in the young people attending the Ukrainian Minor Pontifical Seminary staffed by the Salesian Fathers. At the invitation of the seminary faculty, he even took part in examining the school's graduating class. He rejoiced at all he saw and experienced in "Ukrainian Rome." At that time he was working on a historical novel based on the traditions of Kievan Christianity. Together we searched for such archaic names in the ecclesiastical lexicon as *zhezl* [scepter], *perst* [finger], *posokh* [staff]. Yevhen Malaniuk loved the "literary" language of the Ukrainian Church, calling it "Old Ukrainian." He also prayed in this language. A year later he died without completing his novel. What surprised me was that after what was really no more than a chance meeting in Rome, as a result of which we enjoyed several very interesting conversations, Yevhen Malaniuk sent me a letter with a number of questions and complaints. He asked if such beautiful Ukrainian religious services as vespers and matins were held anywhere in the United States. Unfortunately, I was unable to supply him with this information, because I knew very little about the life of the Ukrainian community in a land that was foreign to me, even though I was well aware that these services were becoming increasingly rare in our churches. I was, however, able to respond to one of the late poet's questions, and it was a request that moved me greatly. He had asked: "Where can I find the complete text of the prayer that begins with the words, 'Lord and Master of my life...,' because that is an extraordinarily profound prayer."

---

<sup>13</sup> Yevhen Malaniuk (1897-1968), a noted poet, essayist, and literary critic. Born in the Kherson region of Ukraine, which was part of the Russian Empire before the Revolution, Malaniuk served as a captain in the Army of the Ukrainian National Republic (1917-1920) in the war for Ukrainian independence and later lived as a political émigré in Czechoslovakia and Poland. A member of the so-called "Visnyk group" during the interwar period, he attained prominence as a leading Ukrainian poet writing outside Soviet Ukraine. He emigrated to the United States in 1949 and died in New York.

That is how a Ukrainian believer expresses his inner religious feelings. The initial imprint of Ukrainian Christianity with its emphasis on repentance, forgiveness, and humility, remains engraved on his soul...

In the hand extended in reconciliation and forgiveness, whoever might extend it—be it a church leader or a simple believer, a righteous man or a sinner—I see an expression of living Christian piety.

\*

In 1947, the "Moskovskaia patriarkhiia" Publishing House in Moscow issued a large collection entitled *Patriarkh Sergei i ego dukhovnoe nasledstvo*.<sup>14</sup> Most noteworthy in the volume is a long article by associate professor (docent) of the Moscow Theological Academy A. V. Vedernikov, "The Spiritual Legacy of His Beatitude Patriarch Sergei" (pp. 271-411). In it the author writes: "The establishment of the patriarchate at the end of 1917 was of enormous significance to our Church." A. V. Vedernikov continues with great circumspection, because he is writing of Tikhon,<sup>15</sup> the first patriarch under the Soviet regime:

Without entering into the details of the events of that period, which is really not that far removed from our own time, it is easy to understand that during the age of the violent collapse of social relations in our country only Patriarch Tikhon was able to preserve the unity of the Orthodox Church, and this constitutes his principal historical contribution. *Having established the basis for the Church's canonically correct relationship to*

---

<sup>14</sup> Reviewed by A. P. Kuznetskiy in *Zhurnal Moskovskoi patriarkhii*, 1947, No. 4, pp. 41-45.

<sup>15</sup> Tikhon (Vasiliy Belavin, 1866-1925) was elected Patriarch of Moscow in 1917 after patriarchal leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church was restored under Soviet government. In 1923, after spending time in custody for opposing the Soviet government's measures against the Church, Tikhon renounced his former views and concluded that the faithful owed secular obedience to the new regime as the divinely sanctioned power in Russia.

*Soviet power, he left the continuation and further development of this matter to his successors.*<sup>16</sup>

It bears mentioning that Tikhon, the founder of the Moscow Patriarchate, was persecuted, imprisoned, and tortured by the atheistic Bolshevik regime and ultimately forced to resign in favor of the compliant Sergei,<sup>17</sup> who first became *locum tenens* [*mestobliustitel'*] of the patriarchal see and only later patriarch. One can only admire the author's adroitness in managing to praise Patriarch Sergei while ingeniously avoiding the issue of "the Church's relationship to Soviet power," even going so far as to call this relationship "canonical." The author of the article continues: "The greatest contribution to the establishment of correct [!] relations between the Church and the Soviet state [he no longer speaks of "power," but of the "state"—i.e., the empire] was made by Patriarch Sergei... The activity of Patriarch Sergei's successor [i.e., Patriarch Alexei,<sup>18</sup> to whom a great deal of space is devoted in this same volume published by "Moskovskaia Patriarkhiia"] is bound to produce a new meaning, a new sense, which the history of the Church will assess in due time."<sup>19</sup>

Thus, in the eyes of this admirer of patriarchs Sergei and Alexei, the establishment of the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Soviet atheistic regime is something new which history will judge in the future. Yet, without waiting for history's judgment, the author proceeds to eulogize this "new meaning":

---

<sup>16</sup> Vedernikov, "Dukhovnoe nasledie sviateishego Patriarkha Sergiia..." in *Patriarkh Sergei i ego dukhovnoe nasledstvo* [Patriarch Sergei and His Spiritual Legacy], p. 311.

<sup>17</sup> Sergei (Ivan Stragorodskiy, 1867-1944) headed the Moscow Patriarchate as *locum tenens* from 1925 until 1943, when Stalin gave the Russian Orthodox Church permission to choose a patriarch again and Sergei was elected to the position. In return for a declaration of loyalty, he achieved the recognition of the Russian Orthodox Church, its faith, its canonical organization and leadership, as compatible with the Soviet order.

<sup>18</sup> Alexei (Sergei Symanskiy, 1877-1971), Metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod (1933-1945), was elected Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1945.

<sup>19</sup> Vedernikov, p. 311.

But even now, based on our historical experience [?], we can conclude that the significance of the patriarchy for our time is defined primarily by the Church's new tasks in the new conditions of its historical existence. However, both these conditions and the current tasks of the Church are inseparably linked with the fate of our Fatherland.<sup>20</sup>

It is worthwhile to draw attention to the way in which the author justifies the close links of the Russian Orthodox Church with the Bolshevik regime ("Soviet power," "the Soviet state," "our Fatherland").

a) Resorting to the method of dialectical materialism (how else?), A. V. Vedernikov describes the tasks of the Church as dictated by the "new conditions of [the Church's] historical existence." It is true that historical conditions change, but the task of the Christian Church is immutable. It is determined not by changing conditions, but by Christ's commandment: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Matthew 28, 18-20). The tasks of the Church are not subject to the conditions of "historical existence," as the Marxists claim. These tasks are everlasting, because they bear the indelible mark of the eternal. And these tasks of the Christian Church emanate not from the changing conditions in the historical life of nations, but from the commission of the founder of the Church, the source and holder of all power, immutable and eternal.

b) A. V. Vedernikov's assertion that the tasks of the Church are inseparably linked with the fate of the "Fatherland" smacks of Russian great-power chauvinism. This assertion has no basis in the Gospel; it is purely political. It reduces the Church to the role of a mere instrument of political currents. The history of Russian Orthodoxy is an unbroken chain of fatal "inseparability" and subordination to political currents.

A. V. Vedernikov illustrates this history; he is aware of all the contradictions. But at the same time, as a champion of Russian great-power politics and as a Russian patriot, he dares not name

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., pp. 311-312.



those who caused this evil, for example, Peter I or Catherine II—the builders of the empire, of the "Fatherland." He dares not criticize them, even though he cites the words of the saintly Bishop Teofan (end of the 19th century) to depict the state of Russian Orthodoxy under Peter:

Wrong was he who disunited and destroyed the ancient good union of the members of the Church. What do we lack? One of our greatest evils is the policelike and despotic cast of our church affairs. It has enveloped everybody and frozen all with arctic cold, and life has come to a halt. Take a good look: there are no fathers in our Church, but something terrible—spies and judges...<sup>21</sup>

A. V. Vedernikov goes on to express his agreement with Bishop Teofan: "That is how a champion of piety describes the pernicious influence on church life of state guardianship."

Is the author aware that in writing this he has depicted not only the state of Russian Orthodoxy in past centuries, but also the true condition of the Russian Orthodox Church in his own time, as well as the future fate of this Church, in which one of the greatest evils is also the "policelike and despotic cast of Church affairs [...] which has enveloped everybody and frozen all with arctic cold, and life has come to a halt"? Is the author aware that by calling the state's guardianship over Church affairs pernicious, he has inadvertently told the truth about the "new meaning" of the relationship between the Church and the State established by Patriarch Alexei and Stalin?

I am not surprised that, having made a muddle of his account of Russian Christianity and its tragic (yes, tragic, because I sympathize with Russian Christian believers) fate, A. V. Vedernikov casts his gaze into the ancient past, to the beginnings of Christianity in the Kievan realm. He writes with longing and sorrow:

But that is not how it was in ancient Rus'. In the time of St. Volodymyr, that good union was only beginning to become established and formed in the struggle against paganism. Having received from the Greeks a fully formed hierarchy headed by a single metropolitan, the Church from the outset

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 313.

assumed the role of a strict but compassionate teacher in the princely realm of Rus'. It taught its rulers to govern their people in accordance with God's truth, and among the people it cared for the beggars, the sick and poor, fought against slavery, which was alien to the spirit of Orthodoxy, improved family relations, spread literacy and enlightenment—in short, it was the dispenser of those spiritual gifts without which the good union of the members of the Church could not have been complete and strong.<sup>22</sup>

I need add nothing more to this description of Kievan Christianity by a Russian patriot and extoller of the Russian patriarchs Sergei and Alexei for having established an inseparable and fatal union with Stalin and the Bolshevik atheistic regime, a union that remains indissoluble to this day. The author's account is quite accurate. He failed to note—or more likely did not want to admit—only one thing: that the above description applies to Ukrainian Christianity and to ancient Ukrainian Orthodoxy! Whereas, it is the Russian bishop, Teofan, whom he quotes, who has supplied a true picture of Russian Christianity in the past and in the present.

As I reflected on the tragedy of Russian Christianity, a tragedy like Dante's hell in which Ukrainian Christianity is sharing, I originally perceived the root of this spiritual *imponderabile* in the syncretism of the concepts of truth and power and their concretization in Russian Orthodoxy. But I *see* and would wish for another element to be part of this *imponderabile*, part of this something that is incapable of being examined and of being measured, but is perhaps the most important of all the *imponderabilia*. I find it in the concept of *kenosis*.

The event that made me consider this concept was a discussion between two priests in Vienna in 1947—that is, at about the time of the publication of the article cited above, which, though disguised as a scholarly study, is no more than a tribute to patriarchs Sergei and Alexei for the purpose of validating the inseparable union between the Moscow Patriarchate and the atheistic Bolshevik regime. In fact, it was this union that was the subject of the discussion. I will not name the two clergymen, except to say that one was a priest of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the other, a priest of the Moscow

---

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 313-314.

Patriarchate, a Russian, and a man with a higher theological education. To the Ukrainian priest's question how this alliance between Patriarch Alexei and Stalin, so demeaning to the Christian Church and so incomprehensible to every Christian, was to be interpreted, the Russian priest responded: "Do you know what 'kenosis' is? We, Russian Christians, understand it to mean that the Church must be prepared to bow even to Satan if the good of the Church demands it." I need not explain that the two clergymen did not reach agreement on this question. What became clear, however, was that the concept of *kenosis* was yet another characteristic feature of the disparity between the two forms of Christianity, the two forms of Orthodoxy—Ukrainian and Russian.

What then is *kenosis*? Theological exegetists have devoted numerous volumes to the elucidation of the meaning of this term in an attempt to interpret the words of Apostle Paul: "Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave..." (Philippians 2: 5-7).

It is not my purpose to join the linguistic dispute about whether the Ukrainian translation of the Greek *eavton ekenozen*, the Latin *semetipsum exinanivit*, or the Old Church Slavonic *umalyl sebe* is correct, because there are those who translate this phrase as "diminished himself."

I use the term as it is given in the translation of the New Testament by Panteleimon Kulish and Ivan Puliui<sup>23</sup> and the Liturgical Commission headed by the late Patriarch Josyf Slipyj.<sup>24</sup> Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, who was extremely well versed in classical languages, also translated this concept as "diminished himself" [*umalyv sebe*] when in 1942 he tried to explain to his priests the thoughts that St. Paul expressed in his Letter to the Philippians, calling this epistle "an exceptionally profound and inspired teaching..."<sup>25</sup>

Metropolitan Sheptytsky's interpretation of this passage is even more significant for Ukrainian Christians in that it was offered by a

<sup>23</sup> *Sviate pys'mo Novoho Zavitu movoiu rus'ko-ukraïns'koiu* (Vienna, 1913), p. 342.

<sup>24</sup> *Chytannia Apostol's'ki* (Rome, 1969), p. 346.

<sup>25</sup> "Naimohutnishyi orudnyk dushpastyrs'koï pratsi," *L'vivs'ki Arkhieparkhal'ni Vidomosti*, R. Lu, Lviv, December 1942, pp. 224-229.

pastor of a flock whose historical existence is profoundly marked by *kenosis* —the diminishment of self, and reached its apogee in the confession of faith and martyrdom. Metropolitan Sheptytsky was aware of all the theological controversies when he wrote: "Citing the example of Christ, [Paul] called the submissiveness of Christ 'kenosis' and this word has plagued theologians for nearly 2,000 years and is the subject of a large theological literature..." Yet, he continued, "despite all the difficulties, it is worthwhile to give into the temptation [?] of undertaking to explain this passage..."<sup>26</sup>

In order to broaden the meaning of the concept of *kenosis*, the Metropolitan discusses "submissiveness"—*tapinosis*, "abasement," "obedience," but none of these terms are adequate to express the whole meaning or to explain the mystery, because *kenosis* is something more. Attempting to explain the first part of St. Paul's sentence, "Jesus [...] did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped" (Philippians 2: 6), the Metropolitan states:

St. Paul could have used this unusual form of expression [...], to force us to consider in depth the immeasurably profound sense of Christ's *diminishment and submissiveness* [...]; he sought his understanding of the *submissiveness of Divine Wisdom* through long prayer-filled endeavors. And what he says allows us to understand at least some of the fathomless profundities of God's truth that mark all that applies to the Divine Persons...<sup>27</sup>

Metropolitan Sheptytsky's explanation is as profound in the theological sense as the text of St. Paul, which is the subject of the lesson. As I reflect on the thoughts of St. Paul and their interpretation by Metropolitan Andrei, it seems to me that both see the enigma of Christ's *kenosis* in the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, or, more precisely, in the humanity of Christ. Thus the Metropolitan continues:

Christ does not believe that He must necessarily cling to His Divine nature to such a degree that He may not abandon it, renounce it, or sacrifice it. And so He made this sacrifice; He accepted this abasement and took the form of a slave. But

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., pp. 226, 224.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 227.

being God, He could not renounce His Divine nature, and so He renounced only what He could renounce. Choosing the path of sacrifice, submissiveness, diminishment, renunciation, He could not cast off His Divine nature, but He could surrender Divine glory in heaven and become a man..., and having taken the form of a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even unto death on a cross... His hunger for sacrifice and submissiveness was such that [...] He did not cease seeking out sacrifice, diminishing himself, renouncing everything, humbling himself, becoming obedient unto death, that is, He went as far in His submission as is possible and conceivable. Thus the state of submissiveness that the Apostle requires of believers is *no ordinary form of humbling oneself, but a way of life that penetrates to the very depths of the soul and empties it of all self-love, cleanses it, compels it to sacrifice, to renunciation of self; it does not allow the soul to rest, but forces it to go as far as it can go ...*<sup>28</sup>

The conclusion I have reached, emphasizing the most important passage in the above quotation, is that *kenosis* in the Christian sense is the course that, like Christ, who said of Himself "I am the way" (John 14: 6), every Christian individual and Christ's Church must follow. *Kenosis* is also the way of life that every believer and the Christian Church must follow—the way of renunciation, sacrifice, and of carrying the cross.

*How much can one renounce?* Metropolitan Sheptytsky gives only a general answer: as much as "is *possible and conceivable* " and "as far as [the soul] *can* go."

From this general response to the question of "*how far?*" , we sense that Metropolitan Andrei set a limit beyond which neither an individual nor those who head the Christian Church and its constituent parts may go. This limit, in the Metropolitan's words, is defined by the terms "possible," "conceivable," and "can." In order to understand what the Metropolitan had in mind when he used these concepts, we need to enter into his reasoning. As I mentioned above, he was a scholar of classical languages, a perceptive philosopher, theologian, and legal thinker. It is safe to assume that when elucidating Biblical texts, Metropolitan Sheptytsky thought in

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

terms of their original languages and conveyed their conventional and well-known concepts in their Ukrainian counterparts.

As the Metropolitan uses it, the concept of "possible" [*mozhlyve*] is a translation of the Latin *possibile* from Scholastic philosophy. His use of the term "conceivable" [*myslyme*] comes from *intelligibile* and *rationabile* from this same philosophy. And the verb "can" [*mozhna*] is from the Latin *licitum*, a defined concept known in canon law and in Christian moral theology. Continuing the Metropolitan's line of reasoning, it is possible to define the limits of *kenosis*—diminishment and renunciation—more precisely. In the sphere of Christian philosophy and theology, this limit, beyond which the Church may not go, lies where it would have to renounce its divinity and its mission. In canon law, and especially in moral theology, the boundary lies where an individual breaks God's commandments. Diminution and renunciation may never be transformed into a betrayal of divinity and humanity in the world.

The most revealing reply to the question of where the limits of diminishment and renunciation lie, i.e., the boundary that may not be crossed without betraying divinity and humanity, is provided by the New Testament in the dramatic dialogue between Christ and His tempter, the Devil (Matthew 4: 1-11; Luke 4: 2-14). To conclude my reflections on the meaning of the concept of *kenosis*, which, in my opinion, characterizes the fundamental difference between Ukrainian and Russian Christianity, I will cite the most significant questions and answers in this dialogue. The devil begins each of the three temptations with the words, "If you are the Son of God," inviting Christ to make use of the power that He derives from His divine nature. Hence the first temptation: "Command these stones to become loaves of bread." This temptation, to which the devil and his earthly servants resort in our day as well, speaks to human poverty, to man's thirst and hunger...

And Christ answers: "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone...!'" This response has inspired writers even in our own time as in the case of Vladimir Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*.<sup>29</sup> Human poverty may not serve as justification for the transformation of the concept of diminishment into a betrayal of divinity and humanity.

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ne khlebom edinyim* (Moscow, 1956; English transl., 1957).

How perfidious the second temptation is: "throw yourself down"—commit suicide, renouncing the consciousness of your own self.

The climactic temptation is the third: "All [the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them] I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me."

Christ's response is firm and inarguable: "Begone, Satan!" The boundary that may not be crossed in *kenosis* lies where stands the frontier post bearing the sign: "Here begins the *suicide* of divinity and humanity! Here begins the *worship of Satan!*"

The pages of the rich history of the Churches of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples, the Kievan and Moscow Churches, are open to scholars and preserved in innumerable volumes. The fate of the Christian Church among the Ukrainian and Russian peoples in our time also lies exposed to the view of contemporary observers. When analyzing the meaning of *kenosis*, of this *imponderabile* in the existence of the Christian Church, I was guided by only one desire—the desire that "others see" the truth, that they perceive where the demarcation line between the two forms of Orthodoxy lies, what constitutes the difference between them. I hope that they, too, become aware of the significance of Christ's command, "*Begone, Satan!*"

\*

As the motto for my reflections on the Millennium of Kievan Christianity, I chose the Biblical text: "Put out into the deep." Guided by it, I encountered a question that belongs to the realm of the psychology of religion—namely, what was the mentality of a baptized individual in the first centuries of Christianity, what were its characteristic features, what of this has survived through the centuries. Finding and understanding the actual beginnings of this consciousness would help us on the occasion of this momentous anniversary to surmount what is occurring on the surface and to set a course of "conciliation and unification," as Metropolitan Sheptytsky called it, on the threshold of the second millennium of Ukrainian Christianity.

In defiance of all the breakers on the surface, I see that deep in the souls of Ukrainian believers Christian consciousness has been preserved in its pristine state. All the upheavals, all the storms, all the

conflicts took place on the surface of Christian life; they were conflicts at the top between those who exercised power, be it in the Church, in the community, or in the nation. It is true that they also harnessed typical power-loving individuals and our own "subservient retainers," who became victims of these historical currents. Regimes changed, borders rent the single organism of our people, but the temples of God and the holy places remained unchanged, just as the consciousness of belonging to the one faith of our ancestors has remained unchanged even until today. We see evidence of this consciousness in the preservation of the oldest monuments of Kievan Christianity. I leave the questions that concern their originality for others to decide. My only interest is how they depict the Christianity which they fashioned.

As I read the *Collection of Sviatoslav* of 1076,<sup>30</sup> I find a vivid portrayal of life on the banks of the Dnieper: "For a horse, the bridle is a steer and a brake, while for a virtuous man there is the learning derived from books. A boat cannot be made without nails, or a virtuous man without the learning obtained from books; [...] a warrior's beauty is in his armor, a boat's in its sails, and that of a virtuous man in the reading of books."<sup>31</sup>

Against the background of the Ukrainian landscape with horsemen and boats on the Dnieper, the author of the *Collection* inserts his own thoughts among the translations from Greek materials that are included in the work. He praises "the learning obtained from books" and education, because "My brothers, the reading of books is good, especially for every Christian..."<sup>32</sup>

Though the above lines are only excerpts from an eight-page-long admonition on the importance of obtaining learning from the reading of books, they testify to the importance of the role of this learning in Kiev: it enlightened instead of "stupefying" as the foes of Christianity claim.

---

<sup>30</sup> *Izbornyk Sviatoslava*. A collection of numerous short works intended for the layman that include "instructions," explanations of difficult passages from the Scriptures, a story, collections of maxims, quotations, and proverbs, and other such texts.

<sup>31</sup> *Izbornik 1076 goda* (Moscow, 1965), p. 153-154 (from the "Word of a Monk on the Reading of Books," pp. 151-158).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151.



Unfortunately, the provenance and contents of Sviatoslav's *Collection* of 1076 has been of least interest to the scholars who researched this literary monument.<sup>33</sup> In preparing its latest edition of the work, Moscow was also not particularly interested in its contents, confining itself mostly to such assertions as "The class orientation of the *Collection*, which defended the interests of the ruling classes of feudal society, was underscored by..."<sup>34</sup>

Moscow's aim in publishing this new edition of the work with many commentaries and the results of paleographic and photographic studies is quite different. This is openly admitted in the foreword: "On the whole, the decision to publish this *Collection* was made because of its exceptional importance as one of the most ancient examples of Russian language and literature."<sup>35</sup> True to their purpose, the publishers endeavor to prove that Sviatoslav's *Collection* is an example of the Russian language. All the commentaries are written in this spirit, but insofar as the editors of the volume are unable to deny the work's Kievan provenance and the contemporary character of the Old Ukrainian language, they describe this linguistic phenomenon as a dialect.<sup>36</sup> *Nil novi sub sole*, the ancient Romans used to say. We agree, there is indeed nothing new under the sun, and we might also add that the Moscow edition of Sviatoslav's *Collection* of 1076 is yet another proof of this dictum.

But allow me to return to the question of religious consciousness. The anonymous compiler of the *Collection* uses various words and images to portray the religious consciousness of his contemporaries:<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> In his mention of the *Collection* of 1076 in the *Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva v dvox tomax* (Munich-New York, 1949), Vol. I: Book 2, p. 734, L. Bilets'ky states that "it may also contain local elements." The work receives more attention in the second part of the same encyclopedia (Paris-New York, 1955- , Vol. II: Book 3, p. 857), where, in addition to its various names—Collection of Sviatoslav, Shcherbatov Collection, Hermitage Collection—we learn that it was "composed in Kiev. [...] Contains various moral admonitions and interpretations of the Scriptures."

<sup>34</sup> *Izbornik 1076 goda*, p. 26.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>36</sup> Cf., for example, *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 207-273.

— Worship the cross of Christ with faith, because on it the Lord earned salvation for all people;

— Honor with faith the icon of Christ and of His Immaculate Mother, and of all the Saints, and speak to them in prayer with love as if you were addressing them directly;

— Hold fear of God in your heart at all times, remembering that God is with you here: in every place, wherever you walk or sit;

— Seek the simplest in all—in food, in clothing, and do not be ashamed of poverty! After all, most of this world exists in poverty;

— Adorn yourself with truth and try to speak the truth to everyone! Do not make yourself become a witness to falsehood because you fear a person!

— It is better for a man to be hated for benefiting from the truth than, marred by hypocrisy, to be loved;

— Be gentle to every person—to those older than you and to those smaller than you; it is a hypocritical gentleness that fears the great and injures the small;

— And gentleness means not to injure anyone, either by word, or deed, or your orders...<sup>38</sup>

The compiler of Sviatoslav's *Collection* concludes his teaching as follows:

The conclusion from what had been said previously: Love God with your whole soul... And be virtuous and truthful, humble, kindhearted, and obedient! Bowing low, raise your mind to heaven! Adore God and be courteous to people! Give comfort to the afflicted! Be patient in misfortune and misery! Be generous and merciful, a provider to beggars, hospitable to foreigners, sorrowful because of sin and joyous in God... Do not judge every man. Be a defender of the injured, and be not a hypocrite.<sup>39</sup>

For the compiler of the *Collection*, this admonition is founded on baptism and new birth, and he gives an incomparable definition of a

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., pp. 208-215.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., pp. 270-273.

pure spring water of our ancient Christianity, and to gaze into its rebirth, more glorious and pristine than ever—such is the purpose of the celebration of this historical jubilee.

b) What is our perception of the Church? To begin with, the notion of the "church" has entered into our consciousness as something quite concrete. First and foremost, it is the temple of God. "Think of the Church," writes the compiler of Sviatoslav's *Collection*, "as heaven on earth, as the altar of the Almighty, and of his servants as God's angels. Therefore, stand in church in fear, as you would in the heavens, as you would before the eyes of God Himself. And when you leave, do not forget what happened there and what you heard there."<sup>42</sup> The Church is also something spiritual and sacramental: "We will come, I and the Father, and create a presence in it so that man becomes God's spiritual temple... The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit live and walk in this temple."<sup>43</sup> This concept of the Church is eastern. This is an allusion to the Church as the Sacred Body of Christ. Of course, the notion of the Church as an institution has also entered into the Christian consciousness of Ukrainians. Though not clearly defined, it is always concrete. The existence or concreteness of the Church as an institution was always linked with those who were directly involved in officiating at services; there were the clergy, the presbyters-priests, the monastic brotherhood, the bishops and the metropolitans.

Metropolitan Ilarion also writes of "faith" and the "Church" in his *Sermon*. He prays: "Have mercy upon us and forgive us, so that by Your grace we shall be led in unity of faith," and he asks God to "make Your Church grow."<sup>44</sup> Elated by the growth of Christ's Church, he proclaims: "the cross sanctifies the cities and there are pastors of the spiritual flocks of Christ; bishops, presbyters, and deacons offer the bloodless sacrifice."<sup>45</sup>

Ukrainian Christianity has always embraced the notion that all these things combined—the temple of God, the place where the Almighty is worshiped, the people who pray there, those who offer

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., pp. 172-173.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 494.

<sup>44</sup> [Ya. Levyts'kyi], *Pershi ukrains'ki propovidnyky i yikh tvory*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1973; Editiones Universitatis Catholicae Ucrainorum S. Clementis Papae, vol. 35), p. 118.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

the Bloodless Sacrifice in the various clerical ranks led by bishops and metropolitans—that all these things constitute their own very concrete and visible Christian Church, which professes the true faith of Christ. And our ancestors were aware that the Greeks and Romans had a similar Churches of their own. Consciousness of the local nature of the Church predominated, the notion of universality was secondary.

c) One could write a voluminous work on the subject of "the Holy Place" in the consciousness of the Ukrainian Christian. All Christian nations have many such places. And the Ukrainian land and Ukrainian people also have them. They include the holy temples of God.

When you pass through the doors of the church think that you are entering the gates of heaven... Stand in wonder and awe and observe all that is happening with faith, with the eyes of your body and of your soul. Then you, too, will abandon your earthly thoughts and look toward future blessings. When you see Christ being pierced in sacrifice to the Father for the whole world, what else can you think being yourself mortal? Lift your arms high and say: glory to Your boundless love of man, Christ, O Lord...<sup>46</sup>

Equally sacred are our cemeteries, the relics of the righteous, our monasteries with their ancient icons... They are all alive and sacred in the consciousness of the Ukrainian Christian regardless of their historical fate. Holy places in Ukraine have been destroyed and restored, burglarized, transformed into warehouses, clubs, or museums of atheism. Yet they have remained our own sacred places, places to which Ukrainian believers have made pilgrimages in the past and continue to do so today, no matter what formal designation they bear—Orthodox, Catholic, Uniate, or Evangelical... The stamp on their spirit is indelible. "Children of the Gospel—Christ's good tidings, the sons and daughters of the resurrection, the successors of future life in Christ Jesus."

Sacred and indestructible in the souls of Ukrainian Christians are Kiev's Cathedral of St. Sophia, Lviv's Cathedral of St. George, the Kievan Monastery of the Caves and Pochaiv Monastery, Zarvany-

---

<sup>46</sup> *Izbornik 1076 goda*, pp. 259-260.

tsia and Hoshiv, Zhyrovytsi<sup>47</sup> and Hrushiv.<sup>48</sup> The Ukrainian land has become holy because it is covered with the precious pearls of holy places. But most holy is the land where Jesus was born, preached, died on the cross, and resurrected. This land became holy par excellence. It is to the Holy Land that the first Ukrainian pilgrim, Danylo, journeyed to pray for his native land.<sup>49</sup> In the spirit of this ancient Christian consciousness, the Metropolitan of Galicia, the Blessed Andrei Sheptytsky organized a pilgrimage of his flock to the Holy Land in 1906. A record of this pilgrimage, entitled *How Rus' Followed in the Footsteps of Danylo*,<sup>50</sup> was published in commemoration of the event. I mention this, because this record was one of my first readers and it moulded my soul in childhood. It was from this account that I began to understand that Danylo the Pilgrim, a hegumen and a native of the Chernihiv region who lived in the 11-12th centuries, was an ancestor of mine and that Rus' was my native Ukrainian land.

As I returned to the sources of our Ukrainian Christian identity, I saw before me the past and present of the Ukrainian Church on its course of historical pilgrimage, and on the horizon there appeared the signs of its renewal and glorious rise. Emerging from the cradle of Christianity in the Christian East, it matured into a universal Church. And even though it remains externally rent in its hierarchical structure and enslaved in its native land, in the consciousness of its faithful it is the *one true Church—sacred, universal, and apostolic*. It is wounded, because it carries the wounds of its historic past, brilliant and tragic at the same time. But it is not dead. It is alive because its soul is eternal.

---

<sup>47</sup> The latter three localities are sites of holy shrines containing miraculous icons to the Holy Virgin and are famous as places of numerous pilgrimages in the past.

<sup>48</sup> In the past several years, Hrushiv has become known as the site of the appearance of the Holy Virgin to a group of local children.

<sup>49</sup> Hegumen Danylo led a large pilgrimage from Kievan Rus' to Palestine between 1106 and 1108. His account of the journey, known variously as *Khozhdenniie, Strannyk, Palomnyk, Skazanie*, was one of the most popular works of Kievan literature and is preserved in more than 90 copies made between the 15th and 19th century. See *Khozhdenniie igumena Daniila v sviatuiu zemliu in Pravoslavnyi Palestinskiy Sbornik*, 3, 9. St. Petersburg, 1885.

<sup>50</sup> *Yak to Rus' khodyla slidamy Danyla*.

At the dawn of its pilgrimage into the second Millennium of its existence, I see its glorious Transfiguration, and I pray for it to the Lord in the words of Metropolitan Ilarion:

O God, our Lord and Master..., give us not into the hands of others, so that Your city not be known as the city of captives and Your people as strangers in a land that is not their own..., bestow Your mercy on Your people, drive out the invaders, establish peace, and put down the lands that are hostile to us,... make joyous our cities, make Your Church grow, protect Your inheritors. Those at slave labor, held captive, in exile..., in prisons, hungry and thirsty—have mercy on all of them and grant them consolation... Have mercy on us and forgive us, so that ... united in our faith, we may all merrily and joyously glorify You...<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> *Pershi ukrains'ki propovidnyky*, pp. 116-118.